

**Qui et pourquoi, depuis la mort de Mgr Lefebvre en 1991, a assigné ce faux objectif prioritaire de la «réconciliation» avec la Rome conciliaire (en fait la «ré-conciliarisation» de la FSSPX) ?**

*Qui a INVENTE, et pourquoi, le faux préalable de l'autorisation de la messe de Saint Pie V ?*

**Pourquoi n'a-t-on pas posé le vrai préalable du rétablissement du vrai Sacerdoce de vrais prêtres ordonnés par des évêques validement sacrés selon le rite valide des Saints Ordres ?**

*Qui a INVENTE, et pourquoi, le faux préalable de la levée des «excommunications» ?*

**Pourquoi n'a-t-on pas posé le vrai préalable de l'abrogation de *Pontificalis Romani* invalide de 1968 et le rétablissement de la consécration épiscopale valide d'avant 1968?**

*A quoi servirait-il de faire dire le vrai rite de la messe par de faux prêtres ?*

**Serait-ce donc qu'après avoir obligé de vrais prêtres à dire une fausse messe, l'on veuille désormais faire dire la messe du vrai rite par de faux prêtres ?**

*Serait-ce que l'on veuille «concilier» les vrais prêtres qui disent encore la vraie messe avec un clergé aussi invalide que le faux clergé anglican ?*

*Gaude, Maria Virgo, cunctas hæreses sola interemisti.  
(Tractus Missæ Salve Sancta Parens)*

dimanche 30 avril 2006

Ce message peut être téléchargé au format PDF sur notre site <http://www.virgo-maria.org/>.

## **Mgr Tissier rejette toute «réconciliation» avec Ratzinger qu'il accuse de professer des «hérésies pires que celles de Luther»**

**Mgr Tissier préconise la suppression pure et simple, «*tabula rasa*», de «*Vatican II qui ne peut être lu comme une œuvre catholique*», et désavoue toute référence au discours du 22 décembre 2005 de Ratzinger**

**Un évêque sacré par Mgr Lefebvre, son secrétaire particulier, son fils spirituel et aussi son biographe, parle. Son intervention est de nature à réduire en miettes 7 ans de «*processus de réconciliation*» avec la Rome antichrist**



Mgr Williamson dans son bulletin d'avril<sup>1</sup> dénonçait les «*ennemis conciliaires*» et mettait déjà en garde la Direction de la FSSPX contre toute «*conciliation*» avec Rome. Il prenait l'image de l'Irlande et comparait Mgr Fellay à Michael Collins qui avait été instrumentalisé par Londres afin de déclencher

<sup>1</sup> Message de Virgo Maria du 13 avril 2006 : [http://www.virgo-maria.org/articles\\_HTML/2006/004\\_2006/VM-2006-04-13/VM-Mgr\\_Williamson\\_Unite\\_contre\\_ennemis\\_conciliaires.htm](http://www.virgo-maria.org/articles_HTML/2006/004_2006/VM-2006-04-13/VM-Mgr_Williamson_Unite_contre_ennemis_conciliaires.htm)

la guerre civile irlandaise, en jouant sur sa faiblesse personnelle. De façon analogue, le «*processus de réconciliation*» engagé par Mgr Fellay au nom de la FSSPX menace celle-ci d'une guerre civile interne.

En déplacement aux Etats-Unis pour les confirmations, Mgr Tissier de Mallerai a accordé le 30 avril 2006 à Stephen L.M. Heiner, un jeune webmestre américain, une interview qui est publiée et diffusée par *The Remnant*, un journal de laïcs américains, dont nous avons déjà publié la traduction française d'un document<sup>2</sup>. Dans ce document publié le 25 février, le rédacteur en chef de *The Remnant* et son collègue de *Catholic Family News*, Michael J.Matt et John Vennari, se livraient à un véritable réquisitoire contre les abbés Ratzinger et Hoyos, et dissuadaient Mgr Fellay et la FSSPX de tout accord avec eux.

Voici quelques éléments essentiels de cette intervention de Mgr Tissier de Mallerai. Son interview a été réalisée par le même jeune webmestre que Mgr Fellay avait corrigé au téléphone en février<sup>3</sup>. Il va sans dire que les propos interminables et filandreux de Mgr Fellay en février font pâle figure en face du texte court, mais vigoureux et digne d'un véritable pasteur, que livre ici Mgr Tissier de Mallerai. On ne compare pas des propos de politiciens, fussent-ils ecclésiastiques, avec les propos des confesseurs de la Foi. En ce dimanche du Bon Pasteur, les brebis sauront faire le tri.

- Au sujet de l'évocation par le texte de la dernière réunion de la Conférence épiscopale française qui insistait sur la «*Communion*» avec Rome et appuyée par Mgr Rifan  
*«Tout d'abord, je ne suis pas familier avec ce texte. Je ne le connais pas. Il ne m'intéresse pas, je ne suis pas ce genre de nouvelles. Ce n'est pas le problème présent. Le problème n'est pas la «communion». C'est l'idée stupide de ces évêques depuis Vatican II – il n'y a pas de problème de communion, il y a un problème de profession de la Foi. La «communion» n'est rien, c'est une invention de Vatican II. Le point essentiel est que ces personnes (les évêques) n'ont pas la Foi Catholique. «Communion» ne signifie rien pour moi – c'est un slogan de la nouvelle Eglise. La définition de la nouvelle Eglise est «communion», mais cela n'a jamais été la définition de l'Eglise Catholique. »*
- Ratzinger n'a rien fait depuis un an. Il ne fait rien pour l'Eglise (répété plusieurs fois)  
*«Je l'ai connu comme négociateur, qui voulait se réconcilier avec nous, nous réintroduire dans l'Eglise Conciliaire. Il était alors pour moi, un homme intelligent, motivé par le projet de la «ré-intégration». Nous avons évité ses initiatives. Mais maintenant, je pense qu'il est le Pape, maintenant, oui, il est le Pape et il a des grâces spéciales, mais il n'utilise pas ces grâces spéciales car il ne fait rien pour l'Eglise. Un an s'est écoulé, et il n'a rien fait !»*  
*[...] «Il était honnêtement persuadé que nous étions en dehors de l'Eglise et que nous avions le devoir de nous ré-introduire dans l'Eglise. C'est bien sûr ridicule, car nous ne sommes pas en dehors de l'Eglise. Nous ne l'avons jamais été. C'était une grande aspiration pour lui (la réconciliation). C'était quelques mois avant ma consécration comme évêque. Mais il est maintenant le Pape ! Il devrait faire quelque chose pour l'Eglise ! Mais il ne fait rien !»*
- Selon Mgr Tissier, Ratzinger ne gouverne pas l'Eglise, il est paralysé volontairement dans la collégialité. Il est attiré par la religion juive.
- Pour Mgr Tissier, il serait normal qu'un simple prêtre soit élu en juillet. L'interviewer Stephen L.M. Heiner insiste beaucoup sur la réélection possible de l'abbé Schmidberger à la tête de la FSSPX.

---

<sup>2</sup> Notre message du 13 mars 2006 : [http://www.virgo-maria.org/articles\\_HTML/2006/003\\_2006/VM-2006-03-13/VM-2006-03-13-1-00-Laics\\_americaains\\_contre\\_le\\_ralliement.htm](http://www.virgo-maria.org/articles_HTML/2006/003_2006/VM-2006-03-13/VM-2006-03-13-1-00-Laics_americaains_contre_le_ralliement.htm)

<sup>3</sup> Message de Virgo Maria du 11 mars 2006 (*Bernard, que fais-tu de ton épiscopat ?*) : [http://www.virgo-maria.org/articles\\_HTML/2006/003\\_2006/VM-2006-03-11/VM-2006-03-11-4-00-Bernard\\_que\\_fais\\_tu\\_de\\_ton\\_episcopat.htm](http://www.virgo-maria.org/articles_HTML/2006/003_2006/VM-2006-03-11/VM-2006-03-11-4-00-Bernard_que_fais_tu_de_ton_episcopat.htm)

- Mgr Lefebvre n'a jamais traité de la validité des consécrations épiscopales selon Mgr Tissier qui déclare ne pas connaître la pensée de Mgr Lefebvre sur ce sujet :

*«Je ne connais pas sa pensée (à Mgr Lefebvre) à ce sujet. Il ne connaissait pas le nouveau rite relatif à l'Episcopat. Il n'étudia ou ne lut pas ces sujets. Parce que **tout simplement, il continua avec l'Ancien Rite**».*

- **Ratzinger est pire que Luther. Ce Pape a professé des hérésies dans le passé et il ne s'est jamais rétracté.** Il a écrit un livre entier en 1968 et il ne s'est jamais rétracté. Il a nié le dogme de la Rédemption.

*"Quand il (B. XVI) était théologien, il a affirmé des hérésies, il a publié un livre plein d'hérésies.*

*[...] Il a écrit un livre appelé Introduction au Christianisme, c'était en 1968. C'est un livre plein d'hérésies. Spécialement la négation du dogme de la Rédemption.*

*[...] Il écrit que le Christ n'a pas réparé nos péchés, qu'il ne les a pas expiés. Que Lui, Jésus-Christ, n'a pas satisfait pour nous péchés. Ce livre nie l'expiation par le Christ de nos péchés...*

*[...] Il nie la nécessité de la rédemption.*

*[...] Il va beaucoup plus loin que Luther.*

*[...] **C'est pire que Luther, bien pire.***

*[...] Il n'a jamais rétracté ces déclarations.*

*[...] [et il a enseigné] **beaucoup d'autres hérésies. Beaucoup d'autres.** Il a émis des doutes au sujet de la divinité du Christ, concernant le dogme de l'Incarnation...*

*[...] Il relit, réinterprète tous les dogmes de l'Eglise. Absolument. C'est ce qu'il appelle l'"herméneutique" dans son discours du 22 décembre 2005.*

*[Il interprète la doctrine catholique] selon la nouvelle philosophie, la philosophie idéaliste de Kant. [...] J'ai lu Joseph Ratzinger, et je peux vous assurer que [tout cela] est vrai."*

- **Il n'est pas possible de lire Vatican II à la lumière de la Tradition.** Vatican II ne peut être lu comme un travail catholique, Vatican II est basé sur la pensée d'Emmanuel Kant, sur l'idéalisme allemand. L'Eglise doit supprimer Vatican II et l'oublier, **faire une tabula rasa de Vatican II**

*"[L'unique interprétation possible, la seule relecture possible du concile est ] à la lumière de la "nouvelle philosophie". Oui, c'est cela la véritable "lumière" [gloussements]. C'est l'unique "lumière" avec laquelle vous pouvez le lire.*

*[...] Vous ne pouvez pas lire Vatican II comme une oeuvre catholique. Il est basé sur la philosophie d'Emmanuel Kant. [...] Exactement [sur] l'idéalisme allemand.*

*[...] Je le dis, un jour **l'Eglise devra effacer ce concile.** Elle n'en parlera plus du tout. Elle l'oubliera. L'Eglise sera prudente si elle oublie ce concile. [...] **L'oublier, oui. Comme un blanc - tabula rasa."***

Mgr Tissier insiste à la fin de son interview auprès de Stephen L. Heiner pour lui dire qu'aucune de ses questions n'a touché le vrai fond des choses, et c'est alors qu'il entreprend de démontrer que l'abbé Ratzinger professe des hérésies. Le webmestre, visiblement surpris par **la force des propos de l'évêque, lui relit ses notes et lui fait confirmer ses propos**, afin de bien s'assurer que ses notes reflètent bien la pensée de Mgr Tissier. Il lui fait observer également que *The Remnant* a une grande diffusion, comme s'il voulait s'assurer que Mgr Tissier est bien conscient de la répercussion que ses propos vont avoir. **Mgr Tissier montre ainsi clairement qu'il assume pleinement son interview.**

Nous observons aussi et malheureusement que dans ce texte, Mgr Tissier répète les incohérences d'Ecône : bien qu'hérétique, Ratzinger serait le vrai Pape. Et Mgr Tissier lui reconnaît la légitimité. Selon lui, l'Eglise supplée. Nous avons déjà démontré que ces incohérences, qui ne sont pas catholiques, **proviennent d'un mauvais enseignement reçu sur la question du magistère ordinaire universel.** Cette fausse conception s'appuie sur une pensée qui **déplace le terme Magistère de son sujet** (la fonction d'enseigner, c'est-à-dire l'autorité légitime) **vers son objet** : l'enseignement ou le message. **Cette inversion de l'objet qui devient sujet, s'oppose à l'enseignement de l'Eglise**, et engen-

dre **une fausse conception de l'infaillibilité du Magistère ordinaire universel**. Nous invitons les lecteurs à se reporter à notre étude<sup>4</sup>.

Malgré ces incohérences déjà connues, par cette intervention **Mgr Tissier de Mallerai rejette tout accord et toute concession avec l'abbé Ratzinger**. Un évêque sacré par Mgr Lefebvre parle et ses propos constituent le **désaveu cinglant de toute l'œuvre de désinformation menée par les abbés Lorans et Séléigny depuis août 2005**. Cette invention du leurre du «*processus de réconciliation*», cette mise en avant de l'«*herméneutique*» du discours du 22 décembre, de la «*réhabilitation de Romano Amerio*», bref toute cette manipulation médiatique par *DICI, Nouvelle de Chrétienté* et *La Porte Latine* vient de voler en éclat. L'Evêque français, Mgr Tissier de Mallerai, vient d'un coup de crosse balayer ces armes de désinformation et de division de la FSSPX forgées depuis des mois et des années par le réseau allemand.

Mgr Lefebvre semble parler à travers Mgr Tissier de Mallerai qui s'exprime dans un langage de confesseur de la Foi. Les discours politiques d'un Mgr Fellay et les communications savamment concoctées par les abbés Lorans et Seligny apparaissent pour ce qu'elles sont : des corps étrangers introduit dans l'œuvre de Mgr Lefebvre afin de la diviser et de **la détourner de sa finalité qui est la préservation du Sacerdoce catholique valide**.

Mgr Tissier a évoqué la question de l'invalidité des sacres **mais sans se prononcer** en des termes qui l'engagent. En fait il dit que Mgr Lefebvre ne l'a pas étudié et **que lui-même, Mgr Tissier ne connaît pas la pensée de Mgr Lefebvre à ce sujet**. Il est à remarquer que Mgr Tissier se garde sur ce sujet de manifester son soutien public à la position du Père Pierre-Marie, dont il évite de prononcer le nom, alors qu'il pouvait le faire, la possibilité lui en étant ainsi offerte par Stephen L. Heiner. En fait, il reste prudent, ce qui laisse deviner que déjà l'étude du Père Pierre-Marie ne convainc plus et qu'au sein de la FSSPX des clercs étudient cette grave question de près et se refusent à emboîter le pas à la pseudo-démonstration de Dom Botte de validité, par une prétendue «*analogie*» avec des rites orientaux, reprise à leur compte sans le dire par les rédacteurs du *Sel de la terre* en novembre 2005 dans le numéro 54. Désormais les travaux de *Rore Sanctifica* circulent ainsi que la démonstration théologique de l'abbé Cekada<sup>5</sup> de l'invalidité de la nouvelle forme de la consécration épiscopale conciliaire, et beaucoup découvrent que **la nouvelle forme de 1968 ne signifie pas le pouvoir d'ordre conféré (*potestas ordinis*) et donc qu'elle est absolument invalide**.

L'opposition interne au sein de la FSSPX devient de plus en plus publique contre l'orientation désastreuse que le clan des «*conciliateurs*», Mgr Fellay, l'abbé Schmidberger, le réseau allemand et leurs relais de Suresnes, ont imprimé à la FSSPX depuis la mort de Mgr Lefebvre. **La survie de la Foi catholique et du Sacerdoce catholique** apparaît de plus en plus comme l'enjeu principal.

Ajoutons que la version du site de Stephen L. Heimer est la version complète envoyée au Remnant. Une polémique<sup>6</sup> a lieu aux Etats-Unis actuellement, certains prétendant que *The Remnant* aurait coupé une partie du texte de Mgr Tissier au sujet de Fatima, car cela ne lui conviendrait pas. Rappelons que Mgr Tissier a donné, en 2004 dans un Symposium de théologie à Paris (actes publiés en octobre 2005), une interprétation de la «*Bête de la terre*» similaire à celle que développa *Rore Sanctifica* tome I, et de façon indépendante, en juillet 2005.

Nous livrons ci-dessous le texte de l'interview en anglais tel que publié par Stephen L.Heiner.

Alors continuons le bon combat  
Abbé Michel Marchiset

---

<sup>4</sup> Message Virgo Maria du 5 février : [http://www.virgo-maria.org/articles\\_HTML/2006/002\\_2006/VM-2006-02-05/VM-2006-02-05-A00-Refutation\\_des\\_erreurs\\_sur\\_l\\_infaillibilite.htm](http://www.virgo-maria.org/articles_HTML/2006/002_2006/VM-2006-02-05/VM-2006-02-05-A00-Refutation_des_erreurs_sur_l_infaillibilite.htm)

Et l'étude sur <http://www.virgo-maria.org/page1.htm>

<sup>5</sup> Message de Virgo Maria du 26 avril 2006 :

<sup>6</sup> <http://angelqueen.org/forum/viewtopic.php?t=7144&postdays=0&postorder=asc&start=0>

Pour vous abonner ou vous désabonner de la lettre d'information Virgo-Maria, veuillez remplir le formulaire disponible sur notre site <http://www.virgo-maria.org/>

---

<http://www.remnantnewspaper.com/Archives/archive-2006-0430-tissier.htm> ou  
<http://truerestoration.blogspot.com/2006/04/my-interview-with-his-lordship-bishop.html>

---

## An interview with Bishop Bernard Tissier de Mallerais

---

Sunday, April 30, 2006

**My interview with His Lordship, Bishop Bernard Tissier de Mallerais, of the Society of St. Pius X, for the print version of the Remnant**

This is the complete text of my interview that I submitted for the April 30, 2006 edition of [the Remnant](#). It runs about 10 pages long. Special thanks to the Society priests and brothers both in America and in Europe that helped make this interview possible through their kind cooperation as well as to Michael Matt who authorized this online publication to coincide with the release of the print issue.

When you are done reading this lengthy text, you may find links to articles commenting on it [here](#).

As we go to press the April Angelus has the entire and unedited text of the February Bishop Fellay Denver Conference which I first broke in summary [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#) with corrections and approval from His Lordship.

<http://truerestoration.blogspot.com/2006/04/responses-to-interview-with-his.html>

Interview with His Lordship, Bishop Bernard Tissier de Mallerais

Colton, California, 21 April 2006

Stephen L.M. Heiner

On behalf of *the Remnant*

*I have met Bishop Bernard Tissier de Mallerais on only one previous occasion – at the 1997 ordination of Fr. Frank Kurtz. Knowing him to be knowledgeable about canon law, I put to him some questions regarding the idea of the “intrinsically evil” nature of the New Mass. He kindly gave me some of his time and explained to me in short order his thoughts on the matter. His courtesy and gentleness struck a chord, especially as I had just watched him celebrate Mass in one of the most precise and holy ways I had ever seen.*

*I expressed my desire to interview His Lordship to Michael Matt, who allowed me to hunt him down – as I'm not European and my French and German are rusty, at best, I finally tracked him down in*

*Ecône (it's 2am in California when it is midmorning in Switzerland, so I was tired **and** speaking bad French) and got permission to see him in Colton while he was here for Confirmations. The interview was recorded in person and took approximately 45 minutes.*

*The text below has been vetted by His Lordship for textual and factual accuracy. As of publication the text of this entire interview has been approved of by him. I use and prefer the use of “Your Lordship” to the more contemporary “Your Excellency” and that explains its appearance throughout the text.*

S.H.: My lord, there is a text that **Zenit** released on 7 April that includes some statements from the French episcopate upon the end of their plenary assembly:

“Truth implies being clear on our points of dissonance. These points include acceptance of the Magisterium more than questions of liturgy, in particular, that of the Second Vatican Council and of Popes of the last decades. **Communion** may be accompanied by questions, requests for precision or further reflection. It cannot tolerate a systematic rejection of the council, criticism of its teaching, or denigration of the liturgical reform decreed by the council.”

Furthermore, **AngelQueen.org** recently released an “exclusive interview” with Bishop Rifan from the diocese of Campos. Within the text of the interview His Lordship states (through a subordinate) that essentially so-called “practical, effective” **communion** within the Roman Rite is demonstrated by celebration in the Novus Ordo, citing canon 751.

How do you respond to these comments regarding “communion” as a Roman Rite bishop who recognizes the valid election of Benedict XVI?

H.L. Firstly, I am not familiar with this text. I do not know it. It is not interesting to me, I do not follow such news. That is not the problem here. The problem is not “communion.” *That is the stupid idea of these bishops since Vatican II – there is not a problem of communion, there is a problem of the profession of faith.* “Communion” is nothing, *it is an invention of the Second Vatican Council. The essential thing is that these people (the bish-*



**ops) do not have the Catholic Faith.** “Communion” does not mean anything to me – it is a slogan of the new Church. The definition of the new Church is “communion” but it was never the definition of the Catholic Church. I can only give you the definition of the Church as it has been understood traditionally.

S.H. And what is that, my lord?

H.L. The Church is a visible society, of those who are baptized, profess the Catholic faith, and submit to the Roman Pontiff. These three elements are essential and necessary – so that is all that matters to me – “communion” means nothing to me.

If I had something important to tell you it is that these people have lost the Faith – *especially faith in the mystery and dogma of the Redemption*. Because, you know, the Second Vatican Council did not say a single thing about Redemption. The liturgical reform, yes, it falsified completely the mystery of redemption.

S.H. Well, this Council, of course, was something that the Holy Father worked closely on as a theologian. You were acquainted with him when he was Cardinal Ratzinger in 1988 and I know that you dealt with him closely regarding the “negotiations” at the time. You’ve had the chance to observe him over a year (it has just been a few days since the anniversary of his election) – has there been a change in his words, actions, or tone since he has become the Holy Father?

H.L. I knew him as a negotiator, who wanted to reconcile us, to reintroduce us into the Conciliar Church. He was thus to me, a man of intelligence, interested in the project of “re-integration.” We avoided his initiatives. But now, I think he is the Pope, now, yes, he is the Pope *and he has special graces*, but he doesn’t use those graces because he does not do anything for the Church. *It has been a year now, and he has done nothing!*

S.H. It has been said that he feels a certain guilt about 1988, because externally he appeared to be “fighting for” the Society. Do you feel this is true?

H.L. He was honestly persuaded that we were outside the Church and that he had the duty to re-introduce us to the Church. This is of course, ridiculous, because we are not outside the Church. We never have been. This was a great desire for him (reconciliation). This was some months before my consecration to Bishop. But now he is the Pope! *He should do something for the Church! But he does nothing!*

S.H. So you have seen nothing concrete that he has done, my lord?

H.L. No, nothing.

S.H. In the recent consistory he increased the voting power of Europe at the expense of the other parts of the Church. It is said that he wants Europe to again take the reins of leadership for the Church. But Europe is infected with the rise of Islam. We are very insulated in America as far as observing militant Islam because they are a very tiny minority here. In the wake of the recent riots and a February excerpt in **Dici** regarding the rise of Islam in Europe, what can you say the state of the Church is in Europe? Is it prepared to take the reins, so to speak?

H.L. This is not a question regarding Benedict XVI, this is a question of the governments in Europe allowing Islam to grow unchecked. The French government, for example, practically invites these Muslims to France. The government wants to control their religion, so they make regulations and laws in order to control it. The bishops do not see this danger – well, they are contradictory. On one side they see the danger and they do not want to give them (the Muslims) the churches (to be used as mosques). And on the other hand, they say that Christians and Muslims must reconcile – that there is no difference between the religion of Christians and Muslims, and that Islam is a very “tolerant” religion. So, they are completely contradictory with themselves.

S.H. You would say that this is the attitude of the bishops in Germany, France, Switzerland, there is no difference?

H.L. Yes, absolutely no difference. They are completely contradictory. They see the danger – because they will be obliged (under French law regarding public buildings) to give empty churches to the Muslims. But then they say that Islam is very good, and tolerant.

S.H. Well, then Benedict’s “European project” has many obstacles. You said that you saw him as a negotiator. Bishop Fellay recently said that he is very closely tied up with the Council. What are the main ideas that this Holy Father holds that are at odds with Tradition?

H.L. Collegiality, for instance. He wants to rule the Church **with** the bishops, **with** the cardinals. He becomes unable to rule the Church. This is evident because he has been the Pope for one year and he has done nothing!

His Lordship had mentioned this twice be-

fore, but I could see that he was more frustrated. He continued...

Collegiality **paralyzes** him. Voila – yes, collegiality paralyzes the Pope.

S.H. And he is willing to be paralyzed?

H.L. Yes, he believes it (in collegiality)!

S.H. Regarding ecumenism, it is said that he was not happy about Assisi...

H.L. Ecumenism is another thing, yes, it was said that he despised Assisi, but we are not sure, and now he has gone into the synagogue many times, with the Jews, so... It is not clear...because he has an inclination towards the Jewish religion.

S.H. Did he not reduce the independence of the Franciscans at the Basilica (of Assisi)?

H.L. Yes, but this is not a major matter.

S.H. When I was on the phone with Bishop Fellay to clarify a quote from his conference in Denver, I had transcribed (I did not tape the event) that “He (Benedict) believes that the secular state is the **preferred** mode of existence within the Catholic view of social organization.” Bishop Fellay corrected me to say “it is the **only** mode of existence.” Are these not always the “big three” topics, that is to say, collegiality, ecumenism, religious liberty? Is he not completely committed to these ideas?

H.L. Yes, he is committed to these three **errors**. Regarding religious liberty he is almost exactly like John Paul II. They are convinced that no government can be Catholic, that no government can acknowledge Jesus Christ as true God. **This is, of course, contrary to Catholic teaching**, specifically the teaching of Pope Pius XI, in *Quas Primas*.

S.H. Yes, and the Syllabus...

H.L. Yes, but the Syllabus was in the 1860s and *Quas Primas* was in 1925, so it is not so old – so outdated, as they would like to say.

S.H. My lord, apart from possible guilt about 1988, it is said that Benedict feels guilt about Fatima. You and the bishops have obviously gone to Fatima to make an act of reparation...what can you say regarding the continued silence about Fatima dating all the way back to Pius XII?

H.L. I cannot say anything here. Fatima is a private revelation. Excuse me, but I don't speak of it.

S.H. Well, I have some more personal questions for you. I recently read your work on the Archbishop. You knew him so well. Were there any surprises for you in writing and researching this work?

H.L. My great surprise was the *great affection and respect that all these progressive fathers had for him* – even if they did not agree with him – it was amazing. They respected him so much for his Christian, his Catholic personality. All of them testified to this when I met them – this – they **loved** him, even though they did not understand him. *Because, truly, they could not reconcile the gentleness, the charity, the frankness, and yet, on the other hand, his strength in the Faith.* They could not reconcile this.

S.H. If they saw His Grace's Christian personality, how did they not see his Christian conclusions?

H.L. Because they were liberal, hence they could not understand that a man could be so kind and yet so strong at the same time.

S.H. The Archbishop, of course, gave you your episcopate. And you are coming up on your 18<sup>th</sup> anniversary of consecration. What have been your thoughts about the episcopate – that is to say, what did you not expect in June of 1988?

H.L. My great surprise is that the crisis in the Church has been so long. We had prayed that the good Lord would send us a truly Catholic Pope, a holy Catholic Pope, just a few years after my consecration, and here we are, 19 years, and it is the same. **It is a great disappointment.** *The crisis lags, and we have to continue to fight.* That is the great difficulty – not for me, but for the faithful especially. *The faithful have to be heartened, they must be encouraged not to be fatigued, to be tired. We must continue to fight.*

S.H. So in your role as Bishop you must travel all around the world to see the faithful. What do you notice is common about us, as traditional faithful?

H.L. I think it is the great esteem for large Catholic families – that is common. The grace of Christian marriage and the desire to have many children – they understand that the future of the Church and the future of their homeland revolve around a fruitful marriage. And that is the grace of Archbishop Lefebvre – that, and the Holy Mass. That is what he preached.

S.H. My lord, the General Chapter of the Society is this summer...

H.L. Ah, yes.

S.H. There is some confusion among the faithful as to whether someone who has been the General Superior may be elected again. For example, Fr. Schmidberger has been Superior General – can he be so again?

H.L. Yes, there is no limitation.

S.H. Yes, Fr. Schmidberger was Superior General after you were consecrated, so you, as a bishop, had to report to a priest. I think the feeling among the faithful was, that once Bishop Fellay was elected, that a bishop would continue on in that position, as opposed to a simple priest. Is this true? Well, let me be more specific without asking you for a prediction. Is it likely that the condition of having a bishop be the Superior General will continue?

H.L. No, it is not normal. Actually, the most normal thing would be for a simple priest to be Superior General.

S.H. Why do you say that, my lord?

H.L. Because it is in our constitutions, and because the existence of bishops within our Society is something extraordinary – not foreseen. It is not normal – so I think it would be very normal for a simple priest to be Superior General, and I would be ready to obey, to submit, to him.

S.H. So it is an extraordinary situation for the Society to have bishops, but you can accommodate to the idea of reporting to a priest, even as a bishop – well, obviously you did so with Fr. Schmidberger. Let me clarify, the constitutions do not prevent a previous Superior General from being re-elected?

H.L. No.

S.H. So Bishop Fellay could be re-elected.

H.L. Yes.

S.H. My lord, you are not heard from as much here, which is a large part of why I wanted to interview you – as English speakers we hear much from Bishop Williamson, and we hear a fair amount from Bishop Fellay, but Alfonse de Galarreta does not speak English. There are always troublemakers, especially from websites who quote so-called anonymous “inside sources” who often know really nothing, who seek to splinter the Society by talking about a so-called “schism within the Society” if and when Bishop Fellay were to make a “deal” with Rome. My question is, when Bishop Fellay speaks, or makes a statement – can we say that he does so “on behalf of the bishops” of the Society?

H.L. No. I would say he speaks as the Superior General of the Society. Simply that.

S.H. So as bishops, your primary role is...

H.L. To give Confirmations, and do Ordinations, simply. That is the role that Archbishop Lefebvre gave us. So we have no “leading role” in the Society, *per se*, we simply submit to the Superior General.

S.H. So, if there were to be a restoration within the Church the bishops within the Society would not be necessary?

H.L. If there were Catholic bishops in Catholic seats, no, we would not be necessary.

S.H. My lord, **The Angelus** recently reprinted a study by Fr. Pierre-Marie, O.P. which postulated that the new rite of consecration for Bishops was valid – this being a question since this Holy Father is the first to be Pope while being consecrated in the New Rite. There is, circulating on the Internet, statements that the Archbishop doubted the validity of the new rites of Episcopal consecration...

H.L. No, no, no. He never discussed the matter, never. No, no.

S.H. So there has never been a question in the Society about the validity of any of the new sacraments?

H.L. Archbishop Lefebvre never discussed the validity of Episcopal consecrations.

S.H. No, not about the episcopacy?

H.L. I do not know his mind on this subject. The new rite regarding Episcopacy, he did not know it. He did not study these matters – or read it. Because simply, he continued with the Old Rite.

S.H. I think I have one more question, where is the Society growing the fastest in the world?

H.L. The essential thing is that we re-establish Catholic families, Catholic schools, these are the great means of the growth of the Catholic Church. Indeed, many of our priests come from our schools. We insist to our faithful that they send their children to Catholic schools.

S.H. Well, that’s all my questions, my lord. Now, when I type this I want to make sure all my quotes are accurate, so I will get you a transcript before you go to Veneta...

H.L. No, no, these questions, you have not addressed the essential things – I appreciate your questions but you did not touch anything essential in your questions...

S.H. What more, my lord?

H.L. Well, for instance, **that this Pope has professed heresies in the past! He has professed heresies! I do not know whether he still does.**

S.H. When you say “has professed,” do you mean he still does?

H.L. No, **but he has never retracted his errors.**

S.H. But my lord, if he has not retracted them, does he not still retain them? What are you speaking of, can you be more specific, I must admit I am no theologian and I have not read any of his works. Was this when he was a Cardinal?



H.L. It was when he was a priest. When he was a theologian, he professed heresies, **he published a book full of heresies.**

S.H. My lord, I need you to be more specific, so we can examine the matter.

H.L. Yes, sure. He has a book called *Introduction to Christianity, it was in 1968. It is a book full of heresies. Especially the negation of the dogma of the Redemption.*

S.H. In what sense, my lord?

H.L. He says that Christ did not satisfy for our sins – did not – **atone** – He, Jesus Christ, on the Cross, did not make satisfaction for our sins. This book denies Christ's atonement of sins.

S.H. Ah, I'm not sure I understand...

H.L. He denies the necessity of satisfaction.

S.H. This sounds like Luther.

H.L. No, it goes much further than Luther. Luther admits the sacrifice...the satisfaction of Christ. It is worse than Luther, much worse.

S.H. My lord, I must return to the beginning of this line of questioning – are you saying he is a heretic?

H.L. No. But he has never retracted these statements.

S.H. Well, then, what would you say, my lord, would you say it was “suspicious,” “questionable,” “favoring heresy”?

H.L. No, it is clear. I can quote him. He rejects “an extremely rudimentary presentation of the theology of satisfaction (seen as) a mechanism of an injured and reestablished right. It would be the manner with which the justice of God, infinitely offended, would have been reconciled anew by an infinite satisfaction...some texts of devotion seem to suggest that the Christian faith in the Cross understands God as a God whose inexorable justice required a human sacrifice, the sacrifice of his own Son. And we flee with horror from a justice, the dark anger of which removes any credibility from the message of love” (translated from the German version, pages 232-233).

S.H. What other heresies, my lord?

H.L. Many others. Many others. He has put up doubts regarding the divinity of Christ, regarding the dogma of the Incarnation...

S.H. This cannot be true...

H.L. It is very true. He re-reads, reinterprets all the dogmas of the Church. This is it. This is what he calls the “hermeneutic” in his discourse of 22 December 2005...

S.H. This hermeneutic is also known as the “living tradition...” It would interpret existing doctrines in new lights...

H.L. Yes, exactly. According to the new philosophy, the idealist philosophy of Kant.

S.H. These are very strong words, my lord, *but yet, the Society is not sedevacantist...*

H.L. No, no, no, no. He is the Pope...

S.H. But these are strong words...

H.L. *Ecclesia supplet.* The Church supplies. It is even in the code of canon law: “in case of doubt, the Church supplies the executive power.” He is the Pope. *Ecclesia Supplet.* But we must know he has professed heresies.

S.H. My lord...has there been such a dark time in Church history?

H.L. That is difficult to say. I would not say such a thing. *It is sufficient to say that he has professed heresies.*

S.H. My lord, I must emphasize that the paper I am writing for has wide circulation in the English speaking world...are these the words you wish to use?

H.L. Yes. Yes. *I have read Joseph Ratzinger, and have read his books. I can assure you that it is true.*

S.H. Well, then I'd like to know what was the Archbishop's opinion of him when he was Cardinal Ratzinger?

H.L. He did not read him. He never read him. He saw him as a man of negotiation. An intelligent, honest man. With dangerous initiatives regarding us.

S.H. This line of discussion which you have introduced, my lord, leads us back to the 1988 Protocol. One of the points there is that the Society would interpret the Council “in the light of Tradition.” Is that still the case today?

H.L. Absolutely not. Not any more.

S.H. So then what would be said, that the Council needs to be revisited, revised entirely?

H.L. No, we would read the Council in the light of the “new philosophy.” Yes, that is the real “light” (chuckles). That is the only “light” by which you can read it.

S.H. So you would *say the Society reads the Coun-*

*cil in the light of the "new philosophy."*

H.L. Exactly.

S.H. And hence rejects it?

H.L. That is the only way it can be read. ***You cannot read Vatican II as a Catholic work.*** It is based on the philosophy of Immanuel Kant.

S.H. Idealism?

H.L. Exactly, German idealism.

S.H. So if you say that the proper way to interpret the Council is in the light of the "new philosophy," how must the Church deal with this Council?

H.L. ***I will say, one day the Church should erase this Council. She will not speak of it anymore. She must forget it. The Church will be wise if she forgets this council.***

S.H. Let me read it back to you from my notes. ***The Church must erase this Council, not speak of it, forget it.***

H.L. Forget *it*, yes. ***As a blank – tabula rasa.*** Ah, you must excuse me, Stephen, I must go hear confessions before Mass. Please excuse me.

S.H. My lord, it has been a great pleasure, and both interesting and surprising.

H.L. Likewise. It has been a pleasure.

So there it is. These are some of the strongest words I have ever seen from a bishop of the Society of St. Pius X. No further commentary beyond the fact that His Lordship was very calm and clear as he spoke, and I thought it was interesting that he stopped me from ending the interview because he felt I had not asked some important questions. I'm grateful for the opportunity that Michael Matt gave me in pursuing this.

I discussed the essence of this interview with Dr. Tom Droleskey, who coincidentally has been studying some writings of Pope Benedict when he was Fr. Ratzinger and furnished me with this additional quote:

"Eucharistic devotion such as is noted in the silent visit by the devout in church must not be thought of as a conversation with God. This would assume that God was present there locally and in a confined way. To justify such an assertion shows a lack of understanding of the Christological mysteries of the very concept of God. This is repugnant to the serious thinking of the man who knows the omnipresence of God. To go to church on the ground that one can visit God who is present there is a senseless act which modern man rightfully rejects" (Die Sakramentale Begründung Christlicher Existenz 1966, Kyrios Publishing, Freising-Meitingen-Germany).