

[Greek hermēneutikos, from hermēneutēs, interpreter, from hermēneuein, to interpret, from hermēneus, [interpreter](#).]

Hermeneutics is the key used to understand a difficult text/document or the lens by which we look at a certain document to understand it correctly.

a methodology or system used interprets certain documents or texts. We see this in the study of biblical text, literature and philosophy. It an interpretative key to understand difficult documents

I.E. it is essential to the proper understanding of the Old Testament to look at the whole Old Testament through the lens of Christ. Since all prefigured Christ.

What is very particular to the Vatican II is that is was a proclaimed to be “pastoral” council very accessible to the people to help them understand and live the Faith. But, what actually followed Vatican II was an unprecedented loss Faith and collapse of morality. The Hermeneutic of continuity will be introduced shift the blame from the council and to try to curse the the “abuses”¹

Since both the Traditionalist and the progressivist immediately saw the causal links between Vatican II as responsible for post-conciliar changes.

Archbishop Lefebvre with prophetic insight rejected the hermeneutic of continuity before it was even proposed. He accused the council

¹ This “*spirit of the Council*” is the license of legitimacy that the innovators oppose to their critics, without realizing that it is precisely confessing that legacy that confirms not only the erroneousness of the present declarations but also the heretical matrix that supposedly justifies them. On closer inspection, never in the history of the Church has a Council presented itself as such a historic event that it was different from any other council: there was never talk of a “*spirit of the Council of Nicea*” or the “*spirit of the Council of Ferrara-Florence*,” even less the “*spirit of the Council of Trent*,” just as we never had a “*post-conciliar*” era after Lateran IV or Vatican I.

<https://www.lifesitenews.com/blogs/abp-vigano-on-the-roots-of-deviation-of-vatican-ii-and-how-francis-was-chosen-to-revolutionize-the-church>

I refer to the book “I accuse the council” which made up 12 official statements at the Council exposing the danger of its documents. He warned that the faithful would become confused, doubting the necessity of the Church, the sacraments, the conversion of non-Catholics, and the necessity of authority.²

The radical post-conciliar changes were done in the name of the council by the same people who drafted/approved the documents. I.e. We must laicize states, change the Mass etc... in the spirit of the council. Immediately after the council the ambiguity of the council was weaponized.

We can look at some words from the architects of the council:

- Edward Schillebeeckx who was the ghost writer for the Dutch bishops and expert at the council: “ We have used ambiguous phrases during the Council and we know how we will interpret them afterwards”³
- Karl Rahner, when asked about interpreting the Council, stated, “What is most important in the Council is not the letter of the decree it promulgated. They still need to be translated into life and action by all of us. Its spirit, its more advanced tendencies, this is what is the most important”⁴. He saw the council as a decisive break from the past and saw this as a very good thing. The modernist were very happy to leave behind the era of the council of Trent.

At a conference in Cambridge in 1979 Karl Rahner drew an analogy between the Christian community before and after the Council of Jerusalem (circa 49AD) and Catholicism before and after Vatican II. He used the language of a 'decisive break' to describe the two transitions, and went so far as to assert that the break experienced after the Council was of such a magnitude that the only possible comparison is with the transition from Jewish to Gentile Christianity at the Council of Jerusalem. He added that such transitions “happen for the most part and in the final analysis, unreflectively; they are not first planned out theologically and then put into effect.”

Paul VI himself noted in a letter back to Cardinal Larraona, dated October 18, 1964, that Chapter 3 of what would become Lumen Gentium did in fact contain “**fundamentally contradictory statements**”, and said that these “objections [are] supported in Our personal opinion.” These concerns would later cause Paul VI to add an explanatory note to the document.⁵

² <https://angeluspress.org/products/i-accuse-council>

³ Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, Open Letter to Confused Catholics, Angelus Press, pg.106.

⁴ Dr. Taylor Marshall, Infiltration: The Plot to Destroy the Church from Within, Sophia Institute Press

⁵ Nota personalmente riservate”, cited in G. Caprile, *Contributo alla storia della "Nota explicativa praevia,*” op. cit., 622 623

We must add to this the fact that the very same Pope who approved the documents and the same experts and bishops who produced the documents implemented the documents after the council. We also note that the ambiguity is not only in a few phrases that can be easily changed, but the whole tone of the documents speaks rupture rather than continuity.

As a “pastoral council” the best way to know its sprits is to see how the authorities implement the document, which the council produced. We therefore hold that spirit of Vatican II directly flows from Vatican II. There is a relation of cause to effect.

The conservative and progressivist agree that the council marks a breaking post with the past. How does the hermeneutic of continuity fit in.

Among those who do see that something is wrong in the post-conciliar era there are some who in order “to save the council” and “stop abuses” propose Hermeneutical solution. This was proposed by Benedict XVI in his Christmas address of 2005, where he reflects on the state of the Church and its relation to Vatican II.

“The last event of this year on which I wish to reflect here is the celebration of the conclusion of the Second Vatican Council 40 years ago. This memory prompts the question: What has been the result of the Council? Was it well received? What, in the acceptance of the Council, was good and what was inadequate or mistaken? What still remains to be done? No one can deny that in vast areas of the Church the implementation of the Council has been somewhat difficult...”

“Why has the implementation of the Council, in large parts of the Church, thus far been so difficult?”⁶

Unfortunately, he will misdiagnose the problem and proposes a false solution.

In his mind, the reason for the crisis in the Church is that there are two contrary dueling hermeneutics or keys in interpreting and applying the council, which came in conflict with each other immediately after the council.

⁶ https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/speeches/2005/december/documents/hf_ben_xvi_spe_20051222_roman-curia.html

There two different Hermeneutics :

The Hermeneutic of Rupture and the Hermeneutic of continuity.

What is the Hermeneutic of Rupture:

“There is Hermeneutic of Rupture: Causes confusion and risk splitting the conciliar and post-conciliar Church.”⁷

Some aspects of the hermeneutic which cause this rupture with Church Tradition.

1. “It asserts that the texts of the Council as such do not yet express the true spirit of the Council. It claims that they are the result of compromises in which, to reach unanimity, it was found necessary to keep and reconfirm many old things that are now pointless. However, the true spirit of the Council is not to be found in these compromises but instead in the impulses toward the new that are contained in the texts.”⁸

The Council documents are did go as far as they should have but intentionally left ambiguities in the documents which would be exploited after the council. The did not go as far as they should have since they conservatives have to be placated but the intentional abilities would be sufficient to give the council

2. “These innovations alone were supposed to represent the true spirit of the Council, and starting from and in conformity with them, it would be possible to move ahead. Precisely because the texts would only imperfectly reflect the true spirit of the Council and its newness, it would be necessary to go courageously beyond the texts and make room for the newness in which the Council’s deepest intention would be expressed, even if it were still vague.”⁹

3. “In a word: it would be necessary not to follow the texts of the Council but its spirit. In this way, obviously, a vast margin was left open for the

⁷ https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/speeches/2005/december/documents/hf_ben_xvi_spe_20051222_roman-curia.html

⁸ Idem

⁹ Idem

question on how this spirit should subsequently be defined and room was consequently made for every whim.”¹⁰

He speaks about the elements of ambiguity and the “spirit of the council” which he recognizes is not good, but

His claim is that a para-conciliar spirit somehow highjacked the true spirit of the council. For Pope Benedict the council is the not cause of the current crises/rupture but the misapplication of the council is the cause of the crisis therefore the solution is to properly and fully implement Vatican II.

He thus misdiagnoses the problem and proposes a false solution:

Is it not possible to separate the spirit of the council for the council.

The facts demonstrate the spirit of Vatican II came from Vatican II. We already saw that there was weaponized ambiguity. These documents were produced by a Council unlike any other council in history; it was revolutionary event in the history of the Church both way it was conducted and the documents it produced.

Revolutionary documents were produced by a revolutionary event?

Yes, **In regards to the council as an event** we will just highlight a few things already explained in other podcast:

- It was called as a pastor council not a dogmatic Council. No dogmas would be defined and no errors condemned. After the council it was – and is– treated as a super-dogmatic council to which unconditional assent is required. How odd that we are asked to give the assent of Faith to a council which did not condemn error or define doctrine.
- In spite of will of a great part of the episcopate to condemn Communism and the facts the Cardinals, bishops and priest would suffering in communist concentration camps, it failed to condemn the great social plague and moral evil of communism. How can the council call itself pastor when it fails address to most pressing pastor issue of the century.
- The fact that the good work of the preparative commission was thrown out in a revolutionary way.

¹⁰ Idem

We see why why Cardinal Suenens called it the 1789 of the Church. The French Revolution overthrew the Christin order.

Archbishop Viganó he calls the Second Vatican Council a “coup d'état” and a “revolution.”¹¹ ...was intended and conceived for its subversive value, and which as such has caused many evils.¹²

As our Lord told us: “ Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit, and the evil tree bringeth forth evil fruit “¹³

Even though only a small % of the documents are openly erroneous the whole sprit is poison and the fruit of the council is poison.

This rupture was so profound that terms pre-conciliar and post-conciliar Church would soon represent a painful reality. This is the first time in history that this terminology is used to speak of a council.

Some concrete examples of the current evils which can be traced back to the council:

If the pachamama could be adored in a church, we owe it to Dignitatis Humanae. If we have a liturgy that is Protestantized and at times even paganized, we owe it to the revolutionary action of Msgr. Annibale Bugnini and to the post-conciliar reforms. If the Abu Dhabi Declaration was signed, we owe it to Nostra Aetate. If we have come to the point of delegating decisions to the Bishops 'Conferences we owe it to collegiality, and to its updated version, synodality.¹⁴

This causal link between Vatican II and current heterodoxy is even confirmed by Pope Francis in defending his Abu Dhabi declaration on Human fraternity.

‘There is one thing ... I would like to say. I openly reaffirm this: from the Catholic point of view the Document does not move one millimeter away

¹¹ <https://www.lifesitenews.com/blogs/abp-vigano-on-the-roots-of-deviation-of-vatican-ii-and-how-francis-was-chosen-to-revolutionize-the-church>

¹² <https://catholicfamilynews.com/blog/2020/06/17/archbishop-vigano-on-vatican-ii-it-is-preferable-to-let-the-whole-thing-drop-and-be-forgotten/>

¹³ Matthew 7:17

¹⁴ <https://www.lifesitenews.com/blogs/abp-vigano-on-the-roots-of-deviation-of-vatican-ii-and-how-francis-was-chosen-to-revolutionize-the-church>

from the Second Vatican Council. It is even cited, several times. The Document was crafted in the spirit of the Second Vatican Council.”¹⁵

We keep in mind that Pope Francis has advocated for the same Hermeneutic of continuity.

We say in philosophy: Against a fact you cannot argue” and it most evident that the spirit of the council flows directly from the council and is in rupture with tradition. We also know that the mind look for a sufficient cause for very effect and the sufficient cause of the crisis is found in Vatican II not in a “para-conciliar” spirit....

We disagree with the analysis that the spirit of the council does not come from the council, but can we agree with the proposed solution to interpret document in light of tradition to fix the problem?

There are two things to consider:

The first is that that documents carry with them the spirit of Vatican II which cannot be reconciled with spirit of the Church

In order to understand why this approach will not work, we will focus on a quote Pope John XXIII in calling the council which Pope Benedict used to justify this theory of hermeneutic of continuity:

The substance of the ancient doctrine of the deposit of faith is one thing, and the way in which it is presented is another...”¹⁶

Secondly: What does means by “interpret the Documents in light of Tradition”

Let’s look at Pope Benedict who is in continuity with John XXIII and John Paul II on this.

Benedict XVI “It is clear that this commitment to expressing a specific truth in a new way demands new thinking on this truth and a new and vital relationship with it; that on one side is the hermeneutic of continuity or reform that seeks to implement Vatican II in fidelity to Sacred Tradition.

¹⁵ <https://fsspx.news/en/news-events/news/vatican-ii-abu-dhabi-debate-between-bishop-schneider-and-archbishop-viganò-59487>

¹⁶ (The Documents of Vatican II, Walter M. Abbott, S.J., p. 715).

What does the Pope mean by a new vital relationship with the truth? What does he mean by fidelity to Sacred tradition?

We know the he followed “New Theology” of Maurice Blondel, Henri de Lubac, etc. which is nothing more than a revitalized Modernism. The foundation of “new theology” is a new definition of truth. ‘Truth is the conformity of my mind to the needs of human life’ which means the truth changes to fit the times. “Tradition” for the modernist is the transmission of experience and is whatever is needed to continue the vital experience of the early Christians.

This is important to understand since John Paul II also spoke about understanding the council in light of Tradition, but also had a false notion of tradition. “The council must be understood in light of the All Holy Tradition and on the basis of the constant magisterium of the Church”¹⁷

Pope Benedict is in fact developing John Paul II idea of interpreting the council in light of Tradition but both have an incorrect notion of Tradition. For them tradition is ever alive and changing to fit the needs of the ‘modern man.’ They want to change the unchangeable deposit of the Faith by looking at it through the lens of Vatican II so that deposit of the Faith correspond to the novelty of Vatican II.

Far from solving any problem, the hermeneutic of reform or continuity increases widespread confusion since looks at Tradition through of lens modernism.

An example of how they interpret Tradition in light of modernism in his same Christmas address of Pope Benedict “The Second Vatican Council, recognizing and making its own an essential principle of the modern State with the Decree on Religious Freedom, has recovered the deepest patrimony of the Church. By so doing she can be conscious of being in full harmony with the teaching of Jesus himself (cf. Mt 22: 21), as well as with the Church of the martyrs of all time.”¹⁸

The Pope here claiming that religious liberty as taught by Vatican II is a true reform.... yet to reform is to return to the true form ¹⁹

¹⁷ John Paul II on November 6, 1978 at the reunion of the Sacred College.

¹⁸ https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/speeches/2005/december/documents/hf_ben_xvi_spe_20051222_roman-curia.html

¹⁹ The Everlasting Man, CW 2:204

It has been sufficiently exposed in previous podcast that the religious Liberty of Vatican II is opposed to Ordinary Universal Magisterium of the Church.

From this follows the claim that the Martyrs died for this false religious liberty, which is completely false. They died for the liberty to worship the True God as God want to be worshiped.

“The martyrs of the early Church died for their faith in that God who was revealed in Jesus Christ, and for this very reason they also died for freedom of conscience and the freedom to profess one’s own faith – a profession that no State can impose but which, instead, can only be claimed with God’s grace in freedom of conscience.”²⁰

Solution

We can look at two complementary aspects as expressed 45 years apart by Archbishop Lefebvre and Archbishop Vigano

For Archbishop Vigano we need and Act of humility from the highest level of the Church and this humility must be accompanied by the courage to correct the errors. ²¹ He laments that those in position of authority won’t dare confess the failures of the council or the new liturgy.

Archbishop Vigano: The solution, in my opinion, lies above all in an act of humility that all of us, beginning with the Hierarchy and the Pope, must carry out: recognizing the infiltration of the enemy into the heart of the Church, the systematic occupation of key posts in the Roman Curia, seminaries, and ecclesiastical schools, the conspiracy of a group of rebels—including, in the front line, the deviated Society of Jesus—which has succeeded in giving the appearance of legitimacy and legality to a subversive and revolutionary act. We should also recognize the inadequacy of the response of the good, the naivety of many, the fearfulness of others, and the interests of those who have benefited thanks to that conspiracy. After his triple denial of Christ in the courtyard of the high priest, Peter “flevit amare,” he wept bitterly” ²²

Regarding the possibility of making a correction to the acts of the Second Vatican Council, I think that we can agree: the heretical propositions or

²⁰ https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/speeches/2005/december/documents/hf_ben_xvi_spe_20051222_roman-curia.html
<https://www.lifesitenews.com/blogs/in-new-interview-abp-vigano-discusses-failure-of-vatican-ii-novus-ordo-mass>

²² <https://www.catholicculture.org/culture/library/view.cfm?recnum=12379>

those which favor heresy should be condemned, and we can only hope that this will happen as soon as possible.²³

While we wait, we must meditate upon and seek to live the fearless words of Archbishop Lefebvre

“We hold fast, with all our heart and with all our soul, to Catholic Rome, Guardian of the Catholic Faith and of the traditions necessary to preserve this faith, to Eternal Rome, Mistress of wisdom and truth.

We refuse, on the other hand, and have always refused to follow the Rome of neo-Modernist and neo-Protestant tendencies which were clearly evident in the Second Vatican Council and, after the Council, in all the reforms which issued from it.”²⁴

²³<https://catholicfamilynews.com/blog/2020/06/17/archbishop-vigano-on-vatican-ii-it-is-preferable-to-let-the-whole-thing-drop-and-be-forgotten/>

²⁴ <https://fsspx.org/en/1974-declaration-of-archbishop-lefebvre>