

Michael A. Creighton  
5315 Don Mariano Rd. SW  
Albuquerque, NM 87105

January 8, 2007AD+.

The Most Reverend Bernard Fellay  
Priorat Mariae Verkündigung  
Schwandegg  
CH - 6313 Menzingen  
Suisse (Switzerland)

Your Lordship,

After attending the SSPX chapel here in Albuquerque, NM for almost 9 years, I have had to leave it since I see there are serious problems with the Society's positions on the papacy. They are in fact heretical and therefore I must come to the conclusion the SSPX, so long as it recognizes the conciliar popes as possessing valid jurisdiction, to be a schismatic sect.

I came to this conclusion after studying the sedevacantist position in order to refute it, but to my surprise found it was the Catholic position. The SSPX book against sedevacantism is a fraudulent presentation of the issue which distracts people from the main points and goes off on tangents such as sedeprivationism (*Cassiciacum* Thesis) and Conclavism. This clearly shows the SSPX to be of bad will and guilty of hiding the truth.

To briefly enumerate some of the problems in the SSPX, they are:

1. A rejection of the ordinary magisterium (Vatican I; Session III - *Dz* 1792) which must be divinely revealed. For instance Paul VI claimed that the new mass and Vatican II were his "Supreme Ordinary Magisterium" and John Paul II promulgated his catechism which contains heresies and errors in *Fide Depositum* by his "apostolic authority" as "the sure norm of faith and doctrine" and bound everyone by saying who believes what was contained therein is in "ecclesial communion," that is in the Church.
2. A rejection of the divinely revealed teaching expressed in Vatican I, Session IV, that the faith of Peter [the Pope] cannot fail. Three ancient councils are quoted to support this claim. (2nd Lyons, 4th Constantinople and Florence). Pope Paul IV's bull *Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio* teaches the same in the negative sense of this definition.
3. A distortion of canon law opposed to virtually all the canonists of the Church prior to Vatican II which tell us a heretical pope ipso facto loses his office by the operation of the law itself and without any declaration. This is expressed in Canon 188.4 which deals with the divine law and footnotes Pope Paul IV's bull, *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*. The SSPX pretends that sections of the code on penalties somehow apply to the pope which flatly contradicted by the law itself. The SSPX pretends that jurisdiction remains in force when the code clearly says jurisdiction is lost and only 'acts' of jurisdiction are declared valid until the person is found out

(Canons 2264-2265). This is simply to protect the faithful from invalid sacraments, not to help heretics retain office and destroy the Church. Charisms of the office, unlike indelible sacraments, require real jurisdiction. The SSPX pretends that penalties of the censure of *ipso facto* excommunication cannot apply to cardinals since it reserved to Holy See (Canon 2227). This is another fabrication since the law does not refer to automatic (*latae sententiae*) penalties but only to penalties in which a competent judge is needed to inflict or declare penalties on offenders. Therefore it only refers to condemnatory and declaratory sentences but not automatic sentences. To say that *ipso facto* does not mean what it says is also condemned by Pope Pius VI in *Auctorem Fide*.

4. The SSPX holds a form of the Gallican heresy that falsely proposes a council can depose a true pope. This was already tried by the Council of Basle and just as history condemned those schismatics, so it will condemn your Lordship. This belief also denies Canon 1556, “The First See is Judged by no one.” This of course means in a juridical sense of judgment, not remaining blind to apostasy, heresy and crime which automatically takes effect.
5. The SSPX denies the visible Church must manifest the Catholic faith. They claim that somehow these men who teach heresy can’t know truth. This is notion has been condemned by Vatican I, Session III, Chapter 2. It is also condemned by Canon 16 of the 1917 code of canon law. Clearly La Salette has been fulfilled. Rome is the seat of anti-Christ and the Church is eclipsed. Clearly, our Lord’s words to Sr. Lucy at Rianjo in 1931 have come to pass. His “Ministers [Popes] have followed the kings of France into misfortune”.
6. The SSPX reject every doctor of the Church and every Church father who are unanimous in stating a heretic *ipso facto* is outside the Church and therefore cannot possess jurisdiction and pretends that is only their opinion when St. Robert states “. . . it is proven, with arguments from authority and from reason, that the manifest heretic is *ipso facto* deposed.” The authority he refers to is the Magisterium of the Church, not his own opinion.
7. Pope Pius XII’s *Vacantis Apostolicae Sedis* is misinterpreted by the SSPX to validly elect a heretic to office against the divine law. A public heretic cannot be a cardinal because he automatically loses his office. This decree only refers to cardinals and hence it does not apply to ex-cardinals who automatically lost their offices because they had publicly defected from the Catholic faith. The cardinals mentioned in this decree who have been excommunicated are still Catholic and still cardinals; hence their excommunication does not cause them to become non-Catholics and lose their offices, as does excommunication for heresy and public defection from the Catholic faith. This is what the Church used to call a minor excommunication. All post-1945 canonists concur that *Vacantis Apostolicae Sedis* does not remove *ipso facto* excommunication: Eduardus F. Regatillo (1956), Matthaeus Conte a Coronata (1950), Serapius Iragui (1959), A. Vermeersch - I. Creusen (1949), Udalricus Beste (1946) teach that a pope or cardinal or bishop who becomes a public heretic automatically loses his office and a public heretic cannot legally or validly obtain an office. Even supposing this papal statement could apply to non-Catholics (heretics), Pope Pius XII goes on to say “at other times they [the

censures] are to remain in vigor.” Does this mean the Pope intends that a notorious heretic will take office and then immediately lose his office? It is an absurd conclusion, hence we must respect the interpretation of the Church in her canonists.

I originally prepared a much lengthier letter which documents all of these in detail, but I am told by people on the inside of the SSPX, your Lordship already knows and is hiding the facts from the faithful. The purpose of a simple listing of these heresies will therefore be sufficient for a public condemnation of you as head of this schismatic sect.

It would appear your Lordship is in mortal sin of schism and heresy and you are warned that by the Church fathers that most clergy will be lost and in the deepest pit of Hell. (*Acts* 20:28) These heretical positions are leading the faithful to their condemnation, in particular my wife, but also those many friends I have made over the last nine years. What assurances can you give to me that those who hold the following positions that attend your chapel can be certain of their salvation?

Errors/Heresies typical of an SSPX chapel attendees and priests:

1. We are free to reject rites promulgated by the Church. [Condemned by Trent Session VII, Canon XIII/Vatican I, Session II]
2. The Pope can't be trusted to make judgments on faith and morals. We have to sift what is Catholic. [Condemned by Vatican I, Session IV, Chapter III.]
3. We are free to reject or accept ordinary magisterial teachings from a pope since they can be in error. This rejection may include either the conciliar 'popes' when teach heresy or the pre-conciliar popes in order to justify the validity of the conciliar popes jurisdiction, sacraments, etc. [Condemned by Vatican I (*Dz* 1792)/*Satis Cognitum* #15 of Leo XIII]
4. The Kantian doctrine of unknowability of reality. We can't know what is heresy, therefore we can't judge. [Condemned by Vatican I, Session III, Chapter 2: On Revelation, *Jn* 7:24].
5. The faith of the Pope can fail. Frequently this is expressed as “we work for” or “we pray for the Popes conversion to the Catholic faith.” [condemned by Vatican I and at least 3 earlier councils mentioned above].
6. Universal salvation, ecumenism, religious liberty, validity of the Old Covenant, etc. can be interpreted in a Catholic sense. [Condemned by every saint, every doctor of the Church and every Pope who comments on such issues; for instance Pope Eugene IV (*Cantate Domino* - Council of Florence)]
7. Contraries can be true. [Hegelian doctrine against Thomistic Philosophy].

If these positions appear to be contradictory, they are. When I point out these positions are against the Faith, frequently the Hegelian doctrine is employed by those in attendance at the SSPX chapel.

It is very sad to see your Lordship pay lip service to these Marranos in Rome against the apostolic mandate (*Titus* 3). Woe to you who call evil good; that is, call a public heretic “Holy Father.” I was embarrassed for you when I saw you lick the boots of the servants of

the Synagogue of Satan at Castel Gondolfo. Every traditionalist except you seems to know who controls the world governments, banking and yes, even the Vatican.

It would be better for your Lordship to make a profession of faith in the doctrines of Vatican I (i. e., adopt the sedevacantist position), however this is too much for me to expect after decades of Hegelian and Kantian thinking. I have an immediate concern which is the salvation of my wife, children and friends. However since you seem to care little for those alleged to be under your care, for the sake of your own soul, I beg you please stop this hypocrisy.

You know that Archbishop Lefebvre from his own 1986 sermon admitted that John Paul II's worship with false religions is a violation of Canon 1258.1 would *ipso facto* excommunicate him. He admitted that Canon 2316 declares them "suspect of heresy, and if they persevere, they are to be treated as being in reality heretics." He goes on to say

**“ . . . perhaps we must say that the Pope is a heretic, is apostate. Now I don't wish yet to say it formally and solemnly, but it seems at first sight that it is impossible for a Pope to be publicly and formally heretical. Our Lord has promised to be with him, to keep his faith, to keep him in the Faith – how can he at the same time be a public heretic and virtually apostatize? So it is possible we may be obliged to believe this pope is not pope.”**

The full text can be read here: <http://www.sedevacantist.com/angeluslefebvre.html>.

The holy apostle Paul commands us “A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid: Knowing that he, that is such an one, is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned by his own judgment.” *Titus* 3:10-11. This is what the Church has always taught *de fide* regarding any person, even those in authority, including the Pope. He is recognized as being condemned and must be avoided. If we shall not obey Pope Paul IV's *de fide* teaching then we come under “the wrath of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul.” Clearly Archbishop Lefebvre's caution was not prudence but paralysis. If he had acted decisively, calamity might have been avoided. Instead, the Archbishop - by his own admission - admits he “recognized that slowly, very slowly, by the deeds and acts of the Pope himself” are those of a heretic and an apostate. I believe the Archbishop consecrated bishops with a moral certitude these men were not popes, otherwise he would be guilty of an act of schism in consecrating bishops against the direct order of a pope. Unfortunately timidity prevented his public profession of the faith.

By continuing to admit these men hold jurisdiction we must deny a host of other dogmas, councils and magisterial teachings of the Church, most especially Vatican I. I understand from some ex-seminarians that Vatican I was never taught in the SSPX seminary since it would bring up some embarrassing and contradictory positions the SSPX holds regarding the papacy. By hiding the faith do you not come under the condemnation of our Lord himself? (*Mk* 8:38; *Mt* 18:17)

Your Lordship has been accused of worshipping Mammon in a recent *Four Marks* article by Elliot Eaton Ross. It is claimed for the sake of your funding from both sides (i. e., those who want reconciliation with heretical Rome and hardliners against any agreement) you play both against each other. This explains reports from the European press of your back door deals with heretics to make some moves to free the old Mass and use your Rosary crusade as a cover for a readymade miracle. Do you think God won't know you are a Machiavelli?

I beg you meditate on your particular judgment and the responsibility of those you may drag to Hell with you. Please be assured of my prayers for your conversion. However, I will do all in my power to expose you for what you are, a schismatic and a heretic, and oppose your Machiavellian principles, most especially with THE WEAPON, i. e., our Lady's Rosary.

*Ora pro nobis sancta Dei genitrix,*  
Michael A. Creighton +JMJ+

**cc:** Fr. Bibeau; Fr. Fullerton; Bp. Williamson; Bp. Galleretta; Bp. Tissier de Mallerais.