



The Recusant

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



“What is spread in the internet since some months is a total misrepresentation from my position. ... Take The Recusant, and all these things, they are totally out! They are nothing to do with the reality. ...

I probably was not clear enough. I would never write the letter which I wrote to the Pope in April 2012 the way I did ... It's clear that it was a mishap.”

- Bp. Fellay, Burghclere, 2nd June 2013

Inside:

- **1988 Consecrations Sermon**
(Archbishop Lefebvre)
- **25th Anniversary Declaration**
(Resistance Priests)
- **25th Anniversary Declaration**
(+Fellay & Co., Econe)
- **What's wrong with +Fellay's
25th anniversary declaration?**
(analysis)
- **Authority & the Glory of God**
(Fr. Girouard)
- **Change of Doctrine? Where..?**
(Fr. Davide Hewko)

FROM THE DESK OF THE EDITOR:

Dear Reader,

The end of July brings good news for the Resistance in this country. The Walsingham Pilgrimage, at which several of you were present, was a great occasion filled with many graces. The barefoot mile was walked and an act of reparation made following Sunday Mass in the ruins of Walsingham Abbey. Those present were also blessed with the presence of Fr. Juan Antonio Iglesias, a former parish priest from Santander in northern Spain, who received conditional sacraments of confirmation and ordination at the hands of Bishop Williamson.

Having renounced the conciliar church, Fr. Iglesias has made it clear that he wishes to live as a Traditional priest, working a fully Traditional no-compromise apostolate for the salvation of souls, and that he is more than happy to assist the Resistance both here and elsewhere. Truly Almighty God looks after

those faithful to Him. When the Resistance Mass Centre was established in Earlsfield at the beginning of June, we knew only of Frs. Pfeiffer and Hewko willing to say Mass for us, all the way from America, and then only once in quite a while. We did not know if there would be any other priests or if so, whence they would come. But it was the right thing to do, and so we trusted in Providence. Since then, we have had more Sundays with Mass than without. Three different priests have offered Mass in England for the Resistance in recent weeks, and we are in contact with others who might be able to help in the future.

The Resistance in London has been blessed. However, our goal is to spread the Faith, not just to keep it, and there are other good souls no less deserving than those who live within range of Earlsfield. Already Mass has been offered in Kent on the odd occasion, although for the moment the Earlsfield Mass Centre, being just about within range of London, continues to serve both London and Kent. From August onwards Sunday Mass is also going to be more regularly available in Scotland. Visits by priests to other parts of the country are a possibility (further West, or in the North of England, for example) - the more people contact us, the more accurate a picture we will have and the better we can plan ahead. The long term plan is to acquire a property of some sort which can be transformed into a chapel in London, establish a separate Mass centre for Kent, and to acquire a priory which can house other clergy whom we hope to welcome in due course. A fund has been set up, and whilst its resources are presently very modest indeed, yet we plan ahead confident that once again Almighty God will provide for our needs when we ask Him with confidence. Please pray that more priests will answer the call of what will be, we are sure, a continually growing number of faithful.

An Important Anniversary

The last month has also witnessed the 25th Anniversary of Archbishop Lefebvre's 1988 Episcopal Consecrations. This momentous event, arguably the most important of the 20th century or more, was marked by Bishop Williamson and many priests of the Resistance in Vienna, Virginia, at St. Athanasius Church, the parish of Fr. Ringrose. Pontifical Mass was celebrated in front of a large crowd of faithful, many of whom had travelled long distances to be present. Lunch at a nearby hotel was followed by conferences. Among the clergy present were Fr. Joachim representing the *Familia Beatae Mariae semper Virginis* in Brazil, a religious order which used to be allied to the SSPX and which are now with the Resistance. Dom Tomas Aquinas from the Benedictine 'Monastery of the Holy Cross,' had also travelled from Brazil, although a different part of that large country. He gave a talk detailing the various sell-outs of the last 25 years which he had had to witness up-close: firstly the compromise and surrender of French Benedictine monastery Le Barroux (from which his own monastery was originally founded) in the weeks following the 1988 Consecrations; then Campos, whose priests used to work closely with his monastery in Brazil; and now of course, the SSPX itself. Also present was Fr. Jean-Michel Faure. Fr. Faure was one of the first priests in the SSPX, and highly esteemed by Archbishop Lefebvre. He founded most if not all of the Latin American apostolate of the SSPX and the seminary at La Reja, Argentina. He was chosen as one of the three candidates (Bishop Fellay's name was only added as a fourth at the last minute) for episcopal consecration in 1988, but he declined, passing the nomination on to Fr. de Galarreta. It is encouraging to hear that Fr. Faure sees, in the work being done to build up the Resistance, the same spirit which animated Archbishop Lefebvre and the priests in the early days of the SSPX.

A new Declaration from the SSPX

The 25th anniversary was also marked by the official SSPX in Écône, Switzerland, with a Pontifical Mass celebrated by Bishop Fellay at which Bishops Tissier and de Galarreta were also present. We have so far been unable to find any photographs of the event which would prove this one way or the other, but we are reliably informed that the turnout was very disappointing, with half the chairs laid out remaining empty.

At this occasion, Bishop Fellay read out a declaration signed by himself and the other two Bishops, which we reproduce elsewhere in this issue. In fact we have given over a lot of this issue to dealing with this new Écône declaration (dated 27th June), because it is a matter of a certain amount of significance. This is the latest ‘official’ declaration of the position of Bishop Fellay and those loyal to him. Bishop Fellay has long been suspected of changing his speech depending on his audience, and so what he may say in private, or even what he may say in public, is only of so much value. Remember the “official withdrawal” of his Doctrinal Declaration, in Ireland? That was spoken, in front of an audience. Not that it matters, but out of interest: have you seen a transcript yet, nearly four months later? Have you heard a recording? Do you know anyone who has? Neither have we. What are the chances that the Roman authorities and the media of the world are aware of it, or that if they are, that they view it as anything more than a rumour? What matters is what is official, what is ‘signed, sealed and delivered’, as the expression goes. And that is precisely what this new declaration is, which is why it deserves our attention. The other reason that it deserves our attention is that it also bears the signatures of Bishops Tissier and de Galarreta.

The reader may see for himself, but it is our considered opinion that this latest official declaration from Bishop Fellay does not in any way contradict the previous official statements of his position, notably the CNS interview (although arguably that was not an official declaration on behalf of the Society), the General Chapter declaration of July 2012 and the April 2012 Doctrinal Declaration. The language used is different. The April 2012 Doctrinal Declaration was never meant to be seen by the priests of the SSPX, much less the faithful, which is why it is refreshingly candid about its liberalism and surrendering of principle. The recent Écône declaration, on the other hand, most certainly *was* written for public consumption. As a result it is replete with ‘Traditional’ sounding words and phrases. Do not be fooled. Take the time, study it carefully, think about what its implications and consequences could be, and decide for yourself.

The article examining this 27th June Declaration ends by noting the virtual absence of Our Blessed Lady from the text, together with any allusion to the great era of apostasy which has been foretold by so many apparitions and prophecies. This is true, but I would also note the following: none of us can be certain that Bishop Fellay even views our times as an era of apostasy. Or at least, not in quite the same way that we do. He has spoken often enough of things improving in the Church. Life in a nice house in the Swiss Alps no doubt permits one to cherish such comforting illusions. Perhaps were His Lordship to spend a year or two living in a London street, travelling about his daily business by bus and underground, offering Mass in a hired hall, and coming into daily contact with the tragic reality of our fallen era, he might suddenly decide that he sees things differently. Or perhaps not.

A Telling Silence

Aside from the continuing evidence of the SSPX's doctrinal abdication, what we also find very alarming is the total lack of response to this scandalous Declaration. Back in March, when the Doctrinal Declaration was published, the response was weak and muted for the most part. But at least there was *some* response! Now, there is virtually none whatsoever. What does your local SSPX priest think of it? How do you know? If you do not, you must ask him. And if he says something to the effect that the declaration is alright apart from paragraph 11, then you must scream and shout and stamp your foot and throw a tantrum, in the midst of which you insist that he re-read it and that this time would he read it properly please! For if he does not, he stands in great danger.

To borrow once again from Fr. Pfeiffer, there is a parallel with the abuses at the Novus Ordo, an example which people fortunate enough to have been born into Tradition might not fully appreciate. When he first encounters Novus Ordo liturgical abuse, a Catholic who has the Faith will be outraged. But over time one becomes weary of being outraged. After weeks, months, years and decades of Marxist hymns, dancing girls in the sanctuary, celebrants dressed as clowns, the local Methodist minister being allowed to concelebrate while the local woman vicar preaches a guest sermon about feminism and 'wimmins lib', and all the rest of it, it sounds quite unremarkable to hear someone complain that his priest was dancing during Mass. 'Dancing during Mass? What's new?! It happens everywhere. All the time. What did you expect? Tell us something we don't know!'

We are in danger of becoming accustomed to the doctrinal slide of the SSPX and less and less moved by each new outrage that we witness, until we reach the stage of numbness. We do not wish that to happen, since that is the point where one accommodates oneself to the new reality, in this case modernism and doctrinal compromise. Therefore it is important to act as soon as reasonably possible, and not to wait too long. Time is not on our side, and it is high time that as many people as possible awoke.

The Recusant wins recognition in the Very Highest Places!

The astute reader will have noticed, via the banner quotation on our front page, that The Recusant recently came in for some criticism from The Leader himself. Personally I feel it is such an honour that I would almost say that I view it as a high point in our apostolate. We will always be happy to be so criticised by such a man. Presumably by "out" he means that we are "wide of the mark" or "wrong" (perhaps he had been watching Wimbledon?). Quite how it is that we have "misrepresented [his] position" I cannot imagine. Those with medium range memories, who can think back as far as last April (issue 6) will remember that we printed the entire text of his Doctrinal Declaration. We did not merely quote from it, nor did we abridge it in any way. For those with very short memories, I quote from the editorial of that issue:

*"We reproduce our own English translation of the full text of **Bishop Fellay's Doctrinal Preamble** on page 24 of this issue. Have a good, careful read and then judge for yourself."*

I then gave my own opinion that it was a "disgraceful document", and said why, adding that: *"It is hardly surprising that he wished to keep this Doctrinal Preamble a secret."* Where is the misrepresentation? Is it not a fact that the document was kept secret for virtually an entire year, and only finally published after it had already been leaked and made public? Given that

he sent the document on our behalf, has he ever said why he tried to keep its contents secret? Has anyone else noticed that whenever he complains of being misrepresented or misunderstood, The Leader always forgets to go into detail or give examples? Is that not a little odd!?

A favourable word about Bishop Fellay (well, almost...)

Nevertheless, and in spite of appearances, we do not have a personal axe to grind against Bishop Fellay. Unlike our opponents, we harbour no personal enmity, and I hope that I do not give any readers a heart attack if I say here that one can state truthfully state Bishop Fellay does not deserve to take the full blame alone (although he does have a lot to answer for). When the SSPX goes under it will be due to the apathy and cowardice of its clerical members. Without their timid compliance none of this could be taking place. That there have been Superiors Generals who act as a destructive influence on their own congregation or who tells heaps of massive lies with a straight face is nothing new in the history of the Church. (And I am not thinking of anyone in particular. No doubt there is some other explanation for Bishop Fellay claiming that he ‘never wanted an agreement before Rome converted’.) Some religious orders have, at times, been led by men who were 100 times worse than Bishop Fellay. What *is* new is that a religious congregation can have its doctrine changed by its Superior General and his fellow travellers, and that the vast majority of its members do not react at all to the change. Especially a congregation founded in the fight against doctrinal heterodoxy and as a reaction to destructive changes! I offer this as my opinion and no more, but the more I think about it, the more convinced I become that had more priests spoken out strongly at the first signs of change, those changes could never have taken place. As the article by Fr. Hewko, “**Change of Doctrine? Where...?**” (p.29) makes clear, the latest official Declaration from Menzingen represents the continuation of the April 2012 Doctrinal Declaration and the July 2012 General Chapter in that it is building a new Society of St. Pius X inside the shell of the old one. A Society of St. Pius X which is no longer the implacable opponent of the New Mass; which does not believe that Vatican II contains any error in the Council itself; which puts a greater premium on authority and obedience than it does on the Faith; which views the whole crisis in the Church as a matter of “human prudence,” as though everything can be put right with a bit of legal tinkering; and which implicitly accepts ecumenism and behaves in an ecumenical way when it asks for Rome to “accept us as we are”, thereby signifying that they will accept Rome and the rest of the conciliar Church as *they* are! Like the conciliar Church, built inside the shell of the pre-conciliar Church, at a glance it looks the same on the outside, and there is physical continuity, in the control of structures and ownership of the real estate, for example. But in reality it is something new.

Once doctrine is changed, everything else must and will change too. I do not know how the current situation will play out or in what exact order the SSPX will fall apart. But we can be certain that it will fall apart and that the situation will become worse, because the doctrine has changed. And nobody protests any more. Nothing matters more than doctrine. Everything else makes sense in relation to it. And when it is undermined, even only partially or indirectly, or put in danger in any way, every priest and every layman has a solemn duty before God to do everything within his power to defend it. That is why we produce The Recusant. That is why so many good people make so many sacrifices for the Resistance. Almighty God will ask you at your judgement: “What did you do in the crisis?” We had all better be ready with a very convincing (and true!) answer!

Pilgrimage of Reparation to Walsingham

13th & 14th July, 2013



Sermon on the Occasion of Episcopal Consecrations

by
Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre

Écône, 30th June, 1988



Your Excellency, dear Bishop de Castro Mayer, my most dear friends, my dear brethren,

Behold, here we are gathered for a ceremony which is certainly historic. Let me, first of all, give you some information.

The first might surprise you a little, as it did me. Yesterday evening, a visitor came, sent from the Nunciature in Berne, with an envelope containing an appeal from our Holy Father the Pope, who was putting at my disposal a car which was supposed to take me to Rome yesterday evening, so that I would not be able to perform these consecrations today. I was told neither for what reason, nor where I had to go! I leave you to judge for yourselves the timeliness and wisdom of such a request.

I went to Rome for many, many days during the past year, even for weeks; the Holy Father did not invite me to come and see him. I would certainly have been glad to see him if some agreement would have been finalized. So here you have the information. I give it to you simply, as I myself came to know it, through the letter from the Nunciature.

Now, some indications concerning the ceremony and some relevant documents regarding its significance.

The future bishops have already sworn in my hands the oath which you find in the little booklet on the ceremony of consecration which some of you have. Thus, this oath has already been pronounced, plus the Anti-Modernist Oath, as it was formerly prescribed for the consecration of bishops, plus the Profession of Faith. They have already taken these oaths and this profession in my hands after the retreat which took place at Sierre during these last days. Do not, therefore, be surprised if the ceremony begins with the interrogations on the Faith, the Faith which the Church asks from those who are to be consecrated.

I also want to let you know that, after the ceremony, you will be able to ask the blessing of the bishops and kiss their rings. It is not the custom in the Church to kiss the hands of a bishop, as one kisses the hands of a newly-ordained priest, as you did yesterday. But the faithful may ask for their blessing and kiss their ring.

Lastly, you have at your disposal at the bookstall some books and flyers which contain all the elements necessary to help you better understand why this ceremony, which is apparently done against the will of Rome, is in no way a schism. We are not schismatics! If an excommunication was pronounced against the bishops of China, who separated themselves from Rome and put themselves under the Chinese government, one very easily

understands why Pope Pius XII excommunicated them. There is no question of us separating ourselves from Rome, nor of putting ourselves under a foreign government, nor of establishing a sort of parallel church as the Bishops of Palmar de Troya have done in Spain. They have even elected a pope, formed a college of cardinals... It is out of the question for us to do such things. Far from us be this miserable thought to separate ourselves from Rome!

On the contrary, it is in order to manifest our attachment to Rome that we are performing this ceremony. It is in order to manifest our attachment to the Eternal Rome, to the Pope, and to all those who have preceded these last Popes who, unfortunately since the Second Vatican Council, have thought it their duty to adhere to grievous errors which are demolishing the Church and the Catholic Priesthood.

Thus you will find among these flyers which are put at your disposal, an admirable study done by Professor Georg May, President of the Seminary of Canon Law in the University of Mayence in Germany, who marvellously explains why we are in a case of necessity: necessity to come and help your souls, to help you! Your applause a while ago was, I think, not a purely temporal manifestation; it was rather a spiritual manifestation, expressing your joy to have at last Catholic bishops and priests who are dedicated to the salvation of your souls, to giving to your souls the Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ, through good doctrine, through the Sacraments, through the Faith, through the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. You need this Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ to go to heaven. This Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ is disappearing everywhere in the Conciliar Church. They are following roads which are not Catholic roads: they simply lead to apostasy.

This is why we do this ceremony. Far be it from me to set myself up as pope! I am simply a bishop of the Catholic Church who is continuing to transmit Catholic doctrine. I think, and this will certainly not be too far off, that you will be able to engrave on my tombstone these words of St. Paul: "*tradidi quod et accepi* - I have transmitted to you what I have received," nothing else. I am just the postman bringing you a letter. I did not write the letter, the message, this Word of God. God Himself wrote it; Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself gave it to us. As for us, we just handed it down, through these dear priests here present and through all those who have chosen to resist this wave of apostasy in the Church, by keeping the Eternal Faith and giving it to the faithful. We are just carriers of this Good News, of this Gospel which Our Lord Jesus Christ gave to us, as well as of the means of sanctification: the Holy Mass, the true Holy Mass, the true Sacraments which truly give the spiritual life.

It seems to me, my dear brethren, that I am hearing the voices of all these Popes - since Gregory XVI, Pius IX, Leo XIII, St. Pius X, Benedict XV, Pius XI, Pius XII - telling us: "Please, we beseech you, what are you going to do with our teachings, with our predications, with the Catholic Faith? Are you going to abandon it? Are you going to let it disappear from this earth? Please, please, continue to keep this treasure which we have given you. Do not abandon the faithful, do not abandon the Church! Continue the Church! Indeed, since the Council, what we condemned in the past the present Roman authorities have embraced and are professing. How is it possible? We have condemned them: Liberalism, Communism, Socialism, Modernism, Sillonism. All the errors which we have condemned are now professed, adopted and supported by the authorities of the

Church. Is it possible? Unless you do something to continue this Tradition of the Church which we have given to you, all of it shall disappear. Souls shall be lost.”

Thus, we find ourselves in a case of necessity. We have done all we could, trying to help Rome to understand that they had to come back to the attitudes of the holy Pius XII and of all his predecessors. Bishop de Castro Mayer and myself have gone to Rome, we have spoken, we have sent letters, several times to Rome. We have tried by these talks, by all these means, to succeed in making Rome understand that, since the Council and since aggiornamento, this change which has occurred in the Church is not Catholic, is not in conformity to the doctrine of all times. This ecumenism and all these errors, this collegiality - all this is contrary to the Faith of the Church, and is in the process of destroying the Church.

This is why we are convinced that, by the act of these consecrations today, we are obeying the call of these Popes and as a consequence the call of God, since they represent Our Lord Jesus Christ in the Church.

“And why, Archbishop, have you stopped these discussions which seemed to have had a certain degree of success?” Well, precisely because, at the same time that I gave my signature to the Protocol, the envoy of Cardinal Ratzinger gave me a note in which I was asked to beg pardon for my errors. But if I am in error, if I teach error, it is clear that I must be brought back to the truth in the minds of those who sent me this note to sign. “That I might recognize my errors” means that, if you recognize your errors we will help you to return to the truth. (What is this truth for them if not the truth of Vatican II, the truth of the Conciliar Church?) Consequently, it is clear that the only truth that exists today for the Vatican is the conciliar truth, the spirit of the Council, the spirit of Assisi. That is the truth of today. But we will have nothing to do with this for anything in the world! .

That is why, taking into account the strong will of the present Roman authorities to reduce Tradition to naught, to gather the world to the spirit of Vatican II and the spirit of Assisi, we have preferred to withdraw ourselves and to say that we could not continue. It was not possible. We would have evidently been under the authority of Cardinal Ratzinger, President of the Roman Commission, which would have directed us; we were putting ourselves into his hands, and consequently putting ourselves into the hands of those who wish to draw us into the spirit of the Council and the spirit of Assisi. This was simply not possible.

This is why I sent a letter to the Pope, saying to him very clearly: “We simply cannot accept this spirit and proposals, despite all the desires which we have to be in full union with you. Given this new spirit which now rules in Rome and which you wish to communicate to us, we prefer to continue in Tradition; to keep Tradition while waiting for Tradition to regain its place at Rome, while waiting for Tradition to reassume its place in the Roman authorities, in their minds.” This will last for as long as the Good Lord has foreseen.

It is not for me to know when Tradition will regain its rights at Rome, but I think it is my duty to provide the means of doing that which I shall call “*Operation Survival*,”

operation survival for Tradition. Today, this day, is Operation Survival. If I had made this deal with Rome, by continuing with the agreements we had signed, and by putting them into practice, I would have performed "*Operation Suicide*." There was no choice, we must live! That is why today, by consecrating these bishops, I am convinced that I am continuing to keep Tradition alive, that is to say, the Catholic Church.

You well know, my dear brethren, that there can be no priests without bishops. When God calls me - no doubt this will be before long - from whom would these seminarians receive the Sacrament of Orders? From conciliar bishops, who, due to their doubtful intentions, confer doubtful sacraments? This is not possible. Who are the bishops who have truly kept Tradition and the Sacraments as the Church has conferred them for twenty centuries until Vatican II? They are Bishop de Castro Mayer and myself. I cannot change that. That is how it is. Hence, many seminarians have entrusted themselves to us, they sensed that here was the continuity of the Church, the continuity of Tradition. And they came to our seminaries, despite all the difficulties that they have encountered, in order to receive a true ordination to the Priesthood, to say the true Sacrifice of Calvary, the true Sacrifice of the Mass, and to give you the true Sacraments, true doctrine, the true catechism. This is the goal of these seminaries.

So I cannot, in good conscience, leave these seminarians orphaned. Neither can I leave you orphans by dying without providing for the future. That is not possible. It would be contrary to my duty.

This is why we have chosen, with the grace of God, priests from our Society who have seemed to us to be the most apt, whilst being in circumstances and in functions which permit them more easily to fulfil their episcopal ministry, to give Confirmation to your children, and to be able to confer ordinations in our various seminaries. Thus I believe that, with the grace of God, we, Bishop de Castro Mayer and myself, by these consecrations, will have given to Tradition the means to continue, given the means to Catholics who desire to remain within the Church of their parents, their grandparents, of their ancestors. They built churches with beautiful altars, often destroyed and replaced by a table, thus manifesting the radical change which has come about since the Council regarding the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass which is the heart of the Church and the purpose of the priesthood. Thus we wish to thank you for having come in such numbers to support us in the accomplishment of this ceremony.

We turn to the Blessed Virgin Mary. You well know, my dear brethren, one must have told you of Leo XIII's prophetic vision revealing that one day "*the See of Peter would become the seat of iniquity*." He said it in one of his exorcisms, called "*The Exorcism of Leo XIII*." Has it come about today? Is it tomorrow? I do not know. But in any case it has been foretold. Iniquity may quite simply be error. Error is iniquity: to no longer profess the Faith of all time, the Catholic Faith, is a grave error. If there ever was an iniquity, it is this. And I really believe that there has never been a greater iniquity in the Church than Assisi, which is contrary to the First Commandment of God and the First Article of the Creed. It is incredible that something like that could have ever taken place in the Church, in the eyes of the whole Church - how humiliating! We have never undergone such a humiliation! You will be able to find all of this in Fr. LeRoux's booklet which has been especially published in order to give you information on the present situation in Rome.

It was not only the good Pope Leo XIII who said these things, but Our Lady prophesied them as well. Just recently, the priest who takes care of the priory of Bogota, Colombia, brought me a book concerning the apparition of Our Lady of "*Buon Suceso*," - of "*Good Fortune*," to whom a large church in Quito, Ecuador, was dedicated. They were received by a nun shortly after the Council of Trent, so you see, quite a few centuries ago. This apparition is thoroughly recognized by Rome and the ecclesiastical authorities; a magnificent church was built for the Blessed Virgin Mary wherein the faithful of Ecuador venerate with great devotion a picture of Our Lady, whose face was made miraculously. The artist was in the process of painting it when he found the face of the Holy Virgin miraculously formed. And Our Lady prophesied for the twentieth century, saying explicitly that during the nineteenth century and most of the twentieth century, errors would become more and more widespread in Holy Church, placing the Church in a catastrophic situation. Morals would become corrupt and the Faith would disappear. It seems impossible not to see it happening today.

I excuse myself for continuing this account of the apparition but she speaks of a prelate who will absolutely oppose this wave of apostasy and impiety - saving the priesthood by forming good priests. I do not say that prophecy refers to me. You may draw your own conclusions. I was stupefied when reading these lines but I cannot deny them, since they are recorded and deposited in the archives of this apparition.

Of course, you well know the apparitions of Our Lady at La Salette, where she says that Rome will lose the Faith, that there will be an "eclipse" at Rome; an eclipse, see what Our Lady means by this.

And finally, closer to us, the secret of Fatima. Without a doubt, the Third Secret of Fatima must have made an allusion to this darkness which has invaded Rome, this darkness which has invaded the world since the Council. And surely it is because of this, without a doubt, that John XXIII judged it better not to publish the Secret: it would have been necessary to take measures, such steps as he possibly felt himself incapable of doing, e.g., completely changing the orientations which he was beginning to take in view of the Council, and for the Council.

These are the facts upon which, I think, we can lean. We place ourselves in God's providence. We are convinced that God knows what He is doing. Cardinal Gagnon visited us twelve years after the suspension: after twelve years of being spoken of as outside of the communion of Rome, as rebels and dissenters against the Pope, his visit took place. He himself recognized that what we have been doing is just what is necessary for the reconstruction of the Church. The Cardinal even assisted pontifically at the Mass which I celebrated on December 8, 1987, for the renewal of the promises of our seminarians. I was supposedly suspended and, yet, after twelve years, I was practically given a clean slate. They said we have done well. Thus we did well to resist! I am convinced that we are in the same circumstances today. We are performing an act which apparently... and unfortunately the media will not assist us in the good sense. The headlines will, of course, be "Schism," "Excommunication!" as much as they want to - and, yet, we are convinced that all these accusations of which we are the object, all penalties of which we are the object, are null, absolutely null and void, and of which we will take no account. just as I

took no account of the suspension, and ended up by being congratulated by the Church and by progressive churchmen, so likewise in several years - I do not know how many, only the Good Lord knows how many years it will take for Tradition to find its rights in Rome - we will be embraced by the Roman authorities, who will thank us for having maintained the Faith in our seminaries, in our families, in civil societies, in our countries, and in our monasteries and our religious houses, for the greater glory of God and the salvation of souls.

In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.



Resistance Mass Centres

<http://www.therecusant.com/resistance-mass-centre>

London:

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



Sunday 4th August

10am Confessions

10.30am Mass

Sunday 11th August

10am Confessions

10.30am Mass

Thursday 15th August

(Mass in Kent.)

Sunday 18th August

10am Confessions

10.30am Mass

Sunday 25th August

10am Confessions

10.30am Mass

Sunday 1st September

10am Confessions

10.30am Mass

Glasgow:

*Burnside Hotel
East Kilbride
Rutherglen
G73 5EA*



For further information,
contact the Resistance in
Scotland by visiting:

Sunday 18th August

5.30pm Confessions

6.00pm Mass

Sunday 25th August

5.30pm Confessions

6.00pm Mass

Sunday 1st September

(TBC)

<http://kentigersociety.blogspot.co.uk/>

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 mission of the SSPX be preserved, through the intercession of its patron.

SSPX Resistance Declaration
on the
25th Anniversary of the Episcopal Consecrations
29th June, 2013

Celebrating the 25th Anniversary of Archbishop Lefebvre's heroic decision in 1988 to consecrate truly Catholic bishops for the defence of the Catholic Faith and for the preservation of valid Sacraments from the devastation of the Church wrought by the disastrous Second Vatican Council, a group of priests express their alarm at the same devastation now being wrought upon the Archbishop's Society of St. Pius X, and they resolve together to do what they can to protect the Church and Society against this newly developed peril.

For just as the churchmen of Rome have used the last 50 years to attempt to reconcile the Church with the world, and in particular by the religious liberty and ecumenism of Vatican II, so the Society's Superior General over the last 15 years has done everything he could to promote the wicked dream of reconciling Catholic Tradition with Conciliar Rome. For example, the Declaration of June 27, 2013 once more leaves the door open to reopening negotiations with Conciliar Rome. (cf. No. 11)

The result of this attempt to reconcile things irreconcilable within the Society of St Pius X has been the disabling of many good priests, the progressive undoing of the Archbishop's work and the endangering of the eternal salvation of souls without number. This is because the Society of St Pius X was for many years an anchor in the true Faith for the entire Church, and now that anchor has snapped. And so just as the authorities of Vatican II lost the confidence of many faithful Catholics by their ambiguities, duplicities, and lies, so now the liberal authorities of the Society of St Pius X are losing all trust of many Traditional Catholics by their betrayal of Tradition.

Now what can a small and scattered group of priests do to save the situation? God will save His Church by converting the Pope when His Mother obtains at last the consecration of Russia to her Immaculate Heart. Nevertheless, truth is not a question of numbers and so we set for ourselves the Archbishop's program:

"The Holy Virgin will have the victory. She will triumph over the great apostasy, the fruit of Liberalism. One more reason not to twiddle our thumbs! We have to fight more than ever for the social Reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ. In this battle, we are not alone; we have with us all the popes up through Pius XII inclusively. All of them combated Liberalism in order to deliver the Church from it. God did not grant that they succeed, but this is not reason to lay down our weapons! We have to hold on. We have to build, while the others are demolishing. The crumbled citadels have to be rebuilt, the bastions of the Faith to be reconstructed: firstly the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass of all times, which forms saints; then our chapels, which are our true parishes; our monasteries; our large families, our enterprises faithful to the social doctrine of the Church; our politicians determined to make the politics of Jesus Christ – this a whole tissue of Christian social life, Christian

customs, Christian reflexes, which we have to restore, on the scale that God wants, at the time God wills. All that I know, the Faith teaches us, it is that Our Lord Jesus Christ must reign here below, now, and not only at the end of the world, as the Liberals would have it!

While they are destroying, we have the contentment of rebuilding. A still greater happiness: generations of young priests are participating with zeal in this task of reconstruction of the Church for the salvation of souls.” (*They Have Uncrowned Him*; chapter XXXIV)

H.E. Bp. Richard Williamson SSPX

Fr. Joseph Pfeiffer SSPX

Fr. Tomas de Aquino O.S.B.

Fr. Jahir FBMV

Fr. Jean-Michel Faure SSPX

Fr. Ronald Ringrose

Fr. Juan Carlos Ortiz SSPX

Fr. Hugo Ruiz SSPX

Fr. Ernesto Cardozo SSPX

Fr. Joaquim FBMV

Fr. Richard Voigt

Fr. David Hewko SSPX

Fr. François Chazal SSPX

Fr. Valan Rajakumar SSPX

Fr. Patrick Girouard SSPX

Fr. René Trincado SSPX

Fr. Olivier Rioult SSPX

Fr. Edgardo Suelo SSPX

Fr. Rafael OSB

Br. Placide OSB

Br. André OSB



The Resistance - not for the faint-hearted!



“Next, we must heal those who have erred in this respect out of faint-heartedness, that is, those who, not because of a debased nature but because of weakness of spirit and lack of discretion, have allowed themselves to be drawn into supporting the Masonic enterprises. Sufficiently weighty are the words of Our predecessor Felix III in this regard. *‘An error which is not resisted is approved; a truth which is not defended is suppressed.... He who does not oppose an evident crime is open to the suspicion of secret complicity.’* By reminding them of the examples of their forefathers, the broken spirits of these men must be reanimated with that courage which is the guardian of duty and dignity alike, so that they may be ashamed and regret their cowardly actions. For surely our whole life is involved in a constant battle in which our salvation itself is at stake; nothing is more disgraceful for a Christian than cowardice.”

By reminding them of the examples of their forefathers, the broken spirits of these men must be reanimated with that courage which is the guardian of duty and dignity alike, so that they may be ashamed and regret their cowardly actions. For surely our whole life is involved in a constant battle in which our salvation itself is at stake; nothing is more disgraceful for a Christian than cowardice.”

- Leo XIII, *Inimica vis* (on Freemasonry), No. 7

*The official SSPX***‘Declaration on the 25th anniversary of the
Episcopal Consecrations’***Read out by **Bishop Fellay** at **Écône**, 27th June, 2013*

1- On the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the episcopal consecrations the bishops of The Society Saint Pius X are eager to express solemnly their gratitude towards Archbishop Lefebvre and Bishop Antonio de Castro Mayer for the heroic deed they were not afraid of performing on the 30th June 1988. Most especially they would like to express their filial gratitude towards their venerable founder who, after so many years spent serving the Church and the Sovereign Pontiff, so as to safeguard the Faith and the Catholic priesthood, did not hesitate to suffer the unjust accusation of disobedience.

2- In his letter addressed to us before the consecrations, he wrote, “I beseech you to remain attached to the See of Peter, to the Roman Church, Mother and Mistress of all churches, in the integral Catholic Faith, as expressed in the Professions of Faith, in the catechism of the Council of Trent, in conformity with that which you have been taught in the seminary. Remain faithful to the transmission of this Faith so that the reign of Our Lord may come.” It is indeed this phrase which expresses the profound reason for the act which he was going to undertake “so that the reign of Our Lord might come,” *adveniat regnum tuum!*

3- Following Archbishop Lefebvre, we affirm that the cause of the grave errors which are in the process of demolishing the Church does not reside in a bad interpretation of the conciliar texts – a “hermeneutic of rupture” which would be opposed to a “hermeneutic of reform in continuity” – but truly in the texts themselves, by virtue of the unheard of choice made by Vatican II. This choice is manifest in its documents and in its spirit; faced with “secular and profane humanism,” faced with the “religion (as indeed it is) of man who makes himself God,” the Church as unique custodian of Revelation “of God who became man” has wanted to make known its “new humanism” by saying to the modern world, “we too, we more than any other, have the cult of man.” (Paul VI, closing speech, 7th December 1965). But this coexistence of the cult of God and the cult of man is radically opposed to the Catholic Faith which teaches us to render the supreme cult and to give the primacy exclusively to the one true God and to only His Son, Jesus Christ, in whom “dwelleth all the fullness of the Divinity corporeally” (Col. 2:9).

4- We are truly obliged to observe that this Council without comparison, which wanted to be merely pastoral and not dogmatic, inaugurated a new type of magisterium, hitherto unheard of in the Church, without roots in Tradition; a magisterium resolved to reconcile Catholic doctrine with liberal ideas; a magisterium imbued with the modernist ideas of subjectivism, of immanentism and of perpetual evolution according to the false concept of a living tradition, vitiating the nature, the content, the role and the exercise of ecclesiastical magisterium.

5- Henceforth the reign of Christ is no longer the preoccupation of the ecclesiastical authorities, despite the fact that Christ’s words, “all power is given to me on earth and in heaven,” (Mt 28:18) remain an absolute truth and an absolute reality. To deny them in action is tantamount to no longer recognising in practice the divinity of Our Lord. Hence

because of the Council, the sovereignty of Christ over human societies is simply ignored, and even combated, and the Church is imbued with this liberal spirit which manifests itself especially in religious liberty, ecumenism, collegiality and the New Mass.

6- Religious Liberty, as exposed by *Dignitatis humanae* and its practical application these last fifty years, logically leads to demanding God-made-Man to renounce His reign over man-who-makes-himself-God, which is equivalent to dissolving Christ. In the place of a conduct which is inspired by a solid faith in the real power of Our Lord Jesus Christ, we see the Church being shamefully guided by human prudence and with such self-doubt that she asks nothing other from the State than that which the Masonic Lodges wish to concede to her: the common law in the midst of, and on the same level as, other religions which she no longer dares call false.

7- In the name of a ubiquitous ecumenism (*Unitatis redintegratio*) and of a vain inter-religious dialogue (*Nostra Aetate*), the truth about the one true Church is silenced; also, as a large part of the clergy and the faithful no longer see in Our Lord and the Catholic Church the unique way of salvation, they have renounced to convert the adepts of false religions, leaving them rather in ignorance of the unique Truth. This ecumenism has thus literally killed the missionary spirit through seeking a false unity, too often reducing the mission of the Church to that of delivering a message of a purely terrestrial peace and of a humanitarian role of lessening want in the world, placing it thereby in the wake of international organisations.

8- The weakening of faith in Our Lord's divinity favours a dissolution of the unity of authority in the Church, by introducing a collegial, egalitarian and democratic spirit, (see *Lumen Gentium*). Christ is no longer the head from which everything flows, in particular the exercise of authority. The Sovereign Pontiff who no longer exercises effectively the fullness of his authority, and the bishops who – contrary to the teaching of Vatican I – esteem that they can collegially and habitually share the fullness of the supreme power, commit themselves thereby, with the priests, to listen to and to follow 'the people of God,' the new sovereign. This represents the destruction of authority and in consequence the ruin of Christian institutions: families, seminaries, religious institutes.

9- The New Mass, promulgated in 1969, diminishes the affirmation of the reign of Christ by the Cross ("*regnavit a ligno Deus*"). Indeed, the rite itself curtails and obscures the sacrificial and propitiatory nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Underpinning this new rite is the new and false theology of the paschal mystery. Both one and the other destroy Catholic spirituality as founded upon the sacrifice of Our Lord on Calvary. This Mass is penetrated with an ecumenical and Protestant spirit, democratic and humanist, which empties out the sacrifice of the Cross. It illustrates the new concept of 'the common priesthood of the baptised' which undermines the sacramental priesthood of the priest.

10- Fifty years on, the causes persist and still engender the same effects. Hence today the consecrations retain their full justification. It was love of the Church which guided Archbishop Lefebvre and which guides his sons. It is the same desire to "pass on the Catholic priesthood in all its doctrinal purity and its missionary charity" (Archbishop Lefebvre, *Spiritual Journey*) which animates the Society of Saint Pius X at the service of the Church, when it asks with insistence for the Roman authorities to regain the treasure of doctrinal, moral and liturgical Tradition.

11- This love of the Church explains the rule that Archbishop Lefebvre always observed: to follow Providence in all circumstances, without ever allowing oneself to anticipate it. We mean to do the same: either when Rome returns to Tradition and to the Faith of all time – which would re-establish order in the Church; or when she explicitly acknowledges our right to profess integrally the Faith and to reject the errors which oppose it, with the right and the duty for us to oppose publicly the errors and the proponents of these errors, whoever they may be – which would allow the beginning of a re-establishing of order. Meanwhile, faced with this crisis which continues its ravages in the Church, we persevere in the defence of Catholic Tradition and our hope remains entire, as we know by the certitude of Faith that “the gates of hell will not prevail against her.” (Mt 16:18)

12- We mean to follow well the injunction of our dear and venerable Father in the episcopacy: “Dear friends, be my consolation in Christ, remain strong in the Faith, faithful to the true sacrifice of the Mass, to the true and holy Priesthood of Our Lord, for the triumph and the glory of Jesus in heaven and on earth” (Letter to the bishops). May the Holy Trinity, by the intercession of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, grant us the grace of fidelity to the episcopacy which we have received and which we want to exercise for the honour of God, the triumph of the Church and the salvation of souls.

Ecône, 27th June 2013, on the feast of Our Lady of Perpetual Succour

From the Parish Bulletin of St. Athanasius, Vienna, VA (USA)

For those who have read the SSPX official statement on the twenty-fifth anniversary of "Operation Survival," we make the following observation. Was not this an exercise in damage control? The SSPX has been so weakened by its readiness to throw doctrine to the wind in search of a deal with Benedict XVI, that it is now necessary to appear more traditional, while they wait out the term of Francis for a Benedict XVII. The younger conciliar clergy, as the story goes, tend to be more conservative. The older-breed liberal clergy are slowly dying out. It is only a matter of time before the climate becomes more favourable for a deal again. Good and well, if that means the true conversion of neo-Rome back to the Catholic faith. Number 11 of the declaration, however, tells a different story. It leaves the door open to a practical agreement without a doctrinal one.

11- This love of the Church explains the rule that Archbishop Lefebvre always observed: to follow Providence in all circumstances, without ever allowing oneself to anticipate it. We mean to do the same: either when Rome returns to Tradition and to the Faith of all time -- which would re-establish order in the Church; or when she explicitly acknowledges our right to profess integrally the Faith and to reject the errors which oppose it....

So even if Rome remains modernist, take us in anyway. We will be satisfied to be just another part of the conciliar pantheon, along with the heretics, ecumaniacs, pantheists, or whatever else is there. The declaration sounds as if there has been a shift back to what the SSPX always stood for, but the door to a deal remains open. Nothing has really changed. It just sounds different. The contents of the can remain the same. The label on the outside just looks a little more like Archbishop Lefebvre.

- Fr. Ringrose

What's wrong with Bishop Fellay's 25th Anniversary Declaration?

What indeed. The answer, alas, is that there is quite a lot wrong with it, though the task of demonstrating exactly what is wrong is not an easy one. I hope therefore that I will be forgiven if I borrow heavily from the excellent analysis done by Fr. Pfeiffer in various talks available on the internet.

On a first reading, the text appears to be disarmingly sound: ‘staunch’ to use a word beloved of one English priest. It has lots of the right vocabulary, with particular words and phrases standing out and lingering in the mind of the reader: “...*duty to oppose errors publicly*...”; “...*errors...in the texts themselves*...”; “...*cult of man*...”; “...*false concept of living Tradition*...”; etc. However, the merit of a text such as this stands or falls on the whole meaning, implied as well as explicit, which is expressed in whole sentences and paragraphs, not in mere phrases. We must therefore carefully re-read the whole thing, looking at what it actually chooses to say and at what this means.

On looking closer, it does seem that the text has been prepared with a very thick layer of “Traditional sounding” rhetoric designed to put the readers critical faculties to sleep and obscure the various weaknesses and loopholes also present. Those readers who have done the penance of studying the deception practiced at Vatican II will recognise immediately what is happening here. Texts at Vatican II were prepared in precisely this way: lots of traditional sounding language for most of the document, and then buried within it a deliberate and fatal flaw, a loophole which allows the whole rest of the document to be undone. As one Traditional Catholic gentleman (himself a lawyer, if my memory serves) once observed about the texts of Vatican II: when reading a contract, a lawyer will pay closest attention not to what the contract *provides* for his client, but in what it *permits* the other party. A chain is only as strong as its weakest link, and a legal document is only as good as its weakest loophole. For example, the document on the liturgy (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*) has many wonderful, Traditional sounding provisions: that Latin should be retained, Gregorian chant be given pride of place, etc. And yet somewhere, mixed in with the rest, it also contains one little part allowing changes and ‘updating’ to take place. The rest is history.

So let us try not to be too dazzled by the ‘hard-line’ vocabulary. Let us look instead at what the text actually says.

Paragraph 1 begins by expressing “filial gratitude” towards Archbishop Lefebvre and Bishop de Castro Mayer. This is fine as far as it goes. It is easy to be theoretically ‘grateful’ to people who are dead. The voice of the Archbishop lives on in his writings and sermons, which is why we note with interest that nowhere does this 25th anniversary text quote from Archbishop Lefebvre’s sermon at the consecrations. Does the gratitude professed in the first paragraph not extend to allowing Archbishop Lefebvre to explain his reasons for performing the consecrations in his own words? Or Bishop de Castro Mayer, for that matter? The signatories are so “eager to express their gratitude” to

Archbishop Lefebvre that they forgot to include him and all-but left him out, except for a few harmless references, some soft-sounding quotes which suit the new agenda of diplomacy towards Rome. Archbishop Lefebvre talking in his letter to the Bishops elect about ‘remaining attached to the See of Peter’ is included (in **paragraph 2**), but Archbishop Lefebvre talking about how Rome is leading everyone down the road of apostasy? Or Archbishop Lefebvre expressing doubts over the new sacraments and the intentions of the Novus Ordo clergy? Perhaps we’re not so grateful for those little bits. Interestingly enough, the same two historic sermons (and Bp. de Castro Mayer’s was a very short, succinct sermon) appear to be absent from all the official SSPX websites as well.

Paragraph 3 concerns the errors of the Council. It mentions that it is not a question of interpretation (hermeneutic of continuity or that of rupture), which appears very good. Here is the relevant part:

“Following Archbishop Lefebvre, we affirm that the cause of the grave errors which are in the process of demolishing the Church does not reside in a bad interpretation of the conciliar texts ... but truly in the texts themselves, by virtue of the unheard of choice made by Vatican II. This choice is manifest in its documents and in its spirit; ...”

Look carefully at the subject of the sentence: what exactly is it that ‘resides in the texts themselves’? Not errors, but the cause of errors. What is this cause? We are not told. However, as Fr. Pfeiffer says, only God causes Himself; otherwise, a cause and the thing it causes are always distinct, they are not one and the same, like rain and the black cloud from which it came. The point can perhaps be best illustrated by taking, as a concrete example, one of the most notorious teachings of Vatican II, religious liberty: that man by his nature has an inalienable right to profess and practise error. Can one claim that this teaching is a ‘cause of error’? Is it not rather an error itself? So what is meant by a cause of error; what causes errors? Pride, laxity, worldliness, imprecision, taking God’s grace for granted, lack of studiousness...who knows; how far back need one go? Is this text being deliberately imprecise in employing such unusual terms? What must be considered is that this is a very pointed and precise phrase. The normal thing is to speak of ‘the errors of the Council’ - that is a phrase which we are all used to and which trips off the tongue easily. Why suddenly change and speak of ‘the cause of errors’? We believe that it is a deliberate exercise in deception. It sounds sufficiently Traditional that to us it appears to be a restatement of Archbishop Lefebvre’s position. Future generations, further removed from the Archbishop and the SSPX he founded, and as a consequence less ‘hard-line,’ will be able to interpret this in a more Rome-friendly, conciliar-friendly sense. After all, it does not tell us what this “cause” is. It only tells us that it was “by virtue of an unheard of choice,” again another unusual and quite deliberate expression. When did Archbishop Lefebvre ever lament that Vatican II had made “an unheard of choice”? What was this choice? We are not told. It is so “unheard of” that we’ve still never even heard of it! What is happening is that although this text sounds sufficiently Traditional to pass through the scrutiny of its contemporaries, yet it is sufficiently ambiguous and novel that it leaves the door open to future interpretation by more liberal minds, in much the same way as some of the ‘time bombs’ in Vatican II.

The rest of the paragraph then goes on to talk about how the true religion cannot be reconciled with the cult of man, and to criticise some words of Paul VI. In itself there is nothing wrong with this, but following on from the talk of the causes of errors and ‘an unheard of choice,’ it leaves the impression that the two are somehow connected, that the one explains the other. Whereas, on re-reading the paragraph, the reader will notice that there is no explicit connection between the two. Yes, the cult of man is radically opposed to the Catholic Faith - what does that have to do with Vatican II? We are not told, we are left to assume. This way of speaking and thinking is most certainly not, as the opening words of the paragraph claim, “following Archbishop Lefebvre”.

In summary: that the texts of the Council “contain the cause of error” can only mean that that the texts of the Council do not contain error. (So when Vatican II tells us that we have a right to choose to be Mormons or Bhuddists, this is not an error.) It looks traditional, sound and orthodox, but its meaning is most definitely not.

Paragraph 4 seems very much concerned with the magisterium. Magisterium refers to the authority of the Church, and thus it is helpful to look at this paragraph together with paragraph 8. On the one hand, it is true that Vatican II has effectively undermined authority in the Church. On the other hand, that is not the main problem with the Council. The problem is doctrinal, it is one of false teaching. Problems with authority necessarily come in the wake of that, since authority is at the service of the Faith, and not vice versa. Archbishop Lefebvre was disobedient and strong in the Faith; Paul VI, although utterly heterodox was a man who ruled the Church with a rod of iron. A delinquent father undermines and loses his authority over his family, but the problem is his delinquency; his loss of authority is only a by product of that delinquency.

Despite appearances, the Social Kingship of Christ is not mentioned in **paragraph 5**, although “The reign of Christ” may well be the same thing. Or it may not be: perhaps we are once again being allowed to make our own assumptions, assumptions which will not necessarily be made by future generations who read this same text. As Fr. Hewko says, a modernist can want “the reign of Christ” in his heart but that is not necessarily the same as the Social Kingship of Christ. We are told that from the time of the Council onwards, the “reign of Christ” was “no longer the preoccupation” and sometimes was “even combated.” (*Even* combated? Just imagine that!) Any Catholic following the nefarious goings on in the conciliar Church knows that Christ’s Social Kingship is not just ignored or “even combated”, it is consistently and constantly denied and contradicted! Archbishop Lefebvre wrote a book entitled: “*They Have Uncrowned Him.*” Not “*They Are No Longer Preoccupied With His Crown*”! One implies a wilful and positively malevolent act; a positive action consonant with diabolical disorientation, Rome losing the faith, and all the other ominous prophecies. The other implies a neglect or absent mindedness, irresponsible perhaps, but hardly of the same order of magnitude; a sin of omission at best. A similar distinction comes to mind every time one hears an SSPX worthy talking about “helping the authorities in Rome to rediscover their own Tradition” or something similar, as if the authorities in Rome had accidentally mislaid Tradition these last fifty or so years and had not been waging an out-and-out total war of extermination against it!

Lest we forget exactly what is at stake, it should suffice to recall of one or two of the

actual effects of the wicked teaching of Vatican II. Reading this text, one might forget that in South America, hundreds of thousands if not millions of souls leave the Church every year to join 'evangelical' Protestant sects, as a direct result of Rome having ordered those countries to abandon their Catholic constitutions and fall into line with the teaching of Vatican II by accepting and enshrining religious liberty. And let us not forget the appalling betrayal of General Franco and many heroic Spaniards who, having literally fought, risked their lives and in many cases shed their blood during three long years of civil war in order to establish a Catholic constitution in Spain, were then rewarded for their loyalty to Rome by Rome ordering them to undo what they had established and open their constitution to all religions.

Archbishop Lefebvre did not famously say to Cardinal Ratzinger: *"Eminence, if only you were more preoccupied with the Christianisation of society! We are preoccupied with the reign of Christ whereas you are not, and you even sometimes combat it."* He said: *"Eminence, you are working for the de-Christianisation of society whereas we are working for the Christianisation of it."* Incidentally, various people are reporting difficulties in obtaining 'They Have Uncrowned Him' - of course, that might just be pure coincidence, and not at all because it does not fit the new idea that Vatican II's religious liberty *"is in fact a very, very limited one. Very limited."*

Paragraph 6 in a similar manner appears at first glance to deal with Religious Liberty, but ducks out at the last moment. This paragraph tells us the Religious Liberty *"leads to"* demanding that God renounce His reign. The problem here can be summed up easily: it does not "lead to" it - it is it! This is akin to saying 'the teaching "Jesus Christ is not God" leads to heresy'. What nonsense. Once again, what can be seen here is a refusal to deal with the problem of the Council. Is the error in the text, is it the Council itself which contains error, or rather is error something which the Council merely leads to? (Perhaps because you make an 'unheard of choice'!?) As elsewhere, paragraph 6 appears to imply the former whilst actually saying the latter.

Paragraph 6 also tells us that the Church is being guided by human prudence. It may seem at first a relatively minor point, but we should recall St. Thomas' teaching that in the end we will be guided by the good spirit or the bad spirit, either by Christ or the devil. Especially since we are talking about the Church, with a supernatural mission. When the anti-Christ emerges, will he follow 'human prudence'? This author thinks it fair to say that it is something far above human intelligence, namely a diabolical 'prudence' which is guiding the Church. The crisis in the Church is not due to bumbling, incompetent men following their own flawed human intelligence. The massive loss of faith and loss of souls is the work a diabolical conspiracy, ultimately the work of the devil.

Paragraph 7 tells us that due to ecumenism and interreligious dialogue, *"the truth about the one true Church is silenced."* Once again, this is misleading. The truth about the one true Church is not merely silenced: it is denied and contradicted. Similarly, ecumenism has not merely *"killed the missionary spirit,"* it has killed the missions and today is still killing millions and millions of souls! Teaching the truth only to your friends, not preaching the truth to outsiders, not being welcoming of newcomers to your Mass centre, these are things which merely kill the missionary spirit. The missionary spirit appears to

be dying or dead in large parts of the SSPX, but even we would stop short of accusing those parts of the SSPX of being ecumenical! Just as paragraph 6 pointedly does not say that religious liberty is an error, paragraph 7 likewise pointedly avoids saying anything similar about ecumenism. It tries to sound like it is against it without actually saying anything of real substance against it.

As mentioned above, **Paragraph 8** deals with authority, an interesting subject given Bishop Fellay's own preoccupation of late, and on closer examination it is very revealing. We are told that: "*The weakening of faith in Our Lord's divinity favours a dissolution of the unity of authority in the Church.*" Leaving aside yet another example of weak and equivocal language ('favours'?), let us examine what this means. What exactly is the main problem being lamented in this statement? The dissolution of the unity of authority. The secondary thing which is mentioned as a problem only insofar as it 'favours' this dissolution of authority is Faith ('faith') in Our Lord's divinity. Implication: unity of authority is more important than Faith in Our Lord's divinity.

"*The destruction of authority,*" we are told, "*represents the ruin of Christian institutions: families, seminaries, religious institutes.*" So once again, it is not a loss of Faith which has caused the destruction of Christendom which we witness all around us. The withered remnants of the Catholic Church, closed convents, barely-any-longer-Catholic schools, increasingly anti-Christ laws being passed by the governments of once-Catholic nations, the almost complete apostasy of at least two generations: these are all things which we thought were the result of Vatican II spreading its errors throughout the Church like deadly poison. But no, according to this document, it is as a result of a destruction of authority. 'If only there were enough authority, then everything would be fine.'

We mentioned the preoccupation with authority earlier on when passing over paragraph 4. Perhaps this is the right time to remind the reader of the words of the scandalous General Chapter Declaration of 2012, which begins by stating that, at the conclusion of its meeting, the General Chapter "*stands at the tomb of Archbishop Lefebvre, united behind the Superior General Bishop Fellay.*" It has been the contention of some that this amounts to official recognition that the new principle of unity for the SSPX, the thing which unifies it, from now on is the Superior General. Previously it was the Faith, but the SSPX is no longer united in doctrine. The idea of unity in truth is conspicuously absent in this text.

Paragraph 9 attempts to speak about the new Mass, but once again cannot quite summon the courage to attack it directly. We are told that the New Mass "*diminishes*", "*curtains*", "*obscures*" and "*undermines*", all of which appear to be sins of omission. Cannot worse be said? Once again, one notices what it avoids saying. Incidentally, one notices that the paragraph makes a point of beginning not merely with "*The New Mass...*" but with "*The New Mass, promulgated in 1969...*" as its subject. Perhaps it was thought that this would satisfy the faithful that Bishop Fellay no longer believes the New Mass was legitimately promulgated [Doctrinal Declaration, April 2012]. Apart from the problem of a Traditionalist Bishop who can change his mind from one month to the next about a question as important as the legitimacy of the New Mass, it is a fact that "*promulgated in 1969*" does not contradict "*legitimately promulgated by Pope Paul VI.*" The two statements are not mutually exclusive, and therefore the one cannot be taken to represent a

correction of the other. It looks diplomatic, but its value is nil. Besides which, there is no indication that Bishop Fellay has in fact changed his mind since he composed the April 2012 Doctrinal Declaration. He has never yet admitted that he made a mistake in admitting that the Novus Ordo was “legitimately promulgated”, nor even that he had ever admitted it. He usually tries to dodge questions about it and on the rare occasions where he cannot avoid being asked, he retreats into his standard defence of ‘I was misunderstood’, ‘I didn’t mean to say that’ etc.) Suffice it to say that this is as big a problem as ever it was. Worse: it is a problem which now involves Bishops Tissier and de Galarreta also.

Paragraph 10 begins thus: *“Fifty years on, the causes persist and still engender the same effects.”* Which causes, exactly? The “causes” in question are what the first nine paragraphs of this declaration have so skilfully avoided identifying, all the while equivocating and downplaying “the effects”. It continues: *“Hence today the consecrations retain their full justification.”* Notice the sleight of hand here: the Archbishop’s justification for the consecrations, in his own words, is nowhere to be found. It is not even alluded to, much less quoted. So how is the reader supposed to know what this retained “justification” is? Presumably we are supposed to take Bishop Fellay’s version, as presented in the preceding nine paragraphs, as being the reason why Archbishop Lefebvre performed the consecrations in 1988.

A very brief quote from Archbishop Lefebvre’s Spiritual Journey, clearly been lifted from a longer sentence, is offered as a justification for stating that the SSPX, *“at the service of the Church ... asks with insistence for the Roman authorities to regain the treasure of doctrinal, moral and liturgical tradition.”*

Surely this sort of language speaks for itself. Did St. Augustine, St. Patrick, St. Isaac Jogues or any one of the legions of heroic missionaries ever “ask with insistence” that the pagans discover the treasure of the Catholic Faith? Or rather, the treasure of the “doctrinal, moral and liturgical tradition” of Rome? Did St. John Fisher “ask with insistence” that Henry VIII rediscover the treasure of his moral tradition?! Does the Church no longer preach? Did Our Lord and his Apostles never command? How is Rome likely to view a Society of St. Pius X which used to demand that Rome convert and abandon the errors of the Council but which now employs such timid, deferential language?

“Following Providence” is the subject of **paragraph 11**, although we are never told exactly what this means, nor are we given any kind of example to illustrate it. What it amounts to is a pious platitude: it sounds nice and holy and it means virtually nothing.

Three of the four Bishops consecrated by Archbishop Lefebvre in 1988, as signatories of this declaration and on behalf of the SSPX, say that *“we mean ... to follow providence ... and not anticipate it”*. What we can gather is that they at least mean well (or at any rate, they say they do)! Isn’t that nice! More than that is unclear. For example, what are they actually going to do in the future? Who knows! Perhaps whatever they feel like doing. Whatever this ‘following of Providence’ actually amounts to, it will be, we are told, *“either when Rome returns to Tradition and the Faith of all time”* or *“when she [Rome] explicitly recognises our right to profess integrally the Faith and to reject the errors*

which oppose it, with the right and the duty for us to oppose publicly the errors and the proponents of these errors, whoever they may be" - never mind the fact that the correction of errors and the denunciation of the purveyors of error is precisely what the SSPX has now ceased doing, as the rest of the declaration makes abundantly clear. Oh the tragic irony. So, the SSPX will "follow Providence" (whatever that means) either when Rome returns to Tradition and the Faith of all time, or before Rome returns to Tradition and the Faith. That ought to be clear!

Paragraph 12 concludes the statement with another hand picked, suitably innocuous quote from Archbishop Lefebvre about remaining faithful to the Mass and the glory of Christ in heaven (it is doubtful whether the worst modernist in Rome would have a problem with that!), and a prayer to the Trinity *"by the intercession of the Immaculate Heart of Mary"*. The latter is notable in one sense as being the only time that Our Lady ever gets a mention in the whole of this rather long document. Nothing about Fatima, La Salette, Quito... one might be forgiven for thinking that Our Lady has little to no role to play in bringing Our Lord's triumph out of this era of apostasy.

What is the standing and significance of this declaration? It is another official, 'signed, sealed and delivered' statement of the position of the SSPX. It takes its place along side the General Chapter statement of 2012 with its six useless 'conditions' of surrender, and along side the April 2012 Doctrinal Declaration. It is the studied opinion of this author that the June 27th 2013 anniversary declaration is no less alarming and dangerous than its predecessors, in fact in many ways more so, since it 'looks Traditional', whereas at least the April 2012 had the virtue of being a straight-forward 'warts and all' representation of where Menzingen now stands. It did what it said on the tin. This declaration does not: the tin is labelled "Tradition" but it contains the same sour contents which are the staple fare of Modernists.

What will Rome make of it? Who knows, but as has been said before, in one sense it hardly matters. The danger of a deal was that it would lead to the Society liberalising and dropping its war footing against the new conciliar religion. In fact, even without an official deal the Society has now been liberalising for some time already, a process which continues apace, and the war footing against the new conciliar religion is truly a thing of the past. When a deal finally happens it will be a deal made by a Society which already accepts everything that the Romans would have reasonably wished for. 'Accept us as we are' does have the drawback of making the matter dependent on how we are. And 'how we are' will continue to work with the passage of time.

Keep working and praying! Stay vigilant!

Resist Menzingen's Modernism! Help build for the future!

Please support

"The Recusant Mass Fund"

P.O. Box 423,

Deal,

Kent

England

Authority and the Glory of God

by Fr. Patrick Girouard

www.sacrificium.org

Dear brothers and sisters in Christ our King,

Much has already been said about the June 27th Declaration by the three bishops of the New SSPX. Please suffer me to add my little bit... First of all, let me tell you that there is something almost comical in the circumstances surrounding the whole thing. Indeed, there has been not only one, but rather **three** Declarations during that week! It is true! Let's see:

NUMBER ONE: On the 27th, we got the Declaration from the 3 bishops of the New SSPX. When you read it quickly, it sounds pretty good, although we cannot fail to see a big problem in paragraph 11. But if you read that document again, you realize there are many subtle errors in other paragraphs. Just listen to Fr. Joseph Pfeiffer's analysis.

NUMBER TWO: On the 28th, the only remaining Bishop of the old SSPX, H.E. Mgr Williamson, and twelve priests and two Benedictine Friars, have been working on a Declaration of their own! I was there, at Fr. Ringrose's rectory in Vienna, Virginia. Our Declaration had been planned already, when news of that of the 3 Bishops came out. So we had to study it and to say something against its big flaw, which had been planted, of course, at the end of the document (paragraph 11). Other priests, who had not been able to travel to Virginia, signed it as well, so that we ended up with 20 signatures.

NUMBER THREE: On June 30th, there has been a "Déclaration de Fidélité Catholique" penned by a layman and presented to the authorities of the New SSPX. Unfortunately, as far as I know, it is only in French. Although the author gave his name to Menzingen, he decided to remain anonymous to the general public. His declaration basically expands, in a good way, the text of the 1974 Declaration from Archbishop Lefebvre. I agree with this text, only I find that it does not go as far as I would like in its conclusions. Those of you who have read our Mission Statement know what I mean: We basically want Rome to get rid of the **whole** "Reform". To the New SSPX this is un-realistic. I would only answer that we hope Rome will convert, even if it is not "realistic" to have such a hope. We should not abandon our principles just because such a conversion would necessitate a miracle from God.

I think we can all agree that, between Menzingen and the Resistance, there has been a multitude of solemn Declarations since September 2011, when Cardinal Levada presented the first Preamble to Bishop Fellay! I must confess I made one myself, on March 28th of this year! What else can you do? Declarations have become the national sport in the world of Tradition! For outsiders, who stumble by accident on traditional websites, all these proclamations must be a source of puzzlement, especially when you have three that come out in four days! They probably think three things: 1-Traditionalists love to "declare" and "proclaim" things; 2-Traditionalists are divided; 3-Traditionalists all seem to be equally nuts! I don't think we can seriously deny the first two points, and I think we are well on our way to achieve the third one...

But the cause, my dear friends, what is the cause of that frenzy of declarations, of that profound division, of that danger of irreversible brain damage? The answer lies in one word: AUTHORITY! Yes, it is true! Authority, when being misused, produces effects that are contrary to its purpose. Indeed, authority is supposed to bring about order and unity in a community, big or small. This order and this unity are necessary for a community to reach its own purpose. When used badly, authority provokes instead chaos and divisions. But how are we to know if it is being used well or not?

In all things, we must consider the end, the final cause, the purpose. Authority comes from God. Like man, and like the society of men, authority is a creature. It is given to men to help them achieve the goal of society. This goal is to provide men with the best conditions possible in which they could themselves attain their end, their purpose. And what is this end? What is the purpose of men, and, by extension, of society and of authority? What is the end of all creatures without exception? It is to glorify God! Whenever a rational creature ignores, forgets, or purposefully betrays that goal of creation, it can only provoke disorder and confusion. And this is what happens when authority is being misused.

Please, let me quote Dom Columba Marmion, OSB: *“When we want to pass judgment on the absolute value of a thing or an undertaking, we must do so by adopting God’s point of view. Only God is the truth; truth is the light in which God, eternal wisdom, sees all things; the value of all things depends on how God evaluates them. This is the only infallible criteria of judgment... But there is a major truth that God revealed us about His motives; it is that He has created everything for His glory (Prov. 16, 4). God gives us everything; He gives Himself in the Person of His beloved Son and, with Him, He gives us all goods; He prepares for us, for all eternity, an infinite beatitude in the society of His adorable Trinity. But there is one thing that He jealously keeps for Himself, which He neither wants, nor can, to give us: It is His glory. (Isai. 47, 8) Therefore, things have a value only in as much as they glorify God.”* (Translated from the French version of “Christ, the life of the Monk”, pp 390-391).

My dear friends, the cause of the confusion, disorder, and chaos we see in the Church since Vatican II, and in the SSPX today, is the abandonment, in practice, of this supernatural vision of things and people. The authorities, at all levels of the Church and of the SSPX, seem to have forgotten that their end is to glorify God.

Indeed, Conciliar Rome, through Vatican II and its “reforms”, continues on its path of glorifying man instead of God. Remember the awful words of Pope Paul VI in his closing speech at the end of the Second Vatican Council (Dec. 7, 1965): *“At least acknowledge its merit (of the spirituality of the Council), you modern humanists, who renounce the transcendence of the Supreme Things, and recognize our new humanism: we, more than anyone, have the worship of man.”* For the last 48 years, we have witnessed this misuse of authority by the Roman hierarchy. They are decidedly not glorifying God! And the same is true concerning the actual Superiors of the SSPX.

Indeed, as the official and legal texts of the Society demonstrate since 2012, the Superiors are now accepting the principle of an agreement with Conciliar Rome without asking for its conversion. Just read again the scandalous April 15th, 2012 Declaration of Bishop

Fellay, as well as the shameful July 14th Declaration of the 2012 General Chapter, and the text of the cosmetic “conditions”. And don’t tell me these texts have no more value! They remain the official and legal position of the Society, notwithstanding the multitude of sermons, conferences, texts, that affirm the contrary! None of these latter have any legal value in the SSPX, and they only represent the private opinions of their authors. Even if the 27th 2013 Declaration would not contain so many errors, and would be perfect, it would not change a thing! To change the official and legal position of the Society, there would need to be a new General Chapter that repudiates these bad documents and writes new ones. There is no getting around this reality! And even if a new General Chapter would make the previous documents null and void, and would only say that it would accept receiving from Conciliar Rome the permission to “continue as we are”, this would still be a grave dereliction of duty, a terrible misuse of authority. Indeed, any Catholic worth its salt, let alone the Superiors of the Society, should have such a great sorrow and horror with regard to the Conciliar Church’s doctrine and actions that they should recoil at the thought of receiving any form of approval from these traitors and enemies of souls and of Christ. The Superiors of the Society are therefore not glorifying God, and thus are misusing their authority, creating the chaos and disorder we are witnessing everywhere in the traditional movement.

If we are tired of the multiplication of Declarations and Statements; if we want to recover our unity; if we desire to be spared irreparable brain damage, we have to pray that the Superiors of the Society of St. Pius X would wake up from their sleep-walking and, desirous of glorifying God and of making good use of their authority, would make one final and short Declaration to Conciliar Rome: “Nullam Partem!” “We will have no part with you!”

Fr. Patrick Girouard

Some useful websites:

www.inthissignyoushallconquer.com

www.cathinfo.com

www.sossaveoursspox.com

www.ecclesiamilitans.com

www.truetrad.com

www.sacrificium.org

aveclimmaculee.blogspot.com

(French)

www.lasapiniere.info

(French)

nonpossumus-vcr.blogspot.co.uk

(Spanish)

www.benedictinos.org.br

(Portuguese)

www.TheRecusant.com

“CHANGE OF DOCTRINE? ...WHERE?”

+ PAX +

July 24, 2012

St. Christina, Virgin & Martyr

Dear N., Dear N.,

As N. remarked in his letter, the Second Vatican Council's great success for the Revolution was in the ambiguous documents.

The same success was accomplished in the Society by ambiguous phrases found in the CNS Interview on May 11, 2012, DIC1 Interview on June 7, 2012, the General Chapter Statement & Six Conditions of July 14, 2012, the April 15, 2012 D O C T R I N A L Declaration and the June 27, 2013 Declaration.

The change of doctrine is found directly or indirectly in the texts of the above documents & interviews. The new doctrines are:

1. The errors of the Council are surmountable, open to discussion and not really from the Council, “but from the general interpretation of the Council.”
2. Religious Liberty and Ecumenism are surmountable and “limited”. The new, erudite wording fails to condemn these heresies as the pre-Vatican II popes had done, and treats them as occasions of error rather than condemned errors that DIRECTLY attack Christ the King and the Faith.
3. The New Mass is now declared to be “legitimately promulgated” which is equivalent to calling it a legitimate Mass. (See talk of Fr. De La Rocque on May 18, 2012, proving this). This compromise has lead many other groups to accept and celebrate the New Mass. At best, the new Declaration charges the New Mass as “diminishing” Christ's Reign, it also “curtails” and “obscures” the Sacrificial nature of the Mass, rather than saying that, in fact, it directly ATTACKS and UNDERMINES by omission, these essential qualities of the Mass, which Cardinals Bacci, Oddi and Ottaviani's Study proves. Furthermore, since “how one prays expresses how one believes” (“lex orandi lex credendi”), for the SSPX to acknowledge as legitimately promulgated a way of prayer that fundamentally attacks what Catholics must believe, is to call that which attacks and undermines the Catholic Doctrine a legitimate prayer, pleasing to God!
4. Consequently, the New Rites and New Sacraments are also considered valid and legitimate. Where does this put our conditional Confirmations and Ordinations?
5. The New Code is accepted, with no distinctions. The New Code is penetrated with the errors and heresies of Vatican II, which must also be implicitly approved by accepting the New Code.
6. The new ecclesiology of recognizing the Conciliar Church as ONE with the Catholic Church of all time is now taught. Abp. Lefebvre always recognized the pope is head of TWO churches, as a result of the crisis; the Conciliar Church by his Modernism, and the

Catholic Church by his lawful authority. Faithful Catholics are obliged to acknowledge him and resist him, simultaneously. This state of the Pope's right to our disobedience exists until Rome returns to Tradition!

7. The acceptance of Vatican II as "enlightening" and "deepening" Tradition as well as admitting that there are doctrines "not yet conceptually formulated" as part of the "living transmission" of the Faith, constitutes a betrayal and unacceptable compromise of the Faith that every Catholic is bound to resist!

This answers your question: "Change of Doctrine? Where?" Vatican II & its Reforms attack the doctrines on:

- The One True Church
- The Social Reign of O. L. Jesus Christ
- The Eternal Priesthood of O. L. Jesus Christ & the priesthood
- The Union of Church and State
- The true and false notions of Liberty & Human Dignity
- The Monarchical Structure of the Papacy
- Outside of the Catholic Church, No Salvation
- The Sacrifice of the Mass
- The 7 Sacraments and their Institution
- The Faith as a whole! (since Modernism is the "synthesis of all heresies" and permeates the entire texts of the Council).

To say "the affirmations of Vatican II...must be understood in the light of the whole, uninterrupted Tradition" as Bp. Fellay does, is to admit a blatant CONTRADICTION! Why? "...Because I do NOT believe that the Declarations of the Council on Liberty of Conscience, Liberty of Thought, and Liberty of Religion can be compatible with what the Popes taught in the past! Therefore we have to choose. Either we choose what the Popes have taught for centuries and we choose the Church OR we choose what was said by the Council. BUT WE CANNOT CHOOSE BOTH AT THE SAME TIME SINCE THEY ARE CONTRADICTORY" (Abp. Lefebvre, Press Conference, Sept. 15, 1976; in a special issue of "Itinéraires", April 1977, p.299).

8. The lies continue perpetrating that "nothing has changed" while the doctrinal compromises, listed above, exist in official documents, officially sent to Rome, in an official capacity! Remember, La Barroux, Campos, Good Shepherd Institute, etc., all boasted that "nothing has changed" and they maintained the right to criticize Modernism & Vat. II! All of them have compromised AFTER their agreements with Modernist Rome. The only difference for the SSPX is that the compromise came BEFORE the written agreement!

9. Tactics are the same as all Revolutionaries; two steps forward, one step back. "...But the annoying thing is that the Liberals themselves practiced this system in the text of the schemas: assertion of an error or an ambiguity or a dangerous orientation, then immediately after or before, an assertion in the opposite direction, intended to tranquillize the conservative conciliar fathers" (Abp. Lefebvre, They Have Uncrowned Him, ch. 24, p.168).

10. All the above new doctrines are further confirmed by the silencings, punishments, threats, refusals of Holy Communion, punitive transfers, canonical monitions and expulsions for all those who openly oppose the new doctrines and orientation expressed by the Superior General and official documents.

Moreover, the fact that the Resistance is not a reaction specified to one location, but all over the world, shows it is a universal problem of the FAITH! The 3 bishops, on April 7, 2012, tried to alarm and warn Bp. Fellay, but they were rebuked and ignored. The fruits of the new doctrines have since appeared, as they had forewarned: division, loss of Faith, confusion and loss of trust in the SSPX authorities.

Even if, by a sudden change of mind, a truly solid, Traditional Catholic Declaration appeared from Menzingen tomorrow, it would still not undo the scandal and compromise of the Faith in the official documents expressing the SSPX's new position! As Fr. Girourd remarked, it would take an equally serious General Chapter and Statement publicly denouncing, rejecting and correcting the scandalous compromises and errors against the Faith, found in the official documents and interviews since early 2012.

The Society would have to simply reaffirm the clear position and mission of its Founder, as before the "Vatican II-B" in July, 2012, and obviously replace the leadership with non Liberals.

"In practice our attitude should be based on a previous discernment, rendered necessary by these extraordinary circumstances of a Pope [or Superior General (addition, mine)] won to Liberalism. This discernment is this: when the Pope says something that is consistent with Tradition, we follow him; when he says something that goes contrary to our Faith, then we cannot follow him! The fundamental reason for this is that the Church, the Pope, and the hierarchy are AT THE SERVICE OF THE FAITH. It is not they who make the Faith; they must serve it. The Faith is not being created, it is unchangeable, it is transmitted.

"This is why we cannot follow these acts of these Popes that are done with the goal of confirming an action that goes against Tradition: by that very act WE WOULD BE COLLABORATING IN THE AUTODEMOLITION OF THE CHURCH, in the destruction of our Faith!

"...Someone once advised me, 'Sign, sign, that you accept everything; and then you continue as before!' (The May 5, 1988 Protocol). NO! ONE DOES NOT PLAY WITH HIS FAITH!" (Abp. Lefebvre, *They Have Uncrowned Him*, ch. 31, p.229).

I hope this answers your question
Her hour!

In Christ the King,

Fr. David Hewko



to the Immaculate Heart to hasten
Fr. Hewko saying
the breviary on a
London bus.

*(2nd June, 2013,
somewhere near
Earlsfield)*



“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