

THE SCHISM EXISTS ONLY IN VATICAN MINDS

“The devil has managed to confuse obedience with fidelity to doctrine. Obedience is at the service of faith, but if authority commands the abandonment of the faith, we must disobey.”

Msgr. Marcel Lefebvre¹

If I, as an army officer, perform an act against a direct order of my commanding officer for an end that charity demands, such as aiding a group of people threatened by their tyrannical rulers, it does not follow that I thereby reject my commanding officer’s authority in general. I reject only *that one order* for the compelling reason that obedience to God trumps obedience to any earthly superior. The same applies to the consecration of a bishop in the face of a refusal of a papal mandate where the salvation of souls requires that permission. Obedience to God comes first.

At most, the penalty such a consecration could attract, *on the assumption that it was not justified by circumstances*, is suspension.² It is impossible, without more, that it could amount to an act which rejects the authority of the Pope as a whole, just as it is impossible that a soldier’s refusal of a commanding officer’s order would amount to a rejection of the authority of the Army’s Chief.

Respect for the Pope’s authority as head of Christ’s Church is a principle of the *Society of St Pius X* whose members pray daily for his protection, life and position. It is ludicrous, then, to declare Bishops de Galaretta and Fellay, and the bishops they consecrated on July 1st, guilty of schism. It is still more ludicrous to lay a similar charge against *the Society’s* priests, religious and faithful, when all they wish to do is to practise their Catholic faith. The distinction at stake is that between real being - *what exists in the real* - and mental being - *which exists only in the mind*.

The best the Vatican apparatchiks can do to justify the charges is to rely on a ruling of the ‘Second Vatican Council’, in its document *Lumen Gentium* nn. 21, 22. Its bishops asserted there that, as well as the fulness of the power of the priesthood, consecration of a bishop confers jurisdiction.³ That ‘teaching’, which suited the synod’s Modernist agenda, contradicted the Church’s tradition.⁴ On this flawed ground, Rome can assert that Bishops de Galaretta and Fellay arrogated to themselves a power belonging to the Pope. Note: on the one hand they allow that the synod’s teaching has *removed* a power from the Pope’s exclusive authority; on the other they accuse *the Society’s* bishops of arrogating this *papal power* to themselves. This act of self-contradiction, continues a policy which ran like a thread through all the utterances of that heterodox synod.

The Modernists in the Vatican are desperate to protect the determinations of the pseudo-synod. No one must be permitted to reject them, especially those whose continued insistence on the principles of Catholic doctrine threatens the very existence of their regime!

Michael Baker

July 12th, 2026—*Seventh Sunday after Pentecost*

¹ In a sermon at Écône, Switzerland, on August 29th, 1976.

² If done for a reason in conformity with the principle *salus animarum suprema lex*, it deserved the highest praise.

³ As St Thomas Aquinas teaches, *Summa Theologiae* II-IIae, q. 39, *et alibi*. The Church has always maintained a distinction between episcopal *power*, which derives from Christ’s *Priestly* authority, and jurisdiction, which derives from His *Kingly* power, the latter falling within the sole prerogative of the Pope.

⁴ The Vatican synod refused to recognise the Church’s definition of what is meant by ‘tradition’ at the *Council of Trent* and the *Vatican Council*, substituting its own heterodox version in *Dei Verbum* n. 8.