

Saturday, June 20, 2009

This message can be downloaded in pdf on our website : <http://www.virgo-maria.org/>.

## **Letter from Arnaud Upinsky, President of *French National Writers union of France*, to Bishop Tissier de Mallerais (SSPX)**



A.Upinsky interrogates him: **“about his duty to make public amends for his repeated silence with regard to the twenty last years of « Archbishop Lefebvre’s fight against the destruction of the Mass ».”**

“During his lecture of March 13, 2009 [note from VM: in the church Saint Nicolas du Chardonnet in Paris, France], he was found to be economical with the truth:

- **He concealed Archbishop Lefebvre’s claim to continue the visible Catholic Church**
- **He concealed the invalidity of Paul VI’s *New Mass***
- **He concealed Archbishop Lefebvre’s vetoing the canonical integration in the « apostate » conciliar church**
- **He concealed Archbishop Lefebvre’s foundation of an organization supplementing the Holy See.”**

This repeated silence was intended to prevent the total contradiction in which the Fraternity of St. Pius X finds itself these days from being put into full light. Once revealed, this contradiction would oblige it either to break off the talks or to repudiate Archbishop *Lefebvre*.” A.Upinsky

### Some words from Father Schoonbroodt for the French speaking writers :

Parmi les réactions catholiques significatives récentes, suscitées par la politique désormais de plus en plus claire des autorités actuelles de la Fraternité Saint Pie X, en vue de rallier, à l'église conciliaire moderniste *œcuménique* antichrist, l'œuvre de sauvegarde du Sacerdoce sacrificiel catholique fondée par Mgr Lefebvre, et de la remettre rapidement entre les mains de son chef actuel l'abbé apostat Ratzinger-BenoîtXVI, se distingue la lettre ouverte à Mgr Tissier de Mallerais que le Président de l'*Union Nationale des Ecrivains de France* (UNIEF), M. Arnaud-Aaron Upinsky, a publiée le 4 avril dernier, et qui a fait l'objet du message du 10 avril 2009 de VM<sup>1</sup>

Cette lettre ouverte est à ce jour restée sans réponse, et Mgr Tissier n'a pas répondu aux graves accusations publiques et factuelles d'occultations volontaires qu'elle comportait, à la suite de sa conférence publique prononcée dans le chœur de l'église Saint Nicolas du Chardonnet le 13 mars 2009 à 20h à Paris.

Gênés par la barrière linguistique, de nombreux amis anglophones nous ont pressé de publier une version fidèle de ce texte en anglais.

---

<sup>1</sup> pour nos lecteurs francophones :

[http://www.virgo-maria.org/Documents/A-A\\_Upinsky/2009-04-04-Communique\\_UNIEF\\_Mgr\\_Tissier\\_de\\_Mallerais.pdf](http://www.virgo-maria.org/Documents/A-A_Upinsky/2009-04-04-Communique_UNIEF_Mgr_Tissier_de_Mallerais.pdf)

[http://www.virgo-maria.org/Documents/A-A\\_Upinsky/2009-04-04-Lettre\\_ouverte\\_a\\_Mgr\\_Tissier\\_de\\_Mallerais.pdf](http://www.virgo-maria.org/Documents/A-A_Upinsky/2009-04-04-Lettre_ouverte_a_Mgr_Tissier_de_Mallerais.pdf)

[http://www.virgo-maria.org/articles/2009/VM-2009-04-10-A-00-Lettre\\_Upinsky\\_a\\_Mgr\\_Tissier.pdf](http://www.virgo-maria.org/articles/2009/VM-2009-04-10-A-00-Lettre_Upinsky_a_Mgr_Tissier.pdf)

C'est pour briser cette barrière et pour faire connaître aux catholiques fidèles anglophones ce qui se passe actuellement en France en ce qui concerne les responsables spirituels de la Fraternité Saint Pie X, que j'ai personnellement demandé à un fidèle catholique dont l'anglais est la deuxième langue d'entreprendre cette traduction qu'il a voulu la plus fidèle qu'il soit possible.

En publiant ainsi la traduction en anglais de cette lettre ouverte du 04 avril 2009 de Mr Upinsky à Mgr Tissier de Mallerai, je tiens à saluer ici le travail dévoué du fidèle catholique qui s'est consacré avec application et généreusement à cette tâche, à ma demande.

M. l'abbé Paul Schoonbroodt

Curé de l'Église du Sacré Cœur de Jésus

Directeur du site web *Virgo-Maria.org*"

*Paul Schoonbroodt*

---

### [Press release of the National Writers Union of France](#)

Please, find enclosed our open letter of April 4, 2009 to His Excellency Bishop Bernard Tissier de Mallerai, **about his duty to make public amends for his repeated silence** with regard to the twenty last years of « Archbishop Lefebvre's fight against the destruction of the Mass ». During his lecture of March 13, 2009, he was found to be economical with the truth:

- **He concealed Archbishop Lefebvre's claim to continue the visible Catholic Church**
- **He concealed the invalidity of Paul VI's New Mass**
- **He concealed Archbishop Lefebvre's vetoing the canonical integration in the « apostate » conciliar church**
- **He concealed Archbishop Lefebvre's foundation of an organization supplementing the Holy See.**

This repeated silence was intended to prevent the total contradiction in which the Fraternity of St. Pius X finds itself these days from being put into full light. Once revealed, this contradiction would oblige it either to break off the talks or to repudiate Archbishop *Lefebvre*.

By covering with his authority the exclusion of the Truth as wished by Rome and necessary to pave the way for incorporation, bishop Tissier de Mallerai has turned his back to the ideal of Truth that has shaped the glory of Western civilization.

These concealments are very serious. Formidable issues like power – religious, political, and civilizational – are at stake. Hence:

- ***The strangling of the Fraternity since the agreement of 2000***

This repeated silence, aimed at misleading the faithful of Archbishop Lefebvre, is intended to make them resign to the unacceptable scuttling of his work for the sake of talks *with foregone conclusion* since the secret agreement of the year 2000, implying the exclusion of any truth that might disturb Rome and preceded by the *lifting of restrictions on the donations and bequests* to the Fraternity as a reward for the *recognition of the legitimacy* of the conciliar Church. The effect of this: the progressive strangling of the Fraternity, leading to the blocking of new episcopal consecrations in particular.

- ***The aim: the sacramental power***

The real purpose of the « talks » concerns the handing down of the authentic sacraments and the Catholic exception which Archbishop Lefebvre has rightly claimed as « true signs » in the Fraternity (and not in Rome!). These points however have been repudiated by the two agreements of the *Motu proprio* (7.7.2007) and the lifting of the excommunications (21.1.2009). To get rid of the Tridentine Mass, by the canonical integration, is the real aim of the Vatican. The Lilliputian work of Archbishop Lefebvre represents just 0,0001 % of the Catholics, so the overreacting of the media and Rome's tenacity can only be explained by the fact that *the ass is carrying relics...*, just as in La Fontaine's fable.

- ***The need of public amends***

These facts are so fraught with consequences that only by having recourse to total truth, fidelity and transparency can bring about the public amends that is called for. Such an act of Justice and Truth is called for on dual grounds: *religious*, but also *epistemological*, vis-à-vis the community of mankind and a public debate that affects science, religion and civilization in the broadest sense.

We hope that the open letter will find a good response with you.

Arnaud-Aaron Upinsky

President of the National Writers Union of France - Press **contact:** [courrierposte@orange.fr](mailto:courrierposte@orange.fr)

-----

Arnaud-Aaron Upinsky  
President of the National Writers Union of France  
8 rue d'Anjou, 75008 Paris

To His Excellency Bishop Bernard Tissier de  
Mallerais  
International Seminary of Saint-Pius X  
Ecône – CH – 1908 RIDDES (VS)

Paris, April 4, 2009

## Open letter

Subject: Your duty to make public amends for your repeated silence with regard to Archbishop Lefebvre's fight against the destruction of the Mass

Monseigneur,

As President of our association and as epistemologist, I have noticed, during your lecture of March 13, 2009, on « Archbishop Lefebvre's fight against the destruction of the Mass », in the church of *Saint Nicolas du Chardonnet* - worldwide symbol of the preservation of the Mass and the fight against the conciliar Church - that you have kept silence about the essence of his twenty years of victorious fight for the survival of the Mass and of the Priesthood. Therefore, I have been trying to find:

- ***The reason for your silence with regard to his claim to continue the visible Catholic Church***
- ***The reason for your silence with regard to the invalidity of the new Mass***
- ***The reason for your silence with regard to Archbishop Lefebvre's vetoing the canonical integration in the « apostate » conciliar Church***
- ***The reason for your silence about Archbishop Lefebvre's foundation of an organization to supplement the Holy See***

The reasons for such acts of concealment are an expression of *disloyalty* of a serious nature *towards* your guests, to the bishop who consecrated you, and to his work as well, and failing to observe the elementary rules of epistemology (science of scientific truth). This obliges me to clarify these reasons to justify the public amends that they demand from you.

### **1) The reason for your silence with regard to the continuation of the visible Catholic Church**

Contrary to the title of your lecture, you failed to mention the *offensive* and *victorious* battle that Archbishop Lefebvre waged during the last twenty years of his life. You only dealt with the first period of his *defensive* and *unsuccessful* fighting, i.e. from the Council onwards up to the destruction of the Mass in 1969 by Paul VI, and then you omitted to evaluate the destruction of the Mass, avoiding the crucial question of the *invalidity* of Paul VI's Mass.

You have also left unmentioned the fact that from 1969 Archbishop Lefebvre, going on the attack with ever *increasing determination*<sup>2</sup>, incessantly drew all the conclusions of the destruction of the Mass by the conciliar Church, founding the Fraternity of Saint-Pius X, designed as an Ark guaranteeing the *survival* of the Mass and the true sacraments, of the Priesthood and of the Catholic Church, in *five stages*, well marked, until his death in 1991: the Mass (1969); the Priesthood (1976); the Episcopate (June 1988); the *veto* on any canonical integration (1989); and after the collapse of the legitimate consecrations of bishops, completed by the famous proclamation « ***Do you have the apostolic mandate?*** » – « ***We do***<sup>3</sup>! »,

---

<sup>2</sup> Thus, following his criticism of Vatican II, of November 21, 1974, **he asserted *crescendo*** that « This reform, descending from liberalism and modernism, is entirely poisonous; it emerges from heresy and returns to heresy » ; after the Bishop of Freiburg had withdrawn his authorization to Ecône early 1975, he ordained 13 priests in June 1976 ; after his suspension *a divinis* by Paul VI on July 22, he defined Vatican II as « a schismatic council », publicly questioning the legitimacy of Paul VI, declaring on August 29, at the « Mass of Lille » « we do not dialogue with the devil » ; after the faithful, led by the prelate Mgr. Ducaud-Bourget on February 27, 1977, had given back the church of Saint-Nicolas-du Chardonnet to the Tridentine rite, he declared on June 15, in Ecône: « ***We do not want to be accomplices of the destruction of the Church*** » ; after the pantheist meeting in Assisi of 1986, drawing the consequences, on June 30, 1988, he consecrated four bishops – including yourself - to ensure the continuation of the apostolic succession, followed by the excommunication the next day.

<sup>3</sup> Marcel Lefebvre, « Opération survie », p. 593, Ed. Clovis, 2002.

his strong claim of the continuation of the *visible*<sup>4</sup> Catholic Church in the Fraternity - and not in Rome -, corroborating with the full logic of the deposit of the faith: « *It is we who have kept it*<sup>3</sup> ».

The inexorable nature of such a chronology of decisions and facts, made as progressive and proportional responses to the self-destruction of the Church, shows that, in the essentials, Archbishop Lefebvre's doctrine is *free of any contradiction*, even if the *deceptive negotiations* with the Vatican might have given the impression – according to *the letter* and not according to *the spirit* – that they contradicted each other, while he was only adjusting his next decision.

*You have been economical with the truth concerning the last 20 years of Archbishop Lefebvre's combat against the conciliar Church - to perpetuate, at any price, the validity of the Mass, the sacraments, and the apostolic succession – and about his claim to continue the visible Church in the Fraternity – not in Rome. The reason for this first act of concealment is simple: any reminding of that would have demonstrated, by contrast, your lack of results and of follow-up of his victorious action for 18 years! It would have put into full light your being in total contradiction and your obligation to break off talks with Rome or repudiate the Bishop that consecrated you.*

## 2) The reason of your silence with regard to the invalidity of the New mass

To make up for your lack of balance and your silence, a series of questions has been asked to you in the end, particularly about the invalidity of Paul VI's Mass (the so called « Lord's Supper »), that led to the destruction of the Tridentine Mass and without which the combat of Archbishop Lefebvre would have been meaningless:

- **To the question**, « You have told us that Vatican II is a « new religion », then, is the *new mass* a Catholic Mass? », your answer was puzzling: « What is a Catholic Mass? »;
- **To the question** « Is the *new mass* valid? », you answered: « I do not know ! »;
- **To the question** « Is there transubstantiation in the new mass? », you answered: « I do not know ».
- **To the question**, brought up after having reminded you of Archbishop Lefebvre's rejection, in three categorical points<sup>5</sup>, of Vatican II and also of his position with regard to the exponential *invalidity*<sup>6</sup> of the *new mass to which you had to assent*, « Are you at least going to dispute the validity of the *new mass* », you have answered to me: « No. The discussions will be in writing, *in secrecy*, and without the involvement of the faithful, who will only be informed step by step. Rome wants a differentiated agreement. We do not, but if there is an agreement one will become indifferent (sic). »
- **To the question**, « The Church – that is the truth. How can the Fraternity think of converting Rome on false premisses? », you uttered furtively « Pray for us » while you went away.

The reason for your repeatedly being economical with the truth in a matter as fundamental as that of the invalidity is that any attempt to reply on your part would have revealed the impasse – the *dilemma* – in which the agreements with Rome have locked you up:

⇒ If you would answer that the *new mass* is *invalid* – as Archbishop Lefebvre has very clearly stated due to the lack of intention -, then that would mean that the conciliar Church is no longer the guardian of the sacraments, and so it is no longer the Catholic Church. Consequently, *talks with her leader have lost their raison d'être* ;

⇒ If, however, you would answer that it is *valid*, it would mean that *the Fraternity is no longer relevant*.

---

<sup>4</sup> In November 1988, **on the necessity of the continuity of the Church, in Rome or in the Fraternity, he said solemnly**: « Where is the visible Church? The visible Church can be recognized by the signs that it has always given for its visibility: **it is one, holy, catholic and apostolic**. I ask you: **where are the true marks of the Church?** Are they more **in the official Church** (I am not talking about the visible Church, I mean the official Church) or **with us**, while we represent what we are? It is clear that it is we who keep the unity of the faith that has vanished from the official Church. (...) Where is the unity of faith in Rome? Where is the unity of faith in the world? **It is surely we who have kept it.** » (in « Fideliter », n° 66 of Nov. Dec. 1988, (emphasis added).

<sup>5</sup> I have then said to you that « Monseigneur Lefebvre was categorical about the following three points of Vatican II :

- **The systematic ambiguity** of its texts, causing the choice of two opposite interpretations, traditional or anathema;
- **The destructive poison** of its fruits, such as what Archbishop Lefebvre said, that the new mass would - as times go by – increasingly have that default of intention of the new post-conciliar priests (see note 4 below) that you yourself noted in your lecture. As you did not remember it, I have reminded you of the fact that you had said that because of your age you knew what was to be understood by « memorial » which is not the case in the generation after Vatican II. And then you acquiesced.
- **The fact that Vatican II is a block**, as the Revolution - « 1789 in the Church » in the words of Cardinal Suenens - so that Archbishop Lefebvre says that: « **Either we must condemn Vatican II, or we must condemn the Council of Trent** ». « Yet, despite this blanket condemnation of Vatican II by Archbishop Lefebvre, you are seeking an agreement with Rome on the texts of this Council which is not like the others, according to him, knowing that this show agreement is easy to find because of the systematic ambiguity that allows of the option to read in a traditional way or the opposite. »

<sup>6</sup> The reference with regard to the invalidity is in his *Open letter to confused Catholics* of 1985, 24 years ago: « What remains in the new mass? », p 39 till 44 with in particular « **There will be fewer valid masses as the faith of the priests gets corrupted and that they no longer intend to do what the Church has always done – for the Church cannot change its intention – that is obvious** » (p 42) and « **a religion that is no longer ours** » (p 44). Since 24 years, almost one generation, this corruption-vanishing of the faith is exponential.

None of these two answers were of any value; your secretive demeanor is therefore the *sine qua non* condition for negotiations with Rome!

*You have been economical with the truth concerning the invalidity of la « Lord's Supper<sup>7</sup> » - a mechanical<sup>8</sup> result of the destruction of the Mass. The reason for this second act of concealment is easy: the reminder of this invalidity and Archbishop Lefebvre's position would have put full light on you, escaping the responsibilities towards the faithful and the truth about the sacraments. This reminder would have made obvious your being in total contradiction and your obligation to break off talks with Rome or repudiate the Bishop that consecrated you.*

### **3) The reason of your silence with regard to Archbishop Lefebvre's veto on canonical integration in the « apostate » Conciliar Church**

Ignoring Archbishop Lefebvre's twenty last years of his life served to ignore his *veto* without appeal on any collaboration with the incorporation of the Fraternity, the aim of the current secret negotiations<sup>9</sup>. That has spared you the trouble of justifying the *Motu proprio*, of July 7, 2007, and the lifting of the excommunications, of January 21, 2009, these issues which are at the core of the hottest current affairs and which explain the number of people that have come to hear you and whose concern has increased tenfold by your speech. The reason for your silence is easy:

- ***Justifying the « oddity » of the *Motu proprio**** (that meant that the Vatican pretended to authorize that what has never been banned, and that the Fraternity cried: a miracle!), would have revealed that, by the first agreement, you have:
  - 1. *Formally admitted* that Paul VI's Mass is a *memorial* and so « normal<sup>10</sup> » whilst the *real sacrifice* of the Mass was not (this is a tragic sham) ;
  - 2. *Formally admitted*, that the conciliar Supper (invalid) and the Catholic Mass (valid) are two *simple alternatives* of the one Roman rite<sup>11</sup> (with the same *lex orandi* and the same *lex credendi*);
  - 3. *Formally recognized the preeminence* of the invalid to the valid! and ***the perfect substantial identity of Paul VI's New Mass with the Mass of all times***;
  - 4. *And by doing so you renounced any possibility of serious and credible debate on its invalidity*, an issue on which everything else depends.
  
- *Since this recognition, on the 7th of July, 2007, of the preeminence of the New Mass, you have already formally denied any legitimacy and each raison d'être for Archbishop Lefebvre's fight against the destruction of the Mass, and so the Fraternity has been reduced to the rank of an obsolete curiosity, persisting in celebrating a Mass « old style » used by a bunch of backward reactionaries doomed to speedy extinction (Benedict XVI, who has never officially celebrated the Tridentine Mass, did not even call it « exceptional », at the announcement of the *Motu*! By this affront, he has sent an inverse signal – of contempt – to the whole world);*
  
- ***Justifying the « oddity » of the lifting of the excommunication*** (meaning that the Vatican pretended to lift an excommunication with the single and sole reason of « sorrowful spiritual (sic) state » of the four Bishops and that the Fraternity cries: a miracle!, whilst it has always denied the reality of these excommunications saying « Neither excommunicated, nor schismatic » !), would have revealed that, by your pseudo « *application* » for lifting the excommunications<sup>12</sup> you have recognized the doctrinal primacy of Rome and that you are *formally committed* to a speedy return in « full communion » with the conciliar Church, hereby legitimized by you. This Church of whom the Archbishop said in his letter to the future Bishops of August 29, 1987: « ***Now that the Chair of Peter and the positions***

---

<sup>7</sup> See the definition of the *new mass* of Paul VI as a memorial service and no longer a sacrifice: « The Lord's Supper or mass is a sacred synaxis [*gathering* in Greek], that means the gathering of the people of God, presided by the priest, to **celebrate the Memorial of the Lord**. (Art. 7 of the *Institutio Generalis* promulgated together with the new *Ordo Missae* by Paul VI on April 3, 1969).

<sup>8</sup> You yourself have compared the work of Annibal Bugnini with that of an engineer, presenting Paul VI as an accomplice.

<sup>9</sup> See « Der Papst meint es ehrlich mit uns », interview of March 12, 2009, given by Fr. Schmidberger, superior of the District of Germany, to the weekly « Die Welt ».about the problems that « still » (sic) oppose « the full (sic) rehabilitation of the Fraternity ».

<sup>10</sup> This word « normal » is used by Benedict XVI, in his letter to the Bishops, accompanying the *Motu Proprio*, to answer their fears: « In the first place, there is the fear that the document diminishes the authority of the Second Vatican Council, and to see one of its essential decisions - the liturgical reform - being called into question." ***This fear is unfounded***. In this regard, ***it must first be said that the Missal published by Paul VI*** and then republished in two subsequent editions by John Paul II, obviously is and ***continues to be the normal form-*** the '*Forma ordinaria*' - of the Eucharistic liturgy. (...) Rather, it is a matter of a twofold use of one and the same rite. » (Emphasis added)

<sup>11</sup> « **Art 1.** The Roman Missal promulgated by Paul VI is the ordinary expression of the 'Lex orandi' (Law of prayer) of the Catholic Church of the Latin rite. Nonetheless, the Roman Missal promulgated by St. Pius V and reissued by Bl. John XXIII is to be considered as an extraordinary expression of that same 'Lex orandi,' and must be given due honor for its venerable and ancient usage. These two expressions of the Church's Lex orandi will in no any way lead to a division in the Church's 'Lex credendi' (Law of belief). They are, in fact, two usages of the one Roman rite. »

<sup>12</sup>By the letter of Archbishop Fellay of December 15, 2008, appealing in behalf of the four Bishops of the Fraternity.

*of authorities in Rome have been occupied by antichrists*, the destruction of the Kingdom of Our Lord continues rapidly in the very interior of his Mystical Body here below, especially by the corruption of the Holy Mass (...) ». A Church of which he said again, on the 11th of February, 1991, in his last conference to the seminarians: « **The situation in the Church is more serious than the loss of faith. It is the foundation of another religion, with other principles. and those are not catholic**<sup>13</sup> ».

- Since the recognition, on the 21st of January, 2009, of the doctrinal, hierarchical and spiritual primacy of the head of a different religion - the conciliar Church -, which, according to the spiritual testament of the Bishop who consecrated you, is not catholic, you have *formally denied* any reason for Archbishop Lefebvre for doing his work, for this Ark of the Fraternity that he has entrusted to you, and of whom you have reported the words: « I finished my job », « This year 1988 was a great grace... a real miracle. It was the first time that, being seriously ill, I am perfectly at ease... before, I worried about the Fraternity still needing me, because nobody could do my job for me. Now, I am at peace, everything is in place and everything works<sup>14</sup>. »

**In view of the self-destruction of the Fraternity**, already accomplished by your twofold recognition of the *preeminence* of the New Mass and of the *primacy* of the conciliar Church, we remind you how strongly Archbishop Lefebvre, at the end of his life, again and again renewed his *veto* on any canonical integration into the conciliar Church:

- **In December 1988**, during talks in which cardinal Ratzinger (whom he calls a (“devil “) had said : « Of course, if you are granted this protocol, some privileges, you must accept what we do; and therefore, **in the church of Saint-Nicolas-du-Chardonnet, the new Mass must be said also**, each Sunday ». « You clearly see, » told Archbishop Lefebvre then, « that he wanted to bring us back to the conciliar Church ». « It is obvious, that they want to impose these novelties **to end the Tradition** [i.e. the validity of the sacraments]. » It is only to fool us », to « diminish our resistance, to drive a wedge in the traditional bloc to destroy it. That is their policy, their continual tactics<sup>15</sup>. »
- **In July 1989**, in defining the tactics of Cardinal Ratzinger to incorporate the Fraternity in order to destroy it, a year and a half before his death, Monseigneur Lefebvre said: « To place oneself inside the Church, what does that mean? And, to start with, about what Church do we speak? If it is the conciliar Church, should we, who have fought against her for twenty years because we want the Catholic Church, have to reenter in that conciliar Church to make here so to say catholic? **That is a complete illusion!** (...) This story of the visible Church of Dom Gérard and M. Madiran is childish. It is incredible that we can speak of the visible Church referring to the conciliar Church, instead of **the Catholic Church that we try to represent and continue**.<sup>16</sup> »
- **In your book** you yourself have reported the substantial principle of the *veto* opposed to the bad bargain of an impossible collaboration, formulated by the Bishop who consecrated you, to cardinal Ratzinger with these words: « Your Eminence, even if you would grant us all... **we will not be able to collaborate, because we work in two separate directions**: you, you work towards the dechristianization of the society, of the Church, but we are working towards the christianization. For us, Our Lord Jesus Christ means all and everything to us...And you, you do the opposite<sup>17</sup>... »

However, deaf to this *veto*, this condemnation without appeal of the childishness of believing that *we could return to the conciliar Church in order to make it Catholic*, you have claimed, in your interview of the 1<sup>st</sup> of February, 2009, to La Stampa: « We will not change our positions, but **we intend to convert Rome**, i.e. to bring the Vatican to our positions. » But, it is the Vatican that already has led you to adopt its positions of the « precondition » (to the incorporation and not to the talks) by your recognition of the *preeminence* of the New Mass (invalid) and of the *doctrinal primacy* of the conciliar Church, the agreement on Vatican II from that moment being no more than a play of words. And the mere fact of pretending to discuss is a denial of loyalty to Archbishop Lefebvre, who said: « **The Vatican II council must be condemned ...or else the council of Trent and all popes are to be condemned**<sup>18</sup> ».

**You have been economical with the truth about the veto of Archbishop Lefebvre on any canonical integration in the conciliar Church. The reason for this third act of concealment is simple: the reminder**

---

<sup>13</sup> Quote of your own book *Marcel Lefebvre*, « J'ai transmis ce que j'ai reçu », o. c., p. 639. (Emphasis added)

<sup>14</sup> Marcel Lefebvre, o. c, p 641 and 642.

<sup>15</sup> *Fideliter*, n° 66 of Nov. Dec. 1988, emphasis added

<sup>16</sup> *Fideliter*, n° 70 of Jul.-Aug 1989, emphasis added.

<sup>17</sup> *Marcel Lefebvre*, o. c. p 577, emphasis added.

<sup>18</sup> *Open letter to confused Catholics*, Archbishop Lefebvre, Angelus Press, 1992, p. 10. Emphasis added.

*of this veto, that stands in the way of any collaboration, would have highlighted the auto-demolition of Archbishop Lefebvre's work, resulting from disobedience to him and already accomplished by your recognition of the preeminence of Paul VI's « New Mass » and of the primacy of the conciliar Church that makes the alleged negotiations on Vatican II illusory.<sup>19</sup> This reminder, like the others, would have put into full light your total contradiction and your obligation to break off talks with Rome or repudiate the Bishop who consecrated you.*

#### **4) The reason for your silence with regard to Archbishop Lefebvre's foundation of an organization to supplement the Holy See**

But there is even more, concerning you personally, since you ignored *the ultimate point of Archbishop Lefebvre's combat* by establishing an organization supplying the authority of the Pope and of the Holy See, by introducing real Church tribunals authorized to grant waivers, to make declarations of nullity of marriages, etc..., by the establishment of the *Canonical Commission St Charles Borromeo*, of which you have been appointed as President.

If you had told the truth about the final months of combat of Archbishop Lefebvre, drawing all the conclusions of his ever more solemn proclamations – such as « there will be fewer valid Masses as the faith of the priests gets corrupted<sup>5</sup> » ; « Either Vatican II has to be condemned, or the Council of Trent<sup>17</sup> » ; « Do you have the apostolic mandate ? », « We do ! » ; « It is we who have kept it ( i.e. the unity of faith that has disappeared from the official Church » and « the marks of the visible Church »<sup>3</sup>) » -, you would have had to reveal Archbishop Lefebvre's very last decision, of January 15, 1991, *to draw* the final conclusions of his « apostolic mandate », *to lay* the foundation of a stand in organization; *to initiate* the creation of an effective stand in organization « making up, to a certain degree, for the deficiency of the Roman congregations » ; *to create* in this way the first canonical Commission Saint Charles Borromeo, replacing the Church tribunal of the *official conciliar Church* (diocesan tribunals and Roman Rota) and of which you still are the President.

Concerning the *invalidity* of the official tribunals, you have said as President about the faithful: « *They do not have the right to go to the novus ordo tribunals*, for it is running great risk of receiving a void declaration of nullity and to remarry cheaply and thus live in sin, in canonical concubinage!<sup>20</sup> » and « *it is true that our sentences in third instance replace the sentences of the Roman Rota, which judges on behalf of the Pope as a court of third instance* ». In truth, on March 13, you would have had to reveal to the « remarried couples » that listened to you and that have been waiting in vain, since years, for the decision of your court, that despite your categorical assertions, your Commission is now blocked by talks with Rome, as, indeed, the ability to consecrate new Bishops. But this *political* paralysis is in total contradiction with Archbishop Lefebvre's will and the interests of the faithful.

***Once more you have been economical with the truth. Your fourth act of concealment regards the final point of Archbishop Lefebvre's struggle, launching a stand in organization for the authority of the Pope and of the Holy See by the setting up of the canonical Commission St Charles Borromeo. The reason is simple: the recall of this work would have shown what the Archbishop understood by continuing the Catholic Church by his own means; how, for 20 years, he has consistently remained at a distance from the « apostate » Rome, whereas you follow the opposite path of reintegration for 18 years, illuding yourself to convert Rome. This reminder would have put full light on your total contradiction with his work and your obligation to break off talks or repudiate him.***

\*\*\*\*

Thus the purpose of *your four cases of concealment* was to prevent the coming into full light of the complete contradiction that you are in and that, once revealed, would oblige you to either break off the negotiations or to repudiate Archbishop Lefebvre, his efforts to save the Mass and his project of the sacerdotal Ark of the Fraternity that is in your care.

By covering with your authority as his biographer, as Bishop and as President of the canonical Commission, excluding the Truth as wished by Rome and necessary to its policy of incorporation (of extinction) of the Fraternity, you have turned your back on the millenary ideal of Truth, - shared by the Church (« The truth will set you free »), Science, Humanities and Justice – that has shaped the glory of Western civilization. But you have also demonstrated how you are able to blind yourself, by the « total and childish illusion » - *dixit* Archbishop Lefebvre - *that you are going to convert Rome...*

After having stated the extreme seriousness of these concealments it still remains to treat of:

1. The *origin* of this policy of excluding the truth, leading to the strangling of Archbishop Lefebvre's work;

---

<sup>19</sup> See the very explicit text of Golias: « According to our information, if the status of personal Prelature is considered (see our previous publications) and has been delayed to its official announcement because of the moral outrage provoked by the lifting of the excommunication, it could evolve also to that of a universal apostolic Administration, a kind of personal diocese of the Pope for the « reintegrists ». Also according to our information, it has been confirmed to us that **Rome will not demand from the Fraternity to adhere to the Council explicitly. The reintegration will therefore take place without the Lefebvrists signing the Decree on Ecumenism, the Declaration on Religious Freedom, Nostra Aetate (relations with the Jews), Lumen Gentium and Dei Verbum.** These texts would be isolated, and read neither in the light of Vatican II, nor to that of all off the Church's Tradition. » (« Personal Prelature or Apostolic Administration ») (Christian Terras, February 3, 2009. Emphasis added.

<sup>20</sup> *Sodalitium* n° 51 of Dec. 2000. Contrary to the demand of Archbishop Lefebvre this Commission has been kept a secret.

2. Its purpose;
3. The *public amends* that you owe him.

■ ***The strangling of the Fraternity since the secret agreement of 2000***

It is, alas, only to blind Archbishop Lefebvre's followers for the essentials, that you have attracted them, in order to get them to accept, step by step, the unacceptable scuttling of their Ark for the sake of negotiations *with foregone conclusions*. This has been going on ever since the year 2000 and only secrecy can guarantee a - murky<sup>21</sup> - success.

Indeed, it is at that time that I got, by my works as epistemologist, knowledge of the *secret agreement* of the year 2000, between the Fraternity and Rome, which had to exclude any inconvenient truth. This agreement immediately showed its existence by the censorship of the Turin Shroud (early 2000), by your incredible silence on the repentance of March 12, 2000, by the *ostentatious* procession of the Fraternity in Rome (August 2000), by the lifting of restrictions on donations and bequests (September 2000) and, in late 2000, by the opening day of the talks that should lead, in stages, to the canonical integration of the Fraternity (from the viewpoint of the Fraternity) and to the final destruction of Archbishop Lefebvre's work (from the viewpoint of the Vatican). ***Release of donations and bequests as a reward for recognizing the legitimacy of the conciliar Church, was the priming of the « exchange » ; as the label « Catholic » had until then been denied by the public power at the instigation of the conciliar Church.***

This unbelievable maneuver of intoxication *gives an idea of the* moral, intellectual and spiritual *strangling* that has befallen the Management of the Fraternity since the extreme pressure exercised on it has no longer met with an obstacle of its size. But it *also shows the size of the formidable religious, political and civilizational power* at stake – related with its survival and illegible by those who do not know that « The book of Religion is written in symbolic language that no one would understand a word of, if it would not be used ». It *shows the inestimable price* attached to the inveiglement of the real treasure that would be the « fusion-acquisition » of Archbishop Lefebvre's sacramental Ark by those whom he called “*the foes of the faith*” in 1991.

■ ***The target of the sacramental power***

Of the existence of the target of this inestimable treasure nobody would – owing to the jamming by the media – have any suspicion. Only by reading the historical, religious and political *long term* it gets revealed. Without any doubt, this target is the treasury of the *Catholic exception* of being the only and exclusive guardian of the handing down of the authentic sacraments, *manifest* since the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem in the year 70: *Catholic exception*, of which Archbishop Lefebvre has rightly claimed the « real signs » in the Fraternity<sup>3</sup> (and not in Rome!), which have, however, been disowned by your two agreements!

The main aim of Vaticanum II was to get rid of the Mass – *abominable* according to Luther – of which the substantial principle is found in the sentence<sup>22</sup> of the Consecration - « *Hic est enim Calix Sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti, mysterium fidei* ». It rehabilitated Luther<sup>23</sup> with Paul VI's Mass. This led Archbishop Lefebvre to conclude: « ***Here is the key of the wish of « change » in the Church: it is all about replacing a divine institution divine<sup>24</sup> by an institution made by the hand of man<sup>25</sup>*** ». Putting a final stop to the *transubstantiation*, not any longer in the conciliar Church – that has already been taken care of – but in the continuation of the Catholic Church that constitutes the Ark of the Fraternity – according to Archbishop Lefebvre's word – that would be *wanting* to definitively abrogate the *new and eternal Alliance* (the New testament). This sacramental shutting down of the Christian era would constitute an event of historical, religious and political importance, comparable to that of the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem in the year 70, closing down the preceding era and abrogating the old Alliance « apparently » - not formally -, by the extinction of the sacerdotal function and of the sacrifices of the Temple. This closure would reopen the questions of justification, of election, etc.

Without that *sacramental and sacerdotal stake* – founding symbol of our era and its bimillenary civilization – the media frenzy and *Rome's* determination to reduce that Lilliputian work of Archbishop Lefebvre that represents hardly some 150 000 persons – that is 0,00002 (two hundred thousandth) of the world population and 0,0001 (a ten thousandth ) of the Catholics -, would be fully incomprehensible. Even more, as this population is presented as being in the last phase of a certain « mental » retardation. Why then all this trouble... *if the ass is not carrying relics?*

<sup>21</sup> « God is light; there is no darkness in Him » Ps. LXXX1, 6.

<sup>22</sup> Archbishop Lefebvre reminds that the ***intimitative tone*** of the five words of the Consecration « *Hic est enim Corpus meum* » that « operate the miracle of the *transubstantiation* » have been in the mass of Paul VI by the *narrative tone* of a simple memorial, making for the abandon of the catholic rite of the transubstantiation. (*Open letter to puzzled Catholics*, o. c, p 41)

<sup>23</sup> *Open letter to confused Catholics*, Archbishop Lefebvre, Angelus Press, 1992., p 10

<sup>24</sup> I.e. ***not made by man's hand*** according to the expression given to the Turin Shroud by the Byzantine artists.

<sup>25</sup> *Open letter to confused Catholics*, Archbishop Lefebvre, Angelus Press, 1992, p125

## ■ *The necessity of public amends*

These facts are so full of consequences that only having recourse to a total sincerity, loyalty and transparency, towards the work, the person of Archbishop Lefebvre and the « negotiations », can bring about the public amends from your part that is imposed, because of such radical concealments concerning an issue that puts at risk the survival of the Fraternity, yes, but also that of the Church that founded Western civilization and its great religion, so that you:

1. ***Restore as soon as possible the full truth of the facts*** of the essentials of Archbishop Lefebvre's *victorious* combat for the survival of the Mass, of the episcopacy and of the Church, in particular about his claim of the continuation of the *visible* Catholic Church in the Fraternity – and not in Rome –, the invalidity of the conciliar Mass and the founding of an organization to compensate for the deficiency of the Roman congregations ;
2. ***Restore the loyalty to Archbishop Lefebvre by breaking off « talks » with Rome*** that immerse you together with the Fraternity in a suicidal contradiction ; *by denouncing* the secret and the subterfuge of the two agreements consisting in the recognition of the preeminence of the *New Mass* and the primacy of the *conciliar Church*. All leading to the auto-demolition of the work of Archbishop Lefebvre, violating his *veto* without appeal ;
3. ***Restore the transparency, returning to Truth's method*** in order to *find* the *organizational* and *intellectual* means that are lacking to face *methodically* and *in a conflicting way*, with all parties concerned and all the elements at stake ( Evangelists, Prophecies<sup>26</sup>, Popes, the holy Shroud of Turin, history of the Church), the problems at stake ( *invalidity* of the New Mass and of the Episcopal consecrations, *signs of visibility of the Church*, *apostolic succession*, etc. ), to start with proven methods ( scientific, juridical, and theological ) – like that of the international Symposium on the Turin Shroud in Rome in 1993 –; that way *unbolting* the Macchiavelistic politics of the talks that block the new ordinations and to overcome that way the strangling that results from the agreement of the year 2000.

The perfect coherence of the doctrine of Archbishop Lefebvre, excluding any coward way out that could be the result of pretended contradictions, *to follow or to betray him* in the open is the only choice left for his successors; *to finish the secrecy and trust the Truth, the only issue worthy of his tombstone*: « I have passed on, what I have received ».

To avoid any misunderstanding, it still needs to be clarified that such an act of Justice and of Truth imposes itself on dual grounds: *religious*, with regard to a loyalty to Archbishop Lefebvre's work of and to the Church, to which you could not be disloyal without denying yourself; but also, *epistemological*, with regard to the community of mankind and to a public debate that affects science, religion and civilization in the broadest sense.

This, Monseigneur, is what I am waiting for, while I stay at your disposal for any necessary epistemological contribution.

Yours truly,

Arnaud-Aaron Upinsky

---

To subscribe you or stop subscribing you newsletter *Virgo-Maria*, please fill the form available on our website <http://www.virgo-maria.org/>

---

<sup>26</sup> From this prophetic point of view, it should be noted that, during his sacerdotal Jubilee of November 19, 1989, Archbishop Lefebvre has said that the « Apocalypse of St John has foretold, in the vision of the two beasts of chapter 13, how the leaders of the Church, **changing their language**, put by a sacrilege profanation, their power in the service of the anti-Christ synarchy (Marcel Lefebvre, o. c, p. 634.