

“Artisans ... for Antichrist”: Jews, Radical Catholic Traditionalists, and the Extreme Right

Mark Weitzman*

The Israeli historian, Israel J. Yuval, recently wrote:

The Christian-Jewish debate that started nineteen hundred years ago, in our day came to a conciliatory close. ... In one fell swoop, the anti-Jewish position of Christianity became reprehensible and illegitimate. ... Ours is thus the first generation of scholars that can and may discuss the Christian-Jewish debate from a certain remove ... a post-polemical age.¹

This appraisal helped spur Yuval to write his recent controversial book *Two Nations in Your Womb: Perceptions of Jews and Christians in late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Yuval based his optimistic assessment on the strength of the reforms in Catholicism that stemmed from the adoption by the Second Vatican Council in 1965 of the document known as *Nostra Aetate*. *Nostra Aetate* in Michael Phayer's words, was the “revolutionary” document that signified “the Catholic church's reversal of its 2,000 year tradition of antisemitism.”²

Yet recent events in the relationship between Catholics and Jews could well cause one to wonder about the optimism inherent in Yuval's pronouncement. For, while the established Catholic Church is still officially committed to the teachings of *Nostra Aetate*, the opponents of that document and of “modernity” in general have continued their fight and appear to have gained, if not a foothold, at least a hearing in the Vatican today. And, since in the view of these radical Catholic traditionalists “[i]nternational Judaism wants to radically defeat Christianity and to be its substitute” using tools like the Free-

* Director of Government Affairs, Simon Wiesenthal Center. My thanks to Mary Christine Athans, who so generously shared her important work on Denis Fahey and Charles Coughlin, for her encouragement and incisive criticism. In addition, I owe thanks to Heidi Beirich, who was also extremely generous in sharing her research on radical Catholic traditionalists, and to Margot Gendreau and Beverly Geller for their research assistance.

The title of this paper is taken from a statement by Bishop Bernard Tissier de Mallerais of the Society of Saint Pius X, who said in 1997 “that the Jews are the most active artisans for the coming of Antichrist,” quoted in Thomas C. Fox, “Lefebvre movement: long, troubled history with Judaism,” *NCR Online*, Jan. 26, 2009, available at: <<http://ncronline.org/node/3180>>.

¹ Israel J. Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb: Perceptions of Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2008) pp. 20-21.

² Michael Phayer, *The Catholic Church and the Holocaust, 1930-1965* (Bloomington, 2001) p. 203.

masons, it is in their views on Jews and Judaism that we can find the most profound expression of their radical rejection of *Nostra Aetate*, Vatican II, and the modern virtues of democracy and tolerance.³

Although the firestorm of publicity aroused in recent years by the actor Mel Gibson's film "The Passion of the Christ" and the more recent Holocaust denial remarks of Bishop Richard Williamson have died down, they serve to remind us that for some Catholics the subsequent statements and reforms by the Church in regard to the Jewish people, such as *Nostra Aetate* and its successor documents, are still unacceptable, and the earlier tradition of "the teachings of contempt"⁴ still retain their validity.

An even more basic question is, of course, that of definition. Following the sociologist Michael Cuneo, I begin with the loose definition of those who have rejected the reforms of Vatican II and "entered into schism from the institutional church." However, I should stress that the focus of this article will be on only examining the attitudes of those extreme traditionalists toward Jews, Judaism, and the related area of religious freedom.⁵

The Society of Saint Pius X (SSPX) has become the locus of the extreme Catholic traditionalist world. It was created in 1970 by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, who first came to attention when he refused to sign the Vatican II statement on Religious Liberty and the Church in the Modern World.⁶ As a result, in 1970, he created a traditionalist seminary in Ecône, Switzerland, and in the same year he founded the Society of Saint Pius X. In 1973 and 1974, the SSPX came to the United States, with chapels being established in California, Texas, and New York. Lefebvre continued to publicly criticize the reforms of Vatican II, including the liturgical changes, and came into more and more overt conflict with Rome. He was ordered to close down his Swiss seminary in 1974 by Pope Paul VI but refused, and as a result his priestly functions were suspended in 1976. This did not stop Lefebvre, who upped the ante in 1983 by threatening to consecrate a successor.

Trying a different response, a year later Pope John Paul II reintroduced, under some conditions, the Tridentine (Latin) Mass, which was a gesture of conciliation to the traditionalists. Lefebvre and the traditionalists were not reconciled however, and three years later Lefebvre again threatened to consecrate a successor. This time the Vatican responded by entering into negotiations with the group, and indeed, on May 5, 1988, Lefebvre signed an agreement that required him to acknowledge his loyalty to the Vatican and to accept the new Mass as legitimate. In return, the SSPX was to be recognized and allowed to continue to use the Tridentine Mass in its services. The very next day, Lefebvre repudiated the agreement, and on June 30, 1988 he consecrated four bishops, in defiance of Rome's authority. This time, the Vatican responded forcefully, excommunicating Lefebvre and his priests and putting the SSPX into a state of schism.⁷ Lefebvre died in 1991, but by then the SSPX had become established and was able to withstand the loss of its founder. Bishop Bernard Fellay (Swiss) was elected as Superior General in 1994 and was re-elected in 2006.

³ Letter of Bishop Gerald Sigaud to Cardinal Tardini, Aug. 22, 1959, posted under the title "What Vatican II Should Have Done," available at: <http://www.sspix.org/MISCELLANEOUS/what_vaticaniishould_have_done.htm>.

⁴ See Jules Isaac's seminal work, *The Teachings of Contempt* (New York, 1964).

⁵ Michael Cuneo, *Smoke of Satan* (Baltimore, 1999) p. 6.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 91-92.

The most recent firestorm erupted when Bishop Richard Williamson of the SSPX questioned the reality of the Holocaust. Williamson was one of the four bishops consecrated by Lefebvre in 1988. In January of 2009, Pope Benedict XVI lifted the excommunications; however, on that same day an interview with Williamson aired on Swedish TV in which he said: "I believe that the historical evidence is strongly against, is hugely against six million Jews having been deliberately gassed in gas chambers as a deliberate policy of Adolf Hitler,"⁸ and "I think that 200,000 to 300,000 Jews perished in Nazi concentration camps, but none of them in gas chambers."⁹

The reaction from outraged Jews and others was immediate and grew upon exposure of Williamson's history of antisemitic comments, which included a belief in the accuracy of the notorious forgery *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.¹⁰ The resulting storm of criticism caused the Vatican to insist upon Williamson's renunciation of his Holocaust denial, which he has refused to do. However, in a letter in February 2009, he did say that "[o]bserving these consequences I can truthfully say that I regret having made such remarks," but he never indicated a recantation of his views.¹¹ The negative import of Williamson's comments, coming amidst the ongoing reconciliation discussions with the Vatican, was also not lost on the SSPX leadership. Fellay weighed in on the matter by issuing a statement that said:

It's clear that a Catholic bishop cannot speak with ecclesiastical authority except on questions that regard faith and morals. Our Fraternity does not claim any authority on other matters. Its mission is the propagation and restoration of authentic Catholic doctrine, expressed in the dogmas of the faith. It's for this reason that we are known, accepted and respected in the entire world. The affirmations of Bishop Williamson do not reflect in any sense the position of our Fraternity. For this reason I have prohibited him, pending any new orders, from taking any public positions on political or historical questions.¹²

Yet Williamson's antisemitism was not new, or hidden. In a letter that was posted on the SSPX' seminary website, dated February 1, 1991, Williamsons reflected on the (first) Gulf War. First he pontificated that the war was instigated by Russia in an attempt to "kill with one stone ... obstacles to the advance of International Socialism," that would then allow "Russia to march through the now unguarded gateway to Europe." But hidden behind the Russian advance, according to Williamson, was another, even more sinister cause. "However, behind the Gulf War, and even behind Russia, may one not, thirdly, fear the looming figure of the Anti-Christ?" The war was a creation of "the many friends of Israel in the USA ... whooping for the United States to break the Arab strong man." Finally, Williamson puts these comments into a clear theological perspective:

⁸ See: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/nol/ukfs_news/hi/newsid_7870000/newsid_7878500/787580.stm>.

⁹ See: <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/vaticancityandhollysee/4317996/Pope-to-cancel-excommunication-of-rebel-bishops.html>>.

¹⁰ See: <<http://www.catholicerald.co.uk/articles/a0000226.shtml>>. See also Steven L. Jacobs and Mark Weitzman, *Dismantling the Big Lie: the Protocols of the Elders of Zion* (Hoboken and Los Angeles, 2003) for current use of the *Protocols* as well as a detailed refutation of the text.

¹¹ See: <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/7915022.stm>>.

¹² Jan. 26, 2009, available at: <<http://www.commonwealmagazine.org/blog/?p=2721>>.

Until [the Jews] recover their true messianic vocation [by accepting the Church] they may be expected to continue fanatically agitating, in accordance with their false messianic vocation of Jewish world domination. ... So we may fear their continuing to play their major part in the agitation of the East and the corruption of the West.¹³

In another letter to his supporters, written on the letterhead of the SSPX's St. Thomas Aquinas Seminary in Winona, Minnesota just a few months later, while discussing the media's debilitating influence on society (referring specifically to the confirmation hearings of Clarence Thomas for the Supreme Court), Williamson quoted the notorious *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* approvingly:

... it is indispensable to stir up the people's relations with their governments in all countries so as to utterly to exhaust humanity with dissension, hatred, struggle, envy ... so that the goyim see no other course open to them than to take refuge in our complete sovereignty in money and all else.¹⁴

Later in the same letter Williamson also cited Protocol 14 ("in countries known as progressive and enlightened, we have created a senseless, filthy, abominable literature"), referring to the "alternative life-style," which in Williamson's view is "so horrible as to cry to heaven for vengeance." Williamson's belief in the *Protocols* has remained consistent. A decade later, in a letter of May 1, 2009, Williamson wrote: "God puts in men's hands the 'Protocols of the Sages of Sion' ... if men want to know the truth, but few do."¹⁵

Interestingly enough, Williamson's letters demonstrate not only his antisemitism but also overt racism and sexism. In an even more recent letter, he explains the 2005 unrest in France by writing: "So when white men give up on saving Jews, looking after other races and leading their womenfolk, it is altogether normal for them to be punished respectively by the domination of Jewish finance, by the refusal to follow of the non-white races and by rampant feminism."¹⁶ Finally, in the above-mentioned letter of February 1991, Williamson even combined two of those themes, noting criticism of his September letter in which he condemned women for wearing pants and jocularly compared it to criticism of his Holocaust denial, beginning the letter as follows:

Few of you will be surprised to learn that the September letter appealing to the women not to wear trousers caused a strong reaction, comparable only to the reaction of the Seminary letter which referred to scientific evidence that certain famous "holocaust gas-chambers" in Poland cannot have served as gas-chambers at all.¹⁷

While Fellay issued his statement in 2009, it is clear that Williamson's antisemitism was evident and publicly disseminated to the membership of the SSPX at least for the 18 years prior to Fellay's public statement. Furthermore, barring any evidence of prior repudiation or discipline of Williamson for his antisemitism, it is clear that Fellay was

¹³ See: <<http://www.sspxseminary.org/publications/letter/1991/February/February/shtml>>.

¹⁴ Williamson, letter of Nov. 3, 1991, copy in author's possession.

¹⁵ Williamson, letter of May 1, 2000, available at: <<http://www.sspx.ca/Documents/Bishop-Williamson/May1-2000.htm>>.

¹⁶ Williamson, "Denial of Christ Creates Chaos," available at: <<http://www.dailycatholic.org/issue/05Nov/nov14lit.htm>>.

¹⁷ See note 13 above.

being disingenuous at best when he claimed that “[t]he affirmations of Bishop Williamson do not reflect in any sense the position of our Fraternity.” In fact, the SSPX and the extremist Catholic traditionalist movement in general are shot through with anti-semitism to such an extent that I believe it is possible to consider antisemitism as one of the foundational doctrines of the movement.

If we return to Lefebvre, we see that his record on Jews and Judaism was also highly questionable. In an August 31, 1985 letter to Pope John Paul II, he was quoted as having spoken approvingly of “both the World War II-era Vichy Regime in France and the far-right National Front” and identified the contemporary enemies of the faith as “Jews, Communists and Freemasons.” In that letter, Lefebvre also criticized “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.”¹⁸

According to the same account, Lefebvre also 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 instigated by Jews.¹⁹

Lefebvre’s followers often share this outlook. One of the four bishops ordained by him in 1988, Bernard Tissier de Mallerais, said in 1997,

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.²⁰

Bishop de Mallerais, who is the authorized SSPX biographer of Lefebvre, in an interview after the Williamson controversy erupted, responded as follows to a direct question about Williamson’s remarks: “I have no opinion about this. ... I think that this question does not concern me, and I have no opinion on this question.”²¹

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 as a Nazi collaborator, 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.²²

When the controversy over Williamson exploded, I immediately went to the SSPX website and captured some documents that were removed shortly afterwards. They included two postings that reflected and summed up the SSPX’s position on Jews and Judaism.

In one essay, the Vatican II teaching that “the Jews should not be spoken of as rejected or accursed as if this followed from Holy Scripture” is described as “outra-

¹⁸ Thomas C. Fox, “Lefebvre movement: long, troubled history with Judaism,” *NCR Online*, Jan. 26, 2009, available at: <<http://ncronline.org/node/3180>>.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ See: <<http://www.cfnews.org/Tissler-09021.htm>>.

²² On Touvier and his connection to the SSPX, see his obituary in the *NY Times*, July 18, 1996, available at: <<http://www.writing.upenn.edu/~afilreis/Holocaust/touvier-obit.html>>.

geous.”²³ The other essay claims that “Judaism is inimical to all nations in general, and in a special manner to Christian nations” and that “the unrepentant Jewish people are disposed by God to be a theological enemy, the status of this opposition must be universal, inevitable, and terrible.” There are claims that “the Talmud, which governs Jews, orders enmity with Christians” and that the “Jewish people persecute Christendom,” “conspire against the Christian State,” commit “usury,” and even “are known to kill Christians”! Thus, the essay defends the notion that Jews should not be “given equality of rights” but rather should be forced into ghettos (“isolated into its own neighborhoods”).²⁴

In their recent exposé of the SSPX and the Catholic traditionalist movement, the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) cited a 1959 letter from Lefebvre’s close ally, Bishop Gerald Sigaud, stating: “Money, the media, and international politics are for a large part in the hands of Jews.” Bishop Sigaud also wrote: “Those who have revealed the atomic secrets of the USA were . . . all Jews. The founders of communism were Jew [sic].” This letter was also posted on the SSPX website.²⁵

Heidi Beirich, the SPLC’s lead researcher on this story, noted: “And as of early February [2009], the SPLC reported that the Canadian SSPX website still hosted an archive of Williamson’s anti-Semitic letters, one of which complains that ‘Jews have come closer and closer to fulfilling their . . . drive toward world domination.’” Other SSPX officials sound similar. After the Williamson controversy broke out, Fr. Floriano Abrahamowicz, a pastor and spokesperson for the SSPX in Northern Italy, defended Williamson and said he, too, was unsure if gas chambers were used for anything but disinfection or whether six million Jews were really murdered. He called the Jews a “people of deicide.” Abrahamowicz was later expelled from the Society.

Meanwhile Rev. Arnaud Sélégnny, the general secretary of the SSPX international headquarters in Menzingen, Switzerland, is on record saying that Williamson would certainly be included in any reconciliation between SSPX and the Vatican because “everybody is allowed to have his opinion in the Society.”²⁶

These positions are not original to the SSPX, nor are they a theological innovation to current Catholic traditionalists; indeed, they bear a striking similarity to the writings of an otherwise obscure Irish priest named Father Denis Fahey, whose work is one of the most—if not the most—frequently cited by the members of the SSPX and similar believers. Mary Christine Athans, in her important book, *The Coughlin-Fahey Connection: Father Charles E. Coughlin, Father Denis Fahey, C.S. Sp., and Religious Anti-Semitism in the United States, 1938-1954*, thoroughly explored Fahey’s life and thought and how his theology of antisemitism made its way from Ireland to the United States.²⁷

²³ *Can it truly be said that the Jewish race is guilty of the sin of deicide, and that it is consequently cursed by God, as depicted in Gibson’s movie on the Passion?* Featured in the Q&A section, March 2004.

²⁴ Frs. Michael Crowley and Kenneth Novak, “Of the Jewish People in History.” Originally printed in the April 1997 issue of *The Angelus* magazine.

²⁵ *Intelligence Report*, Winter 2007. A copy of this letter is in the author’s possession.

²⁶ Heidi Beirich, “Behind the Bishop: The Anti-Semitism of the SSPX,” *Hatewatch*, Feb. 26, 2009, available at: <<http://www.splcenter.org/blog/2009/02/26/behind-the-bishop-the-anti-semitism-of-the-sspx>>.

²⁷ Mary Christine Athans, *The Coughlin-Fahey Connection: Father Charles E. Coughlin, Father Denis Fahey, C.S. Sp., and Religious Anti-Semitism in the United States, 1938-1954* (New York, 1991).

Fahey was born on July 2, 1883 in Kilmore, Golden, County Tipperary, Ireland. In 1900, he was a novice of the Holy Ghost Congregation in France, which was still dealing with the impact of the Dreyfus Affair and the French government's anti-clerical actions, particularly the Associations Laws of 1905 that required religious congregations to be recognized by the government. At that time, France was an incubator of ecclesiastical antisemitism. As David Kertzer wrote: "In the cauldron of Catholic resentment toward the republican state in the 1880s, the Jews, visible in national politics, in the civil service and in the economy, served as a lightning rod, all that was wrong with modern French society."²⁸ This was a struggle that began, according to those Catholics, with the French Revolution, which one such writer described as "[t]he greatest event of history for over 1800 years."²⁹

In 1908, Fahey went to Rome, where he obtained two doctorates (philosophy and theology) and lived at the Collège Français (Pontifical French Seminary).³⁰ Ordained in 1911, Fahey returned to Dublin in 1912, where he stayed (except for 1916-1920, when he was in Switzerland for health reasons) as professor at the Holy Ghost Seminary until death on January 24, 1954. Fahey was fairly prominent in Ireland, maintaining a high profile as a public intellectual, as evidenced by the fact that, upon his death, Irish Prime Minister Eamon de Valera attended his evening funeral Mass.³¹ Mervyn O'Donnell, in his research on Jewish immigration to Ireland in 1933-1939, has pointed out that during this period "[m]any Irish civil servants betrayed negative preconceived notions about the Jews."³² While de Valera was generally seen as being relatively moderate toward Jews at that time, and thus his attendance at the Mass might have been a matter of protocol, it certainly reflected on Fahey's stature at the time of his death.

While in Rome, Fahey was heavily influenced by Father Henri Le Floch, who was the Superior of the Collège Français. Athans described Le Floch

as an exponent of conservative right-wing French and Italian Catholic thought in those anti-Modernist years ... Le Floch had substantial influence on Fahey. ... He was later removed from his position as Rector because of his relationship to the controversial and anti-Semitic *Action Française* movement which was finally condemned by Pius XI in 1926.³³

Le Floch was also a revered mentor to Lefebvre. Athans, who interviewed a number of Fahey's students and younger colleagues in Ireland, wrote that "[s]ome [priests] believe that Le Floch's influence can also be traced to Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre ... founder of the dissident traditionalist movement ... known as the Fraternity of SPX."³⁴ Another resident of the French Seminary was the future Archbishop of Dublin and Primate of

²⁸ David Kertzer, *The Popes Against the Jews* (New York, 2001) p. 170.

²⁹ Vicomte Leon de Poncins, *Freemasonry and Judaism* (New York, 1994) p. 29. This book, originally published in 1929, is now released by what is apparently a black-oriented publishing house.

³⁰ Mary Christine Athans, "A New Perspective on Father Charles E. Coughlin," in *Church History*, Vol. 56, No. 2 (1987) p. 226.

³¹ Athans, *Coughlin-Fahey*, p. 59.

³² Mervyn O'Donnell, "The 'Jewish Question,' Irish Refugee Policy and Charles Bewley, 1933-1939," in Guðmundur Hálfðanarson (ed.), *Racial discrimination and ethnicity in European history* (Pisa, 2003) p. 148.

³³ Athans, *Coughlin-Fahey*, pp. 22-23.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 62-63, n. 25; cf. Yves Congar, *Challenge to the Church: The Case of Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre* (1977) pp. 16, 88-90; see also: <<http://www.catholicity.com/commentary/rutler/07849.html>>.

Ireland John Charles McQuaid, who studied under Fahey. McQuaid's biographer, John Cooney, has asserted that Le Floch's "combination of theological rigidity and political conservatism rubbed off on the seminarians, among them ... Marcel Lefebvre."³⁵ Having been nurtured in the same intellectual milieu, it is no surprise that Fahey and Lefebvre shared much of the same *weltanschauung*.

Among other sources, Fahey also drew on the *Revue Internationale des Sociétés Secrètes*.³⁶ This journal was founded in 1912 by Father Ernest Jouin, who was described by Kertzer as "[t]he main champion of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, and the best known exponent of Catholic antisemitism in the 1920s" in France.³⁷ Jouin and his work were not isolated on the fringes of Catholic life. Pope Benedict XV gave Jouin the title of "Prelate of His Holiness", which he used to add papal authority to his works, and he received further blessings from Vatican Secretary of State Gasparri in 1919 and later from Pope Pius XI as well. Jouin even claimed credit for originating the term "Judeomasonic" in 1920 and claimed to have been told by Pius XI to "[c]ontinue your *Review* ... for you are combating our mortal enemy."³⁸ Fahey was not the only one influenced by Jouin; the influential Italian fascist Roberto Farinacci in 1939 repeated some of these familiar themes in urging harsher anti-Jewish measures in Italy, claiming that the French Revolution had created a great wrong by proclaiming rights of men that grew into rights of Jews and that this situation required remedying by following the paths laid out by the Jesuits over the years in *La Civiltà Cattolica* and by Jouin with his papal approved *Review* and publication of the *Protocols*.³⁹

Fahey was a prolific writer, publishing a series of books and pamphlets, many with repetitive titles and similar themes, including:

- *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World* (Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1935).
- *The Mystical Body of Christ and the Reorganization of Society* (Waterford, Ireland: Browne and Nolan, 1939).
- *The Rulers of Russia*, 3d American edition, revised and enlarged (Detroit: Condon Print. Co., 1940).
- *The Kingdom of Christ and Organized Naturalism* (Wexford, Ireland: Forum Press, 1943).
- *Grand Orient Freemasonry Unmasked as the Secret Power Behind Communism* (1950, (republishation of George F. Dillon's work with a foreword by Fahey).
- *Humanum Genus: Encyclical Letter of His Holiness Pope Leo XIII on Freemasonry* (London: Britons Publishing Society, 1953).
- *The Kingship of Christ and the Conversion of the Jewish Nation* (Dublin: Holy Ghost Missionary College, 1953).

For Fahey, the world was a very simple but dangerous place. In his Manichaeic perspective, he believed that God was only accessible through the Catholic Church, which in turn was "supra-national and supernatural." However, God was locked in a cosmic struggle with Satan, who was, for Fahey, a very real antagonist. Although Judaism was

³⁵ John Cooney, *John Charles McQuaid: Ruler of Catholic Ireland* (Dublin, 1999) p. 53.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

³⁷ Kertzer, *The Popes Against the Jews*, p. 267.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 267-269.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 283-284. Farinacci was described by Susan Zuccotti "as one of the countries most vocal Jew baiters," in Zuccotti, *The Italians and the Holocaust* (New York, 1987) p. 49.

the chief antagonist, Satan's agents in this world included "Bolshevism, as the most recent development in the age-long struggle waged by the Jewish nation against the Supernational Messiah, our Lord Jesus Christ, and his Mystical Body, the Catholic Church." Fahey followed that depiction with a comparison of Catholicism and Judaism that was totally to the detriment of the latter. According to his theology, by its rejection of Jesus as Christ, Judaism attempts to "recast [the world] in the mould of Jewish national life." Fahey concluded by asserting that this rejection "cannot but mean the complete undoing of the Catholic organization of society," which was, in Fahey's view, the appropriate order of things.⁴⁰

As mentioned above, Fahey regarded Communism as just a tool used by the Jews. "The real forces behind Bolshevism in Russia are Jewish forces, and that Bolshevism is really an instrument in the hands of the Jews for the establishment of their future Messianic kingdom."⁴¹

Fahey's contrast between Judaism and Catholicism had different implications, some of which transcended pure theological concerns. For example, in his above-mentioned tract *The Rulers of Russia*, Fahey spells out the differences between Jews and Catholics regarding what he terms "citizenship":

Here it will be well ... to contrast the Jewish idea of citizenship with the Catholic idea. ... As members of their own "messianic" nation, they must strive for the domination of their nation over others, as thus they alone, they hold, justice and peace can be achieved on earth. The Jew would fail in his duty to the Messiah to come if he did not subordinate the interests of other nations to his own. ... But the Catholic Church, being supra-national and supernatural, does not aim at the obliteration of national characteristics and qualities by the imposition of a national form, but at their harmonious development by the elimination of the defects due to original sin.⁴²

This reading of theological history viewed Judaism as a religion committed to ruling over the other nations and its adherents as not possessing the qualities of eligibility for equal citizenship, while Catholicism by its nature (and despite the historical evidence to the contrary) is seen as less restrictive and the proper dominant authority in society.

Fahey further believed that the world had reached its peak in the 13th century, when the Church was its essential ruler (at least in Europe, which appeared to be all that mattered for Fahey). However, that state did not last long. For Fahey, there was no concept of religious liberty; in fact, it was a tool of the devil that was used to take the state and society away from the true worship of the Church. An echo of this belief can also be found in Williamson's thought. In comments on Pope Benedict's Address to the Curia of December 2005, Williamson stated:

What is wrong with freeing States from any obligation to Christ the King is that *implicitly you are denying that Jesus Christ is God*. ... Religious liberty means in effect, a declaration of independence from God, which is directly opposed to the first Commandment. ... However, where Catholics are in a sufficient majority, the State may physically prevent the *public* practice of false religion while tolerating their practice in private.⁴³

⁴⁰ Fahey, *Rulers of Russia* (Detroit, 1940) pp. 44-45.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 72.

⁴³ See: <<http://www.cfnews.org/bw-dec22.htm>>.

This was a fundamental tenet of Lefebvre's belief as well. In his biography by de Malle-rais, he is quoted as saying that the acceptance of the doctrine of religious liberty is "a scandal to Catholic souls (that) cannot be measured. The Church is shaken to its very foundation."⁴⁴

In January 2008, a SSPX theologian repeated this theme in a *Catechism of the Crisis of the Church* addressed to the Church membership. After posing the question "Is there, then, no right to the free exercise of religion?" he offered the following answer:

The true religion possesses the absolute right to develop and to be practiced freely, for no one can be impeded from serving God in the way He Himself has prescribed. It is an exigency of the natural law. The false religions, to the contrary, have no real right to be practiced precisely because they are false and erroneous. Error can never have any right; only the truth has rights.⁴⁵

The same *Catechism* succinctly summed up the SSPX's stance on tolerance; tolerance, it claimed, was simply "the patient endurance of an evil."⁴⁶

For Fahey and similar thinkers, political freedom, not only religious freedom, can only be found in, and thus only given by, the Church, and so the right order is one in which the Church reigns supreme and delegates those freedoms as it desires and for its benefit only. Outside of the Church, there are no rights and no freedom, and all in opposition or in non-belief are agents of Satan.

Fahey's traced it all back to the original fall of humanity in the Garden of Eden, which was then followed by more recent tragic historical events, such as the Reformation and the French Revolution, with equally disastrous results. As he wrote,

[the] Protestant Reformation ... broke the unity of European subjection to the supernatural, supernatural Church of Christ. ... It did not however install a naturalistic international organization. ... That was reserved for the French Revolution [which began] the domination of the world by Masonic Naturalism. ... Behind Masonry, however, [was] the other naturalistic force of the once chosen people. ... The Jews everywhere made use of Freemasonry to secure the rights of becoming citizens of the once Christian states.⁴⁷

Even the horrors of the Holocaust did not shatter Fahey's deep-rooted antisemitism. He did find it necessary after the Holocaust to attempt to draw a distinction between unacceptable antisemitism, which was defined as "hatred of the Jewish nation" and "opposition to the Jewish and Masonic naturalism," which he endorsed as a vital aspect of Catholicism.⁴⁸ For Fahey, naturalism was a source of evil precisely because it inevitably led to rejection of belief in God or any other form of supernaturalism. The revulsion

⁴⁴ Quoted in Rome-SSPX, "Background to the Doctrinal Discussions," available at: <<http://cfnews.org?SSPX-DD.htm>> (which is a traditionalist website).

⁴⁵ Fr. Matthias Gaudron, "Catechism of the Crisis in the Church," *The Angelus*, Vol. XXXI, No. 1 (January 2008) p. 16.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Fahey, *Rulers*, pp. 50-51.

⁴⁸ Fahey, *What Really is Anti-Semitism?*, available at: <http://www.salvationisfromthejews.com/sspx_what_really_is_anti_semitism.html>. The description that he quoted approvingly was taken from a review of his book *The Kingship of Christ and the Conversion of the Jewish Nation*, published in *La Civiltà Cattolica* (March 1947).

felt by the world to the horrors of the Holocaust created the necessity for Fahey to try and distinguish his brand of antisemitism from that of the Third Reich. In the foreword to his 1953 book *The Kingship of Christ and the Conversion of the Jewish Nation* (the body of the book was written before the war but published afterwards) he wrote of

... the confusion created in minds owing to the use of the term "Anti-Semitism." The Hitlerite naturalistic or anti-supernatural regime in Germany gave to the world the odious spectacle of a display of Anti-Semitism, that is hatred of the Jewish Nation. Yet all the propaganda about that display of Anti-Semitism should not have made Catholics forget the existence of age-long Jewish Naturalism and Anti-Supernaturalism. Forgetfulness of the disorder of Jewish naturalistic opposition to Christ the King is keeping Catholics blind to the danger that is arising from the clever extension of the term "Anti-Semitism" with all its war connotation to the mind of the unthinking.⁴⁹

In the body of this book, Fahey went so far as to justify the Nazi actions against the Jews on theological grounds and to imply that the Catholic Church was even more of a victim. In Fahey's words:

One can readily conclude that the National-Socialist reaction against the corroding influence of Jewish Naturalism on German national life leads not only to measures of repression against the Jews but to a dire persecution of the Catholic Church. The deified German race has attacked the rival natural deity, the Jewish race, directly, and has proceeded systematically to get rid of it as corrupting the very fount of deity, German blood.⁵⁰

In other words, the Nazis were only reacting to the Jewish threat, and their major fault was not in the reaction, but rather the form it took. In the same work, Fahey spelled this out in even greater detail: "We have seen that the Nazi movement in Germany is one of a number of national reactions against the naturalistic Internationalism of the Jewish Nation and of Freemasonry."⁵¹ Thus, in Fahey's vision of the Third Reich, the innate Jewish "naturalism" was something that was recognized by many as a danger that would naturally lead to defensive reactions, but it was the Church that was the ultimate opponent and the ultimate victim of the Nazis.⁵²

Fahey, like most conspiratorial antisemites, relied uncritically on highly questionable sources for his information. He used the most rabid of antisemites as reliable sources, for example citing Arnold Leese (in *The Fascist*, May 1939): "Jews are the chief owners of urban real estate in Poland."⁵³ Leese was one of the most well-known and radical anti-semitic figures in England during that period. Among his writings was a work that claimed that the blood libel was real. He also served a number of prison sentences connected to his activities, which included aiding Waffen-SS POWs in escaping from England. Fahey also drew upon the classic antisemitic work *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. Athans has compared Fahey's attitude to the *Protocols* to that of Henry Ford,

⁴⁹ Fahey, *The Kingship of Christ and the Conversion of the Jewish Nation*, pp. 5-6.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 44-45.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

⁵² For a convincing review of the Nazis' overwhelming obsession with and reliance on anti-semitism as a driving force for World War II and the Holocaust, see Jeffrey Herf, *The Jewish Enemy* (Cambridge, 2006).

⁵³ Fahey, *Rulers of Russia*, p. 70, n. 1.

Charles Coughlin, and Nesta Webster (all antisemitic figures who Fahey admired), who “all admitted that [while] they could not prove the veracity of the *Protocols* ... what was described in the *Protocols* was what was going on in the world.” Increasingly Fahey relied on the *Protocols* in his own work.⁵⁴

And again, like many other conspiratorial antisemites, Fahey was prone to seeing conspiracies of Jews everywhere. In one of his books, he even claimed that Jews were attempting to eliminate from the celebration of Christmas any the religious meaning. The proof for this insidious plot was:

Christmas cards that show a row of dogs and a few birds have nothing to remind the recipient of what the rejoicing is for. ... In this process of eliminating the supernatural Messias from the celebration of the anniversary of his birth, the largest firm of Christmas card manufacturers, have certainly played a great part. ... All three directors appear in the communal Directory of the Jewish Year Book (and other Jewish communal activities).⁵⁵

Thus, the Jews, through the ownership of a greeting card company by three Jews, were intent on stripping Christmas of its sacral meaning!

In other works, he published lists of Jews in the Russian/Communist leadership, as well as a list of “Members of the Jewish Nations in the United Nations Organization. ... As of last year [1951] this tiny but powerful group of Zionist nationalists hold the following key posts.” This list comprised 86 names, spread over five pages.⁵⁶ A forerunner of many extremists today, Fahey wrote that “[t]he real purpose of the UN is to pave the way for a ‘World Government’ to which all nations surrender their sovereignty and independence.”⁵⁷

For Fahey, this threat from Jews meant that the Church had to fight back by all available means, including depriving Jews of their civil rights, thus denying them the latitude and freedom they were using to undermine society. He believed that

[a] step to be taken to undo the naturalism of the French Revolution and, at the same time, prevent onslaughts on the Jews, is to withdraw citizenship of other States from all of them, and limit them to citizenship of some other State, their own. That State must not be Palestine, for the Jewish claim to Palestine is implicitly a denial that they have disobeyed God and missed their vocation by the rejection of the True Supernatural Messias.⁵⁸

Finally, after the Holocaust, he was worried that Catholic sympathy for Jews because of their terrible suffering would create a lessening of Catholic anti-Jewish vigilance. And, despite the growing awareness of the Nazi Holocaust, those crimes did not begin to compare to the ancient Jewish crime of deicide, which should have ordained history and the structure of society ever since: “Some Catholics seem to forget that the Jews who, in their terrible opposition to God ... were intent on the most awful crime ever committed, the crime of deicide.”⁵⁹

⁵⁴ Athans. *Coughlin-Fahey*, p. 103.

⁵⁵ Fahey, *The Kingship of Christ and the Conversion of the Jewish Nation*, p. 51.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 169-173.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 174.

⁵⁸ Fahey, *Rulers*, p. 75.

⁵⁹ Fahey, *The Kingship of Christ and the Conversion of the Jewish Nation*, p. 53.

Mark Lilla has described how “[t]he Catholic Church in particular cast itself as spokesman for reaction throughout much of the [19th] century.”⁶⁰ Fahey’s theology was clearly formed in and reflective of that Church. However, his teachings might well have faded into obscurity, but for the fact that he found a powerful ally in the United States in the person of Father Charles Coughlin who brought Fahey to the attention of a receptive audience across the Atlantic.

In her book on *The Coughlin-Fahey Connection* and in other writings, Athans has demonstrated how “the ‘theologian’ Coughlin quoted most frequently was an Irish priest, Father Denis Fahey.”⁶¹ Coughlin did not just quote Fahey or even base his thought on the Irish priest’s writings but took an even more active role, especially by reprinting and distributing Fahey’s tract *The Rulers of Russia* through his Social Justice Publishing Company in 1940, when Coughlin was at the height of his powers. This distribution ensured Fahey’s introduction to a mass American audience.

Coughlin was easily the most prominent Catholic and antisemite in the United States at that time. As one of his biographers wrote: “Coughlin ... dominated among anti-semitic public figures in these years.”⁶² His domination was reflected in his reach. “Not only did he reach millions with his weekly radio broadcasts, but he also disseminated his extremist messages through his widely read magazine *Social Justice*, which claimed 200,000 subscribers.”⁶³ The result was that he popularized an antisemitism that had a significant impact on US popular discourse and even translated into the spurring of antisemitic acts that were often led by his followers and threatened public safety.⁶⁴

As Athans has clearly demonstrated, by bringing Fahey’s writings to an American audience, Coughlin allowed Fahey to become a bridge between the French and papal reactionary Catholic antisemitism of the early 20th century and extreme right-wing groups and figures in America.⁶⁵

Another scholar described it as translating “the struggles of the Christ and Antichrist into contemporary terms, in which Christianity and America represented Christ, and Communists and bankers represented the Antichrist. And conveniently, the two evils were linked together in the Jewish race.” And, while a number of the hierarchy were displeased with Coughlin’s ravings, he nevertheless found a receptive and supportive audience in the diocesan press. One of his key supporters in the eastern United States was the Brooklyn *Tablet*. In a typical defense of Coughlin’s antisemitism, the editor (Patrick Scanlon) remarked:

Fr. Coughlin has fearlessly and courageously discussed the Jewish problem that others would pass by in cowardly silence.... [No Catholic can honestly criticize] Fr. Coughlin’s very temperate reference to the part that a Jewish *Weltanschauung* contributed to the untoward world conditions.⁶⁶

⁶⁰ Mark Lilla, *The Stillborn God* (New York, 2008) p. 222.

⁶¹ Athans, *Coughlin-Fahey*, p. 224.

⁶² Donald Warren, *Radio Priest: Charles Coughlin, the Father of Hate Radio* (NY, 1996) pp. 188-189, 305, cited in Joseph W. Bendersky, “Dissension in the Face of the Holocaust: The 1941 American Debate over Antisemitism,” in *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (Spring 2010) p. 96.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ See, among many others, David Bennett *The Party of Fear* (New York, 1995) pp. 263-266.

⁶⁵ Athans, *Coughlin-Fahey*.

⁶⁶ Brooklyn *Tablet*, Feb. 4, 1939, cited in Esther Feldblum, *The American Catholic Press and the Jewish State 1917-1959* (New York, 1997) p. 46.

What Scanlon called a “temperate reference” was translated by some of Coughlin’s followers into the formation of a radical group called the Christian Front, whose members were implicated in a series of disruptive and violent antisemitic acts that in the late 1930s and early 1940s disturbed the peace and threatened the security of Jews in cities with a large Irish Catholic presence such as Boston and New York. In both cities, the wave of antisemitism was often ignored by sympathetic Catholic police and eventually had to be countered through official action by Massachusetts Governor Leverett Saltonstall and New York Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia.⁶⁷

Even before the wave of antisemitism became overt, the antisemitic discourse had become sufficiently heated and the issue sufficiently politically sensitive that it even reached the White House. In a 1941 memorandum to Myron Taylor, his personal representative to the Vatican, President Franklin D. Roosevelt wrote:

I forgot to mention that when you get the chance, you might express the thought that there is a great deal of anti-Jewish feeling in the dioceses of Brooklyn, Baltimore and Detroit and this feeling is said to be encouraged by the church. The point to make is that if anti-Jewish feeling is stirred up, it automatically stirs up anti-Catholic feeling and that makes a general mess.⁶⁸

Taylor did raise the issue but found the Vatican essentially non-responsive. It was the Vatican’s resident American expert, Father Joseph Patrick Hurley, who himself was a virulent antisemite and who advised the Vatican to ignore Coughlin’s antisemitism.⁶⁹

While the Coughlin-Fahey correspondence continued in the same vein even after Coughlin’s official silencing, the loss of Coughlin’s public platform certainly contributed to the lowering of Fahey’s profile in the United States.⁷⁰

However, the damage had been done, and Fahey’s influence had become entrenched in certain circles. While for the most part scholars have traced Fahey’s influence in the extremist Catholic circles that they have been examining, it is entirely possible that his connection with Coughlin allowed his influence to spread even wider. Among Coughlin’s associates and allies were Gerald Winrod and Gerald L.K. Smith, who were foundational figures in American right-wing extremism. Smith was also in direct contact with Fahey, exchanging letters in late 1940s and early 1950s. Fahey wrote in a letter to Irish follower that

⁶⁷ Leonard Dinnerstein, *Antisemitism in America* (New York, 1995) pp. 120-123, 132-133. Philip Jenkins, *Hoods and Shirts: The Extreme Right in Pennsylvania 1925-1950* (Chapel Hill, 1997) examines the Christian Front and similar groups in one state.

⁶⁸ FDR Archives, President’s Secretary’s File, 1941, Box 51.

⁶⁹ Charles R. Gallagher, *Vatican Secret Diplomacy: Joseph P Hurley and Pope Pius XII* (New Haven, 2008) pp. 68-70; see also Gallagher’s article “A Peculiar Brand of Patriotism: The Holy See, FDR, and the Case of Reverend Charles E. Coughlin,” in David B. Woolner and Richard G. Kurial, *FDR, the Vatican, and the Roman Catholic Church in America, 1933-1945* (New York, 2003) pp. 272-275. Gallagher also points out that Hurley “became the only bishop of the entire Second Vatican Council to officially and publicly protest the signing of *Nostra Aetate*.”

⁷⁰ For example, see Coughlin’s letter to Fahey: “while anti-Semitism is to be abhorred in so far as it is related to hatred for the Jews as individuals and racials, nevertheless, *anti-Judaism, which means opposition to the Judaic concept of life, is not to be so condemned*. ... I cannot understand how so many amongst our hierarchy and clergy are demonstrating tolerance towards Judaism,” letter from Coughlin to Fahey, Mar. 5, 1941, quoted in Athans, *New Perspectives*, pp. 188-189.

the programme of Gerald L.K. Smith as taken from his paper *The Cross and the Flag* ... declares unflinchingly and unequivocally for the Rights of Christ the King. Are his detractors and smearers for Christ the King or against Him? The Judaeo-Communists tried to brand every man who stood for American nationalism and against Communism during the war as pro-Nazis.⁷¹

Another such figure, Francis Parker Yockey, published an article in Coughlin's *Social Justice* magazine in 1938. The Catholic born Yockey was a fervent admirer of Adolf Hitler, who attempted, especially in his almost incomprehensible book *Imperium*, to find a way to adapt Nazism to the post-World War II world. In his early *Social Justice* article, Yockey lamented that an "alien" control of the media resulted in the spiritual enslavement of American youth.⁷² The historian George Michael has also noted Coughlin's influence on Willis Carto, arguably the most important figure on the American far right in the last half-century. Carto has founded and financed a number of major far-right initiatives over the last 50 years, including the Liberty Lobby and its newspaper *Spotlight*, the Institute for Historical Review (the center for Holocaust denial), *The Barnes Review*, and the Populist Party (which ran the notorious neo-Nazi David Duke as its 1988 presidential candidate). Carto recalls Coughlin as a seminal figure from his childhood.⁷³

As a youth Carto claims to have never heard of right-wing extremists, "with the exception of Father Coughlin, to whose broadcasts he would listen with the whole family."⁷⁴ Carto "recalled listening to Coughlin's broadcasts with his family and described him as a spellbinding orator."⁷⁵ He also characterized "Coughlin as a genuine populist" and cited "opposition from Jewish organizations ... as evidence of Coughlin's bona fides as a true American hero."⁷⁶

Carto was also influenced by Yockey, whom he visited in jail just before Yockey's suicide. As Michael writes: "Yockey left quite an impression on Carto; as he once remarked, 'I knew I was in the presence of a great force.'"⁷⁷

This nexus between the extremist traditionalist Catholics and the far right has continued to the present. Richard Williamson has also found himself taken up by a various aspects of the movement. Among those who have adopted the bishop are the notorious neo-Nazi and professional Holocaust denier Mark Weber, the director of the Institute for Historical Review, who in a March 2009 article entitled "Bishop Williamson and 'Holocaust Denial': Why the Uproar?" concluded that "[t]he Williamson affair underscores a well entrenched Jewish-Zionist bias in the cultural life of modern Western society, and reminds us, once again, of the power behind that bias."⁷⁸

Robert Faurisson, the French academic Holocaust denier, who is currently in the middle of a squabble with Weber over the future of Holocaust denial, also sprang to Williamson's defense. According to a posting on his blog:

⁷¹ Fahey, letter of May 3, 1949, quoted in Athans, *New Perspectives*, p. 213.

⁷² On Yockey, see George Michael, *Willis Carto and the American Far Right* (Gainesville, 2008) pp. 75-86.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 154.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

⁷⁸ See: <http://www.ihr.org/williamson_march09.html>.

The height of his enemies' misfortune, and for the traditionalist Catholic he is ... if he ever did fall to his knees before the new Inquisition he would immediately remind everyone of Galileo, the man whom science and history ended up acknowledging to be right despite his abjuration. Even if he wound up losing, Richard Williamson would thus have won.⁷⁹

The links between the Holocaust deniers and Catholic extremists are not limited to Williamson. In 1993, the *Journal of Historical Review*, the house organ of the Institute of Historical Review, the central organization of Holocaust deniers in the United States, published in its September/October issue three short entries under the title "The Holocaust Issue: Three Christian Views." Two were by traditionalist Catholics (including the late Joseph Sobran, fired by William Buckley from his journal *National Review* for antisemitism) and the other was by Bishop Louis Vezelis, described as the "editor of *The Seraph*, a traditionalist Catholic monthly." According to Vezelis, "the preponderance of objective and factual evidence shows the promoters of the Holocaust story to be libelous frauds."⁸⁰ Sobran was defended by the Institute of Historical Review as far back as 1987 and later spoke at its 2002 conference.⁸¹

Despite the denunciations of Williamson's Holocaust denial, and even some pro forma condemnations of antisemitism from the SSPX, there can be no question, based on their own writings, that the antisemitic teachings espoused by Fahey and repeated by Williamson still permeate the heart of the theology of the SSPX and many similar Catholic traditionalists.

For example, still available on the Asia SSPX's website is an article from March-April 2000 by Bishop Salvador L. Lazo, entitled: "My Return of the Traditional Latin Mass: Autobiography of a Traditional Catholic Bishop." In this article, Lazo lists some of the books that inspired him on his spiritual journey. They include Fahey's *The Kingship of Christ and The Conversion of the Jewish Nation*, as well as others about the dangers of Freemasonry. Lazo was very open about their impact on his thought, writing that

Reading these books gave me a better idea of the crisis and confusion in the Church today. It became clear to me who are the real enemies of the Catholic Church. Father Denis Fahey pinpointed them when he wrote: "The enemies of the Catholic Church are three. One invisible, Satan, and two visible: a) Talmudic Judaism, and b) Freemasonry." ... That Judaism is the visible chief enemy of the Catholic Church, is evident from the Church history, from words and deeds of individuals, and groups and the teachings of the Talmud of which the Kabbalah constitute the basis of Judaism.⁸²

Williamson has openly held up Fahey as an authority to be relied upon. On the website of the SSPX's US seminary (based in Winona, Minnesota), I recently found a letter

⁷⁹ See: <<http://robertfaurisson.blogspot.com/2009/04/mark-weber-must-resign-from-institute.html>>.

⁸⁰ Louis Vezelis, "Examine All the Evidence," in *Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 13, No. 5 (September/October, 1993) pp. 34-35. Buckley's opinion of Sobran's antisemitism can be found in William Buckley, *In Search of Anti-Semitism* (New York, 1992). His conclusion (pp. 118-119) was that Sobran had indeed "written anti-semitic articles."

⁸¹ Mark Weber, *Joseph Sobran and Historical Revisionism*, available at: <http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v07/v07p373_Weber.html>; and Sobran, *For Fear of the Jews*, available at: <<http://www.ihr.org/conference/14thconf/sobranconf.html>>.

⁸² See: <<http://www.sspxasia.com/Newsletters/2000/March-April/Autobiography.htm>>.

written by Williamson in 1983, before he was even ordained as a bishop, in which, in relation to a book written by a Protestant author, he advised his readers that “Catholics should be very wary of this kind of book. Let them keep to sound doctrine and proven authors, for instance the excellent Fr. Denis Fahey.”⁸³

Finally, it must be recognized that Fahey’s baleful influence is alive today not only in the SSPX but also in similar-minded groups, as reflected in the following quote. It is from John Sharpe, the former Naval Academy graduate and officer and rabid traditionalist Catholic. Sharpe sued a local paper that had publicized his antisemitic beliefs for libel. In the decision against him, the judge wrote: “No reasonable person can read Sharpe’s individual writings and conclude that he espouses anything other than a deep, abiding and pervasive suspicion of and hostility toward Jews, whether considered as a collective people, religion, nation or ethnic group.”⁸⁴

Sharpe, who has his own traditionalist distribution house, concluded a 2003 article that he published in the SSPX’s magazine *The Angelus* criticizing the 2001 Vatican document *The Jewish People and Their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible* with a quote from Fahey’s *Mystical Body of Christ and the Reorganization of Society*, in which he hoped that “we all then have the courage to respond with the words of Fr. Fahey: ‘In that sense, every sane thinker must be an anti-Semite.’”⁸⁵

The SSPX has been quite open about its goals. Speaking about the current efforts by Rome to bring the group back into the Church, Bishop Tissier de Mallerai was blunt, saying that “we do not change our positions, but we have the intention of converting Rome, that is to lead Rome towards our positions.”⁸⁶

Any attempt by the Vatican to bring these groups out of schism and into the Church must honestly confront these issues and not ignore or hide them. If baptism was once, for Jews, the ticket to admission to Western society, then acceptance of Vatican II, including the rejection of Catholic antisemitism and the acceptance of religious liberty, must be the price of admission for these groups into today’s Church. Pope Benedict has spoken movingly and powerfully about his feelings about antisemitism, the Holocaust, Jews, and Judaism. Yet unless the Church’s current deeds match its words, Jewish-Catholic relations will continue their downward trajectory of recent years.

⁸³ See: <<http://www.sspcxseminary.org/publications/rectors-letters-separator/rectors-letter/64.html>>.

⁸⁴ See: <<http://www.icourt.info/Opinions/judge/Thomas/Sharpe-v-Landmark-Opinion.pdf>>.

⁸⁵ John Sharpe, *Judaism and the Vatican*, available at: <http://web.archive.org/web/20031012011638/http://www.sspcx.ca/Angelus/2003_June/Judaism.html>.

⁸⁶ See: <<http://rorate-caeli.blogspot.com/2009/02/tissier-de-mallerai-speaks.html>>.