

# Faith Crucial – II

January 13, 2018

*Your Excellency,*

*Talking with an Indult priest (one who says the true Mass but obeys the Church officials in Rome) I have become confused about Archbishop Lefebvre and the stand which he took in defence of the Faith. I thought he was right, but now I am not so sure. Here are some of that priest's arguments:-*

*1 The Archbishop disobeyed Rome. That proves that he was proud.*

*2 Had he given up his Society and seminaries to obey Rome, he would have been heroic.*

*3 If he disobeyed Rome to save Tradition, he did evil in order to bring about good, which is wrong.*

*4 To obey a Pope as misguided as Pope Francis is, is a martyrdom by which one imitates Christ.*

*5 For Bishop Fellay to step into the jaws of the Roman lion is, in spiritual terms, heroic.*

Dear Sir,

In sane times the Catholic Church gives to souls a clear direction as to what is true or false, right or wrong, and you would need to be in no confusion. But ever since the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965) these have not been sane times, because the Roman churchmen themselves at that Council abandoned God's true Catholic religion and adopted a false man-made religion which we can call Conciliarism. So ever since the 1960's, Catholics have been confused from top to bottom of the Church, by trying to go in two directions at once. For instance, your Indult priest says the Mass of the true religion, while meaning to obey the Romans set upon the

false religion. No wonder it confuses you to listen to him. And you will remain confused until you fully grasp the difference between God's true religion and men's Conciliarism – God may want you to do some more homework.

A Catholic is a Catholic by the Faith he believes in, by the sacraments he receives and by the hierarchy which he obeys. But he is firstly Catholic by his Faith, without which he would have no concern for the Catholic sacraments or hierarchy. Therefore the Catholic Faith is fundamental to a Catholic, and it is that Faith which the Roman officials abandoned at Vatican II in order to get off the wavelength of God and onto the wavelength of modern man. Therefore Conciliarism is fundamentally different from Catholicism and it creates a quite different viewpoint from which to consider pride, heroism, obedience, and so on. The Catholic viewpoint is true, the Conciliar viewpoint is false. Now, to the Indult priest's arguments:–

1 The Archbishop was not proud, because he was defending God's truth and putting God before men. On the contrary, heretics like Luther and Conciliarists are proud because they are defying God to please men.

2 He was heroic not by giving way to Rome, but by resisting Rome, in order to put God first.

3 When he did what he did in order to save Tradition, he was doing not evil but good to achieve good.

4 Catholic martyrdom lies in suffering harm and death not just for any cause, but only for the true Catholic Faith. The Archbishop suffered a true martyrdom not by giving way to the Popes who had gone wrong, but by doing all he could to make them see how they were abandoning the true Faith.

5 His successors on the contrary, by doing all they can, since 2000 at least, to bring the Archbishop's Society under the control of the Conciliar Romans, are in no terms heroic

because they are putting men before God. Nor are they martyrs, nor are they truly imitating Christ, but they are indeed proud.

Dear Sir, I hope that by now you can see that everything in the Church must ultimately be judged in the light of the Truth and of the Faith. This is because a man's faith or lack of it is his basic attitude to God. A man may choose to go to Hell if he wants, but if he wants to go to the one true Heaven of the one true God, then he must start by believing in Him, according to the true Faith.

Kyrie eleison.