

WAR ON WAR

E

WAR IS ON

FIRST PRELUDE

THREE BISHOPS DECLARE THAT THE WAR AGAINST THE NEW ROME IS STILL ON

AND

BEG BISHOP FELLAY NOT TO SIGN ANY PRACTICAL AGREEMENT WITH IT

SECOND PRELUDE

BISHOP FELLAY AND HIS TWO ASSISTANTS ANSWER THAT THE WAR AGAINST THE NEW ROME IS OVER

AND

THAT THEY ARE GOING TO PROCEED TO AN AGREEMENT WITH THE NEW ROME REGARDLESS OF THEIR WARNING

THOSE TWO LETTERS ARE FOUND EASILY ON THE INTERNET

WAR ON WAR

E

Bohol 18 May,  
OLVC, Manila 20 May,  
Seoul, 27 May 2012.  
My dear faithful,

Part I

## The Fornicating New Rome

Last week I woke up reconciled with the new Rome - I thought for 12 years that it would never come to this, but while I was napping, the Vatican II of the SSPX got on its way and now it is the windows of the Society that open themselves to the New Rome, through the lever of false obedience.

But the New Rome is to be destroyed; she is Carthage to us. We have *nothing* to do with it; We have no canonical structure to do with it, we have to practical agreement to do with it, we have no point of doctrinal convergence to do with it. If Our Lady said "Rome will lose the faith and become the seat of the Antichrist", Rome will indeed lose the faith and become the seat of antichrist, despite all the beautiful diplomatic fixes we can think of, with the help of the Pontifical & Cardinal Regalia, Palaces, Sacred monuments, purple cassocks and fringed cinctures, smooth roman talk and skilled efforts of reconciliation, permission to say masses, trappings of tradition and peanuts of cardinal Hojos.

The new Rome remains death, not for us who have not joined it, but for millions and millions of souls who, for now 50 years could have gone to heaven by staying Catholic or by entering the Catholic Church.

And since what is proposed to us; to be directly under the Pope; (nothing new by the way, since it was always proposed to all those who ended up recycled to modernism); Let us look carefully at the one to whom we wish to entrust ourselves, Pope Benedict XVI, mysteriously and validly reigning over the official church.

Pope Benedict XVI, previously Cardinal Ratzinger, is our most consistent, rational, methodical, organized and effective enemy. He has studied our case for decades; he has almost trapped Archbishop Lefebvre in 1988. While sharing the same heretical theology as the other heretic leaders, he has groomed a perfectly conservative & reassuring image. The man has never thrown anyone into prison; he has never fought us with any weapon but his pen (and sweet melodic voice), and has been most successful. "The power of the horses are in their mouth" (Apoc. IX,19).

"But father, how can you condemn such a man, the very head of the visible church, like that, a priori and with such vehemence?" "Why such a hardening?"

A priori condemnation is bad, but if condemnation comes after a huge mountain of evidence, past & present, such condemnation needs to be strong. Wolf is wolf. If wolf is, wolf thinks as wolf, acts as wolf, and kills as a wolf.

Think as a wolf: After his bad seminary training, Fr. Ratzinger became an adviser of Karl Rahner, maybe the worse "peritus" of Vatican II and revealed his core thinking in the book so traditionally entitled "Principles of Catholic Theology" which I read. His established thinking is that there is no established and stable concept in anything religious BUT ONE MAY NOT GO TOO FAR INTO MUTATING DOGMATIC CONCEPTS. People's minds work at different speed; we need an adaptable and multispeed modernism. Pascendi denounced modernism in 2D; Benedict XVI is modernism in 3D.

This great skill of his seduced many of his modernist confreres, and so it came to pass that Cardinal Ratzinger became the architect of the New Catechism, the Declaration on justification, the Declaration of Balamand, the whole Assisi project... Almost all the disastrous pronouncements of Pope John Paul II can be retraced to him, and can we say that he has changed his mind today? Absolutely not, for when he read his own recent decree of "Beatification" of John Paul II, he stated at length that the main sign of John Paul II sanctity is the council and its strenuous application to the church throughout his pontificate.

That is why it is so important to look if Benedict XVI acts as a wolf now, not yesterday but now; for the big temptation is to believe that things have changed and that Benedict XVI is really leaning towards us, in such a wise as to become almost one of us... How beautiful and hopydopyful, isn't it?

But no; 4 times no at least: as to Hinduism, Islam, Judaism & Protestantism.

Hinduism: When I was in Bombay around 2006, I got to read what Benedict XVI had to say about inculturation in India. He praised it, but with reservations. Isn't that nice and traditional, reservations about inculturation? Well, except for the fact that he reproached the Indian bishops to insert only the Hindu elements into Catholic worship, instead of putting enough of the Buddhist culture; and this is very sad because the Buddhist religion originated from India and Buddhism is a great religion...

Note well: No Indian plumes & feathers, no kumkum on the forehead, but a more consistent and intellectual approach.

Islam: There again, Benedict XVI didn't kiss the Koran, that goes too much against his Bavarian categories of the sensibility. But when he went the Mosque of Istanbul, he took off his shoes, went to the Mirhab, folded his hands in the Moslem position, turned towards Mecca and prayed with the other Moslems surrounding him. The whole thing lasted a few minutes, never to be repeated again; but there again, one can see the same consistency of practice. Benedict XVI is a little like the tape of a surveillance camera; quite boring to watch except on a few horrific frames.

Judaism: The lack of assiduity for Paganism & Islam in Benedict XVI, is clearly compensated by his fervor and admiration for the Jewish religion. Almost every year, the Pope goes to the Synagogue and makes long speeches whose main idea is “The Old Covenant is still valid and not revoked”.

How can one be more clearly opposed to the Catholic faith? To the Epistles of St. Paul? This is so grave that the Ecumenism of Benedict XVI seems to suggest that one religion is above the others, namely Judaism. And the choice for Judaism is judicious, because Judaism is the worse false religion, in that it denies so perfectly and vehemently the Divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

Protestantism: The above is not to suggest that Benedict XVI does not understand the profound spirituality of Martin Luther. But there again, Benedict will go beyond John-Paul. He will enter the protestant temple in full Pontifical Regalia, (not just in white cassock) and participate in the first part (remember, Benedict XVI is a conservative, only half way bad) in a protestant service. His praise for Luther is more detailed and profound; spiritually and theologically motivated: how could it be otherwise; he is a German Pope.

Let us not forget that he is the First Pope to have breached the Catholic Doctrine on Artificial Contraception or to invite Atheists at the prayer meeting of Assisi, or to meet a female Bishop in Bishops’ attire, or to give communion to a protestant (Brother Roger of Taizé) etc..

The recent interview called “The Salt of the Earth” shows a completely confused mind, incapable of stable concepts & dogmas, a mind without Faith say bishop Tissier De Mallerai (whose book could not be published for some time by Clovis for technical reasons; and is not going to be translated by the Angelus out of respect for the sensitivities of the American District). Benedict XVI still sees renewal in the face of destruction. He has made the prowess to write a book on Jesus without mentioning, even once, his divinity. He is completely obstinate in his thinking, therefore any doctrinal discussion with his experts were bound to fail.

Kills as a wolf. If one is so obstinate in his ideas, there is no reason why he should change his actions. Benedict XVI, as far as we know, does not say the True Mass. He did say a mass facing the Orient in the Sistine Chapel but explained immediately that it was because the place doesn’t have an altar facing the people and that the text he recited was the text of the new mass, that mass that sends so many people to Hell.

Nevertheless, Cardinal Ratzinger said the true mass in the past, but that was to set up the Fraternity of St. Peter (That great antechamber for priests before being recycled back into the local diocese) or in Fongombaultin order to lead the meetings to discuss the “Reform of the Reform”.

Per se Benedict XVI does not believe in the True Mass; for him it is a museum piece. Just recently I read in the Wall Street Journal, in the plane, about his visit in Cuba. Very surprisingly, Fidel Castro asked him when he met why did the Church had to change the liturgy. Benedict snapped back immediately: “For renewal”. This is the typical answer of a diehard progressivist.

His obstinacy in error leads him to support all those neo Christian and protestant tainted charismatic contraptions, because these create the false idea of restoration of things, like the Opus Dei, and rehashes whatever is left of the piety of the people back into the sewer of all heresies. Benedict XVI is a genius.

If you want to know who a leader is, you also have to look at whom he appoints, for to govern is to delegate. The three topmost positions in the church are that of Secretary of State, Congregation for the Faith, and Congregation for Bishops.

Cardinal Bertone is Secretary of State and a clear delinquent. Unlike Benedict XVI, he is an open modernist, like his famous predecessors Cardinal Villot and Cardinal Casaroli. He has the bad temper of Villot and the maneuvering spirit of Casaroli and he sees to it that their legacy be maintained, namely that all civil governments remain separated from the Church in Catholic countries and encouraged to be run according to Masonic principles. The Ten Commandments of the Secretariate of State are the rights of man based on the dignity of the human person. Hence world peace requires that no serious steps should be taken to stop the

persecution of Catholics in antichristian countries and that the efforts of those who still want to remain Catholic over there be discreetly thrown into disarray, like in China, in Russia, and in the Muslim world.

Cardinal Bertone got our good friend, Fr. Nicholas Gruner, excommunicated. He is mainly known to us for the burial of the message of Fatima, even if he was not he who engineered it in 2000. Such a task belonged then to the Master: Cardinal Ratzinger.

Next in line is Cardinal Levada, a close friend and successor of Cardinal Ratzinger at the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. He does not seem to be doing much but a vital dossier has been placed on his desk: The dealing with the SSPX . . . . But look how good he is tearing us to pieces.

Cardinal Levada's past is not well known to us and that's a pity. When he was bishop of San Francisco he had parishes for gays and lesbians; so told me our faithful of the Bay Area. It is also well known that he tried to get the late Fr. Heidt back into the diocese, sitting in majesty in his office; flanked by canonical experts & theologians ready to fire. Fr. Heidt was unfazed: "Ok, I'm in, take me back, but on one condition" – "which is?" – "I don't want to see any gay priest even near me in my parish and in my parish activities" – "I'm sorryfoatha, I can only say no" – "same here" replied the old warrior and he left the room. Fr. Heidt is right; what are we doing with those people?

Only a few people know much about Cardinal Ouellet the Prefect for the Congregation for Bishops. Like the other two above mentioned Congregations, his Congregation is busy in maintaining the Church in her desolate state at every local level or diocese. Indeed it would be a big disaster for the novusordo, if out of 4000 bishops or so, just one would turn out to be entirely traditional. Not only that, but the Congregation looks to it that there is no bishop saying the correct mass, coming from the rank of the Ecclesia Deigroups. And if one can be found in Campos, he has to try to govern his followers under the leadership of another Bishop, that is, the official Bishop of Campos.

Souls are sent to hell by the failure of the local clergy to teach their flock the faith and lead people to do penance for their sins. There is no better way to do that than by giving them consistently bad Bishops, some less bad and less aware of what they are doing than others, I agree, but all of them bad without exception.

One could go through all other lesser congregations and see the same pattern of organized liquidation of the Catholic Church, but I will retain only one for the sake of brevity: the Ecclesia Dei commission. While the new Rome wishes to embrace us so tenderly with one arm (Cardinal Levada), with the other arm (MgrPozzo), within the same month, it is strangling to death the Institute of Good Shepherd. This Institute is requested to fall in line with Vatican II for its preaching, seminaries, for the occasional saying of the new mass and for an entire collaboration with the local diocese, contrary to assurances made five years earlier. How on earth are we going to believe that the new Rome is not going to make the same request after five or six years... the little SSPX, it is said, thinks that it can wed the official church without losing the virginity of its Faith.

## Part II

# The Adultery from the Truth

In the light of the above, we can now determine that to place ourselves under Benedict XVI is an adultery from the truth. Pope Benedict XVI is the best of his kind; the Mercedes Benz, Porsche and BMW of modernism. In the present concrete circumstance, such a folly is a treasonable departure from the truth, the handing over of Tradition itself, and the preparation for the massacre of the souls of those who placed themselves under the protection of the Society for now forty years.

Most happily, Providence has always intervened to stop the irreparable from happening, but it would be most useful and safe to know, ahead of time, what sin is entailed by an agreement with the new Rome.

**FAITH:** It cannot exist without confession. The SSPX was designed by its founder to be a perpetual army of the faith, fighting Carthage. It can and will take many blows, but if it steps down from its public stand against error it is to self demolish. Of Satan, Our Lord says “In veritate non stetit” “He failed to stand in the truth” (John VIII,44); the same could be said of us if we mellow. Our Lord argues with the Jews on the standpoint of the truth; a major theme of the whole Gospel of St John in which, very often, authority sides against the Truth. St John is no revolutionist; if authority follows the truth, then of course authority must be followed. But authority can fail with respect to the truth, and not infrequently.

When Faith is in danger, our duty to it becomes immense, and such a duty is the object of the sacrament of Confirmation which anoints the forehead with Chrism against blushing in the fight of the Faith. St Paul says that the heart believes the Faith for its own justification, but, more importantly that the confession of the Faith has to be made for its salvation, and the salvation of erring and confused bystanders. Most of us became Traditional Catholics from the confession of the faith of other Catholics; that is about to change as soon as the new rome puts us in a position of silence about its errors.

Short of destroying us outright, rome wants to contain us in a nice containment unit. But a containment unit is a prison, no matter how comfortable it is and well equipped. Our Faith does not simply belong to us, it belongs to the candlestick, it belongs to those in the world that shall take advantage of it, and add momentum to the pressure on rome to return to the Faith.

**HOPE:** For in this dark hour, instead of a fake return, isn't a full return of rome to the Eternal Rome what we are looking for? The Book of the Apocalypse warns against the deception of Sardis, who has the name of being alive, but is in fact dead (the Persians stormed Sardis by deception) (Apoc. III,1), against the deceptive nature of the pale horse (neither entirely black, nor entirely white; whose rider's name is death, because the admixture of truth and error kills more souls than the blatant heresies of the black horse and the violent persecutions of the red horse (Apoc. VI,8)), and against the devouring locusts that have the appearance of Charity (Apoc. IX,7).

Our Lady is most white, not in any grey, and she loves the tidiness of an army in battle array. She has not promised a Pope doing half of a job consecrating Russia (with Russia not converted as a result), still less a Pope who deforms her message, but a Pope who will do exactly what she requests. Such a mention of a great Pope is also in the prophecy of St Malachi and other prophecies.

How can it be otherwise, since the whiteness that a pope wears signify the purity of his doctrine and the sanctity of his actions as Leader of the sole society capable of saving the human race. Our hope is that the Church becomes again the ark of salvation, becomes capable to beget children for Heaven. That is the Mission and the Charity of the Church.

**CHARITY:** In the circumstances of today, any agreement with the rome of today is a denial of the MISSION of the Society, which was designed precisely to rescue souls FROM the clutches of wolfy popes, cardinals, bishops and priests...worldwide, as the official church fails temporarily in its mission. One can't dodge the clutches of the beast by placing oneself under its head but by staying altogether out of the range of the beast.

Secondly, because so many SSPX priests do not agree with the proposed 180 degree turn, it is necessarily going to end up into a horrible split. We are going to look like a sect, one side of the split fighting “the other side”; making lawyers rich in figuring out which side is going to keep this or that asset of the SSPX.

This in turn is going to discourage many of our faithful who do not have the elements to judge which side is which, and push away the newcomers of Tradition at the sight of this bitter incoming infighting.

That is why I cannot understand at all that cruel phrase “We cannot rule out a split”. On the contrary, it takes just a restating of our doctrinal stand and an assessment of the new rome based on reality to bring a state of unity amongst ourselves. Truth only gathers, and if the SSPX weathers this tempest, it will become unsplittable for many years to come.

Isn't a split what the cruel Rome of today looking for? Are not the Sedevacantists having the time of their life just watching us? Suicide is a sin against Charity; we are not in the right to take the life of an entire Congregation, and that problem must be the sole concern of the next General Chapter.

**PRUDENCE:** Archbishop Lefebvre never trusted the new Rome, even when he was in negotiation with it, because he had a clear vision of their constant operation of error. But even if the Romans were not capable to deceive him, he clearly stated that the experience should never be repeated after his departure, until Rome returns entirely to Tradition. How can we have the pretention of being smarter than the Archbishop, who escaped the wily Romans only by a whisk. And if we don't share the same firmness of analysis of Archbishop Lefebvre, how can we claim to elucidate the practical proposals that Rome is constantly dangling before us? How can we accept to take even a small risk (and the risk is actually enormous) of losing so much at the hand of proven enemies?

The study of Barbier and Cretineau-Joly played an important role in the practical and doctrinal conduct of the Archbishop. In these two authors it is clearly stated that after its initial destructive period (the Terror, in the case of the French Revolution, and the sixties and seventies in the case of Vatican II), the Revolution elects to soften its approach to its enemies. This is called the Thermidorian phase of the Revolution, whose best illustration was the Treaty of La Jaunaye that concluded the wars of Vendée by dividing the Catholic army between those who were tired of the war and the irreducible followers of Charette who got liquidated once they were placed in a state of isolation from the others, who were less willing to fight. Throughout the XIXth century, French Catholicism kept on splitting between liberals and traditionalists, all the way down to Vatican II. All Revolutions have their phase of apparent mellowing in order to isolate those who still want to fight it, that is why it is so important for us not to confuse the false restoration, the false return of Rome to Tradition with the real and total conversion of the Papacy, which will happen, but in God's time. We should not dream to ourselves happy endings to this crisis; "Custos quid de nocte?", says Scripture, "Watchman, what of the night?" Is the light of day coming today or is it some deceptive light?

The agonizing question for us is what is the proportion in our ranks, of those who are tired of this war against the new Rome, who think it is just a useless, damaging and prideful pretention of heroism.

**JUSTICE:** "But, Father, Rome is proposing to repair the injustice done to us, Rome wants to be fair and gives us a place." First of all we are not fighting in order to cleanse our honor, we must be instead like Suzanna who accept to undergo the unjust accusation, or like Rebecca who says "Let this malediction be upon me, my son". Our situation is that of a son cast out of his house by his drunken father who resists the abuse of his mother. After a few days, the father accepts to reinstate the son back into the house on the condition that he stops rebuking him about his few drops of whisky and little bouts of temper against his mother. The conduct of the new Rome is altogether irreprehensible, the father must stop his abuse before he can reinstate his son.

**FORTITUDE:** The aim of war is the destruction of the will to fight in the mind of your opponent. A general differs from a businessman or a bureaucrat in the sense that he must be prudent like them, but also retain this prudence under fire (cf Sun Tsu, "The Art of War"). Patton said to his soldiers "Fear nothing but your general; for if he is good and you are bad, he will whip your ass; whereas if he is bad, it is the enemy that shall whip your ass!" I truly hope that no Sister is reading this paper, otherwise I'm in trouble.

Bishop Fellay talks about threats coming from Rome, but what are these terrible things? A new excommunication or suspension? We are well trained into being excommunicated and suspended because of the truth, and also one may note that for a punishment to be effective, the punisher should believe in what he inflicts. Those threats of Rome are for rabbits: In the past, excommunication would mean imminent danger of eternal damnation; but the new Rome believes only in universal salvation, so that the worse danger for us would be to be relegated to some layer of communion more peripheral than others, but still we would be better off than the Muslims, pagans and atheists, who are all members of the all inclusive balthazarc church, whether they like it or not.

(The only one of whose salvation we can and must despair is not Judas and Lucifer, but Bishop Williamson who, no one can deny, dared to commit the most horrible crime in the entire history of humanity.)Therefore, no, Bishop Fellay will always be fine.

TEMPERANCE: It is not known enough that one of the acts of the virtue of temperance is to reject pride, flattery. In this, today's roman authorities are spectacular experts. They give us permission to say mass anywhere in Rome, have our visiting priests stay in roman palaces, including the Holy Office, just behind St Peter's basilica. They constantly tell us, just like Cardinal Gagnon in 1988, that our work is very valuable, and all the more valuable since the Church of today is rocked by so many problems, and that we must bundle effectively the conservative forces within the church to fight the progressivists (just like conservative fight liberals in liberal democracies, worldwide, failing so pitifully). Their food is gorgeous, the ballet of purple cassocks, birettas, fringes and laces is back, like in the good old days, and there is at all time a gilded door, wide open, inviting us to join in that ballet.If the lentils are good, Iwon't deny it, but let them eat them themselves and I will keep the Faith of my inheritance.

Therefore, as far as I can enjoy that faculty in my priestly power, I curse this sevenfold sin against the seven virtues and the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost. A sin that starts by an indirect but very real assault on the virtue of Faith, and that is followed, in all logic, by the fall of the six other dominoes.

### Part III

## The Thwarted & Tempting Treason

(Situation as of May 25, but in need of periodic reassessment)

We had it coming, for at least 12 years, but the faithful and many priests were given no warning of this huge change of direction, which makes the U-turn to Rome enter into the genus of deception in action or treason.

For the moment the treason is thwarted, thanks to God, thanks to the resistance of many and the opposition of some modernists and French Bishops...but it is still trying to outflank. Therefore we are in need, like on a battleship, of a good fire control to readjust the landing of the shells on the new position of the enemy... and then, but only then will the enemy's ship go to the bottom!

Now, before I allow you to read this letter any further, I request you, my dear reader, to sign this preamble: "I, the undersigned dear reader, hereby declare that Bishop Bernard Fellayhasn't signed anything yet with the new rome, even if he suffers from a powerful desire to do so, and therefore that he is for the moment, until the last split second separating his ink from the paper, entirely excluded from the category of treason and remains our beloved and respected Superior General or the Society of Saint Pius the Tenth. Date: Anytime between now and Bishop Fellay signs. Signed: Dear Reader.

With this document I am safe to proceed, because I know that some of you may accuse me of making my superior a traitor, further down this sermon.

### TODAY'S SITUATION

That will very soon become out of date

The incoming General Chapter is like an incoming Vatican II: instead of being dogmatic as it should have been, Vatican II was a pastoral council, and the incoming SSPX Chapter, instead of being a doctrinal Chapter, to address the emergency at hand, is now wrongly named administrative Chapter. Not that administrative details should be overlooked, but their place is at the end, just as actions follow ideas in the Epistles of St Paul.

Any General Chapter convenes to address issues facing a Congregation. Now, the SSPX faces its most serious issue since its inception: it is splitting doctrinally. (Read the letters of the 3 vs 1 bishops). Therefore, anyone with a sound mind would put current affairs in the backburner and place the one doctrinal problem alone on the center of the table. In these circumstances, the very name of Administrative Chapter, (correct if may be in ordinary time), sounds cruel, like the willful covering of a serious danger. That chapter can only be named DOCTRINAL Chapter.

But even if this could be granted, the Devil will continue to outflank, and for the Devil, the next solution, is to cancel, or even better, postpone the General Chapter, according to the four steps of governance when a serious crisis is happening

Nothing is happening, then  
Something might be happening but we cannot yet determine exactly what it is, then  
Something is happening, but there is nothing we can do about it, then  
It happened; therefore, let's study the next serious crisis.

## HOW WE DID GET HERE

But lets go back and study how our stance got eroded in the course of years.

### -1 LOSS OF CLARITY

What is very worrying at the onset is this newfound culture of secrecy that was not practiced by the Archbishop when he came to Rome. Upon his return he would candidly expose everything he did to his seminarians, and the substance of his dealings would be public news within 48 hours.

Now, in his reply to the three Bishops, Bishop Fellay states that he cannot and will not open himself, even to them BishopS (no small-fries seminarians). Read carefully the paragraph starting "You cannot know how much", and you can clearly see that the trust is gone.

It ain't funny to be a SSPX Bishop these days, and I am not referring to the one who almost got expelled last September and who gets threatened every morning; I am referring to the Lamb and the Dove.

For the small priestly fries, in our internal bulletin, came the scary good news that "now the time has come to be recognized by the official church", or that we are just waiting for a canonical structure from rome once rome has signed our doctrinal statement. Then, inevitably, passengers start to scream, because the plane has switched off the gasses and is losing altitude rapidly; then the pilot puts on the gasses again, saying "I was just joking, nothing is signed, YET."

All this uncertainty is a new cross for us, and breeds a general state of unease.

### -2 LOSS OF FORM OF DUE PROCESS

We tied ourselves, and the promise was frequently restated, that a practical agreement should not take place without an agreement of doctrine between us and rome. Now, the doctrinal discussions have just failed; Benedict XVI just came out of Assisi III, and we want a canonical solution with the new rome?

The signing of a practical agreement with the official church is a matter of primal importance for a religious congregation. That is why, again, it was promised to us that before taking such a momentous decision, the general council of the Society would convene first a General Chapter. Now, we hear of a signing in the month of May or June; how is that possible?

No due consideration is given to the fate of the other congregations (Dominicans, Capuchins, Benedictines, Carmelites, etc.) and all the independent priests that work alongside with us, should we sign. Their future is at stake and their position in the new church would be even riskier than ours and no one gives a dime?

Did we study how Rome is going to countenance our convalidating, that is, our doubting the Novusordo Sacraments of Confirmation and Holy Orders? How are they going to deal with our marriages? But the Pope can't hold it any longer and we must elect all form of precipitation!

Did Archbishop Lefebvre say that the new code of canon law is worse than the new mass, or did he not? If we agree to a canonical agreement and put ourselves in the jumpsuit of a canonical structure, under what canon law do we entrust ourselves?

### -3 FAILURE TO UNDERSTAND THE MEANING OF THE WORD AGREEMENT

What is the deep meaning of a practical agreement with Rome anyways? It is when the Pope will only say the True Mass, because, in order to say mass in the first place, the priest makes use of his practical intellect, where, says St Thomas, the Sacramental Character of Holy Order is impressed indelibly. Now, that is a practical agreement that I can sign; no ambiguity, and an effective agreement or return of Rome to Tradition.

A doctrinal agreement would be the same; that is, not a condemnation of some interpretation of Vatican II, but the condemnation of the entire text of the Council, with all its time bombs, with all its half-truths, with all its blatant errors (religious liberty, for instance), with all its traditional sounding pages alternating with modernist ones, with all its omissions (of the condemnation of Communism, of the definition of Our Lady Mediatrix and Coredemptrix), with all its new notion of the Church, its ecumenism and manifold errors, and in the end with all its consequences. One cannot separate, many of our studies and congresses clearly showed it, the traditional part of the Council from the erroneous one. One cannot separate the very text of the Council from its consequences. One cannot separate a good and bad interpretation of the Council. For so long, we thought we were all agreed about this, and now we are supposed to change entirely that most vital stance of the Archbishop!

A doctrinal agreement needs to be a common and complete rejection of the entire text itself, in one piece, of Vatican II; and that truth and error cannot be disentangled from a Council that draws its dangerousness from its ambiguity. Remember Pascendi!

### -4 A DRAMATIC INCREASE OF GULLIBILITY

The Rosary Crusades are good instruments to measure our gullibleness and the gullibility of our faithful; they give an automatic blessing to what we already plan to do in advance and a perfect warning to the official church that we are coming to buy something from them. But there are limits: Did we seriously believe in 2007, when we came to Rome, bouquet in hand, that Rome was going to give to the entire Church something extremely good (but with necessary imperfections as usual), straight from the hands of Our Lady, instead of a mere repeat of the conditions of the 1984 Motu Proprio, namely : - accept Vatican II

- don't attack the new mass?

Answer: Absolutely yes; and not only that, but with this new distinction between ordinary and extraordinary, the True Mass is put technically in a lower level than the mass of Luther.

Why all this gullibility? Because, this time, it is not like the other time; concrete circumstances have changed and this repackaging of the 1984 Motu Proprio was absolutely sensational. With such a glittery presentation, who cares if it is diamond or plastic?

Exit bachelorette #1; enter the dainty 2009 Rosary Crusade #2:

This time it is the solemn high holy reparation of the injustice done to us, the removal of the excommunication, but! Wait a second, if Rome merely lifts the excommunication, it means it was valid in 1988 and the Archbishop died in his sins. How can Our Lady go for that?

The 2007 and 2009 rosary crusades are a mockery of Our Lady...but surprisingly, the third one doesn't sound bad. But I may be wrong, becoming a flaker myself. And are we going to get goofed again this time? Heaven knows...

Gullibility is such that it looks for occasions to believe. In December 2010 we joined this wonderful Pope in adoration before the Blessed Sacrament for the defense of life, for the defense of the natural order created by God. Bad timing! Benedict XVI made himself famous at the same time by releasing the opinion that the use of condom for a male prostitute involved in sodomy "could be the beginning of a moralizing process". The liberal press immediately got the message; the door is open for the Church authorizing the use of condoms; Fr Ortiz even told me that in the Caribbean, novusordo priests were distributing condoms. After such a lesson, we are still looking for gullibling opportunities!

#### -5 BELIEF IN GRADUAL EVOLUTION

The big argument is that semi Arians didn't convert overnight and sinners take time to overcome their bad habit, and if you treat Benedict harshly he is not going to listen, he is not going to change etc. First, the semi Arians were in no position of strength, they were not the local bishops of the diocese of St Basil and St Gregory; it is basic diplomacy: you rarely obtain anything if you concede something in a position of weakness. And secondly, did St Basil start to believe in the hermeneutic of continuity of the semis as we are doing now? Didn't he correct actively the erroneous concepts of the semis (something Fr Iscara is not proposing us to imitate in St Basil), while postponing the use of difficult expression for a brief time?

The problem is that if you eat supper with the Devil (and our devil is in a position of strength), you need a very long spoon. Bishop Williamson should be the one to be put in charge of the relations with the new Rome... and in charge of communication with the media! (cries of terrified horror in the congregation)

The solution of this crisis is like an exorcism performed on the authorities demolishing today's Church. So many people have joined tradition over the course of years, by us staying above the water, and now we think we are going to catch fishes by dialogue and brave, traditional sword thrusts in the water!?

#### -6 SIGNS OF DOCTRINAL FLAKING

I always thought that the SSPX understood the question of religious liberty; it doesn't seem to be the case if one read the interview of Fr Schmidberger in the angelus and the interview of Bishop Fellay on Catholic News Network (?).

The many lectures publications, symposiums and interviews against Vatican II don't seem to sink in our minds any more. They don't guarantee us from becoming lilylivered against new errors, from becoming implacable placators in our turn, fighting against whistleblowers in our midst, and from becoming popularity seekers before the media.

I remember asking Bishop Fellay in Cebu, before Assisi III, if he could make some big statement and gesture, like the Archbishop did for Assisi I. All I got was an angry NO, on account of our work of dealing with Rome now.

One can understand why Menzinger wants to postpone the General Chapter... there are so many doctrinal questions that need to be assessed and redressed.

I remember praying in 1994, for the election of Bishop Fellay. Next time I will not give any names to God but pray for a General who shall lead us into the battle, vigorously and wisely.

But compromisers can firm up sometimes, so I won't give up just as yet on Bishop Fellay. Pius IX started a liberal and quickly became a rock of truth after his election; Archbishop Lefebvre believed in religious liberty when he was young. We are now completely at the mercy of God, who can punish us if we don't watch what we pray for.

#### -7 GRADUAL & AUTHORITARIAN COERCION OF RESISTANCE TO CHANGE

Just as we are nice to Benedict XVI, good priests and bishops resisting reconciliation are facing growing threats, a perfect repeat of Vatican II: "If you don't agree with the official stance of the Society, leave the society". Well, the duty of a priest of the Society is not necessarily to uphold the position of the society, especially if it has just changed all of a sudden one good morning of May 2012. The duty of a priest of the Society is to protect the Catholic Faith, as long as the official church is overrun by modernism.

Another threat: "Your dialectic between Faith and authority is contrary to the Priesthood" But this exactly what Caiphas told Peter, this is the contrary to that vital quote of Galatians I, 8&9; "If even I or an angel of God..." This is exactly the manner of speech of Pope Paul VI to the Archbishop.

Another threat: "You don't have the grace of state to see the greater picture, you are stepping out of line and spreading confusion" The best way to start confusion in the SSPX is to tamper with its DNA; then of course a cancer is beginning to spread.

#### PLOT COUNTERED

We can still believe, in may 2012, that Our Lady still loves the Society, for as a clear secret plan (deliberate or not, it doesn't matter) and many things were set in place to bring about an official reunion of the official SSPX and the official church; in just a few days, the whole ship got torpedoed.

For it is Britain, and Britain gloriously alone that put an inglorious end to treason, by leaking letters on the internet. Indeed, in this hour, even the frogs will be forever in the debt of these British gentlemen at their finest. In one swift Nelsonian move, all the fawl dispositions of our enemies got exposed and their lies confounded by their own mouths.

The most important thing that these letters do is to break the law of silence. Yes, we knew that something was brewing, and we were slowly talked into it, be we did not expect that it was in such an advanced stage. For our faithful, who for the most were completely unsuspecting, the brutal reality of a split in the Society appeared, thereby compelling them to reach for their rosaries and request the crisis to be averted.

The twin letters of Bishops give such perfect account of the opposite doctrinal positions in the SSPX, that hardly any one of us could give a better summary. Even if the Menzingen letter is written after, the letter of the three remains the answer to it; in such a wise as one could put the facing arguments in two opposite columns.

The Menzingen letter of one bishop sounds as it is written by three and the letter of the three bishops reads as it is written by one. The first part of the Menzingen letter read just like Dom Gerard in 1988, the second part, about depth and breadth seems to be written by somebody else who buys the notion that the hermeneutic of continuity of Benedict XVI is not all that bad, and the last third reads like our internal bulletin and directives that urge us to march triumphantly, we little oysters, into the canonical plate of the Walrus and Carpenter. Its tone is clearly the same tone as Bishop Fellay.

But the resistance of the three proved too strong to overcome, for the moment. Our Lady is indeed a most beautiful queen, and adding to her charm, three little animals came in succession: a cat, a lamb and a dove. Allow me to put it williamsonically for you:

Fighting Bishop	Williamson	Tissier de Mallerais	de Gallareta
Symbol	(big) Cat	Lamb	Dove
Main Weapon	Big mouth	Big speculative intellect	Big practical intellect
Main Target	Bishop Fellay	Benedict XVI	Link betwixt the 2
Angle of attack	Hard and Hot	Cold	Soft
Weakness	Gets Bishop Fellay too angry	Gets Bishop Fellay too indifferent	Gets Bishop Fellay not angry enough
Effect on Bishop Fellay	Would like to expel but can't	Would like to refute but can't	Would like to disagree but can't
Effect on the new rome	Can't even smell the SSPX (Especially French Bishops)	Can't debate successfully with the SSPX	Can't ever bring about a practical deal with the SSPX
<b>RESULT</b>	THE NEW ROME AND THE SSPX REMAIN SEPARATE UNTIL THE PAPACY CONVERTS     <b>VICTORY</b>		

In the end one wonders why Bishop Fellay chose to press on regardless of the opposition of the three bishops, and the degree of im preparation of the new rome itself. In the SSPX, the three bishops carry an enormous weight, despite the fact that they are not in control of the administrative machinery of the SSPX. Many priests remain at first silent on the whole question, some are scared for their future, some resist openly but maybe clumsily (yours truly), and one should not blame them for not having the same grace of Confession as a bishop, but as the faithful sense more clearly the danger with their *sensus fidei*, the shifting lines of battle are gradually pushing back the idea of a false peace with the new rome. What shall happen in this hot summer of 2012 will determine the nature of our war for many years to come.

My dear faithful,  
we are in the thick of the storm,  
much shaken and fearful,  
but with Our Lady, comfortably resting in our hearts,  
until the head of the SSPX adjust itself to reality  
and the visible head of the Church returns to Tradition:  
War is on,  
and when war is upon us,  
war on.

ON WAR

B XVI=N - WOLF=WOLF - RAT=RAT - VAT II IN SSPX - OBEDIENCE VS FAITH - FAITH VS OBEDIENCE – TRUTH ONLY PREVAILS – CHARITYLESS TRUTH=0 – TRUTHLESS CHARITY=0  
– WATCH AND PRAY – KEEP THE FAITH

WAR IS ON