



The Recusant

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



“The Society of St. Pius X regrets sincerely that this spirit of opposition [to an agreement with Rome] has led to an episcopal consecration.”

- Menzingen Press Communiqué, 19th March 2015



In This Issue:

- **Interview with Fr. Faure (September 2013)**
- **Why a Consecration in 2015? (Dom Tomas Aquinas OSB)**
- **‘Non Possumus’ Interview with Fr. Faure (March 2015)**
- **Menzingen’s Reaction to the Consecration of Fr. Faure (Analysis)**
- **‘Non Possumus’ Interview with Bishop Williamson (March 2015)**
- **SSPX-Rome Latest**

FROM THE DESK OF THE EDITOR:

Dear Reader,

This month brings some very good news in the form of a new Bishop for the Tradition. On Thursday 19th March, 2015, Bishop Richard Williamson consecrated Fr. Jean-Michel Faure a bishop in a public ceremony at Santa Cruz (Holy Cross) Benedictine Monastery in Nova Friburgo, Brazil. Many Faithful and several priests assisted at the ceremony, which appears also to have been filmed, although at the time of writing (two days later) this has not yet appeared online.

The implications of this one act are enormous, but before we get into that let us pause to say “Thank You!” to Bishop Williamson, “*Ad multos Annos!*” to the two Bishops, and pause to say another quick prayer for the two of them.

This consecration is perhaps the best news many Catholics will have received in the past two or three years, maybe more. It may come as a surprise to many, and the announcement a mere 48 hours beforehand is somewhat unusual. We agree with some critics in that this is not ideal. It is a shame that the world had to learn about it

through such an unworthy source as the website *Rorate Caeli*. Further, many would have preferred to see it announced months in advance so that priests and faithful from all over the world could have made arrangements to attend, and also to deflect in advance any attempted criticism from certain quarters that there is anything disreputable, hidden, anything to be ashamed of in the event. Clearly there is not, and that is why in 1988 Archbishop Lefebvre was assisted by such a huge crowd of priests and faithful. That being said, we are talking about what would be ideal. There is absolutely no substance whatever in the wholly dishonest equivalence (already being hinted at by some black propagandists) between this ceremony and the clandestine activities of the late Vietnamese Archbishop Thuc amongst the sedevacantists some forty years ago.

It is equally true that many of us had hoped for consecrations to take place sooner and were frustrated by the delay. The consecration of Fr. Faure came for us, as for (almost?) everyone, rather as a bolt from the blue when we were almost beginning to resign ourselves to the situation. And while we’re doing gripes and having a good old moan (better to get it off your chest, they say!), we might also mention that Fr. Faure is not a young man, being only a couple of years behind Bishop Williamson himself. Further consecrations will surely have to take place in the future at some point, but in the meantime at least the burden has been spread. Things are not perfect, but they are a good deal better than they were. Better late than never,

as the saying goes, and therefore we owe it to Bishop Williamson, whatever our other differences, once again to express publicly our heartfelt gratitude to him for this one act.

One mere act. But what a difference it might have made left undone. On the evening of 19th March, hearing that the consecration had taken place, I wrote in an email to a correspondent: "In Menzingen and Rome tonight there will be surely be wailing and gnashing of teeth!" The following day there appeared a Menzingen "communiqué" on *dici.org* condemning the consecration of Fr. Faure, saying that it was not in any way the same as the 1988 consecrations (but forgetting to say how), and implying that the situation is different now from then. Rome so far has not responded, but the local diocese of Nova Friburgo did the two bishops the singular honour of declaring them "excommunicated" from the conciliar Church. Perhaps we follow the lead set by the SSPX priests of 1988 and all write a letter to that Bishop asking him to excommunicate us too from the conciliar church, an entity to which we never wished to belong!

Why am I so confident that the enemies of Tradition will be wailing and gnashing their teeth (in private if not in public)? It is quite simply because they know, perhaps better than us, what the implications of this consecration entail. We should know that too, and I have attempted to draw out some of them, elsewhere in this issue.

Meanwhile, stand by for the issue to be clouded by those with a vested interest in clouding issues, the well-organised agents of black propaganda, who will doubtless proliferate the internet with their contortions and confusion once the Ministry of Information (Menzingen branch) gets itself into gear. This will, after all, presumably have taken them equally by surprise: we may have to wait a few days, but it will come, we can be sure of it. Just watch. If I am any kind of astute observer of Menzingen propaganda, they will spin more than one different version, perhaps a "we're-still-Traditional" version for the still-loyal SSPX faithful, and a more diplomatic "we're-moderate-and-reasonable / things-have-changed-since-1988" version for the consumption of Rome and the Press. One of the angles of attack will be to deny any necessity. Another will be the time-honour "disobedience" card. Already they are telling blatant fibs in claiming that (the then) Fr. Faure was thrown out of the SSPX in 2014, whereas the reality is that he has so far received only his first letter of warning.

As to the necessity, it is a simple matter of common sense which ought surely to be apparent to anyone who has not been asleep for the last three years. But for the sake of posterity and the uncomprehending, let us spell it out. Tradition has a right to exist, it has a right to survive. By "Tradition" we mean more than just a preference for the Tridentine Mass, or Latin instead of English; rather what we are talking about is unadulterated Catholic Doctrine. Within the last three years the SSPX leadership with its Doctrinal Declaration and General Chapter Declaration and all the rest, has given us another doctrine than that which we received from Archbishop Lefebvre, who in turn received it from the Church. The Latin verb *trado, tradere* means to hand over or to hand on, its origin being the verb *do, dare*, to give. That therefore is the meaning of Tradition, it is precisely what is inscribed on Archbishop Lefebvres's tomb: "*tradidi quod et accepi*" - I have handed on what I in my turn received. What is important is that the two should be the same. If one leaves something out, even the tiniest thing, then one is not handing on what one has received. Equally if one adds in something of one's own invention, something which was not in turn received, then one will be handing on something different. Tradition, then, is in one sense a simple matter of jealously

guarding the truth against all temptations. The stakes are true doctrine, but justice also demands that we should not ourselves receive without our also giving in turn. Like the children of keen gardeners who do not bother to show their own children how it is done; or the daughters of full-time mothers who themselves grow up to be ‘wimmins-lib’ careerists and put their own daughters into day-orphanages (known euphemistically as “child care”); or those grammar-school educated politicians who went on to all-but abolish grammar-schools; or the almost-entire generation of Catholics who were brought up with sound catechesis, the daily family rosary and the Tridentine Mass, but who, when it came to their own children, gave them the Novus Ordo tambourines and the T.V.—surely the last word in utter selfishness is to fail to hand on what one had the grace to receive oneself.

Sacred Tradition is of course a matter of so much more than a disciplined education or an appreciation for gardening. It is one of the two sources of Revelation, the other being Sacred Scripture. We rightly look on those who tamper with Scripture as the very worst sorts of heretics. Tradition is no less precious. A Catholic who loves Almighty God instinctively abhors novelty. What the SSPX is now giving us is, I say again, something different from what it received from Archbishop Lefebvre, and significantly different at that. Tradition has a right to survive, and for that it needs Bishops. The case, then, is essentially the same as that made by Archbishop Lefebvre in 1988, and we can make his words our own. Can we trust the conciliar hierarchy to take care of things in the years ahead? Can we trust the SSPX for that matter, given its recent record and current direction? And, as has been pointed out often enough, even if we were mistaken, the subjective conviction sincerely held is enough to free anyone from any and all penalty. So let us have no nonsense spoken about excommunication or the like. When conciliar Rome begins to bandy that word about, ask yourself when the last time you heard it used by them was, and then remind yourself that Cardinal Muller publicly denied the Immaculate Conception and remains in good standing.

Finally, if it was not already clear before, one more thing ought now to be abundantly clear to everyone:

The SSPX will never again consecrate new bishops for itself. Ever.

They themselves have condemned this consecration in unequivocal terms (yes, interesting that they can still use unequivocal language when it suits their purpose! They haven’t quite forgotten how to speak it!) They have said publically that the consecration of Fr. Faure was not justified. For them to consecrate new Bishops in future and claim necessity would be hypocrisy so rank that even they must surely shrink from it. Nor do they have any inclination to consecrate successors of their own, for to do so would incur the displeasure of their “new friends.” If anyone doubts this motive, let him read back over the 2009 decree “lifting” the excommunications and the reaction from Menzingen. They were more than a little too overjoyed by it, to put it mildly. That “lifting” decree really meant something to them. Bishop Fellay is on record (more than once) as saying that the “official” (i.e. conciliar) church is the Catholic church. Fr. Pfluger likewise. For them, another 1988 “excommunication” would be a catastrophe, something to be avoided at all costs. Given this, where will future Bishops come from? In the future, who will ordain priests for Tradition? At present Bishop Tissier de Mallerais is almost 70 years-old, whereas Bishop de Galarreta is 58 and Bishop Fellay, the youngest, about to turn 57. They themselves were consecrated 27 years ago. How will things look in another, say,

ten years' time (not that long in the grand scheme of things) when Bishop Tissier will be 80 years old and the other two pushing 70..?

The faithful have a right to be provided for with priests, as far as that is possible, and young men to be trained and ordained. That is the will of God and the will of the Church. Who will receive the vows of the religious, who will ordain the priests, who will confirm children in the future? Archbishop Lefebvre, it is true, waited until near the end of his life. Nobody could begrudge him that, since he was pioneering a response to an unprecedented crisis in the Church and was therefore the first one to have to go through with this. He also wanted to make it clear beyond all possible doubt to the whole world that he had tried and exhausted all other avenues and possibilities before turning to the last resort. That is why he, in his own words, "went too far" in talking to the modern Romans, that is why he waited longer than would be thought "normal" for a bishop to pass on what he had received. Bishop Williamson is now 75 years old, the age at which the conciliar Church would forcibly retire him. He could not, therefore, be accused of consecrating a successor ahead of time, especially since none of us know how long we will be around for (many people today do not reach the age of 75).

It is clear that Bishop Fellay is gone, his thinking in no way resembles that of Archbishop Lefebvre, and that is without delving into the serious questions about his honesty which need to be answered. Bishop de Galarreta, alas, is not much better. He supports the new direction. As early-on as November 2012 told a conference of SSPX laity in Villepreux, France, that the July 2012 SSPX General Chapter "six conditions" were very wise and prudent, and that if in future an agreement with Rome were to be voted on at the General Chapter and the majority voted in favour of it, well, too bad, you have to go with the majority, the majority can't be wrong. (I paraphrase, but that's what he said. There is a recording of it online buried somewhere in the DICI archives. Fr. Chazal rather wittily remarked: "Excuse me! I remember another General Chapter not so very long ago where the majority got it well and truly wrong! The General Chapter of the Catholic Church, which is to say the Second Vatican Council!")

What will become of Bishop Tissier, I wonder? A January sermon, only just recently made publicly available, shows that his thinking is still in tact. But thoughts and words are worthless when action does not follow from them as a consequence. Does he still regard himself as a son of Archbishop Lefebvre, is he still grateful for what he received from the Archbishop, and if so, will he find the strength, by a huge effort of the will, to hand on in his turn what he himself received? He must realise what is required of him if he wishes to render a good account to his Maker, and that therefore he cannot risk going to his reward without having handed on the episcopacy (and through it, the means to perpetuate and spread the true Faith). He is virtually a house-prisoner in Chicago, and all the resources of the modern SSPX are ranged against him... and yet all things are possible with God. Without doubt Bishop Tissier's spiritual home is the Resistance. He will find far more true friends among the assorted weirdos, losers, cowboys and "socially-isolated" conspiracy nuts of the Resistance than with the worldly, branded SSPX, although he may not yet realise it. Please pray regularly and devoutly for him.

At all events, Almighty God will take care of those who remain true to Him, and because Catholic Tradition is His, He will watch over it and protect it. It may go through trials and betrayals, but He will ensure it has what it needs to continue. Further trials lie ahead for the Resistance, but our demise (to borrow a phrase) has been greatly exaggerated. The SSPX will

only get worse. She may not yet have officially gone through the marriage ceremony with Modernist Rome, but she has been living in sin with it for a little while already. It is thus interesting to note Archbishop Pozzo's words, elsewhere in this issue (p.35), which indicate that the official signing of the agreement will happen once Bishop Fellay has finished smoothing things over in his own ranks and getting his own house in order. That is what many of us have suspected for a while. We ought not to be fixated on a "deal with Rome" since it has already happened in effect, but because so many still are fixated on it, when it does happen it may still have some consequences, it may still produce some reaction, though it will be infinitely smaller than that of 2012, if at all. When (not if) the overt capitulation of the SSPX to modernist Rome happens, there will be people who suddenly realise how things stand and are suddenly very grateful to Providence for providing us with Bishop Faure. The SSPX has sold its birthright, Tradition, for a mess of pottage. The Resistance clings doggedly to Tradition. Tradition is God's, that is why He will always watch over it. That is why we thank God firstly and lastly for this new Resistance Bishop. *Deo gratias.*

"Recusant Interview with Fr. Pfluger" Update

At the time of writing, no response as yet...

The Root of All Evil

If money corrupts, then perhaps that is one reason why Santa Cruz monastery, in the charge of Dom Tomas Aquinas OSB, has remained free of the corruption of the modern SSPX. They are very poor. Having just hosted an episcopal consecration they will now be even poorer and will need to defray those costs. I admit I was originally going to "do a Rostand" again and ask for donations to the Recusant (a few of you have been very generous in the past, thank you), but in truth perhaps they need it more. Contributions to Santa Cruz Monastery may be made online via their website: www.benedictinos.org.br by going to the page called "**como nos ajudar**", which contains their *paypal* account as well as various addresses and the name of their bank. God reward your generosity.

Matters Editorial

Someone may have remarked a little while ago that there were far fewer typing and layout errors in The Recusant lately, and that it was even starting to look almost (dare I say it) "professional"(!)... To which all I can say is that I apologise profusely, I don't know how such a terrible thing can have been allowed to happen and I will do my best to put it right! This issue, being brought out in a rush, is not only rushed, but also a departure from the usual format. Furthermore, most of the articles, being as they are about the consecration, and having appeared only very recently, have displaced other articles originally planned, which in turn will have to wait until the next issue. It is possible that there may be a five or six week hiatus between the April and May issues. If so, please do not panic. That is just how these things work. Please continue to send in material which you think may be of interest. I shall try dutifully to reply to all correspondence.

Finally, permit me to wish all our readers, friend and foe alike, a Holy and Blessed Passiontide and a Happy Easter.

- The Editor

[Editor's note - The following interview was given in French in September 2013. It was translated and put on TheRecusant.com in January 2014. Reasons of space and urgency prevented its being printed before, but in light of recent events it suddenly seems a lot more relevant. So, as a means of introducing us to the man in his own words, here it is. The Introduction is from *LaSapiniere*, which first carried the article, and was translated with it at the same time.]

Original audio: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F8IR_4_DfBE

Transcript: <http://www.lasapiniere.info/archives/1324>

An Interview with Fr. Faure

Introduction:

“The Captain of the Titanic is going to sink us!”

Fr. Faure was one of the first members of the SSPX and is therefore one of its oldest members. He has participated in all the Chapters of the Society and spent many years as a District Superior (Mexico and Argentina).

Archbishop Lefebvre even asked him if he would accept to be consecrated a bishop in 1988. He told us that he refused, proposing Fr. de Galarreta instead. He thought that he lacked the necessary qualities of a Bishop. But he has assured us that in every case he would never have betrayed the cause nor the Faith nor the anti-liberal combat.

Fr. Faure talks to us about the betrayals that he has witnessed, and in particular, the most recent one: the General Chapter of July 2012. He rose up against the way in which Menzingen is manipulating text, facts and people (in particular, Bishop Tissier).

Fr. Faure is a betrayed member of the Chapter, who for his own honour and that of the truth, will unmask the dishonesty of Menzingen. In order to better understand the interview with Fr. Faure, it may be helpful to recall the following facts: on April 15th, 2012, Bishop Fellay wrote a theological declaration intended to reconcile the irreconcilable. This declaration is a staggering acceptance of the Council, the New Mass and the new Code of Canon Law.

During the Chapter of 2012, Fr. de Journa distributed and commented on a single double-sided sheet which demonstrated before all the Chapter members (except Bishop Williamson who had been excluded from the Chapter) that Bishop Fellay's Doctrinal Declaration was nothing less than the Hermeneutic of Continuity. After this exposé from the rector of Écône which took place without any reaction and in a deep silence, the conclusion was self-evident: this declaration had to be rejected by its author. After a little while, the rector of the seminary in La Reja (Argentina) stood up to break the silence. Fr. Pagliarani (in a pre-arranged plan of the General House?) intervened in favour of Bishop Fellay: “Dear colleagues! We're not going to give a slap in the face to our Superior General by forcing him to retract it! The retraction will be implicit in the final declaration of the Chapter.” Then, after this intervention, another Chapter member raised another topic as a diversion, and the Chapter passed on to other business...

That was a master stroke on the part of Bishop Fellay and his partisans. The General House manoeuvred the Chapter so that it didn't punish the Superior General and succeeded in fooling the Chapter members by leaving them to believe that the Doctrinal Declaration was buried by the implicit disapproval of its author. Bishop Tissier was fooled, just like all the others (except the partisans of Bishop Fellay). In a letter of 29th March, 2013, he tells of how "It was tacitly agreed that there would be no need to insist on this subject, given that it was obvious that the Superior General regretted his mistake." And yet, the official line which came out of the General House afterwards was that this Doctrinal Declaration was "a minimalist text which led to some confusion amongst us" (Cor Unum 102). A "sufficiently clear" text "which avoided – what's the word? – ambiguities" (Econe, 7th September, 2012). In the "Note Concerning the Doctrinal Declaration of 15th April 2012", which was composed by Bishop Fellay himself, he affirmed that: "all ambiguity was set aside as regards our judgement of the Council, including the hermeneutic of continuity." He claimed that his thinking, "was not understood by several eminent members of the Society, who saw in it an ambiguity, or even a compromise with the theory of the hermeneutic of continuity." (Cor Unum 104). And, just recently, Bishop Fellay took up this cry once again: "It's an extremely delicate text, and one can even say that in the Society it didn't cause unanimity so much so that I said to Rome I take it back, it's not going to be any use if it's not even understood by people on our side... er... because it was perhaps too subtle, well, there we are, too bad, I take it back. And that's what I said to Rome, and Mgr Di Noia said, I understand, of course, completely, your text that you make has to create unity amongst your own." (Bp. Fellay's conference in Lille, 7th May, 2013)

[N.B. Funnily enough he said exactly the same thing in Burghclere, England on June 2nd, 2013: "Even amongst our priests, I realised that they did not follow my demonstration, the way I built up this text, which was – and this is probably my conclusion – too subtle." - Ed.]

Conference by Fr. Faure

Part I:

Several people have asked me where I stand regarding the Society of St. Pius X. Certain priests of the Society find themselves under surveillance or house arrest.

One of them, Fr. Pinaud, is confined in castle Jaidhof and awaits the illegal judgement of an illegal ecclesiastical tribunal.

When a case comes before a tribunal, it is useful to retrace the life of the accused. We will all go before the tribunal of history and above all the tribunal of God, even our superiors will.

In order to explain what my position is I will briefly retrace my life story as a way of explaining to the history of these last few decades, as far as it concerns me.

On the subject of tribunals, the commander of Helie Saint-Marc, Helie with a "H", a hero of the two wars in Indo-China and Algeria, recipient of the Grand-Croix of the *Legion*

d'Honneur and 13 citations, died a few days ago on 26th August, 2013. He entered in 1961, with the seven commanders of the Foreign Legion Parachute Regiment, in Algiers. How did he come to risk himself in such an affair, such a risk that it seems incredible today; in an affair so contrary to obedience and discipline! He explained it before the military tribunal in this way: "M. le President, you can ask a lot of a soldier, in particular you can ask him to die, that's his job; you can't ask him to cheat, to foreswear himself, to contradict himself, to lie, to disavow, to perjure himself." And today, we could add in the case of a priest of Archbishop Lefebvre, you cannot ask him to betray, to compromise with the enemies of the Faith in the name of a fabled 'sense of the Church' to avoid schism or Sedevacantism which exists only inside Bishop Fellay's head and in the letter of reply to the three Bishops, and which is basically only a pretext, an alibi.

Archbishop Lefebvre used to say that his life was marked by three world wars: 1914-18, 1939-45 and 1962-65; in other words Vatican II was in his opinion worse than the two previous wars in the consequences it had for the Church and for society. Archbishop Lefebvre used to say that Vatican II was the greatest catastrophe in the history of the Church.

In my own little way, I can say that my life has been marked by three immense betrayals, the third of which, thanks be to God did not totally succeed, but whose consequences are already catastrophic for the future of the work of Archbishop Lefebvre. The Society of St. Pius X was the last bastion in the struggle against modernism and liberalism in the Church.

So, I was born in Algeria, in Algiers, in 1941, right in the middle of the war. My father and my five uncles participated in this war from beginning to end. One of them, in France, after the battle of the North in May 1940, escaped twice and managed to get back to Algeria. In 1942, after the American landings in Algeria, they were able to continue the fight: Tunisia, Italy, France, Germany. Some years later, one of them was killed in Indo-China, then another in Algeria. My earliest memories are from about this time. I was educated 40km away from the town of Saint-Augustin, in the East of Algeria, in a Catholic school the headmaster of which was Fr. Barbara, the future publisher of a newsletter of the Catholic resistance: "*Fort dans la Foi*". My Greek teacher, Fr. Malcher, also stayed faithful to the resistance to the Council in the Pyrenees at Pau, after Algerian independence. I studied in Paris at Saint-Croix de Neuilly, then in Algiers in 1960, the year of the barricades. First betrayal, small historical memoire: in 1958 in order to achieve power, after the Algerian uprising which was followed by a coup organised by the friends of General de Gaulle, this same General de Gaulle therefore formally promised, after 13th May 1958, in front of the Army and several thousand French and European Muslims, to obtain whichever solution in Algeria would be the most in line with French interests and the interests of the population concerned.

However, General de Gaulle, in four short years, through a complete reversal of the situation, managed to impose the worst solution to the Algerian problem, with catastrophic consequences for Algeria and for France which is becoming more and more Algerian. It is with this complete reversal that I find a similarity with what has been going on for the last ten years inside the SSPX. This complete reversal was achieved with consummate skill, by an unprecedented feat. Despite all the oaths, all the promises, all the guarantees, through a series of ambiguities, ambiguous formulas, skilfully and carefully-staggered and gradual, constituting a Machiavelian deception without precedent, the General managed to oppose a strong opposition, through using relentless repression, through using numerous changes to

the Army and the Civil Service, and he also sent to death and to torture thousands of Europeans and tens of thousands of Harkis loyal to French civilisation. In this drama, the favoured weapon of the devil for deceiving men, as always, was ambiguity, ambiguous formulas, words with a double meaning. We can understand why, in the Bible, the God of Truth says: *"I hate a double tongue"*, words with a double meaning, *"os bilingue detestor."*

Are we not witnessing today a complete reversal of the situation in the Society of St. Pius X? On the contrary – in the opposite sense – Archbishop Lefebvre helped us to stay separate, to keep our distance, he put us on our guard against the conciliar Church which is no longer Catholic, so he said, and against liberal and modernist Rome which has lost the Faith, so he also said.

Bishop Fellay however, says that there is no such thing as the conciliar Church, that there is only one visible Church, only one Rome and that he can make an agreement with it, that he can trust it to keep its promises and the guarantees offered to us that we can stay as we are. Recently, the Franciscans of the Immaculate trusted in the guarantee of Benedict XVI's *Motu Proprio*, authorising (supposedly) the True Mass.

Part II:

The successor of Benedict XVI blithely tears up his predecessor's *Motu Proprio*, forbidding these Franciscans the Mass, at least without a problematic authorisation from nobody-is-quite-sure-who. There you can see, unfortunately, what the guarantees of the successor of Peter are worth. And if Benedict XVI had accepted Bishop Fellay's doctrinal declaration of 15th April 2012, what would the guarantees of Benedict XVI be worth today? How would we be able to stay as we are? Archbishop Lefebvre, on the other hand, asked: "How are we supposed to trust those people? The ones who justify the denial of *Quanta Cura*, *Pascendi*, the *Syllabus* etc." But Bishop Fellay tells us that today the situation is no longer like 1988, that things have changed – who would have thought it? As a Swiss Guard at the Vatican told Archbishop Lefebvre, "But Monsignor, do you really expect anything else from these people?" It's there, in the biography of Archbishop Lefebvre by Bishop Tissier, on page 506. It just goes to show that there are still some Swiss with a sense of reality.

I'll continue my little history. In 1962 I went into exile, to Mexico. There I discovered the hidden history of another great betrayal. The freemasonic Mexican government attacked the Church and provoked a 'Vendee War,' a Catholic popular uprising which ended with the murder of the President of the Republic, Obregon and also with an agreement with Rome... Which contained the following clause: on pain of excommunication, the Cristeros had to lay down their arms and surrender to the Masonic republic. In spite of guarantees and promises their leaders were then one by one assassinated and a good number of their men too. It just proves that the successor of Peter, in this case Pius XI, can make some pretty serious mistakes. 1926 was also the year of that Catholic tragedy which saw the condemnation of *Action Francaise*, the triumph of the left in the episcopacy, thanks to the chaplains of Catholic Action who started becoming Bishops, and started preparing their Council, as Cardinal Marty said in Paris. This year also saw the defection over to the left of Jacques Maritain, one of the intellectual fathers of Vatican II.

So the second betrayal of 1962 was Algerian Independence, but also the start of a new betrayal, this time of the Church and the Faith, with Vatican II which began by a *coup d'état*, like the Revolution of 1789, whose ideas the Council would introduce into the Church, as testified by several bishops, Congar, Suenens, and in particular Cardinal Ratzinger who spoke of 'two centuries of liberal culture' that the Church had to 'make its own' at Vatican II. Everyone knows what happened, or ought to. You just have to re-read the works of Archbishop Lefebvre. At the Council, as always, the devil's favourite weapon when it comes to deceiving men is ambiguity. Ambiguous formulas, phrases with a double meaning. Our Lord told us "What is, is; what is not, is not. Everything else comes from the devil." But in the Council, one finds numerous expressions of this type: nevertheless, and yet, but, however, and also, in certain cases, etc. Latin must be preserved in the Mass, and yet, however, in certain cases we should perhaps translate it... we know what happened next. Those are the time-bombs of Vatican II, the deliberate ambiguities, which were calculatingly put there for future use. The people who did it said so themselves afterwards!

I'll continue my little history. In 1969, after a retreat in Argentina I went to see the Archbishop of Parana to whom I confided my wish to continue the Tradition of the Church, which I was sure was my priestly vocation. "So go and see Archbishop Lefebvre!" he told me. That was the first time I had heard of Archbishop Lefebvre. It was therefore the Church who sent me to Archbishop Lefebvre, to preserve the Tradition of the Church. And it was Archbishop Lefebvre who preached the Holy Week retreat at Écône. I was on that retreat, and I entered the seminary in October 1972. On 29th June previously, I had been in Rome for the feast of Saints Peter and Paul, and there I had heard with my own ears Pope Paul VI say: "After Vatican II, the smoke of Satan entered into the Church." After, or because of it? I therefore lived at Écône during the decisive years of Archbishop Lefebvre's fight for the Faith. He did me the great and quite undeserved honour of confiding in me and trusting me to the point of allowing me complete access to his correspondence. During my years in the seminary, I noted the sense of combat which the Archbishop had. He followed Providence, of course, but he sometimes looked back to see if the faithful were fighting, if his faithful combatants were following him, as the battles intensified and one fight succeeded another. To reassure his troops, he explained to them that, of course, we're in the Church, that we recognise the Pope, etc. etc. He even went as far as signing an agreement which he immediately renounced. But just so that everyone understands the situation: these precautions cannot now be used to justify doing today the exact opposite of what he told us and said not to do, in other words wait until Rome returns to Tradition before making an agreement. Realist or not, that will all happen whenever God decides, it's not for us to commit suicide.



Fr. Faure, Abp. Lefebvre, Fr. De Galarreta

So Archbishop Lefebvre kept us up to date with all his goings on with Rome, and his reasons for continuing. He denounced forcefully all the errors, especially those of the Pope. And Archbishop Lefebvre spent the last three years of his life warning us against the dangers

and traps which the modernist authorities would not cease trying to bait us with, dangling in front of us all the advantages of an agreement with modernist Rome. In particular in his last conference to the seminarians at Écône! Smoke and mirrors by which so many of our comrades in arms have succumbed, and have thus been condemned to silence and the abdication of the fight for the Faith. As Scripture says: those who ought to have barked against the wolf, to save the flock, to save souls, have become mute dogs. Third betrayal. And it's in this direction that the Superior General of the Society, Bishop Fellay, has been turning us for years now, in the hope of reaching an agreement with Rome. In preparing people's minds for this volte-face, for this capitulation, all means are justified. First of all, the scandalous expulsion of Bishop Williamson.

If Bishop Williamson didn't agree with Bishop Fellay, it was because Bishop Fellay was taking the wrong path. And because Bishop Williamson showed what was in agreement with the thinking of Archbishop Lefebvre, the right path to take. Thereafter followed the aberrant reply of Bishop Fellay to the letter which the three bishops wrote to him. Then the expulsion of numerous priests and faithful from the Society or from its works. For example, they even expelled children from Society schools, in the USA particularly. The blackmail threat of transfers is used against priests who weren't happy about an agreement, such as the recent case of Fr. Beauvais from St. Nicolas du Chardonnet in Paris.

There was the threat of excommunication or denial of the sacraments for those who wished to inform themselves about the real situation of the Society on the internet, which constitutes according to certain priests, a mortal sin. Supposedly. Or for those who refused to shut down their website, for example in England, in Mexico, in Italy, etc. These different threats expressed a fear of those who didn't accept the suicide and who considered themselves obliged to remain anonymous so as not to lose their participation in goods which belong not to Bishop Fellay but to Our Lord Jesus Christ and the Church. Goods which previously had been offered to the Society at the cost of huge sacrifices. For example, those people who, through their generosity built churches, chapels, schools, for the good fight for the Faith and who found themselves, one way or another, excluded.

Threats of expulsion whose expression consists, for example with Bishop Williamson and the uncooperative priests, in finding themselves on the street, deprived of any means of subsistence, no pension, health insurance, social security etc. etc.

Threats of finding oneself excommunicated de facto, forbidden for example from assisting at the profession of vows of a child of some friends of ours, whom we remember newborn. Threats of refusal of priestly ordination, as in the case of the Dominicans, Capuchins, and Benedictines in 2012.

Nominations as well, that is an essential point, to key positions in the Society. Seminary Rectors, professors, District Superiors, who will be the members of the Chapter next time. All of which, and a lot of other things besides, caused turmoil, trouble, fear for many people. Nobody ever feels tempted by the Gulag Archipelago or the psychiatric hospital.

They've begun badmouthing people, calling them imprudent, subversive, revolutionary, disobedient, in summary we're being tricked with the same talk of obedience as forty years ago: obey, otherwise your schismatic, sedevacantist, you're dividing the Society. In exactly the same way, Archbishop Lefebvre in his time was said to be dividing the Church. And much

more seriously, the consequence of this single-minded policy spread over more than ten years, transfers, appointments of fellow travellers who fit the bill, etc., is that seminarians, priests and faithful have lost their convictions and are ripe for a suicidal agreement of the Fraternity of St. Peter / Campos type. Today in our schools, a pupil who does not think that an agreement would be a miraculous solution to all our difficulties is the exception to the rule. The tragic example over the last thirty years of thirteen groups, sometimes important monasteries, convents, a whole diocese in the case of Campos, the Fraternity of St. Peter, etc. reduced to silence, sometimes transformed into accomplices, defending religious liberty and the Council, like the monastery of Le Barroux, and we now even hear Bishop Fellay telling us that the religious liberty of the Council is very, very limited, that it is like lots of other errors which we have supposedly attributed incorrectly to the Council, but which, as Pope Benedict XVI said, are really only a bad hermeneutic or interpretation of the Council. Our Lord said: "A good tree cannot bring forth bad fruit," in other words bad results. If the tree is bad, then cut it down and throw it on the fire! It's Our Lord who says so.

All of the foregoing is evidence that the fight for the Faith handed down though Archbishop Lefebvre has been subverted and betrayed. It would have been on the point of disappearance if the hoped-for agreement, the object of so many efforts, so much pertinacity, had succeeded in June 2012 as Bishop Fellay hoped. Let's not forget, Mgr. Pozzo has come back to Rome. It's not for no reason that he has been called back to Rome! And he has to keep working at creating a baited hook of a kind that might interest Bishop Fellay. We are told, 'But look, the agreement wasn't signed in the end!' Well alright, the Titanic passed right alongside the iceberg, it was a near thing, let's see if that lasts. But the Captain of the Titanic has not altered course, and so the next iceberg is going to sink us all, goods and passengers, body and soul. The coup nearly came off in this fateful month of June 2012. Apart from that, the Chapter which followed immediately went on to endorse the agreement and to settle the final details of 'normalisation,' in other words the Personal Prelature of St. Pius X - see, it's already been baptised with a name! - Ooof! We narrowly avoided death, but the captain is still there and his plan as well, as proven by the latest declaration of Bishop Fellay and the two other bishops, from 27th June 2013, and the new transfer of Fr. Beauvais, as we were saying. He's got to leave St. Nicolas du Chardonnet, to say nothing of the latest nominations of seminary rectors in Germany and Argentina.

Let's say a little bit now about the General Chapter at which I was present last year. Well, of course, there's the question of secrecy. Conspirators who are plotting something will swear an oath of secrecy. Fine. But obviously secrecy has its limits.

When you realise that you've been manipulated, that your superior wanted to make you take responsibility for his decisions, positions which you have never accepted, never voted on, for example to give him carte blanche to expel Bishop Williamson, then you're free to tell the truth. Later on we read in the official newsletter of the French District that the Superior General in April 2013 allowed the Secretary General to reproduce a letter from Bishop Tissier de Mallerais to the Superior General, written on 29th March 2013, about which the Secretary General declares, "This letter was written so as to defend the honour of the Superior General and the Chapter members." But in reality, the letter just attacks the honour of Bishop Williamson as it says itself, explicitly, in its conclusion. It is said in this letter that Bishop Williamson waited for a year before criticising Bishop Fellay's Doctrinal Declaration, which doesn't correspond to reality.

In reality, what it's talking about is paragraphs 4 and 5 of Bishop Fellay's Doctrinal Declaration of 15th April 2012, which were made public by Fr. Pfluger in May 2012 in southern France. It says in the letter, "The General Chapter studied this text," of the declaration, "the Chapter members had complete liberty to denounce its weaknesses," something which I myself did not neglect to do, and that it was tacitly decided that there was no need to insist on this subject, that it was obvious that the superior general regretted it. As to the term 'tacitly,' we could add that one of the Chapter members, Fr. Pagliarani, seminary rector of La Reja in Argentina, spoke up to say that the chapter wouldn't in any case be giving a slap to the Superior General by asking him to recognise his error, but that this would come about as a result of the final declaration of the chapter.

To return to Bishop Williamson, the truth is that each chapter member found waiting for him at his place at breakfast, just before the chapter began, a registered letter from Bishop Williamson addressed to him personally, in which was to be found a very strong critique of paragraphs 4 and 5 of the doctrinal declaration which had been made public about a month previously by Fr. Pfluger. So perhaps Bishop Tissier didn't receive his or didn't read it, but the truth is that Bishop Williamson didn't wait one year to criticise Bishop Fellay's Doctrinal Declaration. In a general way, I can say that at the General Chapter I understood the position which Archbishop Lefebvre and his Traditionalists found themselves in: the majority at the Council was manipulated by a strong, liberal minority through the authority of Popes John XXIII and Paul VI.

In the same way, at the Chapter, the only one with sufficient authority to orientate the debate in the right direction was Bishop Williamson, and that's the very reason why the superiors excluded him. Now at least he is free to say what he thinks, and he makes use of that. Just before the Chapter, the question was over the legality or illegality of the expulsion of Bishop Williamson, which he himself had just put before our very eyes by his letter. What does canon law say about it? Well, canon law says that a bishop is judged by the Pope, not by Bishop Fellay, and yet it is we who are accused of being sedevacantists. So we voted for or against the expulsion of Bishop Williamson. Two hours after the result of the vote, we found on the internet: nine chapter members were against the expulsion. That means that several judged it to be illegal and therefore that it led to the Chapter being considered null.

It is to the shame of the majority of members that they accepted the expulsion of Bishop Williamson and gave carte blanche to Bishop Fellay to expel him from the Society. He was the only one who had shoulders broad enough to save the Chapter and the Society from the planned suicide; someone else did do that, in a certain way, and for a mysterious reason, Pope Benedict XVI. In his "benevolence" to the Society, he renewed for the umpteenth time his requirement that Bishop Fellay accept unconditionally the Council, the New Mass and the conciliar Magisterium which contradicts the Magisterium of the Catholic Church. How did we arrive at such a confusing situation? What ought we have done to avoid it?

Once more it is Bishop Williamson who needs to be quoted: after he finished reading the book by Emmanuel Barbier, Archbishop Lefebvre said, 'If I had read this book before founding Écône, I would have given my seminary a different orientation.' That is, more of a counter-revolutionary orientation, and that's the same as the advice which Mgr. De Proenca Sigaud gave in 1959 to Pope John XXIII and to the Council, when he was responding to the Pope's invitation to share his desires on the question of what Vatican II ought to decide.

So we'll quote a few words of his expose:

"Nonetheless I see other things in the Church which cause me great anguish, they are so serious that I think them worthy of being considered by the ante-preparatory Pontifical Commission, by the ecumenical Council and finally by the Council itself. I see that principles and spirit which calls itself revolutionary has penetrated the ranks of the clergy and the Christian people just as the principles, doctrine spirit and love of paganism did once before, at the moment of the Renaissance, preparing society for the Protestant reformation. Quite a number of the clergy don't see the errors of the Revolution and they don't oppose them. To some other priests, the Revolution is a pleasant ideal and they propagate it, the work with it, they harass the opponents of the Revolution, calumniating them and putting obstacles in the way of their apostolate. Many pastors keep silence, others adhere to the errors, to the spirit of the Revolution."

Well, obviously as far as Mgr. Sigaud is concerned, the enemy of the Church is the Revolution, Freemasonry, Protestantism, etc. And even, yes, International Judaism, for example. You can really see in this document that it was the formation of 'La Cité Catholique' which inspired this bishop. This movement which produced so many excellent fruits in the fifties, and out of which came, among other things, the essential part of the resistance to the council. So that's the area in which we really ought to have been making an effort. I have been trying to use the opportunities to say so, for several years now, whenever there was a meeting, but obviously it hasn't been taken on board. Of course Archbishop Lefebvre thought of counter-revolutionary formation and he thought that the acts of the Magisterium, that is to say the encyclicals which followed the Revolution, were sufficient to arm us in the anti-liberal combat, but unfortunately we're obliged to conclude that that isn't the case. And so we would have needed to add to these acts of the Magisterium a more systematic formation, based on the books of 'La Cité Catholique,' in particular the early editions of the book by Jean Ousset "Pour Qu'Il Règne" ('He Must Reign') and that's how one day the Church will rebuild the Social Reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

May Our Lady, guardian of the Faith, protect us and give us the courage to confront these constantly increasing difficulties.

Help the Benedictines of Santa Cruz!

BRAZIL:

Banco do Brasil S.A.
Sociedade C. Mant. do Mosteiro da Santa Cruz
Ag. 0335-2 - conta 5055-5
Nova Friburgo-RJ
BRAZIL

USA:

Holy Cross Monastery Brazil Inc.
223 West Jackson, Suite 615
Chicago, IL 60606
U.S.A.

...or online via www.beneditinos.org.br --> "Como nos ajudar"

Why a Consecration in 2015?

BY

Dom Thomas Aquinas OSB, superior of the Monastery of Santa Cruz, Brazil



Brazil, March 2015: Bp. Faure and Dom Tomas Aquinas give a press conference

Why a consecration in 2015?

Because the situation remains essentially the same as in 1988. Modernist Rome, which manifested itself at the Council, remains in place and becomes more and more modernist and liberal. The profound perversion of the mind is only intensifying.

But why not wait for the Society of St. Pius X to give us bishops?

Because the authorities of the Society have taken a new direction in relations with Rome.

Do you mean to say that the Society has abandoned the true faith or the fight for the faith?

I mean to say that the leaders of the Society have gradually in recent years, and especially since 2011 and 2012, taken a new direction in their relations with Rome.

But the question is whether or not the Society has abandoned the fight for the faith. What do you think?

The peculiarity of liberals is inconsistency. The current leaders of the Society have made the fight of the Society inconsistent. The healthy part of the Society is trying to fight this battle as in the past, but the dominant wing, its Superior General at the top with Fr. Pfluger, persecute those who want to continue this fight as before.

Do you have any proof of that?

It is all too abundant. The refusal to ordain the Dominican and Capuchin candidates at the appointed time in 2012 is one. The Benedictines of Bellaigue were also threatened. But much more serious and significant was the scandalous expulsion of Bishop Williamson, preceded by the order to cease the Eleison Comments. In fact Menzingen does not tolerate us opposing its new orientation. Menzingen does not want us to publicly continue the fight for the faith as before, following Archbishop Lefebvre and Bishop de Castro Mayer. The district priests are closely monitored and their articles cannot be published without quite strict permission.

But what harm is there in that? Every institution must monitor what is being said in its name!

Not like that. We must punish those who write against the Catholic faith, but not install a regime like the one Bishop Fellay already did. In addition, those with a liberal tendency have broad permission to write, while the book of Father Pivert is removed from sale. *Le Sel de la*

Terre is frowned upon and removed from press stands. The most faithful priests are disavowed or even punished or expelled. Unfortunately, examples abound. The list is already long enough, while the GREC was able to work peacefully and Father Pflüger gives his scandalous interviews without being disturbed.

But there are good articles in *Le Chardonnet*, for example. Isn't it wrong to say that the anti-liberals are persecuted in the Society?

Yes, there are still some good articles in *Le Chardonnet*, and not only in *Le Chardonnet*. Unfortunately, this is far from preventing the accordist tendency of Menzingen from moving forward.

Do you mean, basically, that Menzingen is betraying the fight for the faith?

Yes, Menzingen is betraying the fight for the faith. That is why a consecration has become necessary to assure the continuity of the work of Archbishop Lefebvre, especially as Bishop Fellay now refuses to ordain candidates opposed to his policy, as is the case for several religious communities of men to whom he also refuses the Holy Oils (necessary to baptize children and give extreme unction to the dying).

"We continue," very simply, as Archbishop Lefebvre used to say. And we believe that good Catholics support us from the bottom of their heart. If we seem to be too hard towards Menzingen, take the time to go through the long series of events that have marked the history of Tradition in recent years and you will see that the two most combative bishops of Tradition were, one, expelled from the Society, the other, silenced, at least in part. Added to this are the iniquitous trials of Fr. Pinaud and Fr. Salenave, and still so many facts.

What do you think about the candidate chosen?

He was chosen by Archbishop Lefebvre in 1988. He proposed another name. It is to his credit. Today he accepts this heavy burden. We are deeply grateful to him. To conclude, let us also and especially give our gratitude to Bishop Williamson who knew how to protect and transmit the legacy received from the hands of Archbishop Lefebvre and Bishop de Castro Mayer, which is none other than the deposit of the faith entrusted by Our Lord to the Apostles.

A final appeal: Read the works of Archbishop Lefebvre. Everything is there. Read also the Eleison Comments to understand the seriousness of the current evil. Corção said: "Only the saints believe in evil." Deep words which are a warning. May Our Lady help us to see the evil where it is, to work with her, she who has always crushed the head of the infernal serpent. "Ipsa conteret." That is the motto of Bishop Jean-Michel Faure. May Our Lady bless him and protect him "ad multos annos".

March 18, 2015

Source: www.dominicansavrille.us/urgent-message-episcopal-consecration-today-of-fr-faure-by-bishop-williamson/





**SNAPSHOTS FROM
THE
EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION
OF**

Fr. Jean-Michel Faure, SSPX

**Santa Cruz Benedictine Monastery,
Nova Friburgo, Brazil**

Thursday 19th July, 2015





APOSTOLIC MANDATE

The following was read out during the ceremony of consecration at Santa Cruz Monastery, 19th March (Feast of St. Joseph), 2015.

MANDATUM APOSTOLICUM

We have a Mandate to consecrate from the Roman Church which in its fidelity to Sacred Tradition received from the Apostles commands us to hand down faithfully that Sacred Tradition – namely the Deposit of the Faith – to all men by reason of their duty to save their souls.

For indeed, on the one hand, the authorities of the Church of Rome from the Second Vatican Council down to today are driven by a spirit of modernism which undermines in depth Sacred Tradition to the point of twisting its very notion: *There shall be a time when they will not endure sound doctrine, turning away their hearing from the truth, turning unto fables*, as St Paul says to Timothy in his second Epistle (IV, 3,5). What use would it be to ask such authorities for a Mandate to consecrate a bishop who is going to be profoundly opposed to their most grave error?

And, on the other hand, to obtain such a bishop the few Catholics who understand his importance might have hoped, even after Vatican II, that he could come from the Society of St Pius X founded by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, like the four consecrated for them in 1988 by a previous emergency Mandate. Alas, when the authorities of that Society showed by their constant turning towards the Roman authorities that they were taking the same modernist road, that hope proved to be vain.

From where then could these faithful Catholics obtain the bishops essential to the survival of their true faith? In a world making political war day by day more on God and on His Church, the danger for the Faith seems such that its survival can no longer be left to depend on a single fully anti-modernist bishop. The Church herself asks him to appoint an associate, who will be Father Jean-Michel Faure.

By this handing down of the episcopal power of Orders, no episcopal power of jurisdiction is assumed or granted, and as soon as God intervenes to save His Church, which has no more human hope of rescue, the effects of this consecration and of its emergency Mandate will be without delay put back in the hands of a Pope once more wholly Catholic.

“Automatic excommunication for bishop over illicit ordination”

Bishop Edney Gouvea Mattoso of Nova Friburgo, the local ordinary, stated that he learned of the consecration “with great sadness,” adding:

“...An unlawful act such as this leads to a practical rejection of the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, even constituting a schismatic act, with the penalty of automatic excommunication envisaged by the Code of Canon Law...”

(Catholic News Agency, 19/03/15)

“Bishop Williamson excommunicated after performing an ‘illegitimate act’ ”

Vatican confirms the excommunication of British integrist bishop Richard Williamson

...The secretary of the Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei confirmed that after this ‘illegitimate act’ [Bishop Williamson] has been automatically excommunicated. [...]

“Bishop Williamson consecrated as bishop this priest who no longer belongs to the SSPX either,” explained Archbishop Guido Pozzo ... In the eyes of Mgr Pozzo the new Bishop ordained illicitly, Frenchman Jean-Michel Faure, is “another one of these die-hard extremists who left the SSPX”...

(La Croix, 20/03/15)



“But the Church against her past and her Tradition is not the Catholic Church; this is why being excommunicated by a liberal, ecumenical, and revolutionary Church is a matter of indifference to us.”

(Biography of Marcel Lefebvre, p.547)

“If one day they shall excommunicate us because we remain faithful to these theses we shall consider ourselves excommunicated by Freemasonry.”

(Archbishop Lefebvre, sermon given in 1978)

“We know now with whom we have to deal. We know perfectly well that we are dealing with a ‘diabolical hand’ which is located at Rome, and which is demanding, by obedience, the destruction of the Church! And this is why we have the right and the duty to refuse this obedience... I believe that I have the right to ask these gentlemen who present themselves in offices which were occupied by Cardinals... “Are you with the Catholic Church?” “Are you the Catholic Church?” “With whom am I dealing?” If I am dealing with someone who has a pact with Masonry, have I the right to speak with such a person? Have I the duty to listen to them and to obey them?”

(1978 ordinations sermon at Écône, quote in Apologia pro Marcel Lefebvre Vol.2 p.209)

“I should be very happy to be excommunicated from this Conciliar Church... It is a Church that I do not recognize. I belong to the Catholic Church.”

(30/07/1976 ‘Minute’ Interview)

“Exclusive Interview with Fr. Faure”

WITH

“Non Possumus”

18th March, 2015

Source: <http://nonpossumus-vcr.blogspot.co.uk/2015/03/entrevista-exclusiva-al-rp-faure.html>

How about a little history to begin, Father: how did you get to know Tradition and Archbishop Lefebvre?

In 1968, in Argentina, I visited the Archbishop of Paraná, who said to me: “Do you want to defend Tradition? At the Council I defended it together with a brave Bishop, a friend of mine, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre.” That was the first time I had heard of Archbishop Lefebvre. I went to look for Archbishop Lefebvre in Switzerland in 1972, during Holy Week and there I met him.

Where were you born? Why were you living in South America?

I was born in Algeria and my family, after independence, acquired a plot of land in Argentina, close to Paraná. My family was deported from Algeria because the French government surrendered power to the militant Muslims who committed horrendous massacres during the course of the process of the independence. My grandparents, parents and uncles were farmers there since 1830.

Returning to the story, how your apostolate in the Society come about?

Archbishop Lefebvre ordained me in 1977 in Écône, and 15 days later I accompanied him on a trip through the southern United States, Mexico (where the government refused our entry), Colombia, Chile, and Argentina. The Archbishop put me in charge of starting-up the apostolate in this region. During the first year two Argentinian priests helped me and the following year another Spanish priest (of the SSPX). After this the South American district was created with myself in charge and I began to preach retreats as far north as Mexico. In the first year about 12 vocations were put up in the Buenos Aires priory, which was in a large enough house. Then by 1980 the seminary of La Reja (Buenos Aires) was built, where Archbishop Lefebvre appointed me rector. There I stayed until 1985, when I was named superior of the District of Mexico. That was when we built the churches in Mexico City and Guadalajara. I looked after the different parts of this country together with Frs. Calderon, Angles, and Tam. Then I spent a few years in France. After that I was appointed to the Seminary in Argentina as a history professor and I was there until the expulsion of Bishop Williamson from Argentina (2009).

Did Archbishop Lefebvre confide in you?

Archbishop Lefebvre gave me free access to his mail and correspondence and he put me in

charge of certain cases. He had a certain kind of trust for me: in 1977 in Albano he asked me what I thought about consecrations. On another occasion, also in 1977, he confided to me "They are waiting for me" (the rector professors of Écône). They would suggest accepting the New Mass and the Council in order to preserve the Tridentine Mass. They said to him: "Now we are in confrontation with Rome. If we want to preserve the (Tridentine) Mass we must accept the Council." They wanted the Archbishop to retire to a beautiful house in Germany, but he told them that they were free to leave if they wanted to. He threw them out.

Is it true that Archbishop Lefebvre asked you to accept being consecrated a bishop?

In 1986, while on a visit to Écône, he called me aside after a meal and asked me if I would accept being consecrated a bishop. In view of what happened, maybe I should have accepted.

So you did not accept?

I told him that I thought Bishop De Galarreta would be more suitable.

Can you summarize what happened in 2012?

In that year we were very close to an agreement and it failed at the last moment, probably, due to the Williamson affair. The agreement failed because of that matter and the letter of the three bishops. Both of those things undermined the agreement.

It is said that the key to Bishop Fellay's *ad intra* strategy was getting the backing of the General Chapter. Can you tell us something about that?

The General Chapter was very well prepared by Bishop Fellay and the they (the accordistas) achieved their objectives. That was when I understood what had happened to Archbishop Lefebvre and his friends at the Second Vatican Council. He (Bishop Fellay) had decided on a policy of getting closer to Rome and he managed to get the general support of the Chapter in expelling Bishop Williamson, who was the only one capable of obstructing this policy.

What, in your opinion, should be the conditions required for making an agreement with Rome?

Archbishop Lefebvre told us that as long as there were no real changes in Rome a deal would be impossible, because these people were not loyal, and one cannot expect to change one's superiors. It is the cat that chases the mouse and not the mouse that chases the cat. An agreement would be tantamount to handing oneself over into the hands of the modernists, and thus it must be absolutely rejected. It is impossible. We must wait for God to intervene.

Can you tell us what you think the preliminary visits of various modernist prelates to the Seminaries of the Society? Is it true that once Archbishop Lefebvre received some prelates? What is the difference now?

These were exceptional visits during which Cardinal Gagnon never had the opportunity of defending the Council, whereas these visits now are the first steps of a reintegration (of the SSPX) into the conciliar church.

How do you view an eventual unilateral recognition of the SSPX on the part of Rome?

It's a trap.

Between the 2006 chapter and the start of the crisis in 2012, a change of attitude by the SSPX authorities towards Rome can be seen. What is the reason for this change?

It is due to the SSPX superiors' decision to "reintegrate" themselves into the conciliar church. Since 1994 or 1995 the GREC meetings took place which were significant steps towards a reconciliation, as intended by ambassador Pérol (French ambassador in Italy), and he was the inventor of the lifting of the excommunications (2009) and the Motu Proprio (2007). That must be matched by a recognizing of the Council.

What would Archbishop Lefebvre do in the current situation?

He would continue along the path that he showed us after the consecrations, absolutely discarding any possibility of an agreement.

If in the future you were invited to go to Rome and speak with the Pope, would you go? What would you say?

First, I would consult with all our friends in the Resistance. I would go with Bishop Williamson and the other excellent priests who are fighting the Resistance combat with great courage. And I would keep all our friends well-informed with total transparency.

Bishop Fellay has said that the SSPX agrees with 95% of Vatican II. What do you think of that?

Archbishop Lefebvre answered that the whole Council is imbued with a subjectivist spirit that is not Catholic.

Francis is proving an effective demolisher of the Church and objective destroyer of the Faith. Is he a true pope?

In my opinion, it cannot be said that Francis is worse than Paul VI, who first steered the Church onto a new course, and so we must preserve the attitude of Archbishop Lefebvre, a prudential attitude that excluded sedevacantism. Archbishop Lefebvre always refused to ordain a seminarian who was sedevacantist. And that was the policy of the SSPX until his death. So don't come to us with: "The Archbishop said this or said that."

What is the state of your process of expulsion from the SSPX?

The latest update is that I found in an email, by accident, a second monition. From tomorrow, therefore, the Society of St. Pius X will again have four bishops! They had better throw me out quickly! Deo gratias!

This decision of consecrating a bishop must have been pondered and meditated on for a long time. Just like Archbishop Lefebvre, you, Bishop Williamson and the priests of the Resistance did not want to be collaborators in the destruction of the Church. It is to preserve the Faith intact that you have been persecuted, condemned and slandered so many times. Your episcopal consecration may earn you an alleged excommunication. What were the main reasons for carrying out this consecration?

The main reason is that that we cannot leave the Resistance without bishops. Just like Archbishop Lefebvre said, Catholic bishops are indispensable for the preservation of the true doctrine of the Faith and the sacraments.

Archbishop Lefebvre thought about consecrating you a bishop and now Bishop Williamson is able to fulfil that wish. What will be your main concern?

Striving to maintain the work of Archbishop Lefebvre on the path he traced, without deviating to the right or to the left.

Where will your place of residence be?

In France where we plan to open a seminary close to the Dominicans of Avrillé.

Would you like to say any words to the priests and faithful that are still inside the structure of the Society but who are worried by the liberal drift of the last few years?

Let them re-read and meditate upon the texts of their founder.

Can you explain to us the essence of your coat of arms?

In the centre is the Lamb of the Apocalypse, the Alpha and the Omega, the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world, announced by Isaiah. The hearts recall the Vendée martyrs of the revolution and the Fleur de Lys is the emblem of Catholic France. The motto, “ipsa conteret” (“she shall crush”) is taken from the Vulgate, Genesis 3,15 where God promises the victory of the Virgin Mary over the dragon.

Is there anything else you would like to add?

Let us preserve Faith, Hope, and Charity. We must not doubt and we must ask God and Our Lady to keep us in these virtues.

Father, we give deepest thanks to God, to His Most Holy Mother, and to St. Joseph protector of the Church for this great grace. We pray God that He preserve and keep you. We thank you for having accepted this tremendous burden and we thank Bishop Williamson for consecrating you as one of the successors of the Apostles. Deo Gratias!

Resist Menzingen’s Modernism!

Keep the Fight for the Faith going into the future!



Thank you for supporting
“The Recusant Mass Fund”

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

therecusantmassfund@gmail.com

Menzingen's Reaction

TO

Bishop Faure's Episcopal Consecration

Below is the text of the "Official Press Communiqué" issued by the Menzingen via *dici.org* on the evening following Bishop Faure's consecration. The reader is advised to read it through carefully. It is not especially exciting and one can easily read it without a single word sinking in, so a second reading may be required, if you can stay awake that long.



Communiqué of the General House of the Society of St. Pius X Concerning the Episcopal Consecration of Fr. Faure

On March 19th 2015 Bishop Richard Williamson performed the episcopal consecration of Fr. Jean-Michel Faure at the Benedictine Monastery of the Holy Cross in Nova Friburgo, Brazil.

Bishop Williamson and Fr. Faure have not been members of the Society of St. Pius X since 2012 and 2014, respectively, because of their violent criticisms of any relations with the Roman authorities. According to them, such contacts were incompatible with the apostolic work of Archbishop Lefebvre.

The Society of St. Pius X regrets sincerely that this spirit of opposition has led to an episcopal consecration. In 1988 Archbishop Lefebvre had clearly indicated his intention to consecrate auxiliary bishops who would have no jurisdiction, because of the state of necessity in which the Society of St. Pius X and faithful Catholics found themselves at that time. His sole goal was to make available to the faithful the sacraments which priests ordained by the bishops would offer. After having done everything conceivable to gain permission from the Holy See, Archbishop Lefebvre proceeded with the solemn consecrations on June 30, 1988 before several thousand priests and faithful and hundreds of journalists from around the world. It was abundantly clear from all the circumstances that, despite the lack of authorization from Rome, this action done in the most public manner was for the good of the Church and of souls.

The Society of St. Pius X denounces this episcopal consecration of Father Faure, which, despite the assertions of both clerics concerned, is not at all comparable to the consecrations of 1988. All the declarations of Bishop Williamson and Fr. Faure prove abundantly that they no longer recognize the Roman authorities, except in a purely rhetorical manner.

The Society of St. Pius X still maintains that the present state of necessity renders legitimate its action throughout the world, without denying the legitimate authority of those for whom it continues to pray at every Mass. The Society intends to continue its work of priestly formation according to its statutes. It has every intention to keep the deposit of the Faith and the purity of the Church's moral teaching, in opposition to errors, from wherever they may come, in order to pass on such Faith and morals in the traditional liturgy and by preaching, in accordance with the missionary spirit of its founder: *Credidimus caritati* [1 John 4:16].

Menzingen, March 19, 2015

A few things are apparent on a first reading, but even more on a second and third. Firstly, what is this communiqué supposed to be about, exactly? If we go by the title, it is supposed to be about the consecration of Fr. Faure. Why is it, then, that they spend most of the time telling us what the Society of St. Pius X does? Self-absorbed? Lost for words? Insinuating? Or does the answer lie with whom these press communiqués and DICI in general are aimed at, for whose consumption are they primarily intended (hint: Roman authorities)? “We’re not like them, we’re good guys!” being the main message.

1. Not one of us...

The communiqué (am I alone in wincing at the officious, bureaucratic sound of that word?) begins with an untruth. Bishop Williamson was expelled in 2012, but Fr. Faure had only been sent a letter of warning. He had not in fact been expelled from the SSPX, as he indicates in his recent interview. If a letter of warning (known as a “monition”) itself amounts to expulsion, then what is the point of sending out a letter of warning? Why warn someone about something that has already taken place? If not, and if such a letter is worth the paper it is written on, then surely an actual expulsion ought to follow before it can be claimed that a priest has been expelled.

Look at this another way, if following the right procedure and form matters at all, why not follow them? And if you are going to ignore them whenever it suits, why make such a big thing of claiming to follow them, surely it would be more honest to be openly despotic, rather than trying to cloak despotism in the mantle of law and procedure? The point is not a merely rhetorical one, it puts on display the hypocrisy of Menzingen’s rule for all the world to see. This is not the first time that the SSPX has shown scant regard for its own laws and constitutions when they prove inconvenient. Fr. Pfeiffer and Fr. Hewko, for example, are both equally shunned as outcasts by SSPX clergy even though only one of them so far has ever actually been officially expelled, the other only warned. There are other Resistance priests who have never even had a letter of monition and who are still listed in *Cor Unum* as being SSPX priests, despite their being active in the Resistance. So for all their reliance on following the proper “form”, the letter of the law, (whilst driving a coach and six horses through its spirit), even the letter of the law is as good as meaningless to them when it suits. The supposed “expulsion” of Fr. Faure in 2014 is just one further proof of that.

2. It’s all about “Relations with Rome”!

We notice furthermore, that the communiqué does not actually say whether either Bishop Williamson or Fr. Faure left the SSPX of their own accord or were expelled. It says merely that they, “*have not been members of the Society of St. Pius X since...*” and then says that this was: “*because of their violent criticisms of any relations with the Roman authorities.*” Why “violent” criticism, did Fr. Faure actually throw things at Bishop Fellay at the 2012 General Chapter? Why the need for such rhetoric in a press communiqué? And as for their criticising “any relations” with Rome: is this not just a little dishonest, to put it mildly?! “Relations” (another of those words whose use I find jarring!) between the SSPX and Rome have arguably existed in one form or another all the way along (not always very warm “relations,” admittedly...). In the 1990s Rome would do or say something modernist and the SSPX would criticise them for it. In the early 2000s Rome wooed over Campos from the fight, and the SSPX criticised them, and said that Rome could not be trusted. At about the same time, we now know, Rome was making overtures to the SSPX. Some priests, such as

Fr. Schmidberger, were very keen on the idea, but the majority were not. So nothing, for the moment, came of it. Incidentally, that is why (readers may recall) there were a spate of reports in the secular media around twelve years ago (I remember seeing it in the Times and the Daily Telegraph, for example) saying that an agreement between Rome and the SSPX was imminent. It turned out not to be true, and so the “rumour” was promptly forgotten about. Unbeknownst to all but the inner-circle of initiates, however, things were still continuing quietly, behind the scenes.

The question which is begged, then, is why it was only in 2012 and 2014 respectively that these two clerics ceased to belong to the SSPX, given that relations had been going on for so long and that they criticised any relations, and violently too! We are told that they think that “any relations with Rome” are “incompatible with the apostolic work of Archbishop Lefebvre.” If that were true, why did they not both leave in 2001, when talk of a SSPX-Rome agreement first surfaced, in 2005 when it resurfaced, in 2009 when Bishop Fellay visited the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (when this picture was taken), or at any other point along the way?



3. Spirit of Opposition

In case it seems as if I am labouring the issue, let me point out that it is important in view of what comes next. Immediately after talking about the “opposition” of Fr. Faure and Bishop Williamson to “relations” with Rome, the press communiqué laments that this “spirit of opposition” led to an episcopal consecration. That the lament for this “spirit of opposition” comes right after the mention of “violently oppos[ing] any relations” with Rome can surely only mean that the opposition mentioned is an opposition to Rome or to the SSPX’s recent goings on with the modernists in Rome. It is possible that the spirit of opposition could mean opposition to Menzingen and its new direction... but then the new direction is towards Rome, so in effect does that not amount to the same thing? What this does mean is that Menzingen themselves admit that it is opposition to modernist Rome and the SSPX getting too close to the modernists in Rome which is behind the consecration. And they find it regrettable on that account. That in itself has implications...

4. Not at all like 1988!

Having “regretted” the consecration, the communiqué goes on to “denounce” it, but here, rather tellingly, they forget to say why. Reasons typically given by compromisers for denouncing their fellow Traditionalists tend to include something along the lines of “disobedience to the Roman Pontiff,” or something like that. Archbishop Lefebvre’s critics in 1988 certainly were not shy about coming forward with reasons why they thought he was wrong. I cannot think of one of them who simply wrote “We denounce him!” and left it at that! But the SSPX simply says that it denounces the consecration and then informs us that it is: “...not at all comparable to the consecrations of 1988.”

Well now, let us see if that is true. Bishop Williamson, who was the consecrator in 2015, was himself consecrated in 1988. Fr. Faure, consecrated in 2015, was originally intended to be

consecrated in 1988, and was nevertheless present at those consecrations as one of the most senior members of the SSPX already at that time. In 1988, in place of a mandate from Rome, an emergency mandate was read out, lamenting the impossibility of obtaining a normal mandate from Rome since Rome itself was occupied by the modernists and actively working to destroy Tradition. At the 2015 consecration an emergency mandate was read out which states exactly the same thing. The sermon by Archbishop Lefebvre made clear that he felt he was duty bound to consecrate new Bishops for the survival of Tradition, since one cannot trust the Romans. The sermon in 2015 made clear exactly the same thing, with the added caveat that, since they have now changed direction towards Rome, the SSPX cannot be trusted to preserve and fight for Tradition either. Archbishop Lefebvre could not have incurred excommunication in 1988 because he sincerely believed that he had to do it, he was acting out of necessity, and even if he were mistaken, the subjective intention is enough to absolve one from any penalty. Can anyone doubt that this consecration was done out of the same necessity, subjective if not also objective? The Menzingen communiqué does not even attempt to suggest excommunication, and does not even mention the word, but it does not preclude the idea either. They will let someone else do the dirty work of making that accusation and allow the lie to spread and they will not point out that their own defence also applies to Bishop Williamson and Fr. Faure.

After all, they have provided us with very little in the way of major differences between the 1988 consecrations and those of 2015. The main differences, then, appear to be the location (A Benedictine monastery as opposed to Écône - in what way does that matter?), the number and age of candidates and the short notice given. The latter two are, as has been said, not ideal, but hardly grounds for denunciation! And if Menzingen has a real objection specifically to Bishop Williamson not giving plenty of notice, one might have expected them to at least say so!

5. Who has changed their stance towards Rome?

"All the declarations of Bishop Williamson and Fr. Faure prove abundantly that they no longer recognize the Roman authorities, except in a purely rhetorical manner."

Menzingen is in a very tricky situation. Feeling compelled to condemn the consecration and reassure their new friends in Rome, but unable to say how the doctrine or response to the crisis in the Church of Bishops Williamson and Faure is in any way different to their own, they are reduced to hinting at sedevacantism. If only Bps. Williamson and Faure actually *were* sedevacantists, then life for Menzingen would be so much simpler! As it is, there is a difference in doctrine, there is a difference in position - but not one which Menzingen can own up to. They are in a "catch-22" situation. They have altered their own stance away from that of Archbishop Lefebvre and the old SSPX, a stance which Bps. Williamson and Faure still hold. And they have spent their time lying to and deceiving the faithful, telling them: "We haven't changed!" If now they were to condemn Bishop Williamson and Bishop Faure for being too "disobedient," "schismatic," "hard-line," "extremist," "integrist," etc. [insert your favourite adjective here!] they would have to admit that they themselves have changed. So they simply hint at it. The two bishops, they say, no longer (note the implication: they once did, but not any longer) recognise the Roman authorities except in a purely rhetorical way. Whereas we, the neo-SSPX, on the other hand...? What is being implied, presumably is that the SSPX intends to recognise the Roman authorities... ..in a practical way?

The final paragraph is a masterpiece of diplomacy from people highly skilled in the art of appearing to say something which they haven't actually said. Reference is made to "the present state of necessity" but we are given no hint as to exactly what is causing it, or what that state of necessity is. No reference to the council or modernism. We are told that the SSPX: "intends to continue its work of priestly formation" and nothing else. As has been said so often before, it is tantamount to a lie to constantly refer to the SSPX as being solely for the purpose of forming priests. Most or all religious orders form their priests. The SSPX was created with more in mind. It was created in the form of a missionary order. Isn't a missionary normally concerned with his missions and Mass centres, with the souls to whom he ministers?

"It has every intention of keeping the deposit of the Faith and the purity of the Church's moral teaching, in opposition to errors, from wherever they may come..."

For an order of priests to say that it intends to keep the Faith is like a married man saying that he intends to stay married, or a worker saying that he intends to keep coming in to work, or a customer telling the merchant that he intends to keep paying for what he buys. It ought to be taken as read, so much so that one must wonder at someone who feels the need to say so. Furthermore, there is something missing here. Keeping the Faith in opposition to errors - does that mean keeping the Faith and opposing errors, condemning errors, condemning the purveyors of error... or does it just mean keeping the Faith as opposed to "keeping error"? Why put it like that? Why not just say "The SSPX intends to keep the Faith and to condemn error."? And what exactly is meant by "wherever it may come from"? Is there any doubt about which errors the SSPX ought to be opposing (and used to oppose)? Is there any doubt at all about where those errors come from? Archbishop Lefebvre showed not the slightest hesitation in naming the errors and the culprits in 1988 - why now the sudden reticence? No mention of Vatican II, no mention of modernism. Why might that be?

6. How would today's Menzingen have reacted to Archbishop Lefebvre?

One final thing needs to be said regarding Menzingen's "regret" that the consecration was "done out of a spirit of opposition," and that is to look a little more closely at the consecrations of 1988. In what way was this famous event not done in a spirit of opposition to the conciliar church? Did not Archbishop Lefebvre himself say, constantly, that he opposed the conciliar church, the conciliar revolution and all the changes which it brought about? Did this opposition to conciliarism not have something to do with the consecrations in 1988? Anyone who is unsure may wish to re-read the text of the Archbishop's sermon at that great occasion. They will find it in *Issue 9 of The Recusant* (August 2013). These consecrations, said Archbishop Lefebvre, were done:

"...in order to manifest our attachment to the Eternal Rome, to the Pope, and to all those who have preceded these last Popes who, unfortunately since the Second Vatican Council, have thought it their duty to adhere to grievous errors which are demolishing the Church and the Catholic Priesthood."

Do I detect a faint hint of opposition to "Roman authorities" in what he says? Notice the presence of that word "error", as in "the errors of the Council," not "philosophical tendencies" (which are still present even today!) as the US District website would have it, but real errors, promoted by men in high places, which are currently destroying the Church. The Archbishop then goes on to say that the consecration of new Bishops is essential to continue

to provide souls with the traditional sacraments as a channel of God's grace, which, he laments, *"is disappearing everywhere in the conciliar Church. They are following roads which are not Catholic roads: they simply lead to apostasy."*

No question there about "wherever the errors are coming from"! He goes on:

"Continue the Church! Indeed, since the Council, what we condemned in the past the present Roman authorities have embraced and are professing. How is it possible? We have condemned them: Liberalism, Communism., Socialism, Modernism, Sillonism. All the errors which we have condemned are now professed, adopted and supported by the authorities of the Church."

And:

"This ecumenism and all these errors, this collegiality - all this is contrary to the Faith of the Church, and is in the process of destroying the Church. This is why we are convinced that, by the act of these consecrations today, we are obeying the call of these Popes and as a consequence the call of God, since they represent Our Lord Jesus Christ in the Church."

Such a spirit of opposition! How regrettable!

From all of the above and much more besides, the following seem to us to be reasonable conclusions from Menzingen's reaction to the consecration of Bishop Faure.

1. If the Archbishop Lefebvre of 1988 were contemporary with the Menzingen of today, he would find himself condemned by them;
2. The SSPX of today does not dare to name the error or the culprit when it thinks modern Rome is looking. In front of the Romans, the SSPX is vague and uncritical and shows no opposition, but it does go out of its way to condemn "a spirit of opposition" in others;
3. The SSPX of today "regrets" and "denounces" any episcopal consecrations done without the approval of modern Rome;
4. The SSPX of today will denounce anyone whose recognition of the Roman authorities may be termed "rhetorical," which is to say anyone who in their view does not take sufficiently concrete practical steps to show their subjection and non-resistance to modern Rome; furthermore that they themselves presumably, so as not to fall under their own condemnation, intend to take such steps some time soon and show the world that their "recognition" is not merely "rhetorical";
5. The SSPX of today will never again consecrate bishops without papal mandate. If ever Bishop Fellay and Bishop de Galarreta do consecrate successors for themselves in the coming years (itself a doubtful prospect), it will only be with Roman approval. Which means candidates approved by modern Rome;
6. As a consequence, the future of Tradition will and must pass through the hands of Bishop Faure and whatever other Bishops are consecrated by him and Bishop Williamson as their successors.

Let us pray for the two Bishops, that they remain faithful *usque ad mortem*.



INTERVIEW WITH BISHOP WILLIAMSON

IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE CEREMONY OF THE CONSECRATION OF BISHOP FAURE

Source: <http://nonpossumus-vcr.blogspot.co.uk/2015/03/entrevista-mons-williamson-19-de-marzo.html>

Did the priests support you regarding this consecration?

Yes, there was a group of priests from Latin America and the United States and elsewhere. There are priests that understand, they are not numerous, but they have courage; they have faith, and are determined to continue in the right direction.

What made you decide to perform the consecration at this moment?

It became more reasonable every day faced with the threat of war which is nearly upon us now: it has already been twice avoided with Syria and Ukraine, and the criminal West continues to provoke the Russians. The moment may arise when Putin will say enough is enough and decide to attack.

Your Excellency, already the voices have begun to cry out that you and Bishop Faure are excommunicated. What can you tell us about that?

Truth is more important than authority. Authority exists to serve the Truth, and the Roman authorities have abandoned the Truth thanks to the Council, and they continue to do so more each day, unfortunately. So their punishment and censures carry no weight, they are meaningless

What qualities of Bishop Faure caused you to consider consecrating him a Bishop?

He is calm, he has experience, he is old, a bit younger than me, 73. Also, he is intelligent and has the Faith. He also has experience from the revolution because he fled Algeria in his youth, he lost everything because of this revolution and experienced the treachery of General De Gaulle, so he understands the modern world.

Many of the young priests have almost no experience of the modern world or the Revolution, so they do not perfectly understand the evil. For example, Bishop Fellay does not understand at all the temptations and dangers of Vatican II or its efforts to approach the modern world. He does not understand it and neither do many of the other priests of the Society. They are too young, and Bishop Faure, being old and experienced, avoids this trap of ignorance about what the modern church, the modern world and everything else actually is.

Bishop Faure's base will be France. Will you continue to visit America as before?

That is what I foresee, although events may decide otherwise. Bishop Faure may return quite often to Latin America, because that is where his heart is. Probably that's what will happen.

Your Excellency, will there be more consecrations?

It is quite possible. This time it was done very discreetly, but the next time there will be more than one consecration and it will be made public with plenty of time in advance.

Will the next consecrations be in Brazil?

No, they will probably be in Europe. Thank God that we have Brazil for this first consecration to take place, because it is far away from Europe and far from many problems. Now I'm no longer the only bishop and so the danger is not as great.

Do you expect a condemnation of this consecration from the Society?

I hope they do not because it would be an evil, and I do not hope evil for the Society.

A Society priest has recently said that the Resistance is a group of dissidents with no future.

Of course, that's what they said about Archbishop Lefebvre. But things are not judged according to the positions of men; they are fallible and can be fooled.

And we are also accused of pride.

They also accused Archbishop Lefebvre of pride. But defending the Truth and affirming that the Truth is above all men, that is not pride; it is humility. There is an objective truth above all of us, above Our Lord as man, he says many times in the Gospel of St. John; "I have come not to do My will, but the will of My Father." Thus Our Lord as man is below something that is above Him. He is humble. And He said to the Pharisees: "If I spoke like you who do not know the Truth, I would be a liar." If I retracted my statements, I would be a liar. If I were to reduce my claims, my requirements, it would be like revolting against the Father. The requirements, the absolute, comes from the Father. For all of us, even Jesus Christ as man.

Our Lady of Mt. Carmel Seminary:

olmcs.jimdo.com

Other Useful Websites:

www.inthissignyoushallconquer.com

www.ourladyofmountcarmelusa.com

www.ecclesiamilitans.com

www.truetrad.com

www.sacrificium.org

www.archbishoplefebvre.com

www.resistere.org

www.dominicansaville.us

filiimariae.over-blog.com

cristiadatradicinalista.blogspot.co.uk/

(French)

http://custos-sancto.jimdo.com/

(German)

nonpossumus-vcr.blogspot.co.uk

(Spanish)

www.benedictinos.org.br

(Portuguese)

rex.cz.blogspot.cz

(Czech)

“With friends like these...”



Archbishop Pozzo Does it Again!

“We appreciate the information released by the General House of the Society of St. Pius X, which is very clear,” says Archbishop Guido Pozzo.

[...]

Archbishop Pozzo adds that at the moment the dialogue “is continuing” with the Society of St. Pius X. “Several meetings have been held and more are due to take place with certain prelates to go more deeply into the problems which still need to be clarified, within a trusting relationship,” continues the secretary of the Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei, for whom, beyond the remaining doctrinal difficulties, the problems are “internal to the Society.”

“The Pope,” says Pozzo, “is waiting for the SSPX to decide to enter (the Church), and we are always available, with a canonical project which is already known,” namely the creation of a personal prelature. “A bit more time is needed,” he concludes, “for things to become clear internally (within the SSPX) and for Bishop Fellay to obtain a broad enough consensus to carry out this action.”

(Source: <http://www.la-croix.com/Urbi-et-Orbi/Actualite/Rome/Mgr-Williamson-est-excommunie-de-fait-apres-avoir-accompli-un-acte-illegitime-2015-03-20-1293394>)

...and in response:

Menzingen and DICI suffer an attack of amnesia! (Again!)

“At the Society of St. Pius X’s General House, they are wondering about Archbishop Pozzo’s intention in the last statement, which does not correspond to reality [...]

What makes canonical recognition in the form of a personal prelature impossible at this time is essentially the “doctrinal difficulties”, namely, Rome’s demand that we accept Vatican Council II and the reforms that followed it in a ‘hermeneutic of continuity’.” - DICI.org (www.dici.org/en/news/the-society-of-st-pius-xs-relations-with-rome-according-to-archbishop-pozzo/)

- **Why** do they place quotation marks around “doctrinal difficulties”...?

- **Is not** ‘hermeneutic of continuity’ Benedict XVI’s brainchild? And didn’t Bishop Fellay once tell CNS that he agreed with Benedict XVI’s ideas “totally, absolutely!”...?

- **What about** a certain Doctrinal Declaration of Bishop Fellay’s own making, which the rector of Écône, Fr. de Journa, described as, “nothing less than the hermeneutic of continuity,” and which explicitly accepts Vatican II and the reforms which followed it, going even so far as to claim that the council, “enlightens and deepens Tradition”...?

**WHICH STATEMENT ‘DOES NOT CORRESPOND TO REALITY’..?
WHO IS BEING LESS THAN HONEST?**

A.M.D.G.

Apostolate of Prayer for Priests

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Amen.

O Lord grant us priests,

O Lord grant us holy priests,

O Lord grant us many holy priests

O Lord grant us many holy religious vocations.

St. Pius X, pray for us.

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

Great Britain: 20

Canada: 22

Scandinavia: 2

Spain 10

Australia 5

Ireland 5

Singapore 3

USA 6



“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