THE SIGNIFICENCE OF BISHOP MICHAL STOBNICKI'S VISIT TO SS. PETER & PAUL ROMAN CATHOLIC MISSION
and its opposition by the Disciples of Archbishop Lefebvre

Bishop Michel Stobnicki, consecrated on August 15, 2022, in Poland by Bishop Richard Williamson, arrived at Ss. Peter & Paul Roman Catholic Mission on the morning of Friday October 16 and departed the evening of October 22. He offered the daily Mass at our Chapel for seven days. During his visit he performed a solemn blessing and dedication of the Mission's Chapel and administered the sacrament of Confirmation. He traveled to Washington, D.C., New York City, and Baltimore, MD to perform the Catholic rite of exorcism at the center of political and financial power in the United States as well as at the location of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, zealous defenders of the heresies of Neo-modernism and Americanism. He also visited the Basilica of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, Cathedral of St. Matthew the Apostle, drove around the Basilica of the National Shrine of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, known as the Baltimore Basilica, built between 1806 and 1821 which was the first Catholic cathedral built in the United States after the nation's founding, and visited St. Patrick's Cathedral, the Mother Church of the Archdiocese of New York where prayers were offered for the restoration of the Catholic faith and extirpation of heresy. Everything was without incident except during the exorcism in Baltimore where a clearly possessed woman made a loud, excited and agitated protest. Bishop Stobnicki also visited the National Shrine Grotto of Our Lady of Lourdes and the Chapel of the Immaculate Conception in Emmitsburg, MD. Before arriving at Ss. Peter & Paul Roman Catholic Mission, Bishop Stobnicki visited chapels in California, Arizona and Colorado.

The late and sadly missed Bishop Richard Williamson was a great help to our Mission. He did not agree with us in every respect but sympathized with our work and helped us nonetheless. He was always grateful for very small favors done for him and exercised an unfailing charity. He provided ordination conditionally for Fr. Samuel Waters and provided us with Holy Oils annually. After he consecrated Bishop Thomas Aquinas, he asked him to provide the Holy Oils for our Mission which he did. The following year Bishop Williamson consecrated Bishop Gerado Zendejas and asked him to provide Holy Oils for our Mission which he did until the death of Bishop Williamson. Since the death of Bishop Williamson neither Bishop Zendejas nor Bishop Thomas Aquinas responded to our requests. The reason for this is because Ss. Peter & Paul Roman Catholic Mission does not adhere to the 'integral doctrinal position of Archbishop Lefebvre' and refuse to use the 1962 Bugnini transitional Missal. Bishops Zendejas and Thomas Aquinas are strict Disciples of Archbishop Lefebvre. Their aim is to reconstitute the SSPX as they believe existed in 1985. Any Catholic who does not share their aim is refused their help.

Bishop Stobnicki received emails warning him not to visit or assist Ss. Peter & Paul Roman Catholic Mission because they are "Feeneyites" infected with the errors of "Feeneyism." The Mission also received emails from hypocrites claiming to have read our Mission web page and expressed interest in attending the Mission Masses but first wanting to know if we believe in "baptism of desire." The Disciples of Archbishop Lefebvre call us "Feeneyites" so clarity in definition is called for.

"Feeneyism": It is a slur invented by Neo-modernists against Catholics who believe, like the late Fr. Leonard Feeney, that dogma has to taken literally, a slur against Catholics who believe that dogma says what it means and means what it says. It is a slur against Catholics who recognize that dogma is a Magisterially defined revealed Catholic doctrine that is infallibly true and imposed by the Church on all the faithful as a formal object of divine and Catholic faith which must be believed on the pain of heresy. The denial of a dogma constitutes the very definition of heresy. In fact, the canonical and moral definition of heresy constitutes an *essential definition* which distinguishes the genus and species difference between a heretic and a faithful Catholic, thus dogma necessarily is the proximate rule of faith for all Catholics. Dogma must be understood literally because if dogma does not have to taken literally, heresy looses all literal meaning and the very concept of an infallible definition of a divinely revealed truth becomes an absurdity. Therefore dogma is infallible both in the formal truth expressed and in the material verbal expression used to define that truth. Faithful Catholics do not need to go the Church to find out what a dogma means for a dogma is the Church infallibly telling the faithful what a revealed doctrine literally means, what the faithful are literally called upon to believe. Those that will not believe a dogma are those who will not hear the Church. And those who "will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican" (Matt 18:17).

"Feeneyism" then is directly contrary to the heresy of Neo-modernism which claims that dogma contains a formal divine truth wrapped in a material human expression. They believe that material human expression must necessarily evolve to reflect our progressively better comprehension of the divine truth. Therefore, every Catholic is obliged to find out what the current personal magisterium of the pope declares the dogma to mean today. For the Neo-modernist the pope is the proximate rule of faith. Bishop Stobnicki rejects Neo-modernism and its corruption of Catholic dogma. As for "baptism of desire," Bishop Stobnicki holds it as an Americanist heresy unfortunately believed by the SSPX, a "doctrine" that was never taught in Poland.

Bishop Stobnicki admired Archbishop Lefebvre but he does not adhere to the 'integral doctrinal position of Archbishop Lefebvre' nor his liturgical opinions as professed in 1985. He has no intention of recreating "SSPX 2.0." He recognizes that the SSPX under Archbishop Lefebvre, which it continues today, imposed conformity to doctrinal and liturgical positions by their priests, seminarians and faithful attending their chapels, as well as administrative prudential problems that have undermined an effective and coherent response to the errors of neo-modernism. Bishop Stobnicki's primary aim is to convert Novus Ordo people to the Catholic faith and to our immemorial ecclesiastical traditions that make it possible to know and communicate that faith.

The chief problems perpetuated by the Disciples of Archbishop Lefebvre:
1) Archbishop Lefebvre was a Neo-modernist. He held that dogma does not have to be taken literally. This is addressed in detail in the Ss. Peter & Paul Roman Catholic Mission, **OPEN LETTER, Why the SSPX Cannot ~~Effectively~~ Defend Catholic Tradition,** published in 2010. This Letter addresses the SSPX belief in Baptism of Desire that Archbishop Lefebvre defined as:

> The doctrine of the Church also recognizes implicit baptism of desire. This consists in doing the will of God. God knows all men and He knows that amongst Protestants, Muslims, Buddhists and in the whole of humanity there are men of

> good will. They receive the grace of baptism without knowing it, but in an effective way. In this way they become part of the Church.
> The error consists in thinking that they are saved by their religion. They are saved in their religion but not by it. There is no Buddhist church in heaven, no Protestant church. This is perhaps hard to accept, but it is the truth. I did not found the Church, but rather Our Lord the Son of God. As priests we must state the truth.
> Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, *Open Letter to Confused Catholics*

This is Neo-modernism, it is not the "doctrine of the Church." It requires that every dogma on what is necessary as a necessity of means for salvation be taken in a non-literal sense, reduced from a divinely revealed truth to a human axiom. Thus the "good willed" Protestant, "good willed" Muslims, "good willed" Buddhists, and the "good willed whole of humanity" are in the state of grace, temples of the Holy Ghost, children of God, members of the Mystical Body of Christ without believing a single revealed Catholic doctrine, without receiving any Catholic sacrament, and without being subject to the Roman pontiff. All the dogmas as to what is necessary for salvation are reduced, as Pius XII said in *Humani Generis*, to a "meaningless formula." Neo-modernism deceived many eminent Catholics before Vatican II but it should not deceive us today. The entire purpose of Vatican II was to inject the heresy of Neo-modernism into the Church. Archbishop Lefebvre subscribed to the error of Neo-modernism before Vatican II and, while he rejected some Vatican II documents during the deliberations, he in the end affixed his signature to every neo-modernist document. Archbishop Lefebvre was similarly conflicted with the John Paul II's Prayer Meeting at Assisi. While he theoretically held that the "good willed" Hindu or Muslim may be in the state of grace, child of God, and temple of the Holy Ghost, he was repulsed by the practical application of his theological belief. The Disciples of Archbishop Lefebvre call anyone who does not believe in this doctrine of "salvation by implicit desire" a "Feeneyite" and to them they deny any sacramental support. Apparently, there is no such thing as a "good willed Feeneyite." The Disciples of Archbishop Lefebvre cannot offer any intelligent argument to oppose the Prayer Meeting of Assisi. If a Hindu or Moslem praying with John Paul II is "good willed" and therefore in God's grace, what is wrong with praying with him?

2) Because Archbishop Lefebvre did not believe necessarily in the literal meaning of dogma, he held that the "received and approved" immemorial Roman rite of Mass was a matter of mere discipline subject to the free and independent will of the pope who was called the "master of the liturgy." He held that the pope could do anything he wanted with the liturgy as long as it did not damage his own personal faith. This is addressed in detail in the SS. Peter & Paul Roman Catholic Mission, **OPEN LETTER, Revisited: Why the SSPX Cannot Defend the Catholic Faith or Tradition – July 22, 2023** which covers the SSPX liturgical and sacramental errors. These errors make the defense of the traditional Latin Mass impossible. These errors lead to a corruption of the Catholic Mass, a corruption of Catholic sacramental theology, even to a corruption of the priesthood itself, and ultimately to the SSPX absurd belief in "Bakery and Wine Cellar Consecrations."

We are grateful to Bishop Williamson who described in detail how Archbishop Lefebvre settled upon the use of the 1962 Bugnini transitional Missal for the SSPX and published it in Eleison Comments. Accepting or rejecting a liturgical change based upon its subjective effect on one's own personal faith is a worthless argument in defending the

immemorial Roman rite Mass but this same argument has been recently repeated by Bishop Thomas Aquinas for using the Bugnini 1962 transitional Missal. It was a bad argument in 1985 and, in light of the significant publication of new material and the republication of old classics on liturgical questions since 1990, it is a far worse argument in 2026.

3) The prudential judgment of Archbishop Lefebvre to organize the SSPX as a monolithic centrally controlled opposition to Rome making himself the proximate rule of faith was intended from the beginning. In the United States there was developing a vigorous opposition to the Novus Ordo by traditionally minded diocesan priests in loose affiliation confronting their local ordinaries. Archbishop Lefebvre ordained his first class of seminarians one year before completion of their training and sent them to the United States, not to bring the sacraments to Catholics in need, but to open chapels in direct competition with already established Latin Mass centers. In this he was successful. What would have developed as centers of traditional Catholicism in individual dioceses in opposition to particular local ordinaries became a worldwide centrally controlled opposition removed from any particular diocese and directed by neo-modernists that could offer no effective opposition to conciliar neo-modernist Rome.

Bishop Stobnicki rejects the SSPX governing structure of centralized control, he rejects their belief in "salvation by implicit desire," he rejects their belief that the liturgy is a matter of mere discipline open to the free and independent will of the legislator, he rejects the Disciples of Archbishop Lefebvre unjust imposition of the Bugnini transitional Missal for worship on faithful Catholics, and he rejects the ridiculous SSPX belief in "bakery and wine cellar consecrations." Ultimately Bishop Stobnicki's objections are grounded on the literal meaning of dogma. The goal of Bishop Stobnicki is to resist heretical neo-modernist Rome, convert Catholics to the true faith and help restore the Catholic Church. He is not interested in trying to replicate the SSPX and repeat the same mistakes that SSPX imposed on Catholics committed to defending our immemorial traditions.

Importantly, Bishop Stobnicki knows from direct eyewitness confirmation through SSPX sources, claims that he was able to independently substantiated by his personal sources in Rome, that the four bishops recently consecrated for the SSPX were each individually vetted and finally selected with the approval of Cardinal Víctor Manuel Fernández, Prefect for the Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith and his staff. This vetting was done through several meetings in Rome with each individual candidate along with Fr. Davide Pagliarani, the Superior General of the SSPX and Bishop Alfonso de la Galarreta, his General Assistant. The present "conflict" between Rome and the SSPX is a staged opposition that was neatly signified by the Neo-SSPX when the French district reported that, "At the end of the (celebratory) meal came the most solemn moment of the day. On behalf of the colleagues, Fr. Fabian Reiser, District Superior, offered Bishop (Pascal) Schreiber the pectoral cross and ring that belonged to (Novus Ordo) Bishop Vitus Huonder, former Bishop of Chura. This present was a beautiful sign of continuity. The cross and the ring recall the link between the bishops who served the Church and the transmission of the same faith and the same priesthood." That "same faith" and the "same priesthood" of the neo-modernists.

No doubt there are many reasons for this charade but the most obvious one is to bury the resistance as conceived by Bishops Zendejas, Tomás de Aquino Ferreira da Costa, and possibly Bishop Jean-Michel Faure. With the SSPX now publically believed to be standing up to Rome in the defense of tradition, these resistance SSPX bishops have no brief, no purpose. They have suddenly become ministers with an empty portfolio. The Neo-SSPX has usurped their raison d'être. On the other hand, this farce by Rome and the SSPX only confirms Bishop Stobnicki in his Mission to combat the Neo-modernist heresy wherever he finds it and convert Novus Ordites to the Catholic faith for the salvation of their souls and the glory of God.

There has been a recent assertion that Bishop Stobnicki is a sedevacantist. He is not. I know the source of this claim and it is based upon an unnecessary assumption drawn from a Bishop Stobnicki comment. He perfectly recognizes that sedevacantism is an unjust usurpation of authority that leads to open heresy by those who reject dogma as their proximate rule of faith. For those Disciples of Archbishop Lefebvre who claim that only sedevacantists refuse to use the 1962 Bugnini transitional Missal, Bishop Stobnicki says that the majority of sedevacantists, in fact, do not use the "received and approved" immemorial Roman rite but use the Bugnini transitional Missal of 1956. They accept the Bugnini Holy Week revisions imposed in 1956 during the pontificate of Pius XII. Most sedevacantists are just using an earlier Bugnini transitional Missal. The irony is that sedevacantists use exactly the same arguments in adopting the 1956 Bugnini transitional Missal that Archbishop Lefebvre used in adopting the 1962 Bugnini transitional Missal. The difference is they accept Pius XII and reject John XXIII. Sedevacantists are just neo-modernist Disciples of Archbishop Lefebvre of a different shade.

Bishop Stobnicki's efforts are to build a true resistance to neo-modernist Rome based upon dogma as the proximate rule of faith and not the person of the pope or even the person of Archbishop Lefebvre. The immemorial ecclesiastical traditions of the Catholic Church, by which the faith alone can be known and communicated to others, most importantly of which is the "received and approved" immemorial Roman rite of Mass, will be defended on the strongest of arguments, God's revealed truth.

David Drew
Ss. Peter & Paul Roman Catholic Mission

HOME

BACK