



Most Holy Trinity Seminary

NEWSLETTER

MAY 2009

Published by Most Holy Trinity Seminary, 1000 Spring Lake Highway, Brooksville, Florida 34602. This newsletter is sent free of charge to all Seminary benefactors who contribute \$75.00 or more annually. If you would like to be on our mailing list, please contact us by mail, or at piuspapax@gmail.com.

My dear Catholic people,

On July 1st, I will ordain to the priesthood Rev. Mr. Julian Larrabee. The ceremony will take place at our church in Fraser, Michigan. Along with him, I will promote two to tonsure, Mr. Vili Lehtoranta from Finland, and Mr. Joseph Minges from California, and give minor orders to Mr. Germán Fliess from Argentina. In such a way we will complete our fourteenth academic year.

The activities of the Society of Saint Pius X with regard to their possible reconciliation with Modernism have become secret. They are conducting secret and written exchanges concerning doctrine with the Vatican Modernists. What the outcome of these conversations will be is anyone's guess. Their leaders have within them the principles to go either way: to profess the Faith and resist a reconciliation, or to water down the Faith and cave into a doctrinal compromise. Many of their people are hoping ardently for the former course, to return only to the same inconsistent status quo which has perpetually generated such attempts at reconciliation. But I do think that *something* will happen relatively soon, perhaps before the year is out. Benedict turned 82 in April, and the clock is ticking both for him and for the Society of Saint Pius X.

If anyone is entertaining illusions about Ratzinger, a recent incident should illustrate what is in fact the reality. We all recall that when Bishop Williamson greatly reduced the number of Jews who died at the hands of the Nazis,

Ratzinger told him *immediately* and *in no uncertain terms* that he could not be a member of the "Catholic" hierarchy until he *recanted*. The reason for this swift and uncompromising reaction is that to reduce this number of victims implicitly accuses the Jews of having falsified the number in order to obtain some advantage. But such an affront to Jews is considered a heresy in the ecumenical Novus Ordo religion. The six million figure for Ratzinger is a dogma about which there can be no dialogue at all. Even Bishop Williamson's abject apology for having expressed his opinion publicly was insufficient; only a recantation of the reduced number will be accepted, together with a profession of the six million number.

On April 22nd, however, the chairman of the German bishops' conference, "Archbishop" Robert Zollitsch, denied that Christ died for our sins. He made this explicit denial of Catholic dogma on German television, while being interviewed. When asked if Christ died as a "sacrifice" for the "sins of the people," he responded "no." He said that Christ's death was an act of "tremendous solidarity" with the poor and suffering. When he was again asked if Christ "died for our sins," the answer was "no." Last year this same "archbishop" called for an end to priestly celibacy, and said that he was not opposed to the marriage of homosexuals.

Were there any thunderous fulminations from the Modernist Vatican? Any demands for recantation? None whatsoever.

It is clear to anyone who has studied the catechism that the “archbishop’s” statements are overtly heretical, denying what is contained in the Creeds of the Catholic Church. We are dealing here not with theological subtleties, or even with dogmas which may be less known to the average person. We are dealing with the basics of Catholic teaching. His statements are the ruination of the entire Catholic religion.

Yet he can remain a member of the “Catholic” hierarchy.

Despite these and so many other signs that Ratzinger is nothing but a poorly disguised heretic, the masses of conservatives and traditionalists flock to him as if he were a new St. Pius V. What has he done to merit this title? He has permitted the 1962 (and therefore tainted) Missal to be said under certain conditions. He has done absolutely nothing to curtail the balloons and dancing girls, or the blatant denial of Catholic dogma among members of the “hierarchy.” He has promoted ecumenism with all the vigor of his predecessor John Paul II. He is in every way the radical revolutionary except in his dress and his taste for the traditional liturgy. For him, the traditional liturgy is not something required by Catholic doctrine, but merely a question sentimentality and ritual.

Recently my room was visited by ants, a phenomenon quite common in Florida, which has a good deal of bugs. Nearly all the buildings in Florida sit on a slab, which also invites the six-legged creatures to visit from time to time. So I purchased one of those ant traps which attracts the ants to poison disguised as food, which they busily gather and joyfully present to the queen, who eats it and promptly dies. As expected, the ants swarmed all over this “delight.” As the hours passed, their numbers became fewer and fewer, until finally there was none. As I gazed upon this event, I could not help but think about how the Catholicism-starved and war-weary traditionalists are swarming around Ratzinger who has clothed himself in tradition, only to receive from him a package of poison for their faith which may still be enthroned in their souls.

Did anyone notice Obama’s comments about abortion in his 100 days news conference? This is what he said: “The reason I’m pro-choice is because I don’t think women take that — that position casually. I think that they struggle with these decisions each and every day. And I think they are in a better position to make these

decisions ultimately than members of Congress or a president of the United States, in consultation with their families, with their doctors, with their clergy.”

The implicit general principle from which he is deducing his argument is this: *If you struggle with a decision, and not take it casually, you may opt to do whatever you please.* This is a completely asinine principle. For example, can we say that because Hitler or Heinrich Himmler “struggled” with the decision to gas Jews in concentration camps, they had a right to choose to gas these people? If the bank robber “struggles” with his decision to rob a bank, does he then have the right to choose to rob the bank? And if women do not “struggle,” do they lose their right to choose? For how many seconds or minutes does one have to struggle? What are the signs of struggle?

Obama’s principle could justify any immorality or injustice that man could think of. Similarly asinine is his comment about the impropriety of the government to make these decisions. The most fundamental role of government is to protect innocent life. Consequently government must outlaw murder and punish it severely. So if it is not the place of government to make decisions about abortion, then why should it make decisions about anything which human beings do? Why cannot people go to their families, doctors, and clergy and then do whatever comes to their minds? Why do we need a criminal code? Or even police?

Any normal and thinking person can see that Obama is using these specious — really stupid — arguments in order to establish the principle that the murdering of babies is perfectly acceptable. He is and remains an abortion fanatic, and despite this, he is invited to the foremost “Catholic” university in the country to give the graduation speech.

Would he have been invited and applauded if he had made the same comments about gassing Jews?

At this hellhole of heresy in Indiana, Obama said this: “Maybe we won’t agree on abortion, but we can still agree that this is a heart-wrenching decision for any woman to make, with both moral and spiritual dimensions.” Let us go back to 1942, and substitute a few words: “Maybe we won’t agree on the gassing of Jews, but we can still agree that this is a heart-wrenching decision for any Nazi to make, with both moral and spiritual dimensions.” Too strong a comparison? Perhaps,

because the mass infanticide of abortion is far worse than the Nazi extermination of Jews.

Obama concluded his abortion comments with these slithery words: "Open hearts. Open minds. Fair-minded words." Shall we remind him that we are here talking about murder?

The bulk of the student body loudly applauded the buttery and mind-numbing logic of the abortion fanatic. A few protested.

Then there was an article recently about how nearly all of the opposition to sodomitic "marriages" has fizzled out in Massachusetts. The reader should be reminded of the fact that this state is about 50% "Catholic."

The reason for the weakening and ultimate disappearance of resistance is that the opposition has no solid ground on which to stand. The modern culture, formed by "Enlightenment" principles, holds to absolute freedom of conscience, and the banning of religion in the legislative processes of the nation. In a word, you can do whatever you please, as long as you do not hurt someone else. Babies who cannot scream when they are being murdered do not fall into the category of "someone else."

The Statue of Liberty stands in New York Harbor, being the enthronement of the principle of freedom of conscience and freedom of religion. Her official title is "Liberty Enlightening the World," and is the work of Freemasons from head to toe. The money for her base was raised by the Jewish newspaper editor by the name of Pulizter.

On Holy Saturday, however, the Catholic Church solemnly announces, as the deacon processes down the aisle with the blessed fire, that *Christ* is the light of the world. It is *Christ* that illumines the world, and not some masonic liberalism-goddess in New York. But it is this masonic liberalism-goddess which has poisoned the minds of the entire once Christian world with the darkness of these evil freedoms.

The result is that the pro-liberal and "pro-choice" forces are armed with all the logic. The anti-liberals and anti-immorality forces are armed

with mere sentimentality and holdover attitudes from the once Christian world. All they can say is, essentially, "Well, we never did this before," or "They never approved of these things when I was growing up." But in the system of if-it-feels-good-do-it liberalism, which is ensconced in bronze in New York Harbor and in the minds of nearly all the citizens, what is there to say against a same-sex marriage?

My point is that we cannot rely on merely human common sense to preserve the world from sinking into the slime and muck of perversion, but only on the light of Christ. Human common sense fails because the effects of original sin gnaw away at it like voracious rats. Human beings, left to their own lights, eventually sink. They are in desperate need of the light of Christ the Redeemer. The first and most fundamental redemption of man is the redemption of his mind by the light of the Catholic Faith.

Lumen Christi! Deo gratias.

Sincerely yours in Christ,



Most Rev. Donald J. Sanborn
Rector