

Catholic Candle

▪ April 2016 ▪ catholiccandle.neocities.org ▪ catholiccandle@gmail.com

Some of us at Catholic Candle were part of the Resistance movement against Vatican II during the 1960s-'70s. There was a maxim then:

The Church is being destroyed (in Her human element) from the top (viz., by the pope, cardinals and bishops) and will be rebuilt from the bottom (viz., by priests and laymen).

In our April issue, we are honored to print two articles by Father Raphael, OSB. These articles demonstrate that he was formed in the same mold as Archbishop Lefebvre, standing up fearlessly against liberalism wherever he finds it. Father Raphael deserves our support —spiritual, moral and financial.

We Should Never Attend the New Mass

By Fr. Raphael, OSB (Prior, San José Monastery, Colombia)

We can see on the level of principle that the new mass is always evil since it is a fruit implementing the modernist heresy, and which ultimately ends in heresy.

But suppose someone were to say that the new mass is evil but he should attend it because he obtains some good fruits from it. This person would be claiming that there is a good and a bad effect and he attends the new mass despite the bad effect, in order to obtain the good effect. Such a person would be trying to justify his attendance at the new mass by invoking the *Principle of Double Effect* (also known as the *Principle of the Indirect Voluntary*).

Under this *Principle of Double Effect*, an action is permissible despite some bad effect if—and *only if*—the action fulfills *each* of four conditions. Otherwise the action must not be performed. These four conditions are:

1. There must be an *immediate necessity* to perform such an act;

2. The intention (of the person doing the act) must be to obtain the good effect and never to obtain the bad effect;
3. The good effect of the act must occur first or at least simultaneously with the bad effect; and
4. The good fruit of the act *must* be proportionally greater than the bad fruit.

Note. These four conditions *must all* be fulfilled for the act to be morally *good*. The lack of fulfillment of *even one* of these conditions makes the act *evil* and the act is therefore forbidden.

Applying these four conditions to assisting at the new mass, we can easily see that conditions one, three and four are not fulfilled.

The first condition is not fulfilled since a person could fulfill in his home the obligation to sanctify the Sunday, when there is no Tridentine Mass available. Moreover, mass and communion are never immediately necessary (or necessary at all) when they offend God—as does the new mass.

Catholic Candle note: Another example of a mass which offends God is a satanic mass.

The third condition is not fulfilled since the (purported) good effect directly flows from a cause which itself is evil, *viz.*, the heterodox “celebration” of the new mass. This is not a situation where two effects—one good and the other bad—both flow from one neutral cause. Instead, the new mass is itself the evil cause of the (purported) good effect and this evil occurs first and vitiates all which flows from it.

The fourth condition is also not fulfilled since the new rite is not Catholic and therefore endangers the Faith. It is objectively a sin against the First and Second Commandments (and other Commandments). Further, the end does not justify the means. One must choose death rather than commit a sin. Therefore there is no proportion between the evil of assisting at a new mass and the (supposed) good effect. This means *no one should ever attend the new mass*.

Lastly, a person might wrongly suppose that “there is some good part of the new mass” because the new mass contains the *Our Father* (*etc.*). But the new mass is evil in all cases and participating in any of its *parts is evil as they exist as parts of this evil whole*.

God is offended by mixing things that belong to Him, *e.g.*, the *Our Father*, with other things that belong to the devil, *e.g.*, the new mass. Thus, although reciting the *Our Father* is good

when this is done separated from everything conciliar, God is offended by reciting the *Our Father* as part of the sacrilegious new mass. This is like the fact that He is offended by reciting the *Our Father* as part of a (heretical) Lutheran service. (This is why Catholics are forbidden to participate in even this part of a Lutheran service.) We must stay away from the new mass and its parts.

I am obliged to speak out about this subject due to the gravity of the error now being publicly spread, which is scandalizing Catholics. This error betrays the truth in our battle for the defense of our Faith and the glory and honor of Christ the King.

—Fr. Raphael, OSB (Prior, Colombia)

Which Resistance Bishops and Priests *Really* Uphold Basic Traditional Catholic Principles?

The new mass is intrinsically evil and therefore no one should ever attend it. This is a basic Traditional Catholic principle, without which a person is not a *genuine* Traditional Catholic. How could it possibly be otherwise? The new mass is the principal liturgical embodiment of the new conciliar religion and expresses the core heresies and evils of this new religion.

Of course, we don't judge the *subjective culpability* of those who deny this principle (and who say a person should attend the new mass if it helps him). However, they are objectively wrong.

About ten months ago, Bishop Williamson made the scandalous and grave error of publicly telling a woman that she should attend the new mass if she felt it helped her.

At the time, few people publicly opposed his terrible error. We wondered which Resistance bishops and priests *really* resist liberalism and affirm the core Traditional Catholic principle that **no one should attend the new mass because it is inherently evil**. So we decided to ask them.

We wrote various Resistance bishops and priests to see how they would respond when asked about this principle. One of us personally wrote the following letter to each one:

Dear Father, [and to each bishop: "Your Excellency:"]

Happy and Holy Easter!

As you know, there has been quite a lot of controversy in the Resistance during the last nine months, based on the scandalous idea that a person should attend the new mass if he feels it helps him. That idea is completely opposed to our core Traditional Catholic principles.

I do not judge anyone's subjective culpability for what he does in ignorance. But Catholics simply state (as they should) that "no women should wear a bikini in public", without confusing the issue by talking about her state of mind. Likewise, it is true that no one should attend the new mass regardless of his possible lack of subjective culpability arising from ignorance.

In an effort to do the little I can to reassure Traditional Catholic souls looking for clarity (to make them confident that it is always bad to attend the new mass), I am writing to ask your help.

Please be so kind to affirm that you agree that:

No one should ever attend the new mass because it is inherently evil.

I would like this clarified for purposes of sharing your position (which is also my position) with others, to assure them that they are on the right track holding this core Traditional Catholic principle.

Thank you in advance!

Yours in our Risen Lord,

/sign/

We did not receive replies from some whom we wrote. So we sent a follow-up letter a week later, as follows:

Dear Father, [or Your Excellency:]

As you know, I wrote you a week ago (see below) asking you to assist in bringing clarity to a question much discussed among the Resistance laymen, *viz.*, attending (*i.e.*, participating) in the new mass. I hold that:

No one should ever attend the new mass because it is inherently evil.

For the love of our dear Lord's Mystical Body, and for the good of souls, please kindly respond!

Thank you very much, in advance!

In the Holy Faith,

/sign/

To those that did not answer the second email, we then sent a third email identical to the second email except noting the passage of another week.

We are glad to say that the following bishop and priests clearly affirmed that *no one should ever attend the new mass because it is inherently evil*:

- Bishop Thomas Aquinas, OSB (Prior, Santa Cruz Monastery, Brazil)
- Fr. Raphael, OSB (Prior, San José Monastery, Colombia)
- Fr. Pierre Marie, OP, Prior, on behalf of the 11 Dominican priests in Avrillé, France
- Fr. Edward MacDonald
- Fr. David Hewko
- Fr. Pierre Célestin Ndong
- Fr. Francois Chazal
- Fr. Valan D. Rajakumar
- Fr. Pio Suneel
- Fr. Fernando Altamira
- Fr. Ronald Ringrose
- Fr. Juan Ortiz
- Fr. Joseph Pfeiffer

- Fr. Ernesto Cardozo
- Fr. Richard Voigt
- Fr. Rene Trincado

Dear Reader, please understand that we are neither trad-ecumenists nor are we “taking a vote” to determine the truth regarding this core Traditional Catholic principle, *viz.*, that **no one should ever attend the new mass because it is inherently evil.**

A Catholic who is faithful to Tradition needs to beware of bishops and priests who do not hold this core principle, just like he needs to beware of those who deny that Pope Francis is our pope. Those two positions are *necessary but not sufficient* litmus tests for Traditional Catholicism. Those tests exclude bishops, priests and laymen who either are very confused or pernicious when they claim to be Traditional Catholic.

Regarding the priests on the list above, we are not asserting that they all agree with each other on everything or that they are all correct on every point. We are merely providing information to faithful Traditional Catholics identifying these priests as willing to plainly uphold the core Traditional Catholic principle that **no one should ever attend the new mass because it is inherently evil.**

Likewise, we want you, the Reader, to know which clergy claim to be faithful to Catholic Tradition but who refused to commit themselves to this core Traditional Catholic principle.

Bishop Williamson and Fr. Patrick Girouard both responded *refusing to take a stand* one way or the other. That reminds us of Our Lord’s warning: “I would thou wert cold or hot.” Apoc. 3:15. To those who are neither, Our Lord declares that He “will begin to vomit” them out of His Mouth. Apoc. 3:16.

How can a layman count himself as Traditional Catholic if he will not take a clear position on attending the new mass? Much more, how can a bishop or priest fail to commit himself? We must all be ready to affirm the plain truth whenever asked!

A person might wonder why Bishop Williamson would not commit himself since he wrote on December 13, 2014 that no one should attend the new mass:

Take for instance the **Novus Ordo Mass.** ... [I]t is as a whole *so bad that no priest should use it, nor Catholic attend it.* ... [I]f I say that *the new Mass must always be avoided, I am telling the truth* ...

Eleison Comments #387 (emphasis added).

Further, in a conference on the new mass, Bishop Williamson correctly stated:

The new mass is in any case illicit. ... If it [the new mass] is valid, illicit, may I attend? No. **I may no more attend a valid, illicit [new] mass than I may attend a satanic mass.**

<https://youtu.be/opMuVJcud7M?t=49s>—Listen at minutes 0:49 and 2:38.

In the past, Bishop Williamson also plainly stated that **the new mass is “intrinsically evil”**.
<https://youtu.be/opMuVJcud7M?t=1m5s>

But then on June 28, 2015, Bishop Williamson contradicted himself and publicly stated:

Do whatever you need to nourish your Faith. ... I would not say that every single person must stay away from every single novus ordo mass.

https://youtu.be/Ma9_10iVBik?t=1h1m

If Bishop Williamson’s first three statements are “hot” and his last one is “cold”, then they result in *lukewarm*. We had hoped to avoid this analysis of Bishop Williamson’s contradictory and scandalous words. If he would have been willing to take a Traditional Catholic stand, our plan was to help repair the damage he caused by simply printing his name on the list of Resistance bishops and priests who stand for the truth. Regrettably, he would not.

Besides the persons identified above, we asked Fr. Gerardo Zendejas to affirm this core Traditional Catholic principle that **no one should ever attend the new mass because it is inherently evil**. Over three weeks, Fr. Zendejas received our three requests in his email box (previously confirmed and tested). Fr. Zendejas also received our phone call and voice mail on his cell phone (previously confirmed and tested).

He did not respond.

Fr. Zendejas failing to respond for weeks, that he upholds this basic Traditional Catholic principle, reminds us of Our Lord’s words:

Every one therefore that shall confess me before men, I will also confess him before my Father who is in heaven. But he that shall deny me before men, I will also deny him before my Father who is in heaven.

Catholic Candle note:

The following open letter to Fr. Gerardo Zendejas is written by the Catholics at FatherThemannAnswered@gmail.com.

Previously, these Catholics have written five open letters to liberal leaders of the new-SSPX (the first letter was to Fr. Themann). These letters are posted at <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx.html>. Because those SSPX leaders were so plainly committed to the conciliar path, the authors did not first write those liberal leaders privately, because it would have been futile.

However, because Fr. Zendejas is in some way considered part of the Resistance to liberalism, one of the authors of this present open letter wrote him a letter privately and individually, three weeks ago, containing the same substance as the letter below.

This private letter pointed out Fr. Zendejas' liberal statements and expressed the hope that there was somehow just a misunderstanding. This letter to Fr. Zendejas was courteous, was sent to him as a courtesy and requested a response. He did not give the courtesy of any reply, even after receiving a follow-up call and voicemail.

It is our goal to inform those in the Resistance so they better understand Fr. Zendejas and avoid being influenced by his liberalism.

Open Letter to Fr. Gerardo Zendejas

From: The Catholics at Father.Themann.Answered@gmail.com

April 21, 2016
St. Anselm of Canterbury, Doctor of the Catholic Church

Dear Fr. Zendejas,

We are writing a letter whose contents we have long been turning over in our minds.

There is a great problem among the faithful because of the ambiguity and liberalism in your stance on the problems in the SSPX and regarding the principal errors of our time.

Perhaps you think you are being clear and uncompromisingly traditional. You are not.

We are writing to share with you a few representative examples (among countless others) of the ambiguity and liberalism with which you are roiling the faithful and the Resistance movement. We are writing in a constructive effort to help you see objectively what you are saying, with the constructive hope that you will publicly correct your liberal statements and will speak and write differently in the future.

For example, you say:

In the days of the Council, the teaching of novelties about humanism (man-centered Church) **were** [sic] **opposed and then silenced** by more or less honest means and men, but adherents thereof have since been installed in key positions of power during the post-Conciliar period, so that the new system DEMANDS obedience to such “personal” orientations against the whole previous Magisterium of the Church.

Blue Paper #300 [<https://thebluepaper.org/2015/11/17/the-blue-paper-no-300-the-pact-of-silence-a-virus-for-tradition/>] (bold emphasis added).

Your statement is false for at least four reasons:

- These novelties (about humanism and countless other things) were not silenced, as you say they were! The plain truth is that the council not only continued to teach error all the way to its end but that the council *especially* taught error at its end, since the conciliar documents were mostly approved and issued then.
- Also, it is false that the “adherents” to liberalism were only installed “since” the council. Very many were in positions of power during the council.
- Further, it is false to say their orientations are merely “personal” instead of also being programmatic and enshrined in the council’s official documents.
- You confuse real obedience with apparent (false) obedience.

To take a second example, you say:

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

Blue Paper #300 [<https://thebluepaper.org/2015/11/17/the-blue-paper-no-300-the-pact-of-silence-a-virus-for-tradition/>] (bold emphasis added).

Don't you see how wrong that first clause is? It is structured as a supposition contrary to fact! You are saying that there is no salvation outside the conciliar church!

In fact, the truth is not only that there “could be” salvation outside the conciliar church but that it is our duty to stay outside the conciliar church. As Archbishop Lefebvre declared:

It is, therefore, a strict duty for every priest wanting to remain Catholic to separate himself from this Conciliar Church for as long as it does not rediscover the Tradition of the Church and of the Catholic Faith.

Spiritual Journey, chapter 3.

Regarding the rest of your sentence, *viz.*:

then, is there salvation “outside SSPX” [sic] or other traditionalist groups?

We have no clue what you mean. Are you asking whether persons in the Resistance who are not part of a group, can save their souls? This meaning is suggested by your own comments that: “When you jump out of the [SSPX] boat, you swim by yourself. You did it. What are you doing? You're surviving!” Hear your words during your Oct. 26, 2014 YouTube conference. [<https://youtu.be/Fo-adx1j1fM?t=3m30s>]

If that is what you mean (in the *Blue Paper* #300 quote above), it is false and misleads the faithful by indicating that their salvation is more certain in the SSPX than “swimming” in the Resistance.

Or your unclear statement might be asking whether people in the conciliar church—*i.e.*, who are not in a traditionalist group—can save their souls. It is hard to say what you mean.

You make scandalous statements where you suggest that the problem with Vatican II is merely one of ambiguity. For example, you say:

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 another (contradictory) way by Modernists...

Blue Paper #300 [<https://thebluepaper.org/2015/11/17/the-blue-paper-no-300-the-pact-of-silence-a-virus-for-tradition/>] (the emphasis and parentheses are yours).

You are saying that Vatican II’s conflict with the truth is only an apparent conflict because of ambiguity. You talk here just like Cardinals Burke and Mueller who are conciliar revolutionaries! They lament the misunderstandings and lack of unity because of differences in understanding the council! Although there *is* much ambiguity in the documents of Vatican II, *why don’t you mention the very many plain errors that so pervade these documents?* One of many examples of plain conciliar errors is the error of religious liberty. [<http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/religious-liberty-vatican-ii.html>]

To take a fourth example, you say:

As Catholics we are always compelled by necessity to have to choose between Truth and “obedience.”

<https://thebluepaper.org/2015/11/17/the-blue-paper-no-300-the-pact-of-silence-a-virus-for-tradition/>

Here you use a classic tactic of the enemies of Catholic Tradition, *viz.*, to suggest there can *ever* be a contradiction between Truth and obedience.

Someone could wrongly suppose that your quotation marks around the word “obedience” show you mean *false* obedience. But that supposition is inconsistent with your usage in the same blue paper where you say that the conciliar hierarchy demands obedience (without quote marks) to Vatican II, and also where you say that:

the apparent conflict between “obedience” and Truth rests on
AMBIGUITY.

Blue Paper #300 [<https://thebluepaper.org/2015/11/17/the-blue-paper-no-300-the-pact-of-silence-a-virus-for-tradition/>] (emphasis in original).

If your quotation marks (around the word *obedience* immediately above) really indicated false obedience, then in this statement you would be wrongly saying that there is no real conflict between false obedience and the truth. In fact, truth and real obedience are always on the same side—against error and false obedience on the other side.

Because truth and real obedience are on the same side, as misleading as your statement is, you make it worse by saying that Catholics *always* must choose between truth and obedience! You are saying there is no occasion—at any time or in any situation—when truth and obedience go together!

To take a fifth example, you say:

[Archbishop Lefebvre was] desiring—in spite of many disappointments—that union with the Vicar of Christ can be re-established [sic] as soon as possible without having to compromise on any point of doctrine. No matter what, this is what he stood for!

Blue Paper #300. [<https://thebluepaper.org/2015/11/17/the-blue-paper-no-300-the-pact-of-silence-a-virus-for-tradition/>]

Your statement is false for at least two reasons:

1. Archbishop Lefebvre did not seek any “union” *as soon as possible*; and
2. Archbishop Lefebvre knew he lacked no true union with the Catholic Church.

1. Archbishop Lefebvre did not seek any “union” as soon as possible.

The only thing the Archbishop sought was that the hierarchy regained the Faith as soon as possible. His statement from *Spiritual Journey* (quoted above) proves this. Also, Archbishop Lefebvre was waiting for the conciliar churchmen to acknowledge Christ as King of all, by which those churchmen would join the True Church:

When we are asked when we will get an agreement with Rome, my answer is simple: when Rome re-crowns Our Lord Jesus Christ. We cannot agree with those who uncrown Our Lord. *The day they will acknowledge again that Our Lord is king of peoples and nations, this will not mean that they join us, but that they join the Catholic Church, in which we have always been.*

December 1988 Flavigny conference, *Fideliter* No. 68, March-April 1989.

2. Archbishop Lefebvre correctly held that there was no true problem nor lack of real union with the pope and the Catholic Church, but only disunion with the conciliar church.

As the Archbishop said:

In the Church, law and jurisdiction are at the service of the Faith, the primary reason for the Church. There is no law, no jurisdiction which can impose on us a lessening of our Faith.

Apologia Pro Marcel Lefebvre, by Michael Davies, vol. 1, p.151, quoting the 9-3-75 *Letter to friends and benefactors* #9.¹

So, as Archbishop Lefebvre correctly reasoned, he and his Society were not deprived of their *true union* with the pope because law and jurisdiction cannot be used to harm the Faith and the Society which was (supposedly) “suppressed” entirely because it stood almost alone defending the Faith.

Reverend Dr. Boyd A. Cathey, a canon lawyer, made this same point when he analyzed the SSPX’s canonical case and publicly defended Archbishop Lefebvre at the time. Father Cathey concluded his analysis as follows:

[T]he multiple irregularities and the obvious failure to render justice to Archbishop Lefebvre can only lead to one conclusion: *the Society of St. Pius X continues to enjoy canonical existence*; the measures taken against it and its founder lack validity.

Apologia Pro Marcel Lefebvre, vol. 1, p.450 (emphasis added).

Real union with the pope was always present—truly and essentially—because a modernist pope cannot destroy any faithful Catholic’s essential unity with the Church and Her vicar. Archbishop Lefebvre lacked unity with the conciliar church and *never wanted that unity*.² Therefore, *there was no unity that Archbishop Lefebvre wanted to re-establish*.

Lastly, regarding your errors in this fifth example, you say that Archbishop Lefebvre desired union without compromise. But as Archbishop Lefebvre correctly declares (above), there can *never* be any union with the conciliar church without compromise. This is another reason that what you claim in the quote about Archbishop Lefebvre is utterly false.

Father, you scandalize the faithful also by what you objectively say about the SSPX. For example, you only refer to the problems with the April 15, 2012 doctrinal declaration as being omission, although that document contains glaring *affirmative* errors as well. You say:

[W]e must be aware, and accordingly act to [sic], that **by omission a leadership can also be astray** [sic] from the Apostolic mark in the domain of doctrine, **as it was presented** [sic] **by Bishop Fellay’s declaration on April 15, 2012**. In fact, after his declaration Catholic Tradition has crumbling down [sic] instead of building it [sic] up in today’s tragedy [sic] in the Church, by going astray three more episcopal graces [sic]

Blue Paper #305 (emphasis added).

This false suggestion (that the problem with Bishop Fellay’s declaration is mere omission) fits your very weak criticism of that doctrinal declaration as “not of Archbishop’s standards”. Here are your words:

Bishop Fellay, representing the whole SSPX *de jure and de facto*, handed formally out [sic] to the authorities in the Conciliar Church a doctrinal

Declaration, as a step forward for reconciliation, which [sic] their essential elements are not of Archbishop's standards [sic].

Blue Paper #303 [<https://thebluepaper.org/2016/01/17/the-blue-paper-no-303-advenientem-prelaturam/>] (emphasis yours).

The 4-15-12 doctrinal declaration was not merely lower than the Archbishop's standards but was truly worthy of condemnation! Do you see the difference? Here is an example to illustrate this difference:

Perhaps in your modesty you think that no sermon you have ever given was *up to* Archbishop Lefebvre's standards, because his sermons were so uniquely exceptional. But that does not mean that every sermon you have ever given is worthy of condemnation, does it?

So your very weak statement about Bishop Fellay's doctrinal declaration merely says that Archbishop Lefebvre could have done a better job on that declaration than Bishop Fellay did. Do you see the weakness and grave omission in your statement?

Father, there are countless other things you say in your blue papers and elsewhere, that are frankly incoherent, plainly wrong and leave the reader shaking his head. You leave the reader with the distinct impression that you do not mean what you actually say (since he assumes you mean to teach the Catholic Faith). We take only one more example: you say God instituted *two* societies: the family and civil society. Here are your words:

As Traditional Catholics, it is important to re-establish parental authority in the two societies that Divine Providence has instituted for us—the family and civil society.

Blue Paper #304. [<https://thebluepaper.org/2016/01/28/the-blue-paper-no-304-the-kasper-proposal-is-simply-bad/>]

You know Christ instituted the Catholic Church. Whatever you mean in the quote (above), it “didn't come out right” objectively. In other words, what you said is false, *viz.*, that God instituted two societies—when God *also* instituted the Church.

This is like if you were to say that Divine Providence granted that there would be one bishop faithful to Catholic Tradition: Bishop Antônio de Castro Mayer. Such a statement is false and is a calumny to Archbishop Lefebvre, because he is a second bishop faithful to Catholic Tradition.

Fr. Zendejas, the Catholic Church needs uncompromising priests to guide and sanctify the faithful. In the past you have done much good and you could again do good. We pray that you return from liberalism and incoherence (such as quoted above) and that you assist in this work for Christ the King!

In Him Who is Truth and hates liberalism,

You can reach us at: Father.Themann.Answered@gmail.com

1. St. Thomas says the same thing in the context of what is true about *all* law, including all Church law. *Summa*, Ia IIae, Q. 90.
2. Archbishop Lefebvre declared:

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 #70, July-August 1989.

Back before the SSPX's liberalism, all of its superiors wrote to Rome on July 6, 1988, *asking to be formally excommunicated from the conciliar church:*

We ask for nothing better than to be declared out of communion with this adulterous spirit which has been blowing in the Church for the last 25 years; we ask for nothing better than to be declared outside of this impious communion of the ungodly....To be publicly associated with this sanction which is inflicted upon the six Catholic Bishops, Defenders of the Faith in its integrity and wholeness, would be for us a mark of honor and a sign of orthodoxy before the faithful. They have indeed a strict right to know that the priests who serve them are not in communion with a counterfeit church

https://web.archive.org/web/20110108060421/http://sspexasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Archbishop_Lefebvre_and_the_Vatican/Part_I/1988-07-06.htm

Friendship with the New-SSPX?

By Fr. Raphael, OSB (Prior, San José Monastery, Colombia)

Monsignor Lefebvre stated: “It was the council and its FRUITS that caused the destruction of the Holy Mass, our Holy Faith, our catechisms and the social kingdom of Our Lord Jesus Christ” (19 November 1989).

With this quote in mind, let us make an analogy. The Holy Catholic Church is like the *Tree of Life* (because It is the *only* source of spiritual life and salvation). The new religion of Vatican II is like a deadly disease which has progressively infected this *Tree* (in Its human element) ever since the council.

This conciliar disease attacks the whole *Tree* (in Its human element) and countless enemies labor with the conscious intent to destroy the *Tree*. The disease is in the *Tree* but it is not a product of the *Tree*. This is like the fact that the conciliar church infects the human element of the Catholic Church from within (like a virus does in a body). Then the infected Catholics are like “copies” of the “virus” which further spread the infection by using the *Tree's* own structure (Catholic authority and the hierarchy now occupied by liberals).

The conciliar popes are most responsible for caring for the *Tree of Life* but instead they are working hard to further infect this *Tree* with the deadly disease. These popes should “spray” the *Tree* with “herbicide” to kill the disease, *viz.*, clearly condemning errors and strongly resisting the Church’s enemies. These popes should also “feed” and “water” the *Tree of Life* (in Its human element), with Traditional Catholic doctrine and the True Sacraments. Instead, these popes prevent the *Tree* (in Its human element) from receiving most nutrition and hydration.

Many in the so-called “internal resistance” of the SSPX desire to “water” the *Tree* but their work is in vain because they fail in their duty to also fight the invading disease. This is like, when a citadel is besieged, those within the citadel fail in their duty if they merely plant gardens and feed the livestock! They must fight against the invaders, with all their might!

As our Lord’s conciliar enemies (Rome) further “infect” the *Tree* (in Its human element), the new-SSPX treats them as if they were fighting on our Lord’s side and approaches them in friendship without first demanding their conversion. By not resisting the disease being spread, the new-SSPX is cooperating in the destruction of the *Tree* and is thereby helping our Lord’s enemies. *Even leaving aside the new-SSPX’s own affirmative liberalism, the new-SSPX is cooperating with the destroyers by omission.*

Every SSPX priest now scandalizes the faithful by the very fact of his membership in, and cooperation with, the liberal SSPX, because his membership, assistance and cooperation indicate to the world that he condones and endorses the group and what it now stands for. This is like the scandal a person causes being a member of the Communist Party, even if he rationalizes his membership by thinking of himself as part of the Party’s “internal resistance”. Even if an SSPX priest indicates to some persons that he disagrees with certain SSPX positions, this is not enough because **that SSPX priest is counted, listed and identified internationally** as part of the SSPX. Therefore, the priest is regarded *internationally* as supporting and cooperating with the new-SSPX.

Besides the scandal caused simply by membership, the SSPX priests of the so-called “internal resistance” fail in the duty of every priest and every Catholic to *completely resist* the disease (modernism, ecumenism, liberalism, *etc.*), and use his *maximum efforts* to protect the *whole Tree* (the Common Good of the whole Church) and not merely protect his own friends or his *own little parish* (his own little “branch” of the *Tree*). Some in the so-called “internal resistance” of the SSPX do “speak out”, but they speak quietly and timidly enough so that **they are tolerated by their liberal SSPX superiors.**

Uncompromising Catholics must consider this as a “red light” to attending the Masses of all SSPX priests because they all cooperate with our Lord’s enemies at least by being members of the new-SSPX and also by softening their opposition to SSPX liberalism to the lower level

tolerated by their SSPX superiors. Any SSPX priest who believes that he is speaking out strongly, loudly and continually against the liberalism of his SSPX superiors, is fooling himself.

Any priest who fearlessly stands against SSPX liberalism can count on our help *amplifying* his voice by which he opposes his superiors' liberalism. Then he will soon no longer be in the (so-called) *internal* resistance because he will see how fast the iron fist of Menzingen crushes and expels him as soon as he begins to *really* make a difference by standing fearlessly against his superiors' liberalism.

At that time, uncompromising Catholics will have a "green light" to attend his Masses because then he also will be an uncompromising soldier of Christ the King.

Catholic Candle note:

We appreciate Father Raphael's dedication to the uncompromising truth without regard for human respect.

Donations to Fr. Raphael, OSB and San José Monastery, Colombia can be sent to

Wells Fargo Bank	
Account Name	Adolfo Arizaga Ballesteros
Account number	0433871175
Routing number	122000247
SWIFT Code (international wires only)	WFBIUS6S

There are also Paypal and other donation links on their website. [<http://beneditinos.jimdo.com/donativos/>]

Catholic Candle Note: One of our Readers sent in the following warning:

Get Out While You Still Have Some Faith!

I have heard many people who attend the SSPX chapels say during the past four years (especially since the September 1, 2015 granting of the confession indult-jurisdiction): “I’m not leaving the SSPX right now. I won’t lose my Faith. I’ll be able to see if things get too liberal. Nothing bad is happening in our chapel.”

Yet there are long-term consequences of staying in the SSPX. It does indeed weaken one’s judgment and lowers one’s guard against liberalism.

I remember when I was a child, before my parents found out about the changes in the Mass and before they found the Tridentine Mass for us to attend. We, like many Catholics, “church-hopped” in order to find the least-liberal novus ordo mass to attend. I see now, because hindsight is “20/20”, that although my parents fought the conciliar church while they questioned the novus ordo mass and were told “nothing has changed” and “the mass is still the same”, my parents’ Faith was weakened and their guard was lowered, during those years.

Finally, my parents found a Tridentine Mass said by an “independent” retired diocesan priest. When we attended our first Latin Tridentine Mass offered by this priest, my parents said: “It is like coming home again!” I have heard so many others say this same thing when returning to the Tridentine Mass. We attended independent priests’ Masses for many years because, of course, the SSPX was still in its infancy and there were few Mass centers in the U.S.

My parents’ entire search had been to simply find the True Mass. Indeed, while this *is* an important and a very noble search, they didn’t realize that their Faith was weakened because they weren’t focusing on the entire picture (especially the Faith). In other words, they were not searching for the entire, unadulterated Catholic Faith. Their focus was on the Tridentine Mass, *pro multis* in the consecration, *etc.* Thinking back, it is no wonder that my parents went off-track and petitioned for the 1984 Indult Mass and, in later years, petitioned for the Institute of Christ the King Indult to come into their diocese.

I see a direct parallel that will be repeated now. That is, as the SSPX gets its full recognition, the SSPX will officially join the ranks of the Ecclesia Dei indult groups. What will “conservative-minded traditionalists” do then? Will they indult-church-hop, to try to find the least-liberal Tridentine Mass?

There is more to this matter than just the Mass. What about the doubtfully-ordained “priests” at your local indult Mass? What about the watered down, fluffy sermon you will get? The questions go on and on.

The *whole* of the Faith is important. Every aspect of the richness of the Church’s doctrine, liturgy, sacraments, the uncompromising saints and martyrs of the Church’s glorious history—these are the treasures of the Catholic Church—not just the Tridentine Mass said by so-called “Father” Anybody.

So my warning to you, Dear Faithful who still attend the SSPX chapels, is to get out while you still have some love of the Faith left. Trust in God, as He loves and desires to be trusted, *viz.*, as a child trusts: completely dependent on his dear Father.

God will provide for you, not just the Mass but the entire wealth of the Faith. We Catholics must study our Faith. We must love and appreciate it, in all of its aspects. We must sacrifice to preserve our Faith, stand up for it and testify to its truths. We *can’t* be Catholics who are looking just for the Tridentine Mass and forget our precious and complete Catholic Faith! If we seek only the Mass, we will most certainly weaken and risk altogether losing our Faith ... and our souls!

Bp. Tissier defends agreement with modernist Rome, falsifies Archbishop Lefebvre’s position

We reference a poisonous interview Bishop Tissier de Mallerai gave on March 21, 2016.¹

Bp. Tissier asserts that Benedict XVI fulfilled the two SSPX conditions

Bp. Tissier says, “Then Benedict XVI granted us two ‘preliminary requirements’: the recognition of the freedom of the traditional Mass and the lifting (more or less fortunate, for us and for him) of the 1988 excommunications.”

Bp. Tissier is wrong on both counts. *Summorum Pontificum* does not free the Traditional Mass.² Pope Benedict’s lifting of the excommunications 1) concedes nothing significant to the SSPX and 2) is not “fortunate”.

- It concedes nothing significant, because the decree only applies to the four living SSPX bishops and still treats the excommunications as just (meaning that Archbishop Lefebvre remains excommunicated and condemned):

by virtue of the present Decree I remit the penalty of excommunication latae sententiae incurred by Bishops Bernard Fellay, Bernard Tissier de Mallerais, Richard Williamson and Alfonso de Galarreta, and declared by this Congregation on 1 July 1988. At the same time I declare that, **as of today's date**, the Decree issued at that time **no longer** has juridical effect.³

Emphasis added.

- It is not fortunate, because the excommunications were no misfortune.
 - Bishop Fellay lamented, in his December 15, 2008 letter requesting the lifting of the excommunications, “We firmly believe in the primacy of Peter and in his prerogatives, and for this reason the current situation causes us much suffering”.⁴
 - Bp. Tissier now follows his leader by complaining, “sociologically it was a disgrace”.
 - Archbishop Lefebvre, on the contrary, considered it no disgrace to be banned from the Conciliar Church: “But the Church against her past and her Tradition is not the Catholic Church; this is why being excommunicated by a liberal, ecumenical and revolutionary Church is a matter of indifference to us.” *Biography of Archbishop Lefebvre*, by Bishop Tissier, p. 547. Unlike his spiritual sons, Archbishop Lefebvre took Our Lord's teaching to heart: “Blessed are ye when they shall revile you, and persecute you, and speak all that is evil against you, untruly, for my sake”. St. Matthew 5:11.

Bp. Tissier claims that Rome has changed and the SSPX has not

Bp. Tissier goes on to say:

it became clear, in May and June 2012, that Benedict XVI still required as a condition, as he had said plainly at the start, that we accept the Council and the legitimacy of the reforms. It was a failure. But now there is very clearly a disposition on Pope Francis' side to recognize us without these conditions. ...

Already, doctrinally, they no longer force us to admit “the whole Council” or religious liberty; some of the errors we denounce are on the point of being considered by our interlocutors as open for free discussion, or continued debate. This is progress. We discuss, but they have to admit that we are not changing and it is unlikely that we will change.

Either Rome is moving toward the SSPX or the SSPX toward Rome.

We have proved dozens of times⁵ that the SSPX is becoming liberal and modernist like Rome. With no proof, Bp. Tissier insists that the SSPX is not changing. Therefore, he has to argue that Rome has changed.

So how does Bp. Tissier say that Rome has changed? Before, Rome insisted that the SSPX accept Vatican II right away. Now, Rome is willing to freely discuss Vatican II errors. How can Bp. Tissier call that “progress”?

Why should Rome demand that the SSPX accept Vatican II, when the SSPX already accepts religious liberty⁶ and accepts 95% of Vatican II⁷? Is Pope Francis so dogmatic that he can't wait a few months for that last five percent?

Even Bp. Tissier cannot pretend that modernist Rome has converted. Just look at the synods on the family, and subsequently Pope Francis's disastrous apostolic exhortation.⁸ To save face, Bp. Tissier resorts to falsehoods about Archbishop Lefebvre.

Bp. Tissier falsifies Archbishop Lefebvre's position

Bp. Tissier betrays Archbishop Lefebvre by these words:

Archbishop Lefebvre never laid down as a condition for us to be recognized by Rome that Rome abandon the errors and the conciliar reforms. Even if he did say something like that to Andre Cagnon in 1990, he would never have done so, because that was never his line of conduct, his strategy with modernist Rome. He was strong in the Faith, he did not yield on his doctrinal position, but he knew how to be flexible, patient, and prudent in practice.

Bp. Tissier makes two false claims here:

- that Archbishop Lefebvre did not hold that Rome must reject Vatican II before traditional Catholics can reconcile with Rome; and

- that even if Archbishop Lefebvre held this position as a principle, he would never act that way, because he kept a flexible, prudent practical stance alongside his uncompromising doctrinal stance.

First, Archbishop Lefebvre explicitly taught that modernist Rome must return to the Catholic Faith before traditional Catholics can reconcile with Rome:

It is, therefore, a strict duty for every priest wanting to remain Catholic to separate himself from the Conciliar Church for as long it does not rediscover the Tradition of the Church and of the Catholic Faith.

Spiritual Journey. Ch. III, p. 13.

Bishop Tissier knows about this quote. Just a year ago, on January 1, 2015, he read this quote out in a sermon.⁹ After he read it, he said, “Let me repeat that,” and read the quote again.

Here are a few other examples of what Archbishop Lefebvre truly taught:

- “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*. July–August 1989.
- “They are the authorities and we are the subordinates, so they impose these ideas on us. It is impossible otherwise. As long as they do not rid themselves of these errors—these errors of liberalism and modernism—there is no way we can come to an agreement with them. It is not possible. We cannot approach them because immediately we have to submit to their orientations.” (September 22, 1988)
- “When we are asked when we will get an agreement with Rome, my answer is simple: when Rome re-crowns Our Lord Jesus Christ. We cannot agree with those who uncrown Our Lord. The day they will acknowledge again that Our Lord is king of peoples and nations, this will not mean that they join us, but that they join the Catholic Church, in which we have always been.” Conference, Flavigny, December 1988, *Fideliter* No. 68, March–April 1989.

Second, Bp. Tissier falsely asserts that Archbishop Lefebvre “would never have” acted according to this Catholic principle, even if he held it, because he always maintained a prudent practical flexibility alongside his strong theoretical Faith.

Archbishop Lefebvre is actually prudent for the exact opposite reason, because he publicly lived out his Catholic principles. As St. Thomas Aquinas teaches, prudence “applies universal principles to the particular conclusions of practical matters.” *Summa Theologica*, IIa-IIae, q. 47, a. 6. True prudence applies true principles, that is, the Catholic Faith.

Shortly before his death, Archbishop Lefebvre declared, “The fight is not over for us. After I pass away, my successors will have to fight on. But nothing is impossible to our good God.” (*Fideliter* No. 79, Jan–Feb. 1991). Twenty-five years later, Bp. Tissier is dishonoring Archbishop Lefebvre’s memory. Twenty-five years later, we have to commit irrevocably to living out our true Catholic Faith, as Archbishop Lefebvre did and Our Lord tells us to do:

Every one therefore that heareth these my words, and doth them, shall be likened to a wise man that built his house upon a rock, and the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and they beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded on a rock. And every one that heareth these my words, and doth them not, shall be like a foolish man that built his house upon the sand, and the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and they beat upon that house, and it fell, and great was the fall thereof.

St. Matthew 7:24-27.

-
1. <http://sspx.org/en/news-events/news/bishop-tissier-interview-la-porte-latine-14983>
 2. <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/motu-not-free-mass.html>
 3. http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cbishops/documents/rc_con_cbishops_doc_20090121_remissione-scomunica_en.html
 4. *Id.*
 5. <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/sspx.html>

6. <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/fellay-pozzo-religious-liberty.html>
7. https://web.archive.org/web/20130603054101/http://www.sspix.org/sspix_and_rome/is_the_sspix_heretical_4_12-19-2012.htm
8. http://w2.vatican.va/content/dam/francesco/pdf/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20160319_amoris-laetitia_en.pdf
9. <http://youtu.be/uqRd7914Jb0>

The New-SSPX Contradicts Its Earlier Falsehood About Discontinuing Negotiations with Rome

In its September 5, 2014 press release, the new-SSPX had said that it would meet with the Vatican on September 23, 2014 to:

review the relations between the SSPX and Rome, which were discontinued at the departure of Cardinal William Levada, Cardinal Müller's predecessor, and the resignation of Benedict XVI.

<http://sspix.org/en/news-events/news/cardinal-muller-invites-bishop-fellay-meet-4734>

(Emphasis added.)

Thus, according to this SSPX press release, relations with Rome were “**discontinued**” for **19 months** (between the resignation of Pope Benedict XVI in February 2013, and the September 23, 2014 meeting). *Id.*, & <http://sspix.org/en/news-events/news/cardinal-brandmuller-visits-sspixs-seminary-5823>

On March 4, 2016, the new-SSPX contradicted this falsehood which it told the faithful in 2014. Bishop Fellay stated:

The relations with Rome—as a matter of fact—are ongoing, but that is not quite the correct word... in the sense that *they have never been interrupted*, they have certainly never been broken off.

<http://sspix.org/en/interview-bp-bernard-fellay> (ellipsis in the original; emphasis added).

The new-SSPX lacks the common honesty we expect even from pagans. *See also*, <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-lacks-common-honesty.html>

What does this tell us? The new-SSPX knew that laymen did not want recognition by modernist Rome. Thus, Bishop Fellay decided to lie because it was “necessary” to negotiate the recognition behind their backs to keep gullible laymen believing no recognition was coming (while the new-SSPX focused on changing their minds).

Bishop Fellay’s Letter #85 and the Art of Spin

Bishop Fellay’s November 2015 letter brings to mind one word: SPIN. Most people will read his letter and believe the spin they feel comfortable with—this means accepting his liberalism.

I can now see why the New-SSPX hired a public relations firm to teach the art of spin and monitor fraternity communications. It appears to be a worthwhile investment because with this letter the N-SSPX is surely getting its money’s worth.

Let’s go through the letter to point out obvious aspects of that spin and how it harms trusting souls.

The purpose of Bishop Fellay’s letter was to get laymen and priests in the N-SSPX to accept the upcoming deal with Rome. He knows the deal with Rome is toxic with some (and he can’t afford to lose any more laymen and priests.) So he is playing a previously-negotiated “surprise card”, saying that it’s Pope Francis who is giving ordinary jurisdiction to the Society for Confession (which is the first step toward a full deal), it’s not me—while stating again and again that nothing has changed; “We are preserving Tradition.”

The problem is people believe what they want to believe, regardless of proof to the contrary. An example of this is the Superior General making contradictory statements and most of the Society choosing the one they feel most comfortable with and that agrees with their *uninformed* conscience.

Bishop Fellay said, “We accept 95% of Vatican II,” and also said, “We mourn the unending destruction that VC II has caused the Church and priests and laymen in the SSPX.” People accept the latter statement and ignore the former one, to avoid unwanted (but necessary) action to stand up **for** Christ the King and **against** liberalism in the N-SSPX. Now it’s time for those who are always quick to give the N-SSPX the benefit of the doubt, to start *connecting the dots* and become aware of just what they are willing to believe in order that they can sit on the sidelines and avoid the fight for Tradition.

Let's start with paragraph one, page one. Bishop Fellay states that his letter is "to highlight more clearly how we who are devoted to Tradition....." If that were only true, the New-SSPX would not be losing priests and laymen who are unable to accept the Society leaning liberal and soft on Modernism. Repeating a falsehood doesn't make it true or more acceptable.

The next point Bishop Fellay makes is that "Pope Francis on his own initiative decided to allow...jurisdiction for confession to priests of the Society." Bishop Fellay further states, "We were surprised...and learned about it through the press...." Who would believe that? If you were following the last 10 years of negotiations between Rome and the Society, it'd be unrealistic to think that the Bishop was surprised by Rome's announcement. I suspect this "Trojan Horse" was agreed upon as the first subtle step to recognition. He sent a communiqué thanking the pope for the confession jurisdiction (which the Society does not need because of Necessity).

When you are at war with your enemy (Modernist Rome), you don't play nice with them. It's obvious the N-SSPX is not an enemy of Rome and is trying to be best-of-friends. So much for their fight for Tradition.

The next point he discussed in this letter is a petition to Pope Francis regarding the Synod. It was well-known for months that the Synod was going to be a complete disaster. Bishop Fellay ends paragraph one, page two: "Why does the Church no longer have the courage to speak this way (i.e., against public sinners)?" Well, why doesn't the New-SSPX have the courage to speak out against the evil and errors of Vatican II, instead of accepting 95% of it?

In further discussing the Synod, the bishop speaks of "positive initiatives" by several cardinals and bishops against an aspect of the Synod. Behind their **feeble** criticism of the Synod, these cardinals and "bishops" are promoters and followers of a greater evil: Vatican II, which in all aspects is very detrimental to the salvation of souls. Thus, to finally speak out against one of many liberal and Modernist problems in the Church doesn't even begin to make up for their regular promoting of the VC II evil and errors.

The next point references the *motu proprio* on the simplified procedures for declarations of nullity of marriage ("Catholic divorce"). Bishop Fellay pointed out the potential problem of the *motu proprio* with easy canonical terms, but failed to come down hard on the pope and others who encourage such an attack on the indissolubility of marriage.

The next point concerns the pope's promotion of the so-called "Year of Mercy" without repentance (i.e., for sin) or conversion (i.e., return to grace). While Bishop Fellay appears to endorse the age-old teaching of the Church on the necessity of conversion and contrition for sins, he nevertheless gives the pope a pass by making an astonishing assumption that these

(conversion and contrition) are present in the Synod's documents. Bishop Fellay wonders why the pope doesn't ask himself why so many people have left the Church. You may wonder why the bishop doesn't ask himself why so many priests and laymen are leaving the N-SSPX and joining the Resistance.

Bishop Fellay failed to mention that one receiving the indulgences of the holy "Year of Mercy" must pray in a cathedral that no doubt is desecrated daily by the Novus Ordo mass, which contradicts his assurance about indulgences for the holy year. He states: "Nowhere in the remainder of these habitual conditions (for gaining the indulgences) is there any question of adhering to the conciliar novelties."

The last point: The "Year of Mercy" also celebrates the 50th anniversary of Vatican II. Bishop Fellay states, "This is most unsettling..." but rather than reject outright the evil and errors of VC II, he laments that "We must weep over the ruins caused by this Council." Yet he further stated in the past more than once that the Society accepts 95% of Vatican II and also that he holds that many of Vatican II's documents are **entirely** Traditional.

I emphasize that the spin the N-SSPX is using is to avoid further defections from the Society in the coming months when they accept reconciliation with Modernist Rome. Eventually, the Society will suffer domination by Rome **as the other six religious communities experienced after their "reconciliation" deal with Rome**. Like the N-SSPX, they assured their followers they would never give up their independence and traditionalism. Alas, all six have given up both.

The bishop's Spin, I fear, will be accepted by most still in the Society, just as the laymen and priests accepted Post-Vatican II spin in the 1960s and '70s. However, when reconciliation is in effect, and the N-SSPX accepts more and more of Modernism as demanded by Rome, there is hope that some additional eyes will be opened.

Here is a new line in the sand for you *fence-sitters*, which will also be the "new normal" for the New-SSPX: The local bishop comes to your Mass on Sunday, introduced by your pastor, and in glowing terms warmly welcomes your community (the conciliar expression for "parish") to the Conciliar Church Diocese. *Rome is not going to pass up this chance to silence completely a once-traditional community.*

Let us all pray for the poor blind leaders of the New-SSPX and for all the souls whose salvation they put in jeopardy.

Bishop Fellay Mostly Approves of Pope Francis' Recent Modernist Document Eroding Marriage And the Natural Law

On April 10, 2016, Bishop Fellay stated that Pope Francis' Apostolic Exhortation, *The Joy of Love*, is a summary of the two synods on marriage and is like a "beautiful boat" with a "very small" hole below the water line. Here are his words:

*This Exhortation is the summary of the two Synods on marriage. It is very long, it contains many things that are correct and beautiful, but after building what I was about to call a fine building, a **beautiful boat**, the Supreme Pontiff cut a hole into the hull of the boat, beneath the flotation line, and you all know what happens then. What difference does it make that the hole was made with every possible precaution? What difference does it make that *the hole is very small*? The boat leaks.*

<http://sspx.org/en/joy-mixed-crosses> (emphasis added).

Pope Francis' Exhortation is crafty modernism. There is not just a "very small" leak in a "beautiful boat" (*viz.*, in the Exhortation). This document is a complete shipwreck!

Bishop Fellay's analogy shows how soft he has become—because most boats have small leaks. That is why boats have bilge pumps—to remove the water from very small leaks. A very small leak is not ideal but can be accommodated.

Bishop Fellay Can't Bring Himself to Clearly Say The Pope utters Heresies and Nonsense

Recently:

- Bishop Fellay stated that he counts Pope Francis among his friends. [<http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/fellay-counts-francis-friends.html>]
- Bishop Fellay also said that "a lot" of what Pope Francis says makes him "very happy". [<http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/fellay-interview-liberal-timid.html>]

- The new-SSPX announced plans to train priests jointly with Pope Francis. [<http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-promote-new-evangelization.html>]

With these and similar professions of warm, friendly relations with Pope Francis, don't expect the new-SSPX to ever state the plain truth that Pope Francis preaches heresy!¹ On April 10, 2016, Bishop Fellay specifically stopped short of saying that Pope Francis "utters heresy" or "talks nonsense". Here are Bishop Fellay's words:

[T]here are so many—up to prelates and cardinals; **we would almost say all the way up to the Pope—who not only talk nonsense, but utter heresies that are an open path to sin.**

<http://sspx.org/en/joy-mixed-crosses> (emphasis added).

We leave aside Bishop Fellay's obvious error in basic catechism, when he says that heresy is a "path to sin" rather than that it *IS* a mortal sin. *Baltimore Catechism* No. 3, Q. 472.

-
1. In other words, Pope Francis is a material heretic, although we do not judge his interior culpability. *Catholic Candle* explains the distinction between material and formal heresy, and why it is a mortal sin of rash judgment to conclude that we know Pope Francis is not pope because he is a formal heretic: <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/against-sedevacantism.html#section-5>.