

accusations had been answered, they would have replied: "There must be some truth to our charges; else, he would have ignored them altogether and do not bothered to give us an answer!"

Constant repetition of false rumours is an old trick, perhaps the oldest trick, to destroy the good name and reputation of an adversary.

Was Cardinal Lienart a Mason? Nobody knows for sure. However, while it would be interesting to clear this issue for the sake of History, whatever could be disclosed would have no effect on the validity of Archbishop Lefebvre sacred Orders, nor would make any difference regarding the falsehood of the accusations.

The attack of the detractors was aimed not at Cardinal Lienart but at Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre. If one falsehood against His Grace failed, they would come with a new one, at their convenience. How far they will go? Will they dare to spread the rumor that His Excellency himself was a Mason?

Were they ever aware that the same rumors could be spread against them? What if someone let the world know that in fact the detractors themselves were not even Catholics because the priest who had baptized them was a secret member of a Masonic Lodge? And what about those married by the same priest? Were they living in sin?

How could they prove otherwise if as in the case of Cardinal Lienart the priest was already deceased?

The cunningness of the Devil knows no boundaries! Catholics, true Catholics, must flee from rumors. Nonetheless, the accusers should come forward with concrete proof, if they had any: signed documents; veritable witnesses that might back their charges.

At the right moment, they were asked to do this, and then they either refused or failed to do so.

On the other hand, there is evidence to proof the mischievousness, the falsehood of their rumors. One concrete example of this is a much-talked photo published in *Veritas*. In this fake photo Archbishop Lefebvre appears kneeling at the feet of Pope Paul VI. However, the testimony of expert, professional photographers has explained beyond doubt how this photo was made superimposing two different photos to achieve the calumnious result.

The journalist wording accompanying the photo as well as other articles printed by *Veritas* have been

equally proven to be mere wishful thinking of whomever was the writer. Thus, this publication has entirely lost credibility.

Some members of this peculiar group have muttered, recognizing their serious errs against the Archbishop; but none of them has ever come into the open to correct slurs, to publicly admit the slanders of the group. They give the impression that, disregarding the claims of the conscience of at least some of them, as a group they have chosen to follow commitments of falsehood.

Looking for sensationalism at all costs, some European "gossip-newspapers" of disreputable credibility had taken their information from this source. Europe fears this kind of shoddy press, which lacks ethics. Is it that it is a kind of journalism that knowingly perpetrates evil?

Let us leave all of them, source and newspapers, alone. And let us take now more than ever sides with those who rightly defend the saint memory of Archbishop Lefebvre, true Son of the Church, who devoted his life to the greater honor and glory of God.

The Status of the SSPX in 2018

Today, the SSPX has 637 priests, with 123 professed brothers and 79 oblate sisters working by their side. In its seminaries and novitiates throughout the world, about 250 young men are currently being formed in the service of the altar.

The year 2018 will be marked by an important event in the life of this priestly society. Indeed, the General Chapter comes together every 12 years to elect the Superior General and his two Assistants, but above all to ensure that the statutes are faithfully followed, always in the spirit in which the Society was founded.

A man of the Church who had acquired an important amount of experience in missionary lands, Archbishop Lefebvre warned against all innovations, except those having to do with the administration of the society that are made necessary by the development of the apostolate and the Society's multiple works.



THE CLOISTER

SOCIETY OF SAINT PIUS X

Saint Saviour's House, Saint Agnes avenue

BRISTOL BS4 2DU

Email: stsaviours@fsspx.uk Telephone: 01179775863

DRESS CODE AND MODESTY.

It seems that there is a tremendous confusion in the mind of many people about this very delicate subject. Some people simplify excessively the subject: men should wear trouser and women skirts. Sometime people when they mention the rules of modesty it seems that they apply exclusively for attending mass, or inside the Church when in fact the virtues connected to this issue should be practiced all time.



How did people dress through out history? What should be the moral principles ruling this issue? What do the Holy Scriptures and the Church teaches? What are the modern problems?

Let us see first how people dressed through out human history. Perhaps the first observation we should consider is the fact that clothes were different according to the local customs, the climate, the social rank and they change through history. For example the Roman soldiers wore skirts, the tunic was worn by many men, the cassock of the priests is some type of dress, Scottish men wear kilts (it is a skirt), not always do men wear trousers, nor everywhere and always women wear skirts. Sometimes the clothes of men and women were very similar, **but there were ALWAYS some details making the differences obvious.**

The external adornments of the body were also different.

God created men and women with differences. The feminists and modernists refuse to accept this obvious fact. Differences do not mean less or more dignity. In front of God men and women have the same human dignity and the same eternal destiny for their souls. But also, by the nature created by God, they have different functions and different psychology. Some activities and abilities of the human nature are the same for men and women, some others are different. The modern dialectic oppose the differences that are not contradictory but complementary.

Teaching of Holy Scripture:

A woman must not wear men's clothing, nor a man wear women's clothing, for the Lord your God detests anyone who does this. (Deuteronomy 22:5)

Any man who prays or prophesies with something on his head disgraces his head, but any woman who prays or prophesies with her head unveiled disgraces her head--it is one and the same thing as having her head shaved. For if a woman will not veil herself, then she should cut off her hair; but if it is disgraceful for a woman to have her hair cut off or to be shaved, she should wear a veil. For a man ought not to have his head veiled, since he is the image and reflection of God; but woman is the reflection of man. (1 Corinthians 11:4-7)

I also want women to dress modestly, with decency and propriety, not with braided hair or gold or pearls or expensive clothes, but with good deeds, appropriate for women who profess to worship God. (1 Timothy 2:9-10)

Your beauty should not come from outward adornment, such as braided hair and the wearing of gold jewelry and fine clothes. Instead, it should be that of your inner self, the unfading beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is of great worth in God's sight. For this is the way the holy women of the past who put their hope in God used to make themselves beautiful. (1 Peter 3:2-5)

Teaching of Saint Thomas Aquinas:

II-II question 169; article 1: I answer that, **It is not in the outward things themselves which man uses, that there is vice, but on the part of man who uses them immoderately.** This lack of moderation occurs in two ways. First, in comparison with the customs of those among whom one lives; wherefore Augustine says (Confess. iii, 8): "Those offenses which are contrary to the customs of men, are to be avoided according to the customs generally prevailing, so that a thing agreed upon and confirmed by custom or law of any city or nation may not be violated at the lawless pleasure of any, whether citizen or foreigner. For any part, which harmonizeth not with its whole, is offensive." Secondly, the lack of moderation in the use of these things may arise from the **inordinate attachment** of the user, the result being that a man sometimes takes too much pleasure in using them, either in accordance with the custom of those among whom he dwells or contrary to such custom. Hence Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. iii, 12): **"We must avoid excessive pleasure in the use of things,** for it leads not only wickedly to abuse the customs of those among whom we dwell, but frequently to exceed their bounds, so that, whereas it lay hidden, while under the restraint of established morality, it displays its deformity in a most lawless outbreak."



In point of excess, this inordinate attachment occurs in three ways. First when a man seeks glory from **excessive attention to dress**; in so far as dress and such like things are a kind of ornament. Hence Gregory says (Hom. xl in Ev.): "There are some who think that attention to finery and costly dress is no sin. Surely, if this were no fault, the word of God would not say so expressly that the rich man who was tortured in hell had been clothed in purple and fine linen. No one, forsooth, seeks costly apparel" (such, namely, as exceeds his estate) "save for vainglory." Secondly, when a man **seeks sensuous pleasure from excessive attention to dress**, in so far as dress is directed to the body's comfort. Thirdly, when a man is **too solicitous** [Cf. 55, 6] in his attention to outward apparel.

Accordingly Andronicus [De Affectibus] reckons three virtues in connection with outward attire; namely **"humility,"** which excludes the seeking of glory, wherefore he says that humility is "the habit of avoiding excessive expenditure and parade"; **"contentment"** [Cf. 143, Objection 4], which excludes the seeking of sensuous pleasure, wherefore he says that "contentedness is the habit that makes a man satisfied with what is suitable, and enables him to determine what is becoming in his manner of life" (according to the saying of the Apostle, 1 Timothy 6:8): "Having food and wherewith to be covered, with these let us be content;"--and **"simplicity,"** which excludes excessive solicitude about such things, wherefore he says that "simplicity is a habit that makes a man contented with what he has."

In the point of deficiency there may be inordinate attachment in two ways. First, through a man's **neglect to give the requisite study or trouble to the use of outward apparel.** Wherefore the Philosopher says (Ethic. vii, 7) that "it is a mark of effeminacy to let one's cloak trail on the ground to avoid the trouble of lifting it up." Secondly, by **seeking glory from the very lack of attention to outward attire.** Hence Augustine says (De Serm. Dom. in Monte ii, 12) that "not only the glare and pomp of outward things, but

even dirt and the weeds of mourning may be a subject of ostentation, all the more dangerous as being a decoy under the guise of God's service"; and the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 7) **that "both excess and inordinate defect are a subject of ostentation."**

Article 2. Whether the adornment of women is devoid of mortal sin?

I answer that, As regards the adornment of women, we must bear in mind the general statements made above (Article 1) concerning outward apparel, and also something special, **namely that a woman's apparel may incite men to lust,** according to Proverbs 7:10, "Behold a woman meeteth him in harlot's attire, prepared to deceive souls."

Nevertheless a woman may use means to please her husband, lest through despising her he fall into adultery. Hence it is written (1 Corinthians 7:34) that the woman "that is married thinketh on the things of the world, how she may please her husband." Wherefore if a married woman adorn herself in order to please her husband she can do this without sin.



But those women who have no husband nor wish to have one, or who are in a state of life inconsistent with marriage, cannot without **sin desire to give lustful pleasure to those men who see them, because this is to incite them to sin. And if indeed they adorn themselves with this intention of provoking others to lust, they sin mortally; whereas if they do so from frivolity, or from vanity for the sake of ostentation, it is not always mortal, but sometimes venial.** And the same applies to men in this respect. Hence Augustine says (Ep. ccxlv ad Possid.): "I do not wish you to be hasty in forbidding the wearing of gold or

costly attire except in the case of those who being neither married nor wishful to marry, should think how they may please God: whereas the others think on the things of the world, either husbands how they may please their wives, or wives how they may please their husbands, except that it is unbecoming for women though married to uncover their hair, since the Apostle commands them to cover the head." Yet in this case some might be excused from sin, when they do this not through vanity but on account of some contrary custom: although such a custom is not to be commended.

Reply to Objection 1. As a gloss says on this passage, "The wives of those who were in distress despised their husbands, and decked themselves that they might please other men": and the Apostle forbids this. Cyprian is speaking in the same sense; yet he does not forbid married women to adorn themselves in order to please their husbands, lest the latter be afforded an occasion of sin with other women. Hence the Apostle says (1 Timothy 2:9): "Women . . . in ornate [Douay: 'decent'] apparel, adorning themselves with modesty and sobriety, not with plaited hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly attire": **whence we are given to understand that women are not forbidden to adorn themselves soberly and moderately but to do so excessively, shamelessly, and immodestly.**

Reply to Objection 2. Cyprian is speaking of women painting themselves: this is a kind of falsification, which cannot be devoid of sin. Wherefore Augustine says (Ep. ccxlv ad Possid.): "To dye oneself with paints in order to have a rosier or a paler complexion is a lying counterfeit. I doubt whether even their husbands are willing to be deceived by it, by whom alone" (i.e. the husbands) "are they to be permitted, but not ordered, to adorn themselves." However, such painting does not always involve a mortal sin, but **only when it is done for the sake of sensuous pleasure or in contempt of God,** and it is to like cases that Cyprian refers.

It must, however, be observed that it is one thing to counterfeit a beauty one has not, and another **to hide a disfigurement arising from some cause such as sickness or the like. For this is lawful**, since according to the Apostle (1 Corinthians 12:23), "such as we think to be the less honorable members of the body, about these we put more abundant honor."

Reply to Objection 3. As stated in the foregoing Article, **outward apparel should be consistent with the estate of the person, according to the general custom. Hence it is in itself sinful for a woman to wear man's clothes, or vice versa; especially since this may be a cause of sensuous pleasure;** and it is expressly forbidden in the Law (Deuteronomy 22) because the Gentiles used to practice this change of attire for the purpose of idolatrous superstition. **Nevertheless this may be done sometimes without sin on account of some necessity, either in order to hide oneself from enemies, or through lack of other clothes, or for some similar motive. (see note below)**

Reply to Objection 4. In the case of an art directed to the production of goods which men cannot use without sin, it follows that the workmen sin in making such things, as directly affording others an occasion of sin; for instance, if a man were to make idols or anything pertaining to idolatrous worship. But in the case of an art the products of which may be employed by man either for a good or for an evil use, such as swords, arrows, and the like, the practice of such an art is not sinful. These alone should be called arts; wherefore Chrysostom says [Hom. xlix super Matth.]: "The name of art should be applied to those only which contribute towards and produce necessities and mainstays of life." On the case of an art that produces things which for the most part some people put to an evil use, although such arts are not unlawful in themselves, nevertheless, according to the teaching of Plato, they should be extirpated from the State by the governing authority. Accordingly, **since women may lawfully adorn themselves, whether to maintain the fitness of their estate, or even by adding something thereto, in order to please their husbands,**



it follows that those who make such means of adornment do not sin in the practice of their art, except perhaps by inventing means that are superfluous and fantastic. Hence Chrysostom says (Super Matth.) that "even the shoemakers' and clothiers' arts stand in need of restraint, for they have lent their art to lust, by abusing its needs, and debasing art by art."

ORIGINAL SIN:

Perhaps the first things we should consider before mentioning some virtues involved in this matter, are the consequences of Original Sin. Original Sin had introduced in our nature a tremendous disorder and bad tendencies and desires (called concupiscence). After their sin, Adam and Eve realized that they were naked and felt shame. The sin had destroyed the original order of the nature created by God, and shame and concupiscence appeared. Since then mankind is attracted by lust. Unfortunately the modern world denies that lust is a sin, denies the moral evil of the bad desires and tendencies of the fallen nature. Even worse, they consider a right of nature to deny the moral law established by God. The mutual attraction between men and women, established by God in our nature towards the marriage, can be very easily deviated to carnal desires, due to the concupiscence of the flesh. There is no doubt that revealing clothes because of the shape or the transparency are provocative to the concupiscence of the flesh.

MODERN WORLD:

Another aspect quite important in this matter, is the actual battle against the modern spirit of the world. This modern world is controlled and dominated by enemies of Christendom. They promote fashion in order to destroy the christian virtues and morality, and in order to promote their own agenda. They purposely promote unisex fashion leading to the destruction of the natural differences of genders even to the point to deny completely the differences of sex. Fashion is one of their powerful instruments to reach their goal. **As a Catholic we cannot ignore**

this battle and we should do everything possible to restore the sense of differences of gender (differences does not mean less or more dignity), and to restore the christian dignity. By the sacrament of baptism, we become « temples of the Holy Ghost » and adoptive children of God. Also it is obvious that often the « fashion » promotes vulgarity in words and deed. The « broken clothes », awkward, shocking, too casual, are the way to loose self respect, dignity and the respect due to others. The problem is not exclusively matter of trouser and skirt. Clothes should be properly tailored according these differences of gender, body shape and to keep the moral principles.



SOME VIRTUES TO BE CONSIDERED IN THIS MATTER:

We can consider different virtues (natural and supernatural), although in some aspects they look very similar.

A word has disappeared from the modern vocabulary: the word "**pudour or pudor or pudency**". The pudour is a legitimate and natural sense of shame or embarrassment in front of a situation (words or deeds) against the virtue of purity or modesty. This sense is often lost from the most tender age because of the tremendous public indecency of our present time. This sense should be restore and developed in the family environment. The most obvious act of pudour is to cover properly our body out of respect for our body as being the « temple of the Divine grace », respect for ourselves and respect for others, to avoid provoking sins.

The second virtue, different from the pudour, is **modesty** or attitude of humility in order to avoid vanity, excesses and worldly spirit. It is not always a worldly spirit attitude to wear rich

clothes as Saint Thomas Aquinas explained. It could be necessary in order to be « consistent with a state of life or social rank ». But if the reason of doing it is only an ostentatious vanity, it is certainly a sin against humility and modesty. Also we should consider that it could be a duty of justice to dress nicely in order to « honour » another person, or because you receive him or because you visit him. It could be a sin against the virtue of justice to be too « casual » in your manner of dress; Modesty is not against « elegance », simplicity and elegance can be harmonized and elegance could be a good way to honour our neighbour. Elegance can be part of the good "femininity".

The third virtue should be the virtue of **Justice**. Justice is to give everyone what they deserve. Obviously the first part of Justice is to give to God the honour is due to Him. Being baptized and being « children of God » we owe to honour God, particularly by our behaviour. The so called « **Sunday clothes** » for attending mass is certainly part of the honour due to God. The Church will not blame anyone because of poverty or because the person has to go to work and eventually will not have time or the opportunity to change clothes. However a special care should be given to the way we dress for attending Mass. The virtue of Justice also applies to ourselves. We should respect our soul and our body. It is certainly a matter of self-discipline controlling our passions, our inclinations, our laziness, our comfort, vanity etc. And finally it is matter of justice towards our neighbour. It is a duty to respect our neighbour avoiding offensive behaviour, or provoking another to sin.

Notes:
Particular application of some of the principles given by Saint Thomas Aquinas. Skirts or Trousers?

It is in itself sinful for a woman to wear man's clothes, or vice versa; **especially since this may be a cause of sensuous pleasure;**

Nevertheless this may be done sometimes without sin on account of some necessity, either in order to hide oneself from enemies, or through lack of other clothes, or for some similar motive. (See article of Saint Thomas Aquinas mentioned above.)

A notorious example of application of the principle mentioned above by Saint Thomas Aquinas, is Saint Joan of Arc who wore men's clothes when in prison in order to protect her purity. In **some** (But certainly not alway) modern perverted environment, as for example some public transportation with tremendous promiscuity, or in some work places, it could be necessary for women to wear trousers to protect their purity. The same principle could be applied for medical, physical or work necessities.

NOTHING NEW UNDER THE SUN

RUMOUR HAVE LONG LIFE

This article was written (1978) for the benefit of those who **have been misled by rumours** directed against Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre from sources which are by all means disreputable.

The question arises:

Why should these sources spend so much of their time attacking Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, the man who through his unselfish efforts founded the Society that for more than a quarter of a century has been publicly defending the Holy Mother Church?

Catholics have over and again heard the rumor that Cardinal Lienart was a Mason, and this rumor is presented to them as a fact. However, there is not even one piece of evidence which will back such assertion.

Some cardinals of the period were Freemasons, among them Cardinal Bugnini, whose liaison to Freemasonry has been proved and documented, and Cardinal Dearden, whose Vatican bureau openly admitted that he was a Freemason.

These two cases were the nucleus of a number of Roman Catholic Church leaders who either gave personal acceptance to the fact or did not care to leave around them documented evidence of their Masonic commitments.

Such is not the case of Cardinal Lienart. The rumors started in the United States and in Europe, and can be traced to personal foes of Archbishop Lefebvre and of the Church.

The most likely beginning is probably a "List of Masons in the Vatican" which first appeared in Italy and France. The early issues of this *List* do not have Cardinal Lienart's name.

He was added much later, after Archbishop Lefebvre had firmly opposed the pleas of churchmen, who dissatisfied with Vatican policies had approached Archbishop Lefebvre with the surprising request that the Archbishop should proclaim himself to be the pope, becoming thus the tool of their private vendettas. This kind of pressure took place both in Europe and in the United States.

One by one, this group of churchmen made the trek to Ecône or sought-after the Archbishop on his visits to America, each presenting him his own peculiar requests:

- Declare yourself pope
- Proclaim Paul VI as the Anti-Christ
- Set the date of the end of the world
- And such *ad infinitum*...

In one particular case, an American churchman who later became one of the leaders of the anti-Lefebvre movement, approached the Archbishop and demanded that he declared himself pope. This demand was preceded by half an hour of glowing tribute, addressing Archbishop Lefebvre as "Defender of the Faith", "Hope of the Church", "Second Athanasius", and more.

When the Archbishop answered that he had no such intentions, that he had quite enough to do with his duties as director of his religious order and with the formation of the young seminarians who would become priests at Ecône, his interlocutor replied:

Oh, Your Grace will have nothing to do! As his Secretary of State, I will take care of everything...

Not surprisingly, after a final "No!" from the Archbishop, the same churchman took his leave and made haste to start writing in a fit of anger words of intense hostility, of obscure hatred against the same Archbishop he had proclaimed to be a second

Athanasius. In a matter of hours, the "Defender of the Faith" had become a loathsome "Persecutor of the Faith".

It was not by accident that the attacks of a handful of self-proclaimed "*defenders of the Church*", among which men and women were equally represented, were simultaneously thrown, using the same verbiage, the same phrases, the same deceptive reasoning and argumentation.

Every move was prepared, aimed at their goal: Archbishop Lefebvre. Efforts were coordinated. The Archbishop had firmly dismissed them. The Archbishop had destroyed their vain hopes. Alas, now they will destroy his name, his reputation. The Archbishop had unveiled the evil under their flattering messages. The Archbishop had discovered their manipulative moves, their plots... Therefore, Archbishop Lefebvre was now the target of the wrath of these obtuse and self-proclaimed "*leaders of the Church*".

How far would they go? Each one had cut his or her niche deep. All of them had set their pedestals high. Their aim was not to save the Church but to usurp the authority of the Church for their own unconfessable purposes: personal aggrandizement and an overpowering desire of enrichment.

It is easy to see why the humility, the selflessness, the complete and total, unreserved dedication to God and to the Church of a man like Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre should be so abhorrent to them. Indeed, the Archbishop had seen the only course leading to the salvation of the Holy Mother Church, and this according to canon law and sound theology.

Canon law and sound theology? Well, his detractors would also cite canon law and conveniently quote theology and philosophy too, appointing themselves experts in these fields.

Thus, their own words put them in jeopardy. Their lack of a basic knowledge of these challenging, difficult subjects came to light. Their writings are frequently plagued with errors and contradictions, some of these so

blatant that the reader puts into question whether or not the authors have even the basic, rudimentary knowledge of the Catholic Faith.

The fact is that this group of detractors is attempting to do something they are neither prepared nor qualified to do. Somehow they are certainly aware of this, and when it suits their purposes they do not hesitate to mention the good name of the Archbishop in laudatory approaches. They may even go farther, and associate their self-given name to the name of the Society founded by Archbishop Lefebvre. Do they thus hope to add some halo of respectability to their own irregular origins?

One of their tactics has been aimed at the goal of obtaining a response to their attacks. During the life time of the Archbishop, they hoped that either the same Archbishop or his priests would answer their violent but ridiculous charges. During the lifetime of His Grace, they cried over and again: "*Why doesn't the Archbishop answer these charges? Why?*"

The idea was to lend an air of credibility to their deceitful words. But then every righteous man knows that the best way to deal with liars and detractors is to ignore them and let them drink the bitter juice of their ignored false judgments.

Our Lord Jesus Christ gave the example when He stood silent before the Sanhedrin and Pilate. He knew the evil of their hearts and the intention of their minds. And because He knew, He refused to give an answer.

Archbishop Lefebvre also knew that his detractors were moving in the hopes that if repeated often enough their falsities as unbelievable as they were would finally gain terrain, that their false statements would be believed to be true.

Nothing would be gained by giving an answer to his detractors. Can one really relish or take comfort from the fact that in the course of a disputation he obtains victory upon an unworthy adversary? Detractors have no interest in the truth. They will not look for facts, unless they can accommodate those facts to their purposes. As a rule, they follow double standards.

At the time of their early accusations, their reasoning was: "*Oh, after all, the charges we did make up against Archbishop Lefebvre must be true, because he is afraid to refute them*". Nonetheless, if those