

Aral Daniele - Casa de Nazareth  
P - 2495 Aljustrel FATIMA  
Tel. 00351.49.533112 (with fax)

July 12th 1992

Dr. Eberhard Heller  
Anna Dandler Str. 5/II  
D - 8000 München 60

Dear Mr. Heller,

Thank you very much for your letter of May 19th and for *Einsicht*.

As you can imagine it was very difficult to me to come to München and visit you as you suggested and I mentioned to be possible in mid June. The trip Rome-Fatima is long and my car was a bit overloaded.

Probably you are aware of the article on Mgr Thuc's consecrations in the American rev. *Sacerdotium* by Rev. Fr. Anthony Cekada. It is good to see that those episcopal consecrations are considered with more interest after Mgr Lefebvre's death. I remember their priests saying very often that we all should wait for a decision matured by the bishop's grace of state. I do believe that bishops receive for his function a special grace, but I am not sure that the bishops of our time know well what their function is. That is why we are still waiting for a full episcopal act in the Church in state of necessity.

I have visited last year Mons. Garmona in Acapulco and invited him to Fatima. Later on we visited Mons. Storck in Germany, where a friend of us, an American seminarist, went to finish his studies. Since then three bishops died. Yesterday I have received the news of Mgr Bravo's death few weeks ago in Mexico. R.I.P.

Allow me to return to some difficulties I have, specially regarding "Mons. Guérard's line". A faithful should recognize the true doctrine but also the valid authority who preaches it. In the Church this person have to be endorsed by a superior because all power comes from above. Now we know that P. Guérard asked for this "promotion" and that Mons. Thuc agreed to consecrate him for his qualities as a theologian, for his "thesis", that is bad doctrine: it ignores many points of the Magisterium regarding heretics and it raises a new episcopal dicotomy: A bishop may receive only the powers of Order, separated from the powers of jurisdiction, not for a time but *in radice*. This means a bishop only to continue the Sacraments, but at the same time with the power to choose and to consecrate another bishops. In short, an authority radically without any jurisdiction, but able to perform ecclesiastical acts which request a "roman mandate" of supreme jurisdiction.

Last month I have written to Fr. Cekada regarding this subject. I have send him copies of Mgr Guérard's declaration (special nº/dic.86 of *Einsicht*) also to the American Deacon, a friend of mine, who is about to be ordained by Mgr G. Storck. There are good reasons to think that this is not the intention of the Church regarding the plenitude of the Sacrament of Order.

The conditions above raise many questions: -The continuation of the Church could depend on the requests from priests to bishops to reach an higher state? -Could be borned to the Sacraments? If a vocation is necessary to become a priest, who can be sure by himself being called to become a bishop? And in this case, how can a faithful be assured that the good doctrine of this priest have been properly evaluated? -Could be solved avoiding the prioritarian need to restore the Papacy,

8343923

action over which all other depend to have a canonical justification?

In fact, it is right to say that "*Sede vacante nihil innovetur*", except for one thing: to renovate the person of the pope extinguishing the vacation. This is a must even if it is necessary to return to pure Divine Right, because it is of Divine Right.

I am joining to this our project of a *non possumus* towards the "conciliar hierarchy", based on the doctrine taught by the Bull *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio* of Pope Paul IV. -It is a lay's people witness not an episcopal declaration of Vacancy; -It is not a declaration made by a group in their magazine, but a declaration by a list of groups and publications to be publish in newspapers of Rome etc.; -It is not a new denunciation of errors and heresies, but a public statement about the acts which should follow a vacancy *de facto*; -It is not concerned with people's support, adherences or else, but to testify publicly a reality that conciliar bosses consider closed: "Their irreversibly take over of the Church": the present "mystery of iniquity".

In our *non possumus* we mention the words of Mgr Thuc as an example of what should be now the bishop's duty. Some friend ask me to do it in general without his name, as I initially put it, not to hurt people who have difficulty to accept his initiative. Conversely, there is no mention in favor of Mgr Lefebvre's 88 actions. On the contrary, it is said that even appealing to bishops afflicted by the changes obtained no reply. If the text is not clear please help me correcting it.

I ask you, Dr. Heller, if you know of any declaration of the kind published in regular newspapers in which case I ask you to send me a copy if possible. In 1987 we send around in Rome a pluri-signed "instance" to start saying what we "conclude" now by the *non possumus*. We were prepared to concluded it publicly in 88, if all the fuss made about the "case Lefebvre" would not monopolized the general attention.

I am not optimistic with practical results of this witnessing which I think will be a very displeasing experience for people living in Rome, but this is not the problem. The point is that it should be done by someone for a juridical and specially for a Christian reason, which consist in being counted, with all risks connected. I don't know how it is in München, in Rome the sedevacantism is non existent.

For the moment the groups, publications or persons supporting this initiative are two in Italy, our *Pro Roma Mariana* and the *Nuovo Osservatore Cattolico* of Turin, the groups of Dr.s Gerstner in Germany, the one of M.Denoyelle in Brussels, Prof.Tello who suggested Mr.Felix Sesma in Spain, Riv.*Roma* in Argentina and *Trento* in Bolivia. I am expecting some aswers from England, Belgium, Swizerland, France, South Africa, Australia, Brasil, America, Canada and maybe Japan. We are not worried with the number supporting it but with its representativeness.

I expect you to understand the meaning of our initiative and help us with your support and suggestions for a better text.

Wishing you and yours all the best, I remain, in union of prayers,  
very sincerely yours

*in Cordibus Jesu et Mariae et Joseph*



PS -We have this text translated in Italian, French and Portuguese.