


Anexos

- [Tradução de um trecho do livro de Randy Engel](#)
- [Versões originais em inglês da Tradução de um trecho do livro de Randy Engel](#)
- [Dossiê do caso Urrutigoity no bispado de Scranton nas páginas da internet dos EUA](#)
- [Carta aberta do Dr. Jeffrey M. Bond](#)
- [Chronology](#)
- [Trechos de informações sobre Urrutigoity e Williamson](#)
- [Extracts froms news about Urrutigoity and Williamson](#)

Tradução de um trecho do livro de Randy Engel

« *The Rite of Sodomy - Homosexuality and the Roman Catholic Church* » (O Rito da Sodomia - A Homossexualidade e a Igreja Católica Romana) - Randy Engel - New Engel Publishing, 2006

<http://www.riteofsodomy.com>



Página 963

« **Guru-tigoity** », predador homossexual desmascarado

Em 11 de fevereiro de 1999, Dom Bernard Fellay, Superior Geral da Fraternidade Sacerdotal São Pio X, enviou uma comunicação oficial a Dom Timlin para informá-lo de que o padre Carlos Urrutigoity havia sido acusado de atentado ao pudor em relação a um seminarista sob sua responsabilidade espiritual no seminário de São Tomás de Aquino da FSSPX, localizado em Winona, Minnesota (Estados Unidos da América).

Dom Fellay também destacou que, desde 1987, ou seja, antes de Urrutigoity entrar no seminário de Winona, o padre Andrés Morello, reitor do Seminário de Maria Co-Redentora em La Reja, Argentina, havia acusado esse sacerdote de práticas homossexuais.

O padre Morello disse que tentou expulsar Urrutigoity do seminário de La Reja devido ao seu orgulho, ao hábito de formar "amizades especiais", ao fato de ter reunido ao seu redor uma facção de seminaristas agindo sob sua influência, bem como a graves denúncias sobre questões morais.

Entre as acusações feitas contra Urrutigoity por colegas seminaristas e leigos que viviam no seminário de La Reja estavam suas visitas noturnas, sem convite, aos quartos dos jovens enquanto dormiam, bem como as carícias e massagens que ele praticava nas

partes genitais e nas nádegas de um seminarista no banheiro, dizendo ao jovem que adorava seu "bumbum empinado". Urrutigoity também foi acusado de se interessar excessivamente, ao confessar ou dar conselhos espirituais, pelas tentações sexuais dos penitentes e de se vestir de maneira imodesta durante um acampamento de verão que organizou para os jovens do seminário (ele nadava de sunga).

Infelizmente, o padre Morello nunca conseguiu levar adiante seu plano de expulsar Urrutigoity, pois o seminarista contava com o apoio de Dom Alfonso de Galarreta, Superior de Distrito da FSSPX, assim como de outros sacerdotes influentes.

Em vez disso, Urrutigoity foi enviado ao priorado de Córdoba (Argentina), onde obteve as recomendações necessárias para poder ser posteriormente transferido ao seminário de Winona da Fraternidade São Pio X. Enquanto isso, o padre Morello havia sido designado para Santiago do Chile, o que o colocava temporariamente fora de ação.

No entanto, em julho de 1989, quando o padre Morello soube que Urrutigoity seria muito em breve ordenado em Winona, ele enviou a Richard Williamson, reitor do seminário de São Tomás de Aquino, um dossiê confidencial sobre o aspirante ao sacerdócio. Temendo que esse esforço não fosse suficiente para impedir a ordenação, ele se dirigiu ao seminário acompanhado de um associado. Ao chegarem, Williamson se opôs a eles com a negativa ou “*manifestação de consciência*” de Urrutigoity, que se proclamava inocente do que estava sendo acusado. Williamson elogiou a “*humildade*” de Urrutigoity e acusou Morello e seu companheiro de mentir.

Poucos dias depois, em 16 de julho de 1989, Morello, que estava em conflito interno com a FSSPX sobre questões não relacionadas ao caso Urrutigoity, foi expulso da Fraternidade.

Williamson alegou então que, se não acreditou em Morello, foi porque lhe haviam informado que ele estava ligado a um grupo sedevacantista oposto a Dom de Galarreta. No entanto, ele recebeu a ordem de seu superior, Dom Marcel Lefebvre, que examinou o dossiê de Morello, para vigiar Urrutigoity “*com olhos de águia*”, uma tarefa praticamente impossível dada a vida secreta de um predador homossexual como Urrutigoity.

O padre Urrutigoity, portanto, conseguiu manipular um grupo tradicionalista contra outro para atingir seus objetivos.

Não apenas foi ordenado, mas também foi encarregado de ensinar no seminário de São Tomás de Aquino, onde era chamado de “*Gourou-tigoity*”.

Não é surpreendente que, em sua carta de advertência de fevereiro de 1999 a Dom Timlin, Dom Fellay tenha descrito Urrutigoity como perigoso e ressaltou:

Se ele teve problemas com os superiores da Fraternidade São Pio X, foi sobretudo porque, aos nossos olhos, ele exercia uma influência estranha, anormal sobre os seminaristas e os sacerdotes, que pareciam estar ligados à sua personalidade brilhante e carismática. Quando ele me pediu para reconhecer a fraternidade que pretendia fundar, mencionei explicitamente entre os motivos de minha recusa essa estranha ligação pessoal – análoga à que suscita um guru – entre os discípulos

e seu líder.

Segunda acusação contra Urrutigoity

Foi apenas dois anos após a expulsão do padre Urrutigoity do seminário de São Tomás de Aquino por "atividades subversivas", ou seja, os preparativos secretos para a criação da Fraternidade São João, que ele se estabeleceu no bispado de Scranton, temporariamente residindo na Academia São Gregório, que um seminarista de Winona se apresentou para acusar o sacerdote de atentado ao pudor.

O alvo das tentativas de sedução e das assiduidade sexuais forçadas de Urrutigoity era um jovem chamado Matthew Selinger, que havia idolatrado o sacerdote. Os dois homens haviam formado uma amizade especial no seminário, onde Urrutigoity tinha sido o diretor espiritual do seminarista por dois anos antes de passar à ação.

Selinger tinha histórias estranhas para contar sobre o padre Urrutigoity.

Ele declarou que, em um dia em que estava constipado, foi até o padre Urrutigoity pedir um laxante (Metamucil). O sacerdote, em vez disso, lhe deu um supositório. Nunca tendo usado um antes, o seminarista achou que era um medicamento para uso oral e colocou-o na boca. O sacerdote lhe explicou o uso correto e insistiu para que o jovem o introduzisse na sua presença, como parte de um "ato de **humildade**". Para sua grande vergonha, Selinger resistiu a essa ordem e foi até o banheiro, constantemente se recriminando por não ser maduro o suficiente espiritualmente para seguir as ordens de Urrutigoity e crucificar seu "**orgulho viril**".

Em outra ocasião, Urrutigoity convidou Selinger e seu amigo para nadar nus com ele.

Uma noite, o jovem seminarista acordou para encontrar o sacerdote ajoelhado aos pés de sua cama e se masturbando até excitá-lo. Selinger disse que sua primeira ideia foi golpear o sacerdote, mas como o padre Urrutigoity era um *Alter Christus*, um outro Cristo, ele preferiu se virar e fazer de conta que voltava a dormir, enquanto Urrutigoity desaparecia silenciosamente na escuridão.

O uso original que Urrutigoity fazia dos supositórios no âmbito de seu repertório de "grooming" (preparação, para fins sexuais, de pessoas influenciáveis) **não deixa de lembrar as técnicas empregadas para o mesmo fim pelo "sacerdote" anglicano teósofo e pederasta do século XX, Charles Webster Leadbeater.**

Leadbeater utilizava lavagens intestinais, manipulações genitais e onanismo como meios para estimular a vigor físico, psíquico e espiritual (oculto) de seus jovens discípulos. "Essa espiritualização da pederastia o absolve da culpa que o faz odiar a sociedade... Sua fraqueza não tem mais nada de comum e humano, pois ele sentiu o fogo purificador da divindade," escreve sobre ele seu biógrafo, Gregory Tillet.

Antes que Selinger informasse seus superiores em Winona de que Urrutigoity havia abusado sexualmente dele, o fundador da Fraternidade Sacerdotal São João já tinha se estabelecido confortavelmente como capelão na Academia São Gregório, **de onde ele deveria escolher sua nova vítima em um vasto reservatório de jovens** que, à semelhança de Selinger antes do que

o sacerdote lhe fez, literalmente beijavam o chão por onde ele passava.

Em junho de 1999, houve uma reunião em Winona entre Matthew Selinger, Williamson, reitor do seminário, e a equipe pastoral que o Conselho Diocesano de Revisão encarregou de investigar as acusações contra Urrutigoity. A equipe pastoral incluía o bispo auxiliar John Dougherty, um padre diocesano e um advogado do bispado de Scranton.

No entanto, mesmo após ler o relatório do Conselho sobre o testemunho de Selinger e sabendo que estava diante da segunda acusação credível de sedução homossexual e atentado ao pudor contra Urrutigoity, **Dom Timlin decidiu que as evidências fornecidas contra o fundador da Fraternidade Sacerdotal São João não eram "conclusivas" e não tomou nenhuma providência sobre o caso. Uma operação clássica de encobrimento estava, assim, sendo conduzida sob a direção do Ordinário do bispado de Scranton, com a cooperação do padre Devilliers, parceiro silencioso de Timlin e Superior da Fraternidade São Pedro.**

Se não fosse pela coragem e determinação do Dr. Jeffrey M. Bond, Presidente do Colégio de São Justino Mártir, assim como pelo apoio moral e jurídico que ele recebeu do advogado James M. Bendel, Procurador de Washington, essa operação de encobrimento poderia ter sido bem-sucedida.

Nota 25:

Selinger acabou deixando o seminário, casou-se e se estabeleceu na Califórnia para criar sua família. Quando se soube que ele seria chamado como testemunha contra o padre Urrutigoity no caso John Doe, o padre Eric Ensey, que havia contribuído para a criação da Fraternidade Sacerdotal São João e substituiu Urrutigoity por um certo tempo como conselheiro espiritual em São Tomás (Winona), fez uma visita a ele para convencê-lo a deixar o país e não testemunhar contra Urrutigoity. Ele declarou ao ex-seminarista que Urrutigoity tinha um "problema médico" com o pênis. Acrescentou que, se o sacerdote-fundador caísse, ele (Ensey) também cairia junto. **Vendo que esses argumentos não emocionavam Selinger, Ensey disse-lhe que o advogado de Urrutigoity estava ligado à máfia, insinuando que, se Selinger testemunhasse contra o sacerdote, um mal poderia acontecer com ele ou sua família.** Selinger respondeu que não tinha a intenção de deixar sua esposa e filhos para fugir de uma intimação e pôs Ensey para fora.

Fim da Tradução de um trecho do livro de Randy Engel

Versões originais em inglês da Tradução de um trecho do livro de Randy Engel

« ***The Rite of Sodomy - Homosexuality and the Roman Catholic Church*** » (O Rito da Sodomia - A Homossexualidade e a Igreja Católica Romana) - Randy Engel - *New Engel Publishing*, 2006

<http://www.riteofsodomy.com>

"The Rite of Sodomy - Homosexuality and the Roman Catholic Church" - Randy Engel - New Engel Publishing, 2006

<http://www.riteofsodomy.com>

Página 963

"Guru-tigoity" Exposed as a Homosexual Predator

On February 11, 1999, Bishop Bernard Fellay, Superior General of the Society of St. Pius X, sent a formal communication to Bishop Timlin informing him that Father Carlos Urrutigoity had been accused of molesting a seminarian under his spiritual care at the SSPX's St. Thomas Aquinas Seminary in Winona, Minnesota.

Bishop Fellay also indicated that in 1987, prior to Urrutigoity's acceptance by the Winona seminary, Fr. Andres Morello, Rector of Our Lady Co-Redemptrix Seminary in La Reja, Argentina, had accused the priest of homosexual practices.

According to Fr. Morello, he had intended to expel Urrutigoity from the La Reja seminary because of his significant pride, his habit of forming "particular friendships," his formation of a faction of seminarians acting under his influence, and grave denunciations regarding moral matters.

Among the accusations brought against Urrutigoity by seminarians and laymen living at the La Reja seminary were his uninvited nocturnal visits into the rooms of young men while they were asleep, the fondling and massage of a seminarian's genitals and buttocks under the guise of a medical exam, and the touching of the private parts of a seminarian in a restroom accompanied by the remark that the priest adored his "little round butt." Urrutigoity was also accused of excessive probing during confession and spiritual counseling sessions regarding the sexual temptations of

penitents; and immodest dress (swimming in his underwear) at a summer camp that he organized for young men from the seminary.

Unfortunately, the planned dismissal of Urrutigoity by Fr. Morello never took place as the seminarian had the support of Bishop Alfonso de Galarreta, the SSPX District Superior, and other influential priests.

Instead of being expelled, Urrutigoity was sent to the Priory of Cordoba (Argentina), where he received the necessary recommendations that enabled him to transfer to the SSPX seminary in Winona. By this time, Fr. Morello had been posted to Santiago, Chile, so he was temporarily out of the picture.

However, in July 1989, when Fr. Morello heard of Urrutigoity's imminent ordination in Winona, he sent a confidential dossier on the candidate to Rector Richard Williamson at St. Thomas Aquinas Seminary. Fearing this effort would not be sufficient to stop the ordination, Father Morello traveled to the seminary in the company of an associate. Upon their arrival, they were confronted by Williamson with a denial or "manifestation of conscience" by Urrutigoity, who proclaimed his innocence of the charges against him. Williamson defended Urrutigoity's "humility" and accused Morello and his companion of lying.

A few days later, on July 16, 1989, Morello, who had been involved in an internal dispute with the SSPX on matters unrelated to the Urrutigoity affair, was expelled from the Society.

Williamson later claimed that Morello was not believed because he was reported to be connected to a sedevacantist group in opposition to Bishop de Galarreta. Nevertheless, Williamson was ordered by his superior, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, who had reviewed the Morello dossier to watch Urrutigoity "like a hawk," a virtually impossible task given the secretive life of a homosexual predator like Urrutigoity.¹⁸⁰

Fr. Urrutigoity had successfully manipulated one traditionalist group against another for his own ends.

Not only was he ordained, but he was also assigned to teach at St. Thomas Aquinas Seminary where he was known as "Guru-tigoity."¹⁸¹

Little wonder that in his warning letter to Bishop Timlin in February 1999, Bishop Fellay described Urrutigoity as "dangerous" and noted:

The reason why he got into trouble with the Superiore of the Society of St. Pius X is mainly because we felt he had a strange, abnormal influence on the seminarians and priests, whom he seemed to attach to his brilliant, charismatic personality. When he asked me to recognize the society he intended to found, among the reasons of my refusal, I explicitly mentioned this strange personal, guru-like attachment between the disciples and their leader.¹⁸²

It was not until two years after Fr. Urrutigoity had been dismissed from St. Thomas Aquinas Seminary in Winona for "subversive activities," namely, the secret planning of the Society of St. John, and had settled into the Diocese of Scranton with temporary quarters at St. Gregory's Academy, that a Winona seminarian came forward to accuse the priest of sexual molestation.

The object of Urrutigoity's attempts at séduction and forced sexual attention was a young man named Matthew Selinger who once idolized the priest. The two men had formed a particular friendship at the seminary and Urrutigoity served as the seminarian's spiritual director for two years before making his move.

Selinger had some strange tales to tell about Fr. Urrutigoity.

He said that on one occasion he was constipated and went to Fr. Urrutigoity to get some Metamucil. The priest offered him a rectal suppository instead. Never having used one before, the seminarian thought it was an oral medication and put it in his mouth. The priest instructed him in its correct use and insisted that the young man insert it in his *présence* as an act of "humility." Selinger reluctantly resisted the order and went into the bathroom to insert the suppository all the while rebuking himself for not being spiritually mature enough to follow Urrutigoity's orders and crucify his "manly pride."¹⁸³

On another occasion, Urrutigoity invited Selinger and his friend to swim with him in the nude.

One night, the young seminarian awoke from his sleep to find the priest kneeling by his side massaging his genitals hard enough to produce an *érection*. Selinger said his first instinct was to punch the priest's lights out, but because Fr. Urrutigoity was an *Alter Christus*, another Christ, he turned over and pretended to go back to sleep while Urrutigoity quietly slipped away into the darkness.¹⁸⁴

The novel use of rectal suppositories as part of Urrutigoity's grooming *répertoire* is reminiscent of the grooming techniques employed by the early 20th Century theosophist/pederast Charles Webster Leadbeater.

Leadbeater promoted enemas, genital manipulation, and onanism as a means of promoting physical, psychic and spiritual (occult) vigor among his youthful disciples. "This spiritualizing of paederasty absolves him from the guilt which makes him hate society. ... His is no longer a common human weakness, for he has felt the cleansing fire of divinity," related Gregory Tillet, Leadbeater's biographer.¹⁸⁵

By the time that Selinger informed his superiors at Winona that Urrutigoity had sexually molested him, the SSJ founder was safely ensconced as a chaplain at St. Gregory's Academy selecting his next victim from a large pool of young men, who like Selinger before he was molested, literally worshipped the ground that Urrutigoity walked on.¹⁸⁶

Page 966

In June 1999, a meeting took place in Winona between Matthew Selinger and SSPX Rector Williamson, and the pastoral team that the Diocesan Review Board had assigned to investigate the

accusations against Urrutigoity. The pastoral team consisted of Auxiliary Bishop John Dougherty, a diocesan priest, and a lawyer from the Diocese of Scranton.

However, even after reading the Board's report on Selinger's testimony and with the knowledge that this was the second credible accusation of homosexual seduction and molestation against Urrutigoity, Bishop Timlin decided that the evidence against the SSJ founder was "inconclusive." He took no further action on the matter.¹⁸⁷ A classic cover-up was underway led by the Ordinary of the Diocese of Scranton with the cooperation of Timlin's silent partner Fr. Devillers, Superior of the FSSP.

Were it not for the courage and determination of Dr. Jeffrey M. Bond, President of the College of St. Justin Martyr and the moral and legal support given to Dr. Bond by Washington State attorney James M. Bendell, the cover-up may well have succeeded.

Notes

176 See <http://www.saintjustinmartyr.org/news/CarlosUrrutigoityinLaReja.htm>. Fr. Morello was rector of the SSPX seminary in La Reja from 1981-1988. He is currently the rector of a group called "Campania de Jesus y de Maria" located in the Andes.

177 Ibid.

178 Ibid.

179 Ibid.

180 Ibid.

181 Terrie Morgan-Sesecker, "Accuser to get reports in priests," March 24, 2004, *Times Leader*.

182 Ibid.

183 Deposition of Matthew Selinger in Civil Action No. 02-0444 in Pittsburgh, PA on October 24, 2003.

184 Ibid.

185 See Tiltett, *The Eider Brother*.

186 Selinger eventually left the seminary, married and settled in California to raise a family. When it became known that he would likely be subpoenaed to testify against Fr. Urrutigoity in the Case of John Doe, Fr. Eric Ensey who helped found the SSJ and who replaced Urrutigoity as spiritual advisor for a time at St. Thomas in Winona, paid a visit to Selinger and attempted to persuade him to leave the country to prevent him from being called as a witness against Urrutigoity. He told the former seminarian that Urrutigoity had "a medical protocol" about the penis. He said that if the priest-founder went down he would take him (Ensey) and the whole order down with him. When these arguments failed to move Selinger, Ensey said that Urrutigoity's lawyer had connections to the

Mafia - a suggestion that implied that harm might come to Selinger or his family if he testified against the priest. Selinger said he had no intention of leaving his wife and children to escape a subpoena and showed Ensey the door.

187 Jeffrey Bond Fourth Open Letter of May 19, 2002 to Bishop Timlin, Diocese of Scranton at <http://www.saintjustinmartyr.org/news/BishopTimlinOpenLetter4.html>.

Fim das Versões originais em inglês da Tradução de um trecho do livro de Randy Engel

Dossiê do caso Urrutigoity no bispado de Scranton nas páginas da internet dos EUA

<http://www.saintjustinmartyr.org/news/notices.html>

TODO o dossiê do caso Urrutigoity no bispado de Scranton (cartas, correspondência, julgamentos, testemunhos, artigos...) pode ser encontrado nesta página da web e em seus 9 anexos.

Último conteúdo novo...

I. [O Caso contra a SSJ](#)

II. [Artigos de Jornal](#)

[Quarta-feira, 12 de julho de 2006](#)

III. [Cartas para o Bispo Timlin e o Bispo Joseph F. Martino](#)

IV. [Processos Judiciais contra a SSJ](#)

V. [Declarações de Testemunhas](#)

VI. [Declaração do Rev. Munkelt](#)

VII. [Inconduza Financeira](#)

VIII. [Academia São Gregório](#)

IX. [Petições ao Tribunal da Igreja](#)

Em 14 de outubro de 2001, o Colégio de São Justino Mártir se desvinculou formalmente da Sociedade de São João (SSJ), uma associação clerical no Bispado de Scranton, Pensilvânia. Desde então, o Colégio tem se esforçado para expor a corrupção moral da SSJ. Embora o objetivo principal do Colégio seja se estabelecer como uma instituição de artes liberais com grande tradição de livros e um caráter católico ortodoxo, o Colégio acredita firmemente ter a obrigação moral de impedir que a SSJ cause mais danos a almas jovens e continue a enganar doadores católicos.

A batalha moral do Colégio contra a SSJ trouxe-o a um conflito direto com o Bispo James C. Timlin, que, inexplicavelmente, persiste em apoiar e proteger a SSJ apesar das evidências esmagadoras de incondução sexual e financeira por parte dos membros da

SSJ. Em represália pelos esforços do Colégio para informar o Bispado sobre a grave incondução da SSJ, o Bispo Timlin buscou obstruir e prejudicar os negócios legítimos e os objetivos do Colégio. Em resposta ao ataque gratuito do Bispo Timlin, o Colégio entrou com ações judiciais contra o Bispado e a SSJ. Os leitores são convidados a se informar sobre o caso contra a SSJ acessando os documentos e artigos aqui disponibilizados.

A batalha moral do Colégio resultou em um conflito direto com o Bispo James C. Timlin, que, inexplicavelmente, se recusa a defender a SSJ e a proteger, apesar das evidências contundentes da má conduta sexual e financeira de seus membros. Em retaliação aos esforços do Colégio para informar o Bispado sobre a grave má conduta da SSJ, o Bispo Timlin tentou bloquear e prejudicar a administração e os objetivos legítimos do Colégio. Em resposta a esse ataque gratuito do Bispo Timlin, o Colégio processou o Bispado e a SSJ. Os leitores são convidados a se informar sobre o caso judicial contra a SSJ consultando os documentos e artigos disponibilizados aqui.

1.1.1.1.1 V. Declarações sobre o Escândalo da SSJ

[1.\) Declaração de Mr. Jude Huntz sobre a SSJ](#)

[2.\) Declaração de Mr. Paul Hornak sobre a SSJ](#)

[3.\) Carta do Irmão Alexis Bugnolo sobre a SSJ](#)

[4.\) Declaração de Mr. Joseph Sciambra sobre a SSJ](#)

[5.\) Declaração de Diane Toler sobre a SSJ](#)

[6.\) Declaração de um Antigo Noviço da SSJ](#)

[7.\) Carta de Mr. Conal Tanner para o Bispo Timlin](#)

[8.\) Declaração de Mr. Joseph Girod](#)

[9.\) Declaração de Mrs. Louise Carbonaro](#)

Carta aberta do Dr. Jeffrey M. Bond

Carta aberta do Dr. Jeffrey M. Bond, Presidente do Colégio de São Justino Mártir, e testemunho do padre Andrés Morello sobre o caso Urrutigoity

<http://www.saintjustinmartyr.org/news/CarlosUrrutigoityinLaReja.htm>

September 2, 2002

Dear Friends,

In a letter dated December 8, 2001, I revealed that Fr. Carlos Urrutigoity, the founder and former superior general of the Society of St. John, had been dismissed for homosexual behavior when he was a seminarian at the Society of St. Pius X (SSPX) seminary in La Reja, Argentina. In that same letter, I noted that Urrutigoity, after he had been dismissed from the seminary in La Reja, was admitted as a seminarian into the SSPX seminary in Winona, Minnesota, where he was eventually ordained and made a professor. Finally, I further mentioned that Fr. Urrutigoity was subsequently expelled from the seminary in Winona as a result of his subversive activities.

My letter left many readers with the same question: How could it be that the SSPX dismissed Carlos Urrutigoity for homosexual behavior from one of its seminaries, but subsequently accepted him into another SSPX seminary, and then ultimately ordained him a priest and even made him a professor there?

I put this same question to Bishop Richard Williamson of the SSPX whom I contacted shortly after I learned that Fr. Urrutigoity had been accused of homosexual behavior as far back as his seminary days in La Reja. Bishop Williamson explained to me that Carlos Urrutigoity had indeed been dismissed from the SSPX seminary in La Reja for homosexual behavior, but that he was received into the SSPX seminary in Winona because the key SSPX authorities in North and South American did not believe the charges against him.

According to Bishop Williamson (and others within the SSPX with whom I spoke), the charges against then seminarian Urrutigoity were not believed because of a deep division that was then taking place within the SSPX district in South America. Fr. Andres Morello, the rector of the SSPX seminary in La Reja, was the head of the sedevacantist group. The District Superior, then Fr. Alfonso de Galarreta, led the opposing group. The division was apparently so intense that the two factions avoided each other. As a result, the SSPX authorities - other than Fr. Morello - were willing to believe that the charges of homosexual behavior made against seminarian Urrutigoity were trumped up. Urrutigoity himself claimed that he was being persecuted and slandered because of

his stance against Fr. Morello's group.

Bishop Williamson further explained that when seminarian Urrutigoity arrived in Winona, he was questioned and given the opportunity to write a defense, or "manifestation of conscience," in response to the accusations against him. Bishop Williamson then presented Archbishop Lefebvre himself with Urrutigoity's written defense. According to Bishop Williamson, Archbishop Lefebvre, after reading Urrutigoity's defense, told Bishop Williamson to admit Urrutigoity to the seminary, but to "watch him like a hawk."

Bishop Williamson then told me that he never saw any evidence of Urrutigoity's homosexuality while Urrutigoity was a seminarian, priest, or professor at Winona. Bishop Williamson said that Fr. Urrutigoity was eventually expelled from the seminary in Winona not for homosexuality, but for subversive activities, namely, the secret planning of the Society of St. John in concert with others. Bishop Williamson hastened to add, however, that after Fr. Urrutigoity had been expelled from Winona, a young seminarian, who had left Winona with him, subsequently accused Fr. Urrutigoity of homosexually molesting him. This young seminarian, with whom Fr. Urrutigoity had had a very close particular friendship at Winona, had been under Fr. Urrutigoity's spiritual direction for two years before Fr. Urrutigoity molested him.

Bishop Williamson also told me that he had accompanied this young seminarian when he gave testimony against Fr. Urrutigoity at a Diocese of Scranton inquiry in July 1999. The inquiry was held at the request of Bishop James Timlin of Scranton who sent his auxiliary bishop, John Dougherty, along with another diocesan priest and an attorney, to hear this young seminarian's testimony. Bishop Bernard Fellay of the SSPX had set this whole process in motion when he formally accused Fr. Urrutigoity in a letter to Bishop Timlin dated February 11, 1999. Bishop Fellay had sent this letter to Bishop Timlin because Bishop Timlin had welcomed Fr. Urrutigoity and his followers into the Diocese of Scranton after Fr. Urrutigoity's expulsion from Winona. At the time of Bishop Fellay's formal communication to Bishop Timlin, Fr. Urrutigoity was working as a chaplain at St. Gregory's Academy, an all-boys high school in Elmhurst, Pennsylvania, owned and operated by the Fraternity of St. Peter. Despite Bishop Fellay's letter and the testimony of the molested seminarian, Bishop Timlin allowed Fr. Urrutigoity to continue in his position as chaplain to adolescent boys.

In order to learn more about the charges against seminarian Urrutigoity, I next contacted Fr. Andres Morello, the former rector of the SSPX seminary in La Reja. Fr. Morello is currently the rector of a group called "*Campania de Jesus y de Maria*" located in the Andes. **I wrote to Fr. Morello to ask him about the accusations against Carlos Urrutigoity while he was a seminarian at La Reja. Below is a literal translation of Fr. Morello's response :**

I was the rector of the seminary of La Reja from 1981 until 1988, having been previously the vice-rector; therefore I was able to witness the behavior of now Father Urrutigoity all throughout his stay in that seminary

I was transferred to the priory of Santiago in Chile in 1989, and I remained there from February until July of the same year. I was expelled because of a denunciation or better said a confidential request I made for a canonical investigation of some priests members of the Society of St. Pius X, and also because of the support I gave to some seminarians who left the seminary of La Reja.

When I was rector at the seminary of La Reja, I had the intention of expelling the then seminarian Carlos Urrutigoity for a number of reasons, mainly:

- a significant pride
- maintaining particular friendships
- forming a faction of seminarians under his influence
- grave denunciations regarding moral matters (probably the very ones you already know about)

Against my intention of expelling him, as the product of a delicate situation of intrigues which at the time affected the seminary, and undoubtedly with the support of certain priests and the then superior of the district (bishop de Galarreta), instead of being expelled he was sent to the priory of Cordoba (Argentina). The good recommendations obtained there, as well as the support which I just mentioned, motivated his transfer to the seminary of Winona (USA). Meanwhile I had already been posted at Santiago, Chile.

His imminent ordination to the major orders obliged me in conscience to write a confidential report to the rector of Winona's seminary, bishop Williamson, in order to stop the ordination. A canonical report of such characteristics demanded reciprocal confidentiality, and in particular to keep it secret from the person in question. Bishop Williamson made it known to the then seminarian Urrutigoity so that he could defend himself from our accusations.

On July 1989 we traveled to Winona, and bishop Williamson read to us the defense of Father Urrutigoity, defended his "humility" and accused us of lying. A few days later, on July 16, 1989, I was expelled from the Society.

You know better than I the rest of the story.

According to Fr. Morello's account above, he not only sought to expel Urrutigoity from La Reja for the four reasons stated, but he even traveled all the way to Winona from Chile to argue against Urrutigoity's ordination to the priesthood. The "grave denunciations in moral matters," which Fr. Morello mentions as the fourth reason for expelling Urrutigoity, were set down in writing as part of a dossier given to Archbishop Lefebvre when Fr. Morello requested a canonical investigation of certain SSPX priests (as Fr. Morello explains in his letter above). The accusations of homosexual behavior made against seminarian Urrutigoity appear in this dossier as part of a report entitled "Documento No. 2." This report was signed by a group of priests and seminarians from the seminary of La Reja. Below is a literal translation from the three pages of "Documento No. 2" which focus solely on Urrutigoity:

Page 4, three last paragraphs.

The third case is the one of seminarian Carlos Urrutigoity. Here the subject becomes profoundly disagreeable because of the turpitude of the issues involved, and therefore it is for us very difficult to speak about them. This is why we will only present to you the most serious items.

During his stay in the seminary of La Reja, this seminarian was denounced by a young layman who lives in the seminary, for the following reasons which became most serious as the time passed. Frequently the seminarian brought up in conversation the subject of chastity. He asked him if he had temptations and what did he do in such cases. Also he asked him whether he was a virgin, or if he performed dishonest acts alone or with women.

In a particular conversation he asked him if he went to the movies, and if the films excited him provoking temptations. The lad answered yes, and Urrutigoity asked if this prompted him to search for women, to which the young man replied again yes. Then the seminarian asked if he would consider making the dishonest act with a man. The lad said no.

Page 5.

The same witness denounced as well the seminarian for entering his room without knocking previously. One night at about 3:00 AM he woke up and found him inside the room uncovering him. The excuse that Urrutigoity gave next day was that he had entered the room in order to cover him. Before this situation the lad went to Father Canale, a priest whom he trusted. He laughed and said to him: "The only thing I can tell you is to lock the door." Father Canale was therefore fully aware of the situation and he never talked about it with the superior of the house.

The witness says also that on one occasion the seminarian entered into his room and, finding him in bed, told him that he had a fever. The lad replied that he was feeling well, but Urrutigoity insisted that he had a fever and that in order to confirm it he was going to fondle his genitals to see if they were inflamed, and he did it.

One day Carlos Urrutigoity gave him underwear, insisted that he should get naked and try it on before him to see if it fit. He proposed that he take measurements every week of his physical development, naked and with his back towards the wall, which the young man refused to do.

He gave him a shot and insisted on massaging his buttocks, which he did.

We finish here the testimony of the young man, and we wish to make it clear that these are not all the incidents, just those which we consider more relevant.

A seminarian declares that being in the restroom he touched him in his private parts, and that often he told him things about the private parts, among others that "he adored his buttocks" (the seminarian had not yet received the soutane). He said: "I adore your little round butt" (and made a gesture with his hands).

Another seminarian tells us that he asked him about the sexual life of his past and about his present temptations.

Two traditional young laymen declare that during a summer camp organized by Carlos Urrutigoity - with the inexplicable authorization of Bishop de Galarreta, who knew about the situation, and while the seminarian was in the priory of Cordoba under observation because of his disciplinary problems - he went to the river with a group of young men. There he removed his clothes before the others and remained in underwear. One of the youngsters offered immediately a swimming suit which Urrutigoity rejected, and in such attire he bathed in the river.

(Handwritten) De Galarreta did not expel him because of the problems this could cause, especially with the Calderon family.

We ask your forgiveness, Father, for writing about these unpleasant issues but we consider it necessary since nobody has heard our complaints. What worries us right now is that (a) the superiors know about this situation. Not only was the seminarian not expelled, but the solution to his moral and disciplinary problems is simply to send him to another seminary. (b) Carlos Urrutigoity is about to receive major orders in Winona, USA. (c) a serious investigation was never started.

Page 6, first paragraph.

We are worried and scandalized by all this. We have tried by all means to inchoate an investigation to no avail. Bishop de Galarreta made it impossible to take measures against him, and despite the fact that he now acknowledges his mistake, he still does nothing to repair it.

Those who are familiar with Fr. Urrutigoity's more subtle modus operandi will readily recognize in the testimony above the incipient techniques of a sexual predator who was not yet able to manipulate others by means of the full authority of the priesthood. Indeed, the above account confirms reports of Fr. Urrutigoity's frequent initiation of discussions on "chastity" in order to test the willingness of his objects of seduction. And given what is already known about Fr. Urrutigoity's fondness for suppositories, it is not surprising to read about seminarian Urrutigoity's efforts to manipulate "medical problems" for his own perverse purposes. We also see in the account above a slightly more modest version of Fr. Urrutigoity's willingness to parade naked in front of potential victims. Moreover, we see here further testimony of Fr. Urrutigoity's penchant for late night visits to those who are asleep and thereby vulnerable to his advances. Although Document No. 2 does not accuse seminarian Urrutigoity of sleeping in the same bed with other seminarians, there is ample testimony that Fr. Urrutigoity slept one-on-one with seminarians under his authority at Winona, and with boys and young men under his spiritual direction at St. Gregory's Academy and at the Society of St. John's property in Shohola.

Document No. 2 and Fr. Morello's letter also reveal that Fr. Urrutigoity's present suspension is nothing new for him. Carlos Urrutigoity has been formally accused of homosexual molestation in three different places, yet each time he has managed to evade justice by enlisting episcopal support. Urrutigoity was first accused, as we have seen above, when he was a seminarian in La Reja, Argentina. After Urrutigoity was ordained a priest, and soon after he left the seminary in Winona, Minnesota, he was accused again, this time by the young seminarian who left Winona with him. The third accusation was made in a federal lawsuit by a graduate of St. Gregory's Academy when Urrutigoity was the superior general of the Society of St. John. Note that Fr. Urrutigoity's

victims came from three completely different backgrounds and that they knew nothing about the prior victims. Hence, there is absolutely no basis for the Society of St. John's claim that the accusations of homosexual molestation reflect a conspiracy against Fr. Urrutigoity.

Note also that even those who initially found themselves on opposite sides, such as Bishop Williamson and Fr. Morello, are now all agreed on at least one thing: Carlos Urrutigoity is a homosexual predator. How then can Bishop Timlin, without whose assistance and support Fr. Urrutigoity would have long ago been stopped, continue to protect this Rasputin in a Roman collar? Although Bishop Timlin has been repeatedly warned that Fr. Urrutigoity continues even to this day to create scenarios that place him in the company of young men, Bishop Timlin still does nothing but claim that all the accusations against Fr. Urrutigoity have been fabricated by his enemies.

All who are disgusted with Bishop Timlin's failure to protect his flock from a clear and present danger should write to him at xxxxxx. I also encourage all concerned parties to contact Mr. Andrew Jarbola, the District Attorney of Lackawanna County: (1) to exhort him to ensure that the ongoing criminal investigation of Fr. Urrutigoity and Fr. Eric Ensey is both rigorous and independent of diocesan influence; and (2) to ask why there is no news of impaneling a grand jury.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jeffrey M. Bond
President
The College of St. Justin Martyr
142 Market Road
Greeley, PA 18425

jmb3@ltis.net

www.saintjustinmartyr.org

Chronology

| Date | Who | What |
|------------|------------------------------|--|
| Chronology | | |
| 1987-88 | SSPX Argentina | Accusations of sexual misconduct by Fr. Urrutigoity in the wake of his departure from the seminary of the SSPX in La Reja, Argentina. Despite these accusations, Fr. Urrutigoity is accepted into the seminary of the SSPX in the USA. |
| May 1997 | SSPX USA | Fr. Carlos Urrutigoity, along with another priest and 2 seminarians are expelled from the seminary of the SSPX in the USA. Six other seminarians soon leave as well. We are told that the reason for the expulsion is that they were planning to found a new religious order. |
| 1997 | Diocese of Scranton | The former priests and seminarians of the SSPX find refuge in the Diocese of Scranton PA, where the Fraternity of St. Peter has its North American HQ. Bishop Timlin of the Diocese of Scranton accepts them without doing background checks. |
| 1998 | Diocese of Scranton | Accusations of sexual misconduct by Fr. Urrutigoity in the wake of his departure from the seminary of the SSPX in Winona, MN. After a diocesan inquiry is held, Bishop Timlin of the Diocese of Scranton decides that there is insufficient evidence, despite a letter of condemnation from Bishop Fellay of the SSPX. |
| 1998 | Institute of Christ the King | Fr. Marshall Roberts is expelled from the seminary of the Institute of Christ the King because of accusations of sexual misconduct. He finds refuge in the SSJ. |
| March 1998 | St. Gregory's Academy, FSSP | The police are called in by Fr. Paul Carr of the FSSP (Fraternity of St. Peter) after it is discovered that the priests of the SSJ have served alcohol to minors (boys). |

| Date | Who | What |
|--------------|--|---|
| Aug-Oct 2001 | Dr. Bond of St. Justin Martyr College | Dr. Bond, HeadMaster of St. Justin Martyr College, which is affiliated with the SSJ, learns of the sexual misconduct of Fr. Urrutigoity. Dr. Bond then begins a series of discussions with Bishop Timlin, and with the SSJ. Bishop Timlin refuses to suspend any of the SSJ priests, despite evidence of wrongdoing. The SSJ refuses to admit there is a problem. |
| Oct 14, 2001 | Dr. Bond of St. Justin Martyr College | Dr. Bond decides that St. Justin Martyr College must separate from the SSJ. |
| Nov 19, 2001 | Dr. Bond of St. Justin Martyr College | Dr. Bond sends letters to Apostolic Nuncio for USA and to Cardinal Hoyos, Prefect for the Clergy, telling them about the sexual misconduct of Fr. Urrutigoity. |
| Nov 21, 2001 | Fr. Urrutigoity | Fr. Urrutigoity threatens Dr. Bond with libel. |
| Dec 8, 2001 | Dr. Bond of St. Justin Martyr College | Sexual misconduct by Fr. Eric Ensey becomes known. Dr. Bond issues a public notice to concerned Catholics. |
| Jan 12, 2002 | Diocese of Scranton | The Diocese of Scranton receives a letter of complaint from one of those molested by Fr. Urrutigoity. |
| Jan 15, 2002 | Roman Catholic Faithful (organization) | Press Release, asking for suspension of Fr. Urrutigoity and any other priests involved in sexual misconduct, for resignation of Bishop Timlin, for criminal investigation. |
| Jan 25, 2002 | Diocese of Scranton | Bishop Timlin transfers Frs. Urrutigoity and Ensey elsewhere in the Diocese of Scranton, but does not suspend them. |
| Jan 26, 2002 | Times Leader (paper) | News of the scandal hits the secular press. |
| Feb 6, 2002 | Dr. Bond of St. Justin Martyr College | Fr. Marshall Roberts becomes a third suspected sexual offender. |
| Feb 27, 2002 | Scranton Times-Tribune (paper) | The DA's office of Lackawanna County, PA, launches an investigation into allegations of sexual misconduct by members of the SSJ. |
| Mar 20, 2002 | National Review Online (paper) | A former student of St. Gregory's Academy launches a \$1 million lawsuit against the SSJ, FSSP and Diocese of Scranton. |

| Date | Who | What |
|--------------|---------------------------|---|
| Mar 28, 2002 | St. Justin Martyr College | Fr. Richard Munkelt, formerly with the SSJ, comes forward with further insights into the scandal. |

Trechos de informações sobre Urrutigoity e Williamson

(Tradução do anexo 5)

<http://www.sspxseminary.org/whoweare/winona.shtml>

No outono de 1993, o Seminário recebeu dois novos professores: os padres Juan Iscara e Carlos Urrutigoity. O padre Iscara assumiu as disciplinas de Teologia Moral e História da Igreja. **O padre Urrutigoity tornou-se professor de Dogma, Latim e Música Sacra. Foi sob a influência do padre Urrutigoity que o Seminário rapidamente começou a se concentrar fortemente no aperfeiçoamento dos seminaristas no canto Gregoriano.**

O ano acadêmico de 1996-97 começou sem maiores problemas, mas conforme o segundo semestre se aproximava, uma certa agitação começou a se espalhar pelo Seminário. Formaram-se cliques, e um fosso cada vez mais amplo tornava-se perceptível, opondo em tudo os seminaristas da área de Liturgia àquela do Canto Gregoriano e até mesmo às atividades de lazer. Os sinais iniciais do problema pareciam insignificantes, mas, subjacente a pequenas diferenças de gosto, surgia um “Medievalismo” prejudicial – o desejo de “restaurar” o verdadeiro currículo reconstituído segundo um “modelo medieval” à moda romântica, abandonando o que era chamado de excessos e desvios que teriam sido introduzidos pela Contra-Reforma. Cinco meses depois, descobriu-se que uma sociedade de dissidência havia sido secretamente planejada. A Sociedade de São João havia, de fato, sido concebida para estabelecer uma vida religiosa livre das “desvios” tão desprezados (que na verdade eram as glórias da Igreja).

Esse retorno a uma Idade de Ouro imaginária era, na verdade, a construção de algo completamente novo; a Idade Média foi embora e seu retorno é impossível. Para tentar realizar um projeto como esse no mundo de hoje, seria necessário introduzir novidades que nunca existiram ao longo da história da Igreja, e muito menos na Idade Média. É exatamente isso que os Modernistas fizeram no Concílio Vaticano II. Cada inovação era justificada pelo apelo ao retorno à pureza original da antiga Igreja, enquanto, ao mesmo tempo, nunca se admitia a intenção de se livrar das cargas que a vida segundo a doutrina e as leis da Igreja impõem a nós.

Após longos adiamentos, Dom Williamson afastou do Seminário o “**talentoso, mas orgulhoso jovem padre argentino**” (para utilizar as palavras do próprio bispo) que havia sido o ponta de lança do plano dessa nova sociedade. Ele já havia observado isso antes: um padre recém-ordenado, intelectualmente brilhante, utilizando suas capacidades para tentar reformar a FSSPX à

sua própria imagem, e para, finalmente, frustrado em seus planos, recorrer à subversão e à desobediência – levando outros à sua queda. Esses homens deveriam seguir seu caminho, enquanto o Seminário deveria continuar a manter o que havia recebido do Arcebispo Lefebvre.

Como consequência dessa situação, o Seminário perdeu dois padres e mais de 12 seminaristas. Após esses eventos difíceis, o Seminário foi solenemente consagrado ao Sagrado Coração de Jesus em 6 de junho, para dar glória ao Seu nome e reafirmar que o Seminário é Seu domínio.

<http://www.christorchaos.com/MarchtoOblivion.htm>

No entanto, ainda há mais de um punhado de padres da Sociedade de São Pio X e da Fraternidade Sacerdotal São Pedro que olham com entusiasmo para o *Ordo Missae* de 1965, que permaneceu em vigor por apenas cinco anos antes de ser substituído pelo *Novus Ordo Missae* (o que constituiu um período exatamente três anos mais longo do que aquele em que o Missal modernizado de 1961 de João XXIII esteve em vigor). **Ainda há padres na Sociedade de São Pio X, por exemplo, que permanecem, embora em privado, adeptos das concepções litúrgicas do padre Carlos Urrutigoity, o fundador da corrupta Sociedade de São João**, que agora encontrou refúgio sob a proteção, acreditem ou não, do bispo conciliar de Ciudad del Este no Paraguai, Rogelio Livieres Plano (que enviou uma carta de apoio à Sociedade de São João em 8 de setembro de 2006), um pequeno fato que deveria provar que a perversão não é de forma alguma um impedimento para ser bem recebido nos quartéis gerais da igreja conciliar.

A convicção de Urrutigoity, tal como ele mesmo a expressou pessoalmente durante uma entrevista que me concedeu em Shohola, Pennsylvania, em novembro de 1999, é que **"devemos considerar em que direção a liturgia poderia ter se desenvolvido"** se as "polêmicas" dos anos 1960 não tivessem ocorrido. Em outras palavras, "nós" devemos permanecer abertos à mudança litúrgica para não "cimentar" a Missa de acordo com um Missal qualquer, razão pela qual Urrutigoity, que tinha o pleno apoio da Comissão Pontifícia *Ecclesia Dei*, não hesitaria em usar de vez em quando o Missal de 1910, o Missal de 1955, o Missal de 1962 ou o Missal de 1965, mas em nenhum caso o Missal de 1969, como ele enfatizava**. **Urrutigoity declarou estar a favor de um certo grau de experimentação litúrgica "aprovada", ponto de vista que ensinava durante seus anos de professor no Seminário Santo Tomás de Aquino em Winona, Minnesota, antes de sua expulsão da Sociedade de São Pio X por volta de 1998.**

Havia em Winona seminaristas que apoiavam a abordagem litúrgica de Urrutigoity, mas não ousavam se opor ao legado do Arcebispo Lefebvre ao segui-lo, Urrutigoity, para fora da Sociedade de São Pio X. **Existe pelo menos uma corrente de simpatia pelas concepções litúrgicas de Urrutigoity dentro de certos círculos da Sociedade de São Pio X.** Assim, a própria questão que devastou tantas almas na falsa igreja que é a igreja conciliar, a saber, **a experimentação litúrgica, encontra, em graus variados, apoio entre padres da Sociedade de São Pio X, assim como entre alguns "padres" da Fraternidade Sacerdotal São Pedro**, que incorpora em suas fileiras na França o "lote" adicional de "padres" que celebram o culto protestante e judéo-maçônico que é o *Novus Ordo Missae* a pedido do bispo local conciliar (cf. de Griff Ruby **A RESSURREIÇÃO DA IGREJA CATÓLICA ROMANA**, uma excelente revisão de toda a história do movimento Tradicional, **"honesta e equilibrada"**, assim como uma certa rede de propaganda sob obediência maçônica que em si mesma a promove).

Extracts froms news about Urrutigoity and Williamson

<http://www.dailycatholic.org/issue/04May/may28ttt.htm>

While he was a tiller of souls as the gardener of the harvest, he also found the necessity to weed out those who would weaken the soil. Such was the situation in 1997 when he expelled **Father Carlos Urrutigoity** and two seminarians from St. Thomas Aquinas Seminary. They subsequently took up refuge in the troubled diocese of Scranton, welcomed by the undiscerning **Bishop Timlin** who ignored the warnings of Bishops Williamson and Fellay. Now Timlin's successor in Scranton is reaping the bitter fruits of sexual abuse lawsuits by priests of the Society of Saint John which the rebellious Urrutigoity formed when he could not pass muster under Williamson's watchful, careful scrutiny. Thank God the Bishop was a good gardener and one of the signs of the SSPX to guard carefully not only the Sacred Deposit of the Faith, but the virtues of chastity and modesty.

<http://www.sspxseminary.org/whoweare/winona.shtml>

In the fall of 1993, the Seminary received two new professors: Fr. Juan Iscara and Fr. Carlos Urrutigoity. Fr. Iscara assumed duties teaching Moral Theology and Church History. Fr. Urrutigoity became professor of Dogma, Latin and Sacred Music. Through Fr. Urrutigoity's influence, the Seminary would soon begin to focus heavily on perfecting the Gregorian chant of the seminarians.

(...)

The 1996-97 academic year began smoothly, but as the second semester approached, there was a certain restlessness at the Seminary. Cliques had formed, and an ever-widening rift became perceptible, dividing seminarians in everything from the Liturgy to Gregorian Chant to recreational activities. The initial signs of the problem seemed insignificant, but underlying the minor differences in taste was an unhealthy "Medievalism" - the desire to "restore" the tried and true curriculum according to a romanticized "medieval model," leaving behind what were termed the excesses and deviations brought about by the Counter-Reformation. Five months later, it was discovered that a break-away society was secretly being planned. The Society of St. John was to establish a religious life without the despised "deviations" (which were in fact the glories of the Church).

This return to an imagined Golden Age was, in fact, the construction of something completely new; the Middle Ages are past and its return is impossible. In trying to execute such a project in today's world, it would be necessary to introduce novelties that never existed in the history of the Church, much less in the Middle Ages. This is precisely what the Modernists did at Vatican II. Every innovation was justified by the call of a return to the pristine purity of the ancient Church, while

alongside there was the never avowed intention of avoiding the burdens that life according to the Church's doctrine and laws, and our own statutes, impose upon us.

After a long build-up, Bishop Williamson dismissed from the Seminary the "talented but proud young Argentinian priest" (to quote the Bishop) who had spearheaded the plans for the new society. He had seen this happen before: a recently-ordained, intellectually brilliant priest using his skills in an effort to reshape the SSPX in his own image and finally, when frustrated in his plans, resorting to subversion and disobedience – taking others with him in his fall. Such as these would have to go their own ways, while the Seminary continued to hand on what it received from Archbishop Lefebvre.

As a consequence of this affair, the Seminary lost two priests and over 12 seminarians. Following these painful events, the Seminary was solemnly consecrated to the Sacred Heart of Jesus on June 6th, to give glory to His name and reaffirm that the Seminary is His domain.

<http://www.christorchaos.com/MarchtoOblivion.htm>

Nevertheless, however, there are more than a handful of priests in the Society of Saint Pius X and in the Priestly Fraternity of Saint Peter who look fondly upon the *Ordo Missae* of 1965, which was in place for just five years before being replaced by the *Novus Ordo Missae* itself (which was a period precisely three years longer than the modernized 1961 Missal of John XXIII had been in place). There are still some priests in the Society of Saint Pius X, for example, who remain supportive, albeit privately, of the liturgical views of Father Carlos Urrutigoity, the founder of the corrupt Society of Saint John, which has now taken refuge under the protection, believe it or not, of the conciliar bishop of Ciudad del Este in Paraguay, Rogelio Livieres Plano (who issued a letter in support of the Society of Saint John on September 8, 2006), a little fact that should prove that perversion is no impediment to being welcomed in the official quarters of the conciliar church.

Urrutigoity's belief, expressed to me personally in an interview I conducted with him in Shohola, Pennsylvania, in November of 1999, is that "we should see where the liturgy would have gone" had there not been the "polemics" of the 1960s. In other words, "we" should be open to liturgical change so as not to "cement" the Mass according to any one Missal, which is why Urrutigoity, who had the full support of Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei, said that he would sometimes use the Missal of 1910 or the Missal of 1955 or the Missal of 1962 or the Missal of 1965, but never the Missal of 1969, he emphasized. Urrutigoity thus was in favor of some degree of "approved" liturgical experimentation, a view that he professed during his days as a teacher at Saint Thomas Aquinas Seminary in Winona, Minnesota, before his expulsion from the Society of Saint Pius X circa 1998.

There were some seminarians in Winona who supported Urrutigoity's liturgical approach but who did not want to denounce the late Archbishop Lefebvre by following him, Urrutigoity, out of the Society of Saint Pius X. There is at least some sympathy for Urrutigoity's view of the liturgy in some circles with the Society of Saint Pius X. Thus the very thing that has so devastated souls in the counterfeit church of conciliarism, liturgical experimentation, has varying degrees of support among some priests in the Society of Saint Pius X and among a few "priests" in the Priestly Fraternity of Saint Peter, which has the additional "baggage" of "priests" within its ranks in France

who will celebrate the Protestant and Judeo-Masonic service that is the *Novus Ordo Missae* at the behest of the local conciliar bishop (see Griff Ruby's [**THE RESURRECTION OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH**](#), an excellent review of the entire history of the Traditional movement, "fair and balanced" as a certain Masonically-owned cable propaganda network advertises itself).

<http://www.angelqueen.org/forum/viewtopic.php?t=5849>

Fotocopie e difunda