



FIRST POST

posted: Nov 28 2010, 07:34 PM

By William of Norwich

Maximilian Krah and Menzingen: A Cause for Serious Concern?

The Timeline -

January 2009

A Corporate Attorney by the name of Maximilian Krah became publicly linked with the affairs of the Society of Saint Pius X.

January 20, 2009

Fr. Franz Schmidberger, Superior of SSPX in Germany, issued a press release in which it was stated: "We have not seen the interview given by Bishop Williamson to Swedish television. As soon as we see it we will submit it to scrutiny and obtain the advice of attorneys."

But, in fact, the attorney to whom Menzingen would turn had already been put into place.

It was none other than Maximilian Krah of the Dresden Corporate Law company, Fetsch Rechtsanwälte: the partners being Cornelius J. Fetsch, Maximilian Krah and Daniel Adler.

Link: Fetsch Rechtsanwälte

<http://www.dasoertliche.de/?id=10700323337...&arkey=14612000>

January 19, 2009

One day before Fr. Schmidberger's press release, Maximilian Krah was appointed as delegate to the Board, and manager, of the company Dello Sarto AG. The Chairman of the company is Bishop Bernard Fellay and the Board Members are First Assistant, Fr. Niklaus Pfluger, and the SSPX Bursar General, Fr. Emeric Baudot.

The purpose of the company is stated as being (Google translation):

"Advice on asset management issues and the care and management of assets of domestic and foreign individuals, corporations, foundations and other bodies, in particular of natural or legal persons which the Catholic moral, religious and moral teaching in its traditional sense of obligation and see, and the execution of projects for the mentioned persons, as well as advising on the

implementation of these projects; whole purpose of description according to statutes.”

In other words, Dello Sarto AG appears to be an investment company that speculates, one has to assume, with SSPX funds in financial and other markets in the search for profits for various SSPX projects. But is it possible to get involved in today’s financial markets without being exposed to the risk and/or practice of usury?

The company was commercially registered on January 13, 2009 and issued 100 shares at 1,000 Swiss francs, giving it an initial capital of 100,000 Swiss francs.

As far as the checkbook is concerned, Maximilian Krah and Bishop Fellay alone are enabled individually to issue a payment of funds, while Frs. Pfluger and Baudot are required to obtain a co-signature to do so. Krah is not a cleric, but exercises greater financial powers than the First Assistant or Bursar. Curious.

Link: Dello Sarto AG

<http://translate.google.co.uk/translate?hl...D813%26prmd%3Db>

Maximilian Krah is a Board Member of other associations that control SSPX funds.

In the September 2010 edition of a publication issued by EMBA-Global we read that the “EMBA-Global programme is designed for experienced managers, professionals and executives who seek to develop the skills, knowledge and networks to operate as successful Global leaders, anywhere in the world,” and that it “brings together an elite international network of business professionals.”

Link: EMBA-Global

http://www.emba-global.com/EMBA-Global_Cla...tember_2010.pdf

Maximilian Krah is pictured on page 6 of the September 2010 publication along with the following, accompanying text:

“Maximilian Krah. German. Lawyer. Jaidhofer Privatstiftung, Vienna, Austria. Lawyer with substantial international experience. Currently a Board Member of an Austrian foundation. Responsible for wealth and asset management of the settlement capital, and for the project development of non-profit projects all over the world, which are sponsored by using the achieved funds.”

The full name of the company mentioned above is Jaidhofer Privatstiftung St. Josef and Marcellus. Jaidof is the seat of the SSPX District headquarters in Austria.

The fact that the SSPX appears to be involved in international financial markets will worry many of their faithful who would, rightly, believe that such activity is both risky on the material plane, and questionable on the moral level. There may, of course, be those who are less concerned, feeling that it is acceptable practice in the modern world, and aimed at “a final good.” Are the latter right?

Krah first made his appearance in the international sphere, as far as rank-and-file traditionalists are concerned, in the wake of what has been dubbed by the mainstream media as “the Williamson Affair.” His comments on the bishop were less than flattering, exuded a liberal view of the world, and poured oil on the fire of controversy that raged across the world, and against both the bishop and the SSPX, for months on end. It has been plain for a long time now that the “interview” and the “ensuing controversy” were a set-up, but it was, and still is, a matter of conjecture as to which person(s) and/or agencies engineered the set-up. Perhaps subsequent information in this email will throw more light on this troubling question?

What is beyond conjecture, however, is that Bishop Fellay's attitude towards Bishop Williamson changed dramatically. Even those who will hear nothing against Bishop Fellay have noticed this change. The change has been public and persistent, and has been both insulting and humiliating for Bishop Williamson. It has also been largely carried out in the mainstream media, and, in Germany, the notoriously anti-Catholic communist magazine, Der Spiegel, has found a favored place, much to the astonishment of traditionalists everywhere. It has been there that we heard the shocking references to Bishop Williamson as "an unexploded hand grenade," "a dangerous lump of uranium," etc, as well as the insulting insinuations that he is disturbed or suffering from Parkinson's Disease. The question, let it be remembered, is not whether one agrees or disagrees with Williamson, whether one likes or dislikes either Bishop Williamson or Bishop Fellay, but whether or not a man has a right to express a personal opinion on a matter of secular history. The ambush of Williamson by the Swedish interviewer, Ali Fegan, said by some Swedes to be a Turkish Jew, left Williamson on the spot: to get up and walk out in silence, thereby providing the media with the hook "that his refusal to speak is proof of his revisionist beliefs" or simply to lie. Williamson made his choice. Whether we agree or not is neither here nor there.

In the past, nearly two decades earlier in Canada, Williamson made "controversial comments" on the same subject at what was understood to be a private meeting of Catholics. A journalist, however, found out and made a story out of it. The relevance of this episode is that the attitude of Archbishop Lefebvre contrasts remarkably with that of Bishop Fellay. The first just ignored the "controversy," treating a secular and anti-Catholic media with total disdain, and the matter quickly became a dead issue. The latter played to the media gallery, broke corporate unity with his brother in the episcopacy (specifically warned against by Archbishop Lefebvre during the 1988 consecrations), and turned what should have been a molehill into a mountain.

ENTER KRAH

Krah is instructed to find an attorney to defend Williamson. He opts for Matthias Lossmann as defense attorney, a strange choice. It is strange, because Lossmann is a member of the extremist Die Grünen party (The Greens), an organization that is well-known in Germany as a water melon: green on the outside, red on the inside. A party that is pro-feminist, pro-homosexual, pro-abortion and harbors Daniel Cohn-Bendit, a member of the European Parliament in its ranks. Besides his frontline involvement in the 1968 Red turbulence in the universities in France, he is a known advocate of pedophilia, as his autobiography demonstrates. What was Krah thinking of, then, in choosing such an attorney to represent a Catholic bishop? Was Lossmann really the only attorney in Germany prepared to take this case?

Krah's choice is strange for a second reason. Krah is a member of a political party, but not the Greens. Krah is a prominent political activist and officer in Dresden, in the east of Germany, of the liberal, pro-abortion, pro-homosexual Christian Democratic Union, led by Angela Merkel. Chancellor Merkel also comes from the east of Germany and is commonly referred to in that country as "Stasi-Merkel" after revelations and photographic evidence came to light hinting that she was recruited and formed by the Stasi, the former East German State Secret Police; a common approach made to young people, particularly those seeking professional careers, in the former Communist State of the German Democratic Republic. The same Merkel that publicly reproached Benedict XVI for having lifted the so-called "excommunication" of "holocaust denier" Williamson, and demanded that the Pope reverse the decision.

Krah is pictured on the editorial page, page 3, of a CDU publication, of May 2006, in the link below:

Link: Die Dresdner Union, May 2006.

<http://www.cdu-dresden.de/index.php?mo=mc ...40107b868a48%7D>

He portrays himself in the journal as some kind of Christian (though we are informed via SSPX faithful that he attends the SSPX chapel in Dresden), yet chooses an attorney for Williamson that could not have been worse.

Remember, too, that after the first Der Spiegel hatchet job on Williamson, Krah turned up at the British HQ of the SSPX in London at short notice and sought to get Williamson to do a second interview with the disreputable magazine. Williamson refused to do so, in spite of the fact that Krah had come with these journalists with the express sanction of Bishop Fellay! How in God's name could Mgr. Fellay have thought that a second bite at the apple by Der Spiegel journalists would help the cause of Williamson or the SSPX? Go figure.

Moreover, consider the approach of both Krah and Lossmann in Williamson's first trial. There was no attempt to defend him, though it is plain that Williamson had not broken German law, contrary to public perceptions generated by the media. What occurred, according to non-Catholics who attended the trial, was a shocking parody of a defense: Krah, unctuous, smug and mocking in respect of the bishop; Lossmann, weak, hesitating, insipid. Both effectively "conceded" Williamson's "guilt," but nevertheless argued for "leniency." At no time did they address the legal questions at hand, questions that did not relate directly to the "Holocaust" and its veracity or otherwise, but as to whether or not the provisions of the law actually applied to the Williamson case. In other words, a Caiphas defense.

It can, therefore, come as no surprise that Williamson decided to appeal the Court's decision, and to engage an independent attorney who would address the actual legal questions of the case. That Bishop Fellay, on the basis of media reports, ordered him publicly to sack this attorney or face expulsion is a great surprise, one might even say a scandal, for such situations require knowledge of all the facts, serious reflection, and sagacity. The Press Communiqué demonstrated none of these requirements, and merely represented one more example of Bishop Fellay's unexplained public hostility to Mgr. Williamson. It is significant that the DICl statement referred to Williamson's new attorney as someone who was associated with "neo-nazis," this being a reference to the German National Democrats, an organization that has been in existence for about 50 years and has elected members in some regional German parliaments. If it had been "Nazi" it would have been banned under the German Constitution a long time ago – as many such groups have found out over the years in Germany. Moreover, while DICl chose the term "neo-nazi," the British Daily Telegraph chose "far right," as did those well-known anti-semitic journals, The Jerusalem Post and Haaretz.

Did Krah have an input into this communiqué? We cannot know for sure, but we do know something about Krah that is not common knowledge. Maximilian Krah is Jewish. He presents himself as some sort of 'Christian' in the link provided above, yet we find a more revealing picture of Maximilian Krah, at this link below, in attendance at a fundraising event in New York during September 2010.

Link: American Friends of Tel Aviv University

http://www.aftau.org/site/PageServer?pagen...0_AlumniAuction

The attendees of this fundraising party are alumni of Tel Aviv University. They are raising scholarship funds to assist diasporan Jews to travel to the Zionist State of Israel to receive a formation at Tel Aviv University. Look at the photographs. Every single person is identified and every single one is clearly Jewish. There is no problem whatever with this, Krah included.

However, Krah is at the financial center of the SSPX; he has done no favors to Williamson and his case by his statements and actions; and may be responsible for things yet unknown or unseen.

Since his arrival on the scene, traditionalists have witnessed

1) The abrupt disappearance of important theological articles from District websites regarding Judaism and the pivotal role played by our “elder brothers,” as Bishop Fellay referred to them this year, in Finance, Freemasonry and Communism, none of which could have been construed as “anti-semitic” by the time honored standards of the Catholic Church.

2) Bishop Williamson being continuously and publicly denigrated, humiliated and grossly insulted.

3) The communist journal, Der Spiegel, being favored with arranged interviews and stories to keep the “Williamson Affair” on-the-boil, thereby tending toward the “marginalization” of Williamson.

4) A scandalous and erroneous article being published in The Angelus, in which the faithful were taught that a Talmudic rabbi was a saint, and that the said rabbi was positively instrumental in preparing the Incarnation of Our Lord Jesus Christ and the conversion of St. Paul.

All these facts combined necessarily raise a whole series of questions. These questions can only be answered by those in a position to know all the facts. In this case that person is Bishop Fellay, since he is the Superior General, has unrestricted access to all aspects of the Society’s work, and obviously has taken Mr. Krah into his confidence on both the financial and legal levels.

This writer is making no accusations or insinuations against Bishop Fellay at any level. He is simply requesting that he make public reply to the following questions in order that the doubt and worry, which is widespread among the clergy and faithful since the events of last year, is allayed, and soothed by the balm of Truth.

Your Excellency,

1) Were you aware that Maximilian Krah, who currently has significant power and influence in important areas of the internal workings of the SSPX, was Jewish when he was taken into your confidence?

2) Who introduced, or recommended, Maximilian Krah in his professional capacity to the Society of Saint Pius X?

3) If you were not aware of Krah’s background and political connections, why was he not carefully investigated before being brought into the inner-circle and inner-workings of SSPX?

4) Why does Krah, who is not a cleric of the SSPX or even a longtime supporter of the Society, have such singular power to handle SSPX funds?

5) Who are the shareholders of Dello Sarto AG? Are they all clergy of the SSPX or related congregations? Are the shares transferable through purchase? In the event of the death, defection or resignation of a shareholder, how are the shares distributed? Who in any of these cases has the power to confer, designate, sell or otherwise dispose of these shares? You? The Bursar? The Manager? The Board Members? The General Council?

6) Why is the Society of Saint Pius X engaged in financial activities which may be common in modern society, but which are hardly likely to be in conformity with Church teaching pertaining to money, its nature, its use and its ends?

7) Why was Kraus allowed to keep the pot boiling in the “Williamson Affair” by arranging interviews and providing stories for Der Spiegel magazine? How could an alleged Christian Democrat be the intermediary with a notorious communist journal?

8) Why was Kraus permitted to impose upon your brother bishop an attorney belonging to the extreme left-wing Die Grünen?

9) Why was your brother bishop threatened with expulsion from SSPX for merely hiring an attorney who was actually interested in fighting the unjust and ridiculous charge of incitement? Is it not the case that those of the Household of the Faith must take precedence over those who are without?

10) Can you explain why your public attitude to Williamson has changed, why you have continuously belittled him in public – while he has not responded in kind at any time?

11) What do you intend to do about Mr. Kraus given that his position within the Society is one of influence, but who cannot seriously be regarded as someone who has the best interests of Catholic Tradition at heart? Will you move as quickly to resolve this question as you have in respect of Williamson?

There is no malice meant or intended in this communication. There is quite simply a tremendous fear for the future of the SSPX and its direction

POST SCRIPT

For those who think that the writer is muckraking, I would like to point out that it was me that made public the impending sell-out of the Transalpine Redemptorists several months before it took place. I received brickbats for the relevant post at the time, and some calumniated me – but I was shown to be correct after a short period. This writer has not posted anywhere since that time. He does so now because he possesses information, as he did in regard to the Redemptorists, which needed to be made known widely for the good of Catholic Tradition. Nothing would please me more than to have Bishop Fellay answer these serious questions and put Catholic minds everywhere at rest.



SECOND POST

Posted: Dec 4 2010, 09:50 PM

By Veritas 1961

Since William of Norwich went public with his posting last Sunday, there has been huge interest in the thread that it generated. Most noticeable has been the volume of new information added, some of it disputed by a handful of posters, but much of it has been accepted as incontrovertible. Over the last few days I have been looking back at the various comments and postings, and I believe there is something not quite right about the time frame. If I am right about this, it will have a huge impact on current conclusions.

We know for sure that on Wednesday, November 17, 2010 Matthias Lossmann contacted the German press agency, Deutsche Presse-Agentur (DPA), and told them that he would be standing down from the defence of Bishop Williamson in favour of another, and that "the name would soon be made public. 'You will then see why I no longer feel called for.'"

This statement by Lossman should be mulled over. Why did he feel the need to go to a press agency and say that he was no longer involved in the Williamson case? It is hard to believe that somebody involved with the ultra-politically correct Green Party would have been the object of hatred from members of the public or the gentlemen of press, and all the more so in that he made it clear at the April 2010 court case that he had nothing at all in common with Williamson's views. In fact his comportment during the case demonstrated plainly that he was working against Williamson's interest. We conclude that he was "baiting a media hook" for the "controversy" that was planned to erupt. He could have said nothing about the matter, and answer any questions in the event that they arose spontaneously. He didn't, and this speaks volumes about his motivation, not just at that point in the affair, but from the outset.

We also know that on Thursday, November 18, 2010 Williamson's new choice of lawyer, Nahrath, sent a communication to the new judge, Eisvogel, via her personal office fax. In it, he outlined the fact that he was now under instructions from Williamson and that he wished to request a postponement of the trial in order to get up to speed on the substance of the case.

We know too that Stefan Winters from Der Spiegel rang Nahrath within half an hour, and were already aware of his status as Williamson's lawyer. How did they come across this information? Did the judge or a court official leak this material to these journalists? Possibly, but unlikely, given that even Eisvogel's secretary did not know that Nahrath had sent the fax. If the judge had done so, she would have risked exposure and would undoubtedly have suffered legal sanction for professional misconduct. If it were a court official, he or she would have risked their jobs. It might be argued that there could have been a political motivation. It is possible, of course. But in the absence of even a semblance of information bearing on this, we have to dismiss it from our minds.

We know that Lossman knew who the new lawyer would be. We know this because he decided to stand down from the defence as a consequence of being unwilling or unable to work with Nahrath. Therefore, we have two possibilities. Either Lossmann contacted Der Spiegel himself, or he gave the information to that known associate of Der Spiegel, Maximilian Krahe. The first option is improbable for the good reason that he could have contacted Der Spiegel from the beginning and blown the story wide open himself. The second is very likely, and we have an historical precedent in this matter.

A BRIEF DIGRESSION

Cast your minds back to the period preceding the Bishop's trial which was set for April 16, 2010. On March 4, 2010, Williamson received a communication from Fr. Thouvenot in which he was informed, at the request of Bishop Fellay, to desist from a number of things. One of these was that he was

“receiving a formal order forbidding him to appear before the court of Ratisbonne, and to leave it to his lawyers [Lossman and Krah] to stabilise the situation to your advantage, and to that of the SSPX of which you are a member.”

Why this order from Fellay? Was it a product of fear, or was it motivated by something else? Given that Lossmann was a dead loss as a lawyer, and did nothing to address the actual applicability of the law being brought against Williamson, and given that Krah was, as WoN pointed out, positively injurious to Williamson’s interests, it might be conjectured, reasonably I believe (particularly in the light of subsequent events), that Fellay wanted his chosen lawyers to have a freehand in the court, unhampered by any possible objections from Williamson. If Williamson had been present in the court, it is highly unlikely that he would have tolerated the antics of Krah and Lossmann and, given his ability to speak German, would have countered their mendacious and irrelevant nonsense. He might even have dismissed them on the spot and taken his defence upon himself. This is speculation, for we cannot know the mind of Fellay, unless he tells us what was his motivation, nor can we know what Williamson might potentially have said or done.

However, what follows is not conjecture. Just a couple of days before the trial itself a Der Spiegel journalist from Berlin rang Lossmann. The conversation went like this: “Is Mgr. Williamson going to attend the trial?” “No.” “Why not?” “Orders from his Superior.” “A written order?” “Yes.” “Can I see the text?” “No.”

Shortly after this exchange, Lossman receives a call from Krah: “Do you have the letter from Menzingen?” “Yes.” “Will you copy it to me?” The answer is in the affirmative, and Lossmann sends it on. About two hours later the same journalist rings Lossman and informs him that he now had a copy of Fellay’s order.

The chances, therefore, that Lossmann did not repeat this unprofessional conduct a second time and give information concerning Williamson and Nahrath to Krah are very slim. That Der Spiegel knew within 30 minutes of Nahrath’s appointment makes the Lossmann-Krah connection almost a moral certitude.

IS SOMEONE LYING?

We know that at roughly 9.00pm Swiss time, on Saturday, November 20, 2010, the SSPX General House posted on its website a statement issued by Fr. Thouvenot, at the explicit request of Fellay. It said in part that “The Superior General, Mgr. Bernard Fellay, learned from the press that Mgr. Williamson had revoked, just 10 days prior to his trial, the lawyer charged with his defence.” The statement concluded, as we all now know, by the assertion that if Williamson did not relieve himself of his “so-called neo-nazi lawyer” Fellay would expel him from the SSPX.

Less well known is the fact that Fr. Thouvenot issued a further statement, at the instruction of Fellay, concerning Williamson on Sunday, November 21, 2010 early in the afternoon. It was sent by e-mail to the bishops and district superiors of the SSPX and was headed “Clarifications on the Press Statement of the General House,” and which had as its express aim to “explain” in greater precision the statement of November 20, 2010.

In its second paragraph, it stated: “Mgr. Williamson wished to engage a second lawyer who was politically well-known (“the only neo-nazi lawyer in Germany not yet in prison,”** it is said). . . .The administrative court of Ratisbonne knew about the revocation of the first lawyer [Lossmann] on Wednesday, November 17, 2010 and the identity of his substitute began to seep out on Friday morning, November 19, 2010.”

[**Who exactly said this? Why the implication that all so-called “neo-nazi” lawyers should be in prison? Why not Marxist ones, liberal ones and Zionist ones as well?]

How do I know about this second and lesser known statement? Because it was copied to me by a German-speaking clerical friend.

We know the following courtesy of Hollingsworth posted on page 3:

"I [Williamson] employ Nahrath. BpF sends Fr Angles to tell me (Friday mid-day) that unless I give up Nahrath he will expel me from the SSPX. It seems to me that my appeal can only go ahead with either a non-defending lawyer approved by Menzingen, or a truly defending lawyer that will not be approved by Menzingen. On my behalf Fr A e-mails (about 13h00 GMT Friday) to BpF that I give up appealing in front of the German courts, and ironically I add that it would be a kindness if Menzingen would pay the fine. BpF soon e-mails back, "Deo Gratias. No problem for paying the fine" (Friday, about 15h00 GMT)."

The time frame as outlined here is confirmed by the second and lesser known statement. It states in paragraph 4: "Mgr. Williamson made it known to Mgr. Fellay on Friday, November 19, 2010 in the early afternoon his desire to abandon the trial" and this for the good of the SSPX.

What needs to be made clear here is that Fr. Angles arrived in England on Friday morning, November 19, 2010 and breakfasted with the bishop. But Angles received his order to go to London to reason with Williamson very late Thursday evening, when Fellay was in Rome, at Albano for two days talking to priests of the Italian district. The mandate for Angles was to persuade Williamson to dump Nahrath as his lawyer and thus avoid expulsion. BUT THERE IS THE PROBLEM. For it means that Fellay knew about Nahrath on Thursday, November 18 – that is to say, he knew about Nahrath the same day that Nahrath wrote to Judge Eisvogel, the same day that Der Spiegel knew about Nahrath. Furthermore, the statement of November 20, 2010 says quite plainly: "The Superior General, Mgr. Bernard Fellay learned from the press." HERE IS ANOTHER PROBLEM.

Go to the following link and you will see the results of a search for "Nahrath and Williamson" in a news search.

<http://news.google.com/news/search?pz=1&cf...oring=n&start=0>

This search shows that there are 55 hits (as of 9.00pm GMT, December 4, 2010): the first coming on page 6 and the most recent on page 1. The story first appeared, based on a DPA (German Press Agency) release, on Saturday, November 20, 2010 in the Israeli newspaper, Ha'aretz. It was closely followed by Il Giornalettismo, a little-known online Italian paper, and then by Der Spiegel.

A search of Der Spiegel online, in both German and English, corroborates the news search above for its first mention of the Nahrath connection to Williamson appeared on Saturday, November 20, 2010. Put more clearly: nothing appeared in Der Spiegel or any other paper about Nahrath-Williamson before Saturday, November 20, 2010. Yet we know that Fellay spoke to Angles about this matter late on Thursday, November 18, 2010, inviting him to go to London; while the lesser known statement said that news about the Nahrath-Williamson connection "began to seep out on Friday morning, November 19, 2010."

HOW DID BISHOP FELLAY LEARN FROM THE PRESS ABOUT NAHRATH-WILLIAMSON ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2010, WHEN NOTHING WAS PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS UNTIL TWO DAYS LATER?

There are only few options:

1. Fellay had a premonition or "a hunch" about it.
2. He received some kind of grace from the Heavens about the matter.
3. He was informed by someone in the know by phone, fax, or e-mail of the details.

Option 3 is my preferred response, because it is the only viable option. Who are the candidates for informing Fellay? They are three in number: Der Spiegel, Matthias Lossman or Maximilian Krah.

Where would you put your money?

Der Spiegel is unlikely at that stage because in the article of Saturday, November 20, 2010, Fr. Thouvenot is quoted. That means that in all probability, he was telephoned by Der Spiegel on the day before, Friday, November 19, 2010 as part of the final preparations for going live. Lossman is even less likely. He could have gone direct to Fellay on Wednesday, November 17, 2010, but he went

either to Der Spiegel or Krah. Besides, given his politics, Lossman has no weight within the SSPX. That leaves our old buddy, Krah.

This timeframe means that Fellay had knowledge of the Nahrath question before the time that he claimed knowledge. It means that he had made a deal with Williamson on Friday, November 19, 2010 which put the whole matter to sleep, theoretically speaking. It means that the statement of the SSPX on November 20, 2010 was a stitch up, and the idea that it was to forestall a “huge press campaign” is palpable nonsense, because Fellay, knowing what we now know about the timeframe, could have told Der Spiegel that Nahrath was already out the picture on Friday afternoon when they telephoned for a quote on Friday, November 19, 2010.

That Fellay did not mention the “deal” struck with Williamson on Friday speaks for itself. That he decided to go ahead with the condemnation and threat of expulsion on November 20, 2010 on the headquarters\’ website also speaks for itself. Yet more sickening is the constant reference to the fragile SSPX situation in Germany that has been regularly invoked since the Swedish television set-up. The clarification of Fellay-Thouvenot on Sunday, November 21, 2010 sent to the District Superiors uses this hoary “excuse” again. It says: “The situation in Germany is still tense, and where this new event will have the effect of a bomb and directly menace our apostolate, without mentioning our image, that is to say our reputation.” We have been hearing this since early 2009. What schools, priories or various other structures have been closed down by the German authorities? What priests, monks, sisters or others have been interviewed, questioned and charged with anything? According to my knowledge: none in any class. It is all fear-mongering aimed at marginalizing Williamson in the effort to cosy up to modernist Rome. If anybody wishes to dispute this point, please supply concrete examples - and by that I don’t mean statements by SSPX priests in Germany or elsewhere, but concrete actions by the German State.

One more nugget for readers to chew on. “The Clarification” posted on Sunday, November 21, 2010 justified putting up the condemnation on November 20 at Fellay’s insistence. Although the Fellay-Williamson “deal” had been struck on Friday, November 19, 2010, Fellay went ahead with the condemnation on the 20th because, although Williamson had dropped the lawyer, Nahrath, says, Fellay, Williamson had not informed the German court of his new decision. This is sophistry at its worst. We all know, now, that Angles informed Fellay of Williamson’s decision at 1.00pm GMT on Friday, November 19, 2010. The reply from Fellay came at 3.00pm GMT – that is to say, at 4.00pm in Switzerland and Germany. I have no personal experience of the habits of German bureaucrats, but my experience elsewhere is that Friday afternoon is the worst time to find, and seek the assistance of, any kind of bureaucrat who is looking forward to his “weekend of freedom” from his daily drudgery. Wasn’t Monday soon enough for Williamson to act? Well, no. Why not? Because of “the imminent and threatening press campaign.” Well, why didn’t Fellay tell them, personally or through Thouvenot, that Nahrath was already out of the picture? Ah, you never thought of that line? Perhaps Fellay could have telephoned Krah, since he has widespread contacts and could have found the perfect bureaucrat to solve both Williamson’s and Fellay’s problem on the Friday? Oh! Fellay never thought of that.

A further posting will come in a few days relating to Krah and Der Spiegel, my work and travel permitting (Somebody tell Maximilian to bookmark this blog!). In the meantime, I leave you with this thought.

In the second and lesser-known statement of Fr. Thouvenot to the Bishops and District Superiors, it states in the penultimate paragraph: “We have high hopes that Mgr. Williamson will not commit an irreparable act by allowing himself to be used by political constituencies which make use of our holy religion for ends which are foreign to it.”

Of course, all priests and bishops should avoid being used for unacceptable and disreputable politics, and it should apply, therefore, as equally to the Zionist Lobby now working on the SSPX through Krah and his half-hidden clique as it must to the neo-Nazis. The big difference being, however, that the

latter is a barely existent sect that sells sensationalist newspapers for secularists, whilst the latter is a world-dominating force. SO: let your “yes” be “yes” and your “no” be “no”!



THIRD POST

BY CREDO ON BEHALF OF SOMEONE

Posted: Dec 9 2010, 04:51 PM

I was sent on the following by an individual who wishes to remain anonymous.

Dello Sarto AG

QUOTE

Timeline of Dello Sarto AG

Incorporation Date: 17-12-08

Company Start Date: 19-1-09

Board Members:

See: http://www.moneyhouse.ch/en/u/p/v/dello_sa...3.033.031-9.htm

Bernard Fellay

Emeric Baudot

Niklaus Pfluger

Maximilian Krah

Company Auditors:

19-1-09 to 8-6-10 Grant Thornton auditing AG

8-6-10 till present: Fidartis Revisions AG

Interesting facts about Fidartis Revisions AG:

One of the company's signature authority is a Mr. Peter Josef Müller

Some interesting facts regarding Mr. Peter Josef Müller :-

Director of Company: Laetitia AG since 29-5-09

Administration board signatory of Laetitia AG: Maximilian Krah (individual signatory)

Peter Josef Müller replaced Peter Hochstrasser on the Board of Fidartis Revisions AG on the 9-7-10 with him having Joint Signatory Authority. Furthermore, Dello Sarto AG appointed Fidartis

Revisions AG as auditors the month previous.

Can anyone see a potential issue here? There is an obvious red flag when an auditor has a close business relationship with a person who has a single signatory authority within the company that has appointed those auditors. Not suggesting anything inappropriate has occurred, except for the fact that this needs to be noted for any potential conflict of interests.

Now to move on to another “interesting” company. “STPI Société tradition Patrimoine Immobilier Sàrl”

Board of Directors: See: http://www.moneyhouse.ch/u/g/stpi_societe...1.031.472-9.htm (you may want to go through the google translate, unless you can read French)

CEO: Baudot Emeric

Managing Director: Bernard Fellay

Managing Director: Franz Schmidberger

Purpose (translated via google): “buying, selling, brokerage, management, promotion and enhancement of buildings, it can include making available of the Priestly Fraternity of Saint Pius X for his activities, and any real estate, management and administration of securities in any kind.”

You’d have to say that is a rather open purpose statement!

Recent Company change registers: Used google translate to convert from French. See original at:-

http://www.moneyhouse.ch/u/stpi_societe_tr...1.031.472-9.htm

Company Changes dated 19-11-10 (last month!)

” STPI Tradition Heritage Real Estate Company Sàrl, Lausanne, CH-550-1031472-9, real estate (FOSC of 14.10.2002, p. 13 / 683250). Statutes as amended November 9, 2010. Obligation to provide ancillary benefits, preferential rights, preemptive or exemption: for details, see the articles. The share capital of CHF 160,000 is now composed of 160 shares of CHF 1,000, held by Bernard Fellay, Schmidberger Franz, now in Stuttgart (Germany), Alfonso Genua Galarreta and Niklaus Pfluger, now Menzingen every four each with 40 shares of CHF 1,000 (above all with four each from CHF 40,000). Baudot Emeric was elected president of the managers. According to statement of 9 November 2010, the company is not subject to regular review and waives a limited revision.”

Interesting to say the least!

For your information, here are the companies that has “Bernard Fellay” registered as being on the boards:-

Connections

“ Bernard Fellay is currently working for these companies:

Association Iris (President since 15.01.2009) joint signature at two

Association Saint Pie X Notre Dame des Champs (President – since 15.02.1990 joint signature at two)

Association des Amis Suisses de Notre Dame de Fatima (President since 13.06.1994 joint signature at two)

Dello Sarto AG (Chairman since 19.01.2009 – Single Signature)

Hereditas (President since 10.09.2001 - joint signature at two)

Oratoire St. Joseph SA (Vice-Chairman since 28.04.1989 – Single Signature)

Priestly Fraternity of Saint Pius X. - General House (President since 14.03.2001 – Joint signature of two)

STPI Société Tradition Patrimoine Immobilier Sàrl (Managing Director since 14.10.2002 – Joint signature of two)

Cursory glance at the other companies not mentioned in detail previously, don’t indicate

anything out of the ordinary.

Some general observations:

Bishop Fellay has never been a Parish Priest. He was appointed Bursar General after his ordination in 1982, and continued to be Bursar General until his election as Superior General in 1994. He is an experienced businessman, and thus should be aware of company director obligations.

Two of his fellow senior Bishops, Bishop Williamson and Bishop Tissier de Mallerais do not appear to be on any boards representing SSPX assets, which indeed appears odd.

Whilst appropriate that companies are used to protect and manage the assets of large organizations, one has to wonder how these two companies detailed assist towards the mission of the FSSPX, when suitable companies had already been established to do this.



FOURTH POST

Posted by Veritas 1961 on December 18th, 2010

Re-reading recently the initial posting of William of Norwich, I came to realise that it was a positive gold mine of information. But, like gold mines, it was necessary to do a lot more digging so as to find the true nuggets of value present. Therefore, this posting may be quite long, but I hope that it will be fruitful and that it will serve the cause of truth.

The first thing that I would recommend to those who are disturbed or worried about the facts surrounding Krahgate is to take a look around the Emba-Global website in order to discover precisely what this Business School is all about. You may access it at www.emba-global.com

Here is how the sales pitch of this company starts:

“The EMBA-Global programme brings together an elite international network of business professionals. Through the world-renowned faculty and unique global curriculum they have exclusive access to the most illuminating ideas, ground-breaking research and innovative international business practices. Whether students choose EMBA-Global Americas and Europe or EMBA-Global Asia, together they will help create the future of global business.”
There is nothing unusual here folks, but take away with you that it is all about “going global.”

Under the section “Global Network” this idea is reinforced in this way:

“EMBA-Global students typically operate at an international level, working from different offices around the world, or managing teams in different locations. They represent an array of functions, sectors and nationalities. However, they share a keenness to challenge common perspectives and think on a global scale.”

Take away with you the idea that all those participating in this course are thinking globally and want to act globally.

Under the same section read this:

“On completing EMBA-Global, you become a life-long member of an exceptional, international alumni network totalling more than 75,500. Right from day one of the programme, you have access to this unparalleled pool of knowledge, business experience and networking opportunities.”

Take away with you the idea that this is no mere business school, but one that has as its intention to create a global managerial elite that will stay in touch with one another in the various businesses that their students embrace.

Under the section “Programme Details” read:

“Core courses are taught in a residential study block format that means you study over several consecutive days per month - alternating between London and New York.”

Take away with you the idea that you can drop in and see your friends fundraising for Tel Aviv University. Convenience itself – killing two birds (perhaps even Palestinians who are not “friends” of Tel Aviv University) with one stone!

From the same section read this:

“EMBA-Global has one intake each May and runs for 20 months.”

In the section on “Admission Requirements” please note:

“The calibre and diversity of EMBA-Global students is one of the key strengths that differentiates the programme from the world's other executive MBAs. The admissions process ensures that you will be studying alongside the brightest and the best.”

Take away with you the idea that this is the place to be for globalist wannabees.

In the same section, note some of the other requirements:

“a successful career trajectory with progressive experience over a number of years, managing people, projects, budgets or other resources.”

“transnational responsibilities or evidence that you are working towards these.”

“a worldwide perspective, with international exposure and aspirations, and an interest in building global networks.”

Go to the section on “Fees” and read:

The fees for the May 2011 intake of the EMBA-Global Americas and Europe programme are \$144,156* (the equivalent of roughly £93,000 or €110,000.)

Fees include:

- Tuition
- Course materials, including most textbooks
- Accommodation for all teaching blocks through the first three terms
- Accommodation for the required International Seminar or Assignment.**

The first * indicates that fees may change at any time. The second ** indicates “One International Assignment or Seminar is included in the tuition fee. You may take one additional Seminar or Assignment, provided seats are available. If you choose to undertake an additional International Assignment or Seminar, there is a fee of US\$4,000. Airfare for all study blocks and International Seminars and Assignments is the responsibility of the student.”

Needless to say, additional seminars and assignments are “encouraged” in order to boost your “networking experience.” But take away with you this idea: *that the fees are extortionate for a five term, twenty month course. However it should be noted that if you, or the company that you work for, has the money to undergo this training you are clearly one of “the brightest and the best.”*

Go and look at the section, Emba-Global Class of 2012, and look at the list of companies who have people registered on this course, which we are told leads to “friendships for life built through this intense transformational experience” - Citigroup, Maersk, MTV, Ericsson, HSBC Bank, Morgan Stanley, BNP Paribas, Goodyear, Cisco, Google, Microsoft, Nomura Holdings, CBS, Deutsche Bank, Hoffman La Roche, World Bank, BASF, Merrill Lynch, Barclays Bank, Royal Bank of Scotland, Credit Suisse.

One final point before we cut to the chase. Under “admission requirements,” it says:

“Employer support for the time you will be out of the office is required to apply to the programme. You must provide a signed letter from an authorised person within your company stating that they agree to allow you the required time away from the office to complete the programme. The authorised person may be your department head, president, CEO or head of HR.”

I regret that the run-up to the point has been lengthy, but the background is vital in understanding the portrait being painted. We are, naturally, coming to understand the background of Mr. Kraus as a member of the Emba-Global Class of 2012.

In the Class of 2012 mug shots that you can access online, you will see that a standard format has been used: the student’s name, the student’s nationality, the student’s professional position, and then the company worked for. This is where things become interesting for avid students of Krausgate.

Max gives his name and nationality and profession, the latter being “lawyer.” The obvious company that ought to appear here is the legal firm of which he is a partner:

Link: Fetsch Rechtsanwälte <http://www.dasoertliche.de/?id=10700323337...&arkey=14612000>

Surprisingly it is not. Well then, ought it not to be Dello Sarto given that he is listed as the Manager of that company?

Link: Dello Sarto AG
<http://translate.google.co.uk/translate?hl...D813%26prmd%3Db>

It ought to be, but it is not. He lists as his employer the **Jaidhofer Privatstiftung**, the private Austrian Foundation, founded in 2006 by the SSPX. Why this choice? There must be a reason, but there cannot be many. Could it be that his legal business is not doing well, or could it be that alongside Citigroup, Microsoft and Credit Suisse, it looks rather puny, specially for someone who clearly wants to be among “the brightest and the best”? Whatever the reason, why not Dello Sarto given that he is listed as the Manager of that newly minted entity? Perhaps it too does not cut the ice? Why? Perhaps we need to scroll up a page or two to remind ourselves of something – that one of the entry requirements is “a successful career trajectory with progressive

experience over a number of years, managing people, projects, budgets or other resources.” Clearly, for poor Max to get into the circle of “the brightest and the best” he had to demonstrate that he had wide experience and was used to handling “budgets” [*meaning serious money*] and it is plain that his peers at Deutsche Bank, Morgan Stanley and the rest have that experience in aces.

Go back to Emba-Global Class of 2012 and read the profiles of any selection of the students, and you should be struck by one thing: ***that the Jaidhofer Privatstiftung looks totally out of place if it is just a small business legal structure to aid the growth of the SSPX.*** When Max sat down to fill out his online application form, he would have been forced to choose the business structure that presented him to his potential Emba-Global colleagues in the best possible light.

One thing is for sure. ***Given that the Jaidhofer Privatstiftung is listed as his employer it means per his application*** - “Employer support for the time you will be out of the office is required to apply to the programme. You must provide a signed letter from an authorised person within your company stating that they agree to allow you the required time away from the office to complete the programme. The authorised person may be your department head, president, CEO or head of HR” – ***THAT SOMEONE AT THE HEAD OF THIS SSPX FOUNDATION AUTHORISED KRAH’S ADMISSION TO THE PROGRAMME.***

This undeniable fact – because like so much else that has been brought to light ***is in the public domain*** – leads to a number of questions:

1. Who in authority signed this letter?
2. Why was he given this letter?
3. What possible benefit could the SSPX hope to gain by enrolling this Zionist agent on a massively expensive course designed for recruitment to a global managerial elite in thrall to the New World Order and its worship of Mammon?
4. Did Krah pay for this course out of his own pocket or did the Foundation pay?
5. If he did, is the Jaidhofer Privatstiftung paying for his time when he is not working for them?

But the big question is this: ***WHAT IS THE JAIDHOFER PRIVATSTIFTUNG, AND WHY DID KRAH BELIEVE THAT THIS WOULD LOOK GOOD ON HIS APPLICATION TO EMBA-GLOBAL? THIS IS THE SIX MILLION DOLLAR QUESTION: WHAT IS THE JAIDHOFER PRIVATSTIFTUNG, AND WHAT WAS THERE ABOUT IT THAT CONVINCED THE EMBA-GLOBAL CROWD THAT MAX WAS ONE OF THEIR KIND? ANSWER THAT QUESTION, AND WE MAY BE CLOSE TO ANSWERING WHY A ZIONIST HAS SO MUCH CONTROL OF THE SSPX’S FINANCES AND WHY THE SPIRIT OF ARCHBISHOP LEFEBVRE HAS BEEN INCREASINGLY AND OBVIOUSLY PUSHED ASIDE IN FAVOUR OF AN INDULT-LIKE “TRADITIONALISM”***



POSTSCRIPT

Credo posted the following recently on the Krahgate File from an anonymous source, but one that can be substantiated by a Google search:

Posted: Dec 9 2010, 04:51 PM

Dello Sarto AG

Timeline of Dello Sarto AG

Incorporation Date: 17-12-08

Company Start Date: 19-1-09

Board Members:

See: http://www.moneyhouse.ch/en/u/p/v/dello_sa...3.033.031-9.htm

Bernard Fellay
Emeric Baudot
Niklaus Pfluger
Maximilian Krah

Company Auditors:

19-1-09 to 8-6-10 Grant Thornton auditing AG

8-6-10 till present: Fidartis Revisions AG

Interesting facts about Fidartis Revisions AG:

One of the company's signature authority is a Mr. Peter Josef Müller

Some interesting facts regarding Mr. Peter Josef Müller :-

Director of Company: Laetitia AG since 29-5-09

Administration board signatory of Laetitia AG: Maximilian Krah (individual signatory)

Peter Josef Müller replaced Peter Hochstrasser on the Board of Fidartis Revisions AG on the 9-7-10 with him having Joint Signatory Authority. Furthermore, Dello Sarto AG appointed Fidartis Revisions AG as auditors the month previous.

Whoever the anonymous source was, I thank you for your diligence in getting to the root of what is becoming more and more of an enigma. For the record, I would like to draw the attention of readers to the following small, but significant, points.

1. Both Muller and Krah joined the Board of Laetitia AG on May 29, 2009, and both have individual signatory rights. In fact the company was actually registered commercially *on that very day*.
2. The address of Laetitia AG is given as c/o Bader Law Firm, Grafenauweg 6, 6304, Zug/Train,

Switzerland. “Zug” is the German for the town, “Train” the French name.

3. Interestingly, the address of Dello Sarto, of which Krah is the named Manager, is exactly the same as that of Laetitia AG. Moreover, when you click on “Contact” for Dello Sarto or for Laetitia AG at <http://www.moneyhouse.ch> you find that there is no telephone number, fax number, email address or website listed.
4. In other words, Laetitia was commercially registered as a company in Switzerland **just ten days before** Fidartis Revisions AG took over as auditors of Dello Sarto AG, and Muller joined the board of Fidartis just **one month later**. A lot of legal/commercial work in such a short time.

If you wish to check out most of the details on companies given here, go to <http://www.moneyhouse.ch> and type whatever it is you need to confirm.

5. A Google search for “Bader Law Firm, Switzerland” brings up nothing obvious, but google “BADERTSCHER Rechtsanwälte AG (Zurich)” and you will find it at

<http://www.internationallawoffice.com/directory/Detail.aspx?g=54fb281c-b6db-4ad3-ad47-4d5d5e739909>.

Here is the content of the page. Please read it through to the end in order to grasp that the company associated with the SSPX-affiliate Dello Sarto is one more of those who are dedicated “to global interests and networks.”

BADERTSCHER Rechtsanwälte AG (Zurich)

- **Address**
Muhlebachstrasse 32
PO Box 769
Zurich CH 8024
- **Country**
Switzerland
- **Phone**
41 44 266 20 66
- **Fax**
41 44 266 20 70
- **Email**
info@b-legal.ch
- **Website**
www.b-legal.ch
- **Offices**
[Zug](#), Zurich
- **Languages**
English, French, German, Hebrew, Italian

Work Areas

[Administrative & Public Law](#), [Administrative Law](#), Antitrust, [Arbitration & Litigation](#), [Banking](#), [Banking & Finance](#), [Bankruptcy](#), [Capital Markets](#), [Civil Law](#), [Commercial Law](#), [Company & Commercial](#), [Competition](#), [Construction](#), [Contract](#), [Corporate & Commercial](#), [Corporate Law](#), [Corporate/Commercial](#), [Data Protection](#), [E-commerce](#), [Employment](#), [Energy](#), [Environmental Law](#), [Estate Planning](#), [Estate Planning & Administration](#), [Finance](#), [Health Care](#), [Information & Communication Technology](#), Information Technology, [Inheritance Law](#), [Insolvency](#), [Insurance](#), [Insurance & Reinsurance](#), [Intellectual Property](#), [International Private Law](#), [Liability](#), [Litigation](#), [Mergers & Acquisitions](#), Penal Litigation, [Private Client](#),

[Public Law](#), [Tax](#), [Technology Law](#), [Telecommunications](#), [Transaction Law](#)