

Is this Operation Suicide?

*An Analysis of the evidence relating to an agreement between the
Society of Saint Pius X and the Conciliar Church of Rome*

With material compiled by Stephen J. Fox

In this book I seek to analyse the evidence relating to a possible agreement between the Society of Saint Pius X and the Conciliar Church. I conclude that many of the Superiors of the Society are prepared to enter into an agreement with the Conciliar Church, where that agreement is a practical agreement (only), without a doctrinal resolution and the terms of which would mean that the Society would be subject to the Conciliar Church.

I conclude that the conduct of many of the Superiors of the Society in relation to a possible agreement with the Conciliar Church represents a staggering change from the Society's principles and direction. I conclude that the position adopted by many of the Superiors of the Society in relation to such an agreement is contrary to the position of the Society's founder, Archbishop Lefebvre.

Archbishop Lefebvre said the following words on 6 September 1990¹:

"Some people are always admiring the grass in the neighbour's field...they look to our enemies on the other side. "After all, we must be charitable, we must be kind, we must not be divisive, after all, they are celebrating the Tridentine Mass, they are not as bad as everyone says" —but THEY ARE BETRAYING US —betraying us! They are shaking hands with the Church's destroyers. They are shaking hands with people holding modernist and liberal ideas condemned by the Church. So they are doing the devil's work. They are now saying: "So long as they grant us the old Mass, we can shake hands with Rome, no problem." But we are seeing how it works out. They are in an impossible situation. Impossible. One cannot both shake hands with modernists and keep following Tradition. Not possible. Not possible.

Archbishop Lefebvre said the following words in July or August 1989²:

Question: Some people say, "Yes, but Archbishop Lefebvre should have accepted an agreement with Rome because once the Society of St. Pius X had been recognized and the suspensions lifted, he would have been able to act in a more effective manner inside the Church, whereas now he has put himself outside."

Archbishop Lefebvre: Such things are easy to say. To stay inside the Church, or to put oneself inside the Church - what does that mean? Firstly, what Church are we talking about? If you mean the Conciliar Church, then we who have struggled against the Council for twenty years because we want the Catholic Church, we would have to re-enter this Conciliar Church in order, supposedly, to make it Catholic. That is a complete illusion. It is not the subjects that make the superiors, but the superiors who make the subjects.

¹ Archbishop Lefebvre's address to his priests given in Ecône, Switzerland on 6 September 1990, refer http://www.sspix.org/archbishop_lefebvre/two_years_after_the_consecrations.htm

² http://www.sspix.org/archbishop_lefebvre/one_year_after_the_consecrations.htm

Archbishop Lefebvre said the following words on 30 June 1988 ³:

It is not for me to know when Tradition will regain its rights at Rome, but I think it is my duty to provide the means of doing that which I shall call "Operation Survival," operation survival for Tradition. Today, this day, is Operation Survival. If I had made this deal with Rome, by continuing with the agreements we had signed, and by putting them into practice, I would have performed "Operation Suicide". There was no choice, we must live! That is why today, by consecrating these bishops, I am convinced that I am continuing to keep Tradition alive, that is to say, the Catholic Church.

³ In his sermon at the time of the Episcopal Consecrations of the four bishops in 1988, in reference to the agreement he signed and then withdrew in May 1988 <http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Episcopal-Consecration.htm>

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	5
Conclusion One – Truth and Obedience	17
Conclusion Two – I must be objective.....	23
Conclusion Three – The Society cannot trust Rome.....	24
Conclusion Four – Rome has not changed.....	29
Conclusion Five – Rome stays loyal to its principles	45
Conclusion Six – there may be no benefit of an agreement.....	45
Conclusion Seven – there <i>is</i> something to worry about.....	50
Conclusion Eight – many in the Society appear to be prepared to desert its principles	57
Conclusion Nine – a position of contradiction for Priests of the Society	75
Conclusion Ten – agree to disagree	85
Conclusion Eleven – is there true unity in the Society?.....	92
Conclusion Twelve – the six conditions evidence a departure from the principles of the SSPX	104
Conclusion Thirteen – no protection is given by Condition One.....	105
Conclusion Fourteen – one bishop – what about the other three?	107
Conclusion Fifteen – desirable tribunals.....	109
Conclusion Sixteen – the diocesan bishops are not the friends of Tradition	111
Conclusion Seventeen – could the Society survive?.....	113
Conclusion Eighteen – the promises didn't save Le Barroux.....	115
Conclusion Nineteen – the promises didn't save Campos.....	118
Conclusion Twenty – the promises didn't save the Institute of the Good Shepherd.....	132
Conclusion Twenty-One – treatment of the allies of the Society	159
Conclusion Twenty-Two – those who speak out	162
Conclusion Twenty-Three – the evidence suggests that Archbishop Lefebvre would <i>not</i> agree	163
OTHER MATERIAL.....	189

Introduction

Archbishop Lefebvre and the Society

1. One who reads the book "The Biography of Marcel Lefebvre" written by Bishop Tissier de Mallerais happily discovers how true the Archbishop was when he said that he had passed on to us only what he himself had been taught, had received, "*Tradidi quod et accepi – I delivered unto you that which I myself have received*"– I Cor. 15, 3).
2. I am grateful to Archbishop Lefebvre and the Society. For many years the Society has been the spiritual and moral lifeline for my family.

A compilation

3. I beg you to consider the material and my conclusions in a spirit of charity. I have prepared the material as a *compiler* – not as an author. My words are basic and of little importance. What is important is the evidence and I ask you to consider the evidence objectively. I have not sought to interpret the words written or spoken by reference to the internal or subjective disposition of the relevant author – but rather by reference to the meaning of the words the author has said (or written).
4. There are some who would say that I am not qualified to have an opinion. I can only say that I am sufficiently qualified to see, to read and by the grace of God, to think.
5. I prepared this document by way of a compilation of what I believe to be relevant material. I suggest that the evidence is so clear that it speaks for itself and makes the conclusions inescapable.
6. I have attempted to provide details of the sources of the relevant material that I refer to but I apologise for any mistakes and I assure my readers that any mistakes are unintended and due only to the constraints of time and skill.
7. I do not set out to cause any person disrespect or offence and if any is suffered I pray that the relevant person will forgive me and accept my charitable intentions in this matter.

Something wrong

8. I initially put pen to paper because it became abundantly clear that something was wrong, *wrong* in the sense that the Society had lost its unity⁴, *wrong* in the sense that the Society's

⁴ I note that the General Chapter issued a statement in July 2012 in which the General Chapter stated "We have recovered our profound unity in its essential mission: to preserve and defend the Catholic Faith ...". There can be no "recovery" or alleged recovery unless of course there was a loss of unity before the recovery. I suggest that true "unity" could only be recovered if the reason for the disunity was resolved. I question whether unity has been recovered or only an appearance of unity?

superiors are suggesting that the Conciliar Church is "changing" in favour of tradition when by their own admission and by my own eyes I know it is not changing, *wrong* in the sense that the Society's Superiors are prepared to make the Society subject to that Conciliar Rome, *wrong* in the sense that Society priests are unable or unwilling to openly discuss or criticise a possible agreement with Rome – not because they don't understand the issues involved but because they have been "ordered" to be silent and *wrong* in the sense that Superiors of the Society are contradicting themselves and Archbishop Lefebvre.

9. The suggestion that "there is nothing to worry about" or "that nothing has changed" or "that the Society remains true to the principals of Archbishop Lefebvre" or that "the Society has not and will not enter into an agreement with Rome" are all contrary to the real evidence. The Society has issued a document dated 14 July 2012 (after the recent General Chapter) in which the Society sets out the "conditions" for the "normalisation" of the relations between the Society of Saint Pius X and Rome. Those conditions contemplate that the Society will make itself subject to modern, liberal Rome without any doctrinal resolution and without a return by Rome, to tradition.
10. I am concerned by the fact that the Society has not been able (or willing) to issue a complete and sensible explanation of the issues. Where is a logical and complete analysis of the issues relating to a proposed agreement between the Society and the Conciliar Church in the year 2012? Where is the complete explanation of the contradictions between on the one hand what Archbishop Lefebvre, Bishop Fellay and many other authors said in times past and what Bishop Fellay and Society superiors say today?

Is a change faithful to Archbishop Lefebvre

11. It seems obvious that some Bishops, some Priests and many faithful do not wish to reconcile with Rome. It seems obvious, even by reference to the evidence that I have referred to in this compilation that those Bishops, Priests and faithful may be justified in their objection to such an agreement.
12. If the truth (reality) is that only some of the members of the Society wish to reconcile with Rome in circumstances where the truth (reality) is that Rome has not changed (in favour of tradition and Catholicism) then those members who do wish to reconcile must have changed. It seems to me that the question that must, in charity, be put to each of our Priests and Superiors (for their good and ours) is whether or not they have changed.
13. In charity, we must consider whether or not these men are defending the Faith. We must consider whether or not these men are being faithful to Archbishop Lefebvre. We must ask each of these men whether or not they will be able to say "I have handed on what I received. Everything that I received I have handed on"⁵.

⁵ "The Biography of Marcel Lefebvre" written by Bishop Tissier de Mallerais, page 613

Duties and obligations

14. I have raised my concerns before and I understand that others have raised similar concerns. I note that whilst there have been exceptions, the common response to the concerns is a refusal to sensibly discuss the issues for one or more of the following reasons:
 - 14.1. The matters relate to the internal administration of the Society and do not involve lay people;
 - 14.2. The matters have been adequately addressed in material published by the official communication channels of the Society;
 - 14.3. The Society has not "entered into an agreement with Rome" and therefore "we have nothing to worry about";
 - 14.4. The Society will not "enter into an agreement with Rome";
 - 14.5. The issue relates only to obedience;
 - 14.6. The Superior General is a "good guy" and "you should trust him"; or
 - 14.7. Silence.
15. With respect, I suggest that such responses from the clergy are disingenuous and represent a failure on the part of those responsible to feed the sheep. With respect, I suggest that such responses from my fellow lay people are simply laziness and failure on their part to defend the Faith. How can we claim to be Catholics and traditional Catholics if we do not know what we believe and what the Conciliar Church teaches, why we do not worship in the same way as the Conciliar Church, why we do not seek guidance from our local conciliar bishops. How do I explain to my children the fact (the truth!) that they may not attend the Novus Ordo Mass (or service?) or subscribe to the "new catechism" if I cannot explain why the Society should or should not enter into an agreement with Rome.
16. I have experienced a preparedness on the part of my fellow lay people to "avoid" the issues on the basis that their state in life does not require them to consider the issue or that they are being obedient to the Superiors of the Society, or even to their local priests, or that they believe that everything is in order so long as they can continue to receive the sacraments. I challenge those persons to explain how their state in life could not require them to defend the Faith against the errors of modernism and liberalism, the very errors that "infect the Conciliar Church". I challenge those persons to explain how they will account when they are held responsible for the fact that they may have participated (even by silence) in the destruction of a Society that forms traditional Catholic priests and is generally the *anchor* for Traditional Catholicism in the world. I challenge those persons to be loyal to their forebears and to Archbishop Lefebvre. I challenge those persons to just think!

17. I quote the words of Dr White in his book 'The Mouth of the Lion'⁶:

... The faithful, even those who intuited something might be wrong, trusted in their bishops and their priests and accepted each new outrage with a nod of consent. This was sloth in its most profound sense, spiritual laziness, a refusal to know what is necessary for our salvation and a refusal to act for our own spiritual good. The faithful acquiesced in the destruction of their Church; it was easier than thinking, arguing, acting. They simply did what they were told to do....

18. I quote his grace Bishop De Castro Mayer⁷.

It is painful to witness the deplorable blindness of so many confrères in the episcopate and in the priesthood who do not see or do not want to see the present crisis nor the necessity to resist the reigning modernism in order to be faithful to the mission entrusted to us by God.

I want to manifest here my sincere and profound adherence to the position of His Excellency Archbishop Lefebvre, dictated by his fidelity to the Church of all centuries. Both of us, we have drunk at the same spring which is that of the Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church.

19. In his book "The Biography of Marcel Lefebvre" the author, Bishop Tissier de Mallerais, at page 316 and 317, refers to the following words of his Grace Archbishop Lefebvre:

...What surprises me is that out of all those who were with me at the Seminary and who also become bishops, many accepted it all: Bishop Ancel, Archbishop Garrone, Bishop Lebrun, Bishop Michon, and I don't know who else...they were all keen, some of them more than I, on the thought of taking part in the Pope's battles or in the fight for the Church. They had given brilliant lectures at the Seminary which had remained legendary. But having been appointed as bishops in France, they had been recycled. They had sold out totally to liberalism and to the liberal theses. It is pitiful. It is one of the saddest things of my life.

Obedience

20. There are some who respond to my concerns by suggesting that "the issue is one of obedience" and when pressed to explain they respond by saying that they wish to remain "obedient" or "loyal" to the Superior General of the Society and they may even go so far as to

⁶ 'The Mouth of the Lion', Dr. David Allen White, pg.97 and pg 225

⁷ Archbishop Lefebvre and the Vatican June 30, 1988 Declaration of Bishop Antonio de Castro Mayer
http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Archbishop_Lefebvre_and_the_Vatican/Part_I/1988-06-30C.htm

admonish those Bishops or Priests in the Society who have dared to question whether or not the Society should enter into an agreement with Rome.

21. I find the "obedience excuse" particularly interesting because the same people who are prepared to be "disobedient" to the Conciliar Church are prepared to be obedient to those who propose to make them subject to and part of the same Conciliar Church!
22. I am concerned that the reference to obedience is merely an excuse to avoid having to consider the real issues. How strange! How inconsistent! How lacking in reason! A traditional Catholic presumably "follows" the Society because that person formed the view that the Conciliar Church was in error and that in order to maintain their faith they should "follow" the Society. However that same person is now not prepared to consider whether or not the Superiors of the Society could ever do something that would endanger their faith?
23. I beg my readers to realize that this battle is not some personality contest or political game. We as Catholics are failing if we are 'backing the man' rather than the truth. I beg my readers to think about what happened after Vatican II and how many souls were lost because people were more interested in people than the truth.

Some practical points and common sense

24. If in fact, the correct course for the Society to follow is the course of an agreement with Rome, then surely that course would be "clearly correct" – rather than that course being the subject of such doubt, disagreement and disunity.
25. If the course that is proposed (i.e. an agreement with Rome) is directly different to the Society's course over the last 40 years (and it is) then surely the arguments in favour of such an agreement would be clear. If that were the case then I would expect the Superiors, the priests (at every level) and Society parishioners to know the reasons and to be able to support the proposed agreement. My experience is that the reasons in support of an agreement are as shallow as "the Pope wants this" or "we have to agree at some time" or "otherwise we become sedevacantist"...Even worse, the response from numerous people is that they "don't know" or that they "must be obedient to the Superior General".
26. We should consider what the devil's strategy might be in the year 2012. It seems to me that the powers of darkness would be seeking to cause dissension and disunity and would be seeking to introduce error into the Society or the Society into error. It seems to me that if we acknowledge that the Conciliar Church is modern and liberal and infected with error then we would have to acknowledge that the enemy's purpose would appear to be furthered if the Society can be made part of that Conciliar Church.
27. The idea that the Conciliar Church or Rome would or could take and keep the society "as we are" is a dream or a fairy tale (tragic fairy tale). If Rome does not convert to tradition then Rome continues its liberal modernist religion and traditional Catholicism is unacceptable to that Rome. I note that the possibility that a traditional Catholic may criticise Rome does not mean that traditional Catholicism is acceptable to Rome. It only means that criticism may be

acceptable to Rome, noting that Martin Luther is "acceptable" and noting that other religions or even atheism is "acceptable" to Rome⁸. If the Society cannot convert Rome when it is outside and not subject to Rome's bishops how possibly can the Society convert Rome after an "agreement" is signed and the Society is subject to modern Rome? The only "side" that should want an agreement is the side of the Conciliar Church, the side of liberalism. Rome's only purpose (and it has admitted it) in entering into any agreement is to convert the Society to the ways of the Conciliar Church.

28. In the book "Archbishop Lefebvre and the Vatican" Father Laisney adds the following commentary after a copy of the Archbishop's declaration in 1974 (refer page 11):

... When the Pope returns to the spirit of St. Paul, there will be no need of a "Protocol" nor even the lifting of any penalty. He will see that all these were but a persecution waged by the worshippers of "man making himself God," against the adorers of "God Who made Himself man."...

29. There is no doubt between Rome and the Society – the Society knows what Rome believes (or does not believe). The Society knows that Pope Benedict was previously Cardinal Ratzinger and that as Cardinal and as Pope he is a modernist and a liberalist. Rome knows what the Society stands for – the traditional Catholic Faith. There is no question between the two sides. We know them and they know us. If Rome wanted to change it could do so now. But it refuses to change. Rome's mission and its purpose, is to bring the Society to Rome's liberalism. This was the conclusion of the president of the Society's commission for the theological discussions with Rome, Bishop Alfonso de Galarreta⁹:

*It is essential to the current issue to bear in mind the unmistakable conclusion that we just made on this occasion: they are not ready to give up the Vatican II Council, nor the liberal doctrines of it, and their intention, their obvious desire, is to bring us back to it. At most, Rome would accept a rebalancing and a better wording (formulation), again as part of the "hermeneutic of renewal in continuity". And then we can discuss and we are very useful . . . to endorse the revival of the reform with continuity.*¹⁰

30. By way of example, I recall that some years ago, I and my wife faced the dilemma of how we should educate our high school aged children. By way of background, we are grateful to have access to a Society primary school but when our oldest child was 13 years old we needed to decide whether to educate him by (a) home school (b) state secular school (c) secular private

⁸ In September 23, 2011, Pope Benedict praised Martin Luther and in October 2011, the Pope participated in a gathering at Assisi where not only were all sorts of religions gathered together, but also atheists who were able to express, not their faith of course, but their point of view regarding the faith.

⁹ For confirmation of the appointment of Bishop De Galarreta refer to press release by the SSPX at http://www.sspix.org/sspix_and_rome/press_release_10-15-2009_sspix_commission_members.htm

¹⁰ This is an extract from an abridged version of a translation of a document written by His Excellency Bishop de Galarreta, who was the Society's chairman for the Rome-SSPX commission in charge of the theological discussions. I understand that the document was made available at the October, 2011 meeting of SSPX Superiors in Albano, Italy and that during the last week of June, 2012, this document became publicly available.

school or (d) "Catholic" private school. I consulted at least five priests of the Society in relation to the issue and I received a number of opinions. The common opinion (from all the priests I consulted) was that I should not send my son to the "Catholic school" because if I did so he would lose his faith. The reason was that the "Catholic school" would mix some truth with error and that he would lose his faith in circumstances where he would be subjected to the modern system under the name of "Catholicism". The advice was to the effect that if we chose to send him to a high school then we should send him to a school that was irreligious or that was clearly non-Catholic.

31. My common sense says that that same reasoning should apply to the issue of whether or not the Society should mix with the Conciliar Church when the Conciliar Church is mired in modernism and liberalism. How can the Society (by its priests) on one hand advise me to keep my children out of the Conciliar Catholic schools but on the other hand propose to put itself (and my family) into the Conciliar Church.

Terminology

32. By way of explanation, my references to the "*Conciliar Church*" or to "*Rome*" are references to "*the Rome of neo-Modernist and neo-Protestant tendencies which were clearly evident in the Second Vatican Council and, after the Council, in all the reforms which issued from it*" as opposed to "*Catholic Rome, Guardian of the Catholic faith and of the traditions necessary to preserve this faith, to Eternal Rome, Mistress of wisdom and truth*"¹¹. Also, when I refer to the Conciliar Church or Rome I am generally referring to those men who represent that Conciliar Church or who are imbibed with the errors of that Conciliar Church. On this point of terminology I believe it may assist the reader to refer to the response of his Excellency Archbishop Lefebvre in 1989¹², as follows, in which his Excellency explains his position regarding the Church, which I adopt:

3: "*Lefebvre should have stayed in the Church.*"

Question: Some people say, "Yes, but Archbishop Lefebvre should have accepted an agreement with Rome because once the Society of St. Pius X had been recognized and the suspensions lifted, he would have been able to act in a more effective manner inside the Church, whereas now he has put himself outside."

Archbishop Lefebvre: Such things are easy to say. To stay inside the Church, or to put oneself inside the Church - what does that mean? Firstly, what Church are we talking about? If you mean the Conciliar Church, then we who have struggled against the Council for twenty years because we want the Catholic Church, we would have to re-

¹¹ The 1974 Declaration of Archbishop Lefebvre_November 21, 1974

http://www.sspix.org/archbishop_lefebvre/1974_declaration_of_archbishop_lefebvre.htm

¹²This interview appeared in the July-August 1989 issue of the Society's magazine in France, *Fideliter*. Refer http://www.sspix.org/archbishop_lefebvre/one_year_after_the_consecrations.htm

enter this Conciliar Church in order, supposedly, to make it Catholic. That is a complete illusion. It is not the subjects that make the superiors, but the superiors who make the subjects.

...

4: Danger of schism?

Question: Are you not afraid that in the end, when the good Lord will have called you to Him, little by little the split will grow wider and we will find ourselves being confronted with a parallel Church alongside what some call the "visible Church"?

Archbishop Lefebvre: This talk about the "visible Church" on the part of Dom Gerard and Mr. Madiran is childish. It is incredible that anyone can talk of the "visible Church", meaning the Conciliar Church as opposed to the Catholic Church which we are trying to represent and continue. I am not saying that we are the Catholic Church. I have never said so. No one can reproach me with ever having wished to set myself up as pope. But, we truly represent the Catholic Church such as it was before, because we are continuing what it always did. It is we who have the notes of the visible Church: One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic. That is what makes the visible Church.

My Conclusions

33. I understand that my conclusions are very serious – and hence I do not believe that I can remain silent. In summary, some relevant points to my analysis and the conclusions of my analysis of the material are as follows:

33.1. I am obliged to search for the truth and defend myself, my family and my neighbours against error. Accordingly, I must know enough to recognise error when I see it. I cannot choose ignorance and I cannot blindly follow the superiors of the Church (or the Society) in circumstances where my intellect informs me that their path is not the path of truth and salvation. I must strive to be faithful to the following words:

I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the Faith. As to the rest there is laid up for me a crown of justice which the Lord, the Just Judge, will render me in that day: and not only to me, but to them also that love His coming (II Tim. 4:7-8).

33.2. I must consider the matters at hand objectively. I must be prepared to acknowledge that it is possible that the Superior General or other superiors within the Society could make a mistake. I must be prepared to acknowledge that men are weak, that liberalism exists in the year 2012 and that the Society is not exempt from attack by the very errors that caused the society to be created. I must be prepared to acknowledge that the superiors of the Society are not infallible and that they could try to enter into an agreement with Rome in

circumstances where the Society should not do so. I cannot choose to ignore the truth because the truth may be difficult or painful. I cannot choose to ignore the truth on the basis that I cannot understand why someone does something. I do not need to know or understand the internal disposition of a person and I do not seek to know or understand why a person does or does not do something – I only know what the person does or does not do. That is, the reality is the truth!

- 33.3. The Society cannot trust Rome.
- 33.4. There are suggestions that "there is a change in attitude in the Church..", that Rome has "changed" or is "changing", that "Rome today is not the Rome of 1988" that "interesting things" are happening in Rome. I conclude that Rome has not "changed" in any material manner and is still faithful to the Conciliar doctrines rather than tradition.
- 33.5. I conclude that the primary reason (on a natural level) that there is no "agreement" in place between the Society and Rome today is that Rome (modernist liberal Rome) is *loyal* to its modernist liberal principals – to the point that it (Rome) would not enter into an agreement with the Society unless the Society was prepared to accept Rome's principals.
- 33.6. There is arguably no benefit of an agreement between the Society and Rome, and further, the possible benefit of any such agreement outweighs the risk of an agreement.
- 33.7. The suggestion that "there is nothing to worry about" or "that nothing has changed" or "that the society remains true to the principals of Archbishop Lefebvre" are all contrary to the real evidence.
- 33.8. Many of the Superiors of the Society (and many other Priests in the Society) appear to be prepared to enter into a Practical Agreement rather than an agreement based on the Faith or the doctrine of the Church. This represents a change in their position. The position of the Society was that the Society would only "join" Rome when Rome was traditional – whereas some members of the Society are now prepared to join Rome without any doctrinal solution and without Rome returning to tradition. That position, namely the preparedness and the desire to enter into a practical agreement with Rome is in direct opposition to the previously published position of the Society and its superiors including the published positions of Archbishop Lefebvre, Bishop Fellay, Father Schmidberger and many other priests.
- 33.9. The preparedness and the desire, on the part of some Priests, to enter into a practical agreement with Rome has meant that those priests have had to (or will have to) contradict their previously published positions.

- 33.10. If a satisfactory conclusion to the doctrinal discussions is no longer critical to a regularization of the Society then the Society will be merely entering into an arrangement pursuant to which at best the Society would "agree to disagree" and in doing so the Society would breach its purpose and its mission.
- 33.11. The "Letters between the Bishops" disclose very serious differences –which have not been answered.
- 33.12. The 6 conditions that the Society has provided to Rome to which the SSPX "binds itself" are indicative of a "weakness" on the part of the Society and the Society's departure from the principals of Archbishop Lefebvre.
- 33.13. Condition 1 gives the Society no real protection and does not "remedy" the doctrinal issues between Rome and the Society.
- 33.14. Condition 3 (the guarantee of at least one bishop) means that the Society could be "reduced" to only one bishop and is concerning in view of the position of Rome that the position of the "other 3 bishops" will be dealt with separately.
- 33.15. One of the desirable conditions is "Our own ecclesiastical tribunals, in the first instance". This indicates that the Society has changed its position and that the Society would be prepared to subject itself and its parishioners to the "modern" tribunals in circumstances where there has not been any change in the practice of those tribunals.
- 33.16. The conditions for an agreement include a desirable condition which provides "Exemption of houses of The Society of St Pius X in respect of diocesan bishops". That condition and the fact that it is desirable only evidence the fact that the Superiors of the Society acknowledge that they are prepared to enter into an agreement pursuant to which the works of the Society will be subject to local (Conciliar) Bishops and that such administration will present difficulties.
- 33.17. The Society has not yet been able to show any real "safeguards" that will (or even could) ensure that, in the event of an agreement, the SSPX would survive and would remain Catholic (in accordance with tradition). The Society has not yet been able to show any real reason why, in the event of an agreement, the position of the Society would be different when compared to the "other" traditional groups who have returned to Rome.
- 33.18. The history of the Benedictine Monastery of St. Madeleine of Le Barroux, France (the superior of which was Dom Gerard) supports the conclusion that the Society should not enter into a practical agreement with the Conciliar Church. In particular, the fact "*that no silence be imposed on our anti-Modernist preaching*" did not save it.

- 33.19. The history of the Society of St. John Marie Vianney in Campos supports the conclusion that the Society should not enter into a practical agreement with the Conciliar Church. In particular, the fact that Campos declared "We engage ourselves to go into all yet open questions profoundly, taking into consideration canon 212 of the Code of Canon Law (CIC) and in a sincere spirit of humility and fraternal charity towards all" did not save it.
- 33.20. The history of the Institute of the Good Shepherd supports the conclusion that the Society should not enter into a practical agreement with the Conciliar Church. In particular, the fact that the Institute was to have "doctrinal freedom" did not protect it. One of the original Priests of the Institute, Father Paul Aulagnier was expelled from the Society in 2003 for reasons relating to his public support of reconciliation between the Society and Rome. Father Aulagnier's position has been proven wrong by the fact that the Institute is being "forced" to surrender to the principles of the Conciliar Church but his reasons (for favouring reconciliation in 2003) are the SAME reasons that the Superiors of the Society are using to support reconciliation in 2012. However, in 2012 it would appear that those priests (and Bishop) who argue against reconciliation (for reasons including those used in 2003) are expelled from the Society.
- 33.21. The statements of allied orders in relation to a proposed agreement between the Society and Rome appear to be consistent with the traditional principals of the Society whereas the treatment of those allied orders who have spoken against an agreement appears to be inconsistent with the traditional principals of the Society.
- 33.22. Those priests and bishops who spoke against an agreement appear to be threatened by an actual or threatened expulsion from the Society on the basis that they have rebelled against their Superiors whereas the truth appears to be that the "rebellion" has been committed by those in the Society who have favoured such an agreement and thereby rebelled against the principals and tradition of the Society.
- 33.23. The suggestion that Archbishop Lefebvre would enter into an agreement with Rome on the terms proposed is inconsistent with the words and actions of Archbishop Lefebvre.
34. When I try to understand the situation I can only wonder if the explanation for the situation is as set out in the letter from Father Violette in relation to Father Aulegnier (a Priest of the Society who was expelled in 2003 for matters relating to his public support of reconciliation between the Society and Rome, in which Father Violette said:

In my opinion, I think we might see here the real reason for Father Aulagnier's change. The fight is dragging on. He has been at the center of this fight for over 30 years. Maybe he is tired of the fight! But this is not the first time that a conflict over the faith has lasted for ages. The Arian crisis lasted over 70 years, the papal exile in Avignon 68 years, the

great Schism 39 years. Is this a reason to abandon the fight to come to some arrangement? It's a good thing St Athanasius didn't get tired of being exiled, threatened, falsely accused, excommunicated etc. He wouldn't be St Athanasius.¹³

Stephen J. Fox

28 October 2012

Feast of Christ the King

This document can be found at: <http://isthisoperationsuicide.wordpress.com/>

If you wish, in charity, to correct, improve or otherwise contribute to the material set out in this book, please contact the author at: isthisoperationsuicide@gmail.com

About the author:

Stephen Fox resides in Brisbane, Australia with his wife and ten children. He holds degrees in commerce and law and practices commercial law. Stephen has been attending the Traditional Latin Mass since about 1978, initially as celebrated by Father Buckley, and then as celebrated by priests of the Society of Saint Pius X.

¹³ Letter from Father Violette to the faithful dated December 2003, Refer http://www.sspcx.ca/Documents/Fr-Violettes-Letters/2003_August.htm

Conclusion One – Truth and Obedience

1. **Conclusion: I am obliged to search for the truth and defend myself, my family and my neighbours against error. Accordingly, I must know enough to recognise error when I see it. I cannot choose ignorance and I cannot blindly follow the superiors of the Church (or the Society) in circumstances where my intellect informs me that their path is not the path of truth and salvation. I must strive to be faithful to the following words:**

I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the Faith. As to the rest there is laid up for me a crown of justice which the Lord, the Just Judge, will render me in that day: and not only to me, but to them also that love His coming (II Tim. 4:7-8).

- 1.1. There are some who may respond to my concerns by suggesting that "the issue is one of obedience" and when pressed to explain they respond by saying that they wish to remain "obedient" or "loyal" to the Superior General of the Society and they may even go so far as to admonish those Bishops or Priests in the Society who have dared to question whether or not the Society should enter into an agreement with Rome.
- 1.2. I find the "obedience excuse" particularly interesting because the same people who are prepared to be "disobedient" to the Conciliar Church are prepared to be obedient to those who propose to make them subject to and part of the same Conciliar Church!
- 1.3. I am concerned that the reference to obedience is merely an excuse to avoid having to consider the issue or forming an opinion. How strange! How inconsistent! How lacking in reason! A traditional catholic presumably "follows" the Society because that person formed the view that the Conciliar Church was in error and that in order to maintain their faith they should "follow" the Society. However that same person is now not prepared to consider whether or not the Superiors of the Society could ever do something that would endanger their faith? There is no doubt that Superiors in the Church may make mistakes. As Archbishop Lefebvre said¹⁴:

In the Rogation-tide litanies the Church teaches us to say: "We beseech thee O Lord, maintain in Thy holy religion the Sovereign Pontiff and all the orders of ecclesiastical hierarchy." This means that such a disaster could very well happen.

- 1.4. It is obvious that obedience must have some limits. If our parish Priest preaches error or gives direction that is wrong then we are prepared to complain to his superior and in fact we may be duty bound to complain. If our Superiors do something (or propose

¹⁴ An Open Letter to Confused Catholics by His Grace Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, <http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/OpenLetterToConfusedCatholics/index.htm>

something) that appears wrong what should we do? For my part, I suggest that we should inform our Superiors that we believe them to be wrong and again I believe that we are duty bound to do so. I am convinced that a Catholic should not hide from the issue and refuse to exercise their reason –all under the convenient excuse of "obedience". I am convinced that the worst thing that we can do is pretend that what the superior does is right when our reason and our conscience says it is wrong. I am convinced that to close our eyes is to participate in the wrong.

1.5. Archbishop Lefebvre said¹⁵

In the Church there is no law or jurisdiction which can impose on a Christian a diminution of his faith. All the faithful can and should resist whatever interferes with their faith, supported by the catechism of their childhood. If they are faced with an order putting their faith in danger of corruption, there is an overriding duty to disobey.

It is because we judge that our faith is endangered by the post-conciliar reforms and tendencies, that we have the duty to disobey and keep the Tradition. Let us add this, that the greatest service we can render to the Church and to the successor of Peter is to reject the reformed and liberal Church.

Well, I am not of that religion. I do not accept that new religion. It is a liberal, modernist religion which has its worship, its priests, its faith, its catechism, its ecumenical Bible translated jointly by Catholics, Jews, Protestants and Anglicans, all things to all men, pleasing everybody by frequently sacrificing the interpretation of the Magisterium. We do not accept this ecumenical Bible. There is the Bible of God; it is His Word which we have not the right to mix with the words of men.

.....

Two religions confront each other; we are in a dramatic situation and it is impossible to avoid a choice, but the choice is not between obedience and disobedience. What is suggested to us, what we are expressly invited to do, what we are persecuted for not doing, is to choose an appearance of obedience. But even the Holy Father cannot ask us to abandon our faith.

We therefore choose to keep it and we cannot be mistaken in clinging to what the Church has taught for two thousand years. The crisis is profound, cleverly organized and directed, and by this token one can truly believe that the master

¹⁵ An Open Letter to Confused Catholics by His Grace Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, <http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/OpenLetterToConfusedCatholics/index.htm>

mind is not a man but Satan himself. For it is a master-stroke of Satan to get Catholics to disobey the whole of Tradition in the name of obedience.

St. Thomas Aquinas, to whom we must always refer, goes so far in the Summa Theologica as to ask whether the "fraternal correction" prescribed by Our Lord can be exercised towards our superiors. After having made all the appropriate distinctions he replies: "One can exercise fraternal correction towards superiors when it is a matter of faith."

If we were more resolute on this subject, we would avoid coming to the point of gradually absorbing heresies.

You will be tempted to say: "But what can we do about it? It is a bishop who says this or that. Look, this document comes from the Catechetical Commission or some other official commission."

That way there is nothing left for you but to lose your faith. But you do not have the right to react in that way. St. Paul has warned us: "Even if an angel from Heaven came to tell you anything other than what I have taught you, do not listen to him."

Such is the secret of true obedience.

1.6. In relation to the issue of obedience I quote the words of Bishop Fellay¹⁶:

AUTHENTIC OBEDIENCE

But here, too, many find an easy way out of the crisis: the Pope has spoken, so there is no need to reflect any more, just obey. When everything is normal, it is sufficient, and it is fine. But this does not change the reality of obedience.

Obedience is a virtue, a virtue which is exercised by a human being. When we refer to a human being we mean somebody who has reason and will. That means that this act shall be virtuous insofar as a human being makes use of his reason and will when he obeys. If we just switch them off when we obey, we are no better than a dog. You expect a dog to obey when you command it to stop or walk or bite or bark. You don't expect the dog to question your command. Even when we speak in the context of what is called "blind obedience" of the human being, it remains an act of virtue. If in order to obey, however, we have to demolish what is the highest faculty the good Lord has given us, that is, our reason, there is something wrong.

...

¹⁶ Conference given by Bishop Bernard Fellay on November 10, 2004 at St. Vincent de Paul Church in Kansas City, MO http://www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsection=show_article&article_id=2351

When there is a defect in our obedience it is because we have not given enough obedience. We call this disobedience. But we rarely consider that there is a possibility of giving too much obedience. The phrase seems strange or odd, to speak of "too much obedience," but in fact, it does exist. A simple example: if somebody gives an order and you realize that if you follow the letter of the order you are doing something stupid—maybe you did not understand the order correctly—but nevertheless, realizing that it is stupid, you do it, well, I am sorry, but you are stupid. It is not obedience.

...

So where is the point at which we must say no? It does happen. The point at which we say no is when this authority which has been granted by God to a human being is used against God. If God has given authority to human beings, it is so that through this authority these superiors will lead others to God. Every law and every force of the law is given to lead us to God, to glorify God, to do good.

Authority Is FROM God

It is easier to understand this when you look at God and the origin of obedience and law. We know and see that in any kind of organization, there is an authority, there is somebody commanding and giving orders. Not only that, but on certain levels, these orders can even be binding on our conscience. That means that if we refuse, we sin. That means that we offend not only this human authority, but we offend God. Why is that?—Because any authority which is exercised among human beings has been given by God. It is very important to understand that. It is the very principle of obedience. Why do we obey?—We obey because we see the authority and the commandment of that authority as coming from God. Persons having authority may have had it designated to them by human beings—George Bush has been elected by the Americans, but the authority that Bush has he has received from God. At the end of his life, he will stand in front of our Lord, and he will have to give an account of the way he has used this authority. The same holds for me, for the priests, for the fathers in their families, and so on at all levels. At all levels, any kind of authority is granted by God, and there you have the principle of obedience.

To obey God Himself is not too difficult; we recognize that God is wiser than we are, He is mightier than we, and we understand it is better not to object. But to submit ourselves to human beings whom we easily see as less wise, less perfect, and with many more defects than ourselves—a person commanding things which sometimes even seem to us not reasonable—that's difficult. What I have said is not in contradiction. Certain situations may appear to us less reasonable; nevertheless we still have to obey.

Obedience Is To God

So where is the point at which we must say no? It does happen. The point at which we say no is when this authority which has been granted by God to a human being is used against God. If God has given authority to human beings, it is so that

through this authority these superiors will lead others to God. Every law and every force of the law is given to lead us to God, to glorify God, to do good.

That's the Ten Commandments. Why did God give us commandments? It was to help us in the good direction. What is this good direction? It is God Himself. It is to glorify Him, and any kind of order or law is true law in as much as it is a kind of echo or image of these laws from God. Amongst human beings it can happen, and it really does happen, that these persons invested with authority will, either by evil or most of the time by weakness, make a wrong use of this authority. They will make a wrong commandment. And at that time, this law, which should bring us back to God, instead harms us. It goes against the purpose of law. When this happens, we have to say no, because to say yes is no longer obedience; it goes against obedience, it goes against God, so we must say no.

.....

Now, if you find in that organization a law against the salvation of souls or circumstances in which a law is being used against that purpose, of course you do not obey that law. It is no longer true obedience. In such a case, obedience would go against the purpose itself for which God has founded the Church. And then, of course, you say no. And when you say no, you are not disobedient; on the contrary, you are really obedient, because you look at the purpose and the will of God. You see that this is going against the will of God; I want to follow the will of God, so in that case I have to say no.

These are basics but they are very important. It is very important that you have the right understanding of obedience, because we are called "rebels" and other labels which you know by heart by now. It is just not true. It is like when Rome says to us, "Come back." We say, "We are sorry, but we can't." Why? Because we are already in; we have never been away, so where do you want us to come back from? We are already in.

- 1.7. I conclude that Bishop Fellay's position (as least in 2004) was that obedience to Rome would be obedience that he described as follows "...obedience would go against the purpose itself for which God has founded the Church. And then, of course, you say no. And when you say no, you are not disobedient; on the contrary, you are really obedient, because you look at the purpose and the will of God...". If in fact the evidence shows that Rome today is not sufficiently different to Rome in 2004 then it would seem that obedience to Rome today would in fact be disobedience to God.
- 1.8. I anticipate that "the other side" may suggest that, in the event of an agreement, the "obedience" to Rome will be subject to the "conditions" and the "guarantees that will ensure that the Society stays 'as it is'". Such a position ignores reality. The evidence

shows that Rome is faithful to its Conciliar doctrines, the evidence shows that Rome's purpose "is to bring the Society to Rome's liberalism"¹⁷.

- 1.9. The evidence shows that the Society's conditions (even the right the right to criticise modernism) is similar to the "conditions" that other once traditional (but now modernist) groups were granted by Rome. Archbishop Lefebvre described Rome in the following terms (in 1990):

*.....but THEY ARE BETRAYING US —betraying us! They are shaking hands with the Church's destroyers. They are shaking hands with people holding modernist and liberal ideas condemned by the Church. So they are doing the devil's work. They are now saying: "So long as they grant us the old Mass, we can shake hands with Rome, no problem." But we are seeing how it works out. They are in an impossible situation. Impossible. One cannot both shake hands with modernists and keep following Tradition. Not possible. Not possible. (Archbishop Lefebvre's address to his priests given in Econe, Switzerland on 6 September 1990)*¹⁸

¹⁷ This was the conclusion of the president of the Society's commission for the theological discussions with Rome, Bishop Alfonso de Galarreta when he said:

It is essential to the current issue to bear in mind the unmistakable conclusion that we just made on this occasion: they are not ready to give up the Vatican II Council, nor the liberal doctrines of it, and their intention, their obvious desire, is to bring us back to it. At most, Rome would accept a rebalancing and a better wording (formulation), again as part of the "hermeneutic of renewal in continuity"

¹⁸ http://www.sspx.org/archbishop_lefebvre/two_years_after_the_consecrations.htm

Conclusion Two – I must be objective

2. **Conclusion: I must consider the matters at hand objectively. I must be prepared to acknowledge that it is possible that the Superior General or other superiors within the Society could make a mistake. I must be prepared to acknowledge that men are weak, that liberalism exists in the year 2012 and that the Society is not exempt from attack by the very errors that caused the society to be created. I must be prepared to acknowledge that the superiors of the Society are not infallible and that they could try to enter into an agreement with Rome in circumstances where the Society should not do so. I cannot choose to ignore the truth because the truth may be difficult or painful. I cannot choose to ignore the truth on the basis that I cannot understand *why* someone does something. I do not need to know or understand the internal disposition of a person and I do not seek to know or understand why a person does or does not do something – I only know what the person does or does not do. That is, the reality is the truth!**
 - 2.1. In order to consider the matter we must be prepared to consider what is real – that is, what we see rather than what we feel, what a man says (his actual words) rather than what we think he says or what we think he means, what a man does rather than why he does it etc.
 - 2.2. If we are trying to determine the truth of something we must not start with a bias or a preconceived interpretation of the evidence – rather we must be "open" and prepared to "test" the evidence.
 - 2.3. Whilst we should be prepared to analyse what the Pope or a given Bishop or Priest or any person says or does we should note that our analysis, our questioning, our criticism, even our correction of such words or doings are not done by way of judgement of the person.
 - 2.4. History shows us that churchmen have been in error on many occasions. In fact, out of some thousands of bishops in the Church during (and after) the Second Vatican Council there was only a handful who rejected the errors – among them Archbishop Lefebvre and Bishop De Castro Mayer.
 - 2.5. I am uncomfortable when the response to my queries about the state of the Society and Rome is to the effect that "the issues are not your responsibility" or "you are not qualified to understand" or "the decision rests with the Superior...". I conclude that my duty is to find the truth and that in charity I must ask, in fact, demand the truth.

Conclusion Three – The Society cannot trust Rome

3. Conclusion: the Society cannot trust Rome

- 3.1. The reality is that the Society cannot trust Rome. How could anyone trust men who are betraying us...men who are the Church's destroyers. How could the Society trust such men when the Society knows that their purpose is to continue to destroy the Church! There is nothing that such men could "promise", no "guarantee" that such men could provide that would make an agreement acceptable – and we know this. We know that the Conciliar Church has a new definition of "truth", that truth (to the Conciliar Church) has been disconnected from objective reality. When describing liberalism Archbishop Lefebvre wrote¹⁹:

Things are no longer what they are, but what I think. In such a case, man disposes of truth according to his own taste. This error will be called idealism in its philosophical aspect, and Liberalism in its moral, social, political, and religious aspect. As a consequence, the truth will be different according to individuals and social groups

- 3.2. How could the Society negotiate and agree with such men – for how long would they be "true" to the terms of an "agreement", how long would it take before their interpretation of the agreement (of truth) would be different to the Society's. The truth is that the Society cannot enter an agreement with Rome unless Rome recovers the truth of tradition. Any other view of the circumstances is simply *illusion*²⁰.
- 3.3. To those who wish to refer back to the "conditions" and the "guarantees" I raise three simple points.
- 3.4. Firstly, on what basis do you trust an untrustworthy person? On what basis do you accept a guarantee from an untrustworthy person, do you believe a politician when he says he won't raise taxes. On what basis do you believe a man who by word and by act

¹⁹ Archbishop Lefebvre's book, "They Have Uncrowned Him" page 15

²⁰ Archbishop Lefebvre used the word "illusion" in 1989 when he said "We would have to re-enter this Conciliar Church in order, supposedly, to make it Catholic. That is a complete illusion. It is not the subjects that make the superiors, but the superiors who make the subjects...Amongst the whole Roman Curia, amongst all the world's bishops who are progressives, I would have been completely swamped. I would have been able to do nothing..."; Bishop Fellay has often used the term "illusion" when he has referred to the situation between the Conciliar Church and the Society. For example, in an interview given by Bishop Fellay in February 2011, and called "54 Answers from Bishop Fellay"²⁰, the following comments by Bishop Fellay are recorded "There is one danger: the danger of keeping up illusions. We see that some Catholics have managed to lull themselves to sleep with illusions. But recent events have managed to dispel them. I am thinking about the announcement of the beatification of John Paul II or the announcement of a new Assisi event along the lines of the interreligious gatherings in 1986 and 2002."

is participating in the destruction of the Catholic Church – when he says "come in, we can be friends"?

3.5. Secondly, how could you "trust" such men when the same men tell us expressly that their purpose is in fact to convert the Society – both by their actions and by their words. As to their actions we know that all *traditional* groups who have entered into a "deal" with Rome have ultimately accepted modernism. As to their words, I refer to the following by way of example.

3.5.1. The Vatican issued a statement in 2009 that provided as follows:

For a future recognition of the Fraternity of Saint Pius X, the full acknowledgment of the Second Vatican Council and of the Magisterium of Popes John XXIII, Paul VI, John Paul I, John Paul II, and of the same Benedict XVI is an indispensable condition²¹;

3.5.2. Bishop Muller, the prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (as reported in Catholic Family News) stated as follows:²²

"One can only be Catholic if one fully recognizes the faith of the Church. This includes the Second Vatican Council, which is a particularly important teaching," Bishop Gerhard Ludwig Muller said to Vatican Radio July 4 in his first and only interview since taking up his new post.

3.5.3. Vatican Insider posted a July 2 interview with Archbishop Joseph Augustine Di Noia, newly-appointed Vice-Prefect of the Vatican's Ecclesia Dei.²³ In that interview Archbishop Di Noia says:

... "Vatican II repudiated anti-Semitism and presented a positive picture of Judaism. John Paul II took us further in recognizing the significance of the Jewish People for Christianity itself. This is a new concept which we know the Traditionalists will not be able to accept immediately. Convincing them will take time, and in this respect we will have to be patient."

3.6. Thirdly, I ask what does the "first condition" mean? The condition reads as follows:

Freedom to keep, to transmit and to teach "the sound doctrine of the unchanging magisterium of the Church and of the immutable truth of Divine Tradition";

²¹ In a notice published by Vatican in 2009 <http://rorate-caeli.blogspot.com/2009/02/nota-della-segreteria-di-stato-seguito.html> Authenticity would appear to be confirmed by the Remnant newspaper refer http://www.remnantnewspaper.com/Archives/2009-ferrara-note_from_the_vatican_secretary.htm

²² <http://www.cfnews.org/page10/page46/muller.html> article by David Kerr, Vatican City, Jul 6, 2012 / 02:24 am (EWTN News)

²³ <http://vaticaninsider.lastampa.it/en/the-vatican/detail/articolo/society-of-st-pius-x-di-noia-16482/>

freedom to defend, to correct and to reprove, even publicly, those responsible for the "errors or novelties of modernism, of liberalism, of The Second Vatican Council and their consequences";

- 3.7. I suggest that "*the sound doctrine of the unchanging magisterium of the Church and of the immutable truth of Divine Tradition*" means one thing to the Society and a completely different thing to Rome. For an example of what Rome's interpretation might be, I refer the reader to the book "*Archbishop LEFEBVRE and the VATICAN*". At page 152 there is an extract which provides as follows²⁴:

In 1984, Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, granted an interview to journalist Vittorio Messori on the state of the Catholic Church. The interview was published in English in 1985 as The Ratzinger Report. In it, Cardinal Ratzinger forcefully reaffirms his opinion of the immense and positive work of Vatican II, whose genuine fruits he provides a guideline for achieving. He speaks specifically of Archbishop Lefebvre. The following excerpt is taken from Chapter Two, "A Council to Be Rediscovered."¹⁰⁷

August 15, 1984

Excerpts from The Ratzinger Report

Thus ten years before our conversation, he [Cardinal Ratzinger] had already written: "Vatican II today stands in a twilight."

Thereupon he [Cardinal Ratzinger] continued: "Over against both tendencies, before all else, it must be stated that Vatican II is upheld by the same authority as Vatican I and the Council of Trent, namely, the Pope and the College of Bishops in communion with him, and also with regard to its contents, Vatican II is in the strictest continuity with both previous councils and incorporates their texts word for word in decisive points."

From this Ratzinger drew two conclusions. First: "It is impossible ('for a Catholic') to take a position for or against Trent or Vatican I. Whoever accepts Vatican II, as it has clearly expressed and understood itself, at the same time accepts the whole binding tradition of the Catholic Church, particularly also the two previous councils. And that also applies to the so-called 'progressivism,' at least in its extreme forms." Second: "It is likewise impossible to decide in favor of Trent and Vatican I, but against Vatican II. Whoever denies Vatican II denies the authority that upholds the other two councils and thereby detaches them from their foundation. And this applies to the so-called 'traditionalism,' also in its extreme forms." "Every partisan choice destroys the whole (the very history of the Church) which can exist only as an indivisible unity."

²⁴ http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Archbishop_Lefebvre_and_the_Vatican/Part_II/1984-08-15.htm

- 3.8. I suggest that the "errors or novelties of modernism, of liberalism, of The Second Vatican Council and their consequences" mean one thing to the Society and a completely different thing to Rome. The truth is that Rome will not even admit the errors and certainly not the consequences. So then – what does the condition mean and what protection could it give. If the agreement were a commercial contract we might say it was "void for uncertainty" or "unenforceable because an essential term was not agreed" or "there was never an agreement because there was never a mutual intention to be bound". However, I do not propose to argue the issue from a contract law point of view. I suggest that all I need do is apply some common sense. If two parties cannot agree what the sound doctrine is today or what the errors are today – then on what basis will they agree in the future! It is illusion!
- 3.9. For the purpose of understanding what is different between Rome and the Society, and providing some meaning to the term "liberalism" I quote the following extracts from Archbishop Lefebvre's book, "They Have Uncrowned Him":

Pg. 14 – 15

Therefore, let us open this book of which I am speaking to you: Liberalism and Catholicism by Father Roussel, published in 1926; and let us read that page which depicts Liberalism very concretely (pp. 14 – 16), adding to this a little commentary:

"The Liberal is a fanatic for independence; he extols it to the point of absurdity, in every domain."

So there you have a definition. We are going to see how it is applied, what are the liberations that Liberalism insists on.

The independence of the true and of the good in regard to being: this is the relativistic philosophy of mobility and of becoming. The independence of the intelligence with regard to its object: being sovereign, the reason does not have to submit itself to its object; it creates it; whence the radical evolution of truth; relativistic subjectivism.

Let us emphasize the two key words: subjectivism and evolution.

Subjectivism means introducing freedom into the intelligence, whereas on the contrary the nobility of the intelligence consists in submitting itself to its object, that is, in the adæquatio or conformity of the thinking subject with the known object. The intellect works like a camera; it must fit with precision the intelligible touches of reality. Its perfection consists in its fidelity to the real. It is for this reason that the truth is defined as the conformity of the intellect with the thing. Truth is that quality of thought by which it is in accord with the thing, with that which is. It is not the intellect that creates the things; it is the things that impose themselves onto the intellect, such as they are. Therefore the truth of what is affirmed depends on that which is; it is an objective thing. The person who is

searching for the truth has to renounce himself, to renounce any construction of his own mind, to renounce any idea of "inventing" the truth.

On the contrary, in subjectivism, it is the reason that constructs the truth: we have the submission of the object to the subject! The subject becomes the centre of all things. Things are no longer what they are, but what I think. In such a case, man disposes of truth according to his own taste. This error will be called idealism in its philosophical aspect, and Liberalism in its moral, social, political, and religious aspect. As a consequence, the truth will be different according to individuals and social groups. The truth is then necessarily shared. No one can claim to have it exclusively in its wholeness; it is made and it is sought after without end. It can be guessed how contrary that is to Our Lord Jesus Christ and to his Church.

Pg. 114

The Catholic Liberal declares, "What do you want? One cannot indefinitely be against the ideas of his time, row without ceasing against the current, appear backward or reactionary." The antagonism between the Church and the secular liberal spirit, without God, is no longer desired. They want to reconcile what is irreconcilable, make peace between the Church and the Revolution, between Our Lord Jesus Christ and the Prince of this world. We cannot imagine an enterprise more blasphemous, and more dissolving of the Christian spirit, of the good fight for the faith, of the spirit of the crusade, that is to say, of the zeal to conquer the world for Jesus Christ.

Pg. 211

This is what we are living: since the declaration on religious liberty, the great majority of Catholics are convinced that "men can find the path to eternal salvation and obtain salvation, in the worship of any religion whatever."²⁵ There again the plan of the Freemasons is accomplished; they have succeeded, by means of a Council of the Catholic Church, in "giving credence to the great error of the present time, which consists in... putting all the religious forms on to the same footing of equality."²⁶

Pg. 228

You see, the liberal mind is one that is paradoxical and confused, distressed and contradictory. Such indeed was Paul VI. Mr. Louis Salleron explains this quite well, when he describes the physical look of Paul VI: he says "He has a double face." He is not speaking of duplicity, for this term expresses a perverse intention to deceive which was not present in Paul VI. No, it is a double persona whose contrasted countenance expresses a duality: now traditional in his words, now Modernist in his acts; now Catholic in his premises, his principles, and now progressive in his conclusions, not condemning what he should condemn and condemning what he ought to preserve!

²⁵ *Syllabus*, condemned proposition no. 17.

²⁶ Leo XIII, Encyclical *Humanum Genus* on the Freemasons, April 20, 1884.

Conclusion Four – Rome has not changed

4. **Conclusion: There are suggestions that "there is a change in attitude in the Church.", that Rome has "changed" or is "changing", that "Rome today is not the Rome of 1988" that "interesting things" are happening in Rome. I conclude that Rome has not "changed" in any material manner and is still faithful to the Conciliar doctrines rather than tradition.**

4.1. What is the importance regarding a "change" or "no change" in Rome. The issues would appear to be as follows:

4.1.1. Our Superiors appear to suggest that if Rome has "changed" then the Society can "trust" Rome and can "risk" putting itself under Rome's control;

4.1.2. It would seem to follow that if Rome has not changed then the Society cannot trust Rome and must either stay "separate" to Rome or must make the terms of an "agreement" so protective, so strong and so certain that the Society really stays separate - though "approved" by Rome;

4.1.3. If in fact Rome has not changed then the truth (the objective reality) is that it will not matter what terms are "agreed" – if Rome cannot be trusted then the Society will be ultimately "converted".

4.2. In a letter from three of the Bishops of the Society to Bishop Fellay and the other two members of the General Council, First Assistant Fr. Niklaus Pfluger and Second Assistant Fr. Alain-Marc Nély, Bishops Alfonso de Galarreta, Bishop Bernard Tissier de Mallerais and Bishop Richard Williamson said as follows:

Of course, on the two sides of current division between the Conciliar Church and the FSSPX much wish that the Catholic unity be restored. Honor to those on both sides. But since reality governs everything, and to the reality all these sincere desires must yield, namely that since Vatican II the official authorities of the Church have deviated from the Catholic truth, and today they are shown to be quite given to always remaining faithful to the Conciliar doctrines and practices. The Roman discussions, the "doctrinal preamble" and Assisi III are bright examples of this.

4.3. In a letter from Bishop Bernard Fellay, and the other two members of the General Council, First Assistant Fr. Niklaus Pfluger and Second Assistant Fr. Alain-Marc Nély, on April 14, 2012 those three say as follows:²⁷

²⁷ Letter sent by Bishop Bernard Fellay, Superior General of the Society of Saint Pius X (FSSPX /SSPX), and the other two members of the General Council, First Assistant Fr. Niklaus Pfluger and Second Assistant Fr. Alain-Marc Nély, on April 14, 2012.

..... Now, they trace a line — not straight — but clearly in favor of Tradition. Why should this suddenly stop when we are doing our utmost to be faithful and to intensify our prayer? Will the good God let us fall at the most critical moment? At the same time, your description is lacking in realism as regards both the degree of the errors and their extent.

Degree: Within the Society, some are making the Conciliar errors into super heresies, absolute evil, worse than anything, in the same way that the liberals have dogmatized this pastoral council. The evils are sufficiently dramatic; there is hardly any reason to exaggerate them further). Needful distinctions are not being made, whereas Mgr. Lefebvre did make the necessary distinctions on the subject of liberals several times. This failure to distinguish is leading one or the other of you to a hardening of your position. This is a grave matter because this caricature no longer corresponds with reality and in future it will logically end in a real schism.....

Extent: On the one hand, you saddle the current authorities with all the errors and evils to be found in the Church while leaving aside the fact that they are trying at least partly to disengage themselves from the most serious of them (the condemnation of the "hermeneutic of rupture" denounces real errors). On the other hand, you act as if ALL of them are implicated in this pertinacity ("they're all modernists," "all are rotten"). Now that is manifestly false. The great majority are still caught up in the movement, but not all.

In itself, the solution of the proposed personal prelature is not a trap. This is apparent from the fact, first of all, that the present situation in April 2012 is quite different from that of 1988. To pretend that nothing has changed is an historical error. The same evils afflict the Church, the consequences are even worse and more obvious than before; but at the same time we have observed a change of attitude in the Church, helped by the gestures and acts of Benedict XVI toward Tradition. This new movement, which began at least ten years ago, has been growing. It has reached a good number (still a minority) of young priests, seminarians, and even includes a small number of young bishops who clearly stand out from their predecessors, who confide in us their sympathy and support, but who are still pretty well stifled by the dominant line in the hierarchy in favour of Vatican II. This hierarchy is losing speed. This perception is not an illusion, and it shows that it is no longer illusory for us to contemplate an "intramural" struggle, the difficulty of which we are not unaware. I have been able to observe at Rome that however much the talk about the glories of Vatican II we'll be dinned with is still on the lips of many, it is no longer in people's heads. Fewer and fewer believe it.

This concrete situation, with the canonical solution that has been proposed, is quite different from that of 1988. And when we compare the arguments that Archbishop Lefebvre made at the time, we conclude that he would not have

hesitated to accept what is being proposed to us. Let us not lose our sense of the Church, which was so strong in our venerated founder.

- 4.4. In order to consider the issues we must remind ourselves of a number of points:
- 4.4.1. Why does the SSPX exist, what is its purpose? What was the reason that the SSPX was instituted?
 - 4.4.2. What is the difference between Rome and the SSPX that has kept Rome and the SSPX separate for 40 years?
 - 4.4.3. Has there been any change to Rome's position that removes or reduces that difference? We must consider the objective evidence to answer that question and in doing so we should consider the fruits..."by their fruits you shall know them".
- 4.5. Why does the SSPX exist, what is its purpose? What was the reason that the SSPX was instituted?
- 4.6. The purpose and the reasons may be easily found in any number of writings and statements by well recognized authors. By way of example:

- 4.6.1. In 1974 Archbishop Lefebvre declared as follows²⁸:

We hold fast, with all our heart and with all our soul, to Catholic Rome, Guardian of the Catholic faith and of the traditions necessary to preserve this faith, to Eternal Rome, Mistress of wisdom and truth.

We refuse, on the other hand, and have always refused to follow the Rome of neo-Modernist and neo-Protestant tendencies which were clearly evident in the Second Vatican Council and, after the Council, in all the reforms which issued from it.

All these reforms, indeed, have contributed and are still contributing to the destruction of the Church, to the ruin of the priesthood, to the abolition of the Sacrifice of the Mass and of the sacraments, to the disappearance of religious life, to a naturalist and Teilhardian teaching in universities, seminaries and catechetics; a teaching derived from Liberalism and Protestantism, many times condemned by the solemn Magisterium of the Church.

²⁸ The 1974 Declaration of Archbishop Lefebvre November 21, 1974
http://www.sspix.org/archbishop_lefebvre/1974_declaration_of_archbishop_lefebvre.htm

No authority, not even the highest in the hierarchy, can force us to abandon or diminish our Catholic faith, so clearly expressed and professed by the Church's Magisterium for nineteen centuries.

"But though we," says St. Paul, "or an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema" (Gal. 1:8).

Is it not this that the Holy Father is repeating to us today? And if we can discern a certain contradiction in his words and deeds, as well as in those of the dicasteries, well we choose what was always taught and we turn a deaf ear to the novelties destroying the Church.

*It is impossible to modify profoundly the *lex orandi* without modifying the *lex credendi*. To the *Novus Ordo Missae* correspond a new catechism, a new priesthood, new seminaries, a charismatic Pentecostal Church - all things opposed to orthodoxy and the perennial teaching of the Church.*

This Reformation, born of Liberalism and Modernism, is poisoned through and through; it derives from heresy and ends in heresy, even if all its acts are not formally heretical. It is therefore impossible for any conscientious and faithful Catholic to espouse this Reformation or to submit to it in any way whatsoever.

The only attitude of faithfulness to the Church and Catholic doctrine, in view of our salvation, is a categorical refusal to accept this Reformation.

That is why, without any spirit of rebellion, bitterness or resentment, we pursue our work of forming priests, with the timeless Magisterium as our guide. We are persuaded that we can render no greater service to the Holy Catholic Church, to the Sovereign Pontiff and to posterity.

That is why we hold fast to all that has been believed and practiced in the faith, morals, liturgy, teaching of the catechism, formation of the priest and institution of the Church, by the Church of all time; to all these things as codified in those books which saw day before the Modernist influence of the Council. This we shall do until such time that the true light of Tradition dissipates the darkness obscuring the sky of Eternal Rome.

*By doing this, with the grace of God and the help of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and that of St. Joseph and St. Pius X, we are assured of remaining faithful to the Roman Catholic Church and to all the successors of Peter, and of being *thefideles dispensatores mysteriorum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi in Spiritu Sancto*. Amen.*

- 4.6.2. Archbishop Lefebvre refers to "the Faith" – but what is the faith? It is that body of truths which we believe and which we must believe as Catholics. Archbishop Lefebvre, states:

*"what does faith give you?" "eternal life". And if there is one thing we need, one thing for which we hope, one thing we await, it is indeed eternal life. Hence we are not here concerned with words of little importance; this is not a lecture dealing with something transitory. The question is that of life eternal, of the salvation of our souls. It concerns the salvation of the souls of those about us and entrusted to us, the souls of your children...."*²⁹

- 4.6.3. The errors that Archbishop Lefebvre was referring to are plainly those errors that are contrary to the faith – contrary to the teachings of the one true Church, the errors that include the errors of modernism and liberalism.

4.7. What is the difference between Rome and the SSPX that has kept Rome and the SSPX separate for 40 years?

- 4.7.1. Archbishop Lefebvre refused to accept the errors to which the Conciliar Church has subjected itself. In 1987 Archbishop Lefebvre said:

"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 doing 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! Certain!"³⁰

- 4.7.2. Bishop Fellay has previously stated:

The day will come, we are sure and certain, when Rome will come back to Rome's own Tradition and restore it to its rightful place, and we long with all our hearts for that blessed day. For the time being, however, things are not yet at that point, and to foster illusions would be deadly for the SSPX,

²⁹ A Bishop Speaks Writings and Addresses of Archbishop Lefebvre pg 119

³⁰ Archbishop Lefebvre, Conference, October 4, 1987 "Marcel Lefebvre" by Bishop Tissier de Mallerais, pp. 547-548

as we can see, when we follow the turn of events in Campos." (Superior General's Letter to Friends & Benefactors" # 63³¹ 6 January 2003)

But it would be very imprudent and hasty to dash off ill-advisedly in pursuit of a practical agreement that would not be based on the Church's fundamental principles, and especially the faith. (Superior General's Letter to Friends & Benefactors # 72³² dated April 2008)

... So what we try to say to Rome in all these things is, "Listen, we have to get to the root of the problems." We don't want to make an agreement just for the sake of an agreement. A prelate in the Vatican said to me, "Don't make a cosmetic agreement with Rome." And it is true, we don't want any kind of cosmetic agreement. Things are too serious. The Faith is at stake. We want to keep the Faith! (Conference given by Bishop Bernard Fellay on November 10, 2004 at St. Vincent de Paul Church in Kansas City, MO³³)

..... But this would be possible only on the condition that in Rome, the Pope and his collaborators were convinced of the absolute necessity of Tradition. As long as they are not, nothing will ever happen. Nevertheless, we have to say these things, and I continue to make my requests.

That is what we request from Rome, that Rome confirm us in the Faith, the Faith of all time, the Faith which cannot change. We have the strict right to request this from the Roman authorities, and we do not think that we will really progress towards an agreement as long as Rome has not shown a concrete will to dissipate the smoke that has invaded the temple of God, darkened the Faith, and paralyzed the supernatural life of the Church under cover of the Council and its subsequent reforms. There will be no agreement before then. (Conference given by Bishop Bernard Fellay on November 10, 2004 at St. Vincent de Paul Church in Kansas City, MO³⁴)

So, things are absolutely not ripe for an agreement. We must first help correct Rome's thinking to show them that what they do is wrong. ... (Conference given by Bishop Bernard Fellay on November 10, 2004 at St. Vincent de Paul Church in Kansas City, MO³⁵)

4.8. Has there been any change to Rome's position that removes or reduces that difference?

³¹ http://www.sspix.org/superior_generals_news/supgen_63.htm

³² http://www.sspix.org/superior_generals_news/sup_gen_ltr_72.pdf

³³ http://www.sspix.org/sspx_and_rome/what_catholics_need_to_know.htm

³⁴ http://www.sspix.org/sspx_and_rome/what_catholics_need_to_know.htm

³⁵ http://www.sspix.org/sspx_and_rome/what_catholics_need_to_know.htm

- 4.8.1. Has there been any declaration by the Pope or by a senior cardinal that we could say "this Pope is different!"; The answer is no. Rather, the Pope continues to maintain the principals of modernism and liberalism.
- 4.8.2. I conclude that there has been no change in Rome's position because the change needs to be a change in relation to the differences which were (and are) the very reason for the Society and Rome to be "separate".
- 4.8.3. There are no changes by Rome in that regard. Rather the status of Rome is the same (or worse) than it has been in the last 40 years.
- 4.9. But some will suggest that Pope Benedict has issued the *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum* and this is a sure sign that Rome is in "favour" of tradition. To this argument I note that in Bishop Fellay's "Superior General's Letter to Friends & Benefactors" number 72³⁶ written in April 2008, Bishop Fellay says as follows:

Dear Friends and Benefactors,

The motu proprio Summorum Pontificum, which acknowledged that the Tridentine Mass was never abrogated, raises a certain number of questions concerning the future of the relations of the Society of St. Pius X with Rome. Several persons in conservative circles and in Rome itself have made themselves heard, arguing that, since the Sovereign Pontiff had acted so generously and thus given a clear sign of his good will towards us, there would be nothing left for the Society to do but to "sign an agreement with Rome." Unfortunately, a few of our friends were deceived by such an illusion. We would like to take the opportunity of this Eastertide letter to review once again the principles governing our actions in these troubled times and point out a few recent events which clearly indicate that, basically, nothing has really changed except for the motu proprio's liturgical overture, so as to draw from all this the necessary conclusions.

The fundamental principle that dictates our action is the safeguard of the faith, without which no one can be saved, no one can receive grace, no one can be pleasing to God, as the First Vatican Council states. The liturgical question is not paramount; it only becomes such inasmuch as it is the manifestation of an alteration of the faith and, consequently, of the worship due to God.

...

- 4.10. Dom Lourenço Fleichman, O. S. B.³⁷ states as follows:

I said in 1988 to Dom Gerard what I repeat to you today: thousands of the faithful anxiously wait for you to confirm them in the Catholic faith, in the combat that divine Providence requires of us, without our succumbing to fatigue, weakness, or

³⁶http://www.sspax.org/superior_generals_news/sup_gen_ltr_72.pdf

³⁷http://www.sspaxasia.com/Documents/Society_of_Saint_Pius_X/Open_Letter_to_the_Priests_of_Campos.htm

the siren song of legality. What our Lord requires is martyrdom endured drop by drop, and a clear and simple profession of Catholic faith without compromising with the modernists in the Vatican. The Pope, yes; legality, yes; but above all; respond to God's clear call to the combat of the faith. The day the Pope really converts, it will appear more clearly than the light of day. Obviously, it is not by kissing the Koran or by going to pray in a mosque that he manifests this conversion...

4.11. Bishop Williamson stated as follows (in the year 2003) ³⁸:

But how then will we ever know that the Romans are back to professing the true Faith upon its true basis? Archbishop Lefebvre used to reply: when they subscribe to Pius IX's "Quanta Cura" (against liberalism in politics), to Pius X's Anti-Modernist Oath (against modernism in religion) and to Pius XI's "Quas Primas" (against secularism in society). And the sure sign of the Romans' subscribing sincerely to these papal documents will be when they have no more problem with the SSPX, assuming always that the latter will not have budged. In other words, until the Romans sub-scribe as above, any Rome-SSPX agreement is impossible, and once they subscribe, it will no longer be necessary! Meanwhile, as the Romans tug towards Conciliar perdition, the one thing that the "schismatic" anchorman must do is not budge one inch from his "schism"!

4.12. I note that in order to say that Rome has changed we would need to see real evidence (objective rather than subjective) that Rome rejects the errors which, to date, have kept the Society away from the Conciliar Church. But not only is there no evidence that that has occurred – there is in fact ample evidence that Rome maintains the conciliar course. For example:

- 4.12.1. In Istanbul on October 30, 2006, Benedict XVI visited the Blue Mosque and prayed with Muslim religious leaders while facing Mecca.
- 4.12.2. On 21st October 2007, the Pope attended the interreligious meeting in Naples.
- 4.12.3. In 2008, the Pope visited the Synagogue of New York;
- 4.12.4. In May 2009, the Pope visited the Dome of the Rock mosque in Jerusalem;
- 4.12.5. In 2009, there was a Jewish ritual at the wailing wall which is something only Jews do, but on that day it was practiced by Benedict XVI;

³⁸ <http://www.sspxseminary.org/publications/rectors-letters-separator/rectors-letter/289-persevere-in-truth.html>

- 4.12.6. On January 17, 2010, Benedict XVI visited the synagogue in Rome and referred to Our Lord Jesus Christ only once as "reaffirm[ing] Moses's teaching";
 - 4.12.7. In March 2010, the Pope actively participated in a Lutheran service in Rome;
 - 4.12.8. On January 10, 2011, Benedict XVI affirmed that "religious freedom" was his "top public priority".
 - 4.12.9. On May 1, 2011, Benedict XVI beatified John Paul II, saying that his predecessor had "restored to Christianity its true face as a religion of hope";
 - 4.12.10. Benedict XVI on September 17, 2011, appeared in a "paraliturgical event" with a Lutheran "bishops";
 - 4.12.11. Benedict XVI on September 23, 2011, praised Martin Luther.
 - 4.12.12. In October 2011, the Pope participated in a repetition of the scandal of Assisi where not only were all sorts of religions gathered together, but also atheists who were able to express, not their faith of course, but their point of view regarding the faith;
 - 4.12.13. On March 3, 2012, Benedict XVI stated that Vatican II was a "true sign of God".
- 4.13. I understand that there is a suggestion that Pope Benedict XVI is the friend of tradition. With respect, this may be correct – but only to the extent that that "friendliness" is consistent with his liberal viewpoint. It is interesting to consider the views of Pope Benedict whilst he was still Cardinal Ratzinger. In this regard I quote from the book "Archbishop Lefebvre and the Vatican" July 13, 1988:³⁹

Some Lessons to Be Learned from the Lefebvre Schism

The following is the text of an address by Cardinal Ratzinger, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, given on July 13, 1988, in Santiago, Chile, before that nation's bishops. In the address, His Eminence comments on the "schism" triggered by Archbishop Lefebvre's illicit ordination of four bishops and reflects upon certain internal weaknesses in the Church which have provided fertile ground for the development of the Lefebvre phenomenon. The text of Cardinal Ratzinger's significant address appeared in Italian in the

³⁹ http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Archbishop_Lefebvre_and_the_Vatican/Part_II/1984-08-15.htm

July 30-Aug. 5 edition of *Il Sabato*. This English translation is reprinted from *The Wanderer*.

...

...Lefebvre has seen that, in the fundamental part of the agreement, he was being held to accept Vatican II and the affirmations of the post-conciliar magisterium, according to the proper authority of each document.

...

It was conceded, in addition, that the Society of Saint Pius X would be able to present to the Holy See—which reserves to itself the sole right of decision—their particular difficulties in regard to interpretations of juridical and liturgical reforms. All of this shows plainly that in this difficult dialogue Rome has united generosity, in all that was negotiable, with firmness in essentials. The explanation which Archbishop Lefebvre has given for the retraction of his agreement, is revealing. He declared that he has finally understood that the agreement he signed aimed only at integrating his foundation into the "Conciliar Church." The Catholic Church in union with the Pope is, according to him, the "Conciliar Church" which has broken with its own past. It seems indeed that he is no longer able to see that we are dealing with the Catholic Church in the totality of its Tradition, and that Vatican II also belongs to that.

...

Aside from the liturgical question, the central points of conflict at present are Lefebvre's attacks on the decree which deals with Religious Liberty, and on the so-called spirit of Assisi. Here is where Lefebvre fixes the boundaries between his position and that of the Catholic Church today.

I need hardly say in so many words that what he is saying on these points is unacceptable. Here we do not wish to consider his errors, rather we want to ask where there is a lack of clarity in ourselves. For Lefebvre, what is at stake is the warfare against ideological liberalism, against the relativization of truth. Obviously we are not in agreement with him that—understood according to the Pope's intentions—the text of the Council or the prayer of Assisi were relativizing.

It is a necessary task to defend the Second Vatican Council against Archbishop Lefebvre, as valid, and as binding upon the Church. Certainly there is a mentality of narrow views that isolates Vatican II and which has provoked this opposition. There are many accounts of it which give the impression that, from Vatican II onward, everything has been changed, and that what preceded it has no value or, at best, has value only in the light of Vatican II.

...

He accuses Archbishop Lefebvre of two things. First, he says: "It seems indeed that he is no longer able to see that we are dealing with the Catholic Church in the totality of its Tradition, and that Vatican II also belongs to that."

Archbishop Lefebvre has always recognized the Pope as Pope, and wished to be able to have normal relations with him. The obstacles were not placed by Archbishop Lefebvre; he [Archbishop Lefebvre] did his best to avoid them,

fighting the introduction of new doctrines at the Council while the then Rev. Fr. Ratzinger was pushing for their introduction as a peritus. He did his best to prevent the Pope from calling the meeting at Assisi. [See his "Open Letter to the Pope," jointly signed with Bishop de Castro Mayer—The Angelus, Jan. 1984.] In spite of these new doctrines which entered the Church as a virus, he did his best to keep a relationship with the Pope. It makes no sense to admit that within the Church new values which "originated outside the Church," among the enemies of the Church, as Cardinal Ratzinger admits in The Ratzinger Report,¹²¹ and then pretend that the whole of Vatican II still belongs to the totality of Tradition: "The central points of conflict at present are Lefebvre's attacks on the decree which deals with Religious Liberty, and on the so-called spirit of Assisi....[W]hat he is saying on these points is unacceptable."

We take note that Cardinal Ratzinger accepts the spirit of Assisi and Dignitatis Humanæ as perfectly acceptable. But he himself says that "this particular Council defined no dogma at all." That being so we are not obliged to accept it.

- 4.14. If we had any doubt as to the position of Rome, before or after the recent negotiations we would only have to refer to statements by the members of the Conciliar hierarchy. The following are some examples of the evidence that suggests that we can have no doubt as to what the position of the Conciliar Church vis the Society was (and is).
- 4.15. Bishop Muller, the prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, has indicated that the SSPX must accept the second Vatican Council as a prerequisite to rejoining the Church. As reported in Catholic Family News:⁴⁰

The new prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith has re-stated that the acceptance of the Second Vatican Council is a prerequisite for the traditionalist Society of St. Pius X to rejoin the Church.

"One can only be Catholic if one fully recognizes the faith of the Church. This includes the Second Vatican Council, which is a particularly important teaching," Bishop Gerhard Ludwig Muller said to Vatican Radio July 4 in his first and only interview since taking up his new post.

...

- 4.16. *Vatican Insider* posted a July 2 interview with Archbishop Joseph Augustine Di Noia, newly-appointed Vice-Prefect of the Vatican's Ecclesia Dei.⁴¹ In that interview Archbishop Di Noia says:

"The Church's deep commitment to reconciliation with the Jewish People is

⁴⁰ <http://www.cfnews.org/page10/page46/muller.html> article by David Kerr Vatican City, Jul 6, 2012 / 02:24 am (EWTN News)

⁴¹ <http://vaticaninsider.lastampa.it/en/the-vatican/detail/articolo/society-of-st-pius-x-di-noia-16482/>

personified today by Benedict XVI. The Ecumenical Council wrought a fundamental change. Then John Paul II, above all others, brought home Paul's message that Judaism and Jews have a unique place in salvation history. Nobody can deny that Karol Wojtyla's Pontificate marked a major shift in the theological understanding of Judaism within the Catholic Church."

...

"Vatican II repudiated anti-Semitism and presented a positive picture of Judaism. John Paul II took us further in recognizing the significance of the Jewish People for Christianity itself. This is a new concept which we know the Traditionalists will not be able to accept immediately. Convincing them will take time, and in this respect we will have to be patient."

- 4.17. A transcript of a conference given by the French bishop of the Society of Saint Pius X (FSSPX / SSPX), Bp. Bernard Tissier de Mallerais, in the priory of Saint L.M.G. de Montfort (Maine-et-Loire, France), on September 16, 2012, was made public by French forum Un évêque s'est levé. The main excerpts, according to the available transcript, dealing with the Rome-SSPX negotiations are the following⁴²:

"[T]he agreement considered in 2011-2012 lasted for six months, it has not been blessed by the Blessed Virgin. (We had prayed rosary after rosary, and we keep doing that, that is very good.) But the Blessed Virgin was clearly not behind this idea. She did not walk this path, because on June 30 (it's a secret that I reveal to you, but it will be made public), on June 30, 2012, the Pope wrote with his own hand a letter to our Superior General, Bp. [Bernard] Fellay, signed personally: 'I confirm to you in fact [that], in order [for you] to be truly reintegrated into the Church [Tissier says:] (let us move beyond this expression), it is necessary to truly accept the Second Vatican Council and the post-conciliar Magisterium.'

.....

[French forum content also reported by Andrea Torielli for La Stampa – in Italian]

- 4.18. In a notice published by Vatican in 2009⁴³ the following was stated:

NOTE OF THE SECRETARIAT OF STATE

Following the reactions caused by the recent Decree of the Congregation for Bishops, with which the excommunication of the four Prelates of the Fraternity of Saint Pius X was remitted, and regarding the Negationist or Reductionist

⁴² <http://rorate-caeli.blogspot.com/2012/09/important-with-popes-own-signature.html>

⁴³ <http://rorate-caeli.blogspot.com/2009/02/nota-della-segreteria-di-stato-seguito.html>. Authenticity would appear to be confirmed by the Remnant newspaper refer http://www.remnantnewspaper.com/Archives/2009-ferrara-note_from_the_vatican_secretary.htm

declarations on the Shoah of Bishop Williamson, of the same Fraternity, it is considered convenient to clarify a few aspects of past events.

1. Remission of the excommunication.

As already made public previously, the Decree of the Congregation for Bishops, dated January 21, 2009, was an act by which the Holy Father graciously responded to the repeated requests by the Superior General of the Fraternity of Saint Pius X.

His Holiness desired to remove an obstacle which prevented the opening of a door to dialogue. He now expects that an equal disposition will be expressed by the four Bishops in complete adherence to the doctrine and discipline of the Church.

*The extremely grave censure of *latae sententiae* excommunication, in which the aforementioned Bishops had incurred on June 30, 1988, then formally declared on July 1st of the same year, was a consequence of their illegitimate ordination by Mons. Marcel Lefebvre.*

The removal of the excommunication released the four Bishops from an extremely grave canonical censure, but has not changed the juridical position of the Fraternity of Saint Pius X, which, at the current moment, does not enjoy any canonical recognition by the Catholic Church. Not even the four Bishops, though released from the excommunication, have a canonical function in the Church and they do not exercise licitly a ministry in it.

2. Tradition, doctrine, and the Second Vatican Council.

For a future recognition of the Fraternity of Saint Pius X, the full acknowledgment of the Second Vatican Council and of the Magisterium of Popes John XXIII, Paul VI, John Paul I, John Paul II, and of the same Benedict XVI is an indispensable condition

As it was already affirmed in the Decree of January 21, 2009, the Holy See will not avoid, in ways deemed appropriate, discussing with the interested [party] the questions that remain open, so as to be able to reach a full and satisfactory resolution of the problems which originated this painful division.

3. Declarations on the Shoah.

The positions of Mons. Williamson on the Shoah are absolutely unacceptable and firmly rejected by the Holy Father, as he himself remarked on the past January 28, when, referring to that brutal genocide, he reaffirmed his full and unquestionable solidarity with our Brethren, receivers of the First Covenant, and affirmed that the memory of that terrible genocide must lead "mankind to reflect on the unpredictable power of evil when it conquers the heart of man", adding that the Shoah remains "for all a warning against forgetfulness, against denial or reductionism, because the violence against a single human being is violence against all".

Bishop Williamson, for an admission to episcopal functions in the Church, will also have to distance himself, in an absolutely unequivocal and public manner, from his positions regarding the Shoah, unknown to the Holy Father in the moment of the remission of the excommunication.

The Holy Father asks to be joined by the prayers of all the faithful, so that the Lord may enlighten the path of the Church. May the effort of the Pastors and of all the faithful increase in support of the delicate and burdensome mission of the Successor of Apostle Peter as "custodian of unity" in the Church.

From the Vatican, February 4, 2009.

[Translation corrected according to the published version - L'Osservatore Romano, February 5, 2009 -PDF file]

4.19. I conclude this part by referring to what Bishop De Galarreta, as head of the Society's delegation for the doctrinal discussions with Rome said both before and after the discussions – as relevant to whether or not Rome has changed. It seems to me that his comments are objective because the doctrinal discussions did not involve consideration of an agreement between the Society and Rome.

4.20. Bishop de Galarreta's Comments of December 19, 2009⁴⁴

At the end of the sermon he gave on December 19, 2009, during the ordinations at the seminary of La Reja (Argentina), Bishop Alfonso de Galarreta provided some information and his judgment concerning about the doctrinal discussions that began last October between Rome and the Society of St. Pius X. These remarks, coming from the person at the head of the delegation of the Society's theologians,

⁴⁴ http://www.sspcx.org/ssp_x_and_rome/excerpts_bishop_de_galaretta_12-19-2009_ordination_sermon.htm

are of particular interest. We herewith provide some lengthy excerpts from his sermon:

....

It was good first of all because these meetings are clearly placed on the doctrinal level. It involves a commission which has as its objective the study of doctrinal questions, and which does not have as its finality the consideration either theoretically or practically of any kind of accord whatsoever of a purely legal, canonical, or practical nature. That question is totally excluded. And this was very clearly stated. It is a discussion situated solely and exclusively on the doctrinal level.

- 4.21. A part of the document (a translation) which I understand was written by Bishop Alfonso de Galarreta Reflections about the Roman Proposal is reproduced below.

This document is an abridged version of the original document written by His Excellency Bishop de Galaretta. In order to more easily comprehend the profound reflections of His Excellency, the numerous quotes from Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre which support His Excellency's conclusions have been omitted from this document.

NB. The following reflections by His Excellency Bishop de Galarreta were made available at the October, 2011 meeting of SSPX Superiors in Albano, Italy. During the last week of June, 2012, this document became publicly available. Bishop Alfonso de Galarreta, was the Society's chairman for the Rome-SSPX commission in charge of the theological discussions, and although his remarks were based on a proposal which has undergone some revisions, these reflections remain most current.

To limit myself to the "Preliminary Note" and "doctrinal Preamble", I must immediately state that they are confusing, misleading, false and essentially bad. Even the apparent openness to criticism of the Council is enigmatic and cunning, a well-trained trap ("... legitimate (?) discussion . . . expressions or formulations . . . as "interpretive criteria of necessary Catholic doctrine...", that is to say, according to the "Preamble" II and III, 2, especially the end). This document is substantially unacceptable. It is worse than the 1988 Protocol, in particular in relation to the Council and the post-conciliar magisterium.

PRINCIPLE OF JUDGMENT

In fact it fits perfectly with the thought and the Roman position that the Commission has expressed all along in the doctrinal discussions. It is essential to the current issue to bear in mind the unmistakable conclusion that we just made on this occasion: they are not ready to give up the Vatican II Council, nor the liberal doctrines of it, and their intention, their obvious desire, is to bring us back to it. At most, Rome would accept a rebalancing and a better wording (formulation), again as part of the "hermeneutic of renewal in continuity". And

then we can discuss and we are very useful . . . to endorse the revival of the reform with continuity.

...

But we have just seen in doctrinal discussions what is their design: pure modernism revised and corrected.

Conclusion Five – Rome stays loyal to its principles

5. **Conclusion: I conclude that the primary reason (on a natural level) that there is no "agreement" in place between the Society and Rome today is that Rome (modernist liberal Rome) is loyal to its modernist liberal principals – to the point that it (Rome) would not enter into an agreement with the Society unless the Society was prepared to accept Rome's principles.**

Conclusion Six – there may be no benefit of an agreement

6. **Conclusion: There is arguably no benefit of an agreement between the Society and Rome, and further, the possible benefit of any such agreement outweighs the risk of an agreement.**

- 6.1. I understand that there is a view that the Society will be able to help (or better help) to convert Rome if it is regularised.
- 6.2. I note that in the (internal) letter from Bishop Fellay to Bishops Tissier de Mallerai, de Galarreta and Williamson dated 14 April 2012⁴⁵, Bishop Fellay states:

Let us note in passing that it was not we who were looking for a practical agreement. That is untrue. We have not refused a priori to consider, as you ask, the Pope's offer. For the common good of the Society, we would prefer by far the current solution of an intermediary status quo, but clearly, Rome is not going to tolerate it any longer.

- 6.3. In an interview between Bishop Tissier de Mallerai and Rivarol which occurred on 1 June 2012 but was published on 15 June 2012 the following comments and exchange took place⁴⁶.

Between the sentiments expressed here by Bishop Tissier de Mallerai and those expressed by Bishop Fellay in his recent interviews and sermons, there is a wide gulf hard to ignore.

RIVAROL: *The imminent "reintegration" of the Society of Saint Pius X (SSPX) within the "official Church" is mentioned widely. What is it exactly?*

Bp. TISSIER de MALLERAI : *"Reintegration": the word is false. The Society of Saint Pius X (SSPX) has never left the Church. It is in the heart of the Church. There where the authentic preaching of the faith is, there is the Church. This project of "officialization" of the SSPX leaves me indifferent. We have no need of it, and the Church has no need of it. We are already on the pinnacle, as a sign of contradiction, that attracts those noble souls, that attract lots of young priests,*

⁴⁵ <http://rorate-caeli.blogspot.com/2012/05/letter-of-general-council-of-society-of.html>

⁴⁶ <http://rorate-caeli.blogspot.com/2012/06/bishop-tissier-de-mallerai.html>

despite our pariah status. One would wish to place our lamp under the bushel for our integration in the Conciliar world. This status that is proposed to us, of a personal prelature, analogous to that of Opus Dei, is a status for a state of peace. But we are currently in a state of war in the Church. It would be a contradiction to wish to "regularize the war".

R. : *But some in the Society of Saint Pius X think that it would be in fact a good thing. Are you not bothered by this "irregular" situation?*

Bp. T.: *The irregularity is not ours. It is that of Rome. A Modernist Rome. A Liberal Rome that has renounced Christ the King. A Rome that had been condemned in advance by all Popes up until the eve of the [Second Vatican] Council. On the other hand, the experience of the priestly societies that have joined current Rome is that all, the ones after the others, included Campos and the Good Shepherd, have been constrained to accept the Vatican II Council. And we know what has become of Bp. Rifan, of Campos, who now has no objection to celebrating the new mass and who has forbidden his priests from criticizing the Council!*

R: *What do you say to those who believe that Rome has changed with Benedict XVI?*

Bp. T: *It is certain that Benedict XVI has made some gestures in favor of Tradition. Especially by declaring that the Traditional Mass has never been suppressed and, in second place, by suppressing the so-called excommunication that had been declared regarding us following our episcopal consecration by Abp. Lefebvre. These two positive gestures drew bitter complaints from the episcopates towards Benedict XVI. But Pope Benedict XVI, while he is Pope, remains Modernist. His programmatic address of December 22, 2005 [on the hermeneutic of continuity and reform] is a profession of the evolution of the truths of faith according to the dominant ideas of each time. Despite his favorable gestures, his real intent by integrating us in the conciliar orb cannot be other than to lead us to Vatican II. He had said it himself to H.E. Bp. Fellay in August 2005, and a confidential note by himself, published fraudulently, has confirmed it recently. (Rorate note: the reference here is to a note attributed to Pope Benedict XVI and referring to the SSPX that was among those publicized in the Vatileaks affair.)*

R: *But some think that Benedict XVI, coming from Catholic Bavaria, and who has displayed, they seem to know, "deep piety since his youth," inspires confidence. How do you respond to them?*

Bp. T.: *It is true that the Pope is very pleasant. He is a kind, polite, thoughtful man, a man who is discreet, but possesses natural authority, of man of decisiveness, who has solved many problems in the Church with his personal energy. For instance, problems of morality in this or that priestly institute. But he*

is imbued with the council. When he says that the resolution of the SSPX problem is one of the main tasks of his pontificate, he does not see where the real problem is. He misplaces it. He sees it in our so-called schism. Well, the problem is not that of the SSPX, it is the problem of Rome, of the neo-Modernist Rome, that is not the eternal Rome anymore, that is not anymore the Mistress of wisdom and truth, but that has become a source of error since the Vatican II council, and that remains so today. Therefore, the solution of the crisis can only come from Rome. After Benedict XVI.

R: *So how do you solve this disagreement with Benedict XVI, which is considered scandalous by many of those in the SSPX?*

Bishop T.: *It is true that the SSPX is a "stumbling block" for those who resist the truth (cf. 1 Petr 2, 8) and this is good for the Church. If we were "reinstated", we would, by that very fact, stop being a thorn in the side of the conciliar church, a living reproach to the loss of faith in Jesus Christ, His divinity, in His kingdom.*

R.: *But, Excellency, you wrote with your two colleagues a letter to H.E. Bp. Fellay to refuse a purely practical agreement with Benedict XVI. What are the reasons for this refusal?*

Bp. T.: *The publication of our letter is due to an indiscretion for which we are not responsible. We refuse a purely practical agreement because the doctrinal question is fundamental. Faith comes before legality. We cannot accept a legalization without the problem of the faith being solved. To submit ourselves now unconditionally to the higher authority imbued with Modernism would be to expose ourselves to have to disobey. And what is the good in that? Abp. Lefebvre said since 1984: "one does not place oneself under an authority when that authority has all the powers to demolish us." And I believe that that is wise. I would like us to produce a text that, renouncing to diplomatic subterfuges, clearly affirms our faith and, consequently, our rejection of the conciliar errors. This proclamation would have the advantage, first, of saying the truth openly to Pope Benedict XVI, who is the first to have the right to the truth, and second to restore the unity of the Catholics of Tradition around a combative and unequivocal profession of faith.*

R.: *Some believe that the statute of personal prelature proposed to you will provide sufficient guarantee to you concerning all danger of abandoning the combat for the faith.*

Bp. T.: *That is incorrect. According to the project of prelature, we would not be free to create new priories without the permission of the local bishops and, additionally, all our recent foundations would have to be confirmed by these same bishops. It would thus mean subjugating us quite unnecessarily to an overall Modernist episcopate.*

R.: Could you detail for us this problem of faith that you wish to see resolved in the first place?

Bp. T.: Certainly. It is, as Abp. Lefebvre used to say, the attempt by the Vatican II Council of conciliating the doctrine of the faith with the liberal errors. It was Benedict XVI himself who said it, in his interview with Vittorio Messori in November 1984, by declaring: "the problem of the 1960s (and therefore of the Council) was the acquisition of the most matured values of two centuries of Liberal culture. They are the values that, while originating outside the Church, may find their place, once purified and corrected, in her vision of the world. And it is what was done." That is the work of the council: an impossible conciliation. "What conciliation can there be between light and darkness?", the Apostle says, "what agreement between Christ and Belial?" (2 Cor 6, 15). The emblematic manifestation of this conciliation is the Declaration on Religious Freedom. In the place of the truth of Christ and of his social kingdom over the nations, the Council places the human person, his conscience and his liberty. It is the famous "change of paradigm" admitted by Cardinal Colombo in the 1980s. The worship of the man who becomes God in the place of the worship of the God who became man (cf. Paul VI, address on the closing of the Council, December 7, 1965). It is a new religion that is not the Catholic religion. We do not want any compromise with this religion, any risk of corruption, not even any appearance of conciliation, and it is this appearance that our so-called "regularization" would give us. May the Immaculate Heart of Mary, immaculate in her faith, guard us in the Catholic faith.

- 6.4. To those who would say that the traditionalists will "convert" the modernists from the inside I refer to what Archbishop Lefebvre, said on the subject, in an interview published in the July-August 1989 edition of *Fideliter*⁴⁷:

*One year after the Consecrations
An Interview with Archbishop Lefebvre*

This interview appeared in the July-August 1989 issue of the Society's magazine in France, Fideliter. It is a typically lucid and profound analysis of the state of the official Church and its relations with the Society.

3: "Lefebvre should have stayed in the Church".

Question: Some people say, "Yes, but Archbishop Lefebvre should have accepted an agreement with Rome because once the Society of St. Pius X had been recognized and the suspensions lifted, he would have been able to act in a more effective manner inside the Church, whereas now he has put himself outside."

⁴⁷ http://www.sspx.org/archbishop_lefebvre/one_year_after_the_consecrations.htm

Archbishop Lefebvre: Such things are easy to say. To stay inside the Church, or to put oneself inside the Church - what does that mean? Firstly, what Church are we talking about? If you mean the Conciliar Church, then we who have struggled against the Council for twenty years because we want the Catholic Church, we would have to re-enter this Conciliar Church in order, supposedly, to make it Catholic. That is a complete illusion. It is not the subjects that make the superiors, but the superiors who make the subjects.

Amongst the whole Roman Curia, amongst all the world's bishops who are progressives, I would have been completely swamped. I would have been able to do nothing, I could have protected neither the faithful nor the seminarians. ...

- 6.5. I question whether the Society's purpose has been "lost" in all the discussions about a "deal" with Rome. It would seem that the Society's objective has become a desire on the Society's part to be regularized. That is, the objective of the SSPX has become to "join Rome" rather than to "convert Rome".

Conclusion Seven – there *is* something to worry about

7. Conclusion: The suggestion that "there is nothing to worry about" or "that nothing has changed" or "that the Society remains true to the principles of Archbishop Lefebvre" are all contrary to the real evidence.

- 7.1. The fact is that the material that is available (including the fact that the Society has informed Rome of the "conditions" that the Society would require for the "normalization" of its relations with Rome) evidence a very significant change in the Society's position. The position of the Society was formerly that the Society would only rejoin Rome when Rome returned to tradition whereas now the Society is prepared to join Conciliar, modernist, liberal Rome and make the Society subject to that modernist, liberal Rome –on condition (one of the 3 essential conditions) that the Society has :

Freedom to keep, to transmit and to teach the sound doctrine of the unchanging magisterium of the Church and of the unchangeable truth of Divine Tradition ; freedom to defend, to correct and to reprove, even in public, those responsible for the errors or novelties of modernism, of liberalism, of The Second Vatican Council and their consequences

- 7.2. That condition evidences that the Society is now prepared to "agree to disagree" with Rome, that the Society will accept and cooperate in a situation where error is put beside truth and at the same level as truth.
- 7.3. I understand that some people have concluded that they need not be concerned about an "agreement" between the Society and Rome because there is in fact no agreement.
- 7.4. I understand that whilst there has not been an agreement, the Statement of the General Chapter indicates that the conditions for an agreement (from the Society's point of view) have been specified.
- 7.5. The truth of the matter is that the position of the society has been maneuvered from consideration of whether or not there could be an agreement, to what the conditions of an agreement should be. I suggest that there should be an urgent review of the real issue - whether or not the Society should enter into an agreement with Rome.
- 7.6. I understand that the members of the General Chapter of the Society sent a statement to Rome on 14 July 2012 and that in that document they said as follows:

... We have recovered our profound unity in its essential mission: to preserve and defend the Catholic Faith, to form good priests, and to strive towards the restoration of Christendom. We have determined and approved the necessary conditions for an eventual canonical normalization. We have decided that, in that case, an extraordinary Chapter with deliberative vote will be convened beforehand.

...

The Society finds its guide as well in the constant Tradition of the Church, which transmits and will transmit until the end of times the teachings required to preserve the Faith and the salvation of souls, while waiting for the day when an open and serious debate will be possible which may allow the return to Tradition of the ecclesiastical authorities.

.....

Given at Econe, on the 14th of July of the Year of the Lord 2012

- 7.7. I understand that in an interview given on 16 July 2012 by DICI⁴⁸ the following exchange occurred:

DICI: How do you foresee the relations with Rome after this Chapter?

Bishop Fellay: All ambiguity has now been resolved among us. Very soon we will convey to Rome the position of the Chapter, which has been the occasion to specify our road map insisting upon the conservation of our identity, the only efficacious means to help the Church to restore Christendom.

- 7.8. I understand that in a letter from Bishop Fellay and Fathers Pfluger and Nely to Bishops Tissier De Mallerais, De Galleretta and Williamson they say as follows:

This concrete situation, with the canonical solution that has been proposed, is quite different from that of 1988. And when we compare the arguments that Archbishop Lefebvre made at the time, we conclude that he would not have hesitated to accept what is being proposed to us. Let us not lose our sense of the Church, which was so strong in our venerated founder.

- 7.9. I understand that the Society has provided Rome with a set of "conditions" to which the SSPX "binds itself". I understand that the conditions are as set out below and that the conditions were provided after the General Chapter in July 2012. The fact that the conditions were provided to Rome and published is evidence that:

- 7.9.1. The Society will enter into a practical agreement;
- 7.9.2. The Society will enter into an agreement without a doctrinal resolution;
- 7.9.3. The Society will enter into an agreement on terms that will make the Society subject to Rome.

- 7.10. I understand that the conditions are as follows:

⁴⁸ Source: DICI 258 Doctrinal mutism is not answer to "silent apostasy" Bishop Fellay interview about SSPX General Chapter

Also, the preconditions for eventual normalisation of our relations with the official Church were given a better definition.

PART I: The "Sine Qua Non" conditions

The sine qua non conditions to which the Society binds itself and that she requires from the Roman authorities before considering a canonical recognition:

1 Freedom to keep, to transmit and to teach the sound doctrine of the unchanging magisterium of the Church and of the immutable truth of Divine Tradition ; freedom to defend, to correct and to reprove, even publicly, those responsible for the errors or novelties of modernism, of liberalism, of The Second Vatican Council and their consequences ;

2 Exclusive use of the 1962 liturgy. The retention of the sacramental practice that we have at the moment (including holy orders, confirmation and marriage) ;

3 The guarantee of at least one bishop.

PART II: "Desirable" conditions

1 Our own ecclesiastical tribunals, in the first instance;

2 Exemption of houses of The Society of St Pius X in respect of diocesan bishops;

3 A Pontifical Commission in Rome for Tradition, dependent on the Pope, with a majority of members, and the presidency, for Tradition.

7.11. I understand that according to a recent publicized sermon from a Society priest:

"all SSPX priests have been commanded by Menzinger to be silent and to not preach against an agreement or compromise. "We are required to be silent in all those things which may be perceived against the direction of the present Superior General."

7.12. If that is in fact the position in the Society then it seems clear that if the Society Bishops and priests are regularized by Pope Benedict then it is a small step for us to believe that our priests and Bishops would be required to be silent in all things which may be perceived against the direction of the Pope, or local Bishop.

7.13. I note that the Society has spoken of Rome in firm terms for many years. How can a priest be true to the priest's oath against modernism if the priest does not speak against the fact that Rome is infected with modernism? How can a priest not quote his Lordship Archbishop Lefebvre?

7.14. How will a priest of the Society be able to criticize their superiors (including the diocesan bishops) after an agreement if they are not allowed to do so before and agreement?

- 7.15. I note that 3 of the 4 bishops of the Society have spoken against an agreement with Rome and it seems that the issues and arguments that have been raised warrant careful and serious consideration. I am concerned that if priests are not able to preach against an agreement now then how will they be able to preach against the errors after an agreement is finalized – as appears to be contemplated (suggested) by the first of the 6 conditions referred to below.
- 7.16. I understand that there appears to be uncertainty regarding the Society's position. For example, on one hand there are continuing discussions about the six conditions and the eventual regularization of the society but on the other hand there are statements to the effect that there will be no agreement whilst Pope Benedict is the Pope.
- 7.17. For example, during September 2012 ⁴⁹ Father Schmidberger participated in an interview that is summarized as follows.

...On the first question, dealing with the General Chapter, Fr. Schmidberger remarks about the gain for the SSPX itself: "the General Chapter has provided us with a new unity within our own ranks, [a unity] which had suffered a bit in recent times; and that is a big grace of God, I would say". Concerning the external aspect of the General Chapter, Father remarks that there are three points which must be demanded from the authorities if a visible union with Rome will be established. These are: firstly, that the SSPX will be given the freedom to expose the errors of Vatican II; secondly, that the SSPX will be allowed to only use the liturgical books of 1962; and thirdly, that there must always be a bishop in the Fraternity from within its own ranks.

- 7.18. For example, in a letter written by Father Couture in September 2012, Father Couture states:

September 8, 2012

Dear Faithful,

*..... It is my duty to clarify many things to understand what is happening now.
A deal with modernist Rome?*

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.

⁴⁹ Fr. Andreas Steiner, spokesman of the German District of the Society of Saint Pius X (FSSPX / SSPX), interviewed Germany's current District Superior and former Superior General of the Society Fr. Franz Schmidberger

Some however thought and prophesised that Bishop Fellay was going to surrender the SSPX to the modernist authorities, to the conciliar errors and to the new mass. They were certain this was going to happen in June. But it didn't. They then announced it was going to happen in July. It didn't. Now they say it will be in October, or November, it will not. Or in 5 or 10 years. It will not! They are like the false prophets announcing repeatedly that the end of world is imminent, and that we should store food in our houses in preparation. As a consequence people live in constant fear of what might happen soon. Those who are doing this today are leading souls by fear and away from Catholic Tradition.

The SSPX in Korea

Many false rumours and accusations are circulating at the present about the SSPX in Korea, unfortunately by some of our faithful who have now been caught in this "fear-of-a-deal" syndrome. Let me clarify this.

1. Our Holy Faith

We profess as we have always done to maintain the Catholic Faith in line with the famous Declaration of Archbishop Lefebvre, in 1974:

We hold firmly with all our heart and with all our mind to Catholic Rome, Guardian of the Catholic Faith and of the traditions necessary to the maintenance of this faith, to the eternal Rome, mistress of wisdom and truth. We refuse on the other hand, and have always refused, to follow the Rome of NeoModernist and Neo-Protestant tendencies, which became clearly manifest during the Second Vatican Council, and after the Council, in all the reforms which issued from it. ...

This is what we are, and, by the grace of God, what we will remain.

Conclusion

Dear Faithful, the Society of St Pius X will not abandon you! You have come to us to be guided by priests who provide you with the sound doctrine and with the grace of God, priests who belong to a large organization, the SSPX. !

Fr Daniel Couture

7.19. It seems to me that Father Couture's letter, and the general "suggestion" that the Society will not enter into an agreement with Rome is contrary to the Society's position as evidenced by the statement issued by the General Chapter, by the comments of Father Schmidberger and by other material. As referred to previously:

- 7.19.1. the Society has issued the conditions for its eventual normalisation by Conciliar Rome. Those conditions do not deal with any return, by Rome, to tradition and nor do those conditions deal with any doctrinal solution. That in itself is an express admission that the Society will enter into an agreement with Rome before Rome converts to tradition;

- 7.19.2. it is an illusion to think that any agreement with Conciliar Rome which is subject to any conditions would enable the Society to "maintain the Catholic Faith in line with the famous Declaration of Archbishop Lefebvre, in 1974";
- 7.19.3. the conditions contemplate (admit) that the Society will be subject to "the Rome of NeoModernist and Neo-Protestant tendencies" because the conditions contemplate (admit) that the Society will be subject to the diocesan Bishops (the condition for exemption is only desirable) and that the Society will be subject to the Conciliar Church's ecclesiastical tribunals (the condition refers to a tribunal for the Society in the first instance only and the condition is only desirable) and that the Society will be subject to a "Pontifical Commission in Rome for Tradition".
- 7.20. Father Couture says "We refuse on the other hand, and have always refused, to follow the Rome of NeoModernist and Neo-Protestant tendencies, which became clearly manifest during the Second Vatican Council, and after the Council, in all the reforms which issued from it". But, with respect, the problem is that such words have little meaning when coupled with the fact that the Society has issued the "six conditions". I suggest that the effect of a practical agreement (which is contemplated by the six conditions) would be as follows:

..

*And I may say, had the Society entered into this same agreement, we would be more or less doing the same thing, [as Campos] and if not agreed on all the same points as Campos, at least there would be enormous division among us. Some would say to me, "We have to make an agreement. If you don't do it we are going to lose something." Others would say, "By all means, no." There would be enormous division and a tremendous loss. Why is this? - Because Rome is not at all convinced of the necessity of Tradition, of the necessity of coming back to Tradition to get out of this unbelievable crisis in which we have been since the Council, because they do not want to go to the roots of this crisis. The roots were clearly legalized, put into law, at the time of the Council, and these modern errors are what are killing the Church*⁵⁰ .

- 7.21. Dear Father Couture, with respect, I beg you to review the following extract from a conference by the Superior General of the Society in the year 2004 and the statement of the General Chapter in 2006 and to compare his comments and the statement then with the recent statement of the General Chapter and the "six conditions". Objectively

⁵⁰ In a conference given by Bishop Bernard Fellay on November 10, 2004 at St. Vincent de Paul Church in Kansas City, MO, and originally printed in the November 2004 issue of The Angelus magazine titled "What Catholics need to know" refer http://www.sspcx.org/sspcx_and_rome/what_catholics_need_to_know.htm

speaking, there is a wide divide between the two positions (2004 and 2006 versus 2012). In 2004 the Superior General said "nothing will ever happen" and there would be "no agreement" as long as "the Pope and his collaborators...were convinced..", there would be no agreement before "Rome confirms us in the Faith of all time...". In 2012, the General Chapter imposed NO conditions requiring any change in Rome. The General Chapter simply required the "*Freedom to keep, to transmit and to teach...freedom to defend, to correct and to reprove.....*". The two positions are irreconcilable – the position in 2004 requires Rome to change and the position in 2012 does not. With respect, I submit that something "new" has already happened. With respect, I submit that the Superiors of the Society have already said that the Society will surrender. With respect, I submit that the practical effect of the change would be that the Society will in time "abandon" us.

7.22. In the year 2004 Bishop Fellay stated as follows ⁵¹:

... But this would be possible only on the condition that in Rome, the Pope and his collaborators were convinced of the absolute necessity of Tradition. As long as they are not, nothing will ever happen. Nevertheless, we have to say these things, and I continue to make my requests.

.....That is what we request from Rome, that Rome confirm us in the Faith, the Faith of all time, the Faith which cannot change. We have the strict right to request this from the Roman authorities, and we do not think that we will really progress towards an agreement as long as Rome has not shown a concrete will to dissipate the smoke that has invaded the temple of God, darkened the Faith, and paralyzed the supernatural life of the Church under cover of the Council and its subsequent reforms. There will be no agreement before then.

7.23. In 2006 the General Chapter stated:

....The purpose is not just to benefit the Society, nor to arrive at some merely practical impossible agreement. When Tradition comes back into its own, "reconciliation will no longer be a problem, and the Church will spring back to life".

⁵¹Conference given by Bishop Bernard Fellay on November 10, 2004 at St. Vincent de Paul Church in Kansas City, MO http://www.sspix.org/sspix_and_rome/what_catholics_need_to_know.htm

Conclusion Eight – many in the Society appear to be prepared to desert its principles

8. **Conclusion: Many of the Superiors of the Society (and many other Priests in the Society) appear to be prepared to enter into a Practical Agreement rather than an agreement based on the Faith or the doctrine of the Church. This represents a change in their position. The position of the Society was that the Society would only "join" Rome when Rome was traditional – whereas some members of the Society are now prepared to join Rome without any doctrinal solution and without Rome returning to tradition. That position, namely the preparedness and the desire to enter into a practical agreement with Rome is in direct opposition to the previously published position of the Society and its superiors including the published positions of Archbishop Lefebvre, Bishop Fellay, Father Schmidberger and many other priests.**

8.1. The proposal for a practical agreement is inconsistent with the Declaration of the Society following the 2006 General Chapter⁵². That declaration provides as follows:

DECLARATION OF THE SSPX'S 2006 GENERAL CHAPTER

For the glory of God, for the salvation of souls and for the true service of the Church, on the occasion of its Third General Chapter, held at Ecône in Switzerland, from July 3 to 15, 2006, the Priestly Society of St. Pius X declares its firm resolution to continue its action, with the help of God, along the doctrinal and practical lines laid down by its venerated founder, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre.

Following in his footsteps in the fight for the Catholic Faith, the Society fully endorses his criticisms of the Second Vatican Council and its reforms, as he expressed them in his conferences and sermons, and in particular in his Declaration of November 21, 1974:

We adhere with all our heart and all our soul to Catholic Rome, guardian of the Catholic Faith and of the traditions necessary for the maintaining of that Faith, to eternal Rome, mistress of wisdom and of truth. On the contrary, we refuse, and we have always refused, to follow the Rome of neo-modernist and neo-Protestant tendencies, which showed itself clearly in the Second Vatican Council and in the reforms that issued from it.

Contacts held with Rome over the last few years have enabled the Society to see how right and necessary were the two pre-conditions that it laid down, since they would greatly benefit the Church by re-establishing, at least in part, her rights to her own Tradition. Not only would the treasure of graces available to the Society

52

http://www.sspix.org/superior_generals_news/2006_general_chapter/declaration_of_2006_general_chapter.htm

no longer be hidden under a bushel, but the Mystical Body would also be given the remedy it so needs to be healed.

If, upon these pre-conditions being fulfilled, the Society looks to a possible debate on doctrine, the purpose is still that of making the voice of traditional teaching sound more clearly within the Church. Likewise, the contacts made from time to time with the authorities in Rome have no other purpose than to help them embrace once again that Tradition which the Church cannot repudiate without losing her identity. The purpose is not just to benefit the Society, nor to arrive at some merely practical impossible agreement. When Tradition comes back into its own, "reconciliation will no longer be a problem, and the Church will spring back to life".

On this long road to re-conquest, the Chapter encourages all members of the Society to live, as its statutes require, ever more intensely by the grace proper to it, namely, in union with the great prayer of the High Priest, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Let them be convinced, along with their faithful, that in this striving for an ever greater sanctification in the heart of the Church is to be found the only remedy for our present misfortunes, which is the Church being restored through the restoration of the priesthood.

In the end, my Immaculate Heart will triumph.

- 8.2. The proposal for a practical agreement is inconsistent with Bishop Fellay's previous position. Bishop Fellay has previously stated:

The day will come, we are sure and certain, when Rome will come back to Rome's own Tradition and restore it to its rightful place, and we long with all our hearts for that blessed day. For the time being, however, things are not yet at that point, and to foster illusions would be deadly for the SSPX, as we can see, when we follow the turn of events in Campos." (Superior General's Letter to Friends & Benefactors" # 63⁵³ 6 January 2003)

But it would be very imprudent and hasty to dash off ill-advisedly in pursuit of a practical agreement that would not be based on the Church's fundamental principles, and especially the faith. (Superior General's Letter to Friends & Benefactors # 72⁵⁴ dated April 2008)

... So what we try to say to Rome in all these things is, "Listen, we have to get to the root of the problems." We don't want to make an agreement just for the sake of an agreement. A prelate in the Vatican said to me, "Don't make a cosmetic agreement with Rome." And it is true, we don't want any kind of cosmetic agreement. Things are too serious. The Faith is at stake. We want to keep the

⁵³ http://www.sspix.org/superior_generals_news/supgen_63.htm

⁵⁴ http://www.sspix.org/superior_generals_news/sup_gen_ltr_72.pdf

Faith! (Conference given by Bishop Bernard Fellay on November 10, 2004 at St. Vincent de Paul Church in Kansas City, MO⁵⁵)

..... But this would be possible only on the condition that in Rome, the Pope and his collaborators were convinced of the absolute necessity of Tradition. As long as they are not, nothing will ever happen. Nevertheless, we have to say these things, and I continue to make my requests.

That is what we request from Rome, that Rome confirm us in the Faith, the Faith of all time, the Faith which cannot change. We have the strict right to request this from the Roman authorities, and we do not think that we will really progress towards an agreement as long as Rome has not shown a concrete will to dissipate the smoke that has invaded the temple of God, darkened the Faith, and paralyzed the supernatural life of the Church under cover of the Council and its subsequent reforms. There will be no agreement before then. (Conference given by Bishop Bernard Fellay on November 10, 2004 at St. Vincent de Paul Church in Kansas City, MO⁵⁶)

So, things are absolutely not ripe for an agreement. We must first help correct Rome's thinking to show them that what they do is wrong. ... (Conference given by Bishop Bernard Fellay on November 10, 2004 at St. Vincent de Paul Church in Kansas City, MO⁵⁷)

8.3. The proposal for a practical Agreement is inconsistent with the position of Archbishop Lefebvre;

"Some people are always admiring the grass in the neighbour's field...they look to our enemies on the other side. "After all, we must be charitable, we must be kind, we must not be divisive, after all, they are celebrating the Tridentine Mass, they are not as bad as everyone says" —but THEY ARE BETRAYING US —betraying us! They are shaking hands with the Church's destroyers. They are shaking hands with people holding modernist and liberal ideas condemned by the Church. So they are doing the devil's work. They are now saying: "So long as they grant us the old Mass, we can shake hands with Rome, no problem." But we are seeing how it works out. They are in an impossible situation. Impossible. One cannot both shake hands with modernists and keep following Tradition. Not possible. Not possible. (Archbishop Lefebvre's address to his priests given in Econe, Switzerland on 6 September 1990) ⁵⁸

*(Archbishop Lefebvre, Letter to future Bishops Aug. 29, 1987)
1987*

⁵⁵ http://www.sspix.org/sspx_and_rome/what_catholics_need_to_know.htm

⁵⁶ http://www.sspix.org/sspx_and_rome/what_catholics_need_to_know.htm

⁵⁷ http://www.sspix.org/sspx_and_rome/what_catholics_need_to_know.htm

⁵⁸ http://www.sspix.org/archbishop_lefebvre/two_years_after_the_consecrations.htm

"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 doing 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! Certain!"

*(Archbishop Lefebvre, Conference, October 4, 1987
Marcel Lefebvre by Bishop Tissier de Mallerais, pp. 547-548;*

The adulterous union of the Church and the Revolution is cemented by "dialogue." Our Lord said "Go, teach all nations and convert them." He did not say "Hold dialogue with them but don't try to convert them." Truth and error are incompatible; to dialogue with error is to put God and the devil on the same footing. This is what the Popes have always repeated and what was easy for Christians to understand because it is also a matter of common sense. In order to impose different attitudes and reactions it was necessary to do some indoctrinating so as to make modernists of the clergy needed to spread the new doctrine. This is what is called "recycling," a conditioning process intended to refashion the very faculty God gave man to direct his judgment.⁵⁹

- 8.4. The Proposal is inconsistent with the position of other Bishops in the Society. For example, in an interview on 1 June 2012 between Bishop Tissier de Mallerais and Rivarol, the following exchange occurred.

***R.:** But, Excellency, you wrote with your two colleagues a letter to H.E. Bp. Fellay to refuse a purely practical agreement with Benedict XVI. What are the reasons for this refusal?*

***Bp. T.:** The publication of our letter is due to an indiscretion for which we are not responsible. We refuse a purely practical agreement because the doctrinal question is fundamental. Faith comes before legality. We cannot accept a legalization without the problem of the faith being solved. To submit ourselves now unconditionally to the higher authority imbibed with Modernism would be to expose ourselves to have to disobey. And what is the good in that? Abp. Lefebvre said since 1984: "one does not place oneself under an authority when that authority has all the powers to demolish us." And I believe that that is wise. I would like us to produce a text that, renouncing to diplomatic subterfuges, clearly affirms our faith and, consequently, our rejection of the conciliar errors. This proclamation would have the advantage, first, of saying the truth openly to Pope*

⁵⁹ Chapter 15, "An Open Letter to Confused Catholics" By Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre

Benedict XVI, who is the first to have the right to the truth, and second to restore the unity of the Catholics of Tradition around a combative and unequivocal profession of faith.

...

R.: Could you detail for us this problem of faith that you wish to see resolved in the first place?

Bp. T.: Certainly. It is, as Abp. Lefebvre used to say, the attempt by the Vatican II Council of conciliating the doctrine of the faith with the liberal errors. It was Benedict XVI himself who said it, in his interview with Vittorio Messori in November 1984, by declaring: "the problem of the 1960s (and therefore of the Council) was the acquisition of the most matured values of two centuries of Liberal culture. They are the values that, while originating outside the Church, may find their place, once purified and corrected, in her vision of the world. And it is what was done." That is the work of the council: an impossible conciliation. "What conciliation can there be between light and darkness?", the Apostle says, "what agreement between Christ and Belial?" (2 Cor 6, 15). The emblematic manifestation of this conciliation is the Declaration on Religious Freedom. In the place of the truth of Christ and of his social kingdom over the nations, the Council places the human person, his conscience and his liberty. It is the famous "change of paradigm" admitted by Cardinal Colombo in the 1980s. The worship of the man who becomes God in the place of the worship of the God who became man (cf. Paul VI, address on the closing of the Council, December 7, 1965). It is a new religion that is not the Catholic religion. We do not want any compromise with this religion, any risk of corruption, not even any appearance of conciliation, and it is this appearance that our so-called "regularization" would give us. May the Immaculate Heart of Mary, immaculate in her faith, guard us in the Catholic faith.

8.5. I provide the following extended extracts.

8.6. In Bishop Fellay's "Superior General's Letter to Friends & Benefactors" number 62⁶⁰ written on 7 June 2002, Bishop Fellay says as follows:

*Dear Friends and Benefactors,
Catholic Tradition, in its relations with the Vatican, has truly lived through a number of important events over the last two years.*

Yet while a number of priests draw closer to us, Campos is going back to Rome. We think that the decisive argument for Rome to win them over was the promise of a bishop alongside Bishop Rangel, now gravely ill. They wrote to me that they considered that they could not refuse the Holy Father's wish to give them a bishop, because "that would be schismatic." By way of a bishop, all they have is a promise: "I shall give you a successor." Of course, nobody dares doubt such a

⁶⁰ http://www.sspx.org/superior_generals_news/supgen_62.htm

promise, but the whole question turns on the identity of this successor: who will he be? Where will he be chosen from? One may well think that Rome will seek to ensure the future bishop's faithfulness to Vatican II, because some of the Romans still have reservations as to the "orthodoxy" of Campos's doctrinal stance. Suspicion reigns in Rome.

Campos had also been promised freedom to operate throughout Brazil, but when local bishops opposed the idea, then the freedom of action of the administration granted by Rome shrank back to the limits of the diocese of Campos, period.

What will Campos do? While Campos sets out on its hazardous enterprise armed with ambiguous statements, we see something of great interest happening: at the very same moment, several Catholic communities in Brazil of men and women in no way connected with the priests of Campos have contacted the Society of St. Plus X and wish... to join Tradition! And to send their future seminarians to the Society's South American seminary. In fact, a significant number of faithful scattered all over the huge area of Brazil are beginning to react, and are asking for our help, not for the help of Campos. What a surprise development! It is as though suddenly Brazil was opening up to the Society's apostolate. All we need are workers, meaning priests, and more priests...

Meanwhile, having succeeded in drawing Campos away from the Society and, little by little, from its doctrinal positions, Cardinal Castrillón sent us on April 5 of this year a written reply to our letter of June 22, 2001. In it he proposed to re-start the "dialogue." Before saying a word about it, let me recall the previous exchanges:

When Rome began by offering to the Society a juridical structure with official recognition, then, while expressing our readiness to open discussions, we emphasized the need to rebuild trust.

...But at the same time this letter clearly illustrates that the dialogue of the deaf is not over: how little this Rome understands our position! We might have been willing to go into these various points had the letter not been accompanied by maneuvers making us recall Archbishop Lefebvre's words just before the Episcopal Consecrations of June, 1988, when he said: "The moment for a free and open collaboration between the Society and Rome has not yet come," words as relevant as ever. The maneuvers were twofold:

On the one hand, the cardinal stated in his letter that, given the gravity of the matter in hand, he had always abstained from giving public interviews; yet only a few days later in an interview given to the prominent Italian newspaper La Stampa, he declared that the Society was divided into two groups: "a large majority ardently desiring reconciliation with Rome to relieve its conscience (Letter of April 5), and a little group of fanatics wanting nothing to do with

Rome." (Yet in his letter, the cardinal expressed his desire not to divide the Society).

On the other hand, a few days after sending me the April 5 letter in strict privacy (double envelope, "personal," "confidential"), he faxed the same letter to three other members of the Society! There is no need to go looking for what he was up to, the facts speak for themselves; there is a real attempt here to divide us, which tells us clearly what we must do: keep our distance.

In such circumstances, to begin discussions with Rome is not reasonable. It is imprudent, impossible. Truly, these Romans have no idea what we are about.

...

In conclusion, we see how far Cardinal Castrillón has gone wrong... All of us desire the Church's unity, a unity grounded in the Faith, carried out around Peter confirming his fellow bishops in that Faith, and consummated in the union of Catholics in the Eucharist. To preserve that unity, all of us, to obey our Catholic conscience, have had to avoid driving onto the broad and easy highway proposed by the Conciliar reforms. It is to ease our conscience that we are where we are, and our conscience would be in no way eased if we were to suddenly set out on a path which, precisely in order to stay Catholic, we have refused for 30 years.

+ Bernard Fellay
Superior General

- 8.7. In Bishop Fellay's "Superior General's Letter to Friends & Benefactors" number 63⁶¹ written on 6 January 2003, Bishop Fellay says as follows:

Dear Friends and Benefactors,

OUR RELATIONS WITH ROME

... In the eyes of Rome, obviously, what happened in Campos was merely meant to be the prelude to our own "regularization" in the Society of St. Pius X, but in our eyes what is happening to our former friends should rather serve as a lesson to us.

Generally speaking, Rome means, all things being equal, to come to an agreement with the SSPX. On all sides we hear that the pope would like to settle this matter before he dies. Alas, our fears roused by the Campos agreement have proved to be well-founded, and the evolution we observe of the Campos Apostolic Administration, contrary to Roman expectations, leaves us distrustful.

...

... Various explanations are possible, but it is primarily because of the pluralist and ecumenical vision of things now prevailing in the Catholic world. According to this vision, everybody is to mix together without anybody needing any longer to convert, as Cardinal Kasper said in connection with the Orthodox and even the

⁶¹ http://www.sspx.org/superior_generals_news/supgen_63.htm

Jews. From such a standpoint there will even be a little room for Catholic Tradition, but for our part we cannot accept this vision of variable truth any more than a mathematics teacher can accept a variable multiplication table.

The day will come, we are sure and certain, when Rome will come back to Rome's own Tradition and restore it to its rightful place, and we long with all our hearts for that blessed day. For the time being, however, things are not yet at that point, and to foster illusions would be deadly for the SSPX, as we can see, when we follow the turn of events in Campos. For this purpose, let us emphasize two points in the evolution of the Campos situation: firstly, how their attitude to Rome has changed since the agreement and secondly, how Campos is moving further and further away from ourselves, with all the upset that that implies.

CHANGES IN CAMPOS

Campos, through its leader, Bishop Rifan, is crying out for all to hear that nothing has changed, that the priests of the Apostolic Administration are just as Traditional as before, which is the essence of what they have been granted, and why they accepted Rome's offer: because Rome approved of the Traditional position.

For our part, let us begin by noting that we are well aware that in any disagreement one tends to discredit one's adversary. For instance in the case of our former friends in Campos, there are certainly false rumors circulating to the effect that "Bishop Rifan has concelebrated the New Mass", or, "Campos has completely given up Tradition". However, that being said, here is what we observe:

*The Campos website lays out the Campos position on the burning question of ecumenism: they claim to follow the Magisterium of the Church, past and present. There are quotes from Pius XI's encyclical letter *Mortalium Animos*, next to quotes from John Paul II's *Redemptoris Missio*. We cannot help observing that there has been a careful selection process: Campos quotes John Paul II's traditional passages while other passages introducing a quite new way of looking at the question are passed over. We read, "Being Catholics, we have no particular teaching of our own on the question. Our teaching is none other than that of the Church's Magisterium. The extracts which we publish here from certain documents old and new, bear especially on points of Catholic doctrine which are in greater danger today".*

The ambiguity implicit here has become more or less normal in the new situation in which they find themselves: they emphasize those points in the present pontificate which seem favorable to Tradition, and tip-toe past the rest. Say what we will: there took place in Campos on January 18, 2002, not only a one-sided recognition of Campos by Rome, as some claim, but also, in exchange, an undertaking by Campos to keep quiet, And how could it be otherwise? It is clear by now that Campos has something to lose which they are afraid or losing, and so

in order not to lose it they have chosen the path of compromise: "We Brazilians are men of peace, you Frenchmen are always fighting". Which means that, in order to keep the peace with Rome, one must stop fighting. They no longer see the situation of the Church as a whole, they content themselves with Rome's gesture in favor of a little group of two dozen priests and say that there is no longer any emergency in the Church because the granting of a traditional bishop has created a new juridical situation...They are forgetting the wood for a single tree.

Bishop Rifan, in the course of a brief visit to Europe, went to see Dom Gerard at Le Barroux Abbey in France to present his apologies for having so criticized him back in 1988 when Dom Gerard condemned Archbishop Lefebvre's consecrating or four bishops. In a lecture he gave to the monks, Bishop Rifan pretended there were two phases in the life of Bishop de Castro Mayer: up till 1981 he was supposedly a docile bishop respecting the rest of the hierarchy, from 1981 onwards he was a much harder churchman... "We choose to follow the pre-1981 de Castro Mayer", said Bishop Rifan to the monks, some of whom were surprised at such words, and one of them was scandalized to the point of coming over to the SSPX.

Within this way of thinking even the Novus Ordo Mass can be accommodated. Campos forgets the 62 reasons for having nothing to do with it, Campos now finds that if it is properly celebrated, it is valid (which we have never denied, but that is not the point). Campos no longer says that Catholics must stay away because the New Mass is bad, and dangerous. Bishop Rifan says, by way of justifying his position on the Mass: "So we reject all use of the traditional Mass as a battle-flag to insult and fight the lawfully constituted hierarchical authority of the Church. We stay with the traditional Mass, not out of any spirit of contradiction, but as a clear and lawful expression of our Catholic Faith (...)". We are reminded of the words of a Cardinal a little while back: "Whereas the SSPX is FOR the old Mass, the Fraternity of St. Peter Is AGAINST the New Mass. It's not the same thing". That was Rome's argument to justify taking action against Fr. Bisig of the Fraternity of St. Peter at about the same time that Rome was cozying up to the SSPX. The cardinal's curious distinction is now being put into practice by Campos, as they pretend to be for the old Mass but not against the new. Likewise for Tradition, but not against today's Rome. "We maintain that Vatican II cannot contradict Catholic Tradition", said Bishop Rifan quite recently to a French magazine, Famille Chretienne. Yet a well-known cardinal said that Vatican II was the French Revolution inside the Church. Bishop de Castro Mayer said the same thing....

So little by little the will to fight grows weaker and finally one gets used to the situation. In Campos itself, everything positively traditional is being maintained, for sure, so the people see nothing different, except that the more perceptive amongst them notice the priests' tendency to speak respectfully and more often of recent statements and events coming out of Rome, while yesterday's warnings and today's deviations are left out. The great danger here is that in the end one gets

used to the situation as it is, and no longer tries to remedy it. For our part we have no intention of launching out until we are certain that Rome means to maintain Tradition. We need signs that they have converted.

LEAVING THE SSPX BEHIND

...

One may object that our arguments are weak and too subtle, and of no weight as against Rome's offer to regularize our situation. We reply that if one considers Rome's offer of an Apostolic Administration just by itself, it is as splendid as the architect's plan of a beautiful mansion. But the real problem is the practical problem of what foundations the mansion will rest on. On the shifting sands of Vatican II, or on the rock of Tradition going back to the first Apostle?

To guarantee our future, we must obtain from today's Rome clear proof of its attachment to the Rome of yesterday. When the Roman authorities have re-stated with actions speaking louder than words that "there must be no innovations outside of Tradition", then "we" shall no longer be a problem. And we beg God to hasten that day when the whole Church will flourish again, having re-discovered the secret of her past strength, freed from the modern unthought of which Paul VI said that "It is anti-Catholic in nature, Maybe it will prevail. It will never be the Church. There will have to be a faithful remnant, however tiny".

.....

+Bishop Fellay
January 6, 2003

- 8.8. In Bishop Fellay's "Superior General's Letter to Friends & Benefactors" number 65⁶² written on 8 December 2003, Bishop Fellay says as follows:

Dear Friends and Benefactors,

...Here is a very recent illustration of it: at the beginning of October a new inter-religious meeting took place at Fatima. It is the same thing as Assisi. But now it is at the heart of a Marian sanctuary. The building of a great multi-religious temple there has been announced, under the aegis of the Vatican and ... (wait for it...) the UN!

How can any agreement [with Rome] be possible under such conditions? How can we pass over such aberrations in silence? We reject all "nuanced" agreements, we affirm the contradiction between the true and the false, and we assert our firm will to have nullam partem (no part) in such an enterprise. Why? Quite simply, because we want to remain Catholics. We must turn our backs with horror and disgust on such a way of seeing the Church and living in "communion." How can anyone claim that modernist "Rome" has changed and is becoming favourable to Tradition? What delusion!

⁶² http://www.ssp.org/superior_generals_news/supgen_65.htm

- ...
- 8.9. In a conference given by Bishop Bernard Fellay on November 10, 2004 at St. Vincent de Paul Church in Kansas City, MO⁶³, and originally printed in the November 2004 issue of The Angelus magazine titled "What Catholics need to know" Bishop Fellay states as follows:

Let us review the current situation of the Society of St. Pius X and its relations with Rome. Our status with Rome remains and will always be a very important question. When I refer to Rome, of course, I refer to the Holy Father, Pope John Paul II and the hierarchy. Obviously, the Catholic Church is unthinkable without this hierarchy, without its head, the Pope, and so we are attached to it. We adhere to it and at the same time we protest energetically. Despite its adherence, the Society of St. Pius X is considered a black sheep. All kinds of labels are our glory, like "excommunicated," "schismatic," etc.

.....

We are in a time of dissolution; everything is crumbling. This can cause a certain difficulty for us, in the sense of how we are going to react. We must be careful that our reaction fits the reality. If we automatically presume that everybody is against us, and take the bazooka and shoot at everybody, we may shoot friends, you see! We have to pay close attention and be realistic in our attitude, recognizing what is good and at the same time being careful not to think that everything is fine, because it is definitely not. On the other hand, you have those who say, "Look, Rome is opening its arms, Rome is saying, 'Come in; we'll give you an apostolic administration; we'll give you whatever you want,' so why are you so stand-offish?" I'll tell you why, which is one of the purposes of this conference. It is impressive.

...

Now, it is important to understand why Rome has suddenly come to the Society of Saint Pius X with a smile and friendly behaviour. Not long ago, Rome was very much against us (and the majority in Rome still is). 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 is 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 pluricity, pluriformity.

.....

And I may say, had the Society entered into this same agreement, we would be more or less doing the same thing, and if not agreed on all the same points as Campos, at least there would be enormous division among us. Some would say to me, "We have to make an agreement. If you don't do it we are going to lose something." Others would say, "By all means, no." There would be enormous division and a tremendous loss. Why is this? - Because Rome is not at all convinced of the necessity of Tradition, of the necessity of coming back to Tradition to get out of this unbelievable crisis in which we have been since the

⁶³ http://www.sspix.org/sspix_and_rome/what_catholics_need_to_know.htm

Council, because they do not want to go to the roots of this crisis. The roots were clearly legalized, put into law, at the time of the Council, and these modern errors are what are killing the Church.

...

Authority if from God

...

These are basics but they are very important. It is very important that you have the right understanding of obedience, because we are called "rebels" and other labels which you know by heart by now. It is just not true. It is like when Rome says to us, "Come back." We say, "We are sorry, but we can't." Why? - Because we are already in; we have never been away, so where do you want us to come back from? We are already in.

...

... So what we try to say to Rome in all these things is, "Listen, we have to get to the root of the problems." We don't want to make an agreement just for the sake of an agreement. A prelate in the Vatican said to me, "Don't make a cosmetic agreement with Rome." And it is true, we don't want any kind of cosmetic agreement. Things are too serious. The Faith is at stake. We want to keep the Faith!

... But this would be possible only on the condition that in Rome, the Pope and his collaborators were convinced of the absolute necessity of Tradition. As long as they are not, nothing will ever happen. Nevertheless, we have to say these things, and I continue to make my requests.

It's about the Faith itself

... To the cardinal I write:

That is what we request from Rome, that Rome confirm us in the Faith, the Faith of all time, the Faith which cannot change. We have the strict right to request this from the Roman authorities, and we do not think that we will really progress towards an agreement as long as Rome has not shown a concrete will to dissipate the smoke that has invaded the temple of God, darkened the Faith, and paralyzed the supernatural life of the Church under cover of the Council and its subsequent reforms. There will be no agreement before then.

...

...But this has nothing to do with the Catholic Church, period. It is not the Catholic Church; it is something else, but it is winning. That's the problem. It is like a cancer. Cancers are inside. You may say that a cancer is a tumor, that it is not you. True, but it is still inside. If you can, you cut it out, but after the cancer has spread all over, then the doctors quit. They don't try to remove it, because that would do more harm. I say that this is the situation in which we find the Church. There are foreign entities inside the Church, things which have nothing to do with the Church: they are inside, and they have spread all over in such a way that you cannot take a knife and say, "Let us take this part away," because you would have to cut everything. That is the tragedy of our situation.

Defense of the Faith is not dialogue but warfare

You can see that it goes far beyond the Mass alone. It is the whole religion which is at stake. It is an enormous fight, a fight which goes from top to bottom, in which every Catholic is involved. Nobody can say, Here, I am safe. We are all in this fight. Every Catholic has to say, "I stand for Jesus Christ," but this is true today in a more striking way than ever before.

...

We have all this in mind when we go to Rome to discuss with them. We don't go there in order to get a cosmetic agreement. We go there to try to have them reflect on what they do and to remind them of their duties.

I have given you some ideas for why I say we cannot have an agreement at this time or say that everything is fine. Everything is not fine. And when we bring these things up in Rome, they say to us, precisely, that these things are the things which it will discuss with the Society of St. Pius X once it has signed an agreement. I say, "Wait, wait, wait. Look at the way you've treated the Fraternity of St. Peter, and so on." Events and experience have proven that once you have signed on, Rome says, "Shut up."

...So, things are absolutely not ripe for an agreement. We must first help correct Rome's thinking to show them that what they do is wrong. ...

It shows you how things were and still are. We must avoid getting into emotional arguments....

8.10. In Bishop Fellay's "Superior General's Letter to Friends & Benefactors" number 72⁶⁴ written in April 2008, Bishop Fellay says as follows:

Dear Friends and Benefactors,

The motu proprio Summorum Pontificum, which acknowledged that the Tridentine Mass was never abrogated, raises a certain number of questions concerning the future of the relations of the Society of St. Pius X with Rome. Several persons in conservative circles and in Rome itself have made themselves heard, arguing that, since the Sovereign Pontiff had acted so generously and thus given a clear sign of his good will towards us, there would be nothing left for the Society to do but to "sign an agreement with Rome." Unfortunately, a few of our friends were deceived by such an illusion. We would like to take the opportunity of this Eastertide letter to review once again the principles governing our actions in these troubled times and point out a few recent events which clearly indicate that, basically, nothing has really changed except for the motu proprio's liturgical overture, so as to draw from all this the necessary conclusions.

⁶⁴http://www.sspix.org/superior_generals_news/sup_gen_ltr_72.pdf

The fundamental principle that dictates our action is the safeguard of the faith, without which no one can be saved, no one can receive grace, no one can be pleasing to God, as the First Vatican Council states. The liturgical question is not paramount; it only becomes such inasmuch as it is the manifestation of an alteration of the faith and, consequently, of the worship due to God.

...

*Add to this the pope's positions on religious liberty, and we can easily conclude that the combat for the faith has not slackened over these last few years. The *motu proprio* that introduces the hope of a change for the better in matters liturgical is not accompanied by the logically related measures that should follow in other domains of the Church's life. All the changes introduced at the Council and in the post-conciliar reforms, which we denounce precisely because the Church had already condemned them, have been upheld. The only difference is that now they claim at the same time that the Church does not change... which amounts to saying that these changes are perfectly in line with Catholic Tradition. This confusion of terminology combined with the assertion that the Church must remain faithful to her Tradition might well be troubling to more than a few. So long as facts do not corroborate this new assertion, we must conclude that nothing has changed in Rome's intention to pursue the conciliar course despite forty years of crisis, despite vacant convents, abandoned rectories, and empty churches. ...*

For these reasons the Priestly Society of St. Pius X cannot sign an "agreement." It definitely rejoices at the pope's desire to reintroduce the ancient and venerable rite of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, yet it also observes the opposition—sometimes very tenacious—of entire bishops' conferences. Without giving up hope and without impatience, we can see that the time for an agreement has not yet come. This does not prevent us from continuing to hope, nor from following the line of conduct defined in the year 2000. We are still asking the Holy Father to annul the 1988 decree of excommunication because we are convinced that this would be a boon for the Church, and we encourage you to pray for this to happen. But it would be very imprudent and hasty to dash off ill-advisedly in pursuit of a practical agreement that would not be based on the Church's fundamental principles, and especially the faith.

.....

+ Bernard Fellay, Superior General
April 14, 2008

Footnotes

(1) Interview, *Jesus*, November 1984, p. 72.

(2) Theological term meaning "that cannot be lost"—Translator's note.

8.11. In Bishop Fellay's "Superior General's Letter to Friends & Benefactors" number 77⁶⁵ written in November 2010, Bishop Fellay says as follows:

⁶⁵ http://www.sspx.org/superior_generals_news/supgen_77.htm

Letter to friends and benefactors #77

Dear friends and benefactors,

...

In this, we follow closely in the path traced out for us by our venerated founder, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre. A luminous path in the midst of the shadows of the most terrible trial that can come to a Catholic: that of finding himself in the situation of contradicting the Roman authorities and even the Vicar of Christ. These forty years are so full of lessons that show just how right Archbishop Lefebvre's perception was. Of the Council, the causes of the crisis, the decadence of the priesthood, the weakening of the doctrine, the Church's unprecedented friendliness towards the world and other religions, liberalism. But also of the remedies to be applied, that depend upon fidelity to the doctrine as well as to the plurisecular discipline of the Church. Indeed, we have no inventing to do!

...

What he said thirty, forty years ago is still perfectly pertinent today. This demands of us a great gratitude to God for having given us – and to the whole Church – such a bishop. There is no doubt that, if in the Church his precious indications were followed, the whole Mystical Body would be better off and would soon come out of this crisis. But seeing what is going on in the Church, even if here and there appear gleams of hope, we must admit that, over all, the ship is pursuing the course begun at Vatican II – course a little slower, certainly, with Benedict XVI, but now hardly more than a free-fall broken by a parachute.

...

*Menzingen, First Sunday of Advent, November 28, 2010
+Bernard Fellay*

- 8.12. In an interview given by Bishop Fellay in February 2011⁶⁶, and called "54 Answers from Bishop Fellay", the following comments by Bishop Fellay are recorded:

Doctrinal Discussions: Part 1

Your Excellency, you have decided to attempt doctrinal discussions with Rome. Could you remind us of the purpose?

You have to distinguish between Rome's purpose and ours. Rome indicated that there were doctrinal problems with the Society [of St. Pius X] and that these problems would have to be cleared up before any canonical recognition, problems which obviously would be up to us to resolve, concerning our acceptance of the [Second Vatican] Council. But for us it is about something else: we hope to tell Rome what the Church has always taught and thereby to show the

66

http://www.sspcx.org/superior_generals_news/54_answers_from_bishop_fellay_feb_2011/54_answers_bp_fellay1.htm

contradictions between this centuries-old teaching and what has been done in the Church since the Council. As we look at it, this is the only goal that we are pursuing.

What sort of talks are these: negotiations, discussions, or doctrinal explanation?

You can't call them negotiations. That's not what they're about at all. There is on the one hand an explanation of doctrine, and on the other hand a discussion, because we have in fact a Roman interlocutor with whom we are discussing the documents and how to understand them. But you can't call them negotiations, nor a search for a compromise, for it is a question of Faith.

...

Besides witnessing to the Faith, is it important and advantageous for the Society of St. Pius X to go to Rome? Is it dangerous, and do you think that it might last a long time?

It is very important that the Society give this witness; that is the reason for these doctrinal talks. It is really a matter of making the Catholic faith understood in Rome and trying, why not, to make it understood even more throughout the Church.

There is one danger: the danger of keeping up illusions. We see that some Catholics have managed to lull themselves to sleep with illusions. But recent events have managed to dispel them. I am thinking about the announcement of the beatification of John Paul II or the announcement of a new Assisi event along the lines of the interreligious gatherings in 1986 and 2002.

To sum up, what would you say about these talks today?

If we had to do them over again, we would redo them. They are very important. Of capital importance. If you hope to correct a whole movement of thought, you cannot do without these talks.

Can the Society of St. Pius X play an important role in making Rome aware of this? How? What is the role of the lay faithful in this momentous matter?

As for the Society, yes, we can play a role, precisely by presenting what the Church has always taught and by raising objections to the conciliar novelties. The role of the lay faithful is to provide proof in action, for they are the proof that Tradition can be lived today. What the Church has always demanded—traditional discipline—is not only relevant but really viable even today.

8.13. Bishop de Galarreta's Comments of December 19, 2009⁶⁷

⁶⁷ http://www.sspix.org/sspix_and_rome/excerpts_bishop_de_galaretta_12-19-2009_ordination_sermon.htm

At the end of the sermon he gave on December 19, 2009, during the ordinations at the seminary of La Reja (Argentina), Bishop Alfonso de Galarreta provided some information and his judgment concerning about the doctrinal discussions that began last October between Rome and the Society of St. Pius X. These remarks, coming from the person at the head of the delegation of the Society's theologians, are of particular interest. We herewith provide some lengthy excerpts from his sermon:

...

It was good first of all because these meetings are clearly placed on the doctrinal level. It involves a commission which has as its objective the study of doctrinal questions, and which does not have as its finality the consideration either theoretically or practically of any kind of accord whatsoever of a purely legal, canonical, or practical nature. That question is totally excluded. And this was very clearly stated. It is a discussion situated solely and exclusively on the doctrinal level.

Secondly, it is a discussion about the Second Vatican Council and the post-conciliar magisterium; to be precise, on the Council and the post-conciliar magisterium. The subjects, the themes, of which we shall treat have been well established; they are the ones concerning all the questions, all the themes, we have been critiquing for forty years, especially religious freedom, the modern liberties, the freedom of conscience, the dignity of the human person—as they say—the rights of man, personalism, ecumenism, interreligious dialogue, inculturation, collegiality—the egalitarianism, the democratism, and the destruction of authority that have been introduced into the Church; as well as all the notions of ecclesiology which have totally changed what the Church is: the question of the "self-consciousness" of the Church, the Church as communion, the Church as sacrament, the Church as the People of God; and all these new ideas about the relation between the Church and the world. Then there is the question of the Mass, the new Mass, the new missal, the liturgical reform..., and still other themes. We agreed to have a doctrinal discussion on all these themes. And the most important thing, which was very clearly established, is that the only common criterion possible for these discussions is the anterior Magisterium. I repeat: the only common criterion possible, the sole criterion that we accept and that is a condition sine qua non for these discussions, is the magisterium prior to the Second Vatican Council, the Magisterium of all time, Tradition.

...

Once again, this commission's objective is not to reach some kind of doctrinal agreement, which would be deleterious. No. We are simply going to bear witness to the faith, defend it, do the good we can, and at any rate we shall defend the honor of God, the honor of Our Lord, and the honor of the Church, which is the main thing, if you have understood what I said at the beginning [of this sermon] on the mediation and function of the priest, and that is what matters.

...

"Our interlocutors—I am referring here specifically to our counterparts in this commission—are people with whom one can speak. They understand our language, they understand what we are saying, and they understand our objections very well. We can speak peaceably and in all freedom, and that is enough. If up to that point everything depended on our corresponding with the grace of God, from now on we might say that everything depends entirely on the grace of God, because God, Our Lord, and He alone, is the inner Master Who can illuminate minds and convert [wills]. Only God can touch hearts. We are going there to preach—as I am doing right now—but touch your mind or your heart, only God can do that, and as we do not know God's designs, we do not know where this will go. What we do know for sure is that He can do everything. For God nothing is impossible. He can convert when He wishes, as He wishes, and whom He wishes.

If he recognizes the incertitude that exists in every human enterprise, Bishop de Galarreta clearly reaffirms the twofold certitude the Society possesses in these discussions:

I am giving you these explanations so that you may have some measure of peace and reassurance. If these circumstances, which seem to me absolutely sure, were to change, then we would reconsider whether these discussions, these contacts, should continue or not. We do know clearly what we are not disposed to accept. If we do not know perfectly how things may evolve, on the other hand we do know very clearly what we have no intention of doing under any circumstance: firstly, to yield on matters of doctrine, and, secondly, to make a purely practical agreement. With these conditions and with the disposition which is theirs to agree for the first time to discuss the Council, for this is indeed the first time they have given us the opportunity to present to them a profound doctrinal critique based on the Church's perennial magisterium—it's the first time! —clearly, we must do it. Then, God will tell! Prudence shows us what we ought to do now but not exactly what we should be doing in three or six months because circumstances can change. Be that as it may, what is clear for us is that the mission of the Society is essentially, before all else, even before going to Rome, to bear witness to the Faith. We must perpetuate, safeguard, transmit, and live the true Catholic priesthood. We must keep, defend, live, and transmit the true sacrifice of the Mass.

Conclusion Nine – a position of contradiction for Priests of the Society

9. Conclusion: The preparedness and the desire, on the part of some Priests, to enter into a practical agreement with Rome has meant that those priests have had to (or will have to) contradict their previously published positions.

9.1. I have elsewhere dealt with the inconsistencies between the recent position of Bishop Fellay and his position in times past. I note that the priests of the Society would also be required to change their positions of principle and I provide some inconsistencies by way of example.

9.2. In a recent article, Father Simoulin says as follows⁶⁸:

I believe that I know a little our Society – of which I have been member for 35 years – and thus to have the right to remind all that our "fundamentals" are engraved in golden letters in our statutes:

the goal of the Society is the priesthood and all that refers to it and only what relates to it, i.e., such as Our Lord Jesus-Christ wanted it when He said: Do this in memory of Me.

Such is the heritage of our founder, such are our "fundamentals"; we do not have any others, and we do not want to have others. The Society is not an army raised up against Rome, but an army formed for the Church.

...

After our Jubilee [pilgrimage] of the year 2000, Rome took the initiative of new relations. Today, the same cardinal become Pope has told us that the Tridentine Mass was never abrogated (July 7, 2007):

It is thus allowed to celebrate the Sacrifice of the Mass according to the standard edition of the Roman Missal promulgated by Bl. John XXIII in 1962 and never abrogated;

...he rehabilitated our four bishops (January 21, 2009); he accepted that we hold doctrinal discussions during two years... all things that Archbishop Lefebvre did not require in 1988. It is not exaggerated to say that Bishop Fellay obtained more than what Archbishop Lefebvre required, without however having the same prestige or moral authority. Then, must we be even more demanding than Archbishop Lefebvre and Bishop Fellay?

⁶⁸ 5-11-2012 Editorial from L'Seignadou on the relations with Rome, by Fr. Michel Simoulin (May 2012) Fr. Michel Simoulin, chaplain of the Fanjeaux community wrote this editorial for Seignadou (Sign from God). He served alongside Msgr. Ducaud Bourget at Saint-Nicolas du Chardonnet from 1980 to 1983, was rector of the University of St. Pius X, director at the Econe seminary, prior at Lyon, France, and SSPX District Superior of Italy. read at DICI Source: L'Seignadou reprinted in DICI #254, 11-5-2012

Whatever the state of Rome is, whatever still remains worrisome in Rome, simple good sense and honesty should lead us to consider the current situation with different eyes than in 1988! To take up the formula of one of our bishops, we should not fall into "eighty-eightism!"[1]

We are no longer in 1975 with Paul VI nor in 1988 with John Paul II, but in 2012 with Benedict XVI. To do so would be contrary to reality and to the truth, and can only be the effect of a more or less secret refusal of any reconciliation with Rome, perhaps even of a lack of faith in the holiness of the Church, composed of poor sinners but always governed by her head, Jesus-Christ, and sanctified by the Holy Ghost.

.....For twelve years Bishop Fellay has been arguing with Rome, with ups and downs, to finally arrive at the results quoted above, and even to an amazing result that perhaps nobody has even noticed: these doctrinal discussions, which did not make any noise in the market place, have enabled us to say to Rome what we think... to the point of making the discussions end abruptly!

9.3. Dear Father Simoulin, with respect, I beg you to reconsider. I raise only four points (there are other issues in your letter):

9.3.1. You say *"It is thus allowed to celebrate the Sacrifice of the Mass according to the standard edition of the Roman Missal promulgated by Bl. John XXIII in 1962 and never abrogated "* In Bishop Fellay's "Superior General's Letter to Friends & Benefactors" number 72¹ written in April 2008, Bishop Fellay explains the effect of that "allowance" in the following words:

*Dear Friends and Benefactors,
The motu proprio Summorum Pontificum, which acknowledged that the Tridentine Mass was never abrogated, raises a certain number of questions concerning the future of the relations of the Society of St. Pius X with Rome. Several persons in conservative circles and in Rome itself have made themselves heard, arguing that, since the Sovereign Pontiff had acted so generously and thus given a clear sign of his good will towards us, there would be nothing left for the Society to do but to "sign an agreement with Rome." Unfortunately, a few of our friends were deceived by such an illusion. We would like to take the opportunity of this Eastertide letter to review once again the principles governing our actions in these troubled times and point out a few recent events which clearly indicate that, basically, nothing has really changed except for the motu proprio's liturgical overture, so as to draw from all this the necessary conclusions.*

- 9.3.2. You say "It is not exaggerated to say that Bishop Fellay obtained more than what Archbishop Lefebvre required". This is what Archbishop Lefebvre said in 1990:

*"Some people are always admiring the grass in the neighbor's field...they look to our enemies on the other side. "After all, we must be charitable, we must be kind, we must not be divisive, after all, they are celebrating the Tridentine Mass, they are not as bad as everyone says" —but **THEY ARE BETRAYING US** —betraying us! They are shaking hands with the Church's destroyers. They are shaking hands with people holding modernist and liberal ideas condemned by the Church. So they are doing the devil's work. They are now saying: "So long as they grant us the old Mass, we can shake hands with Rome, no problem." But we are seeing how it works out. They are in an impossible situation. Impossible. One cannot both shake hands with modernists and keep following Tradition. Not possible. Not possible. Now, stay in touch with them to bring them back, to convert them to Tradition, yes, if you like, that's the right kind of ecumenism! But give the impression that after all one almost regrets any break, that one likes talking to them? **NO WAY!...Unbelievable! Unimaginable!** What kind of relations can you have with people like that? This is what causes us a problem with certain layfolk, who...have a kind of deep-down regret that they are no longer with the people they used to be with. "It's a pity we are divided", they say, "why not meet up with them? Let's go and have a drink together, reach out a hand to them"—that's a betrayal! Those saying this give the impression that at the drop of a hat they would cross over and join those who left us. They must make up their minds."*

(Archbishop Lefebvre, Address to his priests, Ecône, September 6, 1990—just over 6 months before his death)

- 9.3.3. In his sermon at the time of the Episcopal Consecrations of the four bishops in 1988, Archbishop Lefebvre said [in reference to the agreement he signed and then withdrew in May 1988]⁶⁹:

It is not for me to know when Tradition will regain its rights at Rome, but I think it is my duty to provide the means of doing that which I shall call "Operation Survival," operation survival for Tradition. Today, this day, is Operation Survival. If I had made this deal with Rome, by continuing with the agreements we had signed, and by putting them into practice, I would have performed "Operation Suicide." There was no choice, we must live! That is why today, by consecrating these bishops, I am convinced that I am continuing to keep Tradition alive, that is to say, the Catholic Church.

⁶⁹ <http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Episcopal-Consecration.htm>

9.3.4. You refer to the "amazing result that perhaps nobody has even noticed: these doctrinal discussions". I beg you to consider the conclusion of the president of the Society's commission for those doctrinal discussions with Rome, Bishop Alfonso de Galarreta. I understand that he said⁷⁰:

*It is essential to the current issue to bear in mind the unmistakable conclusion that we just made on this occasion: they are not ready to give up the Vatican II Council, nor the liberal doctrines of it, and their intention, their obvious desire, is to bring us back to it. At most, Rome would accept a rebalancing and a better wording (formulation), again as part of the "hermeneutic of renewal in continuity". And then we can discuss and we are very useful . . . to endorse the revival of the reform with continuity.*⁷¹

...

For the good of the Fraternity and Tradition, "Pandora's box" must be closed as quickly as possible, to avoid the stigma and the demolition of the authority, disputes, dissensions and divisions, perhaps with no return.

9.4. In September 2012⁷² Father Schmidberger participated in an interview that is summarized as follows.

...On the first question, dealing with the General Chapter, Fr. Schmidberger remarks about the gain for the SSPX itself: "the General Chapter has provided us with a new unity within our own ranks, [a unity] which had suffered a bit in recent times; and that is a big grace of God, I would say". Concerning the external aspect of the General Chapter, Father remarks that there are three points which must be demanded from the authorities if a visible union with Rome will be established. These are: firstly, that the SSPX will be given the freedom to expose the errors of Vatican II; secondly, that the SSPX will be allowed to only use the liturgical books of 1962; and thirdly, that there must always be a bishop in the Fraternity from within its own ranks.

9.5. In a letter from senior priests of the Society to Cardinal Gantin dated 6 July 1988 those priests wrote as follows⁷³:

⁷⁰ For confirmation of the appointment of Bishop De Galaretta refer to press release by the SSPX at http://www.sspix.org/sspix_and_rome/press_release_10-15-2009_sspix_commission_members.htm

For reference to Bishop de Galaretta's comments refer to

⁷¹ This is an extract from an abridged version of a translation of a document written by His Excellency Bishop de Galaretta, who was the Society's chairman for the Rome-SSPX commission in charge of the theological discussions. I understand that the document was made available at the October, 2011 meeting of SSPX Superiors in Albano, Italy and that during the last week of June, 2012, this document became publicly available.

⁷² Fr. Andreas Steiner, spokesman of the German District of the Society of Saint Pius X (FSSPX / SSPX), interviewed Germany's current District Superior and former Superior General of the Society Fr. Franz Schmidberger

Ecône, July 6, 1988
Eminence,

.....

You thought it good, by your letter of July 1st, to inform Their Excellencies Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, Bishop Antonio de Castro Mayer, and the four Bishops whom they consecrated on June 30, at Ecône, of the excommunication latae sententiae. We let you judge for yourself the value of such a declaration, coming from an authority who, in its exercise, breaks with all its predecessors down to Pope Pius XII, in worship, teaching and government of the Church.

As for us, we are in full communion with all the Popes and Bishops before the Second Vatican Council, celebrating precisely the Mass which they codified and celebrated, teaching the Catechism which they drew up, standing up against the errors which they have many times condemned in their encyclicals and pastoral letters. We let you judge on which side the rupture is to be found. We are extremely saddened by the blindness of spirit and the hardening of heart of the Roman authorities.

On the other hand, we have never wished to belong to this system which calls itself the Conciliar Church, and defines itself with the Novus Ordo Missae, an ecumenism which leads to indifferentism and the laicization of all society. Yes, we have no part, nullam partem habemus, with the pantheon of the religions of Assisi; our own excommunication by a decree of Your Eminence or of another Roman Congregation would only be the irrefutable proof of this. We ask for nothing better than to be declared out of communion with this adulterous spirit which has been blowing in the Church for the last 25 years; we ask for nothing better than to be declared outside of this impious communion of the ungodly. We believe in the One God, Our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, and we will always remain faithful to His unique Spouse, the One Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church.

To be publicly associated with this sanction which is inflicted upon the six Catholic Bishops, Defenders of the Faith in its integrity and wholeness, would be for us a mark of honor and a sign of orthodoxy before the faithful. They have indeed a strict right to know that the priests who serve them are not in communion with a counterfeit church, promoting evolution, pentecostalism and syncretism. In union with these faithful, we make ours the words of the Prophet: "Præparate corda vestra Domino et servite Illi soli: et liberabit vos de manibus inimicorum vestrorum. Convertimini ad Eum in toto corde vestro, et auferte deos alienos de medio vestri—Open your hearts to the Lord and serve Him only: and

⁷³ Archbishop LEFEBVRE and the VATICAN July 6, 1988 Open Letter to Cardinal Gantin Prefect of the Congregation for Bishops

He will free you from the hands of your enemies. With all your heart return to Him, and take away from your midst any strange gods" (I Kings 7:3).⁹⁵

Confident in the protection of Her who has crushed all the heresies in the world, we assure Your Eminence of our dedication to Him Who is the only Way of salvation.

*Fr. Franz Schmidberger, Superior General
Fr. Paul Aulagnier, District Superior, France
Fr. Franz-Josef Maessen, District Superior, Germany
Fr. Edward Black, District Superior, Great Britain
Fr. Anthony Esposito, District Superior of Italy
Fr. François Laisney, District Superior, United States
Fr. Jacques Emily, District Superior of Canada
Fr. Jean Michel Faure, District Superior of Mexico
Fr. Gerard Hogan, District Superior of Australasia
Fr. Alain Lorans, Superior, Seminary of Ecône
Fr. Jean Paul André, Superior, Seminary of France
Fr. Paul Natterer, Superior, Seminary of Germany
Fr. Andrès Morello, Superior, Seminary of Argentina
Fr. William Welsh, Superior, Seminary of Australia
Fr. Michel Simoulin, Rector, St. Pius X University
Fr. Patrice Laroche, Vice-Rector, Seminary of Ecône
Fr. Philippe François, Superior, Belgium
Fr. Roland de Mérode, Superior, Netherlands
Fr. Georg Pflüger, Superior, Austria
Fr. Guillaume Devillers, Superior, Spain
Fr. Philippe Pazat, Superior, Portugal
Fr. Daniel Couture, Superior, Ireland
Fr. Patrick Groche, Superior, Gabon
Fr. Frank Peek, Superior, Southern Africa
No answer was received.*

95. *Antiphon at Matins, read July 2, 1988*

9.6. In a declaration dated 18 July 1988, priests of the Society stated as follows

*Archbishop LEFEBVRE and the VATICAN
July 18, 1988*

*Declaration of the German-speaking Superiors of the Society of Saint Pius X
Regarding the Treatment of Archbishop Lefebvre*

On July 1, 1988, the Roman Congregation for Bishops declared Archbishop Lefebvre, Bishop de Castro Mayer and the bishops consecrated by them on June 30, excommunicated for lack of the required pontifical mandate. Many people,

Catholic or not, are speaking of schism. The Society of Saint Pius X rejects this inexact presentation of the facts...

Lastly, the immediate reason for the by-passing of the rule of the apostolic mandate on the consecrations of June 30 consists in the fact that the negotiations with Rome throughout the first half of 1988, in spite of a few concessions, demonstrated more and more strongly the following: Rome, because of its false modernist orientation, is not ready to guarantee in the long term, the freedom and vitality of Catholic Tradition.

† Bishop Bernard Fellay
Fr. Franz Joseph Maessen
Fr. Paul Natterer
Fr. Georg Pflüger
Stuttgart, Germany
July 18, 1988

- 9.7. On August 18, 1988 Dom Gerard made a declaration and then Father Schmidberger commented on the declaration. The following extracts are reproduced from the book "Archbishop Lefebvre and the Vatican" Page 199.

Declaration of Dom Gérard

By this declaration which follows, Dom Gérard, superior of the Benedictine Monastery of St. Madeleine of Le Barroux, France, publicly explained the reasons why he signed the Protocol which Archbishop Lefebvre rejected and the conditions he included with his signature.

.....

Fr. Schmidberger's Remarks on Dom Gérard's Declaration

Rev. Fr. Franz Schmidberger, Superior General of the Society of Saint Pius X from 1983-1994, responded to Dom Gérard's Declaration (of August 18, 1988) by rebutting individual citations. These citations from the Declaration (see pp.199ff.) appear indented while Fr. Schmidberger's remarks are not.

- a) That the tradition of the Church be pushed out of her official, visible perimeter brings prejudice to it. This is contrary to the honor of the Spouse of Christ. The visibility of the Church is one of its essential marks."***

It seems rather contrary to the plan of Divine Providence that the Catholic Tradition of the Church be re-integrated into the pluralism of the Conciliar Church, as long as the latter dishonors the Catholic Church and scandalizes its unity and visibility. "Jesus...suffered without the gate" of Jerusalem, says St. Paul, "let us go forth therefore to Him without the camp, bearing His reproach" (Heb. 13:12-13).

b) It is sad that the only Benedictines who are put aside from the great Benedictine family are precisely those who keep its liturgical tradition...."

On the contrary, it is an honor for Le Barroux to have been rejected by the other Benedictines for its integral fidelity to the Mass of All Times, and thus to have become a wonderful sign of contradiction.

c) All things being equal, i.e., the Faith and the Sacraments being intact, it is better to be in agreement with the laws of the Church rather than contravene them."

On the contrary, when the laws of the Church are abused everywhere, in such a way as to desiccate the living sources of Faith and grace, it is better not to succumb to this scheme.

"Lastly the reason, perhaps the determining one, which inclined us to accept that the suspens a divinis be lifted from our priests, is a missionary reason: should not the maximum number of faithful be enabled to assist at our Masses and liturgical celebrations without being hindered by their local priests or bishop?"

If the priests of Le Barroux considered that they were validly suspended, they have been living for 15 years in mortal sin. If they think that the so-called suspens a divinis merely damages their apostolic influence, they are wrong. The hard way of the Cross is more fruitful than the easy way. Moreover, they should have placed the missionary influence of the whole of Tradition in its necessary cohesion above the influence of their own monastery alone. The common good should be given pride of place over the individual good.

"It would be a grave error to constitute within the Church a sort of great unified party, choosing at its head a leader who manoeuvres his troops at will."

The truly Catholic faithful have acknowledged in Archbishop Lefebvre the good shepherd that the Good Lord provided to them when they were scattered by the modernists. Neither on May 6 nor on June 30 has the grace of his mission left this good shepherd. Much to the contrary! The fidelity of the sheep to the shepherd is a grace for the sheep. The infidelity is first of all an ingratitude and, in the end, a great tragedy.

"We, ourselves, remain strongly attached to the requirements of an integral Faith and to the immutable Tradition of the Church, but our legitimate resistance should not become resistentialism, where suspicion

and purges are the law: the holy liberty of the children of God would be the first victim of this,...."

It is not "suspicion," it is a fact. It is the height of the battle; friends are struck by the enemy. Is it the opportune moment to negotiate private peace with the enemy? There is only one name for such an attitude.

"On the contrary, let all those who fight for Tradition, doctrine, preaching, Mass, and Sacraments, remain attached in fraternal charity. Who can divide us if we all fight for Christ the King?"

For 15 years [i.e., since the early 1970's], there had been a wonderful covenant of charity between all the traditional communities. All that was needed was to continue it through June 30 in doctrinal and prudential unanimity. This was needed to continue the fight for Christ the King. The one who had broken this covenant now was calling for a new covenant!

*Fr. Franz Schmidberger
Superior General,
The Society of Saint Pius X*

9.8. How does any signatory to those documents move from:

*"we have never wished to belong to this system which calls itself the Conciliar Church, and defines itself with the Novus Ordo Missæ, an ecumenism which leads to indifferentism and the laicization of all society. Yes, we have no part..... We ask for nothing better than to be declared out of communion with this adulterous spirit which has been blowing in the Church for the last 25 years; we ask for nothing better than to be declared outside of this impious communion of the ungodly....
.... They have indeed a strict right to know that the priests who serve them are not in communion with a counterfeit church, promoting evolution, pentecostalism and syncretism.*

9.9. To an agreement (or any agreement!) with the Conciliar Church subject to the following conditions:

Also, the preconditions for eventual normalisation of our relations with the official Church were given a better definition. . . .

9.10. With respect, should I ask the same question that Father Violette asked of Father Aulagnier:

In my opinion, I think we might see here the real reason for Father Aulagnier's change. The fight is dragging on. He has been at the center of this fight for over 30 years. Maybe he is tired of the fight! But this is not the first time that a conflict

over the faith has lasted for ages. The Arian crisis lasted over 70 years, the papal exile in Avignon 68 years, the great Schism 39 years. Is this a reason to abandon the fight to come to some arrangement? It's a good thing St Athanasius didn't get tired of being exiled, threatened, falsely accused, excommunicated etc. He wouldn't be St Athanasius.⁷⁴

⁷⁴ Letter from father violette to the faithful dated December 2003, Refer http://www.sspcx.ca/Documents/Fr-Violettes-Letters/2003_August.htm

Conclusion Ten – agree to disagree

10. Conclusion: If a satisfactory conclusion to the doctrinal discussions is no longer critical to a regularization of the Society then the Society will be merely entering into an arrangement pursuant to which at best the Society would "agree to disagree" and in doing so the Society would breach its purpose and its mission.

10.1. If the Society enters into a practical agreement (only) then the Society will be (at best) placing the truth with error even to the extent that the Society will be accepting some of "New Church" and thereby "approving" it. The reality is that the "six conditions" expressly contemplate that the Society will *somehow* work with the Conciliar Church, that the Society will accept the authority of the Conciliar Church's tribunals and that the Society will be subject to the Conciliar Church's bishops. Some may say that the Society will not be accepting of the error of Vatican II (given its proposed right to teach and defend and criticize) but if the Conciliar church accepts those errors and we accept the authority of the Conciliar Church then ...surely we accept the errors. If an agreement is reached then the Society will be participating in the New Church by allowing the New Church to treat the doctrine (s) on the same footing. In times past the Society's position was that it (the Society) would have no part in such error.

10.2. I understand that the Society now proposes to enter into an agreement with Rome on the basis that the Society has the:

"Freedom to keep, to transmit and to teach the sound doctrine of the unchanging magisterium of the Church and of the immutable truth of Divine Tradition ; freedom to defend, to correct and to reprove, even publicly, those responsible for the errors or novelties of modernism, of liberalism, of The Second Vatican Council and their consequences"

10.3. I understood that the purpose of the doctrinal discussions was to correct Rome, to convert Rome, "to bear witness to the faith, defend it, do the good we can". I would have expected that the doctrinal discussions and the conclusion of those discussions would form an important factor in the Society's determination as to whether or not Rome has changed its thinking, whether Rome has reverted to tradition. It now seems that the doctrinal discussions had little purpose (or effect) except that they showed that at best the Society and Rome may agree to disagree and that Rome may be prepared to accept that the Society's position is not "unCatholic".

10.4. It seems that the proposed conditions for normalization which have been proposed after the doctrinal discussions simply contemplate (or admit or agree) that Rome and the Society disagree on doctrinal matters and that they will continue to disagree. How can such an arrangement be appropriate?

10.5. The doctrinal discussions did not only end on the basis that Rome did not find any of the Society's positions to be *un-Catholic* but rather they ended on the basis that:

*It is essential to the current issue to bear in mind the unmistakable conclusion that we just made on this occasion: they are not ready to give up the Vatican II Council, nor the liberal doctrines of it, and their intention, their obvious desire, is to bring us back to it. At most, Rome would accept a rebalancing and a better wording (formulation), again as part of the "hermeneutic of renewal in continuity". And then we can discuss and we are very useful . . . to endorse the revival of the reform with continuity.*⁷⁵

- 10.6. That conclusion seems to make it clear that Rome has not changed. The Rome of today is in reality the Rome of Vatican II. If in fact Rome had changed then the doctrinal discussions should have concluded with meaningful resolutions.
- 10.7. The conclusion of the doctrinal discussions evidences the reality that Rome is not ready to give up liberalism, modernism and that Rome's intention is to bring the Society back to Vatican II.
- 10.8. Bishop Castro Mayer stated in his open letter dated 1 July 1981, as quoted in The Mouth of the Lion by Dr David White at page 115, as follows:

Thus understood, ecumenism presents the following corollaries: 1) Truth is put alongside error in equivalent conditions; 2) one accepts as a natural and normal thing that salvation is possible in any religion; 3) one moves away from proselytizing, which would be a principle of division and not a catalyst for unity; 4) logically, one arrives at recommending to the non-Catholics an even greater fidelity to the error in which they find themselves; and it cannot fail to compare the false Christian religions to the Catholic Church, seeing that they think that the Holy Ghost helps these faiths as well as the Catholic Church to bring the faithful to salvation in the bosom of God.

In spite of these consequences, diametrically opposed to true Catholicism, such ecumenism is accepted in the Catholic milieu. There are even some attempts to promote ecumenical instruction, in common, intended for the faithful of many Christian faiths.

- 10.9. As to the conclusion of the doctrinal discussions there is a vast difference between what Bishop de Galarreta says and what Bishop Fellay says in relation to the issue of doctrinal matters:

10.9.1. Bishop Fellay states:

⁷⁵ This is an extract from an abridged version of a translation of a document written by His Excellency Bishop de Galarreta, who was the Society's chairman for the Rome-SSPX commission in charge of the theological discussions. I understand that the document was made available Archbishop Lefebvre at the October, 2011 meeting of SSPX Superiors in Albano, Italy and that during the last week of June, 2012, this document became publicly available. Archbishop Lefebvre

*The only thing that I can say, because it is part of the press release, is that this preamble contains "certain doctrinal principles and criteria for the interpretation of Catholic doctrine, which are necessary to ensure faithfulness to the Church's Magisterium and to "sentire cum Ecclesia" [thinking with the Church]. At the same time, it leaves open to legitimate discussion the examination and theological explanation of individual expressions and formulations contained in the documents of Vatican Council II and of the later Magisterium." There you have it; no more and no less.*⁷⁶

10.9.2. This is what Archbishop Lefebvre said about "dialogue":

*(Archbishop Lefebvre, Conference, October 4, 1987
Marcel Lefebvre by Bishop Tissier de Mallerai, pp. 547-548;*

*The adulterous union of the Church and the Revolution is cemented by "dialogue." Our Lord said "Go, teach all nations and convert them." He did not say "Hold dialogue with them but don't try to convert them." Truth and error are incompatible; to dialogue with error is to put God and the devil on the same footing. This is what the Popes have always repeated and what was easy for Christians to understand because it is also a matter of common sense. In order to impose different attitudes and reactions it was necessary to do some indoctrinating so as to make modernists of the clergy needed to spread the new doctrine. This is what is called "recycling," a conditioning process intended to refashion the very faculty God gave man to direct his judgment.*⁷⁷

10.9.3. Bishop de Galarreta said, after representing the Society at the doctrinal discussions as follows:

But we have just seen in doctrinal discussions what is their design: pure modernism revised and corrected.....

*We must look at the context in which they intend to incorporate us. An agreement is, like it or not, we integrate into their system in a thinking and reality data that do not depend on us but who depend on their thinking, their theology and their action. And this is how they will be presented (see Campos, text signed by Mgr. Licinio).*⁷⁸

⁷⁶ Interview by Bishop Fellay on 14 September 2011 refer Dici
http://sspax.org/district_news/interview_of_bishop_fellay_after_meeting_with_cardinal_levada_9-14-2011.htm

⁷⁷ Chapter 15, "An Open Letter to Confused Catholics" By Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre

⁷⁸ This is an extract from an abridged version of a translation of a document written by His Excellency Bishop de Galarreta, who was the Society's chairman for the Rome-SSPX commission in charge of the theological discussions. I understand that the document was made available at the October, 2011 meeting of SSPX Superiors in Albano, Italy and that during the last week of June, 2012, this document became publicly available.

10.10. Father Rostand recently stated in an interview with Michael Matt, editor of the Remnant⁷⁹:

MJM: First of all, can you give our readers an update on where the negotiations between the Society of St. Pius X and the Vatican stand at this moment?

Fr. Rostand (FR): We are today in a waiting phase. During the two past years doctrinal discussions took place between the experts of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and those of the Society of St. Pius X. Even though the discussions remained private, it is not a secret that the two positions were not reconciled. There is still disagreement on doctrinal matters, however, it is clear that the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith did not find any of our positions to be non-Catholic. Despite this disagreement, it appears that the Holy Father is willing to grant a canonical statute to the Society. A few weeks ago His Excellency Bishop Fellay sent a doctrinal declaration to Rome. We are now waiting for the answer from Rome.

10.11. With respect, one must ask Father Rostand what possible meaning or comfort we should take from such a declaration. In this regard, I remind Father Rostand of two things:

10.11.1. Archbishop Lefebvre described Rome (in 1990) as people who are the "Church's destroyers"; and

10.11.2. Rome appointed Bishop Mueller as Prefect for the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith in July 2012. For a summary of some of Bishop Mueller's errors, I refer to the article from the SSPX website reproduced below.

10.12. I wonder just what Father Rostand meant and what Rome meant when the term "non-Catholic" was used?

10.13. The Society's article relating to the appointment of Bishop Mueller is reproduced below⁸⁰:

Bishop Mueller: an SSPX analysis

⁷⁹ <http://www.remnantnewspaper.com/Archives/2012-0515-mjm-rostand-interview.htm>

⁸⁰ http://www.sspix.org/miscellaneous/fr_gaudron_on_bishop_mueller_7-6-2012.htm

Bishop Gerhard Mueller, the former bishop of Regensburg, Germany, has just been appointed Prefect for the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith by Pope Benedict XVI.

Fr. Matthias Gaudron, a priest of the SSPX specializing in dogmatic theology and author of the book, Catechism of the Crisis in the Church, recently published some remarks on the SSPX's German District website concerning certain statements made by Bishop Mueller in the past. Fr. Gaudron's comments conclude with a request to His Excellency.

The Church has always considered it to be one of her most important tasks to faithfully keep the Deposit of the Faith, confided to her by Christ and the Apostles, and to defend it against errors in order to pass it on intactly to the coming generations. And thus, rightly so, the office of Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith is one of the highest offices in the Church.

The SSPX in Germany has therefore with astonishment taken notice of the fact that the Bishop of Regensburg, Gerhard Ludwig Mueller, has been appointed to this office. The SSPX asks what suitability for this office can be found in a man that has gone against the Catholic doctrine on a number of occasions, both in his writings as well as in his public speeches.

The following things should be mentioned:

- *Bishop Mueller denies in his book Die Messe: Quelle christlichen Lebens [The Mass: Source of Christian Life] the real transformation of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. Bread and wine remain, according to him, what they are; however, they become tools for integrating the faithful into the living community with the Father and the Son. This resembles the Calvinistic teaching, according to which bread and wine do not transform, but become tools of grace.[1]*
- *Contrary to Catholic doctrine, according to which the transformation of the gifts occurs with the pronouncement of the words of institution, "This is my body... This is the chalice of my blood"[2], Bishop Mueller asserts that the question of the moment of transformation "doesn't make sense".[3]*
- *Bishop Mueller denies in his Dogmatik [currently a standard work in Germany about Dogmatics] the dogma of the Virginity of Mary while giving birth[4], and, therefore, the teaching that Mary gave birth to her son without violating her physical integrity.[5]*
- *In a eulogy for the Protestant bishop Dr. Johannes Friedrich, Bishop Mueller said on October 11, 2011: "Also the Christians that are not in full community with the Catholic Church regarding teaching, means of salvation and the apostolic episcopacy, are justified by faith and baptism and they are*

*fully(!) incorporated/integrated into Church of God, being the Body of Christ." This contradicts the integral Catholic tradition and especially the teaching of Pius XII in *Mystici Corporis*.*

- *Against the Catholic doctrine of the necessity of a conversion to the Catholic Church, as is still proclaimed in the teaching of Vatican II[6], Bishop Mueller characterizes in the same speech the so-called "ecumenism of return" as being "erroneous".*

The Society urgently appeals to Bishop Mueller to comment on these controversial statements, or to correct them. The motivation for this attitude of the Society is not one of personal aversion, but only the wish for unadulterated proclamation of the doctrine.

Since Bishop Mueller has, in the past, not made a secret of his negative attitude towards the Society, the Society does not at first see in this a positive sign for the readiness to discuss its canonical recognition. Nevertheless, it hopes that the new Prefect - regarding discussions in the universal church - may achieve a more positive attitude towards the SSPX.

Footnotes

1 In reality, the body and blood of Christ do not mean the material components of the human person of Jesus during his lifetime or in his transfigured corporality. Here, body and blood mean the presence of Christ in the signs of the medium of bread and wine. ...We have *"now a community with Jesus Christ, mediated by eating and drinking the bread and the wine. Even in the merely personal human sphere, something like a letter may represent the friendship between people and, that is to say, show and embody the sympathy of the sender for the receiver."* Bread and wine thus only become *"symbols of his salvific presence"*. (*Die Messe: Quelle Christlichen Lebens*, Augsburg: St. Ulrich Verlag: 2002, p. 139).

2 *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, n. 1375, n.1377

3 *Die Messe: Quelle Christlichen Lebens*, p. 142.

4 *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, n. 499, n. 510

5 *"It is not about* specific physiological proprieties in the natural process of birth (such as the birth canal not having been opened, the hymen not being broken, or the absence of birth pangs), but with the healing and saving influence of the grace of the Savior on human nature, that had been wounded by Original Sin. ...it is not so much about physiologically and empirically verifiable somatic details."* (*Katholische Dogmatik für Studium und Praxis*, Freiburg 52003, p. 498) In fact, traditional doctrine is concerned precisely with such physiological details.

*[NB: the original translation said *"It is not so much about..."* but a German translator notified us later that the qualifier *"so much"* does not exist in the original text - *Ed.*]

6 *"Whosoever, therefore, knowing that the Catholic Church was made necessary by Christ, would refuse to enter or to remain in it, could not be saved."* (*Lumen Gentium*, 14)

10.14. In the article "A short history of the SSPX" we find the following⁸¹:

The first general chapter of the Society of St. Pius X takes place in Econe in September. In the Acts we read a declaration of principles and directives of the Society of St. Pius X, decisions on pastoral action in the present crisis, and warnings against liturgical changes and false ecumenism, and the rejection of liberalism but also sedevacantism:

The Society of St. Pius X is founded on the history of the Church and upon the doctrine of theologians. It believes that the pope can favor the ruin of the Church by choosing and letting act bad advisors, also by signing documents and decrees which do not engage his infallibility and that cause considerable damage to the Church. Nothing is more dangerous for the Church than liberal popes who are in a continual incoherence.

We pray for the pope, but we refuse to follow him in his errors on religious freedom, ecumenism, socialism and the application of reforms destructive for the Church. Our apparent disobedience is true obedience to the Church and to the pope as successor of Peter in the measure that he continues to maintain holy Tradition... All the members of the Society have one desire, to be submitted in filial obedience to a Rome returned to Tradition.⁸²

10.15. I suggest that to even consider a "practical" agreement with a conciliar Rome is contrary to the published principles of the Society.

⁸¹ http://www.sspix.org/sspix_faqs/a_short_history_of_the_sspix-part-2.htm

⁸² http://www.sspix.org/sspix_faqs/a_short_history_of_the_sspix-part-2.htm

Conclusion Eleven – is there true unity in the Society?

11. Conclusion: the "Letters between the Bishops" disclose very serious differences –which have not been answered.

11.1. Having regard to my previous points, it seems to me that the letter from Bishops Tissier de Mallerais, de Galarreta and Williamson is consistent with the previously published position of the Society and in particular the previously published position of Archbishop Lefebvre and Bishop Fellay. That is, Bishops Tissier de Mallerais, de Galarreta and Williamson oppose a "practical agreement" because:

11.1.1. Rome is today "remaining faithful to the conciliar doctrines and practices"; and

11.1.2. A "purely practical agreement" would necessarily silence, little by little, the Society, a full critique of the Council or the New Mass.

11.2. Bishop Fellay's letter in reply refers to "two defects" in their letter. Bishop Fellay says that the letter from Bishops Tissier de Mallerais, de Galarreta and Williamson is "lacking in a supernatural spirit and at the same time it lacks realism".

11.3. Bishop Fellay's letter then questions whether or not Bishops Tissier de Mallerais, de Galarreta and Williamson "no longer accept that it [Rome] can be the true Church". Bishop Fellay says:

To read your letter, one seriously wonders if you still believe that the visible Church whose seat is at Rome is indeed the Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ, a Church horribly disfigured, to be sure, a planta pedis usque ad verticem capitis, but a Church that in spite of all still has as its head Our Lord Jesus Christ. One gets the impression that you have been so scandalized that you no longer accept that it can still be the true Church. For you, it would seem to be a question whether Benedict XVI is still the legitimate pope.

11.4. With respect, the reference in Bishop Fellay's letter to the "visible church whose seat is at Rome" is curious. The following is what Archbishop Lefebvre said in 1989 in relation to the same issue⁸³:

*One year after the Consecrations
An Interview with Archbishop Lefebvre*

This interview appeared in the July-August 1989 issue of the Society's magazine in France, Fideliter. It is a typically lucid and profound analysis of the state of the official Church and its relations with the Society.

⁸³ July-August 1989 Archbishop Lefebvre, Interview, Fideliter,
http://www.sspix.org/archbishop_lefebvre/one_year_after_the_consecrations.htm

4: Danger of schism?

Question: Are you not afraid that in the end, when the good Lord will have called you to Him, little by little the split will grow wider and we will find ourselves being confronted with a parallel Church alongside what some call the "visible Church"?

Archbishop Lefebvre: This talk about the "visible Church" on the part of Dom Gerard and Mr. Madiran is childish. It is incredible that anyone can talk of the "visible Church", meaning the Conciliar Church as opposed to the Catholic Church which we are trying to represent and continue. I am not saying that we are the Catholic Church. I have never said so. No one can reproach me with ever having wished to set myself up as pope. But, we truly represent the Catholic Church such as it was before, because we are continuing what it always did. It is we who have the notes of the visible Church: One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic. That is what makes the visible Church.

Mr. Madiran objects: "But the official Church also has Infallibility." However, on the subject of infallibility, we must say, as Fr. Dulac said in a suggestive phrase concerning Pope Paul VI: "When years ago the Church had several popes, one could choose from amongst them. But now we have two popes in one." We have no choice. Each of these recent popes is truly two popes in one. Insofar as they represent Tradition - the Tradition of the popes, the Tradition of infallibility - we are in agreement with the pope. We are attached to him insofar as he continues the succession of Peter, and because of the promises of infallibility which have been made to him. It is we who are attached to his infallibility. But he, even if in certain respects he carries the infallibility within his being pope, nevertheless by his intentions and ideas he is opposed to it because he wants nothing more to do with infallibility. He does not believe in it and he makes no acts stamped with the stamp of infallibility.

- 11.5. Bishop Fellay appears to impugn Bishops Tissier de Mallerais, de Galarreta and Williamson as sedevacantists when in fact they do nothing different today than has been done by them, by Bishop Fellay, by Archbishop Lefebvre for many years.
- 11.6. A similar charge was levelled at Archbishop Lefebvre by none other than Cardinal Ratzinger on 13 July 1988. I provide the following extract from the book, "Archbishop Lefebvre and the Vatican"⁸⁴:

Some Lessons to Be Learned from the Lefebvre Schism

The following is the text of an address by Cardinal Ratzinger, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, given on July 13, 1988, in Santiago, Chile, before that nation's bishops. In the address, His Eminence comments on the "schism" triggered by Archbishop Lefebvre's illicit ordination of

⁸⁴ "Archbishop Lefebvre and the Vatican", p.184

four bishops and reflects upon certain internal weaknesses in the Church which have provided fertile ground for the development of the Lefebvre phenomenon. The text of Cardinal Ratzinger's significant address appeared in Italian in the July 30-Aug. 5 edition of Il Sabato. This English translation is reprinted from The Wanderer.

He [Archbishop Lefebvre] declared that he has finally understood that the agreement he signed aimed only at integrating his foundation into the "Conciliar Church." The Catholic Church in union with the Pope is, according to him, the "Conciliar Church" which has broken with its own past. It seems indeed that he is no longer able to see that we are dealing with the Catholic Church in the totality of its Tradition, and that Vatican II also belongs to that.

.....

All this leads a great number of people to ask themselves if the Church of today is really the same as that of yesterday, or if they have changed it for something else without telling people. The one way in which Vatican II can be made plausible is to present it as it is: one part of the unbroken, the unique Tradition of the Church and of her Faith.

11.7. Father Laisney says in that same book (at page 189) as follows:

In this long conference of Cardinal Ratzinger we can distinguish few accusations and many admissions.

He accuses Archbishop Lefebvre of two things. First, he says: "It seems indeed that he is no longer able to see that we are dealing with the Catholic Church in the totality of its Tradition, and that Vatican II also belongs to that."

Archbishop Lefebvre has always recognized the Pope as Pope, and wished to be able to have normal relations with him. The obstacles were not placed by Archbishop Lefebvre; he did his best to avoid them, fighting the introduction of new doctrines at the Council while the then Rev. Fr. Ratzinger was pushing for their introduction as a peritus. He did his best to prevent the Pope from calling the meeting at Assisi. [See his "Open Letter to the Pope," jointly signed with Bishop de Castro Mayer—The Angelus, Jan. 1984.] In spite of these new doctrines which entered the Church as a virus, he did his best to keep a relationship with the Pope. It makes no sense to admit that within the Church new values which "originated outside the Church," among the enemies of the Church, as Cardinal Ratzinger admits in The Ratzinger Report¹²¹ and then pretend that the whole of Vatican II still belongs to the totality of Tradition: "The central points of conflict at present are Lefebvre's attacks on the decree which deals with Religious Liberty, and on the so-called spirit of Assisi....[W]hat he is saying on these points is unacceptable."

11.8. In a letter dated 6 December 2002 (one of a number of letters by his Lordship), Bishop Williamson wrote , in relation to the issue of sedevacantism⁸⁵ as follows:

New Church "Canonizations"

December 6, 2002

Dear Friends and Benefactors,

....

The Society of St. Pius X, following Archbishop Lefebvre (1905-1991), adopts neither the Conciliar nor the sedevacantist solution. It believes that the Second Vatican Council was amongst the greatest disasters in the history of the Catholic Church, yet it considers that the popes who promoted that Council and its ideas (John XXIII, Paul VI, John Paul I, and John Paul II) were or are true popes. How can that be? How can true popes so act as to destroy the true Church?

Firstly, God creates all of us human beings free, with free will, because He does not want robots in His Heaven. That applies also to the churchmen, to whom He chooses to entrust His Catholic Church. These have therefore an astonishing degree of freedom to build up or to destroy the Church. For instance, when Our Lord asks if he will find the Faith when he comes back on earth (Lk XVIII, 8), we know for certain that by men's (not only churchmen's) fault, the Catholic Church will be very small at the Second Coming.

However Our Lord also promised that the gates of Hell would never prevail against his Church (Mt. XVI, 18), and so we also know for certain that God will never allow the wickedness of men to go so far as to destroy His Church completely. In this certainty that the Church will never completely fail lies her indefectibility, and since the first function of the Church is to teach Our Lord's doctrine of salvation, then upon indefectibility in existing follows infallibility in teaching. For souls of good will, the Catholic Church and her Truth will always be there.

...

So we may absolutely refuse Vatican II and all its pomps and all its works and yet not have to become sedevacantists, so long as we understand that Church indefectibility does not mean that large parts of the Church will never be destroyed, only that the Church will never be completely destroyed. Similarly Church infallibility does not mean that the Church's teachers will never teach untruth by, for instance, dubious "canonizations", only that, amongst other truths, the truth of Christian sanctity will never be totally falsified or silenced.

*... With all good wishes and blessings, in Christ,
+ Richard Williamson*

⁸⁵ <http://williamsonletters.blogspot.com.au/search?q=sedevacantist>

11.9. In Bishop Fellay's letter he says "...your description is lacking in realism as regards both the degree of the errors and their extent". It seems to me that the degree of errors and their extent is beyond doubt.

11.10. In April 2008⁸⁶, Bishop Fellay said:

a few recent events which clearly indicate that, basically, nothing has really changed except for the motu proprio's liturgical overture, so as to draw from all this the necessary conclusions.

So long as facts do not corroborate this new assertion, we must conclude that nothing has changed in Rome's intention to pursue the conciliar course despite forty years of crisis, despite vacant convents, abandoned rectories, and empty churches. ...

11.11. In November 2010⁸⁷, Bishop Fellay said:

But seeing what is going on in the Church, even if here and there appear gleams of hope, we must admit that, over all, the ship is pursuing the course begun at Vatican II – course a little slower, certainly, with Benedict XVI, but now hardly more than a free-fall broken by a parachute.

11.12. Bishop Fellay says that "they [Rome] are trying to disengage themselves from the most serious of them".

11.13. In January 2003⁸⁸, Bishop Fellay said:

But the real problem is the practical problem of what foundations the mansion will rest on. On the shifting sands of Vatican II, or on the rock of Tradition going back to the first Apostle?

To guarantee our future, we must obtain from today's Rome clear proof of its attachment to the Rome of yesterday. When the Roman authorities have re-stated with actions speaking louder than words that "there must be no innovations outside of Tradition", then "we" shall no longer be a problem.

And we beg God to hasten that day when the whole Church will flourish again, having re-discovered the secret of her past strength, freed from the modern unthought of which Paul VI said that "It is anti-Catholic in nature, Maybe it will prevail. It will never be the Church. There will have to be a faithful remnant.

⁸⁶ Refer Bishop Fellay's "Superior General's Letter to Friends & Benefactors" number 72 written in April 2008,

⁸⁷ Refer Bishop Fellay's "Superior General's Letter to Friends & Benefactors" number 77 written in November 2010: www.sspcx.co.uk/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=315:letter-to-friends-and-benefactors-77&catid=121:superior-generals-letter&Itemid=87

⁸⁸ Refer Bishop Fellay's "Superior General's Letter to Friends & Benefactors" number 63 written on 6 January 2003: http://www.sspcx.org/superior_generals_news/supgen_63.htm

- 11.14. With respect, I cannot see *actions* that speak rather than words and I continue to see real evidence that Rome has not changed.
- 11.15. If there was any real change would the doctrinal discussions have concluded without a real resolution?
- 11.16. Bishop Fellay's letter mentions "a change of attitude in the Church helped by gestures and acts of Benedict toward Tradition". Bishop Fellay refers to "this perception.... And it shows that it is no longer illusory for us to contemplate an 'intramural struggle'". With respect, Bishop Fellay's words appear uncertain and the better conclusion appears to be that any changes are consistent with Rome's subjectivism. In any event, Rome continues to make appointments and to act in a manner which is wholly consistent with Modernism – rather than any reversion to tradition. For example, the appointment of Bishop Mueller.
- 11.17. With respect, the fact that Rome returned the negotiation back to the "place of no return" merely confirms that Rome has not changed.
- 11.18. The letters between the Bishops to which I refer are reproduced below.

Reverend Superior General, Reverend First Assistant, Reverend Second Assistant,

For several months, as many people know, the General Council of the FSSPX is seriously considering Roman proposals for a practical agreement, after the doctrinal discussions of 2009 to 2011 proved that a doctrinal agreement is impossible with current Rome. By this letter the three bishops of the FSSPX who do not form part of the General Council wish to let him know, with all due respect, of the unanimity of their formal opposition to any such agreement.

Of course, on the two sides of current division between the Counciliar Church and the FSSPX much wish that the Catholic unity be restored. Honor to those on both sides. But since reality governs everything, and to the reality all these sincere desires must yield, namely that since Vatican II the official authorities of the Church have deviated from the Catholic truth, and today they are shown to be quite given to always remaining faithful to the Counciliar doctrines and practices. The Roman discussions, the "doctrinal preamble" and Assisi III are bright examples of this.

The problems arising to the Catholics by the Second Vatican Council are profound. In a conference, which seems like the last doctrinal will of Mgr Lefebvre, which was given to priests of the Society at Ecône a half year before his death, after having briefly summarized the history of the liberal Catholicism resulting from the French Revolution, he recalled how the Popes have always fought this attempt at a reconciliation between the Church and the modern world,

and he declared that the combat of Society of St. Pius X against the Vatican II was exactly the same combat. He concluded:

"The more one analyzes the documents of the Vatican II and their interpretation by the authorities of the Church, and the more one realizes that they are neither superficial errors nor a few particular errors such as ecumenism, religious freedom, collegial structure, but rather a total perversion of the spirit, a whole new philosophy founded upon Subjectivism... It is very serious! A total perversion! ... That is really alarming."

But, is the thinking of Benedict XVI is better in this respect than that of John Paul II? It is enough to read the study made by one of us three, The Faith in Peril from Reason, to realize that the thought of the current Pope is also impregnated of subjectivism. It is all the subjective imagination of the man in the place of the objective reality of God. It is all the Catholic religion subjected to the modern world. How can one believe that a practical agreement can arrange such a problem?

But, some will say to us, Benedict XVI is really well disposed towards the Society and its teaching. As a subjectivist this can easily be the case, because liberals subjectivists can tolerate even the truth, but not if one refuses to tolerate error. He would accept us within the framework of relativistic and dialectical pluralism, with the proviso that we would remain in "full communion," in relation to the authority and to other "ecclesiastical entities ." For this reason the Roman authorities can tolerate that the Society continue to teach Catholic doctrine, but they will absolutely not permit that it condemn Conciliar teachings. That is why an even purely practical agreement would necessarily silence little by little the Society, a full critique of the Council or the New Mass. By ceasing to attack the most important of all the victories of the Revolution, the poor Society would necessarily cease being opposed to the universal apostasy of our sad times and would get bogged down. Ultimately, what will guarantee that we will remain protected from the Roman curia and the bishops? Pope Benoit XVI?

One denies it in vain, this slip is inevitable. Doesn't one see already in the Fraternity symptoms of a lessening in its confession of the Faith? Today, alas, the contrary has become "abnormal". Just before the consecration of the bishops in 1988 when many good people insisted to Mgr Lefebvre so that he reach a practical agreement with Rome that would open a large field of apostolate, he said his thoughts to the four new bishops: "A large field of apostolate perhaps, but in ambiguity, and while following two directions opposed at the same time, and this would finish by us rotting." How to obey and continue to preach all the truth? How to reach an agreement without Society "having rotted" on the contrary?

And when one year later, Rome seemed to make true gestures of benevolence towards Tradition, Archbishop Lefebvre was always wary. He feared that they are

only "maneuvers to separate us from the largest number of faithful possible. This is the perspective in which they seem to be always giving a little more and even going very far. We must absolutely convince our faithful that it is no more than a maneuvers, 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, now, to put ourselves in the hands of those professing these errors." According to Archbishop Lefebvre the characteristic of the Society is, more than to just denounce the errors by their name, but rather to effectively and publicly oppose the Roman authorities which has spread them. How will one be able to make an agreement and make this public resistance to the authorities, including the Pope? And after having fought during more than forty years, will the Society now have to be put into the hands of the modernists and liberals whose pertinacity we have just come to observe?

Your Excellency, Fathers, take care! You want to lead the Society to a point where it will no longer be able to turn back, to a profound division of no return and, if you end up to such an agreement, it will be with powerful destroying influences who will not keep it. If up until now the bishops of the Society have protected it, it is precisely because Mgr Lefebvre refused a practical agreement. Since the situation has not changed substantially, since the condition prescribed by the Chapter of 2006 was by no means carried out (a doctrinal change in Rome which would permit a practical agreement), at least listen to your Founder. It was right 25 years ago. It is right still today. On his behalf, we entreat you: do not engage the Society in a purely practical agreement.

With our most cordial and fraternal greetings,

In Christo and Maria,

*Mgr. Alfonso de Galarreta
Mgr. Bernard Tissier de Mallerais
Mgr. Richard Williamson*

- 11.19. The following is a translation of the internal letter sent by Bishop Bernard Fellay, Superior General of the Society of Saint Pius X (FSSPX /SSPX), and the other two members of the General Council, First Assistant Fr. Niklaus Pfluger and Second Assistant Fr. Alain-Marc Nély, on April 14, 2012.

*SOCIETY OF SAINT PIUS X
Menzingen, April 14, 2012
The Most Reverend Tissier de Mallerais, Williamson, and de Galarreta
Your Excellencies,*

Your collective letter addressed to the members of the General Council received our full attention. We thank you for your solicitude and charity. Allow us in our

turn, with the same concern for justice and charity, to make the following observations.

First of all, the letter indeed mentions the gravity of the crisis gripping the Church and precisely analyzes the nature of the ambient errors that pullulate in the Church. Nonetheless, the description is marred by two defects in relation to the reality in the Church: it is lacking in a supernatural spirit and at the same time it lacks realism.

*The description lacks a supernatural spirit. To read your letter, one seriously wonders if you still believe that the visible Church whose seat is at Rome is indeed the Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ, a Church horribly disfigured, to be sure, a *planta pedis usque ad verticem capitis*, but a Church that in spite of all still has as its head Our Lord Jesus Christ. One gets the impression that you have been so scandalized that you no longer accept that it can still be the true Church. For you, it would seem to be a question whether Benedict XVI is still the legitimate pope. And if he is, there is a question as to whether Jesus Christ can still speak through him. If the pope expresses a legitimate will concerning us which is good and which does not order anything contrary to the commandments of God, have we the right to neglect or to dismiss this will? Otherwise, on what principle do you base your actions? Do you not believe that if Our Lord commands us, He will also give us the means to carry on our work? Now, the pope has let us know that an abiding concern for the regularization of our situation for the good of the Church lies at the very heart of his pontificate, and also that he knew very well that it would be easier both for him and for us to leave things as they stand now. And so it is indeed a decided and legitimate will that he is expressing.*

With the attitude you recommend, no room is left for the Gideons or the Davids or for those who count on the Lord's help. You reproach us with being naïve or fearful, but rather it is your vision of the Church that is too human, and even fatalistic. You see the dangers, the plots, the difficulties, but you no longer see the assistance of grace and of the Holy Ghost. If one grants that Divine Providence leads the affairs of men while safeguarding their liberty, it is also needful to admit that the gestures in our favor over the last several years are also under its guidance. Now, they trace a line — not straight — but clearly in favor of Tradition. Why should this suddenly stop when we are doing our utmost to be faithful and to intensify our prayer? Will the good God let us fall at the most critical moment? That does not make a lot of sense, especially as we are not trying to impose on Him the least self-will, but are trying to examine events closely so as to discern what God wants, and being disposed to all that shall please Him. At the same time, your description is lacking in realism as regards both the degree of the errors and their extent.

Degree: Within the Society, some are making the conciliar errors into super heresies, absolute evil, worse than anything, in the same way that the liberals

have dogmatized this pastoral council. The evils are sufficiently dramatic; there is hardly any reason to exaggerate them further (cf. Roberto de Mattei, *Une histoire jamais écrite*, p. 22; Mgr. Gherardini, *Un débat à ouvrir*, p. 53, etc.). Needful distinctions are not being made, whereas Mgr. Lefebvre did make the necessary distinctions on the subject of liberals several times. i This failure to distinguish is leading one or the other of you to a hardening of your position. This is a grave matter because this caricature no longer corresponds with reality and in future it will logically end in a real schism. And it may well be that this fact is one of the arguments that urges me to delay no longer in responding to the Roman authorities.

Extent: On the one hand, you saddle the current authorities with all the errors and evils to be found in the Church while leaving aside the fact that they are trying at least partly to disengage themselves from the most serious of them (the condemnation of the "hermeneutic of rupture" denounces real errors). On the other hand, you act as if ALL of them are implicated in this pertinacity ("they're all modernists," "all are rotten"). Now that is manifestly false. The great majority are still caught up in the movement, but not all.

So that, coming to the most crucial question, the possibility of our surviving in the conditions of recognition of the Society by Rome, we do not reach the same conclusion as you do.

Let us note in passing that it was not we who were looking for a practical agreement. That is untrue. We have not refused a priori to consider, as you ask, the Pope's offer. For the common good of the Society, we would prefer by far the current solution of an intermediary status quo, but clearly, Rome is not going to tolerate it any longer.

In itself, the solution of the proposed personal prelatry is not a trap. This is apparent from the fact, first of all, that the present situation in April 2012 is quite different from that of 1988. To pretend that nothing has changed is an historical error. The same evils afflict the Church, the consequences are even worse and more obvious than before; but at the same time we have observed a change of attitude in the Church, helped by the gestures and acts of Benedict XVI toward Tradition. This new movement, which began at least ten years ago, has been growing. It has reached a good number (still a minority) of young priests, seminarians, and even includes a small number of young bishops who clearly stand out from their predecessors, who confide in us their sympathy and support, but who are still pretty well stifled by the dominant line in the hierarchy in favor of Vatican II. This hierarchy is losing speed. This perception is not an illusion, and it shows that it is no longer illusory for us to contemplate an "intramural" struggle, the difficulty of which we are not unaware. I have been able to observe at Rome that however much the talk about the glories of Vatican II we'll be dinned with is still on the lips of many, it is no longer in people's heads. Fewer and fewer believe it.

This concrete situation, with the canonical solution that has been proposed, is quite different from that of 1988. And when we compare the arguments that Archbishop Lefebvre made at the time, we conclude that he would not have hesitated to accept what is being proposed to us. Let us not lose our sense of the Church, which was so strong in our venerated founder.

The history of the Church shows that recovery from the conflicts that beset it usually occurs gradually, slowly. And once one problem is resolved, something else starts up... oportet haereses esse. To require that we wait until everything is regulated before reaching what you call a practical agreement is not realistic. Seeing how things happen, it is likely that it will take decades for this crisis to come to an end. But to refuse to work in the field because there are still weeds that may crowd out or hamper the good grain is a curious reading of the Biblical lesson: It is our Lord Himself who gave us to understand by the parable of the wheat and the cockle that there will always be, in one form or another, weeds to be uprooted and grappled with in His Church...

You cannot know how your attitude these last months — quite different for each one of you — has been hard on us. It has kept the Superior General from communicating and sharing with you these weighty matters, in which he would have so willingly involved you had he not found himself before such a strong and passionate incomprehension. How he would have liked to be able to count on you, on your advice and counsel at such a delicate passage in our history. It has been a great trial, perhaps the greatest of his superiorate. Our venerated founder gave the bishops of the Society a precise function and duties. He made it clear that the unifying principle of our society is the Superior General. But for some time now, you have tried, each in his own way, to impose on him your point of view, even in the form of threats, even publically. This dialectic between truth and faith on one side and authority on the other is contrary to the spirit of the priesthood. At least he might have hoped that you would try to understand the arguments that have moved him to act as he has these last years, according to the will of Divine Providence.

We do pray for each one of you, that in this battle which is far from being over we may find ourselves all together for the greater glory of God and for the love of our dear Society.

May our Risen Lord and our Lady deign to protect you and bless you,

*+Bernard Fellay
Niklaus Pfluger+
Alain-Marc Nély+*

i "Just because a pope is liberal does not mean he is not the pope. (...) We have to stay the course and not go astray in the difficult times we are living. We might very well be tempted by extreme solutions and start saying: "No, no, the pope is

*not just a liberal – the pope is a heretic! Probably the pope is even more than a heretic, and therefore there is no more pope!" That is not correct. Just because someone is liberal does not necessarily make him a heretic, and therefore it does not necessarily mean he is outside the Church. We have to know how to make the necessary distinctions. That is very important if we are going to remain on the right track and remain truly in the Church. Otherwise, where are we going to end up? There is no more pope, there are no more cardinals because if the pope was not the pope when he named the cardinals, those cardinals can no longer elect a pope because they are not cardinals... And then what? An angel from heaven is going to bring us a new pope? It is absurd! Not only absurd, but dangerous! Because it might lead us toward solutions which really are schismatic." (Conference at Angers, 1980.) See also *Fideliter* 57, p. 17, concerning the proper measure.*

Conclusion Twelve – the six conditions evidence a departure from the principles of the SSPX

12. Conclusion: The 6 conditions that the Society has provided to Rome to which the SSPX "binds itself" are indicative of a "weakness" on the part of the Society and the Society's departure from the principles of Archbishop Lefebvre.

12.1. I understand that the conditions are as set out below:

Also, the preconditions for eventual normalisation of our relations with the official Church were given a better definition.

PART I: The "Sine Qua Non" conditions

The sine qua non conditions to which the Society binds itself and that she requires from the Roman authorities before considering a canonical recognition:

1 Freedom to keep, to transmit and to teach the sound doctrine of the unchanging magisterium of the Church and of the immutable truth of Divine Tradition ; freedom to defend, to correct and to reprove, even publicly, those responsible for the errors or novelties of modernism, of liberalism, of The Second Vatican Council and their consequences ;

2 Exclusive use of the 1962 liturgy. The retention of the sacramental practice that we have at the moment (including holy orders, confirmation and marriage) ;

3 The guarantee of at least one bishop.

PART II: "Desirable" conditions

1 Our own ecclesiastical tribunals, in the first instance;

2 Exemption of houses of The Society of St Pius X in respect of diocesan bishops;

3 A Pontifical Commission in Rome for Tradition, dependent on the Pope, with a majority of members, and the presidency, for Tradition.

12.2. The conditions evidence that the Superiors of the Society appear to have accepted that they should have an agreement with Rome rather than a conversion of Rome.

Conclusion Thirteen – no protection is given by Condition One

13. Conclusion: Condition 1 gives the Society no real protection and does not "remedy" the doctrinal issues between Rome and the Society

13.1. It would seem that all the Society requires is that the Society have the:

Freedom to keep, to transmit and to teach the sound doctrine of the unchanging magisterium of the Church and of the immutable truth of Divine Tradition ; freedom to defend, to correct and to reprove, even publicly, those responsible for the errors or novelties of modernism, of liberalism, of The Second Vatican Council and their consequences

13.2. Such a freedom would appear to be of little consequence in a church (Rome's church) that grants all manner of rights to other religions or to its own who profess all manner of what they call "Catholicism".

13.3. The condition does not resolve any doctrinal issues – rather the condition only requires the freedom to transmit and teach and defend etc. The condition effectively expresses a preparedness to place the truth next to error. The condition does not require or provide any mechanism by which the issues can be resolved. In fact the condition appears to contemplate that the Society may teach doctrine and criticise error but in circumstances where Rome may likewise continue to teach doctrine and presumably criticize error (even the error of traditional Catholicism!) at the same time. The condition appears to have little relevance in circumstances where the doctrinal discussions between the Society's representatives and Rome's representatives concluded without resolution of the doctrinal issues.

13.4. The condition, at best, would allow the Society to make criticisms like it may do today. That is, the condition at best, maintains the status quo between the Society and Rome, but in reality makes the Society subject to Rome (as contemplated by the other conditions) and in reality is a surrender by the Society because the Society will have entered into an agreement with no doctrinal foundation.

13.5. We have seen this style of condition before.

In the book "Archbishop Lefebvre and the Vatican" the declaration of Dom Gerard dated 18 August is quoted. In that declaration Dom Gerard states:

August 18, 1988

Declaration of Dom Gérard

By this declaration which follows, Dom Gérard, superior of the Benedictine Monastery of St. Madeleine of Le Barroux, France, publicly explained the reasons why he signed the Protocol which Archbishop Lefebvre rejected and the conditions he included with his signature.

.....

The stakes are not small, as one can see.

Our Conditions

We have placed two conditions on the signing of this agreement.

1) That this event be not considered as a discredit on the person of Archbishop Lefebvre: this was brought up several times in the course of our discussion with Cardinal Mayer, who agreed to it. Indeed, isn't it thanks to the tenacity of Archbishop Lefebvre that such a status is being granted to us?

2) That no doctrinal or liturgical counterpart be requested from us and that no silence be imposed on our anti-Modernist preaching.

.....

Dom Gérard, O.S.B.

Fr. Schmidberger's Remarks on Dom Gérard's Declaration

Rev. Fr. Franz Schmidberger, Superior General of the Society of Saint Pius X from 1983-1994, responded to Dom Gérard's Declaration (of August 18, 1988) by rebutting individual citations. These citations from the Declaration (see pp.199ff.) appear indented while Fr. Schmidbergers remarks are not.

a) That the tradition of the Church be pushed out of her official, visible perimeter brings prejudice to it. This is contrary to the honor of the Spouse of Christ. The visibility of the Church is one of its essential marks."

It seems rather contrary to the plan of Divine Providence that the Catholic Tradition of the Church be re-integrated into the pluralism of the Conciliar Church, as long as the latter dishonors the Catholic Church and scandalizes its unity and visibility. "Jesus...suffered without the gate" of Jerusalem, says St. Paul, "let us go forth therefore to Him without the camp, bearing His reproach" (Heb. 13:12-13).

Conclusion Fourteen – one bishop – what about the other bishops?

14. **Conclusion: Condition 3 (the guarantee of at least one bishop) means that the Society could be "reduced" to only one bishop and is concerning in view of the position of Rome that the position of the "other 3 bishops" (now other two bishops?) will be dealt with separately**

14.1. In a Holy See Press Office Communiqué⁸⁹ the following is stated:

Regarding the positions taken by the other three bishops of the Society of St. Pius X, their situations will have to be dealt with separately and singularly..

Holy See Press Office communiqué

On the afternoon of Wednesday 13 June, Cardinal William Levada, prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and president of the Pontifical Commission 'Ecclesia Dei', met with Bishop Bernard Fellay, superior general of the Society of St. Pius X who was accompanied by an assistant. Also present at the encounter were Archbishop Luis Ladaria S.J., secretary of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, and Msgr. Guido Pozzo, secretary of the Pontifical Commission 'Ecclesia Dei'.

The purpose of the meeting was to present the Holy See's evaluation of the text submitted in April by the Society of St. Pius X in response to the Doctrinal Preamble which the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith had presented to the Society on 14 September 2011. The subsequent discussion offered an opportunity to provide the appropriate explanations and clarifications. For his part, Bishop Fellay illustrated the current situation of the Society of St. Pius X and promised to make his response known within a reasonable lapse of time.

Also during the meeting, a draft document was submitted proposing a Personal Prelature as the most appropriate instrument for any future canonical recognition of the Society.

As was stated in the communiqué released on 16 May 2012, the situation of the other three bishops of the Society of St. Pius X will be dealt with separately and singularly.

At the end of the meeting the hope was expressed that this additional opportunity for reflection would also contribute to reaching full communion between the Society of St. Pius X and the Apostolic See.

[SEE COMMUNIQUÉ OF THE GENERAL HOUSE OF THE SOCIETY OF SAINT PIUS X]

⁸⁹ <http://www.news.va/en/news/bishop-fellay-visits-the-congregation-for-the-do-2>

http://www.vis.va/vissolr/index.php?vi=en&dl=5eb79266-fc2a-d4b5-5855-4fb39d6467dc&dl_t=text/xml&dl_a=y&ul=1&ev=1

14.2. In a Holy See Press Office Communique⁹⁰ the following is stated:

Communique on the Society of St. Pius X

Vatican City, 16 May 2012 (VIS) - Early this afternoon, the Holy See Press Office issued the following communique regarding the Society of St. Pius X:

"As reported by news agencies, today, 16 May 2012, an Ordinary Session of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith met to discuss the question of the Society of St. Pius X.

In particular, the text of the response of Bishop Bernard Fellay, received on 17 April, 2012, was examined and some observations, which will be considered in further discussions between the Holy See and the Society of St. Pius X, were formulated.

Regarding the positions taken by the other three bishops of the Society of St. Pius X, their situations will have to be dealt with separately and singularly".

⁹⁰ <http://www.news.va/en/news/communique-on-the-society-of-st-pius-x-2>

Conclusion Fifteen – desirable tribunals

15. **Conclusion: One of the desirable conditions is "Our own ecclesiastical tribunals, in the first instance". This indicates that the Society has changed its position and that the Society would be prepared to subject itself and its parishioners to the "modern" tribunals in circumstances where there has not been any change in the practice of those tribunals.**

15.1. In a letter dated March 1998 titled "The SSPX's Marriage Tribunal"⁹¹, Bishop Williamson explains as follows:

Dear Friends and Benefactors,

Amongst other accusations recently leveled at the Society of St. Pius X in the U.S.A. from former friends to left and to right is one that is delicate to handle in the public domain, and might have been better left in private. However, now that the issue has been raised, not by ourselves, it must not be thought that the Society has no answer. Also that answer throws much light on the nature of the Church and today's fight for the Faith. Let us then tackle the question head on: the question of marriage annulments.

...

But now what happened with the Second Vatican Council? Following the modern world's disordered glorification of the person, of the individual over society, the Council declared (e.g. "Gaudium et Spes" # 50) that children are no longer the one primary end of marriage, but its joint primary end together with the consorting of husband and wife, of which they are the fulfillment. Logically parents could now appeal to an Ecumenical Church Council for support to tear apart the marriage bond in their own interest, no longer subordinate to that of the children. Logically the Newchurch, soft on human passions and modern selfishness, began to declare more and more marriage contracts null. The situation became so scandalous in the United States that the Pope several years ago had to call the American Church to order for, in effect, creating Catholic divorce. Yet still we had the public scandal last year of Sheila Rauch Kennedy, Episcopalian wife of a supposed Catholic appealing to the Catholic Church for help to defend her marriage, and being betrayed.

Of course many couples rejoiced in this "liberty" granted to them by the Newchurch. But what about Catholics who were serious about their faith? How could they look for a serious marriage judgment, in view of their eternal salvation, to authorities now capable of granting two "annulments" and a third marriage to a woman no older than 25 (case known in Detroit)? They heard the Pope himself calling these authorities to order!

Now if people deny that there is a crisis in the Catholic Church, then little that the Society of St. Pius X does can make much sense. But if anybody grants that on the one

⁹¹ <http://www.sspxseminary.org/publications/rectors-letters-separator/rectors-letter/226.html>

hand the true Church owes to Catholics all the help they need to live up to its demanding laws, and that on the other hand the Newchurch is not providing that help, then it makes sense that the Society, amongst others, will step into that gap where it reasonably can, even if it has no territorial jurisdiction, and where it so steps in it may reasonably assume, in accordance with Canon Law, that the Church will, case by case, for the salvation of souls which is the supreme law, supply any missing authority or jurisdiction.

Upon that basis, as sins unfortunately continue, serious Catholics turn to Society priests for absolution from their sins, and these priests have jurisdiction supplied in emergency by the Church to grant absolution. Similarly, since marriage problems can also not wait until the end of the crisis in the Church to be resolved, Catholics may assume that if the Society sets about seriously examining marriage contracts in accordance with unchanging Catholic principles, then they may trust its declarations in the concrete case to be receiving from the Church any jurisdiction lacking, and they may act before God in good conscience upon any such declarations.

Of course the Society may abuse such supplied jurisdiction, because to err is human. But that does not take away the Society's right to act in such cases, because the urgent need of souls may even make that right a duty, for reasons already given. This Church crisis was not of the Society's making, and it is not of the Society's ending. Pray, dear Catholics, not that the Society priests never assume emergency powers, but that for your sakes and theirs they make the right use of those powers. Prudently to assume these powers is not to cut oneself off from the Church, but to engage more completely in the Church's own work.

And do not think – second accusation – that the Society is opening wide the flood-gates to "Traditional annulments". Here in the U.S.A., since the Society undertook this ungrateful task, it has taken only some one hundred cases seriously enough to examine them, and of those one hundred it has declared in less than a dozen cases, I am told, that the contract of marriage was invalid from the beginning. That is, like before Vatican II, a trickle rather than a flood. However, in all one hundred cases the couples concerned can now trust that they know where they stand before God, and that is a great gift.

Enclosed is a flyer that attempts to shed light on the present "liberal" or "conservative" or "Traditional" or "sedevacantist" confusion amongst Catholics. It indicates that there is an objective basis to the subjective sway and swirl of opinions. It is that objective Truth that matters.

Meanwhile, let us profit by Lent to renounce, sacrifice and do our daily duty. Our fallen nature must be held in check, or we will "all perish", says Our Lord (Lk. XIII, 3). May the thought of His Passion be with us in this season.

Sincerely yours in Christ, Bishop Richard Williamson

Conclusion Sixteen – the diocesan bishops are not the friends of Tradition

16. **Conclusion:** The conditions for an agreement include a desirable condition which provides "Exemption of houses of The Society of St Pius X in respect of diocesan bishops". That condition and the fact that it is desirable only evidence the fact that the Superiors of the Society acknowledge that they are prepared to enter into an agreement pursuant to which the works of the Society will be subject to local (Conciliar) Bishops and that such administration will present difficulties.

16.1. In an article published on DICI, "Relations of the Society of Saint Pius X with diocesan bishops" (DICI no. 256 dated June 8, 2012⁹²) Bishop Fellay said as follows.

DICI: A personal prelature is the canonical structure that you mentioned in recent statements. Now, in the Code of Canon Law, canon 297 requires not only informing diocesan bishops but obtaining their permission in order to found a work on their territory. Although it is clear that any canonical recognition will preserve our apostolate in its present state, are you inclined to accept the eventuality that future works may be possible only with the permission of the bishop in dioceses where the Society of Saint Pius X is not present today?

Bishop Fellay: There is a lot of confusion about this question, and it is caused mainly by a misunderstanding of the nature of a personal prelature, as well as by a misreading of the normal relation between the local ordinary and the prelature. Add to that the fact that the only example available today of a personal prelature is Opus Dei. However, and let us say this clearly, if a personal prelature were granted to us, our situation would not be the same. In order to understand better what would happen, we must reflect that our status would be much more similar to that of a military ordinariate, because we would have ordinary jurisdiction over the faithful. Thus we would be like a sort of diocese, the jurisdiction of which extends to all its faithful regardless of their territorial situation. All the chapels, churches, priories, schools, and works of the Society and of the affiliated religious Congregations would be recognized with a real autonomy for their ministry.

It is still true—since it is Church law—that in order to open a new chapel or to found a work, it would be necessary to have the permission of the local ordinary. We have quite obviously reported to Rome how difficult our present situation was in the dioceses, and Rome is still working on it. Here or there, this difficulty will be real, but since when is life without difficulties? Very probably we will also have the contrary problem, in other words, we will not be able to respond to the requests that will come from the bishops who are friendly to us. I am thinking of one bishop who could ask us to take charge of the formation of future priests in his diocese.

⁹² <http://www.dici.org/en/news/interview-with-bishop-bernard-fellay-on-relations-with-rome/>

In no way would our relations be like those of a religious congregation with a bishop; rather they would be those of one bishop with another bishop, just like with the Ukrainians and the Armenians in the diaspora. And therefore if a difficulty is not resolved, it would go to Rome, and there would then be a Roman intervention to settle the problem.

16.2. In an interview on 1 June 2012 between Bishop Tissier de Mallerais and Rivarol, the following exchange occurred.

R.: *Some believe that the statute of personal prelature proposed to you will provide sufficient guarantee to you concerning all danger of abandoning the combat for the faith.*

Bp. T.: *That is incorrect. According to the project of prelature, we would not be free to create new priories without the permission of the local bishops and, additionally, all our recent foundations would have to be confirmed by these same bishops. It would thus mean subjugating us quite unnecessarily to an overall Modernist episcopate.*

16.3. In an interview given by Father Rostand⁹³, the following exchange occurred.

MJM: *What exactly would it mean if the Society were to be granted a personal prelature?*

FR: *The Society of St. Pius X was erected in 1970. Her statutes were approved by the local bishop and even praised by Cardinal Wright in 1971. Then came the two condemnations in 1976 and 1988. For canonical discrepancies and for doctrinal reasons we have always maintained that the suppression of the Society was not valid and that the Society is still a branch of the Catholic Church. In that regard, a personal prelature will not be for us a birth as a new family in the Church but will give us more visibility. In other words, in the essence of things it will not change a lot but in appearances it will. A personal prelature is an institution headed by a prelate. A prelature is like a diocese, except without territorial boundaries. The jurisdiction of the Superior is over persons, clergy, religious and lay people, wherever they are. It therefore seems to be a possibility for the Society that would allow us to remain as we are and continue to grow.*

⁹³ http://www.sspcx.org/District_Superiors_Ltrs/fr_rostand_remnant_interview_5-17-2012.htm

Conclusion Seventeen – could the Society survive?

17. Conclusion: The Society has not yet been able to show any real "safeguards" that will (or even could) ensure that, in the event of an agreement, the SSPX would survive and would remain Catholic (in accordance with tradition). The Society has not yet been able to show any real reason why, in the event of an agreement, the position of the Society would be different when compared to the "other" traditional groups who have returned to Rome.

17.1. I understand that Father Rostand⁹⁴ has said :

***MJM:** According to the terms of an agreement the SSPX will be guaranteed the right to continue its longstanding and constructive critique of Vatican II and the New Mass. But haven't we heard this before? Isn't it true that in every case where this same allowance was granted to other traditionalist fraternities that critique failed to materialize, with many good priests even being induced to concelebrate the New Mass, endorse controversial events such as World Youth Day, and lay aside any meaningful resistance to the revolution unleashed by the Second Vatican Council?*

***FR:** There are a number of things that make the circumstances of today different from previous times. For one, Bishop Fellay insisted upon doctrinal discussions with Rome, and requested as preconditions for this, two signs of goodwill: first, freedom for the traditional Mass, and second, the lifting of the alleged excommunications. Both of these have been accomplished.*

Further, we must not ignore the differences between the Ecclesia Dei communities and us: they have neither autonomy nor bishops.

Further, regarding Vatican II, other writers outside the Society, such as Msgr. Gherardini, can now openly critique the Council as well. Of course, we do not pretend there would be no pressure in the event of regularization, but we must keep in mind that this pressure comes only from certain sources, not all.

17.2. When I consider these "differences" or "reasons" I am not comforted because:

17.2.1. The doctrinal discussions "concluded" on the basis that the Society and Rome, at best, have agreed to disagree (and the Society's chairman of its doctrinal discussions concluded:

The proposed document does confirm that it is illusory and unrealistic to believe that we could reach a pragmatic agreement, appropriate and warranted, and even just acceptable to both parties. Given the

⁹⁴ http://www.sspx.org/District_Superiors_Ltrs/fr_rostand_remnant_interview_5-17-2012.htm

circumstances, it is certain that at the end, after long discussions, we arrive at absolutely nothing. So, why would we get involved?

...

For the good of the Fraternity and Tradition, "Pandora's box" must be closed as quickly as possible, to avoid the stigma and the demolition of the authority, disputes, dissensions and divisions, perhaps with no return.

- 17.2.2. The signs of goodwill will not provide any protection;
 - 17.2.3. As regards bishops the society has 3 bishops who are "against" any practical agreement. In any event I understand that Rome has indicated that the other 3 bishops will be required to make their own arrangements with Rome;
 - 17.2.4. As referred to above the conditions that have been proposed indicate that the Society will be subject to local bishops and accordingly there will not be true autonomy for the Society.
- 17.3. The proposed terms or conditions of an agreement between the Society and Rome are very similar to the terms on which other traditional groups reconciled with Rome – to their ultimate demise. For the purpose of comparison, I refer to only three such groups, the Benedictine Monastery of St. Madeleine of Le Barroux, France (the superior of which was Dom Gerard), the Society of St. John Marie Vianney in Campos and the Institute of the Good Shepherd, but there are others.
- 17.4. In summary, a condition which gives the Society the right to criticise is similar to the terms of the respective agreements entered into by other traditional groups and the condition did not save those groups from the modern Church. The conditions were, in summary:
- 17.4.1. *that no silence be imposed on our anti-Modernist preaching* (the Benedictine Monastery of St. Madeleine of Le Barroux, France);
 - 17.4.2. *We engage ourselves to go into all yet open questions profoundly, taking into consideration canon 212 of the Code of Canon Law (CIC) and in a sincere spirit of humility and fraternal charity towards all* (the Society of St. John Marie Vianney in Campos); and
 - 17.4.3. *...the decree from the Vatican creating the institute offers them the possibility of "participating in a serious and constructive criticism" in view of "reaching an authentic interpretation" of Vatican Council II* (the Institute of the Good Shepherd).

Conclusion Eighteen – the promises didn't save Le Barroux

18. Conclusion: The history of the Benedictine Monastery of St. Madeleine of Le Barroux, France (the superior of which was Dom Gerard) supports the conclusion that the Society should not enter into a practical agreement with the Conciliar Church. In particular, the fact "*that no silence be imposed on our anti-Modernist preaching*" did not save it.

18.1. In the book "Archbishop Lefebvre and the Vatican" the declaration of Dom Gerard dated 18 August is quoted⁹⁵. In that declaration Dom Gerard states:

August 18, 1988

Declaration of Dom Gérard

By this declaration which follows, Dom Gérard, superior of the Benedictine Monastery of St. Madeleine of Le Barroux, France, publicly explained the reasons why he signed the Protocol which Archbishop Lefebvre rejected and the conditions he included with his signature.

.....

The stakes are not small, as one can see.

Our Conditions

We have placed two conditions on the signing of this agreement.

- 1) *That this event be not considered as a discredit on the person of Archbishop Lefebvre: this was brought up several times in the course of our discussion with Cardinal Mayer, who agreed to it. Indeed, isn't it thanks to the tenacity of Archbishop Lefebvre that such a status is being granted to us?*
- 2) *That no doctrinal or liturgical counterpart be requested from us and that no silence be imposed on our anti-Modernist preaching.*

.....

Dom Gérard, O.S.B.

18.2. In an article maintained by the SSPX⁹⁶ and which is primarily concerned with the Campos situation, the following is recorded:

...

Fr. Cottier [of the Conciliar Church] knows from experience that they have "matured," in a manner of speaking, to the Vatican's favor. Too many former companions-in-arms of the sons of Archbishop Lefebvre have concluded their own versions of a "practical and pragmatic type of accord," putting aside questions of

⁹⁵ Archbishop Lefebvre and the Vatican page 199

⁹⁶ Article signed by Hirpinus, dated May 2002, refer:

http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/SiSiNoNo/2002_September/Ambiguous_Accord.htm

doctrine and thinking that they will be able to carry on the good fight for the faith under better conditions. "But let your speech be yea, yea: no, no: and that which is over and above these, is of evil" (Mt. 5:37), as the Lord taught us.

There is the sad conversion of the monastery of Le Barroux which today defends the false religious liberty it attacked yesterday; the story of the Fraternity of St. Peter, many of whose members are today fighting to celebrate according to the rite of Paul VI while yesterday they fought against it. These instances go to show that genuine unity is founded solely on truth, and any other accord that is **not** founded on truth "is of evil."

1. Fragn.Histor. X, 2-4, cit. in Fliche & Martin, *L'Histoire de l'Eglise*.

2. *De comparatae auctoritate Papae et Concilia*.

3. Theodoret, Hist. Eccl. II, XVI (cf. *L'Histoire de l'Eglise*, tit.).

18.3. In an article which appears in the SSPX publication, *The Angelus*, in June 2008, titled "BEWARE OF ROMAN SNAKES"⁹⁷ the following is stated;

*It is not gracious to speak ill of the dead. "De mortuis nil nisi bonum," said the Latins. But where the Faith is at stake, and where a man, apparently until his death, took a stand on the Faith which can gravely mislead the faithful, it is not exactly speaking ill of him to remind the faithful of his mistake. If his soul is now in Purgatory or Heaven, he cannot mind the faithful being told the truth on the occasion of his death. Certainly I will not mind if over my grave a wiser man than I re-directs souls towards the Truth. Therefore Dom Gérard's peace should hardly be disturbed if, in a Society of St. Pius X publication like *The Angelus*, we go back on why he and Archbishop Lefebvre parted company in 1988 on the occasion of the episcopal consecrations. With those consecrations Dom Gérard frankly disagreed, and a few weeks later he came to a separate agreement of his own with Rome. On at least one occasion soon afterwards the Archbishop was observed to be weeping over Dom Gérard's decision.*

They were not sentimental tears. Up till that point Dom Gérard's monastery had been a power-house of Traditional resistance to the Conciliar Revolution. How much stronger that resistance would have been if Dom Gérard had not defected! But from that point on his monastery slowly turned into a defender of that Revolution. One thinks, for instance, of the huge several-volume defence of Vatican II's deadly doctrine on Religious Liberty, published several years ago by a monk of Le Barroux.

...However Dom Gérard believed that Cardinal (then) Ratzinger was a man one could deal with, so he cut his own deal, and most of his monks slid into the embrace of Conciliar Rome, where they have remained ever since...

⁹⁷http://www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsection=print_article&article_id=2732

How had it happened? A priest friend of the SSPX and former monk of Dom Gérard, who knew him well, has an interesting and convincing explanation.

Here is the heart of it:

As Archbishop Lefebvre pointed out, when Dom Gérard quit his monastery in Tournay, which was turning Conciliar, in order to found the Traditional monastery of St. Mary Magdalene, his motivation was mainly to maintain monastic and liturgical tradition. He did not sufficiently grasp the most important theological aspects of the crisis of the Church.

In addition, his intuitive rather than scholastic way of thinking was liable to make him change position suddenly in a way that betrayed his lack of a thorough doctrinal formation. In fact Dom Gérard had never received, or else never assimilated, a formation of the kind called for by Pius X in his encyclical Pascendi. St. Thomas Aquinas and scholastic thinking were far from occupying their due place in Dom Gérard's formation. (End of our friend's quote)

As a French priest used to say who collaborated closely with the Archbishop at the time of the Council, "One may not care for the rigors of Catholic doctrine, but in the Catholic Church very little can be achieved without it." Many a seminarian will testify to how arduous the study of St. Thomas can be, but the ruins of the Catholic Church all around us testify to the wisdom of St. Pius X's insistence in Pascendi on the study of St. Thomas Aquinas as the very first remedy to the mental sickness of modernism.

Soon after Dom Gérard decided to go over to Conciliar Rome, Archbishop Lefebvre wrote:

The consequences are from now on unavoidable. The SSPX will have no further relations with Le Barroux, and we will be warning all our faithful to give no more support to a Congregation which is henceforth in the hands of our enemies, the enemies of Our Lord and His Universal Kingship.

Strong clear words. May Dom Gérard have understood their truth before he died, so that now his soul may be resting in peace.

18.4. "The monastery of Le Barroux [which made its agreement with the Vatican in 1988] ... today defends the false religious liberty it attacked yesterday". Si Si No No, September 2002⁹⁸

18.5. The new mass (as well as the Traditional Mass) is now said at the former-Traditionalist monastery of Le Barroux.⁹⁹

⁹⁸ http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/SiSiNoNo/2002_September/Ambiguous_Accord.htm

⁹⁹ http://www.ecclesiadei.nl/docs/fiuv03_neri.html

Conclusion Nineteen – the promises didn't save Campos

19. **Conclusion: The history of the Society of St. John Marie Vianney in Campos supports the conclusion that the Society should not enter into a practical agreement with the Conciliar Church. In particular, the fact that Campos declared "We engage ourselves to go into all yet open questions profoundly, taking into consideration canon 212 of the Code of Canon Law (CIC) and in a sincere spirit of humility and fraternal charity towards all" did not save it.**

19.1. The Society has published a compilation of documents relating to the situation of Campos¹⁰⁰ and I reproduce part of that compilation as follows.

Dossier: Campos

1- Declaration of Bishop Fellay concerning the priests of Campos January 16, 2002, Feast of Saint Marcel

On January 18, 2002, Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos will read, in the cathedral of Campos, various documents by which Pope John Paul II erects an apostolic administration for the (traditional) priests of Campos and the faithful who are associated with them. Bishop Rangel is recognized as a Catholic bishop and named as the head of the new administration. This administration will have the right to use the 1962 liturgical books, that is to say the Tridentine Mass.

Bishop Rangel will make a profession of Faith, in the name of everyone, and a declaration, in which he recognizes John Paul II as Pope, the bishop of the diocese as the legitimate bishop and Vatican Council II as a council of the Catholic Church. He will nevertheless state that he reserves the right to criticize in a positive way that which is not in conformity with Tradition. Likewise for the New Mass, recognized as valid in itself, but which also is subject to constructive criticism.

...

The Fathers from Campos affirm that they will continue the combat for Tradition. It must also be acknowledged that no substantial concession on a doctrinal level has been made. Time alone will determine how Rome permits the development of this work.

It must be acknowledged that, for the first time, a diocesan kind of structure has been granted to Tradition. A traditional bishop is now recognized as such, as fully Catholic.

¹⁰⁰ <http://www.sspcx.ca/Communicantes/Apr2002/Campos.htm>

.....

*On the feast of Saint Marcel,
+ Bernard Fellay*

2 - Official Texts

***Letter of the Priestly Union of Saint Jean-Marie Vianney, to the Pope (excerpts)
Dated August 15th, 2001***

Most Holy Father,

In the name of our Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Faith, we have endeavoured to hold fast to the holy doctrinal and liturgical Traditions which the holy Church has handed down to us, and, according to our feeble strength and with the help of God's grace, to resist against what your predecessor of illustrious memory, Pope Paul VI has called the "autodemolition" of the Church. This is how we hope to best help your Holiness and the Holy Church. (...)

...

We request, officially, to be able to collaborate with Your Holiness in the work of the propagation of the Faith and of Catholic doctrine, with zeal and for the honour of the Holy Church - 'a standard set up unto the nations' (Is. XI: 12), in the battle against the errors and the heresies which threaten to destroy the Barque of Peter - though in vain, since the 'gates of hell shall not prevail against it'.

We place our profession of the Catholic Faith in the august hands of Your Holiness: we profess perfect communion with the See of Peter, of whom Your Holiness is the legitimate successor.

....

Reply of John Paul II to Bishop Rangel (excerpts)

Dated December 25th, 2001

To our Venerable Brother Licinio Rangel,

And to the dear sons of the Sacerdotal Union Saint Jean-Marie Vianney of Campos, Brasil,

With great joy we have received your letter of 15 August whereby your entire Union renewed its confession of the Catholic Faith, signifying its full communion with the See of Peter, acknowledging his 'primacy and government over the Universal Church, its pastors and faithful', and declaring that they 'do not wish to be separated from the Rock upon which Jesus Christ has founded His Church for anything in the world'.

With the greatest pastoral joy we accept your desire to cooperate with the successor of Blessed Peter in the propagation of the Catholic Faith and its teaching, zealous for the honour of the Holy Church, which is the standard raised amongst the nations (Is. 11:12), and fighting against those who, to no avail, endeavour to shackle the boat of Peter because "the gates of hell will not prevail against her" (Matth. 16:18).

We give thanks to the Lord One and Triune for such good sentiments!

Having considered all these things for the glory of God, the good of the Holy Church and the supreme law which is the salvation of the souls (cf. can. 1752 CIC), and accepting sincerely your request to be admitted to full communion with the Catholic Church, we recognize that you belong to her canonically.

At the same time we inform you, Venerable Brother, that a legislative document will be prepared, which will determine the juridical form by which your ecclesiastical goods will be confirmed and by which the respect of your proper goods will be warranted.

That document will erect canonically your Union as a Personal Apostolic Administration which will be submitted directly to the Apostolic See and whose territory will be the diocese of Campos. The question of the cumulative jurisdiction with regard to the diocesan Ordinary will be dealt with. The government of that Personal Apostolic Administration will be confided to you, Venerable Brother, and your succession will be provided.

The Apostolic Administration will be given the faculties to celebrate the Eucharist and the Liturgy of the Hours according to the roman rite and the liturgical discipline promulgated by our predecessor saint Pius V, and as revised by his successors until blessed Pope John XXIII.

With great gladness, and that your full communion might be rendered certain, we declare the remission of the censure in your regard, Venerable Brother, foreseen by can. 1382 CIC, and simultaneously the remission of all censures and the pardon of all irregularities which the other members of this Union have incurred".

(Apostolic Blessing, etc.)

...

Declaration of Mgr Licinio Rangel

18th of January 2002

I declare, jointly with the priests of the Apostolic Administration of Saint Jean-Marie Vianney of Campos, Brazil, the following:

- We recognise the Holy Father Pope John Paul II along with all his powers and prerogatives, promising him filial obedience and offering our prayers for him.

- We recognise the Second Vatican Council as one of the Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church, accepting it in the light of Sacred Tradition.

- We recognise the validity of the *Novus Ordo Missae* promulgated by Pope Paul VI, whenever celebrated correctly and with the intention to offer the true Sacrifice of the Holy Mass.

We engage ourselves to go into all yet open questions profoundly, taking into consideration canon 212 of the Code of Canon Law (CIC) and in a sincere spirit of humility and fraternal charity towards all. "In necessary things, unity, in doubtful things, liberty, in all things, charity" (St. Augustine).

*Canon 212 of the Code of Canon Law (revised version , Apostolic Constitution *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*, January 25th 1983):

§1 Christ's faithful, conscious of their own responsibility, are bound to show Christian obedience to what the sacred Pastors, who represent Christ, declare as teachers of the faith and prescribe as rulers of the Church.

§2 Christ's faithful are at liberty to make known their needs, especially their spiritual needs, and their wishes to the Pastors of the Church.

§3 They have the right, indeed at times the duty, in keeping with their knowledge, competence and position, to manifest to the sacred Pastors their views on matters which concern the good of the Church. They have the right also to make their views known to others of Christ's faithful, but in doing so they must always respect the integrity of faith and morals, show due reverence to the Pastors and take into account both the common good and the dignity of individuals.

...

Question: What is novel about this event, then?

Father Cottier: There is much more behind Lefebvre's schism: There is the rejection of the Council, of ecumenism, of the principle of religious freedom —a global rejection of which the liturgy was only the flag, although many people went with Lefebvre precisely for this reason.

Since the rupture [in 1988] until today, other followers of his have already returned to full communion with the Catholic Church. However, the principal condition has always been the full recognition of the authority of Vatican Council II. And this is what the principal group, the one of Ecône, has never accepted up until now.

...

Question: How can this specificity be reconciled with effective communion with the whole Church?

Father Cottier: Many Lefebvrists maintain that "our" Paul VI Mass is not valid¹. At least now this-group will not be able to think such a thing. Little by little we must expect other steps: for example, that they also participate in concelebrations in the reformed rite. However, we must not be in a hurry. What is important is that in their hearts there no longer be rejection. Communion found again in the Church has an internal dynamism of its own that will mature.

Question: With last Friday's action, has the implementation of the Council taken a step forward or backward?

Father Cottier: Certainly forward. There was no wish to create ruptures in Vatican II. Its intention was to place the Church in greater consonance with pastoral challenges, with the mission, with divine worship itself.

There was a very strong sense in the Council of the centrality of the liturgy in the life of the Church. And, if there is a privileged place of communion, it is, precisely, the Eucharist. We must rejoice over this reconciliation.

I hope it will open the way to others. In this process, communion with Peter's Successor is fundamental. Also in the liturgy: Until now, in the Mass celebrated by Lefebvrists there was no "communication" with the Pope. Now, at least in Brazil, it will no longer be like this.

1. Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre never stated that the New Mass is, in itself, always invalid, (that would mean: not realizing the real Presence as a Victim of Our Lord on the altar at the Consecration). But he did always say that the New Mass, through its rite, is bad in that sense that it favors protestant heresies and the ruin of the Catholic Faith.

4 - Some Reactions

Commentary of Father Peter Scott, District Superior of the USA for the Society of St Pius X

Regina Coeli Report, Letter to Friends and Benefactors, February 2002 (excerpts)

*The theme of this joint ceremony between modernists and traditionalists was "unity in diversity". In fact, such is the basis of the Indult Mass, as contained in John Paul II's *Motu Proprio* of 1988 *Ecclesia Dei adflicta*, and such is the basis for this reconciliation as described in the joint statement of Bishops Rangel and Guimaraes:*

"We further remember the invitation of the Holy Father, Pope John Paul II: 'All pastors and other faithful must have a new consciousness not only of the legitimacy but also of the riches that the diversity of charisms, traditions, spirituality and apostolate represent for the Church. This diversity also

constitutes the beauty of unity in diversity: this is the symphony that, under the action of the Holy Ghost, the earthly Church elevates to heaven'

(Motu Proprio Ecclesia Dei adflicta). It is thus with intense happiness that we communicate to all this gesture of kindness of the Holy Father, the Pope, wishing an ever-increasing union among Catholics -'unity in diversity' -as the Holy Father wishes, for the greater glory of God and honor of the Holy Church".

We must certainly respect the good intentions of the priests from Campos, who have not attacked the Society's refusal to make a deal, but simply stated that their situation is different, given th at they are all in one diocese. We also must acknowledge that they have not compromised in the same way that the priests of the Fraternity of Saint Peter, who have accepted in principle the celebration of the New Mass and the post-conciliar theology.

Nevertheless, it certainly saddens us that they have backed down on the clear position so well expressed in their 1999 book Catholic, Apostolic & Roman, and that this rift in tradition has come about for the sake of a canonical status, and that the priests of Campos have opted for the easy way out, the path of least resistance. So different were the heroic words of Bishop De Castro Mayer in a similar situation, on June 30, 1988:

"I want to manifest here my sincere and profound adherence to the position of His Excellency Archbishop Lefebvre, dictated by his fidelity to the Church of all centuries. Both of us, we have drunk at the same spring which is that of the Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church" (Archbishop Lefebvre & the Vatican p. 124).

Different also were the words written by the same priests on the occasion of the episcopal consecration of Bishop Rangel:

"Given the present situation of extraordinary crisis through which the Church is passing, with its hierarchy directly and indirectly bringing about its destruction - 'auto-demolition' — and for this very reason systematically naming bishops that have compromised with progressism, this extraordinary episcopal consecration is imposed upon us as an act that we call 'Operation Survival of Tradition'".

...

However, worst of all is the acceptance of the Indult principle of "unity in diversity", namely that we can be one with other "Catholics" in their diverse expressions of religious experience, including charismatics and modernists of all kinds. The principle of unity is not diversity. This is a pure contradiction for anybody who does not hold to the modernist conception of religion being the collection of everybody's personal experiences from within. To the contrary, the principle of unity is Catholic Tradition, as expressed in the catechism, namely, "to profess the same Faith, have the same sacrifice and sacraments, united under one and the same visible head, the Pope". We are only one with Novus Ordo Catholics

inasmuch as they hold fast to these truths, despite the revolutionary direction given by the modernists in the Church, and we are certainly in no way one with any that knowingly and willingly depart from any one of them.

.....

Open Letter to the Priests of Campos

Fr. Lourenço Fleichman, O.S.B.

This letter was written on October 30th, 2001, before the reconciliation between Campos and the Vatican, and was posted on the Internet. It was printed also in the Angelus, February 2002. Fr Fleichman was a monk at Le Barroux, France, when the accord was signed in 1988 between Dom Gerard Calvet and the Vatican. In conscience, he left the monastery in order to remain faithful to the combat for the Faith. He now serves an independent chapel at Niteroi, near Rio de Janeiro.

(...) Here is the first similarity I see between Dom Gerard's attitude and yours: Archbishop Lefebvre had just refused an agreement because he had not been able to perceive in the Vatican's intentions the guarantees that would be necessary to assure the survival of Catholic Tradition. Dom Gerard, placing the particular interests of his monastery above the Church's good, accepted a separation from Archbishop Lefebvre in order to "normalize" his juridical and canonical status, thereby letting fall the sword of combat.

Today, equally, the Society has just rejected an accord for the same reasons as Archbishop Lefebvre, and you prefer to consider your particular interests and not the common good of the Church. You have grown weary of the daily fight and of being marginalized. (...)

I said in 1988 to Dom Gerard what I repeat to you today: thousands of the faithful anxiously wait for you to confirm them in the Catholic Faith, in the combat that divine Providence requires of us, without our succumbing to fatigue, weakness, or the siren song of legality. What our Lord requires is martyrdom endured drop by drop, and a clear and simple profession of Catholic Faith without compromising with the modernists in the Vatican. The Pope, yes; legality, yes; but above all, respond to God's clear call to the combat of the faith. The day the Pope really converts, it will appear more clearly than the light of day. Obviously, it is not by kissing the Koran or by going to pray in a mosque that he manifests this conversion. (...)

Reaction of the Traditional Benedictines

Father Thomas Aquinas, O.S.B.

Prior of Holy Cross Monastery, Nova Friburgo, Brazil

4 December 2001 - Bulletin No. 23.

We share entirely the fears of Mgr Fellay and of the whole Society of St Pius X as well as of the whole family of Tradition throughout the world as we see our friends in Campos engaged in coming to an agreement with Rome without the

doctrinal question having been resolved. That which Mgr Fellay refused is about to be accepted or has already been accepted by Campos. The Society of St Pius X has had ample opportunity to learn the ideas and intentions of Rome. If it wanted to, Campos could profit from this experience. But it must want to do so. Let us pray for our friends, our brothers-in-arms in so many battles. Have they forgotten these words of Mgr Lefebvre: 'Prepare yourselves for a combat which will last a long time?' The combat will be long. 'Rome'is not yet converted. Pius XII predicted that the principal temptation for Catholics in the years to come would be weariness. Let us not become weary of the fight that we might be able one day to say with St Paul: 'I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the Faith' (2 Tim 4: 7). Nor should we weary of praying for Campos, for its priests and its faithful, that their combat might be equally marked by zeal and prudence."

Comments by the traditional transalpine Redemptorists Fathers

Catholic, March 2002 - Golgotha Monastery Island, Papa Stronsay, Orkney Isles, Scotland, UK KW17 2AR

On 22 August, 1999, the priests of Campos declared:

"..... When the ecclesiastical authorities return without condition to teaching and doing that which the Church has always taught and done, we ... will all be at the complete disposition of those same authorities."(Catholic, Apostolic and Roman, 43).

...."

We do not think that their case can be compared adequately with that of Dom Gerard and Le Barroux, or of Fr Bisig and the Society of St Peter. (...) We share wholeheartedly the views expressed by His Lordship, Bishop Fellay in his statement of 16 January. Only time will tell whether the Priestly Union of St Jean-Marie Vianney will remain true to the principles of Bishop de Castro Mayer or simply come to guarantee the pluralism in the Conciliar Church.

5 - Superior General's Message of March 1st, 2002

This document, dated March 1, 2002 is published by D.I.C.I., a news agency set up by the Society of St Pius X and posted on the Internet. D.I.C.I. is for now available only in French(wwwv.le-combat-catholique.com). It is possible also to send them mail at the following address: Service de Presse DICI, Schwandegg CH - 6313 MENZINGEN. Communicantes translated this important message of Bishop Fellay for you. It specifies and completes the declaration dated January 16.

...Before hailing the recognition of Campos as a return of Rome to Tradition, we are obliged to ask ourselves if this event could not also, must not also, be inserted in the post-conciliar logic; and precisely the meeting at Assisi furnishes a convincing argument in favour of this possibility. If post-conciliar Rome is

capable of reuniting so many religions, one could even say all the religions, for a common religious cause, why couldn't it also find a small place for Tradition?

Should we see in this a dilemma for Rome: resolve the "schism of Tradition" in accepting it, whereas the latter has proved itself until now exclusive and condemning (and thus accept that they are right as opposed to modernist Rome) or continue in the line of the reforms? Quite obviously, the line of the reforms is maintained as an intangible and irreversible principle. Thus, the condition that Rome must set down for the acceptance of a traditional movement is the general accepting of the Council (one could discuss the nuances and certain conclusions). It is the necessary step. It is the entering into pluralism under the appearances of being recognised by Rome, that is imposed, and not the return of the conciliar Church to Tradition. Cardinal Castrillon reproached me for this argument. It would not be in the name of pluralism that Rome desires our return, they would not wish to place us in a pluralistic situation. But nevertheless.

The conditions for the realisation of this new prodigy had been expressed by Cardinal Ratzinger, acting in the Camposian agreement from before the beginning of the discussions, first in an article of 30 Days in autumn of 2000, then in the Nef, and finally at Campos, during a press conference, January 19, 2002. Moreover, the papal theologian, Father Cottier, had not used any other argument: the acceptance of the Council is manifestly the major and determining point (afterwards will come the acceptance of the New Mass). It is the principle from which started the revolution in the Church, and in fact all the rest follows. In view of this fact, it seems to me that we find ourselves before another ambiguity with regard to the conciliar Church: when we declare to accept the Council with restrictions (to refuse that which is contrary to perpetual teaching, to interpret the ambiguous in the light of Tradition, to accept what was always taught) it highly appears that we say something completely different than what is understood by the Romans. Because fundamentally, we consider the Council as the great catastrophe of the 20th century, the cause of immeasurable harm done to the Church and to souls, while they see it as the great miracle of the 20th century, the revitalising of the Church.

...

Campos does not wish to see this. The reality will present itself very soon, probably too late. They still think that on the part of Rome, it is the recognition of Tradition. Whereas the opposite has just happened. A part of Tradition, a traditional movement, has accepted, with some reserve, of course, the post-conciliar reality. Rome considers the step sufficient. It must also be remarked that for the first time, a non-dogmatic Council has been set up as criteria for determining catholicity.

...

We avow that we do not understand, in the situation in which we live, how Campos could have so rashly launched into this venture, without requesting or taking the least protective measure.

Whatever one may say to praise the advantages acquired through this new canonical structure, for example the right to the traditional Mass, a traditional bishop, also, the fact that on paper, nothing substantial would have been abandoned: the fragility of the Administration on the one hand, the stability of the reforming Vatican system on the other hand are sufficient arguments to predict the fall of Campos in spite of all the declarations of the best intentions. Furthermore, one must clearly distinguish between a lack of the virtue of faith itself, and a failing in the public confession of faith which is so necessary in certain circumstances, as Bishop de Castro Mayer so well remembered on the day of the episcopal consecrations. And yet a prevarication such as that of Assisi calls for this public confession... which we have not heard coming from Campos.

The situation will not regain a particular interest for us unless all of a sudden they begin to resist and arrive there from at a confrontation with modernist Rome.

THE CONFERENCE: WHAT CATHOLICS NEED TO KNOW
Bishop Bernard Fellay

Edited transcription of a talk given by His Excellency, Bishop Bernard Fellay, Superior General of the Society of Saint Pius X at St. Vincent de Paul Catholic Church in Kansas City, Missouri, on November 10, 2004.

...On the other hand, you have those who say, "Look, Rome is opening its arms, Rome is saying, 'Come in; we'll give you an apostolic administration; we'll give you whatever you want,' so why are you so stand-offish?" I'll tell you why, which is one of the purposes of this conference. It is impressive.

The Lessons of Campos

I'll start with a crushing piece of recent news which illustrates so clearly what happens when you offer your finger...your hand...your arm to the present Rome. We have right in our faces a striking example of what happens to those who trust the present Rome. I speak of Campos.

When Campos was about to make the agreement with Rome, Bishop de Galarreta went to see Bishop Rangel and then I did, too. I told him, "Look at what they are doing to the Society of St. Peter." He replied, "Well, what Rome offers us is so big that we cannot help but trust them. Of course, it's a question of opinion; it's a matter of prudence. As the superior of the Society of Saint Pius X, you may have a different opinion, but that's the way we think." There was nothing more I could do. His thinking was that since Rome consented to grant them a bishop and their Tridentine life, Campos was being granted everything it wanted, so they wanted to sign an agreement.

Now, it is important to understand why Rome has suddenly come to the Society of Saint Pius X with a smile and friendly behavior. Not long ago, Rome was very much against us (and the majority in Rome still is). 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 is 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 pluricity, pluriformity.

Zoo-Cage Catholicism

..... And, once again, let us look at Campos.

The Conversion of Campos

Once again, let's look at Campos and the regression of Bishop Rifan, its head. Months before he was consecrated a bishop, Fr. Rifan participated in the local diocesan Corpus Christi procession. To traditional Catholics who opposed his participation, he replied, "If I do not go, I will jeopardize any agreement with Rome." Also, a few months before his consecration, he said in Rome to the Vicar General-who repeated it to Fr. Schmidberger, so we have it from a direct source: "I have no problem with celebrating the New Mass, but I don't do it because it would cause trouble to the faithful." So when Rome consecrated Fr. Rifan a bishop, they knew already that he had no objection to celebrating the New Mass. I think it is important to see that. These are the first steps. It shows you the direction.

The next step was the jubilee of the diocese of Campos. For that occasion, of course, the local bishop had a great ceremony, and Rome invited Bishop Rifan to go to that New Mass, to be there. And Bishop Rifan went. He did not participate in the sense of concelebrating the Mass, but he was there present vested in his ecclesiastical garb, with a surplice and so on. He was really there at this New Mass.

...

The next step was to be present at the Requiem Mass for the bishop who had evicted the priests of Bishop Antonio de Castro Mayer, Bishop Alberto Navarro. At that Requiem Mass, you had Bishop Rifan there and also the Nuncio. The Nuncio invited Bishop Rifan to go to Communion, and Bishop Rifan received Communion at this New Mass.

The next step was the Mass of thanksgiving of the new Cardinal of Sao Paolo. This time, Bishop Rifan was there again present at that New Mass. He was in the sanctuary; he was not in his surplice; nevertheless, at the time of consecration, with the other priests and bishops celebrating, he raised his hands and said the words of consecration. A seminarian saw him.

And now, the 8th of September this year, we have photos and even a video of the Mass concelebrated by Bishop Rifan on the occasion of the centennial of the coronation of Our Lady of the Aparecida, the patroness of Brazil. He is concelebrating the New Mass, a new Mass where you have really scandalous

happenings: ladies giving Communion in the hand, a ceremony of crowning Our Lady conducted by a woman in the presence of all the cardinals and bishops attending, and so on. Trying to defend himself, Bishop Rifan has said, "But I did not say the words of consecration." That makes it even worse, because it means he is cheating [called dissimulation, or, faking a sacrament—Ed.].

That's the evolution: he has been a bishop two years and he is already concelebrating the New Mass. You see, that is the natural development which was announced from the start by the officials in Rome, Georges Cottier, now Cardinal Cottier [the Holy Father's personal theologian—Ed.] and Msgr. Perl, Secretary for the Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei. At the time of the Campos-Vatican Accord, Fr. Cottier said: "...Little by little we must expect other steps: for example, that they also participate in concelebrations in the reformed rite [the Novus Ordo Mass—Ed.]. However, we must not be in a hurry. What is important is that in their hearts there no longer be rejection. Communion found again in the Church has an internal dynamism of its own that will mature." He prophesied this natural, psychological dynamic and we can see in Bishop Rifan a real, natural, clear demonstration of this.

... And I may say, had the Society entered into this same agreement, we would be more or less doing the same thing, and if not agreed on all the same points as Campos, at least there would be enormous division among us. Some would say to me, "We have to make an agreement. If you don't do it we are going to lose something." Others would say, "By all means, no." There would be enormous division and a tremendous loss. Why is this? Because Rome is not at all convinced of the necessity of Tradition, of the necessity of coming back to Tradition to get out of this unbelievable crisis in which we have been since the Council, because they do not want to go to the roots of this crisis. The roots were clearly legalized, put into law, at the time of the Council, and these modern errors are what are killing the Church.

...

...So what we try to say to Rome in all these things is, "Listen, we have to get to the root of the problems." We don't want to make an agreement just for the sake of an agreement. A prelate in the Vatican said to me, "Don't make a cosmetic agreement with Rome." And it is true, we don't want any kind of cosmetic agreement. Things are too serious. The Faith is at stake. We want to keep the Faith!

...

It's About the Faith Itself

I finish my letter to Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos by reminding him that the rite of Baptism is a contract between the Catholic soul and the Church. The first question asked by the Church at the baptism is, "What do you ask of the Church of God?" The answer is "Faith." What does this mean? It means the Church makes a contract with the soul. You become a member of the Church and I grant you the Faith. It is a guarantee; there is a contract there. To the Cardinal I write:

That is what we request from Rome, that Rome confirm us in the Faith, the Faith of all time, the Faith which cannot change. ...

Who Is REALLY Defending the Faith?

There is one more event which I cite to show you what is going on. A little less than two months ago, five entities under the Ecclesia Dei Commission made a move towards Rome, towards Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos, and put pressure on him to get Rome to excommunicate us. Of these five groups, I know four: the Priestly Union of St. John Baptist Mary Vianney [Campos], the Benedictine Monastery of St. Madeleine of Le Barroux [France], the Fraternity of St. Peter, and the Institute of Christ the King. They asked Rome to excommunicate us. I know already the answer from Rome, from the Pope, from his Secretary of State, and from Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos: All of them say, "No, it is not the time. We want to come to a peaceful situation, so we don't want to excommunicate the Society of Saint Pius X."

.....

Transcription of a talk given by His Excellency Bernard Fellay at St. Vincent de Paul Catholic Church in Kansas City, Missouri (Nov. 10, 2004). Edited by Fr. Kenneth Novak, maintaining its conversational tone.

-
1. See the Feb.March issue of *The Angelus*, pp. 4-5.
 2. Quoted from the Spanish edition of *L'Osservatore Romano*, Feb. 4, 2004.
 3. The document quoted is available on-line:
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/card-kasper-docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_20030227_ecumenical-dialogue_en.html

Conference given by Bishop Bernard Fellay on November 10, 2004 at St. Vincent de Paul Church in Kansas City, MO¹⁰¹)

- 19.2. In Bishop Fellay's "Superior General's Letter to Friends & Benefactors" number 63¹⁰² written on 6 January 2003, Bishop Fellay says as follows:

*Dear Friends and Benefactors,
OUR RELATIONS WITH ROME*

... In the eyes of Rome, obviously, what happened in Campos was merely meant to be the prelude to our own "regularization" in the Society of St. Pius X, but in our eyes what is happening to our former friends should rather serve as a lesson to us.

Generally speaking, Rome means, all things being equal, to come to an agreement with the SSPX. On all sides we hear that the pope would like to settle this matter

¹⁰¹ http://www.sspcx.org/sspcx_and_rome/what_catholics_need_to_know.htm

¹⁰² http://www.sspcx.org/superior_generals_news/supgen_63.htm

before he dies. Alas, our fears roused by the Campos agreement have proved to be well-founded, and the evolution we observe of the Campos Apostolic Administration, contrary to Roman expectations, leaves us distrustful.

...

... Various explanations are possible, but it is primarily because of the pluralist and ecumenical vision of things now prevailing in the Catholic world. According to this vision, everybody is to mix together without anybody needing any longer to convert, as Cardinal Kasper said in connection with the Orthodox and even the Jews. From such a standpoint there will even be a little room for Catholic Tradition, but for our part we cannot accept this vision of variable truth any more than a mathematics teacher can accept a variable multiplication table.

....

CHANGES IN CAMPOS

Campos, through its leader, Bishop Rifan, is crying out for all to hear that nothing has changed, that the priests of the Apostolic Administration are just as Traditional as before, which is the essence of what they have been granted, and why they accepted Rome's offer: because Rome approved of the Traditional position.

...

The ambiguity implicit here has become more or less normal in the new situation in which they find themselves: they emphasize those points in the present pontificate which seem favorable to Tradition, and tip-toe past the rest. Say what we will: there took place in Campos on January 18, 2002, not only a one-sided recognition of Campos by Rome, as some claim, but also, in exchange, an undertaking by Campos to keep quiet, And how could it be otherwise? It is clear by now that Campos has something to lose which they are afraid or losing, and so in order not to lose it they have chosen the path of compromise:

..... For our part we have no intention of launching out until we are certain that Rome means to maintain Tradition. We need signs that they have converted.

LEAVING THE SSPX BEHIND

.....

One may object that our arguments are weak and too subtle, and of no weight as against Rome's offer to regularize our situation. We reply that if one considers Rome's offer of an Apostolic Administration just by itself, it is as splendid as the architect's plan of a beautiful mansion. But the real problem is the practical problem of what foundations the mansion will rest on. On the shifting sands of Vatican II, or on the rock of Tradition going back to the first Apostle?

To guarantee our future, we must obtain from today's Rome clear proof of its attachment to the Rome of yesterday. When the Roman authorities have re-stated with actions speaking louder than words that "there must be no innovations outside of Tradition", then "we" shall no longer be a problem.

.....

+Bishop Fellay
January 6, 2003

Conclusion Twenty – the promises didn't save the Institute of the Good Shepherd

20. **Conclusion: The history of the Institute of the Good Shepherd supports the conclusion that the Society should not enter into a practical agreement with the Conciliar Church. In particular, the fact that the Institute was to have "doctrinal freedom" did not protect it. One of the original Priests of the Institute, Father Paul Aulagnier was expelled from the Society in 2003 for reasons relating to his public support of reconciliation between the Society and Rome. Father Aulagnier's position has been proven wrong by the fact that the Institute is being "forced" to surrender to the principles of the Conciliar Church but his reasons (for favouring reconciliation in 2003) are the SAME reasons that the Superiors of the Society are using to support reconciliation in 2012. However, in 2012 it would appear that those priests (and Bishop) who argue against reconciliation (for reasons including those used in 2003) are expelled from the Society.**

The Institute and background

20.1. The Institute of the Good Shepherd was formed in 2006 pursuant to a decree signed by Cardinal Hoyos and dated 8 September 2006;

20.2. The first Superior of the Institute of the Good Shepherd was Father Laguérie;

20.3. One of the original priests who joined the Institute (and I believe is still a member of the Institute) was Father Paul Aulagnier. Father Aulagnier was expelled from the Society of Saint Pius X in 2003. He had "for a long time ...publicly and virulently opposed the Society's stand regarding negotiations with Rome..";

20.4. When the Institute of the Good Shepherd was formed, Father Laguerie declared as follows:

"We have a new pope who has understood tradition. Tradition has not yet completely regained its rights, but it is making progress. Pope Benedict XVI is a traditionalist pope. And this is something completely new which gives great hopes to the Church",....

20.5. The website for the Institute of the Good Shepherd¹⁰³ provides as follows:

A full fidelity to the Magisterium of the Church infallible

In addition, each founding member personally recognizes "respect the authentic Magisterium" of the Roman See, in a "full fidelity to the Magisterium of the Church infallible (Statutes II § 2). From a doctrinal point of view, according to the speech of Pope Benedict XVI to the Roman Curia December 22, 2005, members of the Institute, as far as in them, are engaged in a "serious and constructive criticism" of

¹⁰³ <http://www.institutdubonpasteur.org/en>

*Vatican II, to enable the Apostolic See to give the authentic interpretation.
Communion creates a space for dialogue and controversy healthy and serene.....*

20.6. The Institute of the Good Shepherd has recently been instructed that:

The question of the practice of the extraordinary form [of the Mass], such as it is formulated in the Bylaws, must be delineated in the spirit of Summorum Pontificum. It would be suitable to simply define this form as the "rite proper" to the Institute without speaking of "exclusivity."

....

Regarding the Seminary of Courtalan, the evaluation is positive, but it would be suitable to include the teaching of the present day Popes and of Vatican II. The pastoral formation should be made under the light of Pastores dabo vobis and the doctrinal formation should include a careful study of the Catechism of the Catholic Church.

...

Rather than maintaining a critique of Vatican Council II, even a "serious and constructive" one, the efforts of your teachers must point out the transmission of the integrity of the patrimony of the Church, insisting on the hermeneutics of renewal in its continuity and using as support the integrity of Catholic doctrine expounded by the Catechism of the Catholic Church.

20.7. By reference to the evidence referred to in this book I note as follows:

- 20.7.1. Father Aulagnier was expelled from the Society as a result of his vocal opposition to the Society's refusal to "reconcile" with Rome (noting that the formal reason for his expulsion was his disobedience etc);
- 20.7.2. Father Aulagnier and Father Laguerie were two of the original members of the Institute of the Good Shepherd;
- 20.7.3. When the Institute was formed the status of the Institute regarding criticism of Vatican II was summarized as follows "the decree from the Vatican creating the institute offers them the possibility of "participating in a serious and constructive criticism" in view of "reaching an authentic interpretation" of Vatican Council II.
- 20.7.4. The Institute, when formed, was to be "traditional" and was "approved" by Rome – but since its formation it is being forced to "*include the teaching of the present day Popes and of Vatican II*".

Expulsion of Father Aulagnier by the Society

20.8. The "Society's stand" (in 2004, when Father Aulagnier was expelled) was as follows:

The present Roman authorities continue to be faithful to their principles of the new theology, new ecclesiology new evangelization exemplified by the spirit of Vatican II and Assisi in which they want to draw us and of which we want no part.

20.9. I understand that Father Aulagnier was described in 2006 as an "integrist" in that he wished to reconcile with the Conciliar Church. I summarise his reasons for wishing to reconcile, by reference to two items of evidence which are reproduced below, namely an interview by Father Aulagnier which appeared in the "Wanderer" publication and a letter written by Father Jean Violette of the SSPX and dated December 2003¹⁰⁴. In his letter Father Violette said:

I think we can summarize Father Aulagnier's arguments in favour of a reconciliation in the following:

- 1. The danger of schism.*
- 2. His [Father Aulagnier's] friendship with the heroic priests of Campos;*
- 3. The attitude of Rome is new;*
- 4. Additionally I think that there is a danger in seeing this conflict last for ages.*

20.10. In the following section I attempt to do four things. Firstly, I adopt Father Violette's summary of Father Aulagnier's arguments (for a reconciliation with Rome). Secondly I expand Father Aulagnier's "explanation" of those reasons by reference to the interview by Father Aulagnier which appeared in the "Wanderer" publication ("the interview"). so that we can consider Father Aulagnier's words. Thirdly, I raise some other interesting (familiar?) comments made by Father Aulagnier in the interview. Fourthly, I add some comments in relation to the relevant points that arise.

20.11. Father Violette summarized Father Aulagnier's first argument in favour of reconciliation as "the danger of schism".

20.11.1. In the interview, Father Aulagnier stated as follows:

This is why we must always remain in contact with Rome, not only for them to progress in the right direction, but unceasingly to remind ourselves of their good memory. We are of the flock. If we remain satisfied with our situation, then there is a danger of "psychological schism." The young people are of my opinion. I call it as it is. The SSPX leadership thinks I exaggerate, but our younger generations have never known a normal ecclesiastical situation.

20.11.2. This argument is the same argument that Bishop Fellay (and his assistants) used in their letter to the Bishops Tissier, de Galarreta and Williamson when Bishop Fellay said:

¹⁰⁴ Letter from Father Violette to the faithful dated December 2003, Refer http://www.sspx.ca/Documents/Fr-Violettes-Letters/2003_August.htm

This failure to distinguish is leading one or the other of you to a hardening of your position. This is a grave matter because this caricature no longer corresponds with reality and in future it will logically end in a real schism. And it may well be that this fact is one of the arguments that urges me to delay no longer in responding to the Roman authorities.

20.12. Father Violette summarized Father Aulagnier's second argument in favour of reconciliation as "His [Father Aulagnier's] friendship with the heroic priests of Campos";

20.12.1. In the interview Father Aulagnier stated as follows:

Secondly, my friendship with these heroic priests has led me to experience their traditional parishes and their numerous works. I have especially seen even here the problem of the Mass. The attitude of Rome is new. Rome gave the Mass to our friends, the priests of Campos. And this freely and without condition. Rome recognizes their right, their facultas to celebrate the Traditional Mass in all the churches of their apostolic administration. I studied their statutes at length. So, for me, these things are going in the right direction in favor of the Mass.

The Campos agreement did not require the compromises made by the Ecclesia Dei institutes in 1988. Campos received a frank recognition of the right to the Tridentine Mass without having to recognize that the new Mass is "legitimate and orthodox." They were simply asked to recognize the validity of the new Mass. Archbishop Lefebvre always recognized and taught that the new Mass was valid. There is a great difference between "validity," "legitimacy," and "orthodoxy." Something can be valid without being legitimate and orthodox.

20.12.2. We need only consider the status of the Campos situation to realize that the Campos experience is not a reason to join Rome.

20.13. Father Violette summarized Father Aulagnier's third argument in favour of reconciliation as "The attitude of Rome is new";

20.13.1. In the interview Father Aulagnier stated as follows:

Why would the consecrations not be reasonable today? Because many Romans have changed and now acknowledge the very difficult situation in which the Church finds herself. Cardinal Castrillon's Mass of May 24, 2003 is not burning straw. This is the fruit of a long evolution which began, it seems, around 1992, with the publication of

a series of books of Cardinal Ratzinger and a series of conferences, homilies, and an interview with Cardinal Stickler. At St. Mary-Major, Cardinal Castrillon spoke for the Church by recalling the "right of citizenship" of the Mass of St. Pius V.

... The attitude of Rome is new. Rome gave the Mass to our friends, the priests of Campos. And this freely and without condition.

- 20.13.2. This argument is the same argument that Bishop Fellay (and his assistants) used in their letter to the Bishops Tissier, de Galarreta and Williamson when Bishop Fellay said:

it is also needful to admit that the gestures in our favor over the last several years are also under its guidance. Now, they trace a line — not straight — but clearly in favor of Tradition.....

*.....
the fact that they are trying at least partly to disengage themselves from the most serious of them*

...but at the same time we have observed a change of attitude in the Church, helped by the gestures and acts of Benedict XVI toward Tradition. This new movement, which began at least ten years ago, has been growing.....

- 20.14. Father Vioette summarized Father Aulagnier's fourth argument in favour of reconciliation as "I think that there is a danger in seeing this conflict last for ages".

- 20.14.1. In the interview Father Aulagnier stated as follows:

Additionally, I think that there is a danger in seeing this conflict last for ages. The Church is a visible and hierarchical society. If one lives too long in an autarchy, one ends up losing the meaning of what a hierarchy is. We are thus in danger, the time passing and the opposition remaining, of forgetting Rome and organizing ourselves more and more outside of Rome. This needs to be acknowledged.

- 20.14.2. This argument is the same argument that Bishop Fellay (and his assistants) used in their letter to the Bishops Tissier, de Galarreta and Williamson when Bishop Fellay said:

To read your letter, one seriously wonders if you still believe that the visible Church whose seat is at Rome is indeed the Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ, a Church horribly disfigured, to be sure, a planta pedis usque ad verticem capitis, but a Church that in spite of all still has as its head Our Lord Jesus Christ. One gets the impression that

you have been so scandalized that you no longer accept that it can still be the true Church. For you, it would seem to be a question whether Benedict XVI is still the legitimate pope.

20.15. We must help

20.15.1. In the interview Father Aulagnier stated as follows:

.....The Holy Father has spoken. We must help and participate in the liturgical restoration in the Church.

20.15.2. This point is the same point that Bishop Fellay (and his assistants) used in their letter to the Bishops Tissier, de Galarreta and Williamson when Bishop Fellay said:

.....If the pope expresses a legitimate will concerning us which is good and which does not order anything contrary to the commandments of God, have we the right to neglect or to dismiss this will?

20.16. The position of Archbishop Lefebvre

20.16.1. In the interview Father Aulagnier stated as follows:

I sincerely believe that today Archbishop Lefebvre would have accepted an accord with Rome.

20.16.2. Father Violette said:

...This is not only insulting it is ludicrous. On the contrary as we will see, the SSPX's present stand would seem more faithful to the Archbishop.

20.16.3. This argument is the same argument that Bishop Fellay (and his assistants) used in their letter to the Bishops Tissier, de Galarreta and Williamson when Bishop Fellay said:

And when we compare the arguments that Archbishop Lefebvre made at the time, we conclude that he would not have hesitated to accept what is being proposed to us.

20.17. We must be inside

20.17.1. In the interview Father Aulagnier stated as follows:

..It is necessary today to be inside with a recognized right of the Mass of St. Pius V on the altars of Christianity. One must have the sense of what is possible

20.17.2. I have previously responded to this argument for reconciliation by adopting a statement of His Grace Archbishop Lefebvre when in July or August 1989¹⁰⁵ he said:

Such things are easy to say. To stay inside the Church, or to put oneself inside the Church - what does that mean? Firstly, what Church are we talking about? If you mean the Conciliar Church, then we who have struggled against the Council for twenty years because we want the Catholic Church, we would have to re-enter this Conciliar Church in order, supposedly, to make it Catholic. That is a complete illusion. It is not the subjects that make the superiors, but the superiors who make the subjects.

20.18. My conclusions are summarised as follows:

20.18.1. The Institute of the Good Shepherd is being subjected to the Conciliar Church and thereby "infected" with modernism, notwithstanding that the Institute was to have the right of "participating in a serious and constructive criticism" in view of "reaching an authentic interpretation" of Vatican Council II...";

20.18.2. Father Aulagnier was ultimately expelled from the Society because of his outspoken favour of a reconciliation of the Society with Rome.

20.18.3. Father Aulagnier's reasons for favouring a "reconciliation" with Rome in 2003 are the SAME reasons that are being used to support a reconciliation between the Society and Rome today in 2012.

20.18.4. By reference to history we know that the truth (the reality) is that Father Aulagnier was wrong in 2003 – because the Institute of the Good Shepherd is now being subjected to the Conciliar Church and its modern principles and we know that the Society has (so far) survived.

20.19. The difference between 2003 and 2012 would appear to be that in 2003 the Priest/s in favour of reconciliation was expelled whereas in 2012 the Priests who are not in favour of reconciliation are being expelled!

¹⁰⁵ http://www.sspix.org/archbishop_lefebvre/one_year_after_the_consecrations.htm

20.20. Letter from Father Violette in relation to Father Aulagnier

I reproduce, in its entirety, the letter from father Violette, who was District Superior of Canada at the time that Father Aulagnier was expelled.

December 2003

Dear Faithful,

Unfortunately I have sad news to end the year. Some of you may have seen it on the Internet. Indeed Father Aulagnier, one of Archbishop Lefebvre's first and closest companion in the resistance, assistant to the Superior General, founding district superior of the French district had to be expelled from the Society. Last September we were saddened by the interview of Father Aulagnier to the Wanderer. At first I thought of replying earlier but then decided to wait to see how this affair would end. This interview, along with an extended article published in French on his website as well as in a French daily newspaper proved to be the last straw.

For a long time now, since 1998, he had publicly and virulently opposed the Society's stand regarding negotiations with Rome. As well he disobeyed our constitutions and repeatedly disobeyed Bishop Fellay's explicit orders thus giving a bad example. He had also created a very difficult situation within the Society trying to sway its members in pursuing an accord with Rome thus trying to cause division and even rebellion against the legitimate authority. The problem was not that he had contrary opinions but that he was airing them in public and trying to undermine the Superior General and the Society. This state of affairs had lasted long enough. Because it was Father Aulagnier and the respect he commanded in the Society, Bishop Fellay and the General Council were very patient but sometimes, even patience can be a fault.

..... This is not only insulting it is ludicrous. On the contrary as we will see, the SSPX's present stand would seem more faithful to the Archbishop.

Now I have not read Father Aulagnier's French articles I've only read the interview in the Wanderer. According to this article, I think we can summarize Father Aulagnier's arguments in favor of a "reconciliation" in the following: 1. The danger of schism. 2. His friendship with the "heroic" priests of Campos. 3. "The attitude of Rome is new." 4. "Additionally I think that there is a danger in seeing this conflict last for ages." Let us consider these points.

1. The danger of schism.

Our resistance is not rebellion. It is the necessary attitude of Catholics who want to keep the faith when faced with prelates who attack, deny or threaten it. We do not want to become Protestants! We continue to believe in the divinity of Our

Lord and His social Kingship, His Church. The fact that we keep the faith and we continue to speak with the Roman authorities shows there is no danger of schism because we still recognize their authority. Dispensations and other ecclesiastical permissions have been sought and received from the Roman authorities. What is in question is not their authority but whether we can trust them or not. It is not just a matter of having a majority in a Roman commission. It is a matter of can we put ourselves under them and trust them to protect our Faith? Unfortunately the present Roman authorities have proven over and over they cannot be trusted, that they have not changed as we will point out later on.

The solution to this crisis will come from Rome when the Roman authorities come back to the integrity of the Faith. But until then we do well to continue our resistance. How long this will take is not our problem but God's. But we cannot for the sake of a fake unity join those who promote errors, who reduce the Church to a human institution, or simply one religion among others thus destroying it. So we continue Tradition and continue to denounce those who reject it in the name of a new conciliar church. As Archbishop Lefebvre said: by cutting themselves off from the previous popes, the modern Roman authorities are the ones who are schismatic. When Rome returns to the Faith the only matter for discussion will be who will become a bishop and who will he replace?

2. His friendship with the "heroic" priests of Campos.

Friendship is indeed a noble sentiment. But does it come before one's duty or before one's Faith. Further, I simply ask the question: Does it take heroic virtue to capitulate in the fight for Tradition in order to obtain recognition? Did it take heroic virtue to renounce their spiritual father, Bishop de Castro Mayer, to abandon and turn against their former comrades in arms? I don't think so. Is Father Aulagnier also on the verge of choosing between the pre-Vatican II and the post-Vatican II Archbishop Lefebvre? As if there was a difference.

3. The attitude of Rome is new

This is the most unbelievable reason of all. Where has Father Aulagnier been for the past 5 years? Have the modern Roman authorities really changed? Has he forgotten what they have done to the Fraternity of St Peter, which is their own creation? Has he forgotten about the two sacrilegious prayer meetings of Assisi? The last one took place a week after they granted recognition to the "heroic" priests of Campos who did not say a word about it. By the way, hasn't he noticed how quiet the "heroic" priests of Campos are since they signed their agreement? Doesn't he know that on May 24 2003, at the same time as Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos was offering the traditional Mass in St Mary Major, the Pope was giving the Catholic church of Saints Vincent and Anastasius, which contains the embalmed hearts of 22 popes, to the Bulgarian Orthodox to share? Some change!

He seems to have forgotten what Archbishop Lefebvre knew well and denounced: there are two Romes: Catholic Rome and the neo-modernist Rome. As did Archbishop Lefebvre, we adhere with our whole heart to Catholic Rome but reject the neo-modernist Rome. Catholic Rome has been infiltrated and is occupied by Modernists. This is a fact. The proclamation by Cardinal Castrillon that "The old Roman rite thus conserves in the Church its right of citizenship" is nice but changes nothing. It is perfectly in line with the neo-modernist ecumenism of the neo-modernist Romans, which is: Why not accept also the Mass of St Pius V? We accept everything else.

But we are not looking for acceptance. We will not be happy if at the next Assisi prayer meeting Bishop Fellay stands closer to the Pope than the Dalai Lama. The Dalai Lama shouldn't even be there. We hope that at the next prayer meeting at Assisi to pray for peace the Pope will be surrounded by all the Catholic bishops consecrating Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. This is where the true peace is. Encouraging prayers to false gods will not bring peace.

So the words of Archbishop Lefebvre to John Paul II in 1988 are still valid today: "The time for cooperation has not yet come." Absolutely nothing has changed. The present Roman authorities continue to be faithful to their principles of the new theology, new ecclesiology new evangelization exemplified by the spirit of Vatican II and Assisi in which they want to draw us and of which we want no part.

The SSPX also continues faithful to the Catholic principles transmitted by the Archbishop. "We do not view reconciliation in the same way. Cardinal Ratzinger see it in the sense of bringing us to Vatican II. We see it as the return of Rome to Tradition. We cannot come together. It is a dialogue between the deaf." For the renewal of the dialogue with Rome "I will raise the question on the doctrinal level: 'Are you in agreement with the great encyclicals of all the previous popes? Are you in agreement with Quanta cura of Pius IX, Immortale Dei, 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 teaching? Do you still accept the anti-modernist oath? Are you in favor of the social kingship of Our Lord Jesus Christ? If you do not accept the doctrine of your predecessors it is useless to talk. As long as you refuse to reform the council in light of the doctrine of these popes who preceded you there is no dialogue possible. It is useless... The opposition between us is not a small thing. It is not sufficient for them to tell us: you can say the old Mass... No the opposition between is not there, it is the doctrine.'"¹

4. "I think that there is a danger in seeing this conflict last for ages".

In my opinion, I think we might see here the real reason for Father Aulagnier's change. The fight is dragging on. He has been at the center of this fight for over 30 years. Maybe he is tired of the fight! But this is not the first time that a conflict over the faith has lasted for ages. The Arian crisis lasted over 70 years, the papal

exile in Avignon 68 years, the great Schism 39 years. Is this a reason to abandon the fight to come to some arrangement? It's a good thing St Athanasius didn't get tired of being exiled, threatened, falsely accused, excommunicated etc. He wouldn't be St Athanasius.

He seems to have forgotten that: "In other times heretics and schismatics left the Church. Today, as St Pius X warned us, they remain to make her evolve from within and to seduce, if it were possible all or part of the flock of the holy bishop... But one does not deal with this kind of enemy all the more so that he is cunning. One does not negotiate with him a false and separate peace. One fights him till the end, strong in his right – Deus vult - God wills it – reminding him of the truths he attacks in vain... Rome knows it made an error, a grave error: the excommunication (against Mgr Lefebvre). How to repair the error? Time will tell. In any case not without a frank return of the hierarchy to the total and integral confession of the catholic faith whole and entire. The day will come when Rome by its conversion will find our serenity.² Seems like [he] has lost his serenity.

Dear faithful do not lose your serenity, stand calm firm in the unchanging faith of all times. Do not abandon the fight. Sure it is dragging out. But we will win.

As usual we thank you for your continued support and assure you of our daily prayers for you and yours especially during the holy season of Advent and Christmastide. May you all have a happy and blessed Christmas and may the newborn Lord and His holy Mother and St Joseph reward and bless you in the coming year.

*With my blessing
Father Jean Violette*

1. Fideliter #66 November-December 1988

2. Father Paul Aulagnier Fideliter #65 September-October 1988

20.21. A Society website¹⁰⁶ records the following:

THE INSTITUTE OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD: DECLARATIONS AND REACTIONS

Résumé : The foundation of the Institute of the Good Shepherd, numbering several priests who belonged to the SSPX, gave rise to various and even divergent statements. Below are declarations made by Fr. Philippe Laguérie, Superior General appointed by Rome, by Cardinal Ricard, Archbishop of Bordeaux who received the new institute in his episcopal city, as well as the reactions of the clergy of the diocese of Bordeaux. We added footnotes when necessary to clarify the texts.

1. Declarations made by Fr. Philippe Laguérie, Superior General of the Institute of the Good Shepherd to France Presse Agency

Fr. Laguérie salutes the gesture of Benedict XVI, "a traditionalist pope" (AFP – Sept. 8, 2006)

The integrist priest Philippe Laguérie was rejoicing on Thursday over the authorization obtained from Rome for the establishment of an institute in Bordeaux in which the traditional Latin Mass will be celebrated. And he saluted the gesture of Pope Benedict XVI as coming from "a traditionalist pope".

"We have a new pope who has understood tradition. Tradition has not yet completely regained its rights, but it is making progress. Pope Benedict XVI is a traditionalist pope. And this is something completely new which gives great hopes to the Church", the priest told AFP.

In 2004, he was excluded from the SSPX founded by Archbishop Lefebvre, but had continued to celebrate services in the Saint Eloi church in Bordeaux.

He also stressed that the authorization of creating an "institute of pontifical right" in Bordeaux had been obtained with the agreement of Cardinal Jean-Pierre Ricard, President of the French Bishops' Conference since 2001.

"For the Institute this is the token that it is entering France through the main door, the door of the president of the Bishops' conference, the cardinal-archbishop of Bordeaux. He gave his explicit agreement", he indicated.

"Today reconciliation takes place around the cradle of the Institute of the Good Shepherd which was just born on this day", he added.

Note: *On September 13, during a TV debate on the News channel LCI, Fr. Laguérie admitted that the adjective "traditionalist" he used with regard to*

¹⁰⁶ <http://www.fsspx.org/en/liturgy/the-mass/the-institute-of-the-good-shepherd-declarations-and-reactions/>

*Benedict XVI was "reductive". Yves Chiron, in his newsletter Aletheia, comments: "To call Benedict XVI 'traditionalist' is simplifying the matter and it is false. Neither the thought, nor the acts of Benedict XVI can be put under the label 'Traditionalism'. The Institute of the Good Shepherd got the traditional liturgy to be recognized as 'its own proper rite'", but it would be a mistake to believe that Benedict XVI has a will to restore the traditional liturgy in the whole Church. During meetings in Fontgombault (an indult Benedictine Monastery), five years ago, he, who was still Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, expounded in a most developed and clear manner his position on the question. He said he was in favor of a 'reform of the reform' (of the 1969 Missal), but he was also considering an evolution of the 1962 Missal (with the introduction of new saints, additional prefaces, and so on...). Elsewhere, he mentioned the necessity for the Church to have 'a single rite'" in the future. On this point, a dispatch from I.Media Press Agency, dated September 8, specifies: "According to Vatican sources, the novelty resides in the fact that 'Benedict XVI himself desired this step" in which 'the traditional missal of Saint Pius V is not a missal apart, but an extraordinary form of the unique Roman rite'. On September 13, during their press conference in Paris, Fathers **Laguérie** and **de Tanouïarn** explained that the Vatican authorities only wanted to consider one single Roman rite under two forms: one ordinary (the Pope Paul VI Mass, in the vernacular), and the other extraordinary (the Tridentine Mass in Latin).*

*On September 8, Mr. **René-Sébastien Fournié** (seminarian), secretary of Fr. Laguérie, assured the AFP: "We made no concession whatsoever on the rock-bottom problem". And he added: Cardinal Ricard "gave his agreement to the Institute having his seat in his diocese". The Archbishop of Bordeaux "had been discussing the matter with Fr. Laguérie for several months, and the atmosphere had taken on a spirit of confidence", he specified.*

The integrists who have rallied to the Vatican mean to establish themselves "everywhere in France". (AFP – 13-09-06)

The head of the integrist priests who have made an agreement with the Vatican was affirming on Wednesday (September 13) that the new Institute of the Good Shepherd, which has been granted to them by the Holy See, desired to open parishes "everywhere in France and elsewhere". "They will have to cohabit with us. We will not be a divisive factor, on the contrary", declared to the press Fr. Philippe Laguérie, Superior General of the Institute, and leader of the five historical disciples of the schismatic Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre who are now rallied to Rome. The institute has in mind abandoned or deserted churches in city centers. "There is no question of arriving somewhere and warning the bishop afterwards", he assured. But "canon law makes it an obligation for an institute and the local bishop to work together". The convention which should be signed for the Saint-Eloi church in Bordeaux, which he has been occupying since 2001 in the diocese of Cardinal Jean-Pierre Ricard, President of the French Bishops' Conference, and which will be the seat of the new institute, "will be the prototype

of what we want to accomplish everywhere in France and elsewhere." According to the priest, Cardinal Ricard like Cardinal **Dario Castrillon-Hoyos**, to whom the pope has entrusted the dialogue with the "Lefebvrites", wishes to perform the first ordinations. Four seminarians are ready. The institute already numbers 6 priests and is going to receive about 10 priests from South-America. "Priests from the SSPX are asking to join us, I am cautious", he added, even if the Vatican "would not find it bad if a sufficient number of priests would come and knock at our door, so that the SSPX may think things over". According to him, who was excluded in 2004 from the organization founded by Archbishop Lefebvre after having been one of its columns, the decree from the Vatican creating the institute offers them the possibility of "participating in a serious and constructive criticism" in view of "reaching an authentic interpretation" of Vatican Council II, and gives them the right to celebrate exclusively the traditional Mass in Latin. "We are the first landmark set by the pope for a return to liturgical unity", he said. And he affirmed that the Vatican is about to publish a document, which will "re-establish the traditional Mass in all its rights". At his side, Fr. **Guillaume de Tanoüarn** laid stress on "the complete change of atmosphere" in the Vatican of Benedict XVI: "We are no longer second-class Christians, we are accomplishing 'a work useful for the Church' according to the words of the decree" creating the institute.

Note: On September 15, the following communiqué was released:

"Fr. **Christian Bouchacourt**, superior of the South American district categorically denies the insistent rumor which is being broadcasted on the Internet and according to which about 10 priests of the district would join the Institute of the Good Shepherd, erected by Rome a few days ago.

This is not the first time that this kind of insinuation is being spread on the Internet by people who realize that Tradition is constantly growing and gaining strength on our continent.

All the priests of our District remain united to our Superior General, Bishop Bernard Fellay, and are unanimous in refusing any practical agreement like that which the Institute of the Good Shepherd has just signed. They consider that such an agreement entails a grave danger for Tradition.

Unlike the Institute of the Good Shepherd, the SSPX does not ask any privilege for itself. But, on the contrary, its fight only aims at restoring the fullness of Tradition in the whole Church."

2. *Declarations from Cardinal Jean-Pierre Ricard, archbishop of Bordeaux, President of the French Bishops' Conference and member of the Ecclesia Dei Commission*

...

Interview granted by Cardinal Ricard to the daily La Croix in its September 11 edition.

It is not easy to receive newcomers.

Cardinal Jean-Pierre Ricard, member of the Ecclesia Dei Commission in charge of dealing with the integrist case, is hoping for reconciliation, but adopts a "prudent realism".

What does this agreement mean concretely?

What is granted is an exclusive use of the rite of the Mass in force in 1962. This concerns the missal as well as the ritual or the breviary.

Does "exclusive" mean that these priests may refuse to celebrate in the Paul VI rite?

Yes, since the use of their rite is exclusive.

Does this mean that they may refuse, for instance, to join in the Chrismal Mass, which gathers all the priests of a diocese around their bishop during Holy Week?

Indeed, this allows them to answer "no" to the request for concelebration. But, alas, they may very well not be the only ones to do so... After the recent elections in the Society of Saint Peter, it seems to me that the possibility of concelebration for the chrismal Mass may also be ruled out for these priests by their superior.

How are you going to manage these contradictions?

On the one hand, we must accept the pope's decision, he himself wanted this. He wanted to make a gesture in favor of those who had followed Archbishop Lefebvre, to show them that they could have a place in the Church. On the other hand, things will have to be very clear concerning the Council and the conciliar heritage. I wish that – even if there have been a few deviations or a few abuses – the extremely positive aspect of what the Church has lived since the Council may be reaffirmed. The Church, which set the Council in motion, is my Church. It is the Church in I would not like the fact that we welcome traditionalist faithful to be thought of, or experienced as a denial of the Council, as if we were questioning the great intuitions of the Council, which have sustained and are still sustaining my presbyterium, and our pastoral work.

Why, in the texts of the agreement, was a "critical" welcome of the Council envisaged?

I quite agree that such or such a point may be questioned, but the tree must not hide the forest. A reformulation or a reorganization of ecclesial life does not at all mean that we question the spiritual event lived by the Church during the Council, and which has been the life of the people of God for forty years.

Do you believe that reconciliation may take place?

I hope so! If everyone expresses the desire to better understand his neighbor, if this effort is made, it seems to me that reconciliation may begin. But it is a spiritual matter. It is not sufficient that a decree be passed for all the problems to be resolved. The real problem is about fraternal relationships. You had two households living side by side and excommunicating each other, they are now called to live under the same roof. It is not easy to receive newcomers. They must realize that they are not in a conquered land. They are getting into a house where there are others occupants. We have to learn how to live together, even if we live on different floors.

Does this act have a historical scope?

...

Are you optimistic?

....

Did you encourage this agreement, or did it come from Rome?

.....

Do you feel you are taking some ecclesial risk?

The risk was taken by Rome, since they depend upon Rome. The risk is also shared by all the bishops, who will accept these priests in their dioceses.

And you are one of them...

The statutes are clear. For all that concerns the Institute's internal life, they depend directly on Rome. For the creation of a parish, parish ministry, or the lay apostolate and the mission, they depend upon the local bishop. They are under obligation to secure the local bishop's agreement for any establishment in a diocese.

3. Reactions of the clergy of Bordeaux

Communiqué of the priests' council on September 15

Meeting with Archbishop Ricard, the delegates of the priests of the diocese have expressed their questions, regrets and joy.

On the occasion of the creation of the Institute of the Good Shepherd, the priests' council of the diocese of Bordeaux:

- reaffirms its communion with its Archbishop, Cardinal Ricard, and accepts as its own the text of the interview he granted to the daily La Croix on September 11, 2006.

- denounces the lack of information and collaboration with the local Church in the creation of the Institute;

- is concerned that a diocese was given no say in a decision in which it was involved;

- repeats the joy of the priests to live their ministry with the zeal born of Vatican Council II, and sets itself the task to invite priests and communities, in the coming months, to tell how the orientations of the council have inspired their ministry and their life;

- affirms its conviction that brotherhood in Christ supposes kindness a priori and truth in what is said and exchanged. Any reconciliation, which would take place out of this exigency, would but delay the time when new difficulties rise.

...

4. And the SSPX?

Interviewed by I.Media press agency, on September 21, Cardinal Castrillo-Hoyos answered. (Excerpts)¹⁰⁷

...

With this new institute, the Mass of St Pius V seems to be reinforced as the extraordinary form of the Roman rite. Is this the case?

This question also seems to me to go beyond what really happened. When the Holy See approves an institute, in this case the Good Shepherd, it approves the reality presented to it. The rite of Saint Pius V never was excluded from the life of the Church. And this is why to this institute, like to many other ecclesial entities, the old rite was granted as its proper rite, for its members as well as for the faithful who go to them.

- 20.22. I reproduce what I understand to be the Decree pursuant to which the Institute was "formed"¹⁰⁸:

Pontifical Commission "Ecclesia Dei"

Decree

N ° 118/2006

Our Lord Jesus Christ really is the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, the Apostle Peter teaches in his first epistle (IP 2, 25). The same place, he exhorts the faithful to follow the footsteps of Pasteur. This exhortation of the Apostle must be followed, obviously, by all Christians. But it primarily concerns those who have been called upon to perform in the Church office of pastor is to say the bishops themselves and their co priests and deacons, for whom Christ the Good Shepherd, who gives his life for his sheep, is the clear example of the life and apostolic ministry.

In a number of dioceses in France, the faithful attached to the previous liturgical forms of the Roman rite, lack of pastors available to provide effective assistance to the bishops in the pastoral care of the faithful.

Recently, in the Archdiocese of Bordeaux, became a group of some priests under the patronage of the Good Shepherd. Members of this group are trying to help her reverend Eminence Cardinal Jean-Pierre Ricard in parish work, first destination of the faithful committed to celebrating the ancient Roman liturgy. The archbishop himself, convinced of the great value of such cooperative receives this

¹⁰⁷ <http://www.fsspx.org/en/liturgy/the-mass/the-institute-of-the-good-shepherd-declarations-and-reactions/>

¹⁰⁸ http://la.revue.item.free.fr/commission_pontifical.htm

community in his diocese, by entrusting the church Saint-Eloi located in his episcopal city with the pastoral care of the faithful.

And as this new institute will also offer other bishops who want his pastoral service, the community, in the particular circumstances of the present time, has humbly requested assistance and support to the Apostolic See. All these elements are well weighed, Commission Pontifical Ecclesia Dei receiving this request sympathetically and with the help of divine aid, under the powers which have been granted by the Supreme Pontiff Benedict XVI, after having informed the Prefect Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life, erected as a society of apostolic life of pontifical right, in the city of Bordeaux, and more precisely in the church Saint-Eloi :

INSTITUTE OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD.

Thus, Commission approved for five years, ad experimentum , constitutions said Institute as they are placed in the text in the Annex to this order.

Finally, members of the Institute, it confers the right to celebrate the sacred liturgy, using, and really like their own rite, the liturgical books in force in 1962, namely the Roman Missal, the Roman Ritual and the Roman Pontifical for confer orders, and also the right to recite the Divine Office according to the Roman Breviary published the same year.

Finally, she called the Reverend Father Philippe Laguérie first superior of the institute.

There is nothing contrary obstacles.

Headquarters the Pontifical Commission " Ecclesia Dei "

Feast of Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, September 8, 2006.

Dario Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos ,

President

Camille Perl,

Secretary

http://la.revue.item.free.fr/commission_pontifical.htm

- 20.23. I reproduce what I understand to be a copy of a letter from the Ecclesia Dei Commission to the Institute dated 23 March 2012 as follows:

Letter from the Secretary of the Ecclesia Dei Commission

To the Institute of the Good Shepherd in France

March 23, 2012

Conclusions of the Canonical Visit To the Institute of the Good Shepherd

Generally speaking, it is necessary to develop the founding charisma of the Institute by thinking more on the future than on the past. To prepare for the next General Chapter, it will be useful to meditate on Christ as Pastor.

Anyone who wants to develop the characteristics of a society of apostolic life must avoid any form of individualism. For this, it would be good to enter into contact with other societies of apostolic life capable of helping in this meditation on communitarian life.

The question of the practice of the extraordinary form [of the Mass], such as it is formulated in the Bylaws, must be delineated in the spirit of Summorum Pontificum. It would be suitable to simply define this form as the "rite proper" to the Institute without speaking of "exclusivity."

....

*Regarding the Seminary of Courtalan, the evaluation is positive, but it would be suitable to include the teaching of the present day Popes and of Vatican II. The pastoral formation should be made under the light of *Pastores dabo vobis* and the doctrinal formation should include a careful study of the Catechism of the Catholic Church.*

To resolve the question of the establishment of the seminary [in other places], unless it is just an extension of the Courtalan seminary itself, the French Conference of Bishops can be asked to suggest the names of the dioceses where it can be installed.

Rather than maintaining a critique of Vatican Council II, even a "serious and constructive" one, the efforts of your teachers must point out the transmission of the integrity of the patrimony of the Church, insisting on the hermeneutics of renewal in its continuity and using as support the integrity of Catholic doctrine expounded by the Catechism of the Catholic Church.

To improve the functioning of the Council and to prepare for the General Chapter, it would be suitable to ask the advice of a canonist. The names of Rev. Fathers Pocquet de Haut-Jussé and Le Bot, OP are suggested. A monthly meeting of the Council seems opportune.

It is desirable to carefully discern the vocations coming from Brazil, as well as to reflect upon the reception of the Institute priests in the different dioceses. It is important that the Bishop accepts and valorizes the special charisma of the Institute for the good of the whole diocese and, at the same time, that the priests of the Institute, with a spirit of communion, insert themselves in the ensemble of the ecclesial life of the Diocese.

The creation of an economic Council will help St. Eloi parish to better conform juridically with the other parishes of the Archdiocese of Bordeaux.

The Angelus school in the Diocese of Bourges must pay more attention to the General Superior. We recommend that it seek to acquire diocesan recognition.

*Monsignor Guido Pozzo
Taken from Radio Cristiandad
Entry of Monday April 16, 2012*

- 20.24. In an article on Dici¹⁰⁹ the following comments are made – which appears to confirm the authenticity of the letter referred to above.

*The prudence and vigilance of the Superior General of the Society are understandable when one knows that currently posted at several European websites is a Note from the Ecclesia Dei Commission dated March 23, following their canonical visitation to the Institut du Bon Pasteur [Good Shepherd Institute, a society of apostolic life in France]. In this document we can read that the professors of the seminary in Courtalain must direct their efforts "concerning the transmission of the Church's patrimony in its entirety, while insisting on the hermeneutic of renewal in continuity and relying on Catholic doctrine as a whole as set forth by the Catechism of the Catholic Church," rather than on "a critique of Vatican II, even a 'serious and constructive' one". This is a critique that theologian John R. T. Lamong, professor at the Catholic Institute in Sydney, nevertheless invites us to make, by posing questions about the Magisterial authority of Vatican II than second the questions of the Society of Saint Pius X. (Read "The questions of a theologian")
(Sources : Figaro/Vie/Spiegel/FSSPX-MG – DICI no.253 dated April 20, 2012)
<http://www.dici.org/en/news/romesociety-of-saint-pius-x-press-review/>*

- 20.25. I reproduce a news article relating to the establishment of the Institute of the Good Shepherd¹¹⁰:

Vatican approves new traditionalist institute September 08, 2006

The Vatican has established a new religious institute to accommodate priests and seminarians leaving the schismatic Society of St. Pius X, the I Media news agency report.

The new group, the Good Shepherd community, will be located in Bordeaux. Members will be allowed to celebrate Mass using the traditional liturgy exclusively. Cardinal Dario Castrillon Hoyos, the prefect of the Congregation for the Clergy, signed the decree establishing the Good Shepherd community on September 8. The institute will be a "society of apostolic life," under the supervision of the Congregation for Clergy and the Congregation for Religious.

¹⁰⁹ <http://www.dici.org/en/news/romesociety-of-saint-pius-x-press-review>

¹¹⁰ <http://www.catholicculture.org/news/features/index.cfm?recnum=46364>

The Vatican has approved the canonical statutes for the new institute, as well as the first superior: Father Philippe Laguérie, a priest who was dismissed from the Society of St. Pius X (SSPX).

Informed sources at the Vatican report that Pope Benedict XVI personally approved the settlement that will allow members of the Good Shepherd society to use the traditional liturgy, following the Missal of St. Pius V. Members of the new institute point out that by authorizing this move, the Pope has fulfilled one of the major demands made by the late Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre before his break with the Vatican in 1988.

The new fraternity will include five priests and a number of seminarians, including several who are in line for ordination to the priesthood shortly. Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos will celebrate the group's first ordinations. All of the members have already left the SSPX.

By establishing this new community, the Vatican has chosen to pursue talks with priests who have left the breakaway traditionalist group, rather than with the SSPX itself. In that respect the move might signal a decision by Vatican leaders that reconciliation with the SSPX is unlikely, after years of unfruitful negotiations. The creation of the Good Shepherd institute could provide an incentive for other priests to leave the SSPX. Talks between the Holy See and the SSPX intensified in 2000, when Pope John Paul II asked Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos to make a special effort to achieve reconciliation with the traditionalists who split from Rome in 1988. Those talks gained even more momentum with the election of Pope Benedict XVI, who was widely seen as sympathetic to the traditionalists' concerns.

In August 2005 the Pope met with Bishop Bernard Fellay, the SSPX superior, for private talks at Castel Gandolfo. However, the talks between traditionalist leaders and Vatican officials eventually cooled, and Bishop Fellay-- who was recently re-elected as the head of SSPX-- has told journalists that he sees little likelihood of a reconciliation in the near future. Father Laguérie, the leader of the new institute, expressed the concerns of traditionalists in March of this year when he wrote that the Vatican should remedy "the scandals of the years 1960- 2000," and insisted that traditionalists should have "total freedom for the liturgy" and the liberty to question the teachings of Vatican II. He argued that Pope Benedict, in a December speech to the Roman Curia, had acknowledged the damage done by popular interpretations of Vatican II.

In April 2006, speaking at Lourdes, Cardinal Jean-Pierre Ricard told the bishops of France that "the question of relations with the SSPX" deserved special treatment. He added that Pope Benedict was particularly anxious to find a resolution after years of division. The French hierarchy, he said, should be prepared to welcome traditionalists back into full communion.

The priests who will compose the Good Shepherd institute have all found themselves in conflict with the traditionalist group to which they once belonged. Father Paul Aulangnier was the superior of the SSPX in France until 2003, when he was dismissed from the group after defending an agreement between the Vatican and

another traditionalist group, the Brazilian Society of St. John Vianney. Father Laguérie, the group's superior, was expelled in 2004 after he openly criticized the formation at SSPX seminaries.

- 20.26. I reproduce part of the interview given by Father Paul Aulagnier to the "Wanderer"¹¹¹.

"Why I Favour Our Superiors Legalizing Our Situation In The Church"

(Editor's Note: Those who follow the movements of the Society of St. Pius X (SSPX) have likely come across the person of Fr. Paul Aulagnier. He was among Archbishop Lefebvre's first class of SSPX seminarians, the first French seminarian to be ordained into the SSPX, and one of the SSPX's strongest proponents of the episcopal consecrations in 1988. As a former assistant to the superior general, Fr. Aulagnier and Archbishop Lefebvre remained close until the archbishop's death.

(In more recent years, Fr. Aulagnier has become an outspoken voice among SSPX clergy who favor reconciliation with Rome. Luc Gagnon, a correspondent from Quebec, recently had the opportunity to interview Fr. Aulagnier for The Wanderer. While some major differences remain over some of our positions at The Wanderer and those of Fr. Aulagnier, we are nevertheless encouraged by Fr. Aulagnier's honesty and good faith in seeking a resolution to the current division between the SSPX and Rome. Along with Fr. Aulagnier, we invite our readers to pray for an end to this division.)

...

In 2001, I was made superior of an autonomous house in Brussels. Then, "no longer in the good books" with the SSPX's leadership, I spent another sabbatical year in Quebec. As I became more and more vocal about my differences with the direction taken by the SSPX leadership, I resigned as assistant to the superior general. I had held this office since Archbishop Lefebvre founded the SSPX. He had first appointed me to this office on November 1, 1969.

...

A Long Evolution

Q. Do you think that the same reasons would be valuable today? Or are there any dangers in waiting for a reconciliation?

A. Today, the conditions would not allow for what was done in June of 1988. Several of my confreres will, perhaps, hit the roof when they become aware of this interview. It does not matter. I am free to state my judgment and I never liked yes men.

Why would the consecrations not be reasonable today? Because many Romans have changed and now acknowledge the very difficult situation in which the

¹¹¹ http://la.revue.item.free.fr/interview_aulagnier_wanderer_anglais.htm

Church finds herself. Cardinal Castrillon's Mass of May 24, 2003 is not burning straw. This is the fruit of a long evolution which began, it seems, around 1992, with the publication of a series of books of Cardinal Ratzinger and a series of conferences, homilies, and an interview with Cardinal Stickler. At St. Mary-Major, Cardinal Castrillon spoke for the Church by recalling the "right of citizenship" of the Mass of St. Pius V.

*Pope John Paul II's encyclical *Ecclesia de Eucharistia* vivit is also very important. Additionally, I think that there is a danger in seeing this conflict last for ages. The Church is a visible and hierarchical society. If one lives too long in an autarchy, one ends up losing the meaning of what a hierarchy is. We are thus in danger, the time passing and the opposition remaining, of forgetting Rome and organizing ourselves more and more outside of Rome. This needs to be acknowledged.*

This is why we must always remain in contact with Rome, not only for them to progress in the right direction, but unceasingly to remind ourselves of their good memory. We are of the flock. If we remain satisfied with our situation, then there is a danger of "psychological schism." The young people are of my opinion. I call it as it is. The SSPX leadership thinks I exaggerate, but our younger generations have never known a normal ecclesiastical situation. ...

Q. Why do you believe that the reconciliation of Bishop Rifan and his priests is a positive step not only for the traditionalists of Campos, but for every traditional Catholic?

A. One reason is the danger of schism which I just expressed. Secondly, my friendship with these heroic priests has led me to experience their traditional parishes and their numerous works. I have especially seen even here the problem of the Mass. The attitude of Rome is new. Rome gave the Mass to our friends, the priests of Campos. And this freely and without condition. Rome recognizes their right, their facultas to celebrate the Traditional Mass in all the churches of their apostolic administration. I studied their statutes at length. So, for me, these things are going in the right direction in favor of the Mass.

The Campos agreement did not require the compromises made by the Ecclesia Dei institutes in 1988. Campos received a frank recognition of the right to the Tridentine Mass without having to recognize that the new Mass is "legitimate and orthodox." They were simply asked to recognize the validity of the new Mass. Archbishop Lefebvre always recognized and taught that the new Mass was valid. There is a great difference between "validity," "legitimacy," and "orthodoxy." Something can be valid without being legitimate and orthodox."

The Catholic hierarchy is finally aware of it. It is never too late in order to do good. It wants to correct the "shadows." How can one not rejoice at this? This is

yet another reason why I favor our superiors legalizing our situation in the Church. It is necessary today to be inside with a recognized right of the Mass of St. Pius V on the altars of Christianity. One must have the sense of what is possible. To ask too much is to ask for nothing. The Holy Father has spoken. We must help and participate in the liturgical restoration in the Church.

.....

Today, everyone says this. All the cardinals who thought over the question are saying this. Cardinal Medina says this, after having said quite the opposite in 1999. Cardinal Arinze as well. He is the prefect of the Congregation of Divine Worship. He is the authority on this subject. As for Cardinal Stickler, he is a canonist whose authority is recognized. Cardinal Ratzinger, who is the workhorse of liturgical restoration in the Church, says it in all his recent books. He also assisted Pope John Paul II in the editing of the Holy Father's latest encyclical we have mentioned. This new honesty is extraordinary. Almost 40 years have gone by where everyone said quite the contrary.

Additionally, the return of the Mass of St. Pius V will not be done in one day. It takes its time, little by little. Regarding liturgical plurality on which Cardinal Castrillon is rooted, I am, of course, in favor to the degree where the "reform of the reform" will allow the rite of the parishes to come closer, little by little, to the Traditional rite. In herself, the Church has always respected liturgical diversity. Take note of the attitude of Pope St. Pius V! Here, there was a matter of a rite which will re-traditionalize. The only condition required is that the rite in question expresses the Catholic faith.

An Apostolic Administration

Q. In the context of these positive stages, is the reconciliation of the SSPX with Rome possible in the near future?

*A. One Mass does not establish a custom. Thus I will speak about restoration of normal relations between Catholics of goodwill. This restoration is more than desirable. It is necessary. In a month? In three years? I do not know. Yet the more that time passes, the more the restoration becomes urgent. But again, minds must be prepared.
.....?*

Q. Considering your friendship and close proximity with Archbishop Lefebvre, do you think that he would have accepted the offer of reconciliation that Rome had recently presented to the SSPX in the line of the accords of Campos?

A. I sincerely believe that today Archbishop Lefebvre would have accepted an accord with Rome. He would have been, perhaps, more cautious and demanding on certain points than Bishop Rangel, but the archbishop would have gone to the end this time. The requirements Rome demanded of the Campos traditionalists are these: the recognition of Pope John Paul II as the legitimate Successor of Peter,

the recognition of the Second Vatican Council interpreted in the light of Tradition, the recognition of the validity of the Novus Ordo Missae, and a free discussion of the council that avoided dialectic and polemic. Archbishop Lefebvre had already accepted this in 1988. One should not be afraid to say this, and I wish someone would tell me why they should not be accepted today.

...
Additionally, through an apostolic administration, we would have better protection today than in 1988. Our bishops, recognized by Rome, would have this role of protector that Archbishop Lefebvre desired in the Roman commission he proposed. And a personal apostolic administration would change nothing of what we do and of what we are. It is the ideal situation. It would basically espouse the reality that we live and that we are familiar with. It is organizational pragmatism that would establish "legally" in the eyes of all what we do, which is fundamentally legal and legitimate.

Q. In closing, we wish to thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to share some of your thoughts with us, and we would also invite our readers to visit your web site at: <http://perso.wanadoo.fr/item.tradition>

20.27. I reproduce part of an interview between Father Philippe and Michael Matt¹¹²:

*A Word from the Institute of the Good Shepherd
Father Philippe Laguérie Interviewed by The Remnant*

Michael J. Matt, Editor, The Remnant

Introduction

...Thankfully, there are many traditional Catholic priestly fraternities around the world doing just that. Many of them are "spin offs" from the Society of St. Pius X, but as the situation grows increasingly desperate, this shouldn't be regarded as anything less than providential. ...

In this spirit, then, we're pleased to present the following interview of Father Philippe Laguérie of the Institute of the Good Shepherd—a relatively new traditionalist order of priests dedicated to the defense of traditional Catholic doctrine and the exclusive use of the traditional Mass and Sacraments. This interview took place just days before the Vatican had announced the recent annulment of the 1988 decree of excommunication against the four bishops of the SSPX. We are grateful to Father Laguérie for taking the time to speak to our readers.

¹¹² <http://www.remnantnewspaper.com/Archives/2009-0228-interview-good-shepherd.htm>

.....

MJM: *If I remember correctly, when the Institute was erected one of the conditions stipulated was that you would retain the right to offer constructive criticisms of the Second Vatican Council. Have you in fact managed to retain that right, and can you give us an example of how it was exercised in recent months?*

Father Laguérie: *In addition to our "charism" when it comes to Liturgical matters (remarkable in that our statutes were set up before the Motu Proprio!), the Institute is also characterized by a true doctrinal freedom, with respect to the doctrines and authority of the Church, to work out hermeneutics of continuity of the Second Vatican Council and a subsequent authentic interpretation. Of course such work has to be accomplished with respect to the ultimate authority on such matters, that is to say of the Pope. In this we follow the remarkable instructions of Pope Benoît XVI in his speech to the Curia of December 22, 2005. We try to reflect in the Church the considerable advances in a traditional interpretation of the Council which the Pope has already initiated. For example, the famous "subsistit in" of *Gentium Lumen*, the precise details brought by the Pontiff on the question of religious liberty, or the prerogatives of the one Church of Jesus-Christ and her radical differentiation with sects, etc. We are trying, by words and writings, to bring back a coherent understanding, very often abused, of the Catholic doctrines according to the continuity of tradition, and not according to the rupture caused by the false Spirit of the Council. It is a difficult job, and one that will not happen overnight. "Truth was reduced by the children of men" complained King David. This year of Saint Paul reminds us of the necessity of boldly preaching the traditional Faith.*

.....

MJM: *On last year's Pilgrimage to Chartres, a priest very friendly to your Institute told me that, in his opinion, the Institute of the Good Shepherd is somewhat unique in that it has permission to offer the traditional Latin Mass exclusively and can't be pressured to offer the New Mass for any reason. Is this, in fact, the case?*

Father Laguérie: *Indeed the Institute has something special within the Catholic Church: We have two aspects of our mission: doctrinal and liturgical. Restore traditional doctrine and restore traditional liturgy. And this, with Vatican authorization and support. Our most cherished wish is obviously that these prerogatives not remain only the prerogatives of the Institute of the Good Shepherd but that they spread throughout the Church. Even if this is quite difficult to accomplish universally for now, it will become ordinary in a few years. Nothing and nobody can force our priests to celebrate the ordinary form of the Mass, not only since the Motu Proprio, but also before. Our priests are bound by the law of obedience to celebrate the traditional Mass. Those who would make the celebration of the ordinary form of Mass part of a condition for ecclesiastical*

communion, even from a simple pastoral point of view do now know Catholic theology. Let us pray that the ostracism of those of us totally dedicated to the traditional Mass, in Europe especially, will begin to fade away for the greatest common good.

MJM: *One of your critics recently suggested that the Institute of the Good Shepherd has permission to offer the Mass and Sacraments according to the 1962 Missal but only inside its own four walls and not outside. Is this true?*

Father Laguérie: *The Institute is committed (not only authorized) to celebrate all the sacraments, not only the Mass, according to the liturgical books of 1962. Consequently, any ministry of ours will have to satisfy this requirement. We will not go anywhere where we might be expected to violate this requirement.*

...

MJM: *So, let me ask you a similar question: As a Catholic newspaper editor living in extremely anti-Catholic times, I'm always looking for ways to unify tradition-minded Catholics against the common enemies of our Faith. I suspect that tactical differences between the Institute and the Society of St. Pius X still exist, but can you nevertheless assure American Catholics that the Institute has its own charism and its own mission, and that it was not set up as an instrument to undermine the Society of St. Pius X?*

Father Laguérie: *Far from a trap (set by whom? I would ask) to lure the Society of Saint Pius X, the Institute of the Good Shepherd could be spoken of rather as a "test". The Society of Saint Pius X must know instinctively that it will be treated tomorrow as we are treated today. In this respect, there is nothing to say that it is necessarily even desirable for the SSPX to sign some sort of agreement immediately. That is a matter left to the prudence of its superiors. If they consulted me, however, I would offer them the following counsel: Wait until we have ten personal parishes; delay until there is some proof that they will have tomorrow what we hope to have today. My fear is that doctrinal discussions with Rome will bog down, whereas step by step negotiating of a practical agreement will lead to a fertile apostolate that can then defend sound doctrine throughout the Church.....*

Conclusion Twenty-One – treatment of the allies of the Society

21. Conclusion: The statements of allied orders in relation to a proposed agreement between the Society and Rome appear to be consistent with the traditional principles of the Society whereas the treatment of those allied orders who have spoken against an agreement appears to be inconsistent with the traditional principles of the Society.

21.1. I understand that the Society deferred the ordinations of the Dominicans of Avrille and the Capuchins of Morgon, who were to be ordained at Econe last June and that the deferral was "dictated simply by the wish of Bishop Fellay to be assured of the loyalty of these communities, before laying hands upon their candidates (cf. I Timothy 5:22)".

21.2. I understand that the Dominicans issued a statement in the following form.

Considering ...
(*Sel de la Terre, No. 81, Summer 2012*)
by *Arsenius*

1) That Archbishop Lefebvre was opposed to Dom Gerard when he wanted to make an agreement with the modernist authorities in Rome. An agreement about which Dom Gerard said that Rome gave everything and asked nothing;

2) That the same Archbishop Lefebvre said after the consecrations that from that time, he would sign an agreement with Rome only if the Roman authorities agreed with several Church documents condemning modern errors;

3) That, in addition, Archbishop Lefebvre had repented of having signed a memorandum of understanding with the Vatican for permission to consecrate bishops, because he concluded that the intentions of the Roman authorities were not good;

4) That, later, Archbishop Lefebvre told the future Benedict XVI, then Cardinal Ratzinger, that he could not agree with him, and that we, the traditionalists, we were trying to Christianize the world while he, the Cardinal, and the other progressivists were working to de-Christianize the world;

5) That the Fraternity of St. Peter, who had received from Rome the right to celebrate the traditional Mass exclusively, was subsequently forced to accept the fact that its members can also celebrate the New Mass;

6) That Archbishop Lefebvre said that he did not agree that we should place ourselves under the authority of those who do not profess the faith in its integrity;

7) That in time of war, to take care to follow the positive laws (for example, traffic laws) may be unwise and, in some cases, can lead to suicide;

8) *That experience shows that very few know how to go back when the Roman authorities do not keep their promises (see the case of the Fraternity of St. Peter);*

9) *That being "reconciled" with Rome produces the result of no longer considering the Roman authorities (progressives) as enemies against whom we must fight;*

10) *That Archbishop Lefebvre said that progressives are similar to those infected with a contagious disease, and should therefore be avoided so as not to become sick like them.*

11) *That in all parts of the world the faithful are in a "state of necessity", which gives them the right to appeal to priests who hold to integrally Catholic doctrine, and also to receive the sacraments and assist at the mass according to traditional rites, and that priests have a duty of charity to go to help these faithful, even without the permission of the local bishop.*

We judge ...

1) *That if Archbishop Lefebvre was still alive, he would make no agreement with the Roman authorities, even if they offered it to us, and even if they asked nothing from us, unless the authorities first condemned the modern errors that have crept into the bosom of the Church, and which have been condemned by previous Popes;*

2) *That even today Archbishop Lefebvre still could not agree with Benedict XVI, because he still has the same thinking that he had as a cardinal;*

3) *That we cannot trust the promises made by men who withdraw the guarantees that they had previously given in favor of tradition;*

4) *That, as Archbishop Lefebvre himself had judged, we must not put ourselves under obedience to those who do not profess the faith in its integrity;*

5) *That in the midst of this terrible war in which we find ourselves (between the Holy Church and modernism, between truth and error, between light and darkness), to seek the regularization of our situation is a reckless act and suicidal: it is giving ourselves to the enemy;*

6) *That it would be, in a way, tempting God, by putting ourselves in a situation that probably:*

a) *will lead us to concede important points when the progressive Roman authorities ask it of us;*

b) *will stop us from treating certain authorities as enemies to fight against;*

c) will leave us to be "contaminated" by progressivism;

7) *That it would be a mistake to limit our field of action to those places for which we would given permission by the Roman authorities or by the diocesan bishops, and not be able to go to the faithful who call us, because in such a place, we might not have official permission to exercise the priestly ministry, because it would not considered to be a grave and general "state of necessity."*

Objection ...

One could object that Archbishop Lefebvre knew very well everything we have said and yet, on several occasions he expressed a desire that the Society's situation be regularized before the Roman authorities.

We answer ...

... that even if this were true, nonetheless, from May 1988 Archbishop Lefebvre no longer expressed that desire and, on the contrary, since that time he took the position that all agreements with the Roman authorities should be preceded by a profession of faith by Rome regarding the great anti-liberal documents of the Magisterium, such as Pascendi, Quanta cura, etc.. He held that new position until his death.

The motive that led to this change was the fact that he could clearly see that neo-modernist Rome has no intention of protecting or supporting Catholic Tradition.

Conclusion

Legal union with Rome? Yes, but in the integrity of the Catholic faith, outside which there is no salvation, and with the freedom to fulfill our duties towards God and neighbor.

Conclusion Twenty-Two – those who speak out

- 22. Conclusion: Those priests and bishops who spoke against an agreement appear to be threatened by an actual or threatened expulsion from the Society on the basis that they have rebelled against their Superiors whereas the truth appears to be that the "rebellion" has been committed by those in the Society who have favoured such an agreement and thereby rebelled against the principles and tradition of the Society.**

Conclusion Twenty-Three – the evidence suggests that Archbishop Lefebvre would *not* agree

23. Conclusion: The suggestion that Archbishop Lefebvre would enter into an agreement with Rome on the terms proposed is inconsistent with the words and actions of Archbishop Lefebvre.

23.1. Bishop Fellay says:

.....This concrete situation, with the canonical solution that has been proposed, is quite different from that of 1988. And when we compare the arguments that Archbishop Lefebvre made at the time, we conclude that he would not have hesitated to accept what is being proposed to us. Let us not lose our sense of the Church, which was so strong in our venerated founder...

23.2. Bishops de Galarreta, Tissier de Mallerai and Williamson say:

.... In a conference, which seems like the last doctrinal will of Mgr Lefebvre, which was given to priests of the Society at Ecône a half year before his death, after having briefly summarized the history of the liberal Catholicism resulting from the French Revolution, he recalled how the Popes have always fought this attempt at a reconciliation between the Church and the modern world, and he declared that the combat of Society of St. Pius X against the Vatican II was exactly the same combat. He concluded:

"The more one analyzes the documents of the Vatican II and their interpretation by the authorities of the Church, and the more one realizes that they are neither superficial errors nor a few particular errors such as ecumenism, religious freedom, collegial structure, but rather a total perversion of the spirit, a whole new philosophy founded upon Subjectivism... It is very serious! A total perversion! ... That is really alarming."

.....Just before the consecration of the bishops in 1988 when many good people insisted to Mgr Lefebvre so that he reach a practical agreement with Rome that would open a large field of apostolate, he said his thoughts to the four new bishops: "A large field of apostolate perhaps, but in ambiguity, and while following two directions opposed at the same time, and this would finish by us rotting."

And when one year later, Rome seemed to make true gestures of benevolence towards Tradition, Archbishop Lefebvre was always wary. He feared that they are only "maneuvers to separate us from the largest number of faithful possible. This is the perspective in which they seem to be always giving a little more and even going very far. We must absolutely convince our faithful that it is no more than a maneuvers, 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, now, to put ourselves in the hands of those professing these errors." According to Archbishop Lefebvre the characteristic of the Society is, more than to just denounce the errors by their name, but rather to effectively and publicly oppose the Roman authorities which has spread them.

..... If up until now the bishops of the Society have protected it, it is precisely because Mgr Lefebvre refused a practical agreement. ...

23.3. It seems to me that the obvious answer to the suggestion that Archbishop Lefebvre would enter into an agreement is that he did not! By reference to the evidence compiled in this work it is obvious that Rome was, during Archbishop Lefebvre's lifetime, prepared to enter into agreements (e.g. with Le Barroux – Dom Gerard, and as it attempted to negotiate with Archbishop Lefebvre), BUT no such agreement was put in place during his lifetime.

23.4. I attempt to compile a summary of what Archbishop Lefebvre said in relation to "an agreement with Rome" in chronological order.

23.5. 1986 An Open Letter to Confused Catholics

By His Grace Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre

Chapter 15. The Marriage of the Church and the Revolution

The Revolution, it has been said, expresses "the hatred of all order that has not been established by man, and in which he is not both king and god." At its origin we find that pride which had already been the cause of Adam's sin. The revolution within the Church can be explained by the pride of men of our times who believe they are in a new age when man has finally "understood his own dignity," and has acquired an increased awareness of himself "to the extent that one might speak of a social and cultural metamorphosis whose efforts have had repercussions on religious life...

... It has, nevertheless, a meaning in itself which is exactly what we see being put into effect everywhere in the post-conciliar Church, in the shape of a salvation reduced to economic and social well-being.

For my part, I think that those who accept this proposition as a common basis for dialogue with unbelievers, and couple new theories with Christian doctrine, will simply lose their faith. The golden rule of the Church has been inverted by the pride of the men of our time. No one listens any more to Christ's ever-living and fruitful words, but to those of the world. This "aggiornamento" condemns itself. The roots of present-day disorder are to be found in this modern, or rather modernist spirit which refuses to recognize the creed, the commandments of God

and the Church, the sacraments, and Christian morality as the only source of renewal until the end of the world.....

The liberals' dream for the last century and a half has been to unite the Church to the Revolution.

All these Popes have resisted the union of the Church with the Revolution; it is an adulterous union and from such a union only bastards can come. The rite of the new mass is a bastard rite, the sacraments are bastard sacraments. We no longer know if they are sacraments which give grace or do not give it. The priests coming out of the seminaries are bastard priests, who do not know what they are. They are unaware that they are made to go up to the altar, to offer the sacrifice of Our Lord Jesus Christ and to give Jesus Christ to souls.

In the name of the Revolution, priests have been sent to the scaffold, nuns have been persecuted and murdered. Remember the pontoons of Nantes which were sunk out at sea after they had filled them with faithful priests. And yet what the Revolution did is nothing compared to the doings of Vatican II, because it would have been better for those twenty or thirty thousand priests who have abandoned their priesthood and the vows made before God, to have been martyred and sent to the scaffold. They would at least have saved their souls, whereas now they risk losing them.

...The blood of the martyrs is the seed of Christians, but the priests or simple faithful who surrender to the spirit of the world will not bring forth a harvest. The devil's greatest victory is to have undertaken the destruction of the Church without making any martyrs.

The adulterous union of the Church and the Revolution is cemented by "dialogue." Our Lord said "Go, teach all nations and convert them." He did not say "Hold dialogue with them but don't try to convert them." Truth and error are incompatible; to dialogue with error is to put God and the devil on the same footing. This is what the Popes have always repeated and what was easy for Christians to understand because it is also a matter of common sense. In order to impose different attitudes and reactions it was necessary to do some indoctrinating so as to make modernists of the clergy needed to spread the new doctrine. This is what is called "recycling," a conditioning process intended to refashion the very faculty God gave man to direct his judgment.

*I have witnessed an operation of this sort in my own congregation of which I was for a time the Superior General. The first thing required is to "accept change." The Council has introduced changes, therefore we also must change. Change in depth, since it is a case of adapting the reasoning faculties to make them coincide with arbitrarily conceived notions. We can read in a booklet issued by the Archbishop's Office in Paris, *The Faith Word by Word*: "The second operation is more delicate and consists of registering the different ways that Christians have*

of reacting, in these various changes, to the very fact of change. This registering is important because actual opposition is due more to a spontaneous and sub-conscious attitude in the face of change, than to precise issues involved in the change."

"Two typical attitudes can be discerned, while allowing for the possibility of intermediate ones. The first means accepting a number of novelties one by one as they are imposed. This is the case with many Christians, many Catholics: they give in little by little.

"Those who take the second attitude accept a total renewal of the expression of the Christian faith at the threshold of a new cultural era, while always taking care to keep close to the faith of the Apostles."

...

A third operation becomes necessary when this second attitude is encountered: "The inquirer cannot help feeling now that his faith is dangerously at risk. Will it not simply vanish, together with the problems that have brought it to that point? He therefore requires some fundamental assurance which will enable him to go beyond these sterile initial reasonings."

So all degrees of resistance have been foreseen. What is the "fundamental assurance" that will be given the neophyte in the last resort? The Holy Ghost! "It is precisely the Holy Ghost who assists believers in the turning points of history."

.....

"The direct and immediate cause (of Modernism) lies in a perversion of the mind," wrote St. Pius X in his encyclical Pascendi. Recycling creates a similar mental perversion in those who did not previously suffer from it. The holy Pope also quoted this observation of his predecessor Gregory XVI: "It is a sorry sight to see how far the deviations of human reason will go as soon as one yields to the spirit of novelty; when, heedless of the Apostles' warning, one claims to know more than one needs to know, and self-confidently seeks for truth outside the Church instead of within it, where it is to be found without the least shadow of error."¹²

¹¹ Gaudium et Spes, 62. Translation from Vatican Council II, ed. by A. Flannery, O.P., Fowler Wright Books (1975).

¹² Singulari Nos, 1834 A.D.

23.6. 8 July 1987 Archbishop Lefebvre, Letter to Cardinal Ratzinger¹¹³

Eminence,

¹¹³ http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Archbishop_Lefebvre_and_the_Vatican/Part_I/1987-07_08.htm

After a serious examination of the answer from the Sacred Congregation for the Faith to the Dubia¹¹⁴, as well as to the objections which we have submitted to it concerning the conciliar Declaration on Religious Liberty, would you please find enclosed our judgment on the matter, and our justification of this judgment. May I enclose documents which will manifest that this judgment is not a personal opinion, but rather that of authorized persons. Since it so happens that I have just published during these past few days a book on this subject called They Have Uncrowned Him, I consider it my duty to respectfully offer you a copy.

During the past few months, we have received several important studies which came from Roman universities and episcopal conferences. I send you a critique of the document of Fr. Cesboué, which was sent to us by the French episcopal conference.

I add a few other miscellaneous writings on the same subject in order to show that our refusal of the liberal principles of the conciliar Declaration is not founded on personal or sentimental opinions, but on the infallible magisterium of the Church. Therefore you will find:

- 1) thoughts of Cardinal Browne,*
- 2) remarks of the Cœtus Internationalis, that is, the group of the Council Fathers opposed to Religious Liberty,*
- 3) the critique of Msgr. Husseau of the Catholic University of Angers,*
- 4) the critique of Fr. de Sainte Marie Salleron, former professor at Teresianum,*
- 5) the letter of Bishop de Castro Mayer, then Bishop of Campos, Brazil, addressed to Pope Paul VI, with its enclosure.*

It appears that we can conclude that the Liberal doctrine of Religious Liberty and the traditional doctrine are radically opposed. A choice had to be made between the draft of the schema of Cardinal Ottaviani and that of Cardinal Béa, on the same subject.

At the last meeting of the Central Commission preparatory to the Council there was a heated opposition between these two Cardinals. Cardinal Béa then affirmed that his thesis was absolutely opposed to that of Cardinal Ottaviani. Nothing has changed since. The traditional magisterium is opposed to the Liberal thesis founded on a false conception of human dignity and on an erroneous definition of

¹¹⁴ In 1985, Cardinal Ratzinger asked the Archbishop to write down his objections to the Declaration on Religious Liberty. In October 1985, a long study of 120 pages was sent to Rome, questioning many points of this Decree: this study is called the Dubia.

civil society. The problem is to know who is right—Cardinal Ottaviani or Cardinal B ea.

The practical consequences of the Liberal thesis adopted by the Holy See after the Council are disastrous and anti Christian. It is the uncrowning of Our Lord Jesus Christ, with the reduction to an equal status before the law of all religions leading to an apostate ecumenism as that of Assisi.

In order to prevent the auto demolition of the Church we beg the Holy Father, through your mediation, to allow the free exercise of Tradition by procuring for Tradition the means to live and develop itself for the salvation of the Catholic Church and the salvation of souls: that the traditional foundations may be recognized, especially the seminaries; that His Excellency de Castro Mayer and myself may consecrate some auxiliaries of our choice in order to give to the Church the graces of Tradition, the only source of the renewal of the Church.

Eminence, after almost 20 years of pressing requests so that the experience of Tradition be encouraged and blessed, requests always left unanswered, this is probably the final appeal in the sight of God and of the Church. The Holy Father and yourself will bear the responsibility of a definitive rupture with the past of the Church and its magisterium.

The magisterium of today is not sufficient by itself to be called Catholic unless it is the transmission of the Deposit of Faith, that is, of Tradition.¹¹⁵ A new magisterium without roots in the past, and all the more if it is opposed to the magisterium of all times, can only be schismatic and heretical.

The permanent will to annihilate Tradition is a suicidal will, which justifies, by its very existence, true and faithful Catholics when they make the decisions necessary for the survival of the Church and the salvation of souls.

Our Lady of Fatima, I am sure, blesses this final appeal in this 70th anniversary of her apparitions and messages. May you not be for a second time deaf to her appeal.

I am, Your Eminence,

*† Marcel Lefebvre
July 8, 1987*

23.7. 29 August 1987 Archbishop Lefebvre, Letter to future Bishops¹¹⁵

"The See of Peter and the posts of authority in Rome being occupied by anti-Christ, the destruction of the Kingdom of our Lord is being rapidly carried out

¹¹⁵ http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Letter_to_the_Future_Bishops.htm

even in His Mystical Body here below....This is what has brought down upon our heads persecution by the Rome of the anti-Christ. This Rome, Modernist and Liberal, is carrying on it's work of destruction of the Kingdom of our Lord, as Assisi and the confirmation of the liberal theses of Vatican II on Religious Liberty prove..."

(Archbishop Lefebvre, Letter to future Bishops Aug. 29, 1987)

23.8. 4 October 1987 Archbishop Lefebvre, Conference¹¹⁶

"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 doing 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! Certain!"

23.9. 29 March 1988 Statement of Archbishop Lefebvre¹¹⁷

"One is driven to wonder how intelligent persons can make a statement like, "They prefer to be mistaken with the pope, than to be with the truth against the pope." That is not what the natural law teaches, nor the Magisterium of the Church... St. Thomas says..."if there was question of a danger for the faith, the superiors would have to be rebuked, by their inferiors, even in public."

23.10. 30 May, 1988, on the occasion of the Episcopal Consecrations¹¹⁸

"And why, Archbishop, have you stopped these discussions which seemed to have had a certain degree of success?" ... It is clear that the only truth that exists today for the Vatican is the conciliar truth, the spirit of the Council, the spirit of Assisi. That is the truth of today. But we will have nothing to do with this for anything in the world!"

Joseph Ratzinger gave in: "Let us find a practical solution." ... How did Marcel Lefebvre not jump for joy? Rome was giving in! But his penetrating faith went to the very heart of the Cardinal's rejection of doctrine. He said to himself: "So, must Jesus no longer reign? Is Jesus no longer God? Rome has lost the Faith. Rome is in apostasy. We can no longer trust this lot!" To the Cardinal, he said:

¹¹⁶ Marcel Lefebvre by Bishop Tissier de Mallerais, pp. 547-548

¹¹⁷ <http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/The-Episcopal-Consecrations.htm>

¹¹⁸ <http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Episcopal-Consecration.htm>

"Eminence, even if you give us everything – a bishop, some autonomy from the bishops, the 1962 liturgy, allow us to continue our seminaries – we cannot work together because we are going in different directions. You are working to dechristianize society and the Church, and we are working to Christianize them.

"For us, our Lord Jesus Christ is everything. He is our life. The Church is our Lord Jesus Christ; the priest is another Christ; the Mass is the triumph of Jesus Christ on the cross; in our seminaries everything tends toward the reign of our Lord Jesus Christ. But you! You are doing the opposite: you have just wanted to prove to me that our Lord Jesus Christ cannot, and must not, reign over society."

Recounting this incident, the Archbishop described the Cardinal's attitude: "Motionless, he looked at me, his eyes expressionless, as if I had just suggested something incomprehensible or unheard of." Then Ratzinger tried to argue that "the Church can still say whatever she wants to the State," while Lefebvre, the intuitive master of Catholic metaphysics, did not lose sight of the true end of human societies: the Reign of Christ. Fr. de Tinguy hit the nail on the head when he said of Marcel Lefebvre: "His faith defies those who love theological quibbles."

pp. 547-548 Marcel Lefebvre by Bp. Tissier de Mallerais

23.11.2 June 1988 Letter of Archbishop Lefebvre to Pope John Paul II¹¹⁹

Most Holy Father,

The conversations and meetings with Cardinal Ratzinger and his collaborators, although they took place in an atmosphere of courtesy and charity, persuaded us that the moment for a frank and efficacious collaboration between us has not yet arrived.

For indeed, if the ordinary Christian is authorized to ask the competent Church authorities to preserve for him the Faith of his Baptism, how much more true is that for priests, religious and nuns?

It is to keep the Faith of our Baptism intact that we have had to resist the spirit of Vatican II and the reforms inspired by it.

The false ecumenism which is at the origin of all the Council's innovations in the liturgy, in the new relationship between the Church and the world, in the conception of the Church itself, is leading the Church to its ruin and Catholics to apostasy.

Being radically opposed to this destruction of our Faith and determined to remain with the traditional doctrine and discipline of the Church, especially as far as the

¹¹⁹ http://www.sspx.org/archbishop_lefebvre/letter_pope_john_paul_ii_post_1988_consecrations.htm

formation of priests and the religious life is concerned, we find ourselves in the absolute necessity of having ecclesiastical authorities who embrace our concerns and will help us to protect ourselves against the spirit of Vatican II and the spirit of Assisi.

That is why we are asking for several bishops chosen from within Catholic Tradition, and for a majority of the members on the projected Roman Commission for Tradition, in order to protect ourselves against all compromise.

*Given the refusal to consider our requests, and it being evident that the purpose of this reconciliation is not at all the same in the eyes of the Holy See as it is in our eyes, we believe it preferable to wait for times more propitious for the return of Rome to Tradition.*⁷²

*That is why we shall give ourselves the means to carry on the work which Providence has entrusted to us, being assured by His Eminence Cardinal Ratzinger's letter of May 30, that the episcopal consecration is not contrary to the will of the Holy See, since it was granted for August 15.*⁷³

We shall continue to pray for modern Rome, infested with Modernism, to become once more Catholic Rome and to rediscover its 2,000 year-old tradition. Then the problem of our reconciliation will have no further reason to exist and the Church will experience a new youth.

Be so good, Most Holy Father, as to accept the expression of my most respectful and filially devoted sentiments in Jesus and Mary.

† Marcel Lefebvre

⁷². *Note the expression. The Society of Saint Pius X never departed from the Church. It remains united with 20 centuries of popes and saints. Those who need to "return" are those who have engaged themselves in new paths of doctrines and practices.*

⁷³. *L'Osservatore Romano and others have objected to this sentence. Archbishop Lefebvre does not say here that the Holy See agrees with all the particular circumstances of the consecrations, merely to its principle.*

23.12. The Archbishop Speaks: Episcopal Consecrations – Letter to the Four Bishops Elect

Archbishop Lefebvre

June 12, 1988

"It's over. The talks between Rome and ourselves are over. The more one thinks about it, the more one realizes their intentions are not good. Look at what happened to the Traditional leaders, Dom Augustin, Fr. de Blignieres, who went over to Rome and have been swallowed up. Rome wants everything to go Vatican II, while they leave us a little bit of Tradition.

"De Saventhem [then President of the conservative (not Traditional) organization, "Una Voce"] tells me we could still come to an understanding. But I tell him the misunderstanding is not over little things. They are not changing their position. We cannot put ourselves in the hands of those people. We would be fooling ourselves. We do not mean to let ourselves be eaten up.

"The Traditional Benedictine Prior, Dom Gerard, tells me that an agreement with Rome would have opened up for us a huge field for the apostolate. Maybe, but in a world of ambiguity, facing in two directions at once, which would make us go rotten in the end. They insist: "But if you were with Rome, you would have more vocations." But vocations like that, if you breathed one word against Rome, would make life in our seminaries impossible! And if we "came to an agreement" with Rome on that basis, then the diocesan bishops would say "Then come along and join in the dioceses", and little by little Tradition would be compromised.

"All the Traditional Sisters and nuns in France are against an agreement. They tell me, "We do not want to be dependent on Cardinal Ratzinger. Imagine if he were to come and give us conferences! He would split us down the middle!"

"As for the risk of some of our priests leaving us if bishops are consecrated, it will be no worse than in 1977, when a block of priests and seminarians walked out of Econe all in one go. They have all now gone over to Rome or dispersed. It is time to take a second decision to face up to this Rome. What else can we do? And if they insist that it is worse this time round, because this time it could mean excommunication, well, I reply that the basic problem remains unchanged: Rome means to exterminate Tradition, while the sedevacantists have no love for us.

"You four will be bishops for the Church, at the service of the Society of St. Pius X, as laid out in the Protocol of May 5. The Society has the standing to deal with Rome. It will be the Superior General's job, when the time comes, to pick up the threads again with Rome.

"Your function will be to give the sacraments of Holy Orders and Confirmation and to KEEP THE FAITH on the occasion of Confirmations, to protect the flock...

You will be an immense support for the Society. Let all four of you be of one mind, without too many personal initiatives, for instance when it comes to requests for ordination. Do not ordain men who are on their own, and if they form part of a community, take a good look at the community.

"Rome wants us to go Conciliar... You will have to make the rounds once a year, once every two years for Confirmations. As for ordinations, I am presently doing 25 to 30 ceremonies a year, but from June 30 onwards, I am not moving from Ecône! I will have done my work, by giving to the Society the structure it needs. And then, as I told the Pope, as soon as Tradition comes back to Rome, the problem will be over.

"As for an eventual excommunication, it will mean nothing, because they are not looking out for the wellbeing of the Church. However, excommunicating us will be a nuisance for them. They are trying to get to me by fair means or foul, through de Saventem, a Czech bishop, and so on and so on. They even wanted to send Mother Theresa of Calcutta. But there is no point in such meetings. It has all been talked out long ago.

"Let anyone just read the letter of the former seminarian of Ecône, Carlo, who went over to Rome to set up a conservative organisation there, called "Mater Ecclesix", who tried to corrupt our seminarians by getting them to leave us, but whose eyes have since been opened wide by the trickery of Rome. In that letter he admits that Rome treats them like outcasts, that they are forced to take off the cassock, that nobody receives them. He has found out what this Rome is like. Rome wants to turn the Society into another "Mater Ecclesiae". And when the first "Mater Ecclesiae" collapsed, Cardinal Ratzinger rejoiced.

"So why should they keep their word to us? We were protected by God when He allowed the agreement of May 5 to come to naught."

23.13. 30 June 1988 (Sermon at the Episcopal Consecrations) ¹²⁰

- 23.13.1. In his sermon at the time of the Episcopal Consecrations of the four bishops in 1988, Archbishop Lefebvre said [in reference to the agreement he signed and then withdrew in May 1988]:

It is not for me to know when Tradition will regain its rights at Rome, but I think it is my duty to provide the means of doing that which I shall call "Operation Survival," operation survival for Tradition. Today, this day, is Operation Survival. If I had made this deal with Rome, by continuing with the agreements we had signed, and by putting them into practice, I would have performed "Operation Suicide." There was no

¹²⁰ <http://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Episcopal-Consecration.htm>

choice, we must live! That is why today, by consecrating these bishops, I am convinced that I am continuing to keep Tradition alive, that is to say, the Catholic Church.

23.14. July-August 1989 Archbishop Lefebvre, Interview, Fideliter¹²¹

*One year after the Consecrations
An Interview with Archbishop Lefebvre*

This interview appeared in the July-August 1989 issue of the Society's magazine in France, Fideliter. It is a typically lucid and profound analysis of the state of the official Church and its relations with the Society.

http://www.sspix.org/archbishop_lefebvre/one_year_after_the_consecrations.htm

1: Why the consecrations?

.....

3: "Lefebvre should have stayed in the Church".

Question: Some people say, "Yes, but Archbishop Lefebvre should have accepted an agreement with Rome because once the Society of St. Pius X had been recognized and the suspensions lifted, he would have been able to act in a more effective manner inside the Church, whereas now he has put himself outside."

Archbishop Lefebvre: Such things are easy to say. To stay inside the Church, or to put oneself inside the Church - what does that mean? Firstly, what Church are we talking about? If you mean the Conciliar Church, then we who have struggled against the Council for twenty years because we want the Catholic Church, we would have to re-enter this Conciliar Church in order, supposedly, to make it Catholic. That is a complete illusion. It is not the subjects that make the superiors, but the superiors who make the subjects.

Amongst the whole Roman Curia, amongst all the world's bishops who are progressives, I would have been completely swamped. I would have been able to do nothing, I could have protected neither the faithful nor the seminarians.

...

4: Danger of schism?

Question: Are you not afraid that in the end, when the good Lord will have called you to Him, little by little the split will grow wider and we will find ourselves being confronted with a parallel Church alongside what some call the "visible Church"?

Archbishop Lefebvre: This talk about the "visible Church" on the part of Dom Gerard and Mr. Madiran is childish. It is incredible that anyone can talk of the "visible Church", meaning the Conciliar Church as opposed to the Catholic Church which we are trying to represent and continue. I am not saying that we

¹²¹ http://www.sspix.org/archbishop_lefebvre/one_year_after_the_consecrations.htm

are the Catholic Church. I have never said so. No one can reproach me with ever having wished to set myself up as pope. But, we truly represent the Catholic Church such as it was before, because we are continuing what it always did. It is we who have the notes of the visible Church: One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic. That is what makes the visible Church.

Mr. Madiran objects: "But the official Church also has Infallibility." However, on the subject of infallibility, we must say, as Fr. Dulac said in a suggestive phrase concerning Pope Paul VI: "When years ago the Church had several popes, one could choose from amongst them. But now we have two popes in one." We have no choice. Each of these recent popes is truly two popes in one. Insofar as they represent Tradition - the Tradition of the popes, the Tradition of infallibility - we are in agreement with the pope. We are attached to him insofar as he continues the succession of Peter, and because of the promises of infallibility which have been made to him. It is we who are attached to his infallibility. But he, even if in certain respects he carries the infallibility within his being pope, nevertheless by his intentions and ideas he is opposed to it because he wants nothing more to do with infallibility. He does not believe in it and he makes no acts stamped with the stamp of infallibility.

That is why they wanted Vatican II to be a pastoral council and not a dogmatic council, because they do not believe in infallibility. They do not want a definitive Truth. The Truth must live and must evolve. It may eventually change with time, with history, with knowledge, etc., ...whereas infallibility fixes a formula once and for all, it makes - stamps - a Truth as unchangeable. That is something they can't believe in, and that is why we are the supporters of infallibility and the Conciliar Church is not. The Conciliar Church is against infallibility - that's for sure and certain.

Cardinal Ratzinger is against infallibility. The pope is against infallibility by his philosophical formation. Understand me rightly! - We are not against the pope insofar as he represents all the values of the Apostolic See which are unchanging, of the See of Peter, but we are against the pope insofar as he is a modernist who does not believe in his own infallibility, who practices ecumenism. Obviously, we are against the Conciliar Church which is virtually schismatic, even if they deny it. In practice, it is a Church virtually excommunicated because it is a Modernist Church. We are the ones that are excommunicated while and because we wish to remain Catholic, we wish to stay with the Catholic Pope and with the Catholic Church - that is the difference.

For Mr. Madiran, who otherwise has a good grasp of the situation, to say that we are not the "visible Church" - that we are quitting the "visible Church", which is infallible - all that is just words which do not correspond to reality.

5: Necessity of bishops?

Question: Is it possible, Your Excellency, to be neither for or against the consecrations, and even to take no position at all concerning them, and to promote the formation of priests such as you have given an example of in founding Econe, without arriving at the conclusion that seminarians being formed for the Catholic priesthood require Catholic bishops to ordain them?

Archbishop Lefebvre: Those who think like that will have bishops like Bishop de Milleville who arrived in civilian clothing to carry out the ordinations at Fontgombault. Had he given a sermon, I wonder just what he would have said to those seminarians and what example he would have given them. That is no longer the Catholic Church: that is the Conciliar Church with all its unpleasant consequences. They are contributing to the destruction of the Church. It was John XXIII, as Fr. Dulac said, began to be two popes in one. It is he who launched the opening of the Church to the world. From that point on, we entered into ambiguity and two-facedness, the way of acting proper to the liberal.

*Hence, I think we should have no hesitation or scruples with regard to these episcopal consecrations. We are neither schismatic nor excommunicated, and we are not against the pope. We are not against the Catholic Church. We are not making a parallel Church. All that is absurd. We are what we have always been - Catholics carrying on. That is all. There is no need to look for unnecessary complications. We are not making "a little Church", as Paupert wrote in his book, *The Torn-Away Christians*. When you arrive at the end of his book, what he writes makes you shudder: "I no longer know what I am"!*

Paupert was a seminarian - maybe a priest - but he lost the Faith and then recovered it more or less, and he inclines to be of a traditional way of thinking, but he is afraid to quit the Conciliar Church. And so, he does not know if he is Catholic or not, whether he is practicing or not. "When I find myself these days in a church, I have the impression that I am not at home. That is why I do not go to Communion."

He is an intelligent man but he finds himself in a sort of cul-de-sac with no way out. It's frightening. And such is the problem of all Catholics who absolutely refuse to take the step over to Tradition. They wish to remain with the occupants of the episcopal sees, with the bishops, but they want to have nothing more to do with the Catholic Faith which they practiced when they were young and which they have not got the will to pick up again. It is truly frightening when one thinks that millions of Catholics find themselves in this situation. That is why many of them are no longer going to Church on Sunday's, while others are joining sects, or are not practicing anything at all and so are losing the Faith.

6: Cannot the Archbishop backtrack?

Question: In a recently appeared book, Econe, How To Resolve The Tragedy, Fr. de Margerie advises you to reconcile with Rome, in effect, by accepting what you have always rejected. What do you think?

Archbishop Lefebvre: I do not personally know Fr. de Margerie. He is full of contradictions. It is clear he is highly embarrassed when it comes to defending religious liberty and stating that it is in conformity with Tradition, that there is no rupture. That is an untenable position. Because the leaders of the Conciliar Church, its most outstanding personalities, like for instance the Rector of the University of the Lateran, or, Msgr. Pavan, who is an important man in Rome (it is he who virtually wrote all of the popes' social encyclicals), openly said in May last year at the Congress of Venice, concerning religious liberty: "Yes, something has changed." Others like Cardinal Ratzinger and theologians who have written numerous works on the question strive to prove that the doctrine of Religious Liberty is in continuity with Tradition. In the old days, Liberty was always held in essential relation to Truth. Now, Liberty is related to the human conscience. This means leaving the choice of Truth up to one's conscience. That is the death of the Church. It means introducing the poison of the Revolution, when the Rights of Man are approved by the Church. At least the rector of the University of the Lateran and Msgr. Pavan recognize the fact. The others will say what they like in an effort to keep us quiet. But there it is, written black on white: "The State, civil society, is radically incapable of knowing which is the True Religion." The whole history of the Church, ever since Our Lord, rises up in protest against such a statement. What about Joan of Arc and the saints and all the princes and kings who were saints, who defended the Church - were they incapable of discerning the True Religion? One wonders how anyone can write such enormities!

Then Rome's replies to our objections which we sent to Rome through intermediaries all tended to demonstrate that there was no change, but just continuity of Tradition. These statements are worse than those of the Council's Declaration on Religious Liberty. It is truly officialdom telling lies.

So long as in Rome they stay attached to the ideas of the Council: religious liberty, ecumenism, collegiality ...they are going the wrong way. It is serious because it results in practical consequences. That is what justifies the Pope's visiting Cuba. The Pope visits or receives in audience Communist leaders who are torturers or assassins, or who have Christians' blood on their hands, just as if they were as honest as normal men.

7: Churchmen against Communism?

.....

8: Pope defending morals?

...

9: Pope appointing conservatives?

Question: John Paul II has nominated bishops in Austria and elsewhere who are considered as being traditional to such a point that a group of German theologians, backed up by French theologians, are criticizing the pope and rebuking him for it. Recently, also, Cardinal Ratzinger published an instruction

with an Oath of Fidelity and a Profession of Faith preceding it. Can't we see here signs of a sort of improvement and a return to more traditional formulas?

Archbishop Lefebvre: I don't think it is a true return to Tradition. Just as in a fight when the troops are going a little too far ahead one holds them back, so they are slightly putting the brakes on the impulse of Vatican II because the supporters of the Council are going too far. Besides, these theologians are wrong to get upset. The bishops concerned - the supposedly conservative bishops - are wholly supportive of the Council and of the post-Conciliar reforms, of ecumenism and of the charismatic movement.

Apparently, they are being a little more moderate and showing slightly more traditional religious sentiment, but it does not go deep. The great fundamental principles of the Council, the errors of the Council, they accept them and put them into practice. That is no problem for them. On the contrary, I would go so far as to say that it is these conservative bishops who treat us the worst. It is they who would the most insistently demand that we submit to the principles of the Council.

No, all of that is tactics, which you have to use in any fight. You have to avoid excesses.

...

10: Benevolence towards Tradition?

Question: Now what should we think of the attitude of Rome as characterized by Cardinals Ratzinger and Mayer, who, up till now, are showing a certain tolerance towards Le Barroux, towards the Fraternity of St. Vincent Ferrer, towards the Fraternity of St. Peter. Do you think they are sincere? Is it a double game that they will keep up until they have exhausted all other means of rallying other traditionalist groups to Rome and then, once the game is over, those that have been reconciled with Rome will be asked to submit to the Council? Or, should we credit them with taking a turn for the better?

Archbishop Lefebvre: There are plenty of signs showing us that what you are talking about is simply exceptional and temporary. They are not general rules, applying to all priests throughout the world. They are exceptional privileges being granted in precise cases. Thus, what is granted to the Abbey of Fontgombault or to the Sisters of Jouques, or to other monasteries - they do not say it - but it is according to the Indult. Now, the Indult is an exception. It can always be taken back. An indult confirms a general rule. The general rule in this case is the New Mass and the New Liturgy. Hence, it is an exception which is being made for these communities.

... In our discussions in Rome with Cardinal Ratzinger, he told me when we were moving towards an agreement, that if authorization was given to use the old liturgy at St. Nicholas du Chardonnet in Paris, there would also have to be New Masses. That was perfectly clear and it clearly shows their state of mind. For

them there is no question of abandoning the New Mass. On the contrary. That is obvious. That is why what can look like a concession is in reality merely a maneuver to separate us from the largest number of faithful possible. This is the perspective in which they seem to be always giving a little more and even going very far. 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, now, to put ourselves in the hands of those professing these errors.

11: The last year

....

12: Feelers towards reconciliation

.....

13: Fear of Tradition

.....

14: Oath of fidelity

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

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

As it stands this formula is dangerous. It demonstrates clearly the spirit of these people with whom it is impossible to come to an agreement.

....

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

15: And regrets?

Question: When all is said and done, then, you have no doubts and no regrets?

Archbishop Lefebvre: No, none at all. I think everything that happened was brought about in a truly providential and almost miraculous way.

Many people were urging me - "You're growing old. If you happen to disappear, what will become of us...?" I could have ordained bishops three or four years ago at least. It would even have been reasonable. But, I think that the good Lord wanted things to ripen gently to show Rome clearly that we have done everything we could to manage to obtain the authorization to have truly traditional bishops.

Even while signing the protocol, Rome refused to give us three bishops, and if we had gone on, in practice we would have had every imaginable kind of difficulty. I truly think we had to come to the decision which I took, and we were at the very end of our rope. Our dear friend, Bishop de Castro Mayer, is so tired now that he can no longer say his Mass, and that is less than one year after the consecrations.

I truly think it was all miraculous - his coming, his journey, his admirable Profession of Faith, his acceptance to perform with me the ceremony of the consecration of our bishops ...all that was miraculous. The press did not realize the importance of his being there. But for me and the bishops who were consecrated that was truly quite an exceptional grace. The fact that there were two bishops to consecrate them is very important. As for me, I feel well. I have no grave illness, but nevertheless I feel the tiredness and I am going to be obliged to give up completely performing the ceremonies which I still accept to perform because I no longer have the strength. I would now be quite incapable of making these worldwide journeys as I used to do. They insist on my returning to the Argentine or that I go to the United States to see the new seminary of Winona, but there are limits and I have reached them. I am only going to keep up the things which are not tiring: like a blessing of a chapel, the taking of the veil with the Carmelites, attending a first Mass ...in sum, little, compared with what I used to do before. I can feel clearly that for me, too, the 30th of June of last year was my limit. I think that the good Lord wished things to happen as they happened. All those who attended the ceremony retain an extraordinary memory of it. All of that was providential. What one may hope is that the faithful should become more and more numerous, that they open their eyes and finish by seeing where the Truth is, and recognize that salvation is in Tradition and not in the Conciliar Church which is more and more schismatic.

16: Heaven's Yellow Pages

...

23.15.6 September, 1990 Archbishop Lefebvre, Address to his priests, Ecône,—just over 6 months before his death¹²²

Archbishop Lefebvre's address to his priests given in Ecône, Switzerland on September 6, 1990. Transcribed and slightly adapted from the French.

The problem

¹²² http://www.sspix.org/archbishop_lefebvre/two_years_after_the_consecrations.htm

Concerning the future, I would like to say a few words on questions which the laity may ask you, questions which I often get asked by people who do not know too much about what is happening in the Society, such as, "Are relations with Rome broken off? Is it all over?"

A lightweight solution

I received a few weeks ago, maybe three weeks ago, yet another telephone call from Cardinal Oddi:

"Well, Excellency, is there no way to arrange things, no way?" I replied, "You must change, come back to Tradition. It is not a question of the Liturgy, it is a question of the Faith."

The cardinal protested,

No, no, it is not a question of Faith, no, no. The pope is ready and willing to receive you. Just a little gesture on your part, a little request for forgiveness and everything will be settled.

...

The heavyweight problem

Meanwhile the problem remains grave, very, very grave. We absolutely must not minimize it. This is how we must reply to the layfolk who ask such questions as, "When will the crisis come to an end? Are we getting anywhere? Isn't there a way of getting permission for our liturgy, for our sacraments?"

Certainly the question of the liturgy and the sacraments is important, but it is not the most important. The most important question is the question of the Faith. This question is unresolved in Rome. For us it is resolved. We have the Faith of all time, the Faith of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, of the Catechism of St. Pius X, hence the Faith of the Church, of all the Church Councils, of all the Popes prior to Vatican II. Now the official Church is persevering, we might say pertinaciously, in the false ideas and grave errors of Vatican II, that much is clear.

...

Ours an ancient struggle

*Well, these texts are astounding, quite astounding! I shall quote you a few texts shortly. It is incredible. In the last few weeks (since I am now unemployed!) I have been spending a little time re-reading the book by Emmanuel Barbier on Liberal Catholicism. And it is striking to see how our fight now is exactly the same fight as was being fought then by the great Catholics of the 19th century, in the wake of the French Revolution, and by the Popes, Pius VI, Pius VII, Pius VIII, Gregory XVI, Pius IX, Leo XIII, and so on, Pius X, down to Pius XII. Their fight is summed up in the encyclical *Quanta Cura* with the *Syllabus* of Pius IX, and *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* of Pius X. There are the two great documents, sensational and shocking in their day, laying out the Church's teaching in face of the modern errors, the errors appearing in the course of the Revolution, especially in the*

Declaration of the Rights of Man. This is the fight we are in the middle of today. Exactly the same fight.

There are those who are for the Syllabus and Pascendi, and there are those who are against. It is simple. It is clear. Those who are against are adopting the principles of the French Revolution, the modern errors. Those who are for the Syllabus and Pascendi remain within the true Faith, within Catholic doctrine. Now you know very well that Cardinal Ratzinger has said that as far as he is concerned Vatican II is "an anti-Syllabus". Therewith the Cardinal placed himself clearly amongst those who are against the Syllabus. If then he is against the Syllabus, he is adopting the principles of the Revolution. Besides, he goes on to say quite clearly, "Indeed we have now absorbed into Church teaching, and the Church has opened herself up to, principles which are not hers but which come from modern society," i.e., as everyone understands, the principles of 1789, the Rights of Man.

.....

We must not waver

Well, we find ourselves in the same situation. We must not be under any illusions. Consequently we are in the thick of a great fight, a great fight. We are fighting a fight guaranteed by a whole line of popes. Hence, we should have no hesitation or fear, hesitation such as, "Why should we be going on our own? After all, why not join Rome, why not join the pope?" Yes, if Rome and the Pope were in line with Tradition, if they were carrying on the work of all the Popes of the 19th and the first half of the 20th century, of course. But they themselves admit that they have set out on a new path. They themselves admit that a new era began with Vatican II. They admit that it is a new stage in the Church's life, wholly new, based on new principles. We need not argue the point. They say it themselves. It is clear. I think that we must drive this point home with our people, in such a way that they realize their oneness with the Church's whole history, going back well beyond the Revolution. Of course. It is the fight of the City of Satan against the City of God. Clearly. So we do not have to worry. We must after all trust in the grace of God.

"What is going to happen? How is it all going to end?" That is God's secret. Mystery. But that we must fight the ideas presently fashionable in Rome, coming from the Pope's own mouth, Cardinal Ratzinger's mouth, Cardinal Casaroli's mouth, of Cardinal Willebrands and those like them, is clear, clear, for all they do is repeat the opposite of what the Popes said and solemnly stated for 150 years. We must choose, as I said to Pope Paul VI: "We have to choose between you and the Council on one side, and your predecessors on the other; either with your predecessors who stated the Church's teaching, or with the novelties of Vatican II." Reply - "Ah, this is not the moment to get into theology, we are not getting into theology now." It is clear. Hence we must not waver for one moment.

A false charity

And we must not waver for one moment either in not being with those who are in the process of betraying us. Some people are always admiring the grass in the neighbor's field. Instead of looking to their friends, to the Church's defenders, to those fighting on the battlefield, they look to our enemies on the other side. "After all, we must be charitable, we must be kind, we must not be divisive, after all, they are celebrating the Tridentine Mass, they are not as bad as everyone says" - but THEY ARE BETRAYING US - betraying us! They are shaking hands with the Church's destroyers. They are shaking hands with people holding modernist and liberal ideas condemned by the Church. So they are doing the devil's work.

Thus those who were with us and were working with us for the rights of Our Lord, for the salvation of souls, are now saying, "So long as they grant us the old Mass, we can shake hands with Rome, no problem." But we are seeing how it works out. They are in an impossible situation. Impossible. One cannot both shake hands with modernists and keep following Tradition. Not possible. Not possible. Now, stay in touch with them to bring them back, to convert them to Tradition, yes, if you like, that's the right kind of ecumenism! But give the impression that after all one almost regrets any break, that one likes talking to them? No way! These are people who call us corpse-like Traditionalists, they are saying that we are as rigid as corpses, ours is not a living Tradition, we are glum-faced, ours is a glum Tradition! Unbelievable! Unimaginable! What kind of relations can you have with people like that?

This is what causes us a problem with certain layfolk, who are very nice, very good people, all for the Society, who accepted the Consecrations, but who have a kind of deep-down regret that they are no longer with the people they used to be with, people who did not accept the Consecrations and who are now against us. "It's a pity we are divided", they say, "why not meet up with them? Let's go and have a drink together, reach out a hand to them" - that's a betrayal! Those saying this give the impression that at the drop of a hat they would cross over and join those who left us. They must make up their minds.

We cannot compromise

That is what killed Christendom, in all of Europe, not just the Church in France, but the Church in Germany, in Switzerland - that is what enabled the Revolution to get established. It was the Liberals, it was those who reached out a hand to people who did not share their Catholic principles. We must make up our minds if we too want to collaborate in the destruction of the Church and in the ruin of the Social Kingship of Christ the King, or are we resolved to continue working for the Kingship of Our Lord Jesus Christ? All those who wish to join us, and work with us, Deo Gratias, we welcome them, wherever they come from, that's not a problem, but let them come with us, let them not say they are going a different way in order to keep company with the liberals that left us and in order to work with them. Not possible.

Catholics right down the 19th century were torn apart, literally torn apart, over the Syllabus: for, against, for, against. And you remember in particular what happened to the Count of Chambord. He was criticized for not accepting to be made king of France after the 1870 Revolution in France on the grounds of changing the French flag. But it was not so much a question of the flag. Rather, he refused to submit to the principles of the Revolution. He said, "I shall never consent to being the lawful King of the Revolution." He was right! For he would have been voted in by the country, voted in by the French Parliament, but on condition he accept to be a Parliamentary King, and so accept the principles of the Revolution. He said "No. If I am to be King, I shall be King like my ancestors were, before the Revolution." He was right. One has to choose. He chose to stay with the Pope, and with pre-Revolutionary principles.

We too have chosen to be Counter-revolutionary, to stay with the Syllabus, to be against the modern errors, to stay with Catholic Truth, to defend Catholic truth. We are right!

Vatican II is profoundly wrong

This fight between the Church and the liberals and modernism is the fight over Vatican II. It is as simple of that. And the consequences are far-reaching.

The more one analyzes the documents of Vatican II, and the more one analyzes their interpretation by the authorities of the Church, the more one realizes that what is at stake is not merely superficial errors, a few mistakes, ecumenism, religious liberty, collegiality, a certain Liberalism, but rather a wholesale perversion of the mind, a whole new philosophy based on modern philosophy, on subjectivism. A book just published by a German theologian is most instructive. It shows how the Pope's thinking, especially in a retreat he preached at the Vatican, is subjectivist from start to finish, and when afterwards one reads his speeches, one realizes that indeed that is his thinking. It might appear Catholic, but Catholic it is not. No. The Pope's notion of God, the Pope's notion of Our Lord, come up from the depths of his consciousness, and not from any objective revelation to which he adheres with his mind. No. He constructs the notion of God. He said recently in a document - incredible - that the idea of the Trinity could only have arisen quite late, because man's interior psychology had to be capable of defining the Trinity. Hence the idea of the Trinity did not come from a revelation from outside, it came from man's consciousness inside, it welled up from inside man, it came from the depths of man's consciousness! Incredible! A wholly different version of Revelation, of Faith, of philosophy! Very grave! A total perversion! How we are going to get out of all this, I have no idea, but in any case it is a fact, and as this German theologian shows (who has, I believe, another two parts of his book to write on the Holy Father's thought), it is truly frightening.

So, they are no small errors. We are not dealing in trifles. We are into a line of philosophical thinking that goes back to Kant, Descartes, the whole line of modern philosophers who paved the way for the Revolution.

Pope John Paul II's ecumenism

.....

Cardinal Casaroli's humanism

.....

Cardinal Ratzinger's way out

On to our well-known Cardinal Ratzinger who made the remark that the Vatican II document Gaudium et Spes was a Counter-Syllabus. He finds it nevertheless awkward to have made such a remark, because people are now constantly quoting it back to him, as a criticism: "You said that Vatican II is a Counter-Syllabus! Hey, wait a moment, that is serious!" So he has found an explanation. He gave it just a little while ago, on June 27, 1990.

You know that Rome recently issued a major document to explain the relationship between the Magisterium and theologians. With all the problems theologians are causing them on all sides, Rome no longer knows what to do, so they have to try to keep the theologians in line without coming down too hard on them, so they go on and on, page after page after page in this document. Now in the presentation of the document Cardinal Ratzinger gives us his thinking on the possibility of saying the opposite of what Popes have previously decided one hundred years ago or whatever.

The Instruction on the Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian, says the cardinal, "states for the first time with such clarity..." - and indeed I think it is true! -

...that there are decisions of the Magisterium which cannot be and are not intended to be the last word on the matter as such, but are a substantial anchorage in the problem...

- ah, the cardinal is an artful dodger! So there are decisions of the Magisterium (that is not just any decisions!) which cannot be the last word on the matter as such, but are merely a substantial anchorage in the problem! The Cardinal continues - "...and they are first and foremost an expression of pastoral prudence, a sort of provisional disposition..." - Listen! - definitive decisions of the Holy See being turned into provisional dispositions!! The Cardinal goes on -

...Their core remains valid, but the individual details influenced by the circumstances at the time may need further rectification. In this regard one can refer to the statements of the Popes during the last century on religious freedom as well as the anti-modernistic decisions at the beginning of this century, especially the decisions of the Biblical Commission of that time...

The magisterium dissolved

Those are the decisions the cardinal could not digest! Hence three definitive statements of the Magisterium may be put aside because they were only "provisional"! Listen to the cardinal, who goes on to say that these anti-modernist decisions of the Church rendered a great service in their day by "warning against hasty and superficial adaptations", and "by keeping the Church from sinking into the liberal-bourgeois world...But the details of the determinations of their contents were later suspended once they had carried out their pastoral duty at a particular moment" (Osservatore Romano, English edition, July 2, 1990, p. 5). So we turn over the page and say no more about them!

So you see how the Cardinal has got out of the accusation of going a bit far when he calls Vatican II an Anti-Syllabus, when he opposes the Pontifical decisions and the Magisterium of the past? - He's found the way out! - "...the core remains valid..." - what core? No idea! - "...but the individual details influenced by the circumstances at the time may need further rectification..." - and there he has it, he is out of his difficulty!

Servants of globalism

*So by way of conclusion, either we are the heirs of the Catholic Church, i.e., of *Quanta Cura*, of *Pascendi*, with all the Popes down to the Council and with the great majority of bishops prior to the Council, for the reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ and for the salvation of souls; or else we are the heirs of those who strive, even at the price of breaking with the Catholic Church and her doctrine, to acknowledge the principles of the Rights of Man, based on a veritable apostasy, in order to obtain a place as servants in the Revolutionary World Government. That is it. They will manage to get quite a good place as servants in the Revolutionary World Government because, by saying they are in favor of the Rights of Man, religious liberty, democracy and human equality, clearly they are worth being given a position as servants in the World Government.*

Our strength is in the Lord

.....
.....

The Society fights on

I wished to lay out a few of these thoughts for you to fortify yourselves and to realize the fight you are carrying on. With the grace of God, because it is obvious we would no longer be in existence if the Good Lord was not with us. That is clear. There have been at least four or five occasions when the Society of St. Pius X should have disappeared. Well, here we are, still, thanks be to God! And goodness gracious, we carry on. We should especially have disappeared at the time of the Consecrations in 1988. So we were told beforehand. All the prophets of doom, and even amongst those close to us said: "No, no, your Grace, do not do that, that is the end of the Society, you can be sure, we assure you, that is the end, it will all be over, you can close down." Yet we survived!

No, the Good Lord does not want his fight to come to an end, a fight in which there have been many martyrs, the martyrs of the Revolution and all those who have been moral martyrs by dint of the persecutions they underwent through the nineteenth century. Even in our own century, St. Pius X was a martyr. All these heroes of the Faith, the persecuted bishops, the sequestered convents, the exiled nuns; all these are to be nothing? That whole fight is to have been a fight for nothing, a fight in vain? A fight which condemns those who were its victims? And martyrs? Impossible. So we find ourselves caught up in the same current, in the continuation of the same fight, and we thank God.

The Society being persecuted

.....

No easy solutions

What is going to happen? I do not know. Perhaps the coming of Elias! I was just reading this morning in Holy Scripture, Elias will return and put everything back in place! "Et omnia restituet" - "and he will restore all things." Goodness gracious, let him come straightaway! I do not know. But humanly speaking, there is no chance of any agreement between Rome and ourselves at the moment.

Someone was saying to me yesterday, "But what if Rome accepted your bishops and then you were completely exempted from the other bishops' jurisdiction?" But firstly, they are a long way right now from accepting any such thing, and then, let them first make us such an offer! But I do not think they are anywhere near doing so. For what has been up till now the difficulty has been precisely their giving to us a Traditionalist bishop. They did not want to. It had to be a bishop according to the profile laid down by the Holy See. "Profile". You see what that means! Impossible. They knew very well that by giving us a traditional bishop they would be setting up a Traditionalist citadel able to continue. That they did not want. Nor did they give it to St. Peter's Society. When St. Peter's say they signed the same Protocol as we did in May, 1988, it is not true because in our Protocol there was one bishop, and two members of the Roman Commission, of which their Protocol had neither. So they did not sign the same Protocol as we did. Rome took advantage of drawing up a new Protocol to remove those two concessions. At all costs they wanted to avoid that. So we had to do as we did on June 30, 1988...

On the bright side

.....

So all that is highly consoling. I think we should thank God, and enable it to carry on, so that one day people are forced to recognize that although the Visitation of 1987 bore little fruit, it showed that we were there and that good was being done by the Society, even if they did not wish to say so explicitly outside of our circles after the Visitation. However, one day they will be obliged to recognize that the Society represents a spiritual force and a strength of the Faith which is irreplaceable and which they will have, I hope, the joy and the satisfaction to make use of, but when they have come back to their Traditional Faith.

.....

23.16.8 December 1989, in the book "Spiritual Journey", Archbishop Lefebvre says as follows (in the preface).

The pages which follow are addressed especially to you, priests and seminarians of the Priestly Society of St. Pius X, to you who, on this day, will renew your promises in this Catholic and Roman society, officially approved by the Ordinary and by the Roman authorities.

If the Holy Ghost permits me to put in writing the spiritual thoughts which follow, before entering—if it please God—into the bosom of the Holy Trinity, I will be allowed to realize the dream of which He gave me a glimpse one day in the Cathedral of Dakar. In the face of the progressive degradation of the priestly ideal, my dream was to transmit the Catholic Priesthood of Our Lord Jesus Christ in all its doctrinal purity and in all its missionary charity, just as He conferred it on His Apostles, just as the Roman Church always transmitted it until the middle of the twentieth century. How should I carry out what appeared then to me as the sole solution to revive the Church and Christianity? It was still a dream, but there appeared to me already the need, not only to confer the authentic priesthood, to teach not only the sana doctrina approved by the Church, but also to transmit the profound and unchanging spirit of the Catholic priesthood and of the Christian spirit, essentially bound to the great prayer of Our Lord which His Sacrifice on the Cross expresses eternally. The priestly truth is totally dependent upon this prayer; that is why I have always been haunted by the desire to show the means for true priestly sanctification according to the fundamental principles of Catholic doctrine concerning Christian and priestly sanctification. Gladly, I borrow the ever so expressive words of St. Paul: "For we preach not ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, and ourselves merely as your servants in Jesus" (II Cor. 4:5).viii

Spiritual Journey Remember your prelates, who have spoken the word of God to you. Consider how they ended their lives, and imitate their faith. Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday and today, yes, and forever. Jesus Christus heri, hodie, et in sæcula (Heb. 13:7-8). Behold their faith! It is because the reign of Our Lord is no longer the center of attention and of activity for those who are our præpositi [our prelates], that they lose the sense of God and of the Catholic Priesthood, and that we can no longer follow them. O Immaculate Virgin, who, by the extraordinary privilege of your Immaculate Conception, dost teach us all of the fundamental truths of our Faith and hast merited to be the Mother of the Eternal Priest, form in us the Priest of Jesus Christ and make us less unworthy to participate in this Divine Priesthood!

† Marcel Lefebvre

*On the Feast of the Immaculate Conception
of the Blessed Virgin Mary, 1989*

OTHER MATERIAL

24. Superior General Letter #53 to Friends and Benefactors¹²³

September 29, 1997

Dear Friends and Benefactors,

....

*From time to time we are rebuked for not appealing to Rome against such injustice. But it would be a waste of time. Rome would merely reply, "Nobody can sit in judgement on the Holy See." The case is closed against us. It comes then as no surprise for us to hear Cardinal Ratzinger in his new book *The Salt of the Earth* himself admitting, "The power we can wield in Rome today is really very little."*⁶

....

However, since there is no attempt to prove that Archbishop Lefebvre was not acting out of necessity, then we are in effect back to the same old "Obey!" without any desire to go into the basic question: Why, despite grave threats, did Archbishop Lefebvre decide that he had to pay no attention to Rome's orders? Why do we refuse the orders we are being given to get in step with the Conciliar and post-Conciliar reforms? How can we be claiming to have a right to continue in such refusal? Why is this refusal not schismatic?

The answer is to be found in the very basis of authority, and the obedience that goes along with authority:

In any given society, authority flows from the nature of the society⁷ which cannot exist without it.

Any society's nature depends in turn on the society's purpose, the goal it proposes to achieve. The goal of any society fixes its nature, structure and means.

Hence authority is limited by the society's purpose, which fixes the framework, extent and competence of authority.

*The function of Authority is to direct minds and wills towards the goal of that society, and by so doing to ensure the society's unity. Now in the case of the two so-called "perfect societies," human authority depends on the goal and, for most of the time, on the structure and means of the society. Being then itself dependent on these, how can it change them? It cannot. "The Church's right to command the faithful is restricted within the limits constituted by what is needful or useful to the eternal salvation of souls."*⁸

So if the Church authority took in hand such changes, it would be overstepping its

¹²³ <http://www.sspaxasia.com/Newsletters/1997/November/Superior%20General%20Letter%20No%2053.htm>

bounds, there would be an abuse of authority, and in that case Church members are no longer bound to obey, but to resist according to the gravity of the abuse.

When the authority is that of the Pope, the highest on earth, sovereign and universal, its limits are fixed not only by its goals (the continuation of the saving mission of our Lord), by the commandments of God and of our Lord its founder (for example, "Going, teach all nations," etc.), but also by the divine Constitution of the Church.

If this authority, meant to be exact reflection of our Lord himself ("Who hears you, hears me"), undertook to overstep those limits, there would be an abuse of authority and we should have to respond as St. Peter did to the Sanhedrin, "We must obey God rather than men."

Now what we blame the Council and post-Conciliar reforms for is precisely that they undertake to change firstly the nature of the church, one and only bride of Christ our Savior, one and only source of the means of salvation which are supernatural and entrusted to her by her divine spouse; secondly the Church's structure (to be replaced by a crippling and anonymous collegiality); thirdly the Church means of grace, Mass and sacraments (to be reduced to merely human activities). Nor are all these changes merely imaginary on our part, but they are recognized and admitted by the Church authorities in place.⁹

That is the reason why we cannot obey. We are refusing the demolition order because it is an abuse of power.

It is not we who have changed. In all centuries, starting with St. Paul, the whole Church has warned against this kind of change. In the name of the infallible Church's teaching of all time, we refuse to co-operate in the Church's self-destruction.

As long as Rome refuses to deal with this gravest of problems, we shall go round and round in a vicious circle, an on-going dialogue of the deaf.

Rome may scare us with all the threats of excommunication it likes, but we shall continue to cry out at the top of our lungs to our Mother for the milk of pure doctrine, for the Faith not hacked to pieces, for the right to praise and adore God without resorting to folklore or show business, but worthily of Him, as did our forefathers; for the right to receive the substantial food of grace through sacraments not doubtfully valid, the right to be led and directed towards eternal pastures instead of through the desert of innovation constantly evolving in accordance with Paul VI's saying: "We have been given the word 'novelty' like an order, like a programme"¹⁰.

The Church is dying, torn apart by divisions hidden under the deceitful slogan of "We are in communion with the Pope"; the Church is being poisoned with the deadly teachings of heresy being scattered abroad "by the handful" in the words of John-Paul II in 1981!!! Rome itself is lost in the maze of a "theology of worldly values" instead of reminding us of the luminous demands and interests of our Creator and Savior.

It is time for the sorcerers' apprentices to give up their ruinous experiments and to

come back to the age-old wisdom from which the Church has never defected, to give us back the Faith, grace, holiness, priesthood, Mass, papacy, all those Catholic treasures in which our Roman Catholic hearts take rest. They belong to us, we have a strict right to them, and no human authority can ever deprive us of that right, not even post-Conciliar Rome.

.....

"The joy of the Lord is our strength!"¹² May He deign to bless you.

+Bernard Fellay

Superior General,

Menzingen,

Feast of Michael Archangel, 1997

1 "Evangile et Mission," #21, May 29, 1997.

2 Letters #153/96 of 11/12/96, #667/89 of 12/1/96, #90/97 of 6/21/97, etc.

3 Concerning the date of the decree of excommunication, the text said, "our decree of June 1st, 1988."

4 Exaudiat May 1997 (Catholic paper from the Somme region).

5 Test of the International Theology Commission on the question "Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus," #31, LaDocumentation Catholique, # 2157, April 6, 1997, p. 323

6 Cardinal Ratzinger, Le Sel De La Terre, Flammarion, 1987, p.86.

7 The philosopher Gretd holds authority to be proper to society, in such a sense that authority is something that cannot not go along with the essence of society, just as a sense of humor is proper to man. Joseph Gretd, Elementa Philosophiae, Vol II, Herder, Barcelona 1961, p. 459.

8 Cardinal Ottaviani, Institutiones Iuris Publici Ecclesiastici, Vatican Polyglot edition, Rome 1958, p. 177.

9 Bishop Polge of Avignon: "The Vatican II Church is new and the Holy Ghost is constantly preventing it from remaining static," Osservatore Romano, Sept. 3, 1976. (Cf. "Iota Unum," p. 102.)

— *Bishop Schmitt of Metz: "The stage of civilization we are going through involves changes not only in our outward behavior, but also in the very concept we form both of creation and of the salvation brought by Jesus Christ." (Cf. Iota Unum, #37, p. 66; Itinéraires, #160, p. 206.) The whole book of Romano Amerio, Iota Unum, Study of Catholic Church Variations in the 20th Century" needs to be quoted.*

— *"Whenever there is a conflict between people and the Faith, it is the Faith which must give way" - "What God the sacraments are signs of." Centre Jean Bart, Paris, 1975, p. 14-15.*

— *"Indeed, especially since the Conferences of all Orthodox Christians and the Second Vatican Council, the rediscovery and up-grading of the Church as communion by both Orthodox and Catholics has radically altered people's outlook and hence their attitudes." Declaration of Ballamand, June 23, 1993, Art. 13 La Documentation Catholique, #2077 (1993), p. 712.*

— *John Paul II: "Vatican II has given us a new vision of the Church, a more open view of the universality of the people of God." To the clergy of Rome, Osservatore Romano, March 8, 1991.*

10 Osservatore Romano, July 3, 1974.

11 John-Paul II, February 6, 1981. Osservatore Romano, February 8, 1981.

12 II Esdras VIII, 10.

25. The document (a translation) which I understand was written by Bishop Alfonso de Galarreta Reflections about the Roman Proposal is reproduced below.¹²⁴

This document is an abridged version of the original document written by His Excellency Bishop de Galaretta. In order to more easily comprehend the profound reflections of His Excellency, the numerous quotes from Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre which support His Excellency's conclusions have been omitted from this document.

NB. The following reflections by His Excellency Bishop de Galarreta were made available at the October, 2011 meeting of SSPX Superiors in Albano, Italy. During the last week of June, 2012, this document became publicly available. Bishop Alfonso de Galarreta, was the Society's chairman for the Rome-SSPX commission in charge of the theological discussions, and although his remarks were based on a proposal which has undergone some revisions, these reflections remain most current.

To limit myself to the "Preliminary Note" and "doctrinal Preamble", I must immediately state that they are confusing, misleading, false and essentially bad.

Even the apparent openness to criticism of the Council is enigmatic and cunning, a well-trained trap ("... legitimate (?) discussion . . . expressions or formulations . . . as "interpretive criteria of necessary Catholic doctrine...", that is to say, according to the "Preamble" II and III, 2, especially the end). This document is substantially unacceptable. It is worse than the 1988 Protocol, in particular in relation to the Council and the post-conciliar magisterium.

PRINCIPLE OF JUDGMENT

In fact it fits perfectly with the thought and the Roman position that the Commission has expressed all along in the doctrinal discussions. It is essential to the current issue to bear in mind the unmistakable conclusion that we just made on this occasion: they are not ready to give up the Vatican II Council, nor the liberal doctrines of it, and their intention, their obvious desire, is to bring us back to it. At most, Rome would accept a rebalancing and a better wording (formulation), again as part of the "hermeneutic of renewal in continuity". And then we can discuss and we are very useful . . . to endorse the revival of the reform with continuity.

AGREEMENT IMPOSSIBLE

The proposed document does confirm that it is illusory and unrealistic to believe that we could reach a pragmatic agreement, appropriate and warranted, and even just acceptable to both parties. Given the circumstances, it is certain that at the end, after long discussions, we arrive at absolutely nothing. So, why would we get involved?

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

¹²⁴ http://strobertbellarmine.net/Reflections_about_the_Roman_Proposal_Complete_Transcript_with_Quotes.pdf

Following the Roman proposal, the real question, crucial, is: should we, can we, we take the path of a "possible" practical agreement first? Is it prudent and appropriate to maintain contacts with Rome leading to such an agreement?

As far as I am concerned, the answer is clear: we must refuse this path because we cannot do something evil so that a good (a good which is, moreover, uncertain) can come from it, and also because this would necessarily bring about evils (very certain) for the common good that we possess, namely that of the Society and of the family of Tradition.

The following summarizes some of the reasons for my point of view:

I. OBEY WHOM, WHAT?

How to submit and obey authorities who continue to think, to preach, and to govern by modernists? We have goals and purposes contrary, even different ways, how to work under them? The problem is not the subjective intentions, but objective, clear, the observation that we have just made their desire: Vatican II, acceptance of the Council and its liberal principles. Essentially nothing has changed, there is no "return".

II. INTERFERENCE WITH THE CONFESSION OF FAITH

How then does this not go against the defense and public confession of faith, against the public need to protect the faithful and the Church? In this regard, if we make a purely practical agreement we are, in the present circumstances, already engaging in duplicity and ambiguity. The very fact is a public testimony and a message: we cannot be in "full communion" with the authorities who remain modernists. 2

We cannot ignore the context either, that is to say, events and constant teachings in the life of the Church today: repeated visits to Protestant churches and synagogues, beatification (soon to be canonized) of John Paul II, Assisi III, preaching religious liberty time and time again, and a long etcetera. Moreover, if we make an agreement we will lose freedom of speech, we must mute our public criticism of the facts, the authorities and even some texts of the Council and the post-conciliar magisterium. To understand and illustrate the points I and II, just look what happened with all the ralliers (those who were won over or those who rejoined) from the Fraternity of St. Peter to the Institute of Good Shepherd: They are inevitably confronted with the choice to surrender or betray their commitments ... and this is the first thing that happens.

III. THE DOCTRINAL QUESTION, THE ESSENTIAL

We must look at the context in which they intend to incorporate us. An agreement is, like it or not, we integrate into their system in a thinking and reality data that do not depend on us but who depend on their thinking, their theology and their action. And this is how they will be presented (see Campos, text signed by Mgr. Licinio).

But we have just seen in doctrinal discussions what is their design: pure modernism revised and corrected.

In particular there will be implied that we would accept three principles implicitly:

1. Relativism of truth, even dogmatic, need for pluralism in the Church. For them we have the experience and charisma of Tradition, good and useful to the Church, but only partial truth. Their system and modernist dialectic (claiming the contrary) allows them

to integrate us in the name of "unity in diversity", as a positive and necessary element, provided we are in full communion (obedience to authority and respect for others and ecclesial realities) and that we remain open to dialogue, always looking for the truth. Proof of this is that they are ready to accept after the statement, both sides, a doctrinal opposition to faith - real and essential.

How implicitly accept this principle, by explicit integration in their system and the official interpretation they give, then it is the foundation of modernism and is destructive of all natural and supernatural truth?

It is accepting the relativism of Tradition, the only true faith.

2. Can be interpreted in accordance with any Vatican II Tradition. We can help find, if necessary, the "right" interpretation. This is the "hermeneutic of continuity". "The hermeneutic of rupture" (while it is true) must be rejected, because neither teaching nor the major post-conciliar Vatican II have been mistaken. After the discussions and the proposed document, it is only too clear, they would accept us as part of the first and reject the second. This is Vatican II endorsement.

3. The truth of faith is changing, as dogmas, formulas and dogmatic definitions of faith are only significant approaches to the mysteries of faith. The core remains, everything else evolves with time, culture, historical circumstances, experience and the experience of God's people. Therefore Tradition is alive, Tradition is Vatican II, and condemnations of liberalism and modernism are exceeded.

THE REAL BATTLE IS DOCTRINAL

In all revolutions, after "the fury" and "the terror" there is a time of consolidation in the new situation, a period of institutionalization. On the other hand it is foreseeable that, if returned there, it is gradual. So we know in advance that there will be phases - more confusing: next to a best in practice and perhaps the intention, a little more order (all relative to the worst) there will necessarily worsen over the clarity of things, the error will be misleading, and seductive, less obvious and more subtle, in short, much more dangerous . . . able to deceive even the elect.

The error is more ambiguous and dangerous when it collects more to the truth, such as counterfeit currency.

So we know in advance that our struggle and our position will be less and less understood, more difficult to explain, justify and maintain. Things will necessarily evolve like that: it is necessary to a proper response from us, so to speak, inversely proportional to the confusion.

The three reasons cited above show that we are in this phase of a false restoration, of a false return. The attitude of the Pope and the Roman Curia, much more confused, contradictory, seductive and has the appearance of Tradition. One must distinguish the good aspects of the current pontificate, incidental or occasional, education and leadership doctrine. But our fight is doctrinal. This is the field of doctrine that is played in victory or defeat of faith and therefore of all church property. 3

IV. ENTRY INTO CONTRADICTION

To move towards a practical agreement would be to deny our word and our commitments to our priests, our faithful, and Rome in front of everyone. This would have hugely negative consequences ad intra and ad extra.

There is no change in the doctrinal point of view from Rome that would justify ours. On the contrary, the discussions have shown they will not accept anything in our criticisms. It would be absurd for us to go in the direction of a practical agreement after the result of discussions and findings. Otherwise, one would think that Msgr. Rifan and Father Aulagnier were right. Such an approach would show a serious diplomatic weakness on the part of the Fraternity, and indeed, more than diplomatic. It would be a lack of consistency, honesty and firmness, which would have effects like loss of credibility and moral authority we enjoy.

V. IMPLOSION OF THE FRATERNITY

The mere fact of going down this path will lead us to doubt, dispute, distrust, parties, and especially division.

*Many superiors and priests have a legitimate problem of conscience and will oppose it. Authority and the very principle of authority will be questioned, undermined. We cannot join the caravan [***aller a la remorque*] in our contacts with Rome, we must keep the commands, mark the time and conditions. So we need a line defined in advance, clear and firm, independent of stress and possible Roman maneuvers. Accordingly, it is not the moment to change the decision of the Chapter of 2006 (no practical agreement without resolving the doctrinal issue) and it is not right or prudent to embark on preparing minds otherwise, before there is in us the conviction, consensus and the decision to change, otherwise it will only cause division and, by reaction, squabbling, anarchy.*

*** Note on Translation: "Aller à la remorque" means to passively follow somebody. In this context : "We cannot be passive in our contacts with Rome."*

VI. CAUTION ALLOWED

The warning of RP Ferrer, secretary of the Cardinal Cadizares: "Do not agree with Rome, she cannot keep her promises to you." We received other warnings similar to Rome. KEEP THE LINE.

So what to do, what to say? What we have better to do this is to keep the line that has ensured the cohesion and survival of the Fraternity and gave lots of fruits vis-à-vis Rome to the Church. They hesitate, they begin to cede that their building is collapsing, they can not live without us... Remain steadfast in our policy and expect that there are clear conditions secure and guaranteed. As reported Archbishop Lefebvre after the consecrations, it will be, unfortunately, the situation worsens at home ... until they are ready to abandon Vatican II. We could answer that views the outcome of the discussions, for faithfulness and loyalty to God, to our consciousness, even to the Church and to the Holy See, we can not engage in a practical way first, but as we have already said, we remain open to cooperate or participate in a study and doctrinal criticism of the Council.

FOLLOW PROVIDENCE

If, then, they cut off contact with us, the consequent break in the constant tension that these contacts mean for the Society would be welcome, and in my view also providential. In any case, knowing them, they will not wait long before talking with us again.

*In conclusion, we must not get ahead of Providence, it is she who will solve the crisis. We must be very careful about the temptation *sub specie boni* (under the appearance of good) , avoid the rush, wait, and only go down that path when there will be no one doubts that Rome (the Pope) wants the Tradition, they have a fair idea of it, it is prudent and that it is the will of God. We need more reasons to change that line to stay in safe and proven that we have. However, the opposite happens.*

BEWARE OF DANGER!

*For the good of the Fraternity and Tradition, "Pandora's box" must be closed as quickly as possible, to avoid the stigma and the demolition of the authority, disputes, dissensions and divisions, perhaps with no return. In this sense, the real question that needs answering is: what are the other requirements, *ad intra* and *ad extra*, in the case of a hypothetical "good" proposal, completely acceptable in itself, for us to try to make an agreement?*

The authorities cited by Archbishop Lefebvre allow us to answer them with clarity and firmness.

+Bishop Alfonso de Galarreta