

**“Advenientem Prelaturam?”**

Perhaps the murmured Personal Prelature proposed to the SSPX is part of a “practical” turn around for Catholic Tradition towards its claudication to Modern Rome. In fact, the *Year of Mercy* - for the celebration of 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Second Vatican Council - is one more step towards a canonical regularization in lifting the *suspension ad divinis* in a “practical way” of those SSPX priests, who were ordained by an excommunicated bishop from June 30<sup>th</sup>, 1988, to January 21<sup>st</sup>, 2009, without an individual statement of forgiveness. Indeed, there are many priests seduced by a legalistic attitude. With their guilty conscience, they think to be excluded out of the Official Church, so that lacking *the stamp of the Visible Church* they make-believe to be reconciled with It. So, is Catholic Tradition only part of the Ecumenical Industry, as Pope Francis wants us to work it out by surrounding?

For Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre the salvation of souls was his primary aim, insofar Canon Law is concerned – *Summa Lex salus animarum* [the supreme law is the salvation of souls]. As the Church weakens, that aim is undermined. As Vatican II spreads its pastoral approach – even more with that madness of the New Evangelization – the Church’s visible structure shakes with a change that is yet fully calculated. As Catholic Episcopacy waivers and betrays to any line of doctrinal reasoning, the saving of the souls in ordinary life becomes less of a possibility. That’s why the Archbishop looking at the crumbling Church’s foundation stated: *“Well, we find ourselves in the same situation. We must not be under any illusions. Consequently, we are in the thick of a great fight, a great fight. We are fighting a fight guaranteed by a whole line of Popes. Hence, we should have no hesitation or fear, hesitation such as, ‘Why should we be going on our own? After all, why not join Rome, why not join the Pope?’ Yes, if Rome and the Pope were in line with Tradition, if they were carrying on the work of all the Popes of 19<sup>th</sup> and the first part of 20<sup>th</sup> century, of course. But they, themselves, admit that they have set out on a new path. They, themselves, admit that a new era began with Vatican II. They admit that it is a new stage in the Church’s life, wholly new, based on principles. We need not argue the point. They say it themselves. It is clear. I think that we must drive this point home with our people, in such a way that they realize their oneness with the Church’s whole history, going back well beyond the Revolution. Of course, it clearly is the fight of the City of Satan and the City of God. So we do not have to worry. We must after all trust in the grace of God.”* (We must not waiver, conference to priests, September 6, 1990)

In 2006 it certainly was straight in one direction to speak that in approaching the Conciliar Church a doctrinal agreement was imperative needed versus a “canonical” agreement. Moreover, in 2007 it was engaged that vicious distinction between *Ordinary and Extra-Ordinary Rite of celebrating “Catholic Mass.”* In addition, two years later with the lifting of the “excommunication of the SSPX bishops,” not only the clergy but also the laity, we were corned as to be “in No Full Communion with Rome.” Then, there came the events of 2012...

There were twenty-two years after the death of Archbishop Lefebvre that the SSPX’s leadership showed up their vacillating attitude in defending Tradition as the Archbishop did throughout his life, in particular during his episcopacy. Hence, their General Counsel openly communicated through the General Superior’s voice: *“... In order to understand clearly the course that we are charting in this situation, it seems to us advisable to provide you with few considerations and observations: 1) Our principle position: the faith first and foremost: we intend to remain Catholic and to that end, to preserve the Catholic faith first of all; 2) The situation in the Church may oblige us to perform acts of prudence relative and corresponding to the concrete situation. The Chapter in 2006 set forth a very clear line of conduct in matters concerning our situation with respect to Rome. We give priority to the faith, without seeking from our part a practical solution BEFORE the doctrinal question is resolved.*

*“This is not a principle but a line of conduct that should regulate our action....* (Bishop Fellay, Letter to the SSPX members, March 18, 2012).

It was openly clear that a shifting and a change of attitude were lurked within the leadership. As a matter of fact, three of the bishops were much concerned about it, in such of an extent that they had sent a united letter

on April 3<sup>rd</sup> to address their due concerns. The response from the General Counsel went shamelessly belligerent and in accordance to the new line of conduct that should regulate their actions. Therefore, Bishop Fellay, representing the whole SSPX *de jure and de facto*, handed formally out to the authorities in the Conciliar Church a doctrinal Declaration, as a step forward for reconciliation, which their essential elements are not of Archbishop's standards. Soon after, the SSPX US-District Headquarter publicly released a video recording performed by the CNS interviewing Bishop Fellay in Switzerland, which conveyed somehow the matters of the famous doctrinal preamble given by Pope Ratzinger. It was a psychological *coup d'état* within their ranks!

Among others subjects, the preamble contained a proposal of Canonical Regularization for the clergy and religious members, in order to be "in full communion with Rome." It has nothing to do with the laity. It is a legal structure within the Church in regards to Canon Law – Personal Prelature. Let us see where is rooted so that we can perceive the danger in which is leading such a proposal.

Personal Prelatures were an inspiration during the sessions of the Second Vatican Council in no. 10 of the "Presbyterorum ordinis," on December 7<sup>th</sup>, 1965, and later Pope Paul VI installed this canonical instruction by the *motu proprio Ecclesiae Sanctae*, on August 6<sup>th</sup>, 1966. In 1983 John Paul II incorporated that ecclesiastical structure in the Canon Law as an ordinary way by the canons: c.294, with the right of incardination within it; c.295, to open seminaries and to promote students to holy orders; c.296, to enroll lay members; c.297, to define pastoral services with the local bishops, among others.

Thus, a Personal Prelature is a canonical structure of the Roman Catholic Church, which comprises a [prelate](#), [clergy](#) and [laity](#) who undertake specific pastoral activities. Such Prelature, similar to dioceses and military ordinariates, is under the governance of the Vatican's [Congregation for Bishops](#). Nevertheless, unlike [dioceses](#) which cover territories, Personal Prelature—like [military ordinariates](#)—takes charge of persons as regards to some objectives and regardless of where they live.

However, the 1983 code's philosophical approach is one of marked moderation and pastoral activities. As new Code, it proclaims an interpretation with a new habit of mind. Many people learned in Canon Law have little reservations about the changes in doctrine and moral adopted after the Vatican II Council. Some proponents of the New Code were antagonistic of the Old, as a juridical way of accomplishing discipline in the Church. Instead they imposed a new "spirit of the new canons." (Jordan F. Hite, Readings, Cases, Materials in Canon Law, 1990) The New Code should complement the new mind, the novel way of thinking or mindset of the Church since Vatican II (Canonist E. McDonough, A Novus Habitus Mentis For Sanctions in the Church, 1988) Therefore, to water down the principles of 1917 old Code in teaching doctrine and moral is a fundamental premise of 1983 Code, their authors hope for an approach based on the Christian Community. For them, Law is not necessarily the work of canonists and primates, but even more it is a reflection of the spirit of the [Modern] Church, as John Paul II said:

*"The instrument, which the Code is, fully corresponds to the nature of the Church, especially as it is proposed by the teaching of the Second Vatican Council in general and in particular way by its ecclesiological teaching. Indeed, in a certain sense this new Code could be understood as a great effort to translate this same conciliar doctrine and ecclesiology into canonical language. If, however, it is impossible to translate perfectly into canonical language the conciliar image of the Church, nevertheless the Code must always be referred to this image as the primary pattern whose outline the Code ought to express insofar as it can by its very nature..."* (JPII Apostolic Constitution, *Sacrae disciplinae leges*, AAS 75, 1983)

There is actually only one functioning Personal Prelature, namely, the Personal Prelature of the Holy Cross [former known as Opus Dei] erected by John Paul II in 1982 through the Apostolic Constitution *Ut sit* and it was ratified in 2002. Their members belong to the Modern system.

Consequently, what Catholic Tradition could expect for a canonical structure, which is rooted in the false teaching of Religious Liberty, Ecumenism, and Collegiality? Would such "Coming Prelature" be a Trojan Horse for the SSPX and Tradition?

Viva Cristo Rey!

Father Zendejas