

# EINSICHT

RÖMISCH-KATHOLISCHE  
ZEITSCHRIFT

*credo ut intelligam*

33. Jahrgang, Number 4

MÜNCHEN

April 2003



**Impressum:** Herausgeber: **Freundeskreis der Una Voce e.V.**, D - 80079 München, Postfach 100540

Postscheckkonto München Nr. 214 700-805 (BLZ 700 100 80); Schaffhausen Nr. 82-7360-4

Bayerische Vereinsbank München Nr. 7323069 (BLZ 700 202 70)

**B 13088 F**

Redaktion: **Eberhard Heller** - Erscheinungsweise: **7-mal jährlich**

Internet: <http://www.einsicht.de>

## CONTENTS:

	page:
"Surrexit Christus, spes mea" (Fr. Paul Schoonbroodt/E. Vaiciulis) engl.....	115
"Surrexit Christus, spes mea" (abbé. Paul Schoonbroodt) franc.....	118
Note of the publisher (E. Heller) engl.....	122
The Roman Catholic Diaspora Church - Fact or fiction (Diether Wendland/E. Vaiciulis) engl. ....	124
La silla apostólica 'ocupada'... (Eberhard Heller/Alberto Ciria) espan.....	134
Where do we stand? (Eberhard Heller/Gladys Resch).....	144

\* \* \* \* \*

**Title:** Christus trägt das Kreuz; Werkstatt von Meister Leonhard, um 1465, Kreuzgang Brixen; Photo: Heller  
**p. 123:** Christus erscheint Maria Magdalena; Leonh. v. Brixen, um 1472, Kreuzgang Brixen; Photo: Heller  
**Redaktionsschluß:** 7.4.2003

\* \* \* \* \*

## HINWEIS AUF GOTTESDIENSTE:

**Basel/Schweiz:** telefonische Auskunft 0041/61/3614 313.

**Marienbad/CZ:** Meßzeiten unregelmäßig; Auskunft H.H. Rissling über Tel. 0731/9404 183 und 07305/919 479

**München:** Hotel Maria, Schwanthalerstr. 112, sonn- und feiertags um 8.30 Uhr hl. Messe (H.H. Kap. Rissling)

**Spinges** bei I - 39037 - Mühlbach / Südtirol: Pfarrkirche, sonntags 6.30 und 9 Uhr, werktags 7.10 Uhr hl. Messe  
Rosenkranz: sonntags, samstags: 18 Uhr 30 (H.H. Pfr. Josef von Zieglauer) **Tel./Fax:** 0039-0472-849468.

Unterkünfte für Besucher und Urlauber: Gasthof Senoner, Spinges, Tel.: 0039-0472-849944; Hotel Rogen, Tel.:  
0039-0472-849478, Fax: 0039-0472-849830; Privatquartiere: Haus Schönblick (Farn. Lamprecht), Tel.: 0039-  
0472-849581; Frau Sargans, Tel.: 0039-0472-84950; Brunnerhof, Farn. Maier, Tel.: 0039-0472-849591

**Steffeshausen** bei 4790 Burg Reuland / Belgien: Herz-Jesu-Kirche, sonn- und feiertags um 8.30 und 10 Uhr hl.  
Messe (H.H. Pfr. Schoonbroodt) (hl. Messe an den Werktagen: tel. Auskunft 0032-80329692) - **Übernachtungs-**  
möglichkeiten in Steffeshausen vorhanden; bitte über H.H. Pfr. Schoonbroodt erfragen.

**Ulm:** Ulmer Stuben, Zinglerstr. 11, sonn- und feiertags um 12 Uhr hl. Messe (H.H. Kaplan Rissling)  
(weitere Auskünfte gibt H.H. Rissling über Tel. 0731/9404 183 und 07305/919 479)

**Hinweis:** Die besonderen Meßzeiten an Ostern erfragen Sie bitte telefonisch bei den jeweiligen Zentren.

## Impressum:

Herausgeber: **Freundeskreis der Una Voce e.V.**, D - 80079 München, Postfach 100540

Redaktionsadresse: Eberhard Heller, D - 82544 Ergertshausen, Riedhofweg 4, Tel./Fax: 0049/8171/28816

## Achtung, Attention, Atención!

Die Redaktion ist ab sofort über folgende E-mail-Adresse erreichbar: **heller\_einsicht@hotmail.com**  
oder: **heller\_eberhard@t-online.de**

# "Surrexit Christus, spes mea" "Christ, Who is my hope, has risen" (Easter Sequence)

by  
Fr. Paul Schoonbroodt  
translated by Emilia Vaiciulis

## A Meditation on the Mystery of Easter

In the Church liturgy the Resurrection of Our Lord Jesus Christ is announced again. Once more our hearts rejoice, because after having suffered under Pontius Pilate, being crucified and buried, on the third day after He has risen from the dead-in fulfillment of the scriptures. Many varying melodies for the Alleluia verse, resumed on the Vigil of Easter, are required to express the explosion of joy of the Resurrection. In such a way they relieve the need to adapt our prayer to express our praise, adoration, and particularly our thanksgiving for the work of Redemption.

## The Resurrection of Jesus was announced by the prophecies

The stupendous mystery of the Resurrection of Jesus was foretold by several prophecies: before it occurred, they were obscure to the understanding. Who, in Old Testament times, was capable of understanding that verse in the Psalms which stated "for you shall not deliver my soul to death, you will not permit that He who loves you will see corruption...". Here, the Resurrection of Christ is foretold in the statements that His Soul would not be left in the valley of the shadow of death, and that His Body would not see corruption. (Acts 2,27 + 31).

When Jesus Himself announced His Resurrection, this announcement did not seem to have provoked much reaction from the apostles. It was only when the three favoured disciples witnessed the Transfiguration of Jesus on Mount Thabor, where He warned them not to speak of it before the Son of Man was resurrected, that they asked each other, what the words "resurrected from the dead" signified. When you consider the first three Gospels, described as 'Synoptic' because they all recounted the same events, this prophecy is shared in common: "Jesus will be put to death, but on the third day He will rise from the dead". (Matth. 16,21; Mk. 8, 31; 9, 31; Lk. 9, 22, 9.36 ff.) Therefore it was foretold how Jesus would die. However the disciples were so devastated by the Passion of Jesus and his cruel death on the Cross that they had need of the words of consolation and counsel which Jesus had previously uttered precisely to sustain them, when this time had come. On the other hand, it must be said that the enemies of Jesus had a sharper recollection of His words. It would seem that the words of somebody one hates are fixed more in the memory because of that. And so it would seem that the hatred of his enemies for Him caused them to remember what He had said all the better because of this hatred. What could they do to prevent Jesus from returning in some way following His death on the Cross? It was necessary for them to take measures to prevent this. "On the morrow, which was Saturday, the princes of the priests and the pharisees went together to find Pilate and they said to him: "Sir, we remember that this imposter, while He was still living had said: "After three days I shall rise from the dead." (Matt. 27, 63).

Thereupon the Jews asked Pilate's authorisation to place a guard of four soldiers at the tomb. They did so because they were absolutely determined to prevent the disciples of Christ from taking His Body away and then spreading the rumour around that Christ had risen from the dead.

## Jesus was buried

We now come to the burial of the crucified One. Because the Sabbath was imminent it was necessary to act without delay. The tortured Body of Jesus was therefor laid in a new tomb which had been fashioned in the rock, near Calvary. The fact that it was a new tomb, in which no man had ever been buried is important in the light of the fact that after the Resurrection it was once again empty. It was Joseph of Arimathea who had offered it for the Lord. According to Jewish burial customs Jesus was placed in a long winding-sheet and was so buried. The entrance of the sepulchre was closed and sealed. An enormous rock was even rolled before it. Clearly nobody would have been able to interfere with such a security measure. Had not guards been posted there too? And now, if in spite of this measure something happened, it could **certainly** not be attributed to the doings of men, but to a supernatural cause -i.e., to God Himself. A direct intervention from God was certainly the last thing they expected. In that case they would be powerless!

## **Jesus rises from the dead**

And yet that is precisely what happened: during the night of the third day that followed, the crucified One, Who was lying in the sepulchre emerged forth to a new form of life. He rose and passed through the grave-stone for now He had acquired subtilty, the proper of the spiritualised, transfigured body. In a German Easter hymn it is said: "nothing could bar His way, neither the seal nor tomb, nor stone or rock". Though He had left the sepulchre through His Resurrection, its entrance was still sealed by a massive boulder. Besides, the Gospels relate that it was only subsequent to the Resurrection that it was rolled away. "Suddenly there was a great earthquake, for an Angel of the Lord descended from heaven, rolled this boulder away and sat on it. His face shone like lightning and his raiment was as white as snow". And now the guards themselves would become witnesses to the Resurrection of Christ: "The guards were so terror-stricken that they were as dead men" (Matt. 28,2-4).

## **It was ascertained that the tomb was empty**

Subsequent to this it was Peter and John who were to confirm the reality of the Resurrection. Both having proceeded to the tomb after hearing the message of Mary Magdalen and the holy women, they found it unoccupied. "Looking in, he saw the linen cloths lying there, but he did not go in: Simon Peter, coming after him, went in to the tomb and saw the linen cloths lying there, and also the veil which had been put over Jesus' head, not lying with the linen cloths, but still wrapped round and round in a place by itself." (John 20,4-7).

Thus they were able to establish the tomb was empty themselves. John speaks of himself in the third person, when he writes: "he entered too, and he saw and believed". (John 20,8).

Many apparitions of the Resurrection of Jesus took place following the official verification of the the empty sepulchre by Peter and John. According to oral tradition Jesus first appeared to His Mother, as is fitting. Firstly she was standing at the foot of the Cross on Good Friday. It was there that the prophecy of Simeon was fulfilled: "A sword shall pierce your soul" (Luke 2,35). Having been profoundly united to the Passion and Death of Jesus on the Cross, she now enjoys this new way of reunion with her resurrected Son. Henceforth, an unspeakable joy will replace her sorrow. In this way the mystery of the participation of the Mother of Sorrows at the death of Jesus on the Cross will be continued in her participation of the triumph of the Resurrection. On the other hand, it is the role of the holy women, not of the Holy Virgin, to announce that Jesus is alive.

## **The accounts of the Apparitions**

Thereafter, apparitions of the Resurrected One continue to take place till the fortieth day after Easter, then comes the Ascension of Our Lord. These apparitions are inaugurated by the one of Easter Day and are completed by the one of the evening when Jesus entered through closed doors wishing them peace and where He showed them the wounds of the Crucifixion and the wound in His side. The disciples rejoiced because they saw the Lord. And He said to them a second time: "Peace be with you. As My Father has sent me, so now I send you. With that, He breathed on them and said to them, Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive shall be forgiven, whose sins you shall retain, shall be retained." (John 20, 19-23). Let us also mention the detailed account of St. Luke of the apparition of Jesus on the road to Emmaus, when He interpreted the sacred Scriptures to them; and then, when He had set down at the table with them, He took bread and blessed and broke and offered it to them. "Whereupon their eyes were opened and they recognized Him, and with that, He disappeared from their sight". (Luke 24,30-31).

As for St. Paul, he recounts what eye-witness had told him: "After that, He was seen by more than 500 of the brethren at once, most of whom are still alive today, though some have gone to their rest" (1 Cor 15,6). Certainly this apparition was just as unforgettable as the others for those concerned. Do we realize the number of times these 500 witnesses would have related their experience to others! How perfectly this account conforms with the preaching of the apostles! Henceforth it was no longer possible to suppress the message of the Resurrection of the crucified One Who had been laid in the tomb.

## **The Resurrected One prepares the apostles for their mission**

It is certain that there were a good number of apparitions not mentioned in the holy Scriptures apart from the official number of 15 accounted for. Seeing that now the disciples believed, there was no more need to convince them of the reality of the Resurrection. What was important now was to

instruct **them** more profoundly in the mysteries of the Reign of God, i.e. of the Holy church, of which Peter was to be the visible Head: "Feed My lambs, feed My sheep". He also instructed them in the rites to be observed for the celebration of the Holy Mass: "Each time you do this, you will do so in commemoration of Me". He taught them how to administer the Sacraments: "Baptise them..." For it is by the Sacraments that the graces of Redemption would be applied to souls. When the Holy Ghost came, He would confirm the teachings of Jesus. "So much converse I have held with you, still at your side. He Who is to befriend you, the Holy Ghost, Whom the Father will send on My account, will in His turn make everything plain, and recall to your minds everything I have said to you". (John 14, 25-26).

### **Like the disciples, Christians receive their strength from the Resurrection**

The preaching of the apostles to men in Mediterranean countries indicates how the Pascal Mystery dominates the life of the early Church. If some converted, others left them. When Jesus said: "He who is not with Me is against Me, he who does not gather with Me, disperses". (Luke 11,23). This affirmation also applied to the Resurrection. Peter and John had to justify themselves before the **Sanhedrin** for the healing of an infirm beggar. "Then Peter was filled with the Holy Ghost and said to them. Rulers of the people, Elders of Israel, listen to me: If it is over kindness done to a cripple and the means by which he has been healed, that we have been called in question, here is news for you and for the whole people of Israel. You crucified Jesus Christ the Nazarene, and God raised Him from the dead; it is in His Name that this man stands healed before you". (Acts 4,8-10).

It is a fact that the apostles, their successors and persecuted Christians throughout the ages, have undertaken all sorts of labors and sufferings, because they believed in the Resurrection. A great number of them finally bore witness to this truth by sacrificing their lives for it like the apostles. Martyrdom has never had the effect hoped for by the persecutors- elimination of Christianity. On the contrary, it had the opposed effect: the Latin saying **Sanguis martyrum semen christianorum** (the blood of martyrs is the seed of Christians) has always been proved right. It has demonstrated the supernatural force of bearing witness to the Faith. The ultimate consequences of this lead to martyrdom. Moreover, who would be so fanatical or stupid as to sacrifice his life for a myth?

### **"I await the resurrection of the body"**

To believe in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ also means to believe in the resurrection of the dead on the day of the Last Judgment. Once again we refer to St. Paul who has this to teach: "If the dead, I say, do not rise, then Christ has not risen either; and if Christ has not risen, all your Faith is a delusion; you are back in your sins". (1 Cor. 15,16-17). In following this train of thought we can easily deduce that the remission of sins by Baptism and then by the sacrament of Penance, the life of grace and eternal salvation, all stem from the Resurrection of Christ. During our earthly pilgrimage, we Christians are obliged to lead our lives guided in the light of the Faith and accompanied by our good works- i.e. by the practice of Christian virtues. By doing so we live like men dead to sin and living a life of grace in Christ. Is this not already the beginning of our mystical life? This is a gift which is not just reserved for religious, for even Catholics in the world living in a state of grace and participation in the celebration of the Holy Mysteries of the Church are able to lead a mystical life! "You have undergone death, and your life is hidden away now with Christ in God" (Col. 3, 3).

It is by receiving Holy Communion that we receive **Christ**, the pledge of our future resurrection and of a happy eternity. And if the Church solemnly obliges us by Church law to fulfill our Easter Duty by confession and Holy Communion, it is by virtue of the mystery of the Resurrection of Christ. "Salvation is to be found nowhere else. Of all the names under Heaven, this alone has been appointed to man as the One by which we are to be saved." (Acts 4,12). The same applies to Christ's Church: "outside of the Church there is no salvation".

### **Confronted with the Easter Mystery, false religions and ideologies must cede**

By fact of the Resurrection of **Christ**, and of ours on the Last Day, the present Jewish messianism, materialistic ideologies and all pagan religions are definitively refuted! In discussions the relationship of the Catholic Religion with non-Catholic ones, it is wrong to think on the lines of the conciliar document *Nostra aetate* which claims that "the Church also esteems Muslims who adore the One living and eternal God", for Islam denies the mystery of the Blessed Trinity. Besides, it must be pointed out that this conciliar declaration claims that "although Islam does not acknowledge Jesus to be God, it venerates Him as a prophet". (Delc. 3).

Each time we recite or chant the Credo we are opposed to modern exegesis. This hardly attaches any

importance to the empty tomb at all, nay, it even declares that the Resurrection is but a figment of the imagination of the early Christians, and can be expressed as followed: "the Jesus business goes on", but the Resurrection of His Body is not taken into consideration. Thus, the modern exegetes deny the most important miracle of Jesus. But the true doctrine teaches us that Jesus was resurrected to life by the reunion of the soul with the dead body which had been buried, never to die again. Henceforth He is glorified, and His Body is no longer submitted to physical laws of gravity, nor is it solid, like bodies ordinarily are. Seeing that Jesus arose through His own power, He thereby definitely proved that He was GOD. Amongst the miracles wrought by Jesus the Resurrection is by far the greatest. If Catholics and even priests are timid in confessing Christ and the Church before the adepts of other religions, one must conclude that they have been taken in by the spirit of the times and by human respect. When on occasions television forums take place, involving discussions between representatives of false religions and Catholics - it is not unusual to find that Catholics are not instructed in their own religion - they are incapable of defending Christ and His Church. What comment can be made about them? They have no filial devotion to Christ. What has become of the love of the disciple for His Master?

The agiornamento introduced into the Church since the so-called Vatican Council II is the cause of profound changes in all Church institutions, of Church doctrine being riddled with errors, of ecclesiastical discipline being abolished, and of the suppression of pious customs. The sources of grace - i.e. the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacraments, have been suppressed. Hardly anyone is interested in sanctifying Sunday any more. Now, for a good thirty years, the expression "weekend" has been commonly used in associating Sunday, the first day of the week with Saturday. The Resurrection having taking place on the first day of the week, it is called Dies Dominica, the Day of the Lord. This day unceasingly reminds us of the Resurrection, and so is solemnised in a special way. Since then, it is not the Sabbath any more, but the first day of the week which shall be sanctified. Probably the enemies of Christ and of the Church imagine that in the space of thirty years they have succeeded in burying the Catholic Church. How short-sighted they are! They do not reckon with the victorious power of the Resurrected One, for on the Cross He carried of the definitive victory over Satan, death, suffering and sin. It will be on the day of the Last Judgment that this victory will shine resplendant before everybody. It is then that the wicked will behold the felicity of the just that they have persecuted on earth: " In the eyes of the foolish they seem to be dead...but they are in peace". (Wisdom 3,3).

Let us conclude: World History attained its summit in the Resurrection of Christ. The final period of time is taking its course and will cease at the Last Judgment with the Apparition of Christ as the Almighty Lord, the Pantocrator.

\*\*\*

**! 'Surrexit Christus, spes mea'**  
**« Le Christ est ressuscité, il est mon espérance »**  
**(Séquence de Pâques )**

**par**  
**l'abbé Paul Schoonbroodt**

Dans sa liturgie l'Eglise nous annonce de nouveau la Résurrection de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ. Une fois de plus nos cœurs se réjouissent, parce que le Christ, après avoir souffert sous le gouverneur Ponce Pilate, après avoir été crucifié et "enseveli, est ressuscité le troisième jour selon les Ecritures. Le chant de l'Alléluia qu'on reprend dès la vigile pascale, va dire cette joie par des mélodies très variées. De ce fait, nos prières rendront une tournure propre, que ce soit la louange, l'adoration et particulièrement l'action de grâces pour l'œuvre de la Rédemption.

Le mystère de la résurrection du Christ repose sur plusieurs prophéties; au moment même ces prophéties étaient obscures. Qui aurait pu comprendre, au temps de l' Ancien Testament, le verset de psaume qui dit: « Car tu ne livreras pas mon âme à l'enfer, tu ne permettras pas que celui qui t'aime voie la corruption » (Ps. 15). Plus tard, lors de son sermon de Pentecôte, St. Pierre citera ce verset en l'interprétant comme ayant rapport à la résurrection. « Car vous ne laisserez pas mon âme dans le séjour des morts, et vous ne permettrez pas que votre Saint voie la corruption... c'est la résurrection du Christ qu'il a vue d'avance, en disant que son âme ne serait pas laissée dans le séjour des morts et

que sa chair ne verrait pas la corruption. » (Actes 2,27 et 31).

Quand c'est Jésus Lui-même qui annonce la résurrection, cette annonce ne semble pas avoir provoqué chez les apôtres beaucoup de réactions. Ce n'est que, lorsque les trois disciples préférés ont été témoins de la transfiguration de Jésus sur le mont Thabor où il leur dit de ne pas en parler avant que le Fils de l'homme ne ressuscite, qu'ils se demandent entre eux ce que signifiait ce mot : « être ressuscité des morts ! » (Mc 9,9) Quand on prend les trois premiers évangélistes qu'on appelle les synoptiques, à cause des récits communs, l'on trouve la prophétie: «L'on mettra Jésus à mort, mais il ressuscitera le troisième jour » (Matth 16,21 ; Mc 8,31 ; 9 ;31 ; Lc 9,22; 9,36 ss.). L'on savait donc de quelle manière la vie de Jésus allait prendre fin. Cependant, le spectacle de la passion du Christ et de sa mort cruelle en croix avait tellement ébranlé qu'ils avaient tout simplement oublié ce que Jésus avait dit auparavant comme paroles de recommandation et de consolation. Par contre, il faut bien dire que les ennemis de Jésus avaient gardé un souvenir plus précis de ses paroles. Il semble bien que la haine contre quelqu'un affûte la mémoire de ce que l'adversaire a dit auparavant. D'ailleurs que pourraient-ils faire pour l'empêcher, si Jésus reviendrait d'une manière ou de l'autre après sa mort en croix ? Il fallait prendre des mesures afin de prévenir cette éventualité. « Le lendemain qui était le samedi, les Princes des prêtres et les Pharisiens allèrent ensemble trouver Pilate et lui dirent: « Seigneur, nous nous sommes rappelés que cet imposteur, lorsqu'il vivait encore, a dit: Après trois jours, je ressusciterai » (Matth. 27,63).

Là-dessus les juifs demandèrent à Pilate de pouvoir placer à la tombe un détachement de quatre soldats. C'était dans l'intention d'empêcher coûte que coûte que les disciples ne déroberent le corps du Christ et qu'ils répandraient ensuite la légende que le Christ serait ressuscité.

### **Méditation du Mystère pascal: Les prophéties ont annoncé la résurrection de Jésus Jésus a été enseveli**

Venons-en à l'ensevelissement du Crucifié. Comme le sabbat allait commencer, il fallait faire vite. On déposa donc le corps meurtri de Jésus dans un tombeau nouveau, qui avait été creusé dans le rocher ; c'était à proximité du Calvaire. Le fait qu'il s'agisse d'un tombeau neuf, où l'on n'avait enterré personne jusque-là, aura son importance lorsqu'il s'agira de constater que le tombeau était vide après la résurrection. C'est Joseph d'Arimathie qui l'avait mis à la disposition du Seigneur. Selon la coutume juive d'ensevelir les corps, Jésus fut déposé dans un grand linceul et enseveli ainsi. La porte du caveau fut fermée et scellée. On roula même une énorme pierre devant. Il est évident que personne n'aurait pu défaire ce dispositif de sécurité. De plus les gardes étaient à leur poste ! Maintenant, si malgré ce dispositif il se passait quelque chose, cela ne serait nullement le fait des hommes, mais d'une puissance supérieure, c'est-à-dire de Dieu Lui-même. Or, ils n'envisageaient nullement une intervention directe de Dieu. En effet, dans ce cas, ils seraient tout à fait impuissants.

### **Jésus est ressuscité**

Et pourtant c'est ce qui allait se passer : Pendant la nuit du troisième jour, le crucifié, qui gisait dans le tombeau, revint à une vie nouvelle. Il surgit et passa sans difficulté à travers la paroi rocheuse du tombeau, car il avait acquis désormais la liberté totale qui est le propre d'un corps **spiritualisé** et transfiguré. Comme il est dit dans un cantique allemand pour Pâques: « rien ne peut lui barrer le passage, ni sceau, ni tombeau, ni pierre, ni rocher ».

Malgré que Jésus ait quitté le tombeau par sa résurrection, la porte devant laquelle l'on avait roulé la grosse pierre était toujours fermée. D'ailleurs l'évangile nous rapporte que ce n'est qu'après l'événement de la résurrection qu'elle a été déplacée. « Tout à coup il se fit un grand tremblement de terre; car un ange du Seigneur descendit du ciel, vint renverser la pierre, et s'assit dessus. Son visage était brillant comme un éclair, et ses vêtements blancs comme la neige ». Maintenant les gardes eux-mêmes deviendront, à leur manière, des témoins de la résurrection du Christ: « Les gardes furent tellement saisis de frayeur, qu'ils devinrent comme morts » (Matth. 28,2-4).

### **La constatation du tombeau vide**

Suite à cela ce sont Pierre et Jean qui confirment la réalité de la résurrection, s'étant rendus tous deux au sépulcre suite au message de Marie Madeleine et des saintes femmes, ils le trouvèrent vide. »S'étant baissé, il vit les linceuls posés à terre, mais il n'entra point. Simon Pierre, qui le suivait, arriva et entra dans le sépulcre, et vit les linceuls posés à terre; le suaire qu'on avait mis sur sa tête n'était pas avec les linceuls, mais plié à part » (Jean 20,4-7). C'est ainsi qu'ils ont pu se rendre compte eux-mêmes que le tombeau était vide. Jean parle de lui-même à la troisième personne en écri-

vant: « il entra aussi , et il vit et il crut » (Jean 20,8).

Ensuite des apparitions multiples du Ressuscité suivirent la constatation officielle du tombeau vide par Pierre et Jean. D'après la tradition orale l'on sait que Jésus apparut en premier à sa mère ce qui est tout à fait normal. D'une part la sainte Vierge, le **Vendredi-Saint**, était debout au pied de la Croix ; c'est alors que la prophétie du vieillard **Siméon** se réalisa: « un glaive transpercera votre âme » (Luc,2,35). Ayant été profondément unie à la Passion et la Mort de Jésus en croix elle bénéficie maintenant de cette rencontre d'un mode nouveau avec son Fils ressuscité. Dès lors c'est une joie indicible qui vient se substituer à sa douleur. De la sorte le mystère de la participation de la Mère des Douleurs à la mort de Jésus en croix se continue en participation au triomphe de la résurrection. Par contre ce n'est pas à la sainte Vierge qu'il incombe d'annoncer que Jésus est dorénavant vivant, mais bien aux saintes femmes.

### **Les récits des apparitions**

Suivent alors les apparitions du Ressuscité jusqu'au quarantième jour après Pâques ; c'est l'Ascension. Ces apparitions sont inaugurées par celle du jour de Pâques à ses disciples ; au soir où Jésus entra, portes closes, en leur souhaitant la paix et où il leur montra les cicatrices de la crucifixion et la plaie du côté. Les disciples éprouvèrent une grande joie ayant vu le Seigneur. Et il leur dit une seconde fois : « La paix soit avec vous. Comme mon Père m'a envoyé, de même je vous envoie. Ayant dit ces mots, il souffla sur eux, et leur dit : Recevez le Saint-Esprit : Les péchés seront remis à ceux à qui vous les remettrez, et ils seront retenus à ceux à qui vous les retiendrez » (Jean 20, 19-23). Faisons également mention du récit détaillé de l'apparition de Jésus aux disciples sur le chemin d'**Emmaüs** par St. Luc interprétant l'Écriture sainte. Étant à table avec eux, il prit le pain, le **bénit**, le rompit, et le leur présenta. Alors leurs yeux s'ouvrirent et ils le reconnurent » (Luc 24, 30-31).

De son côté St. Paul nous transmet ce que des témoins oculaires lui avaient raconté : « Après cela il est apparu en une seule fois à plus de cinq cents frères, dont la plupart sont encore vivants, et quelques-uns se sont endormis » ( 1 Cor. 15,6). Cette apparition comme d'ailleurs les autres apparitions étaient certainement inoubliables pour les témoins. Est-ce que nous nous rendons compte du nombre de fois que les « 500 frères » ont référé ce fait vécu aux autres ? Comme ce témoignage était aussi en parfaite conformité avec la prédication des apôtres ! Dès lors il n'était plus possible d'étouffer le message de la résurrection du crucifié qui avait été enseveli dans le sépulcre.

### **Les apôtres sont préparés par le Ressuscité à leur mission**

Il est certain qu'il faut ajouter au nombre officiel de 15 apparitions rapportées par les saintes Écritures bon nombre d'autres apparitions non consignées dans les textes sacrés. Étant donné que, maintenant, les disciples croyaient, Jésus n'avait plus à les convaincre de la réalité de la Résurrection. Ce qui importait c'est de les introduire plus à fond dans les mystères du royaume de Dieu c'est-à-dire de la sainte Eglise dont Pierre sera le chef visible : « Pais mes brebis, pais mes agneaux ». Il les instruit aussi des rites à observer pour la célébration de la sainte messe. « Faites ceci, chaque fois que vous le ferez, en mémoire de moi ». Il les instruit de la manière dont il faut administrer les sacrements : « Baptisez-les... » Car, c'est par les sacrements que les grâces de la rédemption seront appliquées aux âmes. Quand le Saint-Esprit viendra, il confirmera les enseignements de Jésus.

### **Comme les disciples, les chrétiens trouvent leur force dans le Ressuscité.**

La prédication des apôtres aux hommes des pays de la Méditerranée montre combien le mystère pascal domine la vie de la jeune Eglise. S'il y en avait qui se convertissaient d'autres se détournaient d'eux, il est vrai. Quand Jésus a dit : « Celui qui n'est pas avec moi est contre moi, qui n'amasse avec moi, dissipe » (Luc 11,23), cette affirmation vaut aussi pour la résurrection. Pierre et Jean eurent à se justifier devant le Sanhédrin pour un bienfait en faveur d'un mendiant infirme. « Pierre rempli de l'Esprit Saint leur dit : nous vous déclarons à vous tous, et à tout le peuple d'Israël, que c'est au nom de **Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ de Nazareth** que vous avez crucifié et que Dieu a ressuscité d'entre les morts, que cet homme a été guéri, et qu'il est debout devant vous » (Actes 4, 8,10).

Il est un fait que les apôtres, leurs successeurs et les chrétiens persécutés de tous les temps, ont pris sur eux toutes sortes de labeurs et de souffrances à cause de la foi en la résurrection. A la fin un grand nombre d'entre eux ont témoigné pour cette vérité, comme les apôtres, par le sacrifice de leur vie. Le martyre n'eut nullement l'effet escompté par les ennemis, à savoir la fin du christianisme.



C'est le contraire qui se passa : le dicton latin *Sanguis martyrum, semen christianorum* (le sang des martyrs est la semence des chrétiens) s'est toujours vérifié et prouve la force surnaturelle du témoignage de la foi. La logique ultime de cette foi va jusqu'au martyre. D'ailleurs qui serait fanatique ou imbécile au point de sacrifier sa vie pour un mythe ?

« **J'attends la résurrection des morts** ».

Croire à la résurrection de Jésus-Christ c'est aussi croire à la résurrection des morts le jour du jugement dernier. Une fois de plus nous faisons appel à St Paul qui enseigne ceci: « Si les morts ne ressuscitent pas, le Christ non plus n'est pas ressuscité. Et si le Christ n'est pas ressuscité, votre foi est vaine, vous êtes encore dans vos péchés » (Cor. 15, 16-17). En poursuivant cette réflexion nous découvrirons aisément que la rémission des péchés par le baptême et ensuite par le sacrement de pénitence, la vie de la grâce et le salut éternel trouvent leur source dans la résurrection du Christ. Pendant notre pèlerinage terrestre nous, les chrétiens, nous sommes tenus de mener notre vie dans la clarté de la foi et des bonnes œuvres c'est-à-dire par la pratique des vertus chrétiennes. Ce faisant nous vivons comme des hommes morts au péché et vivant une vie de ressuscité par la vie de la grâce dans le Christ. N'est-ce pas déjà le début de la vie mystique ? C'est un don qui n'est pas réservé aux religieux uniquement, car même le catholique dans le monde, vivant en état de grâce et participant à la célébration par l'Eglise des saints mystères, est apte à mener une vie mystique ! « Car vous êtes morts et votre vie est cachée avec le Christ en Dieu » (Col. 3,3).

C'est en recevant la sainte communion que nous recevons le Christ, gage de notre résurrection future et de l'éternité heureuse. Et si l'Eglise oblige par un commandement à la confession pascale et à la communion, elle en trouve le fondement dans le mystère de la Résurrection du Christ. « Et il n'y a point de salut par aucun autre, car, nul autre nom sous le ciel, n'a été donné aux hommes, par lequel nous devons être sauvés » (Actes 4,12). Il en est de même de l'Eglise de Jésus-Christ : « hors de l'Eglise pas de salut ».

**Face au mystère de Pâques les fausses religions et les idéologies ne tiennent pas**

Par le fait de la résurrection du Christ et de la nôtre au dernier jour le messianisme juif actuel, l'idéologie matérialiste et toute religion païenne est définitivement réfutée. C'est faux de déclarer, comme dans le document conciliaire «Nostra aetate» traitant des rapports de la religion catholique avec les religions non-chrétiennes que « l'Eglise regarde aussi avec estime les musulmans, qui adorent le Dieu Un, vivant et subsistant », car, l'Islam nie le mystère de la Sainte Trinité. Il faut d'ailleurs noter que cette déclaration conciliaire avoue que « bien qu'ils ne reconnaissent pas Jésus comme Dieu, ils le vénèrent comme prophète » (Décl. 3).

Chaque fois que nous récitons ou chantons le Credo nous nous opposons aussi à l'exégèse moderne. Celle-ci n'attache guère d'importance au tombeau vide, par exemple, voire elle assure même que la résurrection n'est qu'un produit de l'imagination des premiers chrétiens ; ce qui peut être résumé par cette phrase : « l'affaire de Jésus va son cours », mais l'on élimine la résurrection corporelle. Ainsi les exégètes modernes nient le miracle le plus important de Jésus. Or, la doctrine vraie nous apprend que Jésus est ressuscité à la vie, par l'union de l'âme et du corps mort qui avait été enseveli ; il ne meurt plus. Désormais il est glorifié et son corps n'est plus soumis aux lois physiques de la gravitation et de l'opacité des corps durs. Etant donné que Jésus est ressuscité par sa propre puissance il a prouvé indéniablement par là qu'il est DIEU. Parmi les miracles opérés par Jésus la résurrection est bien le plus grand.

Si des catholiques, voire même des prêtres, perdent leur assurance devant des représentants d'autres religions et manquent de défendre le Christ et son Eglise, il faut conclure que l'esprit du temps a prise sur eux et qu'ils sont tenus par le respect humain. Lors de discussions entre représentants de fausses religions à la télévision il n'est pas rare de voir et d'entendre des catholiques qui ignorent leur propre religion ; ils ne sont pas capables de défendre le Christ et son Eglise. Que dire ? ils n'ont guère d'attachement au Christ. Qu'est devenu l'amour du disciple pour le divin maître ?

L'*aggiornamento* introduit dans l'Eglise depuis le soi-disant concile Vatican II, a été la cause de ce que les institutions ont changé, la doctrine a été pénétrée d'erreurs, la discipline ecclésiastique a été pratiquement abolie tandis que les pieuses coutumes ont été supprimées. Les sources de la grâce, savoir le saint sacrifice de la messe et les sacrements sont taries. On ne se préoccupe plus de la sanctification du dimanche. Or, depuis une bonne trentaine d'années on parle communément de *week-end* en associant le dimanche, 1er jour de la semaine, au samedi. La résurrection s'étant passée le premier jour de la semaine, il est devenu le dies dominica, le jour du Seigneur. Ce jour nous rappelle sans cesse la résurrection et revêt de ce fait une solennité particulière. Depuis ce ne sera plus le sabbat,

mais le premier jour de la semaine qui sera sanctifié.

Probablement les ennemis du Christ et de l'Eglise s'imaginent qu'ils sont parvenus, en l'espace de trente ans, à enterrer l'Eglise catholique. Comme ils sont myopes ! ils ne comptent pas avec la puissance victorieuse du ressuscité, car c'est sur la croix qu'il a remporté la victoire définitive sur Satan, la mort, la souffrance et le péché. Ce sera au jour du jugement dernier que cette victoire éclatera aux yeux de tous. Alors les méchants verront le bonheur des justes qu'ils ont persécutés sur la terre : « Aux yeux des insensés ils paraissent être morts..., mais ils sont dans la paix » (Sagesse 3,3).

Concluons : l'histoire du monde a atteint son apogée dans la résurrection du Christ. La période finale est amorcée et trouvera son terme lors du Jugement dernier par l'apparition du Christ comme le Seigneur tout-puissant, le Pantocrator.

t Au nom du Père et du Fils et du Saint-Esprit. Ainsi soit-il.

\* \* \*

## Note of the publisher

Dear Reader,

Our periodical EINSICHT has been published since 1971 by the "Freundeskreis of the Una voce e.V." Munich. For the last ten years, it has strived to be a beacon shining out the limped, pure light of the Truths of the Catholic Faith in these chaotic times of religious decadence to enlighten you, dear reader, with respect to problems and trials confronting the Church today. This periodical wishes to assist those really seeking the Truth, bringing them the consolation which the Christ's Church has promised to those who love God and believe in Him.

But above all, EINSICHT is a militant journal, unmasking the treacherous activities of the official apostate Church, as well as criticizing erroneous attitudes in our own conservative ranks. For example, it was proved in this periodical:

- that the N.O.M. promulgated by Paul VI is (in se) invalid,
- that Paul VI, John Paul I, and John Paul II were (is a) heretic(s) occupying the Chair of Peter,
- that most of the bishops and priests have also lost their faith,
- that the most traditionalists - whose leaders are the Econians - have only been a detriment to the true Faith and to the restoration of the Church through their tactics and lack of logic.

We shall not be content with simply analysing. The collaborators of our "Freundeskreis" (Circle of Friends) will demonstrate how the reconstruction of the Church and its restoration as the Institution of salvation is theologically possible. This is far from the Econians, who on the contrary are now like an orthodox sect in the bosom of the apostate 'Conciliar Church'. But reconstruct the Church collaboration between priests and laypeople in Europe, North-America, Central America and South America is necessary to build up viable Church communities and in this way put an end to the diaspora situation in which many Catholics find themselves.

Dear Reader, we would appreciate it, if this issue helped give you your moorings and if you in turn, could help our work by subscribing to our periodical and widely diffusing the doctrinal truths published therein. Address your orders directly to the Editor:

**"Freundeskreis der Una voce e.V." Postfach 100 540, D-80079 München.**

We have no set yearly subscription fee. But we would be most grateful for generous donations for our editorial work, and also for your prayers. Let us ask God through the Blessed Virgin Mary, all saints and St. Michael, the Archangel that the time of tribulation be curtailed, and to give us the strength and fortitude to remain faithful to God.

In the name of the "Freundeskreis e.V."

Yours very sincerely

Eberhard Heller

P.S. With regard to your donations "International Postal Order" or your international cheques, these can be made out to "Freundeskreis der Una voce e.V." Munich.



# The Roman Catholic Diaspora Church - Fact or Fiction ?

by  
Prof. Dr. Diether Wendland  
translated by Emilia Vaiciulis

## A SHORT HISTORICAL BACKGROUND 1)

Shortly after his election, John XXIII announced that an "oecumenical Council" would be convened, supposedly inspired by a very special "illumination" of the 'Holy Ghost'. He then began taking steps to implement this Council. But manifestly none of the 'Council Fathers' hurrying to Rome were aware that this supposed 'Pope' was a blatant heretic (...) In fact, when an oecumenical Council is convened by a Pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church, it has the 'assistentia divina', i.e. the help or support of the Holy Ghost in all discussions and decisions in matters of faith and morals (...) Freely and without any contradictions did all bishops respond to the call of a flagrant heretic for this council. And they willingly submitted themselves to his 'authority'. What an edifying sight! Such a phenomenon had never before occurred in the Catholic Church.

We shall quote a statement of Cardinal Döpfner, President of the German Bishops' Conference, in order to highlight the erroneous ideas on Roncalli held by the bishops: "with many others I confidently hope to see the day when we shall be allowed to venerate Pope John as a saint of the Church." In a radio talk-show, Döpfner explained that in no way was Roncalli's intention to touch dogmas or any basic principles of the Church in the slightest way. Because of his rustic origins, which he himself often referred to, he admitted that even in minor things he had great sense for values of the past.

With such talk, the uneasiness here and there of the conservative faithful was calmed down (...) But most Catholics, both clergy and laymen believed, i.e. they considered even such flagrant lies as the truth. No public protests were to be noticed anywhere, let alone big demonstrations against such monstrosities (apart from a later demonstration with placards by the "Una Voce, Grappe Maria" one in Munich, in which Döpfner himself was publicly exposed as a heretic, together with other ones from the authorities). But a **sustained bombardment of heresies lasting over 10 years** from the 'hierarchy' could not fail to have its effect. **Heresies however are the gates of hell because lack of eternal salvation** is their direct consequence! (...)

## RONCALLI AND HIS 'ILLUMINATED COUNCIL'

There were also only a few - surprisingly few - who soon after the start of this so-called "Pastoral Council", which implicated itself with the impure 'spirit of the world' recognized the horrible fact that Christ, the Head of the Church, had withdrawn His divine assistance from a general Council. Numerous clear indications of this existed. But why? In order to show Catholics that the bishops of the Church, as a whole in these times, did not amount to anything much. However for many it was a grace, as far as their knowledge of the Faith went, and a gift of Christ, who, provided they were of good will, would help them put aside their blind faith and trust in their bishops, which had been instilled into them by their education. The element lacking in blind trust and faith (in the bishops) is, intellectual insight and critical-rational thinking. For this reason one was justified in referring to this phenomenon as the widely disseminated "catholic sickness" which got to epidemic proportions. Later this grave sickness became mortal-in the religious sense. However, when the supernatural life coming from God's grace alone is extinguished, one has no way of detecting this except by the spiritual effects on human nature. Nobody, not even the most pious person can be assured of definitively possessing supernatural grace until his death. That is why St. Paul teaches that each one must work out his salvation " in fear and trembling". (Phil 2, 12).

When a general Council falls into heresy or generates it, this does not mean that it becomes a pseudo-council or it never was a council, but that all the 'catholic bishops' and their satellites participating as the pillars of this council had already become heretics and had apostasied from the Roman Catho-

---

1) Note: First written in 1973, this article was somewhat modified in 1990 and more extensive revisions were made in July 2000 by the author. The first part is abridged here, with editorial comments from EINSICHT.

lic Church. Besides, in three years this apostasy had given rise to that monstrous structure the "roman conciliar church", not just in Rome but in dioceses **world-wide**. Its first Head was Roncalli: he accepted to be crowned with the Tiara to be universally seen by the faithful and not just by Catholics who were in Rome itself, in order to win their approval. The TV and radio also co-operated in widely diffusing this.

If one wishes to come to terms with the disastrous state of the affairs in the Church, (or with the coup d'état in a State) - one must strive to consider its real origins, to go back to what the principal cause was, for without that it would be impossible to grasp where it would all lead to in the long run. If the '2d Vatican Council' had not taken place, all attention would have been riveted exclusively on Roncalli and his henchmen. But the rumpus surrounding the 'reformatory council' deflected many from this consideration. "No reasonable person could be against reforms"! was the slogan of the day. Even Catholics, remaining fast to traditions would hardly appreciate their brothers in the Faith accusing them of being idiotic retrogrades because they 'didn't recognize the signs of the times', because 'they were old-fashioned' (...)

At the time, whether it was through sheer ignorance or only partial understanding of the situation, many confused the visible heretical world-wide bishops' corps with the "little flock of Christ" (in the biblical sense). The fact is, that this flock had ceased to be visible, whether in its totality or in its parts. 2) But at least the question was being asked: "What's doing in the Roman Catholic Church?" And above all, "what's this upheaval in the Church?" For everything was being overturned and questioned. And this was an ongoing process. Who was behind this? It was the Clergy, because the lay-people had nothing to say, and besides, they were far too passive as whole to take any initiative themselves. They were content with the status quo and to just accept the Faith handed down to them by their forbears. This sterile attitude continues to this very day(..)

## **HOW THE CONCEPT OF APOSTOLICITY WAS REFUSED AND DESTROYED**

Hardly was Pius XII, the last pope to date, and hated by a great number, dead and buried (by whose side (oh horrible thought!) Roncalli was later interred!- then almost everywhere in the Catholic Church strange people appeared, above all false mystics (almost exclusively characterized by a **naïve** mariai devotion) and commonly called persons benefiting from special 'illuminative graces', false prophets and charismatics, but also reformers of the liturgy, even 'catholic' theologians who openly questioned dogmas, or who claimed that these dogmas were out-of-date! There was no end to all of these evils darkening the image of the Catholic Church and springing up everywhere. They were even perceived by non - catholics, but not always with a malicious joy. Sometimes even with sadness! What then was the origin of all these evils? Certain people think **that** the vacancy of the Apostolic See which had then begun and which continues on to this day was surely the underlying cause. But that could not be right! Such a vacancy doesn't prevent the Holy Ghost working in the **Church**, apart from the fact that the Holy Ghost, Who has already been sent for some time now, 'breathes, where It will' and not where some would have it breathe...

Therefore one can conclude that the cause was not necessarily outside of the Church, but in the Catholic Church itself. It was in fact heresies, and heresies alone which were the cause of this type of evil in the Church! They were **actively** perpetrated throughout its whole social structure! One advantage of this vacancy at least, was that it served to help expose these heresies springing up every where. That is why one must not only judge this vacancy negatively, but one must try to understand its significance. Because nothing happens without the permission of God, Who, after all knows well why He allows certain physical or moral ills to happen. Only those who either didn't recognize that sede-vacantism has been a permanent state of affairs since Roncalli till the present time, who didn't understand its meaning, divided themselves later into two dialectic camps - the well-known traditionalist- progressivist one, or the old-conservatives - neomodernists, without realizing that in fact they were already part of the 'conciliar church' which had integrated them. (...)

Upon considering the imminent 'reformatory Council', "(...) (it must be noted that it could not be the second Vatican Council because it had been convened by a heretic). All those who apprehensively watched this world spiritual reunion were confronted with the following oppressive question: how many effective members of the Catholic Church, whether clerics or lay-people, would be found to have faithfully and loyally remained in the apostolic Roman Catholic Church at the end of the 'council', in order to take possession of its heritage and to transmit its veritable doctrine?

---

2) The „**little** flock" consists of disciples and apostles called by the Lord; they are to be distinguished from the far more numerous "followers".

For all the agitators who for a long time had been jockeying for a general Reform Council (weren't their spokesmen always be seen on television with reports on the Council?) were bent on radically breaking with the apostolicity of the Roman Catholic Church. Therein lay the significance of their motto "reconsider everything" or "intrepidly set your sights on completely new horizons". The same direction was also indicated by the 'signs of the times'. Later it was said, and it was only logical: "there is now no return to the time before the Council", precisely because this council had triggered off a radical new orientation for the Church!

The average catholic, whether layman or religious, was impressed by this slogan and even considered it quite reasonable. Furthermore, these radical reformers were very conscious of the undeniable fact that the majority of Catholics had lost all sense of the apostolicity of the Church, or else had very vague notions about it; to such an extent that they were not able to recognize as hypocrisy when on Sundays at the Mass the reformers openly professed "Credo in ...apostolicam Ecclesiam". Some knew quite well that they lied like hypocrites, whilst others were not aware of this. Both parties, however, were present at Masses celebrated "una cum Roncalli... ! " 3)

## EN ROUTE TO THE DIASPORA

The attempt to destroy the apostolicity of the Catholic Church was only possible by means of a general Council. And this, on the basis of Vatican I, which excluded the possibility of there being a schism without a heresy. The blood of the martyrs Sts. Peter and Paul was already crying out for vengeance from heaven, but the general council would necessarily push the Church to the outskirts of society and finally drive it underground- so much so that it finally became a "Church of the diaspora". One could even call it the Roman Catholic Church of the diaspora. The sorrowful diaspora-situation of the Roman Catholic Church was more or less obvious after the "solemn closing" ceremony in Oct. 1965 (and the date of its first session), when there could no longer be any doubt that all the 'bishops' places were occupied by heresiarchs. These began to "pasture" their flocks- the catholic faithful- in a "new spirit". In this they were aided by the clergy - i.e. the clerics submitted to them, - in order to incorporate as many Catholics as possible into the summary "conciliar church" (...) Only the 'living' (as opposed to 'dead') members of the Roman Catholic Church-diaspora did not lose their christocentric perspective. They were equally conscious that a Church in diaspora did not lose its apostolicity at all. (This point was a worry for some). In this respect, it could only be prejudiced, albeit rather severely.

This is why the **following** question must be asked, which it will be hardly easy to answer: to what extent could its apostolicity be prejudiced? In fact, the apostolicity of the Church is indestructible. The Church was founded not just by any man, but by Jesus Christ, who built it on "the foundation of the apostles and prophets", as St. Paul teaches (Eph. 2,20). All 'living' members and dignitaries of the catholic- Church- in - diaspora know this, and for this reason they find themselves in radical contradiction with the 'conciliar Roman church' and those with positions of authority.

The end of the year 1965 stands under the sign of this contradiction, and also marks the beginning of a thorny way for the diaspora. At that time the question was raised not only as to how many would be ready to knowingly and courageously engaged on this way, but also to do what was necessary and right to ensure survival- for one self and with others. For it not at all easy to persevere and endure in a diaspora-state of affairs, especially if it was going to extend over several generations (those who were old in 1965 have, in 1990, since died).

## THE GREAT WEAKNESS OF RESISTANCE

The death of Pius XII in 1958 was felt as a strange void by many. Mourning for this "rock in the midst of ocean-breakers" was unbounded and unanimous on the part of the catholic faithful. It was from this time on that the apostolic Roman Catholic Church, increasingly took on the character of a diaspora-Church, and (understandably) this went unnoticed by the overwhelming majority of the faithful. It was only seven years after, in 1965, that it became more noticeable. However, there was no transformation of its essence, and only its state and way of life had changed.

In the light of this knowledge this question can again be raised: what would be the situation of the Church at the end of the diaspora-itinerary, if in the meantime no way out had been found for it? Would it come to the state of affairs in the Church described by St. Paul: 'the same Lord, the same

---

3) Apart from that Roncalli had eliminated the Prologue of St. John at the end of the Mass. That was an embarrassing sign!

Faith, the same Baptism' (Eph. 4,5)? Or rather, would the state of the Church at the end of its way be more in line with what St. John describes in Ch. 12, 13-18 of the Apocalypse? 'The Woman' there mentioned would not pertain so much to Mary as to the persecuted Church: which would flee into the 'wilderness', to her 'place of refuge (...) where she would be well hidden from the serpent's sight". The dragon, however, filled with fury, would in his fight "make war on the rest of her children, on those who kept God's commandments and held fast to the truth concerning Jesus".

We are still far from this point, because one cannot compare the diaspora to a 'desert', in which both persecuted and refugees are obliged to eke out an existence as they can. In the diaspora the opportunity to forge weapons, set up an army (...), and rise up against the neighbouring enemy, dissimulated in the bosom of the 'conciliar church'- still exist!

In no way was this enemy a 'dragon' or a 'beast in service of the dragon', or even an enormous scorpion whose bite was to be feared, but a large inflated tortoise with scintillating colours, subsisting on flies and worms, all it had it was a gaping mouth which continuously emitted pseudo-prophecies and inane promises without intermittence. And this is what Rome, "urbi et orbi" has been doing before the world since 1965 ... Without a well defined enemy, the Catholic diaspora-Church is only fighting against windmills. It ceases to be the "Ecclesia militans" proceeding on its way (...) However even Resistance-fighters themselves will become battle-weary, their resources being exhausted. It is then that they will hang on mystical crosses(...)

An ineptitude bordering on coma characterizes the 'leadership' of the diaspora-Church. This was remarked on right at the beginning, between 1962 and 1969. This is not to be attributed so much to the continual vacancy of the apostolic See, as to three deficiencies concerning the dioceses. One did not have to look too far to try to find a solution for them:

1. There was no organized social structure of the diaspora-Church. This would have had a really useful role to play in preventing the spread of already latent sectarianism, and many groups, larger or smaller, would have benefited from it.
2. There was no central regional (as opposed to national) council of Catholics with a proper theological formation, (e.g. for the German speaking countries). This council would have been competent to give practical directives and guidelines in organizing the life of the 'exiled' Church. The faithful would have referred to them for a ruling on either religious or canonical matters. This council would have confirmed them in the Faith, thus not permitting them to feel abandoned to themselves.
3. The absence of competent catechists for young adults who had already begun to work or had a career, who could deal with such issues as Christian marriages and the foundation of Christian families, apart from dealing with problems which cropped up in a diaspora situation.. **Now** as a general rule, the priests were almost always inept at catechising adults because they were not trained accordingly. This had been generally admitted by experts in the matter. Only those lay-people who had received a theological formation and who were actively involved in adult education and were in touch with their problems were to be considered. Alas, the ones who would have fulfilled all these criteria were not easy to find. Fortunately there was also a need for other kinds of catechists, for which the demand could be met: catechism lessons for children, for example, could be entrusted to parents, since the faithful of the diaspora were well aware of their obligations.

## **'HOPING AGAINST HOPE'**

Is it still possible to remedy the three main causes weakening the catholic diaspora -Church? This oppressive question has been actual for quite some time. Yet with others, I am of the opinion that twenty-five years of unattained goals and the regrettable experiences of that period will have made the situation irremediable. The **only** hope would be a special miracle worked by Christ Himself which would dissipate this general inefficacy, based almost entirely on human respect. By this miracle, many would clearly recognize that Our Lord never abandons His own, above all, when through no fault of their own they have been dispersed!

There are those who see the situation and understand how it came about without having the necessary means to rectify the weaknesses. As for the others, it is a fact that Christ does not love cowards and weaklings, but favours the valiant, who 'hope against hope' and expect help only from the Lord, and not from certain men posing as liberators and messengers of hope Christ Himself raised the alarm against these usurpers, presenting themselves in 'sheep's clothing' but who in reality were



ravenous wolves (...). There are quite a few Catholics of our ranks who (probably because they didn't see the **diaspora-actuality** clearly or realistically enough), believed that the situation of the Church would redress itself "when we have true catholic bishops again", as they said. But even though we do possess some bishops who can be so considered, the state of affairs has not changed at all: The fact that such bishops exist is of no use for ending this diaspora existence. And this is confirmed by the experience of many.

An effective way of helping redress the situation would be **missionary activity by lay-apostles** with fixed, readily attainable objectives set before them. But their 'modus operandi' would be completely different to that adopted by the brash, hypocritical "Pro Pope and Church Movement". Our lay-missionaries would be humble and simple, their only ideal being to serve Christ and His Church, always prepared to be courageously outspoken in bearing witness to Christ, and unswerving in carrying out His commandments. Obviously the lukewarm or cowardly would be excluded from their ranks.

When He founded His Church, Christ did not restrict Himself to just the apostles, but He had disciples too, whom He also sent on missions. Today it is painful and sad to think that modern Catholics are no longer aware that they are disciples too, or, if they are, they don't act accordingly. Alas! The most one can expect today is to encounter spiritual descendants of the two disciples of **Emmaus**: slow of wit and dull of heart, and held back by human respect. Are we bound to accept this state of affairs? By no means! A change for the is within our reach. We must not forget that Our Lord wishes us to always turn to Him in prayer, because He is truly our Lord and Master. Nobody, whether cleric or layman, can achieve anything without Him! (...) More is required than just being personally pious and devout in order to save one's soul in a diaspora situation. Has not Christ said: "he who tries to save his life will lose it"?

At this point, no one can tell for how long this diaspora period of the Church, which has been so shaken in its principle of apostolicity, will **endure**. and it is Christ and He alone who will reverse the situation when the right moment comes. Whatever we want and would seek to attain is of no avail. Who would dare to deny that in one way or an other he did not have a share in the responsibility for the miserable state of affairs at present? Yes, the guilt must be laid on the shoulders of the clergy, of course, but the failure of the lay-people must also not be under-estimated. There is quite a lot to be done by them before the situation improves. But they must work according to Christ's mandates: "He does not gather with Me scatters". Otherwise the situation will get a lot worse before it gets better. And no "gathering with Christ" is possible without the laity participating in missionary apostolate specifically for them. This is something which certain diaspora bishops ought to understand. And unless the situation has changed, there is only one bishop so far to have grasped this. The rest of us live like ostriches with their heads buried in the sand. We are still mistakenly orientated to living our Faith in the context of Church conditions of the past. We fail to realize that these are completely incompatible with the vastly different conditions of today: the problems we are confronted with did not exist in those days.

Recently a book was published in the United States: "Will the Catholic Church survive the twentieth century?" The title alone indicates how the traditionalists who used it were labouring under the illusion that the Church could be 'salvaged' by them. This only goes to show how far they had strayed from an adequate appraisal of the situation of the apostolic Roman catholic Church today. Not only were they on the wrong track but they were fumbling blindly around without the slightest clue as to the reality of the situation. Let us explain. The upper ranks of the hierarchy are to be blamed for the Church's downfall. Its (reaedificatio) **rebuilding** from the ruins can take place in only one way- from the grass-roots level up, with the means best adapted for this, and obviously with Christ divine assistance, for without that one would only be building on shifting sand and mud.

## **A DIVINE CHASTISEMENT**

Despite the fact that the diaspora situation of the Roman Catholic Church has now existed for over 25 years, it is unfortunate that many are still not aware of this. It may be considered as a chastisement from the Holy Trinity, being more remedial in nature rather than purely vindictive. As such, one must not shrink from it. To do so would be as stupid and childish as to reject a salutary medicinal potion being offered, just because it was bitter. This applies for us too. For our condition as members of a diaspora Church is just as bitter. Certainly it is no sweet treat!

Every now and again we meet with Catholics, pious enough, but nevertheless discontent with their



lot. They continually lament that they have not Pope or bishops. But I ask them why is this so terrible? Is Christ alone not sufficient to us?... **Apart** from showing us which are the ways we are to go, is He Himself not The Way? Aren't these words of Our Lord clear enough for these anxious Catholics? Yet paradoxically, in the meantime these roads which lead directly to Him are practically deserted, though signposts are to be found all over the roads. But the crux of the matter is that these signposts are now obsolete; for His Camp has shifted, though its old buildings still remain standing. Most still follow these old signposts. There are only very few enlightened Catholics in our ranks who are aware that these signs must now be read from an altogether different perspective: In other words, why do we not break once and for all with the 'dead' (fallen-away) members of the Church, rather seeking to establish contact with its living members? One can no longer unquestioningly accept the present - day popes and bishops as the "light of the world" per se, even though they may be considered 'validly elected'. .It is useless, pleading ignorance in the matter any longer either in order to escape one's responsibilities. The spiritual well-being of our fellow-Christians and the good of the Church as a whole are at stake!

It does not suffice to profess and adhere to the true doctrines of the Church. This doctrine must also be intelligently presented so that it can bear its fruit in due season. In fact, the doctrine of the Faith lends itself to critical analysis. It well withstands the test of being scrutinised in this way. One cannot say as much for trendy present -day ideologies, or for the so-called World Religions. Specifically Christian doctrines, however, are clear and logical. In no way are they a confusing, incoherent jumble of religiously coloured dicta ! For heaven's sake, why don't Catholics listen to Him Who is not only the source of truth, but Who IS Truth Itself? Instead, they pay attention to heretics, even considering them as "theologians"... They seem to have forgotten that Christ and the apostles also taught, commanded, and put into practice what they taught! Why don't Catholics read the Acts of the Apostles in an intelligent way? They are full of common sense, and so are applicable to present - day conditions. Surely it will **strike** some that there is nothing so new in the situation we are confronted with today- they already existed in the days of the apostles! **History-whether** secular or ecclesiastical, tends to repeat itself. A truly militant Catholic Church can never reach its final goal in this **world/** It is itinerant by nature and this fact must not be overlooked. It is never set in a fixed geographical location, or native to any particular place, because it is of this world, but not of it. (...) The catholic Church - in diaspora - always bears these **hallmarks.**It is in contrast to Church militant, despite its weakened state. It is in contrast to the conciliar Church which is adapted to the '**world**'. and to the 'spirit of the world'.

The conciliar 'church', which has otherwise accepted all catholic sectarian groups and associations into its ranks, has not succeeded in winning over and destroying the Catholic diaspora Church, despite the **latter's** generally weakened condition , because Jesus Christ is its foundation-stone and its Lord. (...) And even here, those who are dispersed but nevertheless belong to the apostolic Roman Catholic Church (the "Mater et Magistra" of old) can be distinguished from those who have gone astray in the Faith, but still call themselves catholics. But that they are not Roman **Catholics** can be easily verified, even indirectly. In fact, those Catholics who are aware of their diaspora condition are usually convinced Christo-centric fundamentalists and confirmed sede-vacantists as well. It is high time that the Catholic Church in diaspora finally accepted its status quo and acted accordingly. Many of its members in diverse regions, though aware that the one true Church was not exactly 'in the limelight' should now resolve to overcome their fear of human respect, the greatest obstacle to openly acknowledging **Christ**, the sole ' Good Shepherd'. Till the stumbling-block of human respect is not put aside, Catholics cannot forge ahead with zeal in bearing witness to Christ or obey His command to "arise, be not afraid!" (Matt. 17, 7), or "do not be afraid, speak out and refuse to be silenced" ( Acts 18,9). There are special graces given to the Church -in - diaspora.. Why refuse to accept them? Nobody is more aware of our situation and that of the Church today than Christ Himself. He is The Teacher par excellence. So why not accept His teachings? It were better to repudiate those false teachers (both men and women) causing such ravages by both their 'catechising' and their teaching of class-room curricula. No Catholic adhering to the true Faith could in conscience confide the teaching of his children to such individuals (...).

## **CATHOLICS IN THE SHADOW OF THE CONCILIAR CHURCH**

The apostate conciliar church, with its new doctrines, new cult, new rites, and new canon law has become a real sociological entity, despite many difficulties, to such an extent that it has now eclipsed the real Catholic Church (of the diaspora) from public view. Its existence is not remarked by society, nor by the liberal democratic states. Even the mass-media and the German Christian democratic

political parties seem to be unaware of its presence. So to what extent is a diaspora Church detectable? It is visible- more or less-. Its characteristic of holiness- less so, which does not mean that it is not there. The conciliar church, on the other hand, is readily seen by all, whether Catholics or non-Catholics. But where are those who clearly and distinctly discern that this monstrous entity has nothing whatsoever to do with the apostolic R.C. Church of old?

The Church is a specific **socio-religious** entity existing in this world, but divinely instituted, by the Son of God. It is built on the foundation of the prophets and apostles. Christ also instituted the sacraments (visible channels of grace) in it in a determined order. Now it is important for the members of the (diaspora)Church to take into account that in the course of **salvific** history the sacraments are transmitted from one generation to another by means of a specific process. They would do well to take note of this, because with the help of grace the weakness in the Church could be surmounted; with this awareness, the diaspora Church would be prevented from taking the wrong course, thus aggravating the situation. Moreover, diaspora Catholics ought to recall that Our Lord Jesus Christ is there to defend the weak. He never sides with the strong and self-reliant. It is necessary to make a distinction between weak and weaklings. The latter are characterized by cowardice. And if one reflects on the matter, most of those who cry "make peace not war" are cowards. They prefer to stay on the sidelines as onlookers, or they "disappear into thin air" when Christ is blasphemed or publicly ridiculed or slandered, by words or pictures, and this is legally permitted! Such is the general situation today. Today's (diaspora) Catholics have come to realize that in spite of the perplexity of some situations and manoeuvres to divert from admitting the reality of the situation, after they were separated from the conciliar church, it was evident for them, that the Church could not continue without the sacraments of Baptism and Matrimony. This was something new and thought-provoking for many, including several members of the clergy. It seemed that the priest was not absolutely indispensable for administering the sacrament of Baptism, independently of the fact that the diaspora situation of the Church is ipse facto an 'emergency' one. For example it would be a grave, irreparable crime not to see to it that, in the absence of priests, their children were properly baptized. There was always the danger of them dying prematurely, whether through sudden sickness or road accidents etc., without being baptized members of the Mystical Body of Christ (Corpus Christi mysticum). And Christ had commanded "let the little children come to Me, and do not prevent them, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.)... And a priest is basically incompetent for giving and receiving the sacrament of Marriage.

Now the diaspora Church has the mission and the duty to reorganize and set up regulative norms for these two realities: this task would fall on the central regional council of which we spoke earlier - the only organization competent to assume this responsibility. The aim would be to realistically tackle any problems as they came, without referring back to the past and wishing that they would be other than what they were.

No one knows the future, even of his own life, because it is a secret of God. He rarely allows a preview of what will happen, but sometimes he does so indirectly by indicating that one has taken a wrong turn on the "religious" road. As for the famous 'signs of the times'- they have to be discerned first as to whether they come from God or from the devil. It is also somewhat bizarre that these days many people who are 'shipwrecked' both morally and religiously walk behind the banner of "religious liberty"- whether moral or religious. In the meantime, what is there to prevent the diaspora **Church** from openly coming to the fore under its own banner- a visible 'sign of contradiction' at least, on the regional level? Understandably, this would require courage, determination and fortitude in the face of inevitable reversals. Then there was the question of the pusillanimous. Who would encourage them and bolster up their hope? ...

"Since our salvation is founded upon the hope of something. Hope would not be hope at all if its object were in view. How could a man still hope for something which he already sees? And if we are hoping for something still unseen, then we need endurance to wait for it." (Rom. 8, 24 ff). Patience implies a passive attitude. The Christian virtue of hope is not vague or indeterminate, but it has an absolute, unconditional goal: He Who IS the Way and the Truth.

#### THE TIME IS NOT YET RIPE FOR THE RENEWAL OF THE CHURCH

The more one comes to terms with the reality of the apostate, heretical 'conciliar church', the more its treachery is exposed; but there are many obvious disadvantages and weaknesses found right throughout **the** diaspora-Church. The vacancy of the Holy See dating from 1958 is one that is readily visible, but it is not the only one. Since the beginning of the diaspora, when the Church had hardly

begun to muster its forces, and later, when it was engaged in active Resistance, its efforts were unfortunately dissipated and not properly organized. They were directed more against somewhat secondary issues resulting from the Council.

For the fundamental evils and defects attacking the very base of the Catholic Church's structure were regrettably only vaguely perceived, and this hindered and even aggravated attempts to reconstruct the Church in those early stages.

If we now consider the prospect for the Church in different regions throughout the world, we must conclude that '5 past midnight' has definitively struck. As for the state of affairs globally no-one is in a position to judge this except the Lord, Who is the Head of the Church, and those whom He chooses to reveal the global situation. Those of us who live so dispersed have to bide our time, whilst "putting our hope in the Lord as long as we live. We don't have private revelations or dreams or strange and ridiculous so-reputed Marian 'apparitions'. We hear no voices (interior or exterior) announcing what will happen to us in the near or distant future, telling us what we should think, or what course of action we should adopt (...) No, but our lot is to persist in the belief that Christ Our Lord will have pity on us and come to the rescue of the innocent and helpless. (...)

When Vatican II **definitely** broke with the R.C. Church of old (...) it was powerless to essentially change it, apart from affecting its day to day life and its 'state' as a Church.

Several were quite concerned at seeing this definitive break, but fewer still could gauge its real implications. Furthermore, the handful of those who were now outcasts or exiles in the diaspora camp were in the precarious situation of being shunned by editors of Catholic publications and journals.

Several were quite concerned at seeing this definitive break, but fewer still could gauge its real implications. Furthermore, the handful of those who were now outcasts or exiles in the diaspora camp were in the precarious situation of being shunned by editors of Catholic publications and journals. There was general opposition to them both from Catholic editors and readers who put up protective **cotton-wool** walls around themselves; who shrivelled you with scorching fire leaping from their eyes if you dared to refuse to blow the trumpet of the holy 'council' like all the bishops. It is astonishing to see how certain Catholics, very well grounded in their Faith, suddenly changed camp (...)

At this moment certain old, unresolved problems which were always deferred till later came to the fore again. For example the problem of unity between the laity and the clergy in the Church had been considered 'normal' for quite a long time. The cause of unity was certainly hindered by the devastating effects of clericalism whose roots went back to the 18th century. Clericalism was a great impediment to unity in the Church.

There were a considerable number of Catholics who kept the Faith integrally but just did not see the parallelism between the diaspora Church and the new conciliar church. Not because they were naive, but because their attention was being continually diverted by disputes on matters of secondary importance (...) This was a deliberate strategy, used to camouflage the rupture with the venerable Catholic Church of old. It was a pity that the vast majority of the faithful were devoid of a critical sense; and it is precisely because of that that it was easy to "pull the wool over their eyes" with the insidious introduction of the sacrilegious celebration of the "Supper of the Lord", or the "Eucharist" (una cum Roncalli or Montini). Those of the faithful who participated in them were unteachable. They refused to want to know what was really going on. And here a difficult question of rather a different nature cropped up: where there any Catholics, especially more educated ones, who were prepared to take supplementary advanced Catechism courses in order to spread and defend the Faith? But how could such adults be contacted? They might be found amongst friends and acquaintances. A personal approach might prove fruitful, but there were more efficient ways of doing it. It was quickly realized that a basic strategy for apostolic activity was wanting. It would be specifically adapted to laity of the diaspora. For such a program to be useful, however, quite a number of 'applicants' for this project were needed, and their work would have to be backed up. But this was an impossible dream. In fact, a good, useful and pertinent plan of action would be sure to attract a lot of attention, especially in a time of general religious confusion. On the whole, all would be aware of such a program, unless they were spiritually blind or had no interest in their Church.

## THE DIASPORA CHURCH - AN UNDENIABLE FACT

In the 60's most of those whom we discussed Church problems with thought that the diaspora Church was a 'fiction'. But in the 70's, the number of sceptics had considerably diminished. And in the 80's, none of those still around used the term 'fiction' any more. A few were conscious of being diaspora Catholics, even within their own families, and were at a loss what to do about it. Sons and daughters- in - law, parents and friends scoffed at them. At the best they were considered as out-dated, refusing the spirit of *aggiornamento*. More than living on the outskirts of society, they were outside it! They are to be situated in the Catholic diaspora Church. As such, they seem weak. In reality they are stronger than all those around them. They know where they are going and will on no account deviate from the way. Nor do they flee to hide themselves away, but it is true that the way is narrow, on the other hand, it is precisely because of this that it leads on more easily to their destination. (...)

Despite the fact that the Apostolic Church was still viable, priests and theologians tainted with clericalism continued to point out to others that it was no longer so strong and powerful, in order to negate its existence in their eyes. However, as the Apostolic Church was gradually transformed into the diaspora (or eclipsed) Church, the latter's weaknesses became more clearly evident. For its progress through time it now took an other route. But because the detour was so sudden and unexpected, it was impossible to raise the alarm about its changes of direction. To put it another way: if a child falls into a well, the best one can hope for is to retrieve him from it covered with bruises - provided his cries for help have been heard. After the years 1962-65, "the children of the Catholic Church" fell into a deep well en masse. A large number of 'rescuers' would have been necessary to get them all out. And as for the 'vineyard of the Lord' there was less and less to see of it because the field-mice had burrowed and bred extensively in it. Several ask themselves where they had sprung from. Others, better informed, could have told them that they had been there for quite a long time.

In the 60's, especially in the Catholic countries, there were also those who would previously never have admitted any criticism of the holy Catholic Church and had always defended it, who now turned away with aversion from the official Church (it was considered as such) and refused to have any more dealings with it. How could one interpret this phenomenon? Amongst those busying themselves with the matter there were two trains of thought, but both were wrong. Some thought that it was something to do with an 'internal emigration' or a 'spiritual emigration' of the Catholic Church. But that would have signified apostasy (of the Church). The others- clergy for the most part- spoke inconsiderately of 'the apostasy of the Catholic Faith' and they thought that these recalcitrant Catholics had ipso facto become **infidels** because one never saw them at the new masses on Sundays. The reality was that in their case it was nothing at all to do with having lost the Faith! On the contrary, it was a defensive attitude, an instinctive way of protecting themselves against all the evils springing up and proliferating all around them, as a result of the reformatory council. This type of Catholic was generally of a higher social and cultural level, hardly deserving the label 'apostate', even if he sometimes declared quite loudly and bravely that in the future he would keep well at a distance from all that was going on in the Church. But his 'bark was worse than his bite', for it was a burst of suppressed anger **resulting** from all the terrible things he had heard or undergone, including having his name blackened. Basically, without being aware of it, this type of Catholic sought to escape the 'spirit of the Council' and its consequences for the Church as a whole. But who was going to enlighten this category of Catholic and help him understand that the R.C. Church was already on diaspora course? For the present, nobody knows where these indignant Catholics are to be found, or what's become of them. Somehow, in the process of the Church being eclipsed they were dispersed and later, apart from a few cases, they could not be recuperated.

Whether traditionalists or progressivists, old-Catholics or neo-modernists, all commonly shared the belief that the conciliar church since its inception was a stylised sort of Catholicism with a new set of creeds. This belief was also held by those who did not know enough about the reasons for the coming into being of the exiled R.C. Church. These different groups overlooked the fact that this conciliar church also bears the hallmarks of a grotesque new 'Counter-Church'. These Catholics perpetually move around in circles, on cue like trained circus-horses in the ring, held on leashes by an invisible 'dompteur' (trainer), and applauded by a huge crowd of spectators. The latter, having paid for their tickets (i.e. church-taxes), now expect to see a good show for their money ... To explain this: ordinarily the throngs in the church are passive by nature and slow to react. What the 'religious' throngs expect from the conciliar church nowadays is not salvation but a **panem et circenses** (bread and games) spectacle, with as much variety as possible, and no strings attached.

## NO ROSY FUTURE IN VIEW

What can a few dispersed individuals do in such a vast field of action? The R.C. Church will certainly survive through the centuries. There is no doubt about this. Christ is with it and with its frail members. The only question now is, how will it survive? If we make a survey, there is much uncertainty about the situation, even in Europe, where it is easier than elsewhere to make an appraisal. Together with others, I personally don't pin too much hope on a so-called diaspora organized 'semi-council' for **specific** purposes, or even for a 'papal election', without there first being a form of operational organization specially adapted to the R.C. Church. And it would be much better to first organize it on the regional level before proceeding to the supra-regional level. The first duty of the Church in exiled conditions is to strive to achieve unity. This is done by respecting and adopting as norms all those principles which foster ecclesiastical unity <sup>4)</sup>, remembering that the Church is situated on a higher plane than conventional sociological entities in the world.

The conciliar roman Church does not just exist in Rome, where its leader can be located- except when he's off on another "pilgrimage". It is also ensconced in all those dioceses where it has been able to make a 'peaceful' takeovers of territory without encountering resistance. The term for it is occupation... As for the occupants themselves, they are none other than thieves and plunderers of others' property. Unfortunately, they have not received any reproaches for their usurpation - members of the diaspora resistance are too feeble to fight. But in the meantime no one is obliged to pay **church-taxes** or other donations to those occupants! (Apart from the fact that exiled Catholics have only dry bread to look forward to anyway!) And how can someone who contributes church-taxes be walled Catholic? .. **That** Catholics are only too few in number is demonstrated by the rare exceptions who step out of the conciliar church set-up...

If Catholics wish to avoid doing harm to their souls or diminishing the liveliness of their Faith through apathy, self-pity, inactivity or refusal to 'open their mouths', first of all they have to be aware of two dangers existing at the present time, but which are fundamentally different from one another:

1. The colossal monstrosity of the heretical apostate conciliar roman church, with its members and adepts and
2. The great weakness of the R.C. diaspora Church. Unfortunately, this situation is not helped by its members. This Church leads a separate existence from the conciliar church. For after all, as **any** reasonable person would admit, one cannot provide a cure for any physical or moral ailments unless these have been diagnosed. Unless this is done, inevitably one arrives at a dead end. And this has been the state of affairs for many years now, without there having been any improvement in the exiled Church's condition. Nobody can deny this faci-

li is high time to do some stock-taking so is not to flounder completely. Furthermore, exiled Catholics should also beware of their 'traditionalist' (sic) enemies, because for many of the faithful they are just as dangerous as the conciliar ones!...It is useless and meaningless for Catholics to worry and make wild speculations about the future of the Church, and what duties and responsibilities every baptised member has. For, as St. Paul says: in the Church "all are members of one another; if one member suffers, the other suffers with it".

Now the Catholic Church in exile is suffering from a generalised, clearly perceptible weakness, resulting from specific causes. The least that can be done is to diagnose them. Efforts in this direction could be made by concerted action on the regional level- if that were still feasible. And for the exiled condition of the Church itself- there was a moment in time when it began. So why should there not be a term to all this in the future? Let us pray unceasingly and sincerely to Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Good Shepherd, to obtain His help! For all who are not with Him are against Him! And He **knows** them all by name!...

---

4) Contrary to the situation in Europe, in Mexico this reconstruction has been ongoing for some time now. There, not only diaspora communities have flourished but real parishes have cropped up where pastoral activities take place on a regular basis.

# La silla apostólica „ocupada“, o la esquizofrenia como principio de la teología

## -Anotaciones sobre la tesis de de Lauriers del „Papa materialiter, non formaliter“-

Eberhard Heller  
trad. de Alberto Ciria

¡No es lo que ustedes están pensando! No se ha producido una nueva elección papal. ¡Gracias a Dios!, pensarán muchos. Tenemos ya demasiados „Santos Padres“: Bawden, Linus II, Gregorio (Palmar), etc.

Por otra parte tampoco es necesario, pues Juan Pablo II sigue ocupando esta silla. Eso lo dicen no sólo los modernistas y los reformadores, no sólo los econistas y los miembros de la hermandad de Pedro, no: también los **des-laurieristas**, que se han establecido en el norte de Italia y en Estados Unidos, son de esta opinión... a diferencia de nosotros, los sedisvacantistas. Reducida a un común denominador, esta idea es el resultado de una breve confrontación repetida con un grupo en la resistencia eclesiástica, del que yo supuse que sólo por razones de piedad hacia su **antiguo** mentor teológico Des Lauriers se obstinaba en la tesis divergente del „Papa materialiter, non formaliter“. ¡Pero me equivoqué con mucho! La virulencia de esta tesis, que constituye el fundamento para todo un sistema teológico que para sus partidarios es aún más significativo que el depositum fidei, se mantiene incólume en el grupo en torno al abad Ricossa. No hace mucho, incluso el obispo McKenna fundamentó la consagración del abad **Stuyver**, en Bélgica, el 16 de enero de este año, diciendo que él es partidario de esta idea. Es decir, recientemente tenemos un „obispo de tesis“ al que en junio se le agregó un segundo, a saber, el abad Sanborn de los Estados Unidos. Fundamentar la consagración de obispos en el hecho de que sean partidarios de un determinado teorema, considerándolo desde la teología y desde la historia de la Iglesia, podría marcar un proceso bastante singular.

El 17 de diciembre del 2001 escribí aún al abad Ricossa: „Usted quiere mandar consagrar al abad Stuyver porque él defiende la tesis de des Lauriers del „Papa materialiter, non formaliter“, que está en contradicción con el juicio de constatación que Su Eminencia monseñor **Ngô-dinh-Thuc** emitió en su conocida DECLARATIO de 1982, según la cual la silla romana está vacante. Como usted tal vez sabrá, el autor de esta tesis, monseñor Guérard des Lauriers, la revisó más o menos al final de su vida (cfr. la carta correspondiente en las **SAKA-Informationen**). A pesar de esta revisión usted y su comunidad siguen insistiendo sobre ella, sin, por cuanto yo sé, haber fundamentado teológicamente esta perseverancia.“

En relación con la consagración del abad Stuyver, que se hizo a instancias del abad Ricossa, un econista –**contra** las protestas de muchos sacerdotes de Francia y Bélgica a los que yo me sumé, y contra el ruego encarecido de muchos miembros de la comunidad, que expresamente para impedir la consagración habían rezado una novena (sabiendo que su sacerdote era inadecuado para este ministerio)-, se evidenció con qué obstinación los miembros de la comunidad Mater boni consilii, „Madre del buen consejo“, que injustamente tienen este nombre, en Verrua de Saboya, Italia, se aferran a este cadáver teológico. En un primer momento parecía que también el abad Ricossa era partidario de esta tesis sólo por piedad, ya que después de todo en su día a día religioso había colaborado estrechamente con sacerdotes sedisvacantistas, como el obispo **Dolan**, el abad Barbara y el párroco Schoonbroodt, y que se distanciaría de esta tesis cuando hubiera encontrado una explicación mejor para interpretar el estado actual de la Iglesia. ¡Eso fue un error! Desgraciadamente, a quienes se cree muertos la mayoría de las veces viven más tiempo. Desgraciadamente.

Pese a las muchas objeciones y refutaciones de la tesis del „Papa materialiter, non formaliter“ -pienso especialmente en los tratados escritos con acritud de Mira Davidoglou en Francia, en la revista LA VOIE, pero también a los argumentos publicados en EINSICHT-, los discípulos de Monseñor Guérard des Lauriers, especialmente el abad Ricossa, hasta ahora no han querido participar en una confrontación real. Siguen aceptando que insistiendo en una posición insostenible todos nuestros esfuerzos para una restitución de la Iglesia se seguirán paralizando sensiblemente.

Puesto que el abad Ricossa, en quien yo veo al principal responsable de estas empresas, no ha reaccionado hasta ahora a mi propuesta de volver a examinar la dignidad de la tesis del „Papa materialiter-

ter, non formaliter", para o bien llegar a una posición común o bien separarnos a causa de diferencias teológicas insuperables, por mi parte veo sólo la posibilidad de volver a presentar los argumentos contra esta tesis... con la esperanza de colaborar con ello para un esclarecimiento definitivo de los espíritus y para una resolución en esta importante pregunta.

A esta exposición sistemática seguirá una descripción de las circunstancias bajo las cuales Guérard des Lauriers fue ordenado obispo en 1981.

¿Qué significa la fórmula „Papa materialiter, non formaliter", con la que el obispo Guérard des Lauriers trató de interpretar el estado de fe y eclesiástico de Juan Pablo II, en el que Guérard des Lauriers ve al –desde su punto de vista legítimo- poseedor del trono papal en el conflicto de proteger la fe con arreglo a su encomendación?

Según la concepción de des Lauriers, que él publicó en la revista CASSICIACUM, monseñor Wojtyła fue elegido Papa legítimamente -por una pars minor y sanior, por cerca de diez cardenales que aún había llamado Pío XII-: por eso él es „Papa materialiter". Pero como en calidad de Papa sostiene habitualmente la herejía -lo cual en calidad de maestro superior no puede hacer- no es Papa en un sentido formal: „Papa non formaliter", es decir, porque no actúa como un Papa. Pero sigue siendo „Papa materialiter", es decir, sigue siendo en cierta manera un Papa potencial. Si en calidad de pastor y maestro superior volviera a proclamar doctrinas ortodoxas en cuestiones de fe y de moral, entonces Juan Pablo II volvería ser Papa „materialiter“ y también „formaliter".

En las **SAKA-Informationen** de enero de 1984 escribe el obispo Guérard des Lauriers: „Por el momento, la Iglesia en disputa está „ocupada" y en un estado de privación (mise en état de privation)". W. [es decir, monseñor Wojtyła] fue elegido en orden (doy validez a esto hasta una contrademostación segura) por un cónclave que constaba de unos diez cardenales auténticos (que no habían protestado contra la elección), luego ocupa en posesión la sede Papal. De este modo, es Papa „materialiter" (según las circunstancias jurídicas externas). Además de otros infringimientos del deber, W. [monseñor Wojtyła] sostiene habitualmente la herejía. Es evidente que W. inflige un daño al „bien común", que en la Iglesia en disputa en realidad **tendría** que ser fomentado desde esta posición. Por tanto, en base al derecho natural, metafísica y jurídicamente, W. es incapaz de ejercer la autoridad. Merced al derecho natural, que en último término viene directamente de Dios mismo, W. no tiene la autoridad fáctica. No es ni puede ser Papa „formaliter“ (en el auténtico sentido interior). No se le puede obedecer, pues sus pseudo-decretos son nulos." Anoto sólo que su tesis, enlazando con el presupuesto de la elección ordinal de Wojtyła, el obispo Guérard des Lauriers en realidad sólo podría haberla presentado como hipótesis.

A este pronunciamiento le sigue también la autopresentación del Instituto Mater boni consilii, al que también pertenece Ricossa: „Cualquiera puede constatar cómo la Iglesia es visitada por tormentas, tal como fueron profetizadas por el Señor, que vienen a ser las peores en sus casi dos mil años de historia. En el Instituto se es de la opinión de que el origen de todo ello hay que buscarlo en el Vaticano Segundo. Allí se gestó la nueva doctrina de la colegialidad de los obispos, de la libertad de religión, del ecumenismo y de la pertenencia de los no católicos al cuerpo místico de Jesucristo, la nueva doctrina sobre las religiones no cristianas y en particular sobre el judaísmo, la relación entre la Iglesia y el mundo de hoy, que sin embargo está en contradicción con el ministerio doctrinal de la Iglesia, con tantos Papas y concilios ecuménicos. La reforma de la liturgia, en particular de la Santa Misa y del derecho eclesiástico, es perjudicial para las almas, propicia la doctrina errónea del protestantismo y permite lo que en base al derecho divino está prohibido (como por ejemplo acciones propias del servicio divino en comunidad con herejes). Pero esto no puede proceder de la Iglesia católica, que después de todo es conducida por el Espíritu Santo y por el sucesor legítimo e infalible de San Pedro. En medio de esta crisis sin parangón que arrastra necesariamente a todos aquellos que han aprobado los documentos del Concilio y las reformas resultantes de ellos, el Instituto no puede aceptar las nuevas doctrinas que atentan contra la fe y la moral, pero tampoco puede sublevar a los fieles llamándolos a la desobediencia frente a la autoridad legítima de la Iglesia. Por eso el Instituto sostiene la llamada tesis de Cassiciacum (esta designación procede de la revista teológica donde esta tesis se expuso por vez primera). Esta tesis la expuso el padre Guérard des Lauriers, beato, miembro de la Academia Papal de Santo Tomás, antiguo profesor de la Universidad Papal Lateranense y en le Saulchoir (Francia). Según esta tesis, Pablo VI y sus sucesores no ostentan la autoridad papal, aunque hayan sido elegidos legítimamente. Según las categorías de la escolástica y según el cardenal Cayetano, el gran comentador de Santo Tomás del siglo XVI, y del erudito Roberto Bellarmino, que vuelve a retomar esta diferencia, son „Papas" sólo materialiter, pero no formaliter. Puesto que ellos no desarrollan el bien de la Iglesia y propagan errores y doctrinas erróneas en la doctrina, no reciben

de Cristo ninguna fuerza para dirigir a los fieles, para adoctrinarlos y santificarlos, mientras no se retracten de estos errores." (Esto puede consultarse en el Istituto Mater Boni Consilii, Località Carbignano 36, I - 10020 Verrua Savoia, tel.: 0161/839335, Fax.: 0161/839334, E-mail: sodalitiu@plion.it, a través de la página web: [www.plion.it/sodali](http://www.plion.it/sodali).)

Pese a la afirmación antes aducida de que monseñor Wojtyła „propagaría errores y doctrinas erróneas en la doctrina", el abad Ricossa, que es la cabeza teológica del instituto, rechaza el reproche de que Juan Pablo II sea un hereje „formal", lo que dicho sin ambages quiere decir que Ricossa opina que monseñor Wojtyła no tiene claro lo que dice... ¡en calidad de presunto maestro supremo! Esta postura es tanto más incomprensible por cuanto que Ricossa, al salir de Econe, había fundamentado este paso con una declaración en la que -junto con los otros tres padres (Munari, Nitoglia y Murro)- condenaba los errores de Econe en cuanto a la autoridad del Papa y del ministerio doctrinal. (1)

Puesto que Wojtyła ha seguido siendo „Papa materialiter" -pese a su palmaria herejía, y yo añado: pese a su apostasia-, no puede decirse que la silla apostólica esté desocupada (de manera consecuente, el instituto Mater boni consilii ponía el escudo de Juan Pablo II en su anterior página web): simplemente no es „activa" en cuanto al cumplimiento de sus tareas que de él se espera. Por eso Ricossa y sus partidarios -para repetir esta sentencia- „no pueden sublevar a los fieles llamándolos a la desobediencia frente a la autoridad legítima de la Iglesia" (refiriéndose a monseñor Wojtyła).

La tesis del „Papa materialiter, non formaliter" puede reducirse a la fórmula simplificada: Juan Pablo II fue elegido Papa legítimamente. Lo sigue siendo aun cuando „sostenga habitualmente la herejía". Sólo que no hay que obedecer a estos decretos heréticos. Si Juan Pablo II sostuviera de nuevo la doctrina de la Iglesia, volvería a ser Papa en toda la extensión. Sólo hay que esperar a su conversión.

A esta posición se le pueden hacer diversas preguntas:

- 1) ¿Corresponde a la argumentación que la Iglesia ha desarrollado hasta ahora?
- 2) ¿Realmente Juan Pablo II fue elegido legítimamente?
- 3) ¿Puede un hereje ser o seguir siendo Papa?
- 4) ¿Qué consecuencias de desprenden de ello para la pretendida reconstrucción de la Iglesia?

En un primer momento, la tesis del „Papa materialiter, non formaliter", suena bastante plausible: un Papa, como maestro supremo de la Iglesia, no puede ser al mismo tiempo el proclamador de herejías. Y si pese a todo lo hace, entonces no hay que obedecerle... hasta que haya vuelto a la ortodoxia. Pero sigue siendo Papa potencial. En el curso de los años he experimentado que la mayoría de los creyentes tiene bastantes dificultades con el problema de un „Papa haereticus". A los ojos de muchos, el Papa (o „Papa") es un „bastión inexpugnable", y apenas se tiene éxito si se trata de demantelarlo. Con esto no me refiero únicamente a la amplia opinión pública, a cuya opinión también se han sumado los católicos modernistas -obsérvese sólo la adoración acritica, en parte entusiástica de monseñor Wojtyła, a quien festeja incluso la prensa liberal-, sino también a muchos clérigos y laicos tradicionalistas. ¿Acaso el propio Cristo no había prometido a Pedro: „Tú eres Pedro, la roca, y sobre esta roca edificaré mi Iglesia" (Mat. 16, 18)? Además, en el Concilio Vaticano I se proclamó además la infalibilidad del Papa como dogma vinculante:

„Cuando el obispo romano habla ex cathedra, es decir, cuando, ejerciendo su ministerio como pastor y maestro de todos los cristianos, desde el supremo poder apostólico de su ministerio decide definitivamente que una doctrina sobre la fe o la moral ha de ser asumida por toda la Iglesia, en base a la asistencia divina que le es prometida en la persona de San Pedro posee aquella infalibilidad de la que el redentor divino quiso saber provista a su Iglesia en las decisiones definitivas en las doctrinas de fe y de moral. Por consiguiente, estas decisiones definitivas del obispo romano son inmodificables por sí mismas, y no en base a la aprobación de la Iglesia." (Denz 1839)

Simplemente no podía estar permitido aquello que no debía ser, a saber, que un Papa pueda ser hereje. Por eso, cuando antes se hablaba de herejía y de cisma a propósito de la persona de Pablo VI -pienso en los sutiles tratados del abad de Nantes, entre otros en su Liber accusationis o en su revista CRC-, se manifestaba de modo legalista, incluso místico, que el Papa sigue siendo Papa aun como posible hereje o como hereje real. En último término existía el truco teológico con el hereje, pero que no era „formal". A menudo se buscaban razones para probar que Montini en realidad nunca había llegado a ser Papa. El Dr. Gliwitzky designó esta postura con bastante acierto de este modo: „La renuncia largamente practicada a traer la fe a la intelección es una de las raíces más profundas de la llamada crisis en la que estamos. Por tanto, todo nuestro esfuerzo tiene que orientarse a, observando los signos, fomentar el saber de cuándo únicamente se está opinando y deseando, cuándo se está esperando, cuándo se está creyendo y cuándo se está sabiendo en la verdad." (Dr. Hans Gliwitzky,



en EINSICHT, año I, Nr. 12, p. 37, artículo „Garabandal“)

En esta medida el padre Guérard des Lauriers había resumido esta postura -psicológicamente tal vez comprensible- en su tesis como en una fórmula. ¿Pero corresponde a la doctrina de la Iglesia, o refleja la concepción de la Iglesia? Ya San Paschasius advierte en el siglo IX: „Quien busca algo fuera de la Iglesia sólo encuentra falsedad, y quien no acepta lo que dijo Cristo se pone a sí mismo fuera de la verdad.“ (2) Naturalmente eso también vale para el Papa. „De este modo, un Papa puede separarse de la cabeza, es decir, de Cristo, mediante la desobediencia en cosas del culto, cuyo deber es protegerlas. A un Papa así, que quiere destruir la Iglesia, se le tienen que oponer todos los cristianos.“ (3) „Un Papa que sostiene doctrinas erróneas“, advierte Suárez, „ya no es Papa, y si se equivoca, entonces no se equivoca como Papa, así como la Iglesia no se equivoca (en esto): ella puede elegir a otro.“ (4) En „Romani Pontificis in definiendo infallibilitas“ se dice: „Sólo con que un Papa se haga culpable de herejía está ya fuera de la Iglesia, y Dios mismo le ha relegado de su ministerio.“ (5) „Por tanto un hereje manifiesto no puede ser Papa“: así dice también el juicio del maestro de la Iglesia San Roberto Bellarmino. (6) Por eso el modo como Ricossa se refiere a San Bellarmino en su fundamentación de la tesis de des Lauriers es totalmente incomprensible, toda vez que éste no sólo no conoce la distinción entre un Papa formaliter y uno materialiter, sino que incluso excluye expresamente la posibilidad de que pueda haber un Papa como Papa hereje (en De romano Pontífice).

Si se compara la tesis de des Lauriers con estas posiciones, puede constatarse fácilmente que no se produce una división entre un Papa „actual“ y uno „potencial“. La herejía tiene para él la consecuencia inmediata de la pérdida del ministerio. Como demuestra la teóloga Myra Davidoglou, la tesis del „Papa materialiter, non formaliter“ es nueva: „Tous les papes que l'Eglise catholique a connus depuis sa fondation sont papes formels; l'idée d'un pape potentiel ayant droit a titres de Pontife romain et au Siège apostolique est une nouveauté, en déuire de l'Ecriture sainte ou de la Tradition apostolique, les deux seules sources de la Révélation divine, ni même de l'histoire de l'Eglise, la possibilité de l'existence d'un tel pape. Sous ce rapport, nous avons donc affaire à une doctrine purement humaine dont nous bornerons.“ (LA VOIE, 1991, Nr. 21, p. 2: „Analyse logique et theologique de la thèse dite de Cassiciacum“). „Todos los Papas que la Iglesia católica ha conocido desde su fundación han sido Papas formales. El pensamiento de un Papa potencial con derecho a la silla apostólica es una novedad en el sentido de que eso no puede concluirse a partir de las Sagradas Escrituras ni de la tradición apostólica, las dos únicas fuentes de la revelación divina, ni tampoco a partir de la historia de la Iglesia. Desde este punto de vista, aquí nos hallamos ante una doctrina puramente humana [es decir, puramente personal].“ (Traducción del párroco Schoonbroodt) Myra Davidoglou continúa: „Dira-t-on que celui qui a perdu la papauté n'en est pas pour autant déchu? [...] Et pourtant, c'est sur „l'apparaitre“, come il dit, que l'auteur va s'appuyer pour tenter d'établir l'occupation non de fait (laquelle est évidente), mais de droit du Siège de Pierre par des hommes come Montini ou fait hors de l'Eglise, parce qu'excommuniés et anathémisés par le Concile du Vatican (1870).“ (LA VOIE, 1991, Nr. 21, p. 3) („Si ha perdido el papado, ¿no se ha salido de él? [...] Y sin embargo el autor [des Lauriers] se apoya para demostrar no la auténtica posesión de la silla papal (lo cual es evidente), sino el derecho a ocupar la silla de Pedro –en el caso de Montini y de Wojtyla–, mientras que él mismo indica que son herejes, es decir, que en realidad están fuera de la Iglesia no sólo de iure, sino también de facto, porque están excomulgados y anatémizados por el Concilio Vaticano Primero –1870–.“ (Traducción del párroco Schoonbroodt)

Aunque des Lauriers no niega la posibilidad de la sedisvacancia, en su opinión ésta sólo se produciría si la elección como Papa de Montini o de Wojtyla hubiera sido inválida, lo cual tendría primero que ser demostrado.

El antiguo profesor de la Gregoriana, des Lauriers, y sus adeptos, no entienden que la acusación de herejía no se dirige al Papa en tanto que Papa, es decir, que con ello se está juzgando quasi por encima del Papa, lo que no está permitido según la máxima de que „el Papa no puede ser juzgado por nadie“ (porque en tanto que Papa es él mismo el juez supremo (7), sino que se trata de un juicio de constatación en el que se declara que a de causa una determinada herejía la persona respectiva ha dejado de ser Papa.

Abordamos ahora la cuestión de si Wojtyla fue elegido Papa válidamente.

Supongamos -para adoptar la posición de monseñor Guérard des Lauriers- que monseñor Wojtyla hubiera sido elegido por una „pars minor et sanior“: entonces la elección habría podido ser válida si el elegido hubiera sido un obispo ortodoxo. Pero la ortodoxia de Wojtyla antes de la elección puede discutirse con razón. Me ahorro enumerar las herejías conocidas de todos que él sostuvo ya antes de ocupar su ministerio. Sólo indico que él fue uno de los que fomentaron especialmente las reformas (a

diferencia del cardenal **Wischinky**, que aunque tampoco opuso resistencia, al fin y al cabo tuvo el mérito de haber reforzado con su intervención a los polacos en su actitud anticomunista). Tras la bula de Pablo IV „Cum ex apostolatus officio” del 15 de febrero de 1559, los prelados y los obispos que antes de ser promovidos se han desviado de la fe católica pierden automáticamente su autoridad y todo ministerio. No tienen potestad para desempeñar un ministerio. Después de que Pablo IV confirma primeramente todas las sanciones que fueron aplicadas a herejes y cismáticos (8), habla decididamente sobre la inhabilidad de los herejes para el ministerio:

„**Añadimos** que si en algún momento hubiera de mostrarse que un obispo, aun cuando actúe en lugar de un arzobispo o un patriarca, o un cardenal de la Iglesia Católica, a la que nos hemos referido antes, también -advírtase- un legado o incluso un pontífice romano antes de ser nombrado cardenal o antes de su elección como pontífice romano, se ha desviado de la fe católica, ha caído en una herejía o en cisma, o los ha provocado y causado, entonces su nombramiento o elección, aun cuando esto haya sucedido con la conformidad y la aprobación unánime de todos los cardenales, son nulos, inoperantes y sin valor. Ni con el recibimiento de la consagración episcopal ni la consiguiente adopción de la dirección y la administración, ni siquiera con la „entronización del Romano Pontífice” ni con la veneración ni la obediencia que todos le deben, por mucho que hayan durado, pueden designarse válidos ni recibir la validez, ni considerarse válidos en ningún aspecto parcial. Hay que pensar que a todos aquellos que de tal modo fueron promovidos a obispos, arzobispos, patriarcas o primados, se les ha adjudicado o se les adjudicará una capacidad de administración nula en asuntos espirituales y temporales. Todo aquello que de cualquier manera ellos hayan expresado, creado, realizado o administrado, y todo lo que se siga de ahí, carece de validez y no puede conferir ninguna seguridad ni tampoco un derecho a nadie. Así pues, los promovidos y elegidos de este modo pierden eo ipso y sin ninguna declaración toda dignidad, posición, honor, título, toda autoridad, todo ministerio y todo poder, aun cuando todos y cada uno de los así promovidos o elegidos anteriormente no se hubieran desviado de la fe y no hubieran sido herejes ni hubieran caído en un cisma no lo hubieran creado u ocasionado.” (Bula „Cum ex apostolatus officio”, § 6)

Por eso, según esta bula no puede admitirse el supuesto de que hubiera habido una „pars minor et sanior”, es decir, legítimos electores del Papa, puesto que ellos habrían perdido igualmente su cargo a causa de la herejía. (En cuanto a la herejía de los obispos y cardenales italianos, monseñor Guérard des Lauriers mantenía una posición más bien peculiar, que se basaba en su experiencia con estas personas: en cierta ocasión nos dijo al Dr. Hiller y a mí que los prelados italianos, que por lo general cuando eran seminaristas fueron alumnos suyos, eran tan tontos que ni siquiera eran capaces de sostener herejías, porque no sabían lo que es esto.) Aquí no encuentra aplicación el decreto del **CIC** según el cual infringimientos jurídicos que son sancionados con censuras no limitan el derecho de elección de los cardenales, porque no se trata de delitos de derecho, sino de delitos de fe.

Se argumenta aún que Juan Pablo II es un hereje material pero no formal, lo cual significa que sostiene una herejía pero no sabe que lo es. Hay que tener claro lo que esto significa: el maestro supremo y el velador de la doctrina no sabe lo que ha de enseñar ni lo que debe custodiar. Estas son las puertas traseras teológicas que la gente como Ricossa se dejan abiertas para no tener que extraer las consecuencias decisivas. Tal concepción está excluida según el Canon 16 § 2a del **CIC**, según el cual el poseedor de un cargo, especialmente si se trata del poseedor del ministerio doctrinal de la Iglesia, no puede hacer valer que no conoce su fe. Puesto que Wojtyła fue ordenado obispo aún bajo Pío XII, previamente tuvo que acreditarse su ortodoxia en un proceso de información y de definición (cfr. **CIC**, Can. 330 y 331).

La pregunta de si un hereje puede ser Papa, los maestros de la Iglesia y los teólogos que se han ocupado de este problema la han respondido inequívocamente con una negación, como se ha dicho antes (Bellarmino, Cayetano, Suárez). El Dr. Katzer, que en el ámbito de habla alemana ocupaba como teólogo una posición similar a la del padre Sáenz y Arriaga en Méjico, se ha ocupado con más precisión de este tema en el artículo „Silla apostólica desocupada” (**EINSICHT VIII/5** de diciembre de 1978, p. 168 ss., reeditado en **EINSICHT XXXII/1**, p. 13 s.). Según él, „la silla apostólica [...] puede estar desocupada:

- a) por muerte física del Papa,
- b) por muerte moral del Papa.

El Papa **está** moralmente muerto cuando ha pecado manifiestamente contra la doctrina de la fe o de la moral. Pero no por ello la silla apostólica queda huérfana, como enfatiza el Papa Pío VI en su conocida constitución apostólica „Auctorem fidei”, tan importante para nuestros tiempos, refiriéndose a san Pedro Crisólogo (9): „Pedro, viviendo en su trono y ocupando la presidencia, ofrece a quienes la

**demandan** la verdad de la fe." Esto sucede merced a los juicios infalibles e inderogables de la silla apostólica."

El decreto de Bellarmino según el cual „Papa haereticus depositus est", „un Papa hereje está depuesto" -un juicio de constatación-, es completado con la fórmula de Cayetano „deponendus est", „hay que deponerlo", en el sentido de que este juicio de constatación hay que darlo a conocer, es decir, que la persona respectiva tiene que ser declarada por la Iglesia como depuesto, porque la Iglesia es una comunidad visible y jurídica, que tiene que estar informada sobre el estado de su cabeza superior. Exactamente esto hizo Su Eminencia monseñor Ngô-dinh-Thuc con su DECLARATIO del 25 de febrero de 1982. No en el sentido de que en la DECLARATIO se constate por vez primera la sedisvacancia y se muestren las consecuencias necesarias, pero es el único documento de un antiguo portador del cargo, de alto rango y muy estimado, que ha acertado con esta constatación y la ha proclamado públicamente. Aun cuando no fuera redactada desde el cargo sino „sólo" „ex caritate", es decir, por preocupación por el bien de la Iglesia, sin embargo monseñor Ngô-dinh-Thuc, en calidad de obispo de la Iglesia católico-romana, expresó esta constatación de modo jurídicamente vinculante para los creyentes. La DECLARATIO es el documento con el que podemos asegurar también en sentido jurídico nuestra resistencia y las demás actividades -más allá de la justificación desde la visión personal de que la jerarquía ha apostasiado-.(10)

La tesis de des Lauriers de que un Papa caído en herejía (un autor americano ha hecho una lista de 101 herejías sólo de Juan Pablo II) -advírtase que un Papa elegido legítimamente- es un „Papa materialiter", es decir, un Papa que todavía puede serlo potencialmente, queda con ello inéquivocamente refutada. El ministerio papal se ha acabado exactamente cuando el poseedor de este ministerio cae en herejía. Como se ha mostrado, el truco de que no es consciente de su herejía, es decir, de que no es un hereje formal, no se puede aplicar. ¿Por qué? Porque no puede ser que aquel que en calidad de sucesor del representante de Cristo aquí en la tierra fue instaurado como maestro y velador supremo de la integridad de la fe proclame simultáneamente la verdad y el error. La identidad de la persona de un Papa no se puede dividir esquizofrénicamente en una „material" y por otro lado una „formal", pues en cuanto tal no estaría en condiciones de preservar su identidad como persona. Tal división esquizofrénica de la persona sería, en cuanto a su contenido, no sólo contradictoria, sino también un contrasentido.

Alguien que, como el Papa, reivindica infalibilidad en asuntos de fe y de moral, que en los ámbitos mencionados encarna la verdad qua ministerio, no puede ser al mismo tiempo el representante del error y de la falsedad. Referido a la persona respectiva, eso significaría no sólo que hace valer la contradicción, sino que introduce la esquizofrenia como principio en la teología. En el momento en que Juan Pablo II muestra que también está propagando el error -como ha acentuado monseñor Guérard des Lauriers, que sostiene por costumbre la herejía-, deja de ser el representante de la verdad infalible.

La tesis „Juan Pablo II es Papa cuando proclama algo ortodoxo y no lo es cuando dice algo herético", significa a su vez que cada creyente tendría que juzgar cada vez sobre la ortodoxia o sobre la herejía del papa. Con ello, la autoridad doctrinal de Roma quedaría transferida a cada creyente, pues ya no sería cierto que „Roma locuta, causa finita" („Roma ha hablado, el asunto está terminado"), sino: cuando Roma ha hablado, sólo entonces se desata el debate entre los creyentes.

¿Qué aspecto tendría bajo este presupuesto -la tesis del „Papa materialiter, non formaliter"- una restitución o una reconstrucción de la Iglesia? (11) Puesto que el „Papa materialiter" sigue siendo Papa -pese a la propaganda del error e incluso de la apostasia-, sólo se trata de que vuelva a ser Papa „formaliter", es decir, que es al mismo tiempo „Papa materialiter" y „formaliter" cuando sostenga (de nuevo) posiciones ortodoxas. Los partidarios como el abad Ricossa esperan por tanto que Juan Pablo II se vuelva a convertir. Con ello, en cuanto a la restitución de la autoridad, la crisis se habría superado... al menos por cuanto concierne a la persona de Juan Pablo II. La cuestión de los otros obispos heréticos o apóstatas (entre tanto „obispos"), que tendrían que ser tratados de modo análogo: „episcopus materialiter, non formaliter", quedaría aún irresuelta. (Pero tal vez el regreso del „Papa materialiter" a la ortodoxia implique también la de los „Episcopi materialiter".) Sobre la seguridad jurídica y sobre la recuperación de la jurisdicción de estos reconfesos no habla ni des Lauriers ni Ricossa. ¿Pero qué sucede si Juan Pablo II mezcla fuertemente en sus decretos la ortodoxia y la herejía -¡Wojtyla es un maestro de la dialéctica!-? ¿Es entonces Papa „materialiter" y al mismo tiempo „formaliter/non formaliter"? Este juego absurdo puede llevarse todo lo lejos que se quiera.

Esta espera de la conversión de monseñor Wojtyla la he comparado siempre con la „espera a Godot" que Samuel Becket describe en la obra de teatro homónima. Allí se espera a Godot, del cual se sabe

que nunca llegará... es decir, una espera completamente absurda. Con estos absurdos se pueden montar obras de teatro (para representar el absurdo), pero no llevar a cabo la reconstrucción de la Iglesia. ¿No se enteró Guérard des Lauriers de que la apostasia es uno de los pecados que son irreversibles, es decir, el rechazo de la verdad, de la verdad viva, por ella misma? ¿Lo han olvidado sus discípulos, entre los que también se encuentra el abad Sanborn en Estados Unidos?

Mientras tanto los fieles han de seguir llevando su vida religioso-eclesial: criticar lo que es criticable, apelar a los „obispos" y al „Santo Padre", no „obedecer" cuando los decretos contradicen a la fe. Pero si entonces, por „exceso de celo" o por „impaciencia" se mandan consagrar sacerdotes y obispos, eso son naturalmente señales cismáticas... ¿acaso porque se desconfía de la providencia divina?

Para aclarar con un ejemplo sacado del ámbito militar las consecuencias que resultan de esta posición, que para Ricossa y su comunidad Mater boni consilii parece ser más importante que el resto de la fe católica: un general comete alta traición y entrega su patria al enemigo junto con la armada que él manda. En lugar de hacer que a este general lo condene un tribunal de guerra y de nombrar un nuevo general, los **des-laurieristas** recomiendan esperar hasta que a este alto traidor se le ocurra volver a cambiar los frentes, para que puedan volver a „servirlo en fidelidad". Mientras tanto, „llenos de esperanza en el cambio de opinión de su general" (dicho en términos teológicos: llenos de esperanza en Dios), los soldados permiten que el enemigo gobierne irrestrictamente.

Para terminar, algunas indicaciones sobre nuestra situación actual. Si se observa el comportamiento de los creyentes, pero especialmente el de los sacerdotes y obispos que pretenden trabajar para la custodia de la fe y la reconstrucción de la Iglesia, entonces desgraciadamente hay que constatar por todas partes sectarismo y resignación. En el tiempo que siguió a la proclamación de la DECLARATIO -al margen de los esfuerzos que el entre tanto fallecido obispo Cannona emprendió a principios de los años noventa para la reunificación de los creyentes, y que el obispo Dávila quiere continuar ahora-, no se ha hecho nada para restituir la Iglesia como institución de salvación. En su visita del año pasado el obispo Dávila ha expuesto la situación de un modo más elegante: „Durante los últimos veinte años, nosotros los sacerdotes sólo nos hemos ocupado de problemas pastorales."

Pero el trabajo pastoral sólo puede ser fructífero si se encuadra en las estructuras eclesiales, pues la administración sacramental ejercida hasta ahora sólo es legítima si se hace con la intención de que suceda como acto de la Iglesia. Sólo a ella, a la Iglesia, le ha conferido Cristo la administración de los sacramentos. Todo lo demás sería puro sectarismo. Por eso, el fin principal de todos nuestros esfuerzos ha de ser llevar adelante esta restitución. Pues Cristo fundó la Iglesia como institución de salvación -y no sólo como mera comunidad de fe- para garantizar con seguridad la transmisión infalseada de su doctrina y de los medios de la gracia. Por tanto, la reconstrucción de la Iglesia como institución de salvación es exigida por la voluntad de su divino fundador. Pero de aquí resulta un dilema. Por un lado falta por ahora la jurisdicción eclesial necesaria para el cumplimiento de estas tareas, puesto que la jerarquía ha apostasiado, mientras que por otro lado la reconstrucción es el presupuesto necesario para el restablecimiento de esta autoridad eclesial. Hay que encontrar una solución teológica clara para este problema.

La mera insistencia en la situación de urgencia que se da a nivel mundial no justifica la actuación iniciada de modo sólo personal ni el activismo de ciertos clérigos, y define teológicamente la situación sólo de modo incompleto, pero tal actitud encierra en sí el peligro del sectarismo, toda vez que cada uno puede obtener de ello para sí mismo las consecuencias que quiera. A nadie se le ocurriría por ejemplo comprarse un uniforme y una escopeta para presentarse luego como soldado del ejército alemán o mejicano. ¿Cuál sería la solución? Para seguir con este ejemplo, sólo sería tal soldado si este ejército lo llamara. Aplicándolo a la Iglesia, sólo sería un verdadero sacerdote si pudiera acreditar que ha sido encomendado por la auténtica Iglesia.

Frente a ello se objeta que para resolver los problemas actuales no se necesita de ninguna estrategia propia, sino que basta con apelar al principio de estado de emergencia. Tal concepción no es sólo falsa, sino que es también altamente peligrosa. Con una medida de emergencia sólo se quiere impedir que se produzca o se haya de producir un estado determinado: quiero que algo no haya de ser. Pero con esta intención no digo (aún) lo que haya de ser. Por ejemplo, cuando construyo un dique quiero impedir que un río desborde la orilla e inunde el campo. Pero con esta medida no he indicado cómo quiero construir mi campo. Es decir, necesito además una idea positiva propia de cómo quiero utilizar el campo que quiero cultivar.

Regresemos a nuestro propio pasado eclesial inmediato: fue necesario administrar consagración-

nes episcopates sin mandato papal para salvar la sucesión apostólica amenazada, tal como hizo monseñor Ngô-dinh-Thuc. Pero sería un gran error suponer que en el futuro se puede renunciar a situaciones ordenadas, en último término al mandato papal, porque la Iglesia está supuestamente en peligro. Pues la apelación al estado de emergencia tiene que pagar por todas las acciones sectarias, incluso por la inadmisibles consagración de sacerdotes casados. Si ustedes, queridos oyentes, echan un vistazo alrededor, no se ha producido justamente aquello que debería haberse alcanzado con la medida de emergencia de entonces: la salvación de la sucesión y de la Iglesia. Nos encontramos en un sectarismo del cual nosotros mismos somos culpables y que nosotros mismos hemos ocasionado. Sólo les vuelvo a recordar lo que es motivo de esta ponencia: las escandalosas consagraciones episcopales que McKenna fundamentaba con aquella tesis, y cuya insostenibilidad les he querido demostrar. ¡Qué abismos se han abierto aquí! Por tanto, para la reconstrucción de la Iglesia, para su restitución como institución de salvación, necesitamos conceptos propios:

- que tengan que estar teológicamente fundados, y
- que por un lado tengan que pasar factura a las realidades actuales
- y por otro lado sean apropiadas para reconfigurar estas realidades de tal modo que, finalmente, la Iglesia vuelva a ser el custodio de la revelación de Dios y la comunidad de los fieles vuelva a estar bajo un Papa elegido legítimamente.

## La consagración episcopal de P. Guérard des Lauriers

Una vez que las investigaciones de los ritos de consagración postconciliares hubieran dado el resultado de que eran dogmáticamente defectuosos, o cuanto menos en sumo grado dudosos, es decir, que conforme a los nuevos ritos las consagraciones eran inválidas, entre nosotros fue creciendo la preocupación por la custodia de la sucesión apostólica, que depende de la serie ininterrumpida de consagraciones válidas (consagraciones episcopales y sacerdotales). Pero cuando monseñor Lefebvre rechazó enérgicamente nuestras preocupaciones al respecto, que algunos miembros de nuestro círculo le habían comunicado, indicando sarcásticamente que él conoce a un obispo casado en Lima... que tal vez se interesaría por nuestro problema..., entablamos contacto con Su Eminencia monseñor Ngô-dinh-Thuc. En ello pudimos apoyarnos en su declaración sobre las ordenaciones sacerdotales y episcopales que él había administrado en el Palmar de Troya, en España, que él fundamentaba señalando la situación de necesidad y el hundimiento generalizado de la Iglesia. El muy honorable Dr. Kutzer, que como teólogo y pastor gozaba de un gran prestigio en el ámbito europeo entre los creyentes conservadores y sedisvacantistas, el Dr. Hiller y yo tratamos con él tanto el problema de la sedisvacancia como también la amenaza de la sucesión apostólica, para preguntarle finalmente si dadas las circunstancias él estaría dispuesto a consagrar a un obispo.

Después de que el Dr. Kutzer, que se había puesto a disposición como candidato para el ministerio episcopal, desgraciadamente muriera de modo repentino, tuvimos que buscar para este ministerio a otro candidato digno con buena reputación entre los creyentes. El padre G. des Lauriers, que era profesor en la Gregoriana de Roma y más tarde durante un tiempo profesor en Econe, se había hecho un nombre como coautor de la „Breve investigación crítica del Novus ordo missae", que habían publicado los dos cardenales Ottaviani y Bacci. El padre Guérard des Lauriers reaccionó a nuestro escrito con una carta extraordinariamente abierta y llena de preocupación, muy personal, en la que también hablaba de la situación de la jerarquía. Conocía a los obispos italianos de aquella época de sus estudios en la universidad papal, porque habían sido sus antiguos estudiantes. Los debates sobre la situación general y la necesidad de una eventual consagración episcopal se celebraron en Etiolles, el lugar de residencia del padre G. des Lauriers, cerca de París, con el Prof. Lauth y Dr. Hiller. Se llegó a la unanimidad en la mayoría de los puntos de discusión. Entre los participantes quedó únicamente como punto de controversia el problema de cómo G. des Lauriers pretendía interpretar la sedisvacancia con su tesis del „Papa materialiter, non formaliter". Pues al margen de la dignidad teológica de esta tesis, en cuanto al modo de llevar una eventual lucha eclesial se desprenden consecuencias totalmente distintas frente a la posición de la estricta sedisvacancia, que fue sostenida públicamente tanto por nosotros como posteriormente también por Su Eminencia monseñor Ngô-dinh-Thuc. Pero si se pretendía seguir un camino común, había que eliminar estas diferencias, y en ello teníamos el convencimiento de que el padre G. des Lauriers se hallaba con su tesis en la famosa „senda perdida".

El señor Hiller, el señor Lauth y yo considerábamos una conditio sine qua non para una eventual consagración episcopal del padre G. des Lauriers que sólo podríamos recomendarlo como candidato

si veía su tesis como falsa. Con este propósito, el Prof. Lauth volvió a viajar, esta vez solo, a Etiolles, para eliminar en una intensa conversación este último „obstáculo a la consagración”.

Cuando Lauth regresó a Múnich, nos aseguró a Hiller y a mi que el padre Guérard des Lauriers había renunciado a su ridícula tesis, que se había distanciado de ella y asumido la posición que defendíamos nosotros, a saber, que reinaba la vacancia. Tras ello, nos dirigimos a monseñor Ngô-dinh-Thuc, que nos había dado su confianza en el curso de los años anteriores, en los que habíamos emprendido diversas empresas con él, para establecer el contacto con el padre des Lauriers como candidato a la consagración. Pero inmediatamente después de la consagración, celebrada el 7 de mayo de 1981, se evidenció que el Prof. Lauth nos había informado mal: el nuevo obispo proclamó que no le importaba estar en situación cismática. A la pregunta de cómo es que se sentía cismático, nos enteramos de que en modo alguno había cambiado su tesis de „Papa materialiter, non formaliter” con la posición sedisvacantista. Adviértase que si nosotros hubiéramos intuido esto, el Sr. Hiller y yo jamás **habríamos** recomendado al padre Guérard des Lauriers como candidato a la consagración. Cuando además de esto nos enteramos de que des Lauriers primeramente tampoco quería ser activo como obispo, a través del Sr. Moser entablamos contacto con el padre Cannona y con la señorita Gloria Riestra de Wolff, la editora de la antigua revista TRENTO, para indagar la disposición, si dadas las circunstancias el padre Cannona estaría dispuesto a asumir el ministerio episcopal para preservar la sucesión, con el conocido resultado de que el 17 de octubre de 1981 recibió la ordenación episcopal junto con el padre Zamora.

En el tiempo posterior, la consagración del padre Guérard des Lauriers hubo de evidenciarse en múltiples sentidos como „accidente”, como por lo demás también otras consagraciones. No sólo porque el obispo Guérard des Lauriers comenzó a atacar de modo penetrante a Su Eminencia monseñor Ngô-dinh-Thuc, que en aquella época había huido a nosotros desde Toulon escapando de la persecución, diciendo que después de todo éste quería adherirse a su tesis del „Papa materialiter, non formaliter” –el arzobispo, que en aquella época vivía con nosotros, lleno de rabia rompió estas cartas y tiró los trozos por la ventana-, sino que también comenzó una lucha pública con los obispos ordenados posteriormente, Cannona y Zamora, sobre la posición eclesiástica „conecta”. En la revista *Sus le banniere* nos insultó a la señorita Gloria Riestra, a De Wolff, al Dr. Hiller y a mí llamándonos cismáticos. No reprocho a Guérard des Lauriers haber establecido su tesis de „Papa materialiter, non formaliter” –**cualquiera** puede equivocarse-, pero considero una falta absoluta de escrúpulos que de forma penetrante e insultante para los afectados atacara precisamente a aquellos que le habían ayudado a asumir el ministerio episcopal. Del todo incomprensible fue su comportamiento contra la DECLARATIO de Su Eminencia el arzobispo Ngô-dinh-Thuc, que el desestimó con la propaganda a favor de su propia tesis. Esta campaña contra quien lo había consagrado llegó incluso hasta el punto -por cuanto recuerdo- de que difundió o hizo difundir el rumor de que el autor de la DECLARATIO no era monseñor Ngô-dinh-Thuc, sino los Sres. Hiller y Heller. Todavía hoy tengo que amenazar en ocasiones con consecuencias jurídicas a personas que siguen afirmando que monseñor Ngô-dinh-Thuc se dejó „comprar” para la redacción de la DECLARATIO.

Con su campaña sin escrúpulos, que él emprendió seguidamente, en favor de su tesis -como yo la formulo **sarcásticamente**- del „medio Santo Padre” y contra su consagrador, contra sus cofrades que se no adhirieron a él sino a la DECLARATIO sobre la sedisvacancia, paralizó sensiblemente nuestra lucha eclesiástica. Y con la misma falta de instinto siguen operando hoy sus antiguos discípulos.

Aparte de estas descortesías, monseñor Guérard des Lauriers perjudicó gravemente nuestra lucha eclesiástica también en otro sentido, ordenando obispos a candidatos sin consultarlo ni hablarlo con sus cofrades episcopales, y sin haber examinado el estado y la capacitación de los sacerdotes cuestionables, o sin atender a las reservas que había frente a ellos. Con ello fue el causante de lo que yo he llamado el „cisma interno” (cfr. EINSICHT XXXI/2, p. 32 ss.). Así, consagró obispo entre otros al Dr. Storck –**que** aunque era un teólogo y un filósofo dotado, como sacerdote había hecho concesiones a Econe y a sacerdotes vagantes-, incluso contra las objeciones presentadas por monseñor Vezelis. Monseñor Guérard des Lauriers consagró incluso al padre McKenna por sugerencia de una anciana señora de Suiza, motivo por el cual, unas semanas antes de la fecha de la consagración, éste se pasó al bando teológico de monseñor Guérard des Lauriers, cuya posición sigue sosteniendo hoy día. Y naturalmente des Lauriers había realizado la consagración contra las protestas de fieles y sin hablarlas con los obispos americanos Musey y Vazalis, que ya ejercían sus ministerios. Igualmente sin consultar a los otros obispos consagró también al ex-econista Munari, que entre tanto ha pasado al estado de laico.

Tal vez a monseñor Guérard des Lauriers, que falleció el 27 de febrero de 1988 -poco antes de

alcanzar los noventa años-, se le pueda considerar que de hecho buscara una solución clara para el problema de la jurisdicción -al contrario que otros obispos- y que al menos al final de su vida pusiera en cuestión la validez de su tesis, que tantos disgustos había deparado, adhiriéndose más bien a la posición del sedisvacantismo establecida en la DECLARATIO de Su Eminencia Ngô-dinh-Thuc (SAKA-Informationen de mayo de 1988).

\* \* \*

## Notas:

(1) Los firmantes, don Franco Munari, don Francesco Ricossa, don Curzio Nitoglia y don Giuseppe Murro, obedeciendo a la doctrina de la Iglesia católica, según la cual es obligatoria la necesidad de una retractación pública **como** consecuencia de la publicación de doctrinas falsas sobre la fe y la moral, declaran retractarse públicamente de que han enseñado, o al menos consintieron implícitamente como concordante con la verdad, que en el tiempo de 1982 a 1985, es decir, durante su pertenencia a la Hermandad sacerdotal San Pío X, creyeron en los siguientes errores:

1. Al Papa romano se le atribuye infalibilidad sólo en las decisiones „ex cathedra" (es decir, cuando enseña dogmas).

2. El ministerio doctrinal habitual y universal de la Iglesia no es infalible.

3. El Concilio Vaticano II puede ser no infalible como concilio pastoral, pero no **como** concilio dogmático. \*

4. Está permitido, y habitualmente se ofrece, negar la obediencia a la doctrina doctrinal, moral y litúrgica de la autoridad legítima (el Papa y los obispos), aunque se reconoce que a esa misma autoridad se le atribuye toda la autoridad en virtud de la instauración divina de la Iglesia.

5. Es posible que la autoridad legítima (el Papa romano) de la Iglesia universal promulgue y ordene leyes (rito misal, sacramentos, código del derecho eclesiástico) que contengan errores, herejías, así como también elementos perjudiciales para la salvación de las almas.

6. Es posible que un auténtico Papa verdadero, un verdadero representante de Cristo, pueda ser al mismo tiempo cismático, apostático y estar en contradicción con la tradición, y que sus actos haya que juzgarlos **como** nulos. Las DECLARACIONES ERRONEAS que hemos citado arriba lastiman mortalmente el dogma católico de la INSTAURACION DIVINA DE LA IGLESIA, su MINISTERIO DOCTRINAL, la INFALIBILIDAD de la Iglesia y del PAPA ROMANO. A todos aquellos a los que hayan ofendido de esta manera, los sacerdotes firmantes piden con esta retractación pública perdón y oraciones, y aseguran que con la ayuda de Dios jamás volverán a sostener errores semejantes. (Citado según KE Nr. 3/1996, p. 80)

(2) P.L. 120. Paschasius Radbertus, Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini, col. 1317.

(3) Ad sacrosanta Concilia a Philippo Labbe et Gabriele Cossartio edita Apparatus alter, Venetiis 1728.

(4) Defensio Fidei, lib. V. De antichristo, Tom. XX, Cap. XXI, 7.

(5) Romani Pontificis in definiendo infallibilitas breviter demonstrata. Thyrsi Gonzales S.J. Parisli 1698.

(6) Controversio de Romano Pontífice, lib. II, cap. XXX.

(7) Cfr. la **bula** de Pablo IV „Cum ex apostolatus officio", § 1: „Considerando este asunto tan difícil y peligroso, el Romano Pontífice, que es el representante de Dios y de Nuestro Señor Jesucristo en la tierra, tiene un poder ilimitado sobre los pueblos y los reinos, y decide jurídicamente sobre todos, sin quedar sometido él mismo en este mundo a juicio jurídico. Sin embargo se le puede contradecir si se encuentra que se ha desviado de la fe."

(8) „Cum ex apostolatus officio", § 2: „Todos los que hasta ahora se han desviado de la fe católica, que han caído en herejía o en cisma o que han provocado y se han hecho culpables de ellos, si son conocidos **como** tales, si se han confesado como tales o si fueron llevados allí, o si (lo que Dios, en su misericordia y bondad, quiera evitarles) en adelante van a desviarse, a caer en herejía o en cisma, a provocarlos o inculparse de ellos, o se vaya a encontrar que se han desviado, que han caído en herejía o en cisma, que los han provocado o se han inculcado de ellos, que lo confiesan o que son llevados allí, que éstos, así lo queremos y lo **determinamos** Nosotros, que éstos, de cualquier estado, grado, rango, oficio y dignidad excelente que sean, aun cuando tengan dignidad episcopal o **archiepiscopal**, o posean dignidad de patriarcas, de primados o una dignidad eclesiástica superior, aunque estén provistos de la dignidad cardenalicia o posean siempre o con limitación temporal, en cualquier lugar de la tierra, el ministerio de un legado de la silla apostólica, que reciban sobre sí las sentencias jurídicas, las censuras y las sanciones que se han mencionado."

(9) PL. 54, 743 ss.

(10) Para comparar esta posición con la de los econistas: ellos también tienen el problema de la falta de autoridad papal, puesto que rechazan igualmente muchas conclusiones del Vaticano II y las reformas que él inició. Pero lo hacen por otro motivo. No discuten que un Papa que es herético deja de ser Papa, pero discuten que Juan Pablo II haya difundido decididamente herejías, sino que sólo es „liberal" o „modernista", dañando de este modo a la Iglesia, por lo que se oponen a sus decretos. Con esta posición „tradicionalista", es decir, teológicamente desacreditada, se mueven sobre una capa de hielo que argumentativamente es muy fina, **como** evidencian todas las negociaciones que han llevado con Roma.

(11) Nosotros, los auténticos sedisvacantistas, nos caracterizamos porque junto con la constatación de que la silla está desocupada pretendemos al mismo tiempo que debe volver a ser ocupada.

# Where do we stand?

by  
Eberhard Heller  
transl. by Gladys Resch

**"Credo... in unam, sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam Ecclesiam."**

The precise question is: Where do we stand in our struggle within the Church? It is not easily answered. The new pseudo-conservatism of the so-called 'Reform-Church' (post-conciliar Church), which disposes of a tremendous suggestibility by the personality of Wojtyla and the public opinion supporting him, and the intended misleading tactic by Écône and her clerical followers on one side, the ignorance of many faithful (but also their naive selfish conception of salvation), and the inexcusable holding back, respectively the refusal of the faithful clergy to enlighten the spiritual darkness and to inform the faithful about the true catastrophe, all these facts have contributed that our own ecclesiastical situation presents herself as being difficult to be seen through. Besides this the view where we stand is not being made clearer by the different judgement and estimation of the consecration of bishops as from 1981. Some of them shout "schism, schism", the others recognize all problems as solved - Glory to God! - by the safeguard of the apostolic succession. (This is supposed to go like this: one chooses a bishop, who is asked to ordain to the priesthood *pede stante* any brought along candidates, or even to consecrate them to bishops ... likely on a base of a private undertaking or a good-will tour!) These people's argument is in fact right, that the Church (with her office-bearer was found as administrator of the means of salvation to save souls, that is the hierarchy exists for the souls and not the other way round: the souls for the hierarchy. (This should be considered mainly by those amongst us, concerned about legality.) But the **delegation of Powers** for the administration of means of salvation was given by Christ to **His Church** - and not to innumerable sects. Both got to be considered together, although in cases of conflicts, the preference applies to the means of salvation.

Which are our possibilities now in view of the difficult and apparently confused conditions, to account for our situation and to define our point of view? Because nothing is more damaging in sorting out confused circumstances, respectively serious problems, than a blind and imprudent activity or uncontrolled defeatism and resignation.

One sometimes is surprised to realize how one can easily arrive to a solution of complicated problems by applying too simple and plain methods. - I shall never forget how a professor of history of art explained to us the Baroque style by the analysis of the typical ornaments.

In the apostolic Creed we so often pray: "Credo ... in unam, sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam Ecclesiam." ("I believe ... in one, holy catholic and apostolic Church".) I believe, as a convinced Catholic in Christ's foundation of the Church, which should, as an institution, guarantee our salvation. The signs "one", "holy", "catholic" and "apostolic" define our faith in the Church. They will serve us as criterium to find out, where we stand **in the Church**, and what got to be done.

The following sentences will first of all explain these characteristics, to enable us afterwards to enlighten our situation. These explanations can do it only in a short and sketched way. With their help we only approach this subject to focus our view upon the task which we are finally faced with.

## I. Unity

The doctrine of the dogmatics (compare Bartmann, Bernhard: "Lehrbuch der Dogmatik", 2 volumes, Freiburg 1928) deals with

- a) unity in **faith**
- b) unity in cult and the sacraments,
- c) unity of the ecclesiastical community in its hierarchical organisation.

The substance of faith is laid down by the ministry of the Church in the *Depositum fidei*, which all faithful are obliged to believe in. The visibility and the recognition of the unity of the Church show itself most clearly by the public acknowledgement of the primacy of the Pope. (See John 10, 16: "One flock, one shepherd"; Matth. 12, 25: "No kingdom can be at war with itself without being laid waste"; St. Paul 1 Cor. 1, 10:... use, all of you, the same language; you must be restored to unity



of mind and pur-pose, there must be no divisions among you"; Pius IX's encyclical of September 6, 1864 - Dz. 1685-1687; Leo XIII in "De unitate Ecclesiae" of June 29, 1896 - Dz. 1954-1962). The unity of the ecclesiastical community and the unity in faith and the sacraments necessitate one another: the unity of ecclesiastical community with its hierarchy is the guarantor for the unity in faith. Reciprocally the unity in faith and the sacraments is the chain, which holds together the Church community in her unity.

Sins against unity of faith are heresy and apostasy; he, who acts against the unity of the ecclesiastical community and renounces the primacy of the Pope, is a schismatic.

## II. Sanctity

Seen in the dogmatic view, sanctity means

- a) an objective real holiness - in the institution of the Church;
- b) a personal holiness - as a duty for all faithful.

The objective real holiness can be

- 1) passive: through sanctified consecration (church, altar, implements)
- 2) active: in so far as it can bring about personal holiness, (sacraments, doctrine)

Thus the whole institution of the Church by Christ is objectively holy with all her establishments, because she is the "Church of God", (compare e.g. Acts of the Apostles 20,28; 1 Cor. 1,2) The personal holiness means the given-by the grace of baptism-revealed possibility to attain perfection of one's own will in the following of Christ, in the imitation, in the entering more deeply in His perfect good, and holy Will, This effort of self-perfection is a constant duty for every single person as well as for the community as a body. Therefore, to be saved, it is not enough to withhold from committing sins, but we are asked to follow actively the road that Christ has shown us. To abide in the **refusal** to grow in personal holiness means to refuse the following of Christ; it means clearly that such a person does not love God and is not prepared to make sacrifices.

I may **say** it once more: This personal holiness is not just to be understood individualistically, but it also applies to the community of faithful as such, who should also show, through and in the love of Christ, this union of love amongst each other. (This obligation is being overlooked by many.)

## III. Catholicity

It shows itself in

- a) an inside,
- b) an outside sign, (mark)

By the inside Catholicity is meant the universality of the Church as institution of salvation in such a way, that faith and the religious life (religio) should involve our whole reality. Faith and religious life are the answer to all essential, most decisive questions, and they open up the possibility for a perfect meaningful life. This inward all-embracing life is such, that nobody has to be excluded from the Church because of his descent, social environment etc. The inward universality to entitle and to fulfil the claim for the revelation therefore applies to all men and people, and is valid for all times (without restriction).

The outward Catholicity means, that the Church, as an institution, **respectively** as community of faith, extends and should extend to all people and the whole world. This Catholicity naturally presupposes the **unity** of the Church (in faith, sacraments and hierarchy.) As the outward Catholicity is a duty, which the Church is supposed to fulfil during the course of her history, ("Go out all over the world ...") it suffices for the actual historic situation, that this end is attainable, i.e. that the Church is intact **in herself** as an institution of salvation. For this reason the Church must always present herself, **regarding** her universality in space and time, in such a way, that by this her strength and dignity, her possibility for expansion and force of persuasion become **visible** and **recognisable**, (virtual Catholicity). On this is based the missionary mandate of the Church. And it is not enough to be only concerned about one's own salvation, that one's endeavour consists **only** to assure that one will go to heaven, but faith includes the coresponsibility for one's fellow-men and neighbours. It is everybody's duty, religious duty, to do its best to reveal also to others, and to show them the way, to participate in the life of Jesus, respectively to be prepared to lead them on this way.

## IV. Apostolicity

It comprises:

- a) the beginning, origin (apostolicitas originis);
- b) the doctrine (apostolicitas doctrinae);
- c) the succession (apostolicitas **successionis**).

The Church is apostolic in so far as she is built up on the foundation by the Apostles, which she got directly from Christ, and in so far as this foundation continues to exist in the successors of the Apostles until the end of times.

Let us now apply the above mentioned criteria to the actual situation of the 'Post-conciliar' Church on one side (a) and (b) to our own ecclesiastical situation, the 'Pre-conciliar' Church.

## I. Unity

a) The so-called Post-conciliar Church has abandoned the unity of the faith by supporting publicly and officially heretic views, (modernism, ecumenism, 'Mass' as meal etc. - One may read through all publications of EINSICHT, which have constantly proved the apostasy by documents.) One should just consider the way how Wojtyla, as head of this 'Church', imagines the re-union with the Orthodox: to avoid the difficulties of the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope, the Orthodox would have no need to accept it, only the roman 'Church' should by faith be under the obligation. (This was mentioned at his visit to Turkey). So he wants to give up the unity of faith for the unity of community! Which conception has this man got of the Catholic dogma?! - Therefore a unity in cult and the sacraments does neither exist for the Tradition of the Church nor between the Orthodox and Roman rite. Every so-called 'office-bearer' makes his own 'liturgy' - and Paul VI even rejoiced about it. (the well known remark of the "multiplicity in the unity") On his trip to Africa Wojtyla affirmed repeatedly, that he was not concerned about the discipline concerning the liturgy, - where everyone could do as it pleases him (even dance) - but about the unity of the 'ecclesiastical' community. The new rites for the sacraments are falsified, so that, due to those rites, a sacrament cannot have its effect anymore. The hierarchy has, by the apostasy, ipso facto become illegitimate and has lost its charge of office.

b) Our whole endeavour of resistance against the 'Reformers' was primely concerned to save holy Mass, to defend the true theology of the Mass and the conser-vation of the whole contents of our faith, and therefore we maintained the unity in matters of doctrine and in practice for the administering of the sacraments for the Tradition in the Church, and also amongst the groups of resistance. No changes were introduced in those groups, and nobody would have been authorised to do so. But the unity of community of the faithful under the hierarchical leadership is missing. A head, whom Christ has chosen fur the leading of His Church, is still missing, so too the necessary bishops and priests for certain areas. Therefore we miss not only the representation for the unity of the ecclesiastical community, but - what is even more serous - the **juristical** mandatory for the still existing office-bearers, (bishops and priests) So, in this time without a Pope, they can only fulfil their duty of priesterly obligations by direct relation with the mandate of Christ. They can only exercise this mandate legitimately, when they do it in consideration with the will of the Church, - whose unity must be intended in the hierarchical order with the papal primacy. (We still expect the contribution by Mgr. Guérard des Lauriers O.P. concerning the exact determination of the rights of bishops and priests in this situation.)

Let us consider the acting of **Écône** under this ecclesiastical aspect: They recognize a 'hierarchy', which has lost its legitimacy long ago. By this they leave ipso facto the community of the true Church and have become schismatics - this critic covers only one part of their error; the more serious one is, that they subordinate themselves to the deliberate destroyers of the Church, the anti-Christ, and this in clear knowledge of the true intentions of these so-called 'Reformers'! By trying at the same time to deny and to prevent the restitution - if **Écône** had not existed the freemasons would have to invent them, as a friend mentioned in this fight for the true Church - **Écône** proceeds in the administration of the (true) sacraments without **legitimate** mandate. Because it is only to **His** Church that Christ has given the power to act in His mandate, i.e. - not considering the problem in connection with the consecration of Mgr. Lefebvre by the freemason Liénart - the **Écônists** fail to work for the unity of the Church. The faithful commit **a sin** when they receive the sacraments adminstered by them, (in exception of extremis.)

## II. Sanctity

a) The 'Reform Church' has by the falsification in matters of faith and sacraments, as well as by this

ipso facto completed repeal of the hierarchical institution, destroyed the objective true holiness. The self-sanctification of the individual and the community of faith as such are widely lost, as this demand has been given up in favour of a diffused appeal for humanism. (The slogan of a 'clergyman': "people, remain as you are".) No one mentions anymore the first commandment, the love of God.

b) We have retained in the objective sphere the institution of the Church (as torso - see § 1 Unity), the doctrine, the sacraments with their sanctification. Everyone, who has the sense of humility should strike his breast and say: *Mea culpa* ..., when reminded of the duty to follow Christ, i.e. the sanctification of one-self and the community for the personal moral perfection. There is no more to be added!!!

### III. Catholicity

a) When one favours the wrong ecumenism as Montini did, as Wojtyła is doing, ("Redemptor hominis", concelebration with Anglicans) (to create the world-unity-religion) one gives up the claim to the universality of the Church. Thus, such a 'Church' becomes *eo ipso* only a party amongst others, which are recognized as having the same rights, by which the claim of the Church to be the only beatifying-one is being given up. As by this the true Catholicity is missing, there can be no mandate for mission anymore.

b) By retaining God's revealed doctrine, we have retained the inner Catholicity. The apostasy of the hierarchy, which has enticed and carried away the greater majority of the faithful, in addition the betrayal of Lefebvre, who, under the mask of Orthodoxy, follows the plan to connect naive, uninformed, confiding faithful to the apostate Rome, and who has thinned out the rows of the loyal people, have reduced greatly the flock of the faithful Catholics. There are still small groups of professing communities or separate groups in Europe, South and North America, Africa, India, Australia and New Zealand, which belong to the Church of Christ and her institution, (faith and sacraments). But as the hierarchical unity is missing, it is impossible to represent visually the virtual Catholicity, i.e. the greatness and strength of the Church ..., especially as some clergymen, who have not become apostates, suppress cowardly their churchly position and opportunity.

### IV. Apostolicity

a) The 'Reform Church' can certainly not call back in her mistaken views on the Apostles. When the elderly bishops, who actually have still been consecrated validly, but who follow the reform course, die, the apostolic succession comes to an end, as the new rite for consecration of bishops is invalid (at least greatly questionable).

b) With the confidence in the assistance of God and thanks to the **action** of Mgr. Ngô-dinh-Thuc - if it is in Gods plan of salvation - the endangered apostolic succession could be saved. The apostolicity too, concerning the doctrine and the origin were retained through the unmisleading holding on to the Tradition.

May I add an explanation to the consecration of bishops. This problem of permittance of the given consecrations (against CIC § 953) will also in future be discussed by certain circles. One could also object that the danger of breaking up the succession would not have occurred as long as there still were validly consecrated bishops in the 'reform-Church', who would have been able to change their ways. Here are mentioned the opportunists amongst the reform-bishops, for instance Mgr. Graber, Mgr. Siri and others. We cannot exclude the possibility that a reform-bishop (validly consecrated) comes back to the Church and repents. But even if it should happen, there would in principal not be a difference concerning the consecrations of bishops by Mgr. Ngô-dinh-Thuc, or one concerning the restitution of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

The opinion, that those validly consecrated bishops or cardinals (consecrated by Pius XII), who reside in the 'reform-Church', would retain their hierarchical position in office, when changing their ways, is a mistake. At their return, which should be openly manifested (by a *abiuratio*), they would not get back their office, lost by their betrayal of faith. The problem of deposition and election of a Pope, as well as the re-organisation of the hierarchy, would only have been postponed. By it nothing could be won. The risk of retaining the succession would unnecessarily have become greater and the faithful would have had to do without the administering of the sacraments, reserved for bishops. (Ordinations, and usually also confirmation.)

## Summary

a) The 'reform-Church' possesses neither the unity, nor the holiness and Catholicity and is about to lose the apostolic succession: she is a pseudo-Church, simply a sect, still with a strong organization, with enormous influence in public life... and Lefebvre hangerson of pseudo-Orthodox. One should think once more of what the people of Écône really want - apart from their subjective intentions: submission under a sect and co-existence of heresy, apostasy and true faith, with which they follow on this level the **same ecumenism** which they reproach Montini and Wojtyła !!

b) Where do we stand now? And here we come back to our question. Apart from the desolate condition concerning the own sanctification of the ecclesiastical community and the diminishing outside Catholicity, the main problem in our present situation remains the recovery of the Church unity as a **hierarchical** structured community of faith. This means the realisation of the following duties: deposition of the 'Papa haereticus', condemnation of the heresies and the heretics, election of a Pope, reconstruction of the hierarchy and self-claim of the Church as visible juridical Church-community, which **represents** the greatness and dignity of the divine revelation. Concerning the self-claim of those groups in the religious underground as Church, one has to make a remark concerning the **pitious** attitude especially of the traditional clerics: if you want to know if a priest confesses the true faith, ask him at a suitable occasion to write out a **stamped** wedding document and to marry two people, or one tries to get a baptism certificate and baptism, - to be read in this line: **stamped** document plus sacrament. The result surprises only those who have not had the experience: usually you are stranded for the stamp, and then the clergyman sends you to the 'reform-Church' for the reception of the possibly valid sacrament, to the danger to commit a sacrilege, just because the 'reform-Church' has still got the stamp.

One could object: as we have not, or only in a limited way the hierarchical structure, the visibility and dignity (say: 'stamp'), we can also in future do without it, as we have got the sacraments, the faith and the succession. I want to give the answer: we **may not do it**. Away from the fact that the outside Catholicity would disappear, Christ has given over the means of salvation for administration to **HIS CHURCH**, who must do it **in the way He has ordered it!!!** And Christ has instituted **HIS CHURCH** as an **institution of salvation** and not only as a professing congregation, which has the sign that all have the same (theoretical) opinions, without really forming a life companionship (as for instance, like the Protestants). And this institution has been formed as a single one and not as a multiplicity of sects, if one renounces the re-establishment of the Church as a hierarchical constructed organism, one loses the power to administer legitimately His means of salvation, the sacraments, and to receive them validly, because the intentions are those of a sect. But there are more very decisive points. It has been said at the beginning that the unity of the ecclesiastical community with the Pope as her head, is the guarantor for the unity in faith. Without highest clerical profession, which is binding in its dogmatic decisions, the unity in faith is in danger. There will probably arise new problems in future, which have to be solved from the view of the faith. Who gives us an authorized answer (from the viewpoint of Christ)? We shall probably be obliged to **give** an answer, which we shall give from our conviction and for which we can stand for. But we must still realize that this answer is unauthorized. Without true authority there is a danger to slide into an unwilling protestantism, which most people overlook.

A problem, where everyone feels clearly the missing of the hierarchy, is the so often mentioned division and the fallen out amongst the true traditional persons and groups. Apart from the hidden organizations, which work either for the approachment to 'Rome' (for instance Lefebvre and his organization) or the destruction of the groups of resistance - with those, there can not be a unity! - and the many personal differences and complaints inside and amongst the different groups, the missing unity has its cause in the hierarchy with an obligatory discipline, but which is not yet built up.

Our main aim for the future must therefore be the reestablishment of the ecclesiastical unity with an intact hierarchy, which got to be attained under the pastoral leadership of the bishops and priests. Then there will be decided who is going to belong to the true Church, according to whatever one is prepared to cooperate towards this unity, respectively to its building up, which may also happen in stages. It is not sufficient anymore to be against the 'NOM', against the occupant Wojtyła and his followers or to be against the Lefebvre-programme of coupling. It will be of a primary importance that we should - apart from the profession to holy Mass - put ourselves under the obligation to stand positively to the true faith and to the reestablishment of the ecclesiastical unity.

Where do we stand? At the cross road between sectarianism and true church.

(From EINSICHT XII/6, p. 194 ss, XIII/1, p. 53 ss (german) and Spezial-number july 1983, p. 2 ss. engl.)