

Condemnations by the "Holy Office"

In many personal libraries of theologians there are books of the famous theologians Henri de Lubac SJ and Yves Congar OP. The two became known as outstanding theologians and advisors to the Second Vatican Council. But whoever looks at their life story is shocked at how the Church through the "Holy Office" dealt with the two, - and discovers astonishing parallels to the way this authority and its representatives dealt with Father Joseph Kentenich.

29 December 2020 - Press Office Schoenstatt International

In the case of Henri de Lubac SJ (* 1896, † 1991, France), there was a condemnation "by mistake". His theological positions had come under suspicion in Rome of being modernist. When Pope Pius XII in 1950 in the encyclical "Humani generis" condemned "some erroneous views" which "threatened to undermine the foundations of the Catholic Church," this was referred to de Lubac by observers, although none of the accusations contained in the encyclical applied to his work. The Jesuit religious leadership was forced to ban him from teaching and publishing without informing him of what he was accused of. He was only "de facto" rehabilitated by his appointment as councilor.

Read more

Henri de Lubac SJ (*1896, † 1991, France).

His theological positions had come under suspicion in Rome of being modernist. When Pope Pius XII condemned in the 1950 encyclical "Humani generis" "some erroneous views" that "threatened to undermine the foundations of the Catholic Church," observers referred this to de Lubac, although none of the accusations contained in the encyclical applied to his work. It is also known that Pius XII read the works of Henri de Lubac.

In 1950, under pressure from the Holy Office, his religious leadership had to ban him from teaching and publishing, without informing him of what he was accused. At this stage he wrote a passionate reflection on the Church. He later said that there was not a single inquiry or discussion, a conversation with Roman authorities or his religious leadership. It was not until 1953 that he was allowed to return to his Lyon teaching position. His "rehabilitation" did not occur until 1960, when John XXIII appointed him advisor to the preparatory commission of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965).

In 1980, during an address in France, Pope John Paul II, spotting de Lubac among the audience, said, "I bow my head before Father de Lubac." In 1983, de Lubac was named a cardinal, and he died in 1991.

The Dominican friar Yves Congar OP (*1904, † 1995, France) had dealt in his theological publications with the Church as the People of God, with the role of the laity, with the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church, and with a dynamic understanding of tradition. These were themes that became important elements of the discussion at the Second Vatican Council. But before the Council they were absolute irritant topics, with which he had to come into contrast especially with Father Sebastian Tromp, who had worked out a completely different draft for the Constitution on the Church. Congar was sent into exile three times, first to Jerusalem, then to Rome, and to Cambridge. In his diary entries, he repeatedly compares the Holy Office to the police system of the Gestapo: "I am crushed, destroyed, betrayed, excluded from everything," he writes in despair. "I am dealing with a ruthless system, a system that

cannot correct or even acknowledge its injustices ..." His rehabilitation consisted in his appointment to the preparatory commission of the Council.

[Read more](#)

Yves Congar OP (* 1904, † 1995, France).

Dominican friar Yves Congar was a professor at the Order's own college in Le Saulchoir when the Holy Office banned the republication and any translation of his book, *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'Église* (True and False Reform in the Church). Important theological themes in Congar's work concern the church as the people of God, the role of the laity, the work of the Holy Spirit in the church, a dynamic understanding of tradition. In 1954 he was banned from teaching and had to leave France. He spent his first exile at the Bible Institute in Jerusalem. After being cited back to the Vatican, Rome became the second place of his exile. Strictest silence was kept about his conversations with the Holy Office. In 1955 he was allowed to return to France, but in the same year he was exiled a third time and moved to Cambridge. In 1956 he was allowed to return to the Strasbourg Dominican Convent.

In his diary entries, published after his death, it is clear what Congar suffered through. He compares the Holy Office several times to the Gestapo, speaking of a "Gestapo-like police system" acting in secret. The otherwise mild-mannered religious and no-nonsense academic paints a picture of a machinery that suppresses conscience, isolates or marginalizes free people, condemns creative spirits but, on the other hand, rewards mediocre personalities and "absolute nothings"; a system incapable of responding to the challenges of the new times and the expectations of the People of God. He writes:

"What strikes me most is the stupidity, the improbable poverty of intelligence and character. The system has produced servants in its image."

"I am shattered, destroyed, betrayed, excluded from everything," he writes in despair. "I am up against a ruthless system, a system that cannot correct or even acknowledge its injustices ..."

Pope John XXIII appointed Congar as consultor of the Council's Theological Preparatory Commission on July 20, 1960. This was his rehabilitation.

Among those condemned at that time were also theologians and priests such as Padre Pio (*1887, † 1968), who was later canonized, the Italian Don Primo Mazzolari (1890-1959), who campaigned for peace and justice, and the German canon lawyer Joseph Klein (1896-1976), who questioned the legal system of the church, advocated a church of "free followership" and wanted to see greater emphasis placed on freedom of conscience.

Particularly suspicious to the "Holy Office" in the first half of the 20th century appeared the connection between theology and psychology, especially depth psychology and all related questions with regard to human sexuality. Thus, Dr. Anna A. A. Terruwe (* 1911, † 2004), a Catholic psychiatrist from the Netherlands, also came into focus. She discovered a so-called emotional deprivation disorder and its cure. Because she based her arguments on Thomas Aquinas, the Roman authorities did not hesitate to issue interdisciplinary condemnations and ban her from further treatment. She was received by the Pope in an official audience in 1969.

[Read more](#)

Dr. Anna A. A. Terruwe (*1911, †2004, Netherlands).

The Catholic psychiatrist combined in her approach the teachings of Thomas Aquinas on the passions with the findings of modern psychology and also treated priests and religious for difficulties and disorders in the area of sexuality.

Because of her work, she was subjected to years of nasty rumors, gossip campaigns and suspicions, especially from the church. Her repeated protests to the Vatican were met with continued silence. Father Sebastian Tromp, also from the Netherlands, contributed significantly to Terruwe's defamation. Her name was mentioned at conferences and in publications - even internationally - as an example of psychiatrists with harmful views.

Although Dutch moral theologians affirmed Terruwe as "orthodox in her teaching and cautious in practice" (the Dutch bishops sent the conclusion of this investigation to Rome), the Holy Office, after a visitation by Father Tromp (1955), published a monitum (an exhortation) criticizing psychotherapy and its use by Catholic physicians. The reference to Terruwe was abundantly clear. Accompanying the letter was a ban on male clergy from being treated by female psychiatrists. In the same year, Ms. Terruwe was banned from further treating patients by the Holy Office.

Firmly convinced that she had always acted in accordance with Catholic teaching, Terruwe decided in 1964 to publish "Opening of the Cases" for a small circle of participants and experts. In it, she presented her view of things. After several newspapers quoted extensively from it, there was a storm of criticism of the Roman Catholic Church's actions toward Terruwe and Duynstee. (Terruwe relied, among other things, on work by the Thomistic theologian Duynstee; the two had a similar concern and cooperated.)

The Dutch bishops, in particular Cardinal B. J. Alfrink, a good friend of Pope Paul VI, used their influence in Rome, as a result of which Terruwe was officially rehabilitated on April 10, 1965. In 1969 she was received by the Pope in official audience. She probably owed the official rehabilitation to the objection of the bishops of her country.

Anna Terruwe drew, among others, on the work of the Thomistic theologian Willem J. A. J. Duynstee (*1886, †1968, Netherlands). Both had a similar concern and cooperated. As with Anna Terruwe, Father Sebastian Tromp entered the scene. He considered Duynstee to be a modernist theologian.

[Read more](#)

W.J.A.J. Duynstee (*1886, †1968, Netherlands).

Because he supported the work of A. Terruwe, he was exiled to Rome. Duynstee was completely misjudged by Father Sebastian Tromp as a modernist theologian: he was a conservative theologian who strove to reconcile the tradition of Catholic doctrine with the modern findings of the human sciences and psychology.

Duynstee studied law in Amsterdam and received his doctorate in 1908. That same year he joined the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer (Order of the Redemptorists). He was one of the first Dutch scientists to apply the results of psychology and psychoanalysis to the field of pastoral care and to give corresponding impulses to moral theology.

In 1928 he became professor of criminal law, criminal procedure, and execution law at the University of Nijmegen, and in 1939 professor of criminal law and introduction to jurisprudence.

In the so-called Duynstee-Terruwe affair he came into conflict with the ecclesiastical authorities. He was cited to Rome, where he remained until 1960. Only after his rehabilitation in 1965 was he allowed to return to his Nijmegen monastery. He died in 1968.

When he was rehabilitated in 1965, it became apparent (even to church officials) that Father Tromp had been fundamentally mistaken.

Parallels to the case of Joseph Kentenich

In all the cases mentioned, one recognizes similarities to the approach of the "Holy Office" in dealing with Father Kentenich. The Causa Kentenich was therefore one among many that were treated in a comparable way by the Roman authority.

In contrast to the cases mentioned above, Father Kentenich's exile was unusually long and concerned not only a theological doctrine, but a worldwide and vital movement to which thousands of married couples and other lay people, priests and sisters belonged.

Father Kentenich's reaction to the action of the "Holy Office" seems interesting. It shows how love for the Church can be combined with intrepidity and frankness:

"That was so clear to me: you must now also give proof of how one remains frank in all circumstances, even toward the Holy Office, with all reverence, obedience (and) docility. When later the Cardinal of Cologne (Frings) fought the battle against Ottaviani, I codified then, and also communicated it: If the Cardinal of Cologne, if at all the entire episcopate, had been more outspoken towards the Holy Office or had become more outspoken, then a reform of the Holy Office would not have been necessary, then this fight before the public would not have been necessary either. I am just telling you this soberly so that you can see: There was always a very clear line. And always unwavering intrepidity."

Parallels between those condemned by the "Holy Office" were drawn by the German moral theologian Bernhard Häring in his book "My Experiences with the Church," published in 1989:

"I took an intimate part in the spiritual sufferings of my Dutch confrere Father W. Duynstee, a distinguished professor of the history of religion ... During a canonical visitation in Holland, he was struck by Father Tromp's lightning bolt: he was banished from Holland without any concrete reason being given to him or to the superiors. He lived through his banishment for several years in Sant' Alfonso [Rome] ... Tromp had not even spoken to Duynstee himself. ... Only in the time of preparation for the Council did Cardinal Alfrink and Father General [SJ] succeed in obtaining for him permission first to visit Holland (but not Nijmegen!) and later to return home. I can still remember how he asked me if the

further banishment from Nijmegen could have other reasons than the will of the Holy Office to be right after all.

A similar case that came to my attention was the banishment of Fr. Kentenich, the founder of the Schoenstatt Movement and flourishing congregations of Sisters. Fr. Tromp had banished him to the United States with strict orders to maintain no contact with his foundations. He obeyed in an exemplary manner. During the Council, Bishop Tenhumberg of Münster asked me to examine Fr. Kentenich's writings and manuscripts and to prepare an opinion for Pope Paul VI on them, which I did. I truly could not discover the slightest thing that could look like heresy. Paul VI ordered the full rehabilitation of Kentenich. The manner in which it took place again gave me much to think about."

Contributions to a more comprehensive picture in the Causa Kentenich.

In cooperation with various persons from the Schoenstatt Movement, topics are being worked on behalf of the General Presidium of the International Schoenstatt Work which concern Father Joseph Kentenich, the founder of the Movement, and which are currently in demand. This is done on the basis of the respective current state of knowledge, which results from the accessible documents and writings. The results of the research and conversations can be read in topic-related articles in each case. You are welcome to send your suggestions for topics for further articles to: mk@schoenstatt.de.

Schoenstatt International Press Office

The texts published below are the responsibility of the Media Commission (Sr. M. Cacilda Becker, International Coordination Office of the Schoenstatt Movement; Sr. Dr. M. Lisianne Braunbeck, General Administration Schoenstatt Sisters of Mary; Heinrich Brehm, PressOffice Schoenstatt; Michael Defrancesco, Schoenstatt Family Federation; Fr. Raúl Espina, General Administration of the Schoenstatt Fathers; Fr. Ludwig Güthlein, Director of the Schoenstatt Movement Germany; Dr. Gertrud Pollak, General Superior Women of Schoenstatt; Sr. M. Veronika Riechel, Schoenstatt Sisters of Mary; Fr. Heinrich Walter, International Coordination Office of the Schoenstatt Movement). They are produced by changing teams of authors (from the Media Commission and Prof. Dr. Hubertus Brantzen, Fr. Heinrich Hug, Prof. Dr. Joachim Söder, Sr. Dr. M. Nurit Stosiek) or by research contributions from individuals.