

>From Blue Paper Year 7 # 300

“Pact of Silence is a virus for Tradition”

If there could be salvation outside Modern- Conciliar Church, then, is there salvation “outside SSPX” or other traditionalist groups?

As Catholics we are always compelled by necessity to have to choose between Truth and “obedience.” Moreover, a Catholic has no choice between practicing the dogma “*outside the Church there is no salvation*” and the present ecclesiastical orientation, which thinks and believes otherwise. To choose between the immemorial teaching of the Church, which says that schismatics and heretics are “outside the Catholic Church,” and the modern present ecclesiastical orientation, it has started with the spirit of the council (“Aggiornamento”). Such modernist spirit has continued nowadays by the New Evangelization’s fever, and being promoted by the attitude of “hermeneutic of continuity” in traditionalist groups.

In the conflict appearing between “obedience” and Truth, better-informed Catholics have chosen the Truth, as Archbishop Lefebvre stood for Tradition. In his thinking with the Church according to Tradition, the Archbishop’s *sensus fidei* manifested that only Truth will ensure union with the invisible Head of the Church, Jesus Christ Our Lord. Thus, he resisted the Post Vatican II ecclesiastical orientation [religious liberty, ecumenism, and collegiality], in order to remain in the one Church of Jesus Christ. He remained acting “within the Church and according to the Church,” resisting the new ecclesiastical tide in the measure that it attempts to distance from the doctrines or the practices of the Faith, kept and transmitted by the Catholic Church, and desiring without ever giving up, and in spite of many disappointments, that the union with the Vicar of Christ, can be re-established as soon as possible without having to compromise on any point of doctrine. No matter what, this is what he stood for!

Hence, the apparent conflict between “obedience” and Truth rests on AMBIGUITY. For instance, at the time of Vatican II, there were those ambiguous terms, which could be understood in one way by Catholics and in other way [in contradiction] by Modernists, like some post Conciliar prelates want to preach the “unity in diversity,” or like “silent apostasy but keeping the faith.” Certainly, deeds speak louder than words. In today’s official Church Pope Francis is an ultra Modernist prelate; he is a master of contrarities, like he is not against Catholic teaching but he is in favor of a humanistic world! As the same token, the ranks of traditional priests -in particular within the SSPX as back bone of Tradition- are being infected again with such a dilemma between Truth and “obedience,” to remark of our confusing time.

At the time of the Council, the teaching of novelties about humanism (man centered church) were opposed and then silenced by more or less honest means and men, but have since been installed in key positions in power during the post conciliar period, so that the new system DEMANDS today obedience to such “personal” orientations against the whole previous Magisterium of the Church.

In this perspective, the break between the unity of faith and a pretended temporary “unity of communion” with the hierarchy (to do what the council says, or to be with the Pope), who omits, keeps quiet or alters the doctrine received from God and transmitted by the Church, creates in the Church militant an “extraordinary” situation – a state of affairs that is neither ordinary nor regular. Is this a crisis of Faith? Or, is this a crisis of authority?

The normal and ordinary situation of the Holy Catholic Church is that the orientation, which is exteriorly commissioned to the hierarchy should favor, or at least not contradict, the orientation, which springs from the invisible Head –Our Lord Jesus Christ– and was given to the Church originally, and He continues to give through grace.

The conflict is between **the orientation** whose acceptance some strive to force and the Catholic sense of faithful; in other words, between **the direction** which is imposed on their government and the conscience that each and every bishop or priest should have of his mission in helping the salvation of souls.

In this “uneasiness” among the faithful, they find themselves attacked in their Faith by those very people who supposed to guide them, and so find themselves conscience-bound to resist those whom they would wish, in normal circumstances, to follow as Pastors, in particular Bishops.

We never would appreciate enough the great blessing of having Archbishop Lefebvre to lead the battle for the Faith! Here is a reminder of his Catholic instinct in regards to talk to Rome....

Among those words from the Vatican News on June 16, 1988, concerning the Protocol between Rome and the SSPX, there are those expressions *“to be used as a basis ... for reconciliation.”* Then, the Archbishop himself, as the SSPX as well, were committed *“to an attitude of study and of communicating with the Holy See, in avoiding all polemics on the subject of the points taught by Vatican II or with the reforms which followed and which they found difficult to reconcile with Tradition.”* This was clearly to be “a pact of silence,” no more critic to novelties and authority.

The bitter experience of post Vatican II years has proved that to argue “in an attitude of study and communicating” with the Roman hierarchy – even with different prelates with their temperaments and ecclesiastical understanding – has utterly been a drama, not only within the critical status of Catholic teaching throughout the world, but also in that declining of unity in teaching among bishops, priests, and faithful related to the SSPX structure.

In fact, the only foreseen result of the “agreement” was the reduction to silence of the unique, authorized and solid voice, which made itself heard at the time by Archbishop Lefebvre’s battle on behalf of Catholic Tradition, confronting such auto-demolition of the Church.

As we know, Tradition does not mean exterior customs, including Latin and rubrics. Indeed, Tradition conveys and transmits the TRUE REVELATION given to the Apostles by Our Lord Jesus Christ, in order to be kept with all its integrity and to be passed from generation to generation until the second coming of Our Blessed Lord. Saint Peter being the first Pope did defend such a Treasure and Deposit of Faith, until his martyrdom for Christ’s sake. As it was to Saint Peter’s duty, it must be with the actual Pope. Evidently, it is not the case of Pope Francis.

Catholic Tradition is not to be respected *“as a SSPX particular charisma,”* as Cardinal Gagnon himself stated during his official interview to the *Avvenire* on June 17, 1988, *“On our part [Roman part], we have always talked of reconciliation; Archbishop Lefebvre, on his part, of recognition. The difference is not small. Reconciliation implies that both parties will make an effort to recognize past errors. Archbishop Lefebvre wants only that it be declared that he was right all the time, and this is impossible.”*

In consequence, the Archbishop wanted not to be asked to recognize “errors” which he has not committed. His fight for the Treasure of the Faith should not ended with surrender, because it would mean that Tradition would be any longer part of the Truth Revealed by God – in Him there could be no change, He is eternal Truth.

For the Archbishop it was clear that talking to Rome was impossible so that “to collaborate” with a hierarchy that overturns into a “living Tradition” as a way of adapting Faith to the modern world, it could end – sooner or later – in some compromise or surrender, or at least some aiding and abetting in silence.

Unfortunately, this is the scenario in which many traditional priests and faithful are involved in our struggles of today’s defending Catholic Church. Needless to say that the real problem is still in Rome, within the *“official authorities in keeping the true faith, but not in safe guarding there administrative individual authority in a frame which looks in exterior order yet is diabolical disoriented.”*

In like manner, it has been after June 2012 SSPX General Chapter for traditionalist faithful (including priests and bishops). Along the three-year “theological discussions” all of us were told to keep silent. As a matter of fact, not only two SSPX bishops mostly wanted to keep silent but also very many priests want to remain exteriorly silent, and when circumstances made pressure they have chosen “obedience” instead of Truth. **So, modernist tendencies work as virus in our blood stream from the inside out, and from the heart to the head and then to the members.**

Was Archbishop Lefebvre right in dismissing the requirements of recognition? Could it be that his concept of Tradition is not as arbitrary as today’s superiors would like to assume? Could it be that Tradition as the simple transmission of the Deposit of Faith is not incomplete and contradictory at all?

He did not keep silent!

Viva Cristo Rey!

Father Zendejas