



The Recusant

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



"The greatest obstacle in the apostolate of the Church is the timidity or rather the cowardice of the faithful."

- Pope St. Pius X

Inside:

- **"Knowing How To Stay Sane"**
(Analysis)
- **"An Inconvenient Bishop"** (Edwin Faust)
- **The GREC**
(Book review)
- **Bp. Fellay's New 'Hermeneutics'**
(Fr. Ortiz)
- **U.S. District Propaganda**
(Analysis)

From the Desk of the Editor:

These are interesting times! Before saying anything else, it may interest the reader to know that this editorial has had to be completely re-written from start to finish, more than once. The intervening time is a mere matter of a week or two, but so much is going on that even with more pages added, and even after squeezing every spare inch of space out of The Recusant, we still have too much material to print and must ruthlessly decide what can go into this issue and what, unfortunately, has to be left for next month. In summary, what we have decided to include in this issue is the following:

"Knowing how to stay sane" Of all the articles on the crisis in the SSPX which we have or are likely to print, this is the most 'out of date' or least 'current'. Written last May when a deal seemed imminent, and never yet translated for or circulated in the English speaking world, we regard this as such a good analysis that despite the intervening months it has still lost none of its relevance. In view of the recent announcement by Ecclesia Dei, it seems to have taken on a new relevance once again. The author's argu-

ment is one of principles and not personalities (a ‘sin’ of which ‘our side’ often stands accused by Menzingen apologists, though it is hardly, if ever, deserved). The author is a French priest, faithful to the course marked out Archbishop Lefebvre, and well versed in Thomistic philosophy. We commend the article to you.

“An Inconvenient Bishop” is a short article by the veteran journalist and Traditional Catholic Edwin Faust. You can surely guess which Bishop it is about! It appeared first on Fr. Gruner’s Fatima website and was linked to on John Vennari’s “Catholic Family News” website until, mysteriously, it was completely removed a day or two later. We would be amazed if there was no pressure from Menzingen or their agents to remove it. It has now found a permanent home on The Recusant website.

“The GREC” (Groupe de Reunion Entre Catholiques) is a subject which might be new to many readers. It certainly appears very unsound (a sort of ‘ecumenical’ Novus/Trad dialogue group), precious little about it seems to have been known until recently, and much has yet to come to light, even though it has been functioning for a number of years. The book review is written by a French Traditionalist layman about a book by one conciliar priest involved. We apologise if the English sounds a little odd – once again it was translated specifically for The Recusant, and our translator says that the French was rather odd too. If nothing else, we are printing this in the hope of at least raising awareness of the subject, since we expect it to come up again in the months and years ahead, particularly if the ambitions of certain clerics come to pass.

Fr. Juan Carlos Ortiz is the latest priest to speak out against the ongoing conciliarisation of the SSPX, with an article entitled **“The New Hermeneutics of Bishop Fellay – Has the SSPX Changed its Position?”** We commend this brave priest to your prayers – the article, reproduced here in translation, requires no comment. Similarly, in Brazil, another Religious Community recently published a declaration which places them in the same ‘naughty corner’ as Dom Tomas Aquinas and the Benedictines of Nova Friburgo. We hope to print a translation of the latter in due course.

And what of Bishop Fellay, what has he been up to lately?

Well, without going into too much detail, since Issue 2 was printed we have become aware of two recent, though somewhat different, public utterances on the part of Bishop Fellay. The first one, a conference given on the Feast of the Holy Family in September, in Flavigny, is decidedly worrying and appears to be something in the way of an apologia for the conciliar hierarchy. It is difficult to say more since, although a commentary in French exists, there does not appear to be either a transcript or a recording anywhere on the internet. If any of our readers are able to locate it, please send it to our email address: we would be very interested indeed. Both a transcript and a recording do exist, however, for the other sermon, given in St. Nicolas du Chardonnet, on All Saints Day. Although the sermon is not without its own peculiarities and non-sequiturs (not least regarding the expulsion of Bishop Williamson), one can clearly detect an attempt on the part of Bishop Fellay to “Trad-it-up” so to speak, to sound as “hardline Traditionalist” as possible. Sev-

eral gratuitous references to things such as La Salette, ‘apostate Rome’, Koran kissing and Assisi are clearly meant to sound as Traditional as possible - perhaps to make the speaker sound more like Abp. Lefebvre? Many of us, however, remain unconvinced. We still recall other things which Bishop Fellay has said and done not so very long ago, which seem to contradict these newfound “Traditionalist credentials” (things which, moreover, he has never retracted). We see this merely as yet another example of how a cunning politician will always try to tailor his remarks to his audience. He will try to say things that he knows will resonate with his listeners. Let us recall also that St. Nicolas is known for being a centre of anti-agreement feeling, not least in the person of its Prior, Fr. Xavier Beauvais. One has to ask oneself: if the Superior General were so scandalised by Assisi III, why did he not condemn it in the strongest possible and most uncompromising terms? Why, after all that has happened, is he still negotiating with these “apostate” people? And how does that sit with his September Flavigny manifesto that whatever heresy and scandal we see “...it is still the Church!” Perhaps the two are reconcilable in his mind. Perhaps the only thing we can conclude is that Bishop Fellay is capable of radically changing his tune at a moment’s notice, and that only he knows what he really thinks. At any rate, actions speak louder than words! If the reader wants a further example of the ongoing “actions” of the SSPX leadership, let us recall to mind the various heretical and heterodox pronouncements of Benedict XVI, all of which are passed over in silence by DICI, by the German District website, by the US District website... even though all the while these same websites are giving us examples of “good”, “conservative” things being done or said by Benedict XVI and certain of his Bishops. One recent example is the report, via Vatican Information Service, entitled “Pope Benedict XVI blesses Islam centre”. With a headline like that, one hardly need read the article! At the time of writing, there is no mention of this on DICI or any other SSPX website. The silence on such matters is deafening.

Where the official SSPX is not silent, alas, is when it comes to lecturing us, the faithful, on our need to follow the corporate line, the latest policy from on high, that they know best, etc. Recent examples of this abound. For example, there is a scandalously poor quality attempt by SSPX.org entitled “The Need to Know vs. Peace of Soul” whose main thesis seems to be that is sinful to seek to know the truth, and that since the SSPX is a religious congregation, it doesn’t really concern you anyway. Then there is the article on the French version of the DICI website (though not the English version – why might that be?) which seems to be a weak attempt to reinvent Archbishop Lefebvre in the image and likeness of Bishop Fellay, using a never-before-seen and unattributed quote purporting to be from the Archbishop in 1975. Thirdly, and more recently still, comes the US “District Superiors letter” warning the faithful against sinful websites where one finds rumours and gossip, together with “calumny, slander and rash judgement”. A full analysis of the other side’s recent attempts at propaganda can be found on our website, and will be printed as space permits.

In short: we faithful have more than reason enough to be concerned. Let us continue to make every effort to stay alert and informed. Watch and pray!

Mundane Matters Revisited

Some of our more recent subscribers have written to us to ask, amongst other things, what is our subscription price. All of this was explained in Issue 1, but of course since we have added well over a hundred new readers in only the last month or so, this will not be familiar to everyone. To answer any other such questions in advance, I reproduce now what I recently wrote in reply to one new subscriber:

“In the first issue we said that we were happy for the moment for people to give whatever they felt able. Some people have given very generously and some have yet to contribute anything, as one might realistically expect, but our thinking is that since this is more of an apostolate than a business venture, and since our goal is to get the information out rather than to turn a profit, we would rather produce the newsletter for free and trust that Providence (and the generosity of our readers) looks after us. If Almighty God wants this to continue, He will make it possible. So, to answer your question, anything would be gratefully received - as much or as little as you can reasonably afford.”

I would like to add a little word to that by saying that we are exceedingly grateful to the many readers who have sent in donations (often accompanied by heartening messages of encouragement and support) which ensure we can continue to operate, and also by encouraging those of you who have so far benefitted in silence to step forward. It is less than two months since the idea of this newsletter first became a reality, but we are already in a more stable position and starting to plan ahead in various ways. In the pipeline is more work to improve the website, and as soon as possible the acquiring of a postal address, which several of our readers have indicated would prove useful. We count on your continued support, and in the meantime thank you for your patience and generosity. Finally, we wish all our readers (friend and foe alike!) a Merry Christmas and a Blessed 2013.



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

“Knowing How to Stay Sane”

By a French Priest

The unrest which has shaken the Society St. Pius X and her friends for several months, has reached such an extent and obviousness that it is difficult not to become worried about it. It is even our duty so it seems to me, to judge these events, inspired by the principles of faith and prudence. If the final decision of signing a canonical agreement with Rome depends on the General Chapter of the Society St. Pius X, it is everybody's duty, within their duty of state and because of their own responsibilities (as bishop, priest, father of a family), to know whether such a legal agreement with the Roman authorities is desirable or not. The following lines are an attempt to help all those who “want to stay sane”, and who want to remain in the sacred peace which comes from Our risen Lord Jesus Christ and His Church.

We will proceed in the following way: After having analysed in the light of common sense the arguments of those who defend a canonical agreement with Rome, we will devote ourselves to the Thomist teaching on the virtue of prudence. After that we will consider the Roman way of thinking on church and magisterium. We will conclude with practical resolutions which, if they are valid for all times, acquire a special relevance today.

Unless stated otherwise, all quotes which are cited (in quotation marks) are from one of the members of the General Council of the Society St. Pius X (Mgr. Fellay, Frs. N. Pfluger and Nély).

I - The Voice of Common Sense

Before we address the issue of doctrinal considerations, we will allow the first words to go to the defenders of the canonical status which Rome proposes for the Society St. Pius X. We will answer them by taking on board some considerations of common sense which come from this or that person, religious, or laity.

1) One has to trust Mgr. Fellay and his assistants and one must not be disrespectful towards them.

Answer: The term “respect” does not represent any difficulty. It means to recognise the dignity in the other person which was granted to him by God (spiritual soul, grace, authority). I do not know any person amongst the opponents to this project of a canonical agreement who has showed a lack of respect.

The trust (in Latin: *fides*) represents the security one has that the other person will keep his promise. It is therefore exactly in the name of trust that we expect the Society St. Pius X to keep the solemn undertaking of the year 2006, namely: never to accept a canonical status without first having reached a doctrinal agreement. It is in the name of our trust in Mgr. Fellay that we believe that he will not reach a canonical agreement with Rome, by opposing the other three bishops of Tradition and a consid-

erable proportion of Tradition itself. To trust in Mgr. Fellay means also to think him incapable of contradicting his letter of 1st December 2011 in which he refused the new code of canon law. If he were to say the opposite today then the matter becomes no longer a question of trust but we should be speaking rather of gratefulness and obedience.

Let us add that the expression “trust” can be misleading. Firstly, because it has today a strong, sentimental connotation: “I trust in this or that person” means very often that I like this person, that I am attached to that person, or that he says things which I like. Above all, this expression distorts the debate, as it makes it a mere question of the person. But here this is absolutely not relevant to the question.

2) *Mgr. Fellay possesses the grace of state, he is pious and loves Our Lord*

Answer: I do not doubt this one second. But here this is not the question. On the one hand one can claim with certainty that Pope Pius XI had the grace of state not to condemn the Action Française, or not to forsake the Christeros – which he did; that Pope Paul VI had the grace of state not to promulgate the New Mass, that Pope John Paul II had the grace of state not to conduct Assisi I, that Benedict XVI had the grace of state not to conduct Assisi III. Every legitimate authority, instituted by God, has the state grace of state in order to lead society according to the ways of God.

One can argue that Mgr. Fellay is pious meaning ready to follow grace. In all honesty, nobody has ever asked me to judge the piety of Mgr. Fellay. But, in order to stick to the subject, does this objection not sound as if the other three bishops of tradition, who firmly refuse any agreement, are not pious? Go and tell them! Make the same accusation to the religious (Capuchins, Benedictines, Dominicans) and the cloistered religious who oppose the undertaking of a canonical agreement.

3) *Be that as it may, one has to be obedient towards superiors.*

Answer: On the whole this statement is correct, provided that one understands obedience in its Catholic meaning. Obedience is a moral virtue, which is on the one hand subjected to the theological virtues and on the other hand subjected to the common good of society which is governed by the leading authority. St. Paul was neither lacking in obedience which he owed to the Pope (St. Peter), nor in respect when he “withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.” (Gal 2, 11), and when he said of him that he “walked not uprightly unto the truth of the gospel.” (Gal 2, 14). One should read for this purpose the works of Père Calmel, O.P. on obedience. Blind obedience is no Catholic concept. Every priest of the Society St. Pius X is going to be responsible before God for the acceptance or refusal of a canonical agreement with present-day Rome. Mgr. Fellay promised (Letter to Friends and Benefactors, 28th November, 2011) that the final text which will serve as the doctrinal foundation for the canonical agreement will be made public. After personal study accompanied by prayer, everybody will have to make their own decision. Nobody will ever be able to accept a text which is either a compromise with heresy, or which suffers from ambiguity and omission.

One should also consider that the religious who have put themselves under the

authority of Mgr. Galerreta, first of all owe to him trust, respect and obedience.

- 4) *The religious of Tradition will be put under the authority of a prelate of this personal prelature who will exercise a direct authority over them.*

Answer: One is allowed to see in this a trick of the modernists which consists of forming a structure which combines all faithful who are attached to the fight of Mgr. Lefebvre; a kind of “nature reserve”. This policy was used for the female congregations in the 1960s. Père Calmel made this very clear to the Dominicans of the Holy Name of Jesus and thus they were preserved from this trap. Such a federation of all traditionalists in one body is a simple means in order to control them and transform them step by step. Today a large number of religious communities of Tradition have refused to follow this dangerous path.

- 5) *The Pope and the Ecclesia Dei Commission wish us well, they are on our side.*

Answer: They love us so much that, if we reject their suggestions within a short period of time, they threaten us with excommunication or at least with being declared schismatic. It is a bit like a young man who falls in love with a young woman and yet she hesitates over whether or not to marry him. By holding a gun to her head he says: “You will marry me within a month otherwise I will kill you.” What beautiful love!

- 6) *Many good things are happening in Rome. Rome is on the point of converting.*

Answer: Well, this sounds like good news. Unfortunately, however, it does not spring to mind when one actually reads the official documents coming from Rome. But supposing that the Romans “have converted” from their modernist errors, we should tell them the same as St. Remi did to Chlodwig: “Adore what you burned, burn what you adored.” In other words, there is no conversion without renouncing of ones errors and mistakes. In this sense Père Calmel recalls: “One will only return to the mass of St. Pius V if one converts.”

Before we embark on a deeper theological study of this “progress” of the actors and sons of Vatican II, let us content ourselves with recalling an image which Mgr. Fellay used a couple of months ago. Even if a bowl of soup contains very good soup, it would suffice to know that it contains one single grain of cyanide to refuse it completely. “Even good itself is converted to bad use,” maintains Père Calmel. The truth taught by semi-modernists is in the service of modernistic thought and is inspired by false principles. The most typical example of that is the new Catechism which the Roman authorities want to impose on us.

- 7) *The Vatican II Church resembles an ocean steamer going at full speed. It can neither come to a stop, nor change its directions immediately. It needs time. It is in this sense that one has to understand the reforms, and also the reform of the reform as recommended by the Pope.*

Answer: This image can already be found in the book by Father Céliér: *Benedict XVI and the Traditionalists*. It appears to me that it cannot be applied in this case for two reasons. Firstly, if one does not change the crew of the steamer, which symbolises its

conversion, then the steamer will sooner or later sheer away from the right course. It does not help to get onto the steamer in order to help it doing that. Secondly, this image proceeds from the assumption that the steamer represents the Catholic Church. But this swerving steamer is not the Church of Christ but of the Devil. It is useful to read the declaration of principles by Mgr. Lefebvre on 21st November 1974. Such confusion is found in the statements of the authorities who are promoting this juridical agreement: “Tradition returns from exile,” “We are being reintegrated into the Church”.

8) *If you decline Rome’s offer then you are schismatic, sedevacantist.*

Answer: With ample respect for the authorities who bring forth such arguments, it is easy to recognise the scarecrow with which Tradition has been reproached for the last 35 years. We are no sedevacantists or schismatics, just as Mgr. Lefebvre was not in 1976 or 1988, or Mgr. Fellay in 2006 or on 1 December 2011. It is true that the papacy is, according to a picture by Père Calmel, in an eclipse, meaning that the sun (the pope) is covered by the moon (neo-modernist thought), which impedes the sun from having the charisma which it should have. One can therefore indeed refuse these doctrinal or practical initiatives because of its modernist direction, without declaring the downfall of the papacy.

One will profit greatly from reminding oneself that fear (in this case, fear of sedevacantism or of schism) is a preferred weapon of the devil. It paralyses and blinds, like a mouse in front of a cat.

9) *The doctrinal discussions in Rome were not successful because of the theologians of Tradition. Nonetheless, if Rome grants us a legal status, one should not be too harsh; one should seek to mute one’s criticism. One will not be able to mention any names (this pope said such error, that bishop caused such scandal).*

Answer: This oft-repeated verdict on the outcome of the doctrinal discussion is prejudicial towards Mgr. Galaretta and the theologians who on this occasion did some work of very good quality, even according to Mgr. Fellay’s judgment at the end of October 2011. Furthermore, this verdict is not justified according to the words of the participants.

Concerning our criticism of modernism, it is up to every individual to keep couch it in the appropriate form and with the appropriate respect. It is true that this or that person has transgressed a bit, but the tree should not hide the forest.

Above all, it is important for the proclamation of the Faith not only to condemn heresies but also heretics. At La Salette, Our Lady did not content herself merely with saying: “One has to keep the Faith”, but she also said “Rome is going to lose the Faith”. Look at what the Fathers of the Church say, too. The majority of St. Augustine’s work is spent attacking people: “*Contra Faustum*” etc. The gentle St. Bonaventure calls a certain Gerald “impudent, slanderer, three times crazy, ‘poisoner’ etc.” And St. Catherine of Siena uses withering invective against the Cardinals of her day. What shall we say about Mgr. Lefebvre who preached at Écône: “The antichrist is in Rome”...?

That is simply the usual policy of modernistic subversion: to force silence upon us, not to point out the culprit. Preach against robbery, yes, but don't shout “Stop! Thief!” One can fill libraries with scientific thesis against errors, provided that one is silent on its preachers. After the acceptance of a legal status, the bishops will not have the right anymore to say who the wolf is. Preaching which is mutilated in this way is not Catholic anymore.

10) One has to stay an apostle. Tradition has to emerge out of the ghetto.

Answer: The older members amongst us recognise the “slogans” which were brought forth by the “backsliders” in 1988 and their successors (Mgr. Rifan in Brazil, Fr. Aulagnier in France, etc.). Firstly one should remark that this does not honour those who utter them, as they imply that they themselves have done hardly any apostolate for 30 years and had lived in a ghetto. I leave these statements to their own responsibility; however I do not recognise myself at all in this view of Tradition. Furthermore, I also notice that those who have the most contact with the world and its sad reality are those who oppose this canonical agreement the most.

Let us add that the word “apostle” etymologically means “one who is sent forth”. It is God who sends, it is He himself who defines conditions, in which the mission of the church can be realised. St. Paul wrote his great letters from prison. From exile, St. Athanasius saved the Church from Arianism.

11) They have offered us a university in Rome, a radio station, even to live in Rome itself, as there is a shortage of bishops.

Answer: On the occasion of the doctrinal discussions in Rome, an important member of a congregation of the Vatican told the Society St. Pius X: “Do not sign an agreement with Rome, as Rome is not capable in keeping its promises.” Look at that! A Roman who is against an agreement!

Furthermore, such promises leave a bad taste in the mouth. How can one not think of the devil, showing Our Lord “all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them” and promising Him “all these will I give thee, if falling down thou wilt adore me.” (Mt 4,9). So all we have to do is be faithful to the local ordinary, to place our episcopate or our priesthood in the hands of the destroyers of the Church and to agree to remain silent on the crimes – and they will give us the moon!

II The Virtue of Prudence

After these considerations which were dictated by our common sense let us now elevate the debate to considerations on the virtue of prudence. She indeed is what is at stake, as the whole question is about knowing whether or not it is expedient to accept the legal status proposed by Rome. The practical judgement follows three stages.

1) The starting point of the prudent way of thinking (the “major premise” as the philosopher would say) sets out the general principles involved. In this case, these are Catholic teaching concerning the Church, the Pope, the Magisterium, the Priesthood, etc. The

aspect of this teaching in which we are most interested is the nature of jurisdiction and of the ecclesiastical Magisterium. It is appropriate to remind ourselves that the ecclesiastical Magisterium is a way of teaching through authority. The Pope and the bishops do not content themselves with offering a doctrine for us to reflect upon, as a professor or preacher would do, but they impose on us a truth which we have to believe. The Magisterium is an act of will of the ecclesiastical authority, applied to our will.

This means that the great question with which we are confronted today is one of knowing what is the explicit will of the Pope and the bishops. When one says “No canonical agreement without doctrinal agreement”, one must understand not only the teaching taught here or there by the Pope, but the teaching which he pretends to impose on us by means of his authority. That is why the question of the Magisterium was the most delicate question of the doctrinal discussions.

Therefore, when we talk of a juridical status, we are therefore talking about a concrete and effective obedience towards the ruling Pope (today’s, as well as tomorrow’s). Accepting this status means promising in the presence of the Church and the world to be obedient to the Pope from now onwards *hic et nunc*, and that we are putting the future of Tradition into his hands. We are no longer seeking a relationship of “good neighbours” with the Church authorities, but a real dependence, a subordinated collaboration. It is precisely because we are not sedevacantists that we have to consider from close-up the exact intention of the Pope and the Roman authorities (Ecclesia Dei).

The second step of a prudent way of thinking – the minor premise – considers the concrete circumstances. In order to be faithful to the laws of logic, this second consideration needs to take into account a point of the first premise, applying it to the present situation (the middle term).

In this case, what we are talking about here is the will and the specific intentions of the Pope and the *Ecclesia Dei* commission.

Here once again we need to draw distinctions. We are not talking about the secret, personal intention of this or that bishop, but rather the clearly expressed will, the direction imprinted in this or that decision, in this or that text. The question is not subjective but objective. In moral theology, one distinguishes between the *finis operis* (the end, or aim of the act itself), and the *finis operantis* the (the aim of the person who acts).

However, the purely subjective question of good will, goodness or good intentions should not be part of the prudent way of thinking (or hardly). More space is needed for explaining things in the light of logic. Let us note two problems with this “subjective” aim. The first is that it is dependent and very variable. For example, in September 2011 we were told that Mgr. Pozzo of the *Ecclesia Dei* commission was very favourable towards us. In December 2011 we were told that, no, he was asking too much of us, and that he was in the modernist camp. Then in March 2012 we were told with the same assurance that he wishes us well after all, and that he understands us.

The second problem with this subjective will is that it is secret. Everyone who has spoken to the competent authorities in Menzingen has been struck by the way that they always base things on what’s being said in the Roman corridors of power, on “I heard someone say...”, on things half-told to them in confidential, muted tones. But one of the

marks of the Church of Christ is its visibility. Supernatural prudence should therefore be applied to visible and incontestable facts.

It is therefore the *finis operis*, the manifest intentions inscribed in the speeches and decisions of the Romans which interests us here.

Let us take a few examples:

- In his meeting with Mgr. Fellay and Fr. Schmidberger in August 2005, Pope Benedict XVI manifested his will with force and clarity:
- You must open the doors of your seminaries to modern theologians;
- You must accept the Second Vatican Council, that is, the texts of the Council and the intentions of the Council fathers, etc.
- In his speech to Cardinals in December 2005, Pope Benedict XVI explained his thinking and his programme of government: he condemned the famous “hermeneutic of rupture” (which we have in common with the modernists) in order to impose his hermeneutic of reform, called the “hermeneutic of continuity”.
- The famous Motu Proprio of 2007 has some good in it. It declares that the Traditional Mass was never forbidden. Even if the conditions for saying it publicly are still somewhat restrictive, this decision gives priests more liberty and courage to celebrate it. But the underlying intention of the Pope is clearly expressed: on the one hand, the New Mass is called the “ordinary form”, that is the universal norm of the (modern) Church, whereas the Traditional Mass is called “extraordinary”, that is to say, an exception permitted by law. On the other hand, it is said explicitly that the two rites will henceforward enrich one another, the Mass of Paul VI becoming more conservative, the Traditional Mass more modern. The *finis operis* of this Motu Proprio is a reconciliation of the rites, a changing of the two liturgies. The real spirit of this Motu Proprio needs to be understood since it is quite clear that the Roman authorities would like to do today to the Society of St. Pius X at a juridical level what they did in 2007 on a liturgical level.
- At every one of the theological discussions in Rome, Mgr. Pozzo presented the SSPX theologians with a text to sign in which they would recognise the authority of Vatican II and the living Magisterium. Some twenty formulas were proposed to them. The real intention of the Romans was thus not a doctrinal joust (*disputatio*), but rather to arrive at a compromise text which everyone could sign. Their aim was not truth, but pragmatism.
- On 14th September, 2011, the Doctrinal Preamble presented for Mgr. Fellay to sign implied acceptance of the hermeneutic of continuity, of the texts of Vatican II, of the new Code of Canon Law, and of the legitimacy of the New Mass. The personal prelature proposed by Rome was, in accordance with this new Code, under the dependence of Diocesan Bishops. The *finis operis* could be seen there very clearly.
- On the 22nd or 23rd September, 2011, the Pope was interrogated in Germany by some Jews, who were indignant at seeing Rome appearing to accept some Traditionalists who refuse Vatican II and in particular the constitution *Nostra Aetate* which affirms that the Jews are our elder brothers in the faith. The Pope replied: “Every Catholic must adhere to *Nostra Aetate* in its essence.”

- In March, 2012, Mgr. Pozzo told the superiors of the Good Shepherd Institute that they must forgo their “positive criticism” of the Council and adopt the “hermeneutic of continuity”, use the new Catechism in their apostolates, and renounce their “exclusive” use of the Mass of St. Pius V.

These declarations and decisions of the Pope and the Roman authorities are sufficiently numerous to permit an accurate deduction: Rome wants to align Traditionalists with Benedict XVI’s understanding of the Council.

The syllogism can therefore be put thus:

- Accepting a juridical status means promising obedience to the will of Rome.
- The will of Rome is to make us adopt Vatican II.

The conclusion is undeniable. This explicit will of the Pope is not the will of Jesus Christ. We therefore cannot accept the proposition of a personal prelature for the Society of St. Pius X.

This is confirmed by analysing the current state of the SSPX, of its allies, and its faithful. Independently of everything written above, the acceptance of such a juridical status is rendered impossible due to the weakness of Tradition. To be able to “enter” modernist Rome like this, we would need to be very strong. However, examples abound of the very serious weakness of Catholics who have, up to now, been defending the fight of Archbishop Lefebvre. Among many of them there is a real desire for a spiritual life and doctrinal formation. There is even, generally, a good understanding of modernism. But very often, knowledge of neo-modernism and of the techniques of subversion is lacking. They see modernism as a heresy, but not so much as a perverted system. Here once again, the writings of Père Calmel are of great benefit: “Modernism is contagious,” he would say, “you must run away from it!” To use an analogy made by a friend, today the cohabitation of Tradition with modernist Rome would be like a mosquito entering a barrel of tar, or a fly entering a spiders web.

III – Semi-Modernism

The various long studies by theologians of the SSPX and priests of Tradition can be summarised thus: the Pope has a phenomenological and evolutionary concept of the Church. He sees rites of Mass and juridical structures of the Church as outward “accidentals”, dependent and variable, of an invisible, mystical reality which subsists in all these exterior forms. As such, these “phenomena” must continually change and follow the direction of history. The motor of such evolution is dialogue, or “*communio*”. It is through exchange and confrontation that the Church advances, like a wheel on the road of history.

That is what explains the way in which the Pope alternates, with his disciples too, between propositions and decisions of a more or less traditional character, and others whose character is veritably heretical. These opposing elements, in him and in the Church, must be in constant contact with each other, rubbing against one another so to speak, to advance common thought.

That is what we need to have studied in depth, in light of these texts, in order to under-

stand the current (‘living’) Magisterium and its “hermeneutic of continuity”. Vatican II and the changes which followed it are consistent with the aforementioned to the extent that they are the fruit of this vital confrontation of various tendencies in the Church and the world. They are good and true if they come from dialogue and “communion”. The current Magisterium condemns both types of “hermeneutic of rupture” to the extent that they take issue with this vital and organic evolution.

Certainly, we’re on the wrong path if we only consider his errors, but also if we allow ourselves to be dazzled by the few truths he may profess, and which we have taken out of their context.

A *sensus Catholicus* will be able to realise it, without even having to the subtleties of Heidegger or Hegel. Effectively, we’re asking for continuity from the Church’s authority. God being immutable, the Truth of God is immutable. The authentic Magisterium participates in this immutability. Therefore, our reproach directed at the Magisterium of Benedict XVI is not only that of having uttered errors, although he has often done so (concerning the Jews, false religions, world government, notions of the same faith, etc.), but also this calculated alternating, this going to and fro between truth and error. An image might help us to understand: the Magisterium of the Church of Christ is like a continuous, unbroken line and not a dotted line. Anyone who doesn’t know the difference between the two is not fit to be in the driving seat!

Of course, this summary is imperfect. One could refer to deeper studies published by the theologians defending Tradition. For the moment it is sufficient to expose the delicate problem of the way in which acts of the new Magisterium are being used and to understand in part why the Roman authorities want so badly to integrate the SSPX into their system.

IV Resolutions

It seems to me that the difficult questions with which we are confronted do nonetheless oblige us not only quiet reflection, but also to personal resolutions.

Close your computer.

It seems to me that the abuse of the so-called digital media (internet, mobile phones, digital cameras, etc.) is one of the causes of today’s confused thinking amongst Catholics and gives rise to a way of thinking which likes sheltering under particular facts and never manages to get back to the underlying principles.

There is a duty of Christian poverty, silence and solitude for those who wish not to be carried away on the torrent of modern thought.

Study liberalism and the ways of revolution.

Reading and meditating upon Sacred Scripture is a the way Providence nourishes the spirit of faith. The rules of combat for the Christian against the devil and against heresies of every age can be found expressed in the classics: the story of the first sin (Genesis), the book of Judith, the two books of Maccabees, the temptation of Christ in the desert (Mt., 4). In that last example, Our Lord chases away the devil using Sacred Scripture (we will resist modernism by relying on the traditional Magisterium) and by

calling the devil by his name: “*vade retro Satanas!*”



An Inconvenient Bishop: The Truth About Richard Williamson

by Edwin Faust
November 27, 2012

The Church has become increasingly solicitous of its public image. The media applauded Pope John XXIII, who wanted to open the windows of the Church to let in the air of the modern world. But the Church has paid a high price for that short-lived media approbation, and the breeze of modernity has swept her into the shifting winds of public opinion.

Whatever Bishop Richard Williamson’s differences may be with the leadership of the Society of St. Pius X, any honest assessment of his ultimate expulsion from the SSPX would have to begin with the incident that caused his superior to remove him from public ministry and sequester him.

Bishop Williamson is of the opinion that gas chambers were not used in the extermination of Jews by the Nazis during World War II. He accepts the conclusions of a disputed scientific study known as the Leuchter Report. Consequently, His Excellency thinks the number of Jews killed in the camps may be closer to one and half million rather than six million. He said as much during an interview with Swedish television conducted in Germany.

This opinion is really what has made Richard Williamson a problem for the SSPX and its supporters who want a deal with the Vatican. Bishop Williamson has been tried and found guilty of Holocaust Denial under German law. He has, unofficially, been found guilty of being inconvenient to the SSPX and the Holy See.

His Excellency's expulsion from the SSPX was consummated in October. It was immediately followed by an announcement from Vatican officials that negotiations with the SSPX were not at an end or a standstill, as formerly thought, but that patience was needed and hope for a reconciliation very much alive. Coincidence?

Jewish organizations that maintain relations with the Vatican denounced the lifting of the excommunications of the SSPX bishops, noting that a "holocaust denier" was among them. The pope's spokesman said the Holy Father did not know of Bishop Williamson's remarks at the time of the decree, implying that such knowledge may have affected the lifting of the excommunications.

Without weighing in on the merits of Bishop Williamson's opinion about the Leuchter Report, is it not pertinent to ask what that opinion has to do with the Catholic Faith? Must one subscribe to a particular version of history to be qualified to practice an episcopal ministry within the Catholic Church? One might also ask: To what extent has ecclesial authority been extended de facto to German courts, Jewish organizations and the popular media?

Bishop Williamson was removed as rector of the SSPX seminary in South America and exiled to Wimbledon not for transgressing any statute of his priestly fraternity; not for any infraction of canon law; not for any public or private dissent from the dogmatic teaching of the Church. Bishop Williamson was stripped of his ministry and hidden from public view for being a public-relations problem.

Had His Excellency recanted his opinion, apologized to all who were ostensibly offended by it, paid his court fine and made his mea culpa to his superior, all might have been well. The problem is: He is an honest man.

He has not been persuaded that he is wrong in his opinion, and he knows he has not transgressed any discipline or doctrine of the Church. He has continued to speak his mind through his blog site. And he has been forthright in stating his position regarding a deal between the SSPX and the Vatican: He thinks the time has not yet arrived when the SSPX can trust the orthodoxy and honorable intentions of the Roman authorities.

He opposes the efforts in this direction of his superior, Bishop Fellay, and has called for new leadership in the SSPX. Whether this merits his expulsion from the fraternity is a question best left to the members of that fraternity. But the elimination of Bishop Williamson certainly relieves the SSPX of a public-relations problem and eases any possi-

ble deal that may be in the works with an intensely media-sensitive Roman Curia. Of course, what those who welcome Bishop Williamson's expulsion may not realize is that the charge of anti-Semitism will continue to be leveled at the Catholic Church under every possible pretext, for it is the Faith itself that many Jews find offensive.

Anyone who knows Bishop Williamson realizes that his integrity is beyond question, as is his charity. However unpopular his opinions, they are not held out of malice, but out of honest conviction. He may be judged eccentric, even imprudent. But he is Catholic to the core. And this may be the heart of the problem. It is time it was acknowledged.

Support Bishop Williamson!

Visit:

<http://www.stmarcelinitiative.com/>

Postal address:

P.O. Box 423, Deal CT14 4BF

Other useful websites:

www.therecusan.com

www.inthissignyoushallconquer.com

www.cathinfo.com

www.sossaveoursspx.com

aveclimmaculee.blogspot.com

(French)

www.antimodernisme.info

(French)

Review of “Towards the Necessary Reconciliation” by Fr. Michel Lelong, promoted by GREC

(By Gentiloup, from the web site “*Un évêque s’est levé!*”)

I have just finished reading the book by Fr. Michel Lelong, entitled: “Towards the Necessary Reconciliation” [**Pour la nécessaire réconciliation** (published December 2011)].

It is a small work of 159 pages, not exciting but quickly read. It is an exposé of GREC, “Groupe de Réflexion Entre Catholiques” [Catholic Think Tank].

This booklet summarizes the work accomplished by GREC, it is a sort of glowing report by the author who was present from the beginning of this organization. His goal is to open up the SSPX to reconciliation with conciliar Rome. Nevertheless, this little book unintentionally clarifies the downward slide of the head of the SSPX and why the ralliement [an apropos French word for the effort to rejoin and compromise with Rome] with conciliar Rome was able to corrupt the spirit at the heart of the SSPX.

This “think tank” was founded in 1997 with the goal of integrating the SSPX with modernist Rome and convincing it to accept the Second Vatican Council.

The founders were Mr. and Mrs. Gilbert Pérol and Fr. Michel Lelong, author of the book and fervent defender of inter-religious dialogue and the Council. Mr Pérol had been the Ambassador of France to Rome.

GREC’s goal is not ambiguous. It is clearly defined throughout this book by different protagonists as being “**Interpreting Vatican II in the light of Tradition**,” according to the formula John-Paul II gave to Archbishop Lefebvre in 1978.

Fr. Michel Lelong is convinced of the benefits of the Council, especially of *Nostra Aetate*, and is a specialist in dialoguing with Muslims.

The Ambassador’s idea was to enter into dialogue with traditional Catholics of the SSPX in the same way that he had dialogued with other religions and from which, to his regret, the SSPX had been excluded.

Fr. Alain Lorans, one of the four founders of GREC, was the spokesman for the SSPX District of France. He immediately obtained permission from Bishop Fellay to participate in the dialogue “for a necessary reconciliation.” He has been very attentive in keeping Bishop Fellay up-to-date with the progress of this dialogue.

The 'Charter' of this group was defined by Mr. Pérol shortly before his death: it is “*to interpret Vatican II in light of Tradition*,” which Benedict XVI himself calls the *hermeneutic of continuity*, in opposition to the *hermeneutic of rupture*...

Commencing its activities with a small committee formed around Mrs. Pérol, Fr. Michel Lelong and **Fr. Emmanuel du Chalard**, the Group “did not cease to give discreet and special support to GREC.”

“Two other priests contributed decisively to the creation and life of our Catholic group. One of them who has since returned to God was the Dominican, Fr. Olivier de La Brosse, the other, Fr. Lorans of the SSPX. I [Fr. Lelong] got to know them in 1997 during a dinner to which we had been invited by Mrs. Pérol. On that day GREC was born.” (Page 24)

This meeting took place in Rome at Madame Pérol's home.

• **Fr. Olivier de La Brosse, who died in 2009, was the spokesman for the Bishops' Conference of France.**

• **Fr. Lorans was the spokesman for the [SSPX] District of France.** He had obtained permission from Bishop Fellay to dialogue with the group .

Thus we have the four founders of GREC:

- Mrs. Pérol
- Fr. Michel Lelong
- Fr. Lorans
- Fr. de la Brosse

In the months that followed, the protagonists remained quietly within their respective communities.

Soon after, conferences would be organized, but without fanfare, for it was necessary that this should remain confidential. Fr. Michel Lelong writes:

“When we meet in friendship, I often think of Gilbert Pérol who, while actively participating in Christian-Muslim dialogue, had the idea of this dialogue between Catholics.” (Page 27)

The apostolic nuncios supported this group, along with various other personalities of the conciliar church who regularly informed the Pope of the progress of the dialogue.

The then SSPX District Superior of France, Fr. Ribeton, joined the group and, a little

later, so did the head of The Institute of Christ the King Sovereign Priest.

To shorten this exposé, **you should know that the initiative of the lifting of the excommunications of the four bishops of the SSPX can be traced back to GREC who had already requested it as a part of the celebration of Jubilee year 2000! In any case Fr. Lelong claims it explicitly in this book and provides many quotations from exchanges of letters among the group, the Roman authorities, and the superior of the SSPX.**

When Mgr Fellay tells us that the lifting of the excommunications is one of the points of the Society's roadmap, that is also false!

They keep returning to the term “full communion.”

“As far as I'm concerned, having been a priest for fifty years and having devoted my ministry to the relationship between the Church and the Muslims, I am deeply attached to the teachings of Vatican II and I am trying to raise awareness and understanding of those [teachings] among our fellow Catholics who follow Archbishop Lefebvre and his successors.” (Fr. M. Lelong Page 42)

“Beginning in 1992, as District Superior of the SSPX in France, I was happy to initiate new contacts with recognized ecclesiastical authorities.

One day, when passing by Randol . . . Abbot Dom de Lesquen was talking to a young man in the forecourt of the monastery. Knowing the role he had played with Dom Gérard during his rapprochement with Rome on July 10, 1988, I approached him and spoke with him . . . about the rapprochement with Rome, of a normalization of the SSPX with Rome . . .” (Fr. Aulagnier, Page 104)

To understand the process of *ralliement* [compromising with one's opponent - Ed.], it suffices to know the underground work of the group whose members admit to it.

Reminder: this book was published in December 2011

It is very important to be familiar with this book so as to know what it is important in the future not to do: no doctrinal discussions at any level so long as Rome has not converted.

This was the point made by Archbishop Lefebvre and which has prevailed until the narrowly avoided *ralliement* in June 2012:

“No practical agreement without a doctrinal agreement.”

Subjects do not form the superiors, and yet, after a practical agreement, the SSPX would find itself subject to the authority of a modernist pope and conciliar congregations.

The truth does not support the least compromise with error, and yet the process initiated by GREC is nothing other than a search for compromise.

In conclusion, here is what Fr. Hewko has to say:

“Fr. Ludovic Barrielle (so highly revered by the Archbishop) commented in 1982:

“I am writing this to serve as a lesson for everyone. The day that the SSPX abandons the spirit and rules of its Founder, it will be lost. Furthermore, all our brothers who, in the future, allow themselves to judge and condemn the Founder and his principles, will show no hesitation in eventually taking away from the Society the traditional teaching of the Church and the Mass instituted by Our Lord Jesus Christ.””

(Quoted by Fr. Hewko in his *Open Letter to His Excellency Bishop Fellay, Society Priests, Religious and Faithful*, dated November 8, 2012.)

Thus, the message is clear—Bishop Fellay does not come to play as a naïve school-boy pretending suddenly to discover in 2012, through a letter from the Pope, the expectation of SSPX recognition of Vatican II. This has been clear from the start of the discussions with GREC!

On January 6, 2004, Fr. de la Brosse sent a letter to Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos (Ecclesia Dei Commission) to give an account of the “Tradition and Modernity” colloquium organized by GREC on November 22, 2003, in Paris:

“At our request, Bishop Philippe Breton was appointed by Bishop Ricard, President of CEF [French Bishops Conference], as the “affiliated bishop” of the group, to attend the meetings and provide the opening prayer, with Fr. Lorans of the SSPX presiding over the final prayer. . . .

Thus the very purpose of the colloquium seems to have been established: French Catholics of various and even opposite sensitivities have freely agreed to engage in a dialogue that does not prejudge a total reconciliation in any way—a field reserved to competent superiors—but this opens the possibility, when the times comes, that the dialogue caucus will find before them partners capable of understanding and mutual respect. . . .

The number of participants was 40 people, all of whom were invited individually by group members. . . .

Very great discretion was observed at the express request of Bishop Ricard, which corresponded to our intentions. No professional journalists were present in the room. No information or comments were leaked in the days which followed, neither in the Catholic nor the secular press.” (Page 45 - 46)

Thus, thanks to support from the Apostolic Nuncio and also to the efforts of Frs. La Brosse and Barthe, Cardinal Ratzinger, then prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, was kept informed of our activities. The election of Benedict XVI was welcomed . . . with great hope. . . . We know, indeed, how during the first months of his

pontificate the new Pope met with Bishop Fellay and made statements and decisions that clearly manifested his desire to re-establish unity in the Church through a **hermeneutic of continuity and not of rupture** with regards to the teachings of Vatican II.” (Pages 48-49)

““Father Lelong and I propose to inform them of this development, of our work methods as well as the results as a whole to our concerned partners, that is to say, on a priority basis: the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy, then the Apostolic Nunciature, the Bishops Conference of France, and the superiors of the Fraternities of St. Pius X and St. Peter. I added some traditional religious communities who had said they were interested and may wish to become participants in some of GREC’s projects.” (pp.47-48)

After the Motu Proprio of 2007, the organizers of GREC sent a new letter to the Pope, asking him again to lift the excommunications.

From page 55 follows a history of GREC’s activities and of the key figures of different sides who are to be involved in this process.

Following the Pope’s meeting with Bishop Fellay in 2005, GREC expanded the SSPX side to include, among others: a very active, very involved Fr. Célier, Jacques-Régis du Cray, even earlier, Marie-Alix Doutrebente .

[Author’s note: Not a few SSPX priests, (outside those cited, who themselves are very involved), have participated in GREC’s work, often as speakers. Some are cited in the book, others are not, whom I know by implication from elsewhere. I prefer to not reveal their names, since I do not accurately know their current position regarding the ralliement.]

It was then that the colloquia revealed the “**doctrinal and spiritual convergence**” between the two parties.

“On June 10, 2010, a GREC meeting was held with the purpose of declaring its support of the Pope following “a particularly unfair media campaign,” around “Fr. Matthew Rouge, Rector of St. Clotilde Basilica in Paris . . . and Fr. Lorans, in charge of SSPX communications.”

That evening, thanks to two speakers’ presentations and the discussion that followed, we sensed how much a reconciliation between all Catholics around Pope Benedict XVI was expected and hoped for, thanks to him.

GREC devoted its meetings to Vatican II, Archbishop Lefebvre, and the Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum, with the participation of historians and theologians providing different points of view, so as to make its contribution during the 2010-2011 academic year.” (Page 69)

“At the time of this writing, one can hope that these meetings will lead to an agreement without delay. But the SSPX must understand that if it has much to offer to Rome, it also has much to receive from it. **It must therefore stop rejecting Vatican II outright and accept the guiding principles in interpreting them as proposed by the Holy Father today.**” (Fr. M Lelong, Page 85)

The stories of different GREC protagonists follow, including those (for the SSPX) of Fr. Lorans, Marie-Alix Doutrebente and Jacques-Régis du Cray.

A very important place is given to **Fr. Paul Aulagnier**, who began when he was District Superior of France, before the foundation of GREC, to open a dialogue in 1992 with conciliarists (notably with Dom de Lesquen, Abbot of Notre Dame de Randol). He continued this role later after becoming a member of the IBP [Institut Bon Pasteur/Good Shepherd Institute]. Still very active in support of the ralliement, he has already rejoined and has obtained a parish in the conciliar structure.



How “Traditional” is Benedict XVI?

“Pope calls for World Political Authority” (*Reuters, July 2009*)

“Pope: Condom Use Can be Justified in Some Cases” (*AP, Nov 2010*)

“Church should not pursue Conversion of Jews, Pope says” (*NCR, March 2011*)

“Pope underlines his top public priority: religious freedom” (*CWN, Jan 2011*)

“Pope Benedict to Appear in Paraliturgical Event With Lutheran Bishopess” (*Rorate Caeli et al., Sept 2011*)

“Nativity donkeys and cattle are a myth, says Pope” (*Daily Telegraph, Nov 2012*)

“Benedict XVI: ‘The Second Vatican Council is a true sign of God’” (*Vatican Insider La Stampa, Dec 2012*)

THE NEW "HERMENEUTICS" OF BISHOP FELLAY

Has the Society changed its position?

by Fr. Juan Carlos Ortiz



Despite some seemingly reassuring recent discourses, the Society of St Pius X continues to go through the most biggest internal crisis, in its complexity and in its seriousness, which it has ever known.

This crisis is particularly *grave* because it derives from serious failings on the part of Bishop Fellay and his two Assistants, in the *doctrinal* field as well as in the domain of *prudence*. This is the main cause of the concern of members of the Society.

Some are tempted to believe that because so far there has not been a practical agreement with Rome the danger is over ... But let us not conclude so quickly!

Despite the appearances, the superiors of the Society *have not retracted* their new concept concerning the role of Tradition in the Church and in particular the relationship with the conciliar church. In addition, they are far from having taking any personal responsibility for this internal crisis caused by their imprudent actions.

It is worthwhile to look closely at two aspects of this internal crisis in order not to underestimate the negative effects that *continue* to be produced in the Society and in the ranks of Tradition.

The first aspect concerns the *main role* which the Society plays in the resistance to the conciliar church and the preservation of Catholic Tradition. If the Society falls, the last bastion of Tradition will fall.

The second aspect concerns the *grave change* made by Menzingen as to the principal role of the Society in the forefront of responding to this crisis of the Church: this new

role is clearly in opposition to the one given by Abp. Lefebvre.

However, this change is very subtle and can be difficult to see for some because while they are claiming that they do not want to give up the doctrinal combat, these superiors have made *canonical recognition* the *essential priority* of the Society. Some doctrinal aspects are still in their agenda, but they are placed on the *secondary level*. Thus, everything must be "redefined" according to this new priority.

This change betrays in them the same "*legalism*" which has afflicted all the traditional communities that have rallied to Rome since 1988. Like them, they feel "guilty" because they have been "excluded" by the official church and they dream of being "reconciled" at all costs.

We know the "*hermeneutics of continuity*" of Benedict XVI by which he has conceived a new interpretation of tradition that would *integrate the 'Conciliar Church' into the Tradition of the Church*.

The authorities of Menzingen, in order to justify their change of position, also have conceived a new "*hermeneutics*" or "reinterpretation" of the main role of the Society, by which they want to *integrate their tradition into the Conciliar Church*.

This "hermeneutic" demands that the SSPX authorities make a distorted "re-thinking" of what Archbishop Lefebvre understood as being a priority for the Society; for example, they only quote words he spoke *before* the break with Rome in 1988, or his more conciliar words concerning the official authorities of the Church.

Thus, what was formerly vigorously rejected in the conciliar church is now "re-thought" with a view to accepting, if not totally, at least "partially" or "under certain conditions", conciliar ideas.

It should be noted that the authorities of the Society betray this new attitude, more by *what they do not say* in regard to the conciliar authorities, by *omission*, rather than by direct speech.

Except for a few more firm phrases here and there (to reassure the "harder" line among us), we can see a long-lasting "positive" attitude towards the teachings and the actions of the conciliar authorities, and in particular of Benedict XVI.

A recent example of this "softening" is certainly the boycott by Menzingen of some books deemed "too hard," books written by Bishop Tissier and by Fr. Calderón on the conciliar church. Another example would be the recent Symposium of The Angelus, in the United States District, which chose as this year's theme "The Papacy" when we are commemorating the 50th anniversary of the disastrous opening of Vatican II!

Some then might ask, for what purpose and by what right should this new direction in the Society be denounced?

I know the Society and its purpose, having been a member priest for 28 years. I deeply love the Society in which I took a commitment for life. I have personally known the Founder, who ordained me, and whose writings and words I have ALWAYS continued to study. It is because of my love for the Society and by filial piety towards Archbishop. Lefebvre that I think it is my duty to speak out publicly.

It appears clear to me that for several years there has been a *fundamental change*, mainly among Bishop Fellay and his two Assistants, concerning *the main role* of the Society of Saint Pius X in these times of crisis in the Church: to fully preserve the Catholic Tradition by fighting against the enemies of the Church both inside and outside.

The main goal of the Society of Saint Pius X in this crisis of the Church cannot be changed since that goal was clearly established by its Founder in many of his writings, sermons, lectures and actions, especially after 1988. Consequently, to change this purpose on important points would be *to depart gravely* from its Founder, and thus to expose the Society *to commit suicide*, by falling into the hands of modernist Rome, which the Society always fought since its foundation.

Experience shows us that all those who strayed from the line drawn by Archbishop Lefebvre eventually finished by betraying the combat for Tradition.

This change in the Society cannot be justified, because in recent years we have not seen in the conciliar church *any* important doctrinal or practical change in the sense of a *real* return to Tradition by the condemnation of the conciliar errors and reforms.

I would like to support what I have just said by showing how the current leadership's affirmations and actions are *completely contrary* to what Archbishop Lefebvre clearly stated. And even if Archbishop Lefebvre did not explicitly speak about some of them, these changes are gravely in opposition to the *common good* of the Society and to basic *common sense*.

1. A FALSE NOTION ON THE VISIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.

Firstly, it clearly appears that *the starting point* of their deviation lies in a *wrong notion about the visibility of the Church*. Their public statements describe the Society as "missing" something fundamental in relation to the "visibility" of the Church. They often speak about the Society as being in an "irregular," "abnormal," "illegal" situation, although all of this, we know, is only *apparent*.

Father Pfluger clearly stated this error in a recent interview: "As for us, we also suffer a *default*, because of our canonical *irregularity*. It is not only the state of the post-conciliar

Church which is imperfect, *so is ours*.” And further on: “The obligation to work actively to overcome the crisis cannot be disputed. And this work *begins with us*, wanting to overcome our *abnormal* canonical state .”(Kirchliche Umschau, October 17, 2012)

The official authorities of the Church for years have stigmatized the Society with these "defects," by means of false charges and unjust condemnations, while we know, and have shown clearly by our writings and our actions, that the Society has *never* left the visible perimeter of the Catholic Church or incurred any canonical crime. Therefore we do not need to surmount any ecclesial or canonical "disability" by asking to be recognized today by the conciliar church. On this point, the authorities are repeating the same false assertions of Dom Gérard and of the “rallied” in 1988, to whom Archbishop Lefebvre (Conference September 9, 1988; Fideliter No. 66) and Fr. *Schmidberger* (Fideliter No. 65) replied pertinently a short time after the consecration of the bishops.

Bishop Fellay also recently stated the same error in understanding the nature of the true Church: "The fact of going to Rome does not mean we agree with them. But it is the Church. And *this is the true Church*. In rejecting what is not good, one should not reject everything. *This is the one, holy, catholic and apostolic*."(Flavigny, September 2, 2012)

This astonishing statement blatantly contradicts what Abp. Lefebvre said about the conciliar church, in the conference quoted above: "... it is WE who have the marks of the visible Church. If there is still a visibility of the Church today, it is thanks to you. *These signs are not anymore among the others* [Conciliar church]."

Archbishop Lefebvre explicitly answered Dom Gérard, who invoked the need to join the “visible church as a reason to join modernist Rome,” with these words: “The story of Dom Gérard about the visible Church is childish. *It’s unbelievable* that we can speak of the *visible Church* about the Conciliar Church in opposition to the Catholic Church that we are trying to represent and continue.”(Fideliter, n. 70 July-August 1989, p. 6)

2. TO OBTAIN OUR “LEGITIMACY” FROM THE CONCILIAR CHURCH.

As a consequence of the first error, the authorities say that it is not enough for the Society to recognize the validity of the authority of the pope and the present bishops, nor to pray publicly for them, nor recognize some legitimate acts (when they are in line with Tradition). For them we must "go further" and ask the conciliar church *to give us a “Legitimacy”* we are lacking!

Here again they openly deviate from Abp. Lefebvre who stated that, as the crisis in the Church continues, we did not need any recognition from the conciliar church, because authentic legitimacy will be logically confirmed to us when the authorities of the Church return to sound doctrine.

Archbishop Lefebvre said that we did not need the conciliar church to give us any

"legitimacy" whatever: "About which Church are we dealing with - I would like to know, - if I am dealing with the Catholic Church, or if I am dealing with another church, a counter-Church, a counterfeit Church? ... But I sincerely believe that we are dealing with a *counterfeit* of the Church, not the Catholic Church."(June 18, 1978)

3. THE NEED FOR A PRACTICAL AGREEMENT.

Then, starting from these two errors, the leaders advocate *an absolute need for a practical agreement* with the current authorities, but *without any prior doctrinal agreement*, thus contradicting what Archbishop Lefebvre had explicitly stated, especially after 1988, and what the General Chapter (which, let us remind Menzingen, has more authority than Bishop Fellay) decided in 2006. Their present search for a purely practical agreement is all the more surprising when one considers that the recent doctrinal discussions between our Theological Commission and the Vatican came to the conclusion that a doctrinal agreement with the conciliar church is *impossible*!

Therefore, for the Society to search for a purely practical agreement with present day Rome, which continues to be in error, is equivalent to committing an "operation suicide"; we will be "absorbed" by the conciliar church, with *all* its structure not only rooted in the council, but working to implement the conciliar and post-conciliar reforms. We know what happened to the eight traditional communities who rallied to this conciliar church without a preliminary doctrinal accord, inevitably the same thing can be expected to happen to us...

Archbishop Lefebvre clearly placed first and foremost, especially after the consecrations of bishops, as a prerequisite to any future dialogue with the conciliar church, a solution to the *doctrinal question*: "I will place the question *on the doctrinal level*: Do you agree with the great encyclicals of all the popes who preceded you ... Are you in full communion with these Popes and with their affirmations? Do you still accept the Anti-Modernist Oath? Are you in favour of the social reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ? If you do not accept the *doctrine* of your predecessors, it is useless to speak. As long as you do not agree to reform the Council considering the *doctrine* of the popes who preceded you, there is no dialogue possible. It is useless. Thus the positions will be clearer."(Fideliter No. 66, Nov.-Dec. 1988, p. 12-13)

4. THE ILLUSION OF "DOING GREATER GOOD."

Then, in order to find a "positive" justification for negotiating with conciliar Rome, the SSPX authorities affirm that this purely practical agreement will allow us *to do a greater good*, for being "within the visible church" - they will convert the conciliar church to Tradition... This is exactly the same argument invoked by Dom Gérard and the priests of Campos to justify their reunion with the conciliar Rome!

Our Founder answered this deceptively "optimistic" perspective with great realism in an interview, saying, "Getting inside the church, what does it mean? And first of all of

which Church are we speaking? If this is about the conciliar church should we, who have fought against it for twenty years because we want the Catholic Church, return to the conciliar church supposedly *to make it Catholic*? This is a total illusion! *It is not subjects who form their superiors, but superiors who form their subjects.*" (Fideliter No. 70 July-August 1989)

And the *facts* show us that the little good that those who have rallied to Rome since 1988 have done does not justify *the greater evil* they have done by abandoning their faithful to the conciliar errors, to the new Mass, to justifications of the actions of the post-conciliar popes, etc...

5. ARE THE PRELIMINARY CONDITIONS SUFFICIENT?

Again, in order to justify this agreement, they affirm that the *preliminary conditions* set by the last General Chapter in July 2012, would be sufficient to avoid falling into the same "traps" as the rallied communities did.

But apart from the fact that these conditions are *insufficient and unrealistic* to protect us from being "assimilated" and "neutralized" by the conciliar church, the General Chapter has forgotten the two most important conditions, clearly requested by Archbishop Lefebvre: the *conversion* of the official authorities of the Church, namely, by their explicit condemnation of conciliar errors, and *exemption from the new Code of Canon Law*.

Archbishop Lefebvre said that even if modernist Rome granted us some preliminary conditions, such conditions would be *insufficient* to make an agreement with them. Here is what he said to Card. Ratzinger: "Your Eminence, look, even if you give us a bishop, even if you give us some autonomy from the bishops, even if you give us the entire liturgy of 1962, if you allow us to continue the seminaries and the Society as we do now, *we cannot work together*, it's impossible, impossible, because we work in two diametrically opposed directions: you work for the de-Christianization of society, of the human person and the Church and we, we are working to Christianize. We cannot agree." (Retreat at Ecône, September 4, 1987)

In addition, Archbishop Lefebvre put the conversion of Rome as a prerequisite to an agreement when he addressed these words to the four future bishops: "...being confident that without delay the See of Peter will be occupied by a *perfectly Catholic* successor of Peter, into whose hands you could deposit the grace of your episcopate for him to confirm it." (August 29, 1987)

And concerning the Code of Canon Law, how could we keep our identity by continuing our combat, if we are under the common law of the conciliar church, which is the *new* Code of Canon Law? Don't they see that the new code was specifically made to implement the conciliar reforms, but *not to preserve tradition*?

6. VATICAN II COULD BE ACCEPTABLE!

And in order to overcome the doctrinal impasse which results from the Second Vatican Council and the post-conciliar “magisterium,” we have seen these SSPX leaders in their recent conferences, their sermons and their interviews show an explicit and repeated determination to *minimize conciliar errors* in order to prepare the minds of the faithful for reconciliation with conciliar Rome.

Did we not hear with stupefaction Bishop Fellay, in an interview with Catholic News Service, state that, “The council is presenting a religious liberty which in fact was *a very, very limited one, very limited,*” and also that *the conclusion* of doctrinal discussions with Rome was that “...we see that many things which we would have condemned as being from the council are in fact *not from the council*, but the common understanding of it.”! And: “the council must be put *within* this great tradition of the Church, must be understood *within* this, and *in correlation* with it. These are statements *we fully agree with, totally, absolutely.*” (May 11, 2012)

And the only (incomplete) revealed text concerning their last doctrinal preamble presented in Rome in April, and spoken of by Fr. Pfluger in a conference, not only betrays the same desire to minimize the conciliar errors but even to *accept* them: “...the entire Tradition of the Catholic faith should be the criterion and the guide of understanding of the teachings of Vatican II, *which* in turn *illuminates* some aspects of the *life* and of Church’s *doctrine*, implicitly present in it, not yet formulated.” (St Joseph des Carmes, June 5, 2012)

Was it not the fact that they passively observed the interfaith meeting of Assisi III without *vigorously condemning it*, even asking some members of the Society not to do so, which was also revealing?

And what is of more concern is that their minimization of the errors of the council seems to come from a while back...as Bishop Fellay already stated back in 2001 (!) in an interview that: “To accept the council, *we do not have a problem,*” “This gives the impression that we reject all of Vatican II. However, *we keep 95% of it.*”(Swiss newspaper La Liberté, 11 May 2001)

Instead of listening to the repeated warnings, asking them not to sign a practical agreement, they contemptuously replied to the *letter of the three bishops* with harsh words...insinuating that these fellow bishops were “sedevacantist,” “schismatic” and were transforming the errors of Vatican II into “super heresies.”

The list would be too long to enumerate all the other statements of Menzingen which move in the direction of a *weakening* on their doctrinal positions; the same weakening is found among other members of the Society who support the agreement. I have seen how

some confreres, who I knew as once being firm in their condemnation of the council and of the post-conciliar popes, hold now “softer” positions and are very supportive of reaching a compromise with Modernist Rome...

7. GRAVE ERRORS AGAINST PRUDENCE.

In addition to the errors in their *principles*, we can also note *serious errors of judgment*, which were also the cause of the most serious *internal division*, in depth and extension, which the Society has ever known.

By imprudent actions, they have preferred to sacrifice the *unity and the common good* of the Society to follow the agenda of modernist Rome, as they have stated in their answer to the letter of the three other bishops of the Society: “For the *common good* of the Society we would prefer by far the current solution of the status quo but manifestly *Rome does not tolerate it anymore*.” (14 April 2012)

Bishop Fellay has also stated that it was almost “inevitable” that a part of the Society would not follow in case of an agreement with Rome: “I cannot exclude that there might be a *split* [within the Society].”(Interview to Catholic News Service) and thus he took the risk of gravely dividing the Society.

Therefore, they preferred to ignore all the *warnings* coming from the three other bishops, from some superiors and members of the Society and even from our fellow Traditional communities who asked them not to sign a purely practical agreement.

This attitude has deeply shocked many members of the Society and created an internal division which has seriously undermined the leadership’s *credibility to govern it*, and among friendly communities it has undermined a confidence which has not been restored.

8. WHO DUPED WHOM?

When we hear their explanations (excuses?) during the last months concerning the supposedly “real reasons” which have led them so far in concessions to Modernist Rome, we see that it is not so much the Roman authorities who have deceived them, but rather that *they have deceived themselves*! For if they have decided, imprudently, to put aside the answers they got from the *official* Vatican channels about the true thought of the Pope, and to favor other channels, so-called “informal” ones, such a decision does not improve their reputation as *prudent* superiors...

Thus they *refused* to see that everything these “unofficial” channels said to them was either gossip or manipulation, because their *desire* to reach an agreement became so much an “obsession,” that they finished by believing everything! Who’s guilty? *They alone*!

How is it possible that they could act so carelessly in a so serious matter? In any institution, even a secular one, such an act leads inevitably to the resignation of the person responsible, because too much trust has been lost. “We take our responsibility,” as Fr. Pfluger threatened to do if the agreements will fail.

Actually, if they have not resigned it is because *they continue to believe in an agreement*. They have not yet learned a lesson from their actions! It is obvious that, despite some obstacles, Menzingen and the Vatican will do everything to “resuscitate” the talks. The expulsion of Bishop Williamson appears clearly as a “telltale sign” that the talks will resume, because the expulsion was, at least for the Vatican, a *sine qua non* condition in favour of a deal.

In addition, we find in Bishop Fellay a grave lack of *practical judgment* about the Pope’s false ideas. How could he think that Benedict XVI would be ready in recognizing us “to put aside our acceptance of the Council,” as he wrote to him in June 2012? Did he not know that the council is “non-negotiable” for Modernist Rome? Is this naivety on his part, or is he simply believing his desires to be reality? In any case, in this he shows that *he gravely lacks in prudence* in doctrinal matters.

9. UNJUST PERSECUTIONS.

Finally, to complete their *blindness* and their *stubbornness* on the path of “reconciliation” with modernist Rome, they have undertaken *persecutions* in order to suppress any opposition, both inside and outside the Society. Since then we have seen a series of intimidations, admonitions, mutations, delays in Holy Orders, expulsions of priests and even of one of our bishops!

They relentlessly persecute and expel people who *oppose* their reunification with Modernist Rome, and at the same time they say cynically that they intend to continue their *opposition*... within the official church once they have been recognized!

In the final analysis, they have established an *authoritarian* government, a real *dictatorship*, in the Society, in order to remove any obstacle opposing their plans of reuniting with Modernist Rome.

Thus, Bp. Fellay and his two assistants have radically changed the *fundamental principles and objectives* of the Society established by our Founder. They have also ignored major decisions of the *General Chapter of 2006*, which forbade a practical agreement with the official church without previous doctrinal agreement. They wittingly ignored the *warnings* of prudent people who counselled them not to make any practical agreement with Modernist Rome. They have jeopardized the *unity and the common good* of the Society by exposing it to a danger of compromising with the enemies of the Church. And finally, they contradict themselves by saying *the opposite* of what they affirmed only a few years ago!

Therefore, they have betrayed the legacy of Archbishop Lefebvre, the responsibilities of their positions, the trust of thousands, and even of those who, deceived by them, continue to trust them.

They have shown a resolute willingness to lead the Society, at all costs, *to rally* to our enemies.

Regardless of whether the agreement with the conciliar church has not yet been made, or will not happen immediately or perhaps never... A *grave danger* remains for the Society, because *they have not retracted* the false principles which have guided their destructive actions.

I see now sadly that they, by wanting somehow to identify abusively their judgments and their decisions with the Society itself, have ultimately *confiscated* it as if it were their personal property, forgetting that they were only appointed to serve for a definite time.

May God have pity on the Society!

Father Juan Carlos Ortiz



(*Ordained in 1984 by Abp. Lefebvre,
and a priest of the SSPX ever since,
Fr. Ortiz is now residing with
Fr. Ringrose at St. Athanasius
Church, Vienna, VA, USA*)

A Novena to St. Pius X



Glorious Pope of the Eucharist, St. Pius X,

you sought to "restore all things in Christ." Obtain for me a true love of Jesus so that I may only live for Him. Help me to acquire a lively fervor and a sincere will to strive for sanctity of life, and that I may avail myself of the riches of the Holy Eucharist, which is sacrifice and sacrament. By your love for Mary, Mother and Queen, inflame my heart with a tender devotion to her.

Blessed model of the priesthood, obtain for us holy and dedicated priests and increase vocations to the priesthood and religious life.

Dispel confusion, hatred and anxiety. Incline our hearts to peace so that all nations will place themselves under the reign of Christ the King.

+Amen

St. Pius X, pray for us.

(Here mention your request)

Archbishop Lefebvre, pray for us!

We recommend praying this novena to beg that the SSPX be restored to its mission, through the intercession of its patron.

Latest from SSPX.org : "Pay no attention to that man behind the curtain!"

(By the Editor)

In the last issue, we attempted to make our readers aware of the importance of the laity in the propaganda war. Since then, the US District website has helpfully given us a prime example of this in the form of the most recent "Pastor's Corner" article on sspx.org, entitled:

"The 'Need to Know' vs. Peace of Soul".

That's right; read that title again. Says it all really, doesn't it? The very fact that "need to know" is in inverted commas appears to imply that really there isn't any need to know anything. Not by you, the reader, at any rate. The article might equally have been entitled "Ignorance is Bliss". Before even reading the article, we are already aware of what it will attempt to say. "We're right – they're wrong. We're the ones in authority! Who are they? Don't listen to them. Only listen to us." This is an old, well-worn theme which will be familiar to many of our older readers who remember Vatican II and the introduction of the Novus Ordo some forty or more years ago.

In many ways, we ought all to be flattered at such a backhanded compliment. It tells us that (in the eyes of the US District website at least), the opposition to the SSPX sell-out is alive and well, and that our influence is very much feared. This latest, lamentable attempt of the SSPX pro-sellout camp to silence their critics and bolster the morale of those faithful who have stayed loyal to them, is but the latest attempt in a succession of several such.

Who remembers a series of video interviews entitled "Against the Rumours"? With would-be clever camera work and music which was uncannily similar to that with which the CNS Fellay interview began, this was a home made copy-cat version of that more professionally made (if no less cringe-worthy) offering from CNS. Although billed in advance as something we would not want to miss, every question will be answered, no issue avoided, no stone left unturned – it turned out to be half an hour of listening to Fr. Rostand being thrown softball questions by his own employee, and yet still managing to produce a great deal of waffle and hot air even at that!

Who remembers a certain article by Fr. Juan Carlos Iscara? Faced with churchmen who profess and preach heresy, we should be silent in order to reunite with the heretics in as inoffensive a way possible. That (allegedly) is what St. Basil tells us! Well, not many people were fooled and the article did no good to its author and publishers nor to the cause which it was supposed to be aiding, other than to provoke a stern, public rebuttal from Bp. Tissier de Mallerais. Within a few weeks, the article was gone.

Who remembers an interview given by Fr. Rostand to the Remnant? Lots of interesting,

well-prepared questions from Michael Matt, and from Fr. Rostand nothing but an endless succession of "I cannot comment", "Let's wait and see", "We musn't speculate about that" etc. Had one of the contributors of The Recusant been given the task of composing a parody interview, we could hardly have done his reputation more damage than he did himself with that embarrassing non-interview.

Each of these attempts were so utterly ineffectual that one may be forgiven for wondering whether they ever really constituted a serious attempt to convince anyone at all, or whether their whole purpose from the beginning was never anything more than a public show of continuing, uncritical loyalty towards Menzingen on the part of Fr. Rostand. But "let's not speculate" - after all, this is undoubtedly one of those things which we "don't need to know"! Whatever the case may be, each of these failures was quietly removed from the website within a short time and never referred to again. Not surprisingly, many of us have even begun to forget about them. This is, in its own way, unfortunate, since we ought not to let their authors off the hook quite so easily. Realistically, however, we have every expectation that, like all those previous attempts, this latest article will soon be equally gone and forgotten. However, while it remains on public display we will make good use of this opportunity to point out some things of importance, and since it is often just as well to point out the obvious, here are a few obvious things needing to be pointed out.

Firstly, the very phrase "need to know" has interesting connotations. Apart from anything else, it implies (correctly, in this case), that there is indeed something to be known which we do not already know. Of course, the inverted commas imply that Bp. Fellay, Fr. Rostand and his allies believe we do not really need to know any more than they choose to tell us. Many of us beg to differ from this view. There is a reason why we all chose at one time or another to support the SSPX. We wish to save our souls and the souls of our families, and we do so by clinging to the whole, 100% pure, unadulterated Catholic Faith and Tradition. Anything which might affect or alter that Faith and Tradition, or weaken it, or dilute it in any way whatsoever is of vital importance to us because our foremost interest is concerned: the salvation of our soul. We therefore have a right and a serious duty before God to know anything which might reasonably be expected to have a bearing or impact on it. To do otherwise, much worse to seek to keep ourselves in ignorance of potential dangers to the Faith or to Tradition, would be a serious failing and negligence for which we would answer to Almighty God. It would be morally wrong for us not to wish to know, for example, what Bishop Fellay's intentions are, what Rome's intentions are, or what the outcome of the next months and years will bring for the SSPX and how that will affect us. If the SSPX effectively neuters itself and ceases to be what it was (whether it be in the wake of a deal with modern Rome, as would certainly be the case, or beforehand, in anticipation/preparation for such a deal, which is also a distinct possibility and has already begun to happen at least in part), then it seems clear that an SSPX-going layman has not only a right but a positive duty to take an interest in it, to inform himself and his fellow Catholics around him as far as is possible. It would be wrong to do otherwise. After all, we are not talking about the private life of some

idiotic "celebrity" being "invaded" by the tabloid media. We are talking about the public discourses of churchmen who hold visible ecclesiastical office, and who have the future of millions of souls and whole societies in their hands. A Bishop has no right to ask people not to pry into what he believes about Vatican II, especially when the purpose of his becoming a bishop in the first place was precisely to continue opposition to that Council's uncatholic effects, and even more so when he has recently given, voluntarily and on his own initiative, an interview to a pro-Vatican II website, in which interview he appears to let that infamous Council off the hook!

Secondly, the article as a whole is one gigantic non sequitur. It spends a lot of time talking about "scapegoating complexes", about how many people feel they have a "right to know everything", and contains a gratuitous reference to Martin Luther whose relevance is unclear. "The mindset that I have a right to all knowledge regardless of duty of state or position in life," we are helpfully informed, "originates in the liberal perspective" - which may well be true, but this hardly applies to the crisis in the SSPX. Those who oppose a deal with modern Rome do not seek to know "everything", merely the things which affect us and of which we need to be assured (with real assurances, as opposed to platitudes - actions speak louder than words). In this case, that means principally those things regarding the position of the SSPX and the apparent desire on the part of certain clerics to subjugate us in an agreement with the modernist foe.

The author tells us that: "Non-SSPX members do not have a strict right to be kept informed about the internal affairs of the SSPX, which is a religious congregation". So there we have it. Of course, there is a sense in which this can be true: it entirely depends on what information is being sought and what one regards as merely "internal affairs". If a layman were demanding to know the age and date of birth of every entrant into an SSPX seminary, for example, or the colour of the curtains in every SSPX priory, or how often and by what means each priest gets his hair cut, he would surely have no right to know, since it is hard to see in what way those things concern him. But if a layman wishes to know the contents of the infamous Doctrinal Preamble (didn't Bp. Fellay promise us all, over a year, ago that he would not keep it secret for long and would reveal what it contained?) or what Bishop Fellay's true intentions are regarding Rome (a fair question at this stage, since he has not been altogether consistent of late!) or what he can reasonably expect from the SSPX in future, then that is surely a different matter altogether, since these are things which he can reasonably expect to affect him, his soul, and the souls of any family or dependants which he might have. Sadly, however, this is a distinction which the "Pastor" (from his corner) does not bother to make. He merely leaves us with the definite impression that if we wish to know anything about the SSPX which might conceivably be termed "internal", anything of any real interest or import in other words, then we ought not to expect anything but a stern telling off. You are a layman. The SSPX is a religious order and you do not belong to it. Now be quiet and go away. Never mind that the SSPX has spent the last 40 years keeping the Faith alive while the rest of the Church slipped, by degrees, into apostasy. If Bp. Fellay and Fr. Pfluger now wish to make us unwilling bed-fellows of those same apostates, that is none of your business, dear reader. Mind your own business, you nos-

ey parker! Stop worrying about things that don't concern you. The priest at your local chapel may at any time be replaced with someone far less offensive to the modern world, your children in SSPX school or attending SSPX camps may be taught the luminous mysteries of the rosary or may unaccountably develop a respect and affection for Benedict XVI (or if they do not, might be refused a place as undesirables!), the name of the local bishop may become increasingly familiar among parishioners at your SSPX mass-centre, sermons against religious liberty and ecumenism may become a thing of the past, with nobody any longer inclined to think, much less say, anything negative about the separation of Church and State, and any mention of Freemasonry the latest sign of being an extremist fanatic and the fastest route to harsh social treatment at the hands of your fellow parishioners... but what concern of yours is that? You need to realise is that those things, and many more horrors besides, do not really concern you!

The rest of the article is sufficiently unoriginal as to require little comment from anyone: much of it really speaks for itself. Take this little gem for example:

"In the end, through the person's ever-growing bitterness (which Archbishop Lefebvre specifically warned traditionalists about), the person develops an obsessive mind thereby losing his balance of temperance in the social life – but in the use of his time, devices and even creatures."

Note the completely superfluous reference to Archbishop Lefebvre. Spare a thought for the poor man who wrote the article, whoever he may be. He had to try to slip in a mention somewhere, but couldn't say a great deal about him or quote from him at length. Any quote from Archbishop Lefebvre would certainly contradict his whole article! Apparently we are all bitter. How can one argue with that?

Then there is this:

"Those who adhere to such an attitude reveal a lack of fortitude and constancy – obsessed by security, they see danger everywhere every time."

Worried that the SSPX might sell out? You're an obsessive who lacks fortitude and constancy! It occurs to us that this type of rhetoric bears more than a passing resemblance to John XXIII's famous speech at the opening of Vatican II:

"In the daily exercise of Our pastoral office, it sometimes happens that We hear certain opinions which disturb Us—opinions expressed by people who, though fired with a commendable zeal for religion, **are lacking in sufficient prudence and judgment in their evaluation of events. They can see nothing but calamity and disaster** in the present state of the world. They say over and over that this modern age of ours, in comparison with past ages, is definitely deteriorating. One would think from their attitude that history, that great teacher of life, had taught them nothing. They seem to imagine that in the days of the earlier councils everything was as it should be so far as doctrine and morality and the Church's rightful liberty were concerned. **We feel that We must disagree with these prophets of doom**, who are always forecasting worse disasters, as though the end of the world were at hand." [emphasis ours]

As we know, history records who was truly the more "prudent" and who best served the interests of Christ's Church.

Need any more be said? We do not recommend that readers look up the article in question or waste time in reading it – there is no danger of your being taken in by it, but it might possibly raise your blood pressure to see just how much your intelligence is being insulted by being offered anything of quite such poor quality. We have read it so that you don't have to, and our verdict is that one really would have to be something of a simpleton to fall for an article like this latest "Pastor's Corner". The fact that the US District offers its readers such a poor diet of transparently specious nonsense may, however, be an unfortunate indication of how they view many of their faithful. If this is so, we sincerely hope that they are mistaken.

Finally, a little word about peace of soul. As I am sure you will have noticed, the "Pastor in the Corner" has an interesting idea of what constitutes "peace of soul" and of how it may be acquired, too. I speak only for myself, but collaborating in the greatest betrayal of recent times would contribute very little to my peace of soul. It is an interesting paradox that exterior turmoil and conflict (in the right cause, of course - and what cause is more worthy than this?) can work in inverse proportion to peace of soul. The Saints fought the hardest for Almighty God, and were often embroiled in all kinds of controversies in their day. Intellectual indolence and moral cowardice is not the way to happiness. Was Archbishop Lefebvre a man who spent his life avoiding conflicts or keeping quiet regarding controversies? In truth, like those Catholics of the early Church who rejoiced in their good fortune at being given an opportunity to become martyrs, we ought really to be extremely grateful to Almighty God for having presented us with so clear-cut an opportunity to show what we are really capable of doing in His service.



Where does the SSPX stand regarding Vatican II?

“We go along with about 95% of the Second Vatican Council”

(Bishop Fellay, DICI 18th May 2001)

“But it is the Church. And *this is the true Church*. In rejecting what is not good, one should not reject everything.”

(Bishop Fellay, Flavigny, September 2012)



“We are not of this new religion! We do not accept this new religion! We are of the religion of all time; we are of the Catholic religion. We are not of this “universal religion” as they call it today—this is not the Catholic religion any more. We are not of this liberal, modernist religion which has its own worship, its own priests, its own faith, its own catechisms, its own ecumenical Bible. We cannot accept these things. They are contrary to our faith.”

(Abp Lefebvre, ordinations sermon, 29th June, 1976)



“If they are accepted by the Church and restored to full communion, they will be a sort of living witness to the continuity. They can be perfectly happy being in the Catholic Church, so they would be a living testimony to show that the continuity before and after the Council is real.”

(Archbishop Di Noia, Ecclesia Die Commission, interview with NCR, 4th July, 2012)



“Holy abandonment is found ‘not in resignation and laziness but at the heart of action and initiative.’ It would be dishonest to pray for victory without really fighting for it. [...] ‘The things I pray for’, St. Thomas More prayed magnanimously, ‘dear Lord, give me the grace to work for.’”
(“The Biography of Marcel Lefebvre” p. 523)

Contact us:

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