

## FLASH

dimanche 22 juillet 2007

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

### Mgr Fellay a-t-il mauvaise conscience ?

Réinterprétation de l'article de Messori par Dici et  
proclamation de soumission de l'abbé Scott en Australie

Nos critiques légitimes au sujet des agissements du supérieur de la FSSPX qui tente de remettre l'œuvre sacerdotale de Mgr Lefebvre entre les mains de l'ennemi rusé de ce dernier, l'abbé apostat Ratzinger, semble avoir provoqué des réactions chez Mgr Fellay ainsi qu'au sein du petit clan des rallieurs, réactions qui dénoteraient une mauvaise conscience ( ?) chez le Supérieur de la Fraternité.

#### Bien qu'apparemment repris en main, l'abbé Scott ne renie pas ses convictions

A peine avons-nous fait connaître les propos vigoureux de l'abbé Scott, supérieur du séminaire de la FSSPX en Australie, contre les principes inadmissibles du *Motu Proprio* (les principes de son article 1) qu'une semaine plus tard est publié sous sa signature et sur son site internet australien, **un nouveau texte, au sujet du *Motu Proprio* qui proclame qu'il a bien fait chanter le *Te Deum*, et qui fait un éloge presque obséquieux du Supérieur, de Mgr Fellay et de sa lettre lue dans toutes les chapelles le 8 juillet.**

Mais en y regardant de plus près, il s'avère que **l'abbé Scott n'a rien renié de ses convictions et que sa condamnation des principes du *Motu Proprio* reste entière.**

Il ne renie aucunement ses deux écrits antérieurs que nous avons fait connaître. En effet il parle des « *deux rites opposés* » et déclare : *“les principes de célébrations mixtes et alternées semblent importants au pape afin d'établir une non rupture entre les deux “usages”*”. **Et s'appuyant sur les déclarations du fondateur, Mgr Lefebvre, l'abbé Scott interdit l'assistance au nouveau rite.** Selon lui, une telle assistance serait *‘coopérer à la politique de non-rupture réconciliante’ de Ratzinger, ‘un moyen de mélanger un peu de miel avec une pilule amère’* selon lui, *‘de telle sorte que nous l'avalions sans même le réaliser’*.

Cependant, son nouveau texte **n'est plus marqué par ce style simple, incisif et clair que nous lui connaissons.**

Il s'agit d'un texte délayé, filandreux où les paragraphes s'enchaînent sans qu'apparaisse nettement la conclusion.

**Ce texte a toutes les apparences d'un texte qui serait le résultat d'une négociation ou, autre hypothèse, qui aurait été rédigé par un autre et qu'il aurait dû signer,** après avoir obtenu quelques adaptations.

**Ce texte est si peu clair qu'il a évoqué dans notre esprit la prose burlesque de Mgr Williamson.**

#### L'abbé Lorans réécrit l'histoire au prix de contorsions risibles

Autre fait similaire, l'abbé Lorans vient de rendre compte de l'article de Messori sur Dici.org<sup>1</sup>, mais en le réinterprétant.

**A chaque phrase gênante de l'interview, il reformule le propos du journaliste en conservant la citation de Mgr Fellay. Cela devient une interview de Mgr Fellay rapportée par Messori censuré et complétée par l'abbé Lorans.**

Nous conseillons à l'abbé Lorans d'aller offrir ses services à Messori, l'ami de Ratzinger et pourquoi pas, d'offrir sa collaboration au *Corriere della Serra*.

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.dici.org/actualite\\_read.php?id=1504](http://www.dici.org/actualite_read.php?id=1504)

En effet, puisque apparemment, il sait mieux faire que ce journaliste professionnel, il pourrait le remplacer avantageusement. Allons plus loin, **pourquoi pas un livre interview du Patron Ratzinger par l'abbé Lorans ?** Après tout il est très actif au sein du G.R.E.C.

Avant d'examiner un point important que l'abbé Lorans tente de minimiser, **il faut signaler que l'abbé Lorans passe complètement sous silence le fait que l'interview ait été réalisé à Menzingen dans les jours qui ont précédé la publication du *Motu proprio*.**

En fin démineur de texte, l'abbé Lorans a isolé le cœur de la bombe de l'interview de Mgr Fellay par Messori qu'il a choisi de traiter à la fin de son article.

Observons la méthode de l'abbé Lorans : ayant traité du texte de Messori en passant sous silence le verbatim de Mgr Fellay (« *La réaffirmation par le Saint Père de la continuité de Vatican II et de la nouvelle messe avec la Tradition constante de l'Eglise* ») qui concerne Vatican II, il insère un propos de Castrillon Hoyos, puis un compte-rendu de l'interview de Ricard à Famille Chrétienne, et revient **pour conclure sur le propos gênant du fameux paragraphe de Messori qu'il ne cite toujours pas** mais dont il aborde l'idée en allant cette fois-ci puiser dans la lettre de Mgr Fellay du 7 juillet.

**Cette méthode lui permet de rompre la continuité du compte-rendu de Messori en détachant le verbatim de Mgr Fellay du commentaire qu'en fait Messori** et qui le met en rapport avec l'idée principale de l'article 1 sur 'un rite unique, deux formes également légitimes (de Pie V et de Paul VI comme on les appelle) expriment également une foi unique'.

Voici ce qu'écrit Messori :

« Il n'en est pas ainsi selon Mgr. Fellay: « *C'est en fait un jour historique. Nous exprimons à Benoît XVI notre profonde gratitude. Ce document est un don de la Grâce. Ce n'est pas un pas, c'est un bond dans la bonne direction* ». Pour le Supérieur des Lefebvristes, la "normalisation" de la Messe « non de St. Pie V », spécifie-t-il, « **mais au contraire de l'Eglise de toujours** », constitue « *un acte de justice, une extraordinaire aide surnaturelle dans un moment de grave crise ecclésiale* ». Et encore : « *La réaffirmation par le Saint Père de la continuité de Vatican II et de la nouvelle messe avec la Tradition constante de l'Eglise – par conséquent la négation d'une fracture que le Concile aurait introduite avec les 19 siècles précédents – nous obligent à poursuivre les discussions doctrinales. Lex orandi, lex credendi : l'on croit comme l'on prie. Et il est désormais reconnu que, dans la Messe de toujours, on prie "comme il faut"* ». En tout cas, à partir d'aujourd'hui, un rite unique, deux formes également légitimes (de Pie V et de Paul VI comme on les appelle) expriment également une foi unique. » **Messori, 8 juillet 2007**

Et voici ce que cela donne sous la plume de l'abbé Lorans :

« **On comprend que Mgr Fellay, dans sa lettre aux fidèles du 7 juillet, ait tenu à souligner le « désir certain (de Benoît XVI) de réaffirmer la continuité de Vatican II et de la messe qui en est issue avec la Tradition bimillénaire** ». **Cette négation d'une rupture causée par le dernier concile - déjà manifestée dans le discours à la curie du 22 décembre 2005 – a été contestée par la Fraternité Saint-Pie X, et c'est bien là que doit se situer un débat doctrinal, après le retrait du décret d'excommunication qui frappe les évêques de la Fraternité.** » Dici.org, 21 juillet 2007

L'abbé Lorans vient nous présenter une négation par Mgr Fellay d'une affirmation par Ratzinger dans le *Motu Proprio* d'une négation d'une rupture causée par le concile déjà précédée par la même négation de la même rupture déjà formulée le 22 décembre 2005 par Ratzinger. Ouf ! Tel un chat, l'abbé Lorans (mais Mgr Fellay pourra en faire de même) s'y entend bien pour retomber sur ses pattes.

**Car selon l'abbé Lorans, Mgr Fellay voulait nier la négation de la rupture. Mais doit-on comprendre qu'il affirme toujours la rupture de Vatican II ? Et si oui, pourquoi Mgr Fellay se réjouit-il d'entendre chez Ratzinger ce que Mgr Fellay serait supposé (selon l'abbé Lorans) contester sur le fond ?**

Car le journaliste cite à juste titre le principe de l'article 1 (unité de foi en deux formes d'un même rite) juste après que l'évêque se soit réjoui de voir Ratzinger désirer affirmer une continuité entre la messe issue de Vatican II et la Tradition.

**Messori a bien compris que Mgr Fellay approuvait l'article 1 du Motu Proprio et en tirait les conséquences.**

**Alors que l'abbé Lorans ne dit rien sur l'article 1, il le passe entièrement sous silence, en essayant de faire croire que Mgr Fellay n'aurait pas approuvé la notion de continuité qui est le cœur même de cet article 1.**

**Nous touchons là aux limites de l'exercice sophistique de manipulation des esprits engagé par Rome et relayée par Mgr Fellay. Un évêque catholique ne parle pas ainsi.**

Tout cela sent très, très mauvais. Il est consternant que le successeur de Mgr Lefebvre et son « *équipe* » en soit arrivé là. Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ a dit « *que votre oui soit oui* ».

**Les propos filandreux de Mgr Fellay ne viennent pas de Dieu. Il veut tromper les clercs et les fidèles afin de pouvoir se « *réconcilier* », mais cela est devenu insoutenable.**

**Les effets de cet engagement de Mgr Fellay : la prise de conscience de beaucoup de clercs sur son compte**

**Il est certain que désormais l'abbé Scott a pu découvrir à qui il a affaire avec la Direction de la FSSPX.** Cela a dû lui dessiller les yeux.

Nous ne savons pas pour qui l'abbé Scott a voté il y a un an, au Chapitre général, mais s'il a voté pour Mgr Fellay, il doit bien voir désormais quelles sont les conséquences funestes de son vote.

**Moins de 12 mois après sa réélection, Mgr Fellay s'est déjà engagé dans un reniement de l'œuvre sacerdotale de Mgr Lefebvre, en approuvant l'article du *Motu Proprio*. Et il poursuit de plus belle en donnant désormais libre cours à ses ardeurs pour la Rome apostate.**

La leçon de cette affaire est semblable à celle qui a pu être tirée lors du concile Vatican II : **lorsque la révolution et ses sophismes, ses infiltrations, ne sont pas dénoncées à temps et éliminées, elles finissent par emporter toute l'institution.**

Continuons le bon combat

Abbé Marchiset

### **Texte de l'abbé Scott**

[http://www.holycrossseminary.com/2007\\_July.htm](http://www.holycrossseminary.com/2007_July.htm)

J.M.J

July 16, 2007

Dear friends & benefactors of Holy Cross Seminary,

It was just one week after returning for the second term that we received the welcome news of Benedict XVI's long awaited *Motu Proprio* "*Summorum Pontificum*", granting limited permission for the celebration of the traditional Mass, traditional rites of the sacraments and traditional breviary. We sang a *Te Deum* in gratitude for this victory in our struggle for the integrity of the Catholic Faith. Meanwhile, the work on improving our buildings has continued apace. The doors and woodwork on the Philosophy classroom have been repaired and repainted, as well as one window replaced. A fourth cell is in the process of remodeling. A garden has been created around the statue of St. Michael. Most importantly five sub-boards providing power to the main building (Sacred Heart wing), have been replaced as part of an ongoing and expensive plan to replace all the defective and dangerous old wiring in the building.

**TRADITIONAL MASS WAS ALWAYS LEGAL**

I am happy to attach to this letter Bishop Fellay's explanation on the occasion of the *Motu proprio*. It is true that this document does not directly affect those of us who have always been convinced of our right to the traditional Mass, but it is a major victory in our combat for the Church, and will, over a long period of time, be an important step in the return to Tradition. The most extraordinary and astonishing admission, made both in the document itself, and in the Pope's letter to the world's bishops, is that the traditional Mass was never abrogated. This means that since 1969 the traditional Mass has always been perfectly permissible, regardless of what we have constantly been told to the contrary. These are the Pope's own words: "*As for the use of the 1962 Missal as an extraordinary form of the liturgy of the Mass, I would like to draw attention to fact that this Missal was never juridically abrogated and, consequently, in principle was always permitted*". *The Pope even goes further. He goes so far as to say that it could not have been abrogated: "What earlier generations held as sacred, remains sacred and great for us too, and it cannot be all of a sudden entirely forbidden or even considered harmful."*

## **BENEDICT XVI VS PAUL VI**

What a contrast this is to the statements of Pope Paul VI, who whilst never formally stating the abrogation of St. Pius V' *Quo Primum*, nevertheless constantly maintained that the New Mass had "force of law" (April 3, 1969), that it would "replace" (April 6, 1969) the traditional Mass as of November 30, 1969, and that it was consequently obligatory. This is how categorically he described the obligation of this obedience, faced with objections, in his general audience of November 19, 1969: "*The reform about to be implemented, then corresponds to an authoritative mandate of the Church. It is an act of obedience, an attempt by the Church to maintain Her true nature. It is a step forward in Her authentic tradition. It is a demonstration of fidelity and vitality to which we all should render prompt adherence... We shall do well to accept it with joyous enthusiasm and to implement it with prompt and unanimous observance*". (Davies, *Pope Paul's New Mass*, p. 557). *He was to repeat the same obligation in his discourse to the Consistory on May 24, 1976: "The adoption of the New Mass is certainly not left to the free decision of the priests and faithful... The New Ordo was promulgated to take the place of the old one."*

Until now, these statements have never been changed, but rather maintained by the Roman authorities. We are particularly grateful for this document because it is an admission that Paul VI was wrong, that he had a false notion of the Church's tradition (that he invoked for it) and was in contradiction with St. Pius V. In fact, this *Motu proprio* is a direct contradiction of Paul VI. We saw this abandonment of post-conciliar reforms for the question of the translation of the "*pro multis*", and now we have seen it with obligation of the New Mass. We can expect to see it in other areas of doctrine and practice that are in contradiction with the Church's Tradition. However, it is particularly ingenuous, if not hypocritical, for Benedict XVI to now pretend that Paul VI never wanted to make the new rite obligatory, by this misleading statement: "*At the time of the introduction of the new Missal, it did not seem necessary to issue specific norms for the possible use of the earlier Missal.*" In truth, Paul VI foresaw no such "possible use".

## **FINALLY A TRADITIONAL POPE?**

Does this mean that Benedict XVI has suddenly become traditional? Not at all. This *Motu proprio* freeing the celebration of the traditional Mass from the stigma of illegality is nevertheless not a blanket permission. It is only allowed in certain circumstances, and is not to be allowed in public and in parishes unless it be "*where there is a stable group of faithful who adhere to the earlier liturgical tradition*" and who requests it (Art. 5, §1) or for special circumstances. The size and interpretation of "*a stable group of faithful*" is deliberately left ambiguous, but it seems to indicate that the group must already exist, and that the pastor is not to create it. It also states that, apart from the eventual possibility of personal parishes just for the traditional rites, only one Mass on Sundays and holy days is permitted in the traditional rite (Art. 5, §2).

However, most damning is Benedict XVI's response to the fear, that he considers unfounded, that the use of the traditional rite of Mass will not cause division, for it does not call into question, he says, the authority of Vatican II. His gratuitous assertion does nothing to allay the bishops' fear. Does not the traditional Mass

express the un-ecumenical integrity of the Faith so effectively undermined by Vatican II? In any case, why would anyone want to celebrate it if it were not to call into question the liturgical reform of Vatican II? The pretense that it is but to be an “*extraordinary form*” of the Roman rite, for there are but “*two uses of one and the same rite*” is equally unconvincing nor does it do anything to change the reality.

The Pope goes further in his promotion of the New Mass. Not only does he claim that the “*ordinary form*” of the Roman liturgy remains the Mass of Paul VI, but he goes on to praise its sacredness, all the while deploring the “*arbitrary deformations*” that the creation of the new Missal made possible. “*Needless to say, in order to experience full communion, the priests of the communities adhering to the former usage cannot, as a matter of principle, exclude celebrating according to the new books. The total exclusion of the new rite would not in fact be consistent with the recognition of its value and holiness.*”

## **BENEDICT XVI’S MOTIVE: RECONCILIATORY NON-RUPTURE**

Why, then, did Benedict XVI issue this *Motu proprio*? What is his motive? He seems to be in full contradiction with himself. He is making this big effort to allow the traditional Mass, and yet at the same time he states that what he really wants us is for us to accept the holiness of the New Mass. The answer is in the “*positive reason*” he gives for it, namely “*interior reconciliation in the heart of the Church*”. It is not really at all for the followers of Archbishop Lefebvre, as the Indult had been, for Benedict XVI discounts those who do not accept “*the binding character of the Second Vatican Council*”.

The reconciliation that he seeks is much deeper. It is a doctrinal and liturgical reconciliation with the Church’s past; it is the effort to show continuity, to prove that there is “*no contradiction*”, “*no rupture*” that is his entire focus. If the Church is to stay Catholic, if it is to continue to exist, it cannot be in rupture or contradiction with itself, as the modernists with their *aggiornamento* stated after Vatican II. What was once said to be a novelty must now be regarded as living tradition, in continuity and not in rupture with the past. Tradition is called living because it is no longer the passing down of an objective deposit of Faith, but is of its very nature changing. Living tradition is evolution with continuity, and so likewise is truth, dogma and liturgical worship. The peaceful coexistence of both forms of the liturgy, new and traditional, and the consideration that they are but two uses and not two rites, is supposed to prove the continuity, to establish the fact of non-rupture, just as the coexistence of Vatican II and preexistent teachings on the necessity of belonging to the Church is proof of non-rupture.

This is the reconciliation that must be established at all costs. Contradiction there cannot be, according to the Pope’s Hegelian mindset, as long as we are mutually understanding and accepting. For truth, reality and sacredness lie in the continuous changing process, in the “*living*” aspect of Tradition as much as in its content. The value and sacredness of the liturgy does not consist in certain ceremonies, prayers, gestures, but in the way they are lived and experienced. The objective opposition between the symbolism and meaning of the traditional rite and the new rite is not relevant. They are two uses, for they represent one living experience. The actual coexistence of both uses is absolutely crucial to establishing the Pope’s point that in fact there has been no rupture; a reconciliation deplored by truly traditional Catholics and modernist bishops alike.

## **WHAT OUGHT TRADITIONAL CATHOLICS TO DO?**

But, you might say, surely we can attend these Masses. They will be traditional Masses. They are not Indult Masses, for they no longer presume a special indult or permission, but are based upon the correct principle that the traditional rite was never abrogated. The *Motu proprio* itself does not attach any explicit and unacceptable conditions, as did the Indult. This delicate question can be resolved on two levels, one doctrinal and one liturgical. The first consideration is doctrinal. If we have won a battle for the celebration of the true Mass, we have not yet won it with respect to the profession of the true Faith, uncontaminated by the errors of Vatican II. Our attendance at Mass must be a profession of this true Faith, whole and entire. Hence the obligation of assisting at the Masses of those priests who stand up against the errors of Vatican II and refuse the idea of “*non rupture*”.



The second consideration is liturgical. Benedict XVI assures the *Novus Ordo* bishops of their ultimate control: “Nothing is taken away, then, from the authority of the Bishop...the local Ordinary will always be able to intervene”. Furthermore, he encourages the assistance at each of the two opposed rites. In fact, he goes so far as to propose that they be mixed in the same celebration, a confusing desecration not even permitted under the Indult: “For that matter, the two forms of the usage of the Roman rite can be mutually enriching: new Saints and some of the new Prefaces can and should be inserted in the old Missal.” The mind boggles at the consequences of such a principle, the practical application of which the *Ecclesia Dei* commission is supposed to study. The principle of alternating and mixing celebrations seems important to the Pope to establish non rupture between the two “uses”. However, it would inevitably greatly weaken the traditional Faith and the convictions of the faithful. It is for this reason that Archbishop Lefebvre, when giving profound reasons why our faithful ought not to attend the Indult Mass, pointed out that they must not attend the traditional Masses of those priests who still celebrate the New Mass, and who are not determined to combat the evils of the New Mass. These were his precise words in 1985:

“Generally speaking, we counsel the faithful against attending the Mass of those priests who have abandoned the combat against the New Mass. It is much to be feared that one day they will be obliged by their bishop to also celebrate the New Mass, to celebrate both Mass, and even to concelebrate, to accept giving Communion in the hand and of celebrating Mass facing the people. All of these things are entirely repugnant to us, and that is the reason why we counsel the faithful not to attend the Masses of these priests...As for us, it is always the same advice: we think that one ought not to go to these Masses because it is dangerous to affirm that the New Mass is just as good as the old one.” (Quoted in *La messe de toujours*, p. 431)

These words apply absolutely literally to the situation of Masses celebrated by non-traditional priests in parishes under this *Motu proprio*. As much good as such Masses will certainly do for those who are still in the *Novus Ordo*, and as much as we ought to encourage our *Novus Ordo* acquaintances to request their celebration, so much ought our faithful not to attend, even if they have no other Sunday Mass available. It would be an unacceptable compromise to attend the Masses of priests of the new rite, who celebrate and administer sacraments according to the new rite, or who are at least willing to do so. It would be precisely to cooperate in the Holy Father’s iniquitous policy of a reconciliatory non-rupture, a clever way to mix a little honey with the bitter pill of Vatican II, so that we might swallow it down without even realizing it.

Let not these realistic considerations, however, dampen the gratitude that Bishop Fellay requests that we have towards Almighty God first, and Archbishop Lefebvre second, who have permitted this victory. The Good Lord will bring much more good out of it than we could imagine, and will draw souls to the unchanging truth of Catholic Tradition.

Yours faithfully in the Eucharistic Heart of Christ the King,

Father Peter R. Scott

**Ecrivez-nous et contactez-nous – Rejetons le piège de l’article 1 du Motu Proprio**

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/>