

Catholic Candle

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

Where Many Traditional Parents Fail

Parental *vigilance* and *leadership* are both exceedingly important for the family's salvation, especially while the Church and the New-SSPX are in crisis.

Parents, keep in mind you are *always setting an example—good or bad—and forming your children 24/7*, even without a conscious effort, **whether you know it or not**. Some parents take a position they think is “foolproof” that accepts leaning left and soft on Modernism, following the lead of the N-SSPX *whom they assume knows best*. Big mistake!

This same ill-advised position was the excuse parents most often used in the 1960s and '70s (Post-Vatican II) to avoid taking action necessary to save their Faith. This position of inaction put them in a lukewarm status ... and you know what our Lord thinks about that! With that position, 99% lost their Faith, as those parents continually drifted further left without realizing it.

Meanwhile, the children learn that accepting a *leaning left* and *softness-on-Modernism* is acceptable because it was their family's norm: “Mom and Dad were okay with that”. This fact will register in their minds for life, when challenged later on, with their Faith on the line. So if you are aware of a crisis in the N-SSPX and if you're not in the Resistance now, *you are failing your children*.

By contrast, children will also remember their parents who would **not** tolerate any liberalism or Modernism under any circumstances. At your Particular Judgment, for which parental stance would you like to be accountable for? I know which one I would. A strong family position against liberalism is an important subject to be discussed in a family meeting. Besides, children—deep down—appreciate leadership with unyielding principles.

In the 1960s and '70s, parents took what they thought was a safe and foolproof position (*viz.*, following their parish priests ... who led them into the VC II changes). Big mistake! They realized too late they had moved so far to the left that they did not recover their Catholic Faith for

themselves and their children. Besides, the easy life of the new conciliar church was too much to give up, for the structured traditional Catholic life of the past.

Of course it is always prudent to make sure your family has access to the Sacraments. But with that end in mind, it is extremely important to ask yourself: *at what price?*

After Vatican II, many Catholic families made a great mistake of accepting the Faith-destroying changes and new conciliar Sacraments (which offend God and are of questionable validity). They didn't want to be in that uncertain and inconvenient world of the "catacombs", as well as exposing themselves to harsh criticism from family and friends, for a traditional stance. I see the same type of ill-advised decisions made by families still in the N-SSPX, *viz.*, accepting liberalism creeping in all around, but not yet so obvious in their parish ... so they assure themselves that "it's all right" to tolerate it—regardless of the bad example they set for their children (which will manifest itself in their children's future decisions regarding the Faith).

They delay action (*i.e.*, leaving the "new" SSPX) on the false assumption that it's better to accept some liberalism rather than be without easy access to Mass and the Sacraments. This is following the devil's plan of subtle, slow spiritual death while falsely believing they're retaining the traditional Catholic Faith for their children.

Japanese Catholics kept the Faith for almost 300 years without priests and the Sacraments. God rewards with extra graces those faithful who stand up and fight for the traditional Catholic Faith when it is under attack and they are unable to practice it openly. By contrast, when Catholics accept a *little* liberalism, they leave the battlefield and the Fight for Christ the King. I believe that He responds by withholding His grace. He sternly warns:

I would thou wert cold or hot. But because thou art lukewarm [*i.e.*, accepting *some* liberalism], and neither cold nor hot, I will begin to vomit thee out of my mouth.

Apocalypse, 3:15-16.

Pay attention to what is going on in your family and in the N-SSPX preparing for the coming deal. It's been delayed for some time in order to liberalize their members and avoid as many defections as possible.

Parents, you must make the difficult decision to stay or to leave the N-SSPX before it is too late. Ensure the salvation of your family and join the battle, when you join the Resistance!

Catholic Candle note: We received this article from a reader:

Sanctifying Your Sundays When You Have No Mass Available

As a general rule, attending Mass every Sunday (or even every day) is excellent. But in your particular circumstances right now, if there is no Mass you can attend without compromise, then it is God's Will that you do *not* attend Mass. (A Mass involves compromise—among other ways—when it is said by a liberal fraternity or priest.) Attending a compromise Mass is a sin and harms your soul. Attending such a compromise Mass because “I need my Sacraments” is merely an excuse to take the easy path and not stand firm out of love for Christ the King.

By you refusing a Mass involving compromise, God will bless you now through other means. He is not abandoning you. He is merely changing His means of sanctifying you to fit the circumstances into which He lovingly put you.

Not only now but also at various other times in history God has sanctified souls without giving them regular access to the Sacraments. Sometimes, physical persecution caused the absence of good priests and the true Sacraments. God called Japanese Catholics to this type of life for almost 300 years (1587-1873). See, *Catholic Encyclopedia*, article: *Japanese Martyrs*.

During that period,

Japan was a forbidden land, and it seemed that for once persecution had been successful in crushing out Christianity. But from time to time there came strange rumors that the Japanese Christians, deprived as they were of altars, priests, and sacrifice, were still here and there holding fast to the faith that had been preached to their fathers by St. Francis Xavier.

Victories of the Martyrs, by St. Alphonsus de Liguori, Benzinger Bros, 1887, Appendix, p.455.

At other times, it has been God's Will that Catholics in some places have been without regular access to the true Sacraments because of travel difficulties and great distances to remote locations. For example:

In one area of Ecuador which was sparsely served by priests, ... Redemptorist priests went two-by-two on horseback, among a population which was completely hidden in the forests or on the crests of volcanoes. Many people, as soon as they heard [that a Catholic mission was planned], closed their cabins and walked as far as 30 miles to take part in the exercises. Where there was no church, they hastily built “green tents” made of tree branches, under which the instructions were given and enthusiastically received for fifteen days, concluded by everyone receiving the Sacraments and consecrating himself and his family to the protection of the Blessed Virgin.

When the Redemptorist Fathers had to leave, the parting was often quite heartrending—the poor people imploring them with tears to remain among them.

Quoted from: *Latin America: A Sketch of its Glorious Catholic Roots and a Snapshot of its Present*, by the Editors of Quanta Cura Press, p.119, © 2016.

To those whom God Wills to be without the Sacraments for a time, He gives the incalculably precious gift of a great increase in Faith. We see that illustrated in the love and devotion of the faithful in the Ecuadorian wilderness, as recounted above.

We also see this in the Catholics living during the Masonic French Revolution, as recounted by Bishop Bruté, who lived through that period in France. Here is how Bishop Bruté described this priceless increase in Faith among the French Catholics living without the Sacraments:

How strong and imperishable was [the Catholic Faith’s] hold upon thousands of hearts; how fervently did every true Christian family pledge its love and life to our blessed Lord; how constantly did Christian mothers require of their offspring, that, no matter what happened, they would never forget their duty to God. With how much anxiety, and yet fidelity, did they endeavor, especially on Sundays, to supply the want of public exercises of Religion and sanctify the day in their family.

Quoted from *Memoirs of Bishop Bruté*, by Bishop James Bayley, from the chapter called *Our Sundays in 1793*, p.169, Sadlier & Co., New York, 1861.

Thus, in some times and places, it has been for the good of their souls that Catholics have been without the benefit of good, uncompromising priests to regularly provide the true Sacraments.

This is true now. Most of you do not have any Mass without compromise, on most Sundays and Holy Days. This will last for as long as God pleases—for *the good of your own souls!* St. Paul teaches us this comforting truth: “[T]o them that love God, *all things work together unto good*”. *Romans*, 8:28 (emphasis added).

Out of love for God and the Faith, we stand against the liberalism of the “new” SSPX and refuse to attend their Masses. But God is never outdone in generosity! In “return” for our sacrifice (losing weekly Mass), God has palpably and greatly strengthened our Faith, as Bishop Bruté experienced and described (above).

The “new” SSPX’s current betrayal is not the first time I have found myself without weekly Mass and the Sacraments. When I was a boy in the 1970s, my family sanctified Sundays without the Mass for a period, because Mass was unavailable without compromising.

Now we are again without weekly Mass, because it is again necessary to make this sacrifice to avoid compromise. For anyone wanting to know how to sanctify the Sunday at home, I will briefly recount what we do now (and did in the 1970s) to sanctify our Sundays for the love of God and the Faith.

Just as the family of (young, future) Bishop Bruté [*Id.*, p.170], my family gathers together to pray the Mass prayers. One of the men reads the Mass prayers slowly and prayerfully, in Latin—which works out surprisingly well. Meanwhile, everyone else reads the translated prayers in his own missal. Many of you might choose that the Mass prayers be read out loud in English, although reading them in the Roman Church’s own language (Latin) is a great idea and allows everyone else to use his own missal’s translation.

As was true of Bishop Bruté’s family, we find that these Sundays without the Sacraments not only strongly increase our Faith but also are the means by which God bestows the priceless gift of a much greater and enduring thirst for Mass and the Blessed Sacrament. As Bishop Bruté recounted about those Sundays:

The King of men and angels was indeed present, invisibly, but not, alas! to be present in the divine Sacrament of love. No, alas! no Priest—no altar was there. Young as I was, I remember how sad, how desolate everything seemed without that living presence; but *how strongly did even this desolation seem to bind my heart to our holy religion.*

Id. p.171 (emphasis added).

Bishop Bruté referred to that period as “a time when all those virtues [*viz.*, Faith, Hope and Charity] acquired additional merit, by the test they were put to.” *Id.*, p.171.

We do what the Bruté family did during their own Sundays without the Sacraments: *viz.*, we invite other Catholics to sanctify the Sundays with us. Everyone is welcome! Praying together is an occasion for fulfilling our Lord’s promise to bless in a special way the prayers “where two or more of you are gathered in My Name”.

Further, inviting people outside our family (to sanctify the Sunday with us) provides moral support and Catholic camaraderie for all of us, as well as helps us to be punctual. We tell them to “come at 9am” and their arrival helps us to start on schedule.

We think it is better to sanctify the Sunday in the morning, when possible. The saints especially emphasized morning as a time for prayer and this is the usual time for Sunday Mass.

During the reading of the Mass prayers, one of the men reads the Epistle and Gospel in Latin and then in English, at the usual time when they occur at Mass. As was true of the Bruté family, we stand at the reading of the Gospel (*Id.*, p.171)—both in Latin and in English.

We kneel, stand and sit during the Mass prayers, whenever we would do so at Mass. This helps us more fully participate in the prayers—with our entire selves—and helps us to unite ourselves with the true, uncompromising Masses occurring elsewhere in the Mystical Body of Christ.

After the Gospel, we do what the Bruté family did during their own Sundays without the Sacraments: *viz.*, we read aloud (for about thirty minutes) an instruction in the Faith. *Id.*, p.171. This is in lieu of the sermon we would have heard had we been able to attend Mass.

We read one of the excellent, challenging sermons of a Father or Doctor of the Church, keyed to the particular Sunday’s Gospel. We are using sermons from the superb four-volume set *Sunday Sermons of the Great Fathers*, (translated by M. F. Toal).¹

Although there are plenty of pre-Vatican II sermon books, we especially urge you to read the Fathers and Doctors of the Church. The Church recommends their sermons above others because they are better than others. They are the greatest because they are the most accessible means of attaining the greatest Catholic wisdom and knowledge of the Faith. It is astounding how beautifully they weave the riches of Sacred Scripture into every paragraph!

Those excellent sermons not only continue the Catholic custom of hearing a sermon on Sunday morning, but they also are part of fulfilling our Catholic duty to continue the study of our Faith throughout our lives.

These sermons are an important reminder to us and to our children that doctrine (the Faith) is paramount and that the problem in the new conciliar religion and now in the “new” SSPX is primarily a problem of the Faith. These sermons are also a good reminder that having the Faith is more important than having the Sacraments. Further, those other problems with the conciliar religion and in the N-SSPX are caused by their problems with the Faith.

When the Mass prayers reach the two consecrations and then the distribution of Holy Communion, we pause (as did the Bruté family, *Id.*, p.171) in silent adoration and for heartfelt Spiritual Communions.

After the Mass prayers, we sing a hymn. This is our second hymn, having sung one before beginning the Mass prayers. As St. Augustine teaches: “He who sings, prays twice.”

Our Faith is wonderfully rich in traditional Catholic hymns, especially Gregorian Chant. Challenge yourself! Expand your repertoire! Learn beautiful traditional hymns you never knew before. Be generous and sing all of the verses. Our Lord is never outdone in generosity!

Following the Mass prayers and this second hymn, we recite a Rosary as Our Lady requested and then sing a third hymn.

The total time for the above prayers and hymns is usually about 2-2¼ hours, finishing with our souls refreshed and better prepared for the week ahead!

Three final notes:

- We wear “church clothes” while we keep Sundays holy without the Mass—just as we did when I was a boy. I think this is important. It reminds us that what we are doing is important and is dedicated to God. Our fallen human nature inclines to sloth and responds to this idea by saying “we know we’re speaking to God even without dressing up.” True, but we need the help of this reminder. This is just like it is important (and is the Catholic way) for a priest to dress like a priest even among persons who don’t need to be informed by what he wears, that he is a priest.

- Sanctify the Sunday in a particular room, a special place. When I was a boy we children were not allowed (without permission) in our home's formal living room. (The children played in a "family room" instead.) This formal living room was where we gathered on Sunday mornings to sanctify the Sunday. Likewise, you should choose a "special" room, not full of toys and distractions, as much as possible. The "specialness" of the place is a further help to remember the specialness of what we are doing.
- Even if you cannot keep the Sunday holy with others, be generous and pray and sing out loud as well as stand and kneel as called for at a Mass. Doing this causes more of your entire selves (voice, ears, knees, *etc.*) to participate in your holy action. God will not be outdone in generosity!

1. Here is a small sample of other excellent (and free) sermons available:

- *Sermons of St. Thomas Aquinas*, for the Sundays of the Year.
<https://ia902305.us.archive.org/30/items/ninetyninehomili00thomuoft/ninetyninehomili00thomuoft.pdf>
- *Sermons for all of the Sundays of the Year*, by St. Alphonsus de Liguori, <https://archive.org/details/sermonsforallsun00liguuoft>
- *On The Little Number Of Those Who Are Saved*, by St. Leonard of Port Maurice, <http://www.fatimacrusader.com/cr92/cr92pg12.pdf>
- *Sermons for Advent and Christmastide*, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, <https://archive.org/details/sermonsofstberna00bernuoft>

Note: Beware! Use Catholic translations, not translations by the heretics, since they distort the meaning to fit their own heresies.

The New Mass Never Gives Grace

We must always judge the claims people make, according to our Traditional Catholic Principles. As one example: it is a core, unshakable Traditional Catholic Principle that Vatican II is a *bad tree* which can only bear *bad fruit*.

In his war against Our Lord, the devil has endless false arguments which seek to deceive Catholics that *bad fruit is really good fruit*. One such Satanic attempt to deceive Catholics is the following superficial “argument” that falsely concludes that the new mass gives Grace:

- The new mass is a Mass.
- The Mass gives Grace.
- Therefore, the new mass gives Grace.

Our Catholic Common Sense (judging according to Traditional Catholic Principles) causes us to know immediately that the hand of Satan is in this “argument”, because the new mass is a bad fruit of a bad tree. No bad fruit is good and something evil cannot be a source of Grace. Our Catholic Common Sense immediately “smells” the work of Satan, even if a Traditional Catholic leader or an “angel of light”¹ were to insist otherwise.

We know that the new mass always offends God and is inherently evil.² God never uses something inherently evil as a *source* of Grace. (However, when a person is ignorant and witnesses evil, God might use that particular time and place as the *occasion* to give His Grace, to help that person see the evil and make changes in his life.)

Further, if every mass gave Grace, then all evil (but valid) masses would give Grace. This cannot be! This would mean all (valid) masses of heretics and schismatics give Grace and thus, are good because they (supposedly) sanctify souls!

We would also be forced to conclude that the (valid) masses of Satanists give Grace and are good, even though they are designed and conducted to mock our Lord and offend him as greatly as possible through the gravest possible sacrileges. Our Catholic Common Sense knows immediately that this is Satan’s “argument” and that it must be false to say all valid masses give Grace.

That argument (above) no more proves the new mass gives Grace, than does the following (false) “argument” prove that all prayer pleases God:

- The Pharisee’s prayer³ is a prayer.
- Prayer pleases God.
- Therefore, the Pharisee’s prayer pleases God.

Through our Catholic Common Sense, we know immediately that this argument is false, and Our Lord told us that God did not hear the Pharisee’s prayer.

The devil knows we have Catholic Common Sense and that this “argument” won’t fool us *if we judge (and reject) this argument according to our Traditional Catholic Principles.*

For this reason, the devil has additional “layers” of false arguments so that he can attempt to deceive by a subsequent “layer” of argument any persons who had managed to remain undeceived by his earlier fallacy. His next “layer” of false argument involves presenting his fallacious “reasoning”, adding something like “Archbishop Lefebvre said this” or “St. Pius X taught this”.

A striking (and unfortunate) example of this type of demonic “argument”, is the one which currently deceives Bishop Williamson (and, tragically, which he is spreading).

Bishop Williamson used to say the new mass is inherently evil and no one should ever attend it.⁴ He now says that *the Council of Trent’s infallible teaching shows that the new mass gives Grace.* Here are Bishop Williamson’s recent words:

I’m sure you ask yourselves: “What kind of world are my children going to have to grow up in? **How are they going to keep the Faith?**” Very good question. By prayer and Charity and **by frequenting the sacraments**, so long as they are still available, **so long as it’s at all still possible to reach the sacraments.** And some Novus—I’ve got into quite a lot of controversy for saying this, but it’s true—there is no question that **some Novus Ordo Masses are valid.**⁵ **And if they’re valid, then it’s defined by the Council of Trent that grace passes,** “ex opere operato”, is the strict phrase.⁶

However much this superficial invocation of the Council of Trent deceives Bishop Williamson

himself, the fact remains that our Catholic Common Sense immediately “smells the rat” despite mention of Trent. Despite Traditional-sounding buzzwords, we know that the new mass is evil and cannot be a source of Grace.

To unmask this false argument, let us look more closely than Bishop Williamson did (in the conference quoted above), at his claim that the Council of Trent shows that the new mass gives Grace.

The Council of Trent truly states that Sacraments are instrumental causes of Grace (“ex opere operato”). See, session VII, canon VIII. The Council of Trent distinguishes (on the one hand) the seven Sacraments—which *cause* Grace—from other good works and prayers (on the other hand) through which we obtain Grace, which are not themselves causes of Grace. Reciting a *Hail Mary* is not a direct cause of Grace. Rather, it is a pious occasion which disposes us and prompts God to give Grace—but not through that prayer as a cause.

However, although Catholics know that the Sacraments cause Grace, it is against Catholic Teaching and Catholic Common Sense to wrongly jump to the conclusion that every valid Sacrament gives Grace, as Bishop Williamson asserts. In other words, although the Sacraments are causes of grace, this does not mean that there aren’t obstacles which sometimes serve to prevent a valid Sacrament from giving Grace.

Bishop Williamson’s superficial “reasoning” misses three key distinctions:

1. No “Grace passes” (to use Bishop Williamson’s expression) to a person receiving the Holy Eucharist in mortal sin, even when the Host is validly consecrated;
2. No “Grace passes” when the Holy Eucharist is validly consecrated by a heretic or schismatic; and
3. No “Grace passes” when the Holy Eucharist is validly consecrated but the rite of the Mass is sinful.

Below we examine these distinctions which show the falsehood of Bishop Williamson’s rash, overly broad claim that every time there is a valid Sacrament, “Grace passes” (*i.e.*, is given).

1. No “Grace Passes” to a Person in Mortal Sin Even When the Holy Eucharist is Validly Consecrated.

When Bishop Williamson says that, if a Sacrament is “valid, then it’s defined by the Council of Trent that grace passes”, he distorts the Council of Trent and makes a false, overly broad “rule” that a valid Sacrament always gives Grace. If his rule were correct, then to receive the Holy Eucharist in mortal sin would give Grace. But such Communion is a mortal sin of sacrilege, not a source of Grace. Thus, Bishop Williamson’s rule is false (because it is overly broad) that every valid Sacrament gives Grace.

2. No “Grace Passes” When the Holy Eucharist is Validly Consecrated by a Heretic.

Bishop Williamson’s second crucial omission is failing to consider valid Sacraments performed by heretics and schismatics. *Such (valid) Sacraments are mortal sins and God does not give His Grace through those Sacraments.* Here is how St. Thomas Aquinas explains this important truth:

[S]ome have contended that heretics, schismatics, and the excommunicate, who are outside the pale of the Church, cannot perform this Sacrament [*viz.*, the Holy Eucharist]. But herein they are deceived, because, as Augustine says (Contra Parmen. ii), “it is one thing to lack something utterly, and another to have it improperly”; and in like fashion, “it is one thing not to bestow, and quite another to bestow, but not rightly.” ... [S]ince the consecration of the Eucharist is an act which follows the power of order, such persons as are separated from the Church by heresy, schism, or excommunication, can indeed consecrate the Eucharist, which on *being consecrated by them contains Christ’s true body and blood; but they act wrongly, and sin by doing so; and in consequence they do not receive the fruit of the sacrifice [viz., Grace]....*

Summa, III, Q.82, a.7, *Respondeo*.

This is a second reason Bishop Williamson is plainly wrong in his superficial misuse of the Council of Trent to support his assertion that “Grace passes” with every valid Sacrament.

For any reader interested in further enumerations of the Catholic teaching that no “Grace passes” when valid Sacraments are given by heretics, see the teaching of St. Augustine, Pope Gregory XVI, St. Fulgentius, St. Bonaventure and St. Jerome, quoted (with citations) in *Lumen Gentium*

Annotated, by Quanta Cura Press, pp. 117, 135 & 138, © 2013, available at: scribd.com/doc/158994906 (free) & at Amazon.com (sold at cost).

Concluding this section: Plainly, our Catholic Common Sense is confirmed by the teachings of the Catholic Faith, *viz.*, even if a particular evil mass were valid, it is false and rash to judge that this mass gives Grace (as Bishop Williamson asserts). This truth applies to all heretics and adherents to any false religions, including the new conciliar religion.⁷

3. No “Grace Passes” When the Holy Eucharist is Validly Consecrated But the Rite of the Mass is Sinful.

Even when a Sacrament is valid, the Council of Trent nonetheless infallibly declares it is a mortal sin to omit the Catholic rites surrounding that Sacraments’ Matter and Form. Here are the Council’s words:

If anyone saith, that the received and **approved rites of the Catholic Church**, wont to be used in the solemn administration of the sacraments, **may** be contemned, or **without sin be omitted** ... let him be anathema.

Session VII, canon XIII.⁸

Thus, the Council of Trent verifies our Catholic Common Sense that a valid sacrament can be a mortal sin (and thus, not give Grace), because of omissions from (or additions to) the Catholic sacramental rite. *This is precisely the case of the new mass, which changes the Catholic rite surrounding the Sacrament’s Matter and Form so that it is inherently a mortal sin of sacrilege and thus, cannot cause Grace* (even if we were to suppose the consecration were valid).

Let us pray for Bishop Williamson that he correct his grave errors promoting the new mass. He has done great good in the past and it is possible for him to still do great good in the future.

-
1. “But though ... an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.” *Galatians*, 1:8. St. Paul further explains that this “angel of light” is the devil: “Satan himself transformeth himself into an angel of light.” II *Cor.* 11:14.

2. <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/attendance-at-new-mass.html>
3. “The Pharisee standing, prayed thus with himself: ‘O God, I give thee thanks that I am not as the rest of men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, as also is this publican. I fast twice in a week: I give tithes of all that I possess.’” *St. Luke* 18:11–12.
4. <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/resistance-really-uphold-basic.html>
5. Bishop Williamson here supposes that if a new mass were to have a valid consecration, this would automatically mean that the new mass is a valid *mass*. For purposes of this article, we leave aside—but do not grant— this unsupported assumption.

Church law treats the Mass’s Offertory as one of the three main parts of the Mass without attending which, a Catholic has not attended Mass. Thus, even if a person were to assume that a new mass’s consecration were valid, *this does not allow us to conclude that such a new mass would be a valid mass as such*, since the conciliar “offertory” is so radically different and might properly be called the very antithesis of the Catholic Offertory. Thus, even if a person were to suppose that a new mass were to have a valid consecration, this is not enough to show that it is a valid *mass* because the new mass contains an “anti-Offertory”.

Also, Bishop Williamson here implicitly makes the unsupported assumption that some conciliar ordinations and consecrations are known to be valid—which is a necessary assumption to support his supposition that some new masses have definitely valid consecrations. But the truth is that the validity of all conciliar “ordinations” and “consecrations” is inherently doubtful. For a thorough explanation of this, see:

- <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/new-ordination-doubtful.html>
- <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B49oPuI54eEGd2RRcTFSY29EYzg/view>
- <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B49oPuI54eEGZVF5cmFvMGdZM0U/view>

6. May 20, 2016 conference available here: <https://youtu.be/GGcr24n8fjo?t=22m>

(emphasis added).

7. We reject the new mass and all other aspects of new conciliar religion, just as we reject all aspects of all other false religions. Although we reject their objective errors, we do not judge other persons' *subjective* culpability for holding those grave errors.

For a thorough explanation of our Catholic duty to judge objective errors but not judge other persons' subjective culpability, see the discussion of the mortal sin of rash judgment here: <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/against-sedevacantism.html#section-5>

8. For a thorough treatment of the evil of changing the Catholic rite of the Mass and thereby causing a valid Mass to be a mortal sin, not a source of Grace, see *Summa Theologiae Moralis*, vol. III, *De Sacramentis*, H. Noldin, S.J., p.245 *et seq.*, Oeniponte, 1920.

SSPX censors itself to please modernist Rome

The only choices are to love God above all things or to worship oneself (as Satan does). There is no middle ground. The world can never reconcile with the true Catholic Church. If the world seems to reconcile with the Catholic Church, the world is only reconciling with a false, hollowed-out church called the conciliar church. The conciliar church pretends to reconcile the world with the Catholic Church, but this is a lie.

Likewise, the conciliar church can never reconcile with the true SSPX of Archbishop Lefebvre. If the conciliar church seems to reconcile with the SSPX, the conciliar church is only reconciling with a false, hollowed-out SSPX. The new SSPX is chasing after the same lie as the conciliar church.

The SSPX has told this lie many times: we haven't changed, we won't change, and Rome is accepting us as we are. The SSPX had ample warning that whenever a traditionalist group joins the conciliar church, it stops attacking conciliar errors. Nonetheless, the SSPX did not heed the warning, but gave up the fight and took up this lie.

The SSPX had ample warning

First, Archbishop Lefebvre spoke very clearly: “It is not the subjects that make the superiors, but the superiors who make the subjects.” When the SSPX submits to the conciliar church, the conciliar church inevitably makes the SSPX conciliar.

Former Pope Benedict XVI likewise described¹ how, when groups join the conciliar church, they become conciliar themselves:

I myself saw, in the years after 1988, how the return of communities which had been separated from Rome changed their interior attitudes; I saw how returning to the bigger and broader Church enabled them to move beyond one-sided positions and broke down rigidity so that positive energies could emerge for the whole.

Moreover, at least six other purportedly traditional groups² preceded the SSPX into the conciliar darkness and gave up their fight against conciliar errors: Good Shepherd, Campos, Le Barroux, Institute of Christ the King, St. Peter, and Papa Stronsay. When Campos surrendered, the collapse was so obvious that even Bp. Fellay warned about the grave mistake they were making.

Even Bp. Fellay saw through Campos’s compromise

I review a few of Bp. Fellay’s points below, to show how Bp. Fellay is disregarding his own prior warnings. The following four quotes come from Bp. Fellay’s 2004 conference.³

- Rome silences traditionalist groups that sign a deal. “Events and experience have proven that once you have signed on, Rome says shut up.”
- Campos signs because of empty promises from unconverted Rome. “We have right in our faces a striking example of what happens to those who trust the present Rome. I speak of Campos. ... I told [Bp. Rangel], ‘Look at what they are doing to the Society of St. Peter.’ He replied, ‘Well, what Rome offers us is so big that we cannot help but trust them. ...’ ... His thinking was that since Rome consented to grant them a bishop and their Tridentine life, Campos was being granted everything it wanted, so they wanted to sign an agreement.”
- After Campos’s deal, Campos faces extra pressure to behave, whereas excommunication frees the SSPX to profess the truth. “This has made things so

that, firstly, they can no longer put any pressure on us. After the excommunication, what kind of pressure can they exert? None. ... This gives us a tremendous freedom. We can speak to their faces without fearing any retaliation from them. This is surprising, but it is the fact, I tell you. Because of his compromise, Bishop Rifan has to say, ‘We have to do this... because otherwise it will jeopardize the agreement.’”

- The SSPX must not follow Campos into the conciliar church. “So when Rome comes to us with a big smile, that is their ulterior motive. That is, we grant you a place, but you must stay very quiet there and not move. ... As long as things are at that level, it is just unthinkable that we should be able to reach a basic or fundamental agreement.”

The SSPX no longer combats the conciliar church

Our Lord taught us, “If the world hate you, know ye that it hath hated me before you.” (John 15:18). Once one starts worrying about the opinion of the world, one stops saying things that would displease the world. Excommunication from the conciliar church now saddens Bp. Fellay and Bp. Tissier.⁴ Since the SSPX now wishes to join the conciliar church, it no longer says things that would displease the conciliar church.

As if our dozens of examples weren’t already ample proof, a National Catholic Register article⁵ (May 19, 2016) confirms this fact once again.

The Register quotes a Vatican source acknowledging that the SSPX “toned down some of their literature, interviews, and publications.”

In the Register article, Bp. Fellay weakly complains that he finds himself “totally puzzled” by Pope Francis. Pope Francis is causing many souls to be lost. That’s not a bit puzzling. But now the SSPX no longer attacks the conciliar church, but merely worries⁶ and whines about being confused.⁷

According to the Register interview, Bp. Fellay doesn’t even notice that the SSPX has compromised, but believes that only Rome has changed. He calls the coming deal “really paradoxical, because we haven’t changed anything”. The more the SSPX dialogues with Rome, he claims, “the more lenient Rome becomes”. Bp. Fellay only sees the sheep’s clothing and not the wolves underneath.

Perhaps most alarming of all, the Register quotes Pope Francis as calling Bp. Fellay “a man with whom one can dialogue”. Can you imagine Pope Francis speaking this way about Archbishop Lefebvre? Not a chance. When the modernists in Rome tried to lure Archbishop Lefebvre into their clutches, he unmasked the trap with a simple question: “Do you still accept the entire Anti-Modernist Oath? Are you in favor of the social reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ? If you do not accept the doctrine of your predecessors, it is useless to talk!” (Fideliter, quoted by Fr. Laisney in *Archbishop Lefebvre and the Vatican*, p. 224.) Our Lord’s only true friends are people like Archbishop Lefebvre who openly defend and take pride in His Kingship.

-
1. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/letters/2009/documents/hf_ben-xvi_let_20090310_remissione-scomunica_en.html
 2. <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-societies-made-deal.html>
 3. http://www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsection=show_article&article_id=2351
 4. <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/tissier-defends-agreement-rome.html>
 5. <http://m.ncregister.com/49501/d#.V1W4fH0-HN>
 6. <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-worries-annulment-abuse.html>
 7. <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-confused-vatican-euthanasia.html>

The N-SSPX Again Proves It No Longer Has A Fighting Spirit

The *modernist-leaning* SSPX major superiors just finished a meeting. In the resulting communiqué, Bishop Fellay says:

The purpose of the Society of Saint Pius X is chiefly the *formation of priests*, the essential condition for the renewal of the Church and for the restoration of society.

Quoted from Bishop Fellay's 6-29-16 communiqué found here: <http://www.dici.org/en/news/communique-from-the-superior-general/> (emphasis added).

No one—not even Cardinal Kasper (one of Rome's most rabid modernists)—could object to this goal! Notice the N-SSPX says nothing about forming priests to fight modernism and to battle the evils of the conciliar church. That is because the “new” *SSPX now wants to form priests in partnership with Pope Francis and the conciliar church.*

As the N-SSPX recently explained:

If the Pope is really thinking of a canonical structure [for the SSPX] ... we could work together, according to our vocation, to the formation of a new generation of priests¹

The communiqué continues:

In the great and painful confusion that currently reigns in the Church, the proclamation of Catholic doctrine requires the denunciation of errors that have made their way into it and are unfortunately encouraged by a large number of pastors, including the Pope himself.

Even Cardinal Kasper would agree that there is “painful confusion” in the Church and even he denounces “errors” (as he sees them). Notice the N-SSPX says nothing about the poison of liberalism and the plague of modernism and nothing about the thousands of deadly errors of Vatican II. Notice also that the *N-SSPX says nothing about the pope being a modernist and teaching modernism.* The cowardly N-SSPX says only that the pope “encourages” unspecified “errors” which have *somehow* “made their way” [who knows how?] into the human element of the Church.

As a remedy, the N-SSPX says it seeks “the support of a Pope who concretely favors the return to Sacred Tradition.” In this way, the N-SSPX shares the goal of the so-called “conservative” wing of the conciliar revolution. Those so-called “conservatives”, also, “favor” a “return to” tradition—because they nostalgically prefer it or wish that “tradition” would “find its place” within the conciliar church’s pantheon of errors.

The N-SSPX says it prays to strengthen the pope—implying that the pope correctly holds the truths of the Catholic Faith but is too timid to speak his mind! Of course, the truth is that Pope Francis is deservedly well-known for boldly speaking his mind on everything (to the detriment of the Church).

Here are Bishop Fellay’s words:

The Society of Saint Pius X prays and does penance *for the Pope, that he might have the strength to proclaim Catholic faith and morals in their entirety*. In this way he will hasten the triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Mary that we earnestly desire as we approach the centennial of the apparitions in Fatima.

Bishop Fellay says that the pope’s supposed timidity (lack of strength) causes him to fail to proclaim the Catholic Faith and morals “*in their entirety*”. Suppose a person makes a statement which is *almost* completely correct—but not quite—we might say that his statement was not true *in its entirety*. But if a person’s statement contains far more errors than truth, it minimizes his errors to say his statement was “not entirely true”—as if there were some small, single error. This is like saying that “Modernism is not true in its entirety”.

Surely Bishop Fellay is the *Master of Minimizing*—trying to make Pope Francis look acceptable and someone with whom he can make a deal! The N-SSPX’s naïve narrative is predictable: When Pope Francis recognizes the SSPX, the SSPX [hopes it] will be able to give him support to make him strong enough to “proclaim Catholic faith and morals in their entirety”. Thus, the SSPX thinks that strengthening a *wolf in sheep’s clothing* (the pope) will make him a good and worthy shepherd.

Lastly, Bishop Fellay promotes another error too, *viz.*, about the triumph of the Immaculate Heart. He makes the false assertion that by proclaiming the “Catholic Faith and morals in their entirety”, the pope will “hasten the triumph of the Immaculate Heart”.

The truth is that Our Lady assures us that Her Immaculate Heart *will inexorably triumph when Russia is consecrated* to Her Immaculate Heart. In other words, nothing can prevent this triumph once Russia is consecrated.

On the other hand, the triumph of Her Immaculate Heart will *not occur until* this consecration, which will occur when matters are most desperate (the desperateness having increased with the current N-SSPX's betrayal).

The pope *beginning to teach the truth*, is a crucial *consequence* of this consecration, which will only occur *after* it has been performed. It is impossible for major improvements to occur (like the pope beginning to teach the Faith) without the consecration occurring first and causing them. In other words, *Our Lady's triumph will have many good components and they will not occur until the consecration.*

If, while Our Lord was on earth, He cured a blind man whose sight already began improving on the day before he is cured by Our Lord, it would seem that Our Lord's cure was merely part of the improvement which was already begun. Our Lord does not work this way! Likewise, God would not begin the improvements which bring about the triumph of the Immaculate Heart before the pope consecrates Russia (and *Bishop Fellay's communiqué is silent* about the pope's duty to do this).

Let us pray for the N-SSPX priests and bishops—both for those promoting such an ineffective and liberal “solution” to the conciliar revolution, and those justifying (their own) silence and inaction against it.

-
1. English translation here: <http://eponymousflower.blogspot.ca/2015/12/alking-former-superior-of-fraternity.html?spref=tw>

Catholic Candle note: *Fr. Franz Schmidberger (who made this proposal) is the former superior general of the SSPX, former district superior of the SSPX German District and a former SSPX seminary founder. He is currently rector of the SSPX seminary in Germany.*