



MOST HOLY TRINITY SEMINARY NEWSLETTER

OCTOBER 2007

20120 BARNETT ROAD, BROOKSVILLE, FLORIDA 34601

My dear Catholic people,

There was a picture which circulated recently on the Internet of Bishop Fellay, “Cardinal” Castrillón-Hoyos, and Ratzinger, in a meeting in Ratzinger’s office on August 29th, 2005.

The picture is disquieting, since Bishop Fellay and Castrillón-Hoyos are smiling broadly as Ratzinger speaks to them.

It should be recalled that only a few weeks earlier at Castel Gandolfo Ratzinger, having been recently elected “pope,” had a similar meeting with Hans Küng. Küng denies the infallibility of the pope, as it is defined by the 1870 Vatican Council, denies the divinity of Christ, and calls Our Lady’s Assumption “an assumption.” He is a brazen and public heretic. This did not stop him from having dinner and a beer with his old friend, Joseph Ratzinger, who together with Karl Rahner formed the nucleus of radical theologians which dictated the theology of Vatican II.

Ratzinger is now in the driver’s seat in the Vatican, promoting Vatican II — his brainchild — despite the appalling statistics regarding the general disintegration of the Church since Vatican II. Opposite him is Bishop Fellay, smiling from ear to ear.

Bishop Fellay is the successor of Archbishop Lefebvre. The latter was one of the leaders of the anti-Modernist movement among the bishops at the Council. He was therefore, logically, opposed to suit-and-tie Ratzinger, the person who was the embodiment of everything which Archbishop Lefebvre *detested* in that Council. He was likewise opposed to suit-and-tie Küng and to suit-and-tie Rahner, theological and personal “buddies” of suit-and-tie Ratzinger.

Archbishop Lefebvre was so opposed to the work of this unholy trio at the Council, that he made the momentous decision to dedicate his whole life and reputation to the destruction of the theology of Ratzinger and his “buddies.”

Between the now white-cassock Ratzinger and Bishop Fellay lies “Cardinal” Castrillón-

Hoyos, who has made his life’s work the reconciliation of traditionalists to the Modernists inhabiting the Vatican. To him is entrusted *Ecclesia Dei*, the commission which oversees the incorporation of disaffected traditionalists into the Modernist structures. Not long ago, another one of these institutes, which reconciles traditionalists, was founded in France with Modernist approval, gathering members of the Society of Saint Pius X desirous of being legal in the eyes of once suit-and-tie — now white-cassock — Ratzinger. Ironically, one of the co-founders was, at least during my time at Écône, among the most avid and convinced sedevacantists.

The picture is disquieting, since after nearly forty years of preserving tradition (mostly) and of taking a rather anti-Modernist stand, it seems that the Society of Saint Pius X has understood nothing about Vatican II and Ratzinger. It is Bishop Fellay who should be talking, not Ratzinger. Bishop Fellay should look angry, Castrillón-Hoyos unhappy, and Ratzinger indignant, as Bishop Fellay blasts him with righteous accusation about the destruction that he has wrought upon the Catholic Church.

Archbishop Lefebvre always said to us in conferences during the early 1970’s that the Second Vatican Council is responsible for the problems in the Church. Indeed he was right. He even wrote a book entitled, *I accuse the Council*. The title could just as easily have been, *I accuse Ratzinger*, since suit-and-tie Ratzinger’s heretical theology was at the heart of that awful Council.

There are other indications that the spirit of the 29th of August, 2005, may be getting warmer. Bishop Dolan was recently approached by a priest who asked him to conditionally re-ordain a priest who had converted from the Novus Ordo. As the story goes, this Novus Ordo priest, who is *una cum*, i.e., who recognizes Ratzinger as a true pope, had approached Bishop Williamson with the request for re-ordination. The response came back, I am told, that he could not do such a

thing, since it was no longer the policy of the Society to re-ordain those ordained in the Novus Ordo.¹ If this story is true, and I have every reason to believe that it is, it appears to be a sign that the Society of St. Pius X is “cleaning itself up” for a fusion with the Vatican Modernists.

Another disquieting development in that regard is the recent announcement that the Society of Saint Pius X is establishing a commission to examine the documents of Vatican II. After thirty-seven years? The Society of Saint Pius X was established in 1970. In 2007, after thirty-seven years of battle with the Novus Ordo, they are now going to examine the contents of Vatican II?

The establishment of this commission reeks of a *rethinking* of Vatican II. Archbishop Lefebvre was always very clear about the errors of Vatican II: that religious liberty was a blasphemy against Christ the King, that collegiality was effectively a denial of papal authority, that ecumenism was contrary to the teaching that the Catholic Church is the one, true Church of Christ. What more needs to be said?

What is to be feared is that Vatican II will be whitewashed and rehabilitated, clearing the way absolutely for the marriage between the Society of Saint Pius X and the Modernists. For the Mass, since the *Motu proprio*, is no longer a problem. It is Vatican II which must be dealt with.

Shall we look forward, then, to the suit-and-tie Ratzinger, now in white cassock, grasping Küng with his left hand, and Archbishop Lefebvre with his right (in the person of Bishop Fellay), all smiling and happy? Will that be the final outcome of the undertaking of Archbishop Lefebvre in 1970?

There is really nothing to stop such a scenario. For as long as the Society of Saint Pius X regards the suit-and-tie Ratzinger as pope, he will have an irresistible gravitational pull on that Society. The result may be, after nearly forty years of resistance, that Vatican II will triumph in the minds and hearts of so many people who followed Archbishop Lefebvre for the very reason that he was resisting Vatican II.

Permit me to turn to a completely different subject. On October 7th, the feast of the Most Holy Rosary, “Archbishop” Niederauer of San

Francisco celebrated “Mass” in the church in the Castro district of that city. It is the homosexual center of San Francisco. In the congregation were two figures dressed very obviously in nun’s outfits, who were members of the “Sisters of the Perpetual Indulgence.” These are men dressed like women, and what is worse, dressed like traditional nuns, but with make-up, lipstick and jewelry. The activities of this “order” of “nuns” is so wicked that it would not be proper to describe them on these pages. Not only do they engage in unnatural acts in public, but they also mock Our Lord in a most blasphemous way through these acts. Archbishop Niederauer can be seen giving them “holy communion.”²

When certain watchdog groups expressed their outrage that members of the “order” should be receiving “holy communion,” Niederauer responded that he did not see anything wrong at the “Mass.” “The congregation was devout,” said Niederauer, “and the liturgy was celebrated with reverence. Toward the end of the Communion line two strangely dressed persons came to receive Communion. I did not see any mock religious garb. As I recall, one of them wore a large flowered hat or garland.”

This is the same “bishop,” appointed by Ratzinger, who was hailed by the sodomite community when he came to San Francisco, the same bishop who called the pro-sodomite and filthy film *Brokeback Mountain* “very powerful.” It was a movie about sodomitic cowboys.

This vice has always existed, but the extolling of this vice and the blindness to its evil has been historically a sure sign of decadence and decay of any society. That those who purport to represent the Roman Catholic Church should condone such things even by their silence is unspeakable. Yet the eyes of so many traditionalists are turned toward Ratzinger as the savior of the Church, including many in the Society of Saint Pius X.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Most Rev. Donald J. Sanborn
Rector

¹ It should be noted that it was never the policy of the SSPX to re-ordain *in all cases*. It was for this reason that we were dismissed from the SSPX in 1983, since they would not adopt a universal policy or re-ordaining, but would do so only in certain cases. We contended (1) that this partial policy made no sense; (2) that it exposed the faithful to the danger of invalid sacraments.

² If anyone wishes to see this for himself, he should go to the following site:
<http://www.lifesite.net/ldn/2007/oct/07101004.html>