

Under Weight of Oppression
Why Today's Church Will Not Clean up its Act
Athanasius Nazianzen

September 8, 2018

"Behold, the days are coming," says the Lord GOD, "when I will send a famine on the land; not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the LORD. They shall wander from sea to sea, and from north to east; they shall run to and fro, to seek the word of the LORD, but they shall not find it. (Amos 8:11-12)

"Socialism is precisely the religion that must overwhelm Christianity . . . In the new order, Socialism will triumph by first capturing the culture via infiltration of schools, universities, churches and the media by transforming the consciousness of society." -- Antonio Gramsci

"As I love to say, the synthesis of the Christian God (of the above) and the Marxist God (of the forward) – Behold! that is the only God whom henceforth we can adore in spirit and in truth." -- Fr Teilhard de Chardin, SJ, Letter, 1952

Corruptio optimi pessima est

Part 1 - Aggiornamento is Italian for "modernism"

Contemporary news media was present and reported in real time an apparition holding that the Church would go through a century of Job-like desolation beginning in 1917. Sure enough, in that century, a New Theology crept into the ranks of the same clergy that took oaths against the very heresy they put into effect, taking control of the apparatus at a rigged council halfway through, leading a pope to decry that the "[smoke of Satan](#)" had entered the Church, mobilizing that same pope to do . . . nothing. From a 4th grade level catechism of instruction, it seems obvious that where the smoke of Satan enters, the Holy Spirit departs.

Alongside this, the unfolding of those same events eerily conforms to the much-derided plan of the *Permanent Instruction of the Alta Vendita*, from the Freemason lodge of the Carbonari circa 1846, that Pope Pious IX authenticated when ordering [Cretineau-Joly](#) to publish it in 1859.¹ In response to this

¹ The *Permanent Instruction of the Alta Vendita* was uncovered well over 100 years before Vatican II and first translated into English by George F. Dillon in 1885. That the Freemason's themselves approvingly recognize [Leon Trotsky's](#) teaching Freemason tactics to the prisoners and staff at Odessa Prison from his 1000-page notebook of instruction in his year of incarceration which provides a clean crossover to Marxist-Leninism. What follows is a sampling of [The Permanent Instruction of the Alta Vendita](#) from John Vennari's translation (while not the preferred translation, it is the most accessible).

- The task that we are going to undertake is not the work of a day, or of a month, or of a year; it may last several years, perhaps a century; but in our ranks the soldier dies and the struggle goes on. We do not intend to win the Popes to our cause, to make them neophytes of our principles, propagators of our ideas. That would be a ridiculous dream; and if events turn out in some way, if Cardinals or prelates, for example, of their own free will or by surprise, should enter into a part of our secrets, this

activity, Pope Leo XIII penned the “Prayer to St Michael”, a prayer that recently found its way back into the mass. But not only that. From the year following Hegel’s death in 1831, from [Mirari Vos](#) (1832), to [Quanta Cura](#) (including the [Syllabus of Errors](#)) (1864), to [Pascendi Dominici Gregis](#) (1907), [Lamentabili Sane](#) (1907), the [Oath against Modernism](#) (in Pope Pius X [Motu Proprio Sacrorum Antistitum](#)) (1910), to [Humani Generis](#) (1953), the pre-conciliar Church engaged in an epic rearguard battle against indifferentism, immanentism, pantheism, Modernism, and its repackaging as the New Theology, condemning all of them. They can all be traced back to Hegel’s covert Hermeticism – the “*Hen kai Pan*”. Looking back, the pre-conciliar Church vanished as if it never existed. Poof! Gone! This discussion accepts the basis of those pre-conciliar warnings, ponders whether the object of those warnings transpired, suggesting that they did. These activities follow a political warfare construct.

On political warfare in the context of the times, counterintelligence techniques common to 19th Century secret societies like the Freemasons were later internalized by 19th Century revolutionaries and their 20th Century Marxist-Leninist-Gramscian and secret police successors. They are characterized by penetration *cum* double agent operations, deception, manipulation, diversion, provocation, among others – all common to the clandestine operations of intelligence and counterintelligence. In more recent years these were relabeled “active measures” and “information operations” by the KGB. The security services of communist and other totalitarian systems and their successors raised these techniques to the level of an operational art. It is well worth noting that the practices of the modernist lay and clerical *periti* at Vatican II reflect many of these same

is not at all an incentive for desiring their elevation to the See of Peter. That elevation would ruin us. Ambition alone would have led them to apostasy, the requirements of power would force them to sacrifice us. What we must ask for, what we should look for and wait for, as the Jews wait for the Messiah, *is a Pope according to our needs . . .* (6-7)

- Now then, to assure ourselves a Pope of the required dimensions, it is a question first of *shaping him ... for this Pope, a generation worthy of the reign we are dreaming of*. Leave old people and those of a mature age aside; go to the youth, and if it is possible, even to the children ... You will contrive for yourselves, at little cost, a reputation as good Catholics and pure patriots. (8)
- This reputation will put access to our doctrines into the midst of the young clergy, as well as deeply into the monasteries. In a few years, by the force of things, this young clergy will have overrun all the functions; they will form the sovereign’s council, they will be called to choose a Pontiff who should reign. *And this Pontiff, like most of his contemporaries, will be necessarily more or less imbued with the Italian and humanitarian principles that we are going to begin to put into circulation.* (9)
- *Let the Clergy march under your standard, always believing that they are marching under the banner of the apostolic keys . . . Lay your snares like Simon Bar-Jona; lay them in the sacristies, the seminaries, monasteries and convents . . . You will bring friends around the apostolic Chair. You will have preached a revolution in tiara and in cope, marching with the cross and the banner, a revolution that will need to be only a little bit urged on to set fire to the four corners of the world.* (9-10)
 - In the context of the *Permanent Instruction*, it is interesting to observe that on Pope Paul VI’s death, the former Grand Master of the Grand Orient of Italy [an Italian Freemason leader], Giordano Gamberini, declared, “It is the first time in the history of modern Freemasonry, that the Head of the greatest religion in the West dies without being in a state of hostility towards Freemasons. And for the first time in history, Freemasons can render homage at the tomb of a Pope, without ambiguity or contradictions.” Roberto de Mattei, “[De Mattei: The Death of Paul VI \(August 6, 1978\). An Anniversary.](#)” *Rorate Caeli*, August 15, 2018.

counterintelligence techniques², to include the purposeful fostering of ambiguity that skirt direct attacks on Church doctrine, but allowed for creative interpretations designed to erode doctrine through error-ridden *praxis* that becomes institutionalized over time. From a political warfare perspective, this is plainly seen throughout the decades since Vatican II and especially in the Pope Francis era. As these counterintelligence characterizations may strike casual readers as harsh on first instance, this assessment will bring into focus why the actions of Church leadership brought this form of scrutiny into frame. Alas, it is not unreasonable. And that is its own point.³

Returning to the century of desolation, the priesthood was not only corrupted, but protected in that corruption. It did not creep in, it was cultivated. As the desolating century came to a close, the faith was in crisis, the Church in collapse, and the only way to claim continuity to the pre-conciliar Church is as its dialectical antithesis controlled by a clergy that can only justify its status by reference to a dialectically determined antithesis by likeminded clergy. If true, however, this would suggest that by every other measure, as a matter of definition, today's church is antithetical to that Church and, hence, cannot be Catholic. Following the 100-year desolation, the apparition also promised that God would reassert control of His Church. This is that year.

While not one to be drawn into things like apparitions, it is nevertheless interesting that in the year following the Fatima century, no less than three high ranking personal confidants of the Pope's handpicked inner circle have been plucked through "emperor has no clothes" revelations of desolating sacrilege⁴ of Maccabean proportions that comes as no surprise to any discerning person - which ends up being just about everyone outside the clergy. Fatima has developed a noteworthy track record. Like a 5-year-old tearing the wings off an insect, one almost gets the sense of a voice calling down; "Hear I am!" "No! Here, I AM. And I am NOT 'coming to be', my eschaton is not immanent, I did not tolerate desolating sacrileges in my temple then, when I sent my priest, Mattathias, and will not tolerate the interfaith of Assisi today." For those whose sense has been one of a Church suffering under the weight of a great oppression, these high ranking, delegitimizing scandals are **not** met with dread but rather with the sense of silent relief that comes when prayers are answered and justice, divine justice - NOT social justice, is being served. They never should have been there, they need to be gone. As has become clear, only an outside force will do so. This is that year. Rejoice!

There is one sense in which it can be said that the Church is not in crisis; that is that the Church is exactly where those in charge wanted it to be, with the people they wanted, when they brought it to this point. *Lex orandi, lex credendi*. At heart, the corruption continues because those who wrested

² Even to the point of cutting off the microphones of those opposed to the modernist agenda – an old Communist Party technique in the heyday of its front operations in non-communist venues.

³ The discussion on counterintelligence is indebted to a grizzled old former senior intelligence officer well qualified in the field.

⁴ "Many of the people, everyone who forsook the law, joined them, and they did evil in the land; they drove Israel into hiding in every place of refuge they had. Now on the fifteenth day of Chislev, in the one hundred and forty-fifth year, **they erected a desolating sacrilege upon the altar** of burnt offering. They also built altars in the surrounding cities of Judah, and burned incense at the doors of the houses and in the streets. The books of the law which they found they tore to pieces and burned with fire. Where the book of the covenant was found in the possession of any one, or if any one adhered to the law, the decree of the king condemned him to death." (1 Maccabees 1:52-57)

control of the Church brought it here. In the face of now decades long, profoundly public human outcry to Satanic levels of abuse, the evidence that those in charge tolerated this activity is that it continues to happen; and most prominently at the highest levels.

Harsh? Maybe. Nevertheless, shepherds that cannot ferret out the wolves are not shepherds at all, and sometimes, the sheep get to have a say in this. Shepherds who build walls to keep from seeing the predation they permit, claiming the wall as the reason they could not see, cannot be allowed to make such claims. When the wolf preys on the sheep, it is the shepherd's fault - period. It's in the Bible – see Acts. Moreover, when Jesus told his Apostles that "Whoever receives one such child in my name receives me; but whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in me to sin, it would be better for him to have a great millstone fastened round his neck and to be drowned in the depth of the sea," he was speaking as much to His future shepherds, His bishops, who tolerated such behavior as to the predators granted access to prey. [Res ipsa loquitur](#). The millstone is the Catholic standard for such abuse. It is against this standard that the bishops, cardinals and Vatican responses are to be measured. "You have been weighed in the balances and found wanting." No dialogue, no praxis. No clericalism.

It is in this frame that we should understand Cardinal Wuerl and, respectfully, the Cardinal Bishop of Boston with his *blah, blah, blah* response. We have heard this before, and, if the same regime remains, we will continue to hear it again and again and again. "Shocked! Just Shocked" Really? You and who else? The problem is not just what is said, but who is saying it. Policy? Enforced by whom? This is not an issue of policy, it's one of corruption - deep malignant metastasized corruption. A moral clergy does not need these policies and no policy can fix a corrupt clergy. One feels compelled to ask the Cardinal Archbishop of Boston how many of those abuse commissions and panels did he sit on alongside Cardinals McCarrick and Wuerl? And just how many other bishops and priests because, the problem is, everyone believes, actually they know as if their child's welfare depends on it, that there are others, that will only come to light by outside exposure leading to another round of "I'm shocked, just shocked". You? Really? Cardinal? Discernment? The decision to wear blinders is the decision that convicts. How about the pope and his Chilean friends? How about his knowing rehabilitation of McCarrick? The only thing confusing about these events is the compounding recognition of complete intentional betrayal by the shepherds. Listening to the parish priest in homily speak of these times as confusing, and maybe for him they are, one cannot help but recognize the *au contraire* reception of those in the pews, those that showed up. This year, finally, the response is not one of confusion, the picture is clarifying and becoming clear. This is the 101st year.

Long overdue, in deference to an authority their positions afford them, an authority their very presence erodes (as programmed), one begins to sense that this year, the bell is tolling to a rising chorus, the *sensus fidelium* is finding its voice as it culminates to say: "ENOUGH! YOU'RE DONE! WE ARE DONE WITH YOU! **GET OUT! BECAUSE YOU SAID IT, THERE IS NOTHING TO HEAR! AND CERTAINLY, NO DIALOGUE!**" It is not that the faithful don't want to believe the Cardinal Archbishop, it's that after [over 40 years](#) of good faith on just this issue with the same people, they can no longer do so, they cannot afford to, it is no longer appropriate that they do (if it ever was). The crisis has burned in, its visceral. **JUST LEAVE!**

Sadly, the cardinals and bishops will characterize the *sensus* as the voice of anger and agitation and will meet it with a "buy time" / "ride it out" response that minimizes their personal direct culpability, per SOP. "[CLERICALISM](#)." "CLERICALISM?" "CLERICALISM!" Is this some kind of joke? (Yes!) It's

certainly a condescending slap in the face. As a disassociating narrative of evasion, “clericalism” provides church leaders the ability to exhaust the issue on irrelevancies while predators continue their unfettered predation knowing the narrative itself provides cover. The decision to designate sexual predation as “clericalism” green flags the activity because it signals, in a case most favorable to those making the “clericalism” claim, a lack of conviction to even name the issue. Cynically, the overbroad (and random) designation “clericalism” also signals the intent to bundle predatory behavior with unrelated issues in a *quid pro quo* negotiating process designed to lead to the *aufheben* (negation) of the bundled issue while leaving questions of predation strangely, but predictably, under-inclusively addressed.

This last point is not as much of a reach as one would like to think. From the rhetoric coming from the Vatican and USCCB, it is not too difficult to glean the actual object of their charges of clericalism. With the plight of Eleazar in the time of Antiochus in mind,⁵ one should consider Pope Francis’s attack on those who raise substantive questions relating to his alleged culpability, when he chooses to accuse them, as has been his pattern, of being [hypocrites, scribes, Pharisees and “rigorists”](#). The Nazguls have likewise been dispatched on the path of meritless *ad hominem* [attacks](#) (and [here](#), and [here](#) and [here](#)) of personal destruction. With the faithful crying out the sacred mission to rid the Church of a predatory culture, the episcopate answers “clericalism”, retires - or threaten to retire - non-radicalized clergy, and then declares victory. Bait and switch. If the Church succeeds on the clericalism issue, who will be surprised at this outcome?

Yet, it is clear that “clericalism” will be a part of the narrative that will serve as the preferred basis for engagement with the Church on this issue. Before continuing, the reader is asked to review at least a portion from one of the two Engels articles in the links in the immediate footnote⁶ and ask, from the milieu arising from those two articles; “Is there any role for any priest, bishop or cardinal to play in

⁵ “Eleazar, one of the scribes in high position, a man now advanced in age and of noble presence, was being forced to open his mouth to eat swine's flesh. But he, welcoming death with honor rather than life with pollution, went up to the rack of his own accord, spitting out the flesh, as men ought to go who have the courage to refuse things that it is not right to taste, even for the natural love of life. Those who were in charge of that unlawful sacrifice took the man aside, because of their long acquaintance with him, and privately urged him to bring meat of his own providing, proper for him to use, and pretend that he was eating the flesh of the sacrificial meal which had been commanded by the king, so that by doing this he might be saved from death, and be treated kindly on account of his old friendship with them. But making a high resolve, . . . and moreover according to the holy God-given law, he declared himself quickly, telling them to send him to Hades. Even if for the present I should avoid the punishment of men, yet whether I live or die I shall not escape the hands of the Almighty. Therefore, by manfully giving up my life now, I will show myself worthy of my old age and leave to the young a noble example of how to die a good death willingly and nobly for the revered and holy laws." When he had said this, he went at once to the rack. *And those who a little before had acted toward him with good will now changed to ill will, because the words he had uttered were in their opinion sheer madness. [italics added]* When he was about to die under the blows, he groaned aloud.” (2 Maccabees 6:18-23; 26-30)

⁶ Prior to the research on this issue for this paper, there was little or no awareness of either AKA Catholic or Randy Engels. There is, however, direct awareness of the generational scandal relating to the Archdiocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis that this writer can attest to in the reporting in the two links provided. “The Strange Case of Archbishop Nienstedt - Part 1,” Randy Engel, on AKA Catholic, August 30, 2018, <https://akacatholic.com/the-strange-case-of-archbishop-nienstedt-part-one/>, and also “The Strange Case of Archbishop Nienstedt - Part 2,” Randy Engel, on AKA Catholic, September 2, 2018, <https://akacatholic.com/the-strange-case-of-archbishop-nienstedt-part-two/>

any investigation into any aspect of the predatory sexual subculture except as witnesses?" Is there any reason to adopt that culture's preferred "clericalism" narrative – or any narrative at all?

For example, the local parish recently scheduled a "sensing" of parishioners on the sexual predation issue. It began with a [video clip](#) of Bishop Barron responding to scripted questions from a member of his *Word on Fire* ministry that had the bishop push back on the idea of clericalism before returning to it in a manner suggesting it to be a part of the way ahead. The video smoothly establishes the narrative early in hopes of controlling the discussion later. *Catholic Culture* defines "[clericalism](#)" as an "advocacy of exaggerated claims on the part of the clergy". A recent example of clericalism might be found in [Cardinal Maradiaga](#)'s claim that, even when informed and in good conscience, that "to ask for the resignation of the pope is, in my opinion, a sin against the Holy Spirit."⁷ If prosecutors take jurisdiction of the issue, the First Amendment will properly bar them from issues of clericalism. This will not cause any problems because, as is universally recognized, the investigation will be directed at the criminal activity associated with an installed predator class that grooms its members in a generational venture. From the 1840's *Alta Vendita* to the 1950's testimony of Bella Dodd, to the activities of Alinsky, there are persuasive indicators that this predation class is a hostile alien insertion into the body of the Church that seeks its destruction through penetration and subversion. It has nothing to do with clericalism. Like the invading parasite in science fiction movies that so tightly wraps itself around the cerebral cortex as to make it difficult, painful, and dangerous to remove, this subculture must likewise be treated as alien, be skillfully isolated, and removed. While the alien is affixed, however, what the host says must be taken in with warning.

By all means, give the offenders the private personal spiritual counseling they need, but please stop the exhibitionistic virtue-signaling practice of reaching out to the abused as if you were not the proximate cause of the event. In this context, the public emoting comes across as strikingly, disingenuously inappropriate and will, at some point, induce a rage-full response.

Indicators suggest that the faithful will no longer hold the lukewarm - that is also putrid - in their mouths and must spit it out. Voices calling for the vertical stroke of Bishops and Cardinals may seem excessive but it reflects the solidifying recognition, the crystalizing reality, that this fish is the most rotten at its head. They were not random bishops who got plucked, they were the hand-picked inner circle that reflects the vision from the top - a fact that cannot be allowed to be minimized. They had to be plucked, they were not going any other way. If I were running the show, I'd be wondering why

⁷ There is a Hegelian sense in which Cardinal Maradiaga is on-point on a holy spirit that seems to have infused post-Conciliar popes that most fully manifests in Pope Francis. As will be discussed, the Hegelian holy spirit can be found in Hegel's *Philosophy of the Spirit*, has parallels to [Joachim of Fiore's concept of the Trinity](#), and manifests itself in the zeitgeist of the times most completely when the Universal merges with the Particular in the Individual. For Hegel, this concept crystalized when, as a professor at Jena, he stepped out of his classroom, saw Napoleon before battle, marveled, and wrote; "I saw the Emperor - this soul of the world - go out from the city to survey his reign; it is a truly wonderful sensation to see such an individual, who, concentrating on one point while seated on a horse, stretches over the world and dominates it" ([Correspondance, T. I, p.114](#)). As will be discussed, this really does bring us back to Ratzinger's 1789. If the mission of the post Vatican II Church is to implement 1789 through the Interfaith dialogue (which executes a dialectic), and the interfaith in typological form is the statist Hermeticism of Hegel ("For Truth is the Unity of the universal and subjective Will; and the Universal is to be found in the State, in its laws, its universal and rational arrangements. The State is the Divine Idea as it exists on Earth" Hegel, *Philosophy of History*), should this really come as too much of a surprise?

and by Whom are my wings getting so publicly plucked to such humiliating effect. The timing with Dublin is noteworthy. Even the deaf can feel the vibration of the thunder.

The Church has been actively engaged in its own destruction for some time; demonstrating an institutional and institutionalized inability to police itself in the face of a chronically horrific ongoing institutional and institutionalized behavior. In 1968, [Pope Paul lamented](#)⁸ that since Vatican II the Church was in a depressing state of “self-criticism,” “inner-upheaval,” and “self-demolition”. In 1982, Ratzinger affirmed this, saying his mission was to destroy the Church (more on that later). This is the Church that Vatican II created that, as Pope Paul stated, Satan entered. For the religiously minded, it’s not too difficult to close the circle on Pope Paul’s admission and draw a straight line to Lot. As noted, Jesus did not “dialogue,” his remedy was the millstone; a form of the very capital punishment that the Vatican now declares we have progressed beyond (think negation). On the dialectal nature of “dialogue,” it should not be lost that its first effect is to negate the millstones in a “process” composed of skin-crawling narratives of “recovery and healing” by the very shepherds who provided unimpeded access to the wolves. It’s “feed my sheep,” not “feed my sheep to the wolves.” For Mattathias and his fellow priests, it was loyalty to God. When he and his fellow priests mobilized, so did the faithful. There’s a reason Maccabees is in the Bible. Loyalty and obedience to whom and for what?

[Part 2 - Vatican II, Political Warfare and Counterintelligence](#)

What follows is a political warfare gloss that addresses the ideological reasons why the Church is incapable in its current status to address the sexual predator issue. Not addressed in this thread, but highly relevant to it, are two mutually reinforcing points that together also reinforce the discussion that follows.

- **First.** 1950’s testimony to the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) of former Communist Party USA members who were active in the 1930’s that document the 1935 Communist International’s (COMINTERN) directive to penetrate and coopt the churches that included Communist Party literature documenting the social justice narratives of the 1930s that now dominate USCCB and the Vatican narratives. See especially the [Testimony of Manning Johnson Testimony to the House Un-American Activities Committee Executive Sessions, 1953](#) but also [Testimony of Bella Dodd to the House Un-American Activities Committee, 1953](#).
- **Second.** From Bella Dodd’s related disclosures that as a CP USA executive and planner, she personally oversaw the placement of over 1000 committed Communist Party members into Catholic seminaries in the 1930’s. At the time of her 1953 testimony, she spoke of the program’s success, noting that some had reached the level of bishops and cardinals, including a few assigned to the Vatican. A center of operation for Bella Dodd was Columbia University. The Institute for Social Research (popularly known as the Frankfurt School)

⁸ Pope Paul VI, “[Address of Paul VI to the Members of the Lombardo Seminar Pontifical](#), December 7, 1968: “The Augustus Pontiff repeats the question: “What do you see in the Pope?”. And he answers: **Sign of Contradiction**: a sign of protest. Today, the Church is going through a moment of disquiet. Some practice **self-criticism**, one might even say in **self-demolition**. It is like an **acute and complex inner upheaval** that no one would have expected after the Council.” (Google Translated from the [Vatican original](#))

relocated to Columbia from Germany at the direction of John Dewey. In *Cry Havoc*, Ralph de Toledano chronicles the Institute's activities from Frankfurt to Columbia. Prior to relocating to America, the Institute targeted the UK, penetrating elite academic centers and taking them over. Of note was the Institute's preference for committed homosexual communists such that they derisively labeled their operation in the UK the "homintern". What makes this relevant is that there is every reason to think that the Institute's placement preferences remained unchanged when locating to Columbia at a time when Bella Dodd was close to Columbia when placing committed communists in the seminaries. While not fully assessed, it should nevertheless be noted that if validated, it would independently affirm, not detract from, a picture that is already well along in formation.

This discussion will move through some strange and prickly topics. While not the forum to go into too much detail, the points raised can be taken to the studs; there is a documentary basis to the claims. Hence, even if there is disagreement, it will still require a level of effort to overcome points made. Having said that, if, around the third time a demonstrable data point is used to establish a disfavored interpretation that leads one to think "I choose not to understand it that way", one should be on notice that he/she may be understanding things along the lines of Josef Pieper's pseudoreality.

- It is entirely possible that the true and authentic reality is being drowned out by the countless superficial information bits noisily and breathlessly presented in propaganda fashion. Consequently, one may be entirely knowledgeable about a thousand details and nevertheless, because of ignorance regarding the core of the matter, remain without basic insight. This is a phenomenon in itself already quite astonishing and disturbing. Arnold Gehlen labeled it "a fundamental ignorance, created by technology and nourished by information." But, I wanted to say, something far more discouraging is readily conceivable as well: the place of authentic reality is taken over by fictitious reality; my perception is indeed still directed toward an object, but now it is *pseudoreality*, deceptively appearing as being real, so much so that it becomes almost impossible any more to discern the truth. (Pieper, *Abuse of Language, Abuse of Power*, Ignatius Press 1992 (German 1974), 33-34.)

To put it bluntly, from the iconic scene in the movie *The Matrix*, unless we take Morpheus's [Red Pill](#), we cannot know the Truth and hence it will not set us free. Because it can sound so bizarre and depressing, as the explanation unfolds, it is important to understand that Red Pill explanations are "the emperor has no clothes" explanations which are suppressed to keep them from standing up; because once formed, they expose the smoke screen and lay bare what lies behind it. A political warfare analysis of what happened rips the mask off of ongoing institutional "conservative" Catholic explanations that have long since lost the ability to hold out even the hope that they may one day explain events. "These **ARE** the 'good' bishops everyone has been waiting to take power" when being told that Pope John Paul II was fixing things in the seminaries back then. Political warfare analysis demands that intent be derived from actions. When documents and constitutions that have conventionally been read one way end up also being able to explain completing - even hostile - interpretations that, never-the-less conforms to and even provides a closer explanation of those same events, then that **MUST** become the interpretation of analysis.

It is as simple as this, the "New Theologians," a repackaging of the Modernist theologians - both of whom were formally condemned by multiple encyclicals drafted for that purpose - flipped the Church at Vatican II in a classic counter-state operation. The New Theologians split into the "radical"

outside group, the *Concilium*, creating space for the inside “moderate” *Communio* to push forward the same agenda while allowing it to assume the posture of being “more reasoned” while actually holding the line as a controlled opposition. (Bolsheviks v Mensheviks) The term for this form of strategy is “splinter movement theory.”⁹

So much smoke and mirrors. From [beginning](#)¹⁰ to [end](#),¹¹ and [after](#),¹² and even more [after](#),¹³ Vatican II was understood to be a pastoral council in which no new doctrines were proposed or promulgated. Derivative authority aside, this should mean that there is no doctrinal authority arising out of Vatican II. This is not to say that Vatican II instruments, especially the constitutional ones, lack authority, but simply that the authority they have is derived from previous councils that were dogmatic; most notably the 1st Vatican Council and the Council of Trent. Hence, non-dogmatic Vatican II instruments were denied even the theoretical authority to negate infallible teachings from earlier dogmatic councils – an authority it could never accrue regardless. Alongside express statements affirming this relationship, the very structure of Vatican II suggests that the only authority it had at its conclusion was what it had coming in.

⁹ All classic counterintelligence state operations, the pedigree of which can be observed as far back as Sun Tzu; the elaborate double-agent operations of the Tsarist Okhrana, and the highly sophisticated provocations of the Soviet KGB and its successors under Putin, not to mention similar operations from the PRC and resurgent militant Islam.

¹⁰ Pope John XXIII, “[Opening Speech at the Council](#).” October 11, 1962: “The greatest concern of the Ecumenical Council is this: that the sacred deposit of Christian doctrine should be guarded and taught more efficaciously . . . The salient point of this Council is not, therefore, a discussion of one article or another of the fundamental doctrine of the Church which has repeatedly been taught by the Fathers and by ancient and modern theologians, and which is presumed to be well known and familiar to all . . . For this a Council was not necessary. But from the renewed, serene, and tranquil adherence to all the teaching of the Church in its entirety and preciseness, as it still shines forth in the Acts of the Council of Trent and First Vatican Council, the Christian, Catholic, and apostolic spirit of the whole world . . . The substance of the ancient doctrine of the deposit of faith is one thing, and the way in which it is presented is another. And it is the latter that must be taken into great consideration with patience if necessary, everything being measured in the forms and proportions of a magisterium which is predominantly pastoral in character.”

¹¹ Pope Paul, “[Address of Pope Paul VI During the Last General Meeting of the Second Vatican Council](#), December 7, 1965: “Still fresh in our memory are the words uttered in this basilica by our venerated predecessor, John XXIII, whom we may in truth call the originator of this great synod. In his opening address to the council he had this to say: “The greatest concern of the ecumenical council is this: that the sacred deposit of Christian doctrine be guarded and taught more effectively . . . But one thing must be noted here, namely, that the teaching authority of the Church, even though not wishing to issue extraordinary dogmatic pronouncements, . . . it has spoken with the accommodating friendly voice of pastoral charity . . .”

¹² Pope Paul VI, [Audience of January 12](#), 1966: “There are those who ask what authority, what theological qualification, the Council intended to give to its teachings, knowing that it avoided issuing solemn dogmatic definitions backed by the Church's infallible teaching authority. The answer is known by those who remember the conciliar declaration of March 6, 1964, repeated on November 16, 1964. In view of the pastoral nature of the Council, it avoided proclaiming in an extraordinary manner any dogmas carrying the mark of infallibility.” (General Audience, December 1, 1966, published in [the L'Osservatore Romano](#).1/21/1966)

¹³ Pope Paul VI, [General Audience of August 6, 1975](#): “Differing from other Councils, this one was not directly dogmatic, but disciplinary and pastoral.”

The bait and switch comes when New Theology doctrines are affixed to Vatican II instruments that lack both dogmatic precedence and continuity with those earlier councils while a controlled opposition harps alternating narratives of “continuity, continuity” and “nothing to see here, move on”. Recognizing the New Theologian influence of the *periti* at Vatican II, it is worth observing that the dichotomy created between Tradition (thesis) and pastoralism (anti-thesis) established a dialectical relationship. When this relationship unfolds, infallible Tradition is subjected to a negation by the zeitgeist of pastoralism. Of course, “both and” expresses the synthesis of the two after being negated in a dialectical turn. Post-conciliar practices calibrated to become institutionalized by practice over time that lack both a dogmatic precedence and continuity, especially if the practice was condemned before Vatican II, should be subject to heightened scrutiny. That is, unless Tradition has already been fully negated (*aufheben*-ed). *Gaudium et Spes*? This is hardly a theoretical question. As recently as July 2018, the lead English language spokesperson for the Vatican, [Fr Thomas Rosica](#), the Chief Executive Officer of Canada's Salt and Light Catholic Media Foundation, and the English language Media Attaché of the Holy See Press Office, boldly declared that Pope Francis had transcended Tradition and Revelation:

- Pope Francis breaks Catholic traditions whenever he wants because he is “free from disordered attachments.” Our Church has indeed entered a new phase: with the advent of this first Jesuit pope, it is openly ruled by an individual rather than by the authority of Scripture alone or even its own dictates of tradition plus Scripture.

Yet, if this political warfare analysis holds up, a paradox arises out of the very dialectical strategy executed at Vatican II. Because it needs Tradition to serve as a point of departure, the pivot, the dialectic essentially abandons the Deposit of Faith, leaving it unscathed. If true, it would suggest that while the execution may present many difficulties, all that is necessary to return to the Magisterial teachings is the decision to do so. The Eternal Church has not been corrupted, its priesthood has, just as in the time of Antiochus. Assisi demands Maccabees.¹⁴

In this regard, a political warfare analysis looks past the theological positioning regarding the pre-Vatican 2 mass, the turning of the altars, and eucharist-in-the-hand, etc, choosing instead to understand their first order importance as being tools for use in the destruction of the sacred in the old, the gutting of all traditions that leads to Tradition; seeking a quick quiet violent eradication - regardless of theological justification. What is most remarkable about the controversy around the old Latin Mass isn't its surprising popularity but rather the intense hostility it meets with from the

¹⁴ Not long after this, the king sent an Athenian senator to compel the Jews to forsake the laws of their fathers and cease to live by the laws of God, and also to pollute the temple in Jerusalem and call it the temple of Olympian Zeus, and to call the one in Gerizim the temple of Zeus the Friend of Strangers, as did the people who dwelt in that place. Harsh and utterly grievous was the onslaught of evil. For the temple was filled with debauchery and reveling by the Gentiles, who dallied with harlots and [had intercourse](#) [*please open*] with women within the sacred precincts, and besides brought in things for sacrifice that were unfit. The altar was covered with abominable offerings which were forbidden by the laws . . . At the suggestion of Ptolemy a decree was issued to the neighboring Greek cities, that they should adopt the same policy toward the Jews and make them partake of the sacrifices, and should slay those who did not choose to change over to Greek customs . . . For example, two women were brought in for having circumcised their children. These women they publicly paraded about the city, with their babies hung at their breasts, then hurled them down headlong from the wall. Others who had assembled in the caves nearby, to observe the seventh day secretly, were betrayed to Philip and were all burned together . . . (2 Maccabees 6:1-6; 8-11)

very Church leadership implicated in other things – like the sexual predation issue. How does such visceral dislike not get scored as contempt?

What you are explaining in your example of the “liberal priest” is a purposeful process that always touches the target in a neutralizing language of disassociation - the occurrence is disassociated from the ruthless intent behind it and made to sound common. Hence, the impact of the devastating effects is always understood in a limiting way - disassociating the “liberal priest’s” actions from the faith killing intent it purposefully drives. Such disabling narratives are designed to have the target roll their eyes, listen in the spirit of the “big tent” and “tolerance” not realizing that, from the beginning, this is the predatory operation. The very “multicultural / diversity” narrative one hears in churches, at mass, and as part of the community outreach ministry is the antithesis to faith that affirms the mission of the “liberal priest” and the polyester clad nun. On post-modern (diversity / multiculturalism / genderism) narratives as antithesis, they dominate many parishes, the USCCB and today’s Vatican. They are the product of the Interfaith Movement. These narratives implement cultural Marxist objectives as, for example, Institute (Frankfurt School) theorist Herbert Marcuse’s successful repurposing of the term tolerance in his the 1965 [Repressive Tolerance](#). In that paper, Marcuse redefined tolerance as intolerance; said it can be implemented through undemocratic means to stop chauvinism (xenophobia), racism, discrimination; and is to be extended to the left while denied to the right.¹⁵ The high-profile media attention given to the permissive predatory sex scandals among bishops, cardinals and proxies has laid bare the brute force execution of these narratives as the guilty continue to deploy them in increasingly loud shrill terms. “Political correctness is the enforcement mechanism to the postmodern narrative (diversity / multiculturalism) that executes cultural Marxism.” “Dialogue” and “praxis” are terms of the negating (*aufheben*) crucible of the dialectic.

Your deconstruction is “critical theory” applied. In Biblical studies, it’s called historical criticism. Since its inception in 1940, the [Industrial Areas Foundation](#) (IAF) has maintained operational control of the Interfaith Movement in the U.S. The IAF was founded by the Gramsci Marxist Saul Alinsky. Closely read, his *Rules for Radicals* reveals that his main point of penetration - his main effort - and principle ally - was the Archdiocese of Chicago. (Just note how the bishop chortles feigned indignation as Alinsky points to the priests in attendance and says they should have been aborted.) Alinsky’s hold

¹⁵ For example, from [Repressive Tolerance](#):

“The realization of the objective of tolerance would call for intolerance toward prevailing policies, attitudes, opinions, and the extension of tolerance to policies, attitudes, and opinions which are outlawed or suppressed.”

“Surely, no government can be expected to foster its own subversion, but in a democracy such a right is vested in the people (i.e. in the majority of the people). This means that the ways should not be blocked on which a subversive majority could develop, and if they are blocked by organized repression and indoctrination, their reopening may require apparently undemocratic means. They would include the withdrawal of toleration of speech and assembly from groups and movements which promote aggressive policies, armament, chauvinism, discrimination on the grounds of race and **religion**, or which oppose the extension of public services, social security, medical care, etc.”

“Liberating tolerance, then, would mean intolerance against movements from the Right and toleration of movements from the Left. As to the scope of this tolerance and intolerance: ... it would extend to the stage of action as well as of discussion and propaganda, of deed as well as of word.”

on Chicago, then Notre Dame, and then the NCCB remained firm even after he published *Rules*, a book he openly dedicated to Lucifer -

- “Lest we forget at least an over-the-shoulder acknowledgment to the very first radical: from all our legends, mythology, and history (and who is to know where mythology leaves off and history begins—or which is which), the first radical known to man who rebelled against the establishment and did it so effectively that he at least won his own kingdom—Lucifer.” - - Saul Alinsky, 1971

Better to be ruler in hell than be subject in heaven. When Alinsky said this, he was as much paying homage to the creator of critical theory, Karl Marx, as he was making his own declaration. He also established historical continuity with Marx, a man who also likewise declared his enmity to God -

- “I wish to avenge myself against the one who rules above . . . Thus, Heaven I’ve forfeited, I know it full well, my soul, once true to God, is chosen for hell.” – Karl Marx, ~1837
- If there is a Something which devours, I’ll leap within it, though I bring the world to ruins — The world which bulks between me and the abyss I will smash to pieces with my enduring curses... *Oulanem*, Karl Marx, 1839

Once one recognizes the oppression, there is nothing “confusing” about the Church’s preoccupation with the Left. In reading this, it should be noted that Alinsky’s hold on the Church extended beyond America to the same Pope Paul who spoke of the “[smoke of Satan](#)”¹⁶ entering the Church. While the Archbishop of Milan, Montini was introduced to Alinsky by the famed French Catholic philosopher [Jacques Maritain](#). Declaring himself a revolutionary (and then immediately walking back his own claim), [Maritain](#) identified Alinsky as “one of the three revolutionaries in the Western world worthy of the name” (himself, Alinsky and the Chilean Eduardo Frei) when also recognizing him as a “great friend” and a “courageous and admirably staunch organizer.” (Jacques Maritain, [The Peasant of Garonne](#), Hole, Rinehart & Winston, 1968, 23) One would not normally put too much weight in Alinsky’s three 1958 meetings with Montini were it not for Alinsky’s exuberance over them alongside his giddiness at the thought of Montini becoming pope. From Alinsky -

- “I had three wonderful meetings with Montini and I am sure that you have heard from him since.”
- “I don’t know who the next Pope will be, but if it’s to be Montini, the drinks will be on me for years to come.” (For an excellent account, see “[Saul Alinsky and “Saint” Pope Paul VI](#)”)

¹⁶ Pope Paul VI, [IX Anniversary of the Incorporation of His Holiness](#), Homily of Paul VI, Solemnity of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, June 29, 1972: “Referring to the situation of the Church today, the Holy Father affirms to have the feeling that **“the smoke of Satan entered the temple of God from some fissure”**. There is doubt, uncertainty, problems, restlessness, dissatisfaction, confrontation. We do not trust the Church anymore; we trust the first profane prophet who comes to talk to us from some newspaper or some social movement to chase him and ask him if he has the formula of real life. And we do not feel that we are masters and masters . . . This state of uncertainty also reigns in the Church. It was believed that after the Council a sunny day would come for the history of the Church. Instead, a day of clouds, of storm, of darkness, of search, of uncertainty has come.” (Google Translated from the [Vatican original](#).)

Alinsky's outreach did not occur in a vacuum. This was the same Montini who secretly reached out to the Soviet Union in the early years of the Cold War.¹⁷ Pope Pius XII was so blindsided when informed of this treachery from various friendly intelligence agencies that he refused Montini the red cap of the cardinalate, an honor that would have to wait for Pius's death and Pope John XXIII's installment. Upon being installed, Pope Paul VI followed through on Pope John XXIII's "*Ost-Politik*", a course of action for which Hungarian Cardinal Mindszenty¹⁸ and Ukrainian Cardinal Slipyj¹⁹ paid a steep price. This alone puts a counterintelligence assessment in frame.

¹⁷ From a grizzled old former senior intelligence officer well positioned to know, but see also Peter Kwasniewski, "[50 Years Ago: Dietrich von Hildebrand Confronts Pope Paul VI](#)," (excerpts are taken from a fascinating 2001 interview with Dr. Alice von Hildebrand), *Rorate Caeli*, June 20, 2015, "It pertains to the rift between Pope Pius XII and the then Bishop Montini (the future Paul VI) who was his Undersecretary of State. Pius XII, conscious of the threat of Communism, which in the aftermath of World War II was dominating nearly half of Europe, had prohibited the Vatican staff from dealing with Moscow. To his dismay, he was informed one day through the Bishop of Upsala (Sweden) that his strict order had been contravened. **The Pope resisted giving credence to this rumor until he was given incontrovertible evidence that Montini had been corresponding with various Soviet agencies.** Meanwhile, Pope Pius XII (as had Pius XI) had been sending priests clandestinely into Russia to give comfort to Catholics behind the Iron Curtain. Every one of them had been systematically arrested, tortured, and either executed or sent to the gulag. Eventually a Vatican mole was discovered: Alighiero Tondi, S.J., who was a close advisor to Montini. Tondi was an agent working for Stalin whose mission was to keep Moscow informed about initiatives such as the sending of priests into the Soviet Union."

¹⁸ From a grizzled old former senior intelligence officer well positioned to know, but see also Roberto de Mattei, "[De Mattei: The Death of Paul VI \(August 6, 1978\). An Anniversary](#)" *Rorate Caeli*, August 15, 2018; "At the Council it was Paul VI who personally blocked the initiative of almost five hundred Council Fathers who had asked for the condemnation of Communism. One of the most illustrious victims of this policy was Cardinal József Mindszenty. After the rebellion in Hungary of 1956, the Cardinal had taken refuge in the American Embassy in Budapest and remained decidedly against any idea of an agreement with the Communist governments. When Paul VI asked him to renounce his title as Archbishop of Esztergom and Primate of Hungary, the Cardinal replied with a respectful but categorical refusal. Paul VI took on the responsibility of declaring the Primatial Archdioceses vacant, informing Cardinal Mindszenty of his removal as Archbishop on November 18th 1973." And also; Peter Kwasniewski, "[50 Years Ago: Dietrich von Hildebrand Confronts Pope Paul VI](#)," (excerpts are taken from a fascinating 2001 interview with Dr. Alice von Hildebrand), *Rorate Caeli*, June 20, 2015, "Add to this Pope Paul's treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty. Against his will, Mindszenty was ordered by the Vatican to leave Budapest. As most everyone knows, he had escaped the Communists and sought refuge in the American embassy compound. The Pope had given him his solemn promise that he would remain primate of Hungary as long as he lived. When the Cardinal (who had been tortured by the Communists) arrived in Rome, Paul VI embraced him warmly, but then sent him into exile in Vienna. Shortly afterwards, this holy prelate was informed that he had been demoted, and had been replaced by someone more acceptable to the Hungarian Communist government. More puzzling, and tragically sad, is the fact that when Mindszenty died, no Church representative was present at his burial."

¹⁹ From a grizzled old former senior intelligence officer well positioned to know, but see also Peter Kwasniewski, "[50 Years Ago: Dietrich von Hildebrand Confronts Pope Paul VI](#)," (excerpts are taken from a fascinating 2001 interview with Dr. Alice von Hildebrand), *Rorate Caeli*, June 20, 2015, "Considering the tumultuous pontificate of Paul VI, and the confusing signals he was giving, . . . disobeying the strict orders of Pius XII to have no contact with Moscow, and appeasing the Hungarian Communist government by renegeing on the solemn promise he had made to Cardinal Mindszenty; his treatment of holy Cardinal Slipyj, who had spent seventeen years in a Gulag, only to be made a virtual prisoner in the Vatican by Paul VI."

Part 3 – Negating 1930 years of Tradition one Dialectical Turn at a Time

The problem may not have been a lack of discernment but rather what the object of discernment was – and still is. In *Hermetica*, Lucifer is god's Angel of Light who helped the immanent god start his messy but necessary self-actualization process that culminates at the end of history. This does not conflict with Marx's march of history. And we wonder why the USCCB is an established ally on the left comfortably aligned with Soros groups, "Think Progress," March of History, "Change", etc. While Alinsky may have been an agnostic, just note that he and Marx were Hegelian and, as it always seems to turn out, the Marxian and Hermetical always tend to be in harmony. For example, just note how the tolerance of Hermeticism – think 1789 – lines up with Marcuse's *Negative Tolerance*. The USCCB itself emanated out of the Marxist Catholic alliance in Chicago, as did the NCCB's Campaign for Human Development. The timeline established by Bella Dodd cannot go unrecognized here and, in this context, neither can Bernardin's "seamless garment". Today, this history is rapidly clarifying itself; and much faster in the non-institutional Catholic world than in it - with an accompanying sense of rage where the only thing worse than being lied to about the current situation is the sense that so many clergy seem to be in a stupor - with eyes glazing over when the discussion is raised. The consequences of this intellectual drain bring to mind Polish Nobel laureate Czesław Miłosz observation from 1980:

- With the law of hierarchy goes the law of travesty and parody. There is inspiration, no idea, or discovery that, when mirrored in a lower intelligence, at a lower level of the "interhuman church," does not lose proportionality in value. If only something of the original, however weakened, however dimmed, would endure! But since the difference of degree is often one on absolute quality, the diluted version becomes a parody of the higher. Inspiration, its parody, and the parody of its parody: they surround us in constant and clamorous collision. Or, to use another metaphor, everything of substance is undermined, hollowed out by the termites of inferiority. By endowing masks and facades with real existence, we find ourselves one day the victims of an illusion. A priest nurtured on the Freudian-Marxian-Chardinian dregs will be a priest in name only; a teacher, though able to read and write, an illiterate and a corruptor; a politician, an outlaw; artists and poets, the helpers of circus managers who stage spectacles with real blood and live copulation, exactly as those Roman circus-theater described by Tertullian.

Looking at the recent affairs of the Vatican and USCCB, it's hard not to ask: Has the Church become Miłosz's circus theater; the gymnasium at the Temple? A political warfare analysis is under some obligation to accept the fact that when Cardinal Ratzinger said he wanted to destroy the Church along the lines advanced by Balthasar in order to bring it in line with the events of 1789, that he meant it (The French Revolution resulted in the purposeful mass killing of Catholics qua Catholics in a revolution dominated by Hermeticists - [Hermeticism being the archetype theosophy of Freemasonry](#)). He also meant it when explaining that the "Pastoral Constitution," *Gaudium et Spes*, was drafted to mainstream these ideas. From *Principles of Catholic Theology* (Ignatius Press, 1987 from German original in 1982), 381-382, Ratzinger stated -

- If it is desirable to offer a diagnosis of the text [*Gaudium et Spes*] as a whole, we might say that (in conjunction with the texts on religious liberty and world religions) it is a revision of the *Syllabus* of Pius IX, a kind of counter-syllabus. Harnack, as we know, interpreted the *Syllabus* of Pius IX as nothing less than a declaration of war against his generation. This is correct insofar as the *Syllabus* established a line of demarcation against the determining

forces of the nineteenth century: against the scientific and political world view of liberalism. In the struggle against modernism this twofold delimitation was ratified and strengthened. Since then many things have changed. The new ecclesiastical policy of Pius XI produced a certain openness toward the liberal understanding of the state. In a quiet but persistent struggle, exegesis and Church history adopted more and more the postulates of liberal science, and liberalism, too, was obliged to undergo many significant changes in the great political upheavals of the twentieth century. As a result, the one-sidedness of the position adopted by the Church under Pius IX and Pius X in response to the situation created by the new phase of history inaugurated by the French Revolution was to a large extent, corrected *via facti*, especially in Central Europe, but there was still no statement of the relationship that would exist between the Church and the world that had come into existence after 1789. In fact, an attitude that was largely prerevolutionary continued to exist in countries with strong Catholic majorities. Hardly anyone today will deny that the Spanish and Italian Concordats strove to preserve too much of a view that no longer corresponded with the facts. Hardly anyone today will deny that, in the field of education and with respect to the historico-critical method in modern science, anachronisms existed that corresponded closely to this adherence to an obsolete Church-state relationship. Only a careful investigation of the different ways in which acceptance of the new era was accomplished in various parts of the Church could unravel the complicated network of causes that formed the background of the "Pastoral Constitution", and only thus can the dramatic history of its influence be brought to light. Let us be content to say that the text serves as a counter-syllabus and, as such, represents, on the part of the Church, an attempt at an official reconciliation with the new era inaugurated in 1789.

- That means that there can be no return to the *Syllabus*, which may have marked the first stage in the confrontation with liberalism and a newly conceived Marxism but cannot be the last stage. In the long run, neither embrace nor ghetto can solve for Christians the problem of the modern world. The fact is, as **Hans Urs von Balthasar** pointed out as early as 1952, that the **"demolition of the bastions"** is a long-overdue task . . . She [the Church] must relinquish many of the things that have hitherto spelled security for Her and that She has taken for granted. She must **demolish** longstanding bastions and trust solely the shield of faith.

Harnack was the Protestant compliment to the same line of attack. Balthasar was on a speaking tour with Karl Barth, the Protestant theologian who considered Hegel to be the "Protestant Aquinas".²⁰ On the question of demolition, Popes John Paul and Benedict both presided over a church when predatory homosexual behavior became institutionalized among its clergy in what can only be called an act of permissive demolition. Alchemical formulas notwithstanding, to demolish Church bastions is to destroy Tradition. The question has to be asked: If Ratzinger was telling the truth about wanting to destroy the Church along Balthasarian lines as he clearly stated, wouldn't the Church look like it does today?

Well, yes!

²⁰ Karl Barth, *Protestant Thought: from Rousseau to Ritschl*, trans. Brian Cozens (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1969), 268, 280.

But if so, why would it be wrong or disrespectful to note Cardinal Ratzinger's comments when hailing Pope Benedict out and saying with a cheer, "MISSION ACCOMPLISHED"! As the dust of history settles, there is rising and convincing evidence that the Church is precisely where it planned to be by the New Theologian *periti* who put it there, including Ratzinger. This is not an issue in controversy, as recently as 2016, [Pope Emeritus Benedict](#) affirmed his role in flipping the Church and remains steadfastly unapologetic even as he acknowledged that the Church is on the verge of [capsizing](#). Wasn't that the objective? Associated with Ratzinger's discussion on the need to double-down on the Balthasarian demolition of the Church was his recognition that, as of the 1980s's, Vatican II had been an unmitigated disaster where his solution was to double-down on the very "reforms" that brought the Church to that point - as if "demolish" does not mean what he decried - DEMOLISH. In doing so, the Cardinal was aware that he was acting in the face of mounting opposition among the *sensus fidelium* -

- Is anything left but the heaped-up ruins of unsuccessful experiments? Has *Gaudium et Spes* been definitively translated into *luctus et angor* [grief and anguish]? Was the Council a wrong road that we must now retrace if we are to save the Church? The voices of those who say that it was are becoming louder and their followers more numerous. Among the more obvious phenomena of the last years must be counted the increasing number of integralist groups in which the desire for piety, for the sense of the mystery, is finding satisfaction. We must be on our guard against minimizing movements. Without a doubt, they represent a sectarian zealotry that is the antithesis of Catholicity. We cannot resist them too firmly. But we must likewise ask ourselves, in all earnestness, why such contractions and distortions of faith and piety have such an effect and are able to attract those who, by the basic conviction of their faith as well as by personal inclination, are in no way attracted by sectarianism. What drives them into a milieu in which they do not belong? Why have they lost the feeling of being at home in the larger Church? Are all their reproaches unfounded? *Principles of Catholic Theology* (Ignatius Press, 1987 from German original in 1982), 389-390.

From this, one can discern that Church safeguards were purposefully stripped and overrun at – and running through - Vatican II. A few brief observations on the above citation from Ratzinger. Did he ever stop to think that maybe he was wrong? Also, note his being confounded by the very dialectical reasoning that informs his thinking, all the "contradictions." More important are his use of the terms "integralists" and "sectarian" to refer to his opposition inside the Church through veiled but aggressively hostile narratives. "Integralist" is an attack term that derisively refers to Catholic theologians that have a Thomistic orientation to their theology. That would be the dominant pre-Vatican II theology that recognized Modernism and the New Theology as heretical. Closely read, Ratzinger *de facto* declared them heretics under his "New Theology" regime. But really, isn't a truly "New Theology" one that breaks with the old "Deposit of Faith" as a matter of definition? The Hegelian cosmology and Hermeticism are intensely Platonic, especially Neo-Platonic, in their orientation and Aquinas's theology severely limits their application. Integralism is a veiled attack on St. Thomas and Thomistic theology. *Wikipedia* defines "[Sectarianism](#)" as "a form of bigotry, discrimination, or hatred." That would be the Cardinal's view of Catholics who might think being Catholic remains an *integral* element of the Church he was bent on destroying.

This line of inquiry raises the need to make explicit what some recognize implicitly and, hence, often goes unrecognized. This analysis assumes that when a person says something, especially when reduced to written instruments in a scholarly or professional forum, they mean what they say. While the assumption is rebuttable, the burden of proof has to lie with those asserting claims like "I know

he said that, but that's not what he means." Really? That such responses lean towards *gnosticism* are compounded when they include, as they often times do, a strange spiritualized babble; a spiritualized *gnosis*. You know what I mean, the *gnosticism* that holds there is a deeper meaning for those in the know - that kind of *gnosis*. The trick to engaging issues in this forum is to recognize the necessity of not getting bogged down in rigged theological narratives, recognizing them for the political attacks that they are.

For example, it might be argued, with substantial supporting evidence, that when Cardinal Ratzinger spoke of the need to destroy the Church, he may not have meant the kind of destruction we are seeing (whatever that "kind" of destruction might be). The response is that it makes little difference to this assessment the manner in which the Church is destroyed so long as it is being destroyed by those who called for its destruction. Why should it matter that the demolition is off schedule for the planner? Demolish is demolish. It is for the other side to draw out the *gnostic* distinctions that collapse in the face of predictively foreseeable events that actually reflect real demolition.

Alongside the analogy to Dostoyevsky's *The Devils* (also *The Possessed*), with Popes Paul, John Paul and Benedict playing Stepan Trofimovich Verkhovinsky to Pope Francis's Pyotor Stepanovich Verkhovinsky, one can add a modern software analogy. What these popes seemed not to recognize is that when you overwrite the firmware "Tradition" with a dialectical operating system, it will cause "Catholic" programs to misfire. The God of the Catholic Church is, and only is, "I Am". Salvation history is not the march of history. As long as the Vatican does not fix the operating system, there will be no software solutions even if the "Catholic" programs themselves are sound. The incompatibility will remain notwithstanding the discernment needed to recognize it. There is something primitive about Pope Benedict's dialectical response to resolving the "mass controversy" he played a role in creating, calling for yet another new mass that is characterized as the synthesis of the pre-Vatican II Latin Mass (thesis) and the *Novus Ordo* (anti-thesis). As Garrigou-Lagrange warned, because the dialectic only negates (*aufheben*), it is a nihilizing process of planned destruction. A clouded awareness of what happens when one puts one's hand in a running garbage disposal doesn't change the outcome. Nor does a preferred belief that such an action won't shred the hand if one puts his/her hand in. The hand will be shredded. Negation negates, nihilizes, reduces its object to meaninglessness. Why should anyone care what the post-conciliar popes were thinking when they purposefully engaged in destruction thinking destruction does not mean destroy?

When reading Ratzinger, and even JP2 (especially his *Faith and Reason*), it is important to recognize and interpret their writings in the dialectical manner in which they were written. Hence, the "pastoral" *Gaudium et Spes* can naturally negate all the pre-Vatican encyclicals directed against Modernism and the New Theology because, being dialectical, that is what it does. The dialectic is the authority behind Ratzinger's suppression of the pre-Vatican II encyclicals, it is the spirit of Vatican II. (To assume the negating power of the dialectic is to *ipso facto* accept its negating authority over Tradition.) Everything that was true yesterday, especially because it was both true and yesterday, gets negated today, which in turn will be negated tomorrow. That is the formula behind "we uphold the Magisterial teachings (from yesterday) but we have to be pastoral (today)". This is how 1930 years of Tradition can be negated one dialectical turn at a time. Poof! Gone! As important, this is what was intended by the relevant Vatican II documents as evidenced by the fact that they remain unimpeded while doing exactly what they continue to do. The New Theology claims the right to completely negate (by *aufheben*) any Tradition or Magisterial teaching where-ever they are out of touch with the living god who manifests himself as Absolute Idea in the *zeitgeist* of the day. Think Teilhard. Think [Gaudium et Spes](#). When read in light of the thinly veiled allusions to *zeitgeist* in

footnote 1 of the Preface,²¹ at least in its application, *Gaudium et Spes* takes on a Maccabean feel precisely because it is Hegelian.²²

Part 4 - Social Justice is repackaged Marxism - repackaged by Marxists

Balthasar's theology tends to mimic Christianity while implementing Hermetic form. When hailing out Hegel in *Word and Revelation*, doing so in conjunction with Hegel's "*Hen kai Pan*", Balthasar was signaling that his work was dialectically in line with Hegel at precisely the point where Hegel affirmed *Hermetica* -

- "*Hen* is the characteristic world that mysticism which ascends by renunciation. *Pan* is the attempt to bring the finite despite this renunciation. "*Hen kai pan*" remains the aspiration of the heart which may well be postulated and assented to as the ultimate ideal but one which lacks any power to attain. What applies to mysticism applies also to philosophy. It can and must postulate that nothing of that which is extraneous to the unity of being, and that in all that is the revelation of being is to be discerned; but it cannot prove, or desire to prove, that the creature is coincident with the creator of simply a mode of him. From the *hen* to the *pan* – the two, after all, belong together – the bridge joining them can only be thrown by God. If this bridge is what the christian (sic) religion consists in, then "there arises the infinite demand that the content of religion should vindicate itself also to thought, and this necessity is not to be eluded." These are the words of Hegel (Hegel, *Philosophy of Religion* 1832, II, 280). His theology and philosophy of the Spirit stand face to face. The positive cannot be the ultimate. (Balthasar, *World and Revelation*, 186-187)

Of course, for Balthasar, what positive Revelation (and Tradition) requires is "*aufheben*" (negation) to bring about the intended synthesis of the true revelatory understanding that god intended – thesis, anti-thesis, synthesis. Just read Balthasar's "negative theology" in this light. If you put Hermes in frame when reading Balthasar, everything pops. Just as god is most fully realized at the end of time because, as Hegel explained, history is the process of god collecting his shattered identity in

²¹ Footnote 1, Preface, *Gaudium et Spec*, December 7, 1965: "1. The Pastoral Constitution "*De Ecclesia in Mundo Huius Temporis*" is made up of two parts; yet it constitutes an organic unity. By way of explanation: the constitution is called "pastoral" because, while resting on doctrinal principles, it seeks to express the relation of the Church to the world and modern mankind. The result is that, on the one hand, a **pastoral slant** is present in the first part, and, on the other hand, a **doctrinal slant** is present in the second part. In the first part, the Church develops her teaching on man, on the world which is the enveloping context of man's existence, and on man's relations to his fellow men. In part two, the Church gives closer consideration to various aspects of modern life and human society; special consideration is given to those questions and problems which, in this general area, **seem to have a greater urgency in our day**. As a result, in part two the subject matter which is viewed in the light of doctrinal principles is made up of diverse elements. Some elements have a permanent value; **others, only a transitory one**. Consequently, the constitution must be interpreted according to the general norms of theological interpretation. Interpreters must bear in mind—especially in part two—the **changeable circumstances** which the subject matter, by its very nature, involves."

²² "In those days lawless men came forth from Israel, and misled many, saying, "Let us go and make a covenant with the Gentiles round about us, for since we separated from them many evils have come upon us." This proposal pleased them, and some of the people eagerly went to the king. He authorized them to observe the ordinances of the Gentiles. So they built a gymnasium in Jerusalem, according to Gentile custom, and removed the marks of circumcision, and abandoned the holy covenant. They joined with the Gentiles and sold themselves to do evil." (1 Maccabees 1:11-15)

creation through an ongoing series of dialectical turns that converge at the end of history when god becomes fully realized, it is important to note that Hegel precisely followed the alchemical formula that his dialectic mainstreamed (that Vatican II adopted). This is Teilhard's "omega point" god. Teilhard replaced "I Am" with "becoming" thus rendering god immanent. Running through Neo-Platonism, Teilhard, emulated Hegel's alchemical formulas (really, alchemy) as well.

Hegel used these formulas to execute his Hermetic cosmology in a manner that emulated the Pietist Lutheranism of his day. Hegel's god only exists in a fully realized state at the end of history, immanently (and pantheistically) dependent upon his creation to transition him from pure undifferentiated thought (Hegel's *Logic* - the Father), through his creation thus allowing the undifferentiated god to know himself through his differentiated creation reflecting back on him (Hegel's *Philosophy of Nature* - the Son) so that the two can dialectically operate off each other through history until all of actualized thought converges at the end of time in the Actualized Absolute Idea (Hegel's *Philosophy of the Spirit* - the Holy Spirit). It's not far off from [Joachim of Fiore](#) (or [here](#), or [here](#)).

As Eric Voegelin recognized, Hegel's immanentized god "immanentizes the eschaton" and, in-so-doing, transitions a church's mission-focus from heaven to earth; seeking god at the end of history through the building-up and perfecting of his creation - "heaven on earth". In practice, the language can be ambiguous. For example, when [Pope Francis spoke in Dublin](#) of *Amoris Laetitia* that it is a guide "to **help God** fulfill our dreams" or that "with your testimony of the Gospel you can **help God** to realize his dream," it may simply be a rhetorical flourish. Yet still, as stated, at least technically, it speaks of God needing man's help to actualize himself in time – undermining transcendence in favor of immanence. It is just a few semantical turns away from Marxism. Under Hegel, Jesus is replaced by the state because god manifests himself in the state. This, in itself, explains the embedded statism of the interfaith movement. In this process, justice transitions to social justice. Social Justice is repackaged Marxism - repackaged by Marxists. Social Justice has become a primary mission of the Church alongside its interfaith mission. In lockstep with the interfaith mission, the USCCB and the Vatican have become aggressively more statist in their posture in recent years. This is a Christianity that Marx can exploit in just the way the *Alta Vendita* envisioned.

Certainly, the drift of this discussion into the esoterica of Hermetica is unsettling because, to be honest, it's weird and can only be made relevant by clear indicators of its influence that, when uncovered, must be assessed. There is too much here; while it may be mitigated, it won't be denied. Fresh off his victory as a Vatican II *peritus*, Father Ratzinger wrote *The Sacramental Reason for Christian Existence*. Reading it, the question must be asked; does his comment come closer to the Magisterial Teachings of the Church on True Presence or does one get the uncomfortable sense that he accommodates the immanentism of Hegel's channeled Hermetica by way of Teilhard -

- "Eucharistic devotion such as is noted in the silent visit by the devout in church must not be thought of as a conversation with God. This would assume that God was present there locally and in a confined way. To justify such an assertion shows a lack of understanding of the Christological mysteries of the very concept of God. This is repugnant to the serious thinking of the man who knows about the omnipresence of God. To go to Church on the grounds that one can visit God who is present there is a senseless act which modern man rightfully rejects." (Father Joseph Ratzinger, *The Sacramental Reason for Christian Existence*, Kyrios Publication, Germany, 1966 – credit Dr. Remi Amelunxen)

As Ratzinger found “*Ecce Agnus Dei*” repugnant in adoration, how does this change when receiving that same host in the sacrament? It does not take a theology degree to recognize the screaming problem (even if it does take a measure of spiritualized *gnosis* to obscure it). There are substantive reasons to fear that Ratzinger’s 1966 comments were not an aberrational one-off. In his 2000 book [Spirit of the Liturgy](#), Cardinal Ratzinger relied on Teilhard’s dialectically derived “Noosphere” to suggest “a new meaning to Christian worship:²³ the **transubstantiated host** is the anticipation of the transformation and divinization of matter in the christological (sic) ‘fullness’.” Ratzinger continued; “In [Teilhard’s] view, the **Eucharist** provides the movement of the cosmos with its direction; it anticipates its goal and at the same time urges it on.”²⁴ More concerning, in a [2009 homily as the Vicar of Christ](#), Pope Benedict again relied on Teilhard to assert that “the role of the priesthood is to consecrate the world so that it may become a **living host**, a liturgy: so that the liturgy may not be

²³ When discussing a “new meaning to Christian worship”, it is important to recognize that new theologies (the “New Theology”) have always been severely frowned upon by the Church, especially when the Eucharist is involved; as for example, when it seems to be made to immanently transcend Tradition. In 1907, Pope Pius X, stated the Church’s hostility to novelty in theology in ¶ 42, *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*:

- “But for Catholics the second Council of Nicaea [787 a.d.] will always have the force of law, where it condemns those who dare, after the impious fashion of heretics, to deride the ecclesiastical traditions, to invent novelties of some kind . . . or endeavor by malice or craft to overthrow any one of the legitimate traditions of the Catholic Church; and Catholics will hold for law, also, the profession of the fourth Council of Constantinople [870 a.d.]: We therefore profess to conserve and guard the rules bequeathed to the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church by the Holy and most illustrious Apostles, by the orthodox Councils, both general and local, and by every one of those divine interpreters the Fathers and Doctors of the Church.”

Recalling that Vatican II was not a doctrinal council while Vatican I was, relying on Luke 22:31, Vatican I, in *Pastor Aeternus* (1870,) likewise made its aversion to “new doctrine” clear when stating the pope’s overriding responsibility is to defend the Tradition:

- The Holy Spirit was promised to the successors of Peter not so that they might, by his revelation, make known some new doctrine, but that, by his assistance, they might religiously guard and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith transmitted by the apostles. Indeed, their apostolic teaching was embraced by all the venerable fathers and revered and followed by all the holy orthodox doctors, for they knew very well that this See of St. Peter always remains unblemished by any error, in accordance with the divine promise of our Lord and Savior to the prince of his disciples: “I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail; and when you have turned again, strengthen your brethren.”

²⁴ The full quote from Ratzinger’s [Spirit of the Liturgy](#); “And so we can now say that the goal of worship and the goal of creation as a whole are one and the same—divinization, a world of freedom and love. But this means that the historical makes its appearance in the cosmic. The cosmos is not a kind of closed building, a stationary container in which history may by chance take place. It is itself movement, from its one beginning to its one end. In a sense, creation is history. Against the background of the modern evolutionary world view, **Teilhard de Chardin** depicted the cosmos as a process of ascent, a series of unions. From very simple beginnings the path leads to ever greater and more complex unities, in which multiplicity is not abolished but merged into a growing **synthesis**, leading to the “**Noosphere**”, in which spirit and its understanding embrace the whole and are blended into a kind of living organism. Invoking the epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, **Teilhard** looks on Christ as the energy that *strives toward the Noosphere and finally incorporates everything in its “fullness’*. From here **Teilhard** went on to give a new meaning to Christian worship: the **transubstantiated Host** is the anticipation of the transformation and divinization of matter in the Christological (sic) “fullness”. In his view, the Eucharist provides the movement of the cosmos with its direction; it anticipates its goal and at the same time urges it on.” (Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *Spirit of the Liturgy*, Ignatius Press, September 2000, 28-29)

something alongside the reality of the world, but that the world itself shall become a **living host.**” Was Pope Benedict praying that the role of the priesthood be transformed from the traditional (Traditional) *persona in Christi* to that of a priesthood that transforms this world (as it moves forward in history)? The Pope continues; “This is also the great vision of **Teilhard de Chardin**: in the end we shall achieve a **true cosmic liturgy, where the cosmos becomes a living host.** And let us pray the Lord to help us become priests in this sense, to aid in the transformation of the world, in adoration of God, beginning with ourselves.” How is this not Heaven on Earth? Ratzinger seems consistent over a 40-year period, seemingly signaling an operating system outcome in the language of the “Catholic Program” that is as discontinuous with Tradition as it accords with Teilhard’s immanentized ramblings which look to Hermetica through gnostic and Neoplatonic constructs.

As concerning, 6 years later, Pope Francis would rely on Pope Benedict’s Aosta homily to support his own reliance on Teilhard in his 2015 [Encyclical *Laudato Si’*](#). Before proceeding, recall that at least officially, Teilhard is still not in good standing with the Church. In 1962, the Holy Office issued a [Monitum](#) (warning) of admonition that “it is sufficiently clear that [Teilhard de Chardin’s] works abound in such ambiguities and indeed even serious errors, as to offend Catholic doctrine” that was reiterated in *L’Osservatore Romano* in 1981. As offensive as Teilhard was to the Pre-Conciliar Church, there is a clear effort to rehabilitate him among the entrenched Catholic chattering class (for example, [here](#), [here](#), [here](#) and [here](#)). Returning to the [Encyclical *Laudato Si’*](#), Pope Francis used Teilhard to support his “Omega-Point-god at the-end-of-history” comment. From [Laudato Si’](#):

- 83. The ultimate destiny of the universe is in the fullness of God, which has already been attained by the risen Christ, the measure of the maturity of all things.[53] . . . *Rather, all creatures are moving forward with us and through us towards a common point of arrival, which is God, in that transcendent fullness where the risen Christ embraces and illumines all things.* Human beings, endowed with intelligence and love, and drawn by the fullness of Christ, are called to lead all creatures back to their Creator.

Paragraph 83, *Laudato Si’* derives its authority from Teilhard through footnote 53. In a clear example of signaling, footnote 53 not only draws support from Teilhard, it does so by further citing in ascending chronological order all the post-conciliar popes who likewise cited him favorably.²⁵ As the footnote suggests, there is a rising preference for Teilhard that ends, as already noted, with Pope Benedict again reimagining the Eucharist along the lines of Teilhard’s bizarre dialectic:

- Pope Paul VI, “[Visit of Paul VI to an Important Chemical-Pharmaceutical Plant](#),” Vatican, February 24, 1966; “And the Holy Father cites Teilhard de Chardin, who gave an explanation of the universe and, among many fantasies, many things incorrect, knew how to read into things a smart ingredient that must be called God.”
- Pope John Paul II, “[Letter of His Holiness John Paul II to Reverend George V. Coyne, S.J. Director of the Vatican Observatory](#),” The Vatican, June 1, 1988; “Further in the fine of this same development, there are already several detailed suggestions for the **final stage**,

²⁵ Footnote [53] [Laudato Si’](#); “Against this horizon we can set the contribution of Fr Teilhard de Chardin; cf. PAUL VI, *Address in a Chemical and Pharmaceutical Plant* (24 February 1966): *Insegnamenti* 4 (1966), 992-993; JOHN PAUL II, [Letter to the Reverend George Coyne](#), (1 June 1988): *Insegnamenti* 11/2 (1988), 1715; BENEDICT XVI, [Homily for the Celebration of Vespers in Aosta](#) (24 July 2009): *Insegnamenti* 5/2 (2009), 60.”

superunification, that is, the unification of all four fundamental forces, including gravity. Is it not important for us to note that in a world of such detailed specialization as contemporary physics there exists this **drive towards convergence**?

If the **cosmologies of the ancient Near Eastern** world could be purified and assimilated into the first chapters of Genesis, might not contemporary cosmology have something to offer to our reflections upon creation? **Does an evolutionary perspective bring any light to bear upon theological anthropology**, the meaning of the human person as the *imago Dei*, **the problem of Christology** – and even upon the development of doctrine itself?

- Pope Benedict XVI, [Homily of His Holiness Benedict XVI](#), Celebration of Vespers with the Faithful of Aosta (Italy), Cathedral of Aosta, July 24, 2009; **“The role of the priesthood is to consecrate the world so that it may become a living host**, a liturgy: so that the liturgy may not be something alongside the reality of the world, but that the world itself shall become a living host, a liturgy. This is also the great vision of **Teilhard de Chardin**: in the end we shall achieve a **true cosmic liturgy, where the cosmos becomes a living host**. And let us pray the Lord to help us become priests in this sense, to aid in the transformation of the world, in adoration of God, beginning with ourselves.”

As will be discussed, convergence is a term that maps to the Interfaith lexicon. With such consistent OS level signaling leading back to Vatican II through all post-conciliar popes, are the faithful simply waiting for the *fait accompli* that, at some point – or series of points, has already been determined by some decision support template in a long-term execution matrix? Are we simply waiting for the *de facto* “spirit of Vatican II” (smoke and all) to become *de jure*? Long before Vatican II, German Lutheranism would suffer the same Hegelian fate. To stand down *sola scriptura*, the demand was to force Biblical analysis to conform to the Hegelian cosmology, already designated a science (think scientism), that insisted on the *Torah* being brought into frame with Homer and other 6th Century BC mythologies in conformance with the ersatz mythological science Wellhausen imposed as a historical critical analysis, and called Hermeneutics (can you cull out the HERMES in hermeneutics?) Hence, JEPD. In the New Testament, Q extends the timeline for the production of the Synoptic Gospels past the destruction of the Temple, forcing a reframing of Revelation, that puts it more closely in frame with – and hence in peer competition with - the rising *gnosticism* and Neo-Platonism of the time. Yet Acts ends with Paul still alive before the fall of the Temple. There is no historical or scientific basis for “Quelle” outside the constructed narratives that demand that it be. Yet, the USCCB’s officially approved Bible, the *New American Bible* (NAB) cites to Q in footnotes as if it existed. At one point, the Vatican did not permit the NAB to be used in Mass, preferring instead the RSCVE. Most Catholics don’t use it. Imposed pseudorealities such as these, constructed over time and cultivated, give voice to Pieper’s “Platonic nightmare” -

- For the general public is being reduced to a state where people are not only unable to find out about the truth but also become unable even to search for the truth because they are satisfied with deception and trickery that have determined their convictions, satisfied with a fictitious reality created by design through the abuse of language. (Pieper, *Abuse of Language, Abuse of Power*, Ignatius Press 1992 (German 1974), 34.)

Part 5 – A New tradition, The “Semen of the Word” Theology - “Pervy and Gross.”

When speaking of destruction, Balthasar is Ratzinger’s point of reference. While Balthasar’s sexualized theology may be sacrilegious when considered in light of St Paul and 1930 years of unbroken Tradition, it is in line with how Hermetic tradition positions the idealized status of women in the role of Ishtar, Astarte and Libertas (who French Freemasons built a large statue of, which New York Freemasons dedicated in New York Harbor). Strange? No question about it. But don’t blame me! A brief Google research and review on the goddess Astarte in Sumerian tradition will help establish an uncomfortable perspective when reading Balthasar:

- The figure of the prostitute is so appropriate for the Church that it defines the Church of the New Covenant in her most splendid mystery of salvation. The fact that the Synagogue left the Holy Land to go and be among the pagans was an infidelity of Jerusalem, the fact that 'she opened her legs in every road in the world.' But this same movement, which brings her to all the peoples, is the mission of the Church. She must unite and merge herself with every people, and this new apostolic form of union cannot be avoided. (Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Sponsa Verbi*, 1969, 267.)
- The 'corporal' union of mankind with the living God is manifested - an extraordinary thing! - by the symbolism of eros, as a realization of what is said in the *Canticum of the Canticles*: existence considered as nuptials. The Church and the soul that receive the semen of the Word and the spiritual truth can only receive it in an attitude of feminine openness and accessibility. She does not become annoyed, does not close herself, does not make herself rigid or assume any virile reaction, but gives herself in the darkness, receives in the darkness without knowing what and how much she receives and gives birth to. (Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theology of History*, 1960, 145.)

Yes, Astarte! As my teenage daughter would say, “Ick”. This “semen of the word” [theology](#) has become entrenched as a permissive subculture. Of note, when reading religious or theological discussions relating to sex where the term “eros” is used, consider it an indicator of possible Hermetic influence by way of Hegel, then look to the Frankfurt School – [eros everywhere](#). If you are informed by typology, this can’t make you feel good. While it does not fit the Catholic typological form, it does the Hermetic. What theologians call typology, intelligence officers call a doctrinal templating. But reading Balthasar, recognizing that Pope John Paul II made him a Cardinal years after publication, and knowing that this was one of Pope Benedict’s two most favored theologians, one must ask: Doesn’t this help explain Assisi? What is the difference between Assisi and the “desolating sacrilege” of Daniel²⁶ and Maccabees? Given the trajectory of Balthasar’s comments, isn’t there “something about Mary” in all of this? What about “Theology of the Body”? If one maps Balthasar’s theological writings, at least the ones I reviewed, one can plainly see that the typology runs through a micro thin “Catholic” veil (to spoof the system) to Hermetics by way of Hegel. Balthasar even

²⁶ He shall turn back and give heed to those who forsake the holy covenant. Forces from him shall appear and profane the temple and fortress, and shall take away the continual burnt offering. And they shall set up the abomination that makes desolate. He shall seduce with flattery those who violate the covenant; but the people who know their God shall stand firm and take action. And those among the people who are wise shall make many understand, though they shall fall by sword and flame, by captivity and plunder, for some days. (Daniel 11:30-33)

wrote very supportive forwards to theosophical works claiming a Catholic nexus to hermetic concepts, as for example, in his forward to *Meditations of the Tarot* -

- A thinking, praying Christian of unmistakable purity reveals to us the **symbol of Christian Hermeticism** in its various levels of **mysticism, gnosis and magic**, taking in also the **Cabbala** and certain elements of **astrology** and **alchemy**. These symbols are summarized in the twenty-two so called “**Major Arcana**” of the **Tarot cards**. By way of the **Major Arcana** the author seeks to lead meditatively into the deeper, all-embracing wisdom of the Catholic Mystery. (The Forward is all downhill from here)

Wasn't tarot condemned?

But wait, there's more. Balthasar left the Jesuits in the 1950's to live a life that clearly emulates Steiner's in his role with Blavatsky. Balthasar, became the spiritual counselor/confessor to the eccentric Adrienne Von Speyr, a twice divorced convert from Protestantism who he helped regress through her previous lives to recapture her virginity (Isn't the only place you'll find reincarnation in Catholic Tradition located in the chapter labeled “Condemned”?). So how did Balthasar and Speyr explain the founding of their publishing house (because no-one would publish her works)? As stated in the *Communio*, a journal founded in the Vatican by Ratzinger, Speyr said their newly founded institution was formed “as a period of pregnancy, where the institute is the child, Adrienne the mother and von Balthasar the father.” How could the two “virgins” have a child - at least spiritually speaking? With the help and support of Balthasar, Speyr channeled Saint Ignatius that “even though [they] were virgins, this was a means by which a man could mark a woman.” UGH! A virgin, that is, through regressions over past lives over which Balthasar presided that the *Communio* published.

Speyr (and Balthasar) believed she and Balthasar were on a “Blues Brother-esque” mission from God, or at least on one from Mary - her Mary. As related in “[They Think They Won, Part 4](#)”, Balthasar said, “In a ‘Marian’ vision, Adrienne says to God: ‘We both (Adrienne and von Balthasar) wish to love You, to serve You, and to thank You for the Church You have entrusted to us . . . we spoke those words both of us together, and for a fraction of a second, she placed the child in my arms, but it was not only the child, it was the *Una Sancta* (the Church) in miniature, and seemed to me, to represent a unity of everything that has been entrusted to us and which constitutes a work in God for the Catholic.’” UGH! Not my *Una Sancta*.

Recalling Balthasar's “semen of the Word” theology, Speyr relates how St Ignatius also channeled that “man's spiritual fecundity is to be deposited in the woman's body that she may bear fruit. In this sense Hans Urs von Balthasar's fertility was deposited in the stigmata, which Adrienne had received for him.” Just close your eyes and visualize this. Or maybe not, certain things cannot be unseen. But consider, if someone acted this out, made a video of it and put it on the web, wouldn't it be a form of internet porn in need of penance? If it wasn't for the fact that these were rather influential and highly ranked Catholics, wouldn't the normal response to this nonsense be to dismiss it as rather (oc)cultish – and just plain weird?

To be clear, Balthasar was hailed as the pre-eminent Vatican II era theologian by, among others, the two successive popes that gave him elite status. Both Popes John Paul and Benedict affirmed Balthasar and both were personally present and instrumental in standing up [Casa Balthasar](#) in Rome. Their endorsements expressly include Speyr (along with her baggage). From the [Lubac-Balthasar-Speyr Association](#) page on the *Casa Balthasar* portal, “the Association began its activities on February

18, 1991, to support the ‘Casa Balthasar’ founded in 1990 under the patronage of Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger.” From the [Three Masters of our Time](#) page on the same portal, we are told that -

- “Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI considered Henri de Lubac, Hans Urs von Balthasar, and Adrienne von Speyr to be spiritual teachers, masters well-suited to illuminate Christian life with a profoundly Catholic doctrine.”

It also included numerous endorsements by Ratzinger as both Cardinal and Pope. For example -

- “The Church itself, in its official responsibility, tells us that Balthasar is right in what he teaches of the Faith, that he points the way to the sources of living water – a witness to the Word which teaches us Christ and which teaches us how to live.” - Joseph Ratzinger, Balthasar’s, 1988

A review of the [Events](#) page at the *Casa Balthasar* portal reveals the playing of Mozart’s *The Magic Flute* - a composition notorious for its Freemasonry theme and imagery (which is Hermetic). Assessments of Balthasar that go too far beyond my teenage daughter’s analysis may be overthinking him. She had him in three words: “pervy and gross.” [She turned 18, I did ask her.]

And herein lies the rub. It’s not just teenage girls. Most men (and women), especially those with children, would not find it too difficult to conclude that a Vatican leadership that’s all in on Balthasar would be soft on a principled response to the predatory clergy that has come to define the Church. Lest we lose sight, while Hermes might take a flyer on acting on such issues, his heart not really being in it, for Christ, it’s the millstone. On this issue, there can be no conflict. As a shepherd, to be in conflict is to be unfit.

The Church disabled itself from being able to address the predatory homosexuality that now *PROPERLY DEFINES* it because it does not quite violate what they believe. A political warfare analysis holds that the Church is what it does. The “Catholic” programs may demand harsh immediate action, as the faithful most certainly do, but the operating system’s level of effort is satisfied with simply going through the motions to get by. “[CLERICALISM](#)” as a response, is an indicator of stunning unfitness.

In *Il nostro compito*, Balthasar noted approvingly that Speyr received a divine mission to “rethink” the “positive value of the so-called corporeity (or sexuality) within the religion of incarnation”. This makes sense when one recognizes that in the Hermetic domain, man was originally androgyne and hence, any theology that seeks convergence at the end of history would naturally anticipate all forms of converged sexuality and genderism as a return to the perfected androgyne. The interfaith model perfectly conforms to this hermetic typology; its doctrinal template. Pope Francis affirmed that the [mission of the Church](#) will continue to be the interfaith mission established a Vatican II.²⁷

²⁷ While outside the scope of this discussion, it should be noted that the antithetical nature of the Church works itself out in other venues, pretty much across the board, sometimes to murderous effect. There is predictive directionality to the failed but non-randomly aligned discernment that governs the post Vatican II Church that, when taken in, can help explain events with a clarifying certainty that often leaves one in a sickened state of disbelief. For example, outside the predatory sexual, BUT INTERLOCKING WITH IT, while the destructive nature of the interfaith movement is not limited to the “as above so below” hermetical form, it remains an active instrument of the statist left of which the Church remains a leading player. Yet, it must be kept in mind that

“As above, so below.” While this is a theological aphorism, it is decidedly not Christian. It is Hermetic. With this aphorism informing “elite” Vatican II theology,²⁸ it brings institutional understanding to the

Interfaith’s typological form demands the convergence of all faiths. Knowingly or not, for those committed to this cause, the demands of convergence work themselves out in history through an ongoing series of alchemical negations (*aufheben*) that include the collapsing (convergence) of all faiths into the actualized *Prisca Theologia* that reforms itself at the end of history as realized Absolute Act – the “*in and for itself*”. It is not the Lutheran Church of Luther that the Vatican romances but rather the offshoot created by Hegel and redirected by Wellhausen which has engulfed Lutheranism in its own negation in pursuit of that same convergence. A discerning Catholic has more in common with an anti-Catholic “*sola scriptura*” Lutheran than he does with a postmodern Catholic not least because both at least accept “I AM” as the exclusive basis for faith in God. As the only outcome for such a process is the calculated collapse of faith through *aufheben*, the left and the Muslim Brotherhood actively compete with each other in the positioning battle to fill the spiritual void – the filling of which constitutes the prize. The USCCB is actively allied with the Muslim Brotherhood in America, the Vatican entertains the Turkish AKP, and Catholic Relief Services (CRS) feeds the very al-Qaeda organizations eradicating Christians (actually Eastern Rite Catholics) in Syria using your tax dollars. Shocked? Why? If what guides the *zeitgeist* of Vatican II is Ratzinger’s 1789, why should we be? If one adds the European Union and U.S. State Department to the Church’s already close relationship with the Muslim Brotherhood and the AKP when assessing statist imposed immigration policies that the radicalized episcopate actively endorses – even against its own faithful - that those involved call a *hijra*, while chronicling the sanctioned violence-inducing rights-destroying arc delivered on the population, one cannot but conclude that the episcopate is knowingly on the side of the destruction of Western civilization that includes the forced dechristianization of the population, including the *sensus fidelium*. Yes, 1789. I get it! Do you? The plea to take Morpheus’s Red Pill is simply a cry in the wilderness to make an intentional decision to “know them by their fruits” in circumstances where we are where they said they wanted us to be when calling for the Church’s destruction. In this situation, there is no precedent for Christ saying; “Let’s dialogue.” (But there is one for His saying, “Get back Satan!” – even to a vicar) While there is no doubt that the “Catholic” program causes many among the episcopate to be personally shocked at the role it plays in eradicating Christians in Syria (and Europe, and America), the operating system “Dialectic” assures this outcome as the necessary precondition for Teilhard’s “omega point” god. Players whose authority is grounded in the operating system (the dialectic) that blocks the firmware (Tradition) should not be allowed to assert that authority in the program (Catholic). Returning to Syria, [to be clear](#): “The USAID’s inspector general, reporting to Congress . . . said that staff of an unnamed non-profit added “fighters” of armed group *Hay’at Tahrir Al-Sham* to lists of civilians eligible for food packages and then covered up the records. The US government regards HTS as a successor to the al-Qaeda-affiliated [Nusra Front](#). Referring to HTS as a “designated terrorist organisation”, the July report said: “The NGO’s employees allowed HTS fighters to be included among program beneficiaries and submitted falsified beneficiary lists to USAID to conceal the fighters’ participation in the food assistance program.” Close professional relationships and personal bonds between the American episcopate and the Muslim Brotherhood – Cardinal McCarrick provided an unforced ringing endorsement of the domestic Muslim Brotherhood in his U.S. Senate testimony, on behalf of the USCCB – along with Syrian Catholic priests coming to America for years pleading that 90% of CRS funds were not going to Christians and Yazidis in Syria, makes the al-Qaeda revelation one that should have been anticipated as a matter of course – and, of course, it was.

²⁸ In his 1969 [Introduction to Christianity](#), in the course of referencing Teilhard, Ratzinger raises the “[monad](#)”, a term closely associated with [gnosticism](#) and [Neoplatonism](#) (and [here](#)); Teilhard’s dialectic equation “which determines the real drift of evolution . . . in the real goal of the ascending process of growth or **becoming**”; and signals the “as above so below” formula. From *Introduction to Christianity*, Ratzinger writes; “But let us return to man. He is so far the maximum in complexity. But even he as mere **man-monad** cannot represent an end; his growth itself demands a further advance in complexity: “At the same time as he represents an individual centered on himself (that is, a ‘person’), does not Man also represent an element in relation to some new and higher **synthesis**?” That is to say, man is indeed, on the one hand, already an end that can no longer be reversed, no longer be melted down again; yet in the juxtaposition of individual men he is not yet at the goal

contra-Traditional / contra-Biblical notion that, yes, we may “[dare hope that all men are saved](#)” (even if it takes a few reincarnations to get there).²⁹ This type of analysis can be repeated with Teilhard and, by varying degrees, the rest of the *Communio* pantheon.

It must be stated simply. If the Church as constituted in 1950 was the One True Apostolic Church, and it can be shown that today’s Church is not that, except in the form of its antithesis - that the only way to claim continuity is to helically assert the very dialectic condemned at that time - then what are people holding onto today when holding back from saying what everybody knows - this emperor has no cloths. There is precise directionality to this corruption.

The assurance that we can know them by their fruits is preceded by the warning to be wary of wolves in sheep’s clothing. There is nothing more predatory than unfettered permissive access to children, teenagers and young adults. It is in this frame that we should assess the Vatican II priesthood, episcopate, cardinalate and (that which will not be named for fear of the Holy Hand Grenade of Antioch). How predatory does it have to get? The episcopate is what it does when it does what it does, everybody knows it, and reasonable people can no longer find in the interior light of their conscience a justification to believe them. One sometimes wonders whether Pope Paul’s horror at the “[smoke of Satan](#)” was driven in part by his culpable recognition that he provided the crack that he had no intention of filling. *Actus reus. Mens rea*. It is because we live in times where the “smoke of Satan” is permitted in the Church, that 2 Thessalonians 2:3-4³⁰ becomes a reasonable benchmark, a measuring criterion, on which to gauge Church events in our time.

but shows himself to be an element, as it were, that longs for a whole that will embrace it without destroying it. Let us look at a further text, in order to see in what direction such ideas lead: “Contrary to the appearances still accepted by Physics, the Great Stability is **not below**—in the infra-elemental—**but above**—in the ultra-synthetic.” So it must be discovered that, “If things hold and hold together, it is only by virtue of ‘complexification’, from the top.” I think we are confronted here with a crucial statement; at this point the dynamic view of the world destroys the positivistic conception, which seems so obvious to us, that stability is located only in the “mass”, in hard material. That the world is in the last resort put together and held together “from above” here becomes evident in a way that is particularly striking because we are so little accustomed to it. (Joseph Ratzinger, *Introduction To Christianity*, Ignatius Press 2004 [Communio Books, 1969], 237)

²⁹ Not to go too far afield, but in Balthasar’s *Dare We Hope*, he makes a weighted distinction (that he insists he does not make because, or course, *aufheben* preserves as it negates) between Christ’s post-resurrection Revelation and His pre-resurrection Revelation that is weighted in favor of the post. While not fully worked out, and hence consigned to a footnote, it’s hard not to notice the dialectical outline that places Christ’s Resurrection as the crucible of negation. From *Dare We Hope*: “Before approaching particular texts, it is necessary to consider the fact that particular words of Jesus can be attributed with a high degree of probability to the pre-Easter Jesus, because in them he uses a language and images that were familiar to the Jews of that time (which does not mean, of course, that these texts, which have been preserved by the synoptic evangelists, are of lesser significance to us), whereas certain reflections by Paul and John clearly look back upon all that happened to Jesus—to his life, death on the Cross and Resurrection - and, in so doing, consider and formulate this totality from a post-Easter perspective.” (Hans Urs Von Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, Ignatius Press, 1988, 18.)

³⁰ Let no one deceive you in any way; for that day will not come, unless the rebellion comes first, and the man of lawlessness is revealed, the son of perdition, who opposes and exalts himself against every so-called god or object of worship, so that he takes his seat in the temple of God, proclaiming himself to be God. (2 Thessalonians 2:3-4)

That the clergy in America does not have the <<fill in the space>> to tell Cardinal Wuerl (and others, many others, quite possibly most) to get out cannot but cause the faithful to faithfully ponder the lack of discernment, the lack of moral and spiritual courage, that raises genuine questions concerning the quality of faith. There's a reason Maccabees in the *Bible*. It begins! The hammer is coming down! Rejoice, it's the 101st year. *GET OUT!*

[You really can't make this up \(think Marcuse's Negative Tolerance\)](#)

"The Pope has a bigger agenda. He's got to get on with other things, of talking about the environment and protecting migrants and carrying on the work of the Church. We're not going to go down a rabbit hole on this." [Cardinal Blase Cupich](#), August 28, 2018.

Abusus non tollit usum