

Section II: Coronation

“But unto you that fear my name the Sun of justice shall arise, and health in his wings: and you shall go forth and shall leap like calves of the herd.”

— Malachi 4:2, DRV

“And it shall come to pass afterward that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy: your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions.”

— Joel 2:28, DRV

“And he shall judge the nations and rebuke many people: and they shall turn their swords into ploughshares and their spears into sickles. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation: neither shall they be exercised any more to war.”

— Isaiah 2:4, DRV

Chapter Eighteen

Monday, June 22, 2015.

Cyberspace. Initial Aftermath of the Consecration.

When twenty-four hours had passed after the Sunday evening consecration, the world news media presented a formal tally, in election-night style with maps and charts, of which Cardinals and bishops participated in the consecration and which ones did not. The only unknown was whether any Cardinals or bishops had appeared to participate, while refusing to pray the consecration formula correctly.

That question would take several weeks of tedious Vatican analysis to answer, but it would potentially affect at most a very small number. All told, the media reported that exactly one-third of the Catholic Cardinals, and exactly one-third of the Catholic bishops, had refused to participate in the consecration ceremony.

Pundits immediately began claiming that this proved the Pope had lost control of the Church, and that the days of a Pope acting like a monarch were definitively over. They said that since democracy was practiced almost everywhere else, it was high time for the Church to get in step with the times and officially become the openly democratic institution that she had been, in fact and to a large extent, ever since the revolution that followed Vatican II.

Media interviews with bishops who participated in the consecration were routinely favorable to the Holy Father, and respectful of papal authority. Many admitted harboring serious doubts about whether the consecration would have any observable effect on Russia anytime soon, but it was a nice prayer and it seemed to them that it can never hurt to ask Heaven for something good.

In contrast, interviews with Cardinals and bishops who had refused to participate were consistently critical of the Pope, and reflected a certain anger and resentment. When asked if they considered themselves excommunicated, many indicated that they did not, since they no longer considered that the Pope alone could “kick people out of the Church.”

They said that would have to be a collegial decision in consultation with their local conference of bishops, and most of them did not think their brother bishops would go along with their formal expulsion. Interviews of this sort persisted through Wednesday evening.

But by Thursday, news reports began to surface of numerous bishops being evicted from their diocesan centers by their newly appointed replacements. To the horror of the mainstream media, Pope Nicholas appeared to be selecting as new bishops a group of mostly-young parish priests who had become known in their respective dioceses for their liturgical “regressiveness.”

A good many of them were described as being “paleo-conservatives” whose practice was to offer almost exclusively the “formerly forbidden” Tridentine Mass. The remainder were accused of “turning their back on

the people” and “obscuring the meaning of the liturgy with unintelligible old Latin.” These were priests who had established a preference for offering the *novus ordo* Mass in Latin, at the old high altar *ad orientum* – in other words, precisely the way the new Mass had been intended when it was originally promulgated.

In many cases, these holy priests who were being made the new bishops were well known to their predecessors, because they had been routinely called down to their diocesan headquarters to be threatened or disciplined for their incorrigibility as traditionalists.

Quite interesting was a widely-repeated broadcast of an interview with Patriarch Filaret III of Moscow. He indicated that, as far as the Russian Orthodox Church was concerned, many of the Catholic bishops who had excommunicated themselves on Sunday night had been the major obstacles to any consideration of a formal reunion with Rome. The Orthodox Church had been concerned with the preservation of liturgical traditions going back hundreds of years, having preserved such treasures as the Mass of Saint John Chrysostom.

The Orthodox Mass was said in Old Slavonic, a liturgical language that, like Latin, was “dead” and therefore no longer susceptible to change over time. Because of their unspoiled liturgical traditions, the Orthodox bishops had dreaded any affiliation with the likes of wacko modernist Catholic bishops who promoted weird and experimental liturgical practices which were insulting to the dignity of Christ’s Church, and who ripped out magnificent artistic treasures in order to turn their once-holy cathedrals into bland modern “worship spaces.”

Such extreme disorder and dysfunction in the post-conciliar Catholic Church had long horrified the Orthodox bishops. But now, with these ‘bad apple’ bishops being rapidly replaced by young, tradition-oriented new bishops, it seemed clear that a new springtime of cooperation and unity was suddenly possible.

Patriarch Filaret even suggested that Russia had once been Roman Catholic, from the years 988 until 1054, when the Great Schism had tragically occurred. To be in schism from the Pope of Rome was a great error, and, if such a consecration could in fact heal the schism between East and West, then what harm could there possibly be in such a miracle from Heaven?