



The Recusant

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



"I had believed that you were disposed to leave till a later date the resolution of outstanding disagreements over certain points of the Council ...

And I committed myself in this perspective despite the fairly strong opposition in the ranks of the Society and at the price of substantial disruption. And I fully intend to continue to do my best to pursue this path..."

- Bp. Fellay, Letter to Benedict XVI, 17th June 2012

Inside:

- **Open Letter the priests of the SSPX**
(Bp. Williamson)
- **St Joseph's Carmel and the SSPX**
- **Fr. Girouard's Declaration**
- **Fr. Ruiz Vallejo's Open Letter**
- **Dom Arizaga's Declaration**
- **"Quo Vadis DICL...?" - Part 2**
- **"Sheer Trickery"**
(Preamble Analysis)

"Crisis in the SSPX" **Conference**

with Fr. Pfeiffer, Fr. Hewko, et al.

Further Details on **p.31**

FROM THE DESK OF THE EDITOR:

Dear Reader,

One or two of you declare yourselves somewhat taken aback by last month's editorial. That is quite right, and good and proper: the situation is shocking, so it is right for you to be a little shocked. However, if the writing, printing and circulating of this newsletter serves any purpose at all, it must be that it is not afraid to deal with even the most awful consequences of the reality which we now face.

Only by owning up to a situation can we then begin to deal with it intelligently and honestly. And although reality is harsh, and the outlook seemingly bleak, we really ought to be grateful to Our Lord for having placed us in this era, since it is really an honour to be given so great an opportunity to show Him just how faithful and steadfast we can be in His service, and how firmly we will cling to His teaching, no matter who is jeopardising or contradicting it. The

greatest Saints from the past longed to be alive in this era, to witness these hardships and difficulties. Our Lord has chosen you. Rest assured, The Recusant will not be altering its position based on what people want to hear - that would make us no better than Bishop Fellay's "New-and-Improved-SSPX". No, what matters is the message, not the messenger.

The point being made in last month's editorial is that we cannot afford to be sentimental about a mere organisation. We do not know when and how we may find ourselves disinherited once more, but it will happen sooner or later and therefore we ought to start preparing for it now, at least psychologically if not materially too. The message of last month's editorial, which I repeat here now, was that we must try not to become too attached to what is human (the organisation calling itself 'SSPX') at the risk of losing what is truly the most valuable (the whole, unadulterated Catholic Faith!). That would be to throw out the family silver in order to better appreciate the wooden box in which it was kept!

We are not loyal to the SSPX but to Tradition! Back when the two were synonymous, the distinction could be momentarily forgotten. But we forget it at our peril, and now that a gap has opened up between the two, it is time to remember what the whole point of this earthly spiritual combat is supposed to be. Far too often in recent times, worthies in the SSPX have treated the Society as an end in itself. I remember Bishop Fellay, to give just one example, following an ordinations ceremony, boasting of how many priests the Society now comprises. At about the same time, the German District website carried an article with all sorts of graphs and pie-charts with the numbers of priests and seminarians, etc. and comparing the SSPX to the other religious orders in the Church (E.g. 'The SSPX is bigger than the *Mission Etrangères de Paris*, but smaller than the *Jesuits*,' etc.) - all of which betrays a very alarming mentality. It is the same mentality which has led to the US District website telling us that the laity have no right to know about the internal matters of the SSPX since the SSPX is a religious order to which we laity do not belong. Any SSPX leader who makes that claim is implicitly admitting that they see the Society as no different to the present-day *Jesuits*, *Dominicans* or the *English Congregation of Benedictines*. Fr. Pfeiffer is, as always, spot on when he describes the institutional pride of the SSPX as being like the donkey on Palm Sunday who, in an amusing poem by GK Chesterton, believes that crowds of people are laying palms and shouting 'Hosanna' for him ("If only I could just get this annoying weight off my back!") If there is one thing the SSPX ought not to be proud of, it is its record as a human organisation - at times it has been badly run and inefficient, and at the best of times it has always had a 'home made' feel to it. And yet because it possessed, practised and defended the entire Catholic Faith and Tradition, God blessed it, in spite of its human weaknesses. What is now happening is that the leadership are ditching what matters (the uncompromising defence of Tradition) due to an exulted view of the part that does not matter (the human institution). Evidence of this can be seen in the excessive officiousness with which the little house in Switzerland treats its priests: 'official declarations' 'clarifications' 'press communiqués' etc abound, every official newsletter has to pass censorship, only DICI is allowed to say anything about Rome, etc. We defy anyone to show the tiniest piece of evidence that such officious, self-centred behaviour or clerical pride was institutionalised in the days of Archbishop Lefebvre or in the SSPX of the 1980s.

The new SSPX seminary in Virginia, whose construction is already underway, is perhaps the most obvious example of this institutional pride. Projected to cost at least \$25 million, it is

being built from scratch at the opposite side of the USA from Winona. The seminary website openly admits that they have spent money on “professional fundraising campaigns”, which includes a promotional video which must be seen to be believed: more than eight minutes long, and yet not one single mention of Archbishop Lefebvre, the Second Vatican Council, the New Mass, the crisis in the Church, Tradition or Traditionalism - indeed, nothing distinguish it from a FSSP or even a conservative conciliar seminary! Just lots of vague talk about “spirituality and silence” etc. When he was present for the laying of the foundation stone recently, Bishop Fellay told those present that the reason for building such a giant seminary was that 200 diocesan Bishops had promised him that when the SSPX is regularised by Rome, they will send their seminarians to him to be trained by the SSPX. One hardly knows whether to laugh or cry. Is it possible that Bishop Fellay could really believe this? Who are these 200 conciliar Bishops, what are their names, which dioceses? If they have made a real commitment, why don't they say so openly, and for that matter, why are they not already sending them to the FSSP seminary in America? Whether or not a good use will be found for it in the end, the new SSPX seminary in Virginia will be a lasting monument, quite literally set in stone, to the pride and folly of ‘Traditionalists’ who lost their way because they put their trust in men and not in God.

One final and rather more unhappy aspect of the pride in our ‘institution’ is the number of scandalous incidents where SSPX priests feel justified in refusing communion to those with whom they disagree. No longer a one-off rarity, the most recent examples come from Australia where a group of people were told that they were to be refused communion for the “crime” of attending a Mass said by Fr. Pfeiffer on his way through that country at the end of April. What is the justification for such wickedness? Well, on at least one occasion, the reason given was “disobedience”! It is nothing short of incredible that such a thing could ever even enter the mind of a priest who is himself disobedient, and whose entire apostolate is founded on (justifiable) disobedience to the local ordinary! And yet, for the crime of “disobeying” the SSPX, the faithful can now expect harsh consequences. Once again, the institution has become an end in itself, and the Catholic Faith is no longer paramount.

Which being the case, the SSPX as an institution is in my opinion no longer deserving of our support. Individual priests of course do deserve our support, but they deserve it in such a way as we actually help them to attain their true end, (E.g. teaching the truth, correcting error, warning their flock of the danger of compromise). On the other hand, ‘support’ which allows a priest to stay comfortably undecided in this hour of crisis, or to put off taking any tough decisions, is the wrong sort of support. He will not thank you for it at his judgement.

What about your local SSPX priest, dear reader? Does he agree with Bp. Fellay that the New Mass was “legitimately promulgated”? If not, how do you know: has he said so, or if he has not, then why not? What does he intend to do about it - does he wish to remain indefinitely in obedience to men whose teachings contradict his own belief? If he has said nothing so far on the subject, and has not publicly declared himself one way or the other, perhaps he would care to explain to you how it is that he deserves your continuing support when he is avoiding doing the very thing which you are supporting him to do? We do not want priests who are just secretly against Vatican II and the New Mass: that is not good enough! There are already quite enough of those to be found here and there, in the dioceses, in the conciliar structures, monasteries and the Ecclesia Dei communities. What is needed are priests who are openly

against it! Priests who will openly condemn the New Mass as illegitimate, the new Code of Canon law as poison, and the “magisterium” of the last fifty years as being irreconcilable with Tradition. What is needed are priests who will warn the flock us of the dangers of Menzingen’s new way of thinking and new direction. That is what deserves our support.

Perhaps this is the right time to remind ourselves what exactly the problem is, and why those of us who wished to be the most loyal of Traditional Catholics in the SSPX are now allowing ourselves to be labelled by the same SSPX as proud, sinful rebels.

The problem is not with trouble makers, rebels, malcontents, ne'er-do-wells, ‘far right infiltrators’, closet sedevacantists, open sedevacantists, Continentals vs. Anglo-Saxons, personality clashes amongst laity or the “evil influence” of Bishop Williamson. The problem is not a “danger of a split”, nor is it that Rome has not been straightforward in their dealings with Bishop Fellay. The problem is not even “a loss of trust in authority [i.e. ‘in me’]” as Bp. Fellay once not so long ago claimed, although it is true that trust in authority has indeed been lost. The problem is that which caused the loss. And what caused the loss? Bishop Fellay and his entourage have fallen away from Tradition. And since he is the Superior General, by doing nothing and saying nothing we would effectively be allowing ourselves to be led out of Tradition and back into Conciliarism by him. It is the age old problem of having to be disobedient in order to stay true.

The crisis in the Church is mirrored in miniature by the crisis in the SSPX. I believe we are now at the equivalent stage of circa 1971. The revolution is by now an undeniable fact and it is firmly and immovably entrenched, but amongst the opposition camp opinion is divided on the question of how to respond. There are a few priests openly resisting the revolution by saying ‘illegal’ Masses in sitting rooms, garages, rented halls, etc., preaching clear, fiery sermons, and travelling many miles with a missionary zeal. Many faithful do attend these Masses, when the opportunity arises, in spite of threats from on high which mention words such as “disobedience”, “schism”, etc. Many other clergy who are personally against the revolution, nevertheless refuse even to consider leaving their parish (where they have been for the last 20 or 30 years) to join the ‘naughty’ priests. Justifications given for this are various and often ‘prudential,’ but ultimately a suspicion of less worthy motives on their part (apathy, fear for the future, attachment to material comfort, etc.) persists. Of course, these priests are still saying the old Mass, they still believe and teach the same doctrine; they just have to be a little careful now not to get into trouble with their new Bishop who is something of a modernist. Things aren’t as easy and straightforward as when they were first ordained; these days, you have to be careful what you say!

Well, dear reader, we know how the story ends, alas! The naughty ones, the disreputable ones, the ones who are slightly crazy and looked down upon by their more ‘respectable’ peers are ultimately the only ones to persevere. Everyone whose position was somewhere in the middle will have vanished within one generation, just like the Marian priests or the so called ‘Church Papists’ in Elizabethan England. They may have disapproved of the Jesuits, whose clear, firm preaching and disobedient, illegal Mass centres might risk giving Catholics a bad name; but sooner or later the illegal Mass centres were all that was left. The others had been forced to succumb, to paraphrase Abp. Lefebvre, by the inevitable logic of the thing, and destroyed. Let that not be us!

OPEN LETTER TO PRIESTS of the SOCIETY of ST PIUS X



28th March, 2013

Reverend and dear Fathers,

The recent publication of the *Doctrinal Declaration*, addressed by the General Council of the Society of St Pius X to the Church authorities in Rome on April 15 last year, confirms our worst fears. We waited for nearly a year to know what it contains. It proves once and for all that the present leadership of the Society of St Pius X means to lead it away from the direction set for it by Archbishop Lefebvre, and towards the ideas and ideals of the Second Vatican Council.

However busy you may be with the daily ministry, this is bound to concern you because it means that the souls under your care are, through you, coming under Superiors meaning to lead them and yourselves towards, even into, the great apostasy of modern times. We recall that it is Superiors who mould their subjects and not the other way around – have we not observed a number of good Society priests, one after another, giving up the fight for the Faith as we know Archbishop Lefebvre led it, and instead going with the flow, with the strong and very different current flowing for some years now from the top of the Society downwards ?

Detailed analysis will confirm the danger of each of the *Declaration's* ten paragraphs, as outlined only briefly below:--

I Fidelity promised to the “Catholic Church” and to the “Roman Pontiff” can easily be misdirected today towards the Conciliar Church as such, and to the Conciliar Pontiffs. Distinctions are needed to avoid confusion.

II Acceptance of teachings of the Magisterium in accordance with *Lumen Gentium* # 25 can easily be understood, especially in conjunction with Rome's 1989 Profession of Faith which is mentioned in a footnote of the *Declaration*, as requiring acceptance of Vatican II doctrines.

III,1 Acceptance of Vatican II teaching on the College of Bishops as contained in *Lumen Gentium*, chapter III, is, despite the "Nota Praevia", a significant step towards accepting Conciliar collegiality and the democratisation of the Church.

III,2 Recognition of the Magisterium as sole authentic interpreter of Revelation runs a grave risk of submitting Tradition to the Council, especially when the interpretation of any break between them is automatically to be rejected (cf. III,5 below).

III,3 The definition of Tradition as "the living transmission of Revelation" is highly ambiguous, and its ambiguity is only confirmed by the vague words about the Church, and by the quotation from the equally ambiguous *Dei Verbum* #8, which follow.

III,4 The proposition that Vatican II should "throw light" on Tradition by "deepening" it and "making it more explicit", is thoroughly Hegelian (since when did contradictories explain and not exclude one another ?), and it risks falsifying Tradition by twisting it to fit the multiple falsehoods of the Council.

III,5 The statement that the novelties of Vatican II must be interpreted in the light of Tradition, but that no interpretation implying any break between the two is acceptable, is madness (All shirts are to be blue, but any non-blue shirt must be taken to be blue !). This madness is none other than that of Benedict XVI's "Hermeneutic of continuity".

III,6 Giving credit to the novelties of Vatican II as being legitimate matter of theological debate is gravely to underestimate their harmfulness. They are fit only to be condemned.

III,7 The judgment that the new sacramental Rites were legitimately promulgated is gravely misleading. The New Order of Mass especially is much too harmful to the common good of the Church to be a true law.

III,8 The "promise to respect" as Church law the New Code of Canon Law is to respect a number of supposed laws directly contrary to Church doctrine.

Reverend Fathers, whoever studies these ten paragraphs in the original text can only conclude that their author or authors have given up the Archbishop's fight for Tradition, and have gone over in their minds to Vatican II. Do you wish yourself and your flock to be moulded by such Superiors ?

Nor let it be said that the first two and last three of the ten paragraphs are broadly taken from the Archbishop's own Protocol of May 5, 1988, so that the *Declaration* is faithful to him. It is well known that on May 6 he repudiated that Protocol because he himself recognized that it made too many concessions for the Society to be able to continue defending Tradition.

Another error is to say that the danger is over because the *Declaration* has been "withdrawn"

by the Superior General. The *Declaration* is the poisoned fruit of what has become a liberal mind-set at the top of the Society, and that mind-set has not been recognized, let alone retracted.

A third misconception is to say that since no agreement has been signed with the apostates of Rome, then there is no further problem. The problem is less the agreement than the desire of any agreement that will grant to the Society official recognition, and that desire is still very much there. Following the whole modern world and the Conciliar Church, the Society's leadership seems to have lost its grip on the primacy of truth, especially Catholic Truth.

Reverend Fathers, "What cannot be cured must be endured." Blind leaders are a punishment from God. However, the least that you can do about this disastrous *Declaration* is to study it for yourselves with everything that led up to it, otherwise you will lose your Society without realizing it, just as the mass of Catholics lost their Church with Vatican II, and did not realize it. Then having made the disaster clear in your own mind, you must tell the truth to your Society flock, namely the danger in which your Superiors are placing their faith and therewith their eternal salvation.

To all of us in that Society which Archbishop Lefebvre made into a worldwide fortress of the Faith, Our Lord is now putting the question of John, VI, 67 : "Will you also leave me?"

To any and all of you I gladly impart the episcopal blessing of your servant in Christ,

+**Richard Williamson**, Nova Friburgo, Maundy Thursday, 2013.

Support Bishop Williamson!

www.stmarcelinitiative.com

P.O. Box 423, Deal CT14 4BF

Spot the Difference!

1988:

"We declare that we recognise the validity of the sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacraments celebrated with the intention to do what the Church does according to the rites indicated in the typical editions of the Roman Missal and the Sacramentary Rituals promulgated by Popes Paul VI and John-Paul II."

2012:

"We declare that we recognise the validity of the sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacraments celebrated with the intention to do what the Church does according to the rites indicated in the typical editions of the Roman Missal and the Sacramentary Rituals legitimately promulgated by Popes Paul VI and John-Paul II."

The Carmel of St. Joseph and The Society of St. Pius X

A brief presentation of the events of Spring, 2013

The Carmel of St. Joseph in Brilon-Wald has existed since 2nd February, 1984. It was founded from the Carmel at Quiévrain which itself was founded by the biological sister of Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre. At the moment the Carmel consists of six professed sisters and a novice who all live in seclusion.

Supplied Authority

In order to be protected from the Modernism of the “conciliar” church, which destroys religious and the religious life, the Carmel at Brilon-Wald, as the mother monastery, entrusted themselves to Archbishop Lefebvre and his Society of St. Pius X for their spiritual care. Archbishop Lefebvre exercised a “supplied authority” over this and other monasteries, whereby he was more a “father, councillor and friend than a juridical authority”, to use the words of the then Superior General of the Society, Fr. Franz Schmidberger in a circular letter to all the allied religious communities on 28th May

1 9 9 1 .

After the death of Abp. Lefebvre this “supplied authority” was given initially to Mgr. Fellay and after his election as Superior General of the Society in 1994 to Mgr. De Galarreta. He exercises this office in the spirit of service, according to Fr. Schmidberger, not as member of the Society of St. Pius X, but as a Catholic bishop, and every religious congregation “was absolutely free to turn towards him or not”. “Neither he nor the Society have the slightest intention of seizing the other communities in any way. It is also important to see in his actions always an extraordinary and not an ordinary jurisdiction, until that day that the things return in God’s Church to the god-given order.” That is what was said in the letter of the Superior General in 1991.

Strange New Ways and a Necessary Decision

Since the year 2000, the Society of St. Pius. X, led by its Superior General Bp. Fellay, struck a new path (which by the way was openly admitted by the First Assistant Father Niklaus Pfluger at a priest meeting of the German district in Stuttgart in September 2011) which was more and more clearly directed at a “canonical regularisation” a “canonical agreement” with conciliar Rome. This increasingly filled the Carmelites of

Brilon-Wald with unrest, since they had entrusted themselves to the Society St. Pius X in order to be protected precisely from this conciliar Rome. Should they now be delivered to them by their own protectors?

The turbulent events especially within the Society itself from Autumn 2011 onwards did not help to allay these concerns and to reassure them. In particular, the Carmel looked towards the relevant responsible Bishop de Galarreta. He initially seemed to give every reason for hope, since he had already spoken clearly in his “Réflexions” on the occasion of a meeting of the superiors of the Society in Albano on the 7th October 2011, and then again most clearly in the joint letter with Bishops Williamson and Tissier de Mallerais to the General Council of the Society in April 2012 against a “canonical agreement”.

After the General Chapter of the SSPX in Summer 2012 with its pitiful “six conditions” for an “honourable surrender”; after the exclusion of Msgr. Williamson initially from the General Chapter and then from the Society, without his brother bishops coming to help him; in particular however after the talk of Bishop de Galarreta in Villepreux in October 2012, in which he changed from Saul to Paul, meaning from an opponent of an agreement to its supporter; after all these events nothing was left of their initial hope. One could not have any trust anymore of being protected by the authorities of the SSPX from conciliar Roman modernism.

Final clarity came through reading the booklet by Fr. Michel Lelong about “GREC” entitled “Pour la nécessaire Réconciliation” which openly exposed how long and with which methods some have been working within the Society for a union with conciliar Rome, that is, how much the “SSPX” has already been infected and undermined and how deep the evil was already rooted.

In the winter of 2012/13 the Carmelites of Brilon-Wald therefore came to the conclusion that it would be necessary to terminate the connections with the SSPX in order to remain faithful to the Catholic faith and not to be delivered to conciliar Rome. When in March 2013 there was the prospect of a visit of Bishop de Galarreta since he happened to be in Germany at that time, they told him on 25th February their decision that they would no longer avail themselves of his “supplied authority” and therefore that his visit was no longer necessary. This step came after intense studies, meditation, prayer and counselling as was their full right, since, according to the writing of the Superior General from 1991 the religious communities were totally free to contact Bishop de Galarreta or

Manoeuvre to Capture a Fortress

The former Superior General and present District Superior from Germany, Fr. Franz Schmidberger, seemed to have completely forgotten his former letter from 1991. For on the same day, 25th February, when he had hardly received the message from Bishop de Galarreta and before he was able to think or even consider - for he was, as usual, at the retreat house of the Society in the Black Forest preaching a retreat - he sent immediately

a fax to the Spiritual of the Carmelites in Brilon-Wald, in which he ordered him to leave the monastery within three days, by the 28th February at 8pm (interestingly, exactly the same moment when Benedict XVI abdicated) and to take his residence for the time being in the District Headquarters in Stuttgart. As justification he mentioned that the Carmelites wanted to separate themselves because of the “alleged liberalism” in the SSPX and they would even refuse to talk to their “ecclesiastical superior” (he probably meant Msgr. de Galarreta). Well then, the “supplied authority” without proper jurisdiction suddenly turned into “ecclesiastical superior”, even though the First Assistant of the SSPX not so long ago claimed in an interview with full consent of both the German District Superior and the General House that the “SSPX” suffers from a “canonical irregularity”. Irregular clergy can certainly not be “ecclesiastical superiors”...

Since the Chaplain was not even present at Brilon-Wald during the 25 - 28th February, he already could not meet this demand. When he returned the situation had already changed. Firstly, some well-meaning priests did what one would have expected from the District Superior, and persuaded the Carmelite sisters to take a respite prior to a final separation from the Society and to attempt a conversation with Msgr. de Galarreta. Thus, a delay of the decision until Easter, and a visit of the Bishop from 20th -23rd March, was agreed upon.

Secondly, the external sister left the Carmel on 28th February. (An external sister is a Carmelite nun who does not live enclosed and who performs external duties e.g: shopping runs). The external sister from Brilon-Wald had only recently solemnly professed her three religious vows to the Carmel St. Joseph on the Feast of St. Joseph 2012. She, however, did not want to know anything about the happenings in the SSPX and refused to take note of any information. Therefore, she was not by any means ready to follow the step of her community.

Her Mother Superior asked her to wait until Easter and offered her that if she disagreed afterwards with the decision, she would be accommodated in another Carmelite Monastery. Appropriate steps had already been taken and a Carmel had been found which would have taken the sister in such a case. The external however, did not want to wait and insisted on leaving the monastery immediately. For this purpose she got in touch with her biological brother, who was stationed as priest in the District Headquarters in Stuttgart and who came immediately to take his sister with him.

Between the retreat which finished on the 2nd March and the priest meeting which began on the 4th March, the German District Superior found time to write a letter to the Chaplain of the Carmel in which he summoned him again, this time as a “command in obedience” to leave the Carmel until 7th March and to be at the District Headquarters in Stuttgart by 8pm. This letter was delivered to the Chaplain on 5th March via “registered mail”.

The Reverend Mother Prioress thereupon personally turned towards Fr. Schmidberger and asked him politely to leave the Chaplain at least until Easter at the monastery, otherwise they, especially after the unlawful removal of the external sister, would be

unable to believe in the purity of his and hence of the SSPX's intentions. The answer came by return on 6th March: It is the right of the District Superior to transfer the priests at his will; he bears no responsibility for the escape of the external sister. Furthermore, the removal of the external was necessary for her nerves and moreover he misses greatly the humility of the remaining Carmelites of Brilon-Wald.

If a thief wants to take a city or fortress he takes the trouble first to cut off the supply. Something similar happened here. After the removal of the external sister who was responsible for providing the means of subsistence, now the Chaplain should have been removed and thus the spiritual means of subsistence should have been cut off. Rev. Fr. District Superior attempted very obviously to seize the Carmel at Brilon-Wald, quite contrary to his assertion in 1991 (another possibility of seizing was not given since the property of the Carmel with its buildings, monasteries, chapel and spiritual house was in the possession of the nuns). All his protestations of innocence were to no avail. For the right to move a priest does not include the right to leave a monastery without a spiritual nourishment and inflict in a certain sense an interdict, despite the fact they have been not found guilty of any offense. And the abduction from a nun from her monastery by a priest who is under his own authority and the accommodation of this escaped nun in his own house, is impossible to have happened without his consent, especially since he defended this unlawful procedure.

The Inevitable Break

The situation was clear for the Carmelites. They informed Mgr. de Galarreta that he did not have to trouble himself anymore. Under such circumstances collaboration with these people was unthinkable. It was also clear for the Chaplain that he could not follow the command of the District Superior. For nonsensical and unjust commands are not mandatory. The command was nonsensical, as in the short period of less than three days it was impossible for the Spiritual to arrange all his affairs, to pack his things and to organise his move. The command was unjust as it was obviously aimed at depriving the Carmelites of Brilon-Wald from the holy mass and the sacraments.

Indeed, the District Superior promised half-heartedly in his "registered mail" to offer a "substitute" for the Spiritual, but on the "appointed date" 7th March, nothing was to be seen or heard of this "substitute". At least up until Easter, the spiritual care for the sisters should have been ensured, and even beyond that for a reasonable period in order to give the nuns the opportunity to find a new Chaplain themselves. Since the Carmel was guilty of no offense, but simply made use of its own right there was no reason for any punishment – especially not in view of the innumerable merits which the monastery had acquired for the German district in nearly thirty years.

Naturally, one has to expect that the SSPX spreads all kinds of insults and slanders against the Carmel in Brilon-Wald and at least speaks badly of it, since they cannot conquer it. Secondly, it can be assumed that the Chaplain will be excluded from the SSPX due to "disobedience". But one has to obey God more than men. "In Deo laudabo verbum, in Domino laudabo sermonem: in Deo speravi, non timebo quid faciat mihi

Fr. Schmidberger's Editorial about the Carmelites

(German District Newsletter, April 2013)

Source: http://www.pius.info/images/stories/mitteilungsblatt/2013/mb_2013_4.pdf

“ ... At this point I have to convey a very painful message: The Carmelites of Brilon-Wald, led astray by their Chaplain, have terminated their friendship with us. This monastery was founded on 2nd February 1984 under the patronage of St. Joseph and recently comprised eight nuns. At the end of February they informed Msgr. de Galarreta who is responsible for the religious communities associated with us that due to the liberalism within the SSPX they would terminate their relationship with us. This [liberalism] was a true threat for their Faith. A year and a half long influencing preceded this decision, over which there was not enough accountability. In recent months subversive and slanderous writings apparently circulated, written by priests who are about to leave us or have already left us. It is obvious that religious women in their seclusion who are only “informed” from this side are not equipped against such an enemy. Step by step their trust was undermined. In the end they became victims of the father of lies and seduction. And thus we can only say with the suffering Job: *“The Lord has given, the Lord has taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord.”*”

This separation should remind us all of the warnings of the great Apostle Paul: *“He that thinketh himself to stand, let him take heed lest he fall.”* (1 Cor 10:12). He does not say ‘he who stands’, but ‘he who thinks that he stands’, precisely because many souls believe themselves in safety; they bathe themselves in virtue, while pride and self-righteousness have ensnared their hearts long ago. Stubbornness, self-righteousness, condescension, criticism, false dialectic, mockery and malice are not the gifts of the Holy Ghost, but characteristics of the adversary of God. It does not matter to him whether he causes the downfall of a soul through its well-known weaknesses, or through its pride of its own virtues. Too often the devil turns into an angel of light and performs his work of seduction *sub specie boni* – under the disguise of good. If one carries one’s own right too far, for example, the highest injustice can be done. Not for nothing the old saying said: *Summum jus, summa injuria*. If you have circumnavigated the dangers of a wrong obedience and avoided liberalism and modernism, you are far from immune to a sectarian anti-liberalism. Only humility of spirit, and perhaps more so of the heart, protects one against a fall. “Learn from me”, says our blessed Lord, “for I am meek and humble of heart.” (Matthew 11:29). ...”



A Correction of the Editorial in the April 2013 German District Newsletter (“*Mitteilungsblatt*”)

The announcement of the separation of the *Carmel St. Joseph* from the Society St. Pius X in the April *Mitteilungsblatt* due to its wrong claims requires some corrections which we want to submit herewith.

Claim: The Carmelites of Brilon-Wald were misled by their chaplain (...) A period of one and a half years of influencing preceded this move.

Correction: There was no influencing, however, sound catechesis, in the form and content similar to the instructions we were commonly used to receive 15 years ago from the Society St. Pius X. Behind this background it was inevitable that the current deviations of the Society St. Pius X from sound doctrine became obvious. Our practical conclusion, the step to separate ourselves from the Society, was not discussed with our Chaplain, he was merely informed of it, excluding the practical question whether he was to go and stay with us in this case.

Claim: We were religious nuns in seclusion who are only “informed” from one side.

Correction: Up until March 2013 we received the *Mitteilungsblatt* and the *Kirchliche Umschau* and therefore we were familiar with the official statements of the Society.

Claim: In the last months, subversive and slanderous writings were apparently circulating in the monastery. (...)

Correction: The main object of our studies were in recent months:

- Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre: Sermons, talks and books (especially: “They have uncrowned Him”)
- Don Félix Sardá y Salvany: “Liberalism is sin” (recommended by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre)
- Father Michel Lelong: “Pour la nécessaire réconciliation - Le Groupe de Reflexion Entre Catholiques (GREC)” (Report of a priest of the official church of the secret talks between the SSPX with Rome for 15 years)

To make up for the one-sided reporting of the *Mitteilungsblatt* we used (without the mediation of our Chaplain) the writings of the SSPX- Resistance. These are flatly condemned by the SSPX as subversive.

Claim: Step by step their (i.e.: our) trust was undermined, ie by said subversion.

Correction: Our trust was undermined by the Society itself. The contradiction and deviation from the clear line of the Archbishop of which abundant statements can be found, were irrefutable documented by the Resistance. That the *Mitteilungsblatt* did not even want to publish the letter of the three bishops Tissier de Mallerais, de Galarreta and Williamson to the General Council in April 2012 as well as the response of the General Council (14.04.2012) , corresponds certainly not with truthful reporting. On the side of the Resistance we meet an objective way of arguing, whereas it is mere subjective arguing on the side of the SSPX.

Claim: Without literal reference but from its context unambiguously applied to us we are subject to: stubbornness, self-righteousness, condescension, criticism, false dialectic, mockery and malice .

Correction: A documentation of our exchange of letters with Bishop de Galarreta and Rev. Fr. Schmidberger which was kept from our side as short and polite as possible would completely relieve us in this regard. We forgo a publication in order not to unnecessarily put personalities of the SSPX in the light of their own allegations.

Proof of liberalism in the Society

That liberalism has entered the Society can be demonstrated by many statements of Bishop Fellay and other well-known representatives of the Society which can be read in their official statements or more clearly compiled on the website of the resistance. The willingness, indeed the pursuit of a practical agreement with still a modernist, conciliar Rome, is the most telling and alarming proof. As complicity in liberalism Don Félix Sardá y Salvany mentions: “Complicity have the fathers, confessors, spiritual directors, directors of institutes, professors and teachers, when they if asked about such things either remain silent or simply not explain where they are obliged to instruct the conscience of their subordinates. “(Chapter 17, No. 6) In Sarto-Verlag (publishing company of the German SSPX) dubious books are distributed. In the *Mitteilungsblatt* and the *Kirchlichen Umschau* appear constantly disputable articles by conservative representatives of the official church without being corrected.

Are we Sedevacantists?

No, we are not. A decision on whether the dubious popes since the Council were ie. are legitimate popes or not cannot be in any way incumbent on us. Therefore, we pray for the pope, without however being able to submit to his still modernist authority.

Our Canonical Situation

According to the letter of the then Superior General of the SSPX, Rev. Fr. Schmidberger, to the monasteries of tradition on 28.05. 1991, the situation for all monasteries associated with the SSPX is as follows: The SSPX itself has no power of jurisdiction over the religious communities. The bishop in charge of the religious communities executes his

office not as a member of the SSPX but simply as a Catholic bishop by virtue of an extraordinary jurisdiction which arises as the communities call on him due to the state of emergency. The communities are completely free to do so. We have therefore forwent in freedom due to the above mentioned liberalism to make use of Msgr. de Galarreta's supplied authority. In its place we are in contact with Msgr. Richard Williamson.

Conclusion

The quest for a rational assessment of the situation of the SSPX, enlightened by faith, has suggested to us after much prayer the following decision: For the love of truth, of the Church and the SSPX as the from God blessed work of the Archbishop, we see it as our duty, to withdraw from the dangerous influence of liberalism which has become apparent in the latter. The life of contemplative sisters has as its goal the contemplation of truth and the union with God, who is truth itself. Half-truths and compromises can impossibly be means to reach this goal. In order to work for the triumph of our Holy Church through the triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Our Lady, to remain faithful to the mission of the Archbishop and to obtain for us and for many souls the highest good, the union with God, we see ourselves forced to confess and protect our faith by distancing ourselves from the Society. We will return with pleasure, as soon as it returns to the line of Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre.

What about the future of the monastery?

Due to the loss of benefactors who cannot understand our step and also due to fact that our external sister left us hastily, we are now in a distressed situation. For over 30 years the district was unable to provide us with a chaplain who could have been able to operate pastorally. Due to a lack of faithful who could help us, we now have to leave our cloister regularly in order to ensure for our livelihood. That we were heading towards this precarious situation was already communicated eight years ago to the then District Superior, without however, appointing a house-chaplain who could fill the empty post. Therefore, we envisage to relocate our Carmel to the south where help is assured. Since our monastery cannot be sold – it reverts back to the SSPX as soon as it is no longer used as a Carmel – we need new financial means to rebuild. Even with a very humble beginning with a smaller building at least 700,000 Euro are necessary. We urgently ask you for your donations to help ensure that the continuation of our monastery in Bavaria or surroundings can be guaranteed. For the faith we have thrown ourselves in the arms of Divine Providence: *“In te, Domine, speravi – non confundar in aeternum* - In you my Lord I hope – I shall not be confounded.”

Our Lady of Mount Carmel, Guardian of the Faith, pray for us!

- *The Sisters of the Carmel St. Joseph*

Contact: Carmel of St. Joseph, Korbacher Str 89, 59929 Brilon Wald, Germany. Tel 02961/6445

Donations: Sparkasse HSL Brilon, BLZ 416 517 70, Account No. 56 267
IBAN: DE58 4165 1770 0000 0562 67, BIC: WELADED1HSL



DECLARATION
to
Members of the Society of St. Pius X,
Affiliated Communities and the Faithful of Tradition



Holy Thursday, 28th March, 2013

Dear brothers and sisters in Christ the King,

On this day when the Holy Church solemnly commemorates the institution of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the sacrament of Holy Orders, I take this opportunity to inform you of my decision to place myself outside the official structure of the Society. My intention is neither to abandon nor to vilify it. The Society is victim of an enterprise that aims to bring it under the power of the Conciliar Church, despite repeated warnings of its founder, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre.

Following my sermons and interventions against a rallying, my district superior, Fr. Jürgen Wegner, transferred me from the Priory of Langley (near Vancouver) to District Headquarters (St-Césaire, near Montreal) with the expressed intention of "closely monitoring" me. He also said that I could no longer criticise the superiors. In his letter to Canadian priests regarding his decision, he attacked not only my public statements, but also my emails and private conversations with the faithful. It is clear that I was being offered to exchange the material welfare of remaining in the Society for my silence in public and in private. This would be no more no less than a form of spiritual prostitution. But I have a soul, and I want to save it. I cannot do that by accepting this deal because, as the saying goes: "silence is tantamount to consent." This is basically why I see it as a moral obligation to refuse the transfer. This is the only way for me to continue to work towards achieving the true goal of the Society, which is not to convert modernist Rome, but to preserve and transmit the true Mass and the true priesthood. So I put myself in the hands of Providence, convinced that Our Lord will take good care of His priest.

Much has been written on the subject of a "purely practical" agreement with Rome. Suffice to say that I fully endorse the statements and studies by other colleagues who are opposed to this new orientation of the Society. I shan't repeat them here. I would, however, like to share some personal reflections on the three aspects of the crisis of the Society:

1. Society authorities want to justify the abandonment of the resolution of the General Chapter of 2006 ("No practical agreement without conversion of Rome"), by saying that the situation is not the same today. They would have us believe that many new bishops, priests, and seminarians are no longer interested in Vatican II and prefer the traditional Mass and theology. Yet they are unable to produce a serious and independent study to demonstrate this. We are being asked no less than to accept what Archbishop Lefebvre termed "Operation Suicide." The General Chapter of 2012, far from correcting this change of direction only wrapped it up in cosmetic "conditions". The only condition that mattered, the conversion of Rome, was abandoned. In addition, this chapter occasioned a reversal of the balance of strength between bishops: From the 7th April 2012 when we had on one side three bishops against a "practical" agreement and on the other, an isolated Bishop Fellay, we found ourselves on the 14th July, with three bishops in favor of such an agreement against an ostracised Bishop Williamson, who had moreover been excluded from the said Chapter. The final statement about the newfound unity actually signalled the end of a period of grace for all "resisters". Henceforth, from 15th July 2012, all opposition vis-à-vis a purely practical agreement, any criticism of the authorities of the Society on this subject, became a crime against the Society itself. A law of silence was instituted. The rest is history. This law of silence is so powerful that Menzingen doesn't even bother to respond to the arguments and accusations; opponents are simply demonised as vulgar rebels of subversive deeds! Exit H.E. Bishop Williamson and a score of priests!

2. H.E. Bishop Fellay's secret documents (14th April 2012 letter to the three other bishops, Preamble the following day), which were published unofficially, allowed us to understand the extent to which frequent relations with today's Rome are dangerous. If even before the signing of an agreement such contacts have changed the Superior General, his assistants, and, by extension, other Superiors, what would happen to simple priests and faithful when they would be officially, legally, permanently under the control of the Roman authorities? One has only to see how Menzingen already persecutes those who oppose this new direction even while we still enjoy a degree of independence vis-à-vis Rome, to understand how far they will go once under the authority of the conciliar Church!

3. Recently, it was asked of us to accept the theory that the term "conciliar Church" does not mean a separate institution of the Catholic Church, but rather a "movement" within it (cf. Fr. Gleize in DICI: <http://www.dici.org/en/documents/can-one-speak-of-the-conciliar-church/>). The logical consequence of this theory would be that the traditionalist movement should return to the formal structure of the Church, to fight from within the conciliar "movement" and thus help Tradition triumph. It is why we often hear SSPX authorities say that the Society must "help the Catholic Church to reclaim her Tradition." Now, on one hand, the Catholic Church, without her Tradition, could not exist, it would no longer

be the Catholic Church. Furthermore, one can no longer speak of a mere "movement" when the liberal and Masonic ideas of Vatican II have been "institutionalised" by reforms covering all aspects of Church life: Liturgy, Catechism, Ritual, Bible, Ecclesiastical Tribunals, Higher Education, Magisterium and, above all, Canon Law. We are confronted with a structure, an institution which is different to the Catholic Church. If it weren't the case, we would be members! But it is not us who have left the Catholic Church, they have, even if they managed to take control of the official structure. Concerning the role of the Pope in all this, it has to be admitted that therein lies a mystery, a mystery of iniquity. Nonetheless, it stands that we are in the presence of two separate institutions: The Catholic Church founded by Our Lord and the conciliar Church, instigated, let there be no doubt, by Lucifer.

These are just three small reflections, but I believe they can shed some light on some aspects of the debate. Now that I have become totally free to speak, you can count, dear brothers and sisters in Christ the King, on my regular contribution to the websites of the growing movement of opposition to the Ralliement, a movement that I believe deserves the name Catholic Resistance.

Pray for thy servant, as I pray for you.

Father Patrick Girouard, SSPX

Some useful websites:

www.inthissignyoushallconquer.com

www.cathinfo.com

www.sossaveoursspx.com

www.ecclesiamilitans.com

aveclimmaculee.blogspot.com

(French)

www.lasapiniere.info

(French)

nonpossumus-vc.blogspot.co.uk

(Spanish)

www.beneditinos.org.br

(Portuguese)

“When the salt loses its flavour...”

An Open Letter from Fr. Hugo Ruiz Vallejo to the Faithful of Mexico City

Dear Friends in Christ,

Some of you are already aware of my departure and my taking up residence here in St. Joseph's House, here in Mexico. In order to avoid any misunderstanding or perplexity on your part, it is not only important but also necessary for me to give you an explanation of the serious reasons which have created this necessity for me.

Nobody from among you should be ignorant of the very serious motives which have guided what is known as the Traditional movement, present at the beginning in various parts of the world, but now principally in the Society of St. Pius X, the work of an exemplary Bishop, Abp. Marcel Lefebvre, who tried to save the values of the Catholic Church from the Modernist invasion which hit the Church of Christ, above all by that which we call Vatican II, and by all the reforms of the Church which this council caused. This attack provoked a totally legitimate defensive movement of faithful Catholics, a movement which is in itself very natural and necessary. The struggle, the war against the doctrinal errors of the modern world which was waged by the Popes of the 18th, 19th and 20th Centuries, by Pope St. Pius X in particular, is the same one which we wished to take on and try to wage in our turn.

Nonetheless, those Traditionalists in particular who have known the beginning of this fight are the ones to state that our superiors have lowered the tone of our demands and of our fight for the defence of the Faith. To begin with, it was argued that this was a means of converting Rome: not only the fact of no longer denouncing as strongly the deviations of Churchmen, but also a way of coming closer and closer to the official Church. The question is: is all this a proportionate means of converting Rome? Or is it a mere illusion? Can one convert someone to the truth by hiding that same truth? Can one convert someone by leaning in the direction of their errors and dialectic?

With increasing concern, we see on the part of many SSPX priests and faithful, as well as allied religious orders, an omission which takes on ever greater and more misleading proportions. A silence which is more and more noticeable.

The fact is that the Romans have renounced not one of their very serious errors of Vatican II, nor the New Mass (Novus Ordo Missae), nor any one of the reforms which are a consequence of this Council and which affect the life of the whole Church. Rome has merely made some concessions of a political nature to bring the Society closer, little

concessions which are not sufficient to serve as proof that there has been a real change of direction in Rome, in other words in the direction of Tradition. Quite the contrary, we find in all these negotiations and dialoguing a diplomacy which is full of duplicity. We cannot base our important decisions solely on rumours or facts which comprise no proof at all of the churchmen's conversion.

The fact is that, despite the famous failure of the doctrinal discussions, supposedly conducted in order to convert Rome, (and which remain unpublished to this day), we are still trying to go full steam ahead towards an agreement with Rome at any price, in extremely dangerous conditions. And to crown it all, there are already today those who think that the Society ought to make an agreement to submit Rome, whether or not Rome has converted! (*"I would even say that, in front of this sublime reality, any talk of whether or not we have an agreement with Rome is a trifling matter... defending the Faith, keeping the Faith, dying in the Faith, that's what's important!"* - Bp. Fellay, Paris, 30th January, 2013) But perhaps we want to be dependent on those who do not have the same Catholic principles as us? Is it possible to have a good pastoral ministry without having good doctrine? Perhaps those who do not have sound doctrine could be in charge of the Traditionalist pastoral ministry? How can we understand one another regarding practice of the Faith if we do not have the same principles regarding Faith and Morals? Perhaps Francis, the new Pope, didn't begin his Pontificate by recommending a book by the heretic Kasper in his Urbi et Orbi in St. Peter's Square! And wouldn't it be a very pious idea to live in a cave with Ali Baba and the 40 thieves in order to convert Ali Baba and the 40 thieves...? A very pious idea, full of realism...!

The conclusions of the Society's last General Chapter have only dramatically confirmed our fears, because in its official conclusion the leaders of the Society declared what will be the six conditions for us to accept an agreement with Rome or a 'regularisation' inside the Roman system. According to these, three are necessary, and the three others "desirable", which means that even if the Pope doesn't let us have them, we will still accept the "agreement". I might mention at this point that one of the "desirable" conditions isn't really a condition. Much could be said about these conditions, but the worst is to be found in the first of these three "desirable" conditions: the decisions of our ecclesiastical tribunals could be overturned by the tribunals of the conciliar Church; and with our agreement too! In other words, they with their modernist principles would make decisions affecting the pastoral ministry of Traditional priests! What's more, in the second "desirable" condition we accept the possibility of having to depend on local bishops, even though we're well aware of the extent to which they would like to have an opportunity to make us submit to the ideas and pastoral practice of Vatican II. A real programmed suicide of Tradition! In addition, in the third of these conditions we also accept the possibility of the man in charge of the commission which represents us to the Pope not being himself a Traditionalist. But how could someone who does not think like us, and who is not one of us, represent us? Fr. Mario Trejo, the District Superior of Mexico, recently said in the District newsletter (*'Dios Nunca Muere'*, no.41, p.7) that in the declaration of the last General Chapter of the Society, *"Every phrase, every word was weighed and examined in order to give testimony to the Faith of all time."* Well, with these conditions, how can the Faith of all time be defended by people who no longer profess it?

In any case, it has now become clear that there is now a new attitude towards Rome and its errors on the part of those who now run the SSPX, a new position full of omissions and ready to make very serious compromises which, even if it hasn't yet been brought about, brings to light a more than worrying state of mind. There is a gradual omission of any reference to our combat, or the objectives which Abp. Lefebvre gave the Society,

An external policy corresponds to an internal 'policy': which is to say that within the Society, each time in an increasingly obvious way, the existence of a policy of repression against anyone who does not agree with the new orientation of the Society is confirmed. Pressuring, harassing, discrediting and punishing in various different ways anyone who shows that they disagree. Many more disturbing statements and actions could be added. Like, for example, what Fr. Raphael Arizaga heard from the mouth of Bishop Fellay in a conference to seminarians at Winona, on 21st December last year: *"Because I wanted to preserve the internal unity of the Society, I withdrew the document in which I said 'I do not reject all of Vatican II' - which is what I really said."*

Abp. Lefebvre counselled against going to Indult Masses as well as those groups with an atmosphere such as the Fraternity of St. Peter, because such atmospheres are corrupted at their root, in the sense that what is taught and promoted in the short- or long-term tends towards assimilation with the conciliar Church. But if the Society of St. Pius X changes its spirit and its objectives, could it not also end up being in a similar state, equal or worse, even if the agreement with Rome has, for the moment, not been made concrete?

I myself have commented on how many priests have changed their attitude towards the combat of Tradition against the enemy, and unfortunately this has been more frequently the case with new priests. I am myself a victim of this new line from our superiors, a line full of omissions about struggle and our combat. Already, they're not seeing many enemies in Rome; optimism has little by little replaced the distrust which one ought naturally to feel towards the destroyers of the Church. My District Superior, Fr. Mario Trejo, has forbidden me to speak about these subjects: not just in sermons, but also in private! Whether it be with the faithful or with other priests, and that with the threat of transfer and severe punishments.

And since I cannot accomplish my mission as a priest from within the Society, a mission which consists of showing forth the truth and denouncing danger which threatens souls, I have decided to continue my ministry outside the structure of the Society, although I continue to be a member of it, and this is for the good of the faithful who are in Mexico City and who wish to have recourse to my priestly ministry. I hope that you, as well as my fellow priests, will understand the reasons for this serious decision.

May God, through Our Lady of Guadalupe, bless and enlighten you,

Fr. Hugo Ruiz Vallejo, SSPX

22nd March, 2013 - In memory of the Seven Dolours of Our Lady

Contact: salterrae22@gmail.com

Declaration of Dom Raphael Arizaga, OSB

2nd March, 2013



I declare that I am a servant of Our Lord Jesus Christ, of the Most Holy Virgin Mary of Guadalupe, and of the father of Our Lord, St. Joseph, and that I desire to live and die for love of Him. Moved by this attitude I am writing this public declaration in order to make clear the reasons for my actions, actions in which I do not believe I have been moved by rebellion or personal interest or anything else other than love of doctrine and charity.

The motive for my actions has been the words of Garrigou Lagrange:

“The Church is intolerant in principle because she believes; she is tolerant in practice because she loves. The enemies of the Church are tolerant in principle because they do not believe; they are intolerant in practice because they do not love.”

The Catholic principles which we have received from Abp. Lefebvre are the motor, the heart, the *raison d'être* of the SSPX, the greatest treasure which we have inherited from him, and through which we have received the Catholic religion in all its force and integrity. Love of this doctrine has led me to trust in a special way the teaching of Bp. Williamson. His advice wisely guided me to continue in my beloved monastery of Silver City and foster a monastic life of fidelity, knowing that this is the best way of serving the Church in the sublime Benedictine vocation. Intolerance regarding principles necessarily moved me to lean on Bishop Williamson, while tolerance in charity led me to continue in my beloved monastery. Unfortunately, my superiors have decided that this way of living is not possible. On Sunday 24th February, the doors of my monastery were closed to me, to my great surprise. My crime? Following Bishop Williamson. I do not wish to attack my monastery, nor my spiritual father Dom Cyprian; they are not modernists; their intention is to give everything to God and to be holy, and their generosity is beyond question. The problem rather lies in a failure to grasp what the greatness of doctrine means: the priority of doctrine above everything else. Doctrine which is found solidly grounded in Bp. Williamson, especially though not uniquely. This has been demonstrated by the fact that his teaching and his Eleison Comments have never been refuted. This love of doctrine means that the condemnation of Bp. Williamson also falls upon me: I have been his friend and his son, that was my sin. My search for wisdom through spiritual direction, with no desire to leave my monastery, only to be confirmed in the faith and to continue my defence of the faith as a soldier of Jesus Christ ought, in order

thus to better help the monastery, this was the cause of my expulsion.

Charity requires me not to condemn either the SSPX or the monastery of Silver City, only God can judge, I forgive all the injustice perpetrated against me. At the same time, I beg forgiveness of all those whom I have offended, especially Dom. Cyprian, whom I shall never cease loving and for whom I continue to pray specially, hoping that Divine Providence reunites us again. I declare myself to be the enemy of nobody. I merely declare that I am intolerant of sin, and an enemy of liberal doctrine, sin against the First Commandment, since liberalism is a blasphemy in practice, which without doubt has infiltrated into various parts of the SSPX.

In charity for my poor soul, please implore the infinite mercy of God, and to all of you, my brothers in the Faith, I appeal to your fraternal charity to pray a great deal for your poor servant.

With the help of God we will soon open a new monastery, and from now on I am asking for your help. We will receive all Catholics who are intolerant in doctrine but tolerant in charity.

Yours forever in Our Holy Father St. Joseph,

Fr. Raphael Arizaga, OSB

NB - Since this original Declaration was written at the beginning of March, a site for the new monastery, the Monastery of St. Joseph, has already been found and one postulant received.

Those wishing to help this new foundation in Mexico may contact Dom Arizaga via:

Monasterio San Jose
Fray Miguel de Terrazas No. 150,
Col. Quintas del Marques,
Santiago de Queretaro
Qro. C.P. 76050
Mexico



“Quo Vadis *DICI*...?” - Part 2



Here is the latest piece of evidence of the continued downward slide of DICI. With a sycophancy and optimism regarding Pope Francis so embarrassing to witness that it would surely make many FSSP priests blush, Fr. Alain Lorans has the following to say, in an article on the DICI website entitled “*Enea and Pius*”:

“In 1458, when he was elected pope and took the name of Pius II, Cardinal Enea Silvio Piccolomini declared to his entourage: “Forget Enea, welcome Pius.” Today, one month after the election of the new pope, here are the questions that Vatican-watchers are asking themselves: “Will Jorge send his kind remembrances to Francis? Or will Francis make everybody forget Jorge?” And even: “Will Francis make us forget Benedict?” Or else: “Will Francis always be the same as at the beginning of his pontificate?” For Church history shows that the pontificate of Pius IX did not end as it had begun.

And therefore everyone is awaiting the first appointments by the Supreme Pontiff: “Who will be the new Secretary of State?” “Who will be the next prefects of the Roman Congregations?” And they all analyze his statements, scrutinize his gestures, and interpret the signs that he gives or does not give....

On the other hand, some are not in the least bit perplexed; they have no need of analyzing, of scrutinizing, much less of interpreting. They think that that already know everything, thanks to knowledge that they think is infused, whereas it is only confused.

Father Alain Lorans”

Whether this was really written for the benefit of the handful of poor souls who still read DICI regularly and take it seriously, or whether Fr. Lorans is actually addressing himself directly to the Pope and Curia and openly courting the Romans themselves with these words, shall have to remain a matter of speculation for the moment. Ah, what a terrible thing is unrequited love!

Be that as it may, after you have finished laughing at his last sentence and recovered your composure, dear reader, please consider the following. Taking into due consideration the mountain of evidence consisting of words, actions and omissions of the current Pontiff which have taken place since his election (and not merely when he was Cardinal “Jorge”), if you view his Pontificate at all with any misgivings (to put it mildly!) then, according to

Fr. Lorans, you are just a smug, deluded 'know-it-all' who thinks he has infused knowledge whereas in reality you're just a confused loon!

Secondly, how amazingly hypocritical for the very people (and Fr. Lorans in particular!) to lecture the rest of the Traditionalist world on "scrutinising" the actions and words of the Pope, of all things! Let us remind ourselves that this is the same DICI and the same Fr. Lorans who "scrutinised" Benedict XVI's 'World Day of Peace' speech so hard, last January, that they managed to report on his entire speech except the glaring full-on heresy about religious liberty contained therein! Pardon me a moment of slight scepticism, but Fr. Lorans has clearly been suffering from continual lapses of scrutiny over recent weeks if he is seriously trying to convince us that we are still waiting for some sort of indications as to what sort of Pope Francis will be! Apparently he has not managed to notice the washing of the feet of a muslim woman, the praying side-by-side with a schismatic Orthodox bishop, the declaration that "I don't need all this" when presented with the keys to the Papal apartment, to name a few things to which many more could be added. And never mind the fact that the biggest liberals from amongst the Cardinals (Kasper, Bertone, etc.) have said openly that they voted for him in the conclave! But perhaps we are being unfair - doubtless Fr. Lorans has been scrutinising the new Pope very closely, there must simply be some other explanation... now, what is it I seem to remember Fr. Chazal saying about DICI and rose-tinted spectacles? Surely there couldn't be any truth in that, could there...?

Finally, there is Fr. Lorans' little statement that Pius IX's papacy did not end as it had begun. Well, yes, it is true that Pius IX, though previously a liberal, became an implacable opponent of all forms of liberalism (Hmmm... ...if Fr. Lorans is hoping for this from Pope Francis, perhaps he had better watch out!) But we would be being dishonest if we did not mention that there was a reason for this unlooked-for conversion on the part of Pius IX: namely, the minor fact of the Freemasons invading and destroying the Papal states, the Papal apartments being invaded by a murderous mob, and Pius IX, having just witnessed his own Prime Minister being murdered in an adjacent room, being forced to flee in disguise, himself only minutes ahead of his would-be assassins. Not the sort of thing one would wish, or expect, to see happen every day! And, as a poster on Cathinfo.com recently sagely observed, after his conversion from Saul to Paul on the road to Damascus, the other Apostles initially still did not trust St. Paul until he had proved himself in word and deed. Although it may be stating the obvious, a miraculous or unforeseen conversion is just that: it is miraculous or unforeseen. And as such it is surely a forlorn hope if we are reduced to hoping for another Pius IX -type success story. Of course, with God, all things are possible. But it is in the nature of miracles to be unexpected and against the grain of what ought to take place. Therefore we ought not presume upon a miracle taking place; whilst possible, we plan without it. And we had better plan for tough times ahead in the Church and the world if the current indications surrounding Pope Francis are anything to go by.

And no, I did not come by that conclusion through a supernatural infusion, but merely through common sense!

"If you were to read DICI every day, you'd lose the Faith!"

- Fr. Joseph Pfeiffer

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 fervour 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.

"Sheer Trickery!"

Bishop Fellay and the Oath of Fidelity

Much has already been said regarding the Doctrinal Declaration which Bishop Fellay offered to Rome in April 2012, and no doubt a great deal more will still be said in the weeks ahead. There are more than a few difficulties and pitfalls in the text. This article, as the others before it, does not claim to be definitive or comprehensive, nor is it intended to be the final word on the matter. We will for the moment focus on just one problem contained in Bishop Fellay's April 2012 text.

We refer to the first footnote, the reference to which is to be found at the end of Section II, which we believe means in effect that the compromise entailed goes even further than appears at a first glance. It reads:

" 1. cf. the new Formula for Profession of Faith and Oath of Fidelity for assuming a charge exercised in the name of the Church, 1989;"

Since Section II of Bishop Fellay's April 2012 text consists of only one sentence and begins with the words "We declare that we accept..." it is surely not unreasonable to conclude that the "we accept" also covers the Oath of Fidelity and Profession of Faith mentioned in the footnote. Nothing to the contrary is evident and it is difficult to see how it would make sense any other way.

Let us now turn our consideration to the text of the Oath of Fidelity in question, referred to in the above-quoted footnote. Its full title is: "Oath of Fidelity on Assuming an Office to be Exercised in the Name of the Church", and as the title suggest, the idea is that it is taken by clerics on appointed to a given office. Whether the intention was that the SSPX clergy would have been required to take it is not the point: by including it in paragraph II of his April 2012 'Doctrinal Declaration' which begins with the words "We declare that we accept...", Bishop Fellay has signalled and signed to the effect that he, on behalf of the SSPX, accepts the contents of this Oath. The reader who is really interested can find the text of the Profession of Faith and Oath of Fidelity on the Vatican website: (www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_1998_professio-fidei_en.html).

Moreover, from an interview which Archbishop Lefebvre gave to *Fideliter* in 1989, the same year as the Oath of Fidelity was published, we know that there was a originally a "preamble" to the oath, which came with the Oath and served as its introduction, although it was not strictly speaking part of the Oath itself. According to the Archbishop, it "clearly indicated" that the final part of the text "has been added because of the spirit of the Council." Unfortunately, this introduction or "preamble" is not easy to find on the Vatican website. No reference to it whatsoever appears on the English page referred to above, indeed, had it not been mentioned by Archbishop Lefebvre, this author might well have been

unaware of its existence. It is only visible in Italian and it reads thus:

"Si è reso necessario, pertanto, provvedere a predisporre i testi atti allo scopo, aggiornandoli con stile e contenuto più conformi all'insegnamento de l Concilio Vaticano II e de i document i successivi."

Which this author, though being no expert in Italian, reads as meaning something like this:

"It became necessary therefore to ensure the preparation of the texts with this purpose in mind: that they be updated in style and content so as to make them more in conformity with Vatican II and later documents."

It is possible that the above-quoted passage could well have been written by the author of the Oath itself as a sort of introductory explanation. What is clear is that, whichever way one reads it, in the eyes of the men who originally published it in 1989 the Oath of Fidelity is a conciliar text. It is a text which has been designed specifically to be in conformity with Vatican II and all post-conciliar documents.

The text of the actual Oath of Fidelity itself is, thankfully, much easier to locate, being readily available in several languages on the Vatican website. The first paragraph of the Oath of Fidelity is perfectly orthodox being, as the Archbishop says in his *Fideliter* interview, nothing more than the Nicene Creed. Then follow two paragraphs stating acceptance of everything contained in Scripture or handed down in Tradition, and "everything definitively proposed by the Church regarding teaching on faith and morals." Again, as the Archbishop says, this in itself is unremarkable and quite acceptable. The paragraph with which the oath concludes, quoted in our last issue (Recusant 6), is clearly the worst part and reads as follows:

"Moreover, I adhere with religious submission of will and intellect to the teachings which either the Roman Pontiff or the College of Bishops enunciate when they exercise their authentic Magisterium, even if they do not intend to proclaim these teachings by a definitive act."

So far, so good. What follows is what is really interesting and where the reader will wish to pay close attention. As mentioned above, this very same Oath of Fidelity, apparently acceptable to Bishop Fellay and the modern SSPX, has already been dealt with by none other than Archbishop Lefebvre himself. In an interview with *Fideliter* magazine entitled "One Year after the Consecrations", given in the summer of 1989, Archbishop Lefebvre spoke of what was then a brand new text issued by Cardinal Ratzinger. Because his words are so clear, and because of its importance and relevance, we will here quote the Archbishop at some length, with emphasis in bold added by the author of this article.

" 14: Oath of Fidelity

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

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

...

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

No, I am not exaggerating. It is clearly expressed in the introduction. It is sheer trickery. One may ask oneself if in Rome they didn't mean in this way to correct the text of the [1988] protocol. Although that protocol is not satisfactory to us, it still seems too much in our favour in Article III of the Doctrinal Declaration because it does not sufficiently express the need to submit to the Council.

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

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

What is very important, then, is that this text is clearly condemned by Archbishop Lefebvre, and in the strongest terms too! And yet it pops up again in a text which Bishop Fellay signed and handed over as a true representation of where the SSPX stands! One begins to see why, in his own words, the SSPX Superior General was somewhat worried about how his text would be received by the faithful!

What is even more interesting to note is the way that Archbishop Lefebvre says that he thinks the Vatican composed the Oath of Fidelity, with its "poisonous" final paragraph, because they felt that the 1988 protocol was not explicitly Vatican II –friendly enough! It has already been pointed out that there is a certain similarity between the 1988 protocol of agreement signed (and almost instantaneously repented of!) by Archbishop Lefebvre, which had been proposed to him by and composed by the Vatican, and the 2012 "Doctrinal Declaration" or "Doctrinal Preamble" proposed by, composed by, and signed by Bishop Fellay (without a similar such repentance!). It is certainly true that there is a

similarity. And yet there are important differences, differences where Bishop Fellay’s text is far worse than that of the Archbishop - Archbishop Lefebvre’s 1988 agreement did not accept the entire Chapter 3 of *Lumen Gentium*, for example! And surely one of the most important differences is the acceptance of the Oath of Fidelity, whose significance we believe has been largely overlooked:

- The 1988 protocol proposed to the Archbishop contained no footnotes that we are aware of, and no reference to this Oath of Fidelity, which did not yet exist.
- The 2012 agreement text proposed by Bishop Fellay contains this “poisonous” barb (to use Archbishop Lefebvre’s word) which had already been condemned by the Archbishop himself, when it first appeared.

Thus Bishop Fellay’s April 2012 text is significantly worse, more liberal, more modernist-friendly, and more lethal and damaging to Tradition than the 1988 text given to Archbishop Lefebvre. Those SSPX clerics who favour an agreement with Rome have made much of Archbishop Lefebvre’s words prior to the episcopal consecrations, and for the past year we have been told that what was being intended was nothing less than what the Archbishop himself would have wished. And yet, in the Archbishop’s own words, Bishop Fellay’s April 2012 “Doctrinal Preamble” text is different from anything that the Archbishop would ever have considered signing, even when at his most optimistic, because:

“Differently from in the [1988] protocol, in these new texts [i.e. in the Oath of Fidelity, and therefore, by extension, in Bishop Fellay’s April 2012 text] there is a submission to the Council and all the conciliar bishops.”

Is Bishop Fellay aware of all this? Is there any conceivable way in which he could not be aware of this? After all, not only ought he to be familiar with the text momentarily signed by Archbishop Lefebvre, but he surely must also be aware of the *Fideliter* interview which was only one year after his own consecration as a bishop. Did he not spot the first footnote in his text? Of having spotted it, did he not grasp its significance? If one layman with a computer and a slightly suspicious mind can unearth and deduce what is written above, can it be asking too much to expect Menzingen with their superior resources to find out about what they are actually signing? Or did he simply know and not care? Taken as a whole, Bishop Fellay’s April 2012 text effectively reconciles Tradition and conciliarism, making them mutually dependent, so it is surely not outside the realms of credibility that he simply allowed it and somehow justified it in his own mind. One certainly does not wish to think him quite so grossly negligent or guilty of the sort of crass ignorance which alone could explain away any subjective guilt. Either way, we see here one more serious question to be added to the large and growing pile of questions which need urgently to be answered by Menzingen.

Finally, since Bishop Fellay has himself explicitly referred to his own qualms about how his April 2012 text would be received by the faithful, and since he himself has said that it would “need to be properly explained”, knowing now what poison it contains, we cannot help being reminded of Archbishop Lefebvre’s words and reapply them 23 years later:



Crisis in the SSPX **Conference**



Speakers:

Fr. David Hewko & Fr. Joseph Pfeiffer

Saturday 1st & Sunday 2nd June, 2013
9am - 5pm

*Talks; Q&A; Social time;
Sunday Mass; Confessions; Rosary;
Renewal of the 1984 Immaculate Heart Consecration;
Lunch and refreshments provided free;*

Earlsfield Library Hall
276 Magdalen Road,
Earlsfield
London SW18 3NY

One minute walk from **Earlsfield Railway Station**
(regular trains from Clapham Jct, Wimbledon, or Waterloo);

15min walk from Wimbledon Park or Southfields
Underground Stations (District Line);

Buses: 44, 77, 270

[Prayers for success, messages of support,
and voluntary contributions to help cover costs
gratefully received from those unable to attend.]

Holy Saints and Martyrs of England and Wales, pray for us!



“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