

Catholic Candle

• June 2016 • catholiccandle.neocities.org • catholiccandle@gmail.com

Catholic Candle note: *We are pleased to welcome this fine article from a new contributing writer, who has been one of our mainstay editors since 2014. She is a lifelong traditional Catholic who resisted the conciliar liberalism beginning in the 1960s (and the pre-conciliar liberalism before that). She now resists the equivalent revolution occurring in the “new” SSPX.*

The Basics of the Church’s Traditional Laws of Fast and Abstinence

In these days of shocking scandals in the conciliar church and creeping liberalism in the New-SSPX, we sometimes forget one of the basic duties of a good Catholic: observing the Church’s Rules of Fast and Abstinence. In the old days, our parish priests reminded us of them in a timely manner: four times a year (Ember Days approximately at the change of seasons) and Eves and Vigils of various Feast days.

However, it was not always easy to keep them clear in our minds. Thus, in the 1970s our (traditional Catholic) pastor put together and distributed the following Chart as a quick reference. It was a real plus for us traditional Catholic families. You may want to save this Chart as well as copy it and pass it on.

Having said that, it is worthwhile noting that the Church’s laws of fast and abstinence are a bare minimum and not the recommended or ideal amount. We should do **much more** fasting and abstinence than what is required. “*Unless you do penance, you shall likewise perish.*” St. Luke 13:5.

We are traditional Catholics and so we follow the “traditional rules”—not choosing the easier path as the conciliar church has. Further, we recommended that Catholics:

- Fast beyond age 60, if they can, in order to be more generous with Our Lord;

- Fast and abstain until Easter Sunday morning, rather than ending these Lenten observances at noon Holy Saturday.
- Have children begin to abstain from meat before the rules absolutely require it. It would send the right message to younger children (and not harm their health in the least). This shows them that a serious Catholic does not ask, “How little can I do?”
- The vigil of the Immaculate Conception is not traditionally a day of fast and abstinence. However, because Pope Pius XII transferred this obligation from the vigil of the Assumption to the vigil of the Immaculate Conception, it seems fitting for traditional Catholics to observe both days.

Two further points:

1. The traditional rules required fasting beginning at 21, but this is perhaps the only occasion when the new code is stronger (in a very narrow respect)—it requires fasting beginning at age 18—although only on a (wimpy) two days per year. We need more fasting (and other penance), not less, and should begin fasting at 18.
2. Contrary to what the conciliar church does in practice, the new code of Canon Law (despite its countless flaws) *does* require abstinence on the Fridays of the year. While the New Code of Canon Law—canon 1251—does allow a national bishops’ conference to substitute the penance of abstaining from a different food, the U.S. conference of bishops has not done this.

The “new” SSPX and other indult groups follow the soft conciliar practice of asserting that no abstinence is mandatory (under pain of mortal sin) on most Fridays of the year. This soft practice ignores:

- a. the traditional law of the Church;
- b. even the lax new code of Canon Law they purport to follow;
and
- c. the fact that the U.S. bishops’ conference has never specified any other food from which Catholics must abstain on Fridays instead of meat.

Traditional Catholic Fast and Abstinence Chart (United States)

Ages	21-59		7-20, 60+	
	Fast?	Abstain?	Fast?	Abstain?
During Lent				
Ash Wednesday	yes	complete	no	complete
Fridays				
Holy Saturday till noon				
Other weekdays		partial		no
Sundays	no	no		
Ember Wednesday	yes	partial	no	partial
Ember Saturday				
Ember Friday				
Ember Friday		complete		complete
Outside of Lent				
Sundays	no	no	no	no
Holy days of obligation				
Fridays				
Ember Wednesday	yes	partial	no	partial
Ember Saturday				
Ember Friday				
Ember Friday		complete		complete

Vigil of Assumption	yes	complete	no	complete
Vigil of Christmas		complete		complete
Vigil of Pentecost		partial	partial	
Vigil of All Saints		partial	partial	

The following simplified chart incorporates our small recommendations from above.

Days of fast and at least partial abstinence

- Weekdays of Lent
- Ember Days
- Vigils of Easter, Pentecost, Assumption, All Saints, Immaculate Conception, and Christmas

Days of complete abstinence

- All Fridays (except holy days of obligation)
- Vigils of Easter, Assumption, Immaculate Conception, and Christmas
- Ash Wednesday

The “New” SSPX’s Need to Promote Conciliar “Beatifications” to Fit-In with Conciliar Church

Since Vatican II, the conciliar church has used its “saint-making machine” for its modernist propaganda. For example, it promotes (supposed “saint”) Sister Katharine Drexel as a humanitarian devoted to “social justice” among the indigenous people.¹ The “new” SSPX follows the lead of the modernists and likewise promotes various new conciliar “saints”. *Id.*

The “new” SSPX showed this tendency again recently, following the lead of the conciliar revolutionaries in the “conservative” wing of the revolution—in particular, (so-called) “bishop” Athanasius Schneider—by promoting so-called “blessed” Laura Vicuña (whom Schneider has been promoting).²

We suppose Laura Vicuña to have been a good girl (she died of tuberculosis at 13 years old.) We hope she is in heaven. She is one of the 1,327 people who Pope John Paul II declared beatified.³

Although we suppose her to be a good girl, the conciliar church uses her shamefully in the service of political correctness. She is stated as “dying for every woman’s dignity”.⁴ She is called the patroness of abuse victims.⁵ The conciliar church emphasizes her desire to be of “service of her brothers and sisters”.⁶

Again, it appears she was a good girl and we hope she is in heaven. But the “new” SSPX *could* instead emphasize traditional girl-saints, such as St. Agnes, St. Philomena and St. Maria Goretti, as the traditional Church does. But those *known* saints are not who the conciliar church emphasizes—and that is the point.

When the SSPX soon makes its “deal” with Rome, how can this “marriage” to the conciliar church work if the SSPX does not accept the massive number of “saints” churned out by the conciliar popes, especially Pope John Paul II? Thus, the “new” SSPX is progressively promoting conciliar (supposed) “saints”, so that it will have a “harmonious marriage” with its conciliar “betrothed”.

For this same reason, the “new” SSPX also says kind words about the (supposed) holiness of Pope John Paul II.⁷ For now, the “new” SSPX does not publicly call him a saint, but is merely waiting until a future time to “connect the dots” between that pope’s “holiness” (which the N-SSPX asserts now) and its future recognition of “St. John Paul the Great”.

-
1. <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-vatican-social-worker.html>
 2. <http://sspx.org/en/news-events/news/life-laura-vicuna>
 3. They are listed here: <https://en.wikipedia.org>

/wiki/List_of_people_beatified_by_Pope_John_Paul_II

4. http://www.digplanet.com/wiki/Laura_Vicu%C3%B1a—linking to this article:
<http://newsaints.faithweb.com/biographies/Vicuna.htm>
5. *See, e.g.*, http://www.catholic.org/saints/saint.php?saint_id=513
6. *See, e.g.*, http://www.catholic.org/saints/saint.php?saint_id=513
7. *See, e.g.*, <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/bouchacourt-promoted-superior-france.html>

Catholic Candle note: *The following article is an analysis of a conciliar position adopted by the SSPX's 2012 Doctrinal Declaration. In that sense, the article is not "new news" but it is still a timely assessment of the "new" SSPX.*

The “New” SSPX Reverses the Course of its Founder and Accepts the New Code of Canon Law

The new code of canon law is one of the evil fruits of Vatican II. As Pope John Paul II explained, the new code is the legislative embodiment of Vatican II:

[W]hat constitutes the **substantial “novelty” of the Second Vatican Council**, in line with the legislative tradition of the Church, especially in regard to ecclesiology, **constitutes likewise the “novelty” of the new Code [of canon law]**.

Pope John Paul II, *Sacrae Disciplinaes Leges*, January 25, 1983 (emphasis added).

Thus, what makes Vatican II evil also makes the new code of canon law evil, since the new code is the practical implementation of the errors of Vatican II.

In 1983 (the year the new code was issued), the world's only two faithful bishops (Archbishop Lefebvre and Bishop de Castro Mayer) publicly raised an “urgent ... cry of alarm”, because of “the errors, not to say the heresies, of the new Code of Canon Law”. November 21, 1983 Open letter to Pope John Paul II.

The following year Archbishop Lefebvre called the new code “another grave problem now undermining the Church” and stated that “the new Canon Law is very serious for it goes much further [*i.e.* promoting errors] than the Council itself.” October 29, 1984 conference at Stuttgart, Germany.

What is the position of the “new” SSPX regarding the new code? Acceptance! As Bishop Fellay declared:

we promise to respect the common discipline of the Church and the ecclesiastical laws, especially those which are contained in the Code of Canon Law promulgated by John-Paul II (1983).

April 15, 2012 Doctrinal Declaration, ¶III, 8 (emphasis added).

The N-SSPX here promises to *respect* the evil and heterodox code which implements Vatican II. This promise implies that the N-SSPX will obey this evil and heterodox new code, because it would be contradictory for the N-SSPX to both claim to “respect” a law and also refuse to obey it.

Lastly, an evil law cannot be both respected and also condemned (as the new code deserves to be condemned for its many errors). Thus, the New-SSPX’s promise to “respect” the new code is a promise not to condemn its many errors. Instead, the N-SSPX’s non-opposition results in approving of the errors of the new code, because “not to oppose error is to approve it”, as Pope St. Felix III teaches.

... and Bishop Fellay wants us to believe that “nothing has changed” in the N-SSPX!

N-SSPX Promotes the New-Mass-Position of a “Conservative” Conciliar Revolutionary

The “old” SSPX used to say that the *new mass is evil and is a danger to the Faith*.

By contrast, the New-SSPX promotes the idea that the problem is *abuses* at the new mass.
<http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/2013-10-15-fr-themann-ltr.html>

One example of this is the “new” SSPX’s recent article about Cardinal Sarah, a member of the so-called “conservative” wing of the conciliar revolution.¹ In this article, the N-SSPX uses Sarah to spread the new position into which it is transitioning, *viz.*, that the problem is abuse at the new mass. This N-SSPX article promotes Sarah’s warning that the new mass is sometimes not said properly and there are sometimes abuses in the new mass.

The N-SSPX conveyed Sarah’s warning about the new mass that:

many [New] Masses “become spectacles” in which the priest no longer celebrates “the love of Christ through His sacrifice” but rather “a meeting of friends, a convivial meal, a fraternal moment.”

The truth is that *all* new masses are humanist meals even under the best conditions (regardless of the intent of the “priest” saying the new mass), because of the new mass’s essential elements and because the new mass is modeled after Protestant services, to please the Protestants.

The N-SSPX conveyed Sarah’s warning about the new mass that:

there is “the *risk* of [the new mass] becoming merely a human game.”

Risk?! In its essence, the new mass is always a humanist service or game.

The N-SSPX conveyed Sarah’s warning about the new mass that:

“we run the *risk* of making our worship [*viz.*, the new mass] too human”.

After giving Sarah’s complaints about abuse at the new mass, the N-SSPX then identifies Sarah’s reason why the abuses occur in the new mass:

the main reason why contemporary liturgy [sic] is adrift is “the priest’s position turned toward the people”.

The “new” SSPX then tells the reader what Sarah proposes as a remedy for abuse at the new mass:

Celebrating [the new mass]—priests and lay faithful both—facing the same direction.

(This indented quote and all others taken from the article cited in endnote #1.)

Without any comment, the N-SSPX sets forth Sarah’s “band aid” solution (that the defects in the new mass would be fixed if everyone faced the same direction).

The “new” SSPX is also silent about Sarah’s referring to “*both*” the priest and the people “celebrating” the mass. This is one of the countless errors of Vatican II which is espoused by even the “conservative” wing of the conciliar revolution. See, *Lumen Gentium Annotated*, by *Quanta Cura Press*, © 2013, p.78, available for free at <https://www.scribd.com/doc/158994906/Lumen-Gentium-Annotated>.

Regarding Vatican II as well, the “new” SSPX is transitioning into its new doctrinal position, viz., that the problems in the Church are that Vatican II is misinterpreted. The N-SSPX promotes Sarah’s assignment of the same root of the problem:

The Cardinal denounces *wrong interpretations of Vatican Council II*, which “never asked priests to celebrate facing the people.”

Lastly, the “new” SSPX conveys to the reader the hope which Cardinal Sarah shares for the (conciliar church’s) future, viz., that the young conciliar “priests” will make things better. Sarah assures us that “many young [conciliar] priests ... welcomed these recommendations [viz., about the priest saying the new mass facing the same direction as the people].”

In conclusion: The N-SSPX is transitioning to acceptance of the new mass—which *Modernist Rome will require from a future “recognized” SSPX*. The N-SSPX’s reasoning is so weak and absurd that it should be enough to wake up the soundest sleeper. This is just one of the trial balloons the N-SSPX is using to determine how gullible its priests and laymen are and how fast the N-SSPX can implement its changes. It is embarrassing and really makes N-SSPX a laughing-stock among thinking traditional Catholics.

1. <http://sspx.org/en/news-events/news/cardinal-sarah-celebrating-mass-facing-lord-16609> ; DICI #337, June 17, 2016, pages 2-3. All indented quotes are taken from this SSPX article and all emphasis is added. Any quote within a quote is the N-SSPX quoting Cardinal Sarah.

The “New” SSPX Is Acclimating the Faithful to Accept the Conciliar Revolution

Angelus Press is currently running an ad to sell *Father's Day* merchandise. This ad depicts a man praying in a conciliar church.¹ At the front of the church is a tabernacle stuck against the front wall but with no altar (since conciliar tables are moveable and are wheeled in and out).

We don't include a copy of this photo depicting the conciliar church because it is protected by copyright and we don't have the owner's permission to use his property. Here is a link showing this photo (for the conciliar cathedral of Hartford). <http://cathedralofsaintjoseph.com/parishlife/?p=523> At this link, the same photo identifies the owner and declares his copyright protection.

By contrast (as shown at the links in endnote #1), *Angelus Press* copied this same photo but carefully cropped out the owner's name and his notice of copyright protection.

Of course, the “new” SSPX has countless photos of its *own* churches. Why would the SSPX use a photo showing a *conciliar* church? Because the “new” SSPX *wanted* to depict a conciliar church, to acclimate its priests and laymen to accept the sights of the conciliar revolution.

When Bishop Fellay was recently asked if “the SSPX [can] be confident of the support of SSPX churchgoers for reconciliation”, he stated:

It will be quite a work, and it will take time to be able to bring the faithful to realize this new face in the history of the Church, this new reality²

In other words, Bishop Fellay recognizes that, over time, he has to change the way the priests and laymen see things, and get them accustomed to accepting the “new reality” of the conciliar church. How else could the “new” SSPX ever fit into the conciliar church? (How often has he and the “new” SSPX assured us that “nothing has changed”?)

Thus, the “new” SSPX acclimates the faithful to accept the conciliar church, by:

- promoting the conciliar church’s “New Evangelization”.
<http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-promote-new-evangelization.html>
- using the conciliar lingo “full communion”. <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/schmidberger-conciliar-ideas-jargon.html>
- saying there is a problem with the status of the SSPX.
<http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/schmidberger-conciliar-ideas-jargon.html>
- adopting the conciliar practice of referring to heretics as “Christians”.
<http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-calls-heretics-christian.html>
- adopting the conciliar practice of referring to murdered heretics as “martyrs”.
<http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-ecumenism-heretics-martyrs.html>
- beginning to use conciliar vestments. <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-promotion-conciliar-ugliness.html>
- beginning to use John Paul II bent crucifixes. <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-promotion-conciliar-ugliness.html>
- beginning to design and construct *conciliar-looking* churches with ugly conciliar ornamentation. <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-promotion-conciliar-ugliness.html>
- beginning to use conciliar lingo such as referring to its missions as “Catholic communities” instead of “Catholic churches” or parishes.
<http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-conciliar-lingo-community.html>
- beginning to call the true traditional Mass the “Extraordinary Form”.
http://www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsection=print_article&article_id=2658

1. <https://www.facebook.com/AngelusPress/photos/a.262838003748676.69003.236704539695356/1186125021419965> ;

http://www.icontact-archive.com/8YY7uup2BLjyLYKOABDmDp_KTO36mV8h?w=3

2. <http://www.ncregister.com/daily-news/sspxs-bishop-fellay-little-by-little-rome-is-giving-us-all-we-need-for-reco/#ixzz4BfvbVEms>

Menzingen's Corrupt Political Machine Prepares for the Next Two New-SSPX General Chapters

In the near future the New-SSPX will call two General Chapters. The first one will seek approval from the Society's voting leadership to accept conditions necessary for recognition by Modernist Rome. No matter how deceptive and disingenuous the terms are, it will be approved—no question.

How can I be so sure of its approval? It's because Bishop Fellay has predetermined who will vote and how they will vote. You see, he has replaced all the major superiors (*i.e.*, those superiors who have a vote) who might have voted "no". He would never call for a General Chapter to approve the deal with Modernist Rome if he weren't assured of the outcome he wants. Also, when the deal is approved by a majority—albeit a pre-selected majority—of the N-SSPX leaders, it will give the soul-destroying deal more credibility in the minds of the low-information, naive laymen and priests.

The following former Superiors were demoted because they were considered NO votes for Bishop Fellay's liberal initiatives in the coming two General Chapters.

Here are a few obvious ones; I'm sure there are others.

- Fr. Peter Scott (former District Superior of the U.S.)
- Fr. Regis de Cacqueray (former District Superior of France)
- Fr. Edward Black (former District Superior of Australia)
- Fr. Paul Morgan (former District Superior of England)

As you may already know, six other once-traditional religious communities made a similar deal with Modernist Rome, with all the so-called guarantees that were later repudiated by Rome over a few years. <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-societies-made-deal.html>

All of these groups eventually accepted Modernism under the control of Rome. With this record of betrayal by Rome, how can any honest traditional leader be willing and gullible enough to deliver so many souls to perdition? Let's continue to do our part and support the Resistance in every way we can. Who knows how many souls we can help to save?

I also believe the predetermined vote was put in place not only for the recognition by Rome, but it is in place for the future General Chapter to select the Superior General in 2018. Bishop Fellay is more of a political leader than a spiritual leader, and **hasn't the SSPX paid the price for that?!** He needs to get himself re-elected as Superior General in order to receive the "favor" Rome must have promised him when he surrenders the N-SSPX to Rome's control.

On second thought, when Bishop Fellay delivers the N-SSPX to Rome, he may choose to give up the office of Superior General in order to live in Rome with a new red hat. Would anyone who delivered so many traditional souls to Modernist Rome do it for less? If that is the case, his predetermined vote will still be necessary to elect his pre-selected replacement. Bishop Fellay, of course, will tell us he needs to be in Rome to convert them to traditionalism. Let's ask the six formerly conservative religious communities that made similar deals with Modernist Rome why they didn't fulfill their goals of converting Rome to Tradition. I know the answer that Archbishop Lefebvre would give: Superiors form underlings; underlings do not form Superiors. And history proves it.

The N-SSPX is in God's Hands now, but He expects us to pray hard that the leadership and their followers' eyes are opened wide—sooner rather than later.

Catholic Candle note: *Sean Johnson (a man still attending SSPX Masses) wrote a weak and tedious 34-page "catechetical refutation" of Traditional Catholic objections against Bishop Williamson's subjectivist recommendation that persons should attend the new mass if they feel it would help them.*

Catholic Candle has already substantially addressed Mr. Johnson's errant ideas and confusions, in articles addressed to Bishop Williamson's own misguided statements:

- <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/williamson-failure-make-distinctions.html>
- <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/attendance-at-new-mass.html>

- <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/williamson-danger-socalled-miracles.html>
- <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/williamson-foolishness-miracles-mass.html>

Fr. Edward F. MacDonald wrote the following short letter pointing out some of Mr. Johnson's confusions. [<http://www.ecclesiamilitans.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Reply-to-Sean-Johnson.pdf>]

Fr. Edward MacDonald's Letter about Never Attending the New Mass

Dear Mr. Johnson,

I do not understand why you are defending Bishop Williamson. It has been some time since I listened to his conference but I think that my memory is sufficiently accurate.

1. His Excellency prefaced his remarks about the NO Mass with the statement that what he was about to say was heresy for traditionalists.

Therefore, he has pre-judged and pre-condemned himself. He is guilty by his own admission.

2. He said that he was going to stick his neck out and people could chop it off.

Thus he has given permission for people to attack what he has said. Those attacking him on this matter do so with his authorisation. Therefore we should not think that we have to counter their arguments. It is curious that being an Englishman he did not offer to be hanged, drawn and quartered, rather than having his head chopped off which is more appropriate for a Frenchman.

In my view these two reasons preclude a defence of His Excellency.

3. His Excellency said that the NO Mass was designed to destroy faith.

There is plenty of empirical evidence to show that it was well designed and has successfully destroyed the faith of millions. Nothing is perfect and some people who attended the NO Mass for many years managed to keep the faith. They are the exception. In those cases it is usually due to some other practise of theirs, *e.g.*, morning and night prayers, the rosary, the little office...

Regarding the **Archbishop Lefebvre quote**, on page 2 of your document.

The Archbishop is talking about the pastoral care of one either saying the NO Mass or actively assisting at it. He says that for some it may NOT be subjectively a sin. It is OBJECTIVELY a sin. I would say that almost always someone attending the NO Mass is not guilty of grave sin. If they knew it was evil they would not attend. (In the seminary we were taught that it is intrinsically evil.)

We admit that there is serious matter (*materia grave*) and that there is full consent. But if there is no knowledge, no knowledge of the seriousness of the sin, then the person is not aware of the grave matter (*materia grave*). They do not commit a subjective sin.

This is not at all what Bishop Williamson said.

Note also, that the Archbishop is speaking of people who are ignorant. This woman did not want to be ignorant. She wanted to know. Probably she expected and wanted His Excellency to tell her why she should not go to the NO Mass. She was not completely ignorant as she did know about the traditional Mass and was at the Bishop's conference.

Bishop Williamson's criterion

According to His Excellency how do we know if we can attend the NO Mass. "IF it nourishes your Faith". This criterion is no good. It cannot be assessed. How do I know if my Faith is nourished or not? I don't know. I do not even know if I am in the state of grace. If I am not in the state of grace my faith is dead and cannot be nourished. If I am in the state of grace I am incapable of measuring my faith. Faith is a supernatural reality. While we are in the wayfarer state our minds are limited to what is sensible. We cannot measure supernatural things. Do I have "little faith" or do I have "great faith"? Do I have more faith today than yesterday? I don't know.

We do know that Catholic sacraments infallibly give grace and with an increase of grace there is an accompanying increase of the virtues. Worthily receiving Holy Communion at the traditional Mass certainly nourishes my faith. Also if I assist at Mass in a dignified manner with attention and devotion it will nourish my faith. This is not the case with the NO Mass.

Another quote from Archbishop Lefebvre more pertinent than yours (emphasis added).

Your perplexity takes perhaps the following form: may I assist at a sacrilegious Mass which is nevertheless valid, in the absence of any other, in order to satisfy my Sunday obligation? The answer is simple: these Masses cannot be the object of an obligation; we must moreover apply to them the rules of moral theology and canon law as regards the participation or the attendance at an action which endangers the faith or may be sacrilegious.

The New Mass, *even when said with piety and respect for the liturgical rules*, is subject to the same reservations since it is impregnated with the spirit of Protestantism. *It bears within it a poison harmful to the faith.* That being the case the French Catholic of today finds himself in the conditions of religious practice which prevail in missionary countries. There, the inhabitants in some regions are able to attend Mass only three or four times a year. The faithful of our country should make the effort to attend once each month at the Mass of All Time, the true source of grace and sanctification, in one of those places where it continues to be held in honor.

Open Letter to Confused Catholics, ch. 4.

If we cannot attend the NO Mass on days of obligation, *a fortiori*, we cannot attend it on weekdays.

The NO Mass, even when said devoutly bears within it a poison harmful to the faith. It poisons the faith. It is incapable of nourishing the faith. This was known long before Archbishop Lefebvre said it. Many priests who rejected the changes of the 60s already said this in 1969.

For many years, perhaps still now, the NO Mass was/is said at Holy Family Church in Detroit, on the high altar, the priest having his back to the people, in Latin, following all the rules, with dignity and presumably devotion. The Communion rail is there and people kneel for Communion received on the tongue. However we cannot go there. Fr. Bonfil (I believe that that is his Christian name) the priest there rejected all of the changes of the 60s. In the late 60s we traditionalists starting going there. However in about 1970 or 71 the NO Mass was imposed on Holy Family Church. Fr. Bonfil

left and cared of us traditionalists. He also invited the SSPX to come. When they came in 72 or 73 he retired to Italy. Fr. Bonfil taught that we could no longer attend Mass at Holy Family Church because now it was the NO Mass. It is poison for the Faith.

The answer to the question “if it nourishes your faith” is that the NO Mass cannot and does not nourish anyone’s faith. Therefore it cannot nourish the woman’s faith. Therefore she cannot go to it. In this case His Excellency gave bad advice. Most good priests do from time to time. The Church is infallible, priests and bishops are not. It is not a disaster because all traditional Catholics knew that he was wrong. Certainly none of the faithful in Ireland think him correct. One Irishwoman was certain that His Excellency was drunk when making these remarks.

Catholic Candle note: *We are pleased to share with you the latest bulletin from Fr. Rafael and the traditional Catholic Benedictine monks at St. Joseph’s Monastery in Colombia.*

Monasterio San José Summer 2016 Bulletin



PAX

We send our greetings in Our Blessed Mother, to all our relatives, friends, and benefactors, praying to God incessantly for your souls and for your intentions, so that one day, with the help of His grace, we may be reunited in the Eternal Bliss of Heaven.

The world events of decadence and apostasy which we observe everywhere oblige us to array ourselves for battle, keeping ourselves united in the Faith. Our holy Faith is the only thing which can closely unite one person with others. But our Faith is precisely the one thing which is the most undermined, attacked, and falsified nowadays. This happens even to the extent that “Catholics” do not look for union in the Faith but merely in opinions and feelings.

Sacred Scriptures tell us “Without the faith it is impossible to please God”; and “He who believes and is baptized shall be saved”. The unique and authentic flag of Catholic Tradition is union in the

Faith, including the fight to defend it. Let us listen to the holy Pope Saint Felix III, who tells us: “When error is not fought, it is soon or later accepted. When the truth is not defended, it ends up being suppressed”.

In these times of apostasy, many Catholics end up seeing the fulfillment of Pope Felix’s prediction. Because Catholics did not raise the flag of defense for the Faith, we see as a consequence that our very pope, Francis, accepts shocking errors. We also watch with sadness how the very last worldwide bastion of the Faith—the SSPX—has been subverted and is now oppressing those who hold the Catholic Faith without compromise.

To raise the flag of the Faith—which is by nature intolerant of error—shall be a cross even unto death, for true Catholics, because the Faith we defend is precisely what the world wants to exterminate. The time for physical and moral martyrdom has arrived. It only remains for Catholics to accept this reality with generous love for our captain, Our Lord Jesus Christ King, Who, before us, shed His Blood for us, on the Cross.

Saint Joseph’s Monastery, with the help of God’s grace, renews its resolution to continue being a bastion for the Faith, combating without rest and without compromise modernism and all other heresies.

We rely upon your prayers, as we offer ours for you.

With our blessing,

Father Rafael Arízaga, OSB, Prior

Catholic Candle note: We asked Fr. Rafael to tell us about the monastery’s current projects. Here is his response:

I need to finish building the second story of the Monastery San José. *See*, the pictures below. This second floor will allow us to grow quickly and be able to lodge visiting priests, religious and laymen to whom we will give monastic retreats.

This second story will also have 18 new monastic cells, an area of bathrooms and showers, a refectory, a library, a chapter room, a classroom and a storage room.

Moving our library to the second floor will allow us to expand the chapel on the first floor so that it has room for the 100 faithful who regularly come for Sunday masses.

I have been contacted by Contemplative Sisters and laywomen (who wish to become Benedictine sisters). They all have asked our help founding a Benedictine convent for nuns who refuse to compromise on the Faith. There are now enough vocations to start this work and I plan to start next August.

I want to buy a (relatively) inexpensive but very beautiful eight acre tract of forest land, one kilometer away from our monastery. I plan to help these sisters build a convent there. That won't happen "overnight" so meanwhile, we plan to rent a (relatively) inexpensive house near the monastery to lodge the nuns and allow them to begin their Benedictine community life right away.





We heartily encourage you to donate to help the excellent work of Fr. Rafael and the Benedictine Monks of San José Monastery, Colombia.

Donations to Fr. Rafael, OSB and San José Monastery, Colombia can be sent to Wells Fargo Bank:

Account Name	Adolfo Arízaga Ballesteros
Account number	0433871175
Routing number	122000247
SWIFT Code (international wires only)	WFBIUS6S

*There are also Paypal and other donation links on the monastery website.
[<http://benedictinos.jimdo.com/donativos/>]*