



The Recusant

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



“Interviewer: What should we think of the Beatification of Paul VI?

Bishop Fellay: **It simply isn’t serious.** The conclusion is that anyone can be a saint, especially if they are pro-Vatican II! Anything to do with Vatican II is now holy, beatified, canonized. Yet again, it is a way of making sanctity banal. It is no longer serious, it just isn’t serious. **It hurts, it hurts us deeply.”** (Emphasis in the original!)

(‘LaPorte Latine’ interview with Bp. Fellay, printed in DICI.304)

Inside:

- **Fideliter: “One Year After the Consecrations”**
(Abp. Lefebvre)
- **“Nothing has Changed!”**
(Fr. Hewko)
- **Austrasia Report V**
(Fr. Chazal)
- **“Blessed” Paul VI - A Weak Response** (Fr. Bruno, OSB)
- **“Diary of an SSPX Faithful”**

FROM THE DESK OF THE EDITOR:

Dear Reader,

First of all, permit me to thank the many of you in various countries who joined us in the all-night vigil of adoration, praying for priests to join the Resistance. The vigil was a success inasmuch as it was well enough attended and a spirit of enthusiasm and optimism were evident throughout, something which many of you may remember from the SSPX of yore but which is, one suspects, sadly lacking in the SSPX of today. We plan to do it again, although this may not be until after Christmas: depending on the availability of a priest.

Beyond that, we shall have to wait and see what the results will be, what Providence has in store for us. One thing which many people

have expressed, and with which I whole-heartedly agree, is that once one has taken the step of not publicly supporting the fallen, heterodox SSPX and of no longer attending their Masses, one appreciates Sunday Mass an awful lot more, since it is less frequent. In a similar way the trials of the Resistance have made many of us appreciate far more the excellent priests which we do have, however few and far between they may be. Remember that a priest is not just someone who is able to say Mass and hear confessions for your convenience, so that you have the comfort of regularity and don’t have to travel too far on Sunday. He is called

“Father” because he is your spiritual father, and like any good father he is meant to take real responsibility for his children, for your spiritual welfare in other words. It is his duty to really care about the state of your soul and your chances of salvation. In order to save his own soul, he must seek to ensure that you save yours: if he does not, and you lose your soul, he stands to lose his. The madness of the modern state with its insistence that mothers must go back to the workplace (an idea which made its debut in Bolshevik Russia almost a century ago), and its “baby farming,” “day-orphanages,” or “childcare” (call it what you will!) has surely proved, if nothing else, that an employee, however dedicated, is no substitute for a genuine parent, the mother, being at home full-time to raise the child. It is surely similar with the spiritual parent, the priest. He is not an employee, his is not a job. He does not have a ‘contract’ or a union, he does negotiate working conditions, hours or rates of pay: like any father who takes care of the welfare of his children, he simply gets on with it and does whatever is necessary, seeing it as his normal duty of state, not so much as his “job” as simply part of who he is. He is the good shepherd who lays down his life for the sheep. Let us note also in passing that the good shepherd goes after any one of the sheep, regardless of which one: even the most annoying, irritating or ungrateful sheep in the entire flock. He imitates the Father in Heaven who makes the sun shine on the crops of the both deserving and the undeserving man.

The “hireling” on the other hand, the paid hand who does not feel a real fatherly responsibility, who sees it as a “job,” a chore which, if it cannot be got out of, is to be completed with as little real love and concern as possible, will always ultimately put his own interests before those of the sheep. We call all priests “father”, but we have all met priests who strike us as less-than-fatherly in the real concern they appear to have for their “children.” If it is the nature of the good shepherd to be self-sacrificing, going so far as to lay down his life for the sheep, then it is the nature of the hireling to be self-interested. My needs come first: I do not mind looking after the sheep, just as long as my own interests do not suffer. However it may appear on the surface, whatever the real life situation, with such a man the interests of the sheep will always come second. It need hardly be said then, that one “good shepherd” is worth a thousand “hirelings”. That is why so relatively few priests can take care of so many souls spread over such a large area. Almost all of the 40-or-so Mass centres in North America are taken care of by only two priests from Kentucky. Here in England, we are visited by priests from Spain and from Austria, each of whom is very much in demand from various different groups closer to home.

It is fairly easy to spot the difference between the two and to tell which is which, provided our judgement is not clouded by other motives. As time goes by, and the decaying corpse of the dead XSPX becomes ever more putrid and rotten, and bits continue to fall off, we can expect to see an increased number of former-SSPX priests at large. The faithful must be on the lookout for spiritual fathers, priests who will really help and complement the work begun by the few priests whom we already have. But we must also be on our guard against the natural human tendency towards selfishness which we all possess. This might take various forms, but with things as they are at present I suspect that for most of us it will take the form of: *“I want my weekly Mass. As long as I get my regular Sunday Mass, I don’t care about the rest of the Resistance or the rest of the world!”* To some extent, of course, this is to be expected: remember that when we sin, what we are in fact doing is choosing an apparent good. The sin lies in placing that good above or before a greater good (ultimately Almighty God). But if evil looked evil, it wouldn’t tempt us. Any temptation which does not come to us under the appearances of good would not be tempting, therefore the devil must make the wrong choice look in

some way like the right one: What could be a stronger temptation than the apparent good of regular Mass, a “normal” parish life, etc? And yet, if it means placing one good above a higher good, if it means that a Resistance priest who could be visiting a larger number of souls is limited to one parish for reasons of “regularity”, “stability”, “normal parish life”, then we must recognise that temptation for what it is, however ‘good’ it appears, and however easy it would be to tell ourselves otherwise. That is why we accept that on many Sundays we will have only Holy Hour and not Mass: we are part of a larger fight. We are not just fighting for ourselves, not just for our family, nor just our parish or Mass centre, but for the Faith across the whole world and for the Social Kingship of Our Lord, and that will necessarily involve no small degree of sacrifice.

That is the situation for the faithful. For the priest, selfishness would likely take a similar form: *“I must have my house to live in and a stipend and a stable group of respectable people (no losers or wierdos!) and a proper chapel in which to say Mass!”* Once again, these are things which appear good and which even are good in and of themselves, but which become evil if they are placed in priority ahead of a greater good. A chapel is better than a rented hall, and ideally all Resistance Mass centres would be in chapels and not rented halls. But if acquiring a chapel for Mass were to mean moving the location of the Mass centre, for example, to a place more difficult for people to get to, then arguably it ought to stay where it is. And if the money required for the purchase of the chapel meant that there was no money spare for plane tickets or other necessities and that as a result fewer groups of faithful received a visit from a priest, then it would certainly be better to wait. It is right for a priest to want ultimately to have a proper parish and everything that goes with it. But it is not right, in such circumstances as our own, for him to begin by seeking those things first, above all other considerations. Furthermore such selfishness on the part of a priest is arguably more serious than selfishness on the part of the laity: the laity are not allowed to be selfish of course, but for a priest it runs directly contrary to the spirit of the priesthood which, as noted above, is of its essence self-sacrificing.

“But what can we do about it? After all, we’re only laity!” Let us remember that during the great Arian heresy, almost all the clergy fell and it was the laity who kept the Faith. Likewise, in this latest crisis the SSPX clergy have by-and-large fallen victim, and it is largely the laity who have stood firm across the globe to defend the Faith. We must have no truck with the “It-must-be-so-because-Father-says-so” or the “We-need-a-priest-to-tell-us-what-to-do-before-we-can-do-it” brand of 20th Century clericalism. This is not Catholic. Pope Pius XI notwithstanding, Catholic Action is the domain of the laity in which the clergy only participate. At the risk of offending anyone, let me further add that some of the finest apostolates were founded by the laity without permission or encouragement from the clergy (and very often in the teeth of opposition from them!) though of course the latter always ‘wanted-in’ once it became a success! In this crisis we are justified - nay, duty bound! - to require any priest whom we come across to show us his credentials, so to speak, up front. Do you accept the Doctrinal Declaration of April 2012? If not, why not? Where do you stand on the SSPX crisis: what, in a few simple sentences, is your doctrinal position vis-à-vis the modern neo-SSPX? What, in a few simple sentences, is the heart of the problem with the neo-SSPX? What do you propose to do about it? Are you prepared to travel to souls, and even if you manage to build up a decent sized Resistance parish would you still be prepared to travel to other souls living further away? In other words: is it the souls themselves whom you care about, or are you only ultimately seeking your own way in life?

...And if he does not give a satisfactory answer, you must not be nice and soft and give him the “benefit of the doubt.” This is one case where doubt is not beneficial; too much is at stake. We are almost (though thank God, not quite!) spiritual orphans, yet we still inhabit the house of the Faith which our parents have since deserted. The Faith is all we have: we must therefore stand firm if we wish Almighty God to send us priests who will also stand firm. And if we are weak and waver, we will be sent priests who are weak and wavery. As with rulers, we will get the priests we deserve.

That is why delinquent or negligent clergy are such a scandal: one leads by example. How much will a child care about his safety or welfare if his parent manifestly does not? What are the chances of a Catholic soul taking their salvation or damnation, their spiritual life, seriously if their spiritual father, be it directly or indirectly, through word or action, shows that he does not? Actions speak louder than words, and the actions of a priest who is self-seeking instead of self-sacrificing are worth more than a thousand sermons on the virtue of selfishness. How can the faithful remain (much less become) generous and tireless fighters for the Faith if they put themselves under priests who are not? The Resistance is starting from scratch with virtually nothing in material terms; the one thing we do have is the right spirit. We must fight to keep it that way, lest we risk losing it.

Our Lady of Mount Carmel Seminary

As time goes on and the XSPX as a source of new priests dries up, the absolute indispensability of a Resistance seminary will become obvious to all. I had the good fortune recently to pay a brief visit to Our Lady of Mt. Carmel Seminary, to spend some time amongst the priests and seminarians and to observe the daily life of the seminary. I now repeat with total conviction what I wrote previously: I am convinced that Our Lady of Mount Carmel Seminary will prove itself the pivot and keystone of the Resistance. Or rather, *it already is*, but this will become more obvious to all as time goes by. Though only just a year-and-a-bit old, the seminary has managed and still manages to overcome great difficulties by little short of a miracle, to survive and to grow: though very poor materially it has a rich spirit of generosity, of selflessness and a confident trust in Divine Providence. It is, without doubt, the most serious and worthwhile thing being undertaken by the Resistance anywhere in the world today, the latter-day Écône of the Resistance, which deserves your wholehearted support, both financially and with prayers. Tuition for the current academic year is \$2,500 per seminarian (of whom there are currently twelve). Future generations of Catholics who will be grateful for the priests formed there, will surely look back with equal gratitude on any support given now for providing of future priests.

Finally, may I once more take the opportunity to wish all our readers, friend and foe alike, a Blessed and Holy Advent, and a Joyful Christmas when it comes around. God bless. - *Editor*



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



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

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

Fr. Hector Bolduc

Susan Horton

Rose Withams

Brian Withams

William Bandlow

Miryam Gomez

Fr. Luigi Villa

Rosalie Chalmers

Gertrude Kendrick

Stephen Power

Geoffrey Kelly

Rose Taylor

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

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

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



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

“One Year After the Consecrations” - An Interview with Archbishop Lefebvre (First published in *Fideliter*, July/August, 1989)

1: Why the consecrations?

Question: Perhaps it would be good to recall why and for what purpose you took the grave decision to consecrate bishops, when you knew at the time that it would cause a violent reaction on the part of Rome. You accepted to run the risk of being excommunicated, of being dismissed as schismatic, because you wished to guarantee, by these consecrations, that the priesthood and the sacraments would continue to be handed on.

Archbishop Lefebvre: Yes, obviously, it was a decision that had to be prepared. The decision was not taken from one day to the next. For several years already, I had been trying to get Rome to understand that as I was advancing in age, I had to ensure my succession. I had to ensure that some day someone would take my place. One can't have seminaries and seminarians without a bishop. The people, too, have need of a bishop to hand down the Faith and the sacraments, especially the sacrament of confirmation. In Rome, they were very well aware of the fact. I alluded to it several times, and finally, I did so in public. No one in Rome can say that I took them by surprise - that they were caught unawares, or that I acted under cover. They were clearly warned several years in advance by letters and by recordings of my sermons which they had in their hands, and by the letter which Bishop de Castro Mayer and myself had addressed to the Holy Father.

I think that is what actually caused a certain change in their attitude towards us. They were afraid of the episcopal consecrations, but they did not believe that I would actually do them. Then, on the 29th of June 1987, when I spoke about them in public, Cardinal Ratzinger was nevertheless a little upset. At Rome, they were afraid that I would really get to consecrating bishops, and that is when they made the decision to be a little more open with regard to what we had always been asking for - that is to say, the Mass, the Sacraments, and the pontifical services according to the 1962 rite of John XXIII. At that moment it seemed that they would not make any demands upon us to go along with the Second Vatican Council. They made no mention of it, and they even alluded to the possibility of our having a bishop who would be my successor.

Now, that was definitely a somewhat profound, radical change on their part. And so the question arose to know what I should do. I went to Rickenbach to see the Superior General and his assistants to ask them: What do you think? Should we accept the hand being offered to us? Or do we refuse it? “For myself, personally,” I said, “I have no confidence in them. For years and years I have been mixing with these people and for years I have been seeing the way in which they act. I have no further confidence in them. However,



Abp. Lefebvre preaching at the 60th anniversary of his priestly ordination: Paris, 1989

I do not wish people within the Society and Traditional circles to be able to say afterwards, you could easily have tried, it would have cost you nothing to enter into discussion and dialogue.” That was the opinion of the Superior General and his assistants. They said, “You must take into consideration the offer which is being made and not neglect it. It’s still worthwhile to talk with them.”

At that moment I accepted to see Cardinal Ratzinger and I insisted strongly to him that someone should come and make a visitation of the Society. I thought that such a visit would result in the benefits of maintaining Tradition being made clear at the same time that its effects would be recognized. I thought that that could have strengthened our position at Rome, and that the requests that I would make to obtain several bishops and a commission in Rome to defend Tradition, would have more chance of succeeding.

Very soon, however, we realized that we were dealing with people who are not honest. Immediately after the visit, as soon as Cardinal Gagnon and Msgr. Perl got back to Rome, we fell under their scorn. Cardinal Gagnon made declarations in the newspapers that were incredible. According to him, 80% of our people would leave us if I went ahead with the episcopal consecrations. We were looking for recognition; Rome was looking for reconciliation and for our recognizing our errors. Those who had made the Visitation to the Society houses said that, after all, they had only seen the externals - that God alone sees what is in men's hearts, and consequently the visit was worth no more than it was worth ...In brief, they were saying things which did not at all correspond to what they had done and said during the visit itself. That seemed unimaginable. Just because they got back to the Vatican and came back under Rome's evil influence, they adopted its mentality all over again and turned on us and scorned us once more.

I nevertheless went to Rome for the conversations, but without any confidence in their success. I wrote at the beginning of the month of January to Fr. Aulagnier: I am convinced that on the 30th of June I will be consecrating bishops. It will be the year of the consecration of bishops because I really have no confidence.

Nevertheless I wished to go as far as possible in order to show what good will we had. That is when they brought up the question of the Council again, which we did not want to hear of. A formula for an agreement was found which was at the very limits of what we could accept.

Then they granted us the Mass and the Sacraments and the liturgical books, but concerning the Roman Commission and the consecration of bishops, they did not want to accept our requests. All we could get was two members out of seven on the Roman Commission - without the president, without the vice-president - and I obtained only one bishop whereas I was asking for three. That was already virtually unacceptable. And, when, even before signing, we asked when we could have this bishop, the answer was evasive or null. They didn't know. November? They didn't know. Christmas? They didn't know ...Impossible to get a date.

That is when, after signing the protocol, which paved the way for an agreement, I sat down and thought. The accumulation of distrust and reticence impelled me to demand the nomination of a bishop for the 30th of June from amongst the three dossiers which I had left in Rome on the 5th of May. Either that, or I would go ahead and consecrate. Faced with such a choice, Cardinal Ratzinger said, “If that's how it is, the protocol is over. It's finished, and there is no more protocol. You are breaking off relations.” It's he who said it, not I.

On the 20th of May, I wrote to the Holy Father, telling him that I had signed the protocol but that I was insistent upon having bishops, and bishops on the 30th of June.

But in fact there was no way of coming to an agreement. While I was facing Cardinal Ratzinger

with that alternative, and while he was saying that he would give us a bishop on the 15th of August, he was asking me for still more dossiers in order that the Holy See might choose a bishop who would meet the requirements laid down by the Vatican. Now, where was that going to lead us?

Realizing the impossibility of coming to an understanding, on the 2nd of June I wrote again to the pope: It is useless to continue these conversations and contacts. We do not have the same purpose. You wish to bring us round to the Council in a reconciliation, and what we want is to be recognized as we are. We wish to continue Tradition as we are doing.

It was over. That was when I took the decision to give the press conference on the 15th of June because I did not wish to act in secret. There can be no durable Tradition without a traditional bishop. That is absolutely indispensable. That is why the Fraternity of St. Peter and Le Barroux are in Wonderland, because they do not have traditional bishops.

2. A bishop for the Fraternity of St. Peter?

Question: The rumour is going around that the Fraternity of St. Peter might be given a bishop.

Archbishop Lefebvre: What bishop? - A bishop that would meet the Vatican's requirements? In that case, they will have a bishop who gently, gently will bring them round to the Council - that's obvious. They will never obtain a bishop who is fully Traditional, opposed to the errors of the Council and to the post-Conciliar reforms. That is why the Fraternity of St. Peter did not, in fact, sign the same protocol as we did, because they do not have a bishop. The protocol that I signed with Cardinal Ratzinger did stipulate that we could have a bishop. And, hence, in a certain way, Rome approved the nomination of a bishop. People say to us: You disobeyed the Holy Father. Disobeyed partially, but not fundamentally. Cardinal Ratzinger gave us the written authorization to have a member of the Society as a bishop. It's true that I consecrated four. But the principle itself of having one or several bishops was granted by the Holy Father. Until proof to the contrary, those who have left us have not obtained any bishop or any representation on the Roman Commission, and so, they have handed themselves over, bound hand and foot, into the hands of the progressives. Under such conditions, they will never manage to maintain Tradition. They say that they are being given everything that they desire, but they are completely deluding themselves.

I think that it was a duty for me and so a necessity for the faithful and for the seminarians to have these traditional bishops.

Once again, I do not think it possible for a community to remain faithful to the Faith and Tradition if the bishops do not have this Faith and fidelity to Tradition. It's impossible. Say what you will, the Church consists first and foremost of bishops. Even if the priests are of your way of thinking, the priests are influenced by the bishops. Whichever way you look at it, the bishops make the priests, and so guide priests, either in the seminaries or in preaching or in retreats or in any number of ways. It is impossible to maintain Tradition with progressive bishops.

Since there was no other way for us to go, I am very happy that we are now assured of having bishops who keep Catholic Tradition and who maintain the Faith. Because it is the Faith that is at stake. It's not a little matter. It's not a matter of a few trifles.

3. "Lefebvre should have stayed in the Church".

Question: Some people say, "Yes, but Archbishop Lefebvre should have accepted an agreement

with Rome because once the Society of St. Pius X had been recognized and the suspensions lifted, he would have been able to act in a more effective manner inside the Church, whereas now he has put himself outside."

Archbishop Lefebvre: Such things are easy to say. To stay inside the Church, or to put oneself inside the Church - what does that mean? Firstly, what Church are we talking about? If you mean the Conciliar Church, then we who have struggled against the Council for twenty years because we want the Catholic Church, we would have to re-enter this Conciliar Church in order, supposedly, to make it Catholic. That is a complete illusion. It is not the subjects that make the superiors, but the superiors who make the subjects.

Amongst the whole Roman Curia, amongst all the world's bishops who are progressives, I would have been completely swamped. I would have been able to do nothing, I could have protected neither the faithful nor the seminarians. Rome would have said to me, "Alright, we'll give you such and such a bishop to carry out the ordinations, and your seminarians will have to accept the professors coming from such and such a diocese." That's impossible. In the Fraternity of St. Peter, they have professors coming from the diocese of Augsburg. Who are these professors? What do they teach?

4. Danger of schism?

Question: Are you not afraid that in the end, when the good Lord will have called you to Him, little by little the split will grow wider and we will find ourselves being confronted with a parallel Church alongside what some call the "visible Church"?

Archbishop Lefebvre: This talk about the "visible Church" on the part of Dom Gerard and Mr. Madiran is childish. It is incredible that anyone can talk of the "visible Church", meaning the Conciliar Church as opposed to the Catholic Church which we are trying to represent and continue. I am not saying that we are the Catholic Church. I have never said so. No one can reproach me with ever having wished to set myself up as pope. But, we truly represent the Catholic Church such as it was before, because we are continuing what it always did. It is we who have the notes of the visible Church: One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic. That is what makes the visible Church.

Mr. Madiran objects: "But the official Church also has Infallibility." However, on the subject of infallibility, we must say, as Fr. Dulac said in a suggestive phrase concerning Pope Paul VI: "When years ago the Church had several popes, one could choose from amongst them. But now we have two popes in one." We have no choice. Each of these recent popes is truly two popes in one. Insofar as they represent Tradition - the Tradition of the popes, the Tradition of infallibility - we are in agreement with the pope. We are attached to him insofar as he continues the succession of Peter, and because of the promises of infallibility which have been made to him. It is we who are attached to his infallibility. But he, even if in certain respects he carries the infallibility within his being pope, nevertheless by his intentions and ideas he is opposed to it because he wants nothing more to do with infallibility. He does not believe in it and he makes no acts stamped with the stamp of infallibility.

That is why they wanted Vatican II to be a pastoral council and not a dogmatic council, because they do not believe in infallibility. They do not want a definitive Truth. The Truth must live and must evolve. It may eventually change with time, with history, with knowledge, etc. ...whereas infallibility fixes a formula once and for all, it makes - stamps - a Truth as unchangeable. That is

something they can't believe in, and that is why we are the supporters of infallibility and the Conciliar Church is not. The Conciliar Church is against infallibility - that's for sure and certain.

Cardinal Ratzinger is against infallibility. The pope is against infallibility by his philosophical formation. Understand me rightly! - We are not against the pope insofar as he represents all the values of the Apostolic See which are unchanging, of the See of Peter, but we are against the pope insofar as he is a modernist who does not believe in his own infallibility, who practices ecumenism. Obviously, we are against the Conciliar Church which is virtually schismatic, even if they deny it. In practice, it is a Church virtually excommunicated because it is a Modernist Church. We are the ones that are excommunicated while and because we wish to remain Catholic, we wish to stay with the Catholic Pope and with the Catholic Church - that is the difference.

For Mr. Madiran, who otherwise has a good grasp of the situation, to say that we are not the "visible Church" - that we are quitting the "visible Church," which is infallible - all that is just words which do not correspond to reality.

5. Necessity of bishops?

Question: Is it possible, Your Excellency, to be neither for or against the consecrations, and even to take no position at all concerning them, and to promote the formation of priests such as you have given an example of in founding Econe, without arriving at the conclusion that seminarians being formed for the Catholic priesthood require Catholic bishops to ordain them?

Archbishop Lefebvre: Those who think like that will have bishops like Bishop de Milleville who arrived in civilian clothing to carry out the ordinations at Fontgombault. Had he given a sermon, I wonder just what he would have said to those seminarians and what example he would have given them. That is no longer the Catholic Church: that is the Conciliar Church with all its unpleasant consequences. They are contributing to the destruction of the Church. It was John XXIII, as Fr. Dulac said, began to be two popes in one. It is he who launched the opening of the Church to the world. From that point on, we entered into ambiguity and two-facedness, the way of acting proper to the liberal.

Hence, I think we should have no hesitation or scruples with regard to these episcopal consecrations. We are neither schismatic nor excommunicated, and we are not against the pope. We are not against the Catholic Church. We are not making a parallel Church. All that is absurd. We are what we have always been - Catholics carrying on. That is all. There is no need to look for unnecessary complications. We are not making, "a little Church," as Paupert wrote in his book, *The Torn-Away Christians*. When you arrive at the end of his book, what he writes makes you shudder: "I no longer know what I am"!

Paupert was a seminarian - maybe a priest - but he lost the Faith and then recovered it more or less, and he inclines to be of a traditional way of thinking, but he is afraid to quit the Conciliar Church. And so, he does not know if he is Catholic or not, whether he is practicing or not. "When I find myself these days in a church, I have the impression that I am not at home. That is why I do not go to Communion."

He is an intelligent man but he finds himself in a sort of cul-de-sac with no way out. It's frightening. And such is the problem of all Catholics who absolutely refuse to take the step over to Tradition. They wish to remain with the occupants of the episcopal sees, with the bishops, but they want to have nothing more to do with the Catholic Faith which they practiced when they were young and which they have not got the will to pick up again. It is truly frightening when one

thinks that millions of Catholics find themselves in this situation. That is why many of them are no longer going to Church on Sunday's, while others are joining sects, or are not practicing anything at all and so are losing the Faith.

6. Cannot the Archbishop backtrack?

Question: In a recently appeared book, "Écône, How To Resolve The Tragedy", Fr. de Margerie advises you to reconcile with Rome, in effect, by accepting what you have always rejected. What do you think?

Archbishop Lefebvre: I do not personally know Fr. de Margerie. He is full of contradictions. It is clear he is highly embarrassed when it comes to defending religious liberty and stating that it is in conformity with Tradition, that there is no rupture. That is an untenable position. Because the leaders of the Conciliar Church, its most outstanding personalities, like for instance the Rector of the University of the Lateran, or, Msgr. Pavan, who is an important man in Rome (it is he who virtually wrote all of the popes' social encyclicals), openly said in May last year at the Congress of Venice, concerning religious liberty: "Yes, something has changed." Others like Cardinal Ratzinger and theologians who have written numerous works on the question strive to prove that the doctrine of Religious Liberty is in continuity with Tradition. In the old days, Liberty was always held in essential relation to Truth. Now, Liberty is related to the human conscience. This means leaving the choice of Truth up to one's conscience. That is the death of the Church. It means introducing the poison of the Revolution, when the Rights of Man are approved by the Church. At least the rector of the University of the Lateran and Msgr. Pavan recognize the fact. The others will say what they like in an effort to keep us quiet. But there it is, written black on white: "The State, civil society, is radically incapable of knowing which is the True Religion." The whole history of the Church, ever since Our Lord, rises up in protest against such a statement. What about Joan of Arc and the saints and all the princes and kings who were saints, who defended the Church - were they incapable of discerning the True Religion? One wonders how anyone can write such enormities!

Then Rome's replies to our objections which we sent to Rome through intermediaries all tended to demonstrate that there was no change, but just continuity of Tradition. These statements are worse than those of the Council's Declaration on Religious Liberty. It is truly officialdom telling lies.

So long as in Rome they stay attached to the ideas of the Council: religious liberty, ecumenism, collegiality ...they are going the wrong way. It is serious because it results in practical consequences. That is what justifies the Pope's visiting Cuba. The Pope visits or receives in audience Communist leaders who are torturers or assassins, or who have Christians' blood on their hands, just as if they were as honest as normal men.

7. Churchmen against Communism?

Question: There has been a break in Cardinal Lustiger's not being able to go to Kiev.

Archbishop Lefebvre: In going to Russia, he thought that Moscow had become Catholic. It's a lack of judgment. The pope, they say, has more or less granted Moscow the right to designate the Ukrainian Patriarch by replacing the present one who himself succeeded Cardinal Slipyj, but of course, the replacement would be a Soviet agent like Pimene.

All of these Catholic visits play into the hands of the Soviets who will end up by getting what

they want, namely, to put the Ukrainians in their pocket by means of a hierarchy under the government's control ...exactly as they did, following on Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary, when they nominated Lekai: the scandal of Lekai! In the old days, all these cardinals and bishops were thrown into prison because they were defending the Catholic religion, but, now, it is they who are throwing into prison the priests who are truly Catholic. We find ourselves in exactly the same situation: the bishops are persecuting us because we remain Catholic. It is not the atheistic government, the socialists, or freemasons who are hounding us down, it is the supposedly Catholic bishops - the Conciliar bishops.

The same thing is happening in the Communist countries. They have the Catholic bishops, bishops who are part of the "Pax Priests" who are in agreement with the Communist government. It's no longer the governments who are doing the persecuting, it is the bishops.

I received a letter from a Hungarian priest who wrote to me: When there are disputes, the government is trying to get the bishop and the priests to agree, and the government plays the role of the "good guy." It's incredible! The pope is causing considerable harm by this way of giving the same respect to error and to vice as to truth and to virtue. It is catastrophic for the little folk. It is the total ruin of all Christian morals, or the very foundation of morality, and even of life in society.

8. Pope defending morals?

Question: John Paul II is defending the unity of the family, he is against the marriage of priests, against abortion. In morals many consider that he is a good pope.

Archbishop Lefebvre: That is true with regard to certain principles of natural morality. Good things are said, but then the priests who are favorable to contraception, for instance, are allowed to go ahead. Nobody takes a strong stand. There are only generic guidelines which are so much a part of natural morals that one could hardly be against. President Bush of the United States is against abortion, so how could the pope be in favor of it?

9. Pope appointing conservatives?

Question: John Paul II has nominated bishops in Austria and elsewhere who are considered as being traditional to such a point that a group of German theologians, backed up by French theologians, are criticizing the pope and rebuking him for it. Recently, also, Cardinal Ratzinger published an instruction with an Oath of Fidelity and a Profession of Faith preceding it. Can't we see here signs of a sort of improvement and a return to more traditional formulas?

Archbishop Lefebvre: I don't think it is a true return to Tradition. Just as in a fight when the troops are going a little too far ahead one holds them back, so they are slightly putting the brakes on the impulse of Vatican II because the supporters of the Council are going too far. Besides, these theologians are wrong to get upset. The bishops concerned - the supposedly conservative bishops - are wholly supportive of the Council and of the post-Conciliar reforms, of ecumenism and of the charismatic movement.

Apparently, they are being a little more moderate and showing slightly more traditional religious sentiment, but it does not go deep. The great fundamental principles of the Council, the errors of the Council, they accept them and put them into practice. That is no problem for them. On the contrary, I would go so far as to say that it is these conservative bishops who treat us the worst. It is they who would the most insistently demand that we submit to the principles of the Council.

No, all of that is tactics, which you have to use in any fight. You have to avoid excesses.

Besides, the pope has just named Msgr. Kasper a bishop in Germany. He was Secretary of the Synod of 1985 presided over by Cardinal Danneels of Brussels. Kasper was the leader, the mastermind, of the Synod. He is very intelligent and he is one of the most dangerous of Conciliarists. He is a little like the bishop of Trier who is President of the German Assembly of Bishops, and who is very dangerous also. They are absolutely men of the left, who, deep down link up with the Rahners and Hans Kungs but who take care not to say so. They keep up appearances in order to avoid being associated by anyone with the extremists, but they have the same spirit. And so, no, I think there is hardly any hope for the moment.

10. Benevolence towards Tradition?

Question: Now what should we think of the attitude of Rome as characterized by Cardinals Ratzinger and Mayer, who, up till now, are showing a certain tolerance towards Le Barroux, towards the Fraternity of St. Vincent Ferrer, towards the Fraternity of St. Peter. Do you think they are sincere? Is it a double game that they will keep up until they have exhausted all other means of rallying other traditionalist groups to Rome and then, once the game is over, those that have been reconciled with Rome will be asked to submit to the Council? Or, should we credit them with taking a turn for the better?

Archbishop Lefebvre: There are plenty of signs showing us that what you are talking about is simply exceptional and temporary. They are not general rules, applying to all priests throughout the world. They are exceptional privileges being granted in precise cases. Thus, what is granted to the Abbey of Fontgombault or to the Sisters of Jouques, or to other monasteries - they do not say it - but it is according to the Indult. Now, the Indult is an exception. It can always be taken back. An indult confirms a general rule. The general rule in this case is the New Mass and the New Liturgy. Hence, it is an exception which is being made for these communities.

We have an example in London where the Cardinal Archbishop has inaugurated three Masses around the Society's church in the capital of Great Britain in order to try to take away our people. "I am trying it for six months," he said. If our faithful begin to leave our centre, he will keep up the experiment. If, on the contrary, the faithful stay with us, he will suppress it. If these Masses are then suppressed, the faithful who have regained a taste for the traditional liturgy will no doubt come over to us.

It seems that Cardinal Lustiger in Paris is envisaging giving a church to the priests who left us, but he would require that New Masses also be celebrated at these churches. In our discussions in Rome with Cardinal Ratzinger, he told me when we were moving towards an agreement, that if authorization was given to use the old liturgy at St. Nicholas du Chardonnet in Paris, there would also have to be New Masses. That was perfectly clear and it clearly shows their state of mind. For them there is no question of abandoning the New Mass. On the contrary. That is obvious. That is why what can look like a concession is in reality merely a manoeuvre to separate us from the largest number of faithful possible. This is the perspective in which they seem to be always giving a little more and even going very far. We must absolutely convince our faithful that it 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. If we have struggled for twenty years to avoid the Conciliar errors, it was not in order, now, to put ourselves in the hands of those professing these errors.

11. The last year

Question: After a year's ministry of the four new bishops that you chose, has everything unfolded as you wished, according to the directives that you gave them in the letter written almost a year in advance of their consecration?

Archbishop Lefebvre: Up to now, it seems that events are unfolding as we wished. We are striving to act in such a way that we cannot be reproached with the bishops' being given a territorial jurisdiction, in such a way that there is no bishop being attributed to such and such a territory. Of course, it's only normal that a French bishop should go to France, and that a German-speaking bishop should go to Germany, but from time to time, we try to bring about an exchange in order to head off that accusation. Of course, it is normal that in the United States, Bishop Williamson should give the confirmations. But Bishop Fellay went to give confirmations in St. Mary's, Kansas, and so one cannot say that the United States are the domain of Bishop Williamson. Bishop Fellay also went to South Africa which had previously been visited by Bishop Williamson. As for Bishop Tissier de Mallerais, he went to South America and to Zaitzkofen in Germany. So, we are striving to establish this principle, that there is no territorial jurisdiction. The four bishops are there to give ordinations and confirmations, to replace me and to do what I did for several years.

For the rest, it is clearly the district superiors who are given a territory which is theirs and who, as far as they can, go to the help of the souls calling for them. For these souls have the right to have the sacraments and the Truth, the right to be saved. And, so we go to their help, and it is the appeal of these souls which grants us the right, as foreseen by Canon Law, to minister to them.

I think we can then thank the good Lord that everything has turned out so well. The feedback reaching us from the faithful proves that they are satisfied and that our bishops are well received.

No doubt we suffered from the departure of some priests and seminarians. But, that is a little like the pilgrimage of Chartres, which this year split in two, into a traditional and a conservative pilgrimage. We may thank the good Lord for having allowed those who are not completely in agreement with us, who do not completely understand what we are fighting for, to leave us. In this way we are stronger and surer in our actions. Without that we would all the time be mixing with people criticizing us, who do not agree with us, within our own congregations, and that would cause division and disorder.

As Fr. Schmidberger, the Superior General, underlined in the last issue of *Fideliter*, we have had a good number of candidates entering our seminaries, the Sisters of the Society, and the other religious traditionalist congregations. And, so, we have not had an unpleasant after-effect of the consecrations, as forecast by certain people who made us fear that there would be a considerable drop in numbers.

12. Feelers towards reconciliation

Question: Did you recently meet Cardinal Thiandoum at his request, and was he seeking to find a way of reconciliation?

Archbishop Lefebvre: It is true, he did insist that I go to see him in Neuilly at the Sisters of St. Thomas of Villanueva, and so I went. He is always very friendly and very affectionate but for the moment there is nothing - nothing on the side of Rome, nothing on the part of Cardinal Thiandoum nor any other cardinal ...There is no sort of opening.

As always, I think that actions are more convincing than words. There are some who say to me, you could easily write a grand letter to the pope. But, for twenty years now, we have been writing

letters which get nowhere. Once again, actions speak louder than words. When we open a seminary or when we create priories, or when we open schools, when the sisters swarm and the convents multiply, that is the only way of forcing Rome to negotiate. It's not a question of my being there, it's a question of the works we do. At Rome, they're well aware that what we're doing is not nothing. The bishops get a little annoyed when we implant ourselves here and there, and so they complain to Rome and Rome knows what's going on.

So I do not think it is opportune to try contacting Rome. I think we must still wait. Wait, unfortunately, for the situation to get still worse on their side. But up till now, they do not want to recognize the fact.

13: Fear of Tradition

Question: If Rome had accepted to give you just one bishop, the protocol of an agreement could have issued in an agreement, and one may be surprised that such a concession, which after all doesn't commit them to very much (one bishop amongst three thousand in the world), should have been refused you.

Archbishop Lefebvre: Yes, it is extraordinary. It can only be explained by their fear of Tradition. It is unbelievable, but they are afraid of a traditional bishop working against the errors of the Council and they cannot bear it.

14. Oath of fidelity

Question: What do you think of the instruction of Cardinal Ratzinger setting up the Oath of Fidelity which includes a Profession of Faith?

Archbishop Lefebvre: Firstly, there is the Credo which poses no problems. The Credo has remained intact. And, so the first and second sections raise no difficulties either. They are well-known things from a theological point of view. It is the third section which is very bad. What it means in practice is lining up on what the bishops of the world today think. In the preamble, besides, it is clearly indicated that this third section has been added because of the spirit of the Council. It refers to the Council and the so-called Magisterium of today, which, of course, is the Magisterium of the followers of the Council. To get rid of the error, they should have added, "...insofar as this Magisterium is in full conformity with Tradition."

As it stands this formula is dangerous. It demonstrates clearly the spirit of these people with whom it is impossible to come to an agreement. It is absolutely ridiculous and false, as certain people have done, to present this Oath of Fidelity as a renewal of the Anti-Modernist Oath suppressed in the wake of the Council. All the poison in this third section which seems to have been made expressly in order to oblige those who have rallied to Rome to sign this profession of Faith and to state their full agreement with the bishops. It is as if in the times of Arianism one had said, "Now you are in agreement with everything that all the Arian bishops think."

No, I am not exaggerating. It is clearly expressed in the introduction. It is sheer trickery. One may ask oneself if in Rome they didn't mean in this way to correct the text of the protocol. Although that protocol is not satisfactory to us, it still seems too much in our favor in Article III of the Doctrinal Declaration because it does not sufficiently express the need to submit to the Council.

And so, I think now they are regaining lost ground. They are no doubt going to have these texts signed by the seminarians of the Fraternity of St. Peter before their ordination and by the priests of the Fraternity, who will then find themselves in the obligation of making an official act of joining the Conciliar Church.

Differently from in the Protocol, in these new texts there is a submission to the Council and all the Conciliar bishops. That is their spirit and no one will change them.

15. Any regrets?

Question: When all is said and done, then, you have no doubts and no regrets?

Archbishop Lefebvre: No, none at all. I think everything that happened was brought about in a truly providential and almost miraculous way.

Many people were urging me - "You're growing old. If you happen to disappear, what will become of us...?" I could have ordained bishops three or four years ago at least. It would even have been reasonable. But, I think that the good Lord wanted things to ripen gently to show Rome clearly that we have done everything we could to manage to obtain the authorization to have truly traditional bishops.

Even while signing the protocol, Rome refused to give us three bishops, and if we had gone on, in practice we would have had every imaginable kind of difficulty. I truly think we had to come to the decision which I took, and we were at the very end of our rope. Our dear friend, Bishop de Castro Mayer, is so tired now that he can no longer say his Mass, and that is less than one year after the consecrations.

I truly think it was all miraculous - his coming, his journey, his admirable Profession of Faith, his acceptance to perform with me the ceremony of the consecration of our bishops ...all that was miraculous. The press did not realize the importance of his being there. But for me and the bishops who were consecrated that was truly quite an exceptional grace. The fact that there were two bishops to consecrate them is very important. As for me, I feel well. I have no grave illness, but nevertheless I feel the tiredness and I am going to be obliged to give up completely performing the ceremonies which I still accept to perform because I no longer have the strength. I would now be quite incapable of making these worldwide journeys as I used to do. They insist on my returning to the Argentine or that I go to the United States to see the new seminary of Winona, but there are limits and I have reached them. I am only going to keep up the things which are not tiring: like a blessing of a chapel, the taking of the veil with the Carmelites, attending a first Mass ...in sum, little, compared with what I used to do before. I can feel clearly that for me, too, the 30th of June of last year was my limit. I think that the good Lord wished things to happen as they happened. All those who attended the ceremony retain an extraordinary memory of it. All of that was providential. What one may hope is that the faithful should become more and more numerous, that they open their eyes and finish by seeing where the Truth is, and recognize that salvation is in Tradition and not in the Conciliar Church which is more and more schismatic.

16: Heaven's Yellow Pages

Question: Of course you realize that your name has disappeared from the latest edition of the *Annuario Pontificio*, the "Papal Year-Book" edited in Rome.

Archbishop Lefebvre: I think that my name has not disappeared from the *Annuario* of the good Lord, at least I hope so, and that is what matters.



OUR LADY of Mt. CARMEL SEMINARY
BOSTON, KY (USA)



THE CHAPEL



MEALS



LESSONS



RECREATION



DIVINE OFFICE



CHORES

DEACONAL ORDINATION, BRAZIL
Br. André OSB, of Santa Cruz Monastery



**All-night Adoration,
London, England**



**Work on the new church
in AIGEN, Austria**



**40-HOURS devotion,
VITTORIA, Brazil**



**Consecration to the
Immaculate Heart of Mary:
CUIDAD JUAREZ, Mexico**



An Extract from a Sermon by Fr. David Hewko

14th September, 2014

Milton, Ontario (Canada)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G_28X4XHt-s



If we want to have the True Mass we must hold the True Faith. How many Orthodox Masses today, Greek Orthodox, Russian Orthodox, Ukrainian Orthodox Masses - they're heretics, they don't have the true Faith. They reject the primacy of Peter. They don't believe that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son. They don't have the Catholic Faith. - but their Masses are valid! It's a mysterious thing. But we cannot go to their Masses. But they're valid. But

they don't hold the True Faith, that's why we cannot go to them. And then also, all those priests who don't hold the True Faith, or those who compromise the True Faith, we cannot go to their Mass.

It sounds difficult. And people do say: "I need the sacraments! We need the Mass! We need Holy Communion!" But there is a grave danger to your Faith if you go to the Indult Mass, the *Motu Proprio* Mass, the Fraternity of St. Peter Mass - and now we have to say also, the Society of St. Pius X Mass. Why? Because the leader, the Superior General has officially, in an official capacity, compromised the Catholic Faith.

And I ask you: pray for Bishop Fellay, pray for his soul. Pray that before he dies, he will publicly reject his betrayal of Our Lord. That he will publicly make reparation for signing that Doctrinal Declaration which if any of us signed, we'd know that we'd compromised the Faith. I know if I had signed it, I'd know I'd go to Hell. Because I would know I had compromised the True Catholic Faith, I'd be saying that the Tradition of the Church can be enlightened by a heretical Council, Vatican II. I can't sign that and hope to save my soul! If I sign a text to say that this thing is legitimate, I betray Our Lord Jesus Christ, I betray all the Popes of Tradition, I betray our founder Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre. So I beg you, pray for Bishop Fellay. What he has done is very serious.

What he has done is to turn the ship - better to use Bishop Williamson's term, the lifeboat because that's all the Society of St. Pius X ever was, it's not the Catholic Church - now, with this Doctrinal Declaration and the General Chapter Statement and the Six Conditions and all the proofs of the modernism of the Society of St. Pius X now, it has turned towards the iceberg, and it has already been ripped open. In 1912 when the Titanic had already been ripped open all along the side and was sinking, all the people above were still busy toasting with their wine and eating their hors-d'oeuvres, and discussing their plans for what they would do when they got to New York. But the Captain knew, he knew they were in big trouble. He didn't say anything, and they were still hoping there was a way they could save the ship, with

all their wonderful, new, modern engineering they could save the ship. But the compartments were filling up one by one and overflowing.

And so the ship was going down and sinking, but it wasn't tilting yet. It was still flat. And the men on board, including the Captain's men were saying: "Well, nothing's changed. Everything's the same." Ever heard that one?

"Nothing has changed!"

- Yes, but what about Bishop Williamson being expelled?

"Nothing has changed!"

- What about the Doctrinal Declaration that betrays the Faith, that overturns the whole fight that the Society was all about?

"Nothing has changed!"

- But it's been signed and sent to Rome, it's alive and kicking!

"Nothing has changed! Everything's the same!"

- What about the letter of Bishop Fellay and the Superiors to the three bishops? Completely modernist ideas, and it even mocks the three bishops!

"Oh, nothing has changed! Everything's the same!"

- OK, well what about the CNS and DIC1 interviews by Bishop Fellay? He actually said 'Well if we have to come under the local bishops, since when is life without difficulties?'

"Nothing has changed! Everything's the same!"

Well, my dear faithful, this is happening! I wish it weren't, because I love the Society of St. Pius X. We all understood the fight, and how Archbishop Lefebvre was prophesied by Our Lady of Quito as the one who would save the Catholic Priesthood and the True Mass. And now it has all been completely overthrown.

And now if you try to bring it up with the lay people or priests, you get told "Nothing has changed! Everything is the same!"

And yet during all that time the Titanic was slowly sinking. And only in the last 45 minutes it tilted, and then part of it broke off. One of the survivors said that at baseball games if they heard the crowd screaming, it reminded them of the terrible screaming in those last 45 minutes, the voices rising in terror as the ship went under. And within five minutes it was completely under. But for hours and hours before "everything" was "the same," nothing appeared to have changed.

And what was the beginning of the disaster? It was hitting the iceberg. What was the disaster for the Society of St. Pius X? It was 2012, the General Chapter Statement which says: "No longer will we wait for Rome to comeback to Catholic Tradition, for the Pope to be perfectly Catholic, we're not going to wait for this any more. Now we're going to seek an agreement despite Rome's conversion."



AUSTRASIAN REPORT V

Dear Father Pfeiffer,

Happy birthday, and two years is not much, but little by little, then more and more, the work of the Archbishop will survive, as the never ending death pangs of the official Society continue.

THE TORPEDOEING OF THE TAJ CHAZAL

Your expression '*Taj Chazal*' was too beautiful to endure in time, so as I returned from my summer vacation journeys to Europe and America, I was signified by Julie Cordova to leave her property. All I want to remember is the great role she played for two years, enabling us to get started. Her strong temper enabled her to take us in without flinching, face down all obstacles, and she took good care of Fr Suelo when he was marooned at the hospital two years ago. But we had to move on. I cannot expel seminarians on demand, even if they commit the irreparable fault of falling out with a powerful Filipina Lola.

On your part, you are also freed from all expulsional charges, but you came and added another flavour of expulsion, as you probably would have been expelled sooner than I was. All my entreaties were in vain, and we were glad to leave with somewhat half of our possessions, wondering what was going to happen to this eight-member micro seminary. But it is always a good test to know if God really wants us, for just as we leave one Julie, another Julie found us a place to rent temporarily in Manila, while in Cebu, a very committed family is donating us one hectare or four acres of land in the mountains, forty minutes from the city.

I was hoping to relocate in Camiguin, on an offered plot as well, but the local authorities would not allow us to settle three kilometres within the radius of the volcano that killed 10,000 sixty years ago. I said "Why not? If our successors don't keep the flame, or become liberal, or sign a deal with the new Rome, let them be blasted away and buried in volcanic ashes!" But there is a better way.

THE MISSIONS

Austrasia has climbed to 40 mission stations of very different kinds and sizes, 10 priests (three in India, four in the Philippines, one in Japan, and two, fairly inactive, in Australia), 6 seminarians (four in the microseminary), and 2000 souls, for your estimate of 1300 in just the Philippines is wildly pfeifferic or just a vision of the future.

INDIA

As usual I can't get my visa to visit India this Christmas, same old cross since 2003, but again, if God wants me in, it should be no problem once the crucifying formalities are completed. I cannot say much about what is going on over there, except that groups are holding fine and that Fr Valan is building his priory in the village of RN Kandighai, to be joined by Dr Suneel hopefully, once his couple of seminary years are completed in Pfeifferville. Fr Valan is willing to erect Austrasia as a Marian Corps District, but i am not in a hurry, while it does indeed sound good.

SINGAPORE AND MALAYSIA

Nothing much to report from there except the usual liberalization signs of the XSPX, like Fr. Stehlin's inculturated idea of the Chinese lamps and moon cakes on the Nativity of our Lady, as the day coincided with the pagan moon cake festival...

Fr Picot will cover these groups while commuting to Australia. Maybe it is the moon cakes, but he had a good Sunday attendance.

KOREA AND JAPAN

Last Sunday 31 souls attended the mass, another milestone, and there was one adult baptism. Two babies are on the way, and there are good grounds for future growth. A rejected Korean seminarian has joined the micro seminary; he was a marine, so welcome to the Marian Corps. The issue was just to get him a dispensation from His Lordship, which he granted, for I think the grounds are sufficient. Then the XSPX scrambled to propose him an alternative path when they realised the blunder, but too late, for he did not join the chapel alone. This week we are doing the annual pilgrimage to Mirinae to pray for the conversion of the rest of Korea, a dying country, like Japan... dying from our western imported liberalism and modernism.

In Japan new people are showing up at last, so a group is constituted in Yamato, to pair it with the Tokyo group of Fr Nariai. In the past reports, we were hoping to convert a protestant family, a truck driver, a couple of ladies, and some others in the space of two years. It was all to no avail, but now some fruits are beginning to show.

THE PHILIPPINES

The groups are as follows: *Bulacan, Quezon City, Cavite, Legazpi, Iloilo, Cebu* (four small sub groups), *Dagohoy, Ormoc, Hindang, Maasin, Santa Cruz, Lilo-An, Camiguin, Illigan, and Zamboanga*. Concerning the seminary, you are getting your way, for Cebu is at the centre of all these destinations and is an international airport with flights even to Korea.

1-3 Manila area

The apostolate has switched to a higher gear of late, because we have calls in three places, north, middle and south. I am not sure if the opportunity for us to say Mass in Quezon will continue, but we had eighty people there, all coming from the Novus Ordo, and some showing interest, but all this hangs on the good will of the 'co-ordinatrix' who is running those Sunday seminars... but nearby there are a few souls from a defunct Latin Mass group that was run by one of our most powerful supporters who lives actually in Switzerland. The northern group in Bulacan is also very green, same as the southern group in Cavite. but it is perhaps this last group that is going to achieve the breakthrough, for they survived very well the Novus Ordo counter attack, 50 of them showing up after they were forbidden to use their own Barangay chapel, then 60 at the basketball court Sunday Mass. Nearby there is a family of five children (something rare now in Manila), that wants to constitute a chapel, but the results are minimal so far. Still I admire them because they reject all form of family planning. A group is also asking in Las Pinas, so it helps us to be on site for a few months. They are moving to Zamboanga. The situation remains fluid in Manila.

The seminary is operating at the moment in two rented houses in Quezon City, north of Manila, and I am very sure my American readers understand the plight we are in, because there are no places to order pizzas in this poor district.

4. Legazpi

That city is famous for its splendid Mayon volcano, that puffed gently while I was there. Through Ariel, my facebook crusader, five Lolos have elected to call us, and were enchanted to discover what was lost. I shall return in December, and local families are getting interested. With my spare time I did some tourism, and the place is loaded with masonic references, including a masonic obelisk on the beachfront, whose symbols I explained to our minuscule microgroup there.

5. Iloilo

As you know, Iloilo is very small, but I just celebrated a marriage of two poor tailors, who, in return, are going to stitch 10 cassocks and surplices from the materials I gave them. There might be another marriage there, so the future has something good in store from the old parish of Fr. Pfeiffer. As ever, I tell them that children alone shall save us from extinction. We are going to improve the chapel further, thanks to the kindness of Philip.

6. Cebu

And there is no dearth of children in Cebu, where we are building our new home. The locals are already contemplating having a school run by us (I mean some of our teaching parishioners), and I have my own idea about it already. The plot donated to us is ideal, with delicious tasting running spring water, in a cool valley not infested with mosquitoes, but with some local noise pollution. We have low construction costs because we are totally out of the city, yet with good costs for the materials (150 pesos per top grade cement bag they say, and rebar is not so expensive as well) because the city is close enough. The gradient is very steep, and we shall have to build a pathway, that will double as a way of the cross but that will give an impressive touch to the whole project. I noticed also the beautiful orange stones that abound there, for free, and perhaps I shall execute the monastic architectural plans that were ordered by Fr Patrick Summers in 2007. Whenever practicable, I shall commence with a stone Church, because Christ is the Stone. Cardboard seminary yes, but the construction of a stone church will begin as soon as possible. On a big gradient, that supposes either a crypt sitting on top of other spaces as well, or a smaller design, yet full of sacred expression, hanging on the side of the mountain.

But for the moment, we are building micro, with chapel and priests rooms on top, seminarians classrooms and utilities below. While I was wondering if we were able to recover the wonderfully carved Hearts of the main Altar of Batangas, I thought if we do, we shall call the Seminary "*Cordium Iesu et Mariae Seminarium*" or "Hearts of Jesus and Mary Seminary". But we are just levelling the ground and digging the septic tanks and putting the concrete pillars right now, hoping to get away, in the end, around 25 000 dollars, all financed from Aurasia.

7. Dagohoy

Thanks to your covering of Romeo's dialysis costs, he seems fit to start building again, and I might use him in Cebu, for the stone church. The group is steady.

8. Ormoc

We are still looking for an adequate place to buy.

9.10.11. Hindang, Maasin, Santa Cruz

The bamboo cathedral is almost finished, and the axis Maasin, Hindang, Ormoc is getting Sunday mass twice a month.

12. Liloan

The whole group is in hibernation, I might go there as soon as the people there pick up their courage against the local priestly dragon and the local finger pointing. The seminarian that came from there already left. Liloan might end up like other attempts in Bagio, Tanay, your attempt in Davao, because we cannot win every battle, even while doing our hardest.

13. Camiguin

They eventually did not get selected for the seminary, because I am unwilling to build except on donated land. I left the biggest seminary bell for their newly built chapel. The group there is thriving, about 50, but when I came, the rains cut the attendance to 28. Some construction was going on there, and I was told about a big priest from Kentucky who got those walls up to one meter, leaving a big financial innuendo... Don't worry, we will pump the means to finish what you began quickly and nicely.

14. 15. Illigan, Zamboanga

Like Camiguin, they are asking a Bishop's visit, because when Bishop Tissier came, confirmations were given only in Cagayan de Oro, but poor people don't move that easily, especially weak neophytes and Cagayan is half a day away from our chapel.

Zamboanga needs the same, and they are looking for a place, and as soon as they do, we shall bamboo cathedral everything into submission.

More or less, all places are feeling the dearth of Bishop's visits...

AUSTRALIA

And none more than Australia.

Holding strongly in 8 places, if we include New Zealand.

Fr Picot is now in charge. He is the priest who had a cup of tea directly with Bishop Fellay, before making his mind. You were advising against, but I think it is the best, because he leads the Society, and there is no better way to know where it is going, and then decide. Basically he told His Lordship that he lied in 2007, 2009 and 2012, and His Lordship was not pleased, and moreover, he maintained that the AFD is a good text when read in its context, and that it is because of our ill will that we make it a bad text. But we can admit that it was very kind of Bishop Fellay to talk for almost three hours with his priest, but there are no signs of improvement in Menzingen... and there probably won't be.

In Australia and New Zealand, the thing that shocked me the most is the many testimonies to the fact that the schools of the Society have become more a liability to the Faith than an asset. They still have a capacity to hold most families in the pews of the sinking ship, but, many parents are beginning to realize that this is the beginning of the end. Interestingly Fr. Nely made a canonical visit to the school of Tynong, sat in a girls' class, and asked "What's the problem with the school?" A girl replied "What's the problem with the Society?" ... Ouch!

Brisbane is the biggest entity of the resistance and Fr. Picot has elected to take his (postal) residence there. But Tynong is still growing further, and Fr. Picot expects a mainstream counter attack over there.

Brilliant and large families are also joining sooner than expected in New Zealand, pledging to cut all ties with the XSPX, which attitude I can only recommend, but not yet enforce. This has drawn us some flak from certain, but it worth the cost, because the death of the Society is gradual. And I

have clearly seen that some were able to convince others to join the resistance by warning others who are still lingering on RMS Titanic. At this stage, if someone is not fighting the new course, or not stopping to support the XSPX financially, or not informing people sitting next to him, or not cooperating actively with the resistance, as Fr Couture famously endorsed in Cebu, he should not sit on the fence, or he is actually bleeding to death on the barbwire.

But the groups are holding very well down under, especially Melbourne, Brisbane and now Wanganui. If we get two more priests, we will open a priory down there, but not before, so as not to curtail the faculty of the Seminary, but if one more priest joins, we will increase the visits, nay, double the frequency.

DOCTRINAL MATTERS

THE CONCILIAR CHURCH AND THE RECONCILIAR SOCIETY

For centuries now, it has been always the same story. The liberal hopes to convert the Devil by reconciling, and on this path of reconciliation, Bishop Fellay is now informing that after the successful reconciliational talks with Cardinal Muller, Novus Ordo bishops are now expected to visit the houses of the XSPX, informally of course, with nothing bad in view, just to say how do you do, like in the wonderful world of Louis Armstrong.

Note also how intent Bishop Fellay is in stressing the “differences that still separates us” with the to-be-reconciled-with entities. That sounds determined, but it is part of the reconciliation process itself. Pope Francis loves these kind of challenges, for his mind (and his hungry jaw) is so open minded as to meet and befriend anyone without being judgemental, as long as the one who comes agrees to work on the above-stated differences, in a reconciliational spirit, because we are all on a path to the truth, out there, beyond the rainbow, [or over the rainbow, I don't really care].

Now the little oysters are asking to retort. (For those who are not familiar with the Walrus and Carpenter in Alice in the Wonderland, please refer to Bishop Williamson's hermeneutics on this question, or simply read the text which is not that long to read). Yes! The little oysters are saying that they stood bravely on the plate and were not eaten, and that on the promise that they would be allowed to state their differences plainly and clearly, they would return to the plate with all others musterable oysters to make one last stand and bring this treasure of what they are, and as they are, to the Church. Fr. Picot says the hellish synod might accelerate the oysters' desire to help their host to keep Tradition, instead of turning them away from the plate...

Having just eaten the 300 oysters -strong *Franciscans of the Immaculate*, the Walrus confided to the Carpenter that more steps were required to make space for the next meal, and that the differences that still remain with the other oysters could eventually be overcome gradually, and that this prudent path is in line with the digestion requirements of any hungry person.

The other thing is the *General Council of Oysters* prefers to go step by step, for fear of scaring oysters away from the plate. A formal agreement to march into the plate was not possible, so it is better to make individual visits of walruses to the oyster racks, while the canonical arrangement of the plate, silverware, bread and butter and fine white wine is made in the meantime.

This is the Fr. Nely approach, a grassroot, case by case, *de facto* reconciliation. It enables them to ignore indefinitely what goes on in Rome. The impossible becomes possible incrementally. Doctrine is just brushed aside by the facts with Fr. Nely, or perhaps talked of in a passing way, over a glass of *Ballantines*, *Glenmorangie*, *Jameson* or *Blue Label*.

Whereas with Bishop Fellay the approach is the opposite (seemingly). It caters to the need to say that the XSPX remains doctrinally sound, so that if we join Rome it will be to tell them better and fuller how wrong they are to eat oysters and mash Catholic doctrine and morality. But the response of Menzinger to the Synod was so weak ("Reservations" instead of outright condemnation, no mention of heresies, and no pointed reference to the main culprit, Francis) that one doubts that they crush heresies in the palaces of Rome, or if they try it, they would do it with polite concerns and soft requests for change we can believe in.

The Pflugerian way involves dialogue as well, but recognizes that we will not agree; that the Novus Ordo has no plans to change, so we just need to adapt and join them in order to make our voice heard. It is a *de facto* doctrinal gradualism. They are there, we cannot ask them to change it upfrontally.

So the group of oysters is presented with a threefold simultaneous way of engaging dialogue. You can complain about the *Plugerian* or *Nely-esque* approach, but you will have to choose the *Fellaysian* one as a firm and uncompromising one in the end. The three positions claim that Charity is on their side, because the intent is to help the Church, by helping the Walrus and the Carpenter to accept their better self.

But my question is: how can something so stupid be planned so intelligently, for the last time I saw, especially when I ate oysters, they had no brains...?

This is Liberalism, *Ecce Liberalismum*.

The official reaction to the Synod was lame.

Also, villains like Cardinal Muller are bought as "conservatives," "friends in Rome," all the while Muller does a very sloppy job at playing the conservative. Their writings are recommended on DICI. With friends like these...

In the meantime: how can one fail to see the obvious...

A SATANIC SYNOD

Vatican III is already upon us, at the hands of the self styled "Synodal Pope". It was textbook revolution. A repeat of what we read in Ralf Wiltgen's book *"The Rhine flows into the Tiber"* with the exception that the Plata river has joined the Rhine, and the rearguard is Polish, African, and from some other isolated places. Conservative elements were allowed to show their token complaints, allowing a more open and pluralistic debate to take place, but the truth that comes from below has to prevail. The Church is turning "gay", divorcish, and morally gradual: that is the reality that takes place and such reality in turn becomes official. Vatican II says the Church is the People of God, Francis just applies this principle. The train is leaving, now if conservatives like Fr. Nely are not interested they can step down, or they can stay and endeavour to persevere...

The reality we are facing now in the conciliar church is even worse than we were expecting of this so called Synod "on the family" with the unimaginable pretence that the rights of little children are going to be respected, while throwing them into homosexual couples, with all the depravities that this alone entails, and with all the abominations taking place with surrogate mothers, (IVF, i.e. plenty of abortions, eugenics, trafficking, abuse of third world women etc.).

And how can one be in favour of the family while condoning so openly divorce, for the first time in the History of a Church which lost one of its most powerful nations, just on the question of the divorce of one man, Henry VIII?

Gradualism means that if you sin, and plan to sin further, as long as you are in the process of hoping to do something about it, you are accepted, nay welcomed. You are just a prisoner of your own device, we'll help you along as you are, and wherever you are, either on the "gay" planet, or on the Lefebvrian planet. We are all pilgrims of truth, said Pope Benedict to the Lutherans.

Typically, the president of the Polish Episcopal Conference stated that this was a departure from the teachings of His Holiness Saint John Paul Two The Great. The most controversial paragraphs were turned down temporarily and by a whisker (64% voted in favour of the text on homosexuals, some voted against because there was not enough for them). So Pope Francis maintained the infamous paragraphs and the whole text of the "*Relatio post discepcionem*" remains open for public debate until next year, sayeth Mgr. Forte, the special secretary, and it is the Pope who has the final say. Note well that these infamous paragraphs fell short of the two third majority but got always a comfortable absolute majority. It will pass easily in the second round, and Francis is clearly saying that those against are Pharisees who will have to obey the "God of surprises".

The mentor of Pope Francis is more Saint Paul-The-Sixth-The-Greater-Than-John-Paul-Two-The-Great, a Pope who showed his skill at facing down people of the past to impose the new aggrornamento. Just like in Vatican II, if the necessary votes are not gathered, the whole matter is thrown again into successive rounds of debate until it passes with faint conservative amendments.

What matters is that the new ideas get floated for the first time in the full view of the world with the endorsement of the supreme authority of the Catholic Church. Opposition is allowed to swing in its turn, only to be defeated and chopped into the weaker recyclable half and the irreducible ones, who get taken care of later, like the good old SSPX.

Note the conservative types thrown at us like Cardinal Muller who has stated that the Virginity of Our Lady is not a physical reality, or Cardinal Napier who says the text is incomplete because it should allow communion to polygamists as well. Conservatives of Vatican III match perfectly the ultra-liberals of Vatican II. In any case, many voters did not approve the controversial paragraphs for reasons of procedure only, and not of content. The whole thing is totally choreographed from the start, including the conservative opposition to it. It is the Pope who appoints the moderators of the Synod and chooses its members at every consistory of Cardinals, removing the old, and promoting the surprises. The Pope orders the demagogic polls and stirs the pot by his scandalous declarations ahead of the Synod. Are the conservatives shocked at the beatification of Paul VI? Well, they should follow the example of the conservative Benedict XVI who duly attended the ceremony and endorsed it... Isn't he slated as number three for takeoff after the "canonization" of Paul VI, John-Paul I? And there will be plenty more of unsavoury "canonizations" to swallow from now on.

Did those conservatives really believe that Revolution would stop? If they did it was useful of them to believe so, to recycle gradually the reactionary elements, but now the horses of Mephysto have to gallop further. All along they are made part of the revolutionary process that needs opposition to keep not just some spice in the debate but a focus on its principles and needs always an enemy to position its weapons better, like "target designation" in warfare.

There is only one last stop for Revolution, and it is Hell. You can check in any time you want, but you can never leave. So come and check into my train, any time you want, sayeth Pope Franshisssss!

In Iesu et Maria,

François Chazal+

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.

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

(As of 7th November, 2014)

Priests:

District of Great Britain: 1

Faithful:

Great Britain: 20

Canada: 22

Scandinavia: 2

Spain 1

Australia 3

Ireland 5

Singapore 3

USA 4

"Blessed" Paul VI - A Weak Response

[Editor's note - below is the text of the official SSPX response to the conciliar "beatification" or Pope Paul VI, which can be found at <http://www.dici.org/en/news/communiqué-of-the-superior-general-of-the-society-of-saint-pius-x-on-the-beatification-of-pope-paul-vi/> and <http://sspx.org/en/news-events/news/reservations-beatifying-pope-paul-vi-5251> On the opposite page is a text written in response to this by Fr. Bruno OSB, taken from the French website francefidele.fr.]



Communiqué of the General House of the Society of Saint Pius X on the Beatification of Pope Paul VI

On October 19, 2014, at the close of the Extraordinary Synod on the family, Pope Francis will go forward with the beatification of Pope Paul VI. The Society of Saint Pius X wishes to express serious reservations concerning beatifications and canonizations of recent popes, whose rushed proceedings dispense with the wisdom of the Church's centuries-old rules.

It is true that Paul VI was responsible for the encyclical *Humanae Vitae*, which letter instructed and consoled the Catholic family at a time when the most basic principles of marriage were under bitter attack. So they are again, and in a scandalous fashion, by certain members of the present Synod.

But Paul VI is also the Pope who saw Vatican II to its conclusion, thereby introducing in the Church a doctrinal liberalism manifested especially in errors such as religious liberty, collegiality, and ecumenism. The result was an upheaval which he himself admitted on December 7, 1968, in the following words: "The Church is now confronted with uncertainty, self-criticism, one might almost say self-destruction. As if the Church were doing violence to Herself." The following year he conceded: "In many areas the Council has not yet put us at peace; it has rather stirred up trouble and difficulties which are useless for reinforcing the Kingdom of God in the Church and in souls." He went so far as to give this dire warning on July 29, 1972: "The smoke of Satan has entered the temple of God through some crack: doubt, incertitude, dissension, worry, discontent, and conflict are plain to see..." But he was merely stating a fact, while failing to take those measures capable of stopping the self-destruction.

Paul VI is the Pope who imposed a liturgical reform of the rites of Mass the other sacraments for reasons inspired by ecumenism. Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci denounced this new Mass because it departed "significantly, on the whole and in its details, from Catholic theology of the holy Mass as formulated during the 22nd session of the Council of Trent." Along the same lines Archbishop Lefebvre said that the new Mass was "infused with a protestant spirit" which is a "poison inimical to the Faith."

Under his pontificate many priests and religious were persecuted, and even condemned, for their fidelity to the Tridentine Mass. The Priestly Society of Saint Pius X remembers with great sorrow the condemnation of 1976 whereby Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre found himself *suspens a divinis* because of his attachment to that Mass and his categorical refusal of the reforms. Only in 2007, with the issuance of Pope Benedict XVI's *motu proprio*, was it finally admitted that the Tridentine Mass had never been abrogated.

Following in the footsteps of its founder, the Society of Saint Pius X declares yet again its attachment to the Church's two thousand-year-old Tradition, convinced that such fidelity, far from vain nostalgia, in fact provides an apt remedy to the Church's self-destruction.

Given at Menzingen October 17, 2014

Response by Fr. Bruno OSB :

On 17th October there appeared a communiqué from the General House of the SSPX regarding the Beatification of Paul VI. Here are some of our thoughts on this document.

"The Society of Saint Pius X wishes to express serious reservations concerning the beatifications and canonizations of recent popes."

Here we find the same language as in the (all too rare) official texts concerning the "canonisations" of 27th April last: questions, doubts, reservations, perplexity were all expressed about it... Bishop Fellay did not talk about pseudo-canonisations, nor "canonisations" in inverted commas. He did not say clearly whether these canonisations were true or false, valid or not, but only that they were "not serious" or that they "present a problem."

Here it is the same: we see that the SSPX expresses only "reservations" – however "serious" they may be – on the very eve of the "beatification" of the Pope of the new Mass! Does the General House think that the act which Pope Francis is preparing for the 19th October will be valid? If not, why do they not use inverted commas, and why not declare frankly that there will be no "Blessed Paul VI," as we did in our communiqué of 13th October?

The SSPX expresses "reservations": it does not manifest its indignation, it does not denounce the scandal as such.

Let us note amongst other things that, since the communiqué comes from the General House, Bishop Fellay has not engaged himself personally. And yet did he not have a duty, both as Superior General of the Society founded by Archbishop Lefebvre to fight for the Catholic Faith, and also as a Catholic Bishop, to take up a clear personal position in such grave circumstances?

"It is true that Paul VI was responsible for the encyclical Humanae Vitae, which letter instructed and consoled the Catholic family at a time when the most basic principles of marriage were under bitter attack."

The "most basic principles of marriage" were "under bitter attack" by the Second Vatican Council, to be precise by the constitution *Gaudium et Spes*, promulgated by... ..Paul VI, on the 7th December 1965. This constitution changed the definition of marriage and opened the way to the inversion of the ends of marriage in the new "code". Three years after *Gaudium et Spes*, the encyclical *Humanae Vitae* did not re-establish "the most basic principles of marriage," hence the weakness and contradictions of this document which condemns contraception. The study of *Humanae Vitae* which appeared in *Sel de la Terre* 75 is useful in helping to understand that this encyclical did not "instruct" and "console" Catholic families in the way they needed.

"So they are again, and in a scandalous fashion, by certain members of the present Synod."

And the Pope? We know the support which he has been giving to Cardinal Kasper and to the other revolutionaries.

We appreciate the euphemisms of the next paragraph, concerning the Council: "doctrinal liberalism" (Is that all?) "upheaval" (was the French revolution, to which Vatican II was compared, a simple matter of an "upheaval"?)

The paragraph on the New Mass is equally timid. It quotes two expressions of Archbishop Lefebvre: they are careful not to choose the most energetic ones.

The paragraph after that, cleverly formulated, lets it be understood – without actually saying so – that the *Motu Proprio* of 2007 was the happy conclusion of Archbishop Lefebvre's combat. Moreover, it is wrong to say, without giving any more details, that this *Motu Proprio* "admitted that the Tridentine Mass had never been abrogated."

In the last paragraph, "Following in the footsteps of its founder, the Society of Saint Pius X declares yet again its attachment to the Church's two thousand-year-old Tradition..." But it omits to renew, "following its founder", its refusal to follow the Rome of neo-modernist and neo-Protestant tendencies (Declaration of 21st November, 1974). This is not the first time, alas, that we note this sort of thing. Is not a hatred of error the touchstone of a love of the truth?

We hope that certain priests of the SSPX, this Sunday 19th October, will not be content with expressing "serious reservations," but will vigorously denounce the very grave scandal which is the "beatification" by Pope Francis of his predecessor of unhappy memory.

Our Lady of Mt. Carmel Seminary:

olmcs.jimdo.com

Other Useful Websites:

www.inthissignyoushallconquer.com

www.ecclesiamilitans.com

www.truetrad.com

www.sacrificium.org

www.archbishoplefebvre.com

www.resistere.org

filiimariae.over-blog.com

(French)

cristiadatradicinalista.blogspot.co.uk/

(French)

nonpossumus-vcr.blogspot.co.uk

(Spanish)

www.beneditinos.org.br

(Portuguese)

rex.cz.blogspot.cz

(Czech)

We are grateful to another of our readers for sending us the following. Although the diary itself is fictional, it contains less fiction than you might think... This author's name will also be engraved on the special plaque in Fr. le Roux's bedroom at the new seminary, although, surprisingly, it is taking a little longer to negotiate this prize than we anticipated...)

Diary of an SSPX Faithful

October 2014

George sent me an email today. He said he still goes to the "Resistance". He's going to send me another Recusant. I'll throw it away like the last one. He says he's adding milk goats to his small farm. What they harvest from their large garden feeds them through winter along with the cow, pig and chickens they butcher. He says they still love homeschooling and the kids do most of the farm work. I bet that's a lie. Anyhow, I could never live in the country. I've always been a city slicker.

November 2014

The SSPX made the deal with Rome! Father announced it from the pulpit today. He said nothing much will change. "We're still the same ol' SSPX." That's good.

December 2014

It's been one month now since the deal with Rome. It's great how uncle Jo and some other relatives have begun writing and calling us, now that we're not outside the Church any more. Father announced that they'll begin saying the hybrid Mass next week and asked for male volunteers to be lectors, but he promised we'd never have women lectors and never altar girls either. They'd better not! I'll never be a lector... ..or at least, I don't think so...?

Christmas Day 2014

There was no Midnight Mass. The rules for the Hybrid Mass allow the priest to forgo the Midnight Mass in case of necessity (such as if the priest and faithful are too tired). So we didn't have it. Too bad! That was always the highlight of Christmas for us. We went to the 9.00am Mass. The choir sang "Santa Claus is coming to town" for the entrance hymn and "Jingle Bells" for the Offertory. A few of us questioned the choir director about it after Mass and she said Father approved it because Santa Claus is really St. Nicholas and he is a "type" of Christ and so "Santa Claus is coming to town" is really "Jesus is coming to Bethlehem" and "Jingle Bells" refers to the bells rung at the Offertory in the Hybrid Mass. I heard that the Resistance priest flew all the way over from Kentucky to offer Midnight Mass for his flock. He must really love them.

March 2015

Another couple at church is getting divorced. I can't believe it! That's the fourth one this year and it is only March!

April 2015

I've been corresponding a lot more with George. He told me to read p.513 of 'Marcel Lefebvre: The Biography' by Bishop Tissier. Archbishop Lefebvre preached before ten

thousand faithful calling for a new crusade. It was the occasion of his Priestly Jubilee at the *Porte de Versailles* in Paris, 1979. He said the crusade would rebuild Christianity. Families were to consecrate their homes to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, pray as a family and “accept many children as a most beautiful gift from God.” He asked them to home school if possible and go back to the land “which is healthy, brings one closer to God, evens out temperaments and encourages one to work.” Then he asked his priests to support the crusade. Well, they really dropped the ball on that one. The only person I heard speak about getting back to the land over the years was Bishop Williamson. I wonder why the SSPX priests don’t foster this way of thinking?

May 2015

George sent me another Recusant. I skimmed through it. I don’t see how we could ever join the “Resistance”. We just can’t be counter-revolutionary; we’d lose all our friends. Father said we’re going to have women lectors because not enough men want to do it.

June 2015

I tried to go to Confession last night but there was a sign in the vestibule saying that Confessions were cancelled. There were quiet a few other parishioners there and we were all puzzled and disappointed. Since ours is one of the largest parishes in the SSPX with six resident priests, Confessions are never cancelled. Today, I found out that all the priests were out on a dinner cruise with the entire school faculty to celebrate the end of the school year. *That’s more important than the Sacrament of Penance?*

July 2015

I’ve been reading Archbishop Lefebvre’s *Spiritual Journey*, which he wrote at the end of his life. On page 21 he asks priests to encourage the faithful to leave the cities, which are places of scandal and perdition and move to the country and to take advantage of correspondence courses for the religious and secular education of their children. Maybe I should have bought that 20 acres bordering George’s property ten years ago. He sure was trying to talk me into it. I could have taken that computer job opening and worked at home. And Rita, just 7 years old then, could have had the horse and sheep she always wanted. But no, we would’ve had to home school and Father told us homeschooling was wrong and we should stay in town and support the schools. Well, at least our kids have gone to Catholic schools from K.G. up. We’re blessed.

September 2015

Anthony is in 10th grade this year and we’re finally going to get him his own computer. He needs to use the internet for high school. I just hope he doesn’t misuse it. The priests never mention anything about that anymore, so it must not really be an issue. I’m just glad Anthony is into sports and not girls.

October 2015

Father’s sermon today was on “Temptation”. He said it is helpful to expose our children to temptation and occasions of sin, that it makes them stronger. I questioned our pastor about it and he confirmed the teaching adding that even proximate occasions of grave sin was fine. I guess I don’t need to worry about Anthony and the internet any more.

November 2015

Anthony seems obsessed with sports. It's all he ever talks about, almost like a religion to him. What upsets me is, he'd rather go to hockey practice than Mass... and the competition is so cut-throat. George's son, the one who wants to be a priest, has a part-time job on a cattle ranch. I doubt he has ever seen a hockey game.

Christmas Day 2015

The 9.00am Mass was a "Children's Mass". Father was dressed up as St. Nicholas and at the Offertory he "offered" candy to the children as they sat on his lap at the communion rail. Then he changed into his vestments and continued the Mass.

January 2016

I'm worried about Rita. Her teacher, Sister Rose, has been talking about careers in religion class lately. I guess, as seniors, it's something they need to think about. But Rita and some of her friends think they want to join the Armed Forces. As Sister sees it, they'd be practising the virtues of courage and magnanimity by joining the military. Rita always wanted to be a mom and have ten kids, but she never talks about marriage and motherhood any more. Her best friend, Annie, wants to be a fighter pilot or a bomber pilot. Annie's sister, who graduated two years ago, is the best combat soldier in her division. George sent me a present: a pair of gloves his teenage daughter knit from the wool she carded and spun from their own Shetland sheep. It seems she has a thriving homespun business going.

February 2016

Anthony's religion teacher told them the four marks of the Church have changed. They don't mean what they did before. I wonder what he's talking about?

...
Father cleared up the matter today. The topic of his sermon was: The New Teaching on the Four Marks of the Church, One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic. The biggest change is in "One". In the past, "One" meant that the Church had one belief, one creed, one catechism all over the world, all down the centuries. Now it means the Catholic Church embraces all churches because we're all "one". One people, one church, one world religion. That really is different, but I guess if the SSPX thinks it's OK, it must be OK...?

March 2016

Father is ordering all new vestments to go with the new liturgy. At Easter he is going to auction off all the old vestments to raise funds for the new priests' resort at the lake. "They need their R&R too."

April 2016

We have only two Masses on Sunday now, instead of three, because the number of faithful has dropped by 40% since last year. Where have all the families gone? Rita graduates next month. Twelve years at the girls school, quite an accomplishment!

August 2016

At dinner tonight Rita broke the news that she joined the Marines. Boot camp starts next week. We are in shock!

November 2016

Rita called and said she's a member of the choir at her Novus Ordo Church on base. She doesn't know why she can't go to the Novus Ordo Mass.

Christmas Day 2016

I'm reading a book I came across: *Fatherhood and Family*, published by Angelus Press. George gave it to me the year Rita was born. I wish I had read it then! Now I'm beginning to understand what the man's role really is as the head of the family and how serious it is... not just for his family but for the Church and society as a whole. It seems like everything is against the man and the family ever since the Industrial Revolution. We men are supposed to restore the Social Kingship of Christ and we're not. I sure made a lot of mistakes. I wish the priests would relentlessly drill this stuff into us, but they hardly ever preach about these topics and even then, just superficially.

January 2017

Rita sent us an email wishing us a Happy New Year. She wants to marry a Marine. He's a non-Catholic, some kind of Buddhist or something, and he has been married before. How can this be happening? Also, she signed up to be a Eucharistic minister. I wonder how George is doing?



A Roman on 'SSPX-Rome':



"It is not true to say that the Holy See wishes to force the SSPX to capitulate. On the contrary, they are invited to place themselves at its side.

...

Interviewer: Have the discussions between Rome and the Society recently been renewed, or did they never stop?

Archbishop Pozzo: In reality, they never stopped. The temporary interruption of meetings was simply due to the nomination of a new prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and to the election of the new sovereign pontiff in April 2013. The path of dialogue thus began again in the fall of 2013, with a series of informal meetings, leading up to the September 23rd meeting between Cardinal Gerhard Muller, prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, and the superior of the SSPX, Bishop Bernard Fellay."

(*'Famille Chretienne'* interview with Archbishop Guido Pozzo, Secretary of the Ecclesia Dei Commission, 20/10/2014)

The SSPX Lacks Common Honesty Regarding Its Vatican “Reconciliation” Meetings

Here are two reasons why you should not rely on the SSPX to keep you informed about its recent and future Vatican reconciliation meetings.

Firstly, the SSPX only informs the faithful about its Vatican meetings when forced to do so because the news media breaks the story first. The SSPX has only admitted two Vatican meetings in the last 21 months.

- The first of these meetings occurred December 13, 2013. *Not until five months later*, on May 12, 2014, the SSPX admitted this meeting. But the SSPX admission came only **two days after** *Rorate Caeli* reported this meeting (on May 10, 2014). See: <http://sspx.org/en/news-events/news/aboutmeeting-pope-francis-and-bishop-fellay-4067>
- On September 8, 2014, the SSPX acknowledged Bishop Fellay’s upcoming meeting with the Vatican, but **not until two days after** *Vatican Insider* broke the story. Here is the SSPX press release: <http://www.prweb.com/releases/2014/09/prweb12151539.htm>

Secondly, the SSPX doesn’t tell the truth when it speaks about its Vatican meetings:

- In its September 8, 2014 press release, the SSPX said that the meeting would be to “review the relations between the SSPX and Rome, which were **discontinued** at the departure of Cardinal William Levada, Cardinal Müller’s predecessor, and the resignation of Benedict XVI.” (idem - emphasis added.) Thus, according to the SSPX, relations with Rome were “**discontinued**” for **19 months** (between the resignation of Pope Benedict XVI in February 2013, and the September 23, 2014 meeting). But the SSPX is not telling the truth!
- Bishop Fellay had a December 13, 2013 meeting in the Vatican, during this period of (supposedly) “discontinued” relations. (See: <http://sspx.org/en/newsevents/news/about-meeting-pope-francis-and-bishop-fellay-4067>)
- The Vatican’s negotiator, Archbishop Pozzo, now discloses that there has been a continual series of meetings with the SSPX, during this period of (supposedly) “discontinued” relations. The Vatican’s negotiator stated that meetings with the SSPX briefly paused in the summer of 2013, but the meetings have continued since then and “**never stopped**”. The Vatican says this “series” of meetings began in the autumn of 2013 and led up to the September 23, 2014 meeting. (<http://sspx.org/en/news-events/news/no-capitulation-what-unity-pozzo-interview-5434>)

SSPX Watch!

“Beatification” of Paul VI - in a belated, last-minute response, Menzingen expressed “reservations,” (see p.28) but the neo-SSPX appears ultimately to accept this bogus pseudo-“beatification” of the man who presided over the greatest Catholic decline in human history and caused the loss of so many souls...

Heterodoxy in the Pulpit #1: *“The Tridentine Mass is like a waterfall of grace, whereas the New Mass only gives you a trickle of grace.”* - so sayeth Fr. Anthony Wingerden, in a sermon at Sts. Joseph & Padarn Church, London. Is that really what is wrong with the New Mass: that it is not as good as the Traditional Mass!? What is more worrying: that a priest can say this in a sermon, or that out of the whole congregation only a small number of people appear to have noticed or thought it important?

Heterodoxy in the Pulpit #2: - St. Mary’s Kansas: In a sermon preached to the largest SSPX parish in the USA (possibly the world) Fr. McFarland used his sermon as an opportunity to promote so-called “natural family planning” as being in line with Catholic teaching for parents who “feel overwhelmed.” He told the congregation, including many large families, that having children “is not a race.”



Angelus Conference: promoting... ..the New Mass?

One of the speakers at Angelus Press’s recent conference was billed as “Fr. X - a diocesan priest”, who turns out to be one Mgr. James Byrnes. Given that the conference was specifically about “the Mass,” and was presumably organised and promoted at some expense, who is this priest to whom the assembled crowd, the other priests and Bishop Tissier had to listen? Is he a heroic fighter for the Faith who has forsaken all and undergone huge trials out of loyalty to the Traditional Mass, like so many of those heroic 1970s priests who despite punishments refused the Novus Ordo?

Not quite. He is a priest who wrote an article in July 2012 for *The Remnant* in which he compared the Traditional Mass and the New Mass to the choice between *Coca-Cola Classic* and *New Coke*! (Remember also: *The Remnant* is the indultish newspaper the editor and two columnist of which also addressed the *Angelus* conference!) Here is what Mgr Byrnes wrote:

“The similarities between the thought and actions of the Coca-Cola company in the spring and summer of 1985 bear a frighteningly strong resemblance to the Roman Catholic Church’s change in its liturgical practice following the Second Vatican Council.”

He goes on:

“Please don’t misunderstand, just as “New Coke” was Coke just like “Coke Classic,” the Novus Ordo Missae is Mass – it is both valid and legitimate – but also like “New Coke” there is something missing from the traditional formula, and that something cannot be ignored and is desired by many who have now “tasted” the traditional formula.”

(<http://www.remnantnewspaper.com/Archives/2012-0731-byrnes-new-coke.htm>)



Nope, not much danger of us misunderstanding that! Am I alone in noting the hilariously tragic irony here? Fr. Themann’s talk was entitled: *“What is our objection to the New Mass?”* According to the star speaker, the answer is that although it is both valid and legitimate, somehow I just don’t like the taste... ..there’s just, I don’t know, something missing!

Australia: SSPX school involves children in Protestant apostolate - St. Thomas Aquinas College, Tynong, Australia has been getting children to participate in “*Operation Christmas Child*,” an Evangelical Protestant initiative. The website of “*Operation Christmas Child*” (<http://operationchristmaschild.org.au/>) makes clear that it is an initiative run by “*Samaritan’s Purse*,” an organisation which uses material aid to the Third World as a means of spreading evangelical Protestantism. On the “What We Do” page of their website, we read:



“CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

(Samaritan’s Purse Australasia-Operation Christmas Child Ltd)

Samaritan’s Purse builds churches, trains church leaders and workers, provides Christian literature and funds practical resources to support the activities of local churches and ministry partners...

(<http://www.samaritanspurse.com.au/what-we-do/>)

Obviously for “church” here, read “heretical sect,” likewise the term “Christian”. Fr. Chazal has mentioned before (see previous Recusants) the scourge of Evangelical Protestant “missionaries” causing huge swathes of the population in once-Catholic countries such as the Philippines to abandon the Faith and embrace heresy. What he didn’t realise was that the SSPX was helping to fund this!

Bishop Fellay in Lourdes: Vatican II’s big mistake was in using the wrong means(!)

What is our objection to Vatican II, again? You might perhaps have thought that the errors of the Council might have something to do with doctrine. Think again! According to the Superior General of the SSPX,



“The big error of the Council was to look in human means to solve an unhuman problem. Losing the influence of the people and trying to recuperate it, they tried the human way.”

(Sermon in Lourdes, 26th October, 2014)

The human way of regaining influence over people...? You mean like professional marketing or “branding” campaigns, for example? Never mind that, the question that remains surely is: will the SSPX allow a mere error of means, an error of approach, to get in the way of the much desired reconciliation? If that’s all it is, then the solution must be fairly simple...



What sort of company does Fr. Frey keep? - Fr. Stefan Frey, district superior of Austria (and former rector of Zaitzkofen seminary) recently gave an interview to *ORF*, the official state-owned news outlet of that country, in which he manages to sound positive about the recent synod, rejoicing that some bishops opposed the more blatant proposals, and saying that the SSPX is “in good company” (“*finden wir uns natürlich in guter Gesellschaft.*”) (<http://religion.orf.at/stories/2674921/>)

As Fr. Chazal notes (see p.25), these so-called “conservatives” (like Cardinal Muller) are themselves heretical villains, they just happen to be not quite so openly heretical as their “liberal” counterparts! How does the saying go about the company you keep...?



“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