THE STATE OF NECESSITY AND THE SOCIETY'S BETRAYAL

Bp. Michał Stobnicki

We hear in today's lesson, in Saint Paul the Apostle's Epistle to Timothy, the exhortation: "Be instant in season, out of season." We are living in an age in which the clergy do not want to carry out this duty indicated by Saint Paul the Apostle. We live in an age in which the voice of the servants of God has fallen silent. Today, a few words on what has happened, and what is happening, with the Priestly Society of Saint Pius X. For not far from here, in the chapel in Tarnów, just before my arrival among you, the local chaplain of the Society began a cycle of catecheses on the state of necessity and announced that episcopal consecrations are planned in the Society before long, so we already have to think about all of this, dear faithful.

Beginning at the beginning: as we all know very well, in the 1960s an open revolution began in the Church. The enemies of the Church, who had been infiltrating it for decades, moved to open attack. Through the anti-council Vatican II the building of a new religion was begun, my dear friends — a church of man, which is meant to replace the Church of God. And in the 1960s, while the deliberations of the Second Vatican Council were under way, what is terrifying is that only a small part of the council fathers saw how dangerous the ambiguities contained in the conciliar texts were. They tried to organise themselves. One of the leaders of this group resisting modernism was the French archbishop Marcel Lefebvre. This group of aware fathers, fighting against modernism, was really small — about 10% of the council fathers. The rest were either liberal, or they were mute, indifferent pastors, infected with liberalism, believing in the slogan of reconciling the Church with the world.

When the deliberations of Vatican II were coming to an end, it became ever clearer that these ambiguities contained in the conciliar texts would be used by the enemies of the Church to destroy the Catholic Church. Archbishop Lefebvre said that there is the Catholic Church and the conciliar church, and that everyone who wishes to save his soul must cut himself off from the conciliar church. Moved by Divine Providence, he founded the Priestly Society of Saint Pius X, whose aim was to put up resistance to modernism. It was a fight against the post-conciliar revolution, which was leading to the destruction of the Catholic faith.

THE 1988 CONSECRATIONS

From the very beginning of his work Archbishop Lefebvre appealed to the state of necessity. He explained that what he was doing did not stem from his personal whim, from his attachment to some liturgical forms. What he was doing stemmed from the necessity of saving the faith. The state of necessity means, in short, that we may sacrifice a lesser good in order to save a higher good. Here on earth the highest good for us is the Catholic faith, without which we cannot save our souls; it is validly, validly and worthily celebrated holy sacraments, the most holy sacrifice of the holy Mass. For it is through the sacraments that God's grace is imparted to us. Bishop Lefebvre stood up to fight in order to preserve these treasures, these greatest treasures that we have here on earth. And from the very beginning he pointed this out clearly: "My aim is the defence of the faith. We are dealing with an assault against the Church. We are dealing with an anti-church, with the conciliar church, which is meant to replace the Catholic Church. And we cannot agree to this. We cannot be obedient to those who are destroying the Church. We cannot pass by indifferently, we cannot keep silent in the face of heresy, in the face of blasphemies against our Lord Jesus Christ."

And through those years, the 70s, 80s and 90s, the Priestly Society of Saint Pius X played a very important, historic, epoch-making role. It made it possible, my dear friends, for the treasure of Catholic Tradition to be preserved. In 1988 Archbishop Lefebvre, who for several years had been conducting talks with Rome, trying to explain to the Roman hierarchs that they had gone astray, that what they preach, the

post-conciliar doctrine, is a false, heretical doctrine — but those talks led to nothing. They were people, and are to this day people, completely blinded by evil. People to whom no logical arguments get through. People not in the least interested in the truth. So Archbishop Lefebvre, realising whom he was dealing with, consecrated four bishops in 1988 without a papal mandate. In itself such an act is something evil. Bishops in the Church are appointed by the pope. Bishops are consecrated on the basis of a mandate from the Apostolic See. Archbishop Lefebvre was aware that obtaining such a mandate was impossible. He was aware that, being 83 years old and suffering from cancer, he would answer before God for a terrible omission. He was aware that he was one of the few bishops in the world who oppose the post-conciliar religion. He was aware of the responsibility resting on his shoulders: responsibility for the survival of the Catholic priesthood, for the survival of apostolic succession, for the preservation of the Catholic faith, of the Mass of all time. And with a view to these goods, which needed to be saved in the face of the attack launched against them by the modernists, he could not look to legal regulations. The ancient Romans used to say: *Inter arma silent leges* — in time of war the laws fall silent. A law established for times of peace cannot be applied in times of war.

My dear friends, this historic, great act of courage of Archbishop Lefebvre was met, of course, with a hateful reaction from the post-conciliar hierarchy: excommunication, accusations, abuse. His name became a synonym for the words "renegade," "schismatic," "rebel." He sacrificed his good name for the sake of saving the Church, for the sake of preserving the Catholic faith.

TALKS WITH ROME

Unfortunately, my dear friends, it is obvious that wherever something good is happening, the devil appears, who tries to destroy that good. And already in the 1990s such an attack of the devil began. The ambassador of the French Republic in Italy, Mr Pérol, hit upon a satanic idea: that Catholic Tradition should be reconciled with the post-conciliar church. And in his apartment in Paris, already in the 1990s, friendly meetings began between priests of the Priestly Society of Saint Pius X, with the blessing of the superior of that congregation, a bishop, and priests from various indult communities or post-conciliar structures. In a friendly atmosphere, over good coffee and wine, they considered how an agreement could be reached, how to come to terms. These meetings, my dear friends, bore fruit in this: that in the Jubilee Year 2000 the Society of Saint Pius X received permission to organise an official pilgrimage to Rome. The papal basilicas were made available to the pilgrims, where they could pray. Also, the four bishops of the Society were invited to lunch with Cardinal Castrillón Hoyos, then Prefect of the Congregation for the Clergy. When this invitation was extended to the Society's bishops, one of them, a certain English bishop, said: "Your Eminence, the problem is that we profess two different religions." The other bishops did not see that it was a trap. They forgot the warning of Archbishop Lefebvre, who used to repeat: "No practical agreement is possible without a doctrinal agreement. If the conciliar hierarchy does not convert to the Catholic faith, then conducting any talks with them makes no sense, none whatsoever." And good Italian pizza, spaghetti, wine, or whatever might be served will not give those talks any sense. Without faith, a common faith, there can be no talk of unity.

Nevertheless, many clergymen of the Priestly Society of Saint Pius X succumbed to the charm of Roman marble, and these relations, against the will of the founder, became ever more intense. And already in the 2000s one can observe a gradually ever softer position of the Society towards the conciliar church, of which I was myself a witness at the Society's seminary in Zaitzkofen in Germany. It was already a different Society from the one whose image I had formed on the basis of the Archbishop's sermons and books. And so, my dear friends, these talks, this dialogue, became ever more intense, the meetings ever more frequent. The Society slowly moved away from the practice of its founder, for instance of conferring conditionally, *sub conditione*, the sacrament of confirmation and the sacrament of priestly ordination. After all, how could one call into question the priesthood of those with whom we get on so well, who are so nice to us, who keep making further gestures of friendship towards us? It would be a great breach of tact if we were now to raise the question whether they are really priests, bishops, or not. It would be a great breach of tact if we were to point out to them

that they are adherents of heresy, that they do not have the Catholic faith.

THE 2012 DOCTRINAL PREAMBLE

These talks finally became official. A commission was appointed on the Vatican side, and on the Society's side a theological commission, which was meant to lead to an agreement, and an agreement was almost reached. In 2012 Bishop Fellay submitted to Cardinal Levada, then Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, a draft doctrinal preamble, a certain doctrinal agreement, in which we find a whole series of scandalous points: beginning with the acceptance of the magisterium of Vatican II read in the light of Tradition — Benedict XVI's hermeneutic of continuity — acceptance of the validity and legality, the legitimacy, of the *Novus Ordo Missae*, of the post-conciliar sacraments, and so on. This declaration so fully met Rome's expectations that Rome was ready in June 2012 to sign the documents and establish a personal prelature for the Priestly Society of Saint Pius X, to grant it legal personality within the post-conciliar structures. Bishop Fellay was already counting his chickens.

Then a certain English bishop, Bishop Williamson, persuaded his fellow bishops, Bishop Tissier de Mallerais and Bishop de Galarreta, to oppose this agreement. Together they wrote a letter to the superior of the Society in which, in very sharp words, they protested against any practical agreement without a doctrinal agreement. They protested against a betrayal of the fight begun by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre. This letter leaked to the media and a commotion arose. And then the Roman hierarchy cancelled the June date and told Bishop Fellay that he had to put his own ranks in order. His own ranks. What did that mean? That same year, in October, Bishop Williamson was thrown out of the Society for opposing the policy pursued by the superiors.

SECRET TALKS WITH HUONDER

Dear faithful, in the following years the dialogue with the post-conciliar hierarchy was conducted already in hiding, in secret. For the following years, on Bergoglio's behalf, the negotiator was a certain Swiss bishop of Jewish origin, of which he himself boasted, Bishop Huonder, ordinary of the diocese of Chur in Switzerland, who secretly met with Bishop Fellay and with chosen priests of the Priestly Society of Saint Pius X in order to discuss the terms of reconciliation. These meetings took place in Switzerland, not far from St. Gallen — and somewhere there our thoughts wander towards the St. Gallen mafia. Perhaps Cardinal Danneels, the late Archbishop of Brussels, who at the press conference at which his biography was presented used that very expression himself, meaning the group of cardinals, bishops and post-conciliar theologians who met in St. Gallen and worked to bring a certain cardinal from Argentina to the Vatican. Nevertheless, these meetings between Bishop Huonder and representatives of the Society did take place. For years they were concealed. It was pretended that there were no contacts, that nothing serious was happening. This is contradicted both by the confidential notes that leaked from the general house in Menzingen, setting out the details of those talks, and by the letter of Cardinal Gerhard Müller, then Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and president of the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, to Bishop Huonder, in which, referring to a conversation with the Argentine Jesuit, Müller confirmed Bishop Huonder's authorisation to conduct a dialogue with the Priestly Society of Saint Pius X.

This dialogue, my dear friends, bore very concrete fruits. On the one hand, the Society ceased criticising the Argentine Jesuit and pointing out his heresies. And on the other hand, Rome kept bringing the Society further gifts. In 2015 the Priestly Society of Saint Pius X received from Francis jurisdiction to hear confessions. In the following years, jurisdiction to bless marriages, and also permission to confer priestly ordinations without the consent of the local bishops. So these concessions on the Society's part were richly rewarded by the post-conciliar hierarchy.

LOSING THE STATE OF NECESSITY

But now we must realise something. Namely, if the Society began to accept these gifts, if the Society ac-

cepted, for instance, jurisdiction to hear confessions and to bless marriages, it means that it has lost the right to appeal to the state of necessity. It means that the Society, its superiors, came to the conviction that there is no longer any threat to the faith justifying disobedience, the non-observance of the norms of canon law, that we are dealing with a legitimate Catholic hierarchy. When Bergoglio granted jurisdiction to hear confessions, to absolve, the Society sent a letter of thanks to the supreme pastor for the jurisdiction granted to them. So by their actions the superiors of the Society confirmed that we are dealing with normality in the Church, that there is no longer any need to resist anyone, that we are dealing with a legitimate hierarchy.

When Bishop Williamson in 2015 consecrated the first bishop — after Bishop Faure had left, been thrown out of the FSSPX — the Society published a communiqué in which it condemned these consecrations. As, of course, did Bergoglian Rome. The Society pointed out that there are no grounds whatsoever for comparing the situation of 1988, when Archbishop Lefebvre consecrated, with the situation in 2015. In other words, the situation in 2015 is already so good that no state of necessity exists. There is no longer any need to preserve the Catholic priesthood from an attempt to destroy it. Suddenly those who were enemies of Catholic Tradition became friends, at least in the eyes of Bishop Fellay and his company, faithful.

And lo, after more than ten years January of 2026 comes and a priest serving in the Society's chapel announces to the faithful a cycle of catecheses on the state of necessity. But how is that? Where was this state of necessity for the last dozen or so years? The Church, my dear friends, is not a private farm. The Catholic faith, my dear friends, is the most important thing, and one may not treat the Catholic faith lightly or treat it as an element of some power games. It is not the case that Father Pagliarani and Father Stehlin[?] now have some lever, and can turn it this way and that, and say now: there is a state of necessity, now there isn't, depending on their own interest. The Catholic Church, my dear friends, operates on the basis of law, canon law, which may not be disregarded. If you have come to the conviction that we are dealing with a legitimate hierarchy which can give you jurisdiction, then by what right do you suddenly want to claim that you may consecrate bishops without Leo's consent? One has to be consistent in life.

AFTER FRANCIS'S DEATH

And in December of last year we hear a statement by Father Pagliarani, the superior of the FSSPX, who declares: after Francis's death the situation compels us to consecrate bishops. And what happened after Francis's death, from May of last year until today, that suddenly the Society feels compelled to something? And for the last dozen or so years, what were we dealing with? What were we dealing with when the Society was making one little deal after another with the post-conciliar hierarchy? When it was quietly coming to terms with Bishop Huonder at secret meetings? Then everything was in order. So what has changed? Everything was in order when Bergoglio was bowing to Pachamama, when he was issuing *Amoris laetitia* [...]. Well, what could have changed after Francis's death? His carcass is lying in the Basilica of Saint Mary Major. It neither speaks nor moves. So what did the poor [?] do that now, suddenly, Father Pagliarani feels compelled to organise episcopal consecrations?

Dear faithful, in November of last year the court theologian of the conciliar church, Cardinal Fernández, published a scandalous document in which he denied the Blessed Mother the titles Co-Redemptrix and Mediatrix of all graces. With his bandit's hand he would rob the Blessed Mother of what she received not from any man but from God Himself. This special role which she plays in the history of salvation she plays by the will of God Himself, not by the will of any man. And no apostate has the right to try to rob the Blessed Mother, to steal from her. And what is interesting, I learn that after the publication of this document, in Rome, at the Congregation — the Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith, as it is now called — a delegation of FSSPX priests presents itself, headed by the superior of one of the districts, and they hold some talks. Fernández insulting the Mother of God no longer bothers them.

My dear friends, we must realise this and say it clearly: the state of necessity has lasted uninterrupt-

edly since the time of Vatican II. Since the time of Vatican II we have been witnesses to attempts to destroy the Catholic faith, which, as we can see, have led to most people in the world today not having that faith. A whole mass of contemporary traditionalists who are convinced that they are Catholics are not Catholics. If they do not come to their senses, do not convert, they will end up in hell. A whole mass of priests of so-called Tradition have not much in common with Catholicism. By their actions they offend God; they are not servants of the God one in the Holy Trinity, but little politicians trying to score something here and there, and they play even with the holy Mass, with Catholic teaching. This, my dear friends, is not the spirit of God; it is a spirit straight out of hell. For if bishops and priests see no problem in what Fernández, for instance, believes, if they are able to meet with him and hold talks about some agreement, then we must ask ourselves whether perhaps they too do not have Fernández's faith today. If so, then let him save himself who can — run to where the pepper grows.

Archbishop Lefebvre, looking at what is happening today with the FSSPX, must be horrified.

LETTER TO LEO XIV

What has been done to the Society that he created on the foundation of the fight, on the foundation of the fight? It has committed, dear faithful, a betrayal: a betrayal of its founder, a betrayal of our Lord Jesus Christ. Now in the coming weeks and months we shall probably be witnesses to raptures: "Well, how good, because the Society is ready to consecrate bishops. Oh, how good, they are preparing us." You will probably hear this. But such trial balloons were released not only in Poland, but also in other countries. Somewhere in the provinces some priest let slip that there will be episcopal consecrations. They did it in France, in Germany and in the United States, to see what the reactions would be. What the reactions would be.

At the same time Father Pagliarani, asked by the Society's older priests what next, answers with disarming candour: "Well, we cannot afford to consecrate bishops without a papal mandate, because the younger generation of priests will not accept it." But who educated this younger generation of priests? Who taught them servility towards heresy and heretics? Who, my dear friends, is responsible for it? No one other than those who teach in the Society's seminaries. So why does Father Pagliarani suddenly complain so about his own priests?

From Switzerland rumours reach us of how this is now to look, what steps are to be taken. Well, my dear friends, nothing great. Namely, a letter is to be sent to Leo analogous to the one that was sent about a year and a half ago to the Argentine Jesuit, with a request for the kind granting of permission to ordain bishops in the Society. And in Menzingen they assume that such talks may last three years, or perhaps four, or perhaps five, who knows. In any case, the more impatient faithful, who see the problem, are to be calmed down. And yet we are talking about a state of necessity, we are preparing, and time will keep flowing, and one day, perhaps in three years, perhaps sooner, perhaps later, we shall hear either that they are carrying out consecrations, appealing to the state of necessity. The question: where was this state over the last years? Since you condemned Bishop Williamson, you condemned Archbishop Viganò, and suddenly, well, suddenly you perceive that there is some problem with the conciliar church, that there is some threat to the faith, where was it over the last years? Or, my dear friends, they will get permission, but the candidates will be well chosen: Bergoglian-Leonine ones, rightly thinking, open people, ready always and everywhere for dialogue.

THE SAME MISTAKEN PATH

Dear faithful, let us therefore keep this before our eyes and remember that already Saint Paul the Apostle foretold that a time would come when men will turn away their hearing from hearing the truth. They will turn away and turn to those who will say what they want to hear, to false prophets. It seems that we are living in such a time today. And what may terrify is that the history which played out in the 1960s during the Second Vatican Council seems to be repeating itself before our eyes. The same methods, the same mistaken path, the search for agreement with the spirit of this world. And the result will be the same:

the betrayal of our Lord Jesus Christ and the loss of the Catholic faith. And the loss of the Catholic faith. This is the road on which the Priestly Society of Saint Pius X walks today. And let us beware that we never set foot on that road.

Amen.