



# The Recusant

*An unofficial SSPX newsletter, fighting a guerrilla war for the soul of Tradition!*



“Look at the caricature of Tradition that calls itself the ‘Resistance’, for example: it is a non-Catholic spirit that is almost sectarian. We wish to have nothing to do with it; it is a movement that is withdrawn into itself, with people who think that they are the only good and just men on earth: that is not Catholic.”

*(Bishop Fellay, interview with ‘Present’ 27/06/2015)*

## Inside:

- **What does the Church teach concerning:**
  - Clerical Immorality?
  - Revealing Another’s Sins?
- **Fake Resistance Watch:**
  - Cathinfo: Making Money out of Scandal (Editorial)
  - “Concerning Fr. Stephen Abraham”
  - Bishop Williamson: More Novus Ordo Madness
  - Fr. Zendejas’s “Blue Paper” (analysis)
  - Who is Fr. Zendejas? (Fr. Zendejas in his own words)
- **SSPX Watch:**  
**Branding comes to Britain**

## **FROM THE DESK OF THE EDITOR:**

Dear Reader,

If you were hoping that I had shed some of the “negativity” of the last issue (October 2015), you are in for a nasty surprise. Last issue I laid out what I consider the outline for the enemy plan of attack. A cuckoo-in-the nest tactic whereby instead of attacking the Resistance directly, they seek to gradually replace it by a harmless substitute of their own device, controlled by them. It is intended that this issue will help to show a little more clearly what that looks like in reality.

Every month it becomes harder to produce the next issue of this newsletter. The controversies only multiply, as do the people who will potentially be “offended”. Every month I expect a fresh controversy to bring in a lot of angry correspondence from readers who disagree. But somehow, so far, it has never quite happened. It may surprise you to learn that since August I have received only one such communication from a reader taking exception to what they read. Can it be that lots

of people are angry and disagree but cannot be bothered to write to me (I have received several agreeing and congratulating)? Or could it be that the majority of readers are more or less aware of what is at stake and therefore are less prone to fall into the dangers of human respect and hero-worship? Or perhaps this really proves that the false illusion, created in internet-land, of lots of Bishop Williamson worshippers fighting those who are critical of him is just that: an illusion. I do not know. Plenty of people have wished that Bishop Williamson were someone he is not, that he really stood for what he should stand for. A vast amount of good could have been achieved. But sooner or later one learns to reconcile oneself to reality: he stands for something with which no Catholic can agree. A Church without hierarchy, structure or (“false”) obedience; acceptance of the “good” done by the New Mass and belief in its dubious “miracles” (one of which, twenty years ago, was approved by one “bishop Bergoglio”!); “liberty” (his own expression); pockets of faithful behaving selfishly; whatever priests remain saying Mass in one place and not travelling (it is called “looking after those who look after me”); a human nature so corrupted in our modern day that no men can become priests (does that mean that human nature has changed? After all, it was already fallen...); and an Archbishop Lefebvre who was all very well in his day, but whose thinking and actions are not what is needed for today (why does Cardinal Ratzinger suddenly spring to mind?)...

Burying our heads in the sand never does any good. Owning up to reality, however horrible it may be, is actually a very “liberating” experience. Bishop Williamson is not on the side of the Resistance and is doing a great many things which could only be expected to harm it. That being so, the more people who wake up and realise it, the stronger the Resistance will become. Thanks be to God, more people are beginning to realise it. Nobody likes to be the bearer of bad news, but nor has anyone the right to shut his eyes to danger.

### **Cathinfo.com**

Some of you will notice that the website Cathinfo.com disappeared from the list of “useful websites” which we occasionally print and has not been recommended in these pages for quite a while. As with all things, there is a reason for that. I have always been slightly uneasy about some of the things I see written there. As laymen we should really feel very uneasy about the position we have been placed in, and should really have to think twice about ever raising our voice against the clergy. That is how I myself feel and have always felt. Where it is justified and even necessary to do so, then it must be for the very gravest of reasons, to wit, that the Faith itself is at stake. If, therefore, we raise our voices against the SSPX, it can only be that we are genuinely convinced that it is deviating from the true path of Catholic doctrine. Which, of course, it is: by accepting Vatican II and all the horrors contained therein, Religious Liberty, Ecumenism, Collegiality, the New Mass, the New Canon Law and all the rest. That being the case, our attack should focus on that. It may be true that “Bishop Fellay is a rat” (as someone famously likes to say), but if he is, that is hardly the point. What is one less-than-honest bishop compared to the myriad of them that have existed down the ages? What matters is doctrine, the Faith, and the compromises made on an official level by the SSPX which can only lead to a gradual loss of Faith, the symptoms of which we see in the diminishing of the four marks.

Hence, I was in two minds and rather wary about recommending that website in the first place, for that reason (too many people spending too much time attacking Bishop Fellay on a personal level) amongst others (historically it has been overrun by sedevacantists, some of

them of the craziest sort, including one poor unfortunate who believed himself to be the Pope and would electronically excommunicate anyone who laughed at him!). Back in the early days I decided to recommend it as a “useful” source of information because I judged that there was some interesting news on there which made up for the nonsense. A little while later I decided that the common sense ratio was becoming too diluted a part of the mix, the nonsense too prevalent. I also was wary of the uncritical adulation of Bishop Williamson, and the fact that the owner (Matthew) decided to put, in the description at the bottom of each page, that his website was: “The de-facto headquarters of the Resistance” (I promise, I am not making that up!) Believing that it risked doing more harm than good to a potential convert to the Resistance, I ceased all mention of it in these pages.

### **Private Property or Public Concern?**

All of that, disedifying though it may be, is nobody’s business as long as it is a private matter. There are plenty of things that I don’t care for, but I will keep my dislike of them to myself. However websites, like newsletters, are tricky things, since, because they are public and not private, and involve a form of publishing (a making public of things), the interests of the common good are necessarily involved. It is not the same as a private conversation, which the rest of the world does not hear and has no right to know. The difficulty arises when a public concern (such as a Resistance website) is privately owned. Now, for practical reasons, it has to be owned by someone. *TheRecusant.com* is legally “owned” by someone, of course (purely for reasons of practical necessity), but morally it belongs to the Resistance and the Church at large inasmuch as it serves the common good and fulfils a purpose beyond the private whim or interests of its owner. The purpose of *TheRecusant.com* is not to benefit whoever legally “owns” it: if that were so it would become, in effect, just another private website with a private agenda and would thus lose its legitimacy and cease to be deserving of support. Rather like the misleading and dishonest claim made at one time by the SSPX that they are just a priestly society whose internal decisions are nobody’s business, whilst legally, on paper, that may be true, morally it is not, because they represent (or used to represent) something far broader than their own private interests: they represented the interests of Tradition and ultimately the whole Church, and hence morally, what they do and decide is everyone’s business. So it is with anything claiming to represent the Resistance as opposed to merely one man’s private interests: a website which claims to represent the Resistance cannot be a “private” or “personal” affair and must as far as possible strive to stay above individual interests.

The website *Cathinfo.com* is the private property of a gentleman living in Texas (USA). It claims to be a Resistance website, but in fact it makes money for him: he makes a living from the revenue generated by his website. The revenue comes from the advertisements on his website which appear at the top and bottom of every page. Advertising is big business and advertising agencies will pay for the opportunity of putting advertisements in front of an audience. The bigger the audience and the more people who are exposed to their advertisements, the more it is worth to them and the more they will pay. Hence the greater number of people visiting his website, the more money he gets.

Readers wishing to see evidence of this for themselves are invited to visit *Cathinfo* with their browser set to block adverts. They will see at the top of the page in the place where the adverts would normally be, the following message (the red outline is in the original):



# CathInfo.com



## Traditional Catholic Forum

A place for SSPX and other Traditional Catholics to discuss matters pertaining to the Catholic Faith

Since 2006

New: [RSS Feed](#)

**You are blocking ads on your browser.**

If you appreciate the service Matthew is providing the Catholic world by running Cathinfo, please consider disabling your ad-blocking software for this domain.

If you find any offensive ads, you can always contact [Matthew](#) and he will promptly add them to the blocked list.

*"The laborer is worthy of his hire."* (Luke 10:7)

**“ You are blocking ads on your browser.**

If you appreciate the service Matthew is providing the Catholic world by running Cathinfo please consider disabling your ad-blocking software for this domain.

If you find any offensive ads, you can always contact [Matthew](#) and he will promptly add them to the blocked list.

*The labourer is worthy of his hire.* (Luke 10:7) ”

The secular press have long been (justly) accused of gleefully encouraging scandal and gossip and of appealing to the very lowest of human instincts in order to sell more papers. It works. Fallen human nature is what it is, and nothing sells like a good scandal. Prudence is boring. Gossip and mud-throwing draws more punters in. More punters equals more money. The natural motive of the secular media to appeal to our baser instincts is thus easy to understand: when all's said and done, it is all about money. Those of us who long ago foreswore the secular press and who would prefer a newspaper which contained fewer lies, more truth, less by way of personality-squabbling, more good example and no immodesty or indecency – we know why such a newspaper could never exist. It would not sell. Its less scrupulous rivals with their pictures scantily clad women and tales of the sordid private lives of “celebrities” would have a natural advantage in appealing to 99.9% of the public. That, alas, is the law of economics today, all other laws which used to keep things semi-decent having been destroyed. Does not this same law of economics operate with *Cathinfo*? Naturally one hesitates to think the worse of anyone, and there might conceivably be some other explanation, but it is very difficult to see what that might be. It is a fact that the owner of *Cathinfo* is not doing something charitable, a work donated for the Church, but is running a business. Either one's primary goal is to make money or it is to do good. Since in practice the two will always end up clashing at some point, it cannot be both. He has an undeclared interest, an *a priori* economic motive for tending to publish first and ask questions later, as also for squashing any attempt to straighten out the truth or inject sobriety, charity or circumspection into the discussion.

But what business of mine or yours is any of this? As mentioned above, if it were a private matter things might be different. However, Cathinfo is publicly visible, exercises a public influence and furthermore, it claims publicly to represent the Resistance - in fact it claims, at the bottom of every page, to be “the de-facto headquarters of the Resistance” no less! This is as misleading as the name - the behaviour is anything but Catholic and there is not much actual info either (“MatthewsPersonalPiggyBank.com” would surely be a more accurate name.

Or how does “MatthewAndFriends.com” sound?), but the very claim, even if it is misleading, does bring with it certain responsibilities. A public accounting is one of them.

Readers will be familiar with the quote from St. Luke’s Gospel, used at the end of Matthew’s message, that “The labourer is worthy of his hire”, which is usually understood as applying to the duty of the laity to support their priests. A priest needs a bare minimum in order to carry out his work of ministering to souls, so that as many souls as possible can benefit thereby. His reward will be in the hereafter. He does not minister to the faithful in order to make money. A layman who chooses to make his living from owning a website has no right to describe himself as a “labourer” who is “worthy of his hire.” Neither, in this case, is true. But when one realises what sort of “labour” for which our “hire” is being begged, things look even worse.

The “labour” in question involves encouraging and allowing all manner of gutter-gossip, lies, inventions, half-truths, exaggeration and personality-based character assassination mixed with a large and fairly evenly-spread dose of injustice towards individuals and a general lack of charity. Almost all of it, of course, from people who write anonymously on the internet. Some six years ago, Cathinfo played host to an attack on a sedevacantist church in Ohio, USA. Speculation and gossip about the private morals of priests abounded. It was a disgraceful episode, though it doubtless drew a large audience like the crowd which always gathers at the scene of a particularly nasty accident. As the owner of Cathinfo, Matthew did later apologise for the part which his website played in it, which I find admirable and praiseworthy. A few years ago, however, similar mud-throwing began about the SSPX and Bishop Fellay. As has been said before, personal attacks, though easy to fall into, are not helpful and are to be regretted since it completely misses the point: we do not have a personal quarrel with Bishop Fellay, we are resisting his harmful actions and novel doctrine, his acceptance of Vatican II. There is enough factual proof of the real problem with Bishop Fellay and the SSPX without anyone needing to invent personal squabbles which can only ultimately serve to discredit the Resistance - a caricature which would make Fr. Yves (“writer of fiction”) Le Roux very proud. This made me very uneasy and wonder whether Cathinfo was not going to do more harm than good in the long run.

More recently still, *Cathinfo* has lent itself to a campaign of particularly nasty and spiteful personal attacks directed almost exclusively against Our Lady of Mount Carmel seminary in Boston, Kentucky. Much of this has been directed against the person of Mr. Paul Hernandez, commonly known as “pablo the Mexican” (sic). Stories abound of Satanism, witchcraft, serial adultery, promotion of pornography, being involved with Masonry and the mafia, putting curses on people... all of them told as though they were undisputed fact (“Every one knows...”) and yet not one piece of actual evidence is ever to be seen, only the impression (carefully created) of lots of different people agreeing with each other, something which is inadmissible at best, especially when the person reporting it is as anonymous as the person they claim to have heard it from. Some of the stories, such as the recurrent accusation of embezzling all the seminary funds, are self-disproving (If that is true, how is it that the seminary is still going? What do Frs. Pfeiffer and Hewko use to pay for things?!) In reality, not only is the gentleman in question *not* guilty of these horrors, he is at present an essential component in the (relatively) smooth running of seminary life. Meals do not cook themselves, errands do not run themselves and priests should not be having to drive themselves to the airport at four o’clock in the morning. They do have chores, but they are able to study too. To his great

credit, Pablo has behaved with a great amount of restraint, remaining largely silent in the face of the huge amount of hatred and vitriol poured over him. And while his silence does him credit, the same cannot (alas!) be said for his critics, who even used the occasion of his son being taken seriously ill into hospital as an excuse to renew their attacks, accusing him of lying or exaggerating the illness in a propaganda ploy to gain sympathy. When Pablo's son died in hospital a couple of weeks ago, the calumny still did not stop. This is behaviour so unworthy of any Catholic that it makes one ashamed even to witness it. Doubtless Providence will cause some higher good to ultimately emerge from it. Perhaps Almighty God is allowing it in order to teach a lesson to those who still have eyes to see.

So: why Pablo? I don't know, but a couple of things occur to me. He is a man of singular mannerisms, with little or no tact who consequently tends to offend people (especially those who have a huge dignity which is easily offended and who nurse the grudge for a long time at the expense of their own and the common good); he is "the one who's different" and thus an easy target. And like the kid in the playground who is different from everyone else, once the bullying starts, nobody is prepared to stick up for him for fear that the mob will turn on them too. Indeed, one suspects that Pablo is merely a handy conduit for attacking Fr. Pfeiffer and Our Lady of Mount Carmel seminary indirectly. Nobody is perfect, and perhaps some people have genuine grievances against him. But taking to the internet in a campaign of character assassination is simply not justified. And the wild and fanciful tales of Satanism, animal sacrifice, and the like are beyond ridiculous. Perhaps the thinking is that if a lie is big enough, no one will dare challenge it? Bishop Williamson's doctrine, Fr. Abraham's proclivities, these are things which are not personal quarrels but matters needing urgent public attention and where the Faith is at stake. And yet I (and others) hesitate a great deal before dealing with them. Ultimately, if we are unsure who is the good guy being unjustly slandered and who the charlatan not being exposed enough, look at the actions and look at the fruits (i.e. what they have achieved).

### **Standing for the Truth: How to Lose Friends and Alienate People!**

Fr. Pfeiffer himself became an object of jealousy and hatred by some from the very start of the Resistance and for all the right reasons. That he travels far and wide to help souls in so many different places led to grumbling by some of his own faithful in Kentucky, for example, who saw no reason why he should not leave the other Resistance chapels hanging in order to say Mass exclusively on his home patch every week without fail. His clear rejection of sede-vacantism and his refusal to blur the boundaries between it and the Resistance has likewise not been forgotten in some quarters where such a thing was being promoted. Then there is the fact that he and Fr. Hewko are disproving in deed what Bishop Williamson teaches in word, by founding and maintaining in these difficult times a seminary, which is now in the middle of its third successful year. This is something which some people, particularly those who are proud to call themselves as "the followers" of Bishop Williamson, will not forgive or forget any time soon. One can either set out intending to make friends or to defend the truth: one or the other, but not both. That Fr. Pfeiffer was prepared to tell people the unpopular and unwelcome truth that they ought no longer to attend SSPX Masses did not help his popularity. Some people simply were not prepared to make the sacrifice of leaving their local SSPX chapel, something which one can understand if not condone. Personally I admire the honesty of those who admit that they should leave but feel too weak to do so. But there are also those

who, not wishing to admit any such thing, in their eagerness to justify themselves, nursed an angry resentment for all those who did what they would not do, and directed against Fr. Pfeiffer in particular. There are not many, but they do exist. A guilty conscience often reacts violently, and nothing hurts more than the truth. To this day, Matthew himself uses *Cathinfo* to denounce Fr. Pfeiffer and what he calls “the red light position” (i.e. that one ought not to attend SSPX Masses) and all those who agree with it as being “schismatic” and “sectarian”. That he himself continued to attend the local SSPX until fairly recently and only left when the (highly dubious - see **p.22 ff.**) “Resistance” priest, Fr. Zendejas, started a chapel nearby, is, I am sure, a mere coincidence.

*are the words and opinions of the individual members who posted them, a*

**CathInfo is the de-facto discussion headquarters for the Resistance,**

**...and which “Resistance” might that be, exactly?**

There is one further thing which is perhaps worth noting in passing. Despite the total lack of decorum, good manners, charity, justice or (in many cases) common sense for which his

website has become known, Matthew will tolerate no criticism whatever of Bishop Williamson or those whom he views as Bishop Williamson’s lieutenants (such as Fr. Gerardo Zendejas). Those occasional visitors who attempt to put in a good word for Fr. Pfeiffer or Our Lady of Mount Carmel Seminary, or who expresses doubt about the wisdom or orthodoxy of various episcopal utterances are invariably banned, and what they have written immediately expunged and “airbrushed out of history”, in the finest Soviet tradition, before anybody else can see it. Add to the mix a noticeable amount of flattery towards the owner by some and the overall effect, for the occasional reader of the website, is the illusion that *Cathinfo* represents a true cross-section of the Resistance faithful and that all of them agree.

The reality is that a large number of Resistance faithful do not read internet forums or do not have internet in their home at all, and that of those who do, a large proportion deplore the shameful behaviour exemplified by *Cathinfo*; likewise many of people who do participate in the “controversy” on *Cathinfo* are, one suspects, not really Resistance faithful. There are some people who seem to jump into any Resistance controversy with just a little too much relish: some might be hardened sedevacantists, some liberal defenders of the neo-SSPX... hidden private agendas abound, the only consistent rule is anonymity. The reality is also that Matthew makes a living from the number of visitors to his website, driven up by scandal and gossip, and that he attends a chapel of Fr. Gerardo Zendejas, the priest encouraged by Bishop Williamson to take control of as many of the Resistance faithful in the USA as possible.

Let me say once again - personal grievances have no place in public dispute. Neither Matthew nor *Cathinfo* have ever done me any harm personally. The owner of *Cathinfo* might be the nicest man in the world, but what he is doing is still wrong. The very large amount of harm and confusion, the appearance of “infighting” caused by the disgraceful things written (by who knows whom) on his website are, alas, a matter of public concern inasmuch as they involve the interests of the common good. When I first heard that *Cathinfo* was used by its owner as an alternative to earning an honest day’s wage, I was disinclined to believe it. But more than one reader from that part of the world has since confirmed it to me, and the fact that he writes so much on his website and so often, throughout the working day, does tend to confirm this also. Nobody should delight in the prospect of harming a man’s livelihood, but on the other hand no man has the right to make a living from such disgraceful behaviour. I have never once heard of anyone becoming a better Catholic as a result of frequent perusal of that

website, whereas I have heard several people say that they had to leave it because of the negative effect it was having on them. As things currently stand, the world would be much better off without *Cathinfo*, which is why I have decided never to visit it again. I hope that many of you will decide to do likewise.

### **Personalities or Principles?**

As always we come back to where we have been so often before. If we support Our Lady of Mount Carmel seminary, if we support Fr. Pfeiffer (just as if we support the Resistance) it is *not* for any personal reasons, but because of the objective reality and because we have a duty to support what will help build and spread the Faith and resist what will cause it to shrink and diminish. Actions speak louder than words. We judge Bishop Williamson and Fr. Zendejas on their actions, not on what anyone else thinks of them nor what we would like to think of them and certainly not on what we hear said about them by others. Fr. Pfeiffer has the right to be treated in the same way. What are Fr. Pfeiffer's actions? As far as I can see, were it not for Fr. Pfeiffer there would be no Resistance in the English speaking world, not merely the USA and Canada. It was Fr. Pfeiffer who founded the Resistance in England and in Scotland (and *not* Bishop Williamson, who steadfastly refused to get involved until *after* the proverbial Rubicon had been crossed!) Not many people know it, but he also founded the Resistance in Munich, the only Resistance Mass centre in Germany. Ireland, Australia, Asia, all in one way or another owe him a debt of gratitude for his actions, which go beyond any mere fancy or opinion and speak far louder than any words ever could. His position is clear, his doctrine sound: he represents what the SSPX once was.

### **One or two final things...**

The Recusant *does not* make a profit and never has (quite the contrary, in fact!). I work for a living, and thus I hope you will pardon the fact that this issue is significantly late (again!). There is no shortage of articles to include, but so as to avoid this issue being 80 pages long I have decided to leave some more recent material until the January issue.

One or two of you wrote to ask the identity of the priest mentioned last time. In order to avoid unnecessary speculation and unfair suspicion I ought to have made it clear, and apologise for not having done so. The priest in question is Fr. Stephen Abraham, and at the time of writing he is still ministering publicly at the behest of Bishop Williamson. It is unpleasant, but when such a very serious risk exists one does not have the right to remain silent. The fact that Fr. Abraham led a pilgrimage at the end of the summer and is due to preach an Ignatian retreat soon, shows that our silence is only helping to make things worse. It is therefore the duty of those of you who have experience of this to warn as many people as possible. The inclusion of a written submission about Fr. Abraham on **p.14** of this issue is a regrettable necessity, but a necessity it is. The temptation is to look after one's own interests and stay comfortable by keeping silent. This is wrong: the common good must come first. I know of others out there who have personal experience, and suspect that there are many more; it is their duty to speak up in the interests of the common good. For the moment the Catholic world is still waiting for them to find a conscience. In the meantime the reader may wish to ponder the implications of a "Traditional" Bishop who thinks that seven years is quite long enough for a 'homo' child-molester to return to public ministry, and the likely effects of any influence that such a bishop has over the Resistance. It does not inspire confidence. The

piece about Fr. Abraham was written and put on the internet, on a certain forum (not *Cathinfo!*), as a one-off post, back in September. The very next day a huge campaign of attacks against Our Lady of Mount Carmel seminary began. Why might be anyone's guess, but I find it a fascinating coincidence. In the meantime, nobody has attempted to deny what was written about Fr. Abraham. One priest (to my knowledge) claimed privately that the piece contained falsehoods, but went strangely silent when challenged to identify which parts specifically. I am told that when it was posted on *Cathinfo* it received the usual treatment and was air-brushed from history as though it had never existed. Spot the difference. Made-up stories about Pablo the Mexican communing with demons and putting curses on people: yes. Factual narrative about Bishop Williamson promoting a child molester homo priest: no.

## News from Mexico

Before I forget to mention it, do please remember Fr. Hugo Ruiz in your prayers. In March 2013 he made a declaration about the new direction ("When the salt loses its savour") and left the SSPX, ministering to souls in Mexico City. In recent months, certain interests have attempted to set up a rival Resistance Mass in Mexico city in an attempt to draw souls away from him and starve him of support. Given that this is very similar to the situation in London where for the past year a regular weekly Mass has been offered in a rival location by either Bishop Williamson or Fr. Abraham (both of whom, by the way, say that it is fine to go to the SSPX!), he has our greatest sympathy and deserves our full support. The priest responsible for the rival Mass in Mexico City is the same one who attempted (in Spanish, on the website *NonPossumus*) to defend Bishop Williamson's Novus Ordo advice (see Fr. Altamira's article in Issue 30). Since this priest is widely viewed as ultra-loyal to Bishop Williamson, one must wonder whether it is entirely his own initiative. Perhaps it is a tactic we will see more of in future: anyone who dares object can expect to be replaced by a rival. The fake Resistance marches on. Any readers of independent means are strongly encouraged to send financial help to Fr. Ruiz whose circumstances are rather straightened as a result of this latest underhand attack. Messages of support can also be sent to him at: [hugoruizv12.22@gmail.com](mailto:hugoruizv12.22@gmail.com)

Finally, permit me to wish a Merry Christmas and Holy New Year to all, friend and foe alike.

- The Editor



**Hail** and blessed be the hour and moment  
in which the Son of God was born  
of the most pure Virgin Mary, at midnight,  
in Bethlehem, in the piercing cold.  
In that hour vouchsafe, I beseech Thee, O  
my God, to hear my prayer and grant my  
desires, *[mention your request here]*  
through the merits of Our Saviour Jesus  
Christ, and of His blessed Mother.  
Amen.

# Snapshots from the Resistance in Mexico City (Fr. Hugo Ruiz)





Of Your Charity  
Remember to Pray for the **Holy Souls in Purgatory.**

Please also remember especially those who have gone to their  
reward since this latest crisis began:

Fr. Hector Bolduc	Fr. Luigi Villa
Fr. Nicholas Gruner	Rosalie Chalmers
Rose Withams	Gertrude Kendrick
Brian Withams	Stephen Power
William Bandlow	Geoffrey Kelly
Miryam Gomez	Rose Taylor
Ronald Warwick	Susan Horton
Santiago Hernandez	Paula Haig

**☉ God, Creator and Redeemer of all the Faithful,**

Grant to the souls of Thy servants departed full  
remission of their sins; that through the help of pious  
supplications, they may obtain that rest of which they have  
always been desirous. Who livests and reignest, world  
without end. Amen.

Eternal rest grant unto them, O Lord, and let perpetual  
light shine upon them. May they rest in peace.  
Amen.



# What Does the Church Teach About: Revealing the Sins of Others?

## The Catholic Encyclopaedia:

“Detraction is the unjust damaging of another’s good name by the revelation of some fault or crime of which that other is really guilty or at any rate is seriously believed to be guilty by the defamer.

[...]

There are times, nevertheless, when one may lawfully make known the offense of another even though as a consequence the trust hitherto reposed in him be rudely shaken or shattered. ... Even when the sin is in no sense public, it may still be divulged without contravening the virtues of justice or charity whenever such a course is for the common good or is esteemed to make for the good of the narrator, of his listeners, or even of the culprit. The right which the latter has to an assumed good name is extinguished in the presence of the benefit which may be conferred in this way.

The employment of this teaching, however, is limited by a twofold restriction.

- The damage which one may soberly apprehend as emerging from the failure to reveal another’s sin or vicious propensity must be a notable one as contrasted with the evil of defamation.
- No more in the way of exposure should be done than is required, and even a fraternal admonition ought rather to be substituted if it can be discerned to adequately meet the needs of the situation. ”

## 1917 Code of Canon Law:

### Canon 1935:

“ §1. However, any faithful is always allowed to denounce the crime of another, to ask for satisfaction or reparation of damages, or also for love of Justice, so that some scandal or evil may be repaired.

§2. Furthermore, there exists an obligation to denounce in all those cases in which such obligation is imposed by some law or particular legitimate precept, or even by the same natural right, for reason of danger to the faith or religion, or by cause of any other imminent public harm.”

*(§1. Quilibet tamen fidelium semper potest delictum alterius denunciare ad satisfactionem petendam vel damnum sibi resarciendum, vel etiam studio iustitiae ad alicuius scandalum vel mali reparationem.*

*§2. Imo obligatio denuntiationis urget quotiescunque ad id quis adigitur sive lege vel peculiari legitimo praecepto, sive ex ipsa naturali lege ob fidei vel religionis periculum vel aliud imminens publicum malum.)*

## St. Thomas Aquinas:

“With regard to the public denunciation of sins it is necessary to make a distinction: because sins may be either public or secret. In the case of public sins, a remedy is required not only for the sinner, that he may become better, but also for others, who know of his sin, lest they be scandalized. Wherefore such like sins should be denounced in public, according to the saying of the Apostle (1 Timothy 5:20): “Them that sin reprove before all, that the rest also may have fear,” which is to be understood as referring to public sins, as Augustine states (De Verb. Dom. xvi, 7).

On the other hand, in the case of secret sins, the words of Our Lord seem to apply (Matt. 18:15): “If thy brother shall offend against thee,” etc. For if he offend thee publicly in the presence of others, he no longer sins against thee alone, but also against others whom he disturbs. Since, however, a man's neighbour may take offense even at his secret sins, it seems that we must make yet a further distinction. For certain secret sins are hurtful to our neighbour either in his body or in his soul, as, for instance, when a man plots secretly to betray his country to its enemies, or when a heretic secretly turns other men away from the faith. And since he that sins thus in secret, sins not only against you in particular, but also against others, it is necessary to take steps to denounce him at once, in order to prevent him doing such harm, unless by chance you were firmly persuaded that this evil result would be prevented by admonishing him secretly. On the other hand there are other sins which injure none but the sinner, and the person sinned against, either because he alone is hurt by the sinner, or at least because he alone knows about his sin, and then our one purpose should be to succour our sinning brother: and just as the physician of the body restores the sick man to health, if possible, without cutting off a limb, but, if this be unavoidable, cuts off a limb which is least indispensable, in order to preserve the life of the whole body, so too he who desires his brother's amendment should, if possible, so amend him as regards his conscience, that he keep his good name.

For a good name is useful, first of all to the sinner himself, not only in temporal matters wherein a man suffers many losses, if he lose his good name, but also in spiritual matters, because many are restrained from sinning, through fear of dishonour, so that when a man finds his honour lost, he puts no curb on his sinning. Hence Jerome says on Matthew 18:15: “If he sin against thee, thou shouldst rebuke him in private, lest he persist in his sin if he should once become shameless or unabashed.” Secondly, we ought to safeguard our sinning brother's good name, both because the dishonour of one leads to the dishonour of others, according to the saying of Augustine (Ep. ad pleb. Hipponens. lxxviii): “When a few of those who bear a name for holiness are reported falsely or proved in truth to have done anything wrong, people will seek by busily repeating it to make it believed of all”: and also because when one man's sin is made public others are incited to sin likewise.

Since, however, one's conscience should be preferred to a good name, Our Lord wished that we should publicly denounce our brother and so deliver his conscience from sin, even though he should forfeit his good name. Therefore it is evident that the precept requires a secret admonition to precede public denunciation.”

(*Summa Theologica*, II.ii, Q.3, art.7, respondeo)

# Concerning Fr. Stephen Abraham

by Greg Taylor

*[Editor's note - The following was written online towards the end of September, 2015. It has disappeared from more than one website, and the website where it was originally written (ArchbishopLefebvreForum.proboards.com) was mysteriously shut down against the wishes of its owner not long afterwards. And yet it remains unchallenged to this day. No public reply, nor any denial have been made, nor will they be. Several people have since contacted the author with the evidence of their own experiences which confirms the conclusions contained herein. None of them yet have spoken up publicly, however.]*

## A Word to my Future Critics

I write the following not because I take any joy in it whatsoever but because I feel it my duty before God. Everything narrated herein is true, and there are many people able to substantiate it. If the matter were unsettled, or if there were any doubt, or if it were only a question of 'accusations' and not facts, I would not presume to bring this to a wider audience. As long as I believed that it served the interests of the common good, I kept quiet; now that I see that my silence is only allowing certain other unscrupulous souls to deepen the scandal, I am convinced that this is the course of action which the good of Tradition, the Church and the Catholic Faith demands. Like the family who would not press charges, the easy way out would be to keep quiet and leave the thankless and unenviable task to someone else, later on. But how much harm might be done in the meantime, and would I not share in the responsibility for that harm?

Finally, please consider that if I write this under my own name and not hiding behind the anonymity which characterises all things internet, it is only because I know that there are many people who have a vested interest in suppressing it and who will therefore attempt to cast doubt on it. Plenty of things are said anonymously on the internet, few of them true. Where something is as serious as this, anonymity would neither be honourable nor helpful, as it would be used as a motive of disbelief by those who do not, or will not believe. Therefore, whilst I am aware of the huge personal risk and the hatred which will doubtless be poured out on me, I offer what I have to tell below openly and honestly, with a clear conscience and confident that Almighty God still looks out for those who love Him.

## Fr. Abraham

The following are not opinions, speculations or suspicions, but facts. They are beyond denial and can be substantiated. For clarity, I have attempted to keep them in more or less chronological order as they occurred, and not necessarily as they came to light.

1. Fr. Abraham was ordained in the early 1990s and stationed in the Philippines and France, ending up in England. Two accusations were made against him, both essentially the same in nature (homosexual, pederastic) though separated in time by a decade or more and at

opposite ends of the earth. The first was in the Philippines in the 1990s, the second in France approximately ten years ago.

2. I have spoken to the priest who was stationed with Fr. Abraham in the Philippines in the 1990s and to whom the first accusation was made. Upon hearing the accusation against Fr. Abraham from the young man in question, whom he knew personally, this priest then told the local superior who eventually passed it up to Bishop Fellay. He is very critical of the way in which both the superior and Bishop Fellay handled the matter. Bishop Fellay told him, so he says, that every accusation has two sides to the story. He told me that he felt that they both reacted too slowly and did not take it sufficiently seriously. Action was, however, eventually taken.

3. In the end Fr. Abraham was moved to France. Priests and faithful in France were unaware of why he had been moved there.

4. His victim in France, approximately ten years ago, was a boy of 14.

5. Fr. Abraham spent some hours in a French Police cell but was released because the family did not wish to press charges.

6. This time the result was that the SSPX authorities forbade him to exercise a priestly ministry and sent him to live in relative seclusion, first in Bristol and then in Wimbledon. He was still allowed to dress as a priest, however, to be called "Father", and despite everything he still did have social contact with whichever faithful came to call at the priory.

7. At the end of 2013, roughly a year after being expelled from the SSPX, plans were going ahead for the purchasing of a house for Bishop Williamson, located in Broadstairs. Bishop Williamson said to at least one person that he would not be willing to go and live there unless Fr. Abraham left the SSPX priory and came to live with him. He also said the same to Fr. Abraham directly. Fr. Abraham agreed to this, and thus Bishop Williamson was willing to move into the new house in Broadstairs.

8. In January 2014 the purchase was completed and Fr. Abraham left the SSPX priory in Wimbledon to go and live in the new house at Broadstairs. He arrived some weeks before Bishop Williamson, who did not move in until the following March. I am told that he went "with the blessing of Fr. Morgan" (the District Superior) though I did not hear this from Fr. Morgan himself and am undecided as to what this might entail even if it is true.

9. Until the very last moment, as long as he was still living in the SSPX priory, Fr. Abraham performed no priestly function or ministry. It was therefore viewed by everyone as being his departure from the SSPX to live in Broadstairs which was the occasion and cause of his resuming his priestly ministry.

10. From January 2014 onwards Fr. Abraham offered Mass in Broadstairs, Kent and from January to March 2014 at the Resistance chapel in London. This was done with the explicit

approval and even (at times very strong) encouragement of Bishop Williamson. On one Sunday in February Fr. Abraham had been scheduled to offer Sunday Mass for the Resistance Mass in Scotland, but having left his ticket behind in the house, was about to turn around and go home. Bishop Williamson insisted that he go anyway and travel up by coach.

**11.** At about this time (I cannot recall the precise date), wishing to satisfy a feeling of unease and with the common good in mind, I asked Bishop Williamson in confidence what it was that Fr. Abraham had done which had earned him suspension from the SSPX. Bishop Williamson replied that he did not know.

**12.** Although some faithful remembered Fr. Abraham from twenty or more years prior, many had only a passing acquaintance with him or none at all. Almost from the very moment Fr. Abraham began to be involved with the Resistance, several faithful in London, Kent and Scotland remarked that he appeared to have decidedly 'homosexual' mannerisms.

**13.** In March 2014 I decided to "un-invite" Fr. Abraham from saying Mass for the Resistance in London. However much I might wish to do so now, I cannot in all honesty claim that my reason for doing this was the grave moral concern outlined above, of which we knew little at that point; rather I was motivated by a mixture of things, chiefly: concern over the contradictory things Fr. Abraham was saying in his sermons, such as his recommendation that the faithful attend the SSPX; the confusion which he had already caused in the congregation; and his avowal that he was not a Resistance priest and disagreed with the Resistance priests on some points. It is true that mixed in with this was a definite uneasiness about certain visible homosexual mannerisms which I and several others had noticed, but at this stage we would have felt unable to mention them, having nothing more than our own observations and suspicions and no inkling that something far more serious lay behind.

**14.** When rumours of a very serious nature concerning Fr. Abraham began to circulate in the early summer of 2015, two faithful who attended his Mass in Broadstairs decided to ask Fr. Abraham directly and in a face to face conversation, if nothing else so as to give him a chance to defend himself in the event that the rumours were malicious and unfounded. They therefore arranged a private interview with him at the house in Broadstairs. At this private interview, Fr. Abraham admitted to them that it was true that he had been the object of two separate accusations, and that the accusations were what had led to his suspension. Furthermore, he admitted that the accusations were true and that he was guilty of what he had been accused. He also said that he was not 'cured' of the temptation, that he still laboured under it, and that such incidents could happen again in the future. To one of the two faithful, a family father, he said that if ever the man were to catch him looking at his children in an unusual way, he was to give him a stern look or a sign so as to make him snap out of it.

**15.** Bishop Williamson is fully aware of all of this and yet he allows Fr. Abraham to exercise a public ministry. Although he has been asked not to return by most of the Resistance groups where he has at one time or another offered Mass, notably Ireland, Scotland and London (in 2014, before a rival Mass centre was set up), Fr. Abraham continues to offer Mass and hear confessions in Broadstairs and at the rival venue in London. Three or four weeks

ago [*i.e. late August 2015*] he led a Pilgrimage to Canterbury. Pictures of this are on the internet. A few months ago he did First Holy Communions in London. Again, pictures of it are publicly available on the internet.

**16.** Bishop Williamson does not merely allow or tolerate this state of affairs: it is he who is chiefly responsible for it, not only due to the circumstances of Fr. Abraham's resuming of public ministry (outlined above) but also due to his episcopal rank. There is good evidence to suggest that it is chiefly out of obedience to Bishop Williamson that Fr. Abraham is still ministering in public, and that were it not for this he would no longer do so. On the occasion of the private interview conducted in Broadstairs with two faithful, Fr. Abraham himself expressed doubt as to whether he should be exercising a public ministry or whether he ought to retire into seclusion. When he said this he was speaking privately face-to-face with the faithful and Bishop Williamson was not present. A little while later, and after he would have had an opportunity to speak to Bishop Williamson privately, he spoke to the same people again and his tone and attitude were quite different.

**17.** Further to this is the undeniable fact that Bishop Williamson does not consider that there is any reason for anyone to be concerned about Fr. Abraham, as he has said more than once. He has reacted very angrily towards any faithful who have tried to raise concerns regarding Fr. Abraham, and although he has not attempted to deny the "accusations" which (thanks to Fr. Abraham's moment of honesty) we now know to be facts, yet he has suggested that it is not a concern because "it was a long time ago."

**18.** At around the start of the summer of 2015, when the facts concerning the reason for Fr. Abraham's suspension were first beginning to emerge, I and others from amongst the faithful felt unsure what to do. It had been commented that it was not fair that we, mere laymen, should be left to carry so great a burden, worrying for the future and wondering what should be done. At the same time if we did not even try to do something, we would by our silence become complicit in any future misadventure by that priest. Bishop Williamson had already shown that he would not listen and was hostile towards anyone raising the issue with him. Since we felt that something had to be done, I decided that I would approach Bishop Faure and plead with him to do something to help. I did not have any contact details for Bishop Faure, however. All I had was news, via a French website, that he would be performing confirmations at Avrillé over Pentecost.

**19.** I therefore travelled to France at very short notice, intent on speaking to Bishop Faure face to face, and waited at Avrillé, refusing to leave until I had done so. In the end I was there for five days. Bishop Faure was very polite, listened intently to all I had to say, smiled a lot, and made sympathetic noises. However, whenever I pressed the question of action and asked him to do something he became evasive, was reluctant to suggest anything and did not say anything that amounted to much. The closest I came to obtaining any real advice from him essentially was: "That sounds very serious. We'd better hope that nobody finds out." It was useless to point out to him that the scandal was getting out anyway, that word had already spread around many people in Britain and Ireland and would in all likelihood continue to do so, and that what was needed was real action. In the end, despite a conversation lasting a

couple of hours at least, I left essentially empty handed and unable to report anything hopeful on my return.

20. Not many weeks later, in the summer of 2015, Bishop Faure offered Sunday Mass publicly in the London chapel served by and associated with Fr. Abraham.

### **In Summary:**

A priest who is a predatory homosexual pederast guilty of two known delicts, at least one of which was against a legal minor, and who by his own admission is still tempted and who is thus still a real danger, is brought into the Resistance by Bishop Williamson and is sent by him out onto the Mass circuit alone. This, despite the fact that the priest had already been suspended by Bishop Fellay for precisely this reason, despite the pleas and concerns raised by a number of faithful, despite the priest himself indicating that he is still potentially a danger and that it could happen again, despite the teaching and laws of the Church, the dictates of common sense and above all the interests of the common good. Bishop Faure was approached for help on the matter, but offered no advice, promised no help and finally gave a public gesture of support for Fr. Abraham by saying Mass at his London venue. A small number of faithful who are devoted to Bishop Williamson, although they are aware of the facts concerning Fr. Abraham, are nevertheless keen to promote him for reasons of their own making, and photographs are regularly published on a website operated by them showing Fr. Abraham ministering to unsuspecting souls, leading pilgrimages, etc. These actions only serve to spread and deepen the scandal and amongst other things, show that silence on our part is no longer helping the interests of the common good. According to the law of the Church, to say nothing of common sense, this priest should not be functioning as a priest in public any longer. If he were to live out the rest of his life in seclusion, offering up prayer and penance, I am convinced that he could well become a Saint. If the current situation continues, disaster, scandal and further damage to the Church, Tradition and the Priesthood are around the corner. His Bishop is deaf to all pleas and the other Bishop associated with him refuses to act. In such circumstances as these, what are the faithful to do?



“My grief urges my tongue to speak, but fear restrains the words; fear only lest I may offend some one if I speak openly of what troubles me, since truth sometimes makes enemies. But for enmity of this kind thus incurred I hear the Truth consoling me. It must needs be, He says, that scandals come. And I do not think that those words which follow, “woe to that man by whom the scandal cometh” (Matt 18:7) concern me. For when vices are attacked and scandal results from it, it is not he who makes the accusation who is to answer for the scandal, but he who renders it necessary.”

- *St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Letter XIX*

*Just in case any of Bishop Williamson's fans feel tempted to claim that it is not so serious, or "a long time ago" (2006 - 2013, seven years, is that such a long time!?), or otherwise to try to defend the indefensible, here is a timely little reminder. Originally posted on: [www.therecasant.com](http://www.therecasant.com) (September, 2015)*

## **What Does the Church Teach about Clerical Immorality?**

### **1917 Code of Canon Law:**

#### **Canon 2359**

§1. Clerics in holy orders, whether they be secular or religious, who are living in concubinage, when a prior warning has proved useless, are to be compelled to withdraw from the illicit companionship and to repair the scandal by suspension (*'suspensio a divinis'*), by being deprived of the fruits of office, benefits, dignity, with due regard to the provisions of Canons 2176-2181.

§ 2. If an offense against the sixth commandment with minors under sixteen years of age be admitted, or if adultery, rape, bestiality, sodomy, pimping or incest with first degree relations be carried out, they are to be suspended, declared infamous and deprived of every office, benefit, dignity and function that they might have and in the more serious cases, deposed.

§ 3. If they have committed an offense against the sixth commandment in some other way, they are to be coerced with appropriate penalties according to the gravity of the case, not excluding deprivation of office or benefit, especially if they have care of souls.

*(§1. Clerici in sacris sive saeculares sive religiosi concubinarii, monitione inutiliter praemissa, cogantur ab illicito contubernio recedere et scandalum reparare suspensione a divinis, privatione fructuum officii, beneficii, dignitatis, servato praescripto can. 2176-2181.*

*§2. Si delictum admiserint contra sextum decalogi praeceptum cum minoribus infra aetatem sexdecim annorum, vel adulterium, stuprum, bestialitatem, sodomiam, lenocinium, incestum cum consanguineis aut affinibus in primo gradu exercuerint, suspendantur, infames declarantur, quolibet officio, beneficio, dignitate, munere, si quod habeant, priventur, et in casibus gravioribus deponantur.*

*§3. Si aliter contra sextum decalogi praeceptum deliquerint, congruis poenis secundum casus gravitatem coerceantur, non excepta officii vel beneficii privatione, maxime si curam animarum gerant. - translation our own.)*

### **Fourth Lateran Council:**

#### **“ 14. Clerical incontinence**

In order that the morals and conduct of clerics may be reformed for the better, let all of them strive to live in a continent and chaste way, especially those in holy orders. Let them beware of every vice involving lust, especially that on account of which the wrath of God came

down from heaven upon the sons of disobedience, so that they may be worthy to minister in the sight of almighty God with a pure heart and an unsullied body. Lest the ease of receiving pardon prove an incentive to sin, we decree that those who are caught giving way to the vice of incontinence are to be punished according to canonical sanctions, in proportion to the seriousness of their sins. We order such sanctions to be effectively and strictly observed, in order that those whom the fear of God does not hold back from evil may at least be restrained from sin by temporal punishment. Therefore anyone who has been suspended for this reason and presumes to celebrate divine services, shall not only be deprived of his ecclesiastical benefices but shall also, on account of his twofold fault, be deposed in perpetuity. Prelates who dare to support such persons in their wickedness, especially if they do it for money or for some other temporal advantage, are to be subject to like punishment. Those clerics who have not renounced the marriage bond, following the custom of their region, shall be punished even more severely if they fall into sin, since for them it is possible to make lawful use of matrimony.”

### St. Thomas Aquinas:

“Heretical, schismatical, excommunicate, or even sinful priests, although they have the power to consecrate the Eucharist, yet they do not make a proper use of it; on the contrary, they sin by using it. But whoever communicates with another who is in sin, becomes a sharer in his sin. Hence we read in John's Second Canonical Epistle (11) that ‘He that saith unto him, God speed you, communicateth with his wicked works.’ Consequently, it is not lawful to receive Communion from them, or to assist at their mass.

Still there is a difference among the above, because heretics, schismatics, and excommunicates, have been forbidden, by the Church's sentence, to perform the Eucharistic rite. And therefore whoever hears their mass or receives the sacraments from them, commits sin. But not all who are sinners are debarred by the Church's sentence from using this power: and so, although suspended by the Divine sentence, yet they are not suspended in regard to others by any ecclesiastical sentence: consequently, until the Church's sentence is pronounced, it is lawful to receive Communion at their hands, and to hear their Mass. Hence on 1 Corinthians 5:11, ‘with such a one not so much as to eat,’ Augustine's gloss runs thus: ‘In saying this he was unwilling for a man to be judged by his fellow man on arbitrary suspicion, or even by usurped extraordinary judgment, but rather by God's law, according to the Church's ordering, whether he confess of his own accord, or whether he be accused and convicted.’

[...]

By refusing to hear the masses of such priests, or to receive Communion from them, we are not shunning God's sacraments; on the contrary, by so doing we are giving them honour (hence a host consecrated by such priests is to be adored, and if it be reserved, it can be consumed by a lawful priest): but what we shun is the sin of the unworthy ministers.”

- *Summa Theologica*, III, Q.82, Article 9 (“Whether it is permissible to receive communion from heretical, excommunicate or sinful priests, and to hear Mass said by them?”) Respondeo et seq.

## St. Peter Damian:

“... I would surely prefer to be thrown into the well like Joseph who informed his father of his brothers’ foul crime, than to suffer the penalty of God’s fury, like Eli, who saw the wickedness of his sons and remained silent. (Sam 2:4) ... Who am I, when I see this pestilential practice flourishing in the priesthood to become the murderer of another’s soul by daring to repress my criticism in expectation of the reckoning of God’s judgement? ... How, indeed, am I to love my neighbour as myself if I negligently allow the wound, of which I am sure he will brutally die, to fester in his heart? ... “So let no man condemn me as I argue against this deadly vice, for I seek not to dishonour, but rather to promote the advantage of my brother’s well-being. “Take care not to appear partial to the delinquent while you persecute him who sets him straight. If I may be pardoned in using Moses’ words, ‘Whoever is for the Lord, let him stand with me.’ (Ezek 32:26)”

- Letter 31, ‘Liber Gomorrhianus’

**...Even the conciliar church has the following to say:**

### 1983 Code of Canon Law:

“Canon 1395 §2. A cleric who in another way has committed an offense against the sixth commandment of the Decalogue, if the delict was committed by force or threats or publicly or with a minor below the age of sixteen years, is to be punished with just penalties, not excluding dismissal from the clerical state if the case so warrants.”

## **Resist All Modernism!** **(Wherever it comes from!)**



Please Note the New Address for -  
**“The Recusant Mass Fund”**

*Dalton House  
60 Windsor Avenue  
London  
SW19 2RR*

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR SUPPORT!**

**October 2015  
Fr. Ribas visits London**



*Prayer for Priests:*  
**All Night Adoration in London**



**Fr. Jacqmin in  
Grantham**

November 2015  
Fr. Pfeiffer visits London



(Baptism in London)



(November 2015):  
Fr. Jacqmin visits  
South Wales...



...and Leighton Buz-



Whereas we thought the issue had been dealt with, within recent weeks Bishop Williamson has released a series of “Eleison Comments” emails defending and elaborating on his novel position regarding the New Mass. Error, and indeed anything liable to harm or weaken the Faith, must be resisted vigorously, no matter from what quarter it emerges. Therefore some comment on this is necessary and unavoidable. We deal with them in reverse order, the most recent first. All the main (unattributed) quotes are from the “Eleison Comments” indicated. Source: [stmarcelinitiative.com/eleison-comments/back-issue/](http://stmarcelinitiative.com/eleison-comments/back-issue/)

## Bishop Williamson: More Novus Ordo Madness!

### 1. ‘Eleison Comments’ No.438 (5th December, 2015) :

*“Catholics, be generous! Recognize God’s goal /  
/ To save, outside “Tradition,” many a soul.”*

*“However, these [Novus Ordo] miracles – always assuming they are authentic – have lessons also for the Catholics of Tradition who have to some extent or another stood back from the Novus Ordo framework.”*

#### Comment:

Is it really wise to “assume they are authentic”? (See 2. ‘Eleison Comments’ 437, p.24) Secondly, “Novus Ordo framework” seems to mean ‘the conciliar church.’ But Archbishop Lefebvre told us not just to “stand back from” it “to some extent or another”, but to have *nullam partem*, nothing whatever to do with it! What new lessons do Catholics outside the conciliar church need to be taught, and why? And how do these “lessons” differ from what Archbishop Lefebvre taught us? Here is what Archbishop Lefebvre and the old SSPX had to say about the “extent” to which we should “stand back from” the “framework” of the conciliar church:

**“We are suspended *a divinis* by the conciliar church, **the conciliar church, to which we have no wish to belong!** This conciliar church is a schismatic church because it breaks with the Catholic Church that has always been. It has its new dogmas, its new priesthood, its new institutions, its new worship... The church that affirms such errors is at once schismatic and heretical. **This conciliar church is, therefore, not Catholic.**”**

(*Reflections on suspensio a divinis*, 1976)

“I should be very happy to be excommunicated from this conciliar church... It is a Church that I do not recognize. I belong to the Catholic Church.”

(*Minute* interview, 30th July 1976)

“We have never wished to belong to this system that calls itself the conciliar church. To be excommunicated by a decree of your eminence... would be the irrefutable proof

that we do not. We ask for nothing better than to be declared excommunicated... excluded from impious communion with infidels.”

(‘*Open Letter to Card Gantin*’, 6th July 1988)

*“Therefore the NOM and the Novus Ordo Church as a whole are dangerous for the Faith, and Catholics are right who have clung to Tradition to avoid the danger. But as they have had to put a distance between themselves and the mainstream Church, so they have exposed themselves to the opposite danger of an isolation leading to a sectarian and even pharisaical spirit, disconnected from reality.”*

**Comment:**

Why did Archbishop Lefebvre say he was *happy* about something which is in fact dangerous? Was he really so ignorant and irresponsible? Why did the SSPX superiors in 1988 write to Rome asking for something dangerous?

Or is not this talk about the “danger” of being “isolated” the “mainstream Church” (note - not the ‘conciliar church’) exactly what we have heard in recent years from Fr. Pfluger and Bishop Fellay? Likewise the supposed “danger” of becoming “pharasaical”, “sectarian” and “disconnected from reality” if we are not more open minded towards the conciliar church? Did Bishop Williamson get Fr. Pfluger to write this for him..?!

*“...while since the 1960’s a mass of Catholic sheep have become too worldly to deserve to keep the true rite of Mass, [yet] they have loved the Mass enough not to lose it altogether.”*

**Comment:**

So: people were too worldly to have the true Mass, but they had some redeeming virtue, so God rewarded them a little bit by letting them have the Novus Ordo? Does this not imply that the Novus Ordo is ‘good but not as good as’ the Traditional Mass? Yet the SSPX always used to say that the Novus Ordo is evil. If the Novus Ordo is evil, surely those Catholics who lapsed and ended up with no Mass were better off? Does not the experience of the last 40 years bear this out: Catholics who lapsed forty years ago still sound like Catholics when one talks to them, whereas Catholics who have been pickled in the un-Catholic Novus Ordo for the last 40 years have nothing about them which previous generations would recognise as Catholic. Two generations of SSPX priests have witnessed how the former often convert easily back to Tradition, whereas the latter are virtually irretrievable and much harder to convert. How can God use the Novus Ordo, a rite which replaces ones Faith with another religion, as a reward for those who “have loved the Mass enough”..?

*“The NOM [Novus Ordo Mass] may have been allowed by God to make it easier for Catholics to leave the Faith if they wanted to, but not impossible to keep it if they wanted to.”*

**Comment:**

This seems to confirm our suspicions about the portion quoted above. Last year an SSPX priest told the London congregation that whereas the Traditional Mass gives a waterfall of grace, the New Mass gives only a trickle of grace. This idea that the New Mass is only “not as good as” the Traditional Mass seems to be what Bishop Williamson is advocating too when he says that it “makes it easier for Catholics to leave the Faith ... but not impossible to keep it.” This is very, very different from saying that it actually destroys and is harmful to

one's Faith. Not having Mass, a chapel, the Blessed Sacrament to visit, a priest to confess regularly to, being poorly catechised as a child or ignorance of Catholic doctrine generally, having a non-Catholic spouse - these are all things which make it easier to lose the Faith. To use an analogy: not having enough food or water, shelter or warm clothing in winter makes it easier to die. But if an evildoer puts arsenic in your tea or turns the gas at night on so that you are poisoned to death while you sleep, that is something altogether different. One is a mere defect, the other a positive evil. Once again, here is Archbishop Lefebvre:

*“Let there be no mistake. It is not a question of a difference between Mgr. Lefebvre and Pope Paul VI. It is a question of the radical incompatibility between the Catholic Church and the Conciliar Church, the Mass of Paul VI being the symbol and the program of the Conciliar Church.”*

(Note to Agence France Presse, 12th July, 1976)

*“Well! It is precisely the insistent demands of those sent from Rome that we change our rite which makes us reflect. And we are convinced that **this new rite of Mass expresses a new faith, a faith which is not ours, a faith which is not the Catholic Faith.** This new Mass is a symbol, an expression, an image of a new faith, a Modernist faith.”*

(Ordinations sermon at Econe, 29th June 1976)

*“This Mass is not evil in a merely accidental or extrinsic way. There is something in it that is truly evil. It was based on the model of the Mass according to Cranmer and Taize. As I said in Rome to those who interviewed me: It is a poisoned Mass”*

(Abp. Lefebvre, 1981, see: ‘Biography of Marcel Lefebvre, p.465)

## 2. ‘Eleison Comments’ No.437 (30th November, 2015):

*“The eucharistic miracles are where /  
/ God shows that He Himself is truly there.”*

*“Facts are stubborn - as long as they are facts. If readers doubt that the eucharistic miracle of 1996 in Buenos Aires is a fact, let them undertake their own research..”*

### Comment:

The limited research of this author, given limited time and resources, suggest a couple of concerns, not least that there seem to be several accounts of what took place, particularly how/where/when the host was dropped, and also that at least two of the scientists whose testimony plays a major part in the story are Novus Ordo Catholics.

*“But if their research of that case leaves them unconvinced, then let them look up the parallel case of Sokólka in Poland, where a whole centre of pilgrimage has arisen around a eucharistic miracle of 2008. And a little more Internet research would surely discover accounts of more such Novus Ordo miracles, with at least some of them being authentic.”*

### Comment:

In other words: “There are lots of miracles! There are so many that at least one of them has to be genuine!” Non sequitur. If one is false, they might just as easily all be false. Like the man who falls for one scam after another and says to himself: “One of them has to be

genuine!” If there are bogus Saints and bogus miracles in the Novus Ordo, then all that tells us is that we cannot trust the Novus Ordo to give us genuine Saints and miracles.

*“This is because the NOM, like Vatican II which it followed, is ambiguous, favours heresy and has led numberless souls out of the Church...”*

**Comment:**

The last part, that the New Mass “has led numberless souls out of the Church” is correct. That Vatican II “is ambiguous”, however, is a dangerous lie, one subscribed to for years by many a Novus Ordo conservative, and sold to us more recently by Bishop Fellay and the liberals in the neo-SSPX. There are many things in Vatican II which are not ambiguous, which have only one interpretation, and which are irreconcilable with Tradition (*Dignitatis Humanae*’s teaching on ‘Religious Liberty’ being perhaps the most infamous).

*“Doctrinally, the NOM [Novus Ordo Mass] is ambiguous, poised between the religion of God and the Conciliar religion of man. Now in matters of faith, ambiguity is deadly, being normally designed to undermine the Faith, as the NOM frequently does. But as ambiguity is precisely open to two interpretations, so the NOM does not absolutely exclude the old religion.”*

**Comment:**

“Normally” designed to undermine the Faith? Which it “frequently” does?! So not always, then? In other words, it is not intrinsically evil, only sometimes; whereas sometimes it does not undermine the Faith! Likewise, the Novus Ordo is not merely “ambiguous”! As Archbishop Lefebvre says, “There is something in it that is truly evil”. Since the rest of what Bishop Williamson writes is based on that false premise (that the Novus Ordo is only ambiguous), his conclusion, that the Novus Ordo “does not exclude the old religion” is equally flawed. Again, Archbishop Lefebvre talks about the “radically incompatibility” between the old religion and the new one, epitomised by the New Mass. How can a thing be radically incompatible with something but at the same time not exclude it?

*“That does not make the NOM acceptable as such, because its intrinsic ambiguity still favours the new direction, but it does mean for instance that the Consecration can still be valid, as Archbishop Lefebvre never denied. Moreover, if the eucharistic miracles are genuine, clearly not all Consecrations of Novus Ordo bishops or Ordinations of Novus Ordo priests are invalid either.”*

**Comment:**

Discussion of validity is surely beside the point altogether. A priest who is a secret Satanist or Freemason, for example, might confect a valid sacrament in order to perform sacrilegious desecration. That it is valid is no consolation whatsoever, and is certainly no indication of whether good can ever come from attending it. Attending a satanic Black Mass would not help you get to heaven, even if it were valid.

*“In brief, the NOM as such is bad as a whole, bad in parts, but not bad in all its parts.”*

**Comment:**

All evil is only “evil in parts but not all its parts.” There is not such thing as “pure evil”,

because the definition of evil is that it is the absence of a due good. A table with only three legs is a bad table. A table missing all its legs and the table-top cannot be so described. Only one part evil makes the whole evil. Therefore, what Bishop Williamson ought to say is simply “The Novus Ordo is evil.” (why ‘bad’?). As it is, what looks like a redeeming qualification is really no more than an rhetorical illusion.

*“What specified Vatican II and the NOM was precisely the officialisation of the modernist heresy within the Church. So does it not make sense that in punishment of their modern worldliness these sheep would broadly lose the true rite of Mass, while in reward of their desire for Mass they would not lose every valid Mass?”*

**Comment:**

No, it does not. Almighty God does not “reward” people by giving them something evil, something poisoned, something radically incompatible with the Catholic Faith. One fares better attending no Mass at all than attending the Novus Ordo. Once again, the idea that the New Mass is somehow not as good as the Traditional Mass but still better than nothing, is novel, untrue, disproved by the experience of the past forty years. In its full implications this idea is also very, very dangerous to the Faith.

**3. ‘Eleison Comments’ No.436 (21st November, 2015) :**

***“God has worked miracles with the N.O. Mass? /  
/ That’s what the evidence suggests. Alas?”***

*“When in June of 1976 Archbishop Lefebvre was on the brink of ordaining the first large batch of SSPX priests despite Rome’s disapproval, a Roman official came to promise him the end of all problems with Rome if only he would celebrate one Novus Ordo Mass. On principle, for doctrinal reasons, he refused. Then how can Almighty God have worked eucharistic miracles with and for this new Mass? Read here next week a suggested answer.”*

**Comment:**

It should be clear by now that Bishop Williamson’s ideas about the New Mass are at radical variance with those of Archbishop Lefebvre and the Society of St. Pius X of old. Archbishop Lefebvre was quite right to refuse to say the New Mass and to prefer suspension in 1976. With his final question (“The how can Almighty God...?”), Bishop Williamson sows doubt into the mind of his reader not only about the orthodoxy of the Novus Ordo Mass, but also about Archbishop Lefebvre and what he stood for. Was the Archbishop perhaps deliberately being difficult towards the Romans, just to make a point, where he could have chosen to be more accommodating and not been any the worse for it? Is it enough to say that he refused “on principle, for doctrinal reasons” and leave it at that? It is true, his refusal was principled, and it was for doctrinal reasons. But I rather suspect that Archbishop Lefebvre would have said that he *had no right* to say the New Mass, since it was evil and poisoned and was destroying the Faith of countless millions; that he had no option, that to have agreed and said the New Mass would have been a sin.

As to Bishop Williamson’s “suggested answer” to his own question, presented in the two subsequent Eleison Comments, we have already examined it above. In short, his answer is

that the Traditional Mass is a reward for fidelity and lack of worldliness, whereas the New Mass is a lesser reward for ‘loving the Mass’. It is not as good as the Traditional Mass, but still good and does not exclude the old religion. If you feel tempted to leave the Faith, the New Mass will be less of an obstacle than the old Mass.

One thing we have avoided touching on is whether the Novus Ordo miracles are really genuine. Well? Are they? The simple truth is I do not know, at least in the scientific sense, but every Catholic instinct in me says no. Three possibilities occur. The first is that they are fakes and frauds. That is not impossible. The world is full of lies now like it never was before. Lies throughout the media, education, banking and finance, everywhere. People generally are more used to the idea that one tells lies to get ahead, they are numb to it. We know that the conciliar church is not above a little dishonesty, now and then, in order to get its way (if they can’t be trusted with the Third Secret of Fatima, why should they suddenly be trusted concerning these ‘miracles’?)

The second possibility is that we are witnessing something like the “signs and prodigies” which Sacred Scripture prophesies will be seen towards the end of times. Certainly, if these ‘miracles’ have the power to lead many Traditional Catholics including some souls with the Resistance and one bishop (who is not, though many think he is) to a softening towards the abominable Novus Ordo, then that might well be an example of “deceiving, if possible, even the elect.” I only suggest it as a possibility - I may be wrong, and I await correction from any priest who would care to put me right.

The third possibility is that they are genuine and are sent as a warning from Almighty God against the sacrilege of the Novus Ordo Mass. There have been cases of miracles warning people off sacrilege. In Belgium, a couple of centuries ago, some Jews stole a host and stabbed it with knives. It bled. They converted. Clearly, desecrating a host by stabbing it with knives is not something God wants us to do, and the miracle does not lend approval to the action which prompted it in any way.

One thing is certain. That Almighty God can be using miracles to give His divine seal of approval to the New Mass is *not* a possibility. What is worrying is that Bishop Williamson discusses none of the three possibilities mentioned above. Nowhere in three separate ‘Eleison Comments’ does he even entertain the idea that the ‘miracles’ might be fakes or prodigies. Nor does he suggest that they might be a warning against sacrilege. Instead, he begins with the *assumption* that they are genuine (which in itself is staggering, when you think about it) and talks about “facts” being “stubborn” as though the matter were already proven beyond question. He then proceeds to use that unfounded assumption to push through a novel teaching about the New Mass of his own device, one which is completely at variance with Archbishop Lefebvre. The entire fiasco is summed up neatly in, and hinted ominously by, one word: the last word of the little jangle at the start of the first email. (“Alas?”), its question mark loaded with suggestiveness.

I am not much of a dab hand at silly rhyming couplets, but in an attempt to summarise the whole sorry business, here is my poor offering:

**The Bishop thinks the New Mass can be good?  
That’s bad enough. What’s worse is why he would!**

The following letter is the (at the time of writing) latest newsletter by Fr. Gerardo Zendejas. It is taken from the website which publishes his newsletters: [www.thebluepaper.org](http://www.thebluepaper.org) His prose style can be at times obscure and we apologise for any headaches caused to those attempting to read and understand it all, however in the interests of honesty and fair play we feel it our duty, as always, to reproduce it in full. Those with less patience or less time will find our own commentary at the end, discussing the main points of his thinking and his message to the faithful. Once again, as always, we invite the reader to draw his own conclusion.

### **“The Blue Paper” No. 300 | The Pact of Silence: A Virus for Tradition**

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

As Catholics we are always compelled to choose between Truth and “obedience.” Moreover, we must likewise choose between practicing the dogma “outside the Church there is no salvation” and the present ecclesiastical orientation, which thinks and believes otherwise—between the immemorial teaching of the Church, which states that schismatics and heretics are “outside the Catholic Church,” and the modern ecclesiastical orientation, which started with the spirit of the council (Aggiornamento). This Modernist spirit has been continued nowadays by the New Evangelization’s fever, and is being promoted by the attitude of the “Hermeneutic of Continuity” in traditionalist groups.

In the conflict between “obedience” and Truth, better-informed Catholics have chosen the Truth, as did Archbishop Lefebvre. In his thinking, with the Church according to Tradition, the Archbishop’s *sensus fidei* maintained that only Truth will ensure union with the invisible Head of the Church, Our Lord Jesus Christ. 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 continued to act “within the Church and according to the Church,” resisting the new ecclesiastical tide in the measure that it attempts to distance itself from the doctrines and practices of the Faith, kept and transmitted by the Catholic Church, and desiring—in spite of many disappointments—that 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 another (contradictory) way by Modernists, like some post-Conciliar prelates who want to preach about things like “unity in diversity,” or “silent apostasy while keeping the faith.” Certainly, deeds speak louder than words. In today’s Official Church Pope Francis is an ultra-Modernist prelate—a master of contrarities, who says he is not against Catholic teaching and yet favors a humanistic world! By the same token, the ranks of traditional priests—in particular within the SSPX, the backbone of Tradition—are being infected again with such a dilemma between Truth and “obedience,” a note of our confusing time.

In the days 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 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.

In this perspective, the break between the unity of faith and a pretended “unity of communion” with the hierarchy (to do what the Council says, or to be with the Pope), which 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, continues to be given through grace.

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

In this state of “uneasiness,” the faithful find their religion attacked by those very people who are 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 the Bishops.

We could never appreciate enough the great blessing of having Archbishop Lefebvre to lead the battle for the Faith! Here is a reminder of his Catholic instinct as regards talks with Rome:

Among those words from the Vatican News on June 16, 1988, concerning the Protocol between Rome and the SSPX, there are certain expressions “to be used as a basis ... for reconciliation.” At that time, the Archbishop himself, and 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 longer to criticize the innovations of the authorities.

The bitter experience of the years following Vatican II has proven that to dialogue “in an attitude of study and communication” with the Roman hierarchy—even with different prelates and their various temperaments and ecclesiastical understandings—has been an utter drama, not only regarding the critical status of Catholic teaching throughout the world, but also in the decline of unity of 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 the auto-demolition of the Church.

As we know, Tradition does not mean exterior customs, such as 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. St. Peter, as the first Pope, did defend this Treasure and Deposit of Faith, until his martyrdom for Christ’s sake. As it was St. Peter’s duty, so must it be that of the present Pope. Evidently, that is not the case with Pope Francis.

Catholic Tradition is not to be regarded “as an SSPX-particular charisma,” as Cardinal Gagnon himself stated during his official interview with the *Avvenire* on June 17, 1988, “On our part [the 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 had not committed. His fight for the Treasure of the Faith should not be ended with surrender, because that would mean that Tradition would no longer be part of the Truth Revealed by God—in Whom there could be no change, Who is eternal Truth.

For the Archbishop it was clear that talking to Rome was impossible, so that “to collaborate” with a hierarchy that turns to a “living Tradition” as a way of adapting the Faith to the modern world would end—sooner or later—in some compromise or surrender, or at least in some cooperation by silence.

Unfortunately, this is the scenario in which many traditional priests and faithful are involved, in our current struggles to defend the Catholic Church. Needless to say, the real problem is still in Rome, wherein the “official authorities in keeping the true faith, but not in safeguarding there administrative individual authority in a frame which looks in exterior order yet is diabolically disoriented.”

In like manner, so it has been for traditionalist faithful (including priests and bishops) since the SSPX General Chapter of June 2012. During 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 desire to remain exteriorly so, and when circumstances brought pressure to bear 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**

So what’s so wrong with all this then? Why bother wasting nearly two-and-a-half pages of this newsletter (not to mention, a certain portion of your valuable time) with what one priest has to say about Vatican II? It may not be easy read but he seems to be generally against it, doesn’t he? He’s one of us, isn’t he? Isn’t what he says more or less right? ...Look again!

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

The first sentence of the entire letter does not make sense. It looks like a conditional clause but is really a non-sequitur. There is no question of *if* there *could* be “salvation outside the Conciliar Church [sic].” Archbishop Lefebvre said that it was your duty to separate yourself from and have nothing whatever to do with the conciliar Church. If one has to ask such questions, one ought rather to ask if there could be salvation *inside* the conciliar church! One rather suspects the answer is a resounding “No!” at least for the likes of you and I. The second part of the sentence asks about there being salvation outside the SSPX “or other Traditionalist groups” (so, outside of being a Traditionalist, in other words). This is very much a Bishop Williamson preoccupation, as the very latest Eleison Comments it making clear. It is neither useful nor helpful to speculate and one wonders why he should open his letter by sowing doubt in the mind of the reader about the usefulness of Tradition or whether even one can find salvation outside the conciliar Church!

*“As Catholics we are always compelled to choose between Truth and “obedience.” ”*

This statement is simply not true. Was it just a slip of the pen, perhaps? The two alternatives are not really alternatives but belong to different choices. Either we are compelled to choose between truth and error, or we are compelled to choose between obedience and disobedience. Truth and obedience are not alternatives, they go together. Of course, it is true that since the Council many Catholics have had to choose between truth and the *appearance* of obedience, but that is not what Fr. Zendejas says. Furthermore, that appearance of obedience is only a mirage: in reality, by obeying an unjust law or ruler, we are disobeying a higher

law, a higher ruler: the truth, Almighty God; just as in disobeying something unlawful, we are really being obedient. Ss. Thomas More and John Fisher chose the truth over the mere appearance of obedience: in reality, in disobeying Henry VIII they were being obedient to Almighty God. St. Thomas teaches that a law which is unjust or evil (the abortion act, would be a good example) in reality is no law at all, since the authority for laws must come from God. But Fr. Zendejas is not making this distinction. Notice, for example, that he says that we are *always* compelled to choose (not “often”, not “since Vatican II...” nor even “...in modern times...”). Likewise he begins not with: “As Traditional Catholics...” but: “As Catholics...” This seems to suggest that it is a normal state of affairs, whereas it is really a symptom of the crisis in the Church. Authority is a good thing and exists for a good reason: it is there to help compel us to do the good which we might otherwise be too weak to do even if we know it. Fr. Zendejas’s words appear to destroy confidence in authority itself. (Again, I wonder if I am imagining the preoccupation of a certain Bishop in his writing...?)

### “Present Ecclesiastical” what...?!

*“Moreover, we must likewise choose between practicing the dogma “outside the Church there is no salvation” and the present ecclesiastical orientation...”*

Throughout his whole letter Fr. Zendejas skilfully avoids naming what the problem with the Council is, or what it has constructed. There reference in the first line to the “Conciliar Church”[sic], (asking whether there can be salvation outside of it!) is the one only reference to that abominable pseudo-institution. For the whole rest of the letter he seems to rely on euphemisms, with “the present ecclesiastical orientation” being only the first of many such.

### Gently Exonerating the Council

Fr. Zendejas then goes on to talk about the: “*modern ecclesiastical orientation*” [again, what is that exactly?] “...which started with the spirit of the Council” - ah, so the *spirit* of the Council is to blame, not the Council itself then? Bishop Fellay himself could hardly have put it better! He goes on:

*“The Modernist spirit has been continued nowadays by the New Evangelization’s fever...”*

Notice the phrase “Modernist spirit” where you would expect to read simply “Modernism”. The two are not the same thing: think about it. And what is this “New Evangelisation’s fever” which is responsible for continuing a bad “spirit”? Who knows. It can get very confusing very quickly when you try to decipher what Fr. Zendejas is saying. Just purely out of interest, I counted the number of other euphemisms he uses in the letter. “*New orientation*” appears three times, “*orientation*” twice, as well as “new direction,” “new system” and “new ecclesiastical tide” once each.

However difficult to follow Fr. Zendejas may sometimes be, however, what is clear is what he is not saying. One can search the letter in vain for any talk of “errors of the Council” or the fact that several things pronounced by the Council are irreconcilable with what the Church has always taught (concerning Religious Liberty, for example), or even any discussion of how doctrinal error sooner or later makes itself felt everywhere: in the law, in the liturgy, in the whole post-conciliar chamber of horrors. Nothing of that. Thank God Archbishop Lefebvre never spoke or wrote this way, or there would have been no SSPX and no Tradition! And while we’re speaking about Archbishop Lefebvre...

## Taking Archbishop Lefebvre's Name in Vain

*“In the conflict between “obedience” and Truth, better-informed Catholics have chosen the Truth, as did Archbishop Lefebvre. In his thinking, with the Church according to Tradition, the Archbishop’s sensus fidei maintained that only Truth will ensure union with the invisible Head of the Church, Our Lord Jesus Christ. “*

First of all, remember what we said above: he ought to write about “the apparent conflict between obedience and Truth,” since the two in reality can never be in conflict. (Perhaps that is why “obedience” is always in quotation marks, but if so he does not make that clear anywhere and the rest of what he says tends rather to suggest otherwise).

Then there is his talk of “better informed Catholics”, an unfortunate choice of words. The experience of many shows that “better informed Catholics” after the Council tended to lapse, to become modernist, to go along with the changes and not to resist. Like the Resistance to the conciliar neo-SSPX, the Resistance to Vatican II was not composed of “better informed Catholics” - it was a mixed bag of all kinds of people, some well informed, some not very well informed, some in between. Saving your soul is not primarily a question of intelligence or of wide-reading. Hell is doubtless filled with some of the most well informed people ever to have existed. Neither does Archbishop Lefebvre deserve to be lumped into this category; history will not remember him as the most “well informed” of the council fathers, but the most virtuous, the most courageous, the most apostolic, the one who loved souls and the truth most, etc. Likewise, surely any Catholic of the Resistance worth his salt must protest at the outrageous statement that it was “the Archbishop’s *sensus fidei*” which motivated him (a ‘sensus fidei’ means a mere instinct for what is Catholic, usually spoken of as belonging to the laity).

*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.*

Notice that the errors of the Council are referred to once again with a euphemism. What did Archbishop Lefebvre resist? He resisted the post-Vatican II orientation! Please note: not only is he said to have resisted an “orientation”, but it is the post-Vatican II orientation, not the orientation of Vatican II. What is the difference? Your guess is as good as mine, but I would say that if I were an indult/novus Catholic, I would have no problem denouncing a post-conciliar orientation as all that that implies is that something bad happened after the Council (which in turn implies that the problem is not necessarily in the Council itself).

### What *did* he stand for?

It gets worse:

*“He [Lefebvre] continued to act ‘within the Church and according to the Church,’”*

This sounds like the sort of thing Bishop Fellay might write. Of course Archbishop Lefebvre was within the Church! That fact should be so obvious to the author and his readers that to say so only gives the effect of calling it into question. Bishop Fellay does this all the time.

*“...resisting the new ecclesiastical tide” - not the actual Council itself, in other words! - “in the measure that it attempts to distance itself from the doctrines and practices of the Faith,”* - so he didn’t even resist this ‘new tide’ completely, only in the measure that it was different from the Catholic Faith (which suggests that it was not always different!).

*“...and desiring-in spite of many disappointments-that 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!”*

Read that last bit again. What was it that Archbishop Lefebvre stood for? According to Fr. Zendejas, he stood for re-establishing union with the Pope (when did he break it?) as soon as possible and without having to compromise doctrine. Fancy that. And there was me reading the Archbishop’s own writings and mistakenly thinking that he had no desire to belong to the conciliar church!

Notice the nice little touch at the end about re-establishing union “without having to compromise” doctrine: Fr. Pfluger and Bishop Fellay have said often enough that they are merely seeking to work inside the Church, and that it is the right thing to do as long as there is no compromise required, etc. Here, for example, is what Bishop Fellay wrote in 2012:

*“Let it be understood that we have ruled out the possibility of our embarking on an alliance that would consist of swallowing the conciliar poison and compromising our positions. That is absolutely not what we are talking about.*

*Nevertheless, considering the lessons of Church history, we see that the saints, with much moral courage and a strong faith, brought back souls that had gone astray in terrible situations of crisis, with much mercy (and firmness), without falling into a reprehensible excess of rigidity, as was the case with the Donatists, for example, or with Tertullian. Notwithstanding the difficulties, the saints did not refuse to work with and in the Church, in spite of the Arian occupation (for example) and the numerous Arian bishops still in office.”*

(Letter to Priests, *Cor Unum*, March 2012)

We have already pointed out often enough before in these pages what is wrong with Bishop Fellay’s thinking. He sees no distinction between the conciliar church and the Catholic Church, and consequently when he sees the historic separation between the SSPX and the conciliar church, he becomes afraid that he is outside of the Catholic Church. It is entirely logical therefore that his priority should be to “re-enter” the [conciliar] Church, and the talk about not having to compromise cannot hide that. In practice modern Rome can afford to generously grant the appearance of no compromise for the time being. Remember how the Good Shepherd Institute some ten years ago announced that “no compromise was necessary” - as did Dom Gerard of Le Barroux. Who had the last laugh? But even if an agreement could be struck which really did require “no compromise”, it would still be wrong, being a mixing of darkness and light, so to speak, and an implicit approval of pluralism.

But as I say, this is old hat. We have discussed it in these pages often enough before. What is fascinating here is that Fr. Zendejas not only shows that he has the same thinking as Bishop Fellay and Fr. Pfluger - worse than that! - he imputes this thinking to Archbishop Lefebvre! “If only we could re-enter the Church! Just as long as we don’t have to compromise doctrine, we have to try to do it as soon as possible, it the most important thing!” That is what he stood for? Poor Archbishop Lefebvre. His thinking and actions falsified, his memory abused, and not only by the neo-SSPX, but now by the neo-Resistance too!

### **What happened at the Council?**

The diligent and persevering reader will have seen how Fr. Zendejas goes on to completely and explicitly exonerate the council:

*“Hence, the apparent conflict between “obedience” and Truth rests on AMBIGUITY.”* (Emphasis in the original) It rests on ambiguity? Not error, then?

*“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...”*

It is true that there are ambiguous passages in Vatican II, planted there by the liberals so as to pass censor by the “conservative” Council fathers and then be interpreted by the liberals afterwards in the most liberal sense possible. However, that is not the whole problem. There are also other passages in the Council which are most decidedly *not* ambiguous. I defy anyone to read what *Dignitatis Humanae* says about Religious Liberty and then tell me how it can be reconciled with the teaching of the Church!

*“Certainly, deeds speak louder than words. In today’s Official Church Pope Francis is an ultra-Modernist prelate—a master of contrariedades, who says he is not against Catholic teaching and yet favors a humanistic world!”*

The phrase “Official Church” is a classic Fellayism, designed as it is to paper over any distinction between the Church and the conciliar church. And the idea that Pope Francis is a man of contradictions is likewise a Fellayism - wishful thinking to the point of lunacy. Pope Francis is a modernist pure and simple. He knows what he thinks and is far more consistent in his thinking than either Bishop Fellay or Fr. Zendejas!

And then of course, we come to this little gem:

*“In the days 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 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.”*

Where does this ridiculous version of history come from? Even Bishop Fellay has not attempted to radically falsify history in this way (not yet, anyway...).

The Council taught not just novelties but error; not just about humanism, but all kinds of error; the errors were not opposed by many, and were never silenced - they are still in the Council texts for all the world to see! And it is false to claim that the “new system” (whatever that is) only came to power after the council through key appointments. The appointments of modernists to key positions was well underway when the Council began, but appointments are as nothing compared to the calamity of *false teaching* which took place. What is the effect of this fantasy nonsense if not to exonerate the Council entirely from any charge of error? In like manner, a little further on in the letter he goes on to say:

*“The conflict is between the new orientation [!] which some [who?] strive to force on the Church [“strive”? Have they not succeeded yet?] and the Catholic sense of the faithful; in other words between the new direction [!] which is imposed on the government of the Church [by whom?/from where?/how?] and the conscience that each and every priest and bishop should have...”* (Emphasis and comments mine)

There is much more one could say, but the whole letter is very long and life is too short (and paper and printing are expensive!). Besides, I value my sanity too highly and even though we have only covered around half of the whole letter, surely that is enough to show that

something is very, very wrong! The persevering reader who reaches the end will not, I fear, feel any the better for it.

### **“Resistance to What?!”**

I suppose we ought to be grateful to Fr. Daniel Themann giving us this phrase which is so apt in this particular case. Fr. Zendejas is supposedly a “Resistance” priest. A year ago he left the SSPX unannounced for reasons which he preferred to keep to himself, and turned up in the Resistance parish in Connecticut without the invitation of the Resistance priest who was their pastor and founder, announcing to the faithful at Sunday Mass that he was their new priest. He has since “taken over” faithful of the Resistance in Texas and in Philadelphia. He survives on the generosity of souls who, when he “took them over”, were faithful of the Resistance, hence it is fair to say that he effectively lives off the Resistance though he does not even agree with it or share its doctrinal position, principally its unbending opposition to Vatican II. He is the clerical cuckoo in the nest: “in the Resistance but not of the Resistance.” Taking souls away from other Resistance priests but teaching something which in a number of ways is remarkably similar to Bishop Fellay’s teaching. It will doubtless come as no surprise to the reader to learn that he spent the week or two immediately before and immediately after this first “Resistance appearance” (in late 2014) in the company of Bishop Williamson, whose thinking he substantially reflected in his sermons of that time.

So, the question begged is: What is Fr. Zendejas ‘Resisting’? The answer seems to be: the Resistance! Reflect on what we know of the enemy’s tactics: we know who is responsible for the crisis in the Church, and we know the long war which this enemy has waged against the Church. We also know how they wage it, and the successes they have had through dishonest means (infiltration, subversion, replacing Catholic bastions with a hollowed-out shell devoid of true teaching...). We know the dedication and singlemindedness with which they prosecute their campaign, the burning hatred which motivates them to wage war against the Church without giving up or tiring, and we know that they did not give up and go home at Vatican II. The question is not whether or if the SSPX fell victim to them - all we lack is the specific details (who, where, when, etc.) Likewise, we can be assured that they will try the same thing on the Resistance. We know that they use ‘useful idiots’ as their willing pawns, giving them some short term gain for their cooperation in the long term campaign. Whether and to what extent Fr. Zendejas or Bishop Williamson are a conscious or willing part of this will remain a mystery, but in any case, strictly speaking it is not something we need to know. All we need to know is that this teaching is something different. If we accept it, whatever the short term gains, we lose everything in the long run.

I do hope that anyone misguided enough to attempt a defence of Fr. Zendejas does so on doctrinal grounds, on the battlefield of ideas not personalities. In the meantime remember that our most precious possession is the entire, unblemished Catholic Faith, part of which must necessarily be our “*nullam partem*” with the Council. The SSPX accepts the Council. And now so too, it seems, does Fr. Gerardo Zendejas. There are a significant number of souls who once resisted but are now being softly and silently led back again in the direction of conciliarism. Do they realise it? Let us pray that at least some of them will wake up and realise the danger before it is too late...

Holy Martyrs of Mexico, pray for us!

## Who is Fr. Gerardo Zendejas?

Fr. Gerardo Zendejas first appeared on the Resistance scene in late October 2014. Though Mexican by birth, he has lived and worked in the USA District for many years and was the prior of Ridgefield, Connecticut when the crisis in the SSPX first became public. Later on he was moved to Texas, until leaving near the end of 2014.

On the last weekend in October, 2014, he telephoned Fr. Pfeiffer on Saturday afternoon to say that he would be taking over the Resistance parishes in Danbury, Connecticut and Sparta, New Jersey, both of which had been founded and maintained by Fr. Pfeiffer. This author was sitting next to Fr. Pfeiffer at the time and witnessed the telephone conversation which took place. Fr. Zendejas was not asking, he was telling. He refused to say what his doctrinal position was, why he had decided to leave the SSPX or to answer any questions which might give a clue to his motives, his teaching, or anything else. "It's too complicated to explain, I'll tell you another time." "You can still visit from time to time. You can hear confessions and I'll say Mass and preach." He also said that he refused to travel far, and would take care of only Danbury and Sparta. He would not, he said, be willing to go to Philadelphia, New Hampshire, Long Island, Syracuse or anywhere else in the North East part of the country. He also refused to have his Masses publicly advertised in advance so that those not in his circle of intimates could attend, and he would not allow a single word of any of his sermons to be recorded for the benefit of those unable to attend. Everything had to be done "discreetly" (secretly, in other words).

Thanks to the presence of mind of one good soul, Fr. Zendejas's sermons and conversation with the faithful after Mass on that Sunday were recorded, and from the recordings a pretty clear if disturbing picture emerges. The document which follows ("Fr. Gerardo Zendejas in His Own Words") was put together at that time (roughly a year ago) using, as far as possible, only Fr. Zendejas's own words. It also became clear that a certain amount of prior planning had gone into his actions: for example, at his first Mass he handed out a newsletter written for the occasion, had an All Saints party planned and had set up a corporation called "Saint John the Baptist" for the cheques to be made out to. This move was clearly not spur of the moment but something premeditated.

Once he had established himself in Connecticut taking the majority of the Resistance parish with him (up until that point it had been one of the biggest Resistance parishes in the world), Fr. Zendejas then attempted to buy a retreat house in Connecticut. The story made the local press because of opposition to the plan from people living locally. In part this was due to (or at any rate, not helped by) the somewhat secretive manner in which the plan was brought forward. Thanks to the local press, we now know for a fact that behind Fr. Zendejas stood a corporation called "BRN Associates". BRN Associates is the "trading name" of Bishop Williamson (could it be that BRN stands for "Bishop Richard Nelson"?). Anyone who wishes to verify this has only to look in his email inbox at any "Eleison Comments" email from recent years, and look at the bottom of the page. There he can read:

**“ © 2011-2015 BRN Associates, Inc. All Rights Reserved.**

### **About Us**

Eleison Comments is published by the St. Marcel Initiative, which is a trade name of BRN Associates, Inc., a non-stock, public, not-for-profit corporation registered in Virginia, USA ”

One has only to glance over the local press reports to see very quickly that it was really BRN Associates who were buying, and that Fr. Zendejas was in reality no more than the front man acting on behalf of “BRN”. To begin with, the press themselves did not even realise the connection with Bishop Williamson which is why they assumed that “BRN” was something founded solely by and for Fr. Zendejas himself. For example:

*“Zendejas left the Society in August and formed his own no-profit group, BRN Associates. BRN plans to convert the big white manor house on the site into a rectory and chapel that will host two Sunday Masses..”*

(“Danbury Church Proposal Stirs Debate Among Neighbors” ctpost.com, 19th March 2015)

*“The pastor of the church, the Rev. Gerardo Zendejas, is a missionary from Mexico who was affiliated up until six months ago with a conservative group known as the Society of St. Pius X ... But Zendejas has since left that group, known as SSPX, and has formed a church called BRN Associates.”*

(“Neighbors Oppose Church’s Move to Quiet Danbury Road” newstimes.com, 11th March 2015)

Later on, it was discovered that Fr. Zendejas was not really the boss, but only the man representing the real boss, Bishop Williamson. This only hindered their cause even further:

*“In February, neighbors were told by Zendejas and his followers that they belonged to a church called BRN Associates. But BRN is not a church. It is a parent company operated by an independent bishop named Richard Williamson. Williamson’s spokesman told Hearst Connecticut Media in late April that it was a mistake for Zendejas and his followers not to be candid about Williamson’s financial interest in the Danbury property.”*

(“Controversial Church Proposal Hits Roadblock” newstimes.com, 12th June, 2015)

Following the failure of the Connecticut purchase, Fr. Zendejas moved down to Texas where in July he bought a large property with a church building, a rectory, a school building and 25 acres of land. The money for the purchase (\$650,000 if reports are to be believed) was given to him by none other than... “BRN Associates”! (Bishop Williamson, in other words). He was also joined by another former SSPX priest, one Fr. Garcia. Like Fr. Zendejas, it was not clear why Fr. Garcia left the SSPX, though one priest in a position to know tells us that he was disciplined for serious improprieties involving women. In July, Fr. Zendejas also hosted a high Mass and conference in Mahopac, New York. The location was chosen because it was just over the border from Connecticut though, as with all things done by Fr. Zendejas, it was arranged in the utmost secrecy, effectively making it invitation only. It was at this conference that Bishop Williamson (infamously told one unfortunate lady that it was a good idea for her to go to daily Mass at the Novus Ordo. In the video recording available online, Fr. Zendejas can be seen in the background and apart from getting up to fetch himself a glass of water he did not stir throughout and gave no sign whatever that he disapproved or disagreed.

More recently, word reaches us that Frs. Zendejas and Garcia have taken over one more and have shown an interest in attempting to move in and take over two other Resistance parishes. God help the poor souls affected by this. They may be leaving the Resistance without even realising it and, as the document which follows makes plain, their priest is one who preaches a Gospel of Selfishness (“I help those who help me!” which amounts to “You scratch my back, I’ll scratch yours!”), who represents a fake substitute for the Resistance and whose motives are, to put it charitably, mixed.

**Fr. Gerardo Zendejas in his own words  
(Sparta, NJ, Sunday 26<sup>th</sup> October, 2014):**

**What is the problem with the SSPX?  
Is it doctrinal? Is it simple to understand?**

"I didn't create the problem. The confusion comes from Europe." [4:05]

"What happens if you go on a Merry-Go-Round, one round, two, three, four, five, and you get off, how do you feel? Dizzy. And you say 'Ah! The world is moving!' Sure. Sure. Who is moving, the world? You! And that's what's happening with Tradition. You are on a Merry-Go-Round and you come out: what to think?!" [12m10]

"If I ask: 'What do you think is going on in the Church?' we will have one, two, three ... fifteen different versions, because we are looking through a little window." [16m15]

"What is happening in Tradition - you can see little things. For example, when they say there's no problem with the new Canon law: you've got to be careful!" [16m50m]

"They [SSPX] are taking a new direction, that's obvious. But it's very subtle." [31m42]

"[Bp. Fellay's letter to 3 bishops] - it's a complicated thing." [45m]

"You can see that every single district in the world: USA, Mexico, France, every district is different. So when you say, 'What is the SSPX position?' - Every district is different." [46m25]

**Is there a solution to the crisis?  
Do we need to respond generously or selfishly?**

"When you jump out of the boat, you swim by yourself. You did it. What are you doing? You're surviving!" [3:40]

"I don't have a solution to the problem. I just want to help people who want to be helped. And the only thing I can give you is the sacraments." [4:15]

Q - Are you going to be working with Fr. Pfeiffer?

A - "Kind of. Everyone is independent at this moment. We are talking together. He likes to go all over the world, I don't."

Q - Well, he goes where people call him, so...

A - "Yes, but that's my position. There are different ways to skin a cat. I am one man, I want to be stable. I have only two places to go: Connecticut and New Jersey, that's it." [5m20]

"What you need is stability." [6m35]

"I work in places where people are in need that I know." [6m30]

"One of the sufferings we all have, all of us, is what is going on [in the SSPX]. And nobody will give you the answer. Nobody. Why? Because, who has a solution?" [7m45]

"Families who have little children, they need a school, they have no solution. People who are single can do whatever they want. A young lady who wants to get married, I don't think she will come here. Why? Because she will look after [her own interests]" [8m55]

"So this situation, I cannot resolve it." [9m45]

“My goal is to help people who need help. And what I can do to help is confession and Mass every Sunday. That’s all.” [11m45]

“The modern world is violent. And when it’s violent, what happens is it’s like you’re in a boat, and the boat is rocking. And what happens if you stand up? You just flip up [i.e. fall over]. God wants us to suffer, that’s why we have to make sure to hold together.” [23m35]

“There’s one right of the faithful: you want to receive sacraments that are sure. You have to look for sacraments that are valid.” [32m50]

“After two years of going around, going around, going around, we need to form groups. We have to make remnants.” [45m45]

“After the letter of Bishop Fellay, everybody fractions. And the Pope is so accelerated that’s why there is confusion. So what do you do?” [46m55]

“The places are too spread all over that it’s difficult to create a relationship. My position is: let’s make a front in the North East. ... The priest cannot travel all over because what they [the people] need is instruction.” [48m20]

Q - Are you going to Syracuse?

A - “No, I think I have to be stable.” [50m10]

“You have a saying in English: ‘You have too many irons in the fire,’ and when you have too many irons in the fire what happens is you go lukewarm and you quit. I don’t want you to quit.” [51m50]

“You see, Fr. Pfeiffer can say it, Fr. Hewko can say it, I can say it. But we cannot resolve the problem.” [52m15]

“I told Fr. Pfeiffer: ‘You have been all over. Now let’s make a bastion.’ ” [56m45]

### **Is Fr. Zendejas really a Resistance priest?**

Q - When you were dismissed Father, what did your superiors say when you left? Did they say ‘Don’t do it!’ ...?

A - “Don’t worry, that’s my business.” [2m30]

Q - Are you going to be an independent priest?

A - “Everyone is independent at this moment. I am talking with Fr. Pfeiffer. [3:25]

“I want to be an alternative [to what? Why?], that’s my position.” [4:00]

Q - What made you finally decide to leave?

A - “Did you understand what I said? I say that people are left over and when you walk down the street if somebody is fallen there, what do you do? You give them a hand. That’s what I am doing. It’s the only thing I am doing. I am walking the extra mile for those who have no place to go.” [4:30]

### **What exactly is his relationship with Fr. Pfeiffer?**

#### **Is Fr. Zendejas being entirely honest about this?**

“I have no job, I have no house, I have no money. A priest cannot stay in a layperson’s house. I have nowhere to stay.” [3:00]

"I'm talking to Fr. Pfeiffer, he goes in different ways it's OK. What I can do is this. And we'll see in the future what else we can do. Because if nothing is stable, not for you, not for us, that's no way to do it." [12m]

Q - I followed Frs. Pfeiffer and Hewko, they led us to where they are now. I'm worried where we'll end up if every priest who comes is not on the same page.

A - "We're on the same page, we have to be, that's why I left the Society." [31m20]

"Fr. Pfeiffer has his merit. We have to work together. For the sake of people we have to work together." [48m]

Q - What does Fr. Pfeiffer say about that?

A - "We have to see how we can work. Because I see it differently to him, we are not antagonists, I see it just different."

Q - But is he good with that?

A - "That's why I'm here. That's why I'm here."

Q - So the difference is that he travels and you prefer to stay, but doctrinally you're the same.

A - "Yes." [50m20]

"I told Fr. Pfeiffer: 'It would be great if you come over and we work together.' He hears confession, and I'll preach." [102m30]

"If Fr. Pfeiffer wants to come, that's fine. If people want me to come I will be willing to come." [103m45]

"I am willing to come. I told Father Pfeiffer: 'You decide and people decide.' " [106m55]

### **In summary, Fr. Zendejas:**

- Skilfully avoids explaining why he left the SSPX or the timing of his departure;
- Says nothing about whether one ought to avoid SSPX Masses or not;
- Will not travel to souls, even relatively nearby (Syracuse, New Hampshire, PA);
- Says that he helps those who help him;
- Tells the faithful they need to be selfish in order to survive, and must not "stand up" in the boat;
- Deliberately deceived the faithful about his relations with the parish pastor/founder, Fr. Pfeiffer;
- Deliberately deceived Fr. Pfeiffer about his take-over of the two parishes. (12hrs notice; one year vs. until January)
- Is unclear about the problem with the SSPX; claims that it is subtle and/or difficult to understand;
- Claims that there is no solution to the crisis;
- Seems to think that the sacraments are the most important thing, more important than doctrine;
- Prepared his takeover in advance (e.g. newsletter, "St. John the Baptist" organization);
- Unlike almost all resistance priests, has written no 'letter to the faithful' or 'open declaration' stating his position;

***The Faithful have a right to know the doctrine of their priests!***

***Why does Fr. Zendejas hide his doctrine?***

[Source: [www.inthissignyoushallconquer.com/other-transcripts](http://www.inthissignyoushallconquer.com/other-transcripts)]



## Archbishop Lefebvre Speaks!

“This very year [1965], Yves Marsaudon, the Freemason, has published the book *‘L’oecumenisme vu par un franc-maçon de tradition’* [‘Ecumenism As Seen By A Traditional Freemason’]. In it, the author expresses the hope of Freemasons that our Council will solemnly proclaim religious liberty... What more information do we need?”

*(Biography of Marcel Lefebvre, p.328)*

“I think that during the next meeting, it will be me who will ask them questions. I will be the one who will interrogate them and I will ask them: ‘What Church are you? Which Church are we dealing with here? I would like to know if I am talking to the Catholic Church or if I am speaking with another Church, with a counter-Church, with a counterfeit Church?’ ...I sincerely believe that we are currently dealing with a counterfeit Church and not with the Catholic Church. Why do I say this? Because they no longer teach the Catholic Faith. They no longer defend the Catholic Faith. They are leading the Church into something other than the Catholic Church. It is no longer the Catholic Church. They sit on the chair of their predecessors, but they are not continuing their predecessors.” *(Econe Conference, 1978)*

“We are not of this new religion! We do not accept this new religion! We are of the religion of all time; we are of the Catholic religion. We are not of this “universal religion” as they call it today—this is not the Catholic religion any more. We are not of this liberal, modernist religion which has its own worship, its own priests, its own faith, its own catechisms, its own ecumenical Bible. We cannot accept these things. They are contrary to our faith.”

*(Ordinations Sermon, 29th June, 1976)*

# SSPX Watch: Branding Reaches Britain!

A previous issue of the Recusant dealt with the “branding” campaign and the fancy new “branded” websites and newsletters in North America and Germany which were the result and product of this campaign of worldliness. The article concluded with the words:

*“So far the British district appears to have avoided this, but do not expect that to last long. Whether or not the “legitimate authorities” of the SSPX will wait another year, until there is a change of District Superior in 2015, it makes little difference in the long run.”*

(Issue 17, pp.32-33)

Lo and behold, one of the first signs of change brought in by Fr. Brucciani, is... a new “branded” district newsletter! Aside from the fancy (and expensive!) looking modern-artsy appearance, and the fact that the British district newsletter looks the same as the district newsletters of Canada, USA, Germany, Switzerland (and perhaps others), there is also the content to be considered.

Even the new name is worth remarking on: *“Ite Missa Est”* - what a peculiar choice. What prompted it, one wonders? What is it supposed to signify? *“Go away! It’s all over!”* might be one way of paraphrasing it!

## SPOT THE DIFFERENCE!



## The Root of All Evil

Is it not strange that, whereas Fr. Brucciani's "Letter from the District Superior" at the front of the newsletter is nice enough (it says some nice things about the Mass, nothing much more), the really important things which he has to say to the faithful are hidden at the back of the newsletter, like a sort of 'final thought to leave you with'. Here is what he says:

### *"In The Balance*

*Having reviewed the operations of the Society in the District, I think it is important that the faithful know something of our income and running costs. In 2014 the income from collections and donations amounted to £620 per faithful, per annum. The difference was made up by reserves and legacies. Clearly, this mismatch of income and expenditure cannot continue for very long and requires that we implement austerity measures to increase income and reduce costs."*

In other words: 'Dear faithful, the SSPX isn't turning a profit! Clearly this is unacceptable! What was meant to be the purpose of the SSPX again - was it to make money? Or is the money not at the service of the apostolate? We also notice the very dangerous and potentially misleading line of thinking implied by talking about donations per faithful. What happens when you have a large family, such as the Society used to encourage, a family of, say, ten children, for example - that means twelve souls who live on one very stretched income. Does not thinking in terms of raw numbers, money per head, tend towards thinking of faithful purely as potential donors? And could it not help to lead to a discouraging of families which are "too large" - such as in Germany where the priests are told that 5 or 6 children is quite enough..? Notice also that the "donations" are not enough, so the difference is made up in "legacies" - as though legacies don't really count as donations and shouldn't really be used to help run the apostolate!

In fact, anyone who wishes to see the true state of things has only to look at the "Charities Commission UK" website ([charitycommission.gov.uk](http://charitycommission.gov.uk)) to discover that in 2014 the District netted a not inconsiderable £1.7 million in donations, of which it spent only £1.4million. Or 78% spending leaving a good 20% profit, in other words.

Fr. Brucciani continues:

*"The best way of increasing income is to increase the number of faithful who attend our Mass Centres!"*

No comment - I let this speak for itself.

*"Financial gain should not be our first motive, however."*

Ah, that's OK then! Whoever would have thought that a SSPX priest would even feel the need to say such a thing! And whatever happened to "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God..."..? And if finance is not our main motive (or "should not be"), why all the talk about...finance?

*"One easy way of increasing support is to encourage others to subscribe to our email announcements"*

That's funny, why do I get a very strong sense of deja-vu..? The US District started doing an aggressive email subscription drive a couple of years ago (they're ahead of the curve when it comes to this marketing stuff...)

*“A more direct way of increasing income is to charge for this newsletter! It costs many hours of preparation (about 100 man hours) and £1 to print. The printed newsletter will therefore cost £1 henceforth.”*

And whose “man hours” are those I wonder? Surely it can’t be the ‘man hours’ of priests? But I thought priests weren’t meant to do paid work for a living? The Recusant, of course, would be better value for money even if we charged £1 for it or more! It has far more content and the content is more relevant, despite having fewer pages, although it is not as flashy and not even in colour (in Europe). So we suspect you’re being charged your £1 for the glitzy, glossy look as much as anything. There is a serious point here: priorities matter. What’s more important - that the newsletter reaches as many people and spreads its message (whatever that is!) as widely as possible, or that it makes a profit? In our case it is clear...

### ***“Decreasing Expenditure***

*We are actively implementing cost cutting measures such as renegotiating or cancelling unfavourable service contracts, reducing paid staff and increasing the efficiency of the way we do things (e.g. meetings/catechism by Skype instead of face to face). One quick way of increasing efficiency and reducing costs is to allow us to communicate by email wherever possible.”*

“Efficiency” is one of those words which seems to have a particularly Godless ring to it, especially in this context. And whereas Skype or email can have its advantage (if you live too far away, for example), some things are just better done in person. It’s not the same. But above all, the same unspoken elephant is in the proverbial room. What is the priority, what is the purpose? Was Fr. Brucciani told that the reason he was being appointed was to make more money out of the District? With the new District Superior has come a new “branded” newsletter and a new focus: money grubbing. All those things which we have witnessed and deplored in America have now arrived here and are here to stay.

We also note with interest that this newsletter also replaces “Mater Dei”, the District Magazine founded by Fr. Emily in the early 2000s. Mater Dei’s content had its ups and downs, to be sure, but it did have some nice colour photos on the front and back covers. All those who generously forked out for a subscription to it, says Fr. Brucciani, will now get the District Newsletter (which used to be free anyway) instead! After all, these are hard times (he even talks of “austerity measures”!) Spare a thought for the poor, penniless district superior!

### **A Challenge**

One final thought. Having delivered his throwaway line that “financial gain should not be our main motive” for wanting people to attend Mass, Fr. Brucciani goes on to say:

*“We need to convince others of the necessity of the Society of St. Pius X for the preservation of Catholic tradition [sic] and hence the future of the Church itself... Loyalty among existing faithful and recruitment of new faithful is therefore vital for our future.”*

Loyalty amongst the faithful has taken a hit in recent months. In some places (Liverpool, for example) there are now more faithful at the Resistance than there are at the SSPX. In other places, the ‘recently departed’ are numerically smaller but significant for having been amongst the most loyal until they left (sacristans, cantors, church cleaners, etc.) We feel that

Fr. Brucciani has touched on something significant here. We left precisely because we were *not convinced* of the necessity of the Society for the preservation of Tradition - quite the contrary. Publications such as the *Flying Squirrel* did nothing to help restore our confidence (nor, for that matter, does *Ite Missa Est!*) If therefore, Fr. Brucciani is serious about (re) gaining “loyalty” of the faithful through “convincing” them, had he not better try a little harder? How “necessary for the preservation of Tradition” can a priestly society be, when it has officially accepted the legitimacy of the New Mass, the New Code of Canon Law, Religious Liberty, Ecumenism and the New Profession of Faith, and when it is participating in the Jubilee of Mercy called by Pope Francis to mark the 50th anniversary of Vatican II..?

If Fr. Brucciani really is serious about wishing to convince people that they need to support the SSPX because the SSPX preserves Tradition (and increasing numbers are showing that they are decidedly unconvinced), then, in a spirit of well-meaning helpfulness, we would like to suggest a public debate on the issue, time and place to be named by him. Somebody (not I, nor anyone I the Resistance) once suggested this to Fr. Morgan, but alas! he wasn't game. It might be objected that a priest should not be involved in such a thing, for the sake of his dignity. If that is so, then he may nominate whom he pleases. I have a funny feeling that he is not as serious as all that (well, maybe he's serious about the money side of things, but I'm thinking of the other bit, the bit about preserving Tradition). But perhaps if a sufficient number of well-meaning souls ring, write, ask in person and email him (efficiency!), who knows, I may be proved wrong. Why not ask him today, right now, before you forget? Accepting our challenge would mean overcoming his challenge. Unless, that is, we were right all along...

**O** Jesus, Eternal High Priest, keep Thy priests within the shelter of Thy Sacred Heart where none may harm them.

**Keep** unstained their anointed hands which daily touch Thy Sacred Body.

**Keep** pure their lips, daily purpled by Thy Precious Blood.

**Keep** pure and unworldly their hearts, sealed with sublime mark of Thy glorious priesthood.

**May** they grow in love and confidence in Thee, and protect them from the contagion of the world.

**With** the power of changing bread and wine, grant them also the power of changing hearts.

**Bless** their labours with abundant fruit and grant them at the last the crown of eternal life.

Amen.

**O Lord** grant us priests,

**O Lord** grant us holy priests,

**O Lord** grant us many holy priests

**O Lord** grant us many holy religious vocations.

St. Pius X, pray for us.



“Holy abandonment is found ‘not in resignation and laziness but at the heart of action and initiative.’ It would be dishonest to pray for victory without really fighting for it. [...] ‘The things I pray for’, St. Thomas More prayed magnanimously, ‘dear Lord, give me the grace to work for.’”  
(“The Biography of Marcel Lefebvre” p. 568)

Contact us:

[recusantsspx@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:recusantsspx@hotmail.co.uk)  
[www.TheRecusant.com](http://www.TheRecusant.com)