

ECCLESIA DEI DELFT



Vatican II: its Hijack, its Spirit and the Consequences

Member of the
Foederatio Internationalis Una Voce



2020, Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary

Contents

Contents.....	2
Vatican II: its Hijack, its Spirit and the Consequences	3
Introduction.....	3
‘ <i>Hijack of the Council</i> ’, when and by whom?.....	4
illegal intervention.....	4
Rebellious Spirit	4
Breaking the rule and the <i>chain of illegalities</i>	6
‘ <i>A fait accompli</i> ’ and the Holy Spirit.....	8
Fait Accompli.....	8
Admission of the <i>Chain of Illegalities and the Hijack</i>	8
Betrayal.....	8
Victory.....	10
The Council: Independently and Autonomously?.....	11
Anti-Roman Resentment	11
Spirit of Lie.....	12
Paradoxical Outcome and the Spirit of the Council.....	13
Restoration by Pope John XXIII.....	14
Disturbed Balance.....	14
Intervention by Pope John XXIII.....	14
Source of the Ambiguities	15
The Hermeneutic of Vatican II.....	15
Opening Address of Pope John XXIII.....	15
The double Tongue of the ‘ <i>Spirit of the Council</i> ’	16
False and Erroneous Interpretation of the Ambiguities.....	17
Gravity of the Falsification of the Council.....	18
Continuity, Discontinuity versus the Hermeneutic of the Church.....	19
Evaluation	20
Consequences of the Hijack.....	20
Resolutions	20
Its Supernatural Character.....	21
The stakes are too high to simply ignore the ongoing catastrophe	22

Vatican II: its Hijack, its Spirit and the Consequences

Ir. Jack P. Oostveen MSc Eng.

Dominic Doyle MSc

Introduction

In his 2019 book “*Infiltration, the plot to destroy the Church from within*” [1] Dr. Taylor Marshall describes how plots against the Church have affected it. Without succumbing to imaginary conspiracy theories, it can be said with certainty that the existence of these plots by the Alta Vendita of the Carbonari, Secret Societies and Communist Infiltration are historically documented. It is therefore correct to consider these plots, although we do not know exactly how and by whom they have been perpetrated within the Church.

However, who are the real perpetrators, who are naïve followers or even well-meaning victims, this is not always clear. Real perpetrators will always deny that they are as such and normally they work in the shadows behind the scenes, creating false arguments and narratives with the intention to convince naïve followers and well-meaning victims of doing the dirty work and therefore it is not easy to recognize them. Furthermore, they falsely accuse those who are opposed to their opinions and objectives of being the source of ‘*confusion, bitterness in human relations and fratricidal wars*’ that they themselves had created.

Therefore, as Mgr. Athanasius Schneider wrote in the foreword to this book that it “*is a significant contribution to the work of raising awareness of the situation and taking preventive actions and countermeasures in future. That it helps many in the Church to wake up.*”

However on page 127 writing in the chapter entitled “*Vatican II – Modernism on Parade?*”, Dr. Marshall was rather concise in his analysis by suggesting that “*Devout Catholics often defend Vatican II by saying that it was ‘hijacked’, and that is certainly the case, but the question is when, and by whom?*”. Is it correct to suggest that the ‘*hijack of the Council*’ is the way by which a devout Catholic defends Vatican II, especially if one leaves open answers to the questions about when and by whom, and what is more significant Dr. Marshall fails to mention the most important aspect: the consequences of such a hijack [2, 3, 4]?

Here, it would be clear that all expressions of ‘*confusion*’, ‘*bitterness in human relations*’, ‘*fratricidal wars and polemics*’ in the Church are symptoms arising from the rebellion against the

-
- 1 “*Infiltration, The plot to destroy the church from within*”. Crisis publications 2019, Taylor R. Marshall, ISBN 9781622828463;
 - 2 “*Fruits of Vatican I, A Wilfull Ignorance of an Ongoing Catastrophe?*” (Part 1 – Observational Analysis), Jack P. Oostveen and David L. Sonnier (2018), [<http://www.ecclesiadei.nl/docs/Fruits-of-Vatican-II-part-1.htm>];
 - 3 “*Fruits of Vatican I, a Renewal in Unity with and in Accordance to the Doctrine or False Interpretations?*” (Part 2 – Process Analysis), Jack P. Oostveen and David L. Sonnier (2018), [<http://www.ecclesiadei.nl/docs/Fruits-of-Vatican-II-part-2.htm>];
 - 4 “*Vatican II, a Council in Threefold?*”, Jack P. Oostveen and David L. Sonnier (2019) [<https://www.ecclesiadei.nl/docs/threefold.html>];

Figure 1; Cardinals Liénart (standing) and Frings (first left) asking for a delay of the voting till next Tuesday [11]

Holy Spirit in general [5], but especially from the *'hijack of the Council'* through a chain of irregularities in its *'first hour'*, which due to the subsequent admission by the Pope concerns the entire Church. The consequences of this are reflected in the Council and its documents, but also in the entire ecclesiastical life from the Council to the actuality of the present.

This paper shows the need to go into some details of the *'hijack of the Council'* and its consequences. Such an analysis is essential for a better understanding of the true hermeneutic of Vatican II.

'Hijack of the Council', when and by whom?

illegal intervention

The success of the efforts by the liberals produced a *paradoxical outcome* for Vatican II: the preparatory work that usually directs the debates, marks the outlook and foreshadows the results of a council, was nullified and rejected from the first session onwards while successive spirits and tendencies followed one after another. This departure from the original plan did not happen as a result from a decision made by the council itself, operating within its duly established rules, but by an illegal act of Cardinal Liénart (Lille/Rijsel). It was on October the 13th, 1962, during the first working session that Cardinal Liénart broke with the Council's legal framework by calling for a delay of the foreseen voting by the Fathers on the make up the commissions of the Council. His intervention was followed by another illegal intervention of Cardinal Frings (Köln) in favour of Cardinal Liénart's proposal, which he also did in the name of Cardinals König (Vienna) and Döpfner (Munich) [6 and 7], which was then accepted illegally by an applauding majority of the Council Fathers.

Rebellious Spirit

From the notes of Father Henri de Lubac S.J. the following references can be found concerning the preparations that led to this illegal intervention on Saturday October the 13th, 1962.



-
- 5 “Gaudet Mater Ecclesia, Opening address of the Second Vatican Council (October 11th)”, Pope St. John XXIII (1962); [because the Vatican website does not provide an English translation of this Opening Address, the translation by <http://www.ourladyswarriors.org/teach/v2open.htm> has been used here and verified by the Dutch translation];
- 6 “Henri de Lubac S.J., *Vatican Council Notebooks – volume one*”, Henri de Lubac (2015); Ignatius Press, ISBN 978-1-58617-305-0;

On Wednesday October 10th, 1962, even before the opening of the Council [6]:

"Early in the afternoon, Fr. Hirschmann S.J., professor of moral theology at Frankfurt, came to see the two of us, Fr. Daniélou S.J. and me. He was charged by the German bishops to ask us about the list that the French bishops had delivered to them through Msgr. Gouet (secretary of the episcopate), a list of the bishops capable of being elected to various commissions".

Friday morning October 12th, 1962 [6]:

"I was in a meeting at the parish of Saint Chrysogonus, at the Trinitatians' house, with the bishops from Madagascar ... Father Chenu was there. We spent a lot of time making up lists of possible candidates for the elections to the various commissions. Towards noon, Archbishop Sartre arrived from Saint Anselm, with the lists drawn up by the Africans"

While in the afternoon [6]:

"Father Daniélou S.J., who had seen a lot of people, thinks that tomorrow the bishops could ask for a delay in the elections to the commissions, so as to have the time to clarify their vote".

and [6]:

"the French bishops met again; they only, by successive votes, drew up a list of French names that they are proposing for commissions. One of them is supposed to have said: We are going to see to it, this council is not the council of experts."

Then on October 13th, when the first Council session opened, Cardinal Liénart, Bishop of Lille, who was one of the ten members of the Presidium, addressed Cardinal Tisserant, who was the President of the Presidium [7] as follows:

"Your Eminence, it is really impossible to vote in this way without knowing whether there are more qualified candidates. If you allow me, I ask the floor."

Tisserant replied [7]:

"The agenda does not provide for a debate. We just got together to vote, I cannot give you the floor."

Cardinal Liénart then took the microphone and claimed that it would be inconvenient to vote on 160 members of 10 commissions on such short notice and asked for a delay so that the bishops would get to know each other better. He also proposed that each of the episcopal conferences draw up a list of candidates to propose to the others. [8, 9 and 10].

-
- 7 „Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil, Eine bislang ungeschriebene Geschichte“, Roberto de Mattei (German translation, 2012), Sarto Verlagsbuchhandlung GmbH Stuttgart, ISBN 978-3-932691-98-0;
- Referring to 'Vatican II', A Lienart; Facult'es Catholique, Lille, 1967;
- 8 „Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil, Eine bislang ungeschriebene Geschichte“, Roberto de Mattei (German translation, 2012), Sarto Verlagsbuchhandlung GmbH Stuttgart, ISBN 978-3-932691-98-0;
- 9 „Joseph Ratzinger, Zur Lehre des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils“, Erster Teilband, (Joseph Ratzinger. Gesammelte Schriften 7/1), re-edited by Mgr. Gerard Ludwig Müller und der 'Institut Papst Benedikt XVI' (2012), Preface by Pope Benedict XVI; Regensburg, ISBN 978-3-451-34124-3, Herder Verlag, Freiburg [full English text of the preface: Pope pens rare article on his inside view of Vatican II, http://en.radiovaticana.va/storico/2012/10/10/pope_pens_rare_article_on_his_inside_view_of_vatican_ii/en1-628717];
- 10 “My Journal of the Council”, Yves Congar O.P. (2012, English translation); Liturgical Press, Collegette, Minnesota, ISBN 978-0-8146-8029-2;

Father Yves Congar O.P. reported in his *Journal of the Council* about the words spoken by Cardinal Liénart that [10]:

*"The paper read by Cardinal Liénart on the first day of the First Session had been **written by Mgr. Garonne**, whose idea it had been, **Cardinal Liénart did no more than read it**".*

Apparently, this act (1) was proposed by Father Daniélou S.J., (2) discussed by the French Bishops the day before, (3) worked out by Mgr. Garonne thereafter and finally (4) executed by the French senior Cardinal Liénart. Evidently, this was not a spontaneous, but a deliberate act by the French Council Fathers. After all, Cardinal Liénart was the only French prelate who had a microphone at his disposal as a member of the presidium, while the questionable argumentation was clearly meant to serve the hidden agenda as suggested by Father Daniélou S.J.

According to the quotations cited above from the diary of Father Henry de Lubac on the 10th and 12th of October, 1962, which are more or less consistent with some other quotes such as those from Belgian sources on 12th of October, 1962, the French were not alone with such an hidden agenda [11]:

On the 12th of October, a day after the opening of the Council, 500 copies of an alternative list of names were copied in the Belgian College. They were delivered by couriers all over Rome and formed the basis for busy telephone and personal consultations.

Cardinal Suenens (Brussels) on October 12th, 1962 [12]:

We should agree on the names of the vote. From 5 to 7 pm meeting here [Belgian College] with the 65 Belgian bishops [including (57) mission bishops].

...

(Cardinal) Bea came this afternoon to ask for my intervention so that tomorrow morning no votes would be taken to allow the candidatures to mature. But it doesn't matter, we are ready to cope.

Mgr. Heuschen (Hasselt) on 12 October, 1962 [13]

Mgr. Charue suggested to see Cardinal Frings on the matter, while the French bishops would also take an initiative. We then decided to visit Cardinal Frings. I was there because I knew a little bit of German and Latin. We had no problem to convince Cardinal Frings that the council itself has to appoint its commissions.

Breaking the rule and the *chain of illegalities*

Obviously, as we can see from these quotations, that even before the first session on October 13th, contacts were established, not only between the Northwestern European episcopates of Germany, Austria, France, Belgium and the Netherlands, but also clearly involving their fellow countrymen, missionary Bishops from all over the world. In this way a network of theologians mediated between several groups of Bishops, such as the Africans and Asians. It should be noted that the core members of this network, who disagreed with the preparatory documents, were theologians from New Theology movement. Now, within

11 <http://www.volgconcilie.be/DagOpDag/67.html>;

12 <http://www.volgconcilie.be/Deelnemers/suenens.html>;

13 <http://www.volgconcilie.be/Deelnemers/heusschen.html>;

a period of three days, from Saturday to Tuesday, about 2500 Council Fathers would have to get to know and gain an understanding of each other while also composing their lists of candidates. This could be considered as objectively impossible. However, the network of theologians was already working on it with the objective to get as many as of their own candidates as possible on the lists.

The fact that Cardinal Frings could speak on behalf of Cardinals König and Döpfner makes it clear that there was unanimity among these German-speaking cardinals and that they had been most likely informed in advance. Because Cardinal Frings was a member of the Presidium, he had the opportunity to intervene directly in favour of Cardinal Liénart, while Cardinals Döpfner and König did not. Then after one or two minutes deliberation ‘*on the spot*’, Archbishop Felici, general secretary, took the floor to declare that the Board of Presidency supported the proposal and that the voting was delayed for 3 days [6]. How can the Presidium, an executive committee, decide “*on the spot*” within one or two minutes deliberation as such? According to the words of Cardinal Tisserant, this board knew that such a delay, in contradiction to the rule set by the Holy Father without His approval, is an illegal act. Evidently, this has also been made clear at the delayed second session on October 16th, when Cardinal Ottaviani requested to shorten the voting procedure: the Presidium, an executive committee, had no power to overrule the rules set by the Pope without his express approval [6]. Cardinal Ottaviani had to send such a request to the Holy Father himself. The Presidium knew its own legal limits. Why then was this legal limitation set aside on October the 13th?

On the one hand, Cardinal Liénart should have forwarded his request to the Pope, not to the Presidium and surely not to the Council Fathers. However, as long as the Pope did not respond, the unchanged procedure had to go on. This could take one or two days, which would be too long for stopping the vote on that first working day.

Thus, a method of *breaking the rules* was deliberately chosen and prepared by the French. Thus, by means of the so called “*sudden and spontaneous raid*” (1 to 4), the senior French Cardinal intervened illegally against the procedure of the first working day of the Council, (5) supported by Cardinal Frings and (6) by an applauding majority of Council Fathers, which was officially forbidden [14], and (7) finally the rule set by Pope John XXIII was illegally overruled by the Presidium.

On the other hand, discussing the topic of a deliberate ‘*on the spot*’ decision made within one or two minutes raises some other questions. To what extent were individual members of the Presidium informed in advance, and did they agree with this illegal request? How else could they illegally decide so quickly to overrule the rule set by the Holy Father if a only a small minority of them would have agreed with such a change?

This is indeed a ‘*hijack of the Council*’, in its first session, initiated by the French and confirmed by the Germans, is it not? This must certainly have had consequences with respect to the assistance of the Holy Spirit. Is that the reason for the paradoxical outcome of Vatican II?

14 “*Theological highlights of Vatican II*”, Joseph Ratzinger (1966), Paulist Press, ISBN 978-0-8091-4610-9;

‘*A fait accompli*’ and the Holy Spirit

Fait Accompli.

Due to the *chain of illegalities* cited above, voting on the membership of the commissions was delayed until October 16th. One of the first consequences of this *chain* of events was the fact that Pope John XXIII was confronted with this delay as ***a fait accompli***. How could he react to this? Undoubtedly, he could not have been aware of the deliberate initiative of the French bishops. Why should the Pope still trust the senior French Cardinal Liénart, who illogically claimed that his intervention was spontaneous and charismatically inspired? [15]

"I only spoke because I felt constrained to do so by a higher force, in which I feel obliged to recognize that of the Holy Spirit"

Such a contradiction cannot be true! The Pope was deliberately faced with a profound dilemma, and no easy way out. Furthermore, any measure he would take against this *chain of irregularities* could potentially do more damage to the image of the Council and the Church, and at the same time lead to further delays.

Admission of the *Chain of Illegalities and the Hijack*

Obviously, Pope John XXIII probably considered having no other choice than accepting this illegal delay. So he (8) accepted the outcome of these irregular acts and (9) allowed the rebellious spirit to be active in the Council, by which (10) the hijack of the Council became a fact. Thus, the hijacked Council continued with the work under a completely new framework than originally intended by the Holy Father. Indeed, the only other alternative would have been to stop the Council after this first working day.

The fact that the Pope admitted and accepted the outcome, does not take away the objectivity of the fact that there was a chain of multiple irregularities confronting him with a *‘fait accompli’*. Moreover, this *chain of consecutive illegalities violating the Council's legal framework* cannot be considered as *‘acting by a humble and gracious collaboration with the intention of the Holy Spirit’*. On the contrary, we must here consider the astonishing claim by Cardinal Liénart that his intervention was a charismatic inspiration by the Holy Spirit. Consistent with the following rationale, this is fake.

Betrayal

Cardinal. Liénart would have us believe that, while the Council was called and prepared by Pope John XXIII on command from the Holy Spirit, during first hour of the first session of the Council, the Holy Spirit would promptly turn on the Council *by breaking the Council's legal framework* and confront the Holy Father with an irregular and unexpected *fait accompli*. Not only is this claim ridiculous, it contradicts the convocation of the Council and the content of Pope John XXIII's opening address.

15 *“Iota Unum, A Study of Changes in the Catholic Church in the XXth Century”* Romano Amerio (1985, Dutch translation), Angela Press, ISBN: 9780963903211;

This opening address only two days earlier, on October 11th, confirms the Pope's conviction that the preparatory work was well done and spiritually inspired. He said that the preparatory documents were "*a first sign and gift of heavenly grace*" from the Holy Spirit [16]:

"Meanwhile, three years have been spent in laborious preparation of the Council, during which careful and broad investigations have been made about the state today of the faith, religious practice, and vitality of Christians and especially Catholics. It is not unjust for Us to see the time spent in preparing the Ecumenical Council as a first sign and gift of heavenly grace"

Moreover, Pope John XXIII had also mentioned the preparatory documents in the convocation to the Bishops as follows [17]:

"We then instituted the different preparatory organizations to which we entrusted the arduous task of drawing up the doctrinal and disciplinary projects, which we intend to submit to the Council. We finally have the joy of announcing that this intense work of study, to which the cardinals, bishops, prelates, theologians, canonists, and experts from all over the world have given their valuable contribution, is now nearing its end. Trusting therefore in the help of the Divine Redeemer, the Beginning and the End of all things, in the help of His most excellent Mother and of St. Joseph — to whom we entrusted from the very beginning such a great event — it seems to us that the time has come to convoke the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council".

And, it was precisely the removal of these preparatory documents, as a "*first sign and gift of heavenly grace*" that was the deeper intention of this delay by the liberal theologians of the New Theology to gain more time in manipulating the Council Fathers to get their own candidates elected. In his note on October 12th, 1962, Father Henry de Lubac S.J. refers to the same Father Daniélou S.J., who proposed to the French Bishops to delay the voting, as follows [6]:

"... He (Father Daniélou S.J.) is already working on a counterplan, which will be combined with the one we believe Father Rahner S.J. is preparing.

And then, reporting on October 19th, 1962, about a meeting of a select number of Council Fathers and theologians opposing the preparatory documents, he wrote [6]:

*'At 4 P.M., on the northwest slope of the Janiculum, a meeting at the boarding house where Archbishop Volk of Mainz is staying to study the drafting of a positive doctrinal schema and to examine the procedure to follow as to have it accepted while setting aside the schemas of the preparatory commission. There were 25 of us. Nine bishops: Volk, his auxiliary, the archbishop of Berlin (Bengsch), Garrone (Toulouse), Guerry (Cambrai) Ancel (auxiliary of Lion), Schmitt (Metz), Weber and his Elchinger (Strasbourg). Among the theologians: K. Rahner S.J., J. Ratzinger, H. Kung, Mgr. Philips (Louvain), Daniélou S.J., Rondet, Congar O.P., Chenu, Labourdette a Dutchman (Piet Fransen SJ or Schillebeeckx O.P.). Very interesting discussion. Karl Rahner S.J. gave some explanations. Then each one gave his opinion, either **on the content** or **on the tactics***

16 "*Gaudet Mater Ecclesia, Opening address of the Second Vatican Council (October 11th)*", Pope St. John XXIII (1962); [\[because the Vatican website does not provide an English translation of this Opening Address\]](#), the translation by <http://www.ourladyswarriors.org/teach/v2open.htm> has been used here and verified against the [Dutch translation](#)];

17 "*Convocation of the Second Vatican Council*", Pope St John XXIII (1961), [\http://vatican2voice.org/91docs/convoke.htm target=" blank"];

to adopt. Various possibilities. The Germans were more scathing than the French. Bishop Elchinger and Bishop Schmitt will serve at liaisons'.

With a follow up on October 22, 1962 [6]:

*'On Sunday, Fathers Rabner S.J., Congar O.P. and Daniélou S.J. met, following the meeting around Bishop Volk. Congar O.P. **is preparing a totally new schema**, as a sort of general prooemium that they would try to have accepted by the Commission for Extraordinary Affairs. Rabner S.J. and Daniélou S.J. are preparing a revision of existing texts, as a fall-back position in case Congar's schema should be rejected on principle.'*

In fact, the deliberate intentions behind the claim by Cardinal Liénart can be characterized as follows: ***"Holy Father, you did not prepare the Council well. With your foolish preparation, you do not know the will of the Holy Spirit at all, therefore we are independent from you and we will take over the lead of the Council, and we know exactly the will of the Holy Spirit"***. Alternatively what other meaning could this entire event have? Logically then from this argumentation it can be concluded, the Holy Spirit was falsely imprisoned by the *"Spirit of the Council"*. And that this was in addition accepted by the Pope!

Victory

How some others felt about this event can be read in the *"Vatican Council Notebooks"* by Father Henry de Lubac S.J. [6] and in *"My Journal of the Council"* by Yves Congar O.P. [10]. In his notes, Father Henry de Lubac says about this event that Canon Martimort of the Institute Catholique Toulouse had suggested the procedure to Cardinal Liénart, and he was very pleased with the outcome. Another said:

"That was imperative: otherwise the bishop would have had to vote haphazardly"

While another prelate, relator of the Congregation of Rites, added to this comment:

"That was precisely what they (=certain Romans, the Holy Office) wanted".

This dramatic little episode is spoken of as a victory of the bishops over the Holy Office. Other victories will no doubt be more difficult.

Father Yves Congar O.P. furthermore wrote in his Journal on October 13th, 1962:

"... the principle importance rests in the fact that this is a first Conciliar Act, a refusal to accept even the possibility of prefabrication"

and

"Between the Supreme head (and his Curia) and the individual bishops, there are intermediate groupings. One of the results of the Council ought to be that giving them more power and independence. The importance of this was demonstrated on the very first day"

It was a Dutch bishop who said

"That was our first victory"

Cardinal Suenens, in his memoirs, emphasized the revolutionary significance of this incident [10]:

"Happy coup and daring injury to the Regiment! ... The destinies of the Council were decided to a great extent at this moment, John XXIII was glad about it"

All these testimonies clearly radiate a common spirit of rebellion, a warlike spirit that fought against the Holy Office. In addition, whereas the Holy Father is the Prefect of the Holy Office, it directly affected Him and thus the entire Church and the Holy Spirit. While Cardinal Suenens wrote in his memoirs that Pope John XXIII was "*glad about it*", he would not have told the Pope that he considered this event as "*a happy coup and a first victory over the Holy Office*". Certainly, looking at the claim by Cardinal Liénart, none of these cowards would have had the courage to tell the Pope the full truth about it.

The Council: Independently and Autonomously?

Father Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope-emeritus Benedict XVI) reported in 1966, within a year after the end of the Council, in his "*Theological Highlights of Vatican II*" the following about this event [14]:

*"The fact that this proposal (by Cardinal Liénart and confirmed by Cardinal Frings) met with lively ovation, despite the official prohibition against applause, indicated that a decision of great moment had here been made. The Council had shown its resolve to act **independently and autonomously**, rather than be degraded to the status of mere executive organ of the preparatory commissions"*.

Clearly, as personal theological advisor to Cardinal Frings, Father Joseph Ratzinger did not mention the illegality of these chain of acts except the prohibition against applause. Was it his natural prudence that prevented him accusing his own Cardinal of illegal acts, or was it a kind of blindness due to his own involvement or both? He had after all worked in close collaboration with Father Karl Rahner S.J. on alternative texts. Father Karl Rahner S.J. was strongly opposed the preparatory documents and even some months before the opening of the Council he openly intended their total removal [18]. However, although Father Joseph Ratzinger himself was opposed to this radical move, believing that it would effectively derail the Council [19], he still collaborated on these alternative texts, despite his knowledge of the intention of Father Karl Rahner S.J.

Anti-Roman Resentment

Moreover, we learn from the remarks of Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI about why he had made no trips to Rome before Easter 1962, and how imprudent teachings had aroused a certain bias [20]:

"Because, I must say, a slight anti-Roman resentment had been imparted to us by our studies. Not in the sense that we would have denied the primacy, denied the obedience to the Pope, but that one had a certain inner reserve towards the theology that was done in Rome".

18 „*Aus Liebe und Treue zur Kirche, Eine etwas andere Geschichte des Zweiten Vatikanum*“, Alexandra von Teuffenbach (2004), Morus Verlag, Berlin, Germany, ISBN3-87554-398-X;

19 Ratzinger, Joseph (1998), *Milestones: Memoirs 1927–1977*, Ignatius Press, ISBN 0-89870-702-1

20 "*Benedict XVI, last testament in his own words with Peter Seewald*", Peter Seewald (2016); Bloomsbury Publishing, ISBN 978-1-4729-4467;

Since he studied from 1946 to 1953, we can of course conclude that he was by no means the only victim. Certainly, a lot of priests and Bishops were sensitive to the false and suggestive accusations against the Curia, and especially the Holy Office. Therefore, the judgement exposed in the expression “*the theology that was done in Rome*” deserves some more attention here. The task of the members of the Holy Office, as collaborators with the Papal Magisterium, essentially differs from that of other theologians, especially the scientists among them. They are the hands of the Holy Father, acting in his name; they must therefore be much more prudent regarding their own opinions, even in private conversations. Therefore, their main duty is not only to teach and to protect the Faith from errors, but also to protect the faithful from confusion due to new theories that are still not clearly defined and of which the physical reality they indicate, is still speculative and not proven. This comment, “*the theology that was done in Rome*” indicates an underestimation or a misunderstanding of the task of the Holy Office. Therefore, such a statement expresses a certain pride that can lead into blindness towards the Truth. This “... *theology that was done in Rome*” can be seen as precisely that spirit of pride behind the many criticisms concerning the preparatory documents.

Factually, this same spirit of pride can be clearly seen in Father Henri de Lubac’s criticisms in his diary for March 12th, 1962 following the last meeting of the preparatory commission [6]:

“Theology, such as I have seen it operate in Rome, is more and more a specialty that grows complicated and rigid. It is not renewed; it does not change the old conception of itself as “queen of science”: it turns its back on science – without losing anything of its pretention to rule over the science, that is, to dismiss, in an arrogant and systematic ignorance. ... Their self-sufficiency is extreme, and their good faith is not in question. There is in this situation that appears to me disturbing. What will this council be?”

And, as he witnessed on October 14th, 1962, this way of thinking concerns many theologians [6]:

‘One gets used to saying : ‘the terrible Cardinal Ottaviani’, ‘the rigidity of doctrine, to call him the leader of the integrists, etc. That is an extreme oversimplification; ...’

Those theologians were responsible for the education of seminarians and young academic priests. And, some of their pupils were already appointed to the level of Bishops.

Spirit of Lie

However, in contrast to the suggestions by these critics, the great majority of about 2000 members, consultants and experts of the preparatory commissions were from outside the Curia. They came from all over the world representing the very most theological schools. Also theologians from among the ‘*New Theology*’ movement were appointed as consultants to the theological committee like the Fathers Yves Congar O.P., Henri de Lubac S.J., Bernard Häring C.Ss.R. and Joseph Lécuier C.S.Sp., while Father Karl Rahner S.J. was appointed to the liturgical commission. Indeed, these preparatory commissions were presided over by a Cardinal from the Curia, representing the Papal Magisterium, while only the Cardinals and Bishops could vote on the proposed texts. The curial secretary and his scribes had also no vote on the preparatory texts, they had an executive task only and had to report weekly

to Pope John XXIII about the progress [21]. Above all, a number of Cardinals and Bishops, who opposed these preparatory documents in the Council, were involved with the preparatory documents themselves, while the Cardinals like Liénart, Frings, König, Döpfner, Suenens and Alfrink were all members of the Central Preparatory Commission of which only about 20% of the voting members (Cardinals and Bishops) were from the Curia [22].

The statement “*Council had shown its resolve to act independently and autonomously*” clearly describes the deliberate intent behind the pursuit of putting in the dustbin the intention of the Holy Father that lay in the three years of preparatory work. Evidently, this Council acting “*independently and autonomously*” contradicts the required attitude of a “*humble and gracious cooperation with all concerned for the purpose of the Holy Spirit, seeking Truth together in love and respect for each other*”. Moreover, the argument ‘... *be degraded to the status of mere executive organ of the preparatory commission*’ which was used to justify consigning the Holy Father's intention to the trash, is nothing more than a bias-based speculative fear that refers to an *anti-Roman resentment*. and a lack of confidence in the Holy Spirit. However, the entire event is in fact, a rebellious act against the Holy Spirit, by which the leadership of the Council was captured.

Paradoxical Outcome and the Spirit of the Council

Father Joseph Ratzinger continued by describing the results of this event as follows [14]:

The bishops who were most likely to carry forward the initiatives of the first general congregation were precisely the ones who received the vast majority of votes. Thus the Council in those early days had already set its fundamental course, ...

Thus, the Council had set its ‘*fundamental course*’: a course independent of the Holy Father’s intention, by which it produced a *paradoxical outcome* for Vatican II. This is indeed consistent with a hijack. This ‘*rebellious Spirit*’ which had used conspiracies and lies, had created a chain of illegalities to remove the ‘*first sign and gift of heavenly grace by the Holy Spirit*’. They spoke about the Holy Office as if it would be a kind of ‘*bulwark of evil*’ and prophesied doom scenarios with regard to a continuation of the conservative line of the Church prior to the Council. While, finally they called this event ‘*a first victory over the Holy Office*’. This cannot surely be consistent with or inspired by the Holy Spirit.

It is therefore logical to conclude from the evidence presented above, that the characterisation “***the Council Fathers will produce their own documents ‘independently and autonomously’ and after they have finished, the Holy Father may only sign them***”, is therefore quite clearly true. One can also consequentially and validly pose the question; does the Holy Spirit really work in this way?

Could it be that this ‘*rebellious Spirit*’ is synonymous with the so-called ‘*Spirit of the Council*’ or ‘*Spirit of Vatican II*’? Why else are these terms so consistently and insistently used instead of the ‘*Holy Spirit*’?.

21 “*Konzilstagebuch Sebastian Tromp S.J.*” herausgegeben von Alexandra Teuffenbach (2006), band 1/1 (Commissio Praeparatoria: 1960-1962), Editrice Pontificia Universita Gregoriana. ISBN 88-7839-057-2;

22 “Acta et Document Concilio Oecumenic Vatican II Apparando, Series II (Praeparatorio”, Vol. II part I, Typo Polyglottis Vaticanis MCMLXV [<https://archive.org/details/ADPII.2.pdf>]

Restoration by Pope John XXIII

Disturbed Balance

The original lists of commission members which were to be inform the Council Fathers, about those who were involved with the preparatory commissions. This was in conformity with the intention of the Holy Father to assure continuity between the preparatory and final documents. Due to the *hijack* on October 13th, and the clearly manipulated lists of several bishops' conferences, which had many names in common, hardly any of the more conservative members of the preparatory commissions were elected, giving "*more influence to the Council Fathers and their theologian advisors*". In that way, the majority of elected members of the Council Commissions represented the *New Theology* and were in favour of rejecting or rewrite the preparatory documents. Therefore, on the one hand, the balance within the Council commissions was disturbed, and on the other hand, the continuity with the preparatory documents was broken. Moreover, no representatives from the Curial Offices, representing the Papal Magisterium, were elected.

Father Joseph Ratzinger, (now Pope–emeritus Benedictus XVI), reported as follows on this outcome [14]:

"The Bishops who were most likely to carry forward the initiatives of the first congregations (session) were precisely the ones who received the vast majority of votes".

Intervention by Pope John XXIII

According to the notes by Father Henry de Lubac S.J. [6] with regard to the (new) lists prepared by the Council Fathers, Pope John XXIII found it necessary to intervene because the Curia was being '*forgotten*' by the Bishops. Furthermore, he decided to increase the foreseen number of eight members per commission to be appointed by the Pope, by which a potential absolute majority of those elected by the Bishops was broken. Moreover, he intended to appoint conservative Council Fathers from the Curia. This upset those attached to the *New Theology*. On October 29th, 1962, Father Henri de Lubac noted [6]:

"According to Father Hirschmann, one can see rather well what governed the Pope's choices for the commissions. He wanted to make a place for the 'Curia', too much 'forgotten' by the Bishops, especially for the secretaries of the Roman congregations; to introduce some religious superiors; to balance nationalities so as to satisfy the small countries; to ensure a continuity with the pre-conciliar commissions. Certain personal influences were also at work. The 'conservative' tendency was accentuated".

And on October 30th, 1962 [6]:

"The Franciscan (Father Castelli) told me that Cardinal Alfrink is pessimistic; it seems to him that between the two principal tendencies there is not only opposition but no possibility of mutual understanding. The composition of the commissions, following the choices of John XXIII, is said to have saddened those who desire a renewal".

This intervention by Pope John XXIII is clearly in contrast with the suggestion given by Cardinal Suenens' statement that the Holy Father would be "*glad about it*". Why this lie? Pope John XXIII tried as far as the situation permitted to ensure continuity with the pre-conciliar

commissions without hard measures. In fact, he tried to restore the intention behind the preparatory period to which end he broke the principle power of the absolute majority of the members elected by the Council Fathers into the council committees.

Source of the Ambiguities

Apparently, the Dutch Cardinal Alfrink realized that by this restorative act of Pope John XXIII, the opportunity for an absolute majority of the liberal wing within the Council commissions was lost. Now, they had to make compromises such that their true intentions were kept hidden. In addition, this approach is precisely the source of the ambiguities in the Council documents. This method used was as proposed earlier by Father Bugnini before a small number of members and consultants of the preparatory commission on Liturgy in 1961, and described here [23]:

“It would be most inconvenient for articles of our Constitution to be rejected by the Central Commission or by the Council itself. That is why we must tread carefully and discreetly. Carefully, so that proposals be made in an acceptable manner (modo acceptabile), or, in my opinion, formulated in such a way that much is said without seeming to say anything: let many things be said in embryo (in nuce) and in this way let the door remain open to legitimate and possible post-conciliar deductions and applications: let nothing be said that suggests excessive novelty and might invalidate all the rest, even what is straightforward and harmless (ingenua et innocentia). We must proceed discreetly. Not everything is to be asked or demanded from the Council – the essentials, the fundamental principles [are]”.

It was a method that had been confirmed by Father Edward Schillebeeckx O.P. in an interview in the Dutch Dominican weekly ‘*Bazuin*’, on the occasion of publication of the first edition of the International Theological Magazine *Concilium* (February 1965) [15]:

“We will express it in a diplomatic way, but after the Council we will draw out implicit conclusions”

These two quotations, the first of which is dated during the preparatory period and the second towards the end of the council, both show how well-meaning Council Fathers were betrayed, and how many of the post-Conciliar Fathers are still betrayed today by this ‘*Spirit of the Council*’, a spirit with a double tongue. Furthermore the fact that Pope Paul VI had to intervene by issuing ‘*Nota Explicativa Praevia*’ to explain how to read certain parts of the Doctrinal Council document ‘*Lumen Gentium*’ and the way the liberal wing i.c. the ‘*Spirit of the Council*’ was upset about it, proves the deliberate use of ambiguities by the Council commissions.

The Hermeneutic of Vatican II

Opening Address of Pope John XXIII

Whereas according Roman Law the intention of the lawmaker determines what is meant by a certain law and how that law has to be understood, one nevertheless has to seek for the published intention of the lawmaker. In the same way, with regard to the true hermeneutic of the Second Vatican Council, one has to listen to Pope John XXIII, who made known

23 “*Annibale Bugnini, Reformer of the Liturgy*”, Yves Chiron (2016), Angelico Press, Brooklyn. ISBN 978-1-62138-411-3;

publicly his intention for the Council in his opening address on October 11th, 1962. This publicly declared intention was that the substantial law of the Council itself as well as for the hermeneutic of the Council documents shall: *'never depart from the sacred patrimony of truth received from the Fathers'*. Accordingly, the Council should be understood as a renewal not in a discontinuity or as a vague kind of continuity with the Church prior to the Council, but more explicitly *'in unity and in accordance with the Doctrine taught by the Fathers'*. Consider the following statements taken from the Opening Address [16]:

- *The sacred deposit of Christian doctrine should be guarded and taught more efficaciously;*
- *The Church should never depart from the sacred patrimony of truth received from the Fathers;*
- *The truth of the Lord will remain forever;*
- *Men, without the assistance of the whole of revealed doctrine, cannot reach a complete and firm unity of minds with which are associated true peace and eternal salvation;*
- *Not, certainly, that there is a lack of fallacious teaching, opinions, and dangerous concepts to be guarded against and dissipated. But these are so obviously in contrast with the right norm of honesty, and have produced such lethal fruits that by now it would seem that men of themselves are inclined to condemn them, particularly those ways of life which despise God and His law or place excessive confidence in technical progress and a well-being based exclusively on the comforts of life;*
- *Men are either with Him and His Church, and then they enjoy light, goodness, order, and peace. Or else they are without Him, or against Him, and deliberately opposed to His Church, and then they give rise to confusion, to bitterness in human relations, and to the constant danger of fratricidal wars;*
- *Our duty is not only to guard this precious treasure, as if we were concerned only with antiquity, but to dedicate ourselves with an earnest will and without fear to that work which our era demands of us, pursuing thus the path which the Church has followed for twenty centuries;*
- *The salient point of this Council is not, therefore, a discussion of one article or another of the fundamental doctrine of the Church which has repeatedly been taught by the Fathers and by ancient and modern theologians, and which is presumed to be well known and familiar to all;*
- *The substance of the ancient doctrine of the deposit of faith is one thing, and the way in which it is presented is another. And, it is the latter that must be taken into great consideration with patience if necessary, everything being measured in the forms and proportions of a Magisterium which is predominantly pastoral in character;*
- *How Catholic truth can be communicated to the modern world 'pure and whole', without attenuations or alterations, but at the same time in such a way that the minds of our contemporaries are aided in their duty of assenting to it.*

These principles are also in conformity with his Encyclical *Ad Petri Cathedram* (1959), in which he condemned in harsh terms anyone who denies the revealed Truth or interferes with the spread of lies or indifferences. These words intended to set the tone of the Council. Pope John XXIII showed no desire to change one *iota* of Doctrine [16]. From these quotes, one can only conclude that he sought to continue and preserve the traditional teaching of the Fathers, his recent and not-so-recent predecessors. In fact, this is not new, it is in conformity with the Church's traditional understanding of hermeneutics.

The double Tongue of the '*Spirit of the Council*'

However, as described above it is clear that the double tongue of the '*Spirit of the Council*' had introduced all kinds of ambiguous embryos into the Council documents: *'formulated in such a way that much is said without seeming to say anything: let many things be said in embryo (in nuce)'*.

To bring these embryos alive they introduced the *'Hermeneutic of the Spirit of the Council/Vatican II'*. To give this hermeneutic an appearance of authority, they falsely suggested that this *'Spirit of the Council'* would be in conformity with the intention of Pope John XXIII by quoting an one-sided selection of elements from the Opening Address, totally out of context with the entire document.

For example, the *'Spirit of the Council'* decoupled the *'medicine of mercy'* from the context that *'the truth of the Lord remains forever'*, *'The Church in every age has opposed these errors'* and *'today's needs by explaining the validity of her doctrine more fully'*. To understand the entire context and its consistency, here cited is the entire section regarding the *'medicine-of-mercy'* from the Opening Address [16]:

As the Second Vatican Council begins, it is clearer than ever before that the truth of the Lord remains forever (Ps 116:2). Indeed, as age succeeds age, we see the uncertain opinions of men take one another's place and new-born errors often vanish as quickly as a mist dispelled by the sun. The Church in every age has opposed these errors and often has even condemned them and indeed with the greatest severity. But, at the present time, the Spouse of Christ prefers to use the 'medicine-of-mercy' rather than the weapons of severity; and, she thinks she meets today's needs by explaining the validity of her doctrine more fully rather than by condemning.

It is clear from the entire context that the *'medicine-of-mercy'* may not in any way be decoupled from the need to explain the Church's Doctrine in conformity with the Fathers more fully, while condemnation of old and modern errors were never abrogated. This latter has been demonstrated by Pope John XXIII himself. In this same Opening Address he clearly condemned *'uncertain opinions of men'*, *'new-born errors'*, *'fallacious teaching, opinions, and dangerous concepts to be guarded against'* and *'particularly those ways of life, which despise God and His law or place excessive confidence in technical progress and a well-being based exclusively on the comforts of life'* [16]

Additionally, is not the sacrament of baptism itself the *'medicine of mercy'* by which the Church has always treated people who repent after accepting the full Doctrine of the Church? In addition, in the same manner, the Church has always dealt with those who have returned in repentance to the teachings of the Church. These two aspects cannot be separated, because, essentially, the *'medicine of mercy'* is the answer of the Church to the confession of the full Faith. If we also consider the *'weapon of severity'*, this is one of the means by which the Church protects the faithful from leaving the sacred patrimony received from the Church Fathers. As such, both methods were used by the Church for those baptized who are in danger of going astray, aren't they?.

False and Erroneous Interpretation of the Ambiguities

However, due to the ambiguous *embryos* laid down in the documents and brought alive by the *'Spirit of the Council'* the Council documents cannot properly fulfil the objective of *'explaining the validity of her doctrine more fully'*. In pursuit of their objectives the promoters of the *'Spirit of the Council'* have played their hand very well; on the one hand by using the *mass-media* they continued to spread a biased view of the Council including their portrayals of the Popes John XXIII and Paul VI. On the other hand, since 1965, by publishing their intentionally

ambiguous and contradictory texts in their own international religious magazine *Concilio* in multiple languages. With the fathers Karl Rahner S.J., Hans Küng, Yves Congar O.P. and Edward Schillebeeckx O.P. as editors they controlled all publications, by which they were able to exclude papers that departed from their line of interpretation. Even during the Council, they started a strong offensive of false interpretation departing from the doctrine of the Church. As described by Archbishop Agostino Marchetto they refused any serious discussion by calling any other interpretation a departure from the Council [24]:

'... the false and erroneous interpretation of Vatican II being one trend of the modern theology that vituperates as anti-conciliar anyone who departs from their monopoly-line of the Council's interpretation'

In this way the hermeneutic rule as established by Pope John XXIII in his opening address, which was also repeated by Pope Paul VI in his closing address in 1965, was replaced with the vague *'spirit of the council'* hermeneutic, which in fact is identical with the *'hermeneutic of discontinuity'*. Herewith they intended to eliminate the influence of the conservative minority and the several interventions by Pope Paul VI, which were clearly in conformance with the Council's rule as set by Pope John XXIII.

Gravity of the Falsification of the Council

The gravity of the falsification of the Council was so strong that Pope Paul VI addressed his concern at least five times. Firstly, about one month after the closure of the Council he spoke the following words at the General Audience on January 12th [25]:

'It would not be the truth for anybody to imagine what the Vatican Council II represented any kind of break, interruption, or liberation from the teaching of the Church, or that it authorized or promoted any kind of accommodation or conformism with the mentality of our times, in its negative or ephemeral aspects'

Secondly, in spring, 1966, he complains in a private audience with Father Tromp S.J., former secretary of the Theological Commission of the Council, about [24]:

'(1) a dangerous relativism, (2) a false mystic about Pope John XXIII, (3) nobody is listening to the voice of Pope, (4) a crisis of celibacy, (5) a false forming of the public opinion, (6) a spirit of Council that has been replaced by a spirit of some Extremist'

Thirdly, on July 24th, 1966, the newly established Congregation for Doctrine and Faith issued a Circular Letter to the Presidents of the Episcopal Conferences addressing some sentences and errors arising from the interpretation of the decrees of Vatican II (*Cum Oecumenicum Concilium*) [26].

24 *"Vatican II, a Counterpoint for History of Council"*, Archbishop Agostino Marchetto (2010), ISBN 978-1-58966-1967;

25 *„Papst Johannes XXIII begegnen“*, Alexandra von Teuffenbach (2005), Sankt Ulrich Verlag GmbH, ISBN 3-936484-47-3;

26 AAS 58 (1966) 659-661; Nuntius 1 (1967) 17-19; Documenta 3 [http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19660724_epistula_en.htm];

Then, some years later for the fourth time, after a period during which theologians, priests, Bishops and even Cardinals supporting the '*Spirit of the Council*' had strongly rebelled against a number of Encyclicals, published by Pope Paul VI in the late sixties, such as *Humanae Vitae*, another important address was given to the Cardinals of the Curia. On June 23rd, 1972, Pope Paul VI clearly condemned the hermeneutic, which was later called by Pope Benedict XVI (2005) the *hermeneutic of discontinuity and rupture* [27]:

'... an emergency which We cannot and must not keep hidden: in the first place a false and erroneous interpretation of the Council, which would want to break with the tradition, even as regards the doctrine, an interpretation which goes so far that the pre-conciliar Church is rejected and one is allowed to consider a 'new' church, as it were reinvented from the inside, as regards the constitution of the Church, her dogma, custom and law.'

Finally, in the same week he spoke for the fifth time, in his homily on June 29th, 1972 when he used the well-known words:

'... from some cracks, the smoke of Satan has entered the temple of God.'

Continuity, Discontinuity versus the Hermeneutic of the Church

From above it is clear that the '*hermeneutics of discontinuity and rupture*' oppose the '*hermeneutics of the Church*' as clearly stated here by Pope John XXIII: '*never depart from the sacred patrimony of truth received from the Fathers*' and remain '*in unity and in accordance with the Doctrine taught by the Fathers*'. However, it should be mentioned here that although *continuity* is certainly the opposite of *discontinuity or rupture*, discontinuity can be mistakenly perceived as continuity, through an ongoing process of barely visible small steps. An example is a curve and a straight line starting from the same point. They clearly diverge from each other, while both are still continuous.

Therefore, true and valid '*continuity*' within the Church should be understood in accordance to the '*hermeneutics of the Church*' as formulated by Pope John XXIII and always directed by the following objectives:

- (1) With regard to doctrine it is manifested as a continuously deepening understanding of the Truth;
- (2) With regard to the adoration of God, it is the Sacredness of the Liturgy under the principle of '*Lex orandi, Lex credendi*';
- (3) With regard to the pastoral work, it is the Salvation of Souls through urging the pursuit of Holiness in accordance with the doctrine, which can be likened in a similar way to the principle of the coupling between '*Lex orandi, Lex credendi*'.

In addition, due to the ambiguities in the Council documents inserted by the '*Spirit of the Council*' the validity of the Church doctrine has not been explained fully, due to which in fact, the '*medicine-of-mercy*' solely used, can only bear bad fruits. Therefore, the '*weapons of severity*'

27 "Die 23 mensis iunii a. 1972: Eminentissimis Sacri Collegii Cardinalium Patribus, Summo Pontifici die Eius nominali felicia ac fausta ominentibus";
[\[http://www.vatican.va/archive/aas/documents/AAS-64-1972-ocr.pdf\]](http://www.vatican.va/archive/aas/documents/AAS-64-1972-ocr.pdf);

and ‘*condemnation*’ should still be the only methods in use against those in grave error, also now.

Evaluation

Consequences of the Hijack

What about the consequences of the ‘*hijack of the Council*’ in general. Here again a quote from the opening address by Pope John XXIII [16]:

Men are either with Him and His Church, and then they enjoy light, goodness, order, and peace. Or else they are without Him, or against Him, and deliberately opposed to His Church, and then they give rise to confusion, to bitterness in human relations, and to the constant danger of fratricidal wars’

Certainly, the rebellious ‘*Spirit of the Council*’ is responsible for the ‘*rise of confusion, to bitterness in human relations, and to the constant danger of fratricidal wars*’ in the Church throughout the Council and in all the years since its closure. Since they rebelled against the Holy Spirit on the first session of the Council confirmed by a majority of the Council Fathers and accepted by the Holy Father, they cannot produce anything other than lethal fruits, as they are cut off from the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Since the ‘*Holy Spirit*’ is the ‘*Spirit of the Truth*’ who cannot and does not contradict Himself, each distortion by deliberate ambiguities, contradictory text phrases or one-sided quotations of the doctrine in the Council documents is potentially a risk of failure regarding the use of these documents. However, this risk of failure can be resolved, but only by taking appropriate corrective measures.

It can be postulated that by allowing these lethal fruits to be produced by the ‘*Spirit of the Council*’, the Holy Spirit has respected the free will of men. But at the same time, in a wonderful way, through the restorative measures by Pope John XXIII, He protected the Council against full doctrinal heresies in leaving open the possibility of interpreting the Council’s documents in accordance with the rule set by Pope John XXIII: ‘*never depart from the sacred patrimony of truth received from the Fathers*’ by free will. And, what about the pastoral measures that are not doctrinal in themselves but are falsely based on the hermeneutic of the ‘*Spirit of the Council*’?

Resolutions

Corrective measure should not only concern the distortions, deliberate ambiguities, contradictory text phrases as well as the one-sided quotations of the doctrine in the Council documents, even embryonal ones, but also all measures taken in the last 55 years, because they are also potentially falsely influenced by the ‘*Spirit of the Council*’. Who will take action or maybe better who is able to evaluate the situation objectively and how long will it take to solve it? And, how effective will such actions or analysis be as long as the ‘*Spirit of the Council*’ is still alive in the Church?

Another way seems to be a complete revision or a re-negotiation of the documents of the Council in compliance with Pope John XXIII’s hermeneutic: ‘*never depart from the sacred patrimony of truth received from the Fathers*’. However, here, the same problem exists with regard to the pastoral measures based on the false ‘*Spirit of the Council*’ during the last 55 years.

Its Supernatural Character

Therefore, the only true solution should be of supernatural character.

Since the hijack and rebellion of the '*Spirit of the Council*' against the Holy Spirit at the first session of the Council, no one has publicly confessed the error or begged the Holy Spirit for Divine Mercy. This omission has caused so much '*confusion*', '*bitterness in human relations*', '*fratricidal wars and polemics*' among faithful, priests, Bishops and Cardinals for so many years that the stakes are simply too high to ignore these facts. Therefore, given the spiritual nature of the root cause and core of the problem, only supernatural and spiritual means can solve it. The following solution is proposed:

The Holy Father together with the entire Hierarchy and the Clergy of the Church shall:

1. Publicly beg the Holy Spirit for forgiveness and Divine Mercy;
2. Publicly declare a clear and renewed Manifesto of Catholic Faith;
3. Publicly do penance;
4. The Holy Father shall publicly declare as invalid and explicitly condemn the rebellious '*Spirit of the Council*'. He shall declare that the documents of the Second Vatican Council have to be understood in accordance with the traditional hermeneutic of the Church, as stated by Pope John XXIII: '*never depart from the sacred patrimony of truth received from the Fathers*' and '*in unity and in accordance with the Doctrine taught by the Fathers*' and he shall take the necessary actions to restore this.

Only by implementing such a spiritual solution shall the Holy Spirit be enabled to inspire and help the Church to solve the problem and restore '*light, goodness, order, and peace*' in the Church again. Finally from this foundation a true spiritual renewal of the Church will appear.

The obvious tragedy and evident consequences of contemporary '*confusion*', '*bitterness in human relations*', '*fratricidal wars and polemics*' in the Church are symptoms only, of the revolt against the Holy Spirit through the '*hijacking of the Council*'.

The stakes are too high to simply ignore the ongoing catastrophe



Published by
Foundation Ecclesia Dei Delft
The Netherlands
<http://www.ecclesiadei.nl>
info@ecclesiadei.nl



Member of Foederatio Internationalis Una Voce