



The Recusant

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



“And if, one way or another, the religious order ends up in such a state that at its Chapters, meetings and other events the most serious members do not dare to say what Charity and Justice require - be it through weakness, small-mindedness or fear of angering the superior and thereby remaining without office (which is a manifest ambition) - then the order is to be considered lost and totally dissolved.”

(St. John of the Cross, Minor Works, Counsel 12)

FROM THE DESK OF THE EDITOR:

Dear Reader,

The summer appears to have been relatively quiet as regards the shenanigans coming from Menzingen, although of course it may simply be that whatever they have been up to has not yet come to light! Nevertheless, together with the constant attacking of the Resistance as ‘rumour mongering,’ this surely gives us some occasion to recall a couple of ‘rumours’ from

not so long ago. In light of how the Resistance is always portrayed by the would-be defenders of the neo-SSPX, it is worth noting where these rumours originated. The first rumour was ‘mongered’ by none other than Fr. Niklaus Pfluger, First Assistant of the SSPX, in January of this year. Not only did he say that there would be an agreement before the summer was out, but he left his audience in no doubt as to just how enthusiastic he felt about it. Indeed, according to Fr. Pfluger an agreement with (or ‘recognition by’ if you prefer - the quibbling over semantics does not change what it involves!) modernist Rome was not merely desirable but actually *necessary* in order to be Catholic. How far his thinking is shared by other senior SSPX clerics remains unclear, but at least he does not dissemble to give him his credit where it is due.

Inside:

- **Archbishop Lefebvre’s final interview**
(Fideliter, Jan-Feb 1991)
- **‘The Angelus Press and Michael Davies’**
(analysis)
- **SSPX Watch Special:**
“Our Relations with...”
Ecclesia Dei & Una Voce
- **‘Fr. Yves le Roux:**
A Writer of Fanciful Fiction!’

The other rumour was from even earlier on in the year, if my memory serves, when Fr. Alain -Marc Nely, SSPX Second Assistant, was reported to have said that a 'unilateral agreement' was on the horizon, meaning an agreement 'which would require nothing from the Society.' This was then confirmed by Bishop Fellay, who said that 'agreement' was the wrong word to use. "Recognition of Tolerance" was his preferred phrase. Once again, dress it up how you will: it would still be essentially the same thing, and the only way one could contemplate such a thing, still less regard it as positive, would be if one viewed the conciliar church (and modern Rome in particular) as in some way 'normal,' or 'still Catholic' and not the mortal enemy of the Faith that experience over the last two generations has proved.

Be that as it may, neither of those two rumours appear to have been fulfilled. There has been no announcement of any 'recognition' ('tolerant' or otherwise) so far. Three things are worth noting here. The first is that however ardently Bp. Fellay, Fr. Pfluger et al. may desire it, the matter does not entirely depend on them. There is Rome to consider, without whose consent it cannot happen. Secondly, let us remember that the desire is the essence of the sin. The man who intends to commit adultery and whose plans are thwarted at the last minute is no less guilty than if his plans had succeeded. Finally, let us recall that to turn modernist and fall away from the Faith does not actually require that one make an agreement with modern Rome. It is one of those non-reversible equations: 'All those who make an agreement with modern Rome fall away and stop fighting, but not all those who fall away and stop fighting have made an agreement with modern Rome'! Any one of us could fall away tomorrow without having come anywhere near Pope Francis. What we are concerned about, therefore, is less whether these rumours are true, than what it would mean were it true and what possible effect it may have.

Tragically, the 'effects' appear already to have preceded the 'cause'. The undeniable evidence of slow but steady watering-down leading to apostasy are everywhere to be seen in the SSPX today. In particular, there is the evidence of an SSPX/Ecclesia Dei collaboration. Archbishop Lefebvre referred to 'Ecclesia Dei' Catholics as betrayers and compromisers (see **p.27**) By contrast today's SSPX leaders are happy to work with them, reserving the full vitriol of their attacks almost exclusively for the Resistance, whom they accuse of all the things that they themselves are guilty of in spades! 'Rumour-mongering,' 'character assassination/personal attacks,' calumny and detraction, 'playing on fears/appealing to emotion,' misrepresenting their opponents concerns/arguments... And much more besides. And, of course, sometimes just good, old-fashioned lies! The reader will find a very fine, mint-condition example of this in the form of the 'Letter to Friends and Benefactors' by Fr. Yves le Roux (**p.28**). This prime specimen is so barely believable that I fully expect at least one reader to ask me if it is really a parody, written by me. I assure you, it is 100% genuine, though I admit, if I had intended to write a spoof anti-Resistance letter, I could hardly have done a better job! With the tragic reality of the neo-SSPX becoming daily more obvious and difficult to hide, we ought to expect a lot more of this to come. It is, after all, the last resort for defending the indefensible.

Those of us who are not 'cradle Traditional Catholics' may remember the sort of stony-cold response and lack of any reasoned arguments which we experienced. The feeling of frustration at being willing to hear any reasonable arguments against the SSPX or the Traditional Mass (for example) if there were any to be made, but hearing no such arguments. Nothing but "You mustn't listen to them! They're bad!" (or similar such). The same response is now standard among neo-SSPX worthies. It is really a sign of hope and ought to encourage us.

They do not answer properly because they cannot. Dear reader, if you ever have any doubts, consider the shameful SSPX / ‘Una Voce’ collaboration and carefully consider what its implications are. Then we shall wait and see if there is any defence attempted. I predict that there will be none.

Archbishop Lefebvre

Arguably, had Archbishop Lefebvre been better known to his ‘followers’, those followers would not have fallen victim quite so easily and we might not be in this mess. The Archbishop Lefebvre known to the average un-enquiring SSPX layman in fact never existed. He is a fictional character, part wishful thinking, part marketing propaganda: a corporate mascot which the company wheels out once in a while to endorse itself, the Catholic equivalent of Ronald McDonald or Colonel Sanders. Occasional comments have been made by unthinking persons about “the two faces of Archbishop Lefebvre” and both sides (Resistance and neo-SSPX) being able to quote Archbishop Lefebvre. This is a myth which very little examination is needed to dispel. The neo-SSPX almost never quote Archbishop Lefebvre in any meaningful way, and *never* at length. It is a pity that the Resistance generally does not seem to make better use of him: we are able to quote him at great length because he is on our side. Furthermore, he is the founder of the SSPX, a man far wiser, more prudent (in the proper sense of the word) and more virtuous than any alive today, who, in the midst of the greatest turmoil in the history of the Church managed to keep everything whilst inventing nothing. His words do not need “interpreting” because unlike virtually everyone today, he does not resort to ambiguity and says what he means. He is the spiritual father and patron of the Resistance, our manifesto and our mandate. He is ours, yours and mine. If you have family or friends still ensnared in the neo-SSPX, make him theirs too.

With this in mind, we intend from now on to print a lot more Archbishop Lefebvre, starting in this issue (p.5) with the last interview given by him, which appeared in the January/February 1991 issue of *Fideliter* magazine. Very little of it has lost its relevance today. At well over 4,000 words we have had to make room, and so some of the content originally intended for this Recusant (news from the Resistance, for example) will now be held over until October. If in future we need to increase the newsletter to 40-pages, so be it. We also intend to produce a booklet containing only Archbishop Lefebvre in his own words, similar to the “Sources” booklet and intended for as wide a distribution as possible.

Information and Action

It has been said before but I shall say it again, because it cannot be said often enough. Merely reading will get you nowhere. Information will do you no good if you do not use it. The booklet which (if all has gone according to plan) should have arrived together with this Recusant is intended to be read and spread. Like The Recusant itself, it is not just some interesting reading; our purpose is not simply to keep you entertained. What we produce and get to you (for free) is done out of a sense of duty which we take very seriously. You too, dear reader, have your own equally serious duty to make use of what you have been given. That is why we do not have a cover price, and why The Recusant is an apostolate and not a business. You will not save your soul *in spite of* the crisis but because of and through the crisis, through how you respond to it. God bless you and help you to play your part. Finally, permit me once again to thank the many of you for the invaluable support you have lent us so far.

Resistance Mass Centres

London:

*Drake House
44 St. George's Road,
Wimbledon
London SW19 4EF*

Liverpool:

*The Liner Hotel
Lord Nelson Street
Liverpool
L3 5QB*

Rugby:

*The Benn Partnership
Railway Terrace
Rugby
CV21 3HR*

Kent:

*Queen of Martyrs House
17 West Cliff Road
Broadstairs
Kent CT10 1PU*

Glasgow:

(contact us for details)



To see the dates & times of Mass and Holy Hour, please check the website :
www.therecasant.com/resistance-mass-centres
or contact us at: recusantsspx@hotmail.co.uk

Resist Menzingen's Modernism!
Keep the Fight for the Faith going into the future!



Thankyou for supporting
"The Recusant Mass Fund"

*P.O. Box 423,
Deal,
Kent CT14 4BF
England*

therecasantmassfund@gmail.com

Account Name - The Recusant Mass Fund
Branch - Canterbury

Sort code - 60-04-27
Account no. - 91178258

Interview with Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre - Fideliter No. 79 January-February 1991

"It is no longer just a question of liturgy, as important as it is, that separates us from Rome, but a matter of the Faith."



On the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the Priestly Fraternity of Saint Pius X, Archbishop Lefebvre kindly answered the questions we asked him. "It is no longer just a question of liturgy, as important as it is, that separates us from Rome, but a matter of faith." We also note how the prelate destroys the calumnies that have been made against him about the conciliar documents on Religious Liberty and "The Church in the Modern World."

Fideliter - Since the coronations there has been no more contact with Rome; however, as you told us, Cardinal Oddi telephoned you saying, "Things have got to be sorted out. Make a little act of asking forgiveness to the Pope and he is ready to welcome you." So why not try this one last approach and why do you think it impossible?

Archbishop Lefebvre – It is absolutely impossible in the current climate of Rome which is becoming worse. We must not delude ourselves. The principles which now guide the conciliar Church are more and more overtly contrary to Catholic doctrine.

Before the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations, Cardinal Casaroli recently declared:

"I want to dwell somewhat on one specific aspect of the fundamental freedom of thinking and acting according to one's conscience: religious liberty ... the Catholic Church and her Supreme Pastor, who has made human rights one of the major themes of his preaching, have not failed to recall that, in a world made by man and for man, the whole organization of society has meaning only insofar as it is the human dimension a central concern."

To hear that in the mouth of a cardinal! He does not speak about God!

For his part, Cardinal Ratzinger, presenting a discussion paper on the relationship between the Magisterium and theologians, affirms he says “for the first time clearly” that “the decisions of the Magisterium cannot be the last word on the matter as such” but are “a kind of provisional disposition ... the core remains stable but the particular aspects that influence the circumstances of that time may need correction later on. In this regard one can point to the declarations of the popes of the last century. The anti-modernist decisions rendered a great service but they are now outdated.” And voila, the position on modernism is turned around! These reflections are absolutely insane.

Finally the Pope is more ecumenist than ever. All the false ideas of the Council continue to develop, to be reaffirmed with ever greater clarity. They are hiding less and less. It is absolutely inconceivable that we can agree to work with such a hierarchy.

Fideliter - Do you think the situation has deteriorated even further since the time before the consecrations when you engaged in discussions that led to the drafting of the Protocol of 5 May 1988?

Archbishop Lefebvre - Oh yes! For example the making of the Profession of Faith which is now claimed by Cardinal Ratzinger since the beginning of 1989. This is a very serious matter. Because he asks all those [Traditionalists] who rallied to them [*i.e. signed an agreement with Rome - trans*] or could do to make a profession of faith in the Council documents and in the post-conciliar reforms. For us it is impossible.

We will have to wait some more before considering the prospect of an agreement. For my part I believe that only God can intervene as humanly we do not any possibility of Rome straightening things out.

For fifteen years we dialogued to try to put the tradition back in its place of honour, in that place in the Church which it has by right. We ran up against a continual refusal. What Rome grants in favour of this tradition at present is nothing but a purely political gesture, a piece of diplomacy so as to force people into compromise. But it is not a conviction of the benefits of Tradition.

Fideliter - When we see that Dom Gérard and the Fraternity of St. Peter got to keep the liturgy and catechism without – so they say - have conceded anything, some people who are troubled to find themselves in a difficult situation with Rome, can be tempted to make an agreement in their turn, through lassitude. They have managed, so they say, to get along with Rome without having to relinquish anything.

Archbishop Lefebvre - When they say they don't have to give anything up, that's false. They have given up the ability to oppose Rome. They cannot say anything any more. They must remain silent given the favours that have been granted them. It is now impossible for them to expose the errors of the Conciliar Church. Softly, softly they adhere, even be it only by their Profession of Faith that is requested by Cardinal Ratzinger. I think Dom Gérard is about to publish a small book written by one of his monks on Religious Liberty and which will try to justify it.

From the point of view of ideas, they begin to slide ever so slowly and end up by admitting

the false ideas of the Council, because Rome has granted them some favours of Tradition. It's a very dangerous situation.

During the audience which he granted to Dom Gérard and a delegation of monks from Le Barroux, the Pope expressed the desire to see them continue to evolve. He didn't hide what he thought. They must submit more and more to the Archbishop [of their diocese] and they must take care not to act as though the conciliar reforms are less-than-appreciated because they have been granted an exceptions to the liturgical rule of the Council. They must also make an effort to bring with them all those who are not yet in obedience to the Holy Father.

These are pressing invitations made to them and it's this which is the purpose of the privileges granted to them.

That is why Dom Gérard wrote to Mother Anne-Marie Simoulin, Father Innocent-Marie, the Capuchins of Morgon and others to try even to influence me. On his return from Rome he launched the offensive to try to convince those who do not follow him to follow in his wake and rally to Rome.

All the things that have been granted to them have only been agreed to with the goal of ensuring that all those who adhere to or are related to the Society will break from it and submit to Rome.

Fideliter - Dom Gérard is thus taking on the role that had devolved to Mgr. Perl.

Archbishop Lefebvre - I have had the opportunity to see at least three letters which Mgr. Perl sent in response to people who had written to him. It is always the same. It is essential to make an effort among those who do not understand the need to make an agreement with the Pope and the Council. It's a shame, he wrote, to see that there have been no more agreements.

Fideliter - You have said, concerning Dom Gérard and others: "They have betrayed us. They are now giving a helping hand to those who demolish the Church, the Liberals, the modernists." Isn't that a bit harsh?

Archbishop Lefebvre - Not at all, no! They appealed to me for fifteen years. It was not I who went looking for them. It is they themselves who came to me and asked me for support, for ordinations, for the friendship of our priests and at the same time the opening of our priories to help them financially. They took full advantage of us, as much as they were able. We did it with good will and even generosity. I was happy to do these ordinations, to open our houses so that they could take advantage of the generosity of our benefactors... And then, suddenly, they telephone me. We no longer need you; it's over. We're going over to the archbishop of Avignon. We're now in agreement with Rome. We've signed a protocol.

It gave us no joyfulness of heart to have trouble with Rome. It wasn't out of pleasure that we had to fight. We did it out of principle, to keep the Catholic faith. And they agreed with us. They cooperated with us. And then suddenly they abandon the true combat to ally themselves with the demolishers on the pretext that they be given some privileges. That's

unacceptable. They have in practice abandoned the fight for the Faith. They cannot attack Rome.

That was what Father de Blignières did too. He has changed completely. He who had written an entire volume condemning religious liberty, he now writes in favour of religious liberty. That's not being serious. One cannot rely any more on men like that, who have understood nothing of the doctrinal question.

I think in any case they commit a serious mistake. They sinned seriously in acting the way they did, knowingly, and with an unreal nonchalance.

I have heard tell of some monks who intend leaving Le Barroux, saying they can no longer live in an atmosphere of lies. I wonder how they managed to stay as long as this in such an atmosphere.

It's the same with those who are with Dom Augustin [Superior of the Benedictine Monastery of Flavigny - trans]. They were even more traditional than us and now they have completely gone over to the other side. For all young people who are there, it's awful to think of such a reversal. They entered the monastery to be really in Tradition. It was the safest, firmest bastion of Tradition, even more so than the Society. They thought they were guaranteed forever. And then they completely turn their coats... and they stay put! It is inexplicable.

Fideliter – Fr. de Blignières, Fr. de Nantes and Dom Gérard have practically accused you of lying when you say that you didn't sign two documents of the Council: *Dignitatis Humanae* on religious liberty and *Gaudium et Spes*. The journal *Sedes sapientiae* reproduced a document from the Vatican archives where there is your name written in your hand. What exactly is it and what is this document?

Archbishop Lefebvre - This idea of interpreting signatures as signifying approval of the conciliar documents germinated in the ill-intentioned mind of Fr. de Blignières .

Approvals or refusals documents were obviously made for each particular document. The vote was secret, done on individual cards, and made with a special pen that allowed the calculation of electronic votes. The cards were taken in by the Secretaries from the hand of each voter.

The large sheets which were passed around from hand to hand among the Council Fathers and to which everyone added his signature were nothing to do with voting for or against, but signified our presence at this session for voting on four documents.

One would really have to take the Fathers who voted against the text for weathervanes, claiming that they approved something that they had refused a half hour before.

We see what we can expect from the imagination of those who are weathervanes and adore what they burned before, such as the Fr. de Blignières, Dom Gérard and that wind-mill par excellence Fr. de Nantes.

Fideliter - Some of the faithful are tempted to keep good relations with those who have rallied, or even attend the Mass or ceremonies that they celebrate, do you think that there

is a danger in that?

Archbishop Lefebvre - I have always warned the faithful vis-à-vis the sedevacantists, for example. There also people say: "The Mass is fine, so we go to it."

Yes, there is the Mass. That's fine, but there is also the sermon; there is the atmosphere, the conversations, contacts before and after, which make you little by little change your ideas. It is therefore a danger and that's why in general, I think it constitutes part of a whole. One does not merely go to Mass, one frequents a milieu.

There are obviously some people who are attracted by the beautiful ceremonies, who also go to Fontgombault, where they have taken up the old mass again. They are in a climate of ambiguity which to my mind is dangerous. Once one finds oneself in this atmosphere, submitted to the Vatican, subject ultimately to the Council, one ends up by becoming ecumenical.

Fideliter - The Pope is very popular. He draws crowds; he wants to gather all Christians together in ecumenism, which he says he is making the cornerstone of his pontificate. At first glance this may seem a noble thought, wanting to actually gather all Christians together.

Archbishop Lefebvre - The Pope wants unity outside the Faith. It is a "communion". Communion with whom? With what? In what? That is no longer unity. This cannot be except in the unity of the Faith. That is what the Church has always taught. That is why there were missionaries, to convert souls to the Catholic Faith. Now you don't have to convert any more. The Church is not a hierarchical society, it is a communion. Everything is distorted. It is the destruction of the concept of the Church, of Catholicism. This is very serious and it is what explains why many Catholics are abandoning the Faith.

When you add to that all the outrageous comments that were made at the synod on the priesthood, declarations like those of Cardinals Decourtray and Danneels, one wonders how there can be any Catholics left.

After Assisi and after similar declarations, we understand that there were many people who go went over to the Mormons, to the Jehovah Witnesses or elsewhere. They lose the Faith, it's not surprising.

Fideliter - Regarding the synod, Cardinal Lorscheider, announcing that two married Brazilians had been ordained priests, requested that consideration be given to ordaining married men with "life experience".

Archbishop Lefebvre - All this is being directed against the celibacy of priests. The synod which will be held in Africa will probably be a step towards the abolition of priestly celibacy, that is if God does not intervene first.

Fideliter - People cite as an example the development of Catholicism the considerable increase in the number of vocations in African countries, including Zaire, where there are hundreds of seminarians.

Archbishop Lefebvre - But we must see how they are formed. In these Third World countries there are many children and being a priest is a social promotion. Unfortunately this is not real progress for Catholicism.

I'm not saying that everything is negative. But these are all conciliar seminarians, with the New Mass, the introduction of bongo drums, the inculturation in the liturgy. What religion will they have? It will no longer be the Catholic religion, but a kind of religious syncretism with purely exterior manifestations. This is serious, because it means the demolition of all the work done by the missionaries.

Fideliter - Beyond the just the liturgy, you often say, it is now a matter of Faith which makes us oppose modern Rome.

Archbishop Lefebvre - Certainly the question of the liturgy and the sacraments is very important, but it is not the most important. The most important is that of the Faith. For us it is resolved. We have the Faith of all time, of the Council of Trent, of the Catechism of St. Pius X, of all the councils and all the popes before Vatican II.

For years they have tried in Rome to show that everything in the Council was fully consistent with Tradition. Now they are showing their true colours. Cardinal Ratzinger never spoke so clearly. There is no tradition. There is no longer any deposit to be transmitted. Tradition in the Church is whatever the Pope is saying today. You must submit to what the Pope and the bishops say today. That's what Tradition is for them, the famous 'Living Tradition', the only ground of our condemnation.

They no longer seek now to prove what they say is consistent with what Pius IX wrote or with what the Council of Trent promulgated. No, all of that is over; it's outdated, as Cardinal Ratzinger said. It is clear and they could have said so earlier. There was no point in our talking, in our discussing with them. Now is the tyranny of authority, because there are no longer any rules. One can no longer refer to the past.

In a sense things today are becoming clearer. They always give us more reason. We are dealing with people who have a different philosophy to ours, a different way of seeing, who are influenced by all modern subjectivist philosophers. For them there is no fixed truth, there is no dogma. Everything is evolving. That is a totally Masonic concept. This is really the destruction of the Faith. Fortunately, we continue to lean on Tradition!

Fideliter - Yes, but you are alone against everyone.

Archbishop Lefebvre - Yes, it is a great mystery.

Fideliter - In the last newsletter "Introibo" Father André notes that although they say the New Mass, a dozen bishops provide hope. They are classified as "traditional bishops" by "Episcopal Who's Who."

Archbishop Lefebvre - Yes, but they are all conciliar. It's only Bishop de Castro Mayer and myself who have resisted that Council and its applications, whereas at the Council there were 250 of us opposing the errors.

I was recently told to re-read the prophecy of Our Lady of Quito (1), where in the early seventeenth century, the Blessed Virgin Mary gave a revelation to a holy nun about the destruction of morals and the terrible crisis which now afflicts the Church and its clergy (2) announcing to her also that there would be a prelate who would dedicated himself to the restoration of the priesthood.

The Blessed Virgin announced that that would happen in the twentieth century. This is a fact. The Good Lord has planned this time in the Church.

Fideliter - You have emphasised that you are convinced that the work you have undertaken is blessed by God, because at several points it could have disappeared.

Archbishop Lefebvre - Yes, that's right. We have always come under very hard, very difficult attacks. Often people who worked with us, who used to be our friends, have turned against us and have really become enemies. It is very painful, but there is nothing to be done. We realise after some time that those are after us and who are trying to destroy us are sinking, and that we continue, we must believe nonetheless that the line of the Faith and Tradition that we have adopted, that we are following, is imperishable because it is the Church and because God cannot allow his Church to perish.

Fideliter - What can you say to those of the faithful who still hope in the possibility of an agreement with Rome?

Archbishop Lefebvre - Our true faithful, those who have understood the problem and who have precisely helped us to continue along the straight and firm path of Tradition and the Faith, were afraid of the approaches I made towards Rome. They told me it was dangerous and that I was wasting my time. Yes, of course, I hoped until the last minute that in Rome we would witness a little bit of loyalty. I cannot be blamed for not having done the maximum. So now too, to those who say to me, "You've got to reach an agreement with Rome," I think I can say that I went even further than I should have.

Fideliter - You answer: you do not have to worry, because we are with Tradition, with all the councils before Vatican II, with everything said by all the popes who preceded it...

Archbishop Lefebvre - Yes, obviously if we were inventing something we would be worried that our invention would not endure. But we're doing nothing new.

A little while ago time I saw a bishop, one of my friends with whom we worked during the council and was in complete agreement with me at that time. And he said: "It is unfortunate that you are in trouble with Rome."

"How can you, who fought at the Council for the same reasons as me," I answered him, "how can you now be surprised? We held continual meetings together and with others to try to maintain the line of Tradition in the Council. And now you have abandoned all of that. Is what we were doing wrong?"

"See the results of the Council. Can you show me any that are good, that are positive? Where and in what areas have the Council and the reforms that came from it brought about

an extraordinary revival in the Church?”

He did not answer. There is nothing. Everything is negative.

Fideliter - And the charismatics?

Archbishop Lefebvre – That’s more negative still. It’s the devil, because charismatics come to us to ask us to exorcise them. One has to believe that they are possessed by the devil.

They call the Spirit. What spirit? There are some people among them who are of good will, without doubt, who are striving to pray, to do adoration, no doubt, but the devil is evil. He draws in with one hand, and he grabs with the other.

We’re not done fighting. When I’m gone my successors will still have to fight.

But God can do anything. On the political level it would have been difficult to predict a year or two ago what is happening right now. No one imagined that the Iron Curtain would be lifted, that Germany would reunify. Now they say that the collapse of the Soviet empire is near.

I received a letter from a Ukrainian bishop who wanted to contact us, to ask us to help edit a catechism because they no longer have anything. He did more than fifteen years in a Soviet prison with some others. A number of them have now been released.

He found his diocese in a terrible state, because everything now belongs to the Orthodox Church. They took everything. So they are trying to recover what they can, but they have against them the Vatican, which is poisoned by this business. The return of these bishops and priests who want to revive the Catholic Church in Ukraine is a nuisance to the Vatican, which above all does not want to get into trouble with the Kremlin and the Orthodox church. This Catholic revival in Ukraine is a nuisance to them. This is what the bishop wrote to me: “There really is a mystery for us surrounding the attitude of Rome.”

For us it is not a mystery!

Fideliter - What conclusions can we draw from the Society after twenty years of existence?

Archbishop Lefebvre - The Good Lord wanted Tradition. I am deeply convinced that the Society is the means that God wanted to keep and maintain the Faith, the truth of the Church and what can still be saved in the Church. Thanks also to the bishops around the Superior General of the Society, who fulfil their indispensable role of maintaining the Faith, of preaching the Faith, and of communicate the grace of the priesthood and confirmation, Tradition remains unchanged and a still-fruitful source the divine life.

All this is very comforting and I think we have to thank God and continue to faithfully keep the treasures of the Church, hoping that one day these treasures resume the place they deserve in Rome and they should never have lost.

Interview by Andrew CAGNON

A.M.D.G.

Apostolate of Prayer for Priests

Pray the following prayer once a day, asking especially that God send us more priests, and that He bless and protect the priests we whom we do have.

Every priest who is included in the apostolate will say a Mass once a month for the faithful who pray for him, for the other priests included in the apostolate and for vocations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Amen.

O Lord grant us priests,

O Lord grant us holy priests,

O Lord grant us many holy priests

O Lord grant us many holy religious vocations.

St. Pius X, pray for us.

Please make a commitment to say pray daily for our priests and then contact us with your name and country to record your inclusion in the numbers.

(As of 17th May, 2014)

Priests:

District of Great Britain: 1

Faithful:

Great Britain: 20

Canada: 22

Scandinavia: 2

Spain 1

Australia 3

Ireland 5

Singapore 3

USA 1

More Evidence of Convergence Between SSPX and Ecclesia Dei Communities:

The 2007 Angelus Press Revised/Expanded Edition of Michael Davies' "Pope John's Council"

**By
Sean Johnson
8-25-14**

This September will see the 10 year anniversary of the death of Michael Davies.

A strong supporter of Archbishop Lefebvre until the time of the 1988 episcopal consecrations, he then opted to side with the indultarian *Una Voce* movement (becoming its President in 1992).

Having traded the battle for integral Catholic doctrine in preference for the permission to attend the 1962 Mass, he significantly toned down his rhetoric, lest his movement be seen to criticize the modernists, and jeopardize the indult.

Among other things, he is remembered for his famous saying, "It's the Mass that matters."

Indeed, this saying could be the motto for every indult group in the Church, since it is the only thing their false obedience has been able to retain (and even in that respect, it is only to be considered a preference; a rite on equal footing with the *Novus Ordo*).

So, it was only natural that Michael Davies and the SSPX should drift apart.

Whether he was conscious of it or not, Michael Davies was only given his "table scraps" because the Romans perceived that others like him (i.e., battle weary, or scrupulous, or compromised Catholics) could be drawn away from the SSPX with the lure of an approved Traditional Latin Mass.

So pitched were the differences between the SSPX and various indult/Ecclesia Dei organizations, that *they did not even march in the same direction* at the annual Chartres (France) Pilgrimage for Tradition, nor would they travel the same route: Leaders would meet in advance of the opposed pilgrimages to ensure the two did not intersect!

This was symbolic of the completely opposite ends which the two groups had in mind: securing the Mass, on the one hand, vs. securing the entire Faith, on the other.

But those were the good old days

Recent years have seen mounting evidence of a convergence of aims and ends between the SSPX and the various indult groups in ways which would have been impossible under Archbishop Lefebvre: The notice appearing on the SSPX Polish District website congratulating the Ecclesia Dei communities' recent 2013 ordinations; the January 2014 letter from Menzingen in which Fr. Pivert's book is condemned, with Menzingen offering strident defenses of the indult communities; the 'trad-cumenical' initiatives in which The Remnant participates at The Angelus conferences; etc).

But I would like to discuss one which flew under the radar: The 2007 Angelus Press reprint of the revised/expanded "Pope John's Council" by Michael Davies.

Having just illustrated the divergence of opinion between Michael Davies and the SSPX since the 1988 episcopal consecrations (and the dumbing-down of the subject matter of Davies' later books, which must always follow upon a regularization), it is a pleasant mythology spread amongst the SSPX faithful that, towards the end of his life, Michael Davies "came back" to the SSPX, and again collaborated with them, having realized the limited and short-sighted nature of his indult position.

However, it is the purpose of this brief article to demonstrate that in fact, it is the opposite which is true:

That with the commencement in 2007 of the branding campaign (designed to cease-fire against modernism and the modernists in Rome, for the purposes of securing a Roman approval of the SSPX), the SSPX moved closer to Michael Davies' indult position, rather than the other way around.

Observe that in 2001, the SSPX was condemning the Vatican declaration *Dominus Iesus* thusly:

"As a result, the document does not wish to repeat, firmly and univocally, that there is only one way of salvation, i.e., that established by Christ in His Church. Instead it gives us to understand, through its equivocations, that we must admit that "historical figures and positive elements of these [other] religions may fall within the divine plan of salvation," and that, according to Vatican II, the false religions can be seen to exercise "a manifold cooperation" and even a "participated mediation" in the one mediatorship of Christ. There is one reservation, however: these "participated forms of mediation... cannot be understood as parallel or complementary to his." In fact, the concept of parallel [equal] complementarity is very different from that of participated [subordinate] mediation.

This concept of participated, subordinate mediation has always been intrinsic to the Catholic religion. What is new in the Declaration, and what is unheard-of in the Catholic religion, is that this participated mediation is now no longer reserved to the Most Blessed Virgin, the Saints and the members of the Mystical Body, but extended to all the false religions (the sects and the pagan religions). This is in harmony with the "new theology," which no longer understands the Mystical Body to be coextensive with the visible Church (plus the individual exceptions in the case of souls united to the Church "in voto," by implicit and explicit desire), but broadens and expands Christ's Mystical Body to embrace all humanity with all its false religious beliefs.

*The fundamental concept of ecumenism can be reduced to this: "All religions are orientated to salvation, which is one, and is of Christ. These religions are ranked according to each one's degree of participation in the fullness of truth and salvation which is found in its highest degree in Christ and his Church." This is the basis supporting the superstructure of the Declaration Dominus Iesus, and we cannot see in what way it differs from the thesis of Modernism, namely, that God reveals Himself "in the life of all the religions, individually and collectively, but most of all in the life of Christianity" (George Tyrrell, *Per la sincerità in Rinnovamento* [For Sincerity in the Renewal] July-Aug. 1907.)" (www.sspxasia.com/Documents/SiSiNoNo/2001_September/Dominus_Jesus.htm)*

That was the SSPX in 2001 (i.e., well before the branding campaign was commenced, and at a time when the plan to “proceed by stages” towards a “reconciliation” was in its infancy).

But in 2007, the Angelus announced that, with the new incoming editor, a new editorial policy would feature a “more positive” and less critical approach.

That same year, Angelus Press released Michael Davies revised edition of “Pope John's Council”, which contained an heretical notion of apostolicity, with Davies claiming that - in accord with *Dominus Iesus* - the Orthodox churches were “authentic local churches,” and that the Orthodox possess formal apostolicity. (p. 97)

The book also contains an Appendix titled “The Declaration *Dominus Iesus* Regarding the Term *Subsistit*” (p. 403-408), in which Davies (and the SSPX's) confusion reaches new heights, going so far as to exclaim, “Some traditional Catholics have questioned the possibility as to how there can be true churches not in communion with the Pope...”, as though it were we who are confused!

Now to be clear, Orthodox bishops possess mere material apostolicity (i.e., episcopal continuity), but not formal apostolicity (which in addition to episcopal continuity, adds jurisdiction).

Since Orthodox bishops possess mere material apostolicity, it necessarily follows that their local churches are not to be regarded as authentic churches (i.e., Since their bishops, lacking formal apostolicity, lack jurisdiction).

At this point, a number of questions arise:

1) To publish such a book, which defends an heretical proposition regarding apostolicity, and promotes an ecumenically inspired *Dominus Iesus* which is perfectly in line with Vatican II's *Lumen Gentium*, the SSPX has walked back on its 2001 condemnation. Why?

2) It seems it was not Michael Davies revising his book to approach the SSPX position outlined in their condemnation of 2001, but rather, the SSPX publishing a book in 2007 which contradicts its own former condemnation of *Dominus Iesus* in 2001, to promote Davies' ecumenical position. Why?

3) Interestingly enough, I perceived this error back in 2007 when I purchased the book, and contacted The Angelus to make them aware of the error on apostolicity. I was told by the editor that it had been reviewed by three SSPX priests before it went to press (the implication being that I was wrong). I pressed the issue, and finally received an acknowledgement from a District official that conceded the point, and told me that, minimally, a notice of “errata” would be inserted in future shipments. Has this been done? Or, have they expunged the ecumenical content from Davies revised volume (in which case there would be little point of publishing a revision at all!)?

(NB: ‘Luker’ – a personage on the website ‘*Archbishop Lefebvre forums*’ - confirms that a sticker has been superimposed on subsequent volumes, but that the only change the overlay makes is to remove the word “formal” from apostolic succession. Hence, an heretical statement has been “improved” to one merely ambiguous. Small consolation. Meanwhile, the entire ecumenical sense of this portion of the book is consistent with *Dominus Iesus* and *Lumen Gentium*)

4) Regardless of who moved towards who, can anyone explain why the SSPX would publish a book promoting ecumenical ecclesiology (i.e., *Dominus Iesus*, and by extension, *Lumen Gentium*)?

My conclusion is this:

The publication of this revised Michael Davies work was one of the first attempts by the branded SSPX at incrementally “shifting” the SSPX audience towards looking favorably upon recent magisterial documents.

It was useful for building the bridge between SSPX-ers, Romans, and indultarians.

The only other alternative is to believe that the SSPX has suddenly become doctrinally incompetent, and is oblivious to publishing errors, which is not likely.

In any case, it shows that Michael Davies definitely did not come back to a traditional SSPX perspective (as though Archbishop Lefebvre would have accepted *Dominus Iesus* any more than Bishop Fellay did in 2001), but instead, that the SSPX moved towards Michael Davies' *Una Voce* position.

More disturbing than this, is the fact that in the larger picture (in light of the other examples cited above, which is far from exhaustive), it evinces an SSPX embarked upon a trajectory of convergence with the indult communities.

Once that convergence is completed, via slow boil, will there really be any need to negotiate a practical accord? Indeed, as the Dominicans at Avrillé recently wrote, the terrain is already prepared for a recognition of tolerance “ad tempus” (in which no written accord will be necessary).

But at what price?

When the day comes that you see the indultarian and SSPX Chartres Pilgrimages for Tradition marching in the same direction, understand that there is much more symbolism there than meets the eye.

Postscript:

In view of the eminence and reputation of Michael Davies, many readers of this article may be reluctant to accept that so gifted a man erred in so obvious and fundamental a doctrine as that on the Church's teaching regarding apostolicity.

The first error of Mr. Davies is that he overlooked (or ignored) the distinction between material vs. formal apostolicity (even though, interestingly enough, he uses the term “formal apostolic succession” in an erroneous sense at the bottom of p. 97).

As recounted above, “material apostolicity” is mere episcopal continuity (i.e., episcopal lineage traceable down to the Apostles), whereas “formal apostolicity” adds to mere material apostolicity the power of jurisdiction, which comes from the Pope.

Since a schismatic “church” cannot possess jurisdiction (other than a supplied jurisdiction acquired through necessity), and therefore cannot possess formal apostolicity, it necessarily follows that schismatic churches can never be considered authentic or true local churches.

But Michael Davies says otherwise:

On p. 98, he cites in support of his contention that the schismatic Orthodox possess formal apostolicity, the Apostolic Letter of Bl. Pope Pius IX, *Arcano Divinae Providentiae* (1868), in which he observes that the great Pontiff: “invited the bishops of the churches of the Oriental Rite not in communion with Rome to be present at the First Vatican Council on an equal basis with the bishops of the Latin Rite in communion with Rome.”

Now it is telling that this citation (obviously meant to justify *Dominus Iesus*, which follows as

a separate appendix at the end of the book on pp 403-408) is entirely absent from the original 1970s version of "Pope John's Council."

But what is missed by Davies is that the Apostolic Letter is not an invitation to participate in Vatican I as schismatics, but an invitation to rejoin the Mystical Body of Christ in order that they could participate:

"On September 8, 1868, the pope wrote an Apostolic Letter, Arcano divinae Providentiae consilio, to the Eastern Orthodox patriarchs, which demanded fidelity to the commitment they made to reunion at the Council of Lyons in 1274 and again at the Council of Florence in 1439." (vox-nova.com/2008/06/14/the-politics-of-infallibility-at-vatican-i-part-1/)

But Davies, confusing the matter even further, misreads this Letter as pointing to the Councils of Lyons and Florence as having allowed schismatics to participate as schismatics, not as uniates (as though schismatics could set policy and doctrine for the Catholic Church!), and not in the proper sense just quoted.

For example, the Orthodox participated in the Second Council of Lyons only because they consented to sign this declaration (which made them Catholics):

"The Holy Roman Church possesses the supreme and full primacy and principality over the whole Catholic Church. She truly and humbly acknowledges that she received this from the Lord himself in blessed Peter, the prince and chief of the apostles, whose successor the Roman Pontiff is, together with the fullness of power. And since before all others she has the duty of defending the truth of the faith, so if any questions arise concerning the faith, it is by her judgment that they must be settled."

That this participation and Council did not end the schism permanently or completely is only because, according to Eastern Orthodox ecclesiology, the representatives had no authority to bind the other Orthodox bishops back home.

But the simple fact is that those Orthodox who participated were converted Catholics at the onset by the signing of that declaration.

It is worth mentioning that in so far as certain Churches (e.g., the Greek Orthodox) become uniate or schismatic at various points in history, they likewise vacillated between true particular churches possessing formal apostolicity, and schismatic churches, possessing only material apostolicity (therefore not representing true local churches at such times).

But in the appendix titled "The Declaration *Dominus Iesus* Re: The Term *Subsistit*," which represents a blatant defense of *Lumen Gentium* as well, the reader will be shocked to see how far this error regarding formal apostolicity and true local churches causes Davies to embrace the new ecclesiology:

"But what of the churches, dioceses, that have breached their unity with the Holy See? Do they cease to be particular churches? By no means." (P. 406)

Now, I will be unjustly fair to Mr. Davies here, because as the phrase stands, he does not distinguish between authentic and schismatic particular churches (which makes it merely ambiguous).

But from the context, previous quotes showing him arguing in favor of schismatic churches representing authentic churches, and the sentence immediately following that just quoted, in which Mr. Davies reverts to his already refuted erroneous interpretation of Pius IX's *Arcano*

Divinae Providentiae, we know what he means, and he finishes with the alarming statement that:

"There is thus no doubt whatsoever that the Dioceses of the Eastern Orthodox Churches constitute true particular churches despite being schismatic." (p. 406)

That statement is *heretical*, insofar as it directly contradicts the Church's immemorial teaching on apostolicity, in addition to implicitly rejecting Pope Pius XII's encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi* (of which *Dominus Iesus* and *Lumen Gentium* are also violators).

No particular church can be said to be a "true particular church" which does not possess formal apostolicity, and therefore receive its jurisdiction from the Pope. It necessarily follows, therefore, that all true particular churches are in union with Rome, since otherwise, it is not possible for them to possess ordinary jurisdiction (the distinguishing feature of formal apostolicity).

To say otherwise is to make of the Petrine Primacy an empty title, by implying jurisdiction (which only flows from Peter) is not necessary for a true particular church to have a legitimate apostolic mission.

As the Catholic Encyclopedia explains, regarding the lack of apostolicity for the schismatics:

"Regarding the Greek Church, it is sufficient to note that it lost apostolic succession by withdrawing from the jurisdiction of the lawful successors of St. Peter in the See of Rome. The same is to be said of the Anglican claims to continuity (MacLaughlin, "Divine Plan of the Church", 213; and, Newman, "Diff. of Angl.", Lecture 12.) for the very fact of separation destroys their jurisdiction. They have based their claims on the validity of orders in the Anglican Church. Anglican orders, however, have been declared invalid. But even if they were valid, the Anglican Church would not be Apostolic, for jurisdiction is essential to the Apostolicity of mission." (<http://newadvent.com/cathen/01648b.htm>)

And it is ludicrous to contend that there can be such a thing as a true particular church not in union with Peter, which is at once divided in government, worship, doctrine, and devoid of jurisdiction and legitimate apostolic mission, for to hold any other opinion is to negate the gravity of schism (and heresy) and make the injunctions of the Church and Pius XII, et al, frivolous and of no consequence for salvation.

Moreover, it is to encourage complacency and peaceful conscience in the hearts of those our Lord is trying to prompt to reach out to the only Ark of Salvation which is the Catholic Church, and in such measure, the position advocated by Davies, *Dominus Iesus*, and *Lumen Gentium* is antichrist.

Therein lies the true evil latent within the teaching of *Dominus Iesus* and *Lumen Gentium*, and the contorted path Michael Davies has traveled in order to attempt to justify them.

But having reached this point, we are brought back to asking ourselves the question:

Why is the SSPX publishing a book promoting such ideas?

To my thinking, that question has already been answered above.



SSPX-Watch Special:

“Our relations with...” ..*Ecclesia Dei* and *Una Voce* !

Quite a bit of evidence has recently emerged that the SSPX is already sliding comfortably into the *Ecclesia Dei* family, albeit without actually announcing or admitting it to its (remaining) supporters. We are grateful to the website ‘*Non Possumus*’ for bringing much of this to our attention.

First of all let us remind ourselves: who or what are *Ecclesia Dei* and *Una Voce*? Following the supposed “excommunication” of Archbishop Lefebvre in 1988, John Paul II wrote a *motu proprio* entitled ‘*Ecclesia Dei Adflicta*’ in which he accused Archbishop Lefebvre of “disobedience” and “schism.” In the same *motu proprio* he also added that:

“A Commission is instituted whose task it will be to collaborate with the bishops, with the Departments of the Roman Curia and with the circles concerned, for the purpose of facilitating full ecclesial communion of priests, seminarians, religious communities or individuals until now linked in various ways to the Fraternity founded by Mons. Lefebvre...”

Thus, the fear of “schism” (a dishonest charge which nobody from the Pope on down ever even attempted to justify) was used as a stick with which to drive all those who never fully understood Archbishop Lefebvre’s resistance to the Council into the arms of the conciliar church. The carrot to entice them was that they would be allowed to have Mass according to the 1962 missal, provided of course, that they were ‘on their best behaviour’. The “commission” thus created was in effect an office in the Vatican and took its name from that same *motu proprio* becoming the “Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*.”

And *Una Voce*? Born in the 1960s, ‘the *Una Voce* Federation’ comprises groups of laity who wish to have recourse to the *Ecclesia Dei* commission. They are “the other end of the pipeline” as it were, and act almost as a ‘lobby group’ for people who merely prefer the Traditional Missal to the *Novus Ordo*. The starting point of their thinking appears to be one of false obedience: one should never attend or offer the Traditional Mass without permission. Hence they respectfully ask permission for the Traditional Mass from the modernist hierarchy (even though doing so involves an implicit falsehood, since it implies that permission is in fact required and that their birthright was in fact legitimately taken from them). When granted permission, they are careful not to upset the same hierarchy by any overt criticism of the hierarchy or of the Council, and thus allow themselves to be used by that same modernist hierarchy to draw souls away from the Masses and chapels of those who really are trying to resist the modernism and apostasy of Vatican II. But lest we be thought of as being unfairly prejudiced against them, here is what *Una Voce* is all about in their own words. On the website www.unavoce.org/about we read that *Una Voce*,

“...is dedicated to ensuring that the Roman Mass codified by St. Pius V is maintained as one of the forms of eucharistic worship which are honored in universal liturgical life, and to restoring the use of Latin, Gregorian Chant, and sacred polyphony in Catholic liturgy.”

What is important in the quote above is not so much the rather jarring “Vatican II-speak” jargon (“eucharistic worship” indeed!), so much as the fact that their goal is to ensure that the true Mass is “one of” the forms, along side the illegitimate, modernist *Novus Ordo* Mass. Thus their goal is pluralism, the co-existence of the Catholic alongside the modernist, of

the true alongside the false, of that which strengthens the Faith alongside that which will weaken and ultimately destroy it.

That is their *raison-d'être* to which they are, in their own words, “dedicated”. Looked at in this way, their goal is diametrically opposed to the goal of the Resistance (like the SSPX of yester-year) whose goal is to ensure *precisely* that the Traditional Mass is not merely “one of the forms of eucharistic worship”! Let us bear that in mind when considering the full import of the adulterous relationship between the SSPX and *Una Voce*. It says less about *Una Voce* than it does about the new, modernist-friendly SSPX. Some readers may find what follows disturbing, though for many others, alas, it will come as no surprise.

1. SSPX and ‘Una Voce Cuba’ now collaborating openly.

The Ecclesia Dei Mass in Cuba (i.e. the “extraordinary form” Mass which the modernist local diocese officially allows so as to neuter any resistance to Vatican II) is currently being said by Fr. Pierre Morroux, a priest of the SSPX.

In the review ‘*Una Voce Informa*’ (Oct. 2013), the President of Una Voce Cuba, Javier Luis Candelario Diéguez, writes:

“A few weeks ago I travelled to the capital accompanied by Fr. Pierre Morroux...”



Una Voce Cuba's President with Fr. Pierre Mourroux



...before going on to recount their conversation about looking in an antique shop for a statue for their chapel, buying a house for ‘the work of Tradition,’ etc. From the sound of it, the two are accustomed to work very closely together.

As it happens, Fr. Pierre Mourroux, 27, is a priest of the SSPX. He was ordained in 2011, and is now stationed in Mexico City, presumably the same SSPX priory in Mexico

City which Fr. Hugo Ruiz was forced to leave more than 18 months ago, after being ordered by his superior never to talk in public or even in private with anyone about ‘relations with Rome’ or anything touching on it. From the sound

of things, Fr. Mourroux would face no such crisis of conscience. How times change.

And from the ‘Facebook’ page of Una Voce comes a charming picture of a little chapel, whose caption boasts that it is the:

“Unique and exclusive altar on the island of Cuba where the Holy Mass is said according to the Extraordinary Form of the Roman Rite. It is the property of Una Voce Cuba, as part of its oratory, while the Mass is offered by priests of the SSPX.”

There has been, as yet, no official denial or “press statement” concerning this from the Mexican District, from Menzingen or from DICI (or even from the newly-appointed Commisar of Propaganda!), enamoured of press statements though we know them to be.

2. SSPX / Una Voce finance

Donativos

En España, a nombre de: Enrique Torrelle Carbona.
Banco Sabadell. Cuenta corriente N°: 0481 0016 10 0001091016
 IBAN/RI: ES000010010001091016 /RIBAN/ESBB
 (Concepto: Una Voce)


En EEUU, a nombre de: Albert Edward Doskey Gutiérrez.
Bank of America. Número de Cuenta: 440100282553
 SWIFT: BOFAUS33 (depósito en euros) SWIFT: BOFAUS33
 (depósito en dólares)

En Cuba, a nombre de: Javier Luis Condellario Diéguez.
Desde Eurogiro. Banco Popular de Ahorros No. de cuenta: 752069
 Sucursal: 3475 SWIFT: BPACLUHHXXX

En México, a nombre de: P. Pierre Morroux. (Concepto: Una Voce Cuba)

BBVA Banquero. Sucursal 020 Nonoalco
 Número de cuenta 022 280 00160583400 a: SWIFT:
 BICRAXMX33-PTM

Por PayPal: Daniel Arturo Vargas de la Mata.
 PayPal: redrecusant@gmail.com
 (Concepto: Una Voce Cuba)



Perhaps it will be argued this is no great surprise, given that the SSPX is already fulfilling the function of Ecclesia Dei / Una Voce. But it is, on reflection, an even deeper, worse form of collaboration. And lest any of the incurably optimistic defenders of the SSPX should try to deny it 'in the absence of proof,' here it that proof.

This notice asking for donations for Fr. Mourroux (priest of the SSPX) was taken from p.64 of the August 2014 '*Una Voce Informa*,' the official *Una Voce* magazine produced for indult-going Catholics of Cuba and Costa Rica.

En México, a nombre de: P. Pierre Morroux. (Concepto: Una Voce Cuba)

Queridos amigos de Una Voce Cuba: pas robé!

El paso inasistible del tiempo, unido a la fuerte crisis económica que vive España, han agotado a nuestro único y principal benefactor. Una familia, que generosamente mantenía todos nuestros apostolados y labores, el tiempo que sus ser penosamente dichos salidos tradicionales sostenían íntegramente el culto divino.

Durante los últimos 4 meses, he buscado desesperadamente nuevos benefactores, que aunque dieran pequeñas cantidades, en las mensuras de apoyo, sirvieran a un monto total que nos permitiera, al menos mantener la Misa. Lastimosamente, aunque diésteo, al presente no he conseguido nada, y nuestra labor de recatación de herencia no ha tenido éxito alguno. En el mes de Enero, hicimos un poderoso llamado por medio de la Revista, y la respuesta fue mínima. Apenas dos personas nos hicieron un depósito de 20 euros. Nuestra situación, para el mantenimiento de la Misa Tridimensional es bien desesperada y dramática. ¡Ya ni hablar del resto de nuestra labores!

Con el dinero ahorrado y un endeudamiento con la FSSPX, hemos podido mantener bien alto nuestro culto, pero no hemos podido pagar la gloria de Dios y el bien de las almas. Más llega el momento de decir: hasta aquí podíamos.

No pedimos grandes sumas de dinero, solo una pequeña cantidad. Sin lugar a dudas la Santa Cuarentena es tiempo propicio para ejercitarnos en esa caridad de la limosna, que libra los pecados y atrae las bendiciones del cielo.

Con la intención de mover vuestra conciencia y recibir de vuestros corazones un donativo, por pequeño que fuere, será extraordinario para nosotros: imparte el Sr. una abnunciación restitución, en la medida de vuestra caridad y generosidad.

Agradecemos la atención que prestéis a la presente.

En Domingo,
 Javier Luis Condellario Diéguez.
 Presidente.

But there is more. A few months ago, the personal blog of one 'Pericon,' a liberal-minded layman and a defender of the neo-SSPX and all things Fellay, published an appeal for funds for *Una Voce Cuba*, stating:

"With the money saved, and with a debt with the SSPX, we have been able to maintain our work well, not sparing anything for the glory of God and the good of souls..."

Con el dinero ahorrado y un endeudamiento con la FSSPX, hemos podido mantener bien alto nuestra labor, no escaumando nada a la gloria de

Does this not suggest that *Una Voce Cuba* was/is financed by the SSPX? Once again, there have to our knowledge been no official SSPX press statements, no official announcements, no official denials.

3. Una Voce refers to "our" vocations at La Reja.

REVISTA UNA VOCE INFORMA

Publicación mensual, editada y distribuida por el Centro de Estudios de la Doctrina y el Espiritualidad Católica del Centro de Estudios de la Doctrina y el Espiritualidad Católica del Centro de Estudios de la Doctrina y el Espiritualidad Católica.



No. 36 Agosto del 2014. Año III.

¡Oremos por nuestros sacerdotes y las vocaciones!

No. 36 Agosto del 2014. Año III.

¡Oremos por nuestros sacerdotes y las vocaciones!

No, not because they have consciously sent men to the seminary there, or because they have any official arrangement in writing with the SSPX seminary - at least, as far as we are aware! It may be nothing more than that they regard SSPX seminarians of South America as "our seminarians". But why might that be? Either way, since a picture is worth a thousand words, here is that picture, taken from the front cover of the same '*Una Voce Informa*.' The Picture shows seminarians of the SSPX seminary at La Reja, Argentina, and the caption reads:

"Let us pray for our priests and vocations!"

4. A Closer Look at ‘Una Voce Informa’

So who exactly is behind *Una Voce Informa*? Although the last question has already been partially answered above, to get a better idea of who we are talking about it is instructive to note briefly the contents of the above-mentioned August 2014 issue of this review. It can presently be viewed on the website www.unavoceinforma.com. The magazine carries a mixture of articles and texts by such authors as: St. Pius X, Archbishop Lefebvre, Bishop Fellay, Bishop Rifan, Pope Francis... and to top it all off: one Alejandro Jorodowsky. The latter appears to be an atheist Jew, known for his involvement in public blasphemy and a friend of the satanic Marilyn Manson. So they cover the whole spectrum!

Furthermore, they proudly boast of the Rosary Crusade totals as if they were their own. Could it be that many of those “tallied” rosaries actually *were* their own? After all, the French District website actively encouraged *Una Voce* / *Ecclesia Dei* Catholics to take part, is it so inconceivable that the same thing should have been going on in South America? And no, there is never anything wrong *per se* with anyone praying the rosary. But if the rosary crusade were an ecumenical effort, perhaps the ‘packaging’ ought to have reflected that fact, in the interests of avoiding any charge of ‘false advertising’. But we digress.



"Cuando se alzó el vértice de esta reflexión, antes pudo presenciar al de orden superior, condecorado y glorificado. En el Episcopado que, por el mundo que vive y por sus propias debilidades, no se resigna, en el mundo de la aplicación a su propia vida, en la semana del Concilio Vaticano II, puede haber sido un momento de la interpretación de la doctrina de la comunión, de la sacramentalidad. Y pudo al mismo tiempo para que se reflejara en orden, en un momento de reflexión, lo que puede ser algo más, de la alianza de la comunión y de la comunión de la comunión. Juan Polanco, el sacerdote de la comunión y de la comunión de la comunión. 14 de febrero de 1988." Agustin "Domestica Coma"

As mentioned before, the magazine ‘*Una Voce Informa*’ is produced for the branches of *Una Voce* in Cuba and Costa Rica. A very brief perusal of the website of *Una Voce Cuba* (www.unavocecuba.com) quickly reveals that the content mentioned above is fairly typical.

Scrolling down the main page of the website of *Una Voce Cuba* one finds a similar mixture, though perhaps not going to quite the same extremes. Even to a non Spanish-speaker, the pictures of St. Pius X, Benedict XVI and John-Paul II (each one accompanied by an approving

quote from its respective Pope) tell

their own tale. And who could fail to notice the advertisement for the conciliar (and definitely not ‘Traditional’!) TV network E.W.T.N...?



A Ti, Benedicto; Obispo de Roma: 'ad'



Given that this website belongs to *Una Voce Cuba*, and given that the same *Una Voce Cuba* was financed at least in part (as it seems) by a loan from the SSPX, is it unreasonable to ask: was this website paid for by SSPX money? Do SSPX faithful realise

that their collections, legacies and other financial contributions are going to support this sort of thing? Furthermore, may we not ask the would-be defenders of ‘much-maligned Bishop Fellay’ and the ‘subverted-by-revolutionaries SSPX’:

Is Fr. Mourroux, priest of the SSPX, are Fr. Mourroux’s Superiors (the District of Mexico, the General House) happy to lend open and public support to such groups and ‘movements’ as these? And if they are, is there not a great deal of injustice in their merciless pursuing of priests such as Fr. Ruiz, whose crime was to be known not to favour a deal with Rome?

The final few things might both seem harmless enough, and might be explained away with relative ease by any neo-SSPX apologist. Taken in the current context, however, the reader may see them in a different light. We merely offer you the what we find. Judge for yourself.

5. SSPX Mass in St. Peter's Basilica, Rome

On 28th August, the French District website *LaPorteLatine.org* proudly boasted a video of one of its priests saying Mass in St. Peter's basilica in Rome, at the altar of St. Pius X. The US District was quick to show this to its own audience. The video can still be viewed online. Particularly worth noting are:

- The ugly modern 'novus ordo' vestments. Are there really no 'Traditional' (i.e. normal) Roman vestments to be had anywhere in Rome? Having seen pictures of *Ecclesia Dei* Masses said in Rome with gorgeous baroque vestments, we are a little sceptical. Perhaps the SSPX celebrant, Fr. Michel de Sivry, not wishing to offend, did not insist...
- The celebrant wears no maniple, nor does he use a burse or altar cards;
- The vestments are red, even though it was a Mass of Our Lady ("Salve sancta parens..."). Is it a coincidence that, according to the conciliar calendar, it was the feast of "Saint Edith Stein, martyr"...?
- Two video cameras are present inside the sanctuary, each manned throughout. Was this really necessary?
- The servers are unvested and wear t-shirts and trainers. And yes, at a few Resistance Masses the servers are also unvested, but at least we have a reasonably good excuse! Were there really no cassocks and cottas to be had anywhere?
- The sermon is full of "Romanitas" - 'Rome is the capital of the Church,' 'Rome is the See of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles,' Rome this, Rome that, Rome, Rome, Rome...! And not one mention of 'modern Rome,' not the faintest hint that there is in fact any problem at all in the Church or in Rome today!
- Head coverings are conspicuous by their absence. And yes, not every single lady at every single SSPX Mass back in the day (or the Resistance today) would necessarily have her head covered. But the majority would. And yes, perhaps some of the congregation are tourists who just happened to be there when Mass was being said. But the French District website says it was a pilgrimage group. And there are only 20-ish souls in evidence! Are they all tourists?!



Is this what the SSPX chapel of the future looks like?

6. Catholic Identity Conference / Angelus Press Conference

The Catholic Identity Conference had escaped our attention up to now. From a quick look at their website, it appears to be a sort of ecu-Trad event for conservatively/traditional-minded Catholics, though for the most part those who are keen to remain ‘in good standing’ with the conciliar church. Below is the line-up of speakers at the 2014 conference.



[Left to Right: Michael Matt, Christopher Ferrara, Dr. John Rao, John Vennari, James Vogel, Louie Verrechio, Kenneth Wolfe and Michael Brendan Dougherty]

The first three speakers from the left are well known *Ecclesia Dei* Mass-goers:

Michael Matt is the editor of a bi-weekly newspaper, *The Remnant*.

Christopher Ferrara and **John Rao** are both regular writers for that same newspaper. *The Remnant* distinguished itself in recent years for trying very hard to take a positive attitude towards the Pontificate of Benedict XVI.

The fourth and fifth speakers named are both SSPX faithful and both ‘editors’ in their own way.

John Vennari is the editor of a ‘traditional’ newspaper, *Catholic Family News*, which always broadly supported the SSPX and which used to carry some interesting and useful articles. Sadly, of late it has distinguished itself only by a deafening silence about the one issue which concerns the SSPX faithful the most. Mr. Vennari deserves our sympathy however, since sales of his newspaper would doubtless be adversely affected whichever side he took (or appeared to take). Though, of course, I am sure that is just a coincidence.

James Vogel appears to be an enthusiastically pro-Menzingen sort of chap, and is also employed by the SSPX as editor-in-chief at Angelus Press (I am sure that is just a coincidence too!). He it was who made an embarrassingly fawning video interview with his boss and employer, US district superior Fr. Arnaud Rostand, nearly two years ago, the purpose of which was to rubbish any suggestion that there might be something slightly amiss in the SSPX of late (it didn’t work!). It is interesting that he has his masters’ permission to speak at this conference: people have been fired from the SSPX for far less.

The remaining three speakers are less well-known, though the last one is billed as: “from *The American Conservative*.” Mass during the conference is said in a diocesan parish church by a priest of the *Institute of Christ the King Sovereign Priest* (an *Ecclesia Dei* organisation). Curiously enough however, the official conference website avoids saying anything at all about the Mass, other than it is “Tridentine”. One has to hold one’s nose and visit the tediously self-absorbed, ‘liberal-Trad’ website *Rorate Coeli* in order to discover who the celebrant will be!



As mentioned above, the other upcoming conference is the one organised by Angelus Press, the SSPX printing house for the whole English-speaking world. Below can be seen the an even longer list of speakers, the majority of them SSPX priests, and of course **Bishop Tissier de Mallerais**. The latter would, until recently have been the only one of the speakers to inspire us with any confidence. His talk at the 2011 Angelus Conference was excellent. Nearly two years of house arrest in Chicago, however, virtually deprived of contact with the outside world, may have taken their toll on him and the very little about him which we do occasionally hear does not look encouraging. Remember him in your prayers.

Among the priestly speakers is the hapless **Fr. Daniel “Resistance-To-What?” Themann**, whose topic is entitled: *“What is our objection to the New Mass?”* - surely something that we would all be very interested to learn! After all, it was legitimately promulgated, so what exactly is “our” objection to it? ‘Objection to what?’!

FEATURED SPEAKERS



Bishop Bernard Tissier de Mallerais, SSPX
Topic: Archbishop Lefebvre and the Traditional Mass



Fr. Jürgen Wegner, District Superior, SSPX
Topic: Introduction and Conclusion



Fr. Juan-Carlos Iscara, SSPX
Topic: The Mass in Times of Persecution



Fr. Daniel Couture, SSPX
Topic: The Symbolism of the Offertory



Fr. Patrick Rutledge, SSPX
Topic: The Spirituality of the Holy Sacrifice



Fr. Daniel Themann, SSPX
Topic: Apologetics: What is Our Objection to the New Mass?



Fr. Joseph Wood, SSPX
Topic: The Mass and Catholic Marriage



Fr. X
Topic: A Diocesan Priest Discovers the Traditional Mass



John Vennari
Topic: Ecumenism: The Original Sin of the New Mass



Michael Matt
Topic: The Motu Proprio and the Future of the Mass



Andrew Clarendon
Topic: The Mass as Vehicle of Catholic Culture



Dr. John Rao
Topic: Luther and the Protestant Attack on the Mass

Then there is **Fr. Juan-Carlos “Economy-of-Silence” Iscara**. We cannot remember having heard from him since that unfortunate article back in May 2012. Let us hope, for his own sake (not to mention that of his audience) that he decides to take his own advice, liberally!

Fr. Couture and **Fr. Wegner** ought to be familiar enough, former district superiors of Asia and Canada respectively, and now district superiors of Canada and the USA respectively.

And we think we have spotted a mistake, to which we hope a well-meaning reader will draw their attention. According to the list of speakers, Fr. Wegner is only down to do the introduction and conclusion. Surely they cannot let a man of his experience go to waste like that! We would like to suggest the following topic title for him, which we think would give the conference attendees better value for money:

“Appearance Is Everything! - Manipulating Mass Media in the Traditional Catholic Money Market.”

Oh yes, and then there are those three speakers from the other conference: John Vennari, John Rao and Michael Matt (who is talking about the motu proprio ‘*Summorum Pontificum*,’ of which he was always an enthusiastic supporter). Need we comment further? Thank you.

Archbishop Lefebvre Speaks:



“It is obvious that by putting themselves in the hands of the present conciliar authorities they [‘Ecclesia Dei’/‘Una Voce’ Catholics] implicitly accept the Council and the reforms that came from it, even if they receive privileges which remain exceptional and provisional. Their acceptance stops them from saying anything. The bishops are watching them.”

(Letter to Fr. Daniel Couture, 18th March, 1989)

“We must absolutely convince our faithful that it [‘Ecclesia Dei’ / permission for the Tridentine Mass] is no more than a manoeuvre, that it is dangerous to put oneself into the hands of Conciliar bishops and Modernist Rome. It is the greatest danger threatening our people.”

(Fideliter interview, July 1989)

“And we must not waver for one moment either in not being with those who are in the process of betraying us. Some people are always admiring the grass in the neighbour’s field. Instead of looking to their friends, to the Church’s defenders, to those fighting on the battlefield, they look to our enemies on the other side. “After all, we must be charitable, we must be kind, we must not be divisive, after all, they are celebrating the Tridentine Mass, they are not as bad as everyone says” - but THEY ARE BETRAYING US - betraying us! They are shaking hands with the Church’s destroyers. They are shaking hands with people holding modernist and liberal ideas condemned by the Church. So they are doing the devil’s work.” *(Address to priests, 6th September 1990)*

“One cannot both shake hands with modernists and keep following Tradition. Not possible. Not possible. ... This is what causes us a problem with certain lay folk, who are very nice, very good people, all for the Society, who accepted the Consecrations, but who have a kind of deep-down regret that they are no longer with the people they used to be with, people who did not accept the Consecrations and who are now against us. “It’s a pity we are divided”, they say, “why not meet up with them? Let’s go and have a drink together, reach out a hand to them” - that’s a betrayal! Those saying this give the impression that at the drop of a hat they would cross over and join those who left us. They must make up their minds. We cannot compromise.” *(Ibid.)*

Fr. Yves le Roux: A Writer of Fanciful Fiction!

Until today, this newsletter carried only non-fiction. But Fr. le Roux has proved such an inspiration to us all, that a couple of writers thought they would try their hand at the same thing! You will find their offerings a little further on. First however, in order for their writing to make sense, you must read the text of the August 2014 *Letter to Friends and Benefactors* (below) sent out a few days ago by the rector of the SSPX seminary in Winona, USA, Fr. Yves le Roux.

We promise you this letter is genuine, it is not a forgery, this is not a hoax!

Neither Head nor Tail

On how Gregory finds peace of soul again after all the turmoil around Bishop Fellay's (alleged) actions.

Dear Friends and Benefactors,

With his left hand Gregory closes the laptop that he has taken with him on vacation, and rubs his head with his right hand, which is for him a sure sign of great impotence and extreme lassitude. Then, he rises slowly and goes out into the countryside, leaning on the walking staff that he favors for those occasions. This afternoon, the August sun still spreads its warmth. Unable to put order in his confused thoughts, he walks aimlessly, seeking a peace that has been evading him for a long time. “What is the source of this perplexity?” he worries. “Why is that I am so disturbed?”

For two years, three perhaps, his friends’ conversations have revolved almost exclusively around the actions of Bishop Fellay, ceaselessly scanning his relations with Rome. Everyone gives his opinion. Many pass judgment – judgments that are sometimes peremptory and often definitive. But they are not alone in this: in their bulletins, sermons or conferences, priests and religious themselves abundantly and regularly re-examine the subject, pouring out and spreading their concerns *urbi et orbi*. Some seem even to have arrived at the point of not knowing any more how “to preach Jesus and Jesus crucified,” as St. Paul liked to say again and again. They feed the confusion by giving their point of view, which, amplified by various Internet forums, becomes suddenly the Gospel truth. From now, the supreme reference that nourishes all reflections is the Internet and its unverifiable rumors...

Initially Gregory had not paid too much attention to it. Men are easily taken in by a rumor for a time, but then, even more quickly, it deflates as a balloon. Gregory had been shaken by the repetition, *ad nauseam*, of the complaints about “the infidelity in regard to the thought and actions of Monsignor Lefebvre” or about “the treason with respect to the tradition to be defended.” To be reassured, he devoted a good part of his afternoons to the attempt of seeing clearly through all these rumors. But his research had not removed his perplexity, quite the contrary.

However, Gregory was honest: he wanted to be free from the rumors, from this stinking atmosphere of suspicions and baseless accusations, and thus, he endeavored to examine only the facts which are inflexible because quite real.

Then, why is he so tired? Why does he leave this study with a burning mind and a heavy heart?

For months, nay, for years, the same old tunes, of inaccuracy and treason, resound without ceasing and are on the mouths of almost all, the charges abound, the judgments are without appeal. Priests rise in rebellion, a bishop draws himself up, the atmosphere is heavy with suspicions which become certainty through being repeated. It seems, if one listens to the persistent rumors, that Bishop Fellay prepares a not very glorious surrender by misleading everyone with mollifying and contradictory remarks. He seems ready to sign an agreement with Rome, without counterpart, without taking precautions and, especially, with no regard for doctrine, which makes of him a Brutus to his Caesar, Monseigneur Lefebvre.

Gregory has walked randomly for a good half-hour, following the paths that open under his heavy step. He hardly pays attention to the countryside which surrounds him, to the beauty of these fields which, under a last caress of the sun, are attired in unique colors. However, the atmosphere of this beautiful summer evening imperceptibly appeases him. The question gnawing at him since he closed his laptop – “how is this possible” – does not hurt him as much as at the beginning. It is no more an unbearable wound, but the expression of a great compassion in the face of a great misery. His right hand slips into his pocket, takes out his rosary and runs the beads with practiced fingers. His prayer rises to Heaven: Pater Noster, “how is it possible?,” Ave Maria, “help them,” Gloria Patri, “draw glory from this”...

The rosary appeases him by elevating him towards God through Our Lady. A last Gloria and a sign of the cross finish the prayer. He then raises his eyes and stops. The sun sets and turns the countryside red. Calm reigns. Gregory’s soul adores God by contemplating His works, in which all is harmony, rule and order.

He remains for a long time seized by this spectacle, always new and always majestic, of the sun setting on the horizon and of the calm of the falling evening, and now, his soul in peace, he sets out again towards his home. His mind is clear. There where he expected to find evidence of the charges that destroyed the reputation of the General Superior of the SSPX, he could find only imprecations that return as a refrain that it is necessary to repeat right and left in order to convince and persuade others of them. There is no proof of a doctrinal rallying or a secret agreement. Quite the contrary, in their morbid excess even those who are the worst accusers of Bishop Fellay become, unwillingly, his best defenders. The old proverb that says that “he who wants to prove too much does not prove anything or only its opposite” is realized once more.

Lately, in Post Falls, has not one of the most virulent accusers affirmed that he himself was ready for an immediate agreement with the Pope, if the Pope did not require him to sign any doctrinal document? Is not this same prelate who presents himself

thus ready to sign a purely practical agreement? What a paradox... What credit can be given to the weekly defamatory attacks against Bishop Fellay, accusing him of destroying doctrine by running after a practical agreement? But the only one who has highly and publicly considered signing a practical agreement is the public prosecutor, and not the vilified defendant. Who wouldn't see here the work of confusion?

In addition, on a website in favor of those who rose against Bishop Fellay and which invites others to rise firmly against him, Gregory could read a study which showed, with the support of texts of Msgr. Lefebvre himself, that Bishop Fellay followed the attitude of his Founder without deviating an iota from it. Where are the blind?

Thus, for months Bishop Fellay has been judged and condemned for parricide, and now even those who accused him happily acknowledge that a practical agreement is possible if it is a question of defending their interests. It is necessary to accept what is evident: Bishop Fellay did nothing but follow the luminous example of Msgr. Lefebvre.

"How is this possible?" reflects Gregory. There is no proof in the accusation and yet everyone is persuaded of Bishop Fellay's prevarication.

The facts, always stubborn, speak for themselves. In the recovered peace of his soul, in the appeasing light of the setting sun, Gregory realizes that the Superior of the SSPX has been the object of a revolutionary attack which consists in pouring on a man torrents of lies, which will end in creating a generalized suspicion which will be more effective as it is impossible to defend oneself against a lie. Eve knows it by her own experience.

Gregory, and we also.

Returning home with a livelier step, finally appeased and eager to communicate to his wife and children the fruit of his thoughts and his prayer, Gregory raises his soul towards God and his prayer of thanksgiving becomes a strange *Te Deum*: "Kyrie Eleison: my God, convert these revolutionary souls or shut them up; appease the souls troubled by so many lies. The hour is serious, the combat continues. Have pity on them and on us"

In Christo sacerdote et Maria.

Fr. Yves le Roux

What can one say? It would be hilarious were it not so tragic!

Notice how the accusations which Fr. le Roux makes against the Resistance are long on emotion and short on detail. They are vague and unspecific. For example, he talks about "rumours," "suspicions," and "baseless accusations" without actually giving any details. Exactly what, in precise detail is Bishop Fellay accused of having done or said or written? Fr. le Roux would rather his readers did not know! All they need to know is that it is "baseless" and "a rumour". And yet although Fr. le Roux himself talks here of the

Resistance making vague, unspecified charges against Bishop Fellay, in reality the “attacks” on Bishop Fellay have been very specific and detailed indeed. Is not Fr. le Roux here to be found guilty of the very thing with which he accuses the Resistance? Are his readers really so stupid as to fall for anything quite so simplistic as this? Would not most Catholics with a grain of common sense feel insulted by being offered this sort of poor quality nonsense? At any rate, we suspect that Fr. le Roux’s tale includes more fiction than he necessarily intended!

As to further observations about Fr. le Roux’s amusing and highly fanciful tale, we got two different writers to write a response, which we reproduce below. We then decided to throw open the floor to our readers in the form of the **2014 Fr. le Roux Fiction-Writing Contest**. There were several entries already so far. To get a better idea of what we’re after, read on. A letter of this sort almost defies parody. Almost, but not quite!

RESPONSE 1:

**The Catholics at Father.Themann.Answered@gmail.com
respond to Fr. le Roux as follows:**

Fr. le Roux sat at his laptop, with a perplexing problem: how can the SSPX get parishioners to ignore the large body of scandalous statements made by SSPX superiors – such as the SSPX’s recent praise of Popes John Paul II and John XXIII and the SSPX describing their “personal lives” as “exemplary”? (1) Worse, yet, Fr. le Roux reflected, such statements are published by the SSPX’s own websites! (2) How, he asked himself, can we get the people to think these SSPX statements are just a series of vague, unconfirmed “internet” rumors? Ruefully, Fr. le Roux reflected that “the facts, always stubborn, speak for themselves.” (3)

Then Fr. le Roux sat up straight. He had an idea! He would use his August 12, 2014 letter to write a story about a man who was troubled and confused, who then attains peace and happiness by ignoring the evidence around him and simply choosing to believe that the SSPX’s liberal statements (on its own websites), are mere rumors! Fr. le Roux smiled with satisfaction at his plan, as he engrossed himself in writing fiction.

(1) Fr. Christian Bouchacourt recently stated that it “is quite probable ... that the personal lives of John XXIII and John Paul II were exemplary.” His words are here: <http://sspx.org/en/news-events/news/good-men-perhaps-poor-fathers-3992> Fr. Bouchacourt, was the District Superior of the SSPX’s South America District, but has now been promoted to become the District Superior of the more influential District of France (which has a large number of priests).

The truth is that it is completely impossible for any Catholic to have an “exemplary” personal life, when he does what these popes did, even aside from their greater responsibility for the whole Church. So, e.g., aside from Pope John Paul II’s incalculable responsibility for the 1986 Assisi meeting because he is pope, he could never have led an “exemplary” personal life even if he were a private man who merely attended the Assisi meeting in only his personal capacity. The same is true of countless other events in the pope’s life: e.g., kissing the Koran.

(2) <http://sspx.org/en/news-events/news/good-men-perhaps-poor-fathers-3992>

(3) Fr. le Roux’s 8-12-14 letter, page 2.

RESPONSE 2 :**(Written for TheRecusant.com)**

Michael sat at his kitchen table, perplexed. He put down his copy of Fr. Yves le Roux's 'Letter to Friends and Benefactors,' with his left hand and rubbed his head with his right. Fr. le Roux sounded like such a good and holy man, his letter was jam-packed with pietistic sentiment and pious-sounding vocabulary, the piety almost dripped off the page, reading his words it sounded as though he cared about nothing but the spiritual welfare of his children, and yet... and yet there was something not quite right. He could not say what it was, but something about Fr. le Roux's letter troubled him.

He had barely even heard of "the Resistance" before. But now, thanks to Fr. le Roux, he now wanted to find out more. Why, after all, if important men in the SSPX such as Fr. le Roux were devoting so much time to attacking these people, then the matter must be very serious indeed! Come to think of it, he could not remember the last time he had heard or read such a strong attack on conciliar Rome by Fr. le Roux or the other superiors. It really did seem almost as though these "Resistance" people, whoever they may be, were the main culprits responsible for the crisis in the Church. And Fr. le Roux in his letter had said that they had been at it for two years, perhaps three..! What on earth would possess people, Michael wondered, and not just any people but Traditional Catholics as well, to maintain such a course of pure, destructive evil in the face of all evidence to the contrary? Was it a case of spontaneous mass hysteria? Diabolical possession? Could such people really exist? Worse than that, according to Fr. le Roux, it was not just laity who were involved but priests, religious and even a bishop too! This was very unusual. It was time that he found out more.

He stood up and, with his right hand, he opened his laptop, a sure sign of action and with a look of determined resolve on his face. A very quick internet search for some key words mentioned in Fr. le Roux's letter ("resistance" "Fellay" "Rome""betrayal") brought him to three or four websites. There he began to look for the baseless rumours to which Fr. le Roux had referred. Here was a text, supposedly the work of Bishop Fellay, which seemed to declared that the SSPX accepted Vatican II, the new code of Canon Law and the new Mass. The footnotes were full of references to *Lumen Gentium*, *Dei Verbum* and other Vatican II documents – Bishop Fellay quoting them favourably. He read the document a second time. Nowhere could he see where it actually condemned Vatican II or the new Mass. Was this one of Fr. le Roux's "rumours"?

On the same website was what purported to be a letter from Bishop Fellay to Pope Benedict XVI, in June 2012, just over two years ago. The letter had a wounded, complaining tone. "*Cardial Levada presented me with a doctrinal declaration which I could not sign,*" it read. "*The new text resumes almost all the points that caused difficulty in September 2011...*" That fitted with what he had heard already from the SSPX

authorities themselves. But what was this? *"Unfortunately, in the current context of the Society, the new declaration will not get through."* "Unfortunately"! What on earth could that mean? Was he going mad, or was Bishop Fellay saying that the new, modernist Doctrinal Declaration, the one which the Romans had presented to him, was only bad because he, Bishop Fellay, would not manage to "get it past" the other SSPX members under him? Surely not! This warranted a closer look. He read that last phrase again. On the webpage was a link to the original French. Michael's schoolboy French was rusty from lack of use, but he concentrated carefully until he had found that same sentence in French. *"Malheureusement"* – that must mean unfortunately – *"dans le contexte actuel de la Fraternite"* – the way the Society is at the moment, or something like that – *"le nouvel declaration ne passera pas"* – the new declaration will not pass. What did that mean, if not to suggest that Bishop Fellay was on the side of the Pope and would happily have signed any text, even the final, more openly modernist declaration, but that the need to keep his own followers from guessing what he was up to, had held him back?

Michael sat there staring in front of him. For some unaccountable reason his mind kept returning to many exasperating discussions with his extended family. Every time the elections came around, his uncle and cousins would insist on dutifully turning out to vote for the local representative who was supposedly a 'conservative.' In vain Michael and his wife would try to show them that the man was really nothing of the sort, that like every slimy politician he had voted for every immoral anti-family law going, and that it was only the need to keep some of his own voters happy so as to get himself re-elected which made him put on the pretence by saying some conservative-sounding things every five years when voting day came around. Of course, no matter how hard Michael tried to show them, it never did any good. His uncle and cousins, he suspected, were the sort of people who liked feeling that they were 'making a difference,' and who went to some effort to persuade themselves that things weren't quite as bad as all that. Ah well. What an odd way his mind worked! How had he ended up thinking about them now, he wondered?

If this letter from Bishop Fellay to the Pope were genuine, it presented a problem, and a lot of questions needed answering. Of course, that was an "if", and there was always the possibility that it wasn't genuine. And yet the website claimed that both the Doctrinal Declaration and the letter to Benedict XVI had been taken word-for-word from *Cor Unum*, the official internal bulletin for SSPX priests. Could it really be? That must mean that it was genuine, unless the people behind this website had invented the text and lied about it coming from *Cor Unum*! But then that would be such a big, open lie that Michael wondered why Fr. le Roux did not denounce it specifically!

Here was another website which discussed current goings-on in the SSPX. He quickly found one article claiming to have news of the movement of priests and the

appointment of new District Superiors. Now that surely would fit into the category of rumours, thought Michael to himself. But wait, what was the phrase Fr. le Roux had used several times? "Unverifiable rumours". Well, when the transfer of priests took place in a few days' time on August 15th, he would be able to see if what they claimed was true. This was certainly not "unverifiable"! So it must be that Fr. le Roux had been thinking of something else...

Here was what one website claimed to be a press release from the SSPX last year, when Pope Benedict XVI resigned. It was full of thanks and praise for him for his "strength" and "constancy". Not one word of criticism for this mastermind of Vatican II. Could this be real? He followed the link to DICI, the press agency of the SSPX. Yes it was real enough; it was no rumour, and it was most certainly verifiable. The same thing happened with the SSPX press release full of hope and encouragement a few months into the Pontificate of Francis, and full of condemnation for the prophets of gloom who were not so encouraged by this new Pope. Surely there had been a mistake: this must have been a Fraternity of St. Peter press release which the 'resistance' people had mistakenly thought was a SSPX press release! Again, he followed the link to DICI. It was from the SSPX after all. The source checked out: there it was, fully verified.

Michael began to feel very uneasy indeed. He had been looking for only fifteen minutes and yet he had so far come up with several very worrying documents. And what was worse, they were no more "rumours" than they were "unverifiable." Just one such document would be bad enough, but several? And there were more which he had not yet looked at! He decided to look at just one more website for today, and then give himself time to mentally digest the matter before continuing.

The final website which Michael looked at carried several declarations by priests and religious. Here was an article by Fr. Hewko, here was another by Fr. Faure (the website claimed that Fr. Faure had been the right-hand man and close confidant of Archbishop Lefebvre – could that be, or was this another outrageous resistance lie? Either way, it ought to be verifiable), and another by the Traditional Dominicans of Avrillé in France, and another by Dom Tomas Aquinas OSB, the Benedictine priest who had resisted the sell out of both Le Barroux in 1988 and Campos in 2001.. and another, and another... All sort of different priests and religious, and from all the four corners of the globe. And what was more, they all seemed to say the same thing.

What could possibly be the answer to all this? There was absolutely no rational way of explaining it. None. Except, that is, if..? But no. No, that was unthinkable. Could it possibly be? But if that were so, what could possibly explain Fr. le Roux's pious, fatherly concern for the faithful going on the internet and finding "unverifiable rumours"? What could explain the curious story about a man who,

after looking online, concludes “There is no proof in the accusations...” and finds inner peace as a result? Could Fr. le Roux be honestly mistaken? But for that he would have to be unaware of all those documents, a mere fraction of which Michael had just seen for himself and many of which came from *Cor Unum*. How could a man as prominent as Fr. le Roux not be aware of them? How could he write about a subject if he himself were blissfully ignorant of it? If a fraction of what those websites claimed were true, then it might even look like Fr. le Roux himself had an interest in keeping people from looking, in keeping people ignorant of what was really a matter of great importance.

For a little time now, Michael’s feeling of uneasiness had been growing. (Michael, and we also.) How ironic, he thought to himself, that the character in Fr. le Roux’s story had started off uneasy and had ended feeling calm. Yet here was he, who had started off calm, feeling increasingly uneasy as a result of all this. But after all, he thought, uneasiness can be a good thing, can’t it? What was the name of that 1950s film where the agitated people turn out to be right all along, and the calm people who urged everyone to pay no attention, turn out to be the bad guys? *Invasion of the Body Snatchers*, that was it! It had always been a favourite of his as a boy. And after all, thought Michael, if there really is something worrying going on, I don’t want to feel at peace. How did that old joke go, about grandpa dying peacefully in his sleep unlike the passengers in the back of his car...?

Michael decided that there was one final thing to do to settle the matter. He would give it one last chance, so that he could say he had tried if nothing else, and if he received anything less than a fully satisfactory reply, he would know for sure.

He sat down and began to write: “Dear Fr. le Roux...”



IT COULD BE YOU...!

The Recusant 2014 ‘Fr. le Roux Fiction Contest’

Fancy trying your hand at some Fr. le Roux -style fiction? Why not give it a go! Send in your entry today! Prizes will be awarded and the winning story will be printed in next month’s Recusant. Don’t worry if you think your story sounds a little ridiculous or unrealistic: remember, we aren’t just talking about any style of fiction, this is ‘le Roux fiction’! Lack of realism should never stand in the way of a good story! And humour is always appreciated!



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

(“The Biography of Marcel Lefebvre” p. 568)

Contact us:

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