

HERE COMES THE BRIDE

THE MUSIC STARTS AGAIN FOR THE SSPX

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS
OF THE LETTERS OF BISHOP WILLIAMSON, RATZINGER, AND BISHOP FELLAY

BY MOST REVEREND DONALD J. SANBORN

THE DECLARATION OF BISHOP WILLIAMSON

On February 26th, Bishop Williamson issued a Declaration in which he apologized for his remarks concerning the Nazi extermination of Jews during World War II. The letter contains a few interesting points, especially those which are found between the lines.

“Observing these consequences I can truthfully say that I regret having made such remarks, and that if I had known beforehand the full harm and hurt to which they would give rise, especially to the Church, but also to survivors and relatives of victims of injustice under the Third Reich, I would not have made them.”

Here Bishop Williamson apologizes for having said what he said about the extermination of Jews, but does not retract what he said. But this does not make sense. For if he was telling the truth, then why is he apologizing for the truth? How could it hurt the Church or the relatives and survivors of victims of injustice, if he was telling the truth? For he did say that up to 300,000 Jews perished at the hands of the Nazis. How is this insulting to the relatives and

survivors, if indeed only 300,000 were put to death?

It is clear that Bishop Williamson is not convinced that it is the truth, which fact brings us to the next paragraph.

“On Swedish television I gave only the opinion (... “I believe”... “I believe”...) of a non-historian, an opinion formed 20 years ago on the basis of evidence then available and rarely expressed in public since. However, the events of recent weeks and the advice of senior members of the Society of St. Pius X have persuaded me of my responsibility for much distress caused. To all souls that took honest scandal from what I said before God I apologise.”

Bishop Williamson calls his statement about the Jews “an opinion.” To have an opinion is to hold something as probably true, with the fear that the opposite may be true. I believe that he is preparing the way for a retraction. For if you hold something as a mere opinion, it is entirely reasonable to hold the opposing opinion, if there is a notable extrinsic cause. For example, if your religious superior wants you to abandon an opinion, his will would constitute sufficient extrinsic cause to abandon it, and hold to the opposing opinion. It is permissible to do this, since

the intellect is not bound to the truth by clear evidence in such a case. Indeed, the intellect assents to the opinion only conditionally, and with fear, conceding that the opposite *may* be true. Hence there is no disservice to the truth if an opinion is abandoned for a just cause.

Consequently, Bishop Williamson is conceding here that the six million figure *may* be true, and that it *may* be true that the Jews were gassed.

It is quite possible that Bishop Williamson will retract, making all well for the final reunion of the SSPX with the Modernists.

RATZINGER'S LETTER

On March 11th, Ratzinger issued a lengthy letter explaining to the bishops the reasons for his lifting of the excommunication of the four SSPX bishops. He says in the first part of the letter that the lifting of the excommunication concerned only the four individual bishops, as individuals, but did not rehabilitate the Society of Saint Pius X. He further states that the only obstacle to their restoration to Modernist unity is of a doctrinal nature:

“In light of this situation, it is my intention henceforth to join the Pontifical Commission “Ecclesia Dei” – the body which has been competent since 1988 for those communities and persons who, coming from the Society of Saint Pius X or from similar groups, wish to return to full communion with the Pope – to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. This will make it clear that the problems now to be addressed are essentially doctrinal in nature and concern primarily the acceptance of the Second Vatican Council and the post-conciliar magisterium of the Popes.”

From this and other recent statements of Ratzinger and other Modernist officials, it is quite evident that the SSPX must accept the teachings of Vatican II, of John Paul II, and of Ratzinger himself. This

assertion blasts to bits the oft repeated theory of the SSPX, that Vatican II is only a pastoral council that did not intend to teach anything definitively. By means of this theory, they were able to tell themselves and the faithful that Vatican II could simply be ignored.

Ratzinger's statement here and elsewhere, that the question is now essentially doctrinal, and that it concerns primarily the acceptance of the “magisterium” of Vatican II and of the post-conciliar “magisterium,” confirms what sedevacantists have been saying all along: that if Ratzinger is pope, then it is impossible not to assent to the conciliar and post-conciliar teachings. In this, Ratzinger is entirely consistent and on the mark.

At the very least, Ratzinger, if recognized as pope, can require the faithful to give *religious assent* to the teachings of Vatican II. This means that it would be a mortal sin to think, believe, or speak whatever is contrary to these doctrines. If he wanted to, Ratzinger could even raise the level of some of the teachings of Vatican II to solemn magisterium.

“The Church's teaching authority cannot be frozen in the year 1962 – this must be quite clear to the Society. But some of those who put themselves forward as great defenders of the Council also need to be reminded that Vatican II embraces the entire doctrinal history of the Church. Anyone who wishes to be obedient to the Council has to accept the faith professed over the centuries, and cannot sever the roots from which the tree draws its life.”

Here Ratzinger gives another version of evolution of dogma. By this he obviously does not mean that we have to accept *Quanta Cura* on religious liberty, or even the creeds of the Church concerning the unity of the Church or the fact that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church. For him, dogmas evolve

with time, and each dogma is true in its own time, and given the circumstances in which it was promulgated. "Accepting the faith professed over the centuries" does not mean for him assent given to pre-Vatican II dogmas, but merely the acceptance of these dogmas *in their historical context*. So he is lecturing the SSPX and the Modernist bishops at the same time. Both have to give up something. The SSPX needs to give up its stone-age attachment to dogmas, as if made of granite, and the Modernist hierarchy must accept the traditional dogmas as historical dogmas, a part of the Church's history, or *anchorage*, as Ratzinger once put it. His analogy means that just as a cruise ship goes from island to island in the Caribbean, lowers its anchor, and spews forth tourists in straw hats who gobble up souvenirs (probably made in China), so the Church stops in various harbors (dogmas) where it rests for a while, only to move on to another island (dogma) as circumstances warrant. So unity is assured inasmuch as there is one ship and one cruise, but the dogmas change from time to time, just like ports of call and the souvenirs.

All this is just a crock of nonsense to hide what is in fact evolution of dogma, a heresy condemned by Saint Pius X, and against which Ratzinger swore in the anti-modernistic oath when he was ordained a subdeacon in the 1950's.

Indeed, to "accept the faith professed over the centuries" is the same thing as to reject Vatican II.

"In our days, when in vast areas of the world the faith is in danger of dying out like a flame which no longer has fuel, the overriding priority is to make God present in this world and to show men and women the way to God."

This comment confirms what I said in *Logical Chickens*: that Ratzinger is concerned that the Vatican II religion is going to be snuffed out. It is as if he read my article, for I had said that Vatican II is

something which is "out of gas." Ratzinger therefore sees the need to reach out to the traditional groups in order to put some life into Vatican II, which is on a respirator. Proud Modernist that he is, he is blind to the fact that it is the very heresies of Vatican II that killed off the lively faith of the centuries.

Not just any god, but the God who spoke on Sinai; to that God whose face we recognize in a love which presses "to the end" (cf. Jn 13:1) – in Jesus Christ, crucified and risen. The real problem at this moment of our history is that God is disappearing from the human horizon, and, with the dimming of the light which comes from God, humanity is losing its bearings, with increasingly evident destructive effects."

The God who spoke on Sinai? Let us go to Sinai and hear this God. "And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying: Go, get thee down: thy people, which thou hast brought out of the land of Egypt, hath sinned. They have quickly strayed from the way which thou didst shew them: and they have made to themselves a molten calf, and have adored it, and sacrificing victims to it, have said: These are thy gods, O Israel, that have brought thee out of the land of Egypt. And again the Lord said to Moses: See that this people is stiffnecked: Let me alone, that my wrath may be kindled against them, and that I may destroy them, and I will make of thee a great nation."

Now I ask: Is this ecumenical? If the ecumenism taught by Vatican II is the true faith, then why does the God of Sinai want to destroy these people, for the mere fact of having worshipped a false god? Why is not the golden calf religion a "means of salvation?"

What did Moses do? "And when he came nigh to the camp, he saw the calf, and the dances: and being very angry, he threw the tables out of his hand, and broke them at the foot of the mount: And laying hold of the calf which they had

made, he burnt it, and beat it to powder, which he strowed into water, and gave thereof to the children of Israel to drink.” (Exodus 32: 19-20) Again, not very ecumenical, to say nothing of the effect on the environment.

What else does the God of Sinai say? Listen: “Thus saith the Lord God of Israel: Put every man his sword upon his thigh: go, and return from gate to gate through the midst of the camp, and let every man kill his brother, and friend, and neighbour. And the sons of Levi did according to the words of Moses, and there were slain that day about three and twenty thousand men. And Moses said: You have consecrated your hands this day to the Lord, every man in his son and in his brother, that a blessing may be given to you.” So the God of Sinai imposes the death sentence upon the worshippers of the golden calf, and as a result 23,000 are slain. God praises those who used their sword in such a task, saying that they have “consecrated their hands” by the slaying of those whose sin was that they professed a false religion. Is this ecumenism? Is this in the spirit of Vatican II?

Ratzinger or John Paul II would have posed in front of the golden calf together with some of the dancers for a photograph.

“Leading men and women to God, to the God who speaks in the Bible: this is the supreme and fundamental priority of the Church and of the Successor of Peter at the present time.”

To the God who speaks in the Bible? But the God who speaks in the Bible rejects Vatican II, as we have seen: In John III: 36 this God says: *“He that believeth in the Son hath life everlasting; but he that believeth not in the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth in him.”* Obviously the God who speaks in the Bible is not very ecumenical towards Jews and Moslems.

“A logical consequence of this is that we must have at heart the unity of all

believers. Their disunity, their disagreement among themselves, calls into question the credibility of their talk of God. Hence the effort to promote a common witness by Christians to their faith – ecumenism – is part of the supreme priority.”

Now we see the true motive of Ratzinger’s olive branch to the SSPX. It is all in the name of ecumenism. As I said in *Logical Chickens*, if Ratzinger cannot reconcile to his One World Church even the Lefebvrists, then what hope is there of accomplishing ecumenical reunion with other “ecclesial communities” (i.e., Protestants)? Ratzinger is telling the bishops that they need to get on the ecumenical bandwagon in this attempt to draw in the SSPX. In other words, they can no longer be “stalwarts” in the enforcement of Vatican II, but must bend somewhat.

“Added to this is the need for all those who believe in God to join in seeking peace, to attempt to draw closer to one another, and to journey together, even with their differing images of God, towards the source of Light – this is interreligious dialogue.” This is more ecumenical drivel. Their differing images of God? Does this include Baal and Moloch in the Old Testament? For Ratzinger’s phrase does not in any way exclude idolatry. Indeed, what is an idol, except a graven image of a false god? What is the difference if this false god remains only in our imagination, or is fleshed out in some idol? It is still a false god. The God of the Bible says, in contrast to Ratzinger: *“And they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed beasts, and of creeping things.”* (Romans I: 23-25) And Ratzinger would have us “journey together” with them, towards the “source of Light?” How can we journey together toward the source of light with people who have no eyes? In other words, unless we first convert them

to the Catholic Faith, which is the light, the Light of Christ, how can we possibly journey together with them toward the light? If we are in possession of the light, what need is there to journey with blind people toward the light? Does this make any sense to anyone except Ratzinger?

“I myself saw, in the years after 1988, how the return of communities which had been separated from Rome changed their interior attitudes; I saw how returning to the bigger and broader Church enabled them to move beyond one-sided positions and broke down rigidity so that positive energies could emerge for the whole.” Very interesting! This means that the various groups which have already caved in to Vatican II, such as the clergy of Campos, the Fraternity of Saint Peter, and others, have lost their opposition to Modernism, at least in the eyes of Ratzinger. “Rigidity,” by the way, was the classic 1960’s term among Modernists for anyone who was opposed to Vatican II. All of us who were in the Modernist seminaries in the 1960’s will testify to that. We were all “rigid.” What Ratzinger is saying is: “Give it time. If I can manage to draw in the SSPX to the Frankenchurch — ‘the bigger and broader Church’ — they will eventually soften and become good Modernists.”

THE COMMUNIQUÉ OF BISHOP FELLAY

The very next day after Ratzinger’s letter, Bishop Fellay issued a public response. Below are a few excerpts.

“After ‘an avalanche of protests was unleashed’ recently, we greatly thank the Holy Father for having placed the debate at the level on which it should take place, that of the faith.”

The significant statement here, one that goes beyond, perhaps, even the intention of Bishop Fellay, is that the discussion should take place on the level of the *faith*. Logically, this indicates that the debate between the Vatican Modernists and the SSPX will be *on*

matters of faith. By these words, he excludes mere theological opinions or interpretations. He even excludes theological conclusions. He has raised the stakes of these historic discussions to the level of matters of faith. I say: “Bravo, Bishop Fellay.” For this is what we sedevacantists have been saying for years, namely that Vatican II has contradicted matters of faith, and not mere opinions or even theological conclusions. In other words, Vatican II is intolerable to the Catholic Faith. The virtue of faith in us cannot assent at the same time to the truths of the Catholic Faith and to what Vatican II teaches. In short, the Catholic Church cannot live with Vatican II. This council must go, and the Faith must prevail over it. If indeed Vatican II has contradicted the Faith, then it is nothing less than the gates of hell trying to prevail over the Church. If indeed Vatican II has contradicted the Faith, then it is proof positive that Paul VI was not a true Roman Pontiff, and that everything which has poured out of Vatican II ever since is tainted with the spirit of heresy.

I repeat that this is the *logic* of Bishop Fellay’s comment. I do not think that Bishop Fellay thought about all of this logic when he made his statement. Furthermore, Bishop Fellay has proven himself to be an incessant flip-flopper, now making hard-line statements, now soft-line statements, just as Archbishop Lefebvre did.

So Bishop Fellay is setting himself up for a real showdown with the Modernists. What Ratzinger will try to do is to *historicize* all the previous statements of popes which contradict Vatican II, that is, he will say that they are all true in their historical context. But the other side of this coin is that Vatican II is also true in its historical context. Ratzinger will want to seek a “clarification” of Vatican II in a document loaded with unintelligible theological gobbledygook, which will say contradictory things encased in so much

vague verbiage that each side will be able to understand it in his own way. This is precisely what Vatican II did. It worked beautifully.

But the SSPX cannot do this. If Bishop Fellay is saying what he means, and means what he says, this will be the Society's supreme moment in which to profess the Catholic Faith in front of its deniers. They will be in exactly the same relationship as the many martyrs of the early ages were to Roman magistrates summoned them for questioning about the Faith. It will not be a time for diplomacy and double-talk. It will be the solemn occasion, under pain of mortal sin, to profess the Catholic Faith without the slightest compromise.

Will they profess the Faith? I think not. The tone of all of these proceedings has been one of compromise, softness, diplomacy, soft soap, smiles, oil, handshakes, and accommodation. Only recently we saw Bishop Fellay make the decision to move the Zaitzkofen subdiaconate ordinations to Ecône, in an effort to appease the "Holy See." Apparently the German bishops are in revolt against the reconciliation of the SSPX with the Modernists. This conciliatory act on the part of Bishop Fellay indicates that he is willing to let the Modernists put chains on Catholic doctrine and discipline (to the extent that the SSPX possesses these things), and to exile Catholicism to Switzerland.

"Far from wanting to stop Tradition in 1962, we wish to consider the Second Vatican Council and the post-Conciliar magisterium in the light of this Tradition which Saint Vincent of Lérins defined as that 'which has been believed everywhere, always, by all' (Commonitorium), without rupture and in a perfectly homogenous development."

Light is the means by which we see the object which is in front of us. Indeed, if there is no light, we cannot see the object at all, even if we should hold it

directly before our eyes. So there is an intellectual light by which our mind sees intellectual objects. There are two intellectual lights: the light of natural reason, and the light of supernatural faith. By the light of natural reason, our minds reject contradictory statements. So if I say that an animal in the field is both a cow and not a cow, at one and the same time, the mind immediately and necessarily dissents, because such a statement contradicts the light of natural reason, what we call the first principles of reason. Without this light, all knowledge would be meaningless. In fact, we could know nothing, because the lights would be out.

The supernatural light of faith is an elevation of the intellect whereby it can see supernatural objects, based on the authority of God revealing. The faith therefore rejects everything which is contrary to divine revelation, since such an object is unintelligible in this supernatural light.

Bishop Fellay here speaks of shedding the light of Tradition, which is revelation, the Catholic Faith, on the documents of Vatican II. How will Vatican II look in the light of Tradition? Very bad. When we shine the flashlight of Tradition on the documents of Vatican II, we will see a dark alley full of garbage cans, rats, and cockroaches. Tradition, in other words, can only *reject* Vatican II, because it is contradiction. If it is not contradiction, then what are we fighting about? Why do we need a traditional movement?

Does Bishop Fellay hope to put a band-aid on these documents in the form of some benign interpretation? First let us define interpretation: it is not *spin*. It is not to place upon the words of Vatican II a meaning which was not intended by the Fathers of Vatican II. It is, instead, to *discover* the meaning which was in the minds of the framers of these documents. Similarly, when we interpret Sacred Scripture, we are striving to *discover* the meaning of the sacred writer, but never to

twist his meaning into something that fits our fancy.

So does Bishop Fellay really think that we are going to discover that *Dignitatis Humanae*, the decree on religious liberty, meant to say exactly what Gregory XVI and Pius IX said, namely that religious liberty is an insanity? Is Ratzinger really going to say that this document in fact means that religious liberty is an insanity?

Does Bishop Fellay really think that Ratzinger is going to say that the decree on ecumenism really means that the Roman Catholic Church is the one, true Church, outside of which there is no salvation, and that all non-Catholic religions are false sects, and that ecumenism really means that all who are in these false sects must abjure their errors before God, and become Roman Catholics in order to be saved? Does it really mean that non-Catholic sects are *not*, in fact, means of salvation, contrary to what the document *explicitly* states?

I could continue with this questioning *ad infinitum*. For there is not only Vatican II to talk about, but all of the post-Vatican II “magisterium,” which is loaded with heresy and error. Are we going to say that all of this is in fact orthodoxy, but merely ambiguously stated?

I hope and pray that the SSPX officials who conduct these discussions, which Bishop Fellay has rightly named “debates,” will see their grave duty to profess the Catholic Faith against Ratzinger’s heresies. I hope and pray, furthermore, that the outcome of these debates will be the enlightenment of the SSPX management, as well as of the rank and file, that they see that Vatican II is in fact an unambiguous breach of the traditional doctrine.

Whatever the outcome of the debates, however, the moment of truth has arrived for the SSPX. Either they will become another Campos, or they will definitively break from Vatican II and Modernism.

“The Priestly Fraternity of Saint Pius X assures Benedict XVI of its will to address the doctrinal discussions considered ‘necessary’ by the Decree of January 21, with the desire of serving the revealed Truth which is the first charity to be shown towards all men, Christian or not. It assures him of its prayers so that his faith may not fail and that he may confirm all his brethren (cf. Luke 22: 32).”

And we pray that Bishop Fellay’s faith may not fail, and that he may confirm all of his brethren.

THE BLOG OF BISHOP WILLIAMSON

On March 21st, Bishop Williamson made a post on his blog in which he said, among other things, the following:

“Therefore the future is in God’s hands. I wish I could say that I object to being reduced to silence, but if the alternative is being reduced to saying only those things that the ‘gentlemen of the Press’ do not object to, then I think I prefer the silence. As far back as 1985, the year of publication for ‘Iota Unum’, Romano Amerio’s famous analysis of Vatican II changes, the Italian Professor was anticipating that a time might come when there would be only silence left... Kyrie eleison.”

These words are absolutely tragic in every sense. If there was ever a time *not* to be silent, it is now. If there was ever a time in which we ought to become hoarse in professing the Faith as loudly as possible, to shout down the heretic and confound him, it is now. But it appears that Bishop Williamson has lost all common sense in this affair, for he has holed himself up in a priory in London because he insists on maintaining what he himself calls a mere *opinion* about a historical event. The ascertainment of fact about this historical event is far beyond his expertise. Furthermore, whatever the truth is concerning it, the importance of it pales in comparison to the importance of

professing the Catholic Faith in these times.

Bishop Williamson was in the perfect position to respond to Ratzinger with a broadside. Ratzinger demanded in February that he “recant” — as if it were a heresy — his position concerning the six million, under pain of never being able to function as a Modernist bishop. Bishop Williamson was at that point the main character on the world stage, and the entire planet was bending its ear to listen for what he would say back to Ratzinger.

It was the perfect opportunity for him to respond to Ratzinger by means of a forceful declaration that it was Ratzinger who needed to recant many heresies, indeed his whole life of heresy and destruction of the Catholic Faith. Instead, Bishop Williamson merely said that he would read some books about World War II to find out what really happened concerning the Jews.

So as the Society of Saint Pius X is dancing before the golden calf of Vatican II, Bishop Williamson, who is the only one who has the courage, intelligence, and eloquence to “savage” Vatican II — to use his own well-chosen expression — has decided that his condemnation to silence in London is in fact a good thing. There he remains a martyr to his opinion about a historical fact which does not concern the Catholic Faith, but only historians, missing the whole point and reason for his ordination as a priest and his consecration as a bishop.

CONCLUSION

I fear that the music — *Here Comes the Bride* — has again started for the SSPX, and that the procession toward Ratzinger, Vatican II and Modernism has resumed. I fear that they will fail to profess the Faith, that they will put their signatures upon a document of Modernist mush which supposedly reconciles Vatican II and Tradition.

And in the meantime, I fear that Bishop Williamson will remain silent, busy reading books about Jews.