



Faced with Roman Proposals

Can we accept today a canonical recognition on the part of Rome Neo-modernist? – Doctrinal Study-

Saint Francis Convent – Morgon – 69910 Villié-Morgon

Translated by St. Elizabeth of Hungary

Preface

In the current turmoil and confusion, we must remain faithful to the authentic Catholic principles and remain rooted in them. And in order that they may truly be the light which enlightens and guides our steps, we must draw practical conclusions from them and apply them rigorously in our everyday life and in our daily attitudes.

Coherence and non-contradiction are the logical consequence of full and complete adherence to the truth.

As Cardinal Pie said, charity, which is the bond of perfection, must be dictated and regulated by truth, and it is in this spirit of charity that we wished to write these lines.

It is above all under the gaze of God that this work has been carried out, for it is to Him that we shall have to account for all our conduct; but it is also to make loyally known the basis of our thinking on the question of the Roman propositions.

Indeed, sharing for many years the same struggle as the other communities of the Tradition, we had at heart to make known to those closest to us how we perceive the current situation.

We hope, in any case, that it will be in this spirit of peace and understanding that this work will be received.

Deign to Our Lady, faithful Virgin and Queen of Peace, maintain between us the supernatural bonds which unite us in truth and charity in her divine Son, Jesus Christ, our King.

Fr. Antoine de Fleurance
Guardian of Saint Francis Convent

To Our Lords Lefebvre and Castro Mayer for the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of their recall to God, as a filial and grateful homage for all that we owe them.

General Introduction

The eventuality of a recognition of the works of Tradition by the present Pope is more and more often mentioned. Can we accept this offer? The answers to this question are very divergent.

On the one hand, we acknowledge that Archbishop Lefebvre had long sought canonical recognition with Rome at the time; if we refused, would it not be sedevacantism, at least practical, or even a schismatic attitude? On the other hand, today's situation is not the same as it was in 1988. There were good reasons for refusing the Roman proposals, but now would not this rejection be anachronistic? In recent times, especially during the Synod on the Family, we have seen very strong reactions of certain prelates towards the progressive line, something unimaginable a few years ago. Would we be at the beginning of a sane reaction?

Yet, did not Monsignor Lefebvre also assure that an agreement with a neo-modernist authority was impossible? Saying this, did he pour into sedevacantism? In the end, is the evolution of the situation in the Church in recent years such a change that it would make canonical recognition possible today?

Whatever the answer to these questions, their stakes are high: they pose a real moral problem.

Indeed, if the answer is that, henceforth, the situation has changed, a canonical solution would no longer put our faith in danger, there is no reason to refuse it; moreover, a refusal would expose us this time to a danger of schism.

If, on the contrary, the answer is that the peril for our faith is always present, then subjection to the Roman authorities exposes us to heresy.

Thus, schism or heresy: it is a question of eternal salvation.

In order to answer this moral problem, we will ask ourselves three questions.

The first one that comes naturally is this: has the situation in Rome not improved since 1988 (question 1)? Indeed, during all the time that separates us from the sacraments, we have never modified our conduct. If today we are considering a canonical solution, still unthinkable a few years ago, is it not that in Rome itself there have been significant changes?

All this brings us back to the foundations of what has been our conduct so far: can we accept a canonical recognition proposed by a neo-modernist authority (question 2)?

Finally, would a refusal of such a recognition not be sedevacantism, or even a schismatic attitude (question 3)?

After that, we can conclude by answering the question asked at the beginning of this study.

QUESTION 1: HAS THE SITUATION IN ROME NOT IMPROVED SINCE 1988?

Two questions arise here. First of all, has not the situation in Rome change? The first is to see whether, apart from us, things have changed, and to what extent. This will be the subject of the first two articles.

The second question will come quite naturally: hence has not the attitude of towards the faithful Catholics changed? We will answer that in the last two articles.

Article 1: Is There Not a Reawakening of The Conservators in Rome

I. Reasons in favor for a positive response

It seems that if the situation in Rome is very different from that in 1988.

FIRST REASON

In fact, the voice of the Conservatives is beginning to be heard. Certainly, we do not deny a certain aggravation of the crisis, both in faith and in morality. At the level of faith, the Pope had never gone so far in the destruction of all the bastions that remained standing: the indissolubility of marriage, the condemnation of homosexuality.

But, moreover, prelates began to speak very seriously of a doctrinal crisis in the Church. For example, Cardinal Burke speaks of a “disorientation” during the course of the Council and the emergence of post-conciliar reforms; he denounced the universal re-questioning, especially in liturgical matters¹.

Similarly, Monsignor Schneider says that the doctrinal crisis is at the root of the crisis of morality: “it is the doctrinal relativism from which moral and liturgical relativism flows. [...] We must first re-establish the clarity and firmness of the doctrine of faith and morals at all levels².”

SECOND REASON

As a result, Rome is divided. In the face of modernism galloping to the summits, not only do the prelates just see, but they react. True, the hierarchy is still progressing, but there is an internal restoration, similar to a movement which increases and escapes the hierarchy; and this movement, we can no longer stop it. This conservative wave is reinforced, if not in numbers, at least in intensity. It would seem that in France, 50% of the new seminarians aspire to the traditional Mass.

As an example of reaction, we can cite Monsignor Schneider, who described the last Synod as “Synod of adultery³”. In it there has been uttered “insolently and without blushing heresies or half-heresies⁴”. In addition, he denounced the manipulations carried out on that occasion. Already a few years ago, he demanded a syllabus on the mistakes of Vatican II.

And the conservative prelates realize that there is a problem in the conciliar magisterium; they defend the truth from Tradition. Is this not a profound change?

II. Notice to the contrary

Cardinal Burke was accused of being against the Second Vatican Council, following his opposition to the last Synod. Questioned by a journalist, the cardinal formally denounced this accusation, claiming that all his clerical formation had been made in the light of the Council. If, then, he reacted, it was not an attack on the principles of the Council.

On the other hand, a cardinal, disappointed by the criticisms made against the Synod's report, told the Pope. The latter replied with a mischievous smile: "Think again, for now I know my enemies⁵." The opposition does not seem to make him tremble.

Finally, Cardinal Sarah was appointed by Pope Francis himself to head the Congregation for Divine Worship⁶, on the 24th of November 2014. He is very conservative, "ratzingue-nothing", and is quite the opposite of the style of the present pope. It is because the latter is not more embarrassed than that by this diversity of sensibilities.

This division in Rome, moreover, is not new: "I am very afraid," said Monsignor Lefebvre, "that we should again fall into the same situation as before, because of the influences which are at play at Rome, because Rome is divided⁷."

III. Substantive Response

Two issues are raised by the foregoing reasons. First, that of the doctrine: is there really a substantial change in doctrine among the conservative prelates? Then, on a practical level: is there such a division in Rome that it has never existed since the Council, and which could lead to the collapse of the progressive camp⁸?

1) A substantial change in the doctrine?

The loss at Rome of the firmness of the doctrine, inaugurated by the Second Vatican Council, led to a multitude of tendencies and opinions. Nevertheless, so far, all members of the hierarchy agree on the Council itself, at least on its acceptance. Monsignor Lefebvre, summing up the situation, said that the stumbling block between them and us is the social kingship of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Consequently, we can really speak of a substantial change when we re-question the Council itself, and that we will begin to preach again of Christ the King. It is not that we should neglect, or even less, despise the healthy reactions, but we must appreciate them to their right extent.

Had the Conservative prelates really challenged the Council itself? Let's hear them talk.

2) A questioning of the post-councilar "magisterium"?

Cardinal Sarah, on the subject of the Synod: "I solemnly affirm that the Church of Africa will firmly oppose any rebellion against the teaching of Jesus and the Magisterium. How could a synod return on the constant, unified and thorough teaching of blessed Paul VI, Saint John Paul II and Benedict XVI? I place my trust in the fidelity of Francis⁹." This is the hermeneutic of continuity; we even have the impression that the magisterium begins with Paul VI. Why only name the conciliar

popes? What becomes of the encyclical *Casti Connubii* of Pius XI? Is it so old that it no longer deserves to be cited as a reference?

As for Monsignor Schneider: “It was the Second Vatican Council that broadened the understanding of the mystery of the Church according to the teaching of the Fathers of the Church by stating: The universal Church appears as a people that gets its unity from the unity of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost (*Lumen gentium*). Baptism, the true faith and visible communion with the successor of the apostle Peter are indispensable elements to be a true member of the Church¹⁰.” In short, it is still the hermeneutics of continuity. “Ecumenism,” he says again, “is necessary in order to be in contact with our separated brethren in order to love them. We can and should collaborate with serious non-Catholics to defend the revealed divine truth and the natural law created by God¹¹.” What a mixture! And before Vatican II, was there not missionary charity? ... since the prelate presents ecumenism as necessary.

What does he think of the Pope? “I thank God,” he said in the same interview, “that Pope Francis has not spoken in the way the mass media expects of him. He has so far presented in his public speeches a very fine doctrine. I hope that he will continue to teach the Catholic doctrine in a very clear way.”

But his statement about *Amoris lætitia* on the 30th of April 2016 is revealing. Of course, he rejects with great firmness the excesses concerning the attitude towards the divorced-remarried. But for him, it is a misinterpretation of this document by the bishops. Admittedly, he acknowledges that the text is ambiguous, “that certain assertions are difficult to interpret according to the traditional doctrine of the Church”, that all this “gives the impression that one assimilates, not in theory but in practice, a union of divorced persons with a valid marriage”. The references to the conciliar “magisterium” are constant: John Paul II, Benedict XVI, the Council itself, the Catechism of the Catholic Church (1992) and its Compendium. He speaks of “the perennial and infallible teaching of the Church [...] especially that confirmed by John Paul II in *Familiaris consortio* § 84 and by Pope Benedict XVI in *Sacramentum caritatis* § 29.

Cardinal Burke also reacted to *Amoris lætitia*. “The only key to the correct interpretation of *Amoris lætitia*,” he says, “is the constant teaching of the Church”: again, the hermeneutic of continuity. “How, then,” he continued, “must this document be received? Above all, it must be received with the deep respect due to the Roman Pontiff as Vicar of Christ, as defined by the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council: ‘The perpetual and visible principle and the foundation of the unity which binds them together is the bishops, or the multitude of the faithful’ (*Lumen gentium* 23).” The cardinal then specifies that any statement of the pope is not necessarily infallible, in which he is right. But it is evident that he holds the whole of the conciliar “magisterium” as an authentic magisterium; it is from this magisterium that it is said that it involves various degrees of authority entailing among the faithful different degrees of adhesion. However, in reality, the conciliar “magisterium” is not an authentic magisterium¹².

Here we are fixed on these prelates. Of course, once again, they are firm on the conclusions of Catholic morality. But is such firmness something truly new in the conciliar prelates?

3) Conservative prelates: a novelty?

As early as the Council itself, we perceive a tendency “diehard” and a moderate tendency among the innovators. Among these, we can cite Cardinal Daniélou and future Cardinal Ratzinger. In 1967, the latter founded the journal *Communio*, which was deemed unreasonable by Karl Rahner’s *Concilium*, judged excessively. Listen now to some of the conservatives of that time.

Cardinal Siri acknowledged that at the Council some had “the intention of bringing the Church to live to the Protestant without Tradition, without the supremacy of the pope. In view of the first goal, we put a lot of confusion. In view of the second, we tempt to make play the argument of the collegiality”. But the Cardinal then took the defense of the Council; according to him, he was “a great dyke against the principle of disaggregation”; he contents himself to challenge “the disturbing events of the post-conciliar period, where the bad habits of making personal ideas pass under the guise of the Council’s formulas.”

Cardinal Wyszyński, primate of Poland, denounces the postconciliar period; he speaks of a “Church whose creed has become elastic and relativistic morality; [...] a Church that closes its eyes before sin and fears the reproach of not being modern¹⁴.”

Even Cardinal Poletti, the Vicar of his Holiness for the city of Rome, at first enthusiastic for the conciliar reforms, wrote later: “In the years which followed the Council, it has produced in the Catholic Church [...] a strong doctrinal and pastoral confusion, which pushed a scholar above all suspicion [sic], like Karl Rahner, to speak of ‘crypto-heresy’ (heresy concealed). It is only too true that this climate engenders a deep disorientation among the faithful themselves¹⁵.” According to him, the cause of this disorder is the change of the ecclesiology: therefore, there is indeed a doctrinal cause.

Cardinal Oddi, known for his conservatism in 1983, in the United States, before an audience of eight hundred people, diagnosed a disintegration of the faith, citing all the dogmas that were then challenged in the seats of the churches and universities. But his conclusion is very disappointing: “The Church no longer inflicts pain. But she hopes to be able to convert the lost.¹⁶”

Finally, Cardinal Ratzinger himself spoke very loudly. “To the historicism of living Peters,” says Amerio, “Cardinal Ratzinger opposes the immutability of dogma. [...] Truths of faith are undoubtedly taught so that it becomes a practice and a life, but the proper object of the catechesis is knowledge and not directly the practice.¹⁷”

To conclude, these prelates go more or less far in their criticism of modern errors. But the common point is that no one goes so far as to question the Council itself. This is exactly what we see in the current conservatives. The difference that we can, however, note, is that these last may be more courageous. But the scope of their

criticisms will necessarily be circumscribed within the framework of the principles on which they are based¹⁸. To get out of this vicious circle, what is needed is to denounce the false principles of the Council¹⁹. Maybe they will one day. But we are not there, at this time. Between the two, there is more than a difference of degrees, it is a difference of nature, a difference of principles, and it is of size.

IV. Responses to objections

First: Prelates Recognize a Doctrinal Crisis

The essence of the answer has already been given in the body of the article. Note however that if Cardinal Burke speaks of disorientation, Cardinal Poletti already made this finding in 1984.

Second: Not Only Do These Prelates See Right, But They React Highly

We also think we have answered in the body of the article. note, however, to the subject of the expression “Synod of Adultery” by Monsignor Schneider that the full sentence should be quoted: “It can be affirmed that the Synod has in a certain sense proved to be in the eyes of public opinion a Synod of adultery, and not the Synod of the family.” The expressions which we emphasize considerably diminish the scope of the charge. “In the eyes of public opinion”: therefore, it is not the Synod itself which is that of adultery, but what the world has interpreted...

The prelate also denounces the “heresies and half-heresies” proposed then during this Synod. Cardinal Poletti already spoke of crypto-heresies about the post-conciliar pastoral ministry, as we have said above. Recognize, however, that Monsignor Schneider's reaction is stronger. As for the syllabus which he demanded, it was certainly not a syllabus on the errors of Vatican II, which he was careful not to attack, but on the errors spread in the Church after the Council.

As for the “wave of reaction” that is growing, the fact is undeniable. Interest in the traditional Mass increases; there is in many an aspiration to the sources. But there are two things to note: first of all, this reaction is inevitable. Indeed, the Revolution is satanic, against nature. We cannot indefinitely compress the natural aspirations. Moreover, divine grace continues to solicit souls, to attract them. Secondly, such a reaction is not new. Indeed, in England, Protestantism had imposed itself by shedding blood. After several centuries of persecution, in the 19th century, a wave of sympathy for Catholicism came into being: it was the Oxford movement. Many had converted. Fearing for the future of Anglicanism, Dr. Pusey, a fiercely anti-Catholic pastor, imagined “the theory of the three branches”, according to which the one Church of Christ would have three parts: Protestantism, “Orthodoxy” and the Catholic Church. There was therefore no need to return to the Catholic Church. But to satisfy the “just aspirations” of those who looked towards Rome, Catholic uses were instituted for them: rosary, procession of the “Blessed Sacrament²⁰”; “Benedictine” monasteries were even erected. It is what we call the High Church. This maneuver stopped the wave of conversions. Dr. Pusey had succeeded in stopping this fine movement, by enclosing it in false principles.

The application is very simple: one must judge of this wave according to the principles which guide it: if it is tolerated like a High Church within the established Church, she will not release from the framework of pluralism, and it is not from her that we must wait for the restoration. If those who lead it call into question false principles and publicly denounce them, their battle will be the right one; for the moment, this is not yet the case.

Let us conclude with a remark: that there are conservatives in Rome, this does not directly affect the direction of the Church, for it is not those we have quoted that hold the reins. Hence our following question:

ARTICLE 2: Is There Not Something That Has Changed Among Those Who Have the Reins of The Church?

I. Reasons for a positive response

It seems that though.

FIRST REASON

In fact, for the pope, what is important is to love Jesus; for him, the doctrine is not very important. Of course, we deplore this last fact. But, at last, the pope is like someone who would like everyone to be saved, that everyone should have access to God; for this he is ready to brave many affronts.

SECOND REASON

The modernists are fizzling out. Those who have made the Council and who have a visceral attachment to it disappear little by little. Moreover, they no longer have vocations. Therefore, they are obliged to take them into account in the government of the Church.

II. Notice to the contrary

On October 12, 2013, Bishop Fellay said in the United States: “The situation of the Church is a real catastrophe. And the actual Pope makes his condition 10,000 times worse. [...] Since the beginning of this pontificate, I say: ‘He cuts the strings [of the parachute], and he hangs a fuse [directed downwards].’ [...] If the present pope continues in where he began, he will divide the Church. He does everything to explode.”²¹

“We cannot have a precise idea at this stage,” he said on October 13, “but we do have something to be terrified. [...] We have in front of us a true modernist.”²²

III. Substantive Response

To find out if there has been a change, or even an improvement, in those who hold the reins, we must begin by examining the facts. Two people will hold our attention: first, the pope, who has the supreme power; then Cardinal Müller, who is supposed to be the “guardian of the faith”, and from whom, in addition, depends the Ecclesia Dei commission.

1) Pope Francis

The first contrast between Pope Francis and his predecessors is that the latter, however modernist they were, were aware of a crisis; Paul VI spoke of self-demolition of the Church, John Paul II of silent apostasy, Benedict XVI noted that Peter's boat was taking water from all sides. None of this in Francis: he feels no anxiety about the state of the Church, the massive apostasy of souls. His predecessors sought to preserve many bastions, especially those of morality; certainly, it was inconsistent with the principles they themselves had laid down.

Francis, on the other hand, strives to make the bastions skip. Let's look at that more specifically.

A) The stronghold of the doctrine

If John Paul II and Benedict XVI endeavored, in their innovations, to show the continuity between them and the past, this worry is far from Francis: "Open the doors," he said to superiors of religious institutes ... "open the doors! You're going to be wrong, you're going to make blunders, these are things that happen! Maybe even a letter from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith will say that you have said this or that ... But do not worry. Explain what you need to explain, but keep going ... [...] I prefer a church that is wrong because it does something, to a church that falls ill because it remains locked up."²³ These remarks recall those of Che Guevara, comparing the Revolution to a bicycle: if it stops, it falls; therefore, one must always advance.

Then consciousness is erected as an absolute rule: there is no longer any truth or falsehood, good or evil, everything is relative to each. "Every human being has his own vision of good, but also of evil. Our task is to encourage him to follow the path traced by what he considers to be the good [...]. And I am ready to repeat it: each one has his own conception of good and evil and each one has to choose and follow the good and fight the evil according to the idea that he has made. It would be enough to live in a better world."²⁴ John Paul II sought to still preserve the divine law: "Man discovers in the depths of his true and right consciousness a law which he has not given himself, and tends to conform to the laws of objective norms of morality." None of this with Francis.

B) The stronghold of morality

There is no need to go into detail on the Synod of the Family. This Synod, and the exhortation *Amoris lætitia* which concludes it, are the death sentence of family morality: divorce and adultery are thereby encouraged²⁵.

Another advance of the Pope are his positive encouragements to homosexuals. "Who am I to judge him?" He said about one of them. "God, when He looks at a homosexual person, does He approve of the existence with affection or reject him by condemning him? You must always consider the person."²⁶

After the declarations, the facts: the pope gives himself in spectacle with homosexual priests; he concelebrates with one of them, Michele de Paoli, and kisses his hand, under the view of the cameras²⁷. This point is very serious; it was the implicit approbation of the vices against nature, which gave Sodom and Gomorrah a terrible punishment. Moreover, it is a subject on which the World Revolution is making all its efforts today.

C) The stronghold of the primacy of the Pope

The Council and the conciliar popes have spoken a great deal about collegiality, but so far, they have jealously defended the prerogative of the papal primate.

Pope Francis seems determined to reverse this order. He speaks of the Church as a “reversed pyramid²⁸” whose “summit is found at the base”. Going further than the collegiality (concerning the bishops), we must evolve towards synodality (where the laity intervene, at different levels); moreover, the Church must be in a state of synodality.

Finally, the pope does not want to slice anything, and seems decided to leave to each “Local Church” a doctrinal autonomy. Yes, humanely, it is to go towards explosion, or better, towards the crumbling of the Church.

D) Conclusion on Pope Francis

We are far from having said everything about this short pontificate, but we know enough to note the undeniable aggravation of the crisis at the level of the one who holds the reins and impresses his mark on the government of the Church.

Let us now look at the prefect of the congregation for the doctrine of the faith.

2) Cardinal Müller

He is a pupil of Gustavo Gutiérrez, the father of the theology of South American liberation, of which he remains an intimate friend.

This prefect of the Congregation of the Faith, who was introduced - especially since the Synod - as a conservative, intervened in 2012 to defend the “rebel” Catholic university in Lima (Peru), whose theology is so depraved that the Cardinal Thorne, Archbishop of Lima, had made him withdraw the titles of “catholic” and “pontifical” university. It was necessary that the cardinal secretary of state - very little traditionalist - Bertone, joined other cardinals to invalidate Cardinal Müller’s intervention, and maintain the sanction against this ultra-progressive university²⁹.

Cardinal Müller, who is also a great admirer of the theology of Professor Ratzinger, was commissioned by him, who became pope, to publish his *Opera Omnia*. We know that Father Ratzinger had passed his master’s thesis in 1957 (five years before the Council) on the theology of history according to St. Bonaventure. The jury severely reproved the Father, as not quoting the texts faithfully, and professing “a dangerous modernism³⁰.” He had to correct his thesis in consequence. But it is the original

thesis and heterodox that was published by Cardinal Müller in the Opera Omnia of Pope Benedict XVI.

These two facts, to the credit of the prefect of the congregation charged with the defense of the faith, would suffice to show that he was no more orthodox than his predecessor at the time of Archbishop Lefebvre³¹.

But if we examine not the cardinal, but the theologian Müller, one is obliged to note that he is also heretical, and Father Gaudron, then a professor of dogma at the Zaitzkofen seminary, was not afraid of publicly accusing him on this ground, when he was bishop of Regensburg. To sum up here briefly his most serious errors, or rather heresies:

- Mary remained well a virgin before, during, and after childbirth, but not physically. This virginity is in the order of grace.
- The transubstantiation is a transformation by God of the natural being of the bread and of the wine in a salvatory communion. The body and the blood don't represent the physical parts of Our Lord Jesus Christ in His glorious body, but rather a mode of presence.
- The Catholics and the Protestants, already joined by the sacrament of baptism, are then already joined in the visible Church. In the strict sense, there aren't several Churches, but of divisions inside the unique people of God³².

Here is a sample of the theology of the one that Benedict XVI chose to defend the Catholic faith, and that Francis confirmed in the same post and promoted cardinal. Here is the character introduced by some as the “security guard of dogma³³”, a conservative prelate whom it is necessary to support in his audacious struggle against the cardinal Kasper. Without watching out that both declare the same ecumenical zeal side by side for many years, within the ecumenical committee of the German Episcopal Conference, in the plural-confessional association of the Christian Churches of Germany, then in pontifical advice for the promotion of the unity of the Christians. It isn't the Cardinal Kasper, but the Cardinal Müller who instituted a common committee with the worldwide Lutheran Federation to prepare for the 500th birthday of the “Reformation”, in 2017, “with the objective of the visible unity of all Christians in the one Church, [...] reconciliation in the practice finished for a long time throughout ecumenical process³⁴.”

3) Conclusion

It is ideas that lead the world. Even if Pope Francis shows his contempt for doctrine, he well has a thought, an ideology, and, as he is a practical man - what he says, he does - confusion succeeds one another with an amazing speed.

Cardinal Müller is more restrained about the ultimate consequences of his principles, but he is a convinced modernist.

So, it is possible to conclude that the line which they intend to impose in the government is perfectly modernist. We can rightly go back on this word of Monsignor Lefebvre: “They haven’t change, if not worse!”

IV. Answers to objections

First: For the Pope, what is important, is to love Jesus

“The first condition of sanctity, is Orthodoxy,” said Cardinal Pie. We cannot have charity without faith; because then, it isn't God who is loved, but a construction of our spirit.

But more pre-occupying is the fact that the pope contents himself with looking at the person, leaving doctrine on the side. The first mission of the pope is to teach nations, and not to make them human. The pope Paul VI had already said: “More than anyone, we have the cult of man”. But the current pope, in practice goes to the point of reducing religion to the human being. And yet without faith it is impossible neither to be saved nor to have access to God. How can the Pope save souls if he refuses to preach doctrine?

Second: The modernists get breathless

Certainly, they have no more a lot of vocations, but those who are appointed to key positions are modernists; it is them who print the guideline for all of the ship, and not the subordinate conservatives.

“Those who made the Council disappear”: yes, but those who succeed them are full of its spirit. It is precisely the case of Pope François. The Council is only a stage of Revolution. Its authors were very tied to its letter, which is understandable; but their successors live of its spirit; for them, therefore, it doesn't matter much to sacrifice or to leave in the shadow this or that text, provided that the basics of the Revolution are intact.

Such is therefore the state of the Church, especially in Rome; forces us to note that there hasn't been change towards the best, greatly on the contrary. However, while continuing its dive, wouldn't the attitude of Rome in relation to the faithful Catholics have changed? It is what is necessary to see now.

ARTICLE 3: Doesn't Rome Return in Honor, All the Same, What Is Dear to The Catholic Faithful?

I. Reasons in favor of a positive answer

It seems as if.

FIRST REASON

First of all, in his homilies - notably in Saint-Martha - Francis uses expressions which we weren't accustomed to hearing in the mouth of a pope. “We must fight the devil, he says, and not by half!” “It is necessary to fight the relativism.”

SECOND REASON

Rome can't use any more towards the faithful Catholics the road roller today. It is too much divided for this. This can only contribute, indirectly, to reinforce the traditional wave.

II. Opinion in the opposite sense

Let's let the Pope speak for himself: "After fifty years, did we do all that the Holy Ghost said to us in the Council, in this continuity in the growth of the Church which was the Council? We celebrate this anniversary³⁵ in erecting a kind of 'monument' to the Council, but especially, which doesn't disturb us! We don't want to change! [...] There is more: some voices want to return back. This is called to be 'stiff nudes', it is called "want to domesticate the Holy Ghost", it is called being 'slow hearts and without intelligence³⁶'."

III. Substantive Response

As in the previous article, it is the facts only that can allow us to answer the question; first the words, then the acts.

1) Words of the Pope

In his speech to CELAM, July 29th, 2013, the Pope warned against some "temptations of the devil". Among them, figure "the pelagian proposal". "She appears fundamentally in the form of *restoration*, he says. In front of the troubles of the Church, only a disciplinary solution is searched, by the restoration of behaviors and in outdated forms which does not even have the culturally capacity to be significant. In Latin America, they meet in small groups, in some new religious Congregations who search in an exaggerated way 'doctrinal or disciplinary' security. She is fundamentally static, even if she promises dynamic ad intra, who goes back. She tries 'to recover' the lost past³⁷."

In the magazine *Études* of October 2013: "If the Christian is a legalist or searches restoration, if he wants everything clear and sure, then he will find nothing." Note in passage that, during the Council, it is exactly the same arguments which were used to sabotage the religious institutes: we accused the religious faithful of juridism, legalism, from excessive attachment to forms out-of-date. But continue the quotation: "Tradition and memory of the past should help us to have the courage to open new areas to God. The one who, today, searches only disciplinary solutions, who strives of a matter exaggerated in doctrinal 'safety', who tries obstinately to recover the lost past, that one has a static and non-evolutionary vision. In that way, faith becomes an ideology among others³⁸."

In *Evangelii gaudium* (n0 94), he is taken in "neo-Pelagianism self-referential and Promethean" of those who feel superior to others because they are attached to the past. This tendency expresses itself by ostentation in liturgy, in doctrine or prestige of the Church. "In that way, the Church is transformed into a museum piece."

The pope worries regarding the Traditional Mass: “What is worrying, it is the risk of the ideologisation of *Vetus Ordo* [emphasize the unflattering expression], its exploitation³⁹.”

On February 19th, 2013, he warns against the “traditionalist” seminarians returned from a seminary. In these circles, we find often psychological and moral problems, and “imbalances” which manifest themselves in the liturgy. The bishops must be vigilant, to avoid a “mortgage on the Church⁴⁰”.

On June 6th of the same year, he announces his concern to his listeners, regarding the “current pelagian which is in the Church in this moment. There are some restorationists groups. I know a few, it has happened to me to receive them in Buenos Aires. And we feel that it is like returning 60 years back! Before the Council... We feel like in 1940... An anecdote, only to illustrate, not to laugh, I took it with respect, but it preoccupies me; when I was elected (pope), I received a card from one of these groups, and they said to me; ‘Your Holiness, we offer you this spiritual treasure, 3525 rosaries.’ Why don't they say: we pray for you, we ask... but this way of holding count... And these groups come back to practices and to disciplines which I lived, you no, because no one is old, in disciplines, in things which at that moment lived, but now not, now they have passed⁴¹.”

The pope still reserves other epithets for the faithful Catholics: They are ‘nostalgics’, “moralistic arguers”, “bat Christians who prefer shadow to the light of the presence of the Lord”.

Here is Pope Francis such as he is, and of what he thinks of those who are tied to Tradition. But after the words, here are the acts.

2) The Acts

A) A significant event: the savage condemnation of the Franciscans of the Immaculate

a - The decree of July 11th, 2013

On July 11th, 2013, the cardinal João Braz of Aviz, prefect of the Congregation for the Institutes of Consecrated Life, made public a decree which releases from their functions the superiors of the Franciscans of the Immaculate and entrusts the government of the Institute to an “apostolic commissioner, Father Fidenzio Volpi (OFM Cap.). And to harden the form of the decree, the cardinal provided an approval *ex audito* of Pope Francis, which withdraws from the Franciscans of the Immaculate any possibility of appeal before the Court of the Apostolic Signature. By the same decree, injunction was made to the brothers to celebrate the new mass, except special authorization of the commissioner⁴²”.

b - Continuation of operations

Father Volpi closed the seminaries of the community, pushed back planned ordinations, prohibited the activities of their publishing house, suspended the lay groups tied to the brothers and prohibited all ties with the sisters⁴³.

“Today, says Roberto de Mattei, in the name of the Pope, the Congregation for the Institutes of Consecrated Life relieving of her functions the government of the Institute to transfer it to a minority of religious rebels, of progressive orientation, on whom the new apostolic commissioner will lean to normalize it, that is to say to drive it to the disaster which it had avoided until now⁴⁴.”

c - In turn of the sisters

After having literally dismembered the congregation of the Franciscans of the Immaculate coming back to Tradition, Rome then takes the religious of this congregation. On May 19th, 2014, Cardinal João Braz of Aviz announces to the general Mother that they are going to have an “apostolic visitor” with extensive powers. And it is a religious modernist and feminist who immediately took the place, to start the “normalization” of the community⁴⁵.

d - Occasion and reasons of this condemnation

A small group of religious complains that their congregation is returning more and more to Tradition. And indeed, when we read the circular letter which Father Volpi addressed to all the brothers, on December 8th, 2013, the motives of condemnation appear clearly: it is their growing attachment to the mass of Saint Pius V, and especially their “crypto-lefebvriste” drift and «surely traditionalist» that raised alarm in Rome. Cardinal João Braz of Aviz, progressive, intervened and took all means to stop the return to Tradition of this flourishing congregation (400 brothers divided in 50 houses across the world, at the head of several radio stations, television stations, and of a publishing company; 400 sisters also, managing radios and publishing companies⁴⁶).

The journalist Antonio Socci makes himself the echo of the general indignation that this wild condemnation provoked: “In the Vatican, there is a new inquisition: Catholic-progressive. She persecutes fiercely the Franciscans of the Immaculate because they have faith and so many vocations. It is a shame⁴⁷!”

e - The Pope knows

The congregation of the Franciscans of the Immaculate is of pontifical right; how could the Pope ignore this affair? He approved the decree of July 11th, 2013, as well as the disastrous dealings of Father Volpi, as he asserted himself to fifty members of the institute, on June 15th, 2014 himself⁴⁸.

f - And the *Motu proprio* of Benedict XVI?

Resuming the interview of June 15th, 2014, Andrea Tonielli reports that, on the *Motu Proprio*, Pope Francis said that he didn't want to move away from the line of Benedict XVI, and he affirmed that the Franciscan brothers of the Immaculate still had the liberty to celebrate the ancient mass, even if for the moment, given the arguments on the exclusive use of this missal - element which wasn't part of the charisma of the foundation of the Institute – a “discernment” with the superior [from now on frankly progressive] is needed and the bishop if he acts about celebrations in parishes, sanctuaries and houses of formation. The Pope explained that he must have freedom, at the same time for those who want to celebrate according to the ancient ritual and for those who want to celebrate with the new ritual, without the ritual becoming an ideological barrier⁴⁹.

g - Francis and the mass of Saint Pius V

As observes Roberto de Mattei: “The Catholic world which refers to the Tradition of the Church [and especially to the mass of Saint Pius V] knows a stage of big expansion, especially among the young people, and this is perhaps the principal reason of hostility which he makes the object of today⁵⁰.”

After having talked with the Holy Father, Monsignor Graubner said, on February 14th, 2014: “He understands that the ancient generation returns to what they lived [traditional liturgy], but he can't understand the younger generation which turns towards it. ‘When I ask myself the question - added the Pope - I conclude that it is a kind of fashion. And since it is a fashion, it is a thing which will pass, to which you shouldn't so much pay attention. But it is necessary to keep patience and benevolence towards those who fell in this fashion⁵¹.’”

Regarding the liberalization of the Mass of always, Francis declared: “I think that the choice of Pope Benedict XVI was prudent, linked with the aid of persons who had this particular sensitivity. What is worrying is the risk of ideologisation of *Vetus ordo*, its instrumentalization.” Francis, for him, remains attached to the liturgy of the new mass, fruit of the Council, and what he wants to avoid at all costs, is that the traditional ritual becomes the flag of those who call into question Vatican City II. (Let's note, by passing, that one of the books published by the publishing company of the Franciscans of the Immaculate was: *Vatican City II, a debate to be opened*, of Monsignor Brunero Gherardini⁵²).

h - The sense of a condemnation

According to witnesses and development of events, it clearly appears that the Franciscans of the Immaculate were condemned because of their progressive return to Tradition, which manifested itself more and more by the exclusive usage of the traditional ritual. Rome realized, indeed, that if the Mass of

Saint Pius V spread, it would shade the Novus ordo and to the neo-modernist spirit which it transports. Because, whatever says the Pope, the Traditional Mass is the fruit and the expression of the Tradition of the Church, while the new mass is the fruit and the expression of the neo-modernism of Vatican II.

In other words, the Mass is a “banner” or a “flag” and not a simple “fashion” linked to “particular sensitivities” or to “clean charisma” of an Institute. If the Franciscans of the Immaculate were condemned, it is because the Tridentine liturgy was more than a fashion for them: it was bringing them back to Tradition by moving them away from conciliar errors.

i - Lessons to draw from the event

The Pope isn't willing to put into question the Council. He opposes to any true return (and as a result exclusive) to Tradition, that is to say, to the faith of always and to the traditional liturgy in the measure where it pretends to be the expression. The Vetus Ordo is conceded only to those who want to conceive it in a neo-modernist way, that is to say, as a ritual brother of the Novus Ordo and expressing the same religion. The letter of the Holy Father addressed to the Fraternity of Saint Peter, on the occasion of its twenty-five years of foundation is very clear: “By celebrating the sacred mysteries according to the extraordinary form of the Roman rite, the members of the Fraternity of Saint Peter contribute, in the fidelity to the living Tradition of the Church, to a better comprehension and the implementation of the Second Vatican Council⁵³.” It is what we want to avoid at all costs!

Everything is confused in Rome, but one the single thing is perfectly clear: they want neither Tradition, nor traditional mass as is, that is to say, as it is the vehicle of the Catholic faith and condemns neo-modernism.

B) The eviction of the cardinal Burke

As we have seen, Cardinal Burke is a “conservative”, but completely acquired in the Council, to whom he owes his clerical training. Nevertheless, his strong opposition to the progressive clan during the Synod on the family was worth his disgrace. He was prefect of the Supreme Court of the Apostolic Signature. The Pope discarded him, on November 8th, 2014.

“The only credible reason, says Roberto de Mattei, is that the Pope offered on a platter the head of Cardinal Burke to Cardinal Kasper, and through him, to Cardinal Karl Lehmann, [...] ancient disciple of Karl Rahner, [...] The discharge Cardinal Burke has an exemplary signification, similar to the destruction in act of the Franciscans of the Immaculate. [...] It isn't about the question of the Traditional Mass, which neither Cardinal Burke nor the Franciscans of the Immaculate celebrate regularly, but of their attitude of non-conformity to the politics of today's predominant ecclesial⁵⁴.”

Those who aren't in the “line of the party” are simply discharged⁵⁵. “The current practice, in Rome,” says Father Toulza, “is to demonstrate a wonderful

forgiveness for those who live wrong, and sometimes a severity discouraging Catholics who try hard to live as such, as well as for the clerics - priests, bishops – of the hierarchy. The actual practice is to protest that they don't want to deal on doctrine, but to give public word readily to those who want to deal on it⁵⁶.”

IV. Answers to the objections

First: The pope says that we must fight the devil

Some words with traditional taste don't make weight next to the pile of words by which he preaches Revolution, and of acts which make these words concrete.

Second: Rome is too much divided to neutralize what is traditional

Even if the pope leaves in place a good many of those who contradicted him, we have just seen that he could use the strong method when he wanted to.

In conclusion, the pope doesn't seem very favorable to what is traditional; but besides that, paradoxically, isn't it indisputable that he is favorable to the SSPX?

ARTICLE 4: The Attitude of Rome In Relation to Us – SSPX And Friendly Communities – Has It Not Changed?

I. Reasons in favor of a positive answer

It seems that if, this attitude is more and more forgiving.

FIRST REASON

In effect, currently, Rome doesn't ask us any more to accept the Council. They ask us to give less importance to the problem which we consider to be capital: the Council. The Roman authorities give us the example themselves, saying to us that we can reappraise religious freedom, ecumenism, etc. while remaining Catholic, and this is a big change.

It means that the criterion which they want to impose on us to prove that we are Catholic won't concern these points any more. This is the approach of the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith and of the Committee *Ecclesia Dei*.

SECOND REASON

Then, let's come to the Pope himself. While Benedict XVI was very attached to doctrine, this isn't the case anymore with Francis. This last one puts speculative questions aside; if we try to know what he thinks, we are perplexed, because he does something, and the following day the opposite. It isn't therefore by this end to take him. For him, what counts, are the persons. With him, you shouldn't speak about doctrine; so, we speak to save souls and the means to save them; thereby, he listens to us. This also is a change.

THIRD REASON

While relations had got entangled under the previous popes, Francis unblocks the situation very slowly, notably by concessions of practical order (jurisdiction for confessions, etc.).

II. Opinion in the opposite sense

On May 9th, the newspaper *La Croix* asked the pope if he was “ready to grant [to ‘lefebvrists’] a status of personal prelature”. “It would be a possible solution, answered the Pope, but before, it is necessary to establish a fundamental agreement with them. The Second Vatican Council has its value⁵⁷.”

On May 24th, the cardinal Müller reminded that if we “want to be entirely Catholic, it is necessary to recognize the Pope and the Second Vatican Council”, and “it isn’t possible to move the Council aside as a simple pastoral chattering”. “Religious freedom as fundamental human right, and the freedom of a true religion when to the supernatural revelation in Jesus Christ, must be unconditionally admitted by all Catholics.”

It seems therefore that nothing fundamental has changed when it comes to the attitude of Rome towards us about the Council. But let’s see it more in detail.

III. Substantive Response

In the attitude of Rome in relation to us, what is new can come down to this:

- Rome doesn’t seem to want to impose on us anymore neither all the Council, nor the new mass.
- We have the right to maintain our positions publicly.

It is these two points which it is going to be necessary now to examine, with the aid of the interventions where Monsignor Pozzo expressed himself on this subject: interviews at *Zenit* (February 25th, 2016) and at *La Croix* (April 7th, 2016).

1) Rome doesn’t seem to want to impose on us all of the Council anymore

A) Various degrees of authority

Let’s see precisely what Monsignor Pozzo says⁵⁹: “In the Second Vatican Council there are doctrinal documents with the intention to reformulate the truth already defined of the faith or of the truth of Catholic doctrine (for example, the dogmatic constitution *Dei Verbum*, the dogmatic constitution *Lumen Gentium*), and there are documents which have the intention of offering directions or guidelines for practical action, which are for the pastoral life an application of doctrine (the declaration *Nostra aetate*, the decree *Unitatis redintegratio*, the declaration *Dignitatis humanae*). The adhesion to the teachings of the magisterium varies according to the degree of authority and the category of the magisterium’s own truth” (February 25th, 2016).

If we hold ourselves to the obvious sense of this passage, it means that in the Council, there are texts with a bigger authority and others with a lesser

authority: but finally, all have some authority. The second thing to remark: Monsignor Pozzo maintains that *Lumen gentium* and *Dei Verbum* only reformulate the traditional truths, which is wrong: the notion of communion with variable geometry, collegiality, to name only the most obvious, are absolutely new elements, which provoked very strong reactions in the conciliar assembly; and the contradiction with traditional doctrine makes that it is impossible for us to accept these documents.

However, it would seem that Monsignor Lefebvre spoke in this sense. Listen precisely to what he said: “Evidently, if the Council respects the truths which were already defined, [...] it is clear that it always stays of defined faith, [...] it carries the theological note⁶⁰ which was given to them! There are in the Council a lot of defined truths, but defined *by the other councils*, by other magisteriums [...]. The cardinal Felici⁶¹ answered that it was necessary to see according to the different texts, that it wasn't possible to give a general theological note. [...] And therefore, by fact he said: all proposals of the Council aren't necessarily to be believed by divine faith⁶².”

By that, Monsignor Lefebvre says that if such truth is contained in Vatican II is of faith, it isn't *because of the authority of the Council*, but because of the authority of a prior magisterial act. In other words, the Vatican II Council doesn't have any authority of its own. It isn't therefore what Monsignor Pozzo says. Then, Monsignor Pozzo, April 2nd, said: “We think [...] that we should ask you only what we ask for, that which is necessary for every Catholic, and nothing more. [...] The Second Vatican Council, in its biggest part, made nothing doctrinal, and therefore we can't ask you for it⁶³.” There is, therefore, at least a part of Vatican II that must be accepted.

To conclude on these various degrees of authority of the texts of the Council, it is necessary to recognize that we are far from the time when they asked us to adhere to it as a dogma of faith. Nevertheless, there remains a zone of shadow: the Roman authorities still ask for a certain adhesion to the conciliar documents.

B) The non-negotiable point

We have just seen what Rome doesn't expect from us anymore; but there is a risk of “diversion” there: the fact that the Roman authorities admit that some texts have less authority should not make us forget the point which they consider to be essential.

Already in October 2014, Monsignor Pozzo said⁶⁴: “What is essential, what we can't renounce, is the adhesion to the *professio fidei* and the principle according to which, it is to the only magisterium of the Church that was entrusted by the Lord the faculty to interpret authentically, that is to say with the authority of Christ, the word of God, written and transmitted. [...] This signifies that the magisterium, if it isn't certainly above Sacred Scripture and Tradition, is nevertheless the authentic authority which judge interpretations on Sacred Scripture and Tradition, from wherever they emanate. As a result, if there are

different degrees of adhesion of the faithful to its teachings, [...] no one can put themselves above the magisterium.”

Essentially, it is therefore adhesion to the “magisterium”. “The magisterium, which isn't above the word of God, written and transmitted, but that serves it, he says on February 25th, is also the authentic interpretation of the previous texts, including those of Vatican II, in the light of living Tradition, which develops in the Church with the help of the Holy Ghost, not as an opposite novelty (it would be disclaiming Catholic dogma), but with a better understanding of the deposit of faith, always in ‘the unity of dogma, of sense and of a way of seeing’ (see Vatican City I, *Dei Filius*, n^o 4).”

And on April 7th: “The Vatican II Council can be adequately understood only in the context of the whole Tradition of the Church and of its constant magisterium”. It is asked to the Fraternity “to accept that the magisterium of the Church is the only one to whom is entrusted the deposit of faith to be kept, defended and interpreted”.

In conclusion, the magisterium is above the Council itself; if therefore the Roman authorities consent to admit that some texts are debatable, they reinforce on the other hand the obligation to adhere to the current magisterium.

C) Which magisterium?

Because it is there that ambiguity begins. We can't say, without important distinction, that we accept the magisterium. If it is about the power to teach, yes, the Roman authorities possess it, in the same capacity as their predecessors before the Council.

But if by magisterium we hear education itself, we have important precisions to give. In 1977, Monsignor Lefebvre said that the Roman authorities had instituted “a new magisterium or a new conception of the magisterium of the Church, conception which is besides a modernist conception”. They speak about a “living magisterium; undoubtedly the magisterium is alive, but still it shouldn't be a magisterium which contradicts what was said before”. And to cite Louis Salleron: “We note that a more and more badly defined magisterium makes of its own will the supreme norm of religious life.” “It is in this that we collide, follows the Archbishop. And it is always in this that it is said to us: ‘Obey, obey, you owe obedience to the Pope⁶⁵.’” Here is the material object of the magisterium, that should be traditional, if not it isn't a Catholic magisterium anymore.

As for the mode of this new magisterium, like Father Gleize says: “For Jean-Paul II, the Vatican II council wanted to inaugurate a new type of magisterium. [...] The specific and definite object of Vatican II and of the post-conciliar magisterium is therefore not the truth, but the human conscience of the truth⁶⁶.” And as this conscience evolves, the truth is expansible.

Where the conclusion: “Of course, follows the same author, the conciliar Pope remains capable of making an act of magisterium, as Pope. But for him to do it in effect, he has to renounce of using the new magisterium redefined at Vatican II.

That is why, the conciliar pope, as conciliar, is unable to make an act of magisterium. The modernist conception⁶⁷ of the magisterium adopted at Vatican II constitutes an obstacle which prevents the exercise of the magisterium of the Pope. To lift the obstacle, it is necessary to renounce the Council⁶⁸.”

By consequence, it is impossible to engage us to adhere to the “magisterium” as Monsignor Pozzo asks.

D) Is this ambiguity new?

In reality, since 1988, the Roman openings already went in this direction. For example, the protocol of May 5th, 1988 contains, in the doctrinal statement: “We declare to accept the doctrine contained in number 25 of the dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium* of the Vatican II Council on ecclesiastical magisterium and the adhesion which is due” (paragraph 2).

After only (paragraph 3) it is a question of the Council: ‘Regarding some points taught by the Vatican II Council or concerning the posterior reforms of liturgy and of the law, and which seem to us hardly compatible with Tradition, we promise to have a positive attitude of study and of communication with the Apostolic Seat, by avoiding all polemical.’”

The case of the Institute of the Good Pastor registered in the same logic. In their statement of September 8th, 2006, the priests of the aforementioned institute affirm: “Every founder member recognizes personally ‘respecting the authentic magisterium’ of the Roman Seat, in a ‘whole fidelity to the infallible magisterium of the Church’ (statutes II § 2). From a doctrinal point of view, in accordance with the speech of the pope Benedict XVI to the Roman Curie December 22nd, 2005, the members of the Institute, as much as it is in them, are hired by a ‘serious and constructive criticism’ of the Vatican II Council, to allow the Apostolic Seat to give the authentic interpretation⁶⁹.” In other words, this criticism is circumscribed within the limits of the hermeneutic of continuity. And yet justly, Monsignor Pozzo - without citing the name - also recalls this hermeneutic; it is what’s necessary to see now.

E) The Council in the light of Tradition?

This expression comes from Jean-Paul II, “who said [during the first audience of Monsignor Lefebvre in 1978] that it was necessary to examine the Council and the decrees of the Council in the light of Tradition and of the constant magisterium of the Church. [...] She is besides, it is necessary to say it, says Monsignor Lefebvre, a bit ambiguous. In the thought of the Holy Father and in the thought of the cardinal Ratzinger, if I understood well, it would be necessary to integrate the decrees of the Council in Tradition, - arranging to make them enter, at all costs. It is an impossible undertaking. While for me, for us, I think, say that we see, that we judge the documents of the Council in the light of Tradition, this evidently means that we reject those that are contrary to Tradition, that we interpret those that are ambiguous according to Tradition, and that they accept those that are faithful with Tradition⁷⁰”.

Besides, rightly, Monsignor Fellay said: “This expression ‘in the light of Tradition’, although essential in itself to understand the Council, proved insufficient. It is too ambiguous, we don't want to use it anymore⁷¹.”

And yet Monsignor Pozzo, we saw him earlier, spring this expression. It would be necessary to agree to read the Council “in the light of the living Tradition, which is developing in the Church⁷²”. It is the hermeneutic of continuity⁷³ that he would so like to impose on us.

2) We have the right to support our positions publicly

A) Is the criticism of the Council completely free?

In the maintenance of February 25th, Monsignor Pozzo asserts: “It doesn't seem that the SSPX denied doctrines of faith or of truth of the Catholic doctrine taught by the magisterium. The criticisms issued concern rather declarations or indications concerning the renewal of the pastoral in the relation of the Church and of society, of the Church and the State.”

Certainly, this affirmation is erroneous, because, we have already said it, even both dogmatic constitutions contain errors, which we refuse. But besides, the errors contained in the decrees of the pastoral order touch dogma (for example, to this one: “Out of the Church, no greeting”).

Furthermore, Monsignor Pozzo also asks “to pass from a position of polemical confrontation and antagonistic confrontation to a position of listening and of mutual respect”. The Roman authorities want to limit to the maximum the critics, and to suppress the attacks, granting us simply “to maintain our positions”.

B) Is this opening a novelty?

In comparison with what Rome has demanded *of us* until now, yes, it is a novelty. But the “constructive criticism” of Vatican II has been already granted to *other* institutes, *Ecclesia Dei*.

3) Conclusion

From all of what precedes, we can conclude that, in the Roman proposals, on the essential there is nothing new. It is on the form that the attitude of Rome has changed: this one here declares itself ready to tolerate a moderate criticism, being always presupposed the adherence in principle to the present magisterium. In short, it would be a criticism in the style of the conservative prelates, whose statements we heard before. It goes without saying that a similar advance can't be accepted.

IV. Answer to objections

First: They ask us to give less importance to the Council

But, as we have just seen, it is to reinforce the necessity to adhere to the current magisterium⁷⁴.

The Roman authorities search “the criterion which they want to impose on us to prove that we are Catholic”. Wouldn't it be rather at these authorities to prove us that they are Catholic? On February 13th, 1975, in front of three cardinals which made him undergo an examination, Monsignor Lefebvre answered: “When I think that we are here in the building of the Holy Office which is the exceptional witness of Tradition and defense of the Catholic faith, I can't help thinking that I am at home, and that it is me, that you call the ‘traditionalist’, who should judge you. [...] One day the truth will take back its rights⁷⁵.”

Second: For the Pope, what counts, are the persons

It is possible to say of Marxism that it gives little importance to ideas, since it is primarily a praxis⁷⁶. But if its doctrine is poor, it exists nevertheless: it is a form of thought, says John Ousset, a philosophical system, an intellectual "dialectic". The pope who introduced the cause of Dom Helder Camâra and of Monsignor Romero doesn't hide his sympathies for their philo-communist ideology⁷⁷. Also, it would be extremely risky, by approaching the pope, to content speaking about souls to be saved, making the impasse on doctrine. We would be as somebody who would sign a contract with a man, without examining the clauses of this contract, but only the person with whom he passes it.

Third: The situation unlocks with Francis

The last intervention of Cardinal Müller rather causes fear that we come back to the start. If it is true that of the practical side, the Pope made some concessions (on confessions, etc.), on the doctrinal plan, once again, nothing essential has changed.

In his time, Monsignor Lefebvre had known the same impasses; to go out of this ambiguous climate, he had decided to wait for the doctrinal conversion of the Roman authorities before envisioning a canonical solution. Wasn't it a wise behavior? It's what is necessary for us to examine in question 2.

QUESTION 2: CAN WE ACCEPT A CANONICAL RECOGNITION OFFERED BY A NEO-MORDERNIST AUTHORITY?

The answer doesn't go without saying. Indeed, during years, Monsignor Lefebvre envisioned an agreement as being possible; more still, he undertook the steps in this sense. Having defined the terms of problematic (introduction), we will ask three questions:

- The first door on the very act itself of recognition, independently of its consequences: Isn't it a duty to look for an official recognition by the Pope (article 1)?

- The second question concerns the consequences which a recognition could have on our faith, and the influence that the middle would practice over us in which we would be inserted; would this be compensated by the apostolic possibilities which would be opened to us: wouldn't a canonical recognition open to us a huge field of apostolate (article 2)?
- And the third question also concerns its consequences, but this time in comparison with the influence from the authorities: Would it be possible for us to get a status which protects us (article 3)?

Finally, as a “critical⁷⁸” step, we will ask a last question: This proposal: “No practical agreement before the doctrinal agreement” is it not a simple prudent judgement (article 4)? After what we will be able to conclude. We put in annex the evolution of the thought of Monsignor Lefebvre on this question.

Introduction

Before entering the deep of the subject, it is important to define the terms of the problematic. And first of all, a precision: it will be a lower question of “agreement”, “canonical recognition”. Is it the same thing? In what do these realities differ?

1) What is an “agreement”?

The etymology of this word points out a harmony of hearts. The common sense of this word (in this context) is that of an “arrangement between those who come to an agreement” (Petit Robert). The same dictionary, to define the expression “agreed”, says [“agrees”]: “Have the same opinion, the same view or the same intention (act in the same sense, make common cause, walk hand in hand, like one man, be joined).” In other words, the agreement indicates a community, either in thought, or in act⁷⁹.

Apply this to the relations between Rome and us⁸⁰. The agreement can be doctrinal or practical.

First doctrinal. Since the Council, a doctrinal gap has widened between the Catholic hierarchy and the faithful who remained tied to Tradition. There is therefore no more agreement but divergence on questions of faith. For fifty years, neo-modernist Rome tries hard to restore an agreement by drawing away the faithful of Tradition towards the doctrine of Vatican II: there is agreement when these adopt the new doctrines. As for Monsignor Lefebvre and for his successors, they tried hard to bring back to traditional doctrine the Roman authorities: in other words, they aimed at a doctrinal agreement in the truth, which assumes the conversion of neo-modernist Rome.

Then the agreement could be practical, that is to say, it is not about the doctrine, since the two parts diverge, but on acting; we find an arrangement to live together, each remaining what like he is. And yet to act is regulated by the law. Therefore, such agreement is sealed by a canonical structure conceded to the communities of Tradition. Is this *modus vivendi* possible without these last changing doctrinally

Indeed, in concrete terms, it has never existed, as the history of successive agreements since 1984 proves this. But it will be necessary for us to examine this question closely.

Finally, the agreement can be doctrinal and practical at the same time. Two cases are to envision: these neo-modernists Roman authorities, offering a canonical status, demand adhesion at the same time to points of doctrine drawn from the Council; these same authorities, come back to Tradition, admit to the SSPX and to the friendly communities the canonical status which they had already⁸¹, after having denied their existence.

An agreement assumes that both parts “come to an agreement”. If it is about a practical agreement, we search an arrangement, modifying as necessary the conditions, until they come to an agreement.

Ordinarily, an agreement is made between two equals, for example between two princes, between two States, or two societies. We conceive with more difficulty an agreement passed between the boss and his workers, or between a bishop and the priests of his diocese. That is why some people prefer, in the reports of the traditional communities with the Holy See, the dialect of canonical recognition.

2) What is a canonical recognition?

A) Recognition in general

The common sense of the word “recognition” (in the context which occupies us) is “the fact to accept (a thing) after having disclaimed it or doubted it”.

More precisely, it is the “action to admit officially, legally. [...] Recognition of a government, by which a State admits the legality of a government coming from a revolution” (Petit Robert).

B) Nature of the canonical recognition

The canonical recognition is the conferment of a canonical structure by the ecclesiastical authority⁸² to an entity without it. In reality, we speak rather about “approval” or of “canonical erection” of an institute. If we use here the term of “recognition”, it is in reason of the particular situation where we find ourselves: the Pope recognizes the legal existence of communities which already exist.

However, in the spirit of the Roman authorities, these communities currently have no legal existence. For example, aforementioned authorities don't admit that the vows of these religious are public vows⁸³ but consider them to be private vows. On the occasion of various agreements (to Barroux, to Papa Stronsay), they made to the members of these communities do their vows again in the hands of the bishop of the place or of a representative of the Holy See. As a result, in case of canonical recognition, it will be necessary to examine these circumstances closely. If the Holy See, either by words, or by facts, declares lawful a work which

he considered until then illegal, to accept this speech, it is ipso-facto, in spite of posterior corrections, suppose that the aforementioned work was illegal before. Implicitly, it is to disclaim the state of necessity which had justified our resistance to the auto-demolition of the Church.

C) Consequences of the canonical recognition

The first consequence is that the recognized institute acquires the moral personality, therefore some autonomy in its internal government.

The second consequence is that this institute depends in a narrower way on the bishop of the place⁸⁴, if it is a diocesan institute, or of the Holy See if it is an institute of the pontifical right. In the latter case, the institute is subtracted from the vigilance of the bishop for all what looks at the internal government. The reason of this vigilance (of the bishop or from Rome) is that it is necessarily conducted by the hierarchy of the Church that institutes drive their members to Christian perfection. Is this canonical dependency towards neo-modernists authorities compatible with the conservation of the faith and with its public confession? This problem is one of the main objects of question 2.

D) Canonical recognition and apostolate

It is the bishop of the area who is responsible for all the faithful of his territory. As a result, all the apostolate of the priests - including that of members of exempt institutes - is regulated by the bishop and is practiced under his dependency and under his vigilance.

That is why Monsignor Lefebvre, envisaging the regularization of Traditional works, examined which structures would be possible to allow the continuation of the apostolate to the faithful in a certain independence of the bishops. This implies institutions directly under the Pope's jurisdiction. Let's examine especially the case of the personal prelatures, envisioned not long ago by Monsignor Lefebvre, and which is still on the agenda today.

The Second Vatican Council⁸⁵ inaugurated the personal prelatures. These are “jurisdictional entities, established by the Holy See as instruments as part of the hierarchic pastoral of the Church, for the realization of particular pastoral or missionary activities⁸⁶”. These pastoral tasks contact particular groups of persons. So that things are made in order, prelatures have to agree with Episcopal Conferences, before their erection, to co-ordinate their work⁸⁷.

At the head of the prelate, there is a prelate with jurisdiction over the faithful on whom particular pastoral activities are practiced. However, to be able to exercise its apostolate in a diocese, the prelate must have got the prior consent of the Common of the place⁸⁸. The personal prelate is therefore an assistant of the diocesan clergy. The faithful who use his apostolate are therefore subjected mainly to the Common of the place, and on top of that, to the prelate of the personal prelate.

This concerns prelatures envisaged by the code of 1983. To tell the truth, the structure envisioned for the SSPX and for friendly communities will enjoy, it seems, of an almost complete independence in report with the bishops; anyway, this independence will be much bigger than that of the Opus Dei. Nonetheless, she can't be complete, because by divine right the diocesan bishop is the leader of the territory entrusted to his care.

So, the simple legal recognition implicates all that: by the recognition of the institutes, there is a dependency in relation to the Holy See, normally to the Congregation of the institutes of consecrated life (although the Holy Father is free to attach them to another congregation); for the erection of the personal prelate – the case applicable - there is a dependency of the Congregation for the Bishops; then, there has to be some understanding with the Commons of the places. Finally, the prelate depends on the Roman Congregation for the bishops.

E) “Unilateral” recognition?

It is an expression which is often heard recently. What is its signification? Can a recognition be bilateral?

Let's limit ourselves to the case of canonical recognition: recognition is the act of the one who admits. And yet who admits the traditional communities? It is the Holy See⁸⁹. It isn't us who admit the latter who gives a canonical structure. As a result, a canonical recognition is essentially unilateral. Then, why this pleonasm?

On one hand, this expression seems to mean that this act of the Pope would be without “doctrinal counterpart”. The offered canonical structure wouldn't be accompanied with a doctrinal statement prior to being signed. In that case, it is better to speak about “canonical recognition without doctrinal counterpart”.

On the other hand, this phrase allows to be heard that traditional writings will be normalized in spite of them, that it will be for nothing, and they won't be able to refuse⁹⁰. And yet this is evidently wrong; it is very necessary to agree on a document, what implicates necessarily an acceptance or a refusal from the part of said works⁹¹.

This brings us to a third possible sense of the expression “unilateral recognition”: this one lets us assume that there wouldn't be a counterpart on the practical plan; everything would go on as before, without any change, if it is only we would be officially recognized. This conceals a key aspect, which is the effective submission to the Roman authorities, and the unavoidable influence which they would exercise over us. Indeed, the law is never “unilateral”; it regulates reports between people (physical or moral) with the aim of the common good, therefore reports between the superior and subjects. It is inconceivable to imagine that the subjects have only the rights and the superior has only the duties; it would be revolutionary. Therefore, the subjects necessarily have duties towards their superiors. So, if the superiors grant something, and even a lot, subjects concede

their submission; the law is therefore principally bilateral. Where from the question which it will be necessary to examine: doesn't this dependency risk bringing to a doctrinal agreement on the Council?

F) De facto recognition?

This expression indicates the act of the Pope who, seeing the talks with the Congregation for the doctrine of faith gets stuck, would pass besides every condition, doctrinal, canonical or liturgical. It would be a recognition rather by way of the facts than by way of law, legal, canonical. The pope would have already begun in this sense (notably by conceding jurisdiction for confessions during the year of mercy).

Let's point out that what is called "recognition of fact" has legal consequences. Indeed, declaring that the confessions of the priests of the SSPX are valid, is equivalent to say that they are lawful, conformed to the rite, to the law. Although the Pope doesn't expressly say: "I give jurisdiction to these priests", he acts well of a delegated jurisdiction⁹²; indeed, it is him who fixed the length (first by restraining it to the time of the year of mercy, then by deciding that it would go on after). What was done for confessions can be done for the other acts of the ministry of the priests of Tradition. It is a kind of "canonical recognition by piece" or "by landings".

What may be the meaning of this distinction between "recognition of fact" and "recognition of rite", it is the difference between the phase where some aspects of our ministry are recognized to be lawful, and the other phase where all aspects of our life would be (what implicates necessarily a legal status, because it isn't possible to be aggregated to a society without following the law). And it is only in this phase that the submission to the Roman authorities would become effective. This differentiation gives to understand that there could be a complete recognition of our legitimacy without dependency towards the current Roman authorities, which is impossible. It is better to speak therefore of "ongoing canonical recognition" or "ongoing canonical regularization" than that of "recognition of fact".

G) Canonical recognition and agreement

Such as is heard at present, the term "agreement" indicates generally a practical agreement, with or without a doctrinal statement (the actual plan includes one). Canonical recognition is included in the practical agreement.

3) The clarity of words

But why make all these precisions of vocabulary? They are necessary, if we want to be "sons of light". In its language, the Church holds with sovereignty the clarity of words. First in the expression of dogmas⁹⁴; but this is the truth of all the teachings of the Church, from encyclicals to the lowest course of catechism for children.

On the contrary, the Revolution redoubts clear expressions. “We didn't watch out enough, says Fr. Joseph Lémann, in France and elsewhere, to the way men of evil managed to reach little by little all avenues of society. Their skill was infernal. They took over language, before taking over your schools, o Catholics, your hospitals, your law courts, your institutions [...]. The invasion had begun in words, in ideas; it ended in institutions. It was logical. A deep thinker made this reflexion, which we can't mediate too much: ‘as long as the people are invaded in their territory, he is only conquered; but if they allow themselves to be invaded in their language, he is finished.’ The language of a people [...] is the supreme rampart of a people, its last sanctuary: and rather than to let it be profaned, he must know how to succumb⁹⁵.” “That is why it is a service to the patriotic cause of nations to shout at them: Transport, before everything, the fight in language, by calling things by their real name, and for that use a name, and for that use a designation that enlightens and disillusions the poor misguided populations⁹⁶.”

Alas, modern Rome left this clarity. Above all, we should not allow ourselves to be imposed by the vagueness of language.

Such is, therefore the objective of this introduction: establish the clarity of language. It is necessary to call a cat a cat. If a canonical recognition passes by dealings where each makes accommodations, it is necessary to call it an “agreement”. For example, the regularization of the priests of Campos is an agreement. When signing, Father Rifan said: “It isn't an agreement, it is a recognition”. “He implied that Rome recognized the well-grounded relevance of Tradition. The faithful were disorientated and believed Father Rifan. They shouted in victory⁹⁷.”

We prefer to leave aside the expressions of “unilateral recognition” or of “de facto recognition”, and speaking simply about “canonical recognition, with or without doctrinal counterpart”: things will be so much clearer.

ARTICLE 1: Isn't It a Duty to Try to Be Officially Recognized by The Pope?

I. Reasons in favor of a positive answer

Yes, it seems that it is a duty to search to be officially recognized by the pope.

FIRST REASON

Indeed, if the Roman authorities, and in particular the Pope himself, calls us to join our efforts to re-Christianize society, we can only be delighted, while ensuring to remain such as we are. And yet just, the pope sees in the SSPX a force who can lay the hand on the dough of the new claimed evangelization from everywhere. He appreciates that we go towards «existential peripheries» - that is, we help souls where they are - what goes in the sense of his program. Finally, he sees well that everything collapses, while on the contrary we represent a force of life for the Church. Have we the right, since then, to refuse a recognition and to keep all these treasures for ourselves?

SECOND REASON

Among the conservatives, we have sympathizers - even cardinals - among whom some need our assistance. It could compensate the weight of the progressives.

THIRD REASON

Any abnormal situation drives itself to normalization. It is in the nature, even, of things. It is, therefore, necessary to go in this sense and to try to restore ourselves in a normal situation.

FOURTH REASON

In years to come, we will have an urgent need of new bishops. It is indeed possible to consecrate without pontifical mandate, in an emergency case, but if it is possible to consecrate bishops with the permission of Rome, aforementioned permission must be searched.

FIFTH REASON

It isn't by ecumenism that the pope comes towards us, but as towards Catholics. He says to whom wants to hear him that we are Catholics. Besides, debates which we have had with our Roman interlocutors or with those delegated by the Holy See, are debates between Catholics. What more normal than to be officially recognized as Catholic?

SIXTH REASON

Our canonical recognition would cause a good confusion inside the Church: the good ones would be encouraged the malicious ones would suffer a defeat.

SEVENTH REASON

Besides, justly, our enemies (modernists and others) oppose strongly to this recognition: it is a sign that it would be a good thing.

EIGHTH REASON

Saint Pius X shows us the example himself. Indeed, the anti-clericals, enjoying the dissension of their adversaries, had taken power in Venice. During the following elections, cardinal Sarto resolved to change the situation. "He laid the foundations of an honorable alliance, says his biographer, between the members of the most representative of the Catholic party and those of the moderate party, alliance contracted under the sign of the most, ample confidence⁹⁸." The victory was complete. So, the popes of the end of 19th and of the beginning of 20th century gave the example of appeasement with secularized countries to re-instill into them an influence of the Church. And on this road of pragmatism, turning the back to isolation, one of the pioneers is Saint Pius X, so famous for his reforms as for his attachment to principles. Also in the crisis of the Church: after the Council, it was important to take distance, as Monsignor Lefebvre did, to show our reprobation of certain new things. Now, the danger is isolationism. It is necessary to arrive at an appeasement with the moderates, to re-instill in the Church the principles of Tradition; and this necessarily passes by a canonical solution.

NINTH REASON

Monsignor Lefebvre, besides, always searched for a canonical solution for the SSPX. He continued his efforts even after the consecrations, although, in his realism, he had little hope of success.

TENTH REASON

Today, we aren't the only ones to criticize the derivatives. In Rome, voices make themselves heard. This freedom which is left them is the guarantee of the one that will be left to us, after the canonical recognition.

II. Opinion in the opposite sense

Against the reasons which precede, let's raise what follows⁹⁹.

On July 14th, 1987, Monsignor Lefebvre said to cardinal Ratzinger: "Eminence, see, even if you grant us a bishop, even if you grant us some autonomy by report to the bishops, even if you grant us all the liturgy of 1962, if you grant us to continue the seminaries and the Fraternity, as we do right now, *we won't be able to collaborate, it is impossible, impossible*, because we work in two diametrically opposite directions: you, you work on the de-Christianization of society, of the human person and of the Church, and us, we work on the Christianization. We cannot get along¹⁰⁰."

In December 1988, he still said: "When we are asked the question of knowing when there will be an agreement with Rome, my answer is simple: *when Rome will re-crown Our Lord Jesus Christ*. We can't agree with those who de-crown Our Lord. The day where they will again recognize Our Lord as King of peoples and of nations, it isn't us whom they will have joined, but the Catholic Church in which we reside¹⁰¹."

Finally, in his spiritual Itinerary, which is like his testament, he writes: "As long as this secretariat [for the unity of the Christians] will keep the false ecumenism for orientation and that the Roman and ecclesiastical authorities will approve, we can affirm that they reside in opened and official break with all the past of the Church. *It is therefore a strict duty for every priest who wants to remain Catholic to separate from this conciliar Church, as long as it won't find the tradition of the Magisterium and of the Catholic faith*¹⁰²."

III. Substantive Response

The advanced reasons above highlight the nature of the problem: that of the collaboration with the current hierarchy of the Church. To answer our question well, it is necessary to remember that the Church is a society, and that a society defines itself by the end which it follows. The Church is the society instituted by Our Lord Jesus Christ with the salvation of souls in view; in other words, with a view to establishing the reign of Our Lord on minds, hearts and institutions.

Now, is this really what the men of the Church have been following since the Council?

To answer this question, it seems to us necessary to question the Council itself about the purpose that it allocates to the Church (the union of mankind in pluralism); it is important to underline that this purpose is in the letter of the Council, this last being the compass of the clerics. It will then be easy for us to know if we can give support to this purpose by collaborating. Finally, we will see how the actual Rome wants to impose it on us.

1) Counciliar Ecclesiology---Pluralism

The Council gave a new definition of the Church, which would be “the sacrament [...] of the intimate union with God and the unity of all mankind¹⁰³”. The Catholic Church wouldn't become identified any more, purely and simply, with the Church of Christ: «This Church, says the Council, as a society constituted and organized in this world, it is in the Catholic Church that she subsists [*subsistit in*], governed by the successor of Peter and the bishops who are in communion with him, although many elements of sanctification and the truth remain out of its structures, elements which, belonging properly by donation of God to the Church of Christ¹⁰⁴, called by them Catholic unity¹⁰⁵.” In other words, the Church of Christ is larger than the Catholic Church; this last one has the totality of the means of salvation; but the other separated "churches" have some also¹⁰⁶. These last are joined with the Catholic Church, but not fully¹⁰⁷. As for non-Christian religions, the continuation of the text maintains, in a more or less veiled way, that they are holders of salvation¹⁰⁸. Where from the new and wrong notion of “full communion” and of “imperfect communion”. The decree on ecumenism is even more clear: “The Spirit of Christ, indeed, doesn't refuse to use [separated communities] as means of salvation¹⁰⁹.”

If, therefore, all religions are means of salvation, what is the Catholic Church searching according to the Council? “From now on, all men, henceforth be more closely joined between them by social connections, techniques, cultural, realize, equally, their full unity in Christ¹¹⁰.” In short, it must realize the unity of mankind, “*by returning* [this one] *conscious*, by unification thanks to science and to progress, from the unity that the Incarnation would have already conducted ontologically (with salvation guaranteed to everybody). It isn't therefore a question any more of converting souls, but of becoming aware – through the “dialogue”- due to the fact that salvation is already realized (implicitly!) and that the unity which was produced in Christ must *superimpose* to that produced by profane development¹¹¹, by carrying it to its accomplishment in this *new unity of mankind*¹¹².” Announcing the scandalous interreligious meeting at Assisi, John-Paul II said: “The ecumenical task aims precisely at this purpose: realizes the Church as a sacrament of a symphonic unit of numerous forms of an only fullness, in the likeness of the Trinitarian unity, source and base of all unity¹¹³”. This language seduces by the luxury of pictures; but how can we speak about “symphony”, where we only hear “cacophony” of contradictory proposals?

The subjacent principle in this new conception of the Church is the pluralism, according to which contradictory doctrines could co-exist pacifically, everything reduced to the rank of opinions. Nobody would have the truth, but each would have pieces of it. This principle is expressed across this shimmering expression: “Unity in diversity”. It would rather be necessary to speak about “lopsided union of contradictories”.

2) Catholic judgement on pluralism

Pluralism puts at the same level truth and error. And yet nothing is more insulting for the truth than such treatment. So already has Pius VII expressed himself deploring the French Constitution of 1815. “Our pain, he says, increases in the

reading of article 22, which not only allows the freedom of religion and of conscience, but promises protection to this freedom and to the ministers of various religions. It is not necessary to demonstrate to you what a mortal blow this article brings to the Catholic religion in France. Because as soon as we affirm the freedom of all religions without distinction, we confound the truth with error and we put on the same line as the heretical sects and the Jewish perfidy, the Holy and Immaculate Spouse of Christ, the Church outside of which there is no salvation¹¹⁴.”

In the same sense, cardinal Pie said: “To condemn the truth for tolerance, it is to force it to suicide. Affirmation kills itself, if it doubts itself; and it doubts itself, if it lets negation settle indifferently next to it. For the truth, intolerance is the care of conservation, it is the legitimate exercise of the right of property. When one possesses, one must defend, otherwise one will soon be completely stripped. [...] Everywhere truth doesn't support falsehood, good excludes evil, order fights disorder. [...] it is the condition of all truth to be intolerant; but the religious truth being the most absolute and the most important of all truths, is by consequence also the most intolerant. [...] Jesus Christ sent His apostles to preach to all nations, that is to say, overturning all existing religions, to establish the unique Christian religion all over the earth, and to substitute the unity of Catholic dogma for all beliefs received by the different peoples. And foreseeing the movements and divisions which this doctrine is going to excite on the earth, He didn't stop, and He declares that He came to bring not peace but the double-edged sword, ignite war not only between the peoples, but in the breast of the same family, and separate, as to the conditions of at least, the believing spouse of the incredulous spouse, the Christian son-in-law of the idolatrous father-in-law. The thing is true, and the philosopher is right: Jesus Christ didn't steal from dogma¹¹⁵.”

As for the origin of pluralism, freemasonry claims to be its father. “The Christians,” says Marsaudon, “should not forget, however, that every path leads to God [...] and stand bravely in this courageous notion of freedom of thought, which, we can really talk about revolution, part of our Masonic lodges., it is stretched magnificently above the dome of Saint-Pierre¹¹⁶.”

That the enemies of the reign of Our Lord profess pluralism, not only do we deplore it, but we denounce it. Hence the question: do we have the right to suggest that we agree with pluralism? The problem is the confession of faith.

3) The confession of faith

The confession of faith is the external act of this virtue: by words or by gestures, we signify externally what we believe internally. Therefore, this external profession is a duty. “It is by believing with heart that justice is achieved, says Saint Paul, and it is by confessing with your mouth that you come to salvation¹¹⁷.” This duty is a positive precept¹¹⁸, which therefore obliges only under the circumstances.

“There is, says Saint Thomas, places and moments where [the confession of faith] is necessary for salvation: it is when by omission of this confession we would subtract from God the honor which He is owed, or to the next one, the usefulness we have to give Him. For example, if somebody, while we question him about the faith, remained silent, and that we could be believed that he has no faith or that this faith

is not true, or that others by his silence could be diverted from the faith¹¹⁹.” In these circumstances, not to declare the faith, it is to deny it.

The angelic doctor states that when faith is in danger, “anyone is required to disclose it to others, either to instruct or confirm them in the faith, or to suppress the impertinence of the infidels”.

Finally, if we hope that it will be of any use, we should not fear the trouble this confession will cause among the infidels.

The code of canon law (of 1917, of course) takes back this duty by divine right to make an ecclesiastical law: “The faithful are required to declare their faith openly in all circumstances where their silence, their hesitancy or their attitude would mean an implicit negation of their faith, a contempt of religion, an injury to God or a scandal for our neighbor¹²⁰.”

In conclusion, it is impossible to us to accept the principle of pluralism: to admit it, is to deny our faith. To suggest publicly that we accept it is to sin against the confession of faith; it is to renounce the royalty of Our Lord, exclusive of false religions; it is to admit the new conciliar ecclesiology; finally, it is to play the game of Freemasonry.

But finally, that Rome professes this pluralism does not oblige us to adhere to this principle. It is like the French Republic, which tolerates all cults: asking the mayor's permission to make a procession is not adhering to the republican pluralism. Hence the question: does Rome seek to impose its pluralism on us?

4) Roman intentions from 1988 to 2016

June 11th, 1988, in Flavigny, Monsignor Lefebvre said: “Their intentions haven’t changed, because their principles haven’t changed. “In this case, he had to note that the Roman authorities had kept their intention of bringing us back to the Council. Which makes sense: you act according to your own principles.

About thirty years later, the principles are always the same, particularly that of pluralism. Can we say, according to the facts, that Rome, during all these years, and up to this very day, has not ceased to act according to these principles with Tradition? That's what we need to see now.

A) Jean-Paul II and the *Ecclesia Dei* committee

Already before the consecrations, John Paul II had sought to obtain a minimum of adhesion to the Council. But the case of the committee *Ecclesia Dei* is particularly interesting, because in the *Motu Proprio* of the same name, the Pope explains in a very clear way which is - for him - the place of Tradition in the conciliar Church.

a - The definition of Tradition

The pope begins by condemning the act of Monsignor Lefebvre consecrating four bishops. But he makes it clear right away that this is not just a disciplinary problem, it's disobedience. "At the root of this act", there is a doctrinal question, namely the notion of Tradition.

In Catholic teaching, Tradition is one of the two sources of Revelation, which is closed at the death of the last apostle. The Revelation is closed, which means it cannot increase. Tradition, as its name implies, is the simple *transmission* of the revealed deposit.

John Paul II condemns this conception, which "does not take into account the living character of Tradition which, as the Second Vatican Council clearly taught, derives its origin from the apostles, continues in the Church under the guidance of the Holy Ghost: indeed, the perception of things as well as of transmitted words increases, either through the contemplation and study of believers who meditate on them in their hearts, or through the inner intelligence that they experience spiritual things, or through the preaching of those who, with episcopal succession, received a certain charisma of truth". Thus, according to the Council, Tradition is alive, that means growing, and therefore Vatican II is part of it. For the Pope, Monsignor Lefebvre's mistake is to have stopped the Tradition in 1962, and that would be the root of the problem. Indeed, the crux of the problem is Vatican II, which contradicts the Catholic Tradition. The two cannot coexist peacefully.

Second, John Paul II affirms "the richness that the diversity of charismata and traditions of spirituality and apostolate represents for the Church, which constitutes the beauty of *unity in variety*: such is the" symphony "which, under the action of the Holy Ghost, the terrestrial Church brings up to heaven" (nº. 5). Thus, the Catholic Tradition is no longer more than a "charisma" and a "tradition of spirituality" among others. It is really, there the principle of pluralism.

Now, the true place of the Catholic Tradition is the throne of the queen who triumphs over her enemies, and not a niche in the pantheon of religions, on equal footing with the false gods, including conciliar errors. However, it is precisely this last place that is given to it by the *Motu proprio Ecclesia Dei*.

b - Ecclesia Dei Strategy

After the doctrine, the Pope goes on to make practical conclusions: he calls upon "all those who have hitherto been in various ways linked to the movement resulting from Archbishop Lefebvre, so that they may realize their grave duty [...] not to continue to support this movement in any way whatsoever". And to fulminate the excommunication against those who would formally adhere to it¹²⁴.

He then called on the bishops to apply broadly the indult of 1984 to these faithful and to take “necessary measures to ensure that their just aspirations are respected”. Finally, he establishes a commission to apply this *Motu proprio*.

Entering the *Ecclesia Dei* system is therefore *ipso facto* to reject the Catholic and “traditional” concept of Tradition. And this, despite all subsequent statements to the contrary. Indeed, Dom Gerard had confirmed on August 18th, 1988 that he had demanded and obtained “that no doctrinal or liturgical counterpart be demanded of us¹²⁶”. Asked about this point, Cardinal Mayer replied: “Dom Gerard's assertion is not exact. It is enough to remember that the agreement was negotiated *on the basis of the protocol of May 5th*, which required the acceptance of the doctrine contained in the Dogmatical Constitution *Lumen Gentium* (Nº. 25) [and the Cardinal then recalls the other paragraphs]. We cannot accept only concessions offered by the protocol and forget the obligations! Just as in the *Motu proprio Ecclesia Dei* of July 2nd last year, we cannot limit ourselves to seeing the openness to just spiritual and liturgical aspirations and forget the implicit criticism of a false concept of Tradition [that is, the one we defend!]¹²⁷.” Accepting this *Motu proprio* means publicly making a profession of pluralistic faith. So, it's about passing to the enemy.

In this light, we can better understand some of Archbishop Lefebvre's strong assertions about rallies. Today, when we are afraid of displeasing or offending them, it is good to hear these words again.

“All that has been granted to them,” he said, “has been granted to them only for the purpose of ensuring that all those who adhere to or are bound to the SSPX disassociate themselves from it and submit to Rome¹²⁸.”

“They betray us. They give the hand to those who destroy the Church. [...] So now they are doing the devil's work, they who were working with us for the reign of Our Lord and for the salvation of souls¹²⁹.”

B) Benedict XVI

Under John Paul II, it was already Cardinal Ratzinger who was responsible for Monsignor Lefebvre's case. Once he became pope, did he continue with the same principle of pluralism? His letter of March 10th, 2009 to the bishops of the Catholic Church will help us to respond. The Pope explains the reasons for the lifting of the “excommunications” of the SSPX bishops.

Benedict XVI began by reassuring the progressive bishops: this measure was purely disciplinary. If the SSPX wants to exercise a legitimate ministry in the Church, it must first accept “Vatican II and the post-conciliar Magisterium of the Popes”.

So why lift the sanctions? Was it really a priority? “Yes,” replied the Pope. “Today, when faith is extinguished everywhere, the priority is to revive it.

Whence follows, as a logical consequence, we must have the unity of believers at heart. Indeed, their discord casts doubt on the credibility of what they say about God. That is why the effort for the common witness of faith of Christians - through ecumenism - is included in the supreme priority. Added to this is the need for all those who believe in God to seek peace together, to try to come closer to one another, to go together, even if their images of God are diverse, to the source of the Light - that is interreligious dialogue.”

Thus, there is a priority: to revive the faith. And the means: ecumenism, interreligious dialogue. And “reconciliation” with the traditionalists is part of this movement.

But why go to this brother “who has something against you” [that brother is us]? Because it is necessary to avoid the “radicalizations” and “reintegrate their adherents”, “to reduce hardening and shrinkage, thus giving a place to what is positive and recoverable for the whole. [...] I myself have seen, in the years following 1988, that, thanks to the revival of communities previously separated from Rome, their internal climate has changed; that the return to the vast and great common Church has made it possible to move beyond unilateral positions and to attenuate hardening so that positive forces for the whole have subsequently emerged”.

In short, it is a task of the Tradition's operation in favor of conciliar revolution, which is embodied in ecumenism and interreligious dialogue. Clemency measures are there to attenuate and eradicate the intolerance of truth; finally, it is a question of entering the system of the conciliar Church where, according to the principle of pluralism, each one respects the opinion of the other.

C) Pope Francis

The latter initially seemed to have little interest in our case. Nevertheless, however, the steps continued, and the Pope is personally involved, in particular by granting to the priests of the SSPX the faculty of absolving validly and lawfully during the year of mercy.

In Archbishop Pozzo's previously quoted interview with Zenit on February 25, the following points can be made.

a - On the way towards “full communion”

The prelate begins by recalling that “the SSPX remains in an irregular situation”, not yet having canonical status. “The members of the SSPX are Catholics on their way to full communion with the Holy See.” This communion will exist when the Canonical recognition of the Fraternity takes place.

Then he takes stock of the progress already made. He notes that the contacts between the *Ecclesia Dei* Commission and the SSPX “have fostered the development of a climate of trust and mutual respect, which must be the basis

for a process of reconciliation”. “We are now at a stage that I believe is constructive and conducive to achieving the desired reconciliation.” From this point of view, the points of divergence should not be considered “as insurmountable walls, but as points of discussion that merit further depth”.

The whole problem is fundamentally distorted in this presentation. The doctrinal problems raised by the Council are of exceptional gravity: implicitly, it is the divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ that is at stake. However, these problems are relegated to the status of “talking points”. From then on, it is only a question of “reconciliation”. We reconcile after an argument, after a misunderstanding. For us, however, this is a completely different matter, and certainly not an argument.

For the Vatican, it is a matter of establishing a climate of trust and mutual respect: that is, each one will respect the positions of the other: it is pluralism again. Farewell to the battle of the faith!

Therefore “full communion” is nothing more than the “pluralist fraternity”.

We cannot accept such language. Accepting to enter, into this process would *ipso facto* make ours the vision of the problem expressed by Archbishop Pozzo, and therefore by the Vatican. Here we touch the confession of faith. This here it becomes necessary for salvation “when, by the omission of this confession, the honor due to God is taken away from him, or from the neighbor the usefulness that must be given to him. [...] Where the faith is in jeopardy, anyone is bound to disclose his faith to others, either to instruct them or to suppress the impertinence of the infidels¹³¹”. To enter, into this process is to put the light of the faith under the bushel.

b - Surmounting obstacles

They are of two types: “doctrinal” and “mental and psychological attitude”.

First, the doctrinal obstacle. This is, of course, the Council. For Bishop Pozzo, the whole problem would come from the confusion between the Council and its spirit; the first would be good and the second bad¹³². Then he falsely asserts that the SSPX would reject only the second but would accept the first! But in any case, “even after the full reconciliation”, we would continue to discuss it.

In the meantime, it is necessary to seek a consensus on the three points necessary for full communion: the integrity of the Creed, the bond of the sacraments and the acceptance of the supreme magisterium of the Church. Bishop Pozzo said that on these three points, the SSPX would agree. As for the points of divergence (ecumenism, religious liberty), these are pastoral and prudential questions, on which the discussion is legitimate.

Secondly, the obstacle of mental and psychological attitude: it is a question of “going from a position of controversial and antagonistic confrontation to a position of listening and mutual respect, esteem and trust”. The Prelate

“believes that the closeness undertaken has given fruit, especially for this change in attitude on both sides”. “The Holy Father encouraged the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, from the very beginning of his pontificate, to continue this method.”

It is not surprising that this task should be assigned to the commission. Indeed, the priests who adhere to it must pronounce this formula: “With regard to some points of doctrine taught by the Second Vatican Council, or with regard, to subsequent institutions relating either to the liturgy or canon law, and which seem to some of them hardly or in no way reconcilable with the declarations of the previous magisterium, I am obliged to follow the positive line of a study and a communication with the Apostolic See, avoiding all polemic notes¹³⁴.” It is to this same state of spirit that Rome wants to lead us today.

The process is very clever. It gives the impression that we are no longer being asked to adhere to Vatican II, and in fact there is no longer any need to explicitly accept it. However, by ceasing the "confrontation" and the “polemic”, in other words, the fight for the faith, we pass on to an attitude of respect¹³⁵, that is, to say we recognize as valid the Roman opinion on these “pastoral questions” is recognized as valid, which amounts to acknowledging the possibility of peaceful coexistence with Vatican II. Let us remember the words of Cardinal Pie: “The affirmation kills itself if it doubts itself; and it doubts itself if it lets, indifferently, its negation lay beside it.” Stop denouncing the error is to admit that it is acceptable¹³⁶; it is therefore implicitly admitting Vatican II.

Note the curious resemblance between this step where we research what joins us rather than what divides us, and the ecumenical step; the method is identical.

5) Conclusion

It is impossible to seek to be officially recognized by the hierarchy of the Catholic Church still imbued with false principles, and especially pluralism (which is consubstantial to the conciliar religion). Because it is impossible not to be integrated into the system that flows from these principles at the same time. To accept such pro-positions is to “steal on dogma”, it is to collaborate with the evil works of the neo-modernist hierarchy, it is endorsing its business. In the eyes of all, a canonical recognition will mean that we agree with it.

This was understood by Archbishop Lefebvre in 1988, when he wrote to John Paul II: “The colloquiums and talks with Cardinal Ratzinger and his collaborators, although they took place in an atmosphere of courtesy and charity, convinced us that the motive for frank and effective collaboration had not yet arrived. [...] In view of the refusal to consider our requests and given the fact that the aim of this reconciliation is not at all the same for the Holy See as it is for us, we believe that it is preferable to wait for more favorable times, for the return of Rome to Tradition. [...] We will

continue to pray that modern Rome, infested with modernism, will once again become Catholic Rome, and return to its bimillenary Tradition. Then the problem of reconciliation will no longer have any purpose, and the Church will find a new youth¹³⁷.”

More than ever, this prelate's speech is topical: “Their intentions have not changed, because their principles have not changed.” Their principles - those of pluralism - are always the same; consequently, they seek to integrate us into their pluralistic system. We must wait until these principles have been rejected, in other words, until the men of the Church have converted.

“We have never wanted to belong to this system, which describes itself as a conciliar Church, and is defined by the *Novus Ordo Missæ*, indifferent ecumenism and the secularization of all society. Yes, we have no place, *nullam partem habemus*, with the pantheon of the religions of Assisi; our own excommunication by a decree of your Eminence [the Cardinal Gantin] or any other dicastery would only be irrefutable proof of this. We ask no better than to be declared *ex communione* of the adulterous spirit that has been blowing in the Church for twenty-five years, excluded of the unholy communion with the infidels. We believe in the one God, Our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Father and the Holy Ghost [...].

“Therefore, to be associated publicly with the sanction imposed on the six Catholic bishops, defenders of the faith in its integrity and completeness, would be for us a mark of honor and a sign of orthodoxy before the faithful. Indeed, they have a strict right to know that the priests to whom they are addressing themselves are not of the communion of an evolutionary, Pentecostal and syncretic counterfeit Church¹³⁹.”

“Anyone who loves the truth hates error,” said Ernest Hello, “this hatred of error is the touchstone to which the love of truth can be recognized.”

“A mistake and a lie that we don't bother to unmask gradually acquires the authority of the real little by little,” says Charles Maurras.

“To not resist error is to approve it; and the truth is oppressed when it is defended softly¹⁴⁰” (attributed to Pope Innocent III [*Translator's note: I was told that it should actually be attributed to Pope St. Felix III*]).

IV. Answers to objections

First: The Pope calls us to the new evangelization

The Pope, being the authority, is the efficient cause of the Church's society. If he calls us, we have to look at what final cause he intends to lead us to. What is this “new evangelization”? Does that mean the same thing to him and to us? Is Francis seeking the social reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ¹⁴¹? If that is not the case, we cannot answer his appeal; that would be endorsing his agenda, falsely suggesting that we agree with the terms. However, we have seen it: since the Council, men of the Church have been heading towards an end that is opposed to the one set by Our Lord.

As for the “existential peripheries”, it is for him to address divorced-married couples, homosexuals, etc., with a complacent regard on their moral disorders. Is that what this term also means for us?

Second: With the conservatives, we could make counterweight

Now more than ever, we have to help these sympathizers. But is canonical recognition the appropriate means? Indeed, what they need is to be made aware of the errors of the Council. Right now, they don't see these mistakes. Indeed, according to them, the thing that we are missing is the canonical recognition. In other words, they did not understand that the problem is not with us, but with them.

Our true way of helping them is to provide them with all the works that will enable them to understand the crisis we are experiencing, and to pray that the Holy Ghost will enlighten them. It is what certain priests near Monsignor Lazo, Bishop Emeritus of San Fernando of the Union (Philippines), are doing. What a magnificent conversion they got! These were not only signs of sympathy on the part of the prelate. He became confessor of the faith. Why did you become a traditionalist, he was asked? “Well, here,” he replied, “it is because I *rejected* the new Mass^{142!}” But there is not only the Mass; the struggle of the faith is even more important. In 1998 he sent John Paul II a Declaration of Faith, denouncing the conciliar errors. “I am for Catholic Rome,” he said, “the Rome of Saints Peter and Paul. I do not serve the Rome controlled by the Freemasons who are agents of Lucifer, the prince of demons^{143.}” And he himself became an apostle to other bishops, sending them documents. “I gave it to them because I think it's at that level of ideas where the battle has to be delivered^{144.}”

Third: Any abnormal situation drives to normalization

The expression is ambiguous. It may mean that any abnormal situation must be made normal again. For example, after the Eastern schism, the Church made every effort for centuries to row dissidents to the fold.

However, the obviated meaning seems to be that, inevitably, things must evolve in the right direction. Now, our poor human nature, left to its own devices, can only roll from abysses to abysses, if no one comes to rescue it. To use the example of the schismatics, in spite of, the numerous efforts of the popes, very few of them have returned to the Church, since a thousand years.

In addition, the term used implies that we are in an abnormal situation. What is indeed abnormal is that the Roman authorities spread modernism. To make a comparison, when a father of a family forces his children to steal, under the threat of severe punishment, they are bound to disobey and resist him; indeed, it is abnormal for children to resist their father; but the primary disorder is indeed that of the father; and if it becomes untenable and dangerous for their virtue, it is prudent for them to distance themselves from him. And as long as this disorder persists, children are forced to resist or stay away. It would be incomprehensible for the children to re-establish normal relations with their father when they know that he is always obstinate in vice.

In our case, we stand at odds with modernist Rome for the reasons mentioned above, and for others that we will see in the following articles. As long as these reasons remain, we are

obliged to remain in the situation where we find ourselves and are labelled as “abnormal” by the objecting.

Fourth: The urgent need of new bishops

It is necessary to distinguish the two questions: the canonical solution and the consecration of a bishop. Each is resolved by its own principles¹⁴⁵.

For the first one (the canonical solution), we have explained the principles in the body of the article. As for the second (the consecration of a bishop), it is resolved by the principle of necessity. Let's hear how Archbishop Lefebvre talked about it, shortly before his death.

In 1990, having learned that Bishop de Castro Mayer's health was declining, Bishop Lefebvre wrote a letter to him to propose the consecration of a successor in the episcopate. “Why consider such a succession, he wondered, apart from the usual Canonical norms?”

“1) Because priests and faithful have a strict right to have pastors who profess in its integrity the Catholic faith, essential for the salvation of their souls, and priests who are true Catholic pastors.

“2) Because the “Counciliar Church” is now spread throughout the world, spreading errors contrary to the Catholic faith and, because of these errors, has corrupted the sources of grace which are the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the sacraments. This false Church is in ever deeper rupture with the Catholic Church.

“It follows from these principles and facts that it is absolutely necessary to continue the Catholic episcopacy in order to continue the Catholic Church. [...]

“This is my opinion, I think it is based on the fundamental laws of ecclesiastical law and on Tradition¹⁴⁶.”

It can be added that Archbishop Lefebvre had made all the steps for the episcopal consecration of the Fraternity with the Roman authorities before 1988. He concluded that “recourse to Rome, always physically possible, is rendered morally impossible by the spirit of which the Holy Father is penetrated: “communion with false religions”, “an adulterous spirit that blows in the Church”, “this spirit is not Catholic”. “For twenty years, he says, “we have been working patiently and steadfastly to make the Roman authorities understand the need to return to sound doctrine and Tradition for the renewal of the Church, the salvation of souls and the glory of God. But we remain deaf to our supplications, much more we are asked to recognize the legitimacy of the whole Council and the reforms that ruin the Church¹⁴⁷.”

If the need for episcopal consecration is felt, it is enough to take up these principles and apply them: the faithful are always entitled to true doctrine and true sacraments; the counciliar Church is always at odds - and even more so than in 1990 - with the Catholic Church; finally, the Holy See does not seem to have questioned the validity of the Council and does not tolerate being attacked on this issue. Here it is easy to see ‘if it is possible to consecrate bishops with the permission of Rome’. As for when to be consecrated, this is a matter of “royal prudence”, that of the chief. It is up to him to apply the principles to the reality of the moment.

Fifth: It isn't ecumenism

Certainly, relations between the Holy See and the faithful of Tradition are not ecumenical. Indeed, ecumenism is the search for a certain union between Christians (Catholics and non-Catholics) without conversion. Here, however, the two terms of these relations are Catholic, so it is not ecumenism.

However, the principle that underlines ecumenism is pluralism: in ecumenical relations, each person respects the convictions of the other, admitting them as valid.

The Holy See wants to impose the same principle to the relations with us. It is therefore not enough to say that it is not by ecumenism that the Pope comes to us - which is true - but it must not be in a pluralistic perspective, which - as we have seen - is not the case.

Sixth: The healthy disorder that our recognition would cause within the Church

Everything that is of traditional tendency meets sympathizers and opponents (more or less virulent). For example, some showed their dissatisfaction when the Good Shepherd Institute was erected, saying that “these people should have stayed outside”; others showed their support, seeing this as a step towards “reconciliation”. Likewise, the Franciscans of the Immaculate were greatly appreciated by many and hated by others. However, this is not enough to say that the GSI was right and that the doctrinal position of the Franciscans is irreproachable. It is not on the reaction of others that an act should be judged, but on its intimate *nature*. In this article, we have already begun to examine the moral nature of a canonical recognition with the neo-modernist authorities. That's enough to judge its validity.

Seventh: Our enemies oppose to this recognition

The reason we have just given is sufficient to answer the present objection. Let us simply add that it is not enough for an effect to be good enough to justify the act that produced it; in other words, the end does not justify the means. It is not permitted to steal money to build a church. Here, too, the good effect (even if very limited) would come from a bad means: aggregation to conciliar pluralism.

Eighth: Saint Pius X gave the example of union with the Liberals

Admittedly, there had been a union with the liberals to drive out the Freemasons. But, as Father Dal Gal says, “Let us also observe that in this alliance between the Catholics and the moderate liberals, it was not the latter but the former who drew up the joint action program to be carried out during the election period and after the elections. It was not the Catholics who had watered down their principles to join the moderates, but the moderates who had joined the Catholic program¹⁴⁸.” In this case, however, it is the neo-modernists who intend to impose their principles on us.

It should be noted that in the case of the separation of Church and State, Saint Pius X resisted the French government which wanted to impose religious associations, which would have led the Church of France to schism. His firmness has led the sectarians to back down. It is therefore false to say that the pontificate of St. Pius X is part of an inescapable

logic of reconciliation and appeasement. It is to read events in the light of the “sense of history”.

Moreover, isolation is not an evil in itself: God had even prescribed it to the people of Israel. If Monsignor Lefebvre distanced himself, it was to preserve his priests from modernist influences. It is not clear why, by the mere fact that thirty years have passed, it is necessary to go through a canonical solution to reintroduce in Rome the principles of Tradition.

Ninth: Monsignor Lefebvre always searched a canonical solution

Let us begin by saying: Archbishop Lefebvre had long sought a canonical solution. But it is absolutely clear - as we recalled at the beginning of the substantive response - that, after the consecration, Archbishop Lefebvre did not seek a Canonical solution until his death¹⁴⁹.

But it is not useless to say why Archbishop Lefebvre first sought a solution on the canonical level. It is because he had hoped and believed for a long time that the Roman authorities were capable of sincerely wanting the good of Tradition. “I had hoped until the last minute,” he said, “that in Rome there would be a little loyalty¹⁵⁰.” This desire to promote Tradition was undeniably that of Bishop Charrière, when he approved the FSSPX. But later, Archbishop Lefebvre had to realize that it was not the Roman authorities at all. “They want to have us under their direct control,” he says, “and to be able to impose on us justly this anti-Tradition policy of which they are imbued. [...] I have noticed the will of Rome to impose on us their ideas and their ways of seeing things¹⁵¹.” “We soon realized that we were dealing with people who are not honest. [...] We, we desired recognition [the will to help Tradition], Rome wanted reconciliation [that everyone make concessions] and that we recognize our mistakes¹⁵².” Cardinal Gagnon himself said at the Avvenire on June 17, 1988: “We have always talked about reconciliation, however, Monsignor Lefebvre, on the other hand, of gratitude. The difference is not small. Reconciliation presupposes that both parties make an effort, that past mistakes are acknowledged. Archbishop Lefebvre only hears that he has always been right, and this is impossible¹⁵³.” “The will of Rome not to help the Tradition,” says Archbishop Lefebvre again, “not to trust them, was obvious¹⁵⁴.” Finally, he wrote to John Paul II “that the time for frank and effective collaboration had not yet come”, because “the aim of this reconciliation is not at all the same for the Holy See as it is for us¹⁵⁵”.

For him, therefore, there is no question of entering the pluralist system: “For them, all this [Catholic doctrine] is evolving and has evolved with Vatican II. The current term of evolution is Vatican II. That is why we cannot bind ourselves with Rome¹⁵⁶.” “It is not surprising that we cannot come to an agreement with Rome. This will not be possible until Rome returns to the faith in the reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ, as long as it gives the impression that all religions are good¹⁵⁷.”

Tenth: The freedom of the conservative prelates is the guarantee of ours

As we have seen, none of the Conservative prelates question the Council and its principles. Only if we too, in one way or another, accept these principles, can Rome tolerate criticism from us. This is totally unacceptable.

ARTICLE 2: Wouldn't A Canonical Recognition Open to Us a Huge Field of Apostolate?

In the previous article, we saw that the canonical recognition of Tradition's works would inevitably pass through our implicit recognition of the false principle of pluralism. But this last point does not exhaust the complexity of the issue. In addition to the problem of pluralism, there is that of the contacts between the conciliar world and us. Hence a first question: wouldn't these contacts be an occasion to contaminate our environment? Or, on the contrary, would they not be the opening of an immense field of apostolate? That is the subject that we will be dealing with now.

I. Reasons in favor of a positive answer

It seems that yes, a huge field of apostolate would open in front of us.

FIRST REASON

Indeed, sympathizers (priests, bishops, and even cardinals) would give us churches, and perhaps even entrust a seminary to our care. In this way we could participate, according to our vocation, in the development of a generation of priests full of faith and apostolic zeal. However, given our situation, the canon barrier makes it impossible for them to do so.

SECOND REASON

Archbishop Lefebvre always had in mind the conversion of the Pope and the hierarchy of the Church. In order to do this effectively, we must have a recognized place in the Church: it is from this one place that we can convert the present authorities.

THIRD REASON

The danger of contamination is great, but we can and must escape it, with the grace of God. Let us remember the parable of the bad grain and the good grain.

II. Opinion in the opposite sense

However, on September 9, 1988, Archbishop Lefebvre said: "If we move away from these people, it is absolutely the same as with people with AIDS. We don't feel like catching him. But they have spiritual AIDS, contagious diseases. If we want to stay healthy, we can't go with them¹⁵⁸."

On June 11, 1988, in Flavigny, addressing the seminarians: "Especially if there was an arrangement [with Rome], we would be invaded by a lot of people: "Now that you have the Tradition and are recognized by Rome, we will come to you". There are many people who will keep the modern and liberal spirit, but who will come to us because it will make them happy to attend a traditional ceremony from time to time, to have contact with the traditionalists. And this is going to be very dangerous for our communities. If we are invaded by this world, what will become of Tradition? Little by little, there is going to be a kind of osmosis that is going to happen, a kind of consensus. "Oh, after all, the new Mass isn't so bad, don't exaggerate!" Slowly and slowly, we will end up no longer seeing the distinction between liberalism and Tradition. It's very dangerous¹⁵⁹."

In a letter of January 29th, 1989, Archbishop Lefebvre wanted to shed some light on this Flavigny conference: “My desire was to convey to the seminarians my apprehensions about dangerous influences on the struggle we are waging for the Catholic faith. The fight requires constant vigilance to protect us from modernist and conciliar errors. [...] I wanted to warn the seminarians against these influences that risked dividing the Traditionalists¹⁶⁰.”

Finally, in a letter to the Pope, he wrote: “Only an environment entirely free from modern errors and modern works can allow the renewal of the Church. This is the middle visited by Cardinal Gagnon and Bishop Perl, a community made up of deeply Christian families with many children, from which many excellent vocations come¹⁶¹.”

III. Substantive Response

The problem raised by all the above is that of contact with those who do not have our faith, and the possible dangers to it. To what extent are these contacts permitted? St. Thomas treated them *ex professo* in the *Summa theologica*. Let's give him the floor.

1) The principles given by Saint Thomas Aquinas

In question 10¹⁶², devoted to “infidelity in general”, he wonders whether it is possible to have a relationship with infidels (Article 9). As Father Bernard, OP, commenting on this treatise in the *Revue des jeunes* (youth magazine), says, the concrete details mentioned by St. Thomas refer to a society that has changed since then, because there is no longer any Christianity. “Nevertheless,” he says, “the principles on which this old and obsolete right was based, have not changed¹⁶³.”

Relationships with a person may be prohibited either to punish them or "for the precaution of those prohibited from communicating with that other person". It is the second case that we're dealing with here. But there is still a distinction to be made here. “If they are faithful who are formed in the faith,” says St. Thomas, “so that from their relationship with the infidels there is more to hope for the conversion of the infidels than a distance from faith among the faithful, there is no reason to prevent them from communicating with infidels who have not received the faith, that is, with pagans or Jews, especially when there is an urgent need. there is no reason to prevent them from communicating with infidels who have not received faith, that is, with pagans or Jews, especially when there is an urgent need. If, conversely, they are simple people who are not very firm in their faith, and whose ruin is, in all likelihood, feared, they must be diverted from relations with the infidels, and above all they must be prevented from having a great familiarity with them, even from communicating with them when there is no need.”

Father Bernard gives this clarification: “As for the cases[which are opportunities for contact with infidels], there are very significant differences depending on the nature of the relationships required by these cases and the more or less great danger they present for the faith: if the relations are simply work, trade, traffic or encounter, they are the most admissible, the least dangerous; but relations of social collaboration, for example in corporate or labor unions, are already more delicate and perilous¹⁶⁴; moreover, the relations of collaboration or doctrinal or literary

attendance, through books, study circles or academies, and especially through schools, are the object of the most wise precautionary measures; finally, at the highest level, the Church warns its faithful against the dangers that faith almost inevitably runs in domestic relations, between husband and wife. [...] As far as business matters are concerned, it is necessary to take into account, in view of the danger of the faith, the more or less close familiarity which they imply, the circumstances of urgency or necessity for living, and *also their affinity with religion*¹⁶⁵".

If we apply all this to the religious sphere, we see that the apostolate, for someone who is sufficiently formed, justifies contact with the infidels. But even a well formed faithful must be cautious and remain on guard against an infidel environment.

By the way, let us note that here, St. Thomas deals with infidelity in general: he speaks of those who follow false religions, as they are a danger to our faith; he does not consider the canonical question (the fact that they are excommunicated, or something else of this kind). Therefore, even if modernists cannot be canonically assimilated to infidels, they do in fact profess a doctrine that is a danger to our faith, and a danger that is all the more insidious if it keeps a Catholic varnish. Therefore, everything we have just said about contacts with the unbelievers generally applies to modernists in this regard of the danger to our faith. This remark is valid for the next articles (a. 10 and q. 12, a. 2), but we will come back to it later.

2) Application to our situation

A canonical solution will necessarily bring the faithful of Tradition into contact with the conciliar world. This is what Archbishop Lefebvre said on the eve of the consecrations in May 1988. He had sent a briefing to the friendly communities in preparation for the meeting at Pointet on May 30th (see appendix). "We must be aware," he said, "that a *new situation* will emerge after the implementation of the agreement. Let's just say the drawbacks:

- [...]
- *Relations with the bishops and a clergy and faithful that are conciliarists.* In spite of the very broad exemption, as canonical barriers disappear, courtesy contacts and perhaps offers of cooperation for school unions - union of superiors - priestly meetings - regional ceremonies, etc. - will be necessary. This whole world is of conciliar-ecumenical-charismatic spirit. [...] Up to now we were naturally protected, the selection was self-assured by the necessity of a *break with the conciliar world*. From now on, we're going to need continuous screening and constant protection from the Roman and diocesan *environments*." [But in Rome,] "they think it is inconceivable that they should be treated as a contaminated environment, after all they have given us.

"The moral problem therefore arises for us:

- Should we take the *risks* of contacts with these modernist circles, with the hope of converting a few souls and with the hope of protecting ourselves, with God's grace and the virtue of prudence, and thus remain legally united with Rome by letter, for we are so by reality and spirit?
- Or, above all, is it necessary to preserve the traditional family in order to maintain its cohesion and vigor in faith and grace, considering that the purely formal link with modernist Rome cannot be weighed against the protection of this family, which represents what remains of the true Catholic Church?"

It is therefore clear that there will be contacts and offers of cooperation. It is not a question of cooperation for the manufacture of objects (or other works of art), nor of social cooperation, but of cooperation in the doctrinal or pastoral order. For example, imagine a prior inviting a priest of the Fraternity of St. Peter to preach Lent in his chapel. Will the superior sanction this prior? If so, and if this prior appealed to Rome, would the latter agree with the superior? This would imply implicitly admitting that the preacher comes from a contaminated environment, and therefore, that the conciliar environment is contaminated¹⁶⁶. If, on the contrary - and this is the most likely - the prior is not sanctioned, it will make precedent, these incidents will multiply, and the doctrinal drift will be uncontrollable. Not to mention that many priests will not agree with this line of conduct, which can only increase disorder and division (because error is a source of division).

Let us assume, then, that diocesan conservative priests or *Ecclesia Dei* regularly frequent our circles, that "faithful" from other movements come to our chapels (the canonical barriers having fallen), this is where Saint Thomas applies: those who are well trained will be more or less resistant to drift, but the others (that is, the larger number of people, don't make illusions) will allow themselves to be contaminated. Should we take this "risk"? Can we call "risk" what is near certainty?

Moreover, the experience of the *Ecclesia Dei* communities has given the illusion that we can stay the course while being officially recognized: these communities have the Mass of all times; so, if we do not look further than the liturgy, we can let ourselves be seduced. In fact, for the past thirty years, we have seen a mixture of our faithful with the rallies, whether they go to Mass there, send the children to their schools or summer camps, or through "mixed marriages". We then witness the weakening of principles: seeing a certain piety in rallies, good deeds, etc., we question ourselves, saying: "Isn't it exaggerated to say that they have passed to the enemy? They're still doing a good job!" Certainly, but this is not enough: what good is it to us if we have abandoned the fight for the faith¹⁶⁷? However, if such an osmosis is already happening now, what will happen if the canonical barriers fall, following a recognition by Rome?

IV. Answers to objections

First: Sympathizers would give us churches or even a seminary

“They’d give us churches”: yes, that’s very likely¹⁶⁸. But which faithful would come? The conservatives of all nuances; it would take a great deal of soul power for preachers to preach the truth with integrity.

However, the most serious difficulty would come from the bishops who entrusted us with these churches: could they tolerate the denunciation of the conciliar errors? And if they tolerated it, the affair would quickly go back to Rome; to whom would the Holy See agree? Let us quote the testimony of the Father Cacqueray in 2001, then serving Toulouse:

“When I was in my previous position in Montreal-de-l' Aude and Toulouse in 2001, there was this explosion at the AZF factory that caused a lot of deaths; the chapel that we owned in Toulouse was a few hundred meters from the factory and by the force of the explosion, the roof of the chapel was lifted up and our chapel was out of commission for nine months; after the adventures that I passed by, we had to find a place to celebrate the Mass. The bishop of Toulouse, for whatever reason, has finally placed a chapel at our disposal in his diocesan house, the chapel of St. Peter and St. Paul. My confreres and I celebrated Mass in this chapel for nine months. I confess that during that period I was faced with this dilemma: either we kept this chapel, or we became homeless in the streets of Toulouse... I therefore paid attention to what I was saying in the diocesan chapel; if there had been a new Assisi at that time, I would have measured my words with precaution to avoid being thrown out of the church. [...] I have lived through this and have no difficulty in imagining the consequences of a similar situation on the whole world, and for all time. I said to myself: in nine months' time, I will be able to repeat everything I have to say. But imagine this in the whole world: priests would be obliged to keep an eye on all the words they would say: many truths could no longer be transmitted, either hidden or concealed by a very weakened discourse. In my opinion, that is how the deviations and distortions we have seen happen.

“Basically, in relation to this idea of entering the " visible perimeter " of the Church, I answer with the argument of freedom: freedom to express the truth completely and in its entirety, especially since we are practically the last to express this truth. If we, the fraternity of St. Pius X, stop saying these truths, who would say them again? Who could tell them to the bishops, and when possible to the Pope himself? I fear, very much that, under these conditions, the treasure entrusted by Providence to Tradition will be a treasure no longer communicated to the Pope, to the authorities of the Church and finally to the faithful. The central argument to which I respond is that of freedom, which must be preserved in order to express the whole Catholic truth¹⁶⁹.”

The same can be said of the seminaries we could be entrusted with.

Finally, let us conclude by saying that the mirage of missionary apostolic success is not new. Father Schmidberger replied to Dom Gérard: “If they think that their so-called “suspense” is detrimental to their apostolic influence, they are mistaken: the Cross is more fruitful than ease¹⁷⁰”.

Second: It’s only when we’re recognized that we can convert the hierarchy

The brighter the light, the brighter it is. Only doctrinal integrity is capable of dissipating the darkness of error; integrity which presupposes a struggle against the latter. The priority is therefore to preserve our faith.

Moreover, the doctrinal integrity of the faithful benefits the infidels. This is what Bishop de Castro Mayer taught. Indicating the dangers of half-heresies (“heresy progresses masked. [...] The devil breaths a spirit of confusion”) he exhorts his priests to carefully form the faithful. “It may seem to many [...] that you are wasting your time, for it will be difficult for them to understand why you are exhausting yourselves to perfect the faith that some already possess so well, when it would be better to seek to convert those who are outside the Church in anticipation of your apostolate. Show how wrong they are. [...] First of all, by your example and your words, you can prove that these two attitudes are not incompatible. [...] Moreover, the integrity of the faith produces among Catholics so many fruits of virtue and so vividly spreads in the Church the good smell of Jesus Christ, that it effectively attracts unbelievers to herself, so that the good done to the sons of the Church will forcefully benefit those who are outside the fold¹⁷¹.”

Third: There is necessarily a mixture of weeds and wheat
The meaning of this parable is that the chief must sometimes tolerate certain contaminated subjects, for fear of doing more harm by extracting the weed. But the seeding of the weed remains an evil, and it is a grave duty for the chiefs to ensure that it does not happen (we have just heard what Bishop de Castro Mayer has said). However, a canonical solution would make it inevitable to spread the error in our ranks, as we have seen above.

On the other hand, relying on grace to escape contamination, at the same time as one puts oneself in the occasion, is tempting God. “This one tempts God,” says St. Thomas, “who, being able to escape from weakness, exposes himself for no reason to danger, as if to see if God could deliver him.” This one tempts God, says St. Thomas, who, being able to escape from weakness, exposes himself for no reason to danger, as if to see if God could deliver him.” However, is there such an imperative need to expose oneself to the danger of contamination, which the objectioner considers serious?

But wouldn't it be possible to eliminate all these influences, thanks to a status that would protect us from them? That is the question that needs to be addressed now.

ARTICLE 3: Couldn't We Get a Status That Protects Us?

I. Reasons in favor of a positive answer

It seems that yes, we could get a status that protects us.

FIRST REASON

Indeed, we are being offered a personal prelature; however, the draft offered for our consideration contains additional guarantees which do not appear in the 1983 code, and which completely shields us from the influence of diocesan bishops. In short, it is an almost complete exemption. And this structure has not been proposed to any other community attached to Rome; therefore, their experience cannot be used as a basis for judging our case.

SECOND REASON

Of course, we will not be able to accept this structure at this time, because certain conditions laid down by the Roman authorities are still unacceptable. But little by little they are gradually removing these conditions in order to achieve union: they have ceased to demand from us the profession and oath of 1989, the acceptance of the legitimacy of the new Mass, the recognition of religious freedom and ecumenism. These doctrines are presented as open-ended questions. And even now, at this time, we are no longer even asked to recognize Vatican II in any way whatsoever. We are even given the right to defend our positions publicly, so the time has come to standardize our work.

THIRD REASON

In addition, we make it a condition *sine qua non* to be accepted *as we are*. This was already what Archbishop Lefebvre asked the Roman authorities to do at that time. And so that there is no ambiguity on this subject, we make it clear to our interlocutors what this means: that we hold certain new rites of sacraments (confirmation, order) as doubtful and, if necessary, we repeat them. We'll have to accept that. So, this condition involves all the others, and that is enough.

FOURTH REASON

We will therefore continue to condemn errors, both before and after the standardization. Nothing will be changed.

THE FIFTH REASON

But is the status enough? No, of course not! It still needs to be respected. The Pope not only has sympathy for us, but also defends us against those who would condemn us. This is a reality. Even if he does not agree with us on all points, nevertheless, he appreciates our work

SIXTH REASON

The foregoing shows how favorable the circumstances of a possible recognition are to us, and has nothing to do with those which presided over the founding of the other traditional communities recognized by Rome. But there is also this circumstance, however, of great importance: these communities were in demand, while for us it is Rome that is putting pressure on us. In other words, it is a sign of Providence, which we had not sought. Therefore, we will have state graces to face this new situation. Besides, aren't the Fraternity and friendly communities consecrated to Our Lady? Our Lady will guide us.

SEVENTH REASON

Moreover, it is not fair to say that the communities attached to Rome have abandoned the fight. For example, the Fraternity of St. Peter, at least in some places, remained faithful to the traditional Mass, with few concessions. It is therefore proof by the facts that we can protect ourselves effectively.

EIGHTH REASON

If we seek a canonical recognition, it is not to be united to the person but to the function of the Pope. Of course, the person can make many mistakes - which we will continue to reject - but the function he performs is sacred.

II. Opinion in the opposite sense

In 1984, to those who wanted to take advantage of the indult to be reintegrated into the official Church - in order to “change things from within”, as they put it - Archbishop Lefebvre replied: “It is a false reasoning. We don't fit into a framework under superiors, even though they have everything in their hands to restrain us. “Once recognized, you say, we will be able to act within the Church”. It is a profound error and total ignorance of the minds of those who make up the actual hierarchy. [...] We cannot place ourselves under an authority whose ideas are liberal and which would lead us, little by little, by the force of things, to accept these ideas and their consequences, first of all the new Mass¹⁷³.”

Or: “Putting oneself inside the Church, what does it mean? And first of all, which Church are we talking about? If it is the conciliar Church¹⁷⁴, we who have fought against it for twenty years because we want the Church, we would have to enter into this conciliar Church to supposedly make it Catholic. *It's a total illusion. It's not the subjects that make the superiors, it's the superiors that make the subjects*¹⁷⁵.”

III. Substantive Response

The above reasons point to two kinds of protections that would prevent us from being contaminated by conciliar environments. The first is the exemption¹⁷⁶ from the jurisdiction of the bishops; by doing so, we would simply be removed from their direct influence. The second is very different: the person - whether natural or legal - remains under the influence of the head (in this case the Holy Father), but protection consists in obtaining from him the commitment that he will not require of us acts that would jeopardize our faith.

The first type of protection - the exemption of bishops - reduces the danger, but does not eliminate it for two reasons.

The first is that the exemption, assuming it were total, would effectively protect us from the bishops' hostility towards Tradition; but if there were any benevolent bishop who offered our priests the opportunity to collaborate with him in certain works, mistrust would fall quite easily. If we accept these offers, we would revert to the previous article.

The second reason is that, ultimately, we would remain subject to a modernist pope. Therefore, the very specific question to be resolved here is this: Can we protect ourselves effectively from a neo-modernist Pope? To answer this question, it will be useful to see the role of authority, in all society, and the willingness to follow authority, which can be seen in human nature.

1) The role of authority in a society

In any society, the leader, as the holder of authority, is right in the efficient cause of that society. It is he who pushes and stimulates his subjects in pursuit of the common good. Without authority, each person is instinctively inclined to seek his or her own personal interests, which make him or her forget - without necessarily being ill will - the demands of the common good¹⁷⁷.

A perfect society - as is the case with the Church - has in she has all the means to reach its end; her leader has all the means necessary to lead his subjects. If it is the Church, these means are excellent in themselves; but if the head - in this case the Pope - no longer leads to the common good¹⁷⁸ of the Church, namely the reign of Our

Lord in souls and institutions, and even more so, if he diverts souls from it, we have a duty to protect ourselves from him, and to continue working for this common good in spite of the Pope. It is in this sense that Monsignor Lefebvre said: “We say that *we cannot be subjected to ecclesiastical authority and keep the Tradition*. They [the rallies] say otherwise. It's deceiving the faithful.¹⁷⁹”

2) A disposition of human nature

Not only does right reason show us that authority is necessary for society to attain the common good, but God has placed in us a disposition to follow authority. Here again, this provision can be obsessed with sin (which so often causes us to disobey!), but fundamentally it always remains.

In his book *Machiavellian pedagogue*, Pascal Bernardin recounts experiences highlighting “the role of authority in human behavior. Professor Milgram] repeated his experiments on 300,000 people; they were repeated in many countries. Their results are undisputed¹⁸⁰.” That is to say, their universal character; it is a law that is rooted in human nature. In the course of these experiments, in a high school, the authority¹⁸¹ asks a teacher to send an electric discharge to the students giving a wrong answer¹⁸²; this he does only reluctantly, against his conscience. Depending on the location, between 60% and 85% of teachers go through with the experiment. Moreover, no teacher tries to denounce the experimenter (thus authority).

The author then discusses conformism. Then he shows how we can change a man's ideas by making him take action against his convictions: these actions provoke an inner contradiction (called “cognitive dissonance”). A man in this situation will seek to “reorganize his psyche to reduce dissonance. [...] In other words, if an individual has been engaged in a certain type of behavior, he or she will tend to rationalize it¹⁸³.”

All of the above is observed by people who do not necessarily have faith, but who take note of phenomena related to the nature of things.

3) Can we protect ourselves from the Pope?

Certainly, since the Council, the Pope has been turning souls away from the common good of the Church, but is there not a way to prevent this evil influence on us, by placing conditions on all canonical recognition: that we should not be required to recognize Vatican II, to celebrate the new Mass, etc.?

In theory, this is still possible, and Archbishop Lefebvre has tried it. But in practice this is almost impossible. And this is quite easily understood. Indeed, once again, in a society, everything is polarized towards the common good. The “good” to which the conciliar popes’ direct souls and institutions is unfortunately not only a false good (see article 1 above), but is diametrically opposed to the true end of the Church: they are opposed to the reign of Our Lord, while we are all tending towards this reign. How can they admit a community that goes against their “common good”? That would be contradictory. Basically, the goals diverge. Archbishop Lefebvre made the observation: “But we soon realized that we were dealing with people who are not

honest. [...] We desire recognition; Rome wanted reconciliation and that we recognize our mistakes¹⁸⁴.”

- 4) So, do we have the right to put ourselves under the authority of a neo-modernist Pope?

A) Our situation

To understand the scope of this issue, let us briefly recall the situation in which we find ourselves. Between 1970 and 1975, Archbishop Lefebvre directed his work without major concern by the Roman authorities. Even in 1971, the Holy See intervened in his favor by a decree of praise. Little by little, he had to take stronger measures to protect himself from modernist influences; first by ceasing to attend the University of Fribourg and then formally banning attendance at the new Mass (1974).

On this occasion, complaints - especially from the French episcopate - warned the Holy See against him, which led to the abolition of the Fraternity in 1975. Since then, our apostolate has been exercised without any effective influence of the ecclesiastic authorities. Hence the question that arises: can we get back under these authorities, that is to say, accept the exercise of their authority over us, knowing that this exercise is usually directed towards an end opposed to the reign of Our Lord?

B) Principles given by Saint Thomas

Let us leave the word to St. Thomas¹⁸⁵ again. “Can the infidels have authority or even sovereignty over the faithful?” The angelic doctor moves from the social sphere (Article 9: contacts with infidels) to the political sphere. “It's a question of subordination,” says Father Bernard, “not just communication.” The angelic doctor moves from the social sphere (Article 9: contacts with infidels) to the political sphere. “It's a question of subordination, says Father Bernard, not just communication.” The aforementioned author explains the context of this question: the feudal order. Admittedly, the serf's subjection to the lords was not absolute, but this authority always “conferred upon him, who was clothed with it, a religious prestige, an investiture which sometimes was a true consecration. You have to remember all this to understand the seriousness of the question asked here¹⁸⁶.”

Isn't this case similar to the one Father Bernard describes? “He that heareth you, heareth Me¹⁸⁷,” Our Lord said to his apostles. The Pope is the vicar of Christ. The consecrations of bishops and the induction of the popes confer on them a prestige more than humane, sacred¹⁸⁸. Moreover, in Archbishop Lefebvre's contacts with the Roman authorities, the latter did not fail to recall him when they demanded his submission. “When the lord has such power over his subjects,” Father Bernard continues, “can the faithful have an infidel at their head? Is it not a scandal for the infidels and a peril for the faithful? That's the question¹⁸⁹.”

To answer, St. Thomas makes a distinction. Two different cases can be considered. Either it is a matter of establishing a new sovereignty or authority of the infidels over the faithful. "This," says the Theologian, "*must not be allowed in any way*, because it would be a scandal and it would be at the risk of the faith. This, says the Theologian, must not be allowed in any way, because it would be a scandal and it would be at the risk of faith. Easily, indeed, those who are subject to the jurisdiction of others can be changed by those who are above them and whose orders they have to follow, unless these subordinates *are of great virtue*." Let us note that the principle stated here by St. Thomas is very general, and can be applied as follows: a modernist to whom authority is bestowed can easily change his subjects.

Indeed, Father Bernard comments, "it is very perilous for the faithful to be govern by an infidel, because by his blasphemies that he says or allows to be said can do a lot of harm to their faith, and by the means of persuasion or persecution which he has." Likewise, a modernist pope, through ecumenical scandals, is a danger to the faith¹⁹⁰, including our own¹⁹¹.

As for the means of persuasion and persecution, we may have forgotten them, but it is enough to refresh our memory by linking the Itineraries of the 1960s and 1970s¹⁸². Closer to us is the case of the Franciscans of the Immaculate.

"These reasons," Father Bernard continues, "are of experience and simple common sense: they relate to the very nature of the situations [independently of the good intentions of a particular subject. NDLR] and are therefore neither changeable nor questionable. So, they are always in effect¹⁹³."

"That is why," St. Thomas concludes, "the Church allows in no way the infidels to acquire sovereignty over the faithful or to be placed at their head, in any capacity whatsoever, in an office."

Secondly, the second case that can be considered is that of an authority that already exists; that of an unfaithful prince who already has authority over the faithful; except in exceptional cases, it is not possible for this reason of infidelity alone to dismiss this prince. This question is not directly relevant to our case, as it is regulated by principles specific to the temporal power of princes.

Later¹⁹⁴, St. Thomas examines the case of an apostate prince. Apostasy is more serious than mere infidelity, because it implies denial. This is what he says about the exercise of authority in such a prince: "Such an exercise of authority could indeed turn into a great corruption of faith, since, as has been said¹⁹⁵, the apostate meditates evil in his heart and sows' quarrels, *seeking to detach people from the faith*." Once again, the conciliar popes are not *canonically* apostates, but how many times did Archbishop Lefebvre not speak of apostasy to their subject¹⁹⁶? On the objective level, they are distancing themselves from the faith, and in fact, they seek to exclude from it those who have remained faithful.

All the relations between Ecône and Rome are a striking proof of this.

As a consequence of the above, it must be said that subjects who would be placed under the authority of superiors who would work for the corruption of the faith should, even at the price of the greatest sacrifices, try to distance themselves as far as possible from the radius of this prevaricating influence.

5) The stakes of this question

They are nothing less than the preservation of our faith and its public confession.

A) The confession of faith

First, the public confession of faith. Experience shows that the neo-modernist authorities are trying to gag us, to silence us. This is what Monsignor Lefebvre said about rallies. "When they say they didn't give up, it's not true," he says in 1991. "They let go of the possibility of countering Rome. They let go of the possibility of countering Rome. They can't say anything anymore. They must be silent, given the favors they have been granted. It is now impossible for them to denounce the errors of the conciliar Church. They are slowly adhering, if only by the profession of faith requested by Cardinal Ratzinger. I think Dom Gérard is about to publish a little book written by one of his monks on religious freedom, which will try to justify it." In fact, the "little book", Father Basile, from the Barroux, published a thesis of 2960 pages. It is that it takes pages to try to reconcile the irreconcilable^{197!}

"From the point of view of ideas, the Archbishop continued, they turn very slowly and ended up admitting the Council's false ideas, because Rome had granted them some favors for Tradition. This is a very dangerous situation." "They have practically abandoned the fight for the faith. They can't attack Rome anymore^{198.}"

In 1988, after the consecrations, the *Courrier de Rome (Courier of Rome)* returned to the May 5th protocol." In the Note issued on June 16th, 1988 by the Vatican Press Room, it is stated that in the protocol "intended to serve as a basis" for "reconciliation", Monsignor Lefebvre and the Fraternity committed themselves "to an attitude of study and communication with the Apostolic See, to avoid any controversy concerning the points taught by Vatican II or the subsequent reforms which seemed difficult to them to reconcile with Tradition". It was clearly a "*pact of silence*".

A bitter experience of more than twenty years has amply demonstrated that arguing "in an attitude of study and communication" with the Vatican was completely useless: the only foreseeable result of the "agreement" was the silencing of the only authorized and disturbing voice that was heard at the time of the Church's self-demolition.

B) Conservation of the faith

Then the faith itself ends up being touched. Here is what Father Gaudron says of the rallies: "They began with a silence that they thought was prudent.

Increasingly, they had to give pledges. They have been subjected, without even realizing it, to the psychological pressure of liberalism - all the more effective since it seems less restrictive. They ended up not allowing themselves to think in any other way than what they were saying and acting (“By not living the way you think,” said Paul Bourget, “you end up thinking the way you live”). In a nutshell, they went right through the gearing - in which they imprudently placed their finger²⁰⁰.

6) Conclusion

We leave the floor to Archbishop Lefebvre: “If I still live a little,” he said, “assuming that from here to a certain time Rome would make an appeal, that they would like to see us again, then I would set the conditions. I will no longer accept to be in the position we found ourselves in at the seminars. *It's finished*.”

“I would ask the question at the doctrinal level: “Do you agree with the great encyclicals of all the Popes who preceded you? Do you agree with *Quanta Cura* of Pius IX, *Immortal Dei, Libertas* of Leo XIII, *Pascendi* of Pius X, *Quas primas* of Pius XI, *Humani Generis* of Pius XII? Are you in full communion with these popes and their affirmations? Do you still accept the anti-modernist oath? Are you for the social reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ?”

“If you do not accept the doctrine of your predecessors, *it is useless to speak*. Until you agree to reform the Council by considering the doctrine of these Popes who preceded you, there is no dialogue possible. It is useless”. This would make the positions clearer²⁰¹.”

IV. Answers to objections

First: The personal prelature would protect us completely

Who will it protect us from? Against the bishops? Of course, in the best of case scenario. But, as we have said, the exemption ties us more closely to the Holy See. Monsignor Lefebvre said in 1988: “We must leave this environment of bishops if we do not want to lose our souls. But this is not enough, for it is in Rome that the heresy is installed. If the bishops are heretical (even without taking this term in the sense and with canonical consequences), it is not without the influence of Rome²⁰².” In other words, an exemption of the bishops is not enough, because one remains as a last resort under the authority of the Holy See.

Autonomy would not go so far as to neglect the bishops. Let us take a comparison: we have talked about religious who are exempt. However, it is enough to read the history of the Church, and the history of religious orders to quickly realize that relations between the secular clergy and the regular clergy have not always been easy. So many misunderstandings, or even jealousy, sources of tension, and which show that the balance is always fragile. And yet, no doctrinal divergence! What would it be, then, with regard to bishops so far removed from traditional doctrine?

Second: The Holy See is suppressing all conditions

There are two different ways for Rome to lead us in the wake of Vatican II.

The first is to require beforehand the formal adhesion of the Council. That has been the method of the Holy See so far.

The other way is for Rome to “let go of the ballast”, to bring about a rapprochement by small steps, by acts of “benevolence”, the aim being to walk together by putting aside the principles; little by little, one adheres to the principles of the one with whom one acts. This is already the advice given by Galpérine (near Lenin), who said in essence: “Do not preach atheism, you would scare people away; this was the error of nihilists. But rather, drag the masses to fight for material interests, you will turn them into atheists.”

But can Rome come to this? Alas yes, modernist Rome is capable of it. First, in regards, to the acts of “benevolence”, here is what Archbishop Lefebvre thought: “They want to have us under their direct control and to be able to impose on us precisely this anti-Tradition policy of which they are imbued. [...] I noticed the *will* of Rome to impose their ideas and their way on seeing us. [...] They do not grant anything out of esteem of the traditional liturgy, but simply to deceive those to whom they give it and to diminish our resistance, to sink a corner into the traditional block in order to destroy it. It's their politics, their conscious tactics. They're not wrong, and you know what pressure they exert. They're making tremendous efforts everywhere²⁰³.”

As for the Roman overtures to Tradition: “I don't think it is a real return. It's like in a fight, when you get the impression that the troops are going a little too far, you retain them. [...] No, it is a somewhat necessary tactic as in any combat. [...] That is why what may appear to be a concession is in reality only a maneuver to achieve detachment from us, as much as possible, the faithful. It is in this perspective that they seem to always give a little more and go very far. *We must absolutely convince the faithful that this is indeed a maneuver, that it is a danger to put oneself in the hands of the conciliar bishops and modernist Rome. It is the greatest danger that threatens them.* If we have struggled for twenty years to avoid conciliar errors, it is not to put ourselves now in the hands of those who profess them²⁰⁴.”

Third: We demand to be accepted “as we are”

It had been the condition laid down by the Barroux. “When Rome says to a community: “You are accepted as you are”, Rome does not think that. Rome thinks in reality: “We accept you as you will be, as you will become”. The Romans know from experience that when there is an agreement, the community will evolve, more or less quickly. So, they accept us as we will be in a year, five years, ten years; not as we *are* today, with our opposition to the new Mass and the Council²⁰⁵.”

We have seen, in Article 1, that Rome strives to obtain that even before recognition, we become what they want us to be: that is, that we move from the fight for the faith to an attitude of academic discussion on the Council. From that point on they will no longer have any difficulty in accepting us “as we are”, or rather as we will be if we accept this change of attitude.

Fourth: We will continue to denounce the errors; nothing will change

At the time of recognition, in the best case, hopefully nothing will change. But over time, the exercise of authority eventually corrodes convictions, and this can happen quickly. Thus, the Institute of the Good Shepherd, two months after its foundation, wanted to be “the bearer of good news: The 1970 war is over. Forty-five years after the Second Vatican Council, we must stop repeating the same double talk²⁰⁶.”

In addition, Rome usually starts by imposing what it considers to be minimal requirements and then increases them. For example, when the priests of Campos rallied, Father Cottier rejoiced, adding: "Little by little it will be necessary to foresee additional steps: for example, that they also participate in the con-celebration in the Reformed rite. But we must not rush. [...] The communion found in the Church has its inner dynamism that will mature²⁰⁷." He went on to say that communion triggers a whole process.

This was also true in the Institute of the Good Shepherd. A certain freedom had been given to them, at its foundation, in relation to the Council. During the first canonical visitation in 2012, the *Ecclesia Dei* Commission deliberated to withdraw from the statutes the mention that the Tridentine Mass was *exclusive*; Moreover, “more than on a criticism, even one that is “serious and constructive” of the Second Vatican Council, the efforts of the formators will have to focus on the transmission of the entirety of the Church's patrimony, insisting on the hermeneutics of renewal in continuity, and taking as a support the integrity of the Catholic doctrine exposed by the Catechism of the Catholic Church[1992]²⁰⁸”.

The same process was renewed with the Oasis of Jesus Priest²⁰⁹. In 2007, Father Muñoz asked Rome to recognize the congregation. The constitutions were then approved *ad experimentum*, with some insignificant alterations. In 2016, for the 50th anniversary of the foundation, the same Bishop Pozzo, who visited the IBP in 2012, granted definite approval to the Oasis, this time with major changes: there is no superior general, but each local superior depends on the bishop of the place (thus, she is more vulnerable; the unity of the congregation is compromised); the traditional mass is no longer the exclusive rite, but the proper “charisma”. It is the entrance into conciliar pluralism.

Fifth: The Pope takes our defense

Certainly, he has read the biography of Archbishop Lefebvre twice, but why? Is it because he was excited about his fight? Or is it to get a better understanding of the issue, to better understand the “psychology” of the traditionalists? Lenin went to spend a vacation in the Vendée; it was certainly not to venerate the memory of the Vendée heroes, but to better see on the ground how the Revolution could succeed in suppressing the uprisings; this was very useful to him for his coup d' état of October 1917.

Does the Pope really want to protect us? And against whom?

- Against the bishops? Let's consider two cases. In the first, there is a conflict over a doctrinal issue. Will the Pope support the bishop with whom he agrees doctrinally, or the priest of the SSPX who criticizes the Council? In addition, for routine matters, it is not the Pope who deals directly with it, but the Roman congregations, which exercise the pontifical power in his name. This is what happened in 1999 with the Fraternity of St. Peter's; the Pope did not intervene, and even “Cardinal Ratzinger,

who seemed to be quite clearly committed to the Catholics, *Ecclesia Dei*, was silent. In fact, his speech of October 24th, 1998 already announced his prudent withdrawal²¹⁰.”

Second case: if it is a disciplinary problem, for example an injustice committed against the SSPX, will the Pope have enough authority to do justice? The last few decades have shown that the Pope has only limited power over the bishops. Can we reasonably foresee that he is prepared to put a whole episcopal conference behind him to defend us?

- Against... the Pope himself? Even a conservative pope can impose something unacceptable on us. Who will protect us from the Pope?

Finally, let us add that the experience of the last twenty-five years proves that Rome is not keeping its promises. In 1999, Michael Davies said: “Archbishop Lefebvre emerged from the 1988 agreement with the Holy See because he felt he could not rely on the Vatican to keep its promises. It seems there are now at the Curia powerful forces determined to prove that he was right²¹¹.”

Rome is ready to promise us the moon, but let us remember the lessons of history. An “armored” agreement becomes ineffective when the holders of authority are unreliable. We imagine things too much as if we are dealing either with honest leaders who keep their word or with equals. In reality, they are the ones who have the authority, and once they have authority over us, they have everything in their hands to put us in line.

Sixth: Our case is not the same as that of the other communities united with Rome, which were applicants.

The objectant insinuates that these communities have had a deregulated desire to be recognized, while we know how to control ourselves, to wait. In short, it suggests that moral integrity is a sufficient guarantee not to fall. We can be very virtuous and be deceived. How many brave faithful, were deceived by their pastors after the Council. Likewise, after the successive rallies, religious of integrity who had followed their superiors sometimes opened their eyes many years later. Monsignor Lefebvre himself let himself be deceived by signing the protocol. We can multiply the examples with envy: Leo XIII and his rallying, Pius XI and the Cristeros affair as well as that of the French Action, etc.

Seventh: The communities united in Rome remained faithful, at least to the Traditional Mass

Yes, most of these communities say only the Traditional Mass; it should be noted that all of them have admitted the legitimacy of the new Mass. This is the minimum of what neo-modernist Rome demanded.

Now, liturgy is not everything; during the Council, traditional mass was celebrated; during the French Revolution, the swearing priests did not know any other rite either. But have these communities made “little concessions”? If they are liturgical concessions, yes, it is

true. Rome, however, is beginning to want to impart the cult of the new “saints” and the use of new prefaces.

But if it is about concessions of doctrinal order, it isn't indeed possible to say that there are “not enough concessions”.

As far as ecumenism is concerned, the Fraternity of St. Peter dedicated the November 2004 - February 2005 issue of *Tu es Petrus* to justify the scandal of Assisi and, in general, interreligious dialogue. The same review, in 2007 (n° 108-109) justified the prayer of Benedict XVI in the mosque of Istanbul. Father Basile of the Barroux wrote two books (2013) to justify conciliar ecumenism. The IGP is silent on the Pope's ecumenical scandals; however, Father Tarnöarn spoke, but in defense of the meeting in Assisi in 2011.

With regard to religious freedom, we have already mentioned Father Basile's thesis. Even the IGP has made statements to justify religious freedom. This subject appears regularly in publications, especially those of the Fraternity of Saint Vincent Ferrer.

It could also be added that the Fraternity of St. Peter, the IGP, the priests of Campos, the Institute of Christ the King, the Barroux, participate in JMJ, or at least encourage them to participate.

Ecumenism, interreligious dialogue and religious freedom are monstrosities, which is utterly insulting to the adorable Trinity; one cannot in any way say that these are “little concessions”. It's the whole foundation of our faith that's ruined.

We have to conclude that there was a doctrinal rally, whereas at the beginning, these communities had only a strategic rally in mind. The epithet of "rallies" is therefore perfectly suited to them.

Eighth: We seek to be united to the office, not to the person of the Pope.

How are we united to the Pope's function, that is, how are we in communion with the vicar of Christ, with the Catholic Church? Quite simply by the absence of schism, as Cardinal Billot²¹⁴ explains very well; if we are not schismatic²¹⁵, we are united to the vicar of Christ, to his function.

Now the problem is the *exercise* of his power. We have seen that this exercise is ordered for an opposite end to the reign of Our Lord. However, as the adage says, *actiones sunt suppositorum*²¹⁶, actions belong to the servant, to the person. Therefore, the activity of Pope Francis - a revolutionary activity - must be attributed to his person, not to his function (because then he does not act as Pope). However, it is precisely from the influence he exerts through his activity that we want to protect ourselves, by refusing canonical status. Therefore, we fully agree with the objectant that it is necessary to be united to the Pope's function and not to his person; and to do so, we must refuse a canonical status that would bind us to his person and hand us over to his influences.

Conclusion on The First Three Articles

We can now conclude by answering the initial question: “Can we accept a canonical recognition offered by a neo-modernist Pope?”

Given its new ecclesiology, one of the fundamental principles of which is pluralism, it seeks to bring us into this pluralistic system. Thus, it is impossible for us to accept the very act of recognition, even before the danger to faith (Article 1).

After the recognition, the canonical barriers having fallen, osmosis with conciliar circles is inevitable, jeopardizing our faith (Article 2).

Finally, a neo-modernist authority will seek to impose its ideas on us, making us abandon the fight for the faith and gradually adhering to modern errors (Article 3).

These three elements are included in the recognition process. Therefore, we cannot accept a canonical recognition offered by the present pope, and therefore no agreement can be envisaged before a doctrinal conversion of the Holy Father.

Now, it remains to be seen whether this conclusion is an absolute rule or simply a prudential measure.

ARTICLE 4: Is This Proposal “No Practical Agreement Before a Doctrinal Agreement” Not A Mere Prudential Judgment Rather Than a Principle?

I. Reasons in favor of a positive answer

It seems like yes.

FIRST REASON

Indeed, it is not a truth of faith. Everyone has the right to hold it as a personal opinion, but it cannot be imposed on others. Let us be careful not to dogmatize opinion.

SECOND REASON

We are here in the field of action, and therefore of prudence. Now, prudence is the virtue of the leader; it is to him that we must rely, unless of course it goes against the faith. But we have just seen that this is not a truth of faith.

THIRD REASON

As Aristotle says, the principles of prudence are not immutable. Even if we admit that it is a principle, it is not immutable. Let's not make it a metaphysical principle.

FOURTH REASON

Moreover, if it really were an immutable principle, Archbishop Lefebvre, who was very firm on the principles, would not have violated it. However, for a long time he sought a practical agreement with Rome. It is therefore clear that this is not an immutable principle.

THE FIFTH REASON

Archbishop Lefebvre never stated, as a condition of our new recognition by Rome, that Rome should abandon the conciliar errors and reforms. Even if he said something like that in 1990, he would never have done it, because that had never been his policy, his strategy

with modernist Rome. He was pragmatic and knew how to seize every opportunity to advance the good cause; this is part of sagacity, which is part of the virtue of prudence.

SIXTH REASON

If Monsignor Lefebvre refused the agreements in 1988, it was because of the conditions, which were unacceptable: they did not want to give us Tradition but wanted to bring us back to Vatican II. So, it was not a refusal in principle. The proof, he signed the protocol of agreement on May 5, 1988: it is that there was nothing contrary to the faith, neither in the content, nor in the fact of signing.

SEVENTH REASON

Of course, doctrine takes precedence over practice, but in the order of time, practice often precedes doctrine. For example, we impose acts on children before explaining to them the why. It is therefore not clear why the practical agreement could not precede the doctrinal conversion of the Roman authorities.

EIGHTH REASON

A canonical solution is an essentially good thing. It's just circumstances that can make it bad. Circumspection - an integral part of prudence - is the responsibility of examining the circumstances²¹⁷. Therefore, a refusal of a canonical solution is not a principle but a prudential question.

II. Notice to the contrary

However, in November 2008, Bishop Fellay wrote: “We do not understand [in Rome] why we do not want an immediate canonical solution. For Rome, the problem of the Fraternity would thus be solved, doctrinal discussions would be avoided or postponed. For us, each day brings us more evidence of the need to clarify as much as possible the underlying questions before going further in a canonical solution, which is not however to displease us. But that is an order of nature, and to reverse things would inevitably put us in an unbearable situation; we have proof of that every day. [...] We cannot leave any ambiguity on the question of acceptance of the Council, of the reforms, of the new attitudes tolerated or promoted²¹⁸.”

And in May 2006: “In any case, it is impossible and inconceivable to move on to the third stage, and therefore to consider agreements, before these discussions [on the principles of the crisis] have resulted in clarifying and correcting the principles of the crisis. [...] We will not sign agreements if things are not resolved at the level of principles. [...] The problem with wanting to make agreements quickly is that they would necessarily be built on grey areas, and that as soon as they were signed, the crisis would reappear violently from those grey areas. It will therefore be necessary, in order to solve the problem, for the Roman authorities to demonstrate and express clearly, so that everyone understands, that for Rome there are not 36 ways out of this crisis, that there is even only one valid one: *that the Church fully rediscovers her own two-thousand-year-old Tradition*²¹⁹.”

An “order of nature” means that doctrine precedes action. If it is in the nature of things, it cannot be changed. It is therefore a principle.

III. Substantive Response

The hitch of the matter is the following: when one says that one cannot make a practical agreement before Rome has returned to Tradition, is there a necessary connection between the two terms: agreement, anteriority of the return to Tradition? Is it valid all the time, or only in certain circumstances, according to the judgment of the virtue of prudence? In other words: is it a principle or a simple prudential judgment?

We will therefore first see whether the doctrinal conversion must necessarily be prior to an agreement; then, if it is a principle.

- 1) Is it necessarily necessary that the Roman authorities have to return to Tradition to consider an agreement?

A practical agreement with neo-modernist Rome entails three things: entry into the pluralist system that is the conciliar Church; the bringing into line by the present authorities (imposed silence, doctrinal contamination); contamination by the environment.

Are these three elements necessarily the consequence of a practical agreement? After a general answer on the fact that knowledge precedes the pursuit of good, we will answer in particular for these three elements.

- A) First: knowledge precedes the pursuit of the good

As we have seen, in a society, what is first is the end, the common good. All the activity of the members of this society is polarized towards the end. The end is the object of will. Now, says Saint Thomas, “intelligence moves the will, presenting its object to it²²⁰”; “intelligence moves like an end, presenting to it the object that specifies it²²¹”. So, all the action of society will be according to the conception we have of the end. as a particular conclusion: doctrine precedes practice, since practice proceeds from practice. And that is an order of nature.

- B) Does an agreement with neo-modernist Rome necessarily imply entry into the pluralist system?

To begin with, more than thirty years of experience show that it is always in this perspective that conciliar Rome makes proposals; therefore, *a posteriori* we note that it is always so.

But even *a priori*, this behavior is logical. Indeed, the current authorities have lost the sense of truth, which is excluded from error. For them, everything is polarized towards universal pluralism. Everything tends there, everything is organized towards this goal.

Under Paul VI, Archbishop Lefebvre was seen above all as an opponent of the conciliar errors, so an effort was made to demand his adherence to the Council. Under John Paul II, the Roman authorities - especially Cardinal Ratzinger - saw in Tradition a sensitivity that could very well be part of conciliar pluralism, provided that its supporters stopped their attacks against the Council. From a

pluralist perspective, it is the only place that Tradition can be assigned. It can therefore be said that an agreement necessarily implies entry into the pluralist system.

C) Do the Roman authorities necessarily seek to bring us back to the Council?

There are two questions to distinguish here: do the Roman authorities necessarily want to bring us back to the Council? And on the other hand: will the faithful necessarily let themselves be contaminated?

As we have seen, Saint Thomas gives the principles of solution to these two questions. Firstly, for the first, when he says that the apostate seeks to involve its subjects in its apostasy. The current Roman authorities are in this case. We cannot say that they are only liberal; there is more: they are prisoners of a whole erroneous system, neo-modernism, and they seek to drag everyone into it.

We can therefore say that the Roman authorities necessarily seek - given their neo-modernist system and their apostasy - to bring us back to their ideas.

For the second question, Saint Thomas says that the faithful easily let themselves be influenced by the infidel prince; this happens in most cases (*ut in pluribus*), which indicates a disposition that is in keeping with human nature. Here, we cannot say that everyone will necessarily let themselves be drawn (because each one remains free), but the greater number will *necessarily* let themselves be drawn.

D) Finally, does an agreement necessarily lead to contamination by modernist environment?

Here, we must answer that for there to be a society, there must not only be a common end, but also a common action. Without this second element, there is no society. For example, passengers on the same wagon have the same purpose: to go to Paris. But there is no common action between them: they do not constitute a society.

Now, if we are canonically recognized by the Roman authorities, we will be governed by the same law, which regulates the relations between all the members of society. There will necessarily be more or less close relations; philosophically, this is inevitable. Now, as Saint Thomas says, these relationships are to be avoided, for they are dangerous for most of the faithful, endangering their faith. Therefore, the agreement will necessarily lead the greatest number to contamination²²².

E) Conclusion

It is necessary that the Roman authorities have returned to Tradition before an agreement can be considered. Without this, we will necessarily stop the fight for the faith and let ourselves be contaminated.

Does that mean it's a principle? That is what remains to be specified.

2) Is it a principle?

A) What is a principle?

A principle is “what something proceeds from, in whatever way²²³”. For example, the point is the principle of the line: the principle of geometry. Unit is the principle of number: the principle of arithmetic. The source is the principle of the river: the principle of physicality. Nature is the principle of being and movement: the principle of philosophy. The premises are the principle of conclusion: logical principle.

In short, we see that the word “principle” is an analogical term: it designates very diverse realities in their essence. Their common point is that each is “what something proceeds from”.

B) Divisions of principles

We are content here to speak of principles in the order of knowledge, which alone interest us²²⁴.

In reason of the end, we distinguish speculative knowledge, ordered to knowing; and practical knowledge, ordered to action.

The principles of speculative knowledge, of science, are the speculative principles; they make us know what is. They may have a speculative object (*what is*; for example, psychology seeks to know human nature), or a practical object (*what must be done*: it is morality). In the latter case, one seeks to know what to do, in general: it is a *universal* knowledge.

Then, the practical knowledge in its end is that of prudence: It is a question of knowing *hic et nunc* what to do. “The role of prudence is to derive *particular* conclusions, that is, practical actions, from universal moral rules²²⁵.” Its role is therefore the application of universal principles in practical action. How does it do that?

“Prudential reasoning,” continues St Thomas, “comes to a practical conclusion, applying the very principles of morality to a particular action. However, a particular conclusion comes from a reasoning formed from a proposal involving knowledge of a particular object. The reasoning of prudence also proceeds from a double intelligence:

- 1^o the intelligence of the general principles of morality [...]; for example, “no harm must be done to anyone”.
- 2^o of the intelligence of a particular truth, minor of the syllogism of prudence, and which declares which action must become the expression of the general law²²⁶.”

René Simon²²⁷ specifies that prudence must be inspired by the supreme principles of morality (like that quoted by Saint Thomas), but also by the conclusions of the moral sciences; these conclusions remain universal, they are principles of action. Finally, prudence is based on experience and must take into account the particular circumstances.

C) Application to our subject

a - As for pluralism

The evil of pluralism is that it puts the truth equal with error; religious pluralism puts the Catholic truth equal with false religions, including neo-modernism: which is equivalent to denying our faith.

So, we can reason like this:

- It is not allowed to enter religious pluralism (moral principle) - that would be to deny our faith.
- However, an agreement with neo-modernist Rome necessarily entails entry into this pluralism (speculative principle).
- Therefore, it is not allowed to make an agreement with neo-modernist Rome (moral principle).

From two necessary premises follows a necessary conclusion. Moreover, the conclusion remains universal: it is never allowed to make an agreement with an unconverted Rome. This therefore remains a universal principle.

b - As for the subjection to a neo-modernist authority

The principle stated by Saint Thomas is precisely that it is never permitted to put oneself under the authority of an infidel, when one is not there.

Moreover, he considers the case of an unfaithful prince, therefore a leader in the political order: a political leader can easily corrupt the faith of his subjects (yet religion is not the proper object of his government). All the more reason for a religious leader to influence the faith of his subjects, because that is the very object of his government.

The reasoning can therefore be stated as follows:

- It is never permissible to place oneself under the authority of an unfaithful religious leader (moral principle).

- However, a canonical solution given by a neo-modernist pope would necessarily place us under the dependence of an unfaithful religious leader (speculative principle).
- Therefore, it is never allowed to accept a canonical solution given by a neo-modernist pope (moral principle).

As in the case of pluralism, conclusion is necessary and remains universal. This proposal therefore also remains a universal principle.

c - A last remark

The initial question is between “principle” and “prudential judgment”. We prefer to speak of a “refusal in principle” as opposed to a “purely prudential refusal”. To oppose a canonical proposal with a refusal of principle is to say that we do not want it, because the authorities who make this advance are modernists, and as long as they are²³⁰. In the case of a purely prudential refusal, an agreement with a modernist authority is not opposed in principle, but only because of a circumstance²³¹; and this refusal can continue indefinitely, as long as this circumstance is present.

For the reasons we have given, our rejection of an agreement with a modernist authority is a rejection of principle.

d - Conclusion

An agreement (or a canonical solution) with a neo-modernist Rome would necessarily make us abandon the fight for the faith, would necessarily put our faith in a near peril, and would be a profession of pluralism. So, when we say, “Disagree with Rome before its doctrinal conversion”, it is indeed a principle; certainly, a principle subordinated to this one: “it is never allowed to put oneself under an unfaithful leader”; and to this other: “it is never allowed to profess pluralism”. It is from these last two principles that it draws all its strength.

It is this principle that has dictated all the refusals of agreement since 1988: if we have refused them, it is because Rome was still modernist and we cannot put ourselves under a heterodox authority. These particular refusals were the result of prudence, which applied this principle to the Roman proposal of that moment.

Moreover, by the way, a prudential judgment is special, because prudence is about individual actions. “We must not accept this Roman proposal that we are being offered today”: this is a particular prudential judgment. But prudential judgment is not universal.

D) What role is left to prudence?

Prudence will simply apply this moral principle to today's reality.

Major: We are not allowed to make an agreement with a neo-modernist authority.

Minor: However, the current authorities are - or are not - neo-modernist.

The conclusion will follow.

Therefore, the role of prudence will be, above all, to examine where the Roman authorities stand. Actually, today, as we have seen, it is not very difficult to answer this question, after the Synod on the Family, and all the rest. But when we have a pope who begins to reject the fundamental principles of neo-modernism, and to conform his government to his thinking, then yes, circumstances will change significantly, and it will be the role of prudence to weigh all these elements.

3) Conclusion of the whole article

“No practical agreement before a doctrinal agreement” is therefore a moral principle, from which, moreover, has flowed all our behavior since 1988 in the question of relations with Rome.

IV. Answers to objections

First: It is not a truth of faith

Certainly, the truths of faith are principles. As they are of faith, they are imposed on every Catholic; it is enough to deny one to no longer have the faith. But only the truths of the faith are principles.

We readily concede that this is not a primary principle, and that it is linked to a particular system: neo-modernism. A little like when Pius XI states: “Communism is intrinsically perverse, and collaboration with it cannot be accepted on any ground²³².” It is a moral principle, although linked to a particular system: communism. But the rule is universal, it is always valid, because it is linked to the (universal) essence of communism.

“We cannot impose it on anyone”: effectively, it is not necessary for salvation to adhere to it; similarly, it is not a moral truth recognized by all; we no longer have, to warn us, the vigilance of the Pope, as in the time of Pius XI vis-à-vis communism. But if one realizes that one is heading towards the abyss by departing from this principle, it would be criminal to let things be done with indifference.

Second: Prudence is the virtue of the leader

Prudence is not the exclusive prerogative of the chief. Saint Thomas explains it very well. Indeed, he distinguishes several species - or subjective parts - of prudence. Among them is first of all the “royal prudence” which is the “most perfect of all²³³”, because it is ordered to

the common good of the city, the perfect society. In the following article, he deals with “political prudence”, that of the citizens: “a certain rectitude of government must be found in them, by which they must direct themselves in the obedience that they grant to their prince²³⁴.” This is linked to the fact that “every man, as a reasonable being, exercises a part of government according to the free play of his reason²³⁵”.

Father Deman comments: “This conclusion requires a conception of obedience. Saint Thomas does not mean that the subject must sift through the order he receives. He is not the master and his political prudence is not royal prudence. As a subject, he is incompetent to appreciate the needs of the common good from which his master draws inspiration in his command. But on the other hand, this subject is a man. *He is responsible for the action he will commit*. He cannot unload on anyone, not even on his master, a responsibility related to his nature to be reasonable. It is his responsibility to check whether the order he receives is worthy of him executing it. [...] Either it is good, or it is bad for him to act as he is commanded - good or bad, let us hear him, with regard to the moral law whose reason is the decisive agent. [...] There is no condition of servitude, however complete it may be desired, which must deprive a man of this use of his reason and his freedom. There is the limit that no sovereignty of one man over another can cross²³⁶.”

If we know for a fact that an action hurt morality, it is never allowed to be accomplished, even if it is commanded by the leader. Now, this is our case here, about a canonical recognition by a neo-modernist authority.

Third: The principles of prudence are not immutable

As we have said, the principle is an analog term. The principles of prudence are on the one hand the rules of morality (including our principle), and on the other hand particular circumstances, which can change them, and indeed, change. But the rules of morality are immutable. For example, it will always be forbidden to collaborate with communism; circumstances that may change are, for example, the collapse of communism in a country. Therefore, if the system that replaces it is not intrinsically perverse, it will be possible to collaborate with it, depending on the circumstances. In the same way here: The Roman authorities can convert: it is a circumstance, which enters into the principles of prudence.

Fourth: If it were a principle, Monsignor Lefebvre wouldn't have violated it

First, let us recognize that Archbishop Lefebvre never explicitly said that it was a principle. He was a pastor, although very firm on principles and an excellent theologian. But he didn't synthesize his thoughts. His mission as bishop was above all to feed souls, to put wolves to flight.

Then, it must be said that it was not at all obvious to him that he was facing a rigorous system, and that any Roman proposal was at the service of this system. Already Pius XI, as for communism, waited until the end of his long pontificate to make a synthesis and give the absolute instruction that we reported above. Just before stating it, Pius XI warned against the deceptions of communism, which knew how to make proposals for peace, going so far as to say that it respected the freedom of consciences²³⁷. But all this is just deceit.

But, unlike the communists, openly atheists and having blood on their hands, the Roman interlocutors were for the most part pious men, humanly very pleasant. This was, for example, the case of Cardinal Ratzinger, Archbishop Lefebvre himself acknowledged, in his letter to the Pope of June 2nd, 1988, that the colloquiums had taken place in an atmosphere of courtesy. Moreover, a certain number of prelates were of good faith²³⁸; it was their minds that were misled by neo-modernist doctrine; and again, not all were affected to the same degree. The contact with these pleasant people had something that made one believe that their ideas were not that twisted.

But isn't it excessive to compare the neo-modernists to the communists in the sense that both have a misguided system of thought? No; in fact, Saint Pius X said of the modernists that their tactic was to scatter their doctrines, "which lends them to be judged as undecisive and undecided when their ideas, on the contrary, are perfectly firm and consistent²³⁹".

However, even if the texts of the Council express all the essence of the pluralist system, the persons in charge in the Church were not all imbued with this ideology, far from it. For example, Paul VI is the very type of the liberal, who is inconsistent²⁴⁰; he was a pope with two faces: sometimes he could say perfectly Catholic things; but he was fascinated by modernity. If he was so hard on Archbishop Lefebvre, it was mainly because he saw in him an opponent of Vatican II, his council. Similarly, everything leads us to believe that Cardinal Wright was sincere and really wanted the good of the Fraternity when he wrote the decree of praise in 1971; but the same cardinal was among the accusers of Archbishop Lefebvre a few years later. It is in this context that we must read Archbishop Lefebvre's statements asking that he be allowed to experience Tradition.

Everything else is the situation under John Paul II. Not that John Paul II was not liberal, but he was imbued with conciliar and pluralistic philosophy. His condescension to tolerate a certain "Tradition" stemmed from this thought. It was not easy for Monsignor Lefebvre to see this change. But little by little he realized it. The event in Assisi dispelled all doubt. "Betting on an agreement with the Pope was an illusion," he wrote on December 29, 1986. "The Pope will grant us on the disciplinary and liturgical plan all that we want, but on the condition of admitting his modernist ideas on religious freedom and ecumenism, that is, of [denying] our Catholic faith. There is no hope on this side. Rome is occupied by modernism and liberalism²⁴¹!"

"The more we analyze the documents of Vatican II and the interpretation given by the Church authorities," he said in 1990, "the more we realize that it is not only a matter of a few errors, religious freedom, collegiality, a certain liberalism, but also a *perversion* of the spirit²⁴²." He uses the same term as Pius XI for communism²⁴³. In conclusion, we can say that it was through a long experience that Archbishop Lefebvre induced this principle, which one could not consider an agreement before the doctrinal conversion of the Roman authorities.

It goes without saying that today the conciliar ideology has blocked everything, and that things are even clearer.

Fifth: Monsignor Lefebvre said it, but would never have done it

Archbishop Lefebvre said very clearly that he himself would set the conditions, this time on the doctrinal level. He said this several times, and we have already quoted all the texts.

“He was pragmatic.” If, by “pragmatic”, we mean that he was wise, we readily admit it, wisdom being the virtue that allows us to better discern promptly what is best²⁴⁴; it is part of prudence. The role of prudence is to put the principles into practice. As a good pupil of Santa Chiara, Archbishop Lefebvre always had this concern to act in the light of principles drawn from Romanism.

But this is not the usual meaning of the word “pragmatic”, which means “the one who gives first place to action” (Petit Robert). It therefore seems better not to use this term here.

Moreover, we do not see the connection between wisdom and not realizing what we have said.

Finally, it is very difficult to make the dead speak. What matters is not so much what our predecessors did or did not do, but the principles from which they were inspired, and to apply them in the present circumstances. That is what we are trying to do here.

Sixth: Monsignor Lefebvre did not refuse the agreements in principle, but because of the conditions

It is very fair to say that Archbishop Lefebvre, before the consecrations, had not refused the Roman proposals on principle. At that time, he considered as possible an agreement with a neo-modernist authority: the only thing to be well established was the conditions. His refusals were therefore purely prudential.

But, all the same, after the consecrations and until his death, he did affirm that an agreement was impossible as long as Rome would not re-crown Our Lord, and that it would not return to Tradition. Is this enough to say that it was a refusal in principle? It doesn't look like it. If Archbishop Lefebvre had only said that, it could have been a purely prudential refusal: “Given that we are stuck, he could have said, to avoid finding ourselves in an inextricable situation, it is better to wait for their return to Tradition.” And as long as this circumstance (the modernism of the Roman authorities) remains, the same prudential refusal can legitimately be maintained.

However, there is more: after the consecrations, when Monsignor Lefebvre expresses his refusal of agreement, from now on, he usually states a principle justifying this refusal. For example, deploring the departure of those who rallied: “We say that we cannot be subject to ecclesiastical authority and keep Tradition. [...] We can't agree with those who uncrown Our Lord²⁴⁶.” “It is not the subjects who make the superiors, but the superiors who make the subjects²⁴⁷.” “You can't both give a hand to the modernists and want to keep Tradition²⁴⁸.” It is therefore very clearly a refusal in principle.

It is true that he said, after the consecrations: “I would have signed a definitive agreement after having signed the protocol, if we had had the possibility to protect ourselves effectively against the modernism of Rome and the bishops²⁴⁹.” He then describes these conditions²⁵⁰, (Roman commission etc.). Then to conclude: “I felt a very clear opposition. We already had only one bishop instead of three, and two places on the commission out of seven. It was not possible to continue like this. *Rome's will not to help Tradition, not willing to really trust it*

*was obvious*²⁵¹." What can be concluded from this passage is that, after the consecrations, Archbishop Lefebvre said that he had considered an agreement as possible, which he would then have signed. He does not say: if I were granted these conditions now, I would sign.

"In reality," he said again at the same conference, "Rome neither wants to support nor to pursue [that is, to continue] Tradition. We want to gently bring these young people [of the Fraternity of St. Peter] and these priests to the Council. That's obvious. During the last contacts I had in Rome, *I wanted several times to probe their intentions*, to measure if there was a real change. This did not seem impossible after the catastrophic and disastrous failures that followed the Council, and also after the visit of Cardinal Gagnon and Bishop Perle²⁵²." It always comes back to this: Archbishop Lefebvre wanted to "sound out intentions", to see if there was "possibility" of protecting oneself. We had to face the facts: their intentions are to fight Tradition, because they are modernists²⁵³. And so, for there to be an opportunity to come to an agreement, they must first return to Tradition.

It is also true that he said on June 9, 1988: "It is true, I signed the protocol on May 5, with a lot of caution, I must say. In itself, it's acceptable, otherwise, I wouldn't even have signed it, of course²⁵⁴." But with hindsight, we can affirm that this text was dangerous, since it served as a basis for the agreements with the Barroux, with the Fraternity of Saint-Pierre, with the priests of Campos... It is only today that the full danger of this situation can be measured. In May-June 1988, Archbishop Lefebvre perceived this danger mainly through the dishonesty of his interlocutors.

Finally, as we have seen, the fact that neo-modernist Rome seeks to bring us back to the Council is due to its system, to the nature of its pluralistic system; it is not an extrinsic condition.

Seventh: Over time, practice often precedes doctrine

Let us take again the example given by the objecting party. Children are imposed acts or practices before being explained why. Admittedly, the child will not immediately understand the validity of the order received; but the parents are bound to give only orders in conformity with Catholic morality. So, on the parents' side, the doctrine precedes action well. The same can be said of the whole practice of the virtue of obedience. It is only when there is evidence that the order given goes against God's law that one must refuse to obey.

In our case, the practice of entering into an agreement with neo-modernist Rome is not in conformity with Catholic doctrine, because it is based on pluralism and exposes our faith in the near future.

Admittedly, Archbishop Lefebvre had considered an agreement preceding the resolution of doctrinal questions, and even, before 1983, called for it. But he assumed two things: the first was that he thought he was dealing with simple liberals whose system was incoherent; therefore, alongside so many un-Catholic experience, they might well let Tradition take its course; yet he came to realize that his interlocutors were very confused in a rogue system.

The second thing is that he hoped that the Roman authorities were capable of sincerely wanting the good of Tradition; however, he realized that this was not the case, and that they only wanted the "good" of a Tradition reviewed and corrected in the light of pluralism.

From then on, to enter into this game was to collaborate in the destruction of Tradition. Therefore, if he was willing to put practice before the resolution of doctrinal questions, it is not any practice, but a practice consistent with the requirements of doctrine. It therefore remains first.

Eighth: A canonical solution is good in itself

The canonical status would establish our subjection to a neo-modernist authority and regulate our relations with the members of the conciliar Church.

And canonical recognition is the act which would establish and found these relationships, these relations.

But what specifies a relationship is its term²⁵⁵. So, the real question is: who do we make a deal with? With whom does a canonical status connect us with? There is no “agreement in itself”, but always with someone, who is the term and the specified, gives it its *essence*.

Now, here, the canonical solution would put us in touch with a pope and a modernist hierarchy; it would certainly regulate our relations with Peter’s successor; but at the same time, it would put us in touch with this “system set up by the Revolution” (to use Father Calmel's expression), which is a bad thing.

Therefore, we cannot say: “a canonical solution is essentially a good thing”; we must specify with whom it puts us in contact with, what is the end of this relationship. And if it is with a modernist hierarchy, it is essentially a bad thing.

**QUESTION 3: TO SAY THAT A CANONICAL
RECOGNITION IS NOT CONCEIVABLE BEFORE
ROME HAS RETURNED TO TRADITION, IS THIS A
SCHISMATIC ATTITUDE, OR AT LEAST A
SEDEVACANTIST ONE?**

ARTICLE 1: Is It a Schismatic Attitude?

I. Reasons in favor of a positive answer

FIRST REASON

To refuse the jurisdiction offered to us is to deny that any jurisdiction comes from the Pope. However, denying the primacy of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff is the characteristic of schismatics.

SECOND REASON

To refuse communion with the Pope and most of the faithful for years and years has given us a schismatic habitus: we no longer even feel the need to integrate the visible perimeter of the Church, we have lost the *sensus Ecclesiae*.

THIRD REASON

To stand aside from the authorities of the Church when they ask us to abandon the faith and the liturgy of all time is understandable and an excuse for schism; but since today we are accepted "as we are", our conduct would become unjustified and the schism would be formal.

FOURTH REASON

The place of Tradition must be within the official perimeter of the Church so that it remains visible.

II. Notice to the contrary

To continue to profess the faith of all times and to celebrate the traditional cult apart from the conciliar Church was never considered by Monsignor Lefebvre as a schism: "We really represent the Catholic Church", he said, and this even after the sacraments of 1988, when John Paul II had just excommunicated him. Why would we be schismatic if we keep the same attitude towards modernist Rome as he did?

III. Substantive Response

1) What is schism?

"Schism," says Cardinal Billot, "opposes unity of communion. [...] It is incurred in two ways. First, if obedience to the Supreme Pontiff is directly refused, by not accepting what he commands, not precisely from the point of view of what is commanded (for this would amount to simple disobedience), but from the point of view of the authority that commands, that is, by refusing to recognize the Pope as head and superior. Second, if we separate ourselves directly from the communion of the Catholic faithful, for example by behaving as a separate group."

At first glance, traditionalists seem to be schismatic in both ways: the absence of an effective bond of dependence suggests that they do not recognize its authority; and they seem to form a sort of "small church" apart - described as "lefebvrists" or "integrist" - refusing to mingle with the other faithful.

2) The bond of faith is first

However, Pope Leo XIII, in the encyclical *Satis cognitum*, speaking of the unity of the Church, says this: "Such great, such absolute concord among men must have as its necessary foundation the understanding and union of intelligences; from which will naturally follow the harmony of wills and agreement in actions. This is why, according to the divine plan, Jesus wanted the unity of faith to exist in His Church:

for faith is the first of all the bonds that unite men to God and it is to it that we owe the name of faithful." A few years later, in *Mortalium animos*, his masterly encyclical condemning false ecumenism, Pius XI repeated the same idea: "Since charity," he said, "is founded on an honest and sincere faith, it is the unity of faith which must be the principal bond uniting the disciples of Christ."

It emerges from these pontifical teachings that there is in the Church a unity more fundamental than the unity of communion: it is the unity of faith. And for the unity of communion to be true, it must absolutely have as its foundation the unity of faith. From then on, it is clear that the first schismatics are heretics: "Heresy," says Cardinal Billot²⁵⁹, "is schism, for it directly opposes the unity of faith." One can oppose unity of communion without opposing unity of faith, but one cannot oppose unity of faith without opposing unity of communion, since the former is the foundation of the latter.

3) It is those who deviate from faith who make the schism

Now, when we consider the situation of the Church since the Second Vatican Council, we see that the people in positions of authority are imbued with liberalism and modernism. They have imposed reforms that destroy the Church, because they oppose traditional faith and worship. Thus, they have broken with the multi-secular Tradition, that is, ultimately, with the unity of faith; and the unity of communion that they are trying to achieve is only a pseudo-unity, because it has lost its true foundation.

The modernist hierarchy, as a modernist, is heretical: it is opposed to the unity of faith by the preaching of its errors, and consequently to the unity of communion. In other words, it is the conciliar church that is schismatic, because it seeks to achieve a unity that is no longer Catholic unity.

Archbishop Lefebvre said it clearly: "The conciliar Church is practically schismatic. [...] It's a virtually excommunicated Church, because it's a modernist Church²⁶⁰."

"The Pope wants to make unity outside the faith. It's a communion. A communion to whom? to what? how?... It's not a unit anymore. This can only be done in the unity of faith²⁶¹."

4) And the Pope?

As Cardinal Journet explains in the *Church of the Incarnate Word*²⁶², the Pope himself can sin against ecclesiastical communion by breaking the unity of leadership, which would happen if he did not fulfill his duty and denied the Church the direction she is entitled to expect from him in the name of someone greater than himself, Christ, her founder and invisible leader. And this is unfortunately the painful situation in which we find ourselves since the Council. If Archbishop Lefebvre wanted to stay away from the modernist hierarchy and the conciliar Church, it was out of fidelity to Tradition, refusing to make schism and break with the unity of faith as it has always been in the Church.

The Church, Father Calmel²⁶³ said, is not the mystical body of the Pope but of Christ. If, then, the Pope is so lacking in his office as to promote heresy and schism, then it

is better to obey Christ and remain faithful to the Church of all time, even if it means enduring the wrath of the authorities in place. Monsignor Lefebvre preferred to stay away from this hierarchy and this false communion: “To leave, then, the official Church? To some extent, yes, of course. If the bishops are in heresy, it is necessary to get out of this environment of the bishops if one does not want to lose his soul. If we move away from these people, it is absolutely like with people who have AIDS. We don't want to catch it. Now they have spiritual AIDS, contagious diseases. If you want to stay healthy, you shouldn't go with them²⁶⁴.”

5) Hence our attitude, in practice

The Catholic must not and cannot be in communion with a hierarchy that favors modernism, liberalism, ecumenism condemned by the popes, and that guides the faithful in ways foreign to Tradition. It would be better to bear the persecutions, the criticisms, the nicknames of “schismatic” and “excommunicated”, rather than to collaborate in their enterprise and in the loss of souls.

6) Conclusion

Thus, it is not those who are attached to Tradition who are really schismatic in reality, it is those who are distancing themselves from it. If the traditionalists are not “in communion”, it is only with the conciliar Church as such; but that is their title of glory. Communion will naturally be rediscovered on the day when Rome returns to Tradition and “re-crowns Our Lord Jesus Christ”. But to seek union with Rome before the authorities have returned to the unity of faith is to abandon our fight, it is - in a certain way - to betray the truth by bringing it into the pluralist and indifferent system orchestrated by the infidel hierarchy at its charge. This would be the triumph of the new ecclesiology of the Second Vatican Council, with its “*subsistit in*”... For us, it is not enough for Rome to admit: “the Church of Christ subsists in Tradition”; it must admit: “the true Church of Christ is Tradition”.

Finally, following Archbishop Lefebvre, we do not want to constitute a “small Church²⁶⁵”, independent in principle from the large one, and that is why we do not seek to establish a parallel hierarchy or to live withdrawn into ourselves and closed to others. We simply want to safely continue our witness for the faith and worship of all time. Only compromising or dangerous contacts for the follow-up of the Tradition are avoided. Our chapels are open to all the faithful and we do not refuse anyone our testimony. We do not refuse to go towards others, with the necessary prudence, to bring them back to Tradition but we are not moved either by “marginalization” (to use Father Calmel's expression), the consequence of our faithfulness to the faith of all time.

7) Precision

When we say that the authorities of the Church are heretical and schismatic, we do not mean that they have broken with the society that is the Church²⁶⁶, for this would require that their heresy and their schism be declared notorious by law, which seems quite impossible since it is up to them to do so. However, their heresy and schism are no less true, breaking with Tradition, destroying the faith and liturgy of all times,

and greatly promoting the loss of souls. A heresy and a schism that are not yet notorious by law can continue their ravages within the Church without the faithful suspecting danger, which makes them all the more formidable²⁶⁷. We must therefore stay away from those who promote them and continue to denounce them: this has been our conduct to this day.

IV. Answers to objections

First: It would be to refuse the primacy of the Pope

We do not deny that the Pope can give jurisdiction and even that - in normal times - it is from him that all jurisdiction is received in the Church. That is not the problem. It is in the fact that jurisdiction is a power, and that this power implies effective subjection to the one who confers it, namely the Pope. And the latter has the right to control the way in which this power is exercised by its subjects.

However, this subjection to a neo-modernist authority being an immediate danger for our faith and for its public confession, we cannot accept it, as we saw in question 2.

Of course, jurisdiction is necessary for the legitimate exercise of ecclesiastical ministry and for the validity of certain acts. Also, not having jurisdiction by the ordinary way, we continue to rely on the substitution of jurisdiction, which the Church confers directly in cases of necessity, and on which we have always relied, these last decades. This right of necessity will end the day when Rome will find Tradition.

Second: Our attitude has given us a schismatic habitus

A habitus contracts by repetition of acts. To contract a schismatic habitus, one would have to perform schismatic acts. But we have seen that our refusal to comply with the directives of modernist Rome are in no way schismatic acts, because of the just and serious reasons that motivate them.

Moreover, we must understand that our conduct towards Rome does not depend on time. It is not up to us to know how much longer the crisis will last: only God knows. For us, we will continue as long as necessary, without getting discouraged or tired. We will always avoid the schism if we continue to follow the recommendations of Archbishop Lefebvre, “to remain attached to the See of Peter, to the Roman Church, Mother and mistress of all the Churches, in the integral Catholic faith, expressed in the symbols of faith, in the catechism of the Council of Trent²⁶⁸ [...]”. The fact that the crisis has lasted for many years causes a much more real danger than that of a schism: it is that of abandoning the fight, through weariness. It is against this danger that we must protect ourselves.

Finally, it is not those who keep the true “*sensus fidei*” who must be accused of having lost the “*sensus Ecclesiae*”. Indeed, the latter would be false if it were to jeopardize fidelity to Tradition.

Third: We are accepted “such as we are”

In Dom Gérard's declaration, following the sacraments of 1988 and his rallying in Rome, we read: "What we asked for from the beginning (Mass of Saint Pius V, catechism, sacraments, all in conformity with the rite of the secular Tradition of the Church), was granted to us, *without doctrinal counterpart, without concession, without denial*. The Holy Father therefore offered us to be integrated into the Benedictine Confederation as we are. [...] All other things being equal, that is, *faith and the sacraments being saved*, it is better to be in accord with the laws of the Church than to contravene them. Thus, to avoid falling into "resistanceism", schism and constituting a "small Church", Dom Gérard rallied Rome, not without setting the condition: "*That no doctrinal or liturgical counterpart be required of us and that no silence be imposed on our anti-modernist preaching*"²⁶⁹."

All precautions seemed to be taken so that this rallying was prudent and allowed the Barroux to remain faithful to Tradition. But history has proved that the practical rallying to modernist Rome ends with a doctrinal rallying: We have amply shown above that we would not be accepted "as we are".

Thus, as long as Rome has not returned to Tradition, our conduct remains justified, and staying away from the modernist authorities does not constitute a schism.

Fourth: The place of Tradition is in the official perimeter of the Church

The Catholic Church is visible through her four notes: she is one, holy, Catholic and apostolic. If the official Church loses this visibility, it is because she is moving away from the traditional faith. Archbishop Lefebvre said it very clearly: "There is no longer unity of faith among them, and it is faith which is the basis of all visibility of the Church. Catholicity is faith one in space. Apostolicity is faith one in time. And holiness is the fruit of faith." Therefore, the solution is clear: if the official Church wants to regain its visibility, it must return to Tradition. But to ask the traditionalists to integrate the official Church, so that it can regain its visibility is to turn the problem upside down, and the experience of the *Ecclesia Dei* communities shows that this would be a mistake, as Archbishop Lefebvre sensed: "Recently, we have been told that it is necessary for Tradition to enter the visible Church [it is not the visible Church, it is the official Church]. I think we made a very, very serious mistake here. [...] It is we who have the marks of the visible Church."

The Archbishop's conclusion is clear: "It is not us, but the modernists who leave the Church"²⁷⁰.

V. To close the question

Let's conclude with the very clear words of Monsignor Lefebvre: "We are not in schism, we are the continuators of the Catholic Church. It's the ones who make the novelties that go into schism"²⁷¹." Indeed: "The anomaly in the Church did not come from us, but from those who tried to impose a new orientation on the Church, an orientation contrary to Tradition and even condemned by the Magisterium of the Church. If we seem to be in an abnormal situation, it is because those who have authority today in the Church burn what they once worshipped and worship what was once burned. *It is those who have deviated from the normal and traditional way that will have to return to what the Church has always taught and always accomplished*. How can this be done? Humanly speaking, it seems that only the

pope, let us say a pope, can restore order destroyed in all areas. But it is better to leave these things to Providence²⁷².”

Thus, the solution to the crisis will not consist in an alleged return of Tradition to a unity that it has never broken, but in the return of the hierarchy and the conciliar Church to traditional faith and worship. This return would be more prevented than encouraged if we entered in their unity, which is not one, in their pluralist “communion”. Our identity would be drowned in this heterogeneous whole: our testimony would be offended and we would have betrayed Christ the King. “What interests us first is to maintain the Catholic faith. That is our fight. Then the canonical question, purely external, public in the Church, is secondary. [...] To be publicly recognized is secondary. We must not seek the secondary by losing what is primary, what is the first object of our fight²⁷³.”

ARTICLE 2: Is This Sedevacantism?

I. Reasons in favor of a positive answer

FIRST REASON

Praying for the Pope is not enough to prove that we recognize his authority. It is necessary to give more obvious marks of submission. We refuse to give them, even when opportunities arise.

SECOND REASON

To systematically refuse everything the Pope says or does is to consider that he is not Pope. *A fortiori* reject the offer of canonical recognition when no doctrinal or liturgical compromise is asked of us. That is what we would do if we were to reject the Roman proposals today.

II. Opinion in the opposite sense

We continue to declare that we recognize the conciliar popes as legitimate successors of St. Peter and true leaders of the Church. “As long as I don't have the evidence that the pope wouldn't be the pope,” said Archbishop Lefebvre, “well! I have a presumption for him, for the Pope. I'm not saying that there can't be arguments that may be in doubt in some cases. But it must be clear that this is not just a doubt, a valid doubt. If the argument was dubious, we have no right to draw huge consequences²⁷⁴!” We also intend to maintain this prudential conduct. Therefore, we reject the theory of sedevacantism.

III. Substantive Response

1) What is sedevacantism?

Sedevacantism is the opinion that the pope who currently occupies the See of Rome is not really pope²⁷⁵.

At first glance, this opinion seems to have some plausibility. Indeed, how can we admit that a true Pope can preach in season and out of season false principles (religious freedom, ecumenism, collegiality, etc.) which are in formal opposition with

Tradition and favor the ruin of the Church and the loss of souls? Yet this is what Pope Francis did, following Paul VI, John Paul II and Benedict XVI.

2) Refutation

However, sedevacantism remains a simple theological opinion, which is not the most likely.

Indeed, when one studies the matter closely, one realizes that the reigning Pope, like his predecessors imbued with conciliar errors, never exercises his infallibility, and that his false conception of his own function certainly even prevents him from exercising a true magisterium²⁷⁶. Therefore, he does not teach the Church with true authority and he can be wrong, for a pope can wander when he does not fulfill his function as a doctor of the universal Church with the assistance of the Holy Ghost. Thus, the preaching by Pope Francis of foreign innovations and even contrary to Tradition can be explained, and it does not seem incompatible with the pontificate. Then, if the reigning pope is heretical, his heresy is neither notorious, nor de facto - because the majority of pastors and faithful do not consider him heretical; nor especially by right - because no authority in the Church can a priori declare him such, the pope being judged by no one on earth. That is why he remains despite everything a member and head of the society that is the Church²⁷⁷. This seems the most probable theologically²⁷⁸.

3) As a consequence

We do not follow the adventurous hypothesis of sedevacantism, but we prefer to imitate Archbishop Lefebvre's prudential conduct: as long as there is no evidence that the Pope is not Pope, we continue to recognize him for the true vicar of Christ on earth. That is why we do not accept the label "sedevacantists".

4) On the other hand

We refuse to follow the new orientations that the pontiffs have been giving to the Church since the Council, because they oppose the will of their divine Founder and invisible Head, Jesus Christ. We reject the heresies disclosed by the modernist authorities and refuse to comply with the Church's destructive directives.

Indeed, one must distinguish the pontifical authority from its exercise which, since the Council, has become revolutionary. The situation is truly exceptional and cannot be resolved according to ordinary rules, as Father Calmel well explained: "The spiritual treatises teach us almost nothing [...] about the revolutionary forms of the exercise of authority, nor, consequently, about the practice of obedience in this unprecedented situation. [...] Either in acceptance or in refusal, we are outside the ordinary categories of obedience and disobedience. [...] [The obligation to obey] does not exist with regard to the system set up by the Revolution, regardless of the authority that sponsors it²⁷⁹." We cannot enter into the conciliar system, which is oriented entirely towards a foreign and even opposite end to that of the Catholic Church.

5) Conclusion

Thus, if we refuse the canonical recognition proposed by Rome, it is not because it comes from the present occupant of the See of Peter, for we recognize the authority of the reigning Pope and are aware of the duty of submission that we have towards Peter's successor; but it is because of the imminent danger that there would be for us to depend on a modernist pope: we would indeed risk losing the integrity of faith. And as we said above, the acceptance of a canonical recognition would in itself be a betrayal, since Tradition would be drowned in the amalgam that the popes, fervently seeking pluralism ("unity in diversity"²⁹⁰), seek to constitute.

Thus, our line of conduct resembles that of the sedevacantists only materially, and not formally. Like them, we stand apart from the modernist pope, but our reasons are not the same: they do not want to recognize the authority of such a pope, while we only seek to escape the exercise of his authority in order to protect our faith and to continue to bear witness to Tradition. It is therefore not the Pope's non-existence that is the basis of our conduct, but the defense and proclamation of our Catholic faith²⁸¹.

Finally, unlike the sedevacantists, we continue to pray for the Pope, so that God may enlighten him and make him faithful to his office again.

IV. Answers to objections

First: To pray for the pope isn't enough

We do not content ourselves with praying for the Pope, but we venerate his person, because of Him whose vicar he is on earth. We place a frame of him in our sacristies and we avoid speaking ill of his person, even when we must publicly denounce his errors. We do not refuse to speak with him, and we testify to him of our fidelity by trying to enlighten him by our fight in favor of Tradition, convinced that this is the best service we can render him. We are prepared to give him all the marks of submission that will be morally possible for us. But for canonical recognition, we cannot consider it, in conscience, until he has shown a sincere desire to return to Tradition, renouncing the errors that he continues to spread today with more zeal than ever.

Second: Systematically refusing what the Pope does is not recognizing him as Pope

It is false to say that we systematically refuse everything the Pope says or does. We rejoice when we see him condemn abortion and contraception, prohibit the priesthood of women, maintain the law of priestly celibacy, etc., because all this is in conformity with the doctrine of always²⁸².

In reality, our resistance is limited to the points on which the Pope departs from Tradition. And if, in fact, this resistance is almost systematic, it is because his preaching is almost systematically tainted with errors, and because the orientation given to the Church since the Council does not vary.

As for “unilateral” canonical recognition, we have already explained why we cannot accept it.

V. To close the question

Let us conclude by echoing the statement made by the priests of Campos in the year 2000, before their defection: “When the ecclesiastical authorities return unconditionally to teach and do what the Church has always taught and done, we, the bishops, priests and faithful, our seminaries, religious houses, churches, chapels, schools, everything will be at the entire disposal of these same authorities. In the meantime, the best service we can render to the Church, the Pope and the bishops, is to resist, and to continue our priestly ministry, in conformity with the Church of all time²⁸³.” That is our course of action.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The canonical regularization process currently underway can be compared to the process of burning a log of green wood. When this one is thrown on the flame, it is unable to catch fire, because there is an obstacle: the sap. Then the flame starts licking the log to warm it up and release the sap. Once out, the log ignites.

Likewise, in our case, there would be an obstacle to canonical status: mutual mistrust between the conciliar world and us. The Pope's “benevolent” gestures have the role of breaking down this obstacle²⁸⁴. These gestures do not formally imply canonical dependence on the Roman authorities. The obstacle of mistrust once fallen, nothing much more will prevent the granting of final status, this time with effective dependence on the Holy See. Can we enter such a canonical structure?

To answer this question, in this conclusion, let us repeat the elements of this study.

We asked ourselves whether the situation in Rome had changed to such an extent that today we could consider a canonical solution, something we considered impossible not so long ago. We were forced to note that nothing essential had changed: the Pope's actions are more and more severe; the reaction of the conservatives, while courageous and deserving of praise, does not, however, call into question the principles of the crisis, on the contrary; the attitude of the Holy See towards what is traditional is not benevolent; finally, Rome's demands towards us are always fundamentally the same (question 1).

So, what exactly are the foundations of our previous refusals to reach an agreement with Rome? More precisely, can we accept an agreement with a neo-modernist Rome? Such acceptance would bring us into conciliar pluralism, silence our attacks against modern errors and put our faith in a near danger. Therefore, the canonical solution can only be considered with a Rome converted doctrinally, and having proved its conversion by working for the reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ and by fighting against the adversaries of this reign (question 2).

By placing ourselves in the hands of the Roman authorities, we would jeopardize our particular good no less than the common good of the Church.

Our particular good: for we are responsible for our soul, and therefore for our faith; but without faith we cannot be saved²⁸⁵. And no one can offload this responsibility on others.

The common good of the Church: indeed, we are not masters of the faith, in the sense that we cannot change it at will. It is the good of the Church, for it is by faith that she lives from the life of her divine Spouse. She is a *common*²⁸⁶ good, not only because she is common to all Catholics, but because she requires the help of all - although not to the same extent

for all - in order to preserve her. Confirmation²⁸⁷ makes us soldiers of Christ: every Christian must be ready to expose himself to defend the faith. And the priestly character attached to the Church's mission gives priests the sacred duty to preach and defend her publicly by fighting error.

We are in the militant Church, attacked from all sides by error. To no longer raise your voice publicly against it is to become its accomplice.

Therefore, it is impossible for us today to place ourselves through a canonical solution in the hands of the neo-modernist authorities, because of their neo-modernism. This is the real obstacle to our recognition by these authorities.

In doing so, far from calling into question the Pope's authority, we are convinced that we are rendering him the first service, which is that of truth (question 3). Through our prayers, we beg the Immaculate Heart of Mary to obtain for him the grace of doctrinal conversion, so that once again he may "confirm his brothers in the faith²⁸⁸".

We are aware that many friends do not share our opinion on this whole issue. Certainly, these friendships are of great value to us, and we hope they will remain. But friendship with Jesus Christ prevails over them, and we prefer the latter to human friendships, should they jeopardize it.

No, we cannot - *non possumus* - enter into a canonical structure submitting us to a modernist authority. We are not saying that against our friends who feel they can get in. But we say so because it is our duty.

First of all, it is our duty towards Our Lord and His Holy Church; we have no right to expose ourselves to making peace with those who betray them.

Then it is our duty for ourselves, because we have our soul to save, and we cannot save ourselves without integrated faith.

It is our duty to the brothers who have entered our community. They entered the school of St. Francis to become saints. Now, the first condition of holiness is orthodoxy²⁸⁹, which is put in imminent danger by a canonical solution.

It is our duty towards our Poor Clare Sisters. They trusted us by settling down with us, depending on our community for the sacraments and chaplaincy. We cannot deceive their trust and put them in an inextricable situation.

It is our duty to our tertiaries. They have to fight hard in this world. They too have trusted us to support them in this tough fight.

Finally, it is our duty to the faithful who have recourse to our ministry. We are not allowed to lead them gently to the poisoned pastures of Vatican II.

We know that some of those who have trusted us would like us to follow the movement and enter into the canonical structure, if Rome concedes it to us. In the past, these dear friends thought like us; we regret that they have changed. But we don't blame them at all; we understand that the situation is very delicate and that it's really not easy to see clearly. May the preceding pages have brought them some light. In any case, we pray for them. But we also pray for ourselves: "Watch ye, and pray", says the divine Master, "that you enter not into temptation. The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh weak²⁹⁰."

Yes, watching: this is a fundamental condition in this fight. Faith is not enough, we still need lucidity and prudence.

But that is not enough either: indeed, how many of our predecessors, since the Council, had seen clearly and yet fell. It is that in addition to lucidity, we need strength, to stand against everything, even if everyone would go against what we see to be the will of God. It takes persevering strength to stand the test of time. And perseverance is above all a grace.

Virgin strong as an army in battle, faithful Virgin, obtain for us the grace of strength and perseverance; grant it to all those we love! Saint Joseph, Patron of the universal Church, protect us.

Morgon, June 3rd, 2016,
in the feast of the Sacred Heart of Jesus,
King and center of all hearts,
King of nations.

ANNEX I: MONSIGNOR LEFEBVRE'S THOUGHTS ON THE POSSIBILITY OF AN AGREEMENT WITH NEO- MODERNISTE ROME

The problem that Archbishop Lefebvre faced during the seminary project in Fribourg was: on the one hand, to transmit the faith and the priesthood to the young people who had recourse to him, and thus to protect themselves from conciliar errors; and on the other hand, to do the work of the Church. The current authorities being imbued with conciliar errors, all the difficulty lies in these relations with said authorities.

Three periods in the history of these relationships can be distinguished. The first (1970-1975), where the Fraternity was recognized by the Roman authorities. The second (1975-1988), a period of intimidation, when Rome sought to prevent Ecône's work from spreading, and when Archbishop Lefebvre showed himself open to arrangements, provided that he was allowed to continue his work as is. Finally, the third (1988-1991), in which Archbishop Lefebvre, noting the impossibility of an arrangement as long as Rome was modernist, continued his work peacefully, awaiting the conversion of the authorities in place.

A) First period: SSPX recognized by ecclesiastical authorities

On November 1, 1970, S.E. Bishop Charriere of Fribourg canonically erected the SSPX "as *pia unio*²⁹¹". On February 18, 1971, Cardinal Wright wrote the "decree of praise", which elevated the SSPX to the rank of an institute of pontifical right²⁹². Moreover, Cardinal Antoniutti, prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Religious, allowed Father Snyder and another American religious to be incardinated directly in the SSPX. These acts are even more important than the decree of praise. On May 6th, 1975, Bishop Mamie, successor of Bishop Charriere, abolished the SSPX. It seems that this suppression is illegal²⁹³; nevertheless, *de facto*, since then, the SSPX is considered by all Church authorities as no longer existing legally.

As for the reasons for this suppression, they are clearly explained by Monsignor Lefebvre in the *Fideliter* already quoted²⁹⁴: it is essentially the liturgical question, the refusal of the new Mass, the refusal of the application of the orientations and decisions of the Second Vatican Council. The last straw was the declaration of November 21st, 1974. "This statement," says Monsignor Mamie, "was for me the confirmation that I could no longer, in conscience, support your Fraternity²⁹⁵." Archbishop Lefebvre appealed and was dismissed without trial." Bishop Lefebvre appealed and was dismissed without trial. "The attacks

against Ecône,” he said, “clearly appear as a manifestation of what His Holiness Paul VI denounced under the name of "self-destruction" of the Church. The attacks against Ecône, he said, clearly appear as a manifestation of what His Holiness Paul VI denounced under the name of “self-destruction” of the Church. In this case, beyond our unworthy persons, our duty is to fight for the honor of God, the Catholic faith and relieve the priesthood also compromised as it is vital for the Holy Church. That is why [...] I will continue to form in fidelity to the Roman Church many young people who have trusted me, happy to have finally found a seminary where they can learn to become, quite simply, Catholic priests²⁹⁶.”

Until his death, this will be a constant at Monsignor Lefebvre's: until the end he seeks to respect legality (appealing, etc.). But if he does not succeed, finding that he is dealing with people who are destroying the Church, he passes over, without a state of mind.

Jean Madiran concluded on this case: These documents “confirm (if it were necessary) that there is little human hope that the Priestly Fraternity of Archbishop Lefebvre can regain a canonical existence as long as the administrative power in the Church remains confiscated by the sectarian and persecuting party that holds Rome under the boot of its foreign occupation [...]. Out of fidelity to the Church, [Archbishop Lefebvre] perseveres in the formation of true priests²⁹⁷.” It is enough to specify that this occupation will continue as long as the Roman authorities have not resumed the tradition and rejected the conciliar doctrine, and we have the conclusions that Monsignor Lefebvre will take draw in summer 1988.

B) Second period (1975-1988) - Search for a *modus vivendi*

1) Archbishop Lefebvre intervenes privately with the Pope

A) Paul VI

At the consistory of May 24th, 1976, Paul VI declared Archbishop Lefebvre “outside the Church” for having disobeyed²⁹⁸. “Out of which church,” asks Madiran. “[...] There are two. And Paul VI has not yet renounced being the pope of these two Churches simultaneously. Under these conditions, “outside the Church” does not cut anything. That there are now two Churches with one and the same Paul VI at the head of one and the other, we have nothing to do with it, we are not inventing it, we see that it is so²⁹⁹.”

Following the ordinations of June 29th, 1976, on July 1, Archbishop Lefebvre was suspended *a divinis*. This measure was followed, for the priests of the SSPX, by the first refusals of jurisdiction³⁰⁰. “From July onwards,” says Jean Madiran, “the war is no longer masked or curbed. The faction that holds the militant Church under the yoke of its foreign occupation wants a quick victory. It needs to crush all Catholic resistance (*ibid.*)”

Despite the condemnations, Archbishop Lefebvre sought to act with the Roman authorities to remedy the situation, by obtaining freedom of action for the SSPX, and by making the voice of Tradition heard.

In an unexpected way, Archbishop Lefebvre was received in audience by Paul VI on September 11. He asks him to let the traditionalists do what they have always

done. “You just have to say the word and everything goes back to normal. You just have to say the word and everything goes back to normal. [...] Let us do this experience. But I am willing to enter into normal and official relations with the Holy See, with the congregations. On the contrary, that's all I ask³⁰¹.”

Coming to the fundamental problems, he said to him: “But review the texts of religious freedom, two texts that formally contradict each other word for word. And important, dogmatic texts. Gregory XVI and Pius IX, *Quanta Cura*, and religious freedom, word for word, contradict each other. Which one should we choose?” – “Ah,” Paul VI replied, “let these things alone, let us not enter into discussions³⁰².” In short, Rome does not deal with doctrine and demands obedience to the person of Paul VI. It is the refusal of any discussion³⁰³. For his part, too bad, Archbishop Lefebvre will continue. “So, whatever happens, even if tomorrow I should be excommunicated, well, what do you want, I will be excommunicated, but excommunicated perhaps, if not by Freemasons [...] well, I would say that it is a certificate of fidelity to the Church of all time³⁰⁴.”

B) Cardinal Seper

“But the years passed. The abuse of power was so obvious that public opinion was becoming more sympathetic to the victims [...]. It took three and a half years before a more in-depth investigation of the doctrine professed by Monsignor Lefebvre and taught at Ecône was decided. On January 28th, 1978, Cardinal Seper, Prefect of the former Holy Office, sent Ecône an abundant questionnaire³⁰⁵.” For a long time, it is now the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF) which takes the file. Doctrine issues, it seemed, were finally being addressed.

Upon his accession to the See of Peter, John Paul II received Archbishop Lefebvre in audience. The Pope says he is ready “to read the Second Vatican Council in the light of Tradition.” Archbishop Lefebvre finds this expression fair to austerity. In a letter he sent him just after, on December 24, 1978, Archbishop Lefebvre reiterated what he had asked Paul VI: “We urge you to say a single word [...] to the bishops of the whole world: “Let it be”; “We allow the free exercise of what the centuries-old tradition has used for the sanctification of souls”.” He prefers this practical agreement to discussions. “I fear that prolonged and subtle discussions will not lead to a satisfactory result and will delay a solution which, I am sure, must seem urgent to you. The solution cannot, in fact, be found in a compromise that would practically make our work disappear³⁰⁶.”

At this stage, it is therefore correct to say that Monsignor Lefebvre prefers a practical solution; this is what emerges from the discussions of the previous months with the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith; the discussions are bogged down³⁰⁷; Cardinal Seper seems not to understand, demands to accept the Council without discussion... What Monsignor Lefebvre is asking for is therefore a “practical agreement” without doctrinal counterpart. Monsignor Lefebvre presupposes to the Pope and the bishops the good will and sincerity to help the faithful and priests of tradition.

At the Pope's request, Archbishop Lefebvre met with Cardinal Seper to review the questionnaire. The interview was a real "interrogation". The relations between Ecône and Rome will remain there.

During his ordinations in 1980, he reaffirmed his position: to remain what we are, to preach the Truth, to continue the Church. Then, "God willing, he will reintegrate us into the official Church as we are. [...] We will enter the official Church since we have been thrown out of that official Church which is not the real Church, an official Church which has been infested with modernism. [...] We're sure, things will get better soon. [...] We are perhaps closer than ever to this solution of being officially recognized in the Holy Church, as SSPX, and with all that we are, all that we think, all that we believe, all that we do³⁰⁸." In November, in Angers, he reiterated: "We are simply asking, perhaps, not to discuss too much theoretical problems, to leave the issues that divide us, such as religious freedom. We do not have to solve all these problems now, time will bring its clarity, its solution. But in practice, as I have said many times, let us experience Tradition³⁰⁹."

C) Cardinal Ratzinger's "Opening"

When Cardinal Seper died in early 1982, Cardinal Ratzinger succeeded him as head of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. On March 25, Archbishop Lefebvre met him in Rome. He clearly states his position. "Ah, the cardinal told me, it's very annoying, we'd still have to find a solution. My solution, I told him, is very simple: accept what we have been asking you for years [the traditional liturgy]. Give us what we want. That's all. Without a solution, we move on to *something else*: the canonical question³¹⁰." That is, the question of ordinations without authorization. It seems that at this stage, when Archbishop Lefebvre speaks of "experience of tradition", it is distinct from the canonical solution. That's all. Without a solution, we moved on to something else: the canonical question. That is, the question of ordinations without authorization. It seems that at this stage, when Archbishop Lefebvre speaks of "experience of tradition", it is distinct from the canonical solution. But he mentions it just after: "If our Society is once again recognized by Rome [...] we accept. We may very well depend on a Roman society or congregation. We have no problem with that. The canonical question would be immediately and totally settled³¹¹." Let us note the elements: that we are allowed to do what has always been done, and moreover, that we are recognized, as we were once recognized.

The cardinal wrote to Monsignor Lefebvre following their meeting. He does not mention at all the solution proposed by Monsignor Lefebvre, but informs him that the Pope has created a cardinal's commission to study and find the right formula (*ibid.*).

On December 23rd, 1982, the Commission having completed its work and the Pope having approved it, the Cardinal sent the Roman reply to Monsignor Lefebvre. The Pope is willing to appoint a visitor if the Archbishop agrees to sign a doctrinal declaration in two paragraphs: Monsignor Lefebvre is asked to adhere to Vatican II in the light of tradition; to recognize that the new Mass "has been

promulgated by the legitimate and supreme authority of the Holy See, [...] and that, *consequently*, this missal is in itself legitimate and Catholic. *Consequently*, I have not and will not deny the validity of the Masses faithfully celebrated according to the New Ordo. Finally, I do not want to imply that these masses are heretical or blasphemous in any way and I want to affirm that they must not be refused by Catholics.” The cardinal specifies that these two points cannot be modified. The purpose of the visit will be to find an adequate canonical status; the consequence will be the acceptance of canon law³¹². Let us note immediately that, for the Holy See, recognizing that the new Mass has been legitimately promulgated necessarily entails its legitimacy and, therefore, that the faithful cannot be turned away from it.

Commenting on this letter, Archbishop Lefebvre shows that relations are tending. On the recognition of the legitimate promulgation of the new missal: “Consequently, he said, I must stop turning the faithful away from it through my criticism.” He begins to sniff out the trap of the expression: “The Council in the light of tradition.” “For Cardinal Ratzinger, it was not a question of interpreting the Council in the light of tradition, but rather of integrating the Council into tradition. It's easy to say, but you have to be able to do it³¹³!” Archbishop Lefebvre affirms that all the divergences crystallize around the Mass (*ibid.*).

Thus, on April 5th, Archbishop Lefebvre responded directly to the Pope by rejecting the paragraph on the Mass and explaining in what precise sense he meant the Council's interpretation “in the light of tradition”. He asks for the freedom to say the traditional Mass, the reform of the *Novus Ordo Missæ* to make it conform to the Catholic faith, and the reform of the texts of the Council contrary to the official Magisterium of the Church³¹⁴.

On July 20th, Cardinal Ratzinger replied to the letter of April 5th. In it he expressed the Holy Father's disappointment at the refusal of the Roman proposal³¹⁵. The cardinal explains in particular his surprise to see the divergence on the expression “the Council interpreted in the light of Tradition”. “The Holy Father is therefore surprised that even your acceptance of the Council interpreted according to tradition remains ambiguous, since you immediately affirm that Tradition is not compatible with the Declaration on Religious Freedom.” Commentary by Monsignor Lefebvre: “This means that the texts of the Council can all be integrated into Tradition. What then becomes the “Light” of Tradition³¹⁶?”

2) Archbishop Lefebvre speaks in public

A) Open letter to the Pope

On November 21st, 1983, given that the fifteen years of private approaches had been in vain, Archbishop Lefebvre published an open letter to the Pope, co-signed by Bishop de Castro Mayer. He denounces the main errors conveyed by the Council and causes of the tragic situation in which the Church is³¹⁷. To give it publicity, he organized a press conference on December 9th, at Roissy airport, where he presented the letter to the journalists. One of them is worried: if

relations with Rome become tense, the situation is blocked, and the future of traditional communities is compromised... “For us, that is not a problem,” he answers. “We have vocations in our seminaries. We are asked throughout the world by communities of the faithful who still want to save their souls and who want to continue the Catholic Church. So, on that side, we have no difficulty. We have no internal problems. But of course, on Rome's side I don't know. I confess that the situation is very gloomy, since Rome is occupied by the modernists³¹⁸.” Finally, he evokes the possibility of consecrating bishops one day, if the gravity of the situation demands it.

Thus, through this episcopal manifesto, we enter a new phase in which Archbishop Lefebvre publicly addresses the Pope for the good of the Church. Let us note that he does not have a guilt complex towards Rome: the problems are with them, not with us. It is about making the voice of truth resound. In short, his whole approach is for the common good of the Church, not for his personal good or that of his work.

On October 3rd, 1984, the Holy See published the indult authorizing the celebration of the traditional Mass, subject to certain conditions, in particular: “Let it be quite clear that these priests and these faithful have nothing to do with those who doubt the legitimacy and the doctrinal rectitude of the Roman missal promulgated by Pope Paul VI in 1970, and let their position be unambiguously and publicly recognized³¹⁹.” Already a year earlier, Archbishop Lefebvre said: “Now, how could religious authority ensure that a priest does not celebrate the old rite out of contempt for the new³²⁰? By asking him to say the new Mass, at least once in a while. It is difficult not to sense in the arrangement of these provisions an attempt to pressure the traditionalist priests to celebrate the new Mass, in the name of a spirit of conciliation that would sign their loss³²¹.”

Six months later, on March 17th, 1985, at a conference given at the Saint Pius X Institute in Paris, Archbishop Lefebvre shows that, despite some traditional aspects of John Paul II, Rome has not changed he replied to journalists who told him: “You should still be able to get along [with John Paul II]!³²²” “When Rome abandons this religious freedom and returns to Tradition, condemning error and therefore no man can have the right to choose his religion, then, really, we can say that there is change³²³.”

Then he shows that Rome wants to find an arrangement on ambiguous formulas. He refuses this arrangement, which would be a compromise with error. “And then I sometimes say: we don't want a mixed marriage. We don't want to be married to people who don't have our religion. If I accepted his mistakes [those of Cardinal Ratzinger] and even almost his heresies, then I would marry a Church that is not the Catholic Church³²⁴!”

With these words, Archbishop Lefebvre does not exclude a canonical solution, but refuses the compromise proposed by Cardinal Ratzinger; he refuses the solution as it is then presented. As we have seen and will continue to see, at this stage he is still open to a solution where we would be given the freedom to continue what we are doing.

“So, what do we do?” To continue what we do, even if we are struck; to develop our action, supported by prayer and sacrifice; to fight without accepting a truce with those who destroy the Church. God blesses these efforts³²⁵. These are the Archbishop’s instructions.

One month to the day after this conference, on April 17th, 1985, Archbishop Lefebvre proposed to Cardinal Ratzinger a new declaration replacing the one proposed by Cardinal Ratzinger on December 23rd, 1982; he also asked that the official recognition of 1970 be returned to the Fraternity and that it be recognized by pontifical right; he proposed that the Fraternity respond to the call that the bishops could make of its priests³²⁶. But this proposal will be rejected by the Pope, because of the refusal of the new conciliar innovations, the new Mass and the new code³²⁷.

In January 1985, in the same sense, Father Schmidberger, Superior General, launched a petition to the Holy Father, asking for the freedom for every priest to say the traditional Mass unconditionally; the cessation of the sanctions brought against Archbishop Lefebvre and his priests; and that the Fraternity be recognized as a society of pontifical right and personal prelature³²⁸. Apart from the personal prelature, this petition reflects Archbishop Lefebvre's letter of April 17th. The signatures were given by the Superior General to Cardinal Ratzinger on March³²⁹.

B) Open letter to perplexed Catholics

After the open letter to the Pope, Archbishop Lefebvre this time addresses an *Open Letter to perplexed Catholics*³³⁰.

At the end of 1985 an extraordinary Synod was to take place, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the closing of the Council³³¹. Archbishop Lefebvre took this opportunity to beg the Pope to take advantage of the Synod to go backwards. He sent him a solemn warning, co-signed by Bishop De Castro Mayer³³², dated August 31st. The two bishops said, among other things: “If the Synod, under your authority, continues in this direction, you will no longer be the Good Shepherd.” John Paul II took this lightly and joked to Bishop Schwery of Sion: “Be careful, now I am no longer a good pastor!” “The measure of indifference towards apostasy is archicomble,” cried Father Schmidberger, “a last cry from the tortured soul of two Catholic bishops has been ridiculed with an irony that can no longer be surpassed³³³.”

And on November 6, Archbishop Lefebvre entrusted the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith with a collection of 39 doubts (objections) on religious freedom, hoping that Rome would finally agree to address the fundamental questions³³⁴.

C) After the Synod of 1985: blindness and obstinacy

Rome had to remain deaf to these warnings, and enter a new phase. The Synod refuses to note the crisis and speaks instead of many fruits of the Council³³⁵.

Worse: one month later, on January 25, 1986, John Paul II announced the interreligious meeting in Assisi, taking advantage of the year 1986 chosen by the UN as the year of peace. On April 13, 1986, he made a visit to the Synagogue in Rome. "The scandal of Christians is consummated", Fideliter comments; "The kiss of shame": thus, the magazine comments on the fraternal embrace with the Chief Rabbi of Rome³³⁶.

On August 27th, Archbishop Lefebvre sent a letter to eight cardinals begging them to publicly protest against the meeting in Assisi³³⁷. And to the Pope himself he will send drawings in order to make him touch with his finger the gravity of this act³³⁸.

Taking stock of these events, Father Schmidberger said: "During the years 1977-1983 a process of clarification took place: the Archbishop declared to anyone who would listen that, despite all his criticism of modernist Rome, he would never break with Peter's successor. [...] The formula "neither heretical nor schismatic" reflects his line of conduct [...]. Finally, since 1983, under the pressure of events [...], Archbishop Lefebvre has attacked, with vehemence that is neither exaggerated nor disrespectful, those responsible for the ruin of the Church in their scandalous acts, in the first place Pope John Paul II, without however, until now, drawing any legal conclusion³³⁹".

All these events could only confirm Monsignor Lefebvre in this conviction: it is not us who are in illegality, it is them! "It is they who are in fact moving away from the legality of the Church and [...] we, on the contrary, remain in legality and validity. Objectively considering that they perform acts in a spirit that destroys the Church, in practice we have found ourselves obliged to act in a way that seems contrary to the legality of the Church. [...] From then on, we acted according to the fundamental laws of the Church *to save souls, save the priesthood, continue the Church*. These are indeed the ones that are at issue. We oppose certain particular laws of the Church to keep the fundamental laws. By making particular laws play against us, it is the fundamental laws that are destroyed: it is going against the good of souls, against the ends of the Church³⁴⁰."

Arrived 1987. On March 9th, Archbishop Lefebvre receives the response to doubts about religious freedom³⁴¹. The Archbishop sees in this response, which reaffirms the conciliar doctrine on the subject, as well as in the Assisi meeting, signs that the time has come to consecrate bishops. He announced it publicly during his ordinations on 29 June³⁴². Rome is locked in its errors and no longer listens to the voice of truth; we must therefore think of the future: the Church must continue and for this we need bishops.

3) The negotiations of 1987-1988

A) An un hoped opening

In the face of the "threat" to consecrated bishops, Rome is moved. Archbishop Lefebvre is summoned to the Vatican. He met Cardinal Ratzinger on July 14th. On the 28th of the same month, the Cardinal sent him a letter in which he

proposed freedom to the SSPX, without a prior doctrinal declaration³⁴³. At first suspicious, Archbishop Lefebvre accepted this openness. “If Rome is willing to give us a real autonomy, the one we have now, but with submission, we would want it. [...] Obviously, this requires solutions that must be examined and discussed and that are not easy to resolve in detail. But with the grace of God it is possible to reach a solution that allows us to continue our work without abandoning our faith.” “It’s a little hope. Oh! I am not overly optimistic because precisely these two opposing currents that I have described, it is very difficult to connect them³⁴⁴.”

The magazine *Fideliter*, wondering which canonical solution would be the ideal, evokes the personal prelature; but this one presented more disadvantages than advantages. Another possible solution: to be recognized as a proper rite “would seem more adapted to the singular role entrusted to the Fraternity by Providence³³⁵”. Archbishop Lefebvre was also considering a solution similar to military ordinariates³⁴⁶.

Rome then sent Cardinal Gagnon and Bishop Perl to visit all the priories of France of the SSPX and the friendly communities (November 19 - December 8). Archbishop Lefebvre had been asking for this for years³⁴⁷.

The visit went very well, but Archbishop Lefebvre has little hope. “Because of the present weight in all this modernized and modernist Church,” he said on December 13th, five days after the end of the visit, “I would not be surprised if they would seek by all means to bring us closer to them and to this conciliar spirit. I fear that³⁴⁸.” “I am very afraid that we will fall back into the same situation as before [i.e. with demands for concessions on Vatican II], because of the influences at play in Rome, because Rome is divided³⁴⁹.”

On January 18th, Archbishop Lefebvre is in Rome. There, he realizes that things may not move as fast as they should. However, it seems certain that the SSPX will be given freedom “without consideration”. On January 30th, he announces to some friends that he will consecrate three or four bishops on June 30th³⁵⁰.

On April 8th, the Holy See published a letter from the Pope to Cardinal Ratzinger, in which John Paul II expressed his wish that efforts to reach an agreement be continued, but at the same time maintained the demand to recognize Vatican II Council³⁵¹. *Fideliter* magazine rightly concludes: “If such an agreement is reached, it will be a miracle³⁵².”

B) A contradiction?

At this point in our study, there is a small difficulty to resolve. On the one hand, as we have seen, Archbishop Lefebvre is inclined to settle his situation canonically. On the other hand, especially from 1984 onwards, he began to say that it was not possible to place oneself under a modernist authority. Thus, after the publication of the 1983 Indult, some faithful wished to be reintegrated into the official Church, to be able to change things from the inside. “This is a false reasoning,” replied Archbishop Lefebvre. “We do not enter a frame under

superiors, when they have everything in hand to stop us. “Once recognized, you say, we can act within the Church.” It is a profound error and a total ignorance of the minds of those who make up the current hierarchy. We cannot place ourselves under an authority whose ideas are liberal and who would condemn us, little by little, by the force of things, to accept these ideas and their consequences, first of all the new Mass³⁵³.”

On July 14th, he told Cardinal Ratzinger: “Eminence, see, even if you grant us a bishop, even if you grant us a certain autonomy with regard to the bishops, even if you grant us all the liturgy of 1962, even if you grant us to continue the seminaries and the Fraternity, as we are doing now, we will not be able to collaborate, it is impossible, impossible, because we are working in two diametrically opposed directions: you, you are working for the de-Christianization of society, the human person and the Church, and we, we are working for the Christianization. We can’t get along³⁵⁴.”

“All summer [1987],” says his biographer, “the realism of the faith that penetrates the Archbishop [...] makes him say inwardly: we cannot collaborate with these adversaries of Our Lord's reign³⁵⁵.”

Yet, despite these words, Archbishop Lefebvre continued the talks for two reasons that seemed sufficient to him. The first and main one was the need to provide the Fraternity and the faithful of the Tradition with Catholic bishops, and thereby save the episcopate. Once the signs from heaven were obtained, he was ready to proceed with the consecrations without further delay. But Rome having proposed to arrange things, he wanted to avoid everything that could have given the appearance of a schism. At the same time as he told his Roman interlocutors that he was open to advances, he reiterated that he would consecrate on June 30th. The other reason was that Archbishop Lefebvre had long believed it was possible - though difficult - to find a way to protect himself from the modernist authorities while at the same time regaining normal relations with them. There were three conditions, or “requirements”, that he set in 1987: “To guarantee the exemption of diocesan bishops, an ordinariate whose Ordinary is the Superior General of the Fraternity; a Roman commission presided over by a cardinal but whose members, including the Archbishop General Secretary, are presented by the Superior General; finally, three bishops, including the Superior General himself³⁵⁶.”

C) The protocol of May 5th, 1988

We can now resume the thread of events. At the request of the Holy See, on April 12 and 13 a meeting was held at the Holy Office between Roman and Fraternity experts to consider concrete proposals. We write a “declaration in five points, that Archbishop Lefebvre, after some corrections on May 4, deemed it possible to sign, since he was allowed to express that “certain points of the Council and of the reforms of the liturgy and of the law seem to him difficult to reconcile with Tradition³⁵⁷.” On the other hand, none of the three requirements is granted; only he is told, orally, that a bishop could be considered for consecration. Clinging to this word, believing the thing assured, Archbishop Lefebvre asked for a second

bishop. As for the commission, it will be composed of members of the Roman discateries... The Archbishop insists with the cardinal, saying that he would like to be part of the commission. Faced with this insistence, Cardinal Ratzinger remains evasive and drags things out. On May 3, Archbishop Lefebvre, jostling the latter, gave the names of the four bishops he wanted to consecrate, announcing that he would send him their files. The following day, May 4th, the decisive meeting between the two takes place. It is on this occasion that the cardinal will say: "I would find it good if at Saint-Nicolas-du-Chardonnet, next to the Masses of the Fraternity, there were a Mass of the parish; the Church is one³⁵⁸." "Ah!" says Archbishop Lefebvre, "it is cohabitation that they want, within the Church... conciliar." For the commission of five members, only two would be from the Fraternity, one of whom would work in the secretariat. Only one bishop would be granted. On the date, the cardinal remains evasive. During the meal, Archbishop Lefebvre said to one of his collaborators: "Let's stop here, I don't want to continue."

Let us take a look at the protocol of agreement that has just been drafted. It contains two parts: a doctrinal declaration and a part settling juridical questions. The doctrinal declaration is not without serious problems, in particular the following points:

- "We declare our acceptance of the doctrine contained in n° 25 of the Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen Gentium* of the Second Vatican Council on the ecclesiastical Magisterium and its due adherence" (n° 2). What Magisterium is this about? In the view of the Roman authorities, this is obviously the conciliar magisterium; in that of Archbishop Lefebvre, it presupposes the Catholic conception of the traditional magisterium. The formula is therefore ambiguous and dangerous: it will be easy for the said authorities to rely on it to force them to accept new developments, or at least to remain silent about them. We'll have to come back to that.
- "With regard to certain points taught by the Second Vatican Council or concerning later reforms of the liturgy and law, which seem to us difficult to reconcile with Tradition, we commit ourselves to have a positive attitude of study and communication with the Apostolic See, avoiding all polemic" (n° 3). In other words, there is no question of denouncing in the pulpit the conciliar errors - which would be a combative and polemical attitude - but contenting oneself with expressing doubts to the Holy See, behind closed doors. It is a weapon to punish preachers who are too "bold".
- "We further declare that we recognize the validity of the Sacrifice of the Mass and Sacraments celebrated with the intention of doing what the Church does and according to the rites indicated in the typical editions of the Roman Missal and the rituals of the sacraments promulgated by Popes Paul VI and John Paul II" (No. 4). At first glance, the formula seems harmless, because as it stands, we have never denied it.

But let us look at the declaration of the priests of Campos (January 18, 2002). “We recognize,” they say, “the validity of the *Novus Ordo Missæ*, whenever it is celebrated correctly and with the intention of offering the true sacrifice of the Holy Mass³⁵⁹.” Although the wording is less clear than that of the Protocol, the two are substantially identical. Now, here is what Father Cottier - future cardinal - the Pope's theologian said about the declaration of the priests of Campos: “Many lefebvrists hold that ‘our’ Paul VI Mass would not be valid. Now this group, at least, will no longer be able to think of something similar. Little by little additional steps will have to be taken: for example, that they also participate in the con-celebration in the reformed rite. But we must not rush. The important thing is that in their hearts there is no longer this rejection. The communion found in the Church has its internal dynamism which will mature³⁶⁰.” We will also have to come back to this “internal dynamism”, that of the Revolution; Father Cottier expressed himself cautiously, and then did not think that this dynamism would act so quickly: the priests of Campos professed the legitimacy of the new Mass, Bishop Rifan con-celebrated in 2004.

- “Finally, we promise to respect the common discipline of the Church and the ecclesiastical laws, especially those contained in the Code of Canon Law promulgated by Pope John Paul II, remaining faithful to the special discipline granted to the Fraternity by a particular law” (n° 5): this is the acceptance of the new Code³⁶¹.

As for canonical questions, let us note the following points:

- The Roman commission regulating relations with the other dicasteries would have only two members of the Fraternity out of five (paragraph 2).
- The friendly communities would be attached to their respective Orders, thus brought into line (paragraph 3).
- The faithful would be subject to the jurisdiction of the local Ordinary (Ibid.).
- Archbishop Lefebvre would be granted the lifting of the suspense and the exemption from the irregularities incurred as a result of the ordinations (paragraph 6). It means recognizing the validity of these penalties, and therefore implicitly of their basis.

Despite this, Archbishop Lefebvre said he would have a bishop. He therefore went to Rome on May 5th to sign the protocol of agreement. When he left Albano, he met a sister from the Cenacle and said: “If Don Putti were here, what would he say? ‘Monsignor, where are you going? What are you doing?’” On the way back, he's not calm. “The head in his hands throughout the rosary and greeting him in the chapel, the Archbishop prays, sometimes sighs, then without saying anything, he withdraws.” On the way back, he's not calm. The head in his hands throughout the rosary and greeting him in the chapel, the archbishop prays, sometimes sighs, then without saying anything, he withdraws³⁶².” He did not sleep at night, he wrote Cardinal Ratzinger a letter to withdraw his signature.

He affirmed that he would consecrate four bishops on June 30, with or without authorization.

“For Archbishop Lefebvre, setting a date is *the test of Rome's sincerity*, proof that he is not fooled, that Rome will not simply wait for his beautiful death³⁶³.” “June 30th is the deadline,” he says. “I feel it, I am reaching the end of my life, my strength diminishes, I have difficulty traveling by car. I can no longer postpone, it would endanger the continuation of the Fraternity and our seminaries.”

On May 20th, he wrote to the Pope to tell him that he needed several bishops by June 30th. On May 24th, he was in Rome for the last time, and asked to be given the answer by June 1st.

D) Rupture of the seminar - The consecrations

On May 30th, he gathered at the Pointet the priests who were great defenders of the faith and the superiors of friendly communities to have their opinion. If opinions are divided among the priests, the religious are unanimous in rejecting the Roman advances. “We can no longer deal with bishops who have lost their faith.” There is a “risk to the faith and cohesion of Tradition”. “It’s a Trojan horse in Tradition.” It is to this last opinion that Archbishop Lefebvre will agree: “The official link with modernist Rome is nothing compared to the preservation of the faith³⁶⁴.”

On the same day, May 30th, the Pope responded negatively to Archbishop Lefebvre's requests. Also on June 2nd, the day of Corpus Christi, Archbishop Lefebvre wrote to the Pope. “The conferences and talks with Cardinal Ratzinger and his colleagues, although they took place in an atmosphere of courtesy and charity, convinced us that the time for a frank and effective collaboration had not yet arrived. [...] Given the refusal to consider our requests and given that the aim of this reconciliation is not at all the same for the Holy See as for us, we believe it is preferable *to wait for more favorable times for Rome's return to Tradition*. [...] We will continue to pray that modern Rome, infested with modernism, will return to Catholic Rome and return to her two-thousand-year-old tradition. *Then the problem of reconciliation will have no more reason to exist*, and the Church will find a new youth³⁶⁵.”

On June 11th, he explained the situation to the seminarians of Flavigny, and said to them, among other things: “They did not change their intention [that is, to bring us back to the Council], because they did not change their principles [the conciliar errors]³⁶⁶.”

On the eve of the consecrations, an envoy of the Nunciature gave him a telegram from Cardinal Ratzinger asking him to go immediately to Rome and not to proceed with the consecrations. He said to a priest: “If today I were brought the papal mandate duly signed, I would postpone the consecration until August 15 and announce it tomorrow³⁶⁷.”

In the Sermon of the Sacraments, Archbishop Lefebvre specifies: “And why, Monsignor, I am told, did you stop these conferences which, however, seemed to have a certain success? Precisely because, at the same time as I was giving the signature for the protocol, at the same minute, the envoy of Cardinal Ratzinger who brought me this protocol to sign, then confided to me a letter, in which he asked me to ask forgiveness for the errors I was making [...]. What is this truth, for them, if not the truth of Vatican II, if not the truth of this conciliar Church? [...] It is the spirit of Assisi. That is the truth today. And we don't want that for anything in the world. That is why, noting this firm will of the present Roman authorities to destroy Tradition and to bring everyone back to this spirit of Vatican II and this spirit of Assisi, we preferred to withdraw. I said, no, we can't. [...] That's impossible. We put ourselves [...] in the hands of those who want to bring us back to the spirit of the Council, to the spirit of Assisi. That's not possible. [...] We prefer to continue in the Tradition and keep it until it *finds its place in Rome and in the spirit of the Roman authorities* [...].

“Today, this day, is Operation Survival, and if I had continued with Rome, continuing the agreements we signed and continuing the implementation of these agreements, I was doing the suicide operation. I can't³⁶⁸.”

C) Third period (1988-1991): to continue the Tradition, even without the approval of Rome

This third period, things are much clearer, for several reasons. First, before the consecrations, it was not easy to detect the Roman *intentions*; these last events made the mask fall. Then, the experience of the rallies will only confirm the wisdom of the decision taken by Archbishop Lefebvre.

1) A course of action: no agreement possible until Our Lord is re-crowned

A) Archbishop Lefebvre gives reasons for the break-up of the conferences

“In 1987,” Archbishop Lefebvre said, “I long hoped for an agreement with Rome that would have shown a certain tolerance, that would have ‘let us experience Tradition’. [...] But, over the years, we had to face the facts; the prospect of an agreement was becoming more distant³⁶⁹.”

We can say that it was this hope that led him to continue the Roman conferences and to presume the loyalty of his interlocutors. “Our true faithful,” he said, “those who understood the problem and who justly helped us to pursue the firm and straight line of Tradition and faith, feared the steps I took in Rome. They told me it was dangerous and I was wasting my time. Yes, of course, *I hoped until the last minute that in Rome we would be shown a little bit of loyalty*. I can't be blamed for not doing my best. So now, to those who come to tell me: you have to get along with Rome, I think I can say that I have gone further than I should have³⁷⁰.” We salute the humility of Archbishop Lefebvre on this occasion.

This hope, combined with the presentiment of his imminent death, and on the other hand, the Roman ill will, remaining in ambiguity, explains why Archbishop Lefebvre finally signed on May 5th; but under what conditions, we remember. He wasn't serene. This contrasts with the great peace that characterized the last three years of his life.

B) The conditions for a resumption of conferences

In order not to find himself in the ambiguous situation of the previous approaches, Archbishop Lefebvre gives the conditions for a resumption of contact with Rome: "If I still live a little," he said, "assuming that Rome makes an appeal some time from now, if they want to see us again, take up talking again, at that moment, it is I who would set the conditions. I will no longer accept being in the situation we found ourselves in at the conferences. *It's finished.*

"I would ask the doctrinal question: 'Do you agree with the great encyclicals of all the popes who preceded you? Do you agree with *Quanta Cura* of Pius IX, *Immortale Dei*, *Libertas* of Leo XIII, *Pascendi* of Pius X, *Quas primas* of Pius XI, *Humani Generis* of Pius XII? Are you in full communion with these popes and with their affirmations? Do you still accept the anti-modernist oath? Are you for the social reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ?

"If you do not accept the doctrine of your predecessors, it is useless to speak. As long as you have not agreed to reform the Council by considering the doctrine of those popes who preceded you, there is no possible dialogue. It's useless.' This would make the positions clearer³⁷¹."

On September 9th, 1988, he returned to the last events. "We must therefore leave this milieu of bishops, if we do not want to lose our souls. But this is not enough, for it is in Rome that heresy is established. If bishops are heretics (even without taking this term in the sense and with the canonical consequences), it is not without the influence of Rome." In other words, an exemption by the bishops is not enough, for one remains as a last resort under the authority of the Holy See. "If we move away from these people, it is absolutely like with people who have AIDS. We don't want to catch it. Now they have spiritual AIDS, contagious diseases. If we want to stay healthy, we shouldn't go with them. [...] The [Roman] authorities have not changed one iota their ideas about the Council, liberalism and modernism. They are anti-Tradition, Tradition as we understand it and as the Church understands it. [...] For them, all this is evolving and has evolved with Vatican II. The current term for evolution is Vatican II. That's why we can't bond with Rome. We could have, if we had managed to protect ourselves completely as we had asked. But they wouldn't. [...] They want to have us under their direct control and to be able to impose this very anti-Tradition policy they are imbued with. [...] I realized that Rome wanted to impose their ideas and their way of seeing on us. [...] They do not grant anything out of esteem for the traditional liturgy, but simply to deceive those to whom they give it and to diminish our resistance, to push a corner into the traditional block to destroy it. It's their politics, their conscious tactics. They are not mistaken and you know what pressures they exert. [...] They make considerable efforts everywhere³⁷²." In

this dense text, Archbishop Lefebvre affirms that we cannot bind ourselves with these people, *because they are anti-Tradition*, and in fact, seek to destroy us. The openings are only tactics. Hence this demand to wait for their doctrinal conversion before being able to put themselves back in their hands.

And in December 1988, in Flavigny: “We say that we cannot be subject to ecclesiastical authority and keep Tradition. They [the rallies] say the opposite. It's deceiving the faithful. [...] We must be free from compromise in regards towards the sedevacantists and towards those who want to be absolutely subject to ecclesiastical authority. [...] So when we are asked when there will be an agreement with Rome, my answer is simple: when Rome will crown Our Lord Jesus Christ. We cannot agree with those who uncrown Our Lord. The day when they will again recognize Our Lord King of peoples and nations, it is not us that they will have rejoined, but the Catholic Church in which we dwell³⁷³.”

One year after the consecrations, Archbishop Lefebvre explained his thoughts on this point. He returns to the 1987-1988 processes. “But personally,” he said about the outstretched hand, “I have no confidence. I have been in this environment for years and years, seeing the way they act. I have no trust anymore. But I would not want, however, that then in the Fraternity and in the circles of Tradition, one would say: you could well have tried. It didn't cost you to argue, to dialogue. That was their opinion³⁷⁴. [...]”

“But soon we realized that *we were dealing with people who were not honest*. [...] We wanted recognition, Rome wanted reconciliation and that we recognize our mistakes. [...]

“I still went to Rome for these conferences, but I didn't trust them. [...] In fact, I wanted to go as far as I could to show the good will, that was ours.”

And further: “Once again, I do not believe it is possible for a community to remain faithful to faith and Tradition if the Bishops do not have this faith and fidelity to Tradition. It's impossible. The Church is first and foremost made up of bishops. Even though we have priests, priests are influenced by bishops.”

A question is then asked to the Archbishop: inside, we could have acted more effectively. “These are easy things to say,” he says. “To put oneself inside the Church, what does that mean? Getting inside the Church, what does that mean? And first of all, what church are we talking about? If it is the Counciliar Church³⁷⁵, we who have fought against it for twenty years because we want the Church, would have to enter this Counciliar Church to supposedly make it Catholic. *It's a total illusion. It is not the subjects who make the superiors, but the superiors who make the subjects.*”

As for the Roman openings towards Tradition: “I don't think it is a real return. It's like in a fight, when you get the impression that the troops go a little too far, you hold them back. [...] No, it's a tactic that's a little bit necessary, like in any fight. [...] That is why what may appear as a concession is in reality only a maneuver to manage to detach as many faithful as possible from us. It is in this perspective that they always seem to give a little more and go very far. *We*

absolutely must convince the faithful that this is indeed a maneuver, that it is a danger to put ourselves in the hands of the conciliar bishops and modernist Rome. It is the greatest danger that threatens them. If we have struggled for twenty years to avoid conciliar errors, it is not to put ourselves now in the hands of those who profess them.”

Speaking of the 1989 profession of faith: “As it is, this formula is dangerous. It shows the spirit of these people with whom it is impossible to get along³⁷⁶.”

In November 1988, in Sierre, he will evoke the foundation of our position, the reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ. “That is why,” he said, “it should come as no surprise that we cannot get along with Rome. *This will not be possible until Rome returns to faith in the reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ, as long as it gives the impression that all religions are good*³⁷⁷.”

C) In the meantime: distance ourselves

In the Spiritual Itinerary, which is like his will, he returns to these subjects. “These conciliar Roman authorities can therefore only fiercely and violently oppose any reaffirmation of the traditional Magisterium. [...] I could [after the approval of the Fraternity in 1970] rightly think that this Fraternity which wanted to be attached to all the traditions of the Church, doctrinal, liturgical, disciplinary etc., would not remain for a long time approved by the liberal demolishers of the Church³⁷⁸.” In other words, because they are modernists, they cannot not want the destruction of Tradition.

The consequence is logical: “As long as this secretariat [for Christian unity] keeps the false ecumenism for orientation and the Roman and ecclesiastical authorities approve it, we can affirm that they will remain in open and official rupture with all the Church's past. *It is therefore a strict duty for every priest wishing to remain Catholic to separate himself from this conciliar Church, as long as it does not rediscover the tradition of the Magisterium and the Catholic faith*³⁷⁹.”

Finally, let us end with a quote from a September 1990 conference. “Some would [...] still want to rally to Rome, to the Pope... We would, of course, if they were in the Tradition. [...] But they themselves recognize that they have taken a new path. [...] ‘Oh, [some say], as long as we are granted the good mass, we can give a hand to Rome; there are no problems’. Here's how it works! They are in an impasse *because one cannot both give a hand to the modernists and want to keep Tradition*³⁸⁰.”

After all these quotations, it is undeniable that there has been an evolution in Archbishop Lefebvre's thinking, not certainly in the doctrines defended, nor in his firmness towards the Roman authorities, but in the perception of their profound intentions. From 1988, he is convinced that the neo-modernist prelates, *because of their principles, cannot* want the good of Tradition that to put themselves in their hands is to be exposed to be contaminated by their liberalism

that consequently it is impossible to consider an agreement as long as they have not returned to Tradition.

D) A question of intention

It seems that Archbishop Lefebvre attached some importance to the evaluation of the intentions of his Roman interlocutors, and that the idea he had of it was then decisive. Aren't we in subjectivism? Moreover, the Church does not judge intentions³⁸¹. Is it not perilous to regulate one's conduct on a question of intention? And by the way, these intentions can change. Finally, whether one has a good or a bad intention, what does it change, in concrete terms?

To answer this difficulty, there are a few distinctions to be made. First, between not guilty intent and guilty intent. Intention is guilty when one knowingly wants something contrary to eternal law. When the will is on such an object but without being aware of its opposition to the eternal law, the intention is not guilty. Here, however, it is not decisive, and even it does not matter whether the intentions of the Roman authorities are guilty or not. Indeed, whether consciously or not, what they are looking for is something objectively wrong.

But one also distinguishes the intention in the modern sense, synonymous with inclination, opposing realization³⁸²; and on the other hand, the intention in the sense given to it by Saint Thomas. For him, "intention is the movement of will towards the end through action." Thus understood, the intention is like the engine that accompanies the action until the end. On the contrary, "it will be a weakness of the intention not to be able to lead to action³⁸³". The intention is all turned towards the end; and nothing is more objective than the end, in action. In the latter sense, "intention" is synonymous with "firm will".

It is in this last sense that Archbishop Lefebvre understood the word "intention" in the context we are dealing with: through the facts, he realized that the Roman authorities were *strained towards*³⁸⁴ an *end* diametrically opposed to the reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ, seeking to drag him into it.

Can these intentions change? Yes, but we have to prove it with the facts. The rest of this study will show us what it is.

E) An objection

However, there is one objection, which could be formulated as followed: Archbishop Lefebvre said: "If they had given me the conditions I had set, I would have signed". And as for the protocol: "If I signed the protocol, it was because there was nothing contrary to the faith".

It is true that Archbishop Lefebvre said that. He said: "I would have signed a final agreement after signing the protocol if we had had the opportunity to protect ourselves effectively against the modernism of Rome and the bishops³⁸⁵." He then describes these conditions, which we have reported above (Roman commission etc.). Then to conclude: "I felt a very clear opposition. We already had

only one bishop instead of three, and two places on the commission out of seven. It was not possible to continue like this. *Rome's will to not support Tradition, not to really trust it was obvious*³⁸⁶.”

“In reality,” he said again at the same conference, “Rome neither wants to support nor to pursue [that is, to continue] Tradition. We want to gently bring these young people [of the Fraternity of St. Peter] and these priests to the Council. That's obvious. During the last contacts I had in Rome, *I wanted several times to probe their intentions*, to measure if there was a real change. This did not seem impossible after the catastrophic and disastrous failures that followed the Council, and also after the visit of Cardinal Gagnon and Bishop Perl³⁸⁷.” It always comes back to this: Archbishop Lefebvre wanted to “sound out intentions”, to see if there was “possibility” of protecting oneself. We had to face the facts: their intentions are to fight Tradition, because they are modernists³⁸⁸. And so, for there to be an opportunity to come to an agreement, they must first return to Tradition.

In the same conference, he deplors the attitude of the rallies. “If they did not say explicitly: we accept the Council and all that Rome is professing now, *implicitly they do*. By putting themselves entirely in the hands of the authority of Rome and the bishops, they will be practically obliged to agree with them³⁸⁹.”

As for the protocol, here is what he said, with hindsight: “While signing the protocol, Rome refused to give us these bishops. And if we had continued, in practice we would have had all the pains in the world³⁹⁰.” “If we had accepted,” he said on June 13th, 1988, “we would have died! We wouldn't have lasted a year³⁹¹.” If we become dependent on modernist authorities, we will be influenced by them. And this - incidentally - despite the best intentions: it is certainly not necessarily liberalism to sign an agreement, it can be a lack of lucidity about the situation, imprudence. What is important here is the *objectivity* of the situation, not subjective intentions - good or bad. In an objectively bad situation you expose your faith³⁹².

Let us conclude by showing that this line of conduct has been well integrated by the Fraternity, after the consecrations. “*As long as this liberal spirit reigns*,” says Father Schmidberger, “we must not expect any change, therefore no arrangement, because our differences are neither human nor political, *but doctrinal*.” “No agreement possible with Rome at the hands of liberals and humanists³⁹³.” In 1992, he also said: “If a resumption of contacts took place, it should first of all concern the doctrine. It is out of the question to speak for the moment of legal or canonical solution, we would only speak of doctrine. [...] It will get better one day, but it can only be in the truth of faith. Any other solution would lead us to the same ground where the Fraternity of St. Peter is today, namely a dead end³⁹⁴.”

In 2006, Father Schmidberger's successor, Bishop Fellay, reaffirmed the need to resolve doctrinal problems before addressing canonical questions. “In any case, it is impossible to move on to the third stage, and therefore to consider agreements,

before these discussions have resulted in clarifying and correcting the principles of the crisis. [...] It is clear that we will not sign agreements if things are not resolved at the principle level. [...] It will therefore be necessary, in order to solve the problem, for the Roman authorities to demonstrate and express clearly, so that everyone understands, that for Rome there are not 36 ways out of this crisis, that there is only one valid one: that the Church fully rediscovers its own two-thousand-year-old Tradition. From the day when this conviction will be clear among the Roman authorities, and even if everything on the ground is far from being settled, agreements will be very easy to achieve³⁹⁵.”

The General Chapter of the Society of Saint Pius X of 2006 reaffirmed, in its declaration: “The only purpose of the contacts that [the SSPX] maintains episodically with the Roman authorities *is only* to help them re-appropriate the Tradition that the Church cannot deny without losing her identity, and not to seek an advantage for herself, or to reach a purely practical ‘agreement’. The day when Tradition *will* regain all its rights, ‘the problem of reconciliation will no longer have any reason to exist and the Church will find a new youth³⁹⁶.³⁹⁷”

2) The experience of the rallies

During his lifetime, Archbishop Lefebvre was able to see the bitter fruits of the rally. Divine Providence allowed him to live long enough - three years - to be able to judge the tree by its fruits.

“When they say they didn’t give up anything, it’s false,” he says in 1991. “They’ve given up on the possibility of countering Rome. They can’t say anything anymore. *They must remain silent*, given the favors they have been granted. It is now impossible for them to denounce the errors of the conciliar Church. Very slowly, they adhere, if only by the profession of faith which is requested by Cardinal Ratzinger. I believe that Dom Gérard is about to publish a little book written by one of his monks on religious freedom and which will try to justify it.” In fact, of “little book”, Father Basile, of Barroux, published a thesis of 2960 pages. It takes pages to try to reconcile the irreconcilable³⁹⁸!

“From the point of view of ideas,” the Archbishop continued, “they saw slowly and ended up admitting the Council’s false ideas, because Rome had granted them some favors for Tradition. It’s a very dangerous situation³⁹⁹.” “They have practically abandoned the fight of faith. They can no longer attack Rome.” Referring to the fact that Dom Gérard and Father Blignières had joined forces, he added: “In any case, I think they made a serious mistake. They have sinned gravely by acting as they did, knowingly and with unbelievable casualness⁴⁰⁰.”

Mainly, what Archbishop Lefebvre has induced is that a modernist superior will inevitably seek to bring his subjects to modernism. For a long time, he hoped that the Roman authorities were able to trust Tradition - following his expression - but he had to conclude that their intentions could only be opposed to Tradition.

Hence, the only solution that remains: to seek to reintroduce in Rome the principles of Tradition. Humanly speaking, it is almost impossible, because these are the

principles that have been abandoned. And, as Bishop Freppel says, you never get up from abandoning principles. It would take a higher authority than the Pope to show him his mistakes. What simple priests and even bishops can do is make the voice of truth resound; God can then perform a miracle, using that voice crying in the desert. The doctrinal discussions of 2009-2011 made this voice resound; through it, God's grace can now touch the minds.

ANNEX II: THE DIALOGUE

By “dialogue”, we do not mean conversation, or discussion, but an agreement and exchanges between people whose thinking is divergent, subject to doctrinal concessions.

It can be said that the masters in this field in the 20th century were the communists. Despite the atrocities they were able to commit, with this weapon they succeeded in seducing a multitude of Christians who had nevertheless witnessed their exactions.

Father Dufay⁴⁰¹ made a detailed analysis of the mechanism of dialogue between communists and Catholics in China. It is striking to note the quasi identity of communist methods with those used by modernist Rome with regard to traditional communities. After summarizing Father Dufay's explanation, we will draw a parallel with the dialogue between Rome and these communities.

1) Dialogue between communists and Catholics in China

A) General principle

First of all, the general principle is that everything that emanates from the communists is to be interpreted in the Marxist sense. When they speak of “patriotism”, it is according to Marxist principles, for a Marxist purpose, and therefore materialist.

B) Sliding Catholics onto political ground

To attract Christians to join their movements and embark the Church in the Revolution, they begin by accusing her of being complicit in imperialism. They seek to attract it to the political arena, transforming religion into a political issue. Thus, the problem is fundamentally flawed. Catholics are invited to be activists “as Catholics”. Therefore, the civil authority claims the right and duty to control the policy of the religious group, carrying out the necessary purifications. Any opponent will no longer be a defender of the faith, but a political refractor. From then on, the government made the faithful Catholics fight by the progressives; they sowed mistrust towards the former, raised the latter against them. As the terrain is profane, there is no longer any question of martyrdom, so the will to resist disappears.

C) Ambiguous formulas

The seduction of dialogue comes from the ambiguous formulas used by the communists: they present themselves as ardent defenders of patriotism. Isn't

patriotism an imperative of Christianity? To hear the communists become patriots, is it not already a victory of Catholicism?

The proposals put forward by the communists always have a possible Catholic interpretation. Moreover, they say they want this interpretation. But then, in their own conduct, they use their own meanings and principles. They know full well that words do not have the same meaning on both sides. Their whole policy of seduction and reaching out is based on this knowledge. The Revolution is primarily a praxis; words are a simple tool. Her method being dialectic, she uses a misunderstood proposition as a ram against the “truthful”. Here, in this case, it will oppose “patriotism” and the Vatican.

D) Concessions

Once Christians are drawn into the trap, concessions and compromises begin. In a circle, someone makes an accusation against a bishop who is considered unpatriotic. At first, this confused Catholics, but they were forced to follow suit, having admitted the principle of patriotism. Thus, they act against their conscience; and quickly they fall into moral decay. Communism makes the Church crumble under the corruption of consciences, from which one does not rise. It is worse than an apostasy, it is a repetition of acts against faith, ideas are completely blurred.

From then on, resistance becomes impossible. Not all of them open their eyes at the same time; thus, the Catholic block divides and disintegrates, piece by piece.

E) Conclusion: from the beginning, refuse dialogue, and prefer martyr

As a result, it is necessary to refuse dialogue, who is faithless, and in unequal weapon. The smiles of the Marxists are infinitely more dangerous than their weapon. Each time when the communists smell a resistance at the Christians, they throw some ballast. It means that for them the break of dialogue is undesirable; this one is essential for their purpose. What to make? Is it possible to continue dialogue? No, because by this carousel, the communists draw the Catholics away in their materialist dialectic: it is therefore the faith which is in game. It is needed, to save her, to accept persecution and martyr. But so, making martyrs, communism prepares its own defeat. «Have courage, I conquered the world», says the King of martyrs.

2) Dialogue between Counciliar Rome and the Traditionalists

A) General principle

If we apply all this to our situation, the first principle is that what comes from the modernists is to be interpreted in a modernist sense. We have seen this, among other things, in the expression of the “Council seen in the light of Tradition”. Their goal is to involve everyone in the revolutionary dynamics of Vatican II, that is, the evolution of dogmas, and ultimately ecumenism, the basis

of the “new evangelization⁴⁰²”, and ultimately, the unity of humankind in the diversity of beliefs, each being equal and free.

B) Drag the traditionalists from the doctrinal plan to the disciplinary plan

To attract the traditionalists into this movement, they begin with accusations: “you are dissidents, cut off from Rome.” Or, they make tempting proposals: the possibilities of a greater apostolic radiance; finally, nothing is more effective than gifts: the 2007 *Motu proprio*, the lifting of excommunications (2009), the jurisdiction for confessions⁴⁰³.

It might be opposed to us that Pope Benedict XVI, when he acknowledged that the traditional Mass had never been banned and declared that priests from all over the world could celebrate it, did not make a concession of detail there. Certainly, we salute the certain courage that it took him since these words aroused the bad mood of almost the whole episcopate. But the truth requires us to emphasize that Benedict XVI, in the very act in which he drops these strong concessions, takes them up again at the same time wishing the mutual fertilization of the two masses. It actually opens a dialectical process to a reform of the reform, in which everyone is invited to make concessions.

As for the other concessions mentioned, it is the Holy See that is the winner, because he appears to be a good prince, showing mercy; our refusal to make concessions will appear all the more odious; thus, psychological pressure is exerted on us to stop the fight. And these advances suggest publicly that things are getting better, when in reality, the fundamental problem, which is doctrinal, remains intact.

Catholics of Tradition are invited to come “as faithful to Tradition”; we want to embark Tradition “as such” in the Revolution; they must keep their “own charisma”. Through this game, the light of Tradition is no longer that which must enlighten every man; it is an opinion among many others.

Thus, the rallying process puts practical questions first, and in brackets the doctrinal problem. It is at this level where the slide occurs. We certainly do not deny the doctrine, but we insist on regularization. And after talking mainly about this, we end up thinking that we are in irregularity. Everything is considered from this point of view. Just as the Communists made religion a political issue, so the Roman authorities made adherence to the Council a matter of obedience. In this way, the motive of martyrdom - faith - is suppressed. Any claim against conciliar errors or against ecumenical scandals will be labeled disobedience or sin against unity. Thus, there are no more martyrs, and little by little the resistance disappears.

C) Reduced to silence, or forgetting the common good of the Church

This shows that, by the very fact of canonical recognition, we are reduced to silence. Archbishop Lefebvre said it about Dom Gérard: “It is not true that they

have not given up anything; they have given up the possibility of countering Rome. They can't say anything anymore. They must be silent⁴⁰⁴.”

This point is fundamental, because it shows that, even if no doctrinal declaration on Vatican II is required of us, we are already ceasing to criticize it, and, *in fact*, we are entering into the revolutionary machine which, in fact, admits everyone with their opinions, but on condition that the opinions of the neighbor are admitted as defensible. Thus, *in fact*, by remaining silent, the conciliar ideology is accepted as acceptable; therefore, it is an implicit recognition of Vatican II. Then, doctrinal questions are quickly put into perspective, and modern errors are explicitly admitted.

This allows us to give an important clarification: the question of the common good. Through our doctrinal struggle and our public opposition to conciliar errors, we defend the common good of the Church. By remaining silent, we would be admitted into the official Church with certain advantages, but in so doing, we would put our particular good above the common good. Such is the Liberal trap: to make the absolute [truth, Tradition] something relative. Indeed, at this moment, truth, Tradition is considered as a good for certain retarded people (us), therefore a relative good, but in no case a necessary good for all, an absolute.

On the contrary, our attitude is that of members of the Church. The member is part of a whole; the part is for the whole. What we want is the good of the Church, the common good, namely, that Rome rediscovers its Tradition. Certainly, some may think that by a canonical recognition one could make the voice of Tradition resound more; the intentions are sincere, but we have seen that it is an illusion. Mr. Seguin's little goat thought she would defeat the wolf, but the terrible reality imposed itself on her. What matters is the objective reality. We must reflect on this, for the common good here is a question of eternal salvation.

D) Ambiguous formulas

As for seduction from ambiguous formulas, take for example: “Accept us as we are.” “When Rome says to a community, ‘We accept you as you *are*,’ Rome does not think that. Rome actually thinks: “We accept you as you will be, as you will become”. The Romans know from experience that when there is an agreement, the community will evolve more or less quickly. So, they accept us as we will be in one year, five years, ten years; not as we are today, with our opposition to the new Mass and the Council⁴⁰⁵.” Another example: the simple word “Church”. “There is only one Church,” Cardinal Ratzinger told Archbishop Lefebvre, “we must not make a parallel Church.” Who would not agree with this proposal, which in itself is perfectly Catholic? “What is this Church to him?” replied the Archbishop. “The conciliar Church, it's clear, he wanted to bring us back to the conciliar Church.”

E) Concessions

So, begin the compromises, the denials of the past. For example, at Le Barroux, where discredit was cast on Archbishop Lefebvre, where it was accepted that visiting priests celebrate Paul VI's Mass, etc. Finally, the thesis on religious freedom. These repeated acts make the meaning of the fight of faith totally disappear. It is persecution without martyrs. The seduction succeeded: if some left, it was a drop in the bucket, there was no mass opposition.

It is easy to apply all this to the 1988 protocol of agreement. We have already identified the dangers. It was only under the ever-increasing psychological pressure exerted by the Roman authorities that Bishop Lefebvre signed it; we remember the terrible discomfort he felt, and the retraction of his signature the following night. It is indeed a compromised text which would not have failed to generate its 'internal dynamism'. This text served the Revolution so well that the conciliar authorities used it as a basis for agreements with the rallies.

Indeed, let us see what happened at Barroux. Dom Gérard wrote an article in *Présent* in the summer of 1988 to justify his position. He affirmed among other things: "What we asked for from the beginning (Mass of Saint Pius V, catechism, sacraments, all in conformity with the rite of the secular Tradition of the Church), was granted to us *without doctrinal counterpart*, without concession, without denial. The Holy Father *therefore* offered us to be integrated into the Benedictine Confederation *as we are*." He went on to say the conditions he had laid down, the second of which was: "That no doctrinal or liturgical counterpart be required of us and that no silence be imposed on our anti-modernist preaching⁴⁰⁶."

Cardinal Mayer was interviewed and questioned about this. "Dom Gérard's statement is not accurate," he says. "It is enough to remember that the agreement was negotiated *on the basis of the protocol of May 5th*, which required the acceptance of the doctrine contained in the dogmatic Constitution *Lumen Gentium* (N° 25) [and the cardinal recalls the other paragraphs that we have stated above]. We cannot accept only the concessions offered by the protocol and forget the obligations! Just as in the *Motu proprio Ecclesia Dei* of July 2nd of last year, we cannot limit ourselves to seeing openness to just spiritual and liturgical aspirations and forget the implicit criticism of a false concept of Tradition [that is to say, the traditional concept of Tradition]⁴⁰⁷."

Little by little, we are asking for more. Archbishop Lefebvre shows how the 1989 profession of faith more explicitly asks what was implicit in the protocol⁴⁰⁸. "You see," he told a friend, "I am a little in the position of Pope Pius VII, and John Paul II is Napoleon. If I sign, John Paul II will later impose organic articles on me⁴⁰⁹." Such is the duplicity of the Revolution.

Little by little, it is more asked. Monsignor Lefebvre shows how the declaration of faith of 1989 asks more expressly what was implicit in the protocol. "See each other, he said to a friend, I am little in the position of the pope Pius VII, and

Jean-Paul II, it is Napoleon. If I sign, Jean-Paul II will impose me later of organic articles.” Such is the duplicity of Revolution.

F) Conclusion: refuse dialogue from the beginning, and prefer moral martyrdom

That is why in 1988 Archbishop Lefebvre understood that it was impossible to discuss, as long as, the Roman authorities were imbued with modernism. For duplicity is consubstantial with modernism; not moral duplicity, but ontological: they are distorted spirits. “And if the blind lead the blind, both will fall into the pit⁴¹⁰.” Archbishop Lefebvre preferred moral martyrdom to save the faith. “Would it not be [...] in the plan of Providence, that the Catholic Tradition of the Church not be reintegrated into the pluralism of the ‘counciliar Church’, as long as it defiles the honor of the Catholic Church and offends both her unity and her visibility? ‘Christ suffered outside the gates of Jerusalem’, Saint Paul tells us, and he adds: ‘So, to go to Him, let us go out of the camp, carrying his opprobrium⁴¹¹.’”

Sources

¹ Cardinal Raymond BURKE, *A Cardinal in the heart of the Church*, Artège, 2015, p. 33-34.

² Monsignor Athanasius SCHNEIDER, Interview at the Rorate caeli site; 1st of February 2016.

³ *Ibid.*, Rorate caeli, November 2nd, 2015.

⁴ *Présent*, November 13th, 2015.

⁵ *Monde et vie* 899, p. 24.

⁶ *Monde et vie* 900, p. 18.

⁷ *Fideliter* 62, p. 31

⁸ We answer this question in the reply to the second objection.

⁹ Cited in *Monde et vie*, 905, p. 19.

¹⁰ *Présent*, January 10th, 2015.

¹¹ Interview with the Latin Mass Society, May 27th, 2014.

¹² We speak of authentic magisterium, or simply authentic, to designate the magisterium of legitimate pastors who do not fulfill the conditions of infallibility. It should be noted that the authentic magisterium of the popes and bishops, although not infallible, nevertheless imposes itself on the adherence of the faithful because the habitual faith and prudence of legitimate pastors normally constitute a presumption in favor of their act of teaching. But the new notion of magisterium has nothing to do with the Catholic truth. This is evident when we analyze the Instruction *Donum veritatis* of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith of May 24, 1990, in which the authentic Magisterium is presented as simply providing provisional conclusions of the dialogue between pastors and people of God; valid at a given moment in history, and that a subsequent step may go beyond. As the document says in § 24: “Pastors did not always immediately perceive all the aspects or all the complexity of a question.” That is why “certain judgments of the magisterium may have been justified at the time when they were pronounced, because the assertions aimed at were inextricably mixed with true assertions and others which were not certain. Only time has permitted discernment and, as a result of in-depth studies, a real doctrinal progress”. It was this state of mind which enabled Cardinal Ratzinger to assert with cold blood that the decree *Gaudium et spes* of Vatican II was like a “counter-Syllabus” (the Syllabus is the catalog of modern errors condemned by Pius IX, in 1864).

¹³ *Renovatio*, 1982, p. 325. Cited in Romano AMERIO, *Iota unum*, N.E.L., Paris, 1987, p. 591.

¹⁴ Homily of April 9th, 1974, at Warsaw. See AMERIO, *ibid.*, p. 591-592.

¹⁵ *Osservatore romano*, October 7th, 1984. See AMERIO, *ibid.*, p. 592.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 270.

¹⁸ As Father Gleize said, about the Conservatives who reacted at the Synod, “it is [...] to maintain the same conclusions which express the same requirements (unity and indissolubility of marriage, refusal of contraception and abortion, also refusal of the different perversions contrary to nature) but by causing them to flow from different principles.” (*Nouvelles de Chrétienté* 155, October 2015, p. 8).

¹⁹ “The crisis will not be solved by more or less adequate people,” said Father Toulza, “if they do not renounce inadequate principles. The restoration of truth and good in the Church has not begun and cannot be done without calling into question the principles of which Benedict XVI and Francis claim, one like the other, but in an undeniably different way.” (*Fideliter* 223, January-February 2015, p. 70).

- ²⁰ Of course, the hosts were not validly consecrated, since the ordinations were invalid...
- ²¹ Cited in DICI 283, p. 5.
- ²² Ibid.
- ²³ Speech of June 6th, 2013 to CLAR officials. Cited in *The Salt of the Earth* 86, p. 167.
- ²⁴ Interview with E. Scalfari, October 1st, 2015. Cited in *Le Sel de la terre* (*The Salt of the Earth*) 91, p. 160.
- ²⁵ And facilitated by the procedure of declaration of invalidity promulgated on September 8, 2015.
- ²⁶ Discourse at Curie, December 21st, 2015, *Catholic Documentation* 2522, p. 14.
- ²⁷ See *Le Sel de la terre* 89, p. 201.
- ²⁸ *Osservatore romano* (French version) 3402, p. 6-7; October 17th, 2015.
- ²⁹ *La Stampa*, February 18, 2013.
- ³⁰ See *Si si, No no*, n° 207, December 1998, p. 3.
- ³¹ “Cardinal Ratzinger,” says Monsignor Lefebvre, “who appears in the press to be more or less traditional, is in fact a modernist” (sacerdotal retreat at Ecône, September 1986, *Fideliter* 55, 13). Father Schmidberger, Superior General of the Fraternity, in May of the same year, writes in *Fideliter* of the Prefect of the Congregation of the Faith that there is “a notion of faith completely acatholic, it is even quite heretical” (*Fideliter* 69, p.6).
- ³² See the complete citations in *Le Sel de la terre* 84, spring 2013, p. 165 sq.
- ³³ *Monde et vie* 906, April 11th, 2015, p. 19.
- ³⁴ *A NDR Kultur*, October 4th, 2012.
- ³⁵ The birthday of his predecessor, Benedict XVI.
- ³⁶ Homily of April 16, 2013, cited in *Fideliter* 219, May-June 2014, p. 25.
- ³⁷ Cited in *Fideliter* 219, p. 32. See *Le Sel de la terre* 86, p. 167.
- ³⁸ Cited *ibid.*
- ³⁹ See *Le Sel de la terre* 91, p. 146.
- ⁴⁰ Agency Zenit.
- ⁴¹ *Le Sel de la terre* 86, p. 167.
- ⁴² *Fideliter* 219, p. 31-33, and *Le Sel de la terre* 86, p. 174.
- ⁴³ See *Fideliter* 219, *ibid.*
- ⁴⁴ *Le Sel de la terre*, 86, p. 174.
- ⁴⁵ *Fideliter* 220, p. 63.
- ⁴⁶ *Fideliter* 219, p. 31-33, et 220, p. 63.
- ⁴⁷ In the daily *Libero*, du of January 5th, 2014. Guillaume Luyt also wrote a very documented article, in the newspaper *Présent* of January 11th, 2014, that he called: *Franciscans of the Immaculate: silence, we purify!*
- ⁴⁸ *Monde et vie* 894.
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁰ DICI 280, p. 2.
- ⁵¹ *Fideliter* 219, p. 31. The rite, the Pope seems to tell us, would be only a matter of unimportant form; and if we give it to him, it would be formalism.
- ⁵² *Ibid.*
- ⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 33.
- ⁵⁴ DICI 305, p. 2-3.
- ⁵⁵ *Fideliter* 233, p. 70, gives more examples of « mutations-sanctions ».
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁷ *La Croix*, May 17th, 2016.
- ⁵⁸ Interview in the journal *Herder Korrespondenz*.

⁵⁹ Bishop Guido Pozzo is the Secretary of the *Ecclesia Dei* Commission since 2009, when Pope Benedict XVI handed over the presidency to the Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. He is an elder of this congregation, having worked for a long time with Cardinal Ratzinger, also with Cardinal Levada. He is therefore a theologian who is broken in doctrinal questions, who declared on November 18, 2009, to the new Man: "I am sensitive - it is not new today - to the theological problems and controversies related to the interpretation of Vatican Council II.

He is a "Ratzingerian", a hermeneutic buff of continuity, which he applies not only to dogma, but also to "the two forms of the unique liturgical rite" of Rome. For him, as for Benedict XVI, "the renewal of the Second Vatican Council is to be understood in continuity with the great doctrinal tradition of the Church. In the history of the liturgy, there is inner growth and development, but we must reject any break or discontinuity with the past" (*ibid.*).

⁶⁰ The theological note is the degree of authority of a truth taught by the magisterium. Thus, we distinguish what is of defined faith, Catholic faith, faith, close to faith, theologically certain, etc.

⁶¹ The conciliar Fathers had questioned Bishop Felici, Secretary-General of the Council, as to the degree of authority of the texts promulgated by Paul VI.

⁶² Acts of the fourth symposium on Vatican II, 2005, p. 21. Conference of June 28th, 1975.

⁶³ Cited by Monsignor Fellay, in DICI 334, April 22nd, 2016, p. 5.

⁶⁴ In this interview, he said that we could not force the Fraternity to renounce to its reservations about the Council.

⁶⁵ Conference of January 13th, 1977, in Vu de haut 13, p. 51-52.

⁶⁶ Act of the fourth symposium..., *ibid.*, p. 77.

⁶⁷ "They are not able to use it, says Monsignor Lefebvre about Paul VI and John Paul II, because they do not believe in a fixed and definitive truth." Cited in the Acts..., *ibid.*, p. 95.

⁶⁸ Acts..., *ibid.*, p. 96.

⁶⁹ Catholic Documentation 2367, November 5th, 2006, p. 973. We can also mention the 1989 profession of faith, which does not explicitly require adhesion to the Council, but which, in its third paragraph, requires adherence to the "authentic magisterium, even if [the pope and the college of bishops] do not intend to proclaim [these doctrines] by a definitive act".

⁷⁰ Conference of December 2nd, 1982. Vu de haut 13, p.57.

⁷¹ Interview at Nice-matin, December 11th, 2006.

⁷² "A being who lives," says Monsignor Lefebvre, "but that is typically modernist, and that is what Pope Pius X attacks in his encyclical Pascendi. He says that one does not have the right to consider Tradition or the faith as a being who lives and develops" (December 2, 1976, Vu de haut 13, p. 49). *Motu proprio Ecclesia Dei* takes up the modernist definition of Tradition as a "developing" being.

⁷³ They act of the thesis developed by Benedict XVI in the speech of December 22nd, 2005, but he defended for more than forty years: there would be perfect continuity between Tradition and the Council.

⁷⁴ Note, in passing, that Bishop Schneider spoke the same language in 2012, at a meeting of Reunicatho (movement to unite Catholics of traditional sensitivity), inviting his listeners "not to give too much importance to Vatican II, as the progressives do" (*Monde et vie* 854, p. 21).

⁷⁵ It's me, the accused, who should judge you Clovis, Étampes, 1994, p. XIV.

⁷⁶ See John OUSSET, *Marxism Leninism*, Catholique City, 1961.

⁷⁷ *Theology of the liberation.*

⁷⁸ The critical step is a judgment about the value of our knowledge. Here, having seen that it is impossible to make an agreement with the neo-modernist Rome, we will ask ourselves the question: is this a certainty? a principle? or a simple prudential question?

⁷⁹ Like synonym, the dictionary cites: arrangement, accommodation, compromise, transaction.

⁸⁰ On purpose, we say "we", to refer to both the SSPX and the friendly communities. First, because we are one family, that of Tradition; secondly, we do not want to give the impression - erroneously - that we would dissociate ourselves a priori from any relationship of the SSPX with Rome.

⁸¹ Because the suppression of the SSPX in 1975 is worthless, and the establishment of friendly communities derives its legitimacy from the state of necessity (the substitution of jurisdiction applies here in this case).

⁸² In general, it is primarily the local Ordinary who approves a congregation, but the consent of the Holy See is always required (Canon 492 § 1).

⁸³ Only vows issued in a canonically erected institute and in the hands of the legitimate superior are public.

⁸⁴ That is to say, the dependence of this institute on the bishop is narrower than that which exists between the latter and the simple faithful.

⁸⁵ Decree *Ad gentes* on the active missionary of the Church.

⁸⁶ Code of Canon Law, ed. Wilson & Lafleur Limited, Montreal, 1990, p. 195.

⁸⁷ Can. 294 (code de 1983).

⁸⁸ Can. 297.

⁸⁹ A personal prelature is normally erected by a *Motu proprio*, that is to say by a document emanated from the pope "by his own movement": it is therefore a unilateral act.

⁹⁰ Bishop Rifan said in 2002: "The pope has offered us the acknowledgement of our bishop with the promise of a successor; we only had to leave the irregular situation where we were. We accepted and, in conscience, we could not refuse this offer » (Le Sel de la terre 43, p. 207).

⁹¹ Thus, in 1988, the Monastery of the Holy Cross made a declaration refusing the agreement established between the Holy See and Dom Gerard. "Our Monastery of Santa Cruz, it was said, was included in the terms of the agreement that we have just refused, without our having been consulted on it. (Bulletin of the Holy Cross 49, pp. 5-6). At the time, Archbishop Lefebvre fully approved this conduct.

⁹² The jurisdiction is either ordinary or delegated. It is ordinary when it is attached to an office (for example, the parish priest has jurisdiction because of his office). It is delegated when given to a person. Here, it is granted to people (the priests of the SSPX), whatever their office.

⁹³ As St. Thomas says (II II, q, 1, a, 3.), the movements are specified by their term, and receive from them their name. For example, the casserole that heats up on the fire undergoes a re-heating, it tends to the state of heat, passing through steps. Here, then, according to the Roman authorities, the term is the canonical status. The movement that leads to it is canonical regularization. Therefore, the movement in which we find ourselves is a *canonical regularization in progress*.

⁹⁴ The term "transubstantiation" (to describe the mystery of the Mass) distinguishes Catholics from Protestants, the term "consubstantial" (about the divinity of Our Lord) distinguishes Catholics from Arians. It is not permissible to abandon these precise terms, to substitute them for others, which are more blurred.

- ⁹⁵ Father Joseph LEMANN, *La religion de combat* (The Religion of Combat), Paris, 1891, p. 452-455. See also the Father Henry RAMIERES, *Le règne social du Cœur de Jésus* (The Social Reign of the Heart of Jesus), Toulouse, 1892, p. 73, 81-82, 86-87
- ⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 456.
- ⁹⁷ *Le Sel de la terre* 88, p. 185.
- ⁹⁸ Father Jerome DAL GAL, Pie X, ed. Saint-Paul, Paris, 1953, p. 198.
- ⁹⁹ The quotes that follow may seem a little strong. We naturally think that they are drawn from their context, and that therefore, we must not take them in an absolute sense. Once and for all, we refer the reader to the text in the appendix, where we have tried to put these quotes in context.
- ¹⁰⁰ *Le Sel de la terre* 31, p. 194.
- ¹⁰¹ *Fideliter* 68, p. 16.
- ¹⁰² *Itinéraire spirituel* (Spiritual itinerary), p. 29.
- ¹⁰³ Constitution *Lumen gentium* [LG], n° 1.
- ¹⁰⁴ And no to the Catholic Church [NDLR].
- ¹⁰⁵ LG n° 8.
- ¹⁰⁶ In any case, this is the authentic interpretation given by the Holy See on June 29, 2007, text in the *Documentation catholique* (Catholic Documentation) 2385, p. 717-720.
- ¹⁰⁷ LG n° 15.
- ¹⁰⁸ LG n° 16.
- ¹⁰⁹ Decree *Unitatis redintegratio*, n° 3. For the refutation of these errors, reference is made to the Acts of the III^o Theological Congress of Si Si No No, *La tentation de l'œcuménisme* (The Temptation of Ecumenism), Publication of the Courrier de Rome, Versailles, 1999, especially p. 48 sq.
- ¹¹⁰ LG n° 1.
- ¹¹¹ That is, to say in the civil society [NDLR].
- ¹¹² *La tentation de l'œcuménisme* (The Temptation of Ecumenism), *ibid.*, p. 138-139. Intervention of professor PASQUALUCCI.
- ¹¹³ Cited in *Fideliter* 50, p. 3.
- ¹¹⁴ Cited in Mgr DELASSUS, *La conjuration antichrétienne* (The anti-Christian conjuration), chapter 16.
- ¹¹⁵ Cardinal PIE, *Œuvres sacerdotales* (Sacerdotal Works), Oudin, Paris, 1891, Volume I, p. 359-361.
- ¹¹⁶ Yves MARSAUDON, *L'œcuménisme vu par un franc-maçon de tradition* (Ecumenism as seen by a Freemason), 1964. Mgr Lefebvre did not fail to point out this work to the Conciliar Fathers, to warn them. See *J'accuse le Concile* (I accuse the Council), ed. Saint-Gabriel, Martigny, 1976, p. 96.
- ¹¹⁷ Rm 10, 10.
- ¹¹⁸ In contrast to the negative precepts: “not to steal, etc.”, which obliges at all times and under all circumstances.
- ¹¹⁹ II II q. 3, a. 2. “To remain silent when one can answer, says St. Bernard, is to consent; and we know that the same punishment awaits those who do evil and those who give him the complicity of consent.” (*Sermon pour la nativité de saint Jean-Baptiste* (Sermon for the Nativity of St. John the Baptist), n° 9; P.L. CLXXXIII, col. 402).
- ¹²⁰ Can. 1325.
- ¹²¹ We have provided full details in the appendix.
- ¹²² Const. *Dei verbum* n° 8. *Motu proprio Ecclesia Dei adflicta* n° 4.
- ¹²³ The Pope uses the same term about ecumenism. We have mentioned it above.

¹²⁴ The decree declaring the "excommunication" of Monsignor Lefebvre says, in the same sense: "We warn priests and faithful not to adhere to the schism of Monsignor Lefebvre, because they would ipso facto incur the very serious penalty of excommunication". (*Fideliter* 65, p. 12). If words have any meaning, it means that the excommunication strikes all those who support the 1988 sacraments; they are expelled... from the Conciliar Church!

¹²⁵ This indult, in the same sense, stated: "Let it be very clear that these priests and faithful have nothing to do with those who doubt the legitimacy and doctrinal rectitude of the Roman Missal promulgated by Pope Paul VI in 1970 and that their position is unambiguous and known to all." That is, the principle of pluralism had to be recognized.

¹²⁶ *Fideliter* 65, p. 18.

¹²⁷ *Fideliter* 67, p. 17.

¹²⁸ *Fideliter* 79, p. 5.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹³⁰ *Documentation catholique (Catholic Documentation)* 2421, p. 318-321.

¹³¹ II II q. 3, a. 2, corpus et ad 2. See also canon 1325 (CIC 1917).

¹³² This distinction is misleading. Paul VI, at many times, called upon the spirit of the Council in his reforms. He, himself dedicated some of the catechesis of Wednesday to deepening the "spirit of the Council". (See for example, his hearings in the Catholic Documentation 1545, p. 702, 703, 705, etc.). This spirit is therefore inseparable from the letter of the Council.

¹³³ On the Credo, yes (and still, do the words mean the same to them and to us? That is doubtful. What do they mean, for example, by redemption? See Le Chardonnet, May 2016, p. 3-5). On the other hand, we do not accept the liturgical reform affecting all the sacraments, and especially the Mass; we persist in affirming that the *Novus Ordo Missæ*, although valid, is bad. As for the "supreme magisterium of the Church", the expression is ambiguous; we reject the post conciliar magisterium. We dealt with this issue in more detail in Question 1, Article 4.

¹³⁴ Cited in *Le combat de la foi (The fight of the faith)* 176, p. 13.

¹³⁵ Of course, we respect people; but here, the term "respect" is contrasted with "polemical confrontation": it is indeed a question of ceasing attacks against the errors professed by the men of the Church, including the Pope.

¹³⁶ Logically, the word "unacceptable" has for contradictory "acceptable", while the opposite term is "to be accepted". The most radical opposition is the first (the contradiction). To admit that Vatican II is acceptable is to radically ruin our entire fight.

¹³⁷ *Le Sel de la terre (The Salt of the Earth)* 25, p. 153.

¹³⁸ Conference at Flavigny, June 11th, 1988.

¹³⁹ Extract from the "Open Letter to Cardinal Gantin", signed by all the districts superiors and seminaries of the Fraternity, July 6th, 1988. *Fideliter* 64, p. 11.

¹⁴⁰ These three quotes come from the brochure d'Arnaud de LASSUS, *Aide-mémoire sur le concile Vatican II (Notes on the Second Vatican Council)*, AFS supplement to n° 221, June 2012, p. 32. [Translator's note: I was told that the quote attributed to Pope Innocent III should actually be attributed to Pope St. Felix III]

¹⁴¹ In question 1, we have seen that no.

¹⁴² *Le Sel de la terre (The Salt of the Earth)* 21, p. 163.

¹⁴³ *Le Sel de la terre (The Salt of the Earth)* 26, p. 166 (the text *in extenso* p. 162-167).

¹⁴⁴ *Le Sel de la terre (The Salt of the Earth)* 21, p. 167. See his autobiography in *Le Sel de la terre (The Salt of the Earth)* 34, p. 89-112.

¹⁴⁵ It should be noted that, in 1987-1988, the occurrence of these two problems blurred the question. Everything was clearer in 1991, for Bishop Rangel's consecration, where only the question of the consecration was at stake.

¹⁴⁶ *Fideliter* 82, p. 13-14.

¹⁴⁷ Cited in Monsignor Tissier De Mallerai, *Marcel Lefebvre, une vie (The Biography Marcel Lefebvre)*, Clovis, Étampes, 2002, p. 570.

¹⁴⁸ DAL GAL, *ibid.*, p. 201.

¹⁴⁹ For more information, please refer to the appendix.

¹⁵⁰ *Fideliter* 79, p. 11.

¹⁵¹ *Fideliter* 66, p. 28-30.

¹⁵² *Fideliter* 70.

¹⁵³ Cited in *La Tradition excommuniée (Tradition excommunicated)*, Publications of the Courrier de Rome (Courier of Rome), Versailles, 1989, p. 40-41.

¹⁵⁴ *Fideliter* 68, p. 9. See p. 4 et 7.

¹⁵⁵ *Le Sel de la terre (Salt of the Earth)* 25, p. 153.

¹⁵⁶ *Fideliter* 66, p. 30.

¹⁵⁷ *L'Église infiltrée par le modernisme (The Church Infiltrated by Modernism)*, p. 71.

¹⁵⁸ Conference at Ecône September 9th, 1988, cited in *Fideliter* 66, p. 28.

¹⁵⁹ *Fideliter* 68, p. 23-24.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 24-25.

¹⁶¹ Letter to the Pope May 20th, 1988; in *Fideliter* 59, p. 63.

¹⁶² Summa theologica, II II q. 10.

¹⁶³ La foi (The faith), V. 2, 1963, p. 286.

¹⁶⁴ The reason for this is that we are no longer strictly in the field of "doing" (arts and trades, emphasizing techniques), but in the field of social or political, the field of "acting", which is regulated by virtue; this is true only if it is regulated by the true religion.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 287-288.

¹⁶⁶ It suffices to recall what happened with the Fraternity of St. Peter in 1999. See *Fideliter* 132, pp. 41-42 and the whole file entitled "Le cynisme de Rome". ¹⁶⁷ In the next article, we will see what has happened to the rallies and their abandonment of the fight for faith.

¹⁶⁸ This is the case of the rallied communities. For example, in Freiburg, Switzerland, the Fraternity of St. Peter's has even been entrusted with a basilica in the city center; only the Tridentine Mass is celebrated there.

¹⁶⁹ Supplement to La Lettre de la Péraudière (The Letter of the Péraudière), "Les rapports entre Rome et la Fraternité Saint-Pie X" (The reports between Rome and the Fraternity of Saint Pius X), conference in Paris, September 27th, 2006, p. 13-14.

¹⁷⁰ *Fideliter* 65, p. 21.

¹⁷¹ *Pastoral letter on the problems of the modern apostolate*, ed. du Sel, 2006, p. 6-11, passim.

¹⁷² II II q. 97, a. 1.

¹⁷³ Cited by Mgr TISSIER DE MALLERAI, *ibid.*, p. 561-562.

¹⁷⁴ "The establishment of this "councilar Church" imbued with the principles of 89", he said, "Masonic principles towards religion and religions, towards civil society, is an imposture inspired by Hell for the destruction of the Catholic religion, its magisterium, its priesthood and the sacrifice of Our Lord." (*Itinéraire spirituel [Spiritual itinerary]*, 1990, p. 21-22).

¹⁷⁵ *Fideliter* 70, p. 6.

¹⁷⁶ The common good is the final cause of society.

¹⁷⁷ *Fideliter* 68, p. 16.

- ¹⁷⁸ Pascal BERNARDIN, *Machiavel pédagogue (Machiavel pedagogue)*, ed. Notre-Dame des Grâces (Our Lady of Graces), 1995, p. 14.
- ¹⁷⁹ The experimenter tells the teacher that he is mandated by the principal, which gives him authority.
- ¹⁸⁰ It is a simulation by the students, but the teacher believes because he is not aware (it is the case of saying!) of the simulation. The students pretend to wring themselves in pain.
- ¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 22.
- ¹⁸² *Fideliter* 70, p. 2.
- ¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 22.
- ¹⁸⁴ *Fideliter* 70, p. 2.
- ¹⁸⁵ II II q. 10, a. 10.
- ¹⁸⁶ *La Revue des jeunes, La foi (Youth review, Faith)*, t. 2, 1963, p. 288-289.
- ¹⁸⁷ Lc 10, 16.
- ¹⁸⁸ Since the Revolution, republican leaders have no longer been surrounded by this sacred prestige. Nevertheless, being leaders, they keep an influence, in this case bad, on their subjects. It's always wrong to have bad leaders.
- ¹⁸⁹ *La Revue des jeunes (Youth Review)*, *ibid.*
- ¹⁹⁰ For more details, see *De l'œcuménisme à l'apostasie silencieuse (From ecumenism to silent apostasy)*, p. 33-40.
- ¹⁹¹ Archbishop Lefebvre said that about the scandal in Assisi.
- ¹⁹² Especially "Les chiens (The dogs)" (Supplément to n° 89), and the appeal to the Bishops of France by Jean MADIRAN (n° 92, p. 4-17).
- ¹⁹³ *La Revue des jeunes (Youth review)*, *ibid.*, p.290.
- ¹⁹⁴ II II q. 12, a. 2.
- ¹⁹⁵ II II q. 12 a. 1st: "The apostate sows quarrel, because he seeks to drive others away from the faith as he has separated himself from it."
- ¹⁹⁶ "Rome is in apostasy. These are not empty words I'm telling you. That's the truth. Rome is in apostasy" (Conference of September 4th, 1987).
- ¹⁹⁷ See Father GAUDRON, *Catéchisme catholique de la crise dans l'Église (Catholic catechism of the crisis in the Church)*, 3rd edition, ed. du Sel, Avrillé, 2009, p. 290.
- ¹⁹⁸ *Fideliter* 79, p. 5-6.
- ¹⁹⁹ *La Tradition excommuniée (Tradition excommunicated)*, Publications of Courier de Rome (Courier of Rome), Versailles, 1989, p. 40.
- ²⁰⁰ Father GAUDRON, *Catéchisme catholique de la crise de l'Église (Catholic catechism of the crisis of the Church)*, ed. du Sel, Avrillé, 3^o edition, p. 289. This mechanism is the one described above by Pascal Bernardin.
- ²⁰¹ *Fideliter* 66, p.12-13.
- ²⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 28-30.
- ²⁰³ *Fideliter* 66, p. 28-30.
- ²⁰⁴ *Fideliter* 70, p. 12, 13, 16.
- ²⁰⁵ *Le Sel de la terre (The Salt of the Earth)* 88, "Chute et dérive du Barroux" ("Fall and drift of the Barroux"), by Father Bruno. The rest of the article is a perfect illustration of the phenomenon we are dealing with.
- ²⁰⁶ "No," replied Arnaud de Lassus energetically, "the 1970 war - in other words the struggle against doctrinal errors and the resulting disorders introduced or aggravated by the Second Vatican Council - this war is not over. The stakes are the same today as they were yesterday: it is the same liberalism, [...] the same conciliar spirit imbued with the philosophy of enlightenment, the same loss of the meaning of truth, which must be opposed

[...]. One does not give up in the midst of battle, when the battle in question - that of truth versus error - does not admit armistice. This is what the Good Shepherd Institute leads us to. How can we follow them in this direction? This is an unrealistic path, because it does not take into account the reality of things.” (AFS 188, p. 1-2).

²⁰⁷ Cited in *Le Sel de la terre (The Salt of the Earth)* 40, p. 166.

²⁰⁸ Revue de presse du district de France (Revue of press of the district of France) n° 301, April 16th, 2012. The report is by a certain Bishop Pozzo...

²⁰⁹ The Oasis of Jesus is a congregation founded by Father Muñoz, a Spanish priest (born in 1927). In 1966 he founded a congregation of contemplative religious, whose members offered themselves for the sanctification of priests and consecrated souls, in the spirit of St. Francis de Sales. It was then approved as a pious union. In 1986, Archbishop Lefebvre approved the Constitutions. See *Le Sel de la terre* 42, p. 246-248.

²¹⁰ *Fideliter* 132, p. 20.

²¹¹ *Ibid.* p. 28.

²¹² Revue of the district of France.

²¹³ The term rallying first referred to the act of the French monarchists and bonapartists who adhered to the Republic from 1892 on the instructions of Leo XIII. The goal was *strategic*: to unite Catholic forces to fight against persecuting laws. In fact, the soul of this policy was the spirit of conciliation with a government that demanded no more than the acceptance of persecuting laws. The result was that the Catholics lost their fighting spirit and eventually adopted the liberal ideas. Thus, the *strategic* rally ended with a *doctrinal* rally.

²¹⁴ Cardinal BILLOT, *L'Église (The Church)*, Publications of Courrier de Rome (Courier of Rome), Versailles, 2010, Volume II, p. 68: “The bond of communion is broken because of the schism”; and p. 76 : “In addition to the character of baptism, the bond of unity of faith and Catholic communion, no other condition is required to be part of the Church”.

²¹⁵ Further down, in question 3, we will make it clear that we are not schismatic.

²¹⁶ See III q. 3, a. 1.

²¹⁷ II II q. 49, a. 7.

²¹⁸ *Lettre aux amis et bienfaiteurs (Letter to Friends and Benefactors)* n° 73, novembre 2008, p. 26.

²¹⁹ *Fideliter* 171, p. 41.

²²⁰ I II q. 9, a. 1.

²²¹ I q. 82, a. 4.

²²² We could have added a confirmation *a posteriori*: all those who made an agreement with Rome knew this osmosis.

²²³ I q. 33, a. 1. *Id a quo aliquid procedit, quocumque modo.*

²²⁴ See the article of Father Gleize, in *Le Courrier de Rome (The Courier of Rome)* 388, June 2015, p. 7-8.

²²⁵ II II q. 47, a. 6.

²²⁶ II II q. 49, a. 2, ad 1.

²²⁷ René SIMON, *Morale*, ed. Beauchesne, Paris, 1961, p. 252.

²²⁸ This is a Celarent syllogism: E-A-E: the conclusion is a negative universal. Of course, the conclusion is less universal - or rather, it has a lesser extension - than the major one, since the relations that Rome wants to have with us through a canonical solution are only a kind of pluralism (which is the genus).

²²⁹ With the same logical remarks (see previous note).

²³⁰ This refusal therefore stems from a universal principle.

²³¹ For example, passing through a street is an indifferent action in itself. But if, for a drunkard, passing a bar is an opportunity for sin, he must not pass in the street where he is. The presence of the bar is this circumstance which motivates the drunkard's purely prudential refusal to pass in this street.

²³² *Divini Redemptoris*, n° 58.

²³³ II II q. 50, a. 1.

²³⁴ *Ibid.*, a. 2.

²³⁵ II II q. 47, a. 12.

²³⁶ Saint THOMAS AQUINAS, *La prudence (Prudence)*, ed. de la Revue des jeunes (of the Review of the Youth), 2nd edition, 1949, p. 322-323.

²³⁷ *Divini Redemptoris*, n° 57.

²³⁸ The intentions of these prelates can be pure, but it is not enough. "One is assured of the righteousness of his feelings," says Louis Veillot, "more than of the accuracy of his thoughts. Unfortunately, today, many believe they are right of spirit because they have the right heart. They're the ones who do the most evil because they do it in the safety of conscience." Archbishop Lefebvre spoke no other way: "I hear you say: "You are exaggerating! There are more and more good bishops who pray, who have the faith, who are edifying..." Would they be saints, as soon as they admit false religious freedom, therefore the secular State, false ecumenism, [...] liturgical reform, [...] they officially contribute to the revolution in the Church and its destruction". (*Itinéraire spirituel [Spiritual Itinerary]*, 1991, p. 9). A clear and frank language cannot qualify as "friends" those who collaborate in the destruction of the Church, even unconsciously. "Innocent" is not synonymous with "harmless".

²³⁹ *Pascendi*, n° 4. Voir n° 53: The modernist system "does not consist of scattered and unrelated theories, but of a perfectly organized body, the parts of which are so well combined that one cannot admit one without admitting them all."

²⁴⁰ See the homily of August 29th, 1976, at Lille, in *Homélies "été chaud" (Homelies "hot summer"*, ed. Saint-Gabriel, Martigny, 1976, p. 31. Cardinal Daniélou himself said it about Paul VI.

²⁴¹ *Le Sel de la terre (The Salt of the Earth)* 96, p. 127.

²⁴² Mgr LEFEBVRE, *L'Église infiltrée par le modernisme (The Church infiltrated by modernism)*, ed. *Fideliter*, Eguelshardt, 1993, p. 141-142.

²⁴³ Here is what Monsignor Sigaud said, comparing liberalism and communism: "Many Catholics have the temptation to behave with communism as the Church behaved with liberalism in the last century and as she still does today. With liberalism, coexistence is possible:

1- Liberalism did not prevent the Church from preaching her doctrine and did not oblige her to preach liberal doctrine;

2- Liberalism allowed the condemnation of one's own mistakes.

But under the communist regime neither of these two licenses existed:

a) The Church is prevented from spreading her doctrine;

b) The Church is obliged to teach the errors of communism;

c) The Church cannot condemn the mistakes of communism.

Communism's opposition to the Catholic Church is essential, radical, perpetual and total.

When communism grants some peace to the Church, it is only a pause in the struggle. This pause can have various causes:

a- International politics may require such a pause;

b- The strategy imposed by the assault on a new country can lead to a fictitious peace in the neighboring country;

c- The initial weakness of communism itself may explain such a truce.

Even the executioner, before killing the victim, pauses to hit him better.

Cooperation with communism will always be for the Church's own ruin." (*Le Sel de la terre [The Salt of the Earth]* 94, p.44). We can replace "communism" by "neo-modernism", and we will have a perfect idea of what this heresy and its manoeuvres are.

²⁴⁴ II II, q. 49, a. 4.

²⁴⁵ It is in this sense that Bishop Tissier de Mallerai said (interview with *Angelus Press*, June 21st, 2008), about the rallies: "These poor people [...] are liberals and pragmatists. These are people who were tired of the long, long battle of the faith." They put action before principles, the canonical solution before the solution of doctrinal problems.

²⁴⁶ *Fideliter* 68, p. 16.

²⁴⁷ *Fideliter* 70.

²⁴⁸ *l'Église infiltrée... (The Church infiltrated...)*, *ibid.*, p. 139.

²⁴⁹ *Fideliter* 68, p. 7-8, March-April 1989. Conference of December 1988.

²⁵⁰ We list them, in annex.

²⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

²⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 7.

²⁵³ Thus, their modernism blinds them both to the ruins accumulated by Vatican II, where they see a renewal, and to the fruits of Tradition, which should have opened their eyes. First, the scales of modernism must have fallen from their eyes.

²⁵⁴ Cited in *Nouvelles de Nouvelles de chrétienté (Christianity News)* 158, p. 12, col 3.

²⁵⁵ In a relationship, three things are distinguished: the relationship itself (for example, fatherhood); its foundation (here, the generation, the act of the father); his term (here: the son). However, as explained by Gredt (*Elementa philosophiae*, Herder, Fribourg, 1961, p. 176), from the same foundation, there can be two different, even opposite, relationships. For example, the similar relationship between two white stones. The subject of the relationship is one of the stones. The foundation is the white. The term is the other white stone. However, white forms the similar relationship with the second white stone, and the dissimilar relationship with a black stone. So, what ultimately *specifies* the relationship is its *term*.

²⁵⁶ *Fideliter* 70, p. 6.

²⁵⁷ "Maintaining the faith and the institutions which for two thousand years have sanctified the Church and souls can in no way be a cause of breaking communion with the Church on the contrary, it is the criterion of union with the Church and with Peter's successor" (Monsignor Lefebvre, July 19th, 1975, cited in *Le coup de maître de Satan (Satan's master stroke)*, 1977, p. 29).

²⁵⁸ Cardinal BILLOT, *L'Église (The Church)*, Volume II, Publications of the Courrier de Rome (Courier of Rome), 2010, p. 69-70.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

²⁶⁰ *Fideliter* 70, p. 8.

²⁶¹ *Fideliter* 79, p. 8.

²⁶² Cardinal JOURNET, *L'Église du Verbe Incarné (Church of the Incarnate Word)*, Desclée de Brouwer, Fribourg, 1962, vol. II, p. 839 sq.

²⁶³ Father Roger-Thomas CALMEL O.P., *De l'Église et du pape (Of the Church and the Pope)*, in *Itinéraires (Itineraries)* 173, May 1973, p. 28.

²⁶⁴ Conference at Ecône, September 9th, 1988, cited in *Fideliter* 66, p. 28.

²⁶⁵ “We are neither schismatics nor excommunicated, we are not against the Pope. We are not against the Catholic Church. We do not have a parallel church. All this is absurd. We are what we have always been, Catholics who continue. That's all. There's no need to look for noon at 2:00. We do not make a “small Church.”” *Fideliter* 70, p. 8.

²⁶⁶ In other words, it is not in the canonical sense of the word, as we have already said above.

²⁶⁷ Let us also quote the words of Archbishop Lefebvre's theologian at the Second Vatican Council: “What is a modernist? He is a man who, no longer having faith (since, by definition, modernism is heresy), has his own way of no longer having it [...]. He retains all dogmatic expressions by radically changing their meaning or by accompanying them with their contradictions - he does not embarrass himself with contradictions. He does not feel the need to leave the Church: on the contrary, his own way of being heretical implies that he remains there. A modernist outside the Church is no longer a modernist. He is a liberal or rationalist Protestant; he is an unbelieving philosopher, or an unbelieving exegete or an unbelieving historian, anything but a modernist. The specific note of modernism is to be an inner heresy of the Church. The enterprise of modernism is to undermine the dogma from within, as termites make of a beam [...]. The more modernist he is, the more difficult it is to recognize him, the more he knows how to keep up appearances.” Father BERTO, document extracted from the personal archives of Monsignor Lefebvre.

²⁶⁸ *La Tradition “excommuniée” (Tradition “excommunicated”)*, Publications of Courier de Rome (Courier of Rome), June 1989, p. 45.

²⁶⁹ *Fideliter* 65, p. 17-18.

²⁷⁰ *Fideliter* 66, p. 27-28.

²⁷¹ Mgr Lefebvre at Lille, August 29th, 1976.

²⁷² *Le coup de maître de Satan (Satan's master stroke)*, Answers to various topical questions, 1977, p. 47.

²⁷³ Monsignor LEFEBVRE, Conference at Ecône, December 21st, 1984.

²⁷⁴ Monsignor Lefebvre, January 16th, 1979.

²⁷⁵ Sedevacantism differs from schism in that it does not deny *in principle* that the occupier of the See of Rome is head of the universal Church and must be in communion with him, but it *does* deny that the *current* occupier of the See of Rome - because of his habitual and objective intention contrary to the common good of the Church - is a legitimate pope; and, therefore, it affirms that all relations with him should be broken off.

²⁷⁶ According to the modernist conception, which is reflected in the *Lumen Gentium* constitution of the Second Vatican Council, the Supreme Pontiff exercises a service: he must listen to the religious sentiment of the People of God and ensure its unity as it evolves through the centuries. Its function is no longer to teach the faithful with authority by imposing on their faith what is contained in the unchanging Tradition of the Church.

²⁷⁷ “The most common opinion of theologians is that heresy and schism destroy Church society precisely to the extent that they are notorious [...]. The rupture of the unity of the Church occurs indeed at its level: since it is a question of the rupture of a social bond, it occurs only in favor of acts likely to deprive such a bond [...], that is to say in favor of social acts, which are not only external, but also public and *notorious acts of law*. Such acts are all (and only those) which the hierarchical authority of the Church legally denounces as incompatible with the common good of Catholic society.” (Father GLEIZE, professor of ecclesiology at the Ecône seminary, in the *Courier de Rome (Courier of Rome)*, September 2013). Thus, as long as there is no legal recognition of his heresy by authority, a heretic remains a member of ecclesiastical society.

- ²⁷⁸ For a more complete and detailed refutation of sedevacantism, see n° 79 of *Sel de la terre* (Salt of the earth) or the *Courrier de Rome (Courier of Rome)* February 2016.
- ²⁷⁹ *Itinéraires (Itineraries)* 148, p. 14 et 17.
- ²⁸⁰ Bishop Fellay, in his sermon during the pilgrimage to Le Puy on April 10, 2016, could only note that *confusion* reigned in Rome. How would we immerse ourselves in this environment? The devil fishes in troubled waters.
- ²⁸¹ “It is not the non-existence of the Pope that is the basis of my conduct, but the defense of my Catholic faith” (Response of Monsignor Lefebvre to Father Guérard des Lauriers).
- ²⁸² Our joy is limited, however, because the principles on which the Pope relies on are not necessarily the right ones... (Human rights, human dignity, Vatican II, etc.).
- ²⁸³ *Catholiques, Apostoliques, Romains; notre position dans l'actuelle situation de l'Église (Catholics, Apostolics, Romans; our position in the present situation of the Church)*; Union Sacerdotale saint Jean-Baptiste-Marie Vianney, Campos, Brazil. Brochure edited by Publications Saint Jean Eudes, June 2000.
- ²⁸⁴ As for us, we intend not to abandon this just distrust towards the authorities, hostile to Tradition, because they are hostile to the reign of Our Lord.
- ²⁸⁵ See He 11, 6.
- ²⁸⁶ Reference will be made to the treatise on the caritate of Saint Thomas, where it shows how eternal bliss, while being the happiness of each saint, is a common good. See also Charles DE KONINCK, *De la primauté du bien commun contre les personnalistes (The primacy of the common good over personalities)*, Québec, 1942.
- ²⁸⁷ It is the duty of every Christian to receive this sacrament.
- ²⁸⁸ 1 Lc 22, 32.
- ²⁸⁹ Thus spoke Cardinal Pie to Count Albert de Mun: “One is an apostle only if one works to be holy; and the first condition of holiness is orthodoxy. The most generous ardor cannot replace it. We cannot do anything without grace, and grace shall not be brought to divorce with doctrine. In the servant of God and of the divine cause, error, even unconscious and which does not constitute formal sin, is still a very serious obstacle to the fruitfulness of word and deed.”
- ²⁹⁰ Mc 14, 38.
- ²⁹¹ Erection Decree in *Fideliter* 53, p.6.
- ²⁹² *Fideliter* 55, p. 3. Facsimile of Order in Council, p.5.
- ²⁹³ See on this subject the *Courrier de Rome (Courier of Rome)*, mars 2016.
- ²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 6-7.
- ²⁹⁵ Letter of May 6th, 1975, in *Itinéraires (Itineraries)* 205 ter, p. 29.
- ²⁹⁶ *Itinéraires (Itineraries)* 205 ter, p. 55-56; letter of Mgr LEFEBVRE to the “*Libre Belgique (Free Belgium)*”.
- ²⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 57.
- ²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 108.
- ²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 113.
- ³⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 149.
- ³⁰¹ *Itinéraires (Itineraries)* 207 bis, p. 109.
- ³⁰² *Ibid.*, p.117.
- ³⁰³ See especially PAUL VI's letter of October 11th, 1976, which closes all doors (*Itinéraires [Itineraries]* 207 bis, p. 121).
- ³⁰⁴ Conference of August 20th, 1976 (COSPEC 32 B).
- ³⁰⁵ *Itinéraires (Itineraries)* 233, p. 4-5.
- ³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 139-140. See also the letter of April 13th, 1978 to Cardinal Seper, p. 116.

- ³⁰⁷ Archbishop Lefebvre also believes that he has already said everything, that his interlocutors know what he thinks (see conference of June 21, 1978, COSPEC 60 A). It will be his turn to ask them which Church they are from, and if they accept the encyclicals of the popes before the Council.
- ³⁰⁸ *Fideliter* 16, p. 9-10.
- ³⁰⁹ *Quinze ans après Vatican II (Fifteen years after Vatican II)*, conference at Angers, November 23rd, 1980.
- ³¹⁰ *Fideliter* 29, p. 45.
- ³¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 45-46.
- ³¹² We are then on the eve of the promulgation of the new code. See *Fideliter* 35, p. 51-53.
- ³¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 59.
- ³¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 55-57.
- ³¹⁵ *Fideliter* 45, p. 6 to 20, publishing this letter *in extenso*, putting in front of the commentaries as well as the texts of Monsignor Lefebvre and Father Calmel, demonstrating that we are in the midst of a dialogue of the deaf.
- ³¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p.17.
- ³¹⁷ *Fideliter* 36, p. 3-12. He begged him to use his pontifical power to confirm his brothers in the faith.
- ³¹⁸ *Fideliter* 37, p. 15.
- ³¹⁹ *Fideliter* 42, p. 19.
- ³²⁰ There is obviously a “shell” in *Fideliter's* text which writes: “... that a priest does not celebrate the new rite out of contempt for the old?” This goes against the context and makes the subject unintelligible. NDLR.
- ³²¹ *Fideliter* 35, p. 60.
- ³²² *Fideliter* 45, p. 23.
- ³²³ *Ibid.*, p. 26.
- ³²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 28.
- ³²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 30-32.
- ³²⁶ *Fideliter* 46, p. 2-3.
- ³²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4-5. Letter of cardinal RATZINGER, May 29th, 1985.
- ³²⁸ *Fideliter* 43, p. 16-17. Recognition as an institute of pontifical right would regulate the situation of the FSSPX towards Rome; the personal prelature would regulate the apostolate of priests.
- ³²⁹ The total is 130,000 signatures. *Fideliter* 45, p. 21-22.
- ³³⁰ *Fideliter* 48, p. 2-3, May—June 1985.
- ³³¹ *Fideliter* 48, p. 16-17. Declaration on the Synod of 1985.
- ³³² Text in *Fideliter* 49, p. 4-6.
- ³³³ *Ibid.*, p. 2-3.
- ³³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 7-8. Presentation of these doubts.
- ³³⁵ *Fideliter* 50, p. 2. “It's willful blindness,” the magazine comments. “The wound becomes completely incurable.”
- ³³⁶ *Fideliter* 51. p. 4.
- ³³⁷ *Fideliter* 54, p. 3.
- ³³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 17-20.
- ³³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 23-24.
- ³⁴⁰ *Fideliter* 55, p. 7. Conference, September 1986.
- ³⁴¹ *Fideliter* 58, p. 8.
- ³⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 2 et 6.

- ³⁴³ *Fideliter* 60, p. 4. It had been two years since, given the apocalyptic deterioration of the situation, Archbishop Lefebvre had interrupted his efforts to find a canonical solution.
- ³⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 18-19.
- ³⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 9.
- ³⁴⁶ *Fideliter* 62, p. 3.
- ³⁴⁷ *Fideliter* 61, p. 4. Account of the visit in *Fideliter* 62, p. 5-26.
- ³⁴⁸ *Fideliter* 61, p. 7.
- ³⁴⁹ *Fideliter* 62, p. 31.
- ³⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 2. On February 2 he confirmed this news: "I am determined to consecrate at least three bishops on June 30, hoping to have John Paul II's approval, but if he were not to give it to me, I would ignore it for the good of the Church, for the perenniality of Tradition." (Mgr TISSIER DE MALLERAIS, *Marcel Lefebvre, une vie (The Biography, Marcel Lefebvre)*, Clovis, Étampes, 2002, p. 581).
- ³⁵¹ Letter in *Fideliter* 63, p. 3-5.
- ³⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 1.
- ³⁵³ Mgr TISSIER DE MALLERAIS, *ibid.*, p. 561-562.
- ³⁵⁴ *Le Sel de la terre (Salt of the Earth)* 31, p. 194.
- ³⁵⁵ Mgr TISSIER DE MALLERAIS, *ibid.*, p. 577.
- ³⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 580-581.
- ³⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 582.
- ³⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 583.
- ³⁵⁹ *Le Sel de la terre (The Salt of the Earth)* 40, p. 160.
- ³⁶⁰ Interview of January 19th, 2002, in *Le Sel de la terre (The Salt of the Earth)* 40, p. 166.
- ³⁶¹ See what we have said above.
- ³⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 584.
- ³⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 585.
- ³⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 589.
- ³⁶⁵ *Le Sel de la terre (The Salt of the Earth)* 25, p. 153.
- ³⁶⁶ Lecture given in Flavigny on June 11th, 1988, broadcast by Ecône in 2008 (CD) under the title: "Why I refused the agreements with Rome".
- ³⁶⁷ Mgr TISSIER DE MALLERAIS, *ibid.*, p. 593.
- ³⁶⁸ *Fideliter* 64, p. 5-6.
- ³⁶⁹ *Fideliter* 59, p. 70.
- ³⁷⁰ *Fideliter* 79, p. 11.
- ³⁷¹ *Fideliter* 66, p.12-13.
- ³⁷² *Fideliter* 66, p. 28-30.
- ³⁷³ *Fideliter* 68, p. 16.
- ³⁷⁴ We see here another reason why Archbishop Lefebvre continued the conferences: his young collaborators pushed in this direction.
- ³⁷⁵ "The establishment of this "counciliar Church" imbued with the principles of '89," he says, "with Masonic principles towards religion and religions, towards civil society, is an imposture inspired by Hell for the destruction of the Catholic religion, its magisterium, its priesthood and the sacrifice of Our Lord." (*Itinéraire spirituel [Spiritual Itinerary]*, 1990, p. 21-22).
- ³⁷⁶ *Fideliter* 70, p. 2, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 16.
- ³⁷⁷ *L'Église infiltrée par le modernisme (The Church Infiltrated by Modernism)*, éd. *Fideliter*, 1993, p. 70-71.
- ³⁷⁸ *Itinéraire spirituel (Spiritual Itinerary)*, *ibid.*, p.8.

- ³⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 29.
- ³⁸⁰ *L'Église infiltrée... (The Church infiltrated...)*, *ibid.*, p. 137 et 139.
- ³⁸¹ *De internis Ecclesia non judicat*, says the adage of canon law.
- ³⁸² In that sense we say, "Hell is paved with good intentions."
- ³⁸³ Note of Father PINCKAERS, dans "La revue des jeunes" ("Youth Review"), *Les actes humains (Human Actions)*, Cerf, Paris, 1962, p. 344. See I II q. 12, a. 1. See also Father Achille DESURMONT, *La charité sacerdotale (Sacerdotal Charity)*, 1901, tome 1, p. 92 sq.
- ³⁸⁴ *In-tendere*: lean towards. Hence the word "intention".
- ³⁸⁵ *Fideliter* 68, p. 7-8. March—April 1989. Conference of December 1988.
- ³⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 9.
- ³⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- ³⁸⁸ Thus, their modernism blinds them both to the ruins accumulated by Vatican II, where they see a renewal, and to the fruits of Tradition, which should have opened their eyes. First, the scales of modernism must have fallen from their eyes.
- ³⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ³⁹⁰ *Fideliter* 70, p. 17.
- ³⁹¹ *Le Sel de la terre (The Salt of the Earth)* 28, p. 167.
- ³⁹² Thus, the good intentions of the rallies clash with the intentions of the counciliers; is the story of the iron pot and the earth pot; it is the latter that bears the brunt. The Roman authorities have all the means to impose their goal on them.
- ³⁹³ *Fideliter* 69, p. 5.
- ³⁹⁴ *Fideliter* 86, p. 3-4.
- ³⁹⁵ *Fideliter* 171, p. 41.
- ³⁹⁶ Letter of Archbishop LEFEBVRE of June 2nd, 1988 to Pope John Paul II.
- ³⁹⁷ Declaration of the chapter, in *Nouvelles de Chrétienté (Christian News)* 100, p. 6.
- ³⁹⁸ See Father GAUDRON, *Catéchisme catholique de la crise dans l'Église (Catholic Catechism of the crisis in the Church)*, 3rd edition, ed. of Sel (Salt), Avrillé, 2009, p. 290.
- ³⁹⁹ *Fideliter* 79, p.5.
- ⁴⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 6.
- ⁴⁰¹ Father François DUFAY, *En Chine, l'étoile contre la croix (In China, the Star against the Cross)*, Castermann, Paris, 1954. We borrow the application from the modernists at n° 135 of *Combat de la foi catholique (Fight of the Catholic Faith)*, October 7th, 2001.
- ⁴⁰² All this is very clearly explained by BENOIT XVI in his letter of March 10th, 2009. The priority today, he says, is to fight against the extinction of the "faith". For this to happen, Catholics must be united among themselves (counciliers and traditionalists), then Christians (ecumenism) and finally believers (interreligious dialogue). These three phases are in the same dynamic. We must not play into the game, the rules of which were laid down by the revolutionaries.
- ⁴⁰³ In the same letter of March 10th, 2009, BENEDICT XVI acknowledges that in the past, favors given to traditional groups have changed their internal climate, and that they have ceased to behave "unilaterally": in other words, they have softened and made concessions.
- ⁴⁰⁴ *Fideliter* 79, p. 5.
- ⁴⁰⁵ *Le Sel de la terre (The Salt of the Earth)* 88, "Chute et dérive du Barroux (Fall and Drift of Barroux)", by Father BRUNO. The rest of the article is a perfect illustration of the phenomenon we are dealing with.
- ⁴⁰⁶ *Fideliter* 65, p. 18-19.
- ⁴⁰⁷ *Fideliter* 67, p. 17.
- ⁴⁰⁸ *Fideliter* 70, p. 16.

⁴⁰⁹ *Le Sel de la terre (The Salt of the Earth)* 32, p. 178.

⁴¹⁰ Mt 15, 14.

⁴¹¹ He 13, 12-13. *Fideliter* 65, p. 20. Father SCHMIDBERGER.

Index

Preface	2
General Introduction	3
QUESTION 1: HAS THE SITUATION IN ROME NOT IMPROVED SINCE 1988?	4
<u>ARTICLE 1: Is There Not a Reawakening of The Conservators in Rome</u>	4
I. Reasons in favor for a positive response	4
II. Notice to the contrary	5
III. Substantive Response	5
1) A substantial change in the doctrine?	5
2) A question of the post-counciliar “Magisterium”?	5
3) Conservative prelates: a novelty?	7
IV. Answers to objections	8
<u>ARTICLE 2: Is There Not Something That Has Changed Among Those Who Have the Reins of The Church?</u>	9
I. Reasons for a positive response	9
II. Notice to the contrary	9
III. Substantive Response	9
1) Pope Francis	10
2) Cardinal Muller	11
3) Conclusion	12
IV. Answers to objections	13
<u>ARTICLE 3: Doesn’t Rome Return in Honor, All the Same, What Is Dear to The Catholic Faithful?</u>	13
I. Reasons in favor of a positive answer	13
II. Opinion in opposite sense	14
III. Substantive Response	14
1) Words of the Pope	14
2) The Acts	15
IV. Answers to objections	19
<u>ARTICLE 4: The Attitude of Rome In Relation to Us – SSPX And Friendly Communities – Has It Not Changed?</u>	19
I. Reasons in favor of a positive answer	19
II. Opinion in opposite sense	20
III. Substantive Response	20
1) Rome doesn’t seem to want to impose on us all of the Council anymore	20

2) We have the right to support our positions publicly	24
3) Conclusion	24
IV. Answers to objections	25
QUESTION 2: CAN WE ACCEPT A CANONICAL RECOGNITION OFFERED BY A NEO-MORDERNIST AUTHORITY?	25
Introduction	26
1) What is an “agreement”?	26
2) What is a canonical recognition	27
3) The clarity of words	30
<u>ARTICLE 1: Isn’t It a Duty to Try to Be Officially Recognized by The Pope?</u>	31
I. Reasons in favor of a positive answer	31
II. Opinion in the opposite sense	33
III. Substantive Response	33
1) Conciliar Ecclesiology---Pluralism	34
2) Catholic judgement on pluralism	34
3) The confession of faith	35
4) Roman intentions from 1988 to 2016	36
5) Conclusion	41
IV. Answers to objections	42
<u>ARTICLE 2: Wouldn’t A Canonical Recognition Open to Us a Huge Field of Apostolate?</u>	47
I. Reasons in favor of a positive answer	47
II. Opinion in opposite sense	47
III. Substantive Response	48
1) The principles given by Saint Thomas Aquinas	48
2) Application to our situation	49
IV. Answers to objections	50
<u>ARTICLE 3: Couldn’t We Get a Status That Protects Us?</u>	52
I. Reasons in favor of a positive answer	52
II. Opinion in opposite sense	54
III. Substantive Response	54
1) The role of authority in a society	54
2) A disposition of human nature	55
3) Can we protect ourselves from the Pope?	55
4) So, do we have the right to put ourselves under the authority of a neo-modernist Pope?	56
5) The stakes of this question	58
6) Conclusion	59
IV. Answers to objections	59
Conclusion on The First Three Articles	64

<u>ARTICLE 4: Is This Proposal “No Practical Agreement Before a Doctrinal Agreement” Not A Mere Prudential Judgment Rather Than a Principle</u>	64
I. Reasons in favor of a positive answer	64
II. Notice to the contrary	65
III. Substantive Response	66
1) Is it necessarily necessary that the Roman authorities have to return to Tradition to consider an agreement?	66
2) Is it a principle?	68
3) Conclusion of all the article	71
IV. Answers to objections	71
QUESTION 3: TO SAY THAT A CANONICAL RECGNITION IS NOT CONCEIVABLE BEFORE ROME HAS RETURNED TO TRADITION, IS THIS A SCHISMATIC ATTITUDE, OR AT LEAST A SEDEVACANTIST ONE?	76
<u>ARTICLE 1: Is It a Schismatic Attitude?</u>	76
I. Reasons in favor of a positive answer	76
II. Notice to the contrary	77
III. Substantive response	77
1) What is schism?	77
2) The bond of faith is first	77
3) It is those who deviate from faith who make the schism	78
4) And the Pope?	78
5) Hence our attitude, in practice	79
6) Conclusion	79
7) Precision	79
IV. Answers to objections	80
V. To close the question	81
<u>ARTICLE 2: Is This Sedevacantism?</u>	82
I. Reasons in favor a positive answer	82
II. Opinion in opposite sense	82
III. Substantive Response	82
1) What is sedevacantism?	82
2) Refutation	83
3) As a consequence	83
4) On the other hand	83
5) Conclusion	84
IV. Answers to objections	84
V. To close the question	85
GENERAL CONCLUSION	85

ANNEX I: MONSIGNOR LEFEBVRE’S THOUGHTS ON THE POSSIBILITY OF AN AGREEMENT WITH NEO-MODERNISTE ROME	87
A) First period: SSPX recognized by ecclesiastical authorities	87
B) Second period (1975-1988) – Search for a modus vivendi	88
1) Archbishop Lefebvre intervenes privately with the Pope	88
2) Archbishop Lefebvre speaks in public	91
3) The negotiations of 1987-1988	94
C) Third period (1988-1991): to continue the Tradition, even without the approval of Rome	100
1) A course of action: no agreement possible until Our Lord is re-crowned	100
2) The experience of the rallies	106
ANNEX II: THE DIALOGUE	107
1) Dialogue between communists and Catholics in China	107
2) Dialogue between Counciliar Rome and the Traditionalists	108
Sources	113