

Benevolent Ally? – II

September 9, 2017

When last year Bishop Athanasius Schneider of Astana in Kazakhstan in an interview with *Adelante la Fe* expressed many views in agreement with Catholic Tradition and with positions taken by Archbishop Lefebvre, these “Comments” (498, Jan. 17, 2017) asked if he was a true ally of the Archbishop’s Society.

In July of this year he authorised the publication of an article expressing views of his, even more Catholic and supportive of Tradition. If he was not yet a true ally, has he become one? To answer the question, one must distinguish: subjectively, his heart is in the right place because he wants to save souls by the faithful application of unchanged Tradition, but objectively his mind is still not all the way there, because he still thinks, or says he thinks, that the original intent of Vatican II was not to create a new Church. But, Your Excellency, Our Lord said that by their fruits you will know them. Fruits of Vatican II? Newchurch!

Thus, much that Bishop Schneider says this time about Catholic Tradition is Catholic doctrine, entirely true. For instance (paragraph 6), Tradition is the criterion by which to judge all later doctrine, and (8) in case of doubt raised by ambiguity or novelty, Tradition has the priority. There are ambiguities and novelties of Vatican II which clash with Tradition (10), and the “Hermeneutic of Continuity” is insufficient to resolve the clash. Alas (19), for 50 years a Nomenklatura (Communist-style bureaucracy) within the Church has used the ambiguities of Vatican II to distort the Council’s original intent, and to create a new church, of a relativist and protestant kind. Climaxing today (20) is the use of the Council’s objective ambiguities and departures from Tradition to block all discussion by declaring these to be “infallible.” But this “infallibilising” of the Council must stop (22), and give way to free and open theological

discussion, to which (24) a canonically recognised SSPX could make a valuable contribution. True doctrine alone is truly pastoral, and alone is the will of God for the salvation of souls. Thus far the Bishop's latest article.

But, your Excellency, what makes you so sure that the original intent of the Council was not to create a neo-protestant Newchurch? Do you think the ambiguities were not deliberate? Have you not read, for instance, how Fr Schillebeeckx admitted that they were planted as time-bombs, to be detonated after the Council? Maybe many Council Fathers could say after the Council, like William II of Germany, "Ich habe es nicht gewollt," I did not want it (WW I). But certainly not all of them did not want the Newchurch, and the "movers and shakers" did want it. You cannot think that the "new church," as you yourself call it, came out of the Council by accident! Study books about the Council, like *The Rhine flows into the Tiber* by Ralph Wiltgen . The Council was an epic struggle, and the Catholics lost.

And if the Newchurch is the fruit of a conspiratorial minority steering a mass of cardinals, bishops, priests and laity towards it, who watch too much television and do not say enough prayers, do you really think that "free and open theological discussion" will solve the problem? Half a year before he died, Archbishop Lefebvre said that the real problem with Vatican II was not even the major identifiable errors like religious liberty, collegiality and ecumenism, but an all-pervading subjectivism which empties out of Catholic doctrine all its objective force, and thereby dissolves the Catholic Church. And the question is not even whether the Archbishop said that, but whether it is true. And it is resoundingly true. The mind of modern man has been reduced to mush, by his own fault and that of Freemasonry in particular. Your Excellency, do you know anything about Freemasonry, or do you think, like so many poor souls have been induced to think, that it is a harmless organisation of do-gooders, unjustly

calumniated?

Between 2009 and 2011, there were half a dozen sessions of “free and open theological debate” between four theologians of Rome and four from the SSPX (prior to its betrayal by the General Chapter of 2012).

Result? Nothing! Menzingen promised that the contents of the discussions would be published. We are still waiting. To please Rome, somebody within the SSPX wants to brush Tradition under the carpet!

Kyrie eleison.