Q & A on Consecrations
May 22 2026

We are here to answer questions concerning the consecration of bishops which will happen on July 1st. We want to make known the position and reasons for the SSPX consecrating bishops. We wish to avoid all useless dialectics and polemics. Remember the questions about the consecration of bishops, the position of the SSPX, and the crisis of the church are treated extensively on the SSPX podcasts: there is a series on the Consecrations and another on the Crisis of the Church.

These questions are a compilation of the questions received and we hope that we will either directly or indirectly answer all your questions.

How many bishops will the SSPX consecrate? When will we know their names?

There will be four bishops consecrated. The Superior General wished that the candidates continue undisturbed in their apostolate and so chose to wait to release the names. In 1988 Archbishop Lefebvre only released the names 3 weeks before. We will know the names soon.

Why did the SSPX only choose to consecrate four bishops rather than more as there is much global uncertainty today?

This is a prudential decision and we do not presume on providence. We consecrate the number of bishops we need to care for the faithful now and in the foreseeable future and not the number that we might need if some unknown were to occur. The Superiors judge that four bishops on top of the two we have is enough. I trust that the Holy Ghost is guiding them and that they know far better than me. Afterall, who better to ask how many bishops we need then the bishops themselves and both bishops were part of this decision making.

Why does the SSPX turn to the Pope, who is imbued with modernism for permission for the Consecrations and then disobey the pope and consecrate bishops?

The pope is the pope and head of the Church and we owe respect and honor to the office not the man. Thus, it pertains to the pope to appoint bishops so out of respect of the Church Law and the office of the pope we go to Rome to seek permission for the consecration bishops and explain why we will proceed if permission is not granted. The SSPX believes in and respects the power of the pope and bishops although we often cannot obey them because what they tell us is dangerous to faith and morals.

Does the existence of Orders such as the FSSP and other Latin Masses change the case of necessity for the SSPX?

The case of necessity is caused by the inability for souls to receive the traditional teaching of the Church on faith and morals and the inability to receive the traditional Mass and Sacraments.

All Traditional Mass groups, FSSP (Fraternity of St. Peter), Institute of Christ the King etc… which are under the umbrella of Rome, have to accept at least implicitly, the errors of Vatican II and the Novus Ordo Mass. The public position of these groups is that the Novus Ordo Mass is not only valid but licit (good) but they prefer to say the Traditional Mass. To attend these churches

of the FSSP or these other groups can lead souls to error in the faith because they have compromised the fight for the faith by their acceptance of and refusal to condemn Vatican II and the Novus Ordo Mass. Thus, by attending the Mass of these groups you are placing yourself under these priests and implicitly accepting their position.

The SSPX maintains and has always maintained that Vatican II contains errors- Religious liberty, Ecumenism, Collegiality and the Novus Ordo Mass flows from these errors. Thus, souls come to the SSPX because they are sure that, here, they will be free from the poison of Vatican II. This is what constitutes the state of necessity for the SSPX. Go read the recent declaration of faith made by the SSPX to Rome, no other group under the umbrella of Rome would dare to say such things to Rome as they would be severely punished.

Please find a few examples from the Declaration of Faith:

"There is only one Faith and one Church by which we may be saved. Outside the Roman Catholic Church, and without the profession of Faith that she has always taught, there is neither salvation nor remission of sins."

"The mandate received by the Apostles, to preach the Gospel to every man and to convert every man to the Catholic faith, remains binding until the end of time and responds to the most absolute and most pressing necessity in the world. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned."[3] Therefore, to renounce the fulfilment of this mandate constitutes the gravest of crimes against humanity."

"To a unique Faith there corresponds a unique form of worship, the supreme, authentic, and perfect expression of that same Faith."

"The Holy Mass is the perpetuation in time of the Sacrifice of the Cross, offered for many and renewed upon the altar. Although offered in an unbloody manner, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is essentially expiatory and propitiatory. No other form of worship offers perfect adoration."

"Consequently, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass can in no way be reduced to a mere commemoration, to a spiritual meal, to a sacred assembly celebrated by the people, to the celebration of the Paschal mystery without sacrifice, without satisfaction of divine justice, without expiation of sins, without propitiation, and without the Cross."

Bishop Athanasius Schneider said this about the declaration in his interview on EWTN: "They acknowledge the Pope's full authority, his jurisdiction, his teaching, and ask him: 'Please, strengthen us in this Catholic Faith which we profess.' And what they profess is the constant doctrine of the Church. All the points they list in this declaration are nothing other than what the Church has always professed, always."

Did Archbishop Lefebvre lie in 1988 when he said he had the papal mandate?

Firstly, the correct words are apostolic mandate and Archbishop Lefebvre said yes, and explains that he had a mandate from the Holy Catholic Church to proceed with Consecrations due to the modernism of Vatican II. This can be said to be an Apostolic mandate although, it did not come from the pope, but came from a duty to protect the faith passed down from the Apostles. This was in no way an attempt to deceive anyone.

The SSPX condemns the consecration of bishops by Bishop Williamson and the Resistance and by the Sedevacantists. Does not the case of necessity also justify their consecration of bishops?

The SSPX objections to these consecrations has nothing to do with the case of necessity which could indeed, justify their consecration of bishops. Firstly, we object because of their refusal to go to Rome and the Pope and to ask permission. This refusal flows from a flawed understanding of authority and true obedience that is dangerous.
Secondly, many of these consecrations (esp. regarding the Sedevacantists) were performed in secret or by dubious bishops and this leads to very doubtful validity of some of these consecrations.

Pope Francis granted jurisdiction to the SSPX for confessions and asked the bishops of each diocese to grant delegation to the SSPX for marriages. If the SSPX is excommunicated, this jurisdiction will presumably be removed. Will the SSPX tell couples their marriage will no longer be recognized by Rome?

The SSPX holds that the confessions and marriage, performed before Pope Francis granted us jurisdiction, were valid due to the case of necessity. This was explained in the last sermon. Thus, the SSPX will continue to give the Sacraments as the Church will supply jurisdiction and yes, of course this will be explained to couples.

Since, the Consecrations are considered an act of schism by Rome how will the SSPX protect the faithful from being "excommunicated" by formally adherence to the Schism?

Firstly, yes, Rome is saying the SSPX is performing a schismatic act by consecrating bishops without apostolic mandate. However, the SSPX has repeatedly emphasized that we are not setting up a rival hierarchy but are consecrating bishops without jurisdiction as we recognize the authority of the Pope and the Bishops. Thus, there is no schism but Rome chooses to ignore this.

Secondly, it is clear that Rome is opposed to the SSPX due to our rejection of the errors of Vatican II and the Novus Ordo Mass. The Faith and the salvation of souls are the highest law and one to which all other law is subject. Thus, we will consider any penalties by Rome as invalid and offer up the injustice to Our Lord who was unjustly crucified and it will be an honor to suffer this for the faith!

Thirdly, Canon Law says that persons acting out of grave fear or necessity are not guilty of a penalty- this is obviously the case of the SSPX. So the excommunication is invalid.

Lastly, Rome has threatened excommunication "to all who adhere to the schismatic act" but it is unclear what they mean by the word "adhere". Does attending an SSPX Mass mean your

excommunicated? I think that the difficulty in specifying what they mean by adhere will make it more or less an empty threat but nobody knows.

In the Hawaii Six Case, six people approached the SSPX for Confirmation and the bishop of the diocese excommunicated them. This case was appealed to Rome and Cardinal Ratzinger ruled that they could not be punished for coming to the SSPX for sacraments. This demonstrates that Rome recognized the injustice of excommunicating souls because they approach the SSPX for the sacraments.

If the pope issues a decree that all jurisdiction is removed from the SSPX due to a state of formal schism whose authority is higher: the pope's direct decree or the SSPX's private interpretation of the case of necessity?

Pachama, synodality, the allowing of divorced and remarried couples to receive communion, the blessing of homosexual unions etc… are public abuses which happened and came from Rome and the Pope. If this does not constitute a case of necessity, what does? Thus, the SSPX is protecting the highest laws which the Pope has the Supreme duty to protect- the faith and the salvation of souls. The Church then supplies jurisdiction in cases of necessity.

There is also a general doctrinal confusion: where do you look for the truth? Whom do you trust? Then, there is the general moral confusion found everywhere and the more or less universal liturgical impoverishment.

Recently, the scandal came out that Pope Leo, as a priest, actively attended a Pachamama ceremony- this is objectively idolatry! The recent synod report on homosexuality brought further confusion on basic Catholic morals. Bishop Athanasius Schneider said the text from the synod is clear propaganda with thinly veiled use of Christian terms and is pagan at heart! Thank God for his courage in standing up and condemning this. All of this only further demonstrates the case of necessity.

How does Rome continue to reconcile their actions with Church Law opposed to them?

This is a reference to canon 1323 stating that penalties are not applied to crimes committed out of necessity or grave fear.

Firstly, Rome refuses to admit any state of necessity caused by Vatican II. Thus, they deny the whole premise that the SSPX has a right to continue to exist in the present state and to proceed with the consecrations.

Secondly, there is a lack of intellectual honesty in Rome and the world today and people are not always looking for the truth. Rome today uses Canon Law when they wish but are all too ready to dispense with it at other times.

Why did the SSPX give it's recent declaration of faith to Pope Leo?

The declaration of faith was given to Pope Leo and Rome as a fraternal correction for the errors we see coming from Rome and as a profession of faith for the entire Church. We hope that it will move the Pope and leaders of the Church as well as all Catholics to stand up and fight for the true faith.

Do you have outside SSPX sources defending the Consecrations?

Bishop Athanasius Schneider's interview May 15th is the strongest- this letter is on the fsspx.news. See the following excerpts:

"The Society has written to Pope Leo on several occasions and explained publicly, as well as in February in Rome to Cardinal Fernández, that it does not wish to establish a parallel hierarchy. It will not grant these bishops any jurisdiction, but only the possibility of administering the sacraments of Holy Orders and Confirmation, nothing more. The intention is therefore clear: there is no schismatic intent. They even wish to collaborate with the Pope and ask him to allow these ordinations. They simply want the guarantee of transmitting the eternal faith without any ambiguity or compromise…

"At the same time, while Pope Leo and the Vatican promote the inclusiveness of the synodal path, of synodal methods, while they are generous with the German Synodal Way, generous with the Chinese Communist Party by allowing it to ordain bishops there, the contrast is immense. And these faithful of the Society of Saint Pius X, who love the Pope, who pray for the Pope, who simply want the guarantee of transmitting the faith of all time without any ambiguity—I insist: without any ambiguity—are being denied this, and now they are being punished."

"I think that if the Pope does this, if he does not grant them this permission and excommunicates them, it will remain in history as a huge error of rigidity, of pastoral rigidity, and of unilateral severity towards Tradition in the Church….."Holy Father, please, avoid such a wound in the Church. You can avoid it."

What will the SSPX do if Rome forces us to drop the use of "Catholic" as she owns this trademark?

The name "Catholic" is not trademarked and so I think anything like this happening is improbable but if it does the reality of us being Catholic remains unchanged.

Would the SSPX accept a Novus Ordo bishop with the appropriate conditional orders?

The SSPX is willing to assist bishops or priests seeking to return to tradition. There is always a trial period of some years before the SSPX gives these bishops or priests an apostolate as we must ensure that they have the same beliefs and spirit as the SSPX. Of course, the SSPX investigates and ensures that they have valid orders.

What conditions would be necessary to enter into regular communion with Rome?

The SSPX has always refused to seek canonical status with Rome if it means that we must compromise our fight for the faith. The 1988 and 2012 "agreements" failed because the SSPX refused to say that the Novus Ordo Mass was licit- that is good. Thus, any agreement with Rome cannot compromise the fight for the faith or salvation of souls.

In the May 6th 2017 Interview of Bishop Fellay with Cardinal Mueller following the doctrinal discussions the SSPX had with Rome, he specified that for the SSPX to return to "Communion with Rome" we must accept the following:

1. *It is necessary to require members of the Society of Saint Pius X to adhere to the new form of the Professio fidei (profession of faith) dating from 1988. Consequently, it is no longer sufficient to ask them to make the Professio fidei of 1962.*
2. *The new text of the doctrinal declaration must include a paragraph in which the signatories explicitly declare their acceptance of the teachings of the Second Vatican Council and of the post-conciliar period, granting to said doctrinal affirmations the degree of assent due to them.*
3. *Members of the Society of Saint Pius X must recognize, not only the validity, but also the legitimacy of the Rite of the Holy Mass and the Sacraments, according to the liturgical books promulgated after the Second Vatican Council.*

Obviously, we cannot accept these conditions and so communication with Rome was more or less broken off until recently, when we requested bishops.

Explain how the pope and bishops can be in such error without having defected or lost there office?

In Canon Law the loss of an office because of a crime such as heresy only occurs when an authority above establishes the fact of the crime. Thus, because no authority has established the "heresy" of the Pope and bishops then, they remain in power. If there is a doubt as to the loss of an office, the one in office retains power.

Why do we call Pope Leo, His Holiness when he is a modernist?

We call Pope Leo "His Holiness" out of respect for the office of the papacy and we use the proper titles for all the clergy of the church out of respect for their office.

How can the Catholic Church be holy and without blemish, if the Her leaders are imbued with modernism?

The Catholic Church is Holy because Her founder, Our Lord Jesus Christ, is Holy. Her doctrine is Holy and She leads souls to holiness and some souls to heroic holiness in every age. She is not holy because all of her members are holy. Thus, the pope and bishops being imbued with errors lessens the visible holiness of the Church at this time but in no way detracts from the fact that the Catholic Faith is Holy here and now. The Catholic Church will only be perfect in Heaven!

Why does the SSPX follow the 1962 liturgy and not return to the 1955, when it is clear that Bugnini influenced it?

Rome alone has the right to change the Mass and so out of obedience to Rome the SSPX uses the Last Missal promulgated by Rome before Vatican II as we can be sure this is not imbued with the errors of Vatican II. It is not a question of preference.

The 1962 liturgy simplified the feasts of the calendar, added St. Joseph to the canon, and other minor changes. None of these changes can be considered modernist even if Fr. Bugnini was behind them.