



## Who Would Have Thought!?

There are many reasons for Vatican II Catholics to be encouraged!

Who in **1957** when Pius XII was still pope would have thought that in 1965 the Catholic Church would have *totally reversed* Pope Pius IX who just a century before condemned religious freedom as “madness” (*deliramentum*)!?

Who would have thought in **1960** that in 2008 a woman and a black would have been vying for President of the United States!?

Who, indeed, in **1988** would have thought in 1990 the mighty Soviet Union and all its satellites would be no more!?

In the ancient language of the Western Church, ***ab esse, ad posse***: If it happened, it’s possible!

Let us not be discouraged. Let us learn from history both as what to do, but most of all what *not* to do.

Many of our most critical-thinking sisters and brothers have chosen to join other churches or, indeed, other religions. Many others have simply drifted away from religious life altogether in discouragement. Yet others have formed Catholic communities alongside the “regular” Church.

Principle: Each person *must* follow her/his conscience.

However, we should learn from history that none of the above kinds of moves will substantially change the main Catholic Church.

Personal example: Father Charles Davis was as perceptive and influential a Vatican II Catholic theologian in 1967 as were Karl Rahner, Edward Schillebeeckx, and Hans Küng. In the wake of Pope Paul VI’s disastrous 1968 encyclical *Humanae vitae* on birth control, Davis left the priesthood and the Catholic Church in protest. No one inside the Catholic Church even remembers him today, while Rahner, Schillebeeckx, and Küng are still read and studied as theological forces to be reckoned with inside Catholicism in 2008.

Perhaps in a few years we Vatican II Catholics will be able to write: Who in 2008 would have thought....!?

Leonard Swidler  
President

## *Vatican II: a Sociological Analysis of Religious Change* by Melissa Wilde

It is with great, if humble, glee that I devote the second *ARCC Light* book review in a row to one of my favorite pastimes – debunking. In the last issue, thanks to Bill D’Antonio and his fine team’s work, we discovered that Americans have not really left the Church in droves, have not given up on the Church, and have resisted the hierarchy’s attempt to get them to turn off their God-given brains and “just trust us.”

Now, thanks to the solid work of another sociologist, building on the research of a colleague at Vatican II, we are going to examine another well-known “fact:” the bishops at Vatican II were educated and directed by a small group of theologians who gained control of the Council and ran with it. **WRONG!** The bishops worked their own way through Vatican II, thank you very much, and broke some pretty impressive ground in the process.

*Vatican II: A Sociological Analysis of Religious Change* by Melissa J. Wilde (Princeton, 2007) was originally, like many ground-breaking books, a doctoral dissertation. Wilde’s goal, quite simply, is to find out who at Vatican II wanted what and why? Who voted how and why? Or, as she puts it more formally in her introduction, “. . . to take the rich and complex history of the Council, and re-examine it through a sociological lens – to discover the factors that explain its outcome and in doing so, identify the factors that determine religious change more generally.” (2)

This might sound pretty dry and academic and, frankly, the rather heavy doses of sociological theory all through the book might make it unpalatable for some. But, there are many gems hidden in this field – historical information on what really happened during those four momentous sessions in Rome and valuable insights on how to advance progressive reforms in the home of reaction – Rome.

First, a word on sources. Dr. Wilde has done her homework, combing through all the literature on Vatican II and depending heavily, as we all do, on the magisterial five-volume *History of Vatican II* by Alberigo and Komonchak (Orbis, 1995-2006) for a basic factual outline and corrective. But she also uses a valuable original source that has not been used before. Rocco Caporale, SJ was a brilliant young sociologist and doctoral candidate at Columbia University in the early 1960s (who also taught part/time at Manhattanville College when I was there!). As part of his doctoral dissertation he conducted interviews (in 9 languages) with almost 90 of the most important bishops and theologians at the Council during the First and Second Sessions, taking meticulous notes that included not only what the interviewee said but also Caporale’s impressions and evaluation of his subject. Dr. Caporale published a slim volume entitled *Vatican II: Last of the Councils* (Helicon, 1964) with some general impressions of the group dynamics of the bishops in Rome which is quite interesting, but, to my knowledge, his full dissertation has not been published. Indeed, it was Joseph Komonchak who brought the very existence of these interview notes to the attention of Ms. Wilde. Caporale’s extensive notes and his observations could thus be cross-referenced with the votes from the Vatican’s Secret Archives, notes from meetings of Domus Mariae, and various archival collections.

Dr. Wilde obviously doesn’t even try to discuss or analyze the entire Council or all its decrees. She begins by attempting to characterize the attitudes towards reform,

ecumenism and collegiality of the broad geographic blocks of bishops and then she tests her characterizations in 3 crucial matters: the Declaration on Religious Freedom, the fight over a separate decree on the Virgin Mary, and failure to liberalize the Church's stand on birth control.

Over 40 percent of the bishops at Vatican II were European but there were two very different Europes. The bishops of Italy, Spain, Portugal and Ireland, countries with 20 percent of the Council's votes, came from what Wilde characterizes as monopolistic religious environments. They were very conservative and wanted to protect the status quo. They also had many members and allies in the Curia. The bishops of Northern Europe and North America, 25 percent of the total, who were from politically and religiously stable countries, were progressive and economically-minded. Wiley sees the Latin American bishops, 22 percent of the whole, as progressive though not ecumenical, due to the challenges of evangelical Protestants to the Catholic monopolies in South America. Finally, the "Mission Church" in Asia and Africa, who also held 22 percent of the votes, was progressive and ecumenical. "Thus," says Wilde, "there were four distinct groups of bishops at the Council, three of which were open to reform, but each with its own interests and priorities: ...." (38)

Wilde demonstrates how important she considers the Declaration on Religious Freedom, *Dignitatis Humanae*, by making it the main "case study" whose votes, development and meaning are centerpieces of her book. In discussing this revolutionary change in the outlook of the Catholic Church – from "we are the true faith" to "everyone must have the freedom to find religious truth" with its implication that non-Catholic religions are real, valid and salutary – Wiley briefly traces the development of the ecumenical movement and concludes that secure, progressive bishops do listen to the legitimate arguments of other religious leaders and see all intellectual legitimacy as one – Catholic or Protestant. Ironically, the Eastern/Communist block bishops also wanted a statement on religious freedom to give them leverage against their own governments.

But these are broad, simple answers. How does one coordinate an overwhelming majority of over 2500 Bishops to hound a Declaration?

As Ms. Wilde puts it:

... progressives built a far more extensive and flexible organization than their conservative counterparts, they were more successful at developing compromise positions that the vast majority of bishops could support. These organizational differences derived from different cultural understandings of the nature of authority in the Roman Catholic Church. Progressives believed in the doctrine of "collegiality," which, in essence stated that the bishops, when convened as a Council, are as infallible as the pope – a doctrine that conservatives saw as threatening his authority and primacy. Consequently, while progressives built a highly-effective, consensus-based, organization as soon as the Council began, conservatives were very much slower to mobilize, and when they did so, formed a hierarchical organization which never developed into much more than a letter-writing campaign to the Pope. (57)

Most people know the story of how the French Cardinal Lienart, seconded by German Cardinal Frings, stopped the Curial steamroller on the first day of the Council by

speaking for the postponement of a vote to re-elect the conservative members of the preconconciliar commissions that had drawn up the "Vatican business as usual" schemas. (18) Lienart then asked the Council of Presidents to entrust the task of drawing up lists of nominees to the commissions to the Episcopal Conferences (EPs). (19) The next step in the progressives' plan to counteract the overwhelming power of the Curia and to propagate their ideas among over 2,500 bishops who did not know each other, was the formation of the *Domus Mariae* group. This was the brainchild of the French bishops led by Lienart, and the Latin American bishops of CELAM, led by Helder Camara and Manuel Larrain.

Wilde describes the plan thus:

Together they decided to create an international group of bishops representing their ECs that would meet regularly to discuss Council procedures and proceedings, develop positions which could be supported by the majority of bishops, and strategize about ways they could bring their ideas to fruition. Their group, ... came to be named after the hotel where they met weekly, the *Domus Mariae* (House of Mary, DM hereafter), and quickly became a key part of the progressive organization and ultimate progressive outcome of the Council. (19)

The DM core group consisted of 22 leaders of Episcopal Conferences, including CELAM (Latin America) and FACE (Africa). After their weekly meetings, these 22 immediately conveyed the content, ideas and suggestions from the meeting to their conferences, which met once or twice a week. The 22 would each then convey the reactions, opinions and suggestions of their conferences back to the DM group at the following meeting, and the DM would incorporate that feedback into revised versions of whatever they were drafting or discussing. To quote Wilde:

The DM's wheel-like organizational structure allowed them to quickly and efficiently gain consensus about their agenda and strategies in a small group of twenty-two, and convey that information to more than nineteen hundred, or almost three-quarters of the bishops, within a week. In their next meeting, the DM could get feedback from each EC representative and tailor their strategies accordingly. (65)

These bishops believed deeply in communication and consensus-building as part and parcel of their collegiality - they saw all three as holy. "In effect, they decided to build a "participatory democracy" within the hierarchical and nondemocratic structure of the Church." (63) Further,

The DM benefitted not only from its relationship to individual episcopal conferences, but also from strong links between episcopal conferences. ... Communication between the DM and the ECs lasted throughout the four Council sessions. ... This collegial consensus-building within the ECs allowed the DM to develop compromise positions that they could be relatively sure would be supported by the diverse episcopates they represented. (66-67)

It is important to note, however, that the DM kept a low public profile, and never referred to itself publicly as an entity. What Wilde calls its "semi-marginality" allowed it to function more effectively.

By the Second Session of the Council, a few conservative bishops, including Marcel Lefebvre and

Luigi Carli, "... began corresponding with each other and with their personal theologians with the intention of slowing down, if not stopping, the progressive momentum of the Council." (69) By the Third Session, an organization was formed called the Coetus Internationalis Patrum, International Group of Fathers or CIP but, as Wilde describes it in her subtitle to this chapter, it was "Anticollegial, Suspicious of ECs, and Isolated." (70) The theology of the conservatives, their absolute belief in hierarchy, dogmatic immutability, the power of the individual bishops in their sees and the Papacy over all, meant that they didn't try to build consensus by communicating with bishops who might disagree: they mainly spoke to one another and wrote petitions to the Pope. But, they had many allies within the Curia, so they were patient.

The second half of Wilde's book focuses on her three case studies, which really cannot be discussed properly in a review. Like the rest of *Vatican II*, these chapters show careful work and attention to detail. Finally, her appendices and notes are especially interesting and useful, complementing the text.

This book is a very valuable addition to our understanding of Vatican II, in no small measure because of the remarkable interviews of Rocco Caporale. It is unfortunate that they were not used sooner. Now that they are publicly available at Catholic University of America's Vatican II Archive, they will hopefully be used more widely. This is not meant to detract from Melissa Wilde's great work. She has triaged a tremendous amount of material and made it accessible and understandable. Some may find this book a bit daunting in its ongoing attempt to classify events and maneuvers at the Council with classical sociological theory, and some readers of my generation, who lived through the events in question and the pontificates of John XXIII and Paul VI, may quibble with some of her interpretations of their actions and positions, but if one perseveres, this book is fascinating and a goldmine. Its greatest contribution to the literature on Vatican II is, as Andrew Greeley says in the part of his review quoted on the back of the volume "Wilde has written the first serious sociological study of the dynamics of the Second Vatican Council. The men who organized the 'progressive' faction were not, as is often claimed, theologians who were manipulating bishops, but bishops from the countries where the church was engaged

with modernity, ... They were great men who accomplished great deeds."

Christine M. Roussel

## Editorial

We are now almost two full years into the papacy of Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, a/k/a/ Benedict XVI, and we are seeing his true colors more and more, almost day by day.

I must be honest: when I learned Ratzinger had been elected Pope, after almost 27 years of John Paul II, I felt as if I had been punched in the stomach. Then, since I still believe in God/de and that S/He cares about Jesus' woebegotten church, I tried very hard to look at things positively. Surely, Pope Ratzinger's education and erudition would provide some safeguards? Surely, JPII had subjected us to enough whittling down of the legacy of Vatican II? Surely, Benedict's removal of papal protection of the notorious pedophile founder of the Legionnaires of Christ was a sign of greater honesty from the Vatican. Surely, this smiling little man who joked that his would not be a long papacy had mellowed from the Enforcer of the previous reign. Right? Wrong!

One should always give a new pope the benefit of the doubt, a chance to show his best before criticizing him too strongly, but I don't think we should let such good intentions blind us to the absolutely dizzying power that canon law and Catholic passivity have given to the pope. Having absolute power to set everything "right" is a dream as old as humankind. It is an especially tempting dream to a devout, rigid, authoritarian, book-loving but temperamentally timid cleric who fears the world around him has gone mad. Ratzinger/Pope Benedict XVI is such a man.

This reading of BXVI, past and present, is not necessarily as far-fetched as it seems. Ratzinger was born in a lower-middle class, religious family (the 2 sons became priests and their sister became their housekeeper) in a small village in Bavaria. He entered the seminary at 12, but his seminary was closed when the war required resources and draftees. He was a very reluctant Hitler Youth for two years and when he was drafted into the army, he claimed he never loaded his gun and soon deserted his unit for home. Ratzinger went back to his

## **A REVOLUTION IS COMING!!!**

**Don't miss it !!!**

**Hear the Bishop all Australia is talking about**

**Geoffrey Robinson, Author of *Confronting Power and Sex in the Catholic Church: Reclaiming the Spirit of Jesus***

**will speak at Temple University  
Friday, May 16th at 7:30 pm**

**Then Saturday join six renowned Catholic writers for an all-day conference exploring the ramifications of this eye-opening book and the future of the American Catholic church.**

**SPONSORED  
BY ARCC AND UOTF**

seminary in the Fall of 1945 and was ordained in 1951. Ratzinger's world was home, religion and study. When the Nazis upset that world, he tried hard to avoid them, and then he ran for home, for his familiar world. This is a pattern I see repeated all through his life.

John Allen, Ratzinger's biographer, describes these years charitably but then adds a telling summary of his view of the National Socialism episode: "...Ratzinger understands the twelve years of the Third Reich as a trial by fire for the Catholic church, in which the church was triumphantly vindicated." (23) This is consistent with Allen's analysis of the mature Cardinal: "Having seen fascism in action, Ratzinger today believes that the best antidote to political totalitarianism is ecclesial totalitarianism." (3) Rather frightening but probably fairly accurate on the whole.

It's well-known that Ratzinger was Cardinal Joseph Frings' *peritus* at Vatican II, and some Catholics think this means he was a liberal young reformer. Vatican II was doubtless an exciting forum for an ambitious 35 year old theologian, but it is crucial for an understanding of Ratzinger to keep in mind that his Vatican II was the early council, with its emphasis on *ressourcement*, a return to the sources of Catholicism. The mature Council's liberalism, culminating in *Gaudium et Spes*, frightened him and he fought it in word and print.

However, Ratzinger also happily furthered his academic career, progressing from Bonn to Münster to Tübingen during and immediately after the Council, bringing personal good out of seeming professional backpedalling. Ironically, the last move, to Tübingen, was largely due to the good offices of Hans Küng. But these were the turbulent '60s. Küng was not afraid of lively give and take with his students and colleagues, but Ratzinger was. The student unrest and increasing radicalization of his fellow faculty in 1968 disturbed him to the point that, in 1969 he left Tübingen, the most prestigious and erudite university in Germany, and went to Regensburg, a new university he had just helped establish to create a new generation of docile, orthodox theologians. Once again, when his beliefs and now his authority were challenged, rather than dialoguing, he ran to what was secure and controllable.

The Vatican, and especially Pope John Paul II, continued to favor Ratzinger and he gave them loyal service, including rallying the German bishops around JP II's decision to strip Hans Kung, his former friend and benefactor, of the right to teach as a recognized Catholic theologian. Ratzinger also began the attack on liberation theology and its theologians which he continued through the 1980s. Thus, when John Paul named Cardinal Ratzinger head of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in 1981, Ratzinger was a known entity - a rock-solid, ultra-Catholic, brilliant, hard-working, and single-minded, perhaps even ruthless, defender of his vision of the Church - which coincided with John Paul's vision quite well.

I'm sure I'm not the only Catholic observer who has wondered increasingly over these past few years if Ratzinger was not, in fact, the "brains" behind the Wojtyla papacy. Karol Wojtyla was certainly very intellectually gifted but the extent of his intellectual achievements has just as certainly been inflated by his admirers, the authors of the legend of "John Paul the Great." This supposed genius failed to receive a doctorate in Rome and had to return to his Poland

to secure it. He was allowed to travel freely outside Poland cultivating contacts during a period when no one who did not supply information to the Communist Secret Police ever received permission to travel, and he is said to have - humbly - brought a recent EKG to the second 1978 conclave to demonstrate that he wouldn't die within a month like Luciani! One cannot deny that Wojtyla and Ratzinger made an excellent team, allowing John Paul II to lyrically proclaim at the Wailing Wall

"We are deeply saddened by the behaviour of those who in the course of history have caused these children of yours to suffer and, asking your forgiveness, we wish to commit ourselves to genuine brotherhood with the people of the covenant."

Ratzinger railed, "The Church's constant missionary proclamation is endangered today by relativistic theories which seek to justify religious pluralism," (*Dominus Iesus*). Although Wojtyla and Ratzinger were similar in many ways - arrogant, narrow Catholics, authoritarian, intolerant, convinced of their absolute rightness, xenophobic - there were differences between them. Wojtyla was slightly less pedestrian than Ratzinger, had a bit more of the Romantic and the dreamer, a bit more vision and empathy for the suffering, especially as he weakened and suffered toward the end of his life. He lived a bit more by emotion, and so, whether he realized it or not, having an absolutely implacable "Enforcer" allowed Wojtyla to give rein to his more "liberal" side, especially toward the Jews and the "Separated Brethren," without worrying that the Church would be weakened while he focused on that. And so during the JP II Papacy, we have him announcing that the subject of women priests is closed - it may not even be discussed, and Ratzinger chiming in with "And that's infallible." Wojtyla the Bishop may have signed *Gaudium et Spes* at the Council but Ratzinger the Enforcer distorts that same document to justify *Dominus Iesus*. And on and on.

This raises a small but fascinating question: was Ratzinger John Paul's designated successor? Some months before the Conclave, at least one elector voiced to John Allen the thought that Ratzinger was probably best suited to the job, and Allen is convinced many others had the same opinion. The massive demonstrations of grief at the death of John Paul II, and the very carefully staged "santo subito" manifestations doubtless had an effect on the Electors, convincing them that they had better find someone associated with John Paul who would continue his policies. After almost twenty-five years of faithful collaboration, Ratzinger certainly fit that bill. He was intelligent, experienced, he had been present at the great events of his time, he was the great hope of the anti-Vatican II factions everywhere, and was expected to continue the reversal of the reforms of that Council. As pointed out in Ingrid Shafer's essay, "The Genie is Out of the Bottle," in the July 2007 issue of *ARCC Light*, as soon as it became likely that Ratzinger would be the next pope, restorationist groups began to prepare for the liturgical and other changes they knew he would make. It is not unlikely that this process began even before the death of the Pope.

One finds startling substantiation for this view in a fascinating letter from Cardinal Ratzinger to Dr. Heinz-Lothar Barth, dated June 23, 2003, which was recently

posted on the site of Prof. Joseph O'Leary of Sophia University, Tokyo. It reads in relevant part:

To Dr. Heinz-Lothar Barth, 23 June 2003

Dear Dr. Barth,

...You are asking me to act for a broader availability of the old Roman rite. Actually, you know yourself that I have no deaf ears towards such a request. My work on behalf of this cause is meanwhile generally known.

Whether the Holy See will "admit the old rite again for every place and without restrictions" as you desire and have heard it rumored cannot be simply answered or confirmed without further ado. Still too great is the aversion of many Catholics, instilled in them over many years, against the traditional liturgy which they scornfully call "preconciliar". Also one would have to reckon with considerable resistance on the part of many bishops against a general readmission.

Things look different, however, if one thinks about a limited readmission. The demand for the old liturgy is limited, too. I know that its worth, of course, does not depend upon the demand for it, but the question of the number of interested priests and laypeople, nevertheless, plays a certain role. Besides, such a measure can now, only some 30 years after the liturgy reform of Paul VI, be implemented only stepwise. Any new hurry would surely not be a good thing.

I believe, though, that in the long term the Roman Church must have again a single Roman rite. The existence of two official rites is for bishops and priests difficult to "manage" in practice. The Roman rite of the future should be a single rite, celebrated in Latin or in the vernacular, but standing completely in the tradition of the rite that has been handed down. It could take up some new elements which have proven themselves, like new feasts, some new prefaces in the Mass, an expanded lectionary – more choice than earlier, but not too much, – an "oratio fidelium", i.e., a fixed litany of intercessions following the Oremus before the offertory where it had its place earlier.

Dear Dr. Barth, if you commit yourself to work for the cause of the liturgy in this way, you will surely not stand alone, and you will prepare "public opinion in the Church" for eventual measures in favor of an expanded use of the earlier liturgical books. One should be cautious, however, about awakening too high or maximum expectations among the traditional faithful. ...

With delight I give you the blessing you have asked and remain sincerely yours

Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger  
([http://josephsoleary.typepad.com/my\\_weblog](http://josephsoleary.typepad.com/my_weblog))

One could not ask for a better explanation of the liturgical edicts of the past year. They are not meant to lure the Society of Pius X back into the Church, although certainly Benedict would like to reunite these traditionalists so close to his heart to the Church. They are meant to bring Catholic liturgy back to Benedict's comfort level. Pope Ratzinger is running absolutely true to form: he dislikes modern music

and loves old sacred music: now, therefore, the Church "discourages" the use of modern music and establishes a special Curial department to make sure it is not used. Pope Ratzinger loves the Tridentine Mass: now, therefore, a pastor may not refuse the Tridentine Mass to a "stable" (but no mention of how large or small) group that requests it. No bishop's permission is needed and those refused will be heard in Rome. The next step, presumably, will be the "Roman rite of the future" mentioned in Cardinal Ratzinger's letter, which sounds very much like the Tridentine Mass with a slightly larger lectionary and a few new prefaces. Even if Ratzinger's jocular line on being elected – "this won't be a long pontificate" – proves true, he is trying to assure the continuation of his version of Catholicism in the next reign or two by regularly appointing Cardinals to keep the Electoral College at its maximum number of 120. He has already named 1/4 of the College in just two years!

These liturgical reversions are perfectly in keeping with Benedict's theology. So was one of his Curial cardinals suggesting recently that tabernacles be moved back to the center of churches. So was his saying some of the proper prayers at Christmas Mass in Rome in Latin rather than understandable Italian. So was his recently saying Mass for the Vatican's staff in the Sistine Chapel with his back to the congregation. Pope Ratzinger certainly sees the priesthood as cultic, separate from the "faithful," uniquely enabled to offer worship to God, but it is deeper than that: as early as 1968, in an article on the Early Fathers of the Church, he described the core of Catholicism as "episcopal, sacramental, and liturgical." (Allen, 98) His view had not changed in 1979, when he defended the silencing of Kung in a homily saying "The Christian believer is a simple person: bishops should protect the faith of these little people against the power of intellectuals." (Allen, 130) Ratzinger has always seen cultural relativism as the greatest danger to the faith. Something is either true or not: relativism puts that into doubt and is especially dangerous when combined with appealing Eastern philosophies. As Allen puts it very astutely: "Rooted in an Augustinian/ Bonaventurian outlook, Ratzinger has always stressed the critical distance that must separate the church from the culture." (Allen, 90) So, Pope Ratzinger is not 'The Servant of the Servants of God' to use one of the oldest titles of the Pope: he is the Fuhrer, because ecclesial totalitarianism is safe.

It is safe and it is what Ratzinger feels comfortable with – and that's what this papacy is all about. Ratzinger is determined to use all the power of the papacy to set the Catholic world aright, to re-evangelize it, meaning correct it from Vatican II and modernism. The Church will return to the simple, obedient, trusting body it always was. People, especially intellectuals, will conform or leave. It will be a smaller, purer Church, more true to the strict message of God's love – or else.

Unfortunately, Ratzinger's theology was already passed in the 1930s when he first learned it. The age of the infantilized Catholic laity is past; the day of the deified clergy is past, except in the factories cranking out Legionnaires and OD'ers; the day of loving Fascisti popes is over - their death-knell was the eighteenth-century Enlightenment.

In a way, the most symbolic expression of this papacy's mind-set is the recent comment by a Curial minion that respect for the sacred started to diminish when Communion began to be given in the hand and so a solution would be to once again give it on the tongue. Only a priest is holy enough to touch the sacred species. What about the priesthood of all believers taught by Vatican II? The truth is Ratzinger & Co. never accepted it and now he is using the biggest religious bully-pulpit in the world, the Papacy, to remove the traces of Vatican II, bit by bit by bit. One of the Medici popes is reputed to have said "Since it has pleased God to make us pope, let us enjoy it." Pope Ratzinger's variation on that might be "Since it has pleased God to make us pope, let us use it" - to undo all the liberal mistakes of the last forty years and restore the Church to its pristine purity. Those who don't like it can leave.

In Pope Benedict's imagined scenario, the bishops, priests, and laity meekly accept the will of his magisterium. That was barely true even in the late 1930s of his childhood in Bavaria. Now, it's well on its way to being only a memory. Sorry, Pope Ratzinger: your small, if vocal, groups of supporters notwithstanding, you are two centuries too late!

Christine M. Roussel

You can be an ARCCAngel and help us publish an issue of ARCC Light by making a \$500 donation. This can be done by an individual or a group, and it can be as a memorial or a tribute that will be acknowledged on this page. Please contact Bob Schutzius (rschutz1@prodigy.net) for details.

ARCC Light is published by the Association for the Rights of Catholics in the Church. For membership information, contact ARCC, 3150 Newgate Drive, Florissant, MO 63033, send email to [arcc@arccsites.org](mailto:arcc@arccsites.org), or visit our website, <http://arccsites.org/>. Suggested donations are \$25.00 per year. Editors: Christine M. Roussel, PhD, [rsvpcmr@juno.com](mailto:rsvpcmr@juno.com) Ingrid H. Shafer, PhD, Email: [ihs@ionet.net](mailto:ihs@ionet.net)

