



The Recusant

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



“But surely there are simple souls who are easily misled by sowers of discord[...] I would like to make this clear: let no one imagine that he can criticize authority with impunity.”

-Fr. Niklaus Pfluger, interview with Kirchliche Umschau. October. 2012.

Inside:

- Bp Williamson’s open letter to Bp. Fellay
- “Honour and Glory to Bishop Williamson” (Dom Thomas Aquinas OSB)
- “Two Bishops: A Clash of Wills” (Analysis)
- “The Deal” in their own words
- Fr. Hewko’s open letter to the clergy and faithful of the SSPX
- Concerning “Our Elder Brothers”

FROM THE DESK

OF THE EDITOR:

Greetings once again, dear reader. Since the last issue was sent out at the end of October, there has been a flood of news and “matters SSPX” to comment on, from the expulsion of Bishop Williamson, to Rome’s announcement, via an Ecclesia Dei press release, that the talks are back on and that they hope a deal will be reached soon. (Is it possible that those two things could be wholly unconnected? The SSPX German District press spokesman, Fr. Steiner, certainly doesn’t seem to think so – we reproduce his words elsewhere in this issue). Our dilemma, then, is where to begin, what to include in this edition and in what order. The initial idea was to issue one newsletter per month, had we time and energy enough, we could (time permitting) quite easily fill one per week! There is certainly no lack of important news. Nonetheless, we shall try to pick out what is important, and keep the Recusant coming out roughly as often as the District newsletter.

More about “The Recusant”

The previous editorial addressed the idea behind the name of this newsletter. There is another question which was not addressed, perhaps because its answer will be obvious to many of you. Nonetheless, to avoid confusion, let us spell it out here. Why a newsletter? There are many reasons, although there is one principle reason. These are dark days in the history of the Church, and dark days for the SSPX. That Catholics who share the faith ought to stick together is surely obvious. And that a newsletter is one way of keeping contact with a large-ish group will be easily understood. We also need to be kept informed, and it helps when you know that the person next to you or to whom you are speaking has read the same material, seen the same shocking evidence and understands the same realities as you yourself; you can then take certain things for granted as shared knowledge, without having to remember and explain every detail, covering the same ground, each time you speak to someone else. There is also the difference between understanding and passing on something: there are many things which, upon seeing them, we ourselves understand with little difficulty; but then when we try to explain what we have seen, read and understood, to another person who has not, we find it more difficult. We hope that if you are able to pass on this newsletter, it will make your task slightly easier.

There is a battle raging for the soul of the SSPX, and consequently, for Tradition and thus for the Church itself. One of the principle weapons used in this battle (or withheld, as the case may be) is information. It is in the interests of “our side” that as much of the current goings-on are known, and as widely afield, as possible. It is in Menzingen and Rome’s interests for as many of the faithful as possible to remain “in the dark.” The truth does not hide. The devil operates by means of plots and schemes, lies, dissembling, “spin” and all the rest of it. One thing which has characterised the strange behaviour of Menzingen and their allies within recent times, and which points clearly to some new organisation having supplanted the SSPX which we all knew, is the information blackout. The SSPX used to critique and correct the Conciliar Church in the most strident and uncompromising terms. That is for the most part no longer the case. All the official news and information outlets of the SSPX are now worse than useless, because they are ruthlessly controlled by Menzingen and are thus deliberately hiding certain things from us. This is what also explains the heavy handed tactics being used against alternative sources of information. Recent examples include the “suggestion” made by Bishop Fellay to Fr. Morgan that the sacraments be withheld from two members of the British faithful for the “crime” of being moderators of the internet forum *Ignis Ardens*. This is not a rumour, nor is it hear-say. That certain Menzingen apologists are reduced to insinuating that reports of this were untrue is itself a

telling admission on their part. The two faithful, Mr Gregory Taylor and Mrs Clare Webber are known to many of us, as of course is Fr. Morgan. Anyone can check for himself and see if such stories are fictitious or real. In the USA Mr. Hugh Dolan, the man who runs a website called "SOS Save Our SSPX" has been denied communion at Ridgefield. Again, this is not hearsay. His own account of this can be found online fairly easily. In Manilla, the SSPX Asia District sacked from its employ a man with seven children to feed, for the crime of attending a said Mass by Fr. Chazal. Several parishioners in Post Falls, Idaho, report that at a conference last month the US District Superior, Fr. Rostand boasted to a packed hall that he regularly reads websites such as *Ignis Ardens* and *Cathinfo.com* to try to identify the people who are writing things which he does not like, or which oppose an SSPX/Rome agreement or the direction of Bp. Fellay. Aside from the indignity of such a boast, we must ask ourselves: why would anyone go to such great lengths? Why is it so important for them?

Like it or not (and it is not we who desired this sad situation to come about), there is currently a vacuum where the normal SSPX news and information channels ought to be. The Recusant is produced by, and primarily for, the British District (though it is beginning to make its way further afield). The SSPX District of Great Britain has at its disposal a monthly newsletter, and a quarterly magazine. Neither of these, for obvious reasons, can be used to tell people what they really need to hear. One can read the District newsletter for what it doesn't say, but when it comes to the current SSPX controversy, don't expect to be informed directly by it. This is not to be construed as a criticism of Fr. Morgan on our part. Be that as it may, there is a vacuum to be filled, an important need to be supplied. The Recusant was created to fulfil that vital role. If you wish to read about the St. Michael's School raffle, read the official District Newsletter. If you wish to read about what is really going on in the SSPX, and where the latest danger facing the SSPX is to be found, read this "unofficial newsletter". Of course, we still encourage you to support St. Michael's School as you always have done, and to continue to read the District newsletter. But read this also, as a supplement.

All the people involved in this project are laity. We say what we think needs to be said, and what needs to be heard. A priest must take certain things into consideration: he will not always feel that he can afford to be wholly forthright, and he can easily find himself in a very difficult position. Many of us have both heard and expressed opinions on the comparative silence of the official District newsletter. Whatever the reason for it, and whatever the rights and wrongs, that is the way it is, and we must assume that things are unlikely to change any time soon. For us laity, the situation is different. We usually have no excuse other than cowardice and laziness. There is a reason why Bishop Fellay has been concentrating so much lately on trying to win over the laity, and trying to suppress

independently-controlled, lay-run “SSPX” websites. Against his priests he can use his “iron fist” (let us not forget the outrageous treatment of the Capucin and Dominican ordinands, refused ordination at less than a weeks notice essentially because Bishop Fellay suspected that they might have an opinion of the SSPX/Rome saga which differs from his own!) How to silence the clergy is not what keeps Bishop Fellay and Fr. Pfluger awake at night. Faced by concerned laity, however, their position is much more precarious. We have not only a right to know the truth, but a positive duty to know it, and then to tell and re-tell it. If we will not step forwards to defend the SSPX and Tradition, nobody will.

About this issue

In the last issue we included an article entitled “Quo Vadis Mgr. de Galarreta?” It occurs to us that the question might equally be asked “Quo Vadis SSPX?” Answers to that question, clues as to the future direction of the SSPX, are available out there for those who know where to look. Here’s a hint: Fr. Pfluger and Fr. Schmidberger have so far shown themselves to be at the cutting edge of formulating new SSPX policy, and appear to go even further than Bishop Fellay in their vision for the SSPX. They also have demonstrated a complete lack of restraint when talking about vitally important issues or revealing sensitive information. And they do so with apparent impunity. It almost feels as though the future of the SSPX is decided elsewhere than where we would imagine it: Bishop Fellay is certainly the chief spokesman of the new SSPX, and not only to Rome. He also has the unenviable job of selling the new SSPX to as many people as possible, and trying to convince the faithful that this really is consistent with the Archbishop Lefebvre whom many still remember, and with the SSPX which almost everyone remembers from not so very long ago. We shall not spend too long on the question in this issue, as we feel we shall be returning to it often enough in the months ahead. We would however like to draw your attention to the remarks made by Fr. Schmidberger in a recent interview with a local Radio station in Munich, reproduced elsewhere in this issue.

We also include in this issue some more news and information on Bishop Williamson, of the sort that you will not see via the official SSPX channels. It has been said that the fifth mark of the Church is that She is persecuted. The persecution, a form of bloodless martyrdom, suffered by Archbishop Lefebvre at the hands of the Church to which he had dedicated his life was perhaps his crowning glory. Bishop Williamson would not wish any parallel to be drawn, but we will draw it all the same: that he is persecuted by the Church, and moreover by his own priestly Society, near the end of a long life of service in that same Society, is also to his honour and credit. If someone isn’t persecuting you, you must be doing something wrong. We reproduce, among other things, the letter sent by Bishop

Williamson to Bishop Fellay, not because of who its author is, but because the things contained therein speak for themselves. Before we had read that letter, before even it was written, our previous editorial ended with the words "Bishop Fellay must go". To us this seems self-evident. On the other hand, those who will not see what is happening to the SSPX, will perhaps never see it.

By way of better understanding the conflict between Bishop Williamson and Bishop Fellay, we reproduce a brief article which originally appeared on the website *Ignis Ardens*, whose author is one "Binx". His point is well made, and is at the heart of the controversy surrounding the deal with Rome. Namely, that the haggling over conditions by which we will "re-enter the Church" (an unfortunate expression which Bishop Fellay has already used far too often for it to be any longer excused as "bad translation", "taken out of context" or "mere slip of the tongue in the heat of the moment"!) is a debate into which we should not enter, lest we miss the point altogether. Our grounds for opposition is that, even if modernist Rome were to offer us every liberty we could possibly ask for or stipulate as a "condition", and even if they could be trusted 100% to keep their word and to abide by both the letter and spirit of any agreement made, yet still we do not want it. We do not want to become yet another exhibit in the Museum of Horrors which is the Novus Conciliar "church". A "church" which believes it can reconcile the contradictory, and which wishes to add us to the gilded cage containing the "Traditionalist" exhibit, along with the "Anglican exhibit" (complete with their "tradition" of 39 articles!), the "Neo-Cathecumenal Way" exhibit, whichever "exhibit" it is that welcomed Tony Blair as a "convert", the "gay outreach" exhibit (of which there is one infamous example in London), and who knows how many other horrors! No. That will never do. We refuse. *Recusamus!* Benedict XVI may believe in "reconciled diversity" of this sort. We do not. We supported the SSPX because it represented what we knew the Church to be. The Novus Ordo Museum of Horrors may be all things to all men, but it is not the Church.

Finally, we wish especially to draw your attention to the open letter from Fr. Hewko to the SSPX clergy and faithful. Fr. Hewko, already known to many of us through those of his sermons which have appeared online for several years now, is a model of what every SSPX priest should be. His open letter speaks for itself, needs no comment, and is an excellent resource to give to SSPX relations or acquaintances who are either still undecided, unfamiliar with what has been happening, or even those small number who wilfully refuse to take sides. This fight will end up encompassing us all in the end, and the more information is spread around the better and the more allies we will have. Ignorance and blindness are the tools of the current SSPX leadership, because it is they who have something to hide. We strongly encourage those of you who are able, to print off a copy of Fr. Hewko's letter to give to those without. Likewise, we also would encourage any generous souls reading this and who have at their command the

necessary resources, to print off a copy of a new book by one Stephen J Fox, "Is this Operation Suicide." Too long to be included in The Recusant, we did briefly consider printing it as a booklet and posting it together with this issue. However, this would more than double our printing and postage costs. Therefore, for the moment, we will print a few copies in booklet form, and will send it for free to anyone who asks for it, and who sends us their address (needless to say, donations are still welcome!). It is recommended reading.

For those with internet, the book can be found and either downloaded or read online for free at:

isthisoperationsuicide.wordpress.com

Errata

Astute readers will have noticed some typesetting errors and bits missing in the previous edition. Although nothing of vital importance was omitted, we will be all the more vigilant from now on to make sure that no further mistakes creep in. As they say, "the devil is a pro." We are amateurs. We do not command the huge budget of Angelus Press, nor the publicity of DICI. We are sincere, however, and we submit our humble efforts to the judgement of posterity and Almighty God.

Top of Page 7, in the article "But I'm only a layman! What can I do?", should have begun: *"4. Read and re-read good literature. We particularly recommend the writings of Archbishop Lefebvre. Contrary to false impressions being generated in certain quarters, the Archbishop was neither a compromising appeasnik nor a politically correct opponent of 'conspiracy theories'..."* etc.

Bottom of Page 10, the article on Mgr. de Galarreta's latest words was missing the very last sentence, which reads thus: *"If (God forbid!) his words represent the current position of those who consider themselves as the anti-agreement camp yet "in good standing with the SSPX," then the fault lines have shifted a long way within the last year."*

**R.I.P.**

Of your charity, please pray for the repose of the soul of Susan Horton, who died on Monday 29th October, 2012 at the age of 89. Although we expect a full obituary to appear in Mater Dei, we nonetheless wish to remind readers of the following. Mrs Horton, originally a convert, was a stalwart of the British SSPX for many years, and in more recent times an ally in opposing the subversion of the SSPX by Menzingen. Susan Horton was responsible for organising the group of British pilgrims which went to Econe in 1988, worked as a secretary both at the District Headquarters and at St. Michael's school for many years (we are told that she did this unpaid), and was known to almost everyone in London, where until only last year she ran the repository in Ss. Joseph and Padarn Church. A supporter of Bishop Williamson and a signatory to the Open Letter from the British Faithful to Bishop Fellay, she will be missed by many of us and remembered for a long time to come. Please remember her in your prayers. Requiescat in pace.

☉ God, Creator and Redeemer of all the Faithful,

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

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

A Novena to St. Pius X

**Glorious Pope of the Eucharist, St. Pius X,**

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

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

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

+Amen

St. Pius X, pray for us.

(Here mention your request)

Archbishop Lefebvre, pray for us!

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

OPEN LETTER TO BISHOP FELLAY **ON AN "EXCLUSION"**

London, 19 October, 2012

Your Excellency,

Thank you for your letter of October 4 in which, on behalf of the General Council and General Chapter, you let me know of your "recognition", "declaration" and "decision" that I no longer belong to the Society of St Pius X. The reasons given for your decision to exclude your servant are, you tell me, the following: he has continued to publish the "Eleison Comments"; he has attacked the authorities of the Society; he has exercised an independent apostolate; he has given support to rebellious colleagues; he has been formally, obstinately and pertinaciously disobedient; he has separated himself from the Society; he no longer submits to any authority.

May not all these reasons be summed up in disobedience? No doubt in the course of the last 12 years your servant has said and done things which before God were inappropriate and excessive, but I think it would be enough to point them out one by one for him to make the apology called for in all truth and justice. But we are no doubt agreed that the essential problem is not to be found in these details, that it can be summed up in one word: disobedience.

Then let us at once point out how many more or less disagreeable orders of the Superior General have been unfaithfully obeyed by your servant. In 2003 he left behind an important and fruitful apostolate in the United States to go to Argentina. In 2009 he left his post as Seminary Rector and left behind Argentina to moulder in a London attic for three and a half years, with no episcopal functions because they were denied him. All that was left to him by way of ministry was virtually the weekly "Eleison Comments", the refusal to interrupt which constitutes the large part of the "disobedience" of which he stands accused. And ever since 2009 it has been open season for the Society Superiors to discredit and insult him to their hearts' content, and Society members all over the world have been encouraged by their example to do the same if they wished. Your servant hardly reacted, preferring silence to scandalous confrontations. One might go so far as to say that he obstinately refused to disobey. But let that go, because that is not the real problem.

Then where is the real problem to be found? By way of reply let the accused be allowed to give a rapid overview of the history of the Society from which he is supposedly separating himself. For indeed the central problem goes a long way back.

Starting with the French Revolution towards the end of the 18th century, in many a formerly Christian State a New World Order began to establish itself, thought up by the Church's enemies to chase God out of his own creation. To begin with, the old order in which throne upheld altar was replaced by the separation of Church and State. As a result, society was structured in a radically different way, creating serious difficulties for the Church, because the State, being henceforth implicitly godless, was bound in the end to fight the religion of God with all its might. Sure enough, the Freemasons set about replacing the true worship of God with the worship of liberty, a worship of which the neutral State in matters of religion is merely an instrument. Thus began in modern times a relentless war between the religion of God, defended by the Catholic Church, and the religion of man, liberated from God, and liberal. The two religions are as irreconcilable as God and the Devil. A choice has to be made between Catholicism and liberalism.

But man wants to have his cake and eat it. He does not want to have to choose. He wants it both ways. So in the wake of the French Revolution Félicité de Lamennais invented liberal Catholicism, and from that moment on, the reconciling of things irreconcilable became common currency within the Church. For 120 years God in his mercy gave to his Church a series of Popes, from Gregory XVI to Pius XII, who for the most part saw clear and held firm, but an ever growing number of layfolk were inclining towards independence from God and towards the material pleasures which liberal Catholicism makes much more accessible. The corruption spread until it infected bishops and priests, at which point God finally allowed them to choose the kind of Popes they preferred, namely Popes who would pretend to be Catholic but would in fact be liberals, whose talk might be right-wing but whose action is left-wing, who are characterized by their contradictions, ambiguity, Hegelian dialectic, in brief, by their lies. We are into the Newchurch of Vatican II.

It was bound to be. Only a dreamer can reconcile things in reality irreconcilable. Yet God, as St Augustine says, does not abandon souls that do not first want to abandon him, and so he comes to the aid of the small remnant of souls that is unwilling to join in the soft apostasy of Vatican II. He raises an Archbishop to resist the betrayal of the Conciliar churchmen. Respecting reality, with no desire to reconcile things irreconcilable, refusing to dream, this Archbishop speaks with a clarity, a coherence and truth that enables the sheep to recognize the voice of the divine Master. The priestly Society which he founds to form true Catholic priests begins on a small scale, but by its resolute refusal of the Con-

ciliar errors and of their basis in liberal Catholicism, it draws to itself a remainder of true Catholics all over the world, and it constitutes the backbone of a whole movement within the Church which will go under the name of Traditionalism.

But this movement is intolerable to the churchmen of the Newchurch who mean to replace Catholicism with liberal Catholicism. Backed by the media and State governments, they do everything they can to discredit, disgrace and ostracize the courageous Archbishop. In 1976 Paul VI suspends him "a divinis", in 1988 John-Paul II "excommunicates" him. He is a supreme nuisance to the Conciliar Popes because his voice of truth has the effect of showing up their pack of lies and of imperilling the betrayal they mean to carry out. And despite being persecuted, despite even being "excommunicated", he holds firm, as do the large number of the priests of his Society.

Such faithfulness to the truth obtains from God a dozen years of internal peace and external prosperity for the Society. In 1991 the great Archbishop dies, but for another nine years his work carries on, faithful to the anti-liberal principles on which it was built. So what will the Conciliar Romans do to bring the resistance to an end? They will exchange the stick for the carrot.

In 2000 a major Jubilee Year pilgrimage of the Society to Rome shows forth in the basilicas and streets of Rome the power of the Society. The Romans are impressed, despite themselves. A Cardinal invites the four Society bishops to a sumptuous luncheon in his apartment. Three of them accept. Immediately after this most brotherly encounter, contacts between Rome and the Society which had grown rather cold over the last 12 years, pick up again, and with them begins a powerful process of seduction, as one might say, by means of scarlet buttons and marble halls.

Indeed contacts warm up again so swiftly that by the end of the year many priests and laity of Tradition are already afraid of a reconciliation taking place between Catholic Tradition and the liberal Council. The reconciliation does not come about for the moment, but the language of Society headquarters in Menzingen is beginning to change, and over the 12 years to come, it will show itself ever less hostile to Rome and ever more open to the Newchurch, to its media and their world. And while at the top of the Society the way is being paved for the reconciliation of irreconcilables, so amongst the priests and laity the attitude towards the Conciliar Popes and Church, towards everything worldly and liberal, is becoming more and more favourable. After all, is the modern world that surrounds us really as bad as it is made out to be?

This advance of liberalism within the Society, noticed by a minority of priests and laity but apparently not noticed by the great majority, became evident to many more in the spring of this year when, following on the failure in the spring of 2011 of the Doctrinal Discussions to bring the doctrines of Tradition and the Council together, the Society's Catholic policy up till then of "No practical agreement without a doctrinal agreement" changed overnight into the liberal policy of "No doctrinal agreement, therefore a practical agreement". And in mid-April the Superior General offered to Rome, as basis for a practical agreement, an ambiguous text, openly favourable to the "hermeneutic of continuity" which is Benedict XVI's favourite recipe to reconcile, precisely, the Council with Tradition ! "We need a new way of thinking," the Superior General said in May to a meeting of priests of the Society's Austrian District. In other words, the leader of the Society founded in 1970 to resist the novelties of the Council, was proposing to reconcile it with the Council. Today the Society is conciliatory. Tomorrow it is to be fully Conciliar!

It is difficult to believe that Archbishop Lefebvre's foundation can have been led to bracket out the principles on which it was founded, but such is the seductive power of the fantasies of our godless world, modernist and liberal. Notwithstanding, reality does not give way to fantasies, and it forms part of reality that one cannot undo the principles of a founder without undoing his foundation. A founder has special graces that none of his successors have. As Padre Pio cried out when the Superiors of his Congregation were starting to "renew" his Congregation in accordance with the new way of thinking of the Council, just closed: "What are you doing with the Founder?" The Society's Superior General, General Council and General Chapter may keep Archbishop Lefebvre on hand as a mascot, but that will not help if they all share in a new way of thinking that by-passes the crucial reasons for which he founded the Society. Therefore however good their intentions, they are leading the Society to its ruin by a betrayal parallel in all respects to that of Vatican II.

But let us be just, let us not exaggerate. Since the beginning of this slow collapse of the Society, there have always been priests and laity who saw clear and did their best to resist. In the spring of this year their resistance became more weighty and numerous, so that the General Chapter of last July did place an obstacle in the way of a false Rome-SSPX agreement. But will that obstacle hold up? One may fear not. In front of some 40 Society priests on retreat in Écône in September, the Superior General, referring to his policy with regard to Rome, admitted: "I was wrong," but whose fault was it ? - "The Romans deceived me." Likewise from the whole springtime crisis he said that there had arisen " a great distrust within the Society" which would need to be healed "by acts and not just by words", but whose fault was it ? Judging by his acts since September, which includes this letter of October 4, he is blaming the priests and laity who failed to put their trust in him as their

leader. After the Chapter as before, it seems as though he can brook no opposition to his conciliatory and Conciliar policy.

And that is the real reason why the Superior General has given several times the formal order to close down "Eleison Comments". Indeed the "Comments" have repeatedly criticized the Society authorities' conciliatory policy towards Rome, thereby attacking them implicitly. Now if in this criticism and these attacks there has sometimes been a failure to observe the respect normally due to the office or persons of the Society authorities, I readily beg forgiveness of anyone concerned, but I think that anybody actually reading the particular "Comments" implicated will recognize that the criticism and attacks usually abstracted from the persons, because the issues at stake are far more than just personal.

And if we do come to the great problem far surpassing mere persons, let us call to mind the immense confusion presently reigning in the Church, and placing in peril the eternal salvation of souls without number. Is it not the duty of a bishop to uncover the true roots of this confusion and to denounce them in public? How many bishops in the whole wide world see clear as Archbishop Lefebvre saw clear, and how many are teaching accordingly? How many of them are still teaching Catholic doctrine at all? Surely very few. Then is now the moment to be trying to silence a bishop who is doing so, if one is to judge by the number of souls that hang on to the "Comments" as they would to a lifebelt? How in particular can another bishop be wanting to shut them down when he himself has just had to admit to his priests that he let himself be deceived for many a long year on the same great questions ?

Likewise, if the rebellious bishop took upon himself – for the first time in nigh on four years – an independent apostolate, how can he be blamed for having accepted an invitation, coming from outside the Society, to give the sacrament of Confirmation and to preach the word of truth? Is that not the very function of a bishop? And if he is accused of having preached what was a word of "confusion", there is always the same answer: what he said in Brazil was confusing only for people who follow the line confessed to be an error, as evoked above.

So if he does seem for years to have been separating himself from the Society, the truth is that he has been distancing himself from the conciliatory Society, and not from that of the Archbishop. And if he seems insubordinate to any exercise of authority on the part of Society leaders, the truth is that that applies only to orders running counter to the purposes for which the Society was founded. In fact how many other orders are there at all, besides the order to close down the "Comments", which he can be blamed for having disobeyed in a "formal, obstinate and pertinacious" manner? Is there even one other such order? Since Archbishop

Lefebvre refused to obey only acts of authority of Church leaders which were of a nature to destroy the Church, his disobedience was more apparent than real. Likewise refusing to close down the "Comments" is a disobedience more apparent than real.

For indeed history repeats itself, and the Devil keeps coming back. Just as yesterday Vatican II wished to reconcile the Catholic Church with the modern world, so today one could say that Benedict XVI and the Society's Superior General both wish to reconcile Catholic Tradition and the Council; so again tomorrow, unless God intervenes between now and then, the leaders of the Catholic Resistance will be trying to reconcile it with Tradition henceforth Conciliar.

In brief, your Excellency, you may now go ahead and exclude me, because the arguments above are not likely to persuade you, but the exclusion will be more apparent than real. I have been a member of the Archbishop's Society ever since my perpetual engagement. I have been one of its priests for 36 years. I have been one of its bishops, like yourself, for nearly a quarter of a century. That is not all to be wiped out with one stroke of a pen. Member of the Archbishop's Society I therefore remain, and I wait.

Had you remained faithful to the Archbishop's heritage, and had I myself been notably unfaithful, gladly I would recognize your right to exclude me. But things being as they are, I hope I shall not be lacking in the respect due to your office if I suggest that for the glory of God, for the salvation of souls, for the internal peace of the Society and for your own eternal salvation, you would do better yourself to resign as Superior General than to exclude myself. May the good Lord give you the grace, the light and the strength to perform such an outstanding act of humility and of devotion to the common good of everybody.

And so, as I have so often finished the letters I have written to you over the years,

Dominus tecum, may the Lord be with you.

+Richard Williamson.

Contributions to support Bishop Williamson may be made via:

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



*Left to Right:
Fr. Cardozo,
Bishop Williamson
and Dom Thomas
Aquinas OSB*

HONOR AND GLORY TO BP. WILLIAMSON

**Dom Thomas Aquinas
September 3, Feast of St. Pius X**

In this dramatic moment in the life of the Holy Church, moment in which the Faith is most gravely threatened, an episcopal voice rises and confirms the faithful in the faith of their Baptism. Whose is this voice but of the bishop persecuted, slandered, accused of rebellion, etc., etc., etc.? And why is he persecuted, slandered, accused? Precisely because he defends the Faith and this crime has no forgiveness in the modern world. The modern world accepts everything; it even accepts the Tradition, as long as the Tradition accepts the modern world. The modern world is a highly concentrated solvent. It accepts everything it can dissolve, except the indissoluble Catholic Faith, except the integral, pure and immaculate Catholic doctrine, and this is what is at stake in this dramatic moment for the Tradition. Are we going to divide the Faith as Solomon proposed the two women vying for a child? The modernist Rome says: "Yes, let's divide the Faith, let's do a bargain. Why not?" Bishop Williamson says: "No, non possumus", and we are with him: "Non possumus!". Like Saint Peter we say to the Pharisees: "We cannot stop preaching in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ! Judge yourselves whether it is better to obey God than men." The child must live, as in the judgment of Solomon. In the present case, it is not the child who should live, but the mother, Our Mother the Holy Church. To divide Her by giving a piece to the modernists and a piece the traditionalists? Never!

For all these reasons we say and proclaim: "Honor and glory to Bishop Williamson and to all the priests who defend the faith without compromise with the enemies of the Catholic Faith." Some may be scandalized by the mere fact of speaking about enemies in this terrible battle. If this is your case, dear reader, remember that the Church here on earth is called militant, because it militates against three cruel enemies, as states the Catechism of the Council of Trent, which are the devil, the world and the flesh. Also remember the prayer: "By the sign of the Holy Cross, deliver us, from our enemies, O Lord our God." Remember also what says St. Pius X, who we celebrate today. The enemies of the Church are currently in the veins of the same Church.

These enemies are in Rome, unfortunately, this Rome who wants to make a deal with the Tradition, i.e., the Rome modernist which wants to make a deal with the eternal Rome. To what end? Even if it is not known the intention of the heart of Benedict XVI, it is not difficult to know how all this will end if this agreement (whose bitter fruits are already being felt, even before completion) takes place. The fruit, which already can be seen, is the silence of the Tradition, but as St. Gregory the Great said: "The Church would rather die than be silent." Then She, the real mother, won't shut up, will not do this shameful agreement, but will continue to speak, preach and work for the salvation of their children. This is what the brave priests are doing, this is what is doing Bp. Williamson. For this reason we say: "Honor and glory to Bp. Williamson, successor of the apostles and confessor of the Faith"

Honor and glory to the Bishop who administered 99 confirmations in eight days and directed his apostolic word 15 times to different audiences, which together represent more than 300 people in this vast Brazil, evangelized by the Portuguese and now by a Bishop of the former "island of saints".

Our monastery of Santa Cruz and the faithful of Rio, Salvador, Vitoria, Campo Grande (where a connection delay prevented the departure of Bp. Williamson), Maringá and Nova Friburgo thank the solicitude of a true Archbishop Lefebvre's son, faithful to his teachings, who came in to confirm, not only with the sacrament, but also with his deep understanding of revealed doctrine, of the modern errors and of medicine for today's illness, among which stands out with a special glow the Holy Rosary, which Bp. Williamson recommends to pray complete every day. May the Virgin Mary obtain us the grace to watch and pray to avoid falling into the temptation of agreements and to defeat the infernal serpent that wants to destroy Tradition.

Two Bishops: A Clash of Wills

(With thanks to *Binx of Ignis Ardens*)

The expulsion of Bishop Williamson by Bishop Fellay may be traced to a clash of wills. The cited disobedience (by both men) is nothing more than the manifestation of that clash. But to what are the two wills attached?

The answer to that question leads ultimately, I think, to two different visions of the Society's mission in the world and in the Church. And the most recent manifestation of that difference finds expression in the rhetoric surrounding the negotiations with Rome.

Bishop Fellay claims that he did not seek an alliance with Rome but that Rome rather was the initiator. We must take him at his word, as we cannot read his secret desires nor any secret actions they may have inspired. What we can observe, however, is what he openly defends: a general receptivity to the Pope's desire for a canonical regularization of the SSPX. Indeed, we have heard countless times from Bishop Fellay or from one of his appointees the argument that goes thus: if the Pope desires to recognize us and we are allowed to keep doing what we have always done, how can we resist? Or to put it another way, if we get offered the sweetheart of all traditionalist deals, we would be fools not to take it.

In response to this logic, those opposing Bishop Fellay (including Bishop Williamson at times) have often made what I would call a miscalculated counter-attack by arguing that Rome is not to be trusted. "Look at all the other traditionalist groups," they say. "Look what happens to their so-called deals after they submit themselves to Roman authority." True enough. Rome is not to be trusted, and that is worth noting in itself. But this approach to the argument glosses over a bigger problem because it implies that if somehow Rome could be made to hold up its end of the bargain, the sweetheart of all deals should indeed be accepted. But this is not so.

While it is likely true that Rome would renege on any deal (let alone one that would allow the SSPX to openly criticize the Council), this is not the primary reason to avoid such an arrangement. In fact, even if Rome were to muster up enough gentlemanly spirit to stick to its negotiated concessions—even then, a canonical regularization would be fundamentally uncatholic for several reasons:

1. The true priesthood and the true faith should not be subjugated—symbolically or otherwise—to an apostate hierarchy.

2. It is not Catholic for the Roman Church to have one kind of faith and practice for all the clergy and all the faithful in all the dioceses of the world, and a different kind of faith and practice for a special subgroup of Roman Catholics, spread also across the globe but untethered, as is their want, from the local diocesan bishops.

3. Likewise, it is not Catholic for the Society to accept Rome's formal separation (by way of a special canonical structure) of tradition from the rest of the Church. Such indifferentism must always be resisted because it affirms implicitly the modernist principle of a multiplicity of faiths dependent only on the immanent spirituality and aesthetic preferences of the persons involved.

4. Acceptance of canonical regularization with hands-off governance from modernist Rome also betrays a contradictory and liberal spirit with regard to ecclesiastical obedience. It says, in effect, we would welcome the appearance of obedience (i.e. the canonical structure) so long as we are not made to actually follow anyone's orders and are allowed instead to continue doing whatever we ourselves deem best, with essentially no restrictions (i.e. the sweetheart deal). In short, the reason to avoid a deal with Rome has nothing to do with the deal's conditions nor whether Rome would honor them. It has everything to do with the nature of the entity on the other side of the bargaining table. Rome has built a New Order, a new system of faith and mass and sacrament. There is no proper place within that fantasy land for the real reality.

Of course, Bishop Fellay, being an excellent judge of his audiences, had to have been aware that some in his society, among both clerics and laymen, would instinctively detect and resist this idea of a practical deal without doctrinal agreement. And even if he did not know beforehand, he knew soon enough by way of Internet fora that this was the case.

In response, he offered several talking points with regard to the ongoing negotiations: 1) The Holy Father wants this. We must do it because he wishes it. To resist would be a kind of practical sedevacantism. 2) Rome is slowly (but surely) returning to tradition. From the inside, the Society may have an instrumental (maybe even glorious!) role in restoring the Church. 3) Archbishop Lefebvre would have accepted this deal. 4) Canonical regularization would restore an old injustice. It is ours by right to be recognized as part of the Roman ecclesiastical structure. And 5) Some in the SSPX are in danger of making the Council into a caricature: in other words, it's not quite as bad as the naysayers have made it out to be, and 95% of it is downright acceptable.

These talking points do not, of course, refute in any way the principled objections to a practical deal without doctrinal agreement, but they certainly are effective in

allaying the fears of the more timid doubters, and they provide the unabashed supporters of this new course a small arsenal of rhetoric to use here and there as circumstances warrant.

In the end, as we know, Rome did not even keep on the table the sweetheart deal touted initially by Menzingen, but it was abundantly clear that if they had done so, Bishop Fellay would have been agreeable. Pregnant in this reality is that Bishop Fellay's vision of the Society's mission includes a return, in some fashion, to the conciliar church. If not at this time, then at some future time, when Rome offers (and doesn't withdraw) another sweetheart deal. Trying to put this vision in the best light, we might imagine that the bishop sees the Society affecting the universal Church like some kind of powerful curative medicine. Delusional though such a vision may be, it is less cynical, at least, than a number of alternative explanations for such receptivity to the offers of modernist Rome.

There are clearly a great many Society priests and faithful who have no trouble at all with Bishop Fellay's vision. Whether they held such a view in the past matters not. They are quite willing to trust his leadership (and be inspired by his talking points) in the present. But there are plenty who resist as well, and chief among them is Bishop Williamson. For him, and for those who are drawn to him, the Society's mission is not to be the divine catalyst for the resurrection of the Catholic Church but rather more humbly to form good, integral Catholic priests who will keep the faith during Rome's absence from it. When Rome returns, the mission is over. Until that time, Rome's interest in absorbing the Society into its vast amalgamation of religious experience is to be politely but firmly rebuffed.

So these two wills are at war. Bishop Fellay is open to, if not desirous of, canonical regularization without doctrinal agreement, provided that a few—three, to be exact—practical conditions are met. And Bishop Williamson is not. Each man has supporters, and some from each camp have suggested that the real reason for the expulsion is Bishop Williamson's "holocaust" remarks of a few years ago. In some sense, this is probably true. That was, at least, the moment in time when the opposition of wills was first made public. And Newrome itself has made it clear that they will not allow dissent on this particular point, entrenched as they are in the socio-political norms of the New Order. Still, I have a hard time believing that the content of Bishop Williamson's remarks is the source of Bishop Fellay's terminative action. I cannot read his mind, but I suspect that even he has some private doubts about the official numbers. What he cannot abide, however, if he is to navigate the Society to an eventual agreement with Newrome, is the resolute opposition to his will in that endeavor, especially from such a lofty chair as that of a brother bishop. This obstacle has now been removed.

Concerning "The Deal"

"There has been a lot of back and forth, exchanges, letters and protests, but we are back to square one."

(Bishop Fellay, Sermon at Econe ordinations, 29th June 2012)

"Bishop Fellay said recently, in many public conferences in Australia, that nothing new would happen for the SSPX under the present pope. And if we consider the appointment last June of the German Archbishop Müller at the head of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith – he considers Vatican II as infallible – the present situation is going to continue as it is for many more years."

(Fr. Couture, "An Appeal to our Korean Faithful" – 8th September 2012)

"Fathers François Chazal and Joseph Pfeiffer, as of today, Sunday September 9th are no longer allowed to celebrate masses in any of our mass centres in the District of Asia. [There follows a list of reasons, the first of which reads:]

1. "The deal" They continue to claim with certainty that the Society of St Pius X is about to surrender to the modernist Rome...They lead the faithful with the fear that this drama will surely happen."

(Fr. Couture letter to the Asian faithful on the expulsion of Frs. Chazal and Pfeiffer, September 2012)

"He said that things are back to their starting point, since the notion that "Rome" would approve the Fraternity without making any demands for compromise, has been shown to be false. Benedict's text of June 13 made this abundantly clear.

He said there are two possible outcomes now – either renewed excommunications and a declaration of schism (he thinks this less likely) or that the Fraternity will be left as it is (he thinks this the likeliest outcome). A renewed round of discussions was not mentioned as a possibility. What he did say was that he didn't think that the relationship with "Rome" could now be repaired "in this pontificate".

(An Australian layman reporting on Bishop Fellay's conference in Adelaide, Australia, 5th August 2012)

"I was utterly deceived by Benedict XVI"

(What Bishop Fellay reportedly said in a talk given to the seminarians and faculty of Econe, September 2012)

"Lefebvrians need more time before they can respond to the Vatican's offer of reconciliation and the Holy See seems willing to concede it. A statement issued today by the Pontifical Commission "Ecclesia Dei" - which is in charge of relations with traditionalist communities within the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and led by the Congregation's prefect, Mgr. Gerhard Ludwig Müller - stated that last 6 September the Priestly Fraternity of St. Pius X asked for "additional time for reflection and study" in order to prepare its response to the Holy See's reconciliation proposal.

[...] last week, Lefebvrian leaders announced the exclusion of Mgr. Richard Williamson, one of the Fraternity's four bishops, from the Society of St. Pius X. Mgr. Williamson had been on a collision course with SSPX leaders because of his refusal to make any compromise whatsoever with Rome and because he had asked Fellay to resign..... The "Ecclesia Dei" statement makes no reference to Williamson's expulsion, which the Holy See was very much in favour of...."

("Lefebvrians ask for more time", Vatican Insider - La Stampa, Saturday 27th October, 2012)

"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 [the discussions with Rome]. 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.

[...]

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." "

(Archbishop Lefebvre, Sermon at the Consecrations at Econe, 30th June 1988)

"We cannot enter into a system under superiors who are in a position to stamp us out. 'Once we are recognised,' you say, 'we will be able to act from within the Church.' This is completely wrong; it is to totally misunderstand the minds of those in the present hierarchy. To realise this, one need only read [a recent interview with] Cardinal Ratzinger. [...]

We cannot place ourselves under an authority whose ideas are liberal and who little by little would condemn us, by the logic of the thing, to accept these ideas and their consequences."

(Archbishop Lefebvre, Fideliter, No.37, 1984)

Fr. Schmidberger's Vision for the Future of the SSPX

(from his interview given to Münchner Kirchenradio, 24th October 2012)

"I would describe the current situation as grinding to a halt and that things have become more difficult than easier, because Rome has raised some claims which we cannot accept that easily. But we will have to continue to talk about these points. Especially about the liturgy. And the hermeneutic of continuity: is the Second Vatican Council really a continuation of all the other Councils, or has there arisen a break: that is the decisive point. And then obviously certain decisive statements of the Council itself, for example ecumenism, these things have to be discussed and talked about.

I can see a possible solution in the following: we agree to disagree over certain judgements on the Second Vatican Council, but one cannot deny that the Society of St. Pius X is Catholic, that it accepts the whole deposit of the Faith as a matter of course, that it recognises the Pope, prays for him, is united with him, is attached to eternal Rome. On those other points **we cannot come to a mutual agreement, but we will continue to discuss so that with time we can reach true statements, solutions to these points.**"

[If anyone would like to hazard a guess as to precisely what this means, or what horror this entails for the poor SSPX faithful in the future, we would be interested to hear from you! Answers on a postcard to recusantsspox@hotmail.co.uk
We think we know what he has in mind...]



OPEN LETTER TO HIS EXCELLENCY BISHOP FELLAY, SOCIETY PRIESTS, RELIGIOUS AND FAITHFUL

November 8, 2012

Feast of the 4 Holy Crowned Martyrs

When Catholics during the Protestant Revolution were told: “Accept the Oath of Supremacy or death!” most Catholics took the Oath. But the Lord God was pleased to raise up an army of martyrs and a saint-pope who condemned the rising errors at the Council of Trent.

When Catholics during the French Revolution were told: “Peace at the price of a little incense to the ‘gods’ of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity!” Although most compromised, yet God raised up thousands of martyrs and a faithful Resistance from the Vendee. Then, a Cardinal Pie of Poitiers to combat the Revolution’s “peaceful implementations” of the Napoleonic era. Within a century, faithful Catholics rallied behind the *Syllabus* of Pope Pius IX, who condemned Liberal Catholicism.

When Catholics were told: “Better Red than dead!” refusing to cooperate in what Pius XI called an “intrinsically evil” economic, political and atheistic system, many did nothing, but millions of Catholics filled the Martyrs’ bleachers in Heaven, and heroic resistance was offered on the part of bishops, priests and laity throughout Russia, Ukraine, Poland, China, Vietnam, Hungary, Spain, etc., etc. In Hungary, the so-called “Peace Priests” were promised their Latin Mass, their churches, incense and vestments as long as they remained silent on the “touchy” issue of Communism. Cardinal Mindszenty, one of the few not to bow down, firmly refused and was imprisoned for 14 years.

When Catholics in Mexico were obliged to conform to the anti-Catholic laws of the Freemasonic government under Calles, many only watched from afar, but there rose up the Cristero Resistance who valiantly resisted them, shouting their: “Viva Cristo Rey!” in opposition to the Federalista’s: “Viva Satanás!”

When Catholics were told: “Obey, and submit to the Vatican II Reforms!” Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, Bishop de Castro Mayer, and many priests preferred to appear “disobedient” rather than betray the Faith of Tradition. Unfortunately, most clergy and laity falsely “obeyed” and went along with the enforced directives of Vatican II.

It so tragically happens that, now, 42 years after its founding, the “life-boat” of the Society of St.Pius X is being coaxed with sweets and promises into the “harbor” of Modernist Rome filled with “sunken boats” of numerous traditional communities, once publicly opposing the errors of Vatican II.

The SSPX always resisted openly and valiantly, with the grace of God, up until July 14, 2012, when the new direction towards a practical agreement became a “determined” and “approved” endeavor. This change of principle brought about a whole new orientation in the SSPX policy toward Rome and an official departure from the uncompromising stand of Archbishop Lefebvre, expressed in the Declaration of 1974 and the Statements of 1983 and 2006. Before, it was always: “No practical agreement until there’s a doctrinal agreement;” now, it’s “practical agreement without first the doctrinal agreement.” Dare we say: “Go along to get along? Agree to disagree?” (A small error in the principles leads to disastrous conclusions).

Archbishop Lefebvre was our holy Founder. He not only had the grace of state of a Superior General, but also the grace of state as a Founder of a religious organization, to which he sought to impart his (1) spirit; (2) his principles; and (3) his experience. These were the fruit of many years of leadership in a wide variety of pastures. He was a theologian of high repute (cf. The testimony and praise of Canon Berto, the Archbishop’s episcopal theologian during Vatican II). He was a bishop and later, archbishop (with several bishops subject to him). He was the papal representative for all of French-speaking Africa. He was the Superior General of the largest Missionary Religious Order in the Church. He was a frequent visitor to the Popes in Rome. He was on the Preparatory Commission for the Second Vatican Council. He was a key member of “Coetus Internationalis Patrum” during the Council. He made many interventions during the Council (cf. *I Accuse the Council!* by Archbishop Lefebvre). He was not afraid to challenge and rebuke both the Council and the Popes of the Council afterwards. He was the man of the Church chosen by Divine Providence to launch the SSPX despite tremendous pressure from inside and outside the Church. His role of saving the Church and Priesthood was prophesied by the Virgin Mary in Ecuador, nearly 350 years ago! From such a man there is much to learn.

Fr. Ludovic Barrielle (so highly revered by the Archbishop) commented in 1982: “I am writing this to serve as a lesson for everyone. The day that the SSPX abandons the spirit and rules of its Founder, it will be lost. Furthermore, all our brothers who, in the future, allow themselves to judge and condemn the Founder and his principles, will show no hesitation in eventually taking away from the Society the Traditional Teaching of the Church and the Mass instituted by Our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Would it not be accurate to say that Archbishop Lefebvre's spirit, principles, and experience are summarized in the following response as well as warning, made to his sons? When asked about reopening dialogue with Rome in 1988 (after he admitted that signing the May Protocol was a big mistake), he replied: "We do not have the same outlook on reconciliation. Cardinal Ratzinger sees it as reducing us, bringing us back to Vatican II. We see it as a return of Rome to Tradition. We don't agree; it is a dialogue of death. I can't speak much of the future, mine is behind me, but if I live a little while, supposing that Rome calls for a renewed dialogue, then I will put conditions. I shall not accept being in the position where I was put during the dialogue. No more!"

"I will place the discussion AT THE DOCTRINAL LEVEL: 'Do you agree with the great encyclicals of all the Popes who preceded you? Do you agree with *Quanta Cura* of Pius IX, *Immortale Dei* and *Libertas* of Leo XIII, *Pascendi* of Pius X, *Quas Primas* of Pius XI, *Humani Generis* of Pius XII? Are you in full communion with these Popes and their teachings? Do you still accept the entire anti-Modernist Oath? Are you in favor of the social reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ? If you do not accept the doctrine of your predecessors, it is useless to talk! As long as you do not accept the correction of the Council, in the light of the doctrines of these Popes, your predecessors, no dialogue is possible! It is useless! Thus the positions will be clear.'" (*Archbishop Lefebvre and the Vatican*, p. 223, Interview of *Fideliter* Nov-Dec 1988). [N.B. See more related quotes opposing an agreement, at the end. They far outnumber the few expressing slight hope for some agreement, before 1988.]

Our dear Founder clearly saw "three surrenders" by making a merely practical agreement with Modernist Rome, regardless of the number of conditions, which are: (1) surrender to Rome's ultimate power of veto on the major decisions of the Society; (2) surrender of the power of veto over any future elected Superior General; and (3) surrender of the power of veto over the names of candidates proposed as future bishops. With these influential powers handed over to the enemies of Jesus Christ, "they will string us along little by little; they will try to catch us in their traps, as long as they have not let go of these false ideas." (Archbishop Lefebvre, Dec. 13, 1984 *Address to Priests of the French District*). And further: "That is why what can look like a concession, is in reality, merely a maneuver." And more: "We must absolutely convince our faithful that it is no more than a maneuver, that it is dangerous to put oneself into the hands of Conciliar bishops and Modernist Rome! It is the greatest danger threatening our people! If we have struggled for twenty years to avoid the Conciliar errors, it was not in order to, now, put ourselves in the hands of those professing these errors!" (Archbishop Lefebvre Interview, *Fideliter*, July-August 1989). "I said to him [Cardinal

Ratzinger who became Pope Benedict XVI] ‘Even if you grant us a bishop, even if you grant us some autonomy from the bishops, even if you grant us the 1962 Liturgy, even if you allow us to continue running our seminaries in the manner we are doing it right now—we cannot work together! It is impossible! Impossible! Because we are working in diametrically opposing directions; you are working to de-Christianize society, the human person, and the Church, and we are working to Christianize them. We cannot get along together!’ Rome has lost the Faith, my dear friends, Rome is in apostasy! I am not speaking empty words! That is the truth! Rome is in apostasy! One can no longer have any confidence in these people! They have left the Church! They have left the Church! They have left the Church! It is certain! Certain! Certain! (*Marcel Lefebvre*, by Bp. Tissier de Mallerais, p.548. The above is an accurate translation from YouTube audio of the actual voice of Archbishop Lefebvre).

But the objection can be heard: “That’s exaggerated, Father, there’s no agreement yet, and there won’t be one under this pontificate, all is back to normal!”

Such are the words. But why so many actions to the contrary? Why, then, was the General Chapter Declaration of 2012 not amended to conform to all the previous SSPX Declarations? Why were the “6 Conditions” left to remain flimsy and uncorrected? (In other words, why is the “For Sale” sign still out on the front lawn?) Why do the expulsions, silencing, refusal of Holy Communion, threats and punishments not desist for those openly opposing a false agreement? Why the expulsion of Bishop Williamson who openly adhered to the non-compromising line of Archbishop Lefebvre? Why the sigh-of-relief expressed by an SSPX spokesman upon the expulsion of Bishop Williamson: “The decision will certainly facilitate the talks [with Rome]?” (Fr. Andreas Steiner to the German News Agency DPA).

Why, upon the 50th Anniversary of “the greatest disaster in the history of the Church” (Archbishop Lefebvre) Vatican II, the overwhelming silence on the official websites (cf.SSPX.org and DICI) of our Founder’s condemnation of the errors of the Council, unless it be to avoid such “polemical hindrances” towards an agreement? Why the recent “Ecclesia Dei” press release about negotiations still continuing? Why such a minimum reaction, in comparison with that of Archbishop Lefebvre, to the trampling of the First Commandment at Assisi III? Why were the ambiguous interviews of CNS, DICI and YouTube (granted, “cut and paste” but) not promptly corrected and still, as yet, not clarified? (For example: “...We see that, in the discussions, many things which we would have condemned as being from the Council are, in fact, not from the Council, but the common understanding of it [....]. Many people understand wrongly the Council [....] the Council presents a religious freedom that is a freedom that is very, very limited.” (Bishop Fellay, CNS Interview, May 11, 2012, 1:06 until 1:23). What happened to the “I accuse the Council,” pronounced by Archbishop Lefebvre?

Your Excellency, please return to your former preaching of the “Truth in charity!” When you once openly warned the priests of Campos, Brazil not to make a practical agreement with Modernist Rome. You once traced the fall of Campos under Bishop Rifan, and a similar pattern is now engulfing our dear Society! You once said: “For the time being, however, things are not yet at that point (i.e. Rome’s conversion to Tradition) and to foster illusions would be deadly for the SSPX, as we can see, when we follow the turn of events in Campos.” (Bishop Fellay’s Letter to Friends and Benefactors #63, Jan. 6, 2003).

You once told us: “I think Rome’s friendliness towards us is because of its ecumenical mentality. It is certainly not because Rome is now saying to us, ‘Of course, you are right, let’s go.’ No, that’s not the way Rome thinks about us. The idea they have is another one. The idea is an ecumenical one. It is the idea of plurality, pluriformity!” (Letter to Friends and Benefactors #65, Dec, 8, 2003). This ecumenical mentality has only increased with Pope Benedict XVI (e.g. the scandals of Assisi III, visits to the Mosque, Synagogues, admittance of Anglicans without renouncing their errors, etc.).

As for Rome “changing towards Tradition,” we can recall similar conditions promised to the Le Barroux Monastery to freely preach against Modernism, and have the True Mass, but under the agreement, they collapsed to compromise, accepting the New Mass within 5 years after! As recent as March 2012, the Good Shepherd Institute has been seriously pressured by Rome to teach Vatican II in their seminary and adopt the New Catechism. The Redemptorists in Scotland were officially put under the diocesan bishop as of August 15, 2012. Our dear Founder explained the reason why up to nine traditional communities yielded to compromise the Faith, because “IT IS NOT THE SUBJECTS WHO FORM THE SUPERIORS, BUT THE SUPERIORS WHO FORM THE SUBJECTS.” (Archbishop Lefebvre 1989 Interview *One Year After the Consecrations*). (“Let him who thinks he stands,...”).

Seeing the sorrowful direction of our dear SSPX now only confirms more and more that it really is determined to enter into an agreement with the Conciliar Church without a doctrinal resolution and, as the 6 Conditions prove, willingly enter an agreement that will, by that very fact, subject the SSPX to Modernist Rome. “We have determined and approved the necessary conditions for an eventual canonical normalization” (General Chapter Statement of SSPX, July 14, 2012). It is not rumors, it is there, “in stone.”

How is it possible for a priest of the SSPX to be true to his anti-Modernist Oath and, therefore, obliged to preach against Modernism, against Rome’s being infected with Modernism, and the insanity of making a merely practical, impossi-

ble agreement with Modernist Rome, and yet consequently, be continually silenced?

Recent events show such priests are subject to punishments by silence, punitive transfers or expulsion. How is it possible for a priest to preach the Truth "in season and out of season" in such an atmosphere?

So, I desire with all my heart to maintain the anti-Modernist Oath I made before the Most Blessed Sacrament and intend to keep it, by keeping the same sense and meaning of the doctrine of the Church of all time. Furthermore, I cannot speak for other priests, but I cannot abandon the clear, unambiguous stand of our Founder, Archbishop Lefebvre (who would doubtlessly fiercely oppose this new direction since July 2012) and choose to appear "disobedient" while, in fact, truly obeying the directives of our Founder.

To our young Catholic people, "be strong, let the Word of God abide in you, and you will overcome the wicked one" (I John 2:14). The Archbishop once said: "Some people call me 'dissident' and a 'rebel,' and if that means against the Vatican II Council and the Liberal Reforms, then yes, I am 'dissident' and a 'rebel.'" So, I humbly add, that, if, to oppose this direction towards subjecting Catholic Tradition to Modernists who do not hold the integral Catholic Faith (and thereby endangering the eternal salvation of countless souls!) then yes, following Archbishop Lefebvre, I too am "dissident" and a "rebel." On the contrary, the truth appears to be that the "rebellion" has been committed by SSPX members who favor an agreement and thereby rebel against the principles and tradition of the Society. In good conscience, I cannot follow in that direction.

So, therefore, after several months of much prayer and reflection, it seems clearly the Will of God that I help in the Resistance to the dismantling of Archbishop Lefebvre's work, by assisting the priests who want to maintain his principles. The present address is: Our Lady of Mount Carmel, 1730 N. Stillwell Rd., Boston, Kentucky 40107. (Warning: Be slow to believe cyberrumors such as "this is a repetition of 'the 9' in 1983." Stay with the actual documents, letters and facts. See especially the well-documented work, *Is This Operation Suicide?* by Stephen Fox).

Doubtless, I seem bold in expressing myself in this manner! But it is with ardent love that I compose these lines, love of God's glory, love of Jesus Christ the King, love of Mary, of the souls, of the Society of St. Pius X, of the Church, of the Holy Father, the Pope! Just as the SSPX had always continued the Archbishop's work, until Rome returns to Tradition; so the SSPX priests of the

Resistance will continue his work, with God's grace, "without bitterness or resentment," until the leaders of the SSPX return to our Founder's principles.

Your Excellency, I would be happy to see you when you pass by.

May your Excellency deign to accept my gratitude and the assurance of my most respectful devotion in Our Lord,

Fr. David Hewko



"The greatest service we can render the Catholic Church, the Successor of Peter, the salvation of souls and our own, is to say 'NO' to the reformed Liberal Church because we believe in Our Lord Jesus Christ, Son-of-God-made-Man, Who is neither liberal nor reformable!"

Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre (Sept. 3, 1975, *Letter to Friends and Benefactors* #9)

"It is, therefore, a strict duty for every priest wanting to remain Catholic to separate himself from this Conciliar Church, for as long as it does not rediscover the Tradition of the Church and of the Catholic Faith."

Archbishop Lefebvre (*Spiritual Journey*, p. 13)

Concerning "Our Elder Brothers"

"The Jews are 'our elder brothers' in the sense that we have something in common, that is, the old Covenant."

(Bishop Fellay, interview with Famille Cretienne, January 2009)

"The position of Bishop Williamson is clearly not the position of our Society. Antisemitism has no place in our ranks. ... Antisemitism has been condemned by the Church. So do we condemn it."

(Bishop Fellay, press statement, February 2009)

"Israel Wednesday blasted the rehabilitation of Williamson. [...]"

It said the Church's distancing itself from Williamson's position was "the first step in the right direction" and said it expected "more explicit and unequivocal decisions and statements on this issue." "

(CNN Article "Vatican: Bishop must recant Holocaust denial" February 2009)

"Bishop Williamson's remarks are further evidence that the Society of St. Pius X has no place in the mainstream church," said Abraham H. Foxman, ADL national director. "It is hard for us to imagine how a congregation that does not accept fundamental church teachings against anti-Semitism, and promotes classic anti-Jewish canards, can be accepted back into the fold,"

("Jewish Leaders denounce traditionalist's remarks on deicide", CNS, October 2011)

"The effort to reintegrate the traditionalist Society of St. Pius X into the Catholic Church "absolutely does not mean" that the Catholic Church will accept or support the anti-Jewish or anti-Semitic positions espoused by some members of the society, said Cardinal Kurt Koch."

("Cardinal: Vatican-SSPX talks do not signal toleration of anti-Judaism" CNS, 8 November 2012)

"The decision [to expel Bishop Williamson] will certainly facilitate the talks"

(Fr. Andreas Steiner , SSPX German District media spokesman, 24th October, 2012)

"The SSPX...is part of a democratic society and is committed fully to the free, democratic basic order."

(SSPX German District Website "SSPX FAQ" <http://pius.info/faq-meistgestellte-fragen>)

"The SSPX condemns all forms of anti-Semitism!"

(SSPX German District Website - as above)

"All the reforms carried out over twenty years within the Church to please heretics, schismatics, false religions and declared enemies of the Church, such as the Jews, the Communists and the Freemasons."

(Archbishop Lefebvre, letter to John Paul II, August 1985)

"The bishops invite false religions into the Catholic Church with Jesus Christ Who is true God; it is a scandal! Now, we have heard that in Rome, they have done the same thing - even the Pope was, last Sunday, in a synagogue! This is a scandal. What is the synagogue? Who are these Jews in the synagogue? They are the enemies of Jesus Christ, because they are the successors of the Jews who refused Jesus Christ, who crucified Jesus Christ. They refused Him and said, "He is not our Savior; He is not our God," and they crucified Him. It is the same Jews, and they say the same thing; they refuse Jesus Christ. They are against Jesus Christ and don't recognize Him as the Messiah."

(Archbishop Lefebvre, confirmation sermon, New York, April 1986)

"Since Israel refused the true Messiah, it would give itself another messianism that is temporal and earthbound, dominating the world by money, Freemasonry, Revolution, and social democracy. We must not, however, forget that those Jews who were disciples of the true Messiah founded the true Israel, the spiritual kingdom, which prepares the heavenly kingdom. The worldwide designs of the Jews are being brought about in our time, but they started with the foundation of Masonry and the Revolution which has decapitated the Church and set up worldwide socialist democracy."

(The biography of Archbishop Lefebvre, p.602ff)

"The author wants a clear distinction to be made between hatred of the Jewish nation, which is Anti-Semitism, and opposition to the Jewish and Masonic naturalism.

[...]

...Numbers of Catholics are so ignorant of Catholic doctrine that they hurl the accusation of Anti-Semitism against those who are battling for the rights of Christ the King thus effectively aiding the enemies of Our Divine Lord. Secondly, many Catholic writers copy unquestioningly what they read in the naturalistic or anti-supernatural Press and do not distinguish between Anti-Semitism in the correct Catholic sense, as explained above, and 'Anti-Semitism,' as the Jews understand it. For the Jews, 'Anti-Semitism' is anything that is in opposition to the naturalistic Messianic domination of their nation over all the others. Quite logically, the leaders of the Jewish nation hold that to stand for the Rights of Christ the King is to be 'Anti-Semitic.' "

(Fr. Dennis Fahey, CSsP, "What is Anti-Semitism?", June 1950)



“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