



The Recusant

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



“But surely there are simple souls who are easily misled by sowers of discord[...] I would like to make this clear: let no one imagine that he can criticize authority with impunity.”

-Fr. Niklaus Pfluger, interview with Kirchliche Umschau. October. 2012.

Inside:

- *How to help the cause*
- *Quo vadis Msgr. de Galarreta ?*
- *Bishop Fellay in his own words*
- *Fr. Chazal's War Aims*

From the Desk of the Editor:

"Recusant" /'rɛkjuːz(ə)nt/

- a person who refuses to submit to an authority or to comply with a regulation.
- *historical* a person who refused to attend services of the Church of England (from Latin *recusare* – to refuse)

We decided on this as a title for this newsletter, since it is a succinct description of our current position. "Recusant". This is how we describe ourselves. We refuse. In distinction to those around us, our neighbours, acquaintances and work colleagues, and even – alas! – relatives, we refuse anything which the modern world thinks it has to offer and with which it seeks to entice us: all its lies, all its fads, its childish, superstitious “beliefs” its pompous delusions of grandeur, its golden calves, its censorship and also its license, its barbaric, ignorant manners in thought, word and dress. In a

word, modernity, together with all its pomps, all its works and all its empty promises. We refuse to participate. We are the party-poopers who sit in the corner and refuse to join in the "fun" (we know where it is really leading! We even suspect who may be the ones trying to "encourage" us!)

Together with this refusal of modernity must be added our refusal of the ghastly, hellish attempt to fuse the Catholic Faith with that same modern world.

This is why we are resigned to being known as "Traditional" Catholics and not merely Catholics. Some of us may initially have kicked against the goad, protested that we are merely "Catholics" plain and simple. And while this is true, we all learned sooner or later (if we did not know it already) that reality had overtaken us. Once upon a time, not so very long ago, all "Catholics" were "Traditional". To a Catholic living at any time up to the 1960s the epithet would have seemed almost laughably superfluous. Alas, no more.

There are many who are now growing up with the full benefit of Catholic Tradition who perhaps do not fully appreciate what they have been given. They would do well to speak to those Traditional Catholics of an older generation who first, having gone to the trouble of refusing the modern world, then equally found they had to refuse the "modern Church" from the late 1960s onwards, and who resigned themselves never more to enter the local parish Church, (buildings to which they have far more moral right than the current "Catholic" occupants, and which in many cases their parents had helped finance and build), referred to as "disobedient", "excommunicates", having to watch as relatives were refused burial in a "Catholic" cemetery, and many more personal tragedies besides. Catholic "Traditionalism" (the main vehicle for, and driving force behind which, has long been the SSPX) did not simply appear, as if by magic. It did not fall like manna from heaven. It was fought for, and hard won: inch by painful inch, soul by soul, priest by priest. We have come a long way since the tumultuous days in the immediate aftermath of the Council. Yet once again, there is a need for devout souls to stand strong, for once again everything is under threat.

We who refuse the modern world, we who refuse the modern Church due to its adulterous marriage to the modern world, we now are duty bound to refuse

the modern SSPX leadership on account of their apparent desire for an adulterous marriage with the modern Church.

We refuse the nonsense talked by Benedict XVI when he says that America is the model for all nations, that the Jews do not need to be converted or that religious freedom, including the freedom to join a false religion and to worship in it publically is "the pinnacle of all other freedoms," and "... a sacred an inalienable right." We likewise refuse Bishop Bernard Fellay when he says that Benedict XVI is leading the fight for Tradition, that he is improving matters in the Church, and that therefore the SSPX ought officially and legally to place itself fully at Benedict XVI's disposal and at the disposal of those whom he sees fit to appoint as his delegates.

We shall, in due course, attempt to present our readers with evidence for what we see as the overturning and subversion of the mission of the SSPX. Suffice it to say that we no longer recognise in Bishop Fellay the work of Tradition nor the legacy of Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre. Archbishop Lefebvre is often quoted as saying, quite rightly, that Vatican II was the French Revolution inside the Catholic Church. Well, what we are witnessing right now is "Vatican II within the SSPX". And like those heroes of forty years before, it is now up to us to resist, to refuse, to take whatever steps necessary to safeguard the purity of the Catholic Faith, whatever the cost. Let us ask God that He gives us grace sufficient to rise to the challenge. The purpose of this newsletter, as well as to inform, is to strengthen, encourage and galvanise our resolve not to give in, and to speak the truth as we see it. The Emperor has no clothes. Bishop Fellay has shown to all the world that he is, at best, rather confused and irresolute on certain matters which are at the heart of our fight for Tradition; at worst, that he has fallen away from Tradition, that he is no longer a Traditionalist in any meaningful sense, and is therefore no longer our leader in any sense of the word. For the good of the SSPX, and therefore by extension the good of the Church, Bishop Fellay and his inner circle must go. They must go now.

About our Circulation, and Other Mundane Matters

Finally, before you read on, allow me to turn to some matters of practicality.

You will notice that you have been sent more than one copy of this newsletter. Please read one and pass the others along. Some of the information which we intend to present requires thought and reflection, and it may well be worth your while giving it a second or third reading. Enquiries, letters to the editors, suggestions, and the postal address of new readers (i.e. those who wish to subscribe and were not fortunate enough to have been mailed a copy first time around) may be sent in via the email address provided elsewhere.

It is to be expected that some sort of campaign of unpleasantness will follow the release of this newsletter, conducted on behalf of Bishop Fellay by those who fondly imagine that they are showing great virtue in their imagined "loyalty". Knowing human nature for what it is, and wishing to keep everybody's mind on the ideas at stake, we will not be releasing any of the names of those connected with this newsletter. We fully expect that guesses will be hazarded, and wild accusations thrown around by those of our opponents fortunate enough to get hold of a copy. If this does happen, we would like to reassure our other (sympathetic) readers that no matter how certain these people sound, no matter how much noise they make, how openly they denounce this layman or that priest by name as being the driving force behind this initiative, nor how blood curdling their threats – they are merely guessing, are probably wrong, and are incapable of doing anything to stop our message getting out. It is for this reason that we do not provide you with a postal address, a telephone number, nor shall we be leaving "The Recusant" in the repositories of SSPX Mass centres (and we advise you not to do so either). Its circulation is, thus, entirely dependent on you, the reader, passing it in person to other people whom you know. The only way to contact us directly is via our website. We are, as mentioned already, fighting a guerrilla war. Our opponents hold all the levers of power within the SSPX, and they control all the official outlets of information, which they are currently using in a very unscrupulous (not to say untruthful) manner to further their own nefarious ends. This newsletter is an attempt to redress the balance, to tell the other side of the story, but we foresee that once our circulation begins to

spread, attempts will be made, by fair means or foul, to put an end to our modest operation.

The newsletter is provided free, but we hope eventually to receive modest donations from some good souls towards our running costs. Those with internet may donate online via our website www.TheRecusant.com. For those without internet, we would simply suggest that you give it to the person who gave you this copy. Assuming that that person then does the same (which they surely will - we are all honest Catholic souls after all), the money will eventually filter back to where it is needed.

Likewise, you will notice that we have also sent you, included inside this newsletter, a copy of Fr. Chazal's "War aims" and his excellent synopsis: "I excuse the Council". Once again, please circulate liberally!

Written on the Feast of St. Raphael, 2012

Archbishop Lefebvre Speaks

"Your first aim is not to fight against error, but to know the truth. Your central concern should be study, your sanctification, silence, meditation and the exercise of charity." ("The Biography of Marcel Lefebvre" p. 515)

"Our position is only tenable if we have the souls of martyrs.... It is no joke. God's love asks this of us: to give witness like this is hard and it wears you down with all the false problems of authority and obedience. It is love of God that made the martyrs, those who confessed the Faith. [...] God does us a great honor in making us confessors of the Faith in our age. Whatever our feelings of being ostracized or abandoned, let us be true!" ("The Biography of Marcel Lefebvre" p. 464)

"But What Can I Do? I'm Only a Layman!"

We welcome suggestions, will accept correction from any of the many good SSPX clergy of whose existence we are aware, but for the moment here is a brief list of suggestions:

1. Pray.

Pray the Rosary. Do penance.

(We include, elsewhere, a novena.)

2. Write letters. Whilst there is arguably very little point in writing to +Fellay or any of inner circle or his allies, there is a great deal to be gained by writing to the clergy who are part of the favoured few. Bishop de Galarreta. Bishop Tissier. And of course, Bishop Williamson. If you appreciated their joint letter of last May opposing a deal with Rome, if you are worried about the direction in which the SSPX is being taken: let them know. It might not work wonders, but it would do no harm. And you may never see the good effect that it has.

3. Don't forget the religious communities. Of course, each of these will have their own attitude or "alignment", which will depend in part on the superior of that community. But we must remember that while the religious communities are "allied" they are not actually a part of the SSPX properly speaking. Therefore they are in a unique position, since Menzingen cannot bludgeon them with "obedience", or with the replacement of a troublesome, independent-minded and principled superior with someone of a more pliant nature. Let us remember too that when Archbishop Lefebvre canvassed opinion in the run up to the Episcopal Consecrations of 1988, the allied religious communities were amongst the most vocal critics of any notion of compromise with modern Rome. If modern Rome one day succeeds in swallowing the SSPX apostolate whole, or even merely in largely neutering it, it may one day fall to these good religious to keep the flame alive. The Avrillé Dominicans and Morgon Capuchins spring immediately to mind. We suggest that you write an appreciative letter to their respective superiors, and send them a donation.

4 Read and re-read good literature: We particularly recommend the writings of Archbishop Lefebvre. Contrary to recent untruths emanating from certain

quarters, the saintly Archbishop was neither a compromising appeasnik, nor a politically correct opponent of 'conspiracy theories', nor would he have had much truck with the nonsense that can now be read on several websites of the SSPX. He was a man of God, and if we were not 100% certain that he would fully back the position which we have taken, we would not recommend his writings now.

5. Stay in touch with like minded souls. There is a danger, stronger in some places than in others, that each of us thinks that he is alone – that is how the enemy will win. You are not alone, dear reader. Far from it. The more we are in regular contact with one another, the less chance of any of us becoming bamboozled by slick, professional propaganda, and the stronger will be our resistance. If you have misgivings about the idea of an adulterous marriage between the SSPX and modern Rome, even if you know only one other person who agrees with you, talk to them: they will know others, who will know others. Ridiculous and mundane though it may sound, a huge amount of good can come of a few friends meeting up for a drink once a month and discussing these issues.

6. Remember recent history. There is nothing new under the sun. The current SSPX crisis is merely a re-run of the crisis into which the whole Church plunged some 40 years ago. If we are witnessing "Vatican II within the SSPX", it would be as well for us to learn the lessons which the original Vatican II crisis has to teach us. Talk to people who remember the Church before the Council, the Council itself, the introduction of the new Mass, the early days of the SSPX. One of the many horrible features of the cultural revolution which is both a cause and an effect, is that a wedge has been driven between the generations. Children do not talk to their grandparents. Young people no longer talk to old people. Or if they do, they do not do so regularly enough, respectful enough, or prepared to listen and learn. Age brings wisdom: many of us are fortunate enough to have in our midst souls who have lived through some of the worst times in the history of the Church. If we ignore them, we do so at our own peril and to our ultimate undoing.

Quo Vadis Mgr. de Galarreta?

Much publicised with a great fanfare on all the major websites of the SSPX (DICI, LaPortLatine), immediately translated professionally into English and given pride of place on the US District website, SSPX.org, Bishop de Galarreta's October 13th talk, given at the "Journées de la Tradition" in Villepreux, France, whilst not wholly clear, does appear to represent a serious and alarming shift in his position on the SSPX-Rome relations.

Precisely what is this new position of the Bishop is so far unclear. Likewise his reason for changing his tune in this way. But it is clear to us that foul play is afoot.

Space prevents us from examining every detail of the whole talk, although there is plenty which we could comment on: strange utterances, questions begged, 'sins of omission', and more besides. One wonders if parts of it were written for him. And then, of course, there is the official Menzingen version of our breakup with Rome - 'We dumped Rome!' - whereas, as many people now know (including Bishop de Galarreta) the opposite is true. It was Rome who turned up her nose at Bishop Fellay's cherished preamble. (Word has it that they told him it was "too ambiguous"! How it must hurt to be told that by an arch-Modernist, but truth comes from strange quarters!).

After talking for nearly twenty minutes, slowly, around the same essential point (that the Faith is a combat), His Excellency finally arrives at the more "interesting" part of his discourse. Speaking of the general chapter, after claiming that it "went very well", he goes on to talk thus about the six 'conditions' (three essential and three desirable) which the chapter laid down as requisites for any deal with Rome. The Bishop claims that, as far as the mission of the SSPX being safeguarded, "...it is obvious that everything is there." (i.e. contained within, covered by) the first two conditions.

He then goes on to speak thus:

“ The Society's position is much more precise and clear now than it was six months ago; it is much better, for we do not exclude the possibility of Providence choosing to bring about a return to the Faith through conversion [on the Part of Rome, presumably – Ed.]

We have simply said: if there is not firstly a return on the part of Rome or of the next Pope to Tradition [...] but if this Pope wishes simply to allow Tradition, what are the conditions that would allow us to accept a canonical normalization, in view of the good that we could do in the Church and this good is considerable? We must not deny this possibility.”

Compare with the Bishop de Galarreta of little more than a year ago, who argued very effectively against this very same way of thinking, at the meeting in Albano:

Following the Roman proposal, the real question, crucial, is: should we, can we, we take the path of a "possible" practical agreement first? Is it prudent and appropriate to maintain contacts with Rome leading to such an agreement?

As far as I am concerned, the answer is clear: we must refuse this path because we cannot do something evil so that a good (a good which is, moreover, uncertain) can come from it, and also because this would necessarily bring about evils (very certain) for the common good that we possess, namely that of the Society and of the family of Tradition. [...]

How then does this not go against the defence and public confession of faith, against the public need to protect the faithful and the Church? In this regard, if we make a purely practical agreement we are, in the present circumstances, already engaging in duplicity and ambiguity. The very fact is a public testimony and a message: we cannot be in "full communion" with the authorities who remain modernists.

For reasons of space, we will content ourselves with observing the following.

Firstly it is clear that merely by the very fact of talking about “conditions”, of defending the idea of “conditions” for a deal with Rome in this way, Bishop de Galarreta has departed from his previous position: “We must refuse this path”!

Secondly, it is not entirely clear what was the purpose of this discourse. Unless of course, it is no more than it appears: a shameless piece of marketing on behalf of the General Chapter and the leadership of Bishop Fellay and his inner circle. It is the sort of thing which we can well imagine Bishop Fellay saying, but then maybe that's the point: the fact that it comes from Bishop de Galarreta might be what is meant to reconcile us to the post-Chapter SSPX.

Thirdly, as mentioned above, we are prompted to wonder at the Bishop's motive for giving such a contradictory, or at best unclear, talk. We note with interest that the expulsion of Bishop Williamson was announced little over a week later (the ultimatum must have been given before Bishop de Galarreta delivered his talk). One “hard-liner” is thrown out, and the other strangely changes his tune, both at more or less the same time. Coincidence?

Finally, and arguably most worryingly of all, the tenor of Bishop de Galarreta's talk is not wholly liberal, not wholly Fellayite, not wholly accordist. It may still be that he sees himself as a “conservative” or “hard-liner” within the SSPX, holding back the more advanced ambitions of certain of his clerical

“The Leader” Speaks:

1. On what “the agreement” means for you and I

“In itself, the proposed solution of a personal Prelature is not a trap.”

- April 2012 letter to Bps. Tissier, Williamson and de Galarreta

“ Interviewer: Do you foresee any oversight by territorial diocesan bishops once the Society is regularized?

Bp. Fellay: That would be our death.”

- February 2009, Interview with the Remnant

“ DICI: A personal prelature is the canonical structure that you mentioned in recent statements. Now, in the Code of Canon Law, canon 297 requires not only informing diocesan bishops **but obtaining their permission in order to found a work on their territory.** ... Are you inclined to accept the eventuality that future works may be possible only with the permission of the bishop in dioceses where the Society of Saint Pius X is not present today?

Bishop Fellay: ...**It is still true—since it is Church law—that in order to open a new chapel or to found a work, it would be necessary to have the permission of the local ordinary.** We have quite obviously reported to Rome how difficult our present situation was in the dioceses, and Rome is still working on it. Here or there, this difficulty will be real, but since when is life without difficulties? ... And therefore if a difficulty is not resolved, it would go to Rome, and there would then be a Roman intervention to settle the problem. ”

- August 2012 Interview with DICI

2. On Vatican II (...and on what he really said about Vatican II in that infamous CNS interview)

“As for the Council, when they [CNS] asked me the question, “Does Vatican II belong to Tradition?”, I answered, “I would like to hope that that is the case” (which a faulty French translation transformed into: “I hope so.”) ”

- August 2012 DICI interview.

"I would hope so," he [Bishop Fellay] said, when asked if Vatican II itself belongs to Catholic tradition.

- May 2012 CNS interview (conducted in English).

“The Pope says that the - he even said it recently - that **the council must be put within this great tradition of the Church, must be understood within this, and in correllance [sic] with it. These are statements we fully agree with, totally, absolutely.** The problem might be in the application, that is: Is what happens really in coherence or in harmony with Tradition? But the principle we definitely do adhere to it. The Church must remain within its Tradition and cannot get out of it, because the Church has not been founded by man, but by our Lord himself, we talk about the Divine constitution of the Church and the main rules who guide the Church are given by God himself and not by man. And this cannot be changed. ... The problem of what really means Hermeneutic of continuity or of a reform, there you need to go deeper in. ”

- from a more lengthy extract of the same CNS interview, entitled “Extras: The Society of St. Pius X” available on youtube.com

“[Y]our vision of the Church...is too human and even fatalistic; you see dangers, plots, difficulties, you no longer see the help of grace and the Holy Ghost.

[You] are in the process of making the Council's errors into super-heresies, as though it is becoming absolute evil, worse than anything...”

- April 2012 letter to Bps. Tissier, Williamson and de Galarreta

3. ...and finally: on Bishops who talk politics

“In this interview, he expressed himself on historical questions, and in particular on the question of ... the Jews [...] It's clear that a Catholic bishop cannot speak with ecclesiastical authority except on questions that regard faith and morals. Our Fraternity does not claim any authority on other matters. [...] For this reason I have prohibited him, pending any new orders, from taking any public positions on political or historical questions.”

- Menzingen Press Statement, January, 2009

“...we must not be afraid to affirm that **the current Roman authorities, since John XXIII and Paul VI, have made themselves active collaborators of international Jewish Freemasonry and of world socialism.**

[...]These conciliar Roman authorities cannot but oppose savagely and violently any reaffirmation of the traditional Magisterium. **The errors of the Council** and its reforms remain the official standard consecrated by the Profession of Faith of Cardinal Ratzinger in March 1989.”

- Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre (taken from “Spiritual Journey” p.8 ff)

From the Editor:

Re. Bishop Williamson

As we go to press, news is breaking of the expulsion and further persecution of Bishop Williamson. Many of us owe the good Bishop a great deal, and we will not see him thrown out onto the street. Arrangements are already being put in place to support the Bishop, and although we realise that many of you will quite naturally want to know how to help, we must ask you to be patient for a very little while longer while the details are being finalised. More on this will follow shortly, via the website, and then in the next edition of this newsletter. In the meantime, we will communicate to him messages we receive and will endeavour to keep you updated.

Fr. Francois Chazal

WAR AIMS

Trenchant

Since that fateful month of May 2012 my specific intent has always remained the same : “That the SSPX and the New Rome remain separate until Rome converts”. It is what you call a victory condition.

Now, after three months of strenuous fight from priests, bishops, monks and faithful, we are witnessing some serious backpedalling from Bishop Fellay, that are all to his credit, and that are also very reassuring in the sense that His Lordship does not believe in his own infallibility after all.

In the process, some of us got shot down, much expectedly, and now comes the question to stop questioning openly our superiors, fall back into line, dismantle this embryonic network of priests that just came out and avoid dividing the flock and needless fighting with our confreres.

Humility is the best disposition to answer this question, but as St Thomas says, humility is based on truth. So which is the best, to continue to be bashed for the sake of the truth, humbly bashing remaining deceits of the Devil, or declare that the war is won, for the time being, write the promised “war won” document, and leave the security of the SSPX to the SSPX big guns.

Well, two things: we are nothing and, secondly the beast is still breathing. What if us few continue to serve that purpose of exposing the prince of lies, cater the need of those souls only who want to profit from our priesthood and wait patiently until our last war aim is attained.

PART 1

THE BEAST IS STILL BREATHING

The SSPX crisis stays on as long as its head, Bishop Fellay, teaches errors and allows errors to spread, thus dividing the flock. Otherwise the 20 resistance priests (as of September 2012) are guilty of dividing the flock.

So let us make a SSPX headscan. Fortunately I was able to see Bishop Fellay on September 04th, talked to him for one and a half hour, just 72 hours before his big Econe backpedalling (priests conference, 09.07.2012).

For about 20 minutes or more His Lordship rebuked me for my scandalous, destructive and revolutionary behavior and this terrible refusal to stop my activities, etc. then he asked me the reason for such pertinacity.

I replied: "Because I believe that you have a new theory on Vatican II, by which its errors, keep that Council erroneous, but are surmountable." I was warned by Fr. Koller: Bishop Fellay is an intelligent man; one cannot accuse him of being simply in favor of Vatican II; it is much more complicated than that. Bishop Fellay knows his public.

His Lordship then answered: "Archbishop Lefebvre thought like that at some stage, and he signed the texts of the Council" Then I think he realized he had failed to deny the accusation and started to pound the notion that he is indeed against Vatican II, that I am just persevering making him say that he likes Vatican II when the opposite is true, that he is the one who knows best what his thoughts are.

I then showed him my small collection of eight quotes of his, called "I excuse the Council" and he replied "This is not what I said... from start to finish we disagree with Rome on Vatican II and that is why the talks have failed. You base your entire thing on a false assumption of what we think (about VII)."

When he got finished I then asked candidly: "If you are indeed truly against Vatican II, why were you, my Lordship, so silent about Assisi III?" Referring to one phrase pronounced in St Nicolas du Chardonnet, he said that he made his all the condemnations of the Archbishop about Assisi. That sounded awkward and Fr. Nely rushed to the rescue, explaining how bad Assisi III really was. Not

getting it, I reminded his Lordship of his resolute NO, when I was with him in Cebu, to my request for a strong and public stance against Assisi III. (He said the same to the Pfeiffer brothers at the time)

Then I asked why there is such little difference between DICI and other Ecclesia Dei websites, or even Zenit for that matter. There was absolutely no reply on that question. I nailed it then, mentioning the doctrinal scandals of Rome in these last three months, based on the evidence of what we read in the "Osservatore Romano". That paper got sifted through the pink glasses of DICI to let you know only good things about Benedict XVI this summer. You don't have to know that the Pope, as of this summer, is praising Vatican II continually, insists that Muslims stay Muslims, prepares to beatify the successor of Escriva, continues to support the Focolari and other neo-christian movements, praises pluralism and Religious Liberty as the solution to the persecution in the Middle East, etc.

If you knew these facts, they would obscure our newfound good opinion of Benedict XVI, and our ignorance that the errors of Vatican II are still raging. DICI is the mouthpiece of Menzingen; it is professionally run and prepares the agreement with the new Rome in the long run, through a massive use of pink paint, all the while of today's backpedalling. In fact, there is no backpedalling at DICI. On all of this I was not able to get any clarification from His Lordship.

Then I raised the issue of the CNS interview (May 11th 2012), and more specifically the words of Bishop Fellay about Religious Liberty and this is what he said "On CNS I was talking to the American Catholics who raise Religious Liberty to the High Heavens. THE FOUNDATION IS THE RECIPIENTIS (OR RECEIVER). This "very limited" is the contrary of what you make me say. I was showing that there is a way to deal with the problem. It came out sideways."

(Modern philosophy bases everything on the mind of the knower, the receiving subject; while catholic philosophy bases everything on the thing known, the "res" existing out there, whether we like it or not)

I then felt I had heard enough; it came to me that I had enough of what I

wanted to make sure: That the mind of my Superior General is no longer anchored in Catholic Truth, but that his concepts are shifting on the right and on the left, on the yes and on the no.

When I look back on my written transcript, I see that pattern occurring all the time: Things have changed in Rome BUT it doesn't mean that everything has changed. The Pope wants to recognize the SSPX, BUT his desire is blocked by VII and modernist bishops.

Rome already grants us the exemption BUT there are problems for opening houses.

It is not going to work if we ask bishops' permissions, BUT there are so many novus ordo bishops that are calling us.... We have our own apostolate BUT all bishop has absolute power. We should be treated equally with bishops BUT it is normal that the bishop should have a say (about us). If Rome accepts to put its errors on the level of opinion we can attack BUT Rome is absolutizing the Council. We have some more buts in the Econe conference. The Pope still believes in Vatican II BUT he wants to recognize us. (same as)The 2006 principle (no practical agreement until Rome converts) is true BUT what do we mean by "conversion of Rome"? Something gradual or progressive? The offer of Rome was worthy of notice BUT, I guarantee you, I was never interested in a deal. On this last but, may I ask you to read again the April 14th letter to see if this but is genuine? No wonder we are accused to be black and white on a regular basis... that is because the official SSPX teaching is now all grey.

So I felt enough was said; there was no need to touch the rather more complex issue of the Magisterium, the question of our newfound and extensive use of the new Code of Canon Law, and other issues. I had the time to apologize for some wrongful or disrespectful past choice of expressions, ate twice at the table of His Lordship, was allowed to say my private mass on a side altar (unlike in Manila), visited a place that has a charm of its own and was very kindly put to the train by Fr. Selegny who, as a witness, promised me to send me a detailed transcript of the conversation. I would like to say that bishop Fellay was fair to me, a man totally opposed to his ideas and in full war against them.

Now the ideas of bishop Fellay and the unchecked spread of liberalism in the

SSPX was also the purpose of my visit to another bishop, and since Fr. Couture is using that bishop against me, well, I shall recount all the details of that visit as a defence.

His Lordship accepted to see me on the 16th of August in Econe. For 15 minutes or so, I reeled under a powerful episcopal broadside, all my joints shaking under the cold anger of His Lordship Bishop Bernard Tissier de Mallerais. My attitude, he said, was completely out of place, taking upon myself a task that does not belong to me and making a show of total disobedience...

I tried to recover by saying that I had grave doctrinal difficulties with bishop Fellay, showing, as usual, my little collection of quotes called "I excuse the Council". His Lordship answered "I know, I know; I have 10 times more of these quotes favorable to Vatican II that you don't know of!"

"But, my Lord, how can we be so quiet about this and the lamentable outcome of the General Chapter?"

"The General Chapter, he answered, was a disaster; I signed my name there, because it was a collegial action, but certainly not to say that I agreed with the contents. Therefore trust what the generals do, take your assignment in France and be quiet for at least three months."

"My Lord, the ship is taking water; it is torn open under the waterline. I do admire what you and others have done to try to save her, but you know full well that error is now spreading through the official channels of the SSPX. How can you offset the whole weight of the institution, the teachers put into position in the seminaries, the watered down sermons and publications... Our faithful stay less and less away from indult masses, mix up marriage ceremonies, practice NFP more and more without the grave reasons mandated by Pius XII, making NFP an open door to more wicked forms of contraception. Their minds are getting infected by DICL. It is natural for them to trust the two assistants who go even further than bishop Fellay and preach the scary good news that Rome has changed ..."

I went on for quite some time, accepting corrections on some points like the fact that we cannot hold the Pope fully responsible for the nomination of bad

bishops in the whole world. Otherwise I told him that he can disavow me as much as he likes but that this whole silence of this summer is “contre-nature”, anti-natural: “I cannot and will not accept it, even if I get abused and thrown out. I cannot accept this incoming massacre of souls which is prepared more by the erosion of minds than by the actual signing of an agreement with Rome. If only your Lordships made a public stand against Menzingen I would gladly fall in line and follow the captain. I agree that it is not my job to speak out, but if the shepherds are asleep, the dogs are the next line of resistance, as the wolves have entered the barn .

Talking about errors in general often flies above the heads of the faithful. I do not see the tide of the battle turning in the right direction and I gave 12 years of benefit of the doubt to my superiors, writing letters and being very obedient. With six more years, bishop Fellay has ample time to put neutral or liberal superiors into position and the turning around of the ship will be impossible. You are not, my Lord, the only one to be pushed in the corner; Fr. Peter Scott hardly said anything in March; and after being circumvented by Fr. Rostand, is now to be sent to Zimbabwe. Fr. Hewko made no attack against Menzingen at Fr. Reuter’s first Mass and got heavily punished. Many other priests are in the same case. This does not augur well for the future. If this is the way they treat priests, while no deal is signed; how will it be on the day of the deal, when everybody will be made to fall into line?

What I am doing does look like a rebellion, but I am not asking everyone to do the same. If I am wrong, the ship will not sink and I will die happy; but if I am right to warn the passengers, there will be more left of us if the tragedy actually happens. The problem comes from the commanding bridge of the ship; and your resistance below deck is impressive, but it is only delaying the final outcome. Some priests at least must do the job of exposing the source of errors”.

By then, His Lordship was cooled; I had discussed about many of these facts with him when he came to the Philippines last year. I understand that it is his

love of the Society, his desire to keep a united army that motivates it, but that Society is no more united on doctrine and the liberals attack him more and more and refuse to publish his book on the errors of Benedict XVI. In fact he is beginning to be silenced and more is to come.

I felt very sad for him because, all along, there was such truthfulness in him, even as he was rebuking me. I don't mind to be rebuked by such an honest man, and I believe that bishop Tissier will always preach against the Rome of today and tell us to keep out of its range.

To tell you the truth, he still does not, to this day, agree with what I am doing. He wrote to Fr. Pivert (my spiritual director) to coerce me, repeating the same argument, in writing this time, namely that the errors of bishop Fellay are 10 times as many as they appear in public and that the General Chapter is a disaster, but that there is no reason to launch such an untimely attack against the SSPX management.

(Now, my Dear Reader, forgive me for being so long on bishop Tissier's thinking. It is because it reflects the thinking of so many of the priests I was able to meet in France, which is the Mecca of dissent with Menzingen, but also completely paralyzed. French are like that: unless a leader emerges, takes charge and tells you to charge, nobody charges.

In the US it is the reverse: an estimated 14 are firmly against Menzingen and maybe 50% are just personally weary of an agreement with Rome, but would follow orders; while the rest is in favor of the deal and sometimes tell it openly. So that is not much opposition against Menzingen, but there are proportionally more priests in open resistance (10) than in France (2).)

One of the most prominent of these French minds I was able to meet was Fr. Gleize, who dropped me in Morgon on August 17th. We talked for five hours; what a great, clean and clear mind! His main points were:

A new doctrine has now emerged in the SSPX; and this new doctrine is assorted with silencing, menaces and punishments.

The main sign of Providence pointing to that shift is the deafening silence on

Assisi III, contrasting so badly with the outcry of the Archbishop, back in 1986, for Assisi I. Also deafening is the silence that followed the May crisis and the General Chapter: From the table at Econe to the priories across the world... no reaction from those who knew so well that things went wrong.

Even if the deal is off for the moment, Fr. Gleize said, the inclination to it remains: Fr. Schmidberger told him that it is not enough to pray for the Pope by name at Mass, Benedictions and Holy Week; or to have his picture in the Sacristy, etc... none of these things guarantees us we are not going to become sed-evacantists. The desire of agreementists is a long time desire, and it is a constant feeling to be in an inordinate, almost sinful separation from the "Church". I told Fr. Gleize that Fr. Laisney (who brainwashed me for three days in Manila on the agreement) clearly suffers that same kind of pain. He was reportedly preaching for the agreement in Kuala Lumpur recently. Bishop Fellay, when I saw him, told me that our idea of the Church is too radical, a Church that exists only on paper (cf. also his Adelaide conference). If the deal is off, it is not because of us; it is because Rome still does not want it, blocks it, even if the Pope wants it. Very sad.

We talked at length about the new praxis of the SSPX regarding canonical affairs and especially the growing tendency of the SSPX to let all its difficult cases be resolved by the new Rome and in the light of the new Code of Canon Law. Many canonical irregularities occurred at the general chapter, especially around the way bishop Williamson was dealt with. The declaration and six conditions look like something botched up and containing a serious shift of orientation of the entire congregation.

Another confirmation of bishop Fellay's change of stance is what he preaches in his regular three hours conferences: That Rome has changed. Visiting Avrillé and Morgon, I was told by the superiors of these places that when they went with Fr. Matthew in Menzingen, bishop Fellay took two and a half hours to persuade them that Rome has changed. Their jaws dropped both

at the change of tack and at the effort taken for it.

My own parents went to a three hours conference in Brignolles in June; same thing: "Rome has changed". Still my poor parents left the conference not feeling having learned anything and not understanding what it was that we were supposed to understand.

And what is going to be said in the big Angelus "Papacy" hootenanny in October... given the recent backpedalling? One may guess that the Papacy is going to be somewhat bad, BUT good enough to some other extent.

Therefore 20 priests or so are currently embarked in the process of warning openly the flock about the remaining errors of Menzingen, despite the backpedalling on the deal with Rome, on the April 15th declaration and on the issue of exemption. For if one describes the new Rome in a wrong and pinky way, it is normal to fear that, six years from now, the SSPX will be six feet under the new Rome...

PART TWO

WHAT HAPPENED?

War on! What next... but... What happened?

In the month of May an internal note stated that in the case Rome accepts our latest doctrinal protocol (of April 15th), a canonical structure will be proposed to us.

Then on June 13th the offer of Menzingen was refused by Rome, a bit as it was refused in September 2011, and then began a backtracking process that is still going on. The official line is now that we are back to square one, that the deal is off, and that we never looked for a deal in the first place. On September 07th bishop Fellay backtracked totally on the April 15th declaration and on another major mistake done in the General Chapter; when it merely wished, as a condition, to be exempt from novus ordo dioceses.

In the meantime two things continue to happen: doctrinal change and lack of clarity on our relationship with Rome.

THE GENERAL CHAPTER

At the General Chapter, everything was supposed to be perfectly clear, but the documents that came out of it already need clarification.

Fr. Petrucci told me that the capitulants were in a hurry to write the texts and that the intent of many of them was to create a framework that would prevent bishop Fellay to approach the new Rome prematurely. Most of them told us that they really fought, got the best, saved the day. This clearly fits the new war aim of Menzingen: that the war is over.

SECOND ARTILLERY ADJUSTMENT

I have no doubt on the intentions of the capitulants but the text that emanated from the Chapter, some product of a compromise between two positions, scared me so much that I wrote an attack against it, got it posted on the internet, got it printed and posted to all the priories and friendlies of France, and distributed it to the faithful in a paper form. Here is the gist of it:

Proclaimed on Bastille day, this text is a bit sentimental at times and even if it has a quote of the Archbishop, it is a declaration much weaker than the 1974 and 1976 Declarations. The question of the Magisterium remains ambiguous in this text because we do not have any more a mention of two opposite magisteria (two Romes (1974), two Churches (1976)), but the main trick of the text is in the tail; in those six conditions for a canonical recognition of the SSPX.

A first group omits the 2006 notion that we wait for the conversion of Rome to have a deal with it. It is the first time we give up, so officially, contrary to the rejection of the deal by the Archbishop in 1988 and his many subsequent warnings that the crisis will last long and requires Rome to be good again. The first condition talks about keeping our liberty to teach and our liberty to attack those teaching the errors. The second and third are about keeping our exclusive use of traditional rites and having at least one bishop.

All this sounds very brave, but the core principle of a liberal democracy is this liberty for anyone to disagree publicly on all important issues. So we will have the liberty to teach Tradition while others will have the liberty to defend

modernism, we will attack the new mass while others will attack the true mass under the same roof; same for all other issues. One French bishop understood that very well saying: "Let them come and disagree with Vatican II (if they can), for we disagree with the twenty other Councils."

It never worked. Why? Because it never works to enter the system, as the Archbishop said: "Had I signed the agreement we would have been finished in one year." (June 13th 1988). Once in the system, we will not stand against those guilty of errors of Vatican II, because those who tried before never succeeded, and we are already beginning to stop rebuking Peter when found worthy of blame (Galatians). Again, look at DICl, while in the past we had no qualms saying openly that the Vatican was infiltrated with Freemasons and that their ideas had triumphed.

Mixed with bad catholic priests and faithful, our own faithful will be weakened, disoriented and divided, even more than today.

As for the liturgy, it suffices to say that Mgr Pozzo just told the institute of Good Shepherd to fall into line five year after their deal; and as for this lonely bishop, how will he cater for the needs of 1000 or so traditional priests with their faithful? "And if that Bishop dies?", asked one faithful candidly in south France. Fr. Pfluger answered "Well, Rome will appoint another one"...

The second group of conditions is almost scarier, these being wishable or suitable conditions, by which we ask without pressing to keep only our minor tribunals, relinquishing in advance the dealing of big cases (as we already do, because when the matter is grave or important we either leave it to Rome to deal with the case or we refuse to treat the case; I've been told by canonists and seminary teachers).

Hopefully bishop Fellay backtracked verbally on the second condition, saying that of course our exemption from novus ordo diocese is an absolute necessity for us. That it didn't appear to be so at the General Chapter is what worries me. (And since it is a matter of law, a written amendment should be placed in the final text).

Same lack of clarity for the third condition, that we merely wish to have a "majority for Tradition" and a presidency in that pontifical commission under

the Pope. Other Ecclesia Dei people can claim to be also for tradition, stooges of Mgr Muller. That's in the case the Pope doesn't wish to press on his advantage and renounces to place his men directly into this commission.

"Lord, intend to my help; make haste into succoring me."

SSPX DISCALCED, OR OF STRICT SURVIVANCE

Consequently, early August, I flew to Washington DC and met Fr Joe, who was able to cobble together a group of five priests in Vienna, Virginia, to organize what we call a "United Corps of Priests". We sat three days, tempers flared in perfect harmony with the gravity of the situation we were facing. But at least we were able to plant a flag by stating our intent, electing a boss and setting up a visible base.

Here is the text of the Declaration; hopefully it is short:

Only She can help you + Vienna, Virginia, Aug 10th 2012.

"The heart of the Faith is the Divinity of Christ and his Kingship over all nations: "Oportet illum regnare". The errors of Vatican II are an indirect attack against his Divinity and a direct attack on his Social Kingship. They will for ever remain the Revolution of 1789 within the Church.

Today's Vatican has only changed for the worse since the Council (more damage, more new heresies, more effective semi-modernism), to such an extent that we can repeat the Archbishop's words of 1974 and 1976: "The Church that affirms such errors is at once schismatic and heretical. This Conciliar Church is therefore not catholic. To whatever extent Pope, bishops, priests or faithful adhere to this new church, they separate themselves from the Catholic Church." (June 29th 1976).

The Pope has allowed the True Mass, but only within the pantheon of modernist liturgies. Further, he has made clear his espousing of the false doctrine of Religious Liberty by preaching it to be the model of how the Church and State are to relate one to another. Lastly the doctrine of Ecumenism has been widely and consistently professed by the Pontiff in his visits to protestant temples, synagogues and mosques and Assisi III confirms that the spirit of Assisi well. It was this spirit that moved the Archbishop to undertake an "Operation

Survival” that is now itself in great peril.

Today’s SSPX clearly wants to place itself under this Conciliar Church, mitigates the poison of Vatican II, is more and more silent in face of the abuses by the conciliar hierarchy, uses ambiguous language referring to two opposite Magisteria. At the same time that it is ever ready to believe in a constant debate with obdurate Roman officials, it uses strong arm tactics toward those standing against wicked reconciliation.

We must wait for Our Lady to convert the Pope and inspire him to consecrate Russia to her Immaculate heart in union with all the bishops and we must persevere in the Charity of the Truth and in the Truth of Charity, organized in a united corps of priests faithful to the position always maintained by Archbishop Lefebvre.”

Fr. Joseph Pfeiffer, Fr. Ronald J. Ringrose, Fr. Richard Voigt, Fr. David Hewko, Fr. François Chazal.

We then elected Fr. Pfeiffer as a “boss”, for two years, because there are not enough Indians for this Indian chief. Electing a Superior General, two assistants, general

bursar and general secretary would be utterly ridiculous at this stage, for we are far away from being even fifty, but also we recognize bishop Fellay to be our legitimate superior (remember, he has not signed any deal with the new Rome), even if, just like in the case of Benedict XVI, we withdraw the exercise of obedience to him for motives of Faith until this crisis is over.

Thus, our name remains the same, SSPX. We are just aware that today’s doctrinal slide endangers our engagements, promises and oaths, especially our anti-modernist oath, as Fr. Koller said so well in his sermon. We expect lawyers to be unleashed at some stage, but in the worse case, they might be able to retag us as sspcx discaled, observants, because ours is a split within the same order, as happened many times in the course of Church History. We are not creating a new contraption, a society of St Pius XXIII, some vague other institute. All this to nail the notion that we did not change the message, while the official line of the SSPX has changed.

Then we set up a base in “Our Lady of Mount Carmel, 1730 N Stillwell road, Boston Kentucky 40107, USA, with permanent resident priest(s). Then we set up a banking structure to receive financial support. We hope to start a little school there and create our own websites to complete the good work of “True Trad” and other websites. If we can we will run a paper newsletter and walk again on the moon, but let’s not look too far!

I do understand why some SSPX superiors are in hot pursuit after us; for it really seems we are undermining while in fact we are simply organizing, faced as we were, with a clear path of expulsion. When Bishop Fellay told me that we are going to fizzle out, I replied: “Well, my Lord, we shall receive all the priests you shall send to us”. It is a pity to see any priest being thrown out of his congregation for no good reason and ending in isolation.

Thanks to the latest backpedalling, the crisis is seemingly averted, but what will happen if Menzingen backpedals on the backpedalling again, as it did many times before? We just want to be a little iron piece that prevents the pedaller. And what if Bishop Williamson gets expelled? Where shall he go? And the priests that shall follow him... shall they also end up in isolation? It is a good thing if Bishop Williamson keeps all his options open, gets an outside help to force Menzingen to keep him in, by giving it a foretaste of what a SSPX bishop on the loose is. For now we are just around 20 scattered, ie., hardly anything, but we know for certain that Menzingen does not want that little bud to blossom.

In normal times, it is better if the 4 bishops stay united, just as, in the case of another crisis, if the three counter the one as they did so effectively. As for the faithful, after warning of the situation, we shall limit ourselves to those only who call us for help and provide all the others with a permanent and unthrottled means of information. First to the Jews, then to the Gentiles; first we shall seek the small remnants in the SSPX crowd, and then we shall fish for all other men.

To be well understood, our fight must be described as an analogous fight; one battle, many angles. It is also like an attack in echelon, because not all priests

and faithful realize the evil of the day at the same time; nor do they choose to take a public stance at the same time; nor do they choose to take a public stance at the same time.

Once again we are no saviors of the SSPX, but I hope you understand we play a little part in something wider, for the resistance to reconciliation has many prongs and shapes: from Mother Ann-Marie Simoulin who threatens to start anew and rebukes her own brother, Fr. Simoulin, to Dom Thomas Aquinas in Brazil who is running groups of faithful, just like us, to the many good priests who resist in France, to some heroic nuns who show readiness to undergo the persecution of their whole community, to Dr. David Allen White who will not countenance any nonsense... the list is quite long and consoling. If Menzingen stays on today's backpedal, the crisis will lose some of its urgency, it will be harder for us to explain away our position to the faithful and to persuade too many priests to join our movement... but this crisis will not be over, because we have clear signs of life in the Beast.

TOUR DE FRANCE (RÉSISTANTE)

While Fr. Joe spent a long time in the US, successfully patching up a group of priests, I was able to spend three weeks to make a "tournée des popotes de la résistance" or a check up of the cooking habits of places resisting the doctrinal shift of the SSPX. Most priests are aware of the change of doctrine at the top, and because the district is big, the attitude of liberal priests is easier to take notice. Just a few examples I got from letters and conversations: In le Pointet, the nuns praise Benedict XVI before little children, a priest in Brittany calls John Paul II a saint, luminous mysteries of the Rosary are included in a newly edited song book in one of our schools, one rector of a seminary has inserted quotes of Benedict XVI in his latest book on the family, and I just heard Fr. Toulza was forced, I believe, to put a text in Fideliter, defending Mgr Muller...

Those things would never have happened before We have just lost one priest in Corsica who went back straight to the diocese and two monks left the Benedictine monastery of Bellaigue because they are in favour of the agreement. In

Germany, out of a total of 40 priests, 10 are against an agreement while all others are in favor, in varying degrees. Liberal faithful criticize bishop Tissier or outspoken priests like Fr. Beauvais. Fr. de Cacqueray is harder to criticize, because he is one of these rare priests able to keep his district together, thanks to his great natural authority and piety.

As of 14th of August I did not know where my new assignment was. Fr. Toulza told me it would be Reims, a nice historical place at the heart of WW1 battlefields. I was glad to see Fr. Toulza to sign a 2000 copies publication contract of my book on Christ the King called "La Cite Oubliee". That joy was short lived as three weeks later, that book on the social teaching of the Church got forbidden by bishop Fellay, not for its contents, I hope, but for the name of its author. An independent house called DPF should print it next year. Dr. Chojnowsky is currently translating it in the US. (Please, note well, I am a lazy priest, that's official now).

It is to be expected that the matter of my assignment is going to be put to the fore by my adversaries, despite the fact that Fr. Couture recognizes, even in writing that I always obeyed before. Bishop Fellay thanked me for the undeniable 16 years of obedience, but not for what appears to him to be my year 2012 disobedience.

By tampering with doctrine, bishop Fellay lost a scepter that I saw falling from my position in Manila and it is from where I was when the crisis began that I shall begin to make my stand. The question for me is that the doctrinal shift in the SSPX is so grave that it needs to be exposed, i.e. preached against; but it is impossible to preach the truth if one is placed into silence. That is why I asked Fr. Girod if I would be allowed to preach against the errors of bishop Fellay from the pulpit. His answer was, "Nobody preaches against his boss in a company" and I replied "...unless the company is sinking". Moreover he told me that on Sunday I would be assigned to the chapel of Troyes, that counts thirty people. In France we call it "un placard", a cupboard. Not only that, but this priory is a priory of three priests taking care of less than 200 faithful, because the chapel of Joinville was taken away from their responsibility. Then I figured:

France is not my turf; if I embark to denounce Menzingen from there, I will embarrass Fr. de Cacqueray who is so friendly to me and force him to condemn me, and the faithful hearing how bad I am from the official channels won't be able to know for themselves. In Asia, when the faithful hear from Fr. Couture how bad I am; having known me for ten years, they can know for themselves that I am even 40 times badder than Father makes me to be. There are also enough anti liberals in France to carry out the fight, and the Asian faithful, being more recent additions to the traditional movement and less served by an overextended Society in Asia, are more vulnerable to errors and lies. They are more in need of help, but overall it is especially a question of impact. I told repeatedly my French confreres; you don't need me here to rise to the occasion, I am still a junior and in no position whatsoever to lead you and tell you what to do. You have your own leaders, go and fetch them, like the peasant that came to fetch La Rochejaquelein during the Vendee war.

RETURN TO ASIA

“Ça va foirer”, “It is going to fizzle”, Fr. Nely told me in Menzingen; and Fr. Pfeiffer concurs entirely: “In theory we are totally toasted, and our main obstacle is the fear (of being explelled, denied sacraments, denied schools etc.). and the second obstacle is confusion; they tell us “Father, what is happening?” They are begging what is going on; they are being told nothing by the official channels”. Barring a miracle we should fizzle out, we are just a straw fire, a priest told us. We don't even have the funds to travel around America to see the people who want to see us. We were not paid before in Asia, and now we depend even more on the spontaneous generosity of the faithful. Many people we do not know give us support, proving that it is because of the issues, and not their personal love of us.

Small groups have appeared everywhere, calling for help and offering help to us. In some place we took over the entire chapel, in other places we find a little group. It is not easy to cast us out of places that do not belong to the Society, which makes me understand better why Menzingen has been so adamant to centralize all properties in recent years.

All the while we remain under fire from the well entrenched official channels of the SSPX. These have one war aim, our silence, and are constantly labeling us as disobedient, unsupernatural, practical sedevacantists, chaosmongers, pamphleteers, misquoters, calumniators, breakers of the peace and division causing rebels. Priests, brothers and faithful are told to fast at our passage, people should not talk to us, brothers should not talk to us, we were expelled from the common table in Manila, I couldn't get the permission to assemble plastic ships in the library, nor could we celebrate private masses at any time on the side altars, even at three in the morning, use the telephone, computers, copy machines etc. The priests in Manila were told not to grant us absolution. I found out by going to confession to one of them and asked him why; "I know the penitent was his answer". I then asked Fr. Couture who told us that he cannot answer the question while we got told by another priest he was told that the absolution of our sins is in fact reserved to Menzingen. We sensed that by staying longer in Manila we were piling coals on their heads. We had made all possible public statements, including a Mass on the street; time to move on.

Public announcements are put on the websites of Asia and America, and are read from the pulpit. Interesting descriptions of me are made in Japan. Groups of people are sent to crash some parties we organize, making the debate more lively and interesting, I believe.

Hopefully we took all these treatments dismissively and with good cheer, most of the time, but note well, my dear reader, that none of these public counterattacks went to the doctrinal bottom line. Therefore, "Let us exit Jerusalem with Christ, Carrying his opprobrium." (Heb.)





“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. 523)

Contact us:

recusantsspx@hotmail.co.uk
www.TheRecusant.com