

Reflections about the Roman Proposal from Bishop Alfonso de Galarreta

NB: The following reflections by His Excellency Bishop de Galarreta were made available at the October, 2011 meeting of SSPX Superiors in Albano, Italy. During the last week of June, 2012, this document became publicly available. Bishop Alfonso de Galarreta, was the Society's chairman for the Rome-SSPX commission in charge of the theological discussions, and although his remarks were based on a proposal which has undergone some revisions, these reflections remain most current.

To limit myself to the "Preliminary Note" and "doctrinal Preamble", I must immediately state that they are confusing, misleading, false and essentially bad. Even the apparent openness to criticism of the Council is enigmatic and cunning, a well-trained trap ("... legitimate (?) discussion . . . expressions or formulations . . . as "interpretive criteria of necessary Catholic doctrine...", that is to say, according to the "Preamble" II and III, 2, especially the end). This document is substantially unacceptable. It is worse than the 1988 Protocol, in particular in relation to the Council and the post-conciliar magisterium.

Archbishop Lefebvre: *Our true believers, those who understand the problem and we have just helped to continue the straight and firm and the Tradition of faith, feared the steps I made in Rome. They told me it was dangerous and that I was wasting my time. Yes, of course, I hoped until the last minute in Rome has to testify a little bit of loyalty. You can not blame me for not doing the maximum. So now, those who say to me, you must agree with Rome, I can safely say that I went even farther than I should have stayed. (Fideliter no. 79, p. 11).*

Fideliter: *What do you think of the statement of Cardinal Ratzinger establishing an oath of fidelity and that includes a profession of faith?*

Archbishop Lefebvre: *Firstly, there is the Creed which poses no problems. The Creed has remained intact. And, so the first and second sections raise no difficulties either. They are well-known things from a theological point of view. It is the third section which is very bad. What it means in practice is lining up on what the bishops of the world today think. In the preamble, besides, it is clearly indicated that this third section has been added because of the spirit of the Council. It refers to the Council and the so-called Magisterium of today, which, of course, is the Magisterium of the followers of the Council. To get rid of the error, they should have added, "...insofar as this Magisterium is in full conformity with Tradition."*

As it stands this formula is dangerous. It demonstrates clearly the spirit of these people with whom it is impossible to come to an agreement. It is absolutely ridiculous and false, as certain people have done, to present this Oath of Fidelity as a renewal of the Anti-Modernist Oath suppressed in the wake of the Council. All the poison in this third section which seems to have been made expressly in order to oblige those who have rallied to Rome to sign this profession of Faith and to state their full agreement with the bishops. It is as if in the times of Arianism one had said, "Now you are in agreement with everything that all the Arian bishops think."

No, I am not exaggerating. It is clearly expressed in the introduction. It is sheer trickery. One may ask oneself if in Rome they didn't mean in this way to correct the text of the protocol. Although that protocol is not satisfactory to us, it still seems too much in our favor in Article III of the Doctrinal Declaration because it does not sufficiently express the need to submit to the Council.

And so, I think now they are regaining lost ground. They are no doubt going to have these texts signed by the seminarians of the Fraternity of St. Peter before their ordination and by the priests of the Fraternity, who will then find themselves in the obligation of making an official act of joining the Conciliar Church.

Differently from in the Protocol, in these new texts there is a submission to the Council and all the Conciliar bishops. That is their spirit and no one will change them. (Fideliter, no. 70, p. 16).

Fideliter: *Do you think the situation has deteriorated further since you had the conversations that led to the drafting of the Protocol of 5 May 1988?*

Archbishop Lefebvre: *Oh yes! For example the fact of the profession of faith which is now claimed by Cardinal Ratzinger since the beginning of 1989. This is a very serious matter. Because it asks all those who joined or could do to make a profession of faith in the documents of the Council and the post-conciliar reforms. For us it is impossible. (Fideliter No. 79, p. 4).*

PRINCIPLE OF JUDGMENT

In fact it fits perfectly with the thought and the Roman position **that the Commission has expressed all along in the doctrinal discussions. It is essential to the current issue to bear in mind the unmistakable conclusion that we just made on this occasion: they are not ready to give up the Vatican II Council, nor the liberal doctrines of it, and their intention, their obvious desire, is to bring us back to it.** At most, Rome would accept a rebalancing and a better wording (formulation), again as part of the "hermeneutic of renewal in continuity". And then we can discuss and we are very useful . . . to endorse the revival of the reform with continuity.

AGREEMENT IMPOSSIBLE

The proposed document does confirm that it is illusory and unrealistic to believe that we could reach a pragmatic agreement, appropriate and warranted, and even just acceptable to both parties. Given the circumstances, it is certain that at the end, after long discussions, we arrive at absolutely nothing. So, why would we get involved?

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

Following the Roman proposal, the real question, crucial, is: should we, can we, we take the path of a "possible" practical agreement first? Is it prudent and appropriate to maintain contacts with Rome leading to such an agreement?

As far as I am concerned, the answer is clear: we must refuse this path because we cannot do something evil so that a good (a good which is, moreover, uncertain) can come from it, and also because this would necessarily bring about evils (very certain) for the common good that we possess, namely that of the Society and of the family of Tradition.

The following summarizes some of the reasons for my point of view:

I. OBEY WHOM, WHAT?

How to submit and obey authorities who continue to think, to preach, and to govern by modernists? We have goals and purposes contrary, even different ways, how to work under them? The problem is not the subjective intentions, but objective, clear, the observation that we have just made their desire: Vatican II, acceptance of the Council and its liberal principles. Essentially nothing has changed, there is no "return".

***Archbishop Lefebvre:** Such things are easy to say. To stay inside the Church, or to put oneself inside the Church - what does that mean? Firstly, what Church are we talking about? If you mean the Conciliar Church, then we who have struggled against the Council for twenty years because we want the Catholic Church, we would have to re-enter this Conciliar Church in order, supposedly, to make it Catholic. That is a complete illusion. **It is not the subjects that make the superiors, but the superiors who make the subjects.** (Fideliter No. 70, p. 6)*

I don't think it is a true return to Tradition. Just as in a fight when the troops are going a little too far ahead one holds them back, so they are slightly putting the brakes on the impulse of Vatican II because the supporters of the Council are going too far. Besides, these theologians are wrong to get upset. The bishops concerned - the supposedly conservative bishops - are wholly supportive of the Council and of the post-Conciliar reforms, of ecumenism and of the charismatic movement. Apparently, they are being a little more moderate and showing slightly more traditional religious sentiment, but it does not go deep. The great fundamental principles of the Council, the errors of the Council, they accept them and put them into practice. That is no problem for them. On the contrary, I would go so far as to say that it is these conservative bishops who treat us the worst. It is they who would the most insistently demand that we submit to the principles of the Council. (Fideliter No. 70, p.12)

That was perfectly clear and it clearly shows their state of mind. For them there is no question of abandoning the New Mass. On the contrary. That is obvious. That is why what can look like a concession is in reality merely a maneuver to separate us from the largest number of faithful possible. This is the perspective in which they seem to be always giving a little more and even going very far. We must absolutely convince our faithful that it is no more than a maneuver, that it is dangerous to put oneself into the hands of Conciliar bishops and Modernist Rome.

It is the greatest danger threatening our people. If we have struggled for twenty years to avoid the Conciliar errors, it was not in order, now, to put ourselves in the hands of those professing these errors. (Fideliter No. 70, p. 13-14)

II. INTERFERENCE WITH THE CONFESSION OF FAITH

How then does this not go against the defense and public confession of faith, against the public need to protect the faithful and the Church? In this regard, if we make a purely practical agreement we are, in the present circumstances, already engaging in duplicity and ambiguity. The very fact is a public testimony and a message: we cannot be in "full communion" with the authorities who remain modernists.

We cannot ignore the context either, that is to say, events and constant teachings in the life of the Church today: repeated visits to Protestant churches and synagogues, beatification (soon to be canonized) of John Paul II, Assisi III, preaching religious liberty time and time again, and a long etcetera. Moreover, if we make an agreement we will lose freedom of speech, we must mute our public criticism of the facts, the authorities and even some texts of the Council and the post-conciliar magisterium. To understand and illustrate the points I and II, just look what happened with all the ralliers (those who were won over or those who rejoined) from The Fraternity of St. Peter to the Institute of Good Shepherd: They are inevitably confronted with the choice to surrender or betray their commitments ... and this is the first thing that happens.

***Fideliter:** When we see that Dom Gerard and the Fraternity of St. Peter got to keep the liturgy and catechism, no - they say - they have conceded nothing, some who are troubled to find themselves in difficult situations with Rome, may be tempted to join the long turn by lassitude. "They come well, they say, to agree with Rome without having abandoned anything."*

***Archbishop Lefebvre:** When they say they did not give up, it's wrong. They abandoned the ability to counter Rome. They can not say anything. They must remain silent given the favors granted to them. They are now unable to denounce the errors of the conciliar Church. Slowly they join, if only by the profession of faith that is requested by Cardinal Ratzinger. I think Dom Gerard is about to publish a little book written by one of his monks, on religious freedom and that will try to justify it. (Fideliter No. 79, p. 4-5)*

***Fideliter:** Since the consecrations there is more contact with Rome, however, as you told, Cardinal Oddi called you saying: "We need things work out. Just a little gesture on your part, a little request for forgive-ness and everything will be settled." So why not try this last approach and why you think it impossible?*

***Archbishop Lefebvre:** It is absolutely impossible in the current climate of Rome which is becoming worse. We must not delude ourselves. The principles that guide the conciliar Church are now more and more openly contrary to Catholic doctrine.*

Before the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, Cardinal Casaroli said recently: "I wish to dwell a little on a specific aspect of the fundamental freedom of thought and act according to conscience, therefore freedom of religion... The Catholic Church and her Supreme Pastor, who has made human rights one of the major themes of his preaching, did not fail to recall that in a world made by man and for man, the whole organization of society has meaning insofar as it makes the human dimension of central concern." Hear it in the mouth of a cardinal! It is not what God says!

For his part Cardinal Ratzinger, by presenting a document on the relationship between the Magisterium and theologians, affirms, he says "for the first time with clarity" that "decisions of the Magisterium cannot be the last word on the matter as such" but "a kind of interim arrangement... The core remains stable but the particular aspects which have an influence on the circumstances of time may need further corrections. In this regard it may be noted the declarations of the popes of the last century. Anti-modernist decisions have done a great service... but they are now outdated." And now, the page of modernism is turned! These reflections are absolutely insane. Finally the Pope is more than ever ecumenist. All the false ideas of the Council continue to flourish, to be reaffirmed with ever greater clarity. They hide less. It is therefore absolutely inconceivable that we can agree to work with a hierarchy like this. (Fideliter No. 79, p. 3-4)

***Fideliter:** You said, pointing to Dom Gerard and others: "They betrayed us. Now they give up to those who demolish the church, the Liberals, the modernists. " Is not that a bit harsh?*

***Archbishop Lefebvre:** But no. They appealed to me for fifteen years. It's not me who went to pick them. It is they themselves who came to me and ask for support, for ordinations, the friendship of our priests along with the opening of our priories to help financially. They all used us as they could. We did it with a good heart and even generously.*

I was pleased to make these ordinations, to open our homes so they can benefit from the generosity of our benefactors... And then, suddenly, I phone: we no longer need you, it's over. We will go to the Archbishop of Avignon. We are now in agreement with Rome. We signed a protocol.

It is not from gaiety from heart that we had difficulties with Rome. It is not for pleasure that we had to fight. We did it for principles, to keep the Catholic faith. And they agreed with us. They collaborated with us. And then suddenly they abandon the real fight to ally with wreckers under the pretext that they are given a few privileges. This is unacceptable. They have virtually abandoned the fight of faith. They cannot attack Rome.

This was true also of Fr. de Blignières. He changed completely. He who had written a whole volume to condemn religious freedom, he now writes in favor of religious freedom. This laugh is not serious. We can no longer count on men like these, who did not understand the doctrinal question. I think in any case they commit a grave error. They have gravely sinned by acting as they did, knowingly and with an implausible casualness. (Fideliter No. 79, p. 6)

III. THE DOCTRINAL QUESTION, THE ESSENTIAL

We must look at the context in which they intend to incorporate us. An agreement is, like it or not, we integrate into their system in a thinking and reality data that do not depend on us but who depend on their thinking, their theology and their action. And this is how they will be presented (see Campos, text signed by Mgr. Licinio).

But we have just seen in doctrinal discussions what is their design: pure modernism revised and corrected. In particular there will be implied that we would accept three principles implicitly:

1. Relativism of truth, even dogmatic, need for pluralism in the Church. For them we have the experience and charisma of Tradition, good and useful to the Church, but only partial truth. Their system and modernist dialectic (claiming the contrary) allows them to integrate us in the name of "unity in diversity", as a positive and necessary element, provided we are in full communion (obedience to authority and respect for others and ecclesial realities) and that we remain open to dialogue, always looking for the truth. Proof of this is that they are ready to accept after the statement, both sides, a doctrinal opposition to faith - real and essential. How implicitly accept this principle, by explicit integration in their system and the official interpretation they give, then it is the foundation of modernism and is destructive of all natural and supernatural truth? It is accepting the relativism of Tradition, the only true faith.
2. Can be interpreted in accordance with any Vatican II Tradition. We can help find, if necessary, the "right" interpretation. This is the "hermeneutic of continuity". "The hermeneutic of rupture" (while it is true) must be rejected, because neither teaching nor the major post-conciliar Vatican II have been mistaken. After the discussions and the proposed document, it is only too clear, they would accept us as part of the first and reject the second. This is Vatican II endorsement.

Archbishop Lefebvre: *Then Rome's replies to our objections which we sent to Rome through intermediaries all tended to demonstrate that there was no change, but just continuity of Tradition. These statements are worse than those of the Council's Declaration on Religious Liberty. It is truly officialdom telling lies.*

So long as in Rome they stay attached to the ideas of the Council: religious liberty, ecumenism, collegiality . . . they are going the wrong way. It is serious because it results in practical consequences. That is what justifies the Pope's visiting Cuba. The Pope visits or receives in audience Communist leaders who are torturers or assassins, or who have Christians' blood on their hands, just as if they were as honest as normal men. (Fideliter No. 70, p.10)

3. The truth of faith is changing, as dogmas, formulas and dogmatic definitions of faith are only significant approaches to the mysteries of faith. The core remains, everything else evolves with time, culture, historical circumstances, experience and the experience of God's people. Therefore Tradition is alive, Tradition is Vatican II, and condemnations of liberalism and modernism are exceeded.

Archbishop Lefebvre: *That is why they wanted Vatican II to be a pastoral council and not a dogmatic council, because they do not believe in infallibility. They do not want a definitive Truth. The Truth must live and must evolve. It may eventually change with time, with history, with knowledge, etc., ...whereas infallibility fixes a formula once and for all, it makes - stamps - a Truth as unchangeable. That is something they can't believe in, and that is why we are the supporters of infallibility and the Conciliar Church is not. The Conciliar Church is against infallibility - that's for sure and certain.*

Cardinal Ratzinger is against infallibility. The pope is against infallibility by his philosophical formation. Understand me rightly! - We are not against the pope insofar as he represents all the values of the Apostolic See which are unchanging, of the See of Peter, but we are against the pope insofar as he is a modernist who does not believe in

his own infallibility, who practices ecumenism. Obviously, we are against the Conciliar Church which is virtually schismatic, even if they deny it. In practice, it is a Church virtually excommunicated because it is a Modernist Church. We are the ones that are excommunicated while and because we wish to remain Catholic, we wish to stay with the Catholic Pope and with the Catholic Church - that is the difference. (Fideliter No. 70, p. 8).

But specifically, we are not in the same truth. For them the truth is progressive, the truth changes with time, and Tradition: Vatican II is today. Tradition for us is what the Church has taught since the apostles to the present. For them, no, it's tradition Vatican II resumes itself all that was said earlier. Historical circumstances are such that now we must believe that Vatican II did. This has happened before, here no longer exists. It belongs to the time spent. That is why the Cardinal did not hesitate to say "The council is an anti-Vatican II Syllabus." One wonders how a Cardinal of the Holy Church can say that the Council of Vatican II is an anti-Syllabus, very official act of Pope Pius IX encyclical Quanta Cura in. It is unimaginable. I said one day to Cardinal Ratzinger: "Eminence, it is necessary that we choose: either religious freedom as in the Council, or the Syllabus of Pius IX. They are contradictory and should be chosen. Then he told me: "But my Lord we are not at the time of the Syllabus." - Ah! I said, then truth changes with time. So what you say Today?, Tomorrow it will no longer true. There is no way to agree, it is in continual evolution. It becomes impossible to speak."

They have that in mind. He repeated: "There is more than a church is the Church of Vatican II. Represents Vatican II-Tradition." Unfortunately, the Church opposes Vatican II Tradition. This is not the same. (Fideliter No. Occasional - 29 to 30 June, p. 15)

Certainly the question of the liturgy and the sacraments is important, but it is not the most important. The most important question is the question of the Faith. This question is unresolved in Rome. For us it is resolved. We have the Faith of all time, the Faith of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, of the Catechism of St. Pius X, hence the Faith of the Church, of all the Church Councils, of all the Popes prior to Vatican II.

For years they tried to Rome to show that everything in the Council was fully compliant with Tradition. Now they are discovered. Cardinal Ratzinger had never spoken with such clarity. There is no tradition. There is more deposition to be transmitted. Tradition in the Church, that is what the Pope said today. You must submit to what the Pope and the bishops said today. For them this is the tradition, the famous living tradition, the only ground of our condemnation.

Now they no longer seek to prove that what they say is consistent with what was written by Pius IX, what was promulgated by the Council of Trent. Now all this is over, it is passed, says Cardinal Ratzinger. It is clear and they could have said so sooner. It was not worth us speaking about, discussing. Now is the tyranny of authority, because there is no longer any rule. We can no longer refer to the past.

In a sense the thing is now becoming clearer. They always give us more reason. We deal with people who have a different philosophy than ours, another way of seeing, which are influenced by all philosophers and modern subjectivists. For them there is no fixed truth, there is no dogma. Everything is changing. This is an absolutely Masonic design. This is really the destruction of faith. Fortunately, we, we continue to build on Tradition! (Fideliter, no. 79, p. 9)

The Pope desires unity outside the faith. It is a communion. Communion to whom? What? What? It is no longer a unity. This can be done only in the unity of the faith. This is what the Church has always taught. Why there were the missionaries, to convert to the Catholic faith. Now you must not convert. The Church is no longer a hierarchical society, it is a communion. Everything is distorted. It is the destruction of one notion of the Church, Catholicism. This is very serious and this explains why many are Catholics who abandon the faith. (Fideliter, no. 79, p. 8)

THE REAL BATTLE IS DOCTRINAL

In all revolutions, after "the fury" and "the terror" there is a time of consolidation in the new situation, a period of institutionalization. On the other hand it is foreseeable that, if returned there, it is gradual. So we know in advance that there will be phases - more confusing: next to a best in practice and perhaps the intention, a little more order (all relative to the worst) there will necessarily worsen over the clarity of things, the error will be misleading, and seductive, less obvious and more subtle, in short, much more dangerous . . . able to deceive even the elect. The error is more ambiguous and dangerous when it collects more to the truth, such as counterfeit currency.

So we know in advance that our struggle and our position will be less and less understood, more difficult to explain, justify and maintain. Things will necessarily evolve like that: it is necessary to a proper response from us, so to speak, inversely proportional to the confusion.

The three reasons cited above show that we are in this phase of a false restoration, of a false return. The attitude of the Pope and the Roman Curia, much more confused, contradictory, seductive and has the appearance of Tradition. One must distinguish the good aspects of the current pontificate, incidental or occasional, education

and leadership doctrine. But our fight is doctrinal. This is the field of doctrine that is played in victory or defeat of faith and therefore of all church property.

Cardinal Pie: *One would think that some men do not want some order in the facts as to revive the disorder with impunity in their minds, and they require some physical security in the sky that to have the right to again, without too much danger, the old fabric of their lies for a moment interrupted by fear? Fools, for not yet understood that it is ultimately the field of doctrine that is won or lost the battles that decide the future! No, a whole portion of society can not keep it longer this attitude in which we are still condemned to painting: the pen still in hand to teach the same principles, under arms for exterminate the consequences down the happy evening in the street to shoot the acts caused by the doctrines and by the examples in the morning. Contradiction constantly renewed, and that will continue only so long as men who have some authority and some influence over their fellows, sincerely embrace the Christian truth and practice. (Works, Vol. II, p. 170-171)*

Fideliter: *Cardinal Oddi recently declared, "I'm convinced that the division shall not last long, and that Archbishop Lefebvre shall soon be back in the Church of Rome." Others say that the Pope and Cardinal Ratzinger feel that the "Lefebvre affair" is not closed. In your last letter to the Holy Father, you declared that you were waiting for a more propitious time for the return of Rome to Tradition. What do you think of a possible re-opening of the dialogue with Rome?*

Archbishop Lefebvre: *We do not have the same outlook on a reconciliation. Cardinal Ratzinger sees it as reducing us, bringing us back to Vatican II. We see it as a return of Rome to Tradition. We don't agree; it is a dialogue of death. I can't speak much of the future, mine is behind me, but if I live a little while, supposing that Rome calls for a renewed dialogue, then, I will put conditions. I shall not accept being in the position where I was put during the dialogue. No more.*

I will place the discussion 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, Immortale Dei and Libertas of Leo XIII, Pascendi Gregis of Pius X, Quas Primas of Pius XI, Humani Generis of Pius XII? Are you in full communion with these Popes and their teachings? Do you still accept the entire Anti-Modernist Oath? Are you in favor of the social reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ? If you do not accept the doctrine of your predecessors, it is useless to talk! As long as you do not accept the correction of the Council, in consideration of the doctrine of these Popes, your predecessors, no dialogue is possible. It is useless." Thus, the positions will be clear. The stakes are not small. We are not content when they say to us, "You may say the traditional Mass, but you must accept the Council." What opposes us is doctrine; it is clear. (Fideliter, No. 66, p. 12-14)

IV. ENTRY INTO CONTRADICTION

To move towards a practical agreement would be to deny our word and our commitments to our priests, our faithful, and Rome in front of everyone. This would have hugely negative consequences ad intra and ad extra. There is no change in the doctrinal point of view from Rome that would justify ours. On the contrary, the discussions have shown they will not accept anything in our criticisms. It would be absurd for us to go in the direction of a practical agreement after the result of discussions and findings. Otherwise, one would think that Msgr. Rifan and Father Aulagnier were right. Such an approach would show a serious diplomatic weakness on the part of the Fraternity, and indeed, more than diplomatic. It would be a lack of consistency, honesty and firmness, which would have effects like loss of credibility and moral authority we enjoy.

V. IMPLOSION OF THE FRATERNITY

The mere fact of going down this path will lead us to doubt, dispute, distrust, parties, and especially division. Many superiors and priests have a legitimate problem of conscience and will oppose it. Authority and the very principle of authority will be questioned, undermined. We cannot join the caravan [***aller a la remorque*] in our contacts with Rome, we must keep the commands, mark the time and conditions. So we need a line defined in advance, clear and firm, independent of stress and possible Roman maneuvers. Accordingly, it is not the moment to change the decision of the Chapter of 2006 (no practical agreement without resolving the doctrinal issue) and it is not right or prudent to embark on preparing minds otherwise, before there is in us the conviction, consensus and the decision to change, otherwise it will only cause division and, by reaction, squabbling, anarchy.

*** Note on Translation: "Aller à la remorque" means to passively follow somebody. In this context : "We cannot be passive in our contacts with Rome."*

VI. CAUTION ALLOWED

The warning of RP Ferrer, secretary of the Cardinal Cadizares: "Do not agree with Rome, she cannot keep her promises to you." We received other warnings similar to Rome. KEEP THE LINE.

So what to do, what to say? What we have better to do this is to keep the line that has ensured the cohesion and survival of the Fraternity and gave lots of fruits vis-à-vis Rome to the Church. They hesitate, they begin to cede that their building is collapsing, they can not live without us... Remain steadfast in our policy and expect that there are clear conditions secure and guaranteed. As reported Archbishop Lefebvre after the consecrations, it will be, unfortunately, the situation worsens at home ... until they are ready to abandon Vatican II. We could answer that views the outcome of the discussions, for faithfulness and loyalty to God, to our consciousness, even to the Church and to the Holy See, we can not engage in a practical way first, but as we have already said, we remain open to cooperate or participate in a study and doctrinal criticism of the Council.

FOLLOW PROVIDENCE

If, then, they cut off contact with us, the consequent break in the constant tension that these contacts mean for the Society would be welcome, and in my view also providential. In any case, knowing them, they will not wait long before talking with us again.

In conclusion, we must not get ahead of Providence; it is she who will solve the crisis. We must be very careful about the temptation sub specie boni (under the appearance of good) , avoid the rush, wait, and only go down that path when there will be no one doubts that Rome (the Pope) wants the Tradition, they have a fair idea of it, it is prudent and that it is the will of God. We need more reasons to change that line to stay in safe and proven that we have. However, the opposite happens.

Archbishop Lefebvre: *Without dwelling on the fact that many things were not, the focus was on the high expectations that give rise to the charismatic and Pentecostal. In Rome, they want to be convinced of that. They stubbornly closed their eyes to the catastrophe of the Council and they are trying to accomplish, on the ruin to which they are currently leading the Church. And they want us to enter into this current. If we take a step in that direction, if we submit to authority without warranty, more or less long term, two, three or five years, we will lose the tradition. But we do not want to lose it. **We therefore can not submit ourselves to authorities who want us to lose Tradition.** As I have already stated, if I went to Rome to discuss, it is because I wanted to try to see if we could reach agreement with the ecclesiastical authorities, while putting us away from their liberalism and safeguarding Tradition. Force me has been clear that no agreement could be reached that gives us both warranties and the belief that Rome wanted to sincerely contribute to the preservation of tradition. I waited until June 5 to write to the Pope: "I'm sorry, but we can not hear us. You do not have the same goal as us. By this access, your goal is to bring us back to the Council. Mine is rather to be able to maintain outside the Council and its influences." (Fideliter no.68, p 15)*

BEWARE OF DANGER!

For the good of the Fraternity and Tradition, "Pandora's box" must be closed as quickly as possible, to avoid the stigma and the demolition of the authority, disputes, dissensions and divisions, perhaps with no return. In this sense, the real question that needs answering is: what are the other requirements, ad intra and ad extra, in the case of a hypothetical "good" proposal, completely acceptable in itself, for us to try to make an agreement? The authorities cited by Archbishop Lefebvre allow us to answer them with clarity and firmness.

+Bishop Alfonso de Galarreta