

Letter to our fellow priests

Antimodernisme.info



Quarterly contact letter between members of the Society Saint Pius X

(Number 3 – February 2013)

Our articles of association recommend that we avoid “modern errors carefully, specifically liberalism and all its substitutes.” Our articles of association are binding on the Superior General and on the Assistants so that they make sure that the Society does not fall “into tepidity” nor “into compromise with the world frame of mind”. By the light of teachings of our founder, Bishop Lefebvre, and that of our Superior General, Bishop Fellay, we are setting out to work in such direction.

The General Council reminded the three bishops, on April 14 2012, of the need to make “necessary distinctions” “about the liberal” in order to avoid “a ‘total’ hardening”. Indeed, the conciliar liberal seeks a compromise between the Church and the world whereas the traditional liberal seeks a compromise between the catholic tradition and the

conciliar Church friend of the world. In a conference given in Ecône in December 1973, Bishop Lefebvre noted that our “drama” is today “infinitely more severe” than in the past, because “liberals are nowadays widespread within the Church to such extent that one wonders who is not a liberal! Soon, we will have enough with our fingers to count the few individuals that truly respect the Church’s doctrine!” Arguments of “liberal Catholics” were :

“The Church must find an agreement with the society in which we live, we cannot continue to live on the fringes of the society, the Church must in the end accept the world such as it is, in order to penetrate inside the world and supposedly convert the world ... The separation between Church and the State, the Church on equal footing with other religions, freedom of the press, freedom of conscience ..., it is not possible to continue to fight against those things. These things are now admitted by everybody, even by priests!”

“But”, responded Bishop Lefebvre, “one must take it or leave it. This is the end of Catholicism, either we defend truly Our Lord Jesus Christ and the whole Church and the whole Catholic religion ... If we were to start to cohabit with the evil, to discuss endlessly with the evil, to make compromises with the evil, then it is a lost battle, it really is a lost battle.”

I) To study liberalism is a pastoral duty

The Chapter insisted several times on the critical duty for a priest to study. Among topics that need to be studied, liberalism plays an important role. During a retreat that took place in Ecône, on September 22 1988, Bishop Lefebvre expressed its astonishment because of the “number of encyclicals about Freemasonry”.

“Why talk about those things in a seminary, as if this be the knowledge needed to be acquired in a seminary, as if this be what was needed to be taught to the faithful? But if one does not know the source of errors, of what destroys societies, souls and the Church, we would be incompetent shepherds ...it is an absolute requirement to study liberalism and to understand it well and I believe that many of those that left us to reportedly join Rome, did not understand what is liberalism and how

Roman authorities since the Council are infested with these errors. If they had understood, they would have flown away from danger and would have stayed with us. This is serious, because by coming close to these authorities, one is necessarily contaminated. They represent the authority and we are subordinates ... they impose on us their principles ... so long as they do not get rid of liberalism errors, there is no way one can find an agreement with them, it is just not possible.”

Fellow priests “in favor of an agreement” and priests that find favor with the director of DICl – by the way this director is also a founder of GREC – have they read and understood references recommended by Bishop Lefebvre on this topic? If yes, how could they wish to subject Tradition to Roman authority? Rome deceives the world, bemans the Church and instead of denouncing this imposture, we are asking Rome to acknowledge us “such as we are” (footnote 1)? And this, knowing that “discussions have showed profound disagreement on almost all topics discussed” (footnote 2)? What can explain such self-delusion, if it is not ignorance of liberalism?

II) The liberal is an illogical individual

“We are so much tempted by illogicality which stands very close to liberalism. The liberal person is one that would be tempted not to follow his intelligence when it needs to be put into practice because it is difficult, because it is hard work. He understands, but in practice, he compromises. He makes compromises with himself, but this compromise is a sin. We are illogical when we sin ... there are always reasons to say: “it was a good thing in the past, it probably will be a good thing in the future, but today no ... there are some truth that one should not say, that one should not assert”. Thus, about this attitude, it is imperative that this not be our attitude in our live. We must avoid to be illogical persons, to be those that always seek compromises, that compromise, that compromise ...” (footnote 3).

Bishop Fellay and his Council yet wrote to the three bishops: “For the common good of the Society, we would prefer by far the current interim solution of the statu quo, but obviously Rome no longer tolerates this situation”. (Bishop Fellay, letter dated April 14, 2012)

III) The virtue of Prudence

“Catholic liberals have kept on saying that their will for orthodoxy is equivalent to that of those most intransigent persons. The compromise they have sought is not theoretical but practical.” ... They always come back to this reasoning. They are telling us: “see, we are shepherds. We accept the reality, we are concrete people, we are practical!” But what is the practice? The practice is the implementation of principles with the help of the virtue of prudence, it is not something else than that. What is the practice when principles are missing? ... “yes, yes, yes, we agree, we share the same Credo, etcetera. Yes, but when we find ourselves in the world, then one must adjust oneself to the level of the others, one must live with the others, if not you will never convert others”. To say this is a total error! ... Popes have perceived the danger of those Catholics that are almost elusive because they claim when one wants to corner them: “No, no, I agree”. But afterwards, they come to terms with enemies of the Church ... They are traitors ... more dreadful than avowed enemies ... they divide the minds, destroy unity, weaken strengths that instead should be combined all together against the enemy ... You will be told that it is you who cause division, but it is not possible to divide when one abide by the truth ... those who divide are those who try to diminish the truth in order to find agreement with everyone ... Those that have it wrong must convert themselves into the truth and should not try to find common grounds between truth and error ...” (footnote 4)

During the Council, liberals have put to sleep Catholics by telling them that dogma would remain untouched and that the Council was only taking care of pastoral matters; During the Society Council, liberals among us put us to sleep by saying that catholic principles are not being reviewed but that “this is not about a human prudence but” this is about a supernatural prudence, this is about “an equilibrium that is very fragile, that requires the assistance of the Holy Spirit and the Gift of Advice”

(footnote 5). Bishop Lefebvre, in a conference dated in year 1978 (assisted by the Holy Ghost?) claimed:

“I think that during the next meeting, it will be me who will ask them questions. I will be the one who will interrogate them and I will ask them: “what is your Church?” Which Church do you represent, I would like to know if I am talking to the Catholic Church or if I am speaking with another Church, with an organization that is against the Church, with an organization that is a forged Church and not the true Catholic Church? I sincerely believe that we are currently dealing with a forged Church and not with the Catholic Church. Why do I say this? Because they no longer teach Catholic faith. They no longer defend catholic faith. They are leading the Church into something else than the Catholic Church. It is no longer the Catholic Church. They are sitting on the chair of their predecessors but they do not speak the same language than their predecessors.”

Bishop Fellay does not think that way: “we are not talking about a Church that does not exist materially! We are talking about the Church that exists, really exists, that is in front of us, that has a hierarchy, with a pope. It is not the product of our imagination: the Church is there, the Church truly is there, it is the Roman Catholic Church. We claim and we must confess that this Church is holy, is one, because faith requires us to do so.” (footnote 6)

IV) This concrete Church, is it Catholic ?

Bishop Lefebvre wished “to reintegrate in the official and standard structure of the Church”.

And yet:

“I believe, did he say, that we find ourselves within the Church and that we are the true sons of the Church, and that others are not. They are not the true sons of the Church, because liberalism is not a son of the Church. Liberalism is against the Church, liberalism operates to destroy the Church, in that sense they cannot claim that they are sons of the

Church ... some are prepared to sacrifice the fight for the faith by saying: "let us first reintegrate the Church! Let us first do everything to integrate the official structure, the public structure of the Church. Let us be silent about dogmatic issues. Let us be silent about the malice of the Mass. Let us keep quiet over the issues of religious freedom, Human Rights, ecumenism. And, once we will be inside the Church, we will be able to do this, we will be able to achieve that ... but to think that is a great mistake! One does not integrate a structure and does not accept superiors, by claiming that we will overthrow everything as soon as we are inside, whereas they have all the means to suppress us! They have all the authority. What first matters to us, it is to maintain the catholic faith. This is what we are fighting for. Then the canonical issue, this purely exterior issue, this public issue inside the Church, is secondary. What matters, it is to stay within the Church ... inside the Church, in other words, to keep the same catholic faith and the true priesthood and the true Mass and the true sacraments, and the same catechism, with the same Bible. This is what matters to us. This is what the Church is about. Public recognition is a secondary issue. Thus we should not seek what is secondary by losing what is primary, by losing what is the initial purpose of our fight! "Once we are admitted, we might maybe be able to operate from inside the Church ?" ... no, to say that means that one does not know well those that currently lead us! One only needs to read this well-known sentence from Cardinal Ratzinger to get well informed ... I am now reading to you immediately this sentence which is essential in his interview: "The problem of the nineteen sixties was to acquire for the Church the best values expressed during two centuries of liberal culture ... this objective has been attained". Yet the principles of two centuries of liberal culture are ecumenism and the declaration of Human Rights, religious freedom! And Cardinal Ratzinger recognizes them. He says: "this has been done!" ... To say such a thing is very serious! This condemns all what he says in his interview, because that is the heart of his thoughts, and this is what we are blaming for, this is what we do not want. It is not possible to put oneself under an authority which has liberal ideas, which will inevitably lead us, step by step, by force of circumstances, to accept liberal ideas and all consequences of those liberal ideas which are the new Mass, changes in the liturgy, changes in the Bible, changes in catechism, all these changes ... Some say: "but

they have fought against catechism!” ... yes, but they simply put the brakes on, because the changes were going so far that putting on the brakes was necessary. Consequences of their own principles scare them. Thus they put on the brakes at times, but they nevertheless continue to want to keep liberal ideas. In no way should liberal ideas be changed!”(footnote 7)

But Bishop Fellay stated: “priests or bishops [and the pope?] are leading souls to hell [...] And the Church, even in that state, remains holy, remains capable to sanctify. If today, dear faithful, we receive sacraments, grace, faith, it is through this Roman Catholic Church, not thanks to its faults, but thanks to this real concrete Church. [...] The Church is today capable to transmit the faith, to communicate the grace, the sacraments.”(footnote 8) The illegitimate Mass ? Heresies of the new code and of the new catechism ? Sins against the faith in Assisi ...? Bishop Lefebvre did not preach that way, here is what he said:

“I believe that you should be convinced of this: you truly represent the Catholic Church ... lately, we are being told that it is necessary that Tradition integrates the visible Church. I think that to say that is an extremely serious error. Where is the visible Church ? ... Where are the true marks of the Church? ... It is clear that we are the ones who keep the unity of the faith, which has disappeared from the official Church ... it is us who possess the marks of the visible Church ... it is not us but it is the modernists that leave the Church. And about the expression “to leave the visible Church”, it is an error to equate official Church with visible Church ... to leave thus the official Church? To some extent, yes, it is obvious. One is obliged to leave this circle of bishops, if one does not want to loose one’s soul. But this will not suffice because it is in Rome that heresy has settled. If bishops are heretics, it is not without the influence of Rome.” (footnote 9)

Bishop Fellay sharply distances himself from the ecclesiology of Bishop Lefebvre. On the pretext of mystery, he mixes up and amalgamates Catholic Church and conciliar Church in one unique “Church that is very tangible ... that is in a miserable state.” (footnote 10)

V) To tell off publicly those responsible for liberalism errors

Our articles of association ask us to be attached “unfailingly to the Roman Church and to the successor of Peter who is acting as a true Successor of Peter”, but not to the conciliar Church, neither to a modernist that offers as an example of holiness a sacrilegious pope who kisses the Coran, neither to a pope who invites Julia Kriteva, representing the non-believers, in order “to pray for the peace” (sic). This person declared, after having praised Jean-Paul II as apostle for the Human Rights: “thanks go to Pope Benedict XVI for having invited for the first time in these locations humanists among your ranks.” This woman wanted, in the sanctuary, “a world governance that is ethical, universal and solidarity-based.” How is it possible that some superiors remained silent and sought an agreement with this conciliar Church when our patron saint warned the Catholic Church against this “vast movement of apostasy organized, in all countries, for the establishment of a universal Church.” (footnote 11)

The Chapter wants that the Society continues to “freely” “tell off even publicly those responsible for liberalism errors and its consequences”. Yet, one should not delude oneself, if the head of the Church is modernist, the head of the Society is today seriously tainted with liberalism. All of us, particularly our superiors, have to examine our own conscience: are we not, each of us from our own seat, responsible of the rise of liberalism in our own congregation?

Not long ago, Bishop Fellay explained to us that in 2006, “heresies spread quickly” and “authorities were propagating a frame of mind that is both the modern and modernist one of Vatican II”, but that in year 2012, things are being restored, *ad intra*, by Benoît XVI. And that “this requires us to take a new positioning with regards to the official Church ... it is about a supernatural view on the Church.” (footnote 12) How is it possible that these lines have been written after Assisi III? Benoît XVI, is he restoring the faith *ad intra* by organizing *ad extra* interreligious gatherings condemned by the Church, with on top of this, the help of humanists who are also atheists in order to work for the “promotion of the true good of humanity”? One of our theologians who participated in the Roman discussions confided to one fellow priest: “the head of bishop Fellay is rotten but the Chapter will prevent him from signing. One must grin and bear it for the next 6 years.” Is that a sure thing? Is that enough?

How many members of the Chapter are prepared to profess publicly the Catholic faith with all its consequences:

“We never wanted to belong to that system that calls itself a conciliar Church, and defines itself by the Novus Ordo Missae, the ecumenism disengaged from the Catholic cause and the widespread secularization of all the society.”(footnote 13)

Bishop Lefebvre got it wrong in May 1988. In September 2012, in spite of God’s given grace to perform its role and in spite of his Counsel, in spite also of “the help of the Holy Ghost and the Gift of Advice”, Bishop Fellay recognized he has been mistaken on the intentions of the Pope. But, in reality, the error is not there, because Benoît XVI never hid its intentions. The problem comes from a hazy concept of the “real Church” which is “a very, extremely serious mistake.”

Errare humanum est, sed perseverare diabolicum! The liberalism of our superiors is a punishment for our congregation. Do we not share responsibility in that sin because of our negligence to live from the treasure transmitted by our founder, because of our laxity, because of our worldly ties and because of our clerical self-wise swollen with pride ?

Vigilate et orate.

Footnotes

- 1 Bishop Fellay, Cor unum, number 102, Summer 2012
- 2 Bishop Fellay, Cor unum, number 101, March 2012
- 3 Bishop Lefebvre, retreat in Ecône, September 17, 1981
- 4 Bishop Lefebvre, spiritual conference, Ecône, January 1974
- 5 Bishop Fellay, Cor unum, number 102, Summer 2012
- 6 Bishop Fellay, conference in Flavigny, September 2, 2012

- 7 Bishop Lefebvre, spiritual conference, Ecône, December 21, 1984
- 8 Bishop Fellay, November 1, 2012, Ecône
- 9 Ecône, September 9, 1988
- 10 Bishop Fellay, conference in Flavigny, September 2, 2012
- 11 Pie X, Notre charge apostolique, August 25, 1910
- 12 Bishop Fellay, Cor Unum, number 101, March 2012
- 13 Open letter of the superiors of the SSPX to cardinal Gantin, Ecône, July 6, 1988