

UNIT 6A – THE COURSE OF THE COUNCIL

RECOMMENDED READING:

1. OVERALL VIEW

The Church was not experiencing (apparently) any serious crisis at the time of the Council.

- John XXIII had praised the state of the Church in glowing terms in his official calling of the Council (*Humanae Salutis*).
- He contrasts this vitality with the spiritual poverty of the world.
- But he is equally convinced that the world is especially open to the influence of the Church if only the Church can express her doctrine in a way accommodated to modern thought. He hopes that the Council will “smooth the way” for the return of separated brethren.

The Council was composed of four sessions which ran from September/October – December of 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965.

- These are known as the four sessions of the Council. During the intervening time, the bishops returned to their dioceses.
- There were 2,400 Council Fathers (by far, the largest gathering in Church history). The large number will itself foster conformity:
 - Individual/small groups of bishops will have little influence
 - Discussion could be hopelessly prolonged if all voiced their views.
- Most bishops arrive unprepared with little notion as to why they are there (remember, Councils are normally called only in times of great Crisis).
- The liberal-leaning bishops of Germany, France, Belgium, and The Netherlands are very much the exception to this trend.

UNIT 6A TABLE OF CONTENTS:

1. Overall View.....
2. Opening of the Council (1962)
 - a. Opening Speech
 - b. First Rhine Group Victory
 - c. Second Victory
 - d. Between 1st + 2nd Sessions
3. The Second Session (1963)
 - a. Significance and Implementation
 - b. Between 2nd and 3rd Sessions
 - c. Minority Opposition
4. What’s “Wrong” With Vatican II Documents?
 - a. Ambiguity
 - b. Neo-Modernist Time Bombs
5. The Third Session (1964)
 - a. *Lumen Gentium*
 - b. *Unitatis Redintegratio*
6. The Fourth Session (1965)
 - a. *Nostra Aetate*
 - b. *Dei Verbum*
 - c. *Dignitatis Humanae*
 - d. *Gaudium et Spes*

2. OPENING OF THE COUNCIL (1962)

1. JOHN XXIII'S OPENING SPEECH:

"We believe we ought to disassociate ourselves entirely from these prophets of doom who are constantly predicting the worst... According to them, contemporary society would lead to nothing but ruin and calamity; compared to past centuries, our own age shows nothing but destruction."

- Again, the pope is convinced that there is reason for optimism because (apparently) the world is open to the Church's teaching.

"This sure and unchangeable doctrine must be studied and expounded according to methods demanded by modern day thought. The deposit of faith is one thing, but the way it is presented is something quite different. In our teachings, we must have recourse to a style of presentation that is especially pastoral."

The goal of the Council therefore is practical first and doctrinal second rather than the other way around.

"Today, the Spouse of Christ prefers to have recourse to the medicine of mercy rather than brandishing the arms of severity. She considers that, rather than condemning, she better responds to the needs of our age by emphasizing the wealth of her doctrine."

- Again, the naivety that the world is open if we would just stop being so offensive.
- **N.B. An explanation which does not specifically mention errors and false interpretations is almost always ambiguous by nature.** What exactly is meant is always made clearer by specifying what is certainly not meant.

2. FIRST RHINE GROUP (EUROPEAN ALLIANCE) VICTORY: DELAYED VOTE ON A COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

- October 11 - Council opens with much ceremony.
- October 13 - vote for members of Council Commissions (160 elected members, 16 per each of 10 commissions).¹
 - Council Fathers given names of all prelates who participated in preparatory work (reasonable that they be best suited for Council commissions).
 - Rhine group realizes that many conservatives will probably be chosen because they dominate the list, and most Fathers will simply vote for the names on the list.
 - According to pre-arranged plan, when the first General Congregation opens, Cd. Lienart rises and protests and asks for a delay of vote. Cd. Frings of Cologne seconds the motion. After a burst of applause, the Congregation is suspended after only 15 minutes.
- During next three days later, Rhine Group proposes that national hierarchies prepare lists of candidates, Rhine countries collaborate and select multi-national but liberal list of 109 candidates.
- 88 of their candidates elected or appointed by the pope – more than 30% of total

¹ *The pope would personally select 9 additional members for each commission, bringing the total to 25.*

commission membership, whereas they were just over 10% of Council Fathers

3. SECOND VICTORY: REJECTION OF PREPARED SCHEMAS

- a. Council's main task is to examine, amend, and then accept or reject schema.
- b. With significant representation on commissions, Rhine group postpones indefinitely (effectively rejecting them) debate on all prepared schemas except that of the liturgy.
- c. October 22, liturgy schema (most liberal schema by far) given first consideration.

On December 8 the first session closes with not a single schema approved. This symbolizes the practical rejection of the Council's preparatory work.

4. BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND SESSION

German-speaking bishops returned home fully aware that they were in a position to dominate the Council.

- They held two major meetings to prepare for the Second Session (Munich in February and Fulda in August).
 - These meetings produced alternative schemas and significant commentary (mostly authored by Fr. Rahner) on the schemas on Revelation, the Church, and Our Lady.
 - Other national episcopacies held meetings as well but none so well-organized as these, and in practice, Rahner's views could be accepted by the entire Council once they were accepted by the German-speaking bishops.

On June 3, 1963, John XXIII dies. Paul VI elected June 21.

- Just before the Council reopens, Paul VI changes the rules of procedure.
 - Control of Council will be directed by four Cardinal Moderators (all liberals).
 - Rules permitting *periti* to attend commission meetings (of which they are not a member) are loosened.
 - Any five members of a commission could submit amendments for commission consideration. Five was exactly the minimum number of European Alliance members on every commission.

3. SECOND SESSION (1963)

1. SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION

This session is significant for **two reasons**:

- The schema on Our Lady runs into liberal opposition due to its un-ecumenical implications. As a result, it is lumped in with the schema on the Church by the slim margin of 17 votes (1,114 votes in favor).
- Debate on the Liturgy schema continues. On November 29, it is announced that the decree

UNIT 6A: VATICAN II

on the Liturgy is disciplinary and not doctrinal and does not involve the Church's infallibility. At the very end of the Second Session, the schema is overwhelmingly approved.

- This approval is largely due to the common perception that this document was the crown of the liturgical movement of the previous 100 years (when in fact, it was merely the crown of the distorted liturgical movement of the previous 30 years).

Immediately after the Second Session, Paul VI creates the *Consilium for the Implementation of the Constitution on Sacred Liturgy* (1/25/1964) composed of 42 members.

- A liberal Cardinal is placed at its head (Lercaro).
- Its Secretary is Fr. Bugnini who had been secretary of the preparatory commission on the liturgy as well.
- Most Council Fathers from Liturgical Commission are named (this was the most liberal of the commissions).

2. BETWEEN THE SECOND AND THIRD SESSIONS

- German bishops meet at Innsbruck and decide, among other things, that Our Lady should not be given the title Mediatrix of All Graces since it is a “disputed question.”
- Note that it is hardly a disputed question among orthodox theologians.
- This was a common tactic among the liberals to point to the views of the *avant garde* theologians as evidence that there was no theological consensus on a given doctrine. And since, it was a debated topic, it should not be mentioned in a pastoral council.
- Note its anti-ecumenical implications.
- Rules of procedure again changed such that any Father who wished to address the Council had to provide written summaries of their speech five days in advance and had to have the support of 70 Council Fathers.
- This effectively silenced all minority opposition within General Meetings.

3. MINORITY OPPOSITION: *COETUS INTERNATIONALIS PATRUM*

- Led by Archbp. Sigaud of Brazil
- Among Cardinals, members included: Siri (Genoa) and Browne (Curia).
- Other prominent/active members: Archbp. Lefebvre, Bp. Castro Mayer, and the Abbot of Solemses.
- The group consisted of roughly 250 Fathers but sometimes garnered 475-575 signatures for their petitions.
- They won some minor victories but lacked funds and were constantly attacked in the Press.
- The clauses which they succeeded in inserting into the Council documents stand out from the overall tone of the text like “foreign bodies.” (term of Archbp. Lefebvre)

4. WHAT'S "WRONG" WITH THE VATICAN II DOCUMENTS?

Before discussing the Third and Fourth Sessions (the most Schema-intensive), we must consider what exactly is "wrong" with Vatican II documents. It is easy to oversimplify why the Vatican II documents are "bad." Somehow, it is clear that Vatican II caused a radical and destructive transformation in the Church. But you may be surprised when you read the documents to find that they are not "as bad" as you would have probably expecting. What makes the documents destructive?

1. AMBIGUITY

- a. ...due to lack of condemnations. A document which avoids specific condemnations possesses almost inevitably a certain ambiguity by that very fact. In addressing a question, one opens the door to misunderstanding if one refuses to point out the wrong ways one's words could be interpreted.²
- b. ...due to intentional vagueness.
 - i. *"A certain number of important theological questions about which no agreement could be reached were left open by choosing formulations that could be interpreted differently by particular groups and theological tendencies at the Council."* (Fr. Karl Rahner, p.51)
 - ii. *"We will express it in a diplomatic way, but after the Council, we will draw out the implicit conclusions."* (Fr. Edward Schillebeeckx O.P. in 1965)
- c. ...due to ecumenical intent. Words were deliberately chosen to minimize the doctrinal differences and to emphasize doctrinal similarities between Catholicism and non-Catholic creeds/modern thought patterns. This ecumenical intent was absolutely explicit throughout Council discussions.³

2. NEO-MODERNIST TIME BOMBS: Besides these general shortcomings and the general dangers which they pose, certain specific choices of wording were inserted into the documents whose full consequences would be drawn after the Council.

- i. These time bombs were practical mechanisms for justifying a revolution in Catholic teaching and practice.
- ii. But they were also *Neo-Modernist* time-bombs i.e. they correspond to the views of a new theology, a coherent system of thought. **This fact is *not* obvious to the casual reader.** One must have been trained in this new theology (or trained against it) to see the direct causal link between the documents and the Crisis.
 1. The subtlety of the time bombs and the need for being trained in the "system" explains why most Council Fathers did not see the danger in the documents.
 - a. They surely noticed the lack of "negative" clarification and the diplomatic tone, but these dangers were swallowed in the name of "pastorality" which was the uniqueness of this Council as everyone knew.

² This lack of "negative" clarification is obvious to anyone accustomed to previous magisterial teachings.

³ Even at a first reading, although one might be surprised that the documents are not as obviously liberal as one expected, the verbosity (long-winded explanations rather than precise statements) and diplomatic tone are fairly evident.

- b. Furthermore, the documents do contain many explicitly traditional statements thanks to the work of the Coetus.

Today, “conservative” modernists e.g. Benedict XVI, seeing that the revolution has gone farther than he intended but unwilling to acknowledge that their beloved Neo-Modernism is the source of the problem, lay the blame on a “hermeneutic of rupture” which displaced the “hermeneutic of continuity” which the Fathers intended. Note the following.

- This is at least an implicit admission of ambiguity because only ambiguous documents could lend themselves to different hermeneutics.
- This view (accepted by conservative *Novus Ordo* Catholics and *Ecclesia Dei* Catholics) is a tempting one because it is true that most Council Fathers did *not* support a doctrinal rupture.
- The falsity of the view is that the time-bombs are a reality. They were placed there intentionally and they correspond to a coherent system of unCatholic thought.

5. THE THIRD SESSION (1964)

This session would see the approval of two extremely important schemas.

- *Lumen Gentium (LG)*, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, **November 21, 1964**
- *Unitatis Redintegratio (UR)*, Decree on Ecumenism, **November 21, 1964**

1. LUMEN GENTIUM: DOGMATIC CONSTITUTION ON THE CHURCH

The schema on the Church was the first schema discussed.

- After much debate, Mary is given the title (among many) of Mediatrix but not with the conclusion “of all graces.” Nevertheless, the praise of Mary was still stronger than the liberals wanted, and the chapter on Mary was considered by many of them as a defeat.
- **Problematic themes within LG (composed under the influence of Congar):**
 - Church of Christ seems to be broader than the Catholic Church, perhaps embracing the whole human race – the Catholic Church is not quite universal enough.
 - LG speaks not of the “nature” of the Church but of the “mystery” of the Church.
 - LG prefers the term “communion of the people of God” to describe the Catholic Church rather than a Mystical Body since one can be more-or-less in communion, but one is either a member or not of a Body.⁴
 - LG famously states that the Church of Christ subsists in the Catholic Church.
 - “*In the human nature united to Himself, the Son of God, by overcoming death and resurrection, redeemed man and changed him into a new creature.*” (n.7)
Automatically?

⁴ Congar borrowed this notion from Tyrell.

- LG already erodes the proper notion of priesthood which will become very evident in the liturgical reform.
 - Although it declares that the two priesthoods are essentially distinct, it claims that they are “*ordered one to another.*” (n.10)
 - Later it says that the members of the people of God are distinguished by their duties since some are called to exercise ministry for the good of their brethren. (n.13) Again the emphasis is that the priest is defined by his relation to the People not to the Victim of sacrifice.

2. UNITATIS REDINTEGRATIO: DECREE ON ECUMENISM

“The restoration of unity among Christians is one of the principle concerns of the Second Vatican Council. Christ the Lord founded one Church and one Church only. However, many Christian communions present themselves to men as the true inheritors of Jesus Christ; all indeed profess to be followers of the Lord, but they differ in mind and go their different ways as if Christ Himself were divided.”

- These opening words of the document are orthodox.

“In this one and only Church of God from its very beginnings, there arose certain rifts which the Apostle strongly censures as damnable. But in subsequent centuries, much more serious dissensions appeared and large communities became separated from full communion with the Catholic Church – for which, often enough, men of both sides were to blame... men who believe in Christ and have been properly baptized are put in some, though imperfect communion with Catholic Church.”

- Must distinguish between personal blame and doctrinal blame.
- Full communion is a novelty which blurs the visible, institutional nature of the Church.

“It follows that these separated Churches and Communities, though we believe they suffer from defects already mentioned, have by no means been deprived of significance and importance in the mystery of salvation...for the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them as means of salvation”⁵

- A person **may** come to salvation while in a false religion but not because of that false religion. They are not means.
- Whatever has salvific effect in that religion belongs to the Church and is not what makes that religion to be that religion i.e. it is not the specific difference.
- This is further illustrated by the fact that invincible ignorance is a condition for those salvific elements being efficacious to anyone in a false religion.

“In certain circumstances... it is allowable indeed desirable that Catholics join in prayer with separated brethren. Such prayers are certainly a very effective means of petitioning for the grace of unity...”

- Bishops conferences are empowered to determine when such prayer is permissible.

⁵ Vatican II, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, n.3.

6. THE FOURTH SESSION (1965)

This last session sees the approval of all remaining schemas (eleven), the most important of which were:

1. **NOSTRA AETATE: DECLARATION ON RELATION OF THE CHURCH WITH NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS – October 28, 1965**

- *“The Church, therefore, urges her sons to enter with prudence and charity into discussion and collaboration with members of other religions. Let Christians, while witnessing to their own faith and way of life, acknowledge, preserve, and encourage the spiritual and moral truths found among non-Christians, also their social life and culture.”*
 - But are not these spiritual and moral truths also found in Catholicism?
 - Might not their social life and culture be based on what is false in their religions?
- The document strains to find the least similarity between Catholicism and each non-Christian religion for example:
 - *“In Hinduism, men contemplate the divine mystery and express it through an unspent fruitfulness of myths.”* (n.2)
 - But this is false. Hindus contemplate a false notion of God.

2. **DEI VERBUM: CONSTITUTION ON DIVINE REVELATION – November 18, 1965**

- The document contains many orthodox statements about Tradition being a source of revelation, but the emphasis is unquestionably given to Scripture. Furthermore, there is the implication of a continuous experienced-based revelation.
- *“The Tradition that comes from the apostles makes progress in the Church, with the help of the Holy Spirit. There is a growth in insight into the realities and words that are being passed on. This comes about in various ways. It comes about through the contemplation and study of believers who ponder these things in their hearts. It comes from the **intimate sense of the spiritual realities which they experience**. And it comes from the preaching of those who have received along with their right of succession in the episcopate, the sure charism of truth. Thus, as the centuries go by, the Church is always advancing toward the **plenitude of divine truth.**”*
- A far more liberal schema practically denying Tradition was blocked at last minute.

3. **DIGNITATIS HUMANAЕ: DECLARATION ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY – December 7, 1965**

- It makes the right to *publicly* profess one's religion to reside in the *person* (rather than a right of the state to tolerate such practice) as a *natural* right.
- Note that John Courtney Murray, the mastermind of this teaching, had already been censured by the Holy Office for his views.

4. **GAUDIUM ET SPES: PASTORAL CONSTITUTION ON THE CHURCH IN THE MODERN WORLD = December 7, 1965**

- *“Human nature, by the very fact that it was assumed...has been raised in us also to a dignity beyond compare. For, by His Incarnation, He, the Son of God, has in a certain way united Himself with each man.”* (n.7)
- *“While rejecting atheism root and branch, the Church sincerely professes that all men,*

UNIT 6A: VATICAN II

believers and unbelievers alike, out to work for the betterment of this world in which all alike live. Such an ideal cannot be realized however apart from sincere and prudent dialogue.”

(n.21)

- Note the non-supernatural good emphasized here (by no means the only place Vatican II mentions improvement of temporal circumstances).
- Note the need for dialogue.
- *“It is regrettable that those basic personal rights are not yet being respected everywhere, as in the case with women who are denied the chance freely to choose a husband, or a state of life, or to have access to the same **educational and cultural benefits** as are available to men.”* (n.29)
- *“The mother too (in addition to the father) has a central role in the home for the children , especially younger children depend upon her considerably; this role must be safeguarded without, however, underrating women's **legitimate social advancement.**”* (n.52)

The Council closed on December 8, 1965.

UNIT 6B – THE POST-CONCILIAR REFORMS

RECOMMENDED READING:

In this unit, we will analyze how the Church was able to undergo such a profound change in so short a time. The explanation for such a dramatic historical shift seems to involve four elements.

1. The “spirit” of Vatican II.
2. The influence of a new theological synthesis: an integrated Neo-Modernist system.
3. Changes in Church administration: structure, personnel, and policy.
4. Vehicles for disseminating Neo-Modernism among faithful: catechisms and the New Mass.

1. THE “SPIRIT” OF THE COUNCIL

In a way which is unique among Councils, Vatican II had a “spirit” i.e. something expressed in the documents but going beyond the literal wording of the documents.

If a “practical” goal is the focus, a “spirit” will almost necessarily exist.

- This “spirit” or underlying principle was manifestly one of **change**.
- “Novus” recurs 212 times in Vatican II documents – far more than any other Council.
- Paul VI: *“The word newness has been given to us as an order, a program.”*⁶
- The continual reference to *“Faith of Vatican II”* and to *“Church of Vatican II”* by bishops and theologians after the Council is an implicit admission to innovative nature of 2nd Vatican Council. No one ever spoke of the *“Church of Nicea,”* nor the *“Faith of Trent’.*⁷

UNIT 6B TABLE OF CONTENTS:

1. The “Spirit” of the Council
2. Neo-Modernism: The System Behind the Spirit
 - a. Historical Connection Between Modernism and Vatican II
 - b. Historical Connection Between Vatican II and Post-Conciliar Reforms
 - c. Ideological Connection: Neo-Modernism
3. Changes in Church Administration and Policy
 - a. Reform of the Holy Office
 - b. Reform of the Relationship Between Curia and Bishops
 - c. Separation of Church and State
 - d. Reform of Religious Orders
4. Catechisms and the New Mass

What exactly is driving this “newness” and “change”? The primacy of “union” over truth.

- a. The “pastoral” (i.e. **ecumenical**) rather than doctrinal focus of the Council is both obvious and obviously new.
- b. Equally obvious is the ambiguity of the documents produced by this ecumenical focus, hardly surprising since Protestant had a hand in drafting them.
- c. Note also that “dialogue” appears 28 times in Council texts though **never** found in any

⁶ O.R., July 3, 1974.

⁷ *That the Church must be essentially the same throughout time (essentially traditional for example) is made evident when one realizes that the Church is Christ, in social form, living through time.*

papal or conciliar document before Vatican II.

- d. Paul VI sums up the need for putting doctrine in a secondary role with this quote, less than three weeks after the Council: *“The Church, with its demanding and precise attitude to dogma, impedes free conversation and harmony among men; it is a principle of division in the world rather than of union. How are division, disagreement and dispute compatible with its catholicity and its sanctity?”* (December 24, 1965)

Although this new “spirit” of ecumenically driven change is intentional, it is also true that the expression “spirit of council” will provide cover for anyone who wants to make any kind of change.

2. NEO-MODERNISM AS THE SYSTEM BEHIND THE SPIRIT

Such a *universal* shift in Catholic thought and practice suggests that its “engine” would be an integrated, organized system of thought – a counter-theory of Catholicism that could be exchanged for the existing one as a “unit” and be put into immediate service.

We can **prove** that this is exactly what happened in **two ways**.

1. We can make a **historical connection** between Modernism and the reforms which followed Vatican II by simply stringing together names e.g. Tyrell influenced de Lubac who played a significant role in the Church during and after the Council.
2. We can make an **ideological connection** between Neo-Modernist theory and the practice of the Church after Vatican II.

1. THE HISTORICAL CONNECTION BETWEEN MODERNISM AND VATICAN II: 3 FACTS

- I. St. Pius X had already warned in *Pascendi* that, for the first time, the Church was confronted with a complete un-Catholic system being spread by men within the Church for the purpose – not of destroying the Church *per se* but of re-inventing it.
 - a. *There, such a counter-system did exist, just 60 years before Council.*
- II. By everyone's admission, the most influential men at Vatican II were the intellectuals, the *periti*. The most influential of them were Rahner, Congar, and de Lubac.
 - a. *“Theologians as eminent as Henri de Lubac, J. Danielou, Yves Congar, Hans Kung, R. Lombardi, Karl Rahner, and others played an extraordinary role in the preparatory work.”* (Bp. Karl Wojtyla)
 - b. *If such a complete counter-system did exist, we would expect to find it among the intellectuals.*
- III. All three of these men borrow extensively (often by their own admission) from the

UNIT 6B: REFORMS

thinkers condemned by Pius X (*Pascendi*) and Pius XII (*Humani Generis*) including Kant, Heidegger, Tyrell, and Blondel. This explains why all three of these men had been censured (to some extent or another) by the Holy Office.

- a. *Now the link between the minds behind Vatican II and Modernist thought is obvious.*
- b. *The divergence between Neo-modernist thought and Catholic doctrine should also be obvious by the historical connection of names involved. It is further highlighted by the historical fact that all preparatory schema (except Liturgy), prepared under the influence of the Curia are rejected.*

Therefore, there is a historical link between thinkers behind Vatican II and the condemned Modernist thinkers before Vatican II – between the Modernists and the Neo-Modernists.

2. HISTORICAL CONNECTION BETWEEN VATICAN II AND THE REFORMS AFTER VATICAN II

- Official commentary of Council texts in German cites: Rahner (95 times), Congar (67 times), St. Thomas (48 times), and de Lubac (15 times).
 - Therefore, the documents were *meant* to be interpreted by Neo-Modernists. Collectively, they are cited 3.5 times as often as the greatest theologian in Church history (and Rahner alone twice as often).
- After the Council, Neo-Modernists hold great influence in the Church.
- On January 3, 1966 Paul VI at suggestion of European Alliance, creates five commissions for the interpretation of Council texts:⁸
 - Religious, Missions, Christian Education, Apostolate of the Laity, Bishops and the Government of Dioceses... note that the *Consilium* was already in existence.
 - Most members are former *periti*.⁹

- Rahner and de Lubac both named to the International Theological Commission.
- Ratzinger, de Lubac, and von Baltasar are all named cardinals by John Paul II.
- Before becoming pope, Ratzinger was the most powerful man in the Curia serving as Head of the *Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith*, the *International Theological Commission*, and the *Pontifical Biblical Commission*.
- Paul VI had staffed the *Biblical Commission* with Neo-Modernist exegetes, and Ratzinger (as Head of these 3 bodies), “packed the court” with various Neo-Modernists.¹⁰
- Popes Paul VI, John Paul II, and Benedict XVI frequently express their admiration for Rahner, Teilhard de Chardin, Kung, de Lubac, von Balthasar – even Blondel.

3. THE IDEOLOGICAL CONNECTION: EXPLANATION OF NEO-MODERNISM

⁸ “We will express it in a diplomatic way, but after the Council, we will draw out the implicit conclusions.” Fr. Schillebeeckx, in the Dutch magazine *De Bazuin*, 1965. (See *Iota Unum*, p. 107.)

⁹ As reported in *The Tablet*. *Cd. Heenan of Westminster had said that it would be a disaster if those responsible for the wording of the documents were allowed to interpret them.*

¹⁰ See *One Hundred Years of Modernism*, p. 293.

To understand how complete a synthesis Neo-Modernism is, note its basis: Existentialism.

- Agnosticism is not really a complete “system.” It is a skepticism which causes a certain re-interpretation of dogma, faith, etc., but it has more of “negation” about it than “alternative system.” Existentialism has *more* of an alternative system about it, so it lends itself more to a complete re-interpretation of even individual dogmas e.g. Redemption, original sin, last judgment, etc.¹¹
- The notion of “re-interpretation” strikes us as something pre-meditated and malicious, but it is important to note that if one possessed an alternative philosophy and even a little formation in alternative theology, re-interpretation would come almost naturally.

3. THE CHANGES IN CHURCH ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY

This is the next step in understanding how the Church was able to undergo such a profound change in so short a time. We have noted already the powerful positions held by Neo-Modernists (the papacy, not the least, of course).

1. REFORM OF THE HOLY OFFICE (Renamed Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith)

The Holy Office was *established* in 1542 by Paul III to combat heresies, and to suppress dangers to the Faith.

- The Holy Office was reformed in 1965 (this was called for by Modernists condemned by *Pascendi*).
 - No more obligations would be *imposed by law* e.g.: Index
 - Index remains binding on conscience if the book represents a danger to the personal faith of a particular person.
 - But no longer has the force of ecclesiastical law. The Church trusts the “*intellectual maturity*” of Christians.
- Investigations into authors no longer conducted in secret, making it almost impossible to condemn anyone if the theologian has powerful protectors. (Very few condemnations since 1968.)

¹¹ We say “more” of an alternative system since Existentialists claim that it is a non-system by definition.

2. REFORM OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CURIA AND THE BISHOPS

After Vatican II, the national bishops' conferences acted much more independently of and even in opposition to the Vatican.

- This was a result of the Council's teaching on collegiality (to be studied later) or the democratization of the Church hierarchy.
 - A major example of this was the bishops' opposition to Paul VI's encyclical *Humanae Vitae* (1968) which condemned artificial contraception.
 - Although Paul VI took a brave stand on this issue, he created much of the problem himself by refusing to allow the Council to condemn it and by giving the impression that it was an issue which still had to be studied.

3. SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

Following the teaching of *Dignitatis Humanae*, Rome urged the secularization of Catholic states: Spain, Italy, Swiss cantons, and especially South American nations.

- This effectively:
 - Sent a message of doctrinal and moral relativism (e.g. divorce no longer illegal).
 - Restricted the Church's influence over public life (civil rights legislation, education, etc.)
 - Opened the door to Protestant (etc.) evangelization (particularly in South America).

4. REFORM OF RELIGIOUS ORDERS (See *Iota Unum*, Chapter 14)

- After Vatican II, every religious order held a special general chapter to update their constitutions to bring them in line with the Vatican II decree *Perfectae Caritatis*.
- Principles of change:
 - Define religious life in terms of service to man, not God.
 - Decrease differences with secular world (the world which it serves).
 - Lay dress.
 - Living outside the community becomes common.
 - Redefine notion of obedience to respect the freedom of the individual.
 - Obedience as dialectical dialogue between superior/inferior to determine God's will.
 - Interesting to note that Benedict XVI launched an investigation into the religious lives of American nuns in 2009 concerned over falling numbers, unorthodox positions, and liberty of action. There was an outcry among American nuns.¹²

4. VEHICLES FOR DISSEMINATING NEO-MODERNISM: CATECHISMS AND THE NEW MASS

¹² See BBC article, August 8, 2009.

NEW CATECHISMS:

The few specifically mentioned are by way of example:

- The **Dutch Catechism** (by far the worst)
 - Written by Schillebeeckx: denied Incarnation, Real Presence, priesthood, and angels.
 - *Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* condemned it but permitted that it be printed so long as the condemnation was printed as an appendix!
- **French Catechism** (*Living Stones*)¹³
 - Also riddled with heresies.
 - Attacked by Cd. Ratzinger, but he withdrew his comments after French bishops defended it.
- **The Catechism of the Catholic Church** (1994)¹⁴
 - This is the “Bible” of the conservative Novus Ordo camp and does reveal a certain “conservatizing evolution” of Neo-Modernism.
 - Nevertheless: *“Together with the liturgical reform and the New Code of Canon Law, the new Catechism gives a solid foundation to the ecclesiastical reform started by the Council.”* (John Paul II, December 18, 1992).
 - This is obvious since, in large part, the Catechism is simply a stringing together of Vatican II quotations.
 - Problematic passages include:
 - *“The Old Testament is an indispensable part of Sacred Scripture. Its books are divinely inspired and preserve permanent value for the Old Covenant has never been revoked (n.121).”*
 - *“The divisions between Christians hold the Church back from realizing the plenitude of Catholicity which is proper to it in those of her children who, it is certain, belong to it by Baptism but who find themselves separated from full communion.”* *Unitatis Redintegratio*, quoted in the Catechism.
 - *“The matrimonial covenant, by which a man and a woman constitute themselves a lifelong community, ordained by its natural character to the good of the spouses as well as to the generation and education of children... (n.1601)”*

The New Mass: primary vehicle of the New Theology. See next section.

¹³ ***One Hundred Years of Modernism*, pp.281-282.**

¹⁴ *The official Vatican version was published in 1992, but it was not translated into vernacular languages until 1994.*