



VI ER OGSÅ KIRKEN - en forening af katolikker

www.veok.dk

VEOK's Nyhedsmail nr. 58

26-jan-2009

Pavens rehabilitering af biskopper udnævnt af Lefebvre

Som også meddelt i danske medier har Benedikt XVI ophævet ekskommunikationen af de biskopper, som ærkebiskop Lefebvre havde viet. Som formand for VEOK vil jeg på det skarpeste udtrykke min forbavselse, sorg og protest over denne uovervejede beslutning, der kun kan skade vor paves og kirkes internationale omdømme.

Her følger et udpluk af kommentarer fra diverse amerikanske og engelske aviser. Og for at vise, at biskop Williamson ikke blot er holocaustbenægter, men også har nogle ret bizarre meninger om kvinder medtages til sidst et brev, han har ladet offentliggøre i 2001. Det er chokerende læsning.

Kaare Rübner Jørgensen
Formand for VEOK

Indhold:

1. National Catholic Reporter: Lefebvre movement: long, troubled history with Judaism
2. The Guardian: Replacing dialogue with deafness
3. New York Times: Healing Schism, Pope Risks Another
4. The Observer: Pope stirs up Jewish fury over bishop
5. The Global News Service of the Jewish People: Jewish-Catholic crisis seen in bishop's rehabilitation
6. Bishop Williamson's Letter

1. National Catholic Reporter: Lefebvre movement: long, troubled history with Judaism

By JOHN L. ALLEN JR.
Jan. 26, 2009

When the Vatican lifted the excommunication of four traditionalist Catholic bishops Jan. 21, it's entirely possible Rome was unaware that one of those bishops, an Englishman named Richard Williamson, had just given an interview to Swedish television in which he denied that the Nazis had used gas chambers and asserted that no more than 200,000 to 300,000 Jews had died during the Second World War.

In retrospect, however, it would be disingenuous for anyone to feign surprise.

A troubled history with Judaism has long been part of the Catholic traditionalist movement associated with the late French Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre — beginning with Lefebvre himself, who spoke approvingly of both the World War II-era Vichy Regime in France and the far-right National Front, and who identified the contemporary enemies of the faith as “Jews, Communists and Freemasons” in an Aug. 31, 1985, letter to Pope John Paul II.

Reacting to the furor over Williamson, the Vatican has stressed that lifting the excommunication is not an endorsement of his views on the Holocaust, and has repeated its firm commitment to Catholic-Jewish dialogue and to combating anti-Semitism. The pope’s outreach to traditionalists should instead be seen, spokespersons said, as an “act of peace” intended to end the only formal schism in the wake of the Second Vatican Council (1962-65).

Canonical experts also point out that, technically speaking, Holocaust denial is not heresy. It’s a denial of historical truth, not a truth of the faith, and hence repudiating it is not inconsistent — at least from a strictly logical point of view — with the Jan. 21 decree from the Congregation for Bishops ending the excommunication of the four Lefebvrite prelates.

That’s a fine distinction, however, likely to be lost on much of the world, especially given that Williamson’s comments hardly came out of the blue.

A long history

The historical association between some strains of traditionalist Catholicism and anti-Semitism run deep, intertwined with royalist reaction to the French Revolution in the 18th century and, later, the Boulanger and Dreyfus Affairs in France (1886-1889 and 1894-1899). In populist European conservatism, the defense of Christian tradition has often been linked to a suspicion of “contamination” — originally by Jews, and more recently, by Europe’s rising Muslim presence.

Observers of the traditionalist landscape caution people not to paint with too broad a brush, as if every Catholic attracted to the older Latin Mass or to traditional views on doctrinal matters is somehow tainted by anti-Semitism. Similarly, experts also warn that critics of Catholic traditionalism can sometimes be quick to label as “anti-Semitic” attitudes that may be controversial theologically or politically, but that don’t in themselves reflect real prejudice.

For example, traditionalists often uphold a robust missionary theology, insisting that the church cannot renounce its duty to evangelize any group, including Jews. Similarly, traditionalists often challenge Vatican II’s teaching on religious freedom, church-state separation, and interreligious dialogue. Neither position, observers say, necessarily conceals latent anti-Semitism.

For its part, the Priestly Fraternity of St. Pius X, the body founded by Lefebvre, issued a 2007 statement asserting that “a Catholic cannot be anti-Semitic without destroying the origin and essence of his own faith.” Nonetheless, there’s also a track record in some traditionalist and Lefebvrite circles of open hostility toward Jews and Judaism that is anything but latent.

As noted above, Lefebvre himself wrote to John Paul II in 1985, three years before his decision to ordain four bishops in defiance of the pope’s authority, to argue that Vatican II’s

“Declaration on Religious Liberty” had produced a series of poisonous consequences, including “all the reforms carried out over 20 years within the church to please heretics, schismatics, false religions and declared enemies of the church, such as the Jews, the Communists and the Freemasons.”

This sense of antagonism was lifelong. In 1990, one year before his death, Lefebvre gave an interview to the journal of the National Front in France, suggesting that Catholic opposition to a residence of Carmelite nuns at the site of the Auschwitz concentration camp was being instigated by Jews.

Lefebvre’s followers often share this outlook. In 1997, one of the four bishops ordained by Lefebvre in 1988, Bernard Tissier de Mallerais, said, “The church for its part has at all times forbidden and condemned the killing of Jews, even when ‘their grave defects rendered them odious to the nations among which they were established.’ ... All this makes us think that the Jews are the most active artisans for the coming of Antichrist.”

Nor has their record been confined simply to making statements. In 1989, Paul Touvier, a fugitive charged with ordering the execution of seven Jews in 1944, was arrested in a priory of the Fraternity of St. Pius X in Nice, France. The fraternity stated at the time that Touvier had been granted asylum as “an act of charity to a homeless man.” When Touvier died in 1996, a parish church operated by the fraternity offered a requiem Mass in his honor.

In just the past year, controversy arose in Germany when a priest of the fraternity asserted that Jews were “co-responsible” for the death of Christ. Also in 2008, an Italian priest of the fraternity celebrated a Latin Mass in honor of the 63rd anniversary of the death of fascist leader Benito Mussolini.

Reaching a crescendo

By all accounts, this strain reaches a crescendo in Williamson, whose views were a matter of public record well before his most recent comments to Swedish television.

In 1989, for example, police in Canada briefly considered filing charges against Williamson under that country’s hate speech laws after he gave an address in Quebec charging that Jews were responsible for “changes and corruption” in the Catholic church, that “not one Jew” perished in Nazi gas chambers, and that the Holocaust was a myth created so that the West would “approve the state of Israel.”

Williamson also praised the writings of Ernst Zundel, a German-born Canadian immigrant whose works include *Did Six Million Really Die?* and *The Hitler We Loved and Why*, both considered mainstays of Holocaust denial literature.

In 1991, Williamson issued a letter from Winona, Minn., where he served as rector of a Lefebvrite seminary, stating, “Until [Jews] rediscover their true Messianic vocation, they may be expected to continue fanatically agitating, in accordance with their false messianic vocation of Jewish world dominion, to prepare the Antichrist’s throne in Jerusalem.”

In 2000, Williamson went on record suggesting that the “Protocols of the Elders of Zion,” supposedly a plot for Jewish global domination regarded by historians as an anti-Semitic

hoax created in Tsarist Russia, is authentic. “God put into men’s hands the Protocols of the Sages of Sion ... if men want to know the truth, but few do,” Williamson said.

Nor have Williamson’s comments flown under the Catholic radar. A 2008 piece in England’s *Catholic Herald* documented his anti-Semitic record and included a judgment from Shimon Samuels, director of international relations at the Simon Wiesenthal Center, to the effect that Williamson is “the Borat of the schismatic Catholic far-right.”

Samuels said at the time that Williamson is “a clown, but a dangerous clown.”

In that 2008 *Catholic Herald* piece, Williamson denied being an anti-Semite, but said that he opposes “adversaries of Our Lord Jesus Christ.”

“If Jews are adversaries of Our Lord Jesus Christ — obviously not all of them, but those that are — then I don’t like them,” he said. “My definition of anti-Semitism is to be against every single Jew purely because he’s a Jew. That’s not at all my case. I once had a Jewish rabbi come and speak to seminarians. Does that sound to you like anti-Semitism?”

To be sure, Williamson’s controversial views are not confined to Jews. He has also suggested that the 9/11 bombings were not the result of airplanes hijacked by terrorists but rather “demolition charges,” has criticized the film “The Sound of Music” for a lack of respect for authority, and has expressed sympathy for what he described as the “remotely Catholic sense” of the Unabomber for the dangers of technology.

Spokespersons for the Fraternity of St. Pius X and other traditionalist Catholic groups have generally said that Williamson’s views do not represent the corporate position of the traditionalist movement. Reacting to the most recent comments, Bishop Bernard Fellay, superior of the fraternity, said that Williamson had expressed a “personal opinion.”

Vatican watchers have likewise stressed that Benedict XVI’s motives in reaching out to traditionalists, including Williamson, are certainly not to canonize his positions on Judaism or any other subject, but rather to promote unity in the church. Over the centuries, popes have always abhorred schism because of the article of Catholic theology that any legitimately ordained bishop can ordain other bishops — and thus, if it is not arrested, a schism can become self-replicating and produce a parallel church.

Early returns, however, suggest that in the court of broader public opinion, disentangling the pope’s logic from the taint of association with anti-Semitism will be a tough sell. The chief rabbi of Rome, Riccardo Di Segni, sounded despondent on Monday about where things will go from here.

“I don’t know what kind of resolution there can be at this point,” Di Segni said.

Nogle kommentarer på Allens blog

[Unity, B16?](#)

Submitted by Jim McCrea on Mon, 01/26/2009 - 13:54.

Unity, B16? At any and all cost?

The withdrawal of these

Submitted by R. Dennis Porch, MD on Mon, 01/26/2009 - 13:57.

The withdrawal of these excommunication's are politically very troubling for the Church and any ecumenical outreach to a broader group of humanity. It probably all but destroys Pope John Paul II outreach to Judaism. It is also troubling because although Cardinal Ratzinger was never a hard core member of the Nazi Youth organization, he was a member even if forced. One would wonder what projections in his mind come from this group.

On the other hand this is an encouraging moment in that in order to eliminate a schism in the church the Pope was able to easily change the course of his predecessor's excommunication. It shows us that the current excommunication of Apostolically validly ordained women may be more like Joan of Arch's excommunication than an enforcement against an enemy of Catholic doctrine and if this Pope can overcome an excommunication of his predecessor, then the next Pope can certainly do the same.

Some have compared modern excommunication to the torture and killings of the Holy Inquisition, but there is a bit of a difference, the torture is no longer physical and the church is no longer powerful enough to legally physically murder anyone that does not agree with the Papal administration of the moment. The mental torture however persists and is in fact a vast misuse of power by an authoritarian figure. Let's hope that our Church will grow and develop as the People of God begin to see excommunication for what it is (political misbehavior by an authoritarian) rather than a form of eternal torture in hell.

Williamson is a nut.

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Mon, 01/26/2009 - 14:31.

Williamson is a nut. How does he get away with expressing such outrageous opinions and no one in the leadership of the Catholic Church calls him to task for it? Let women make a statement in favor of priesthood for women or the like and they are swiftly excommunicated or the like. Clerics can be anti-Semitic, child abusers and abusers of women and some positive argument is always found for them. This sickens me.

2. The Guardian: Replacing dialogue with deafness

Is the welcoming of Lefebvrists back into the Catholic church an aberration, a moment of gross insensitivity, or a policy statement

Jonathan Romain, Monday 26 January 2009 11.30 GMT

How could he have got it so wrong! The pope has every right to welcome back into the Catholic fold those who had been guilty of some internal religious error – as he [chose to do over the weekend](#) with those who had been ordained without Vatican permission by the breakaway French archbishop, [Marcel Lefebvre](#).

However, if one of those concerned was also guilty of some other offence – such as declaring that paedophiles are merely lonely men who deserve comfort rather than condemnation ... or claiming that the willingness to be a suicide bomber is an essential pre-condition for being a Muslim – then the internal doctrinal dispute would surely pale into

insignificance besides the warped mentality of that individual. The idea of any rapprochement would be politically unwise and morally abhorrent.

Yet this is exactly what has just happened – for one of those welcomed back is Richard Williamson, who [denies that the Holocaust occurred](#) or that Adolf Hitler ever had such a policy. Whereas most other people in the universe are aware of the mass graves, the crematoria, the meticulous records that the Nazis themselves kept, Williamson seems blissfully ignorant.

He holds that historical evidence "is hugely against six million [Jews] having been gassed in gas chambers as a deliberate policy of Adolf Hitler ... I believe there were no gas chambers." He goes on to estimate that between 200,000 to 300,000 perished in Nazi concentration camps "but not one of them by gassing".

Unless Williamson has the excuse of having been in a coma for the past 60 years, it cannot be ignorance; it has to be malice. Forget about historical evidence, there is plenty of living evidence, for there are still thousands of people – Jews and non-Jews, victims, perpetrators and bystanders – who lived through that terrible period and who can testify through eye-witness accounts to the gassing and to the other forms of mass slaughter. It was only a few years ago that similar assertions of Holocaust-denial by David Irving were subject to rigorous examination in the high court in London and were found to be totally spurious.

But if Williamson can be dismissed as somewhere on the spectrum between mad and bad, then serious questions must be raised about the Vatican's judgment in rehabilitating him. It does not speak well about its own sense of propriety. It speaks even less well about its sensitivity to Jewish-Catholic relationship, which had flourished after Pope John XXIII initiated [Vatican II](#) in 1963 and which had received a boost under the papacy of John-Paul II. However, developments since the election of Benedict XVI – such as the re-introduction of a [prayer](#) calling for the conversion of the Jews – have made Vatican-watchers wonder whether interfaith dialogue is still a priority. This latest move seems to reinforce the doubts.

How can Jews – or any person of goodwill – not fail to be aghast at the Vatican bringing Williamson back into the Catholic fold? It might have been passably acceptable if it had been accompanied by a public disavowal of his Holocaust-denial. The silence on this is chilling. Is it an aberration, a moment of gross insensitivity, or is it a policy statement, heralding a return to religious arrogance in which dialogue is replaced by deafness?

What is so frustrating is that for the past 45 years, rabbis and priests have met regularly for conferences, Jewish and Catholic laity have visited each other's places of worship, scholars from both faiths have worked together, religious officials have produced joint declarations, and, with a few hiccups here and there, have brought a level of harmony and warmth that no one would have dreamt possible this time last century. The thought that this genuine progress might be reversed is desperately worrying for those who hold that there are many paths to heaven and that no one faith has a monopoly on God. Yes, the pope must be concerned with healing divisions within the church, but not in ways that can lead to conflict with those outside it.

3. New York Times: Healing Schism, Pope Risks Another

By RACHEL DONADIO

Published: January 25, 2009

ROME — A day after [Pope Benedict XVI](#) said he would revoke the excommunications of four schismatic bishops, including one who has denied the Holocaust, concern about the pope's decision extended into the [Vatican](#) itself.

Cardinal Walter Kasper, the director of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity and the liaison for Vatican-Jewish relations, said Sunday that he had not been consulted. "It was a decision of the pope," the cardinal said in a telephone interview.

That Benedict apparently did not widely discuss a matter that has provoked anger among Jewish groups and liberal Catholics was not out of character, however. It was just the latest example of how the pope is increasingly focused on internal doctrinal issues and seemingly unaware of how they might resonate in the larger world.

As such, it perfectly captured the theological aspirations — and political shortcomings — of his four-year-old papacy.

In 2007, Benedict approved broader use of the Latin Mass, a reform sought by the same traditionalists he has now reinstated, but one seen by many in the church as divisive. The year before, the pope angered Muslims when he cited a medieval scholar who said that Islam brought things "evil and inhuman," and he was seemingly ill prepared for the repercussions. He later apologized.

Again this weekend, a doctrinal question exploded into a global polemic. Benedict's decision to extend an olive branch to the four men was apparently born from a deep personal and theological desire to heal the only schism in the Roman Catholic Church in a century.

On Saturday, he said he would welcome back into the fold the four members of a sect founded in opposition to the reforms of the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s. The bishops are members of the St. Pius X Society, which was founded in 1970 by a French archbishop, Marcel Lefebvre, in opposition to Vatican II reforms. They were excommunicated by [Pope John Paul II](#) in 1988 after Archbishop Lefebvre consecrated them in unsanctioned ceremonies.

The most contentious of the four is the British-born Bishop Richard Williamson, who in a recent television interview said he thought the "historical evidence" was against six million Jews dying in Nazi gas chambers.

Some saw the pope's decision as part of a trend, or at least an indication of his priorities.

"There is obviously a theological strategy, but the repercussions on the public opinion field beyond the church are obviously only secondary in priority," said Mordechai Lewy, the Israeli ambassador to the Vatican.

The move baffled Alberto Melloni, a professor of church history and the director of the liberal Catholic John XXIII Foundation for Religious Science in Bologna, which produced a history of Vatican II. "What is very inexplicable to me is how it's possible to not calculate the consequences. This is abnormal," he said.

The Society of St. Pius X does not appear to have issued any public statements on Bishop Williamson's views on the Holocaust. But the society has never been welcoming toward other faiths.

Jewish leaders said the pope's decision was a setback. "It's a very serious situation," said Riccardo di Segni, the chief rabbi of Rome. He said the tenets of Lefebvism were as worrisome as Bishop Williamson's personal views.

Rabbi di Segni said he did not know what the next chapter would bring. "I don't know what kind of resolution there can be at this point," he said.

In a public statement, the Vatican said Saturday that the revocation was a step toward full reconciliation with the Lefebvists and that further talks would seek to resolve the "open questions."

Other liberal critics said the pope's decision to welcome the Lefebvists showed that he was more willing to embrace schismatic conservatives than wayward leftists.

In his days as Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, the prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Benedict censured many left-leaning prelates, including ones adhering to the Marxist-inflected Liberation Theology movement popular in Latin America.

"I would be happy if the pope would be for reconciliation, especially also for people on the progressive side," said Hans Küng, a professor of theology at the University of Tübingen, Germany, who has for decades been Benedict's most formidable critic on the left. A Catholic priest, Father Küng was forbidden by the church to teach theology.

The revocation seemed to move the papacy further toward intellectual concerns rather than the daily lives of Catholics. Under Benedict, the church "risks becoming a Vatican hierarchy disincarnated from faith," said Ezio Mauro, the editor of the center-left daily *La Repubblica*, who writes on church-state issues.

Father Küng agreed. Benedict "does not see that he is alienating himself from the larger part of the Catholic Church and Christianity," he said. "He doesn't see the real world. He only sees the Vatican world."

4. The Observer: Pope stirs up Jewish fury over bishop

The Vatican is reinstating a British priest who denies millions died at the hands of the Nazis

[Tom Kington](#) in Rome and [Jamie Doward](#)

Tension between the Vatican and Jewish groups looked set to explode yesterday after Pope Benedict XVI rehabilitated a British bishop who has claimed no Jews died in gas chambers during the [second world war](#).

Benedict yesterday welcomed back into the Roman Catholic Church Richard Williamson and three other men who were excommunicated in 1988 after being ordained without Vatican permission. The three had been appointed by breakaway French archbishop Marcel Lefebvre. The Vatican decree issued yesterday spoke of overcoming the "scandal of divisiveness" and seeking reconciliation with Lefebvre's conservative order, the Society of Saint Pius X, which opposes the modernisation of Catholic doctrine.

But Jewish groups have warned the Pope that the decision could damage Catholic-Jewish relations after Williamson claimed in an interview, broadcast last week, that historical evidence "is hugely against six million having been deliberately gassed in gas chambers as a deliberate policy of Adolf Hitler ... I believe there were no gas chambers".

Shimon Samuels, of the Simon Wiesenthal Centre in Paris, said he understood the German-born pope's desire for Christian unity but said Benedict could have excluded Williamson, whose return to the church will "cost" the Vatican politically.

In an interview taped last November and aired last Wednesday on Swedish television, Williamson said he agreed with the "most serious" revisionist historians of the second world war who had concluded that "between 200,000-300,000 perished in Nazi concentration camps, but not one of them by gassing in a gas chamber". Williamson added he realised he could go to jail for Holocaust denial in Germany.

British Jewish groups condemned the decision and said they feared it could damage social cohesion. "The Council of Christians and Jews have said that in recent years there has been a considerable increase in antisemitism from some of the eastern European churches," said Mark Gardner, spokesman for the Community Security Trust which monitors attacks on Jewish people in the UK. Gardner said he hoped the Vatican would make it clear it abhors Williamson's comments about the gas chambers.

"Jews will be extremely alarmed by the lifting of this excommunication on somebody who holds such extreme anti-Jewish views," Gardner said. "I hope the Vatican will speak out on this particular aspect of Williamson's ideology."

Elan Steinberg, vice president of the American Gathering of Holocaust Survivors and their Descendants, warned last week the Vatican's actions would play into the hands of those seeking to stir up trouble. "For the Jewish people ... this development ... encourages hate-mongers everywhere," Steinberg said. Rome's chief rabbi Riccardo Di Segni said that revoking Williamson's excommunication would open "a deep wound".

Senior Vatican spokesman Father Federico Lombardi fought back yesterday, telling the Observer: "Williamson's statements are not agreed with and are open to criticism, and they

have nothing to do with the lifting of the excommunication. One is not connected to the other. The Society of Saint Pius X has itself distanced itself from these statements."

Relations between the Vatican and Jewish groups are already strained by the row over Pope Pius XII, who was pontiff during the second world war, and is being considered by the Vatican for beatification. He is accused by some historians and Jewish leaders of failing to speak out against the Holocaust.

Israeli officials recently protested when a senior cardinal said Israel's offensive in Gaza had turned it into a "big concentration camp".

It is not the first controversy for Benedict. His decision to allow freer use of the old Latin mass, including a Good Friday prayer for the conversion of Jews, caused widespread anger. His reintroduction of the Latin mass earned him criticism from Jewish groups but brought him closer to the Swiss-based Society of Saint Pius X, which opposed many of the changes introduced in the 1960s by the Second Vatican Council, including holding mass in local languages.

The society's leader, Lefebvre, was still at odds with Rome in 1988 when he ordained four new bishops, including Williamson, without permission from the Vatican, earning excommunication both for himself and all four bishops. Lefebvre died in 1991.

Benedict has pushed to normalise relations with the society, meeting the current head, bishop Bernard Fellay, shortly after becoming pope in 2005.

In its statement yesterday, the Vatican said Benedict was bringing the bishops back into the fold "with the hope that full conciliation and shared communion is achieved as soon as possible".

5. The Global News Service of the Jewish People: Jewish-Catholic crisis seen in bishop's rehabilitation

January 25, 2009

ROME (JTA) -- Pope Benedict XVI's rehabilitation of a traditionalist bishop who denies the full extent of the Holocaust could lead to a crisis in Jewish-Catholic relations, Jewish leaders said.

"By welcoming an open Holocaust denier into the Catholic Church without any recantation on his part, the Vatican has made a mockery of John Paul II's moving and impressive repudiation and condemnation of anti-Semitism," Rabbi David Rosen, the chairman of the International Jewish Committee for Interreligious Consultations, said in a statement.

The pope on Saturday rescinded the 1988 excommunication of British-born Richard Williamson and three other traditionalist bishops who were followers of Marcel Lefebvre, the late French archbishop who rejected Vatican reforms including those recognizing the validity of Judaism as a living religion.

Williamson has made several statements over the years questioning the reality of the Shoah. Last week he told Swedish television, "I believe there were no gas chambers," adding that only up to 300,000 Jews were killed in Nazi camps.

The pope's action came just days before the annual international Holocaust Memorial Day on Jan. 27, the anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz.

Jewish leaders in Italy and elsewhere had warned that rehabilitating Williamson could prove a serious setback to Jewish-Catholic relations, already strained by controversy over the wartime role of Pope Pius XII and last year's reintroduction of an Easter prayer that some see as calling for conversion of the Jews.

Rome's Chief Rabbi Riccardo Di Segni said that rehabilitating Williamson would open a "deep wound."

Yad Vashem, the Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Authority, said in a statement released Sunday, "The reinstatement is an internal Church matter. However, it is scandalous that someone of this stature in the Church denies the Holocaust. Denial of the Holocaust not only insults the survivors, memory of the victims, and the Righteous Among the Nations who risked their lives to rescue Jews, it is a brutal attack on truth.

"Even if the revocation of the excommunication is unrelated to Williamson's comments regarding the Holocaust, what kind of message is this sending regarding the Church's attitude toward the Holocaust? Although we understand that Williamson's statements do not represent the Church's stance, we continue to hope that the Church will vigorously condemn these unacceptable and odious comments."

6. Bishop Williamson's Letter

Girls at University

Emancipation's Mess of Pottage (Gen. XXV, 29-34)

Winona, September 1, 2001

Dear Friends and Benefactors:

Canadians strike me as a gentle people; but "strike" is the word! Ten years ago I was innocently asked in Canada whether women should wear trousers. Some ten weeks ago, also in Canada, I was asked whether a girl should go to a conservative Novus Ordo university. The answer now to the second question may be as stormy as the answer to the first: - because of all kinds of natural reasons, almost no girl should go to any university!

The deep-down reason is the same as for the wrongness of women's trousers: the unwomaning of woman. The deep-down cause in both cases is that Revolutionary man has betrayed modern woman; since she is not respected and loved for being a woman, she tries to make herself a man. Since modern man does not want her to do what God meant her to do, namely to have children, she takes her revenge by invading all kinds of

things that man is meant to do. What else was to be expected? Modern man has only himself to blame.

In fact, only in modern times have women dreamt of going to university, but the idea has now become so normal that even Catholics, whose Faith guards Nature, may have difficulty in seeing the problem. However, here is a pointer in the direction of normalcy: any Catholic with the least respect for Tradition recognizes that women should not be priests - can he deny that if few women went to university, almost none would wish to be priests? Alas, women going to university is part of the whole massive onslaught on God's Nature which characterizes our times. That girls should not be in universities flows from the nature of universities and from the nature of girls: true universities are for ideas, ideas are not for true girls, so true universities are not for true girls.

NATURE OF UNIVERSITIES

Let us begin with the true university. As defined by Cardinal Newman in his famous "Idea of a University", it is "a place of teaching universal knowledge". Universities in this sense were a creation of the Catholic Church in the Middle Ages, and, as the Cardinal splendidly recalls, theology held pride of place there because, as science of the Supreme Being, it is the supreme science which alone can appoint to all other sciences their proper place. So a true university is a place for all-round learning of reality beneath the queenship of Catholic theology. The value of sciences and this need of theirs for theology is why the Catholic Church is always tending to create universities, and why she alone can create true universities, directing all study ultimately to the glory of God and the salvation of souls.

From which, one must question what kind of queenship can be exercised by Novus Ordo theologians, even conservative. Normally, "conservative" Catholics who have left Tradition are in bad faith, so will be bad teachers, while those who have never known Tradition will be ignorant, and so bad teachers. Both will make a point of "rescuing" a damsel in "schismatic" or "excommunicated" distress. Therefore a Traditional girl putting herself under "conservative" teachers will, to keep her Faith, require a special effort to resist the menfolk whom God designed (and her parents paid) her to follow. She will then be voluntarily so setting her true Catholic Faith against her true feminine nature that one or the other is almost bound to suffer.

It also follows from the queenship of Theology that a democratic age like ours, rejecting God and dethroning Theology, will make a nonsense of universities. Sure enough. All around us we see "universities" which are much worse than brothels, because not only does democratic "equality" indiscriminately herd there together all kinds of boys and girls with little or no interest in ideas so that they should not be studying in the first place, but also, by silencing Theology and rendering Philosophy ridiculous, these "universities" corrupt the highest part of the youngsters' nature, their minds, leaving their lower nature with little or no means of resisting the aided and abetted promiscuity of the two young sexes. Survey the waste on any "university" campus today - feckless unmen and trashy unwomen whose noblest activity is throwing frisbees at one another!

Such "universities" dedicated to the defiance of God and Nature, make mincemeat of the youngsters' Faith (if they had any), of their morals and of their common sense. Poor

parents. But they have mocked God, and God is not mocked. Obviously no boy, let alone any girl, should be sent to such a "university". What needs to be proved is that even to a decent university, if such could be found, few or no girls should be sent. This is because of the God-given nature of girls. Which, despite today's massive propaganda to the contrary, is quite different from the God-given nature of boys!

NATURE OF GIRLS

For a sane grasp of woman's nature, let me appeal to the Church's Common Doctor, St. Thomas Aquinas, distant now by three-quarters of a millennium from our own disturbed times. The three reasons he gives in his *Summa Theologiae* (2a, 2ae, 177,2) why woman should not teach in Church in public can all be applied to why she should not teach or learn in a public university. Firstly, he says, teaching is for superiors, and women are- not to be superior, but subject, to their men (Gen III,16). Secondly, women stepping up to teach in public can easily inflame men's lust (Ecclus IX,11). Thirdly, "Women are not usually ("communiter") perfect in wisdom".

To grasp these three reasons, let us back up another five millennia, to Adam and Eve. Since the word "nature" comes from the Latin word for "being born", then to study a thing's nature one goes back to its birth. Eve was created by God to be a "help" to Adam (Gen. 11,18). She was to help him, says St Thomas Aquinas elsewhere (1a,92,1), not for any other work than that of generation (or reproduction), because for any other work man could be more suitably helped by another man. It follows that woman's nature is intrinsically geared to motherhood, so that in all things pertaining to motherhood she is man's superior, in all else she is his inferior, and in none of all the things in which the two sexes are complementary are they equal.

Now to attract a man so as to marry and become a mother, to nurture and rear children and to retain their father, she needs superior gifts of feeling and instinct, e.g. sensitivity, delicacy, tact, perspicacity, tenderness, etc. by which her mind will correspondingly be swayed, which is why no husband can understand how the mind of his wife works! For to do the work of generation, i.e. to ensure nothing less than the survival and continuation of mankind, God designed her mind to run on a complementary and different basis from her man's. His mind is designed not to be swayed by feelings but on the contrary to control them, so that while his feelings may be inferior to hers, his reason is superior. And reason being meant to rule in rational beings, then he is natured to rule over her (Gen. III, 16), as can be seen for example whenever she needs to resort to him for her feelings not to get out of control.

Correspondingly, while she senses family (and loves to talk about it), he responds to the world around and wants to master it (Gen II,15,19,20). While she is people-oriented, he is reality-oriented. (How often will a woman pull an idea or a question of reality back to family! - "You're against drink? You're attacking my husband!" This is in woman's nature. One does not mock her for it.) So while she is queen of feeling within the home, he must be king of reason over the home. So while he must love her and listen to her, at the end of the day she must obey him, because he is natured to take the broader view and to be the more reasonable (Eph V 22,25: Col III, 18,19).

FIRST REASON

Now what does a university call for? Whereas in modern "universities" the males all believe in "if it feels good, do it," which is why they are, as they wish, overrun by feeling females, on the contrary in a true university one thinks about universal reality, which is the prerogative of men. A woman can think in this way, or do a good imitation of handling ideas, but then she will not be properly thinking as woman. The dilemma is inescapable: she cannot do what is properly men's thinking or work without cutting across her deepest nature. Did this lawyeress check her hair-do just before coming into court? If she did, she is one distracted lawyer. If she did not, she is one distorted woman.

Moreover, true university thinking tends to produce leaders because true students have pondered on more or less universal reality. Cardinal Newman may argue that the cultivated mind is an end in itself, but if Mother Church has always raised universities, is it not because an elite of all-round minds will in any society powerfully help many souls to get to Heaven, if those minds' studying has been governed over all by the true Faith? But women are neither meant, nor normally gifted, to be leaders! Therefore girls should not be at university. As for a Queen Isabella the Catholic, Spain was her family and she never went to university! Nor did Theresa of Avila, Catherine of Sienna or Joan of Arc.

Concretely, if a girl devotes several years of her youth and much money of her parents to acquiring a university education, especially a decent one, how easily will she submit to her husband, especially if he has not had that education? And how may she not argue with him if he has had it? And if she has a "degree", how will she not think herself above the multiple humiliations of being "barefoot and pregnant"? And if she is a "graduate", how will she not hold-herself superior to being-a "vegetable at the-kitchen-sink"? And if making a family makes her forget in the right kind of way all about "graduating", "degrees" and "university", why go there in the first place? The dilemma is inescapable: in doing manly things like going to a university, either she is merely going through the motions or she is damaging her potential for motherhood - conclusion: she should not go there.

SECOND REASON

We come to St Thomas' second reason: the inflaming of lust. Enough said about today's unibrothels. What will happen if heaps of boys and girls are thrown together with mention of God even forbidden is massive common sense, but that is not the whole story!

Just suppose that a decent girl can find a decent university which is cultivating on a broad front minds of an elite of boys who will provide tomorrow's world with its leaders. If she is smart enough to study, will she not be smart enough to know that even if she does not wish to distract the boys, she will still be a distraction? To this reason there is no exception. So if she is that decent, will she not prefer to hang back from distracting the future leaders that she and all her society tomorrow will need? Then the more decent the university, will she not the more keep away? What woman can be imagined taking part in Plato's Dialogues? Not even the Blessed Virgin Mary took part in the Last Supper. Girls at university are a double source of confusion, both doing what girls were not created to do, and distracting the boys from doing what the boys were created to do.

At any true university, the worthwhile students do not want to be distracted by girls. Those are exactly the potential husbands that the really intelligent girls will go after. That is why even really intelligent girls should not be at university.

THIRD REASON

For indeed - St. Thomas's third reason - "women are not usually perfect in wisdom". This is because woman's family-wisdom is priceless, it comes straight from God, but it is as wisdom, because it orders only a part of reality.

Woman's thinking is subjective, inward, intuitive, concrete, small-scale, with a gift for loving details. University thinking needs to be objective, outward, rational, abstract, large-scale, with a drive towards the grand principles. Her thinking follows her heart. University thinking can only follow the head. While a university professor is teaching, the boy will be listening to and learning from the words but the girl will naturally be listening to the man and learning by osmosis. Only by an effort will she listen to the words, because her heart is elsewhere - usually on the boys. Naturally docile and possibly possessed of more than sufficient brains, she can always do a good imitation of a good student, especially if she wishes to please a particular male professor. Nor, again, should she be mocked for that, insofar as God designed her to please and to attract - a husband. Rarely, however, will the impressive studentess be a really good student, because the Lord God simply designed her heart and mind for a quite other task. Girls, do you really want to spend so much of your time and of your parents' money on doing something God almost for sure did not mean you to be doing?

OBJECTIONS

But Pius XII encouraged you to make the best of being forced out into the world? - Maybe he was making the best of an already bad situation in the 1940's and 1950's, when he hoped women would bring to bear their femininity on the public domain. However, by the definitions of "feminine" and "public", that is a contradiction in terms. Fifty years later, who can deny that the public domain has de-feminized, woman? As a friend said, "Women used to have careers open to them only in nursing and teaching, which they did well. Now they no longer know how to do either!"

It is high time for Catholics to buck the current and to buck the world! Europe, center of Christendom, is collapsing, because European girls are all being taught to go to "university" and to "put off" having babies! Woman and family are in desperate crisis - do we want to follow the swine over the cliff?

But men today are unfit to lead, so you have to go to university to take their place? – You cannot take their place!!!! (The exception proves the rule). Today you are merely following them into "universities", tomorrow you will be following them out. By hook or by crook, do something motherly, play your part as God meant you to do, and God can give you back from above the manly leaders and the husband that you pray for and need, but that you cannot by the nature of things wrest to yourselves from below. You cannot restore God's order by breaking it. Get behind your men! Behind, you have an enormous power to inspire and guide. In front, you will merely make them more irresponsible than ever...

But what about the Dominicans' school for girls in Idaho? - As much as St Thomas Aquinas disapproves women teaching in public, he approves their teaching in private, in other words at home, "or in a home-like setting". A university cannot resemble a home, but wise Mothers can keep a girls' secondary school like a home. See the enclosed flyer for an encouragement to support the same Dominican Mothers' primary and secondary schooling in France.

But where will girls' secondary schools find women teachers if no girls go to university? - One needs no university to learn most of what secondary schoolgirls need to be taught, for instance "domestic economy, setting up home, running a house, the care and education of children, the spiritual and social preparation for marriage" - Pius XII's timeless list, to the Union of Catholic Women, June 24, 1949. Of course if the law of the land, as now in France, demands "university" "diplomas" for women to teach or to open girls' schools, then some women's "university" attendance becomes, for the duration of that law, an exceptional necessity. However, exceptions make bad rules!

But what about the co-educational college of the Society of St Pius X at St. Mary's in Kansas? - It is still a family-scale operation, typical of the true Church's drive to teach the true Faith in as much depth as possible amidst difficult circumstances, but according as it may expand and rise in the future to a truly university level of teaching, I for one piously hope that the boys will by then be giving such a lead and example, creating such a new world, that the girls will no longer feel any need to attend.

But what are girls in the meantime to do, who have a brain and are not ready to get married? - Let them use their brain: firstly, to grasp how God designed them, and for what role; secondly, to pray God He grant us all some men; thirdly, to read at home on their own (for instance Jane Austen, a classic example of how much domestic woman can do); fourthly, to devise with their parents a feminine place and function where they can mature towards marriage. Or - for Heaven's sakes - let them think of a vocation! Old saying: "A woman is once a woman, a nun is twice a woman"!

CONCLUSION

For all these reasons, domestic girls are not by nature for public universities. Where did modern man go wrong?

As man puts himself in the place of God, so this life on earth blocks out of view any after-life in God's Heaven or Hell. Man's pride unchains his inclination to pleasure here below. Self comes first But children - however unconsciously - demand and reward selflessness in their parents. Therefore the children, and the demand, and the reward, most go. But woman's life is natured to center around children. Therefore woman's life in particular becomes empty, as does her home, especially if working conditions take her husband also away. She will inevitably follow him into his domains, eg. university, where she is liable to impose female patterns that do not belong, but that are frustrated at home. She will not let her being remain meaningless!

As this letter has often argued, such a breaking of family, home and woman is too deep a violation of Nature for the modern way of life to be able to survive. With men in the lead,

Catholics, whose Faith should give them a handle on Nature, will be wise, according to circumstances, to take remedial action now. The journey of a thousand miles begins with the first step.

Men, think! Give substance to the home! Girls, I bless you, your parents and all dear readers.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

+ *Richard Williamson*

+Richard Williamson