

Catholic Candle

☪ May 2024 ☪ catholiccandle.org ☪ catholiccandle@gmail.com

Words to Live by – from Catholic Tradition

We must Show Ourselves to be Valiant Members of the Church Militant And Not Cowards and Quitters.

The teaching of the Mystical Doctor, St. John of the Cross:

Though the path is plain and smooth for people of good will, those who walk it will not travel far, and will do so only with difficulty if they do not have good feet, ***courage, and tenacity of spirit.***

St. John of the Cross, *Saying of Light and Love*, #3 (emphasis added).



An Effective Response to Protestants about Praying to Mary

Protestant sects all belong to the devil, although many individual protestants do not know that fact. One of the devil’s deceptions is to cause them to refuse to pray to the Blessed Virgin Mary and also to seek to dissuade others from praying to her.

For example, one of the *Catholic Candle* Team was silently praying his morning rosary on public transportation, when a protestant woman sat down next to him. She looked him in the eye and declared: “You don’t have to pray to Mary. I go right to Jesus.” This woman was Hispanic and was plausibly an apostate Catholic.

Of course, when attempting to lead people to the Holy Catholic Faith, there are different approaches suitable for different situations based on what principles and “starting points” such people will acknowledge. But when a protestant (or a protestantized Catholic) declares to you that we should not pray to Mary but instead “go right to Jesus”, try responding to that protestant, saying:

The next time you are talking to Jesus, ask Him if He also wants you to talk with His Mother, or whether He prefers that you ignore her.”

It is our experience that the protestant looks thoughtful, perhaps surprised, and has a new perspective to “take home” and think about. After that, pray for that protestant, that this “seed” will germinate and flourish.



Catholic Candle note: *Catholic Candle* normally examines particular issues thoroughly, at length, using the teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas and the other Doctors of the Church. By contrast, our feature **CC in Brief**, usually gives an extremely short answer to a reader’s question. We invite readers to submit their own questions.

CC in Brief

Q. Is it permissible for a priest to receive conditional ordination even though he himself has no doubts about the validity of his earlier ordination?

A. Anytime there is even the smallest reasonable doubt about the validity of a priest’s ordination, he should be conditionally ordained.¹

When a priest’s ordination is doubtful, that ordination should be **treated** as invalid. This is the **whole point** of conditional ordination. If a doubtful ordination were treated as valid, then there would never be a reason for a conditional ordination.

However, this smallest doubt (which requires conditional ordination), must be a real, (*i.e.*, an affirmative) doubt. In other words, there must be a **reason** to doubt the validity of the ordination.

A doubt for no reason at all, that is, a wholly negative doubt (“*dubium est mere negativum*”), is not sufficient to require or even allow conditional ordination.² Such a negative doubt is “entirely imprudent and empty” (“*omnino imprudens atque inane*”).³

¹ See, *e.g.*, *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology*, Hunter, S.J., Benziger Bros., 1896, vol. 3, p. 219 (requiring conditional ordination wherever there is even the “smallest doubt” about the validity of the ordination). *Cf.*, Denzinger 1151 (Condemnation by Pope Innocent XI in 1679 of those accepting probably-valid sacraments and not taking the safer course).

² See, H. Nolin, S.J., *Summa Theologiae Moralis, Oeniponte*, 1920, vol. III, p.27.

³ See, H. Nolin, S.J., *Summa Theologiae Moralis, Oeniponte*, 1920, vol. III, p.27.

Thus, the Catholic Church’s test for determining the need for conditional ordination, is whether there is the smallest real **reason** to doubt, but (of course) excluding any doubt for no reason at all.

Some priests who received an earlier conciliar “ordination” before coming to tradition, subsequently received a traditional conditional ordination but they have claimed that they themselves had no doubt about the validity of their own prior ordination but received conditional ordination only because some laymen had doubted the prior ordination.

However, in the case where an ordination was **really** free from even the smallest reasonable doubt, then receiving even a conditional ordination would be a sacrilege.

Further, consider this: if a validly-ordained priest were permitted to receive conditional ordination anyway, without committing sacrilege, then what is the limiting principle? Would he be permitted to receive conditional ordinations after having already received 100 prior conditional ordinations, simply because **some** other people continued to have unreasonable doubts about his ordination? The answer is obviously “no”.

Therefore, it is clear that a doubt concerning a prior ordination must be a **reasonable** doubt, at least a small one. Any doubt which is “entirely imprudent and empty” is not enough to allow conditional ordination regardless of how many people hold such an empty, unreasonable doubt.

Catholic Candle Note:

For further information about the **inherent** doubtfulness of the conciliar “ordination” rite, read these analyses:

- <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/new-ordination-doubtful.html>
- <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B49oPuI54eEGd2RRcTFSY29EYzg/view>

For further information about the doubtfulness of the conciliar “consecration” rite, read this analysis:

- <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B49oPuI54eEGZVF5cmFvMGdZM0U/view>



Mary's School of Sanctity

Lesson #34 Afterword on the *Spiritual Exercises*

A Reflection on Mary and the *Principle and Foundation*

Having finished the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius, let us take this lesson to reflect on how Our Dear Mother Mary lived the *Principle and Foundation* to perfection.

First we will need to recall the actual text that St. Ignatius gives us for the *Principle and Foundation*:

Man is created to praise, reverence, and serve God Our Lord, and by this means to save his soul. All other things on the face of the earth are created for man to help him fulfill the end for which he is created. From this it follows that man is to use these things to the extent that they will help him to attain his end. Likewise, he must rid himself of them insofar as they prevent him from attaining it.

Therefore, we must make ourselves indifferent to all created things, insofar as it is left to the choice of our free will and is not forbidden. Acting accordingly, for our part, we should not prefer health to sickness, riches to poverty, honor to dishonor, a long life to a short one, and so in all things we should desire and choose only those things which will best help us attain the end for which we are created.

Our Catechism teaches us that the chief creatures of God are angels and men. We say “chief creatures” because both angels and men were created with an intellectual power. Angels and men are the type of creatures that can know God, not as He comprehends Himself, but understanding God is the Supreme Being with His infinite perfections. When we humans ponder our ability to know God, we can see that it is astounding that God gave us such a wonderful capacity.

Man's highest faculties are his intellect and his will. He must use these powers to **praise, revere,** and **serve** God his Creator. The more a man uses his will and intellect properly, the better he serves God. In fact, God wants man to perfect his intellect.

But how does man perfect his intellect? He pursues truth and studies it. He is able to look at and study divinely revealed truths. He also needs to look at the world around him

in order to examine it through his senses and discover reality on many levels. [Romans 1:20]⁴

In addition to learning through observation and study, man can learn by God infusing truth in him.⁵ God has done this wonderful thing to His saints. He did this on the highest level for Mary.

Now let us consider some additional facts in order to better see God's magnificent plan for Mary and for us. The angels also were created with the moral obligation to praise, revere, and serve God. Their intellects are far superior to ours.

Lucifer was the highest angel and had the strongest intellect of all the angels. Yet, in his pride and abusing his free-will, he failed the test that God put forth to the angels. We are not sure of the exact nature of the test, but one could think that Lucifer and one-third⁶ of the total number of angels refused to accept the fact that God would become incarnate as Man. Not only this, but also the angels would have to serve God made man and His Holy Mother who was merely a human – a woman at that.⁷ Therefore, Lucifer failed to fulfill the purpose for which he was created.

Let us contrast his failure with Mary. Mary is God's masterpiece and she fulfills His Plan the best. We must remember that God gave her all of her prerogatives **because** God chose her to be His Mother. God loves Mary more than He loves all the angels and saints put together. God gave her more knowledge and virtue than all the angels and saints put together. She took Lucifer's place, as it were. Thus, it is not surprising that Satan hates her and her humility, her exact obedience, and the fact that God has given such power and majesty to her. Satan hates the fact, too, that God made her **our** Mother, our model and our protectress.

⁴ Romans 1:20 "For the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made: His eternal power also, and divinity: so that they [*viz.*, men who pervert the truth] are inexcusable." To put this quote in context, St. Paul had been speaking of those who "detain the truth of God in injustice: because that which is known of God is manifest in them. For God had manifested it unto them", and St. Paul was here showing how it was manifested to them.

⁵ Angels have only infused knowledge because they do not have bodies and therefore do not have bodily senses.

⁶ *Apocalypse 12:3-4* "And there was seen another sign in heaven: and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads, and ten horns and on his heads seven diadems: and his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and cast them to the earth:"

⁷ The proud angels of the lower choirs might have also rebelled because of the thought that God would assign some of them to be the guardians, helpers, and companions to humans – who were so low compared to their angelic selves!

Let us reflect how she followed the *Principle and Foundation* perfectly. She praised God from the moment of her Immaculate Conception. She had perfect use of her reason from that moment. She spent her earthly life always in the deepest contemplation of God and His truths.

Her love for God exceeds the love for Him of all of the angels and the other saints combined. As a result, she revered God the most during her earthly sojourn. She was presented in the temple when she was a tender three-year-old and learned the Scriptures. She prayed for the redemption of Israel.

When the angel Gabriel appeared to her, she humbly wondered what his greeting meant. She was well-aware how to *discern the spirits* and how to protect herself from pride. She tested Gabriel's message by referring to her vow of chastity and then she was satisfied by the way Gabriel expressed God's holy plan. She had no doubt that God would preserve her virginity. She revered His Divine Plan for the Incarnation. She most willingly gave her "fiat". She understood she would have a life of suffering because the Son of God was to be born as an oblation to God for the salvation of mankind.

St. Joseph, too, had taken a vow of perpetual chastity. Both Our Lady and St. Joseph understood the chastity that would be sacred in their marriage. Both were committed to serving God with their whole hearts. They would serve God together in monastic married life. In their midst *God-made-Man* would grow to manhood.

Think of their anguish when Our Lord stayed behind in Jerusalem at age twelve. God kept His intention hidden from them in order to increase their merit. Their suffering was in reparation for the sins of men and they were setting examples for parents for all the generations to come.

Mary as a wife is such a resplendent model for all wives. She was subservient to St. Joseph, as this was part of her service to God. Wives should obey their husbands and follow Mary's example. She loved God so much and was devoted to her duty because she loved God.

Mary was also a perfect example for all mothers. She was ever ready to sacrifice all for her family. Of course, Our Lord was her Son and her God. Hence, her role of Mother was a unique one. Nevertheless, Our Lord was subservient to His parents.

All through Our Lord's Public Life, Our Lady served Him in countless ways. We know, too, of her ultimate gift of herself at the Foot of the Cross where she endured a bloodless martyrdom. Her anguish was like that of no other earthly mother because hers was the most that any human person could possibly suffer. Yes, she earned the martyr's palm, Our dear Mother of Sorrows.

The remainder of her days on earth was spent in the service of God as she ministered to the needs of the Apostles and the nascent Church. Our Lord gave her to us to be Our

Mother while He hung on the Cross. She was faithful in serving her Son by giving her services to the Church which He founded. Of course, she is ever Our faithful Mother, even as Queen of Heaven and all Creation. She is our Protectress too.

With these reflections in mind, we see that we could never find a better model (besides Our Lord Himself) of someone who kept the ***Principle and Foundation*** perfectly. Mary is a model not only for women, but for men, too. We, like Mary, were created to praise, revere, and serve God. Our mission in life is not as sublime as Mary's was, but nevertheless, we must be always ready to do whatever He may ask of us. Let us go to Our Mother, Our Model, and Our Protectress and beg her for guidance on how to make the best effort we can to seek God's plan and to fulfill His Will for us.

Queen of Angels, pray for us. Help us to faithfully praise, revere, and serve God so that by this means, we can save our souls.



Live Preparing for Your Particular Judgment

We should live our life today as if we will face God for our Particular Judgment tomorrow. God is the Judge at our Particular Judgment, and we have to give an account of our whole life: every thought, word, act, or omission.

More specifically, Jesus Christ as Man will be our Judge at the Particular Judgment. Before Him each soul must stand. The soul will stand in the awful presence of God the Son, to give an account of its whole life: of every thought, word, act, and omission.

Neither does the Father judge any man, but all judgment He has given to the Son.

St. John's Gospel, 5:22.

A man's whole life will be spread before him like a great picture. He will remember everything, although he might have forgotten much at the moment of death. How he will wish then that he had done only good!⁸

⁸ *My Catholic Faith*, Bishop Louis Morrow, My Mission House, Kenosha, WI, 1949, Lesson 77, pp. 154-155.

He who dies in mortal sin, even if only with one single mortal sin, will be sent at once to hell.⁹

How can we be careless about a matter of such importance, when we are absolutely certain of being judged by God? “For what shall I do, when God shall rise to judge?” *Job*, 31:14.¹⁰

One of the most important “topics” of our Particular Judgment, is whether we have compromised our perfect Catholic Faith.

Webster defines “compromise” as “coming to an agreement by concession” or “making a shameful concession.” It is no secret that today’s N-SSPX has become liberal following the death of its founder, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre in 1991.

Thus, today’s followers of the Society – in order to remain in it – have had to compromise and accept its very liberal teachings. At the top of the list of such compromises is the disgrace of accepting parts of the evil anti-Catholic Second Vatican Council with the insistence that it was okay to accept VII because the council “it was just misunderstood”. The “new” SSPX also teaches many other errors which jeopardize the faith of their followers.

The conclusion is inescapable in our minds: Today’s “new” liberal SSPX is **not** the same SSPX of Archbishop Lefebvre. Here are a few of the reasons we hold this.

1. The SSPX previously taught that the rubella vaccine and other vaccines developed through abortion are always sinful. By contrast, the SSPX now says this same rubella vaccine is justifiable for some people and similarly justified are the COVID vaccines which were also developed through abortion.¹¹

⁹ *My Catholic Faith*, Bishop Louis Morrow, My Mission House, Kenosha, WI, 1949, Lesson 77, p.155.

¹⁰ *My Catholic Faith*, Bishop Louis Morrow, My Mission House, Kenosha, WI, 1949, Lesson 77, p.155.

¹¹ Here are the SSPX quotes (both the new and old ones) in part 3 of this article: <https://catholiccandle.org/2021/01/01/reject-the-covid-vaccines/>

2. The SSPX says it now accepts 95% of Vatican II¹² and says that Vatican II contains no direct heresy and “not so many” errors.¹³
3. The SSPX now teaches that the religious liberty taught by Vatican II is “a very, very limited one, very limited”.¹⁴ The truth is that the scope of religious liberty that Vatican II teaches is unlimited as long as public order is not breached.¹⁵
4. The *new* SSPX falsely teaches that “many Vatican II texts are traditional”.¹⁶ The truth is that there are no traditional documents of Vatican II (much less “many”).
5. Among these Vatican II documents, is *Lumen Gentium*. The SSPX now teaches that this document is free from errors/liberalism.¹⁷ The truth is that there are hundreds of liberal and false statements in *Lumen Gentium*?¹⁸

¹²

https://web.archive.org/web/20130603054101/http://www.sspix.org/sspx_and_rome/is_the_sspix_heretical_4_12-19-2012.htm

¹³ While he was superior general, Bishop Fellay said:

In Vatican II, there is no direct heresy. There are openings. Openings to the [sic] error. And some direct errors. Not so many direct errors.

Hear Bishop Fellay’s words here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JuCOdk99mfA&spfreload=5>, beginning at the 50 second mark.

¹⁴ Listen to then-superior general Bp. Fellay’s exact words at the following link – listen at minute 1:25 of 6:00 at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DdnJigNzTuY&feature=topics>

¹⁵ Read the quote from Vatican II here: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/religious-liberty-vatican-ii.html>

¹⁶ http://archives.sspix.org/sspx_and_rome/is_the_sspix_heretical_3_12-11-2012.htm

¹⁷ <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-the-new-sspx-claims-archbishop-lefebvre-endorsed-vatican-iis-lumen-gentium,-as-free-of-all-errors-and-ambiguities.html>

¹⁸ <https://catholiccandle.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Lumen-Gentium-Annotated.pdf>

6. The SSPX called the new mass “Holy Mass”.¹⁹ Besides this, the SSPX now calls the Traditional Mass by its conciliar name, *viz.*, the “Extraordinary Form”.²⁰ The “new” SSPX teaches that the new mass is good (though not as good as the Traditional Mass), by likening the new mass to a tin trumpet, and likening the Traditional Mass to a silver trumpet.²¹
7. Indeed, while Bishop Fellay was superior general, he attended the new mass and afterwards praised it.²² His two assistants (who were second and third in authority in the SSPX) also attended a new mass on another occasion.²³ The SSPX has blamed the dispute between the Vatican and the “old” SSPX concerning the new mass, on how “profound” Archbishop Lefebvre’s “motives” were and the bewilderment of the SSPX priests and followers because they were “fed up” with the “way in which the new mass was being celebrated.”²⁴ Bishop Fellay says that

¹⁹ Bishop Fellay June 30, 2018 interview found at: <https://fsspx.news/en/news-events/news/bishop-fellay-interview-%E2%80%9Cwe-are-disturbing-factor-church%E2%80%9D-39449> .

²⁰ Quotation is found at this link: http://www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsectiprint_article&article_id=2658

²¹ Here are Bishop Fellay’s words:

If you welcome a head of state and have the choice between a **silver trumpet and a tin trumpet**, do you use the tin trumpet? That would be an insult; you don’t do that. And even the **best new Masses are like tin trumpets in comparison to the old liturgy**. We have to use the best for the dear Lord.

Quoted from the Bishop Fellay June 30, 2018 interview found at: <https://fsspx.news/en/news-events/news/bishop-fellay-interview-%E2%80%9Cwe-are-disturbing-factor-church%E2%80%9D-39449> (emphasis added).

²² Read the news report and quotes from Bishop Fellay here: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/fellay-promotes-hybrid-mass.html>

²³ Read the news report here: <https://rorate-caeli.blogspot.com/2014/05/rorate-exclusive-pope-francis-received.html>

²⁴ Here is the longer quote from Bishop Fellay, starting with the question:

Q: Cardinal Ratzinger was a connoisseur and veteran promoter of Catholic Tradition and a friend of the Traditional Mass; why couldn’t he reassure the Archbishop?

Bishop Fellay: He did not understand how **profound the Archbishop’s motives** were or how bewildered the faithful and the priests were. Many were simply **fed up** with the **post-conciliar scandals and nuisances and with the way in which the new Mass was being celebrated**. If Cardinal Ratzinger had understood us, he would not have acted

“what needs to be corrected” in the new mass are things like making a better vernacular translation.²⁵ By contrast, the truth is that the new mass itself (even in Latin, and under the “best” conditions) is evil and sacrilegious.

8. The “new” SSPX falsely indicates that Pope Francis abides in the truth, and is preserved from error.²⁶ When he was superior general, Bishop Fellay declared that he is “very happy” with a lot of what Pope Francis teaches.²⁷ Bishop Fellay falsely says that Pope Francis’s *Amoris Laetitia* is like a “beautiful boat” with a “very small” hole in it.²⁸ This SSPX praise is false and liberal and the SSPX is minimizing the evil of Pope Francis's teachings.

that way. And I think that he regretted it. That is why he then tried as Pope to repair the damage with the *Motu Proprio* and lifted the excommunication. We are truly grateful for his attempts at reconciliation.

Quoted from the Bishop Fellay June 30, 2018 interview found at: <https://fsspx.news/en/news-events/news/bishop-fellay-interview-%E2%80%9Cwe-are-disturbing-factor-church%E2%80%9D-39449>

Despite what Bp. Fellay says in the quote above, the “*motu proprio*” does not free the Traditional Mass for faithful and informed Catholics. <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/20-reasons-motu-proprio>

Further, he misleads Catholics about the so-called lifting of the excommunications. <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/tissier-defends-agreement-rome>

²⁵ Quotation, citation, and analysis here: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/fellay-promotes-hybrid-mass.html>

²⁶ Read the SSPX quotes and find the citations to the SSPX publications here: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/bouchacourt-francis-preserved-error.html#fnref1>

²⁷ Read the SSPX quotes and find the citations to the SSPX publications here: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/fellay-interview-liberal-timid.html>

²⁸ *Amoris Laetitia* is Pope Francis’s scandalous and heretical document on marriage. The truth, of course, is that this document is a *complete shipwreck!* (continuing Bishop Fellay’s boat metaphor). Plainly, Bishop Fellay greatly minimizes the truth when he says Pope Francis’s “beautiful boat” has a “very small” hole, because most boats have very small leaks. That is why boats have bilge pumps – to remove the water from very small leaks. A very small leak is not ideal but is not a disaster like *Amoris Laetitia* and other teachings of the conciliar church.

Read the SSPX’s *Amoris Laetitia* quotes and find the citations to the SSPX publications here: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/fellay-francis-eroding-marriage.html>

9. We know that Jesus Christ is God. For this reason, Mary is the Mother of God because she is the mother of a Person Who is God. For the same reason, the Jews committed Deicide because they killed a Person Who is God. Vatican II contradicted the traditional teaching from the time of the apostles, that the Jews committed Deicide.²⁹ The SSPX has adopted this conciliar error and denies the Church’s teaching that the Jews *did* commit Deicide.³⁰
10. Catholics should not hold it as *certain* that we will go to heaven. But the liberal SSPX now teaches that Hope makes us certain of going to heaven.³¹ The “new” SSPX is teaching the vice of presumption not the Theological Virtue of Hope.
11. The *new* SSPX falsely teaches that Vatican II does *good*, because the “Second Vatican Council ... illuminates – *i.e.* deepens and further makes explicit – some aspects of the life and of the doctrine of the Church”.³² The truth is that Vatican II does *no* good.
12. Among countless other conciliar errors, is the error that there supposedly exist “degrees of being in communion with the Catholic Church”.³³ The “new” SSPX indicates it accepts this conciliar theory by now using the term of “full communion”, as if there were any other kind. *Id.*

²⁹ *Nostra Aetate*, §4.

³⁰ Quotations, citations, and analysis of the Catholic teaching and of the “new” SSPX’s denial of the Catholic teaching, are here: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/2014-01-14-bp-fellay-ltr.html>

³¹ Here is one example of this SSPX teaching: in the November-December 2016 *Angelus* Magazine, Fr. Wegner declares:

Faith makes us know God: we believe in Him with all our strength but we do not see Him. Our faith, therefore, needs to be supported by the **certitude that some day [sic] we will see our God, that we will possess Him and will [sic] be united to Him forever. The virtue of hope gives us this certitude** by presenting God to us as our infinite good and our eternal reward.

<https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-the-new-sspx-teaches-the-vice-of-presumption-as-if-it-were-the-virtue-of-hope.html>

³² Quoted from Bishop Fellay’s April 15, 2012 Doctrinal Declaration (dashes are in the original).

³³ Quotation, citation, and analysis here: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/schmidberger-conciliar-ideas-jargon.html>

13. While he was superior general, Bishop Fellay said that Pope Francis’s exhortation on marriage “contains many things that are correct and beautiful”.³⁴ This is false! These teachings on marriage are vile and are thoroughly-conciliar
14. The SSPX teaches that Vatican II’s *Optatam Totius* is free from errors/liberalism. The truth is that there are many liberal and false statements in this conciliar document.³⁵
15. The “new” SSPX published an article about Islam’s hostility toward other religions. This article **stressed the importance of religious liberty for every religion** and omitted to state the Catholic truth that error (including religious error) has no rights.³⁶ The truth is that only the true Catholic Faith has the right to be taught.³⁷
16. The “new” SSPX says we must continually change.³⁸ This echoes the conciliar hierarchy, which continually emphasizes the need to change, to “renew” ourselves, and to “ride the wave of revolution of faith”.³⁹
17. The conciliar church refers to promotion of conciliar errors as *The New Evangelization*.⁴⁰ The “new” SSPX proudly declared that Pope Francis sees the SSPX as a help in *The New Evangelization*. *Id.* How could this happen without the “new” SSPX showing a willingness to promote conciliar errors?

³⁴ Quotation, citation, and analysis here: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/fellay-francis-eroding-marriage.html>

³⁵ <https://catholiccandle.org/2019/01/08/the-evils-of-vatican-iis-decree-on-priestly-training/>

³⁶ Quotation, citation, and analysis here: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-jourdan-religious-liberty.html>

³⁷ <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/religious-liberty-vatican-ii.html>

³⁸ Quotation, citation, and analysis here: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/pfluger-traditional-catholics-change.html>

³⁹ To read the conciliar quotes promoting continual change (and to read an analysis of them), see *Lumen Gentium Annotated*, by *Quanta Cura Press*, pp.66-78, ©2013, available at: [scribd.com/doc/158994906](https://www.scribd.com/doc/158994906) (free) & at Amazon.com (sold at cost).

⁴⁰ Quotation, citation, and analysis here: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/SSPX-promote-new-evangelization.html>

18. The SSPX now blurs or even omits the difference between the Catholic Church and the modernist conciliar church.⁴¹ Archbishop Lefebvre made this clear distinction.⁴²
19. The SSPX and Archbishop Lefebvre used to say that the indult groups “are doing the devil's work”.⁴³ Now the SSPX treats those groups as colleagues in the Lord's vineyard.⁴⁴
20. When he was superior general, Bishop Fellay said that by an agreement with Rome, the SSPX “will return to the Church”.⁴⁵ The truth is that faithful and informed Catholics (*i.e.*, Traditional Catholics) have ***always been in*** the Church.

⁴¹ For example, here is Bishop Fellay: “The fact of going to Rome doesn't mean that we agree with them. But it's the Church! And it's the true Church!” Bishop Fellay, Flavigny, 09/02/2012).

⁴² For example, here is Archbishop Lefebvre relating his discussion with then-Cardinal Ratzinger:

Cardinal Ratzinger repeated it many times, “But Monsignor, there is only one Church, you mustn't make a parallel church.” I told him: “Your Eminence, it is not us who are forming a parallel Church, as we are continuing the Church of all times, it is you who are forming the parallel church for having invented the Church of the Council, which Cardinal Benelli called the Conciliar Church; it is you all who have invented a new church, not us, it is you who have made the new catechisms, new Sacraments, a new Mass, a new liturgy, not us. We continue to do what was done before. We are not the ones who are forming a new church.

Econe, Press Conference, June 15, 1988. There are many other examples of Archbishop Lefebvre distinguishing between the Catholic Church and the conciliar church.

⁴³ See, e.g., <https://sspx.org/en/two-years-after-consecrations>

⁴⁴ See, e.g.,

- <https://remnantnewspaper.com/web/index.php/articles/item/2032-catholic-identity-conference-makes-history>
- <https://catholicidentityconference.org/index.php/speakers>
- <http://histoirepatrimoinebleurvillois.hautetfort.com/archive/2015/09/13/premiere-messe-du-chanoine-pierre-dumain-en-la-basilique-de-5684030.html>

⁴⁵ Here is the longer quote: “Anyway, the Pope said that it is only a problem of canonical discipline. An act of Rome will suffice to say it is finished and we will return to the Church. It will come. I am very optimistic.” Bp. Fellay, Interview with Les Nouvelles Caledoniennes, 12/27/10.

21. The liberal “new” SSPX promotes the error that everyone is in the state of grace.⁴⁶

Plainly, the “new” SSPX is liberal and teaches conciliar heresy. Why their followers didn’t wake up and leave could be due to having a “hard” conscience. As is shown in many *Catholic Candle* articles, a sensitive and informed conscience is critical to salvation. Without such a conscience one cannot get to heaven.

Here is one way that St. John of the Cross, the Church’s Mystical Doctor, teaches this truth:

God desires the smallest degree of purity of conscience in you more than all the works you can perform.

St. John of the Cross, *Saying of Light and Love*, #12.

Here is how *The Imitation of Christ* teaches this truth:

A pure and good conscience shall bring more joy than learned philosophy. Then shall the contempt of riches far outweigh all treasures of the children of earth Learn to suffer now in little things, that thou mayest be delivered from more grievous sufferings All is vanity except to love and serve God alone”.⁴⁷

We should help the followers of today’s liberal N-SSPX by informing ourselves so that we can help to inform them. We should stand our ground and our lives should demonstrate that one can live a holy, devout Catholic life without Sacraments for as long a period as God Wills for us. Catholic history has given us many examples from past centuries for us to follow.

As we know, God understands what is best for us at all times. So, thank Him for all He is doing and has done for us. He will neither lead us astray, nor will He be outdone in His generosity to those serving Him.



***Catholic Candle* note:** Below is the fourth and final part of an article showing that women should wear dresses and skirts and not pants.

⁴⁶ <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/04/17/in-case-you-missed-it-april-2024/>

⁴⁷ *Imitation of Christ*, Thomas à Kempis; Book I, Ch. 24.

Recap of the first part of the article

In part one of this article, we saw five reasons why men (as well as women) need to understand the Catholic standards of modesty for women (and men).

The article then lists four reasons why women should not wear pants:

1. It is objectively a sin against the revealed Divine Law for a woman to wear pants;
2. It is objectively a sin of lewdness^[1] under the Natural Law for a woman to wear pants, even apart from the issue of pants being more revealing of a woman's body;
3. A woman who wears pants objectively commits a sin of feminist usurpation of man's role and "nature" and denial of her own "nature" and role in God's plan; and
4. A woman wearing pants objectively sins because pants are immodest for her due to their revealing too much of her figure.

Then the article looks at the first of those reasons. The first part of which is found here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/02/19/women-should-wear-dresses-and-skirts-not-pants/>

Recap of the second part of the article

In part two of this article, we saw the second reason why women and girls should wear skirts and dresses and not pants: *viz.*, because it is objectively a sin of lewdness^[1] under the Natural Law for a woman to wear pants, even apart from the issue of pants being more revealing of a woman's body. The second part of this article is found here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/03/21/women-should-wear-dresses-and-skirts-not-pants-part-2/>

Recap of the third part of the article

In part three of this article, we saw the third reason why women and girls should wear skirts and dresses and not pants: *viz.*, a woman who wears pants objectively commits a sin of feminist usurpation of man's role and "nature" and denial of her own "nature" and role in God's plan. The third part of this article is found here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/04/17/women-should-wear-dresses-and-skirts-not-pants-part-3/>

This article is a companion article to our article about *Mary-like Neckline Modesty*, which can be found here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2023/05/21/marylike-neckline-modesty/>

These articles apply to girls as well as women and assist them in fulfilling the role and great work for which God created women. Read more about this role and great work here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2019/12/02/the-role-and-work-that-god-gave-to-woman/>

Women should Wear Dresses and Skirts, Not Pants – Part 4

4. A woman wearing pants also sins because pants are immodest for her due to their revealing too much of her figure.

Let's start this section with a recap to see the connection between rebellion and immodesty:

Recap of the Three Types of Rebellion Present When Women Wear Pants

The devil is the inventor of sin, as St. Thomas Aquinas teaches.⁴⁸ The devil is the first revolutionary and his battle cry is “*non serviam!*” We see Satan's rebellious spirit in his inducing women to wear pants:

- He leads their rebellion against God, getting them to wear men's clothes against the revealed Divine Law. *Deuteronomy*, 22:5.
- He leads their rebellion against Nature (getting them to wear men's clothes) against the Natural Law. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.169, a.2, ad 3.
- He leads their rebellion against men's authority (getting women to wear men's clothes) as a feminist rebellion against living the role in life that God intends for women.

But rebellion is only one of Satan's favorite weapons. Immodesty is the other.

Satan Promotes Immodesty at the Same Time, Using These Rebellions

Considering that Satan chooses *women wearing pants* as a tool of rebellion, we would expect (even before looking into the issue) that Satan's tactics would not only foment rebellion but would also promote impurity, since impurity, like disobedience, is one of the most common sins that Satan promotes.

⁴⁸ St. Thomas Aquinas, *Lectures on St. John's Gospel*, ch.8, §1250.

Satan knows what Our Lady warned at Fatima that “more people go to hell because of sins of the flesh than for any other reason.”⁴⁹ Thus, Satan promotes impurity because he knows impurity is such an effective tool for damning souls.

Upon reflection, we see that our preliminary expectation is correct that Satan’s tool of *women wearing pants* combines the sin of rebellion with the sin of immodesty because pants are too revealing of a woman’s body.

Let us now look at this issue of pants being immodest on a woman.

Different Dangers for Men and Women Regarding Impurity

Men and women are different and possess different tendencies towards impurity. Men are more easily led into sins against purity through their sense of sight. For this reason, modesty for men chiefly requires custody of their eyes as the guard of purity.

By contrast, women are more tempted in matters of impurity through vanity by seeking to attract the eyes of men by excessive exposure of their (*viz.*, the women’s) bodies. Thus, it is in the “nature” of women that they are more interested in being admired by men for their appearance rather than admiring men’s appearance. That is why also, that men are more interested in the appearance of women than they are interested in women admiring *their* appearance.

Of course, this does not mean that men should be unconcerned with the modesty of their own dress or that women should be unconcerned with custody of their eyes. But the stronger, typical tendencies are for men to encounter dangers against purity because of looking at women, and women to encounter dangers against purity by the way they seek to attract men’s eyes by their appearance. These different tendencies of the two sexes are why men are the usual consumers of pornography and women are the usual subjects of pornography.

Further, God made woman the more beautiful and attractive sex, and He made women's bodies more sensual. Thus, the virtue of modesty requires that this greater attractiveness be concealed with womanly attire, which takes Nature into account. So, women must wear clothes which cover up more. They must wear loose-fitting dresses and skirts.

⁴⁹ *The Whole Truth About Fatima*, Frere Michel de la Sante Trinite, Vol. II, Ch.4 appendix II.

Three Ways Pants are Immodest for Women

Pants reveal too much of a woman's figure because:

- ❖ Pants make a woman's legs more visibly defined. A dress, compared to pants, fits the lower body in a way similar to how a mitten fits a hand, compared to a glove. Plainly, a glove reveals more of the hand's shape.

(This importance of a woman concealing her feminine silhouette is also the chief reason why modesty requires her to wear a slip under her dress, *viz.*, to avoid the outline of her legs being visible.)

- ❖ Pants "allow daylight" (to show between her legs) all of the way up to her private parts.
- ❖ Pants also reveal more of the contours of a woman's backside than does a dress or skirt.

So, because women are obliged to dress in a manner that conceals the contours of their bodies, rather than reveals them, this is why they must wear dresses and skirts, not pants.

Answers to Six Objections

There now remains only for us to answer six objections to this key moral principle (*viz.*, that women should wear dresses or skirts, and not pants):

1. **Objection:** A person could object that some (so-called) "modest" pants can be permissible because they conceal more of a woman's figure than do "some skirts".

Response: This "justification" only shows that there are some skirts which are immodest also and should never be worn. Further, although a woman should never wear an immodest skirt, nonetheless, such a skirt does not involve her committing the sins of rebellion which occur in wearing men's clothes.

2. **Objection:** Couldn't we say that our modern society has now accepted women wearing pants so that pants have become women's clothes (as well as men's clothes)?

Response: No. As we already saw above, pants were not generally accepted by society as "women's clothes" until relatively recently, when society got sufficiently

corrupt so as to accept women wearing pants. This was in the same period in which society began to accept various other evils (e.g., tattoos⁵⁰, cremation⁵¹, rock and roll “music”, and wives and mothers being career women⁵²), all of which showed and promoted the degenerateness of society.

But what is accepted by a corrupt society is not the proper measure by which we should make the determination what is acceptable. Here is one way that Pope Pius XII teaches this truth:

[A] garment must not be evaluated according to the estimation of a decadent or already-corrupt society, but according to the aspirations of a society which prizes the dignity and seriousness of its public attire.⁵³

3. **Objection:** A person could say that women wearing pants is “no big deal” and that “I’m used to it”.

Response: Such excuse merely shows that the person has become used to sin and has suffered some moral taint. Here is one way that Pope Pius XII warned against this attitude:

The most insidious of sophisms, which are usually repeated to justify immodesty, seems to be the same everywhere. One of these resurrects the ancient saying “let there be no argument about things we are accustomed to”, in order to brand as old fashioned the rebellion of honest people against fashions which are too bold⁵⁴

⁵⁰ Read about societal acceptance of tattoos not occurring until society became sufficiently corrupt, roughly beginning in the 1960s: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/tattoos-are-a-sin-to-obtain-and-a-sin-to-display.html>

⁵¹ Read about societal acceptance of cremation not occurring until society became sufficiently corrupt, roughly beginning in the 1960s: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/cremation-is-barbaric>

⁵² Society began to view it as acceptable for wives and mothers to abandon their role in life at roughly the same time (the revolutionary 1960s) as society began considering women wearing pants as acceptable and not shocking. Read this article here: *The Role and Work that God Gave to Woman*, <https://catholiccandle.org/2019/12/02/the-role-and-work-that-god-gave-to-woman/>

⁵³ Pope Pius XII, *Address to the Latin Union of High Fashion*, November 8, 1957.

⁵⁴ Pope Pius XII, *Address to the Latin Union of High Fashion*, November 8, 1957.

4. **Objection:** Suppose a woman has duties which “require” her to perform activities for which a dress is immodest because the wind blows her dress upwards, or she is on a ladder cleaning, or because of the way she “must” move her limbs during such activity.

Response: It might be that some activities would require a dress that is longer or of heavier fabric than modesty requires for other activities. But there are no activities which a woman should perform which cannot be done under appropriate conditions and wearing modest and womanly clothes. Furthermore, all activities suited for women have been performed in earlier generations, by good women in dresses or skirts.

5. **Objection:** “But where I live it gets so cold in the winter! So. I ‘need’ to wear pants to stay warm.”

Response: Cold weather is not a new phenomenon and winter is not a new invention. Throughout the history of mankind, women have dressed modestly, in womanly clothes, and stayed warm. But, of course, warm, womanly undergarments will help accomplish this, as well as long winter coats and dresses made of thick fabrics suitable for the season.

6. **Objection:** There can’t be anything wrong with a woman wearing pants when she is alone, when no one will see her.

Response: 1) Notice that God’s Commandment in *Deuteronomy* does not forbid cross-dressing only when the person will be seen. Cross-dressing is forbidden all times. 2) Further, it is a sin of lewdness under the Natural Law to cross-dress even in private. Perhaps this is easiest to see in the case of a man who, in private only, dresses in a pink calico dress (as in the example given above). 3) Wearing pants changes a woman’s outlook even if she were to wear them only in private, since she is still wearing the “feminist uniform” and still showing (though in private) that she “wears the pants in the family”. We are creatures of habit and this practice would have a deleterious effect on the woman. 4) It is generally unwholesome for a person to walk around nude without a good reason to do so such as showering, even if no one sees him/her. Likewise, (although to a lesser degree than nudity), it is unwholesome and sensual for a person to dress indecently even when alone if there is no good reason to do this.

Three Additional Consequences of this Standard of Womanly Modesty

Please note the following consequences that flow directly from the above Catholic requirement of Mary-like modesty that women should never wear pants:

1. Just as women and girls should not wear pants, this same standard also applies to photographs, paintings, and statues, whether the woman or girl who is depicted is known or unknown. It would obviously be illogical for a woman to carefully dress modestly herself but also to promote or display scandalous art on her wall (or scandalous pictures of her relatives hung with magnets on her refrigerator, *etc.*). For the very same reason that she is forbidden to dress this way, a Catholic is forbidden to promote or display such immodest images.
2. Parents, especially mothers, have a duty to guide their daughters not only to comply with the Catholic standard of modesty but also to ***love this beautiful virtue.***
3. If we somehow come into possession of pants that are meant to be worn by women or girls, we should not give them away or donate them, because then we would become an accomplice or accessory to someone else's sin of wearing these pants.

Conclusion

From the above considerations, it is clear that women should not wear pants because the virtue of womanly modesty forbids this and also because it is a revolt against God in three ways.

We live in pagan times. Just as a living organism only stays alive (*i.e.*, remains a living plant or animal), if it resists the corrupting influences (*e.g.*, of bacteria) which are all around it, likewise we must protect the life of our souls (which live the life of grace) by resisting the moral corruption of sin all around us.

Let us beware of rationalizing immodesty by saying that the standard of Mary-like modesty is too old-fashioned and that we live in modern times where the requirements of modesty are weaker.

It is *Catholic Common Sense* that we should not adopt the dress or other practices of the anti-Christ revolution (including women wearing pants) no matter how many other people do so in our corrupt times. So, however much the cultural revolution has accepted "unisex" clothes and women dressing in men's clothes such as pants, nonetheless, when women wear pants "they are abominable with the Lord". *Deuteronomy, 22:5.*

Let us live our Catholic Faith! We need to restore all things in Christ! One important aspect of this is for women to dress like women and to not be an abomination to the Lord.

Catholic feminine modesty is a beautiful ornament of a good woman or girl. All of us – men and women – should love and appreciate this virtue!



Catholic Candle's purpose is to promote and defend the Traditional Catholic Faith. Many of our Readers assist us in this task by spreading the word about *Catholic Candle* and by sharing email copies (or paper copies) of our monthly magazine. To those readers: thank you for your help promoting Traditional Catholic Faith and Practice! We encourage the rest of our readers to share *Catholic Candle* with whoever would be interested. Anyone can subscribe to our free monthly magazine by emailing us this request or by subscribing on our website.