

April '82

+

ARCHBISHOP MARCEL LEBEVRE
April 1982 - Conference with the seminarians
ST. THOMAS AQUINAS SEMINARY, RIDGEFIELD, CONN.

Subject: "Concerning the Unity in the Society"
(Reproduced from a tape recording):

"I am very happy to meet with you and speak with you, as I did in Ecône and Zeitskoffen. Each time I do some conferences for the seminarians. It is very important while I am still alive, that the young priests and seminarians know the motive (our attitude) of our life in the Church, in this time of great confusion. It is very difficult in these times to pick the good way (the Catholic attitude) in the Church. You know that. Perhaps for some of you, you had some difficulty in choosing the right way, to choose the right seminary. And I think that if you have chosen the seminary of St. Pius X, it is because you think we are right in the spirit of the Fraternity. And you know that we are always between 2 ways (between 2 extremes)."

ONE EXTREME

"For some priests and seminarians, they think the attitude of the Fraternity is too hard and outside the bishops and hierarchy of the Church. This mentality is: 'that it is better to accept some of the reforms (of Vat. II)...because they come from the pope and from Rome and all bishops accept this reform and they cannot be very bad.' This is impossible, and I said to them: 'If you think so, then you cannot remain in the Fraternity. It is impossible. You must choose either the spirit of the Fraternity or accept the reform of Vat. II.' They preferred to go outside the Fraternity."

"Two professors, one in Zeitskoffen, and one at Ecône, preferred to leave the Fraternity and begin to say the New Mass and New Office. What a pity that this Father at Ecône did...he had some influence over some of the Italian seminarians there...and he influenced them to leave. It was a very great pity and great sadness for us because I had great hopes for priests for Italy... Italy needs many many traditional and true priests. The seminaries in Italy are very very bad. All seminaries there are modernist. In the parishes it is not so bad, because some of the older priests are conservative and good. But perhaps more than in France, Switzerland, Poland, and Belgium, that the situation of seminaries in Italy perhaps is worse, worse than the other countries. Many seminaries are closed. The seminary in Turrain (sp?) with 300 rooms is closed. No seminarians. So they need good priests and it was very sad for us to lose these Italian seminarians at Ecône. In Zeitskoffen, the professor left, but took no seminarians with him."

THE OTHER EXTREME

"There is also another tendency...some young priests and seminarians, they think that it is necessary to do the Ritual without recognizing the pope, cardinals, bishops, etc...i.e., no more Catholic Church now...it is finished...and so we must abandon all these people and do a new Church, i.e., a Catholic Church but outside of Rome, far from Rome. And so some young priests, 3 years ago, left the Fraternity because I said that that (their proposition) is impossible. I cannot say that Rome does not exist now...no Rome, no cardinals, no bishops,...etc. It is impossible that Jesus Christ would abandon His Church into such a situation. It is impossible!"

"Where are we going if we have no more pope, bishops, cardinals, or Church?? If no more visible Church? Where is the Church if this is so?"

"And so we can see that these priests found another Church. No more Catholic Church. Now some priests receive consecration as bishops. They are having some meeting with Fr. McKenna and 6 other priests and some bishop (i.e., bishop Thuc) and he ordains other bishops. They had a meeting and perhaps in some weeks or months ahead they will choose another pope. That is a logical conclusion of this tendency. It is very very dangerous!"

"Fr. G---, a dominican priest, was a friend of Ecône...he gave good spiritual conferences and spiritual exercises at Ecône. But always he said: "No Pope...he does not exist." I said: "That is not true. You cannot say that." And so now he...is with Palmar de Troya in Spain...because he thinks perhaps the true pope is in Palmar de Troya...yes, yes! A great theologian thinks this! He is a very intelligent man...very extraordinary..."

"Your place is not in the Fraternity"

"The consequence of this tendency is schism with Rome, saying Rome is finished. That is absolutely impossible. I do not accept that! A young priest said: 'I do not recognize the pope...no pope in Rome...and I cannot pray for the pope.' (With this attitude): Your place is not in the Fraternity. Not in the Fraternity. Because we must pray for the pope (said emphatically)...because the pope is bad...his spirit is bad, is liberal...it is not that we say the pope has good doctrine and is traditional...no. But it is a big difference between saying "the pope is not good" and saying, "he does not exist".

"In the history of the Church you have some examples of holy men who speak against the pope...but they recognized him as the pope...and they said to the pope, "you have no right to do that...no right..." St. Paul did this with St. Peter...St. Paul said to St. Peter: "You have no right to do that...you do not walk in the way of the Gospel...you are against the Gospel..."

"We in this time, we must do that and say: "You have no right to give a new Mass and new catechism...you have no right to destroy the Catholic Church..." They know that...they know that. But the time is coming when they will say: "...yes we are doing wrong..." But they will not say this now. Perhaps they will admit their guilt in 2 years, or 3 years, or 35 years, I do not know. God knows. But they know now they do a very bad thing in the Church. But they do not recognize that the bad thing comes from the council of Vatican II. When I said that to the pope or cardinals in Rome, they said: "...no, no, you cannot say that...certainly there are many things wrong in the Church, many things bad...but we cannot say Vatican II is not good, that the New Mass is bad..." But I said just that to them: "I am sure that the New Mass is bad. I am sure that Vat. II is a bad spirit. There are some things in Vat. II that are good but especially on 'Religious Liberty' we cannot accept such a declaration...it is impossible."

THE TRUE WAY

"Now you can see how it is very difficult for you and me and for all the priests of the Fraternity to choose the True Way, the way of God, the way of the Catholic Church. I think that the priests

that do as Fr. Compani (who left with the Italian seminarians from Ecône), or as Fr. G---...they choose the bad way. To Fr. Compani, I wrote: "Now you choose the way to destroy the Church...when you say the New Mass you help in destroying the Church..." Also, 5 or 6 new priests abandoned the Fraternity in France (because they do not believe in the pope) and I said to them: "You do a schism... you have no more Church...it is finished! For you there is no Church...who represents the Church? Nobody. It is finished!" "

"It is very difficult to know the thing we must refuse and the thing we must accept. It is very difficult. In the story of the Reform, from Church History, we must say that they (the saints) remained conformed to the Tradition of the Church and the Theology of the Church...and that is very difficult. Now, it is impossible to accept 'this' or 'that' because it is against the Tradition and Theology of the Church."

"So we must be careful. Do not judge with sentimental judgment, but judge with reason and good sense, with the sense of the Faith, because it is evident that modernism is not only the error of this day alone...because St. Pius X condemned it after it had existed perhaps about 2 centuries. And so the influence of modernism in the Church, and the effects we see in the Church, make it dangerous for us...we must be very careful not to refuse obedience when we have no right to refuse obedience, and know when we have a right and a duty to refuse obedience."

"Thus, in the Fraternity, Ecône is the example of our attitude, or our actions and judgments in this time of the confusion in the Church."

DEVIATIONS FROM ECÔNE

"I am afraid, i.e., I can say that I am afraid that I know that in some seminaries (of the Society) they change the custom of Ecône. If we choose a certain act in Ecône it is not without reason, without a motive. And so I think in this time when there is so much confusion, if we begin to change here, e.g., in Albano, they do some new rule (or rubrics), or in Zeitskoffen, or here (in Ridgefield), ...where is the unity?? Slowly, slowly,, although you do something that is not so very important, slowly slowly, perhaps we may realize a division in the Fraternity. That would be very sad. Our fortitude, our strength...we are strong because of our unity. Because the Fraternity has a superior general, not because I am superior general, but because you have a superior general. I hope, while I am still alive, I can see with my own eyes the new superior general, my successor...(laughingly): ...yes...why not? I think that it would be a good thing to have...at least a Vicar General...while I am still alive...and if I get sick or die, then he who was nominated by the districts will take over and continue the Fraternity...its very important that you have continuity in the Fraternity."

THE GOOD CATHOLIC SENSE

"Many people come to the Fraternity. This morning I saw more people come to Mass here at the seminary, more that I have seen ever before...it is a very good thing. Why do these faithful come here? They are more or less afraid of this tendency of, e.g., Fr. Fenton, Fr. McKenna, or others. They are afraid of them. The faithful have

the good sense to judge these men to be wrong and that they have no right (to do what they have done). But the Fraternity is a strong organization of the Church. The faithful know that we follow the good way, i.e., the Catholic Church ...we do not like to go outside of the Catholic Church, but we remain in the Church...and they know that I am going to Rome to speak with the pope and the cardinals...they know that and they like that. "

"If some faithful follow some of these priests (e.g. "Sede Vacante" priests), that teach: 'no more pope in Rome', the number of these followers are very few. It is the same everywhere (i.e., very few followers), not only in America, but everywhere. If today we began to say in the Fraternity that there is no more pope, no more cardinals, no more priests, many people would abandon us."

"They have the sense (good sense). They know that it is possible to have some objection against the direction of the pope... they know! They are not against us when we are against the reform of Vatican II...they are with us...but not if we abandon the Catholic Church...no, no. It is very very important to know this fact."

THE BREVIARY OF POPE JOHN XXIII

"I know that for some of you and some of the professors here, it is very difficult to change the breviary, the office, and take the breviary edited by Pope John XXIII. But you know that this reform is not truly of Pope John XXIII. It was done during the pontificate of Pope Pius XII. Myself, I know that because when I was apostolic delegate in Dakar, and when I was going to the episcopal conference in Mada-gascar...in West Africa, etc., for the episcopal conferences, I received a letter from Rome to speak with the bishops in Africa to ask questions about the reform of the breviary, during the pontificate of Pope Pius XII."

"I know that there are some things that are not very good (in the Pope John XXIII breviary)...but there are some things good in it. For example, with the centuries, the popes canonized many saints. More and more feasts were created and they took the place of the Temporal Cycle...do you understand? If you have many feasts, feasts, feasts, each day we say always the office of some feast, and no more the Mass of the Temporal...and this Mass, especially the Masses of Lent, are very ancient and magnificent, full of the doctrine of penance and of the Redemption of Jesus Christ. They are very good Masses. And so with this reform of Pope Pius XII, during all of Lent we can say these ancient Masses, and that is a good thing; that is not a bad thing. But I know, e.g., the suppression of the Octave of the Epiphany is a pity...it was very nice, a big feast. But we cannot say that it is a sign of modernism. To say that it is a sign of modernism is too exaggerated. You know that in June, for example, in the breviary before Pius XII we have certain days, 3 or 4 octaves in the same time, and we do the commemoration of the Sacred Heart, of St. John Baptist, of Corpus Christi, etc.... 3 or 4...it is too much."

"It is very important to conserve the Temporal cycle. And as to the reform of Pope Pius XII to the new translation of Psalms...Pope John XXIII was against that. He said that. I heard that myself from Pope John XXIII that he was against the new psalter."

"Thus, we cannot say always: 'that is modernist, this is modernist, that is modernist.' Perhaps it was that certain men when in doing this reform of the breviary, in their minds they intended it to be the preparation of a future reform that is modernist. But to say that this reform (edited under Pope John XXIII) was modernist, I think that is exaggerated. I do not think it is modernist. We cannot say that it is."

"You know that in the breviary, what is the most important thing? It is not the lessons (of Matins)...but it is the psalms. That is the very traditional prayer, the psalms, and all psalms (in the Pope John XXIII breviary) remain intact. No change of the psalter. We say in one week all 150 psalms (when we pray the Pope John XXIII breviary), and that is what is important in the breviary. That is what Pope St. Pius X said. When Pope Pius X did his (liturgical) reform, he said, the basis of the breviary is the psalms."

"I think that it is very good if we can pray in the same manner in all our houses. I give you an example where there is difficulty over this: In St. Mary's, Kansas, I sent 3 sisters last year to Kansas. They are accustomed to pray the breviary of Pope John XXIII. They arrived in Kansas. In all our houses, the sisters pray with the priests, with the brothers, and sometimes some of the faithful likewise pray with them. When they arrived in Kansas, Fr. Collins and Fr. Berry, pray with the old breviary. So they cannot pray with them...the sisters say their prayer in the convent and the Fathers say their prayer in the Church...they cannot pray together. That is a pity. I think that it is very important, i.e., that the sisters, the fathers, the brothers, and the whole community pray together, all the prayers...so that there is a unity in the community, unity in the prayer, a unity in the Mass, a unity in Communion, etc., all this unity is very very important...and many good consequences result in the life of the Community from such a unity."

"Now the 3 deacons I will ordain tomorrow, should I raise them to the priesthood next year, along with the one, DeLallo, at Ecône, there will be 4 new priests for America...if, e.g., 2 of these are stationed at the same priorate and if one says: 'ah no, no, I can say the old breviary only', and another says: 'ah no, no, I take the breviary, the new breviary, the breviary of the Fraternity...', then there are 2 priests who cannot pray together...what a pity. Thus begins a division in the Fraternity. This cannot be. I think that before you receive another superior general, I think it is very important that I give to my successor a unified society..."

"That is for the breviary and it is the same for other things as well. We must preserve the Tradition as we have in Ecône and all the other seminaries...That is the reason why I ask Fr. Debruk (sp?) to put together the 'diurnal' ...it is very well prepared... and so we publish the diurnal with all the hours from Lauds to Compline. And so if we do another book with Matins, we will have a complete breviary. It will be a good thing because it is always more and more difficult to find a good breviary. I like you to maintain strength in unity here at the seminary."

CONCERNING ROME

"Cardinal Seper died in December (1981) and now Cardinal Ratzinger is in charge of the Congregation of the Faith. The pope chose him to be intermediary between Rome and the Fraternity."

"When I was in Rome, I phoned for Cardinal Ratzinger to see if he would meet with me and he said yes. I spoke with him for 1 hour and 45 minutes...we discussed as always about the same things."

"Before, perhaps one or two years ago, the first question they always put to me was: 'You are against the pope'. I answered, 'No, I pray for the pope; our seminaries pray for the pope, etc. But we are against certain ideas of the pope.' Now the problem is finished. They know now we are not against the pope...but we are against some actions and ideas of the pope's, yes."

"The second charge was always: 'But you are against the Council of Vatican II.' I said, 'I am not against the Council itself, but I am against many things said and done in the Council.' I refused to sign 2 decrees: 'Religious Liberty' and 'Gaudium et Spes'. The other decrees I signed, but I know and I said that if I know before that the reform come from the Liturgy, I do not sign in the council; but I know that it was passive from this decree that we have so bad a reform."

"You know that the pope said (3 weeks after his nomination) we must judge the council in the light of Tradition. Perhaps he feels we must accept all the decrees and interpret this decree by the light of Tradition. But he does not say this. He says we can accept the light of Tradition to judge what we must accept and what we must refuse. Because our rule is the magisterial teachings of 20 centuries...Tradition."

"In the council, when some Father asked Mgr. Felici, the Secretariat of the Council, what was the Theological note of the Council, he said: 'This Council is a pastoral council, not dogmatic.'"

"Secondly, if the Council defined something as infallible, it is infallible. But he does not say that anything was infallibly defined. Thus nothing is infallible in the Council."

"Thirdly, we must judge the texts by the Norm of Theological Interpretation, i.e., with Traditional Theology. I had no objection to this note of the Council and I told Cardinal Ratzinger this!"

"At this point, it is different. Before they said: 'You must accept today's teaching of the Church and not judge it by what was taught before.' That is impossible, that is modernist! But no more do they say this to me now. Slowly, slowly, I think that with patience, strength, and fortitude, they accept what we stand for. But there is still one obstacle left. They cannot accept our stand on the liturgy, i.e., that we say that the New Mass and the New Reform is bad."

CHANGES IN THE DIVINE OFFICE MADE BY PIUS XII **

1. Simples are reduced to commemorations.
2. Semi-doubles are suppressed, henceforth are only of simple rite.
3. The following Sundays are to be celebrated under the double rite of first class: the four Sundays of Advent; all Sundays from the first Sunday of Lent to Low Sunday inclusive; Pentecost Sunday.
4. All Octaves have been suppressed with the exception of Christmas, Easter and Pentecost. The days within these octaves are elevated to double rite.
5. Only the following have first Vespers: feasts of first and second class; all Sundays; any feast of our Lord occurring on a minor Sunday.
6. Dominical prayers, Suffrage of the Saints, and Commemoration of the Cross have been suppressed.
7. Ferial prayers - said at Vespers and Lauds only and then only on the following days: Wednesdays and Fridays in the ferial office of Advent, Lent and Passiontide; on all ember days, with the exception of the ember days of Pentecost when the ferial office is said. The rubrics of the Breviary, prescribing their recitation at other times also, are abrogated as of January 1st, 1956.

**Taken from "Matters Liturgical"

24 April 83

ARCHBISHOP MARCEL LEFEBVRE
April 24, 1983 - Conference with the seminarians of
ST. THOMAS AQUINAS SEMINARY
(Reproduced from a tape recording):

<u>Conference #1:</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.	"I cannot give ordinations to you"	1.1
2.	"NON SERVIAM"	1.1
3.	THE UNVEILING - SEDITION	1.1
4.	ON THE POPE	1.2
5.	THE CATHOLIC PRINCIPLE	1.2
6.	"Divino Afflatu" (Pope St. Pius X)	1.3
7.	"It is Pope Pius XII' Reform"	1.4
8.	"THE SURPRISE"	1.5
9.	"THE RUPTURE"	1.5
	i. "I was tolerant for them..they are intolerant for me..."	
10.	TWO EXTREMES: { i. PROGRESSIVISM ii. SEDE VECANTEISM	1.5
11.	ROME IS OCCUPIED BY MODERNISM	1.6
12.	FR. SANBORN: "...has taught you against the Fraternity..."	1.6
13.	"I don't like to go against my brothers"	1.7
14.	NO COMPROMISE: THE LETTER TO POPE JOHN PAUL II	1.7
	i. To celebrate the Tridentine rite.....	1.8
	ii. To reform the N.O.M.--Make it Catholic.....	1.8
	iii. Reform the Council -- Make it Catholic.....	1.8
	a. These Truths - denied and contradicted since Vat.II	
	iv. The Social Kingship of Jesus Christ.....	1.9
	v. My one desire - Salus animarum!	1.9
	vi. I cannot sign anything that attacks the Faith.....	1.9

"It seldom happens that one can do good without
any trouble..."

-St. Vincent de Paul

ARCHBISHOP MARCEL LEFEBVRE
 April 24, 1983 - Conference with the seminarians of
 ST. THOMAS AQUINAS SEMINARY

"I cannot give ordinations to you"

"My dear seminarians, I am always very happy to meet you and to stay with you in your seminary. I do not know myself how many times I have come...to Armada, and here...to meet you and your professors. It was always for me a pleasure. I have sought many times to give you ordinations; that is the principal gift to receive in the seminary. But you know that today I cannot give ordination to you. Why? You know that."

NON SERVIAM

"I cannot give ordination because in November (1982), I gave the priesthood to 3 of you, i.e., 3 young deacons, and I think in January...at the end of January, when I asked young Fr. Zapp to go to St. Mary's to help Fr. De LaTour, he said, 'No. I cannot go to St. Mary's. I refuse to go to St. Mary's.' For me it was very sad and very bad...a young priest, the first priest (to do this in the Society)...I ask him to go...and he said: 'I refuse'. Why?? Why refuse? Why? He said: 'I cannot go to St. Mary's, because at St. Mary's they have the rite (liturgy) of Pope John XXIII.'"

THE UNVEILING: - SEDITION

"Well, this liturgy is the liturgy of Ecône. It is the liturgy I myself have been using now for 20 years. It is a liturgy we use, more or less, everywhere in the Fraternity."

"But this fact, this refusal of Fr. Zapp's was an unveiling of another thing more important...(of something far graver)...more sad. For I know as he said to me (himself) that he was supported by the director of the seminary (Fr. Sanborn). And so if the director of seminary of Ridgefield helps the seminarians to disobey to the Superior General of the Fraternity, then where are we going? Then what is the seminary? He (Fr. Zapp) is the first priest I ordain here... these 3 young priests (I ordained), who were here for all of their studies...(the first fruits of this seminary)...the first to refuse to go to the place (I assigned him) because he refused the liturgy of that place."

"The director (himself) of the seminary...he agreed with this young priest...that is impossible! Not only the director of the seminary was agreed with this young priest, but some professors and some priests from the Northeast District. They say (they agreed with Fr. Zapp) because the liturgy of Pope John XXIII is not good. And so they condemn it...they condemned me...and they condemned Ecône...How is this possible???...that they condemn the bishop who gave them their ordinations? When these priests, all of them, were at Ecône, they accepted this liturgy. When I gave them ordination, with the liturgy of Pope John XXIII (i.e., ordained in the liturgy of Pope John XXIII), they accepted this liturgy...they accepted it during 2 years, 3 years, etc.,...they accepted it during all that time. When they left Ecône, they changed, and they took another orientation. They decided to abandon what was practiced at Ecône and to keep (solely) to the liturgy of St. Pius X."

+

ON THE POPE

"Now, not only do they dispute about the liturgy, but also about the pope...you know that some of these priests...they are, in their hearts, against the fact that there is a pope in Rome. They say that there is no pope in Rome, no pope in the Church, no Cardinals in Rome, no more hierarchy in the Church. In their hearts they say all sacraments in the new reform...all sacraments, they are invalid. And so they show that 'their spirit' is not the same as my spirit and my teaching. The teaching I have always given in my seminaries, in Ecône, in Zeitskoffen, in Buenos Aires, in Albano, its the same...I do not change...I cannot change. (This spirit of theirs), that is very very very sad."

"Certainly we are agreed in many doctrines, these priests and I. We have the same doctrine about the Church, about theology, i.e., we follow St. Thomas Aquinas in philosophy, in theology, etc. But to interpret the situation of the Church now, we have not the same meaning, nor the same thinking. This is very dangerous, i.e., the way they follow is very very dangerous. You know that there are other priests in the world, in France, in America, in Mexico, in Dutch-land, Germany,...there are some priests who follow the same dangerous way. They say: 'No more pope; no more...all sacraments are invalid, etc.' But now they are going, slowly, slowly, into SCHISM. That is very dangerous...very dangerous."

THE CATHOLIC PRINCIPLE

"What is the first principle to know what we must do in this circumstance, in this crisis in the Church? What is my principle? The principle of the Church is the principle of St. Thomas Aquinas. It is not my choice; its not my favor; its not my personal desire... I am nothing...I merely follow the doctrine of the Church...and this doctrine is expounded by St. Thomas Aquinas...So what does St. Thomas Aquinas say about the authority in the Church? When can we refuse something from the authority of the Church? PRINCIPLE: 'Only when the Faith is in question.' Only in this case. Not in other cases... only when the Faith is in question...and that is found in the Summa Theologica: II II Q.33, a.4, ad 2m:

St. Thomas' answer is that we cannot resist to the authority; we must obey: "Sciendum tamen est quod ubi immineret periculum fidei." Periculum fidei, i.e., the danger to our faith..."etiam publice essent praelate a subditis arguendi.", i.e., the subject can be opposed to the authority if the Faith is in question ("periculum fidei"); "Unde et Paulus, qui erat subditus Petro, propter imminens periculum scandali circa fidem, Petrum publice arguit," i.e., St. Paul opposed St. Peter because it was a danger for the Faith (cf. Galatians 2:11)."

"That is the principle (of St. Thomas), and I cannot harbor another motive to resist the Pope...it is very serious to be opposed to the Pope, and to the Church. It is very serious, and if we think that we must do that, we must do it (resist the Holy Father) only to preserve our Faith, and not for any other motive."

"We must now do an application of the principle. For me I think that the liturgical reform of Pope John XXIII has nothing against

the Faith. You can take the Pontificale, the Rituale, the Breviary, the Roman Missal, and...what is in these books of Pope John XXIII that is against the Faith? Nothing! And so ((in an urgent tone)); ...I cannot refuse this book (of Pope John'), because he is the pope, and the pope gave me this book (and I must obey). It is quite another thing with the reform of Pope Paul VI...in this book of reform of Pope Paul VI is a very grave danger to my Faith...it is precisely: "Periculum Fidei". So I refuse it, because Ecumenism is the idea and motive of this reform...and this Ecumenism...they say themselves, i.e., Pope Paul VI, Bugnini, etc., all say the motive of their reform is Ecumenism, and this Ecumenism takes away all (Catholic) things which are displeasing to the Protestant. That is incredible! In our books of Catholic Liturgy? And not only in the liturgy do they remove all that displeases them, but also in canon law, in the institution of the Church...But what displeases the Protestant? The doctrine, the Faith, the Catholic Faith. The Sacrifice of the Mass, as Sacrifice, the Protestant cannot accept. If we ask to the Protestants they would verify to this...They were present (at the Council) and helped do this reform; and the definition of article 7 on the Mass, is a Protestant definition. So we cannot accept it! It is impossible!"

"I wrote to the Pope (John Paul II), ten days ago. I wrote that this reform is Ecumenism and this Ecumenism is bad, and I cannot accept it, and I cannot accept this Novus Ordo Mass. Thus my response is in the negative, because the Pope asked me to accept this New Mass. I said, 'No, I cannot accept the New Mass...never can I accept it.' If they do not change this 'New Mass', I cannot accept it. But I know the motive of the reform of Pope John XXIII. I have no reason (with the reform of Paul VI), but I have a reason and motive to accept (the reform of Pope John XXIII), because (this reform) uses the same principle (found in) 'Divino afflatu' (papal decree of Pope St. Pius X).

"Divino Afflatu"

"If you read this bull of Pope St. Pius X, to his liturgical reform, you will find the same principle that Pope John XXIII used for his reform. The first consideration of Pope Pius X is about the Psalter: he said, the psalter is the essential thing in the breviary...the psalms: 'Accedit quod in Psalmis mirabilis quaedam vis inest ad excitanda in animis omnium studia virtutum.' He has a consideration for the psalms, which is very magnificent! It shows that the heart of our breviary is this 'psalterium', and he has a citation of St. Augustine as well to support this. Thus, Pope St. Pius X says: 'Jure igitur optimo provisum est antiquitus et per decreta Romanorum Pontificem, et per canones Conciliorum, et per monasticas leges, ut homines ex utroque clero integrum Psalterium per singulas hebdomadas concinerent vel recitarent.' (Translation: 'Rightly therefore and most excellently as its been provided for from ancient times, and through the decrees of the Roman Pontiffs and through the canons of the Councils, and through monastic laws, that both men and clergy should, each week, sing or recite the entire psalter..')

"That is the Tradition, i.e., to say every week all the psalms ...that is an ancient rule in the Church...to say all the psalms in the week...and ((emphatically))that is the rule of Pope John XXIII.

So after he said how magnificent the prayer of the psalms are, he (Pope Pius X) said that with time we have many feasts of holy men ...many feasts...and they became so numerous that we could not say all the psalms in a week. So many bishops and cardinals asked for a diminishing of the feasts of the saints. (St. Pius X:)

"It is hardly remarkable therefore that many bishops in the world referred their wishes in this matter to the Apostolic See; above all at the Vatican Council (Vat.I,1870) when they asked this amongst other things, that as far as possible the old habit of reciting each week the whole psalter should be brought back. In such a way however, that for the clergy working in the vineyard of the Lord, there should not be imposed a heavier burden. With these desires and wishes which predated our own Pontificate, and which from then on was by our venerable brethren and by pious men were put forward, we indeed also thought that it should be granted, carefully however, lest, by the recitation of the entire psalter included all in one week, anything should fall away from the worship of the saints, or lest anything, on the otherside, the burden imposed on the clergy should be wearisome (i.e., the divine office)."

"And so they tried to conserve this rule, i.e., to say all the psalms in the week, and to have some feasts, but not so many that we always have the same psalms from the Common of feasts...and so it is the same rule followed by Pope John XXIII. Perhaps in some details, we can say it should be better, etc.; you know we have no important reason to refuse this reform."

"It is Pope Pius XII's Reform"

"In reality, this reform was done by Pope Pius XII, not Pope John XXIII. When I was Apostolic delegate in Rome, they asked me to have Episcopal Conferences, in Madagaskar, in Camarone (sp?), and the rest of French speaking Africa, and in Central Africa...at 4 Episcopal conferences, to ask the bishops about a reform of the breviary. You know that was during the Pontificate of Pope Pius XII."

"But these young priests say that 7 men who did this reform were the same ones who did the reform of Pope Paul VI. I said to them: 'That is not true'. Perhaps in the commission, it is possible that some of these men were there...perhaps Bugnini was a member of this commission (of Pope Pius XII). You know that during the Pontificate of Pope John XXIII, this pope...removed Msgr. Bugnini from his teaching post at the University of The Lateran. Pope John XXIII was against Bugnini. I knew the president of the commission who did this reform of Pope John XXIII...it was Msgr De Matto..., who was the Abbot of 'St. Paul outside the Walls'...he is still there at 'St. Paul's'...I know him very well and I speak many times with him. He was the president of the commission of reforming the liturgy, under the Pontificate of Pope John XXIII. He is very much a Traditionalist...very Traditional...and after, during the Council of Vatican II (under Pope Paul VI) he was put outside (removed) because he was a Traditionalist, and they replaced him by Msgr. Bugnini...that is true! That is a big change...a big change...it is not the same. It is not true to say that this reform of Pope John XXIII is the beginning of

the reform of Pope Paul VI...it is not true."

"So, I have said concerning this reform (of Pope John XXIII), we must obey the pope, especially since we have no reason to refuse it."

"THE SURPRISE"

"If I tolerated...and sometimes I know that some Fathers (after ordination at Ecône), they return to their countries, they use the old Liturgy of St. Pius X...I know that...and I tolerated it...but I was surprised that they changed (their attitude, towards) the liturgy we have at Ecône...but in the past these Fathers did not say they were against the liturgy of Ecône...they don't say that...and I thought (all along) they accepted the liturgy of St. Pius X and they likewise accept the liturgy of Pope John XXIII...but now, today, with this fact of Fr. Zapp ((his insubordination)), now I know...((said very distressedly)) now I know that they do not accept (the John XXIII liturgy), they refuse it! And they speak against this institution! That is true! I cannot accept that...that is a rupture...a division in the Fraternity."

"THE RUPTURE"

"How is this possible, that they accept what they are against in the Fraternity? And I think that it is very important to obey to the pope...this obedience is important...because, why don't they (for example) take another liturgy, like the Oriental Liturgy?...why don't they take the Coptic Liturgy?...or some other liturgy...why do they pick the liturgy of St. Pius X?...I have no reason (to disobey)." ((Point: It is not a matter of preference or taste, but a matter of obedience to legitimate authority)).

"And so they are now very intolerant. I was tolerant for them... and now they (the young priests) are very intolerant for me, intolerant for Ecône, and for the Fraternity...that is bad...a very sad situation. I said to them: 'I ask you to say...if you accept the liturgy we have at Ecône, and in the Fraternity, the liturgy in the beginning of the Fraternity, the liturgy in the Fraternity for 13 years.' I cannot continue to give you the priesthood...when after being ordained you then say: 'I refuse, I refuse the place you are assigning me to...' If this is the case, then there is no more opportunity in the Fraternity...it spells the end of the Fraternity.' Thus, I say to you (seminarians), if you do not accept this liturgy, I do not oblige you to use it...but by your refusal I cannot give you ordinations...you must ask for ordination in another place..."

TWO EXTREMES

PROGRESSIVISM

SEDE VECANTEISM

"Some people abandon the Fraternity on the Left (i.e., moving towards the left), and some abandon her moving towards the Right; Those who abandon the Fraternity on the Left, they now use the rite of the New Mass...they are Progressivists...they are not against Progressivism any more. Those who abandon us to the Right, for them, there is no more any relations with Rome, no more relation with the Church, and they look (for a pope elsewhere)...as in the case of Fr. G--, where he went to Spain to see if the famous 'Palmar De Troya', i.e., Clemente...he went there to see if Clemente is the True Pope! Because such

priests (who defect to the right) they look for authority; (by nature) they cannot remain without authority...because they have none...they have none."

ROME IS OCCUPIED BY MODERNISM

"We do not follow the pope, but he is the pope...he is the pope...but we do not follow him when we know he poses a danger to the Faith...that is the principle. When the pope poses no danger to our Faith, we have no problem...but we must admit that Rome is occupied by the Modernists; that is true, e.g., Casaroli, Bacio, the Secretary of the Congregation of the Faith, etc., all of them, they are modernists...and also the pope, he, during his life, he was influenced by the Modernists...he is Modernist, more or less, so he is not a strong pope. Perhaps, if it is possible that he cannot accept that we continue with the old-rite, with the old Mass, etc.

FR. SANBORN "...has taught you against the Fraternity"

"The Director has taught you...against the Fraternity. Now you can see that the situation here in America, in the seminary, in this district in the Northeast, is very confused...very confused. I never thought that we would arrive at this situation. If I knew this was going to happen, I would have done some prohibitions before, because now, the director of this seminary, along with some professors here have taught you against my attitude, against the attitude of Ecône, against the Fraternity...and thus there is no more authority..there is no more Fraternity...because that is what was this seminary' (mentality)...it is my seminary...I nominated Fr. Sanborn to be the Rector, and I did the nomination of these professors...and I gave you into the hands of these professors, and now they speak against me...this is impossible!"

"I am doing everything possible to preserve you, to preserve the Fraternity, to preserve the seminary; to save the seminary, to save your priesthood; But to say: 'I must change', ...we cannot continue, it is impossible...(...I cannot change...). They refuse to be confirmed in my attitude, they refuse. I spoke with Fr. Sanborn during 3 hours and he refused. What can I do? It is a very grave pity. So I cannot give you ordinations now, before I can know for sure if you are with the Fraternity, or against the Fraternity. I am going to wait for you to answer my question, 'yes', or 'no', you accept the liturgy of Pope John XXIII. If you say you refuse, well, your place is not here. Even if you refuse and prefer to go outside the Fraternity,...what can we do? I would prefer less people who are obedient...I tried to have unity in the Fraternity, which is our strength against Modernism...to fight against the Modernists, to fight against the Progressivists, to fight against the bad spirit of the whole world. To do this we must be strong. If somebody goes away (goes against the Fraternity), then there is no more unity and strength...we cannot fight...we cannot gain the victory (over the bad spirit in the world)."

"This situation is very sad because I thought that I was helping my priests, (since I gave them) all my prayers, all my spirit, all my heart. I gave all this to these priests...and they did good work. But it is a pity now...what will happen to the Faithful?...the poor Faithful, if they know that 5 or 6 or 7 priests are no more members

of the Fraternity of St. Pius X? What has happened? They will be bewildered to hear that it is true, these priests are not members of the Fraternity any more...((with great distress & heartache)); ...it is very sad, very sad for the faithful. I know these American faithful...they are very good people...and now...what can I do?"

"I don't like to go against my brothers"

"Perhaps it is my fault, because I waited too long...if I took this decision 3 or 4 years ago, perhaps the situation would not be as grave as now. But perhaps I am too lenient, too tolerant, too good to them, because I do not like to go against my brothers, my priests. So I tolerated them...I thought perhaps next year, or some time, things would change...but truly nothing has changed...its not better...in fact things have gotten worse with time."

"Thus, we must pray...we must pray. I hope, slowly, slowly, they can return in the good way, in the good progress of the seminary ...and I hope I can give you ordination. We need priests...but we do not need priests that disobey, no."

"I am very happy that one of these 3 Fathers (ordained in Nov. '82) accepted to help Fr. De LaTour in St. Mary's, i.e., Fr. Hunter. They are doing a very very good work there now...all the people now are very very happy with these 2 Fathers. I hope you take him as an example, i.e., that they would be for you an example."

"So, during these next days, I am waiting for your answer. I think that some of you, have given your answer to Fr. Sanborn. I hope that if you agree with me...I hope sincerely that you agree with me. You know the situation in the Church is so bad, so sad in the Church. If we are not very strong during this time, then what will happen to the Church? We must be united, we must be strong. I think that nobody can say I am ready to abandon the fight...that is not true. Somebody said that Msgr. Lefebvre is ready to do a compromise with Rome. Where is this compromise? Where? I shall read to you some lines of my answer to the pope. I always receive letters from Cardinal Ratzinger who is in charge to be the connection between the pope and the Fraternity. They say to me: 'If you accept the New Mass, we will give you the Old Mass.' That is the first time they say, '...we will give you the Old Mass...', because before they said: 'No, that is impossible to return in time to the Old Mass... no, never this Old Mass, never.' "

"NO COMPROMISE: THE LETTER TO POPE JOHN PAUL II"

April 5, 1983

Holy Father,

It is at the feet of the Crucifix that I am replying to you, Holy Father, united to all the bishops, priests, religious, nuns, and faithful, who have undergone a moral martyrdom by a forced imposing of this liturgical reform. How many tears, how many sorrows, how many premature deaths for which the responsibility lies with those who have wrongly imposed these changes worked in the name of a completely wrong Ecumenism. That is to say that my reply to the paragraph concerning the Novus Ordo Missae is 'negative'. The very authors of this reform have stated that its purpose was

Ecumenical, i.e., to say that it intended to suppress, without touching doctrine, what displeases our separated brothers... Now it is quite clear that what displeases our separated brethren is the doctrine of the Catholic Mass. So to satisfy them an equivocal or ambiguous Mass has been brought in, in which the Catholic doctrine has been faded out. How can we think that such a diminution of the expression of Faith has been inspired by the Holy Spirit? The definition of the Mass given in article #7 in the introduction to the Novus Ordo Missae, even when corrected shows quite clearly this diminution and even falsification of Catholic doctrine. Using this ecumenical Mass makes people acquire, and gives people a 'protestant' and 'indifferentist' mentality, placing all religions on a footing of equality, just as does the declaration on 'Religious Liberty', upon the doctrinal basis of the 'rights of man' and 'human dignity' wrongly understood, and condemned by St. Pius X in his letter on the 'Sillon'. The consequences of this state of mind or spirit spread within the Church, inside the Church, are deplorable, and are ruining and sapping the spiritual vitality of the Church.

In Conscience all we can do is turn priests and faithful away from using the Novus Ordo Missae if we wish that the complete and whole Catholic Faith remains still living. As for the first paragraph concerning the Council (Vat.II), I gladly accept to sign it in the sense that Tradition be the criterion in the interpretation of the documents, which is moreover, the meaning of the note of the Council on the subject of interpreting its texts. Because, it is evident that Tradition is not compatible with the declaration of 'Religious Liberty', according to the experts themselves, like Fathers Congar and John Courtney Muri(sp?).

Hence we see no other solution to this problem than as follows:

FIRSTLY - Freedom to celebrate according to the old rite in accordance with the edition of the Liturgical books promulgated by Pope John XXIII.

SECONDLY - A reform of the 'Novus Ordo Missae' to give it back the clear expression of Catholic dogma, the reality of the act of Sacrifice, and of the Real Presence, by an adoration more marked out..(and a clear distinction must be made) between the priesthood of the priest and the priesthood of the faithful, and to express clearly the propitiatory reality of the Sacrifice.

THIRDLY - We see no other solution than a reform of the statements or expressions of the Council which are contrary to the Official Magisterium of the Church, especially the declaration on 'Religious Liberty', and the declaration on 'The Church and The world,' on the declaration on 'Non-Christian religions,' etc.

It is vital to the Church to affirm by the Sacrifice of the Mass that there is no salvation except through the Sacrifice of Our Lord, Our only Savior, Our only Priest, Our only King. The Catholic religion is the only true religion. The other religions are false and carry souls into error and into sin. Only the Catholic religion was

founded by Our Lord Jesus Christ, and so we can be saved only by it. Hence the necessity for all souls to have a valid and fruitful Baptism, which makes them members of the Mystical Body of Our Lord.

Hence the urgency of the Social Kingship of Our Lord, inscribed in the constitutions in certain states to protect Catholic souls against the dangers of vice, and in order to favor the conversion of the people of those states for the salvation of their souls.

Now all of these Truths are henceforth implicitly denied or contradicted ever since the Vatican II Council, to the great delight of the enemies of The Church. It is urgent, most Holy Father, to bring these Truths back into honor. They are the very substance and reason for the being of the Church, the reason for the existence of the priesthood, the episcopacy, and of the papacy.

Most Holy Father, I have only one desire which has animated my whole life, 'to work for the salvation of souls in the most perfect submission to the successor of Peter, in accordance with the Catholic Faith that was taught me in my childhood, and at Rome in the eternal city.' Hence it is impossible for me to sign anything which attacks this Faith as is the case with this 'false ecumenism' and with this 'false religious liberty.' I wish to live and to die in the Catholic Faith, pledge of eternal beatitude. May your holiness be so kind as to believe in my respectful and filial sentiments,

In Jesus & Mary

+Marcel Lefebvre.

"So, no compromise. That is one of many many letters...but no results for the moment. Nothing. But, we try to do something... to see one day a return to Tradition in Rome, but...only God knows when. Now we must pray and ask God to continue...to continue our vocation, to continue the Church, to continue to save souls, to continue the True Tradition of the Catholic Church. That is the principle thing, and I hope that you have understood what all I have just said to you. I thank you for your attention."

25 April 83

+

ARCHBISHOP MARCEL LEFEBVRE
April 25, 1983 - Conference with the seminarians of
ST. THOMAS AQUINAS SEMINARY (Reproduced from a tape recording)

<u>Conference #2:</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. The new Rector - Fr. Williamson	2.1
2. On The Pope - Is he a pope?	2.1
i. The Virtue of Obedience	
3. Concerning Validity of the New Rite Sacraments ...	2.2
i. The Church took some 350 years, studying the validity of Anglican Orders..before deciding they were invalid!!	
4. ON MARRIAGE ANNULMENTS	2.4
(i) "Many couples from Spain go to America to get annulments..."	
(ii) "We...cannot abandon the Faithful..."	
(iii) "We cannot accept the New Canon Law..."	
5. THE NEW CANON LAW	2.5
(i) Do not impose Mortal Sin where there is none.	
(ii) The 'ecumenical Bible' - it is evil!	
(iii) 'Eucharistic Hospitality' - Sacrilege!!	
6. "I desire...to give you the True Catholic Faith..."	2.6
(i) "It is not my thinking"	
(ii) "It is what the Church Teaches"	
(iii) "This can be found in your books fill with Tradition, Patrology, etc".....	
(iv) "It is not my doctrine, my opinion,nor my ideal".....	
(v) "The Beautiful Way to the Priesthood".....	2.7

ARCHBISHOP MARCEL LEFEBVRE

April 25, 1983 -- Conference with the seminarians of
ST. THOMAS AQUINAS SEMINARY

"My dear seminarians:

I think you understand my conference of yesterday, and the consequences of it. Now, I read to you the nomination I am doing for the seminary:

'After the consultation of the General Council, Msgr. Marcel Lefebvre, Superior General of the Fraternity of St. Pius X, nominates Fr. Williamson as superior of the Community of Ridgefield, i.e., director of the Seminary in Ridgefield, to replace Fr. Sanborn who is nominated for (no other) function. That on 25 April 1983, '

+Marcel Lefebvre
Superior General
Fraternity of St. Pius X

"It is a very important nomination, i.e., the nomination to be superior of the seminary. I hope that the seminary of Ridgefield shall have the same orientation and attitude as the other seminaries of the Fraternity. I know that the formation here in philosophy and theology for the priesthood, were very good. I know that you were in a good climate for that formation. But unfortunately on the point of the Liturgy, your training was not the same way, the same attitude, the same as in the other seminaries of the Fraternity. I hope that you have understood yesterday's conference concerning this subject of the Liturgy."

ON THE POPE

"Today I have the intention to give you other explanations of our attitude concerning the pope. That is another thing that is very controversial. You know yourselves that there are some priests who say: 'There is no pope now since 1965...no pope in Rome.' What is the Fraternity's attitude toward the pope in this circumstance? We think that it is a big presumption, i.e., a very good presumption that the pope is pope. And so we presume that the pope is pope, in our actions and in our attitudes; we act assuming that the pope is pope. So we pray for the pope. I am going to Rome to meet with the pope."

"To say with certainty, metaphysically, that the pope is pope ...I do not know for sure...I think he is...but I do not know. I have no metaphysical certitude that the pope is pope. I think it is a very great (i.e., very good) presumption that the pope is pope. So we must pray for him and have relations with him, as pope. That is why I cannot accept that in some priorates or houses that they refuse to pray for the pope. Many faithful are scandalized when they know that the priests do not pray for the pope, because 80% - 90% of the faithful think the pope is pope. Surely the pope is not good, that we say; for there are many motives to say that...it is very sad for the Church, but it is true. Some

of these priests abandon the Fraternity because they think there is no pope in the Church now. They say: 'If you say that there is a pope in Rome, then you must obey to the pope'...but obedience is not a virtue when it is not for the good, for the common good, or for the personal good. Obedience is a virtue when we do something by obedience for the good, not for doing evil. That is common sense. Children are not obliged to obey their parents if the parents command something that is bad, or evil. It is clear! It is the same for all authorities, ie, when they abuse their power. When authority asks something bad, we must refuse, it is clear. All authority receives its power from God...they have this power in order to realize the common good for society, for the family, the Church, the city, etc. That is clear. So, if the popes ask us to say this (New) Mass, this bad Mass done with 'ecumenism', we do not accept...it is against our Faith. If the Pope gives us the text of 'Religious Liberty', we cannot accept, because it is against the Tradition of the Church. I said just that to Pope Paul VI when I had the last audience with him. (I asked Pope Paul VI): 'What must we do?' 'Some popes, as Pope Pius IX said he is against this 'Religious Liberty', and the Council of Vatican II says: 'we must accept this religious liberty.' Who is right? Who is wrong?' Pope Paul VI said to me: 'We cannot discuss about theology now.' I said to him: 'I choose Pope Pius IX's view (on 'Religious Liberty') because he (represents) Tradition.' He speaks the same as Pope Leo XIII. I do not accept the declaration of 'Religious Liberty' in the Council of Vatican II.' "

"That is very important for the faithful, because if you say: 'We have no pope, i.e., no popes since 1965' (since Pope Paul VI, as they say, became a heretic when he signed the decree on 'Religious Liberty', thus he was no longer pope), then, as they say, 'there are no cardinals because there is no pope...if he designated some cardinals, since he is not a pope...he has no right to make cardinals...and if these cardinals are not cardinals, they have no right to choose another pope...thus they cannot perform a (valid) conclave.' Well, if this is true, then where are we going? There is no pope, no more cardinals, no more conclaves, no more, no more. So tell me, how will we get another pope? (since the line of successors of St. Peter and the Apostles is broken)...impossible...the pope must thus come out of the sky???"

"So, you know, in 'St. ----' in Canada, there is a pope in Canada now...and he said: 'I am nominated (pope) by God', not by conclave, but by God. Well, he said that and the man of Palmar de Troya, (Clemente) he said the same thing: 'I am nominated by God.' Why not a third pope? Thus, people look for authority... it is natural...and (especially) priests, they cannot remain without authority (above them)...so they 'create' an authority (a false authority). You know that some bishop, i.e., Msgr. Ngo D'Thuc, he made some bishops, and now they can have some meetings to look for (an authority), i.e., to make (for themselves) another pope. That is very dangerous. We cannot do a rupture with Rome. Rome is the center of the Church. We cannot have 'any other pope' than the pope who is the true successor of St. Peter, the pope who is in the Seat of St. Peter. And the Seat of St. Peter is Rome!

It is the diocese of Rome. The bishop of Rome becomes Pope because he is the Bishop of Rome. When the cardinals choose a pope, they do not choose 'a pope' but they choose 'the Bishop of Rome', because each Cardinal is a 'parish priest' of the parishes in Rome. So they are parish priests of Rome and they choose 'their bishop'. Because the Bishop of Rome is in the Seat of St. Peter, he becomes the pope. That is the rule in the Catholic Church. So we cannot have 'any other pope' than the successor of St. Peter, in the Seat, the Diocese of Rome. That is (also) the attitude of the Fraternity. It is very important that you know this attitude and you have this attitude, so that in the future you may show the good way to the faithful...so that they may remain true Catholics, and not become schismatic."

"Concerning the Validity of the New Rite Sacraments"

"Fr. Williamson tells me some of you have a difficulty in understanding, concerning the New Rite of ordination, and over the 'New Rite' Sacraments. The rule of theology for the condition of validity of Sacraments, can be found in (your manuals) of Theology. We must perform an application of these conditions...to the new rite Sacraments of the reform of Vatican II. In some cases it is very difficult to know if it is valid or not. Especially in the vernacular translations of the form of the sacraments. In latin it is easier to know if its valid or invalid, but in the vernacular, it is very difficult to know if some words invalidate a sacrament. So we must do, in some cases, a detailed study of that case. You know that many priests today change the form of the Sacrament! That is another difficulty in determining validity or invalidity, e.g., 'What did this bishop say when he did this sacrament?' A bishop said, e.g., concerning the form of Confirmation... that it was certainly valid (in the vernacular).' We ask: 'Well, what did he say? What did he do?' We must perform an examination of these things before we can say they are valid or invalid. We must study each case."

"It is very difficult, as in the case of the ordination of new priests, because: '...what do they have as the intention when they perform the Sacraments? What is a Sacrament for the young priest now (in the Conciliar Church)?' Is it a sign, a symbol? (For them)...it has no signification. Many of these young priests, they do not know what 'Grace' is...they do not know. They do not believe in Original Sin. What do they do when they give the Sacrament of Baptism? What do they think this Sacrament does? They do not know! It is very difficult, we know that. But we cannot say: 'All the Sacraments are invalid.', without performing an examination...we cannot say that. We must do a study. For example you may say, in this country (they do this), in this diocese, (they do that), etc...we must consider these things before passing judgment. We cannot say, 'a-priori', that all sacraments are invalid...no...For example, we do not know what oil they use for the Sacrament of Confirmation. If you read in your dictionary of theology about the Sacrament of Confirmation, the conclusion is that, if (as was the case before Vatican II), they do not use olive oil, then it is not a valid Confirmation. But now, in the new Canon Law, either olive oil or 'other oils' may be used!! Valid? Invalid?

If they use olive oil or peanut oil? It is invalid if it is not olive oil, because in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, they say we must use olive oil, not any other oil, for validity. The situation is very difficult now for us...but I think after 10 or 20 years it will be even more difficult for you, because the situation is getting progressively worse with time...they change...no rite to give the Sacrament (no rule), etc."

"Now, for priestly ordinations it is the same situation. We must see what they have done in each case, and to determine if the form was valid or not, we must do a study. In some cases, some theologians are against the validity, while some theologians are for validity, etc."

"In the Anglican Ordinations, you know that the Church spent 3 & 1/2 centuries (studying its validity), before finally giving a decision about the validity of Anglican Ordinations, i.e., that they are invalid. It is only after 350 years that we are finally sure that the Anglican Ordinations are invalid!! (laughingly): Oh...it is very difficult to come to a decision (on the new rite) in one week!!"

"If we think truly that a Sacrament is (most likely) invalid, then we must redo the Sacrament conditionally. I have done so many times with Confirmations."

ANNULMENT OF MARRIAGES

"These annulments of marriages pose another difficulty for the true priests, as you. The annulments of the diocese are good or authentic if their is a strong motive in concordance with the Tradition of the Church. The annulment is either true or not true, right or not right. It is difficult to say...we must do another study...what is the principle of judging... It is difficult...if you are going to the Chancery in the diocese, and what shall they say?: 'That is not your offer; that is our offer...you have no right to know our motive for this annulment.' Thus we must do by ourselves this examination...and it is not easy. Sometimes, the two persons who got an annulment are really married and they go ahead and get re-married in a 'Catholic marriage'...it is terrible!"

"Cardinal Seper himself said to me: 'Many couples from Spain go to America to get an annulment of their marriage, and they return in Spain and they re-marry in the Church with the annulment they got in America.' They know that in some dioceses in the U.S., it is very easy to have an annulment. Terrible! That is a situation before God! You know that in some dioceses there are 1,000's of annulments annually...and so the situation is clearly very bad. But if the people come and ask: 'Is my Baptism valid? Is my Confirmation valid?' --We must study the question and if we have difficulty in giving our judgment, we must ask the seminary, to the professor, about this case, etc, as we always did with Rome before the Council, where in some diocese when there was a very difficult case, we wrote to Rome asking for a solution to the problem, (to the Sacred Penitentiary)...and also now the Sacred Penitentiary is still, more or less, good...and they still give answers. I know

some priests in the Fraternity who wrote to the Sacred Penitentiary, and they received an answer."

"We must help the people. We cannot abandon the faithful. That is why it is very very important for you to study very deeply and seriously your Moral Theology, and True Canon Law...not the 'New Canon Law,' but the true canon law."

"THE NEW CANON LAW"

"Yes, it is true, the 'New Canon Law' is another book of the reform of Vatican II. Now there is the 'New Mass' (new missal), the 'New Bible', (i.e., an 'ecumenical Bible'), ecumenical catechism, and now an 'ecumenical canon law'. It is of the same spirit...the pope himself says that this new canon law is striving to write into juridical language the 'new ecclesiology of the Council of Vatican II'. That signifies it is another book imbued with the bad spirit of ecumenism. Perhaps there are still some rules in this book we can use. We use, e.g., the newer rule of the Eucharistic Fasting (i.e., the rule of Pope Pius XII): you know we ask the Faithful to observe a 3 hour fast before Communion, whereas before we could not take something after midnight. We had to fast before from midnight before Communion. In some cases then we can follow the newer rules. We cannot say, e.g., to a man who takes Communion after one hour only of fasting, who Confesses in Confession, that 'it was not good for me to take Communion after only one hour of fasting,' you cannot say to him: 'you have committed a Mortal Sin'. No. I cannot say that, because the Church now gives 50 minutes before the Communion as the time required for the fast. But you can say to the penitent: 'you do wrong, you cannot do that...you have done, perhaps a venial sin because it is a lack of respect for Communion', etc. You can urge him strongly to follow the 3 hour fast but you cannot say he does a Mortal Sin (when there is no mortal sin.). We must take into consideration the new rules of the Church. They are the commandments of the Church and we cannot do this commandment. It is the same for Mass...e.g, if a man confesses he went to 'Sunday Mass' on Saturday evening (the new rule of the Church permits this)...you can chastise him for doing so, but you cannot say to him, 'you have done a Mortal Sin,' etc. Yes, you can say to the penitent: 'You did a bad thing because you must sanctify Sunday...and this permission of the Conciliar Church is very bad...you must sanctify Sunday, not Saturday, etc.'"

"We must take care not to impose Mortal Sins on people who havenot committed any. We must, nevertheless, preserve the 'true canon law', the 'true Missal', the 'true Pontificale', the 'true Bible', etc. We refuse this ecumenical Bible...that is incredible, the Word Himself in the Bible...and what is this ecumenical Bible? It is a compromise between Catholics and Protestants to censure or criticize the Holy Ghost! The Scripture is drawn by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. And so they criticize the Holy Ghost, and they make a mixture of words with the Word of God. How is it possible that in Rome in the Bibliothec Library of the Vatican, they sell this 'ecumenical Bible'?? Incredible!! I think that in all Catholic Libraries we can find this 'ecumenical Bible.' We cannot accept this! It is impossible!"

"We must conserve the true canon law. In the instruction in the new canon law they talk about 'Eucharistic Hospitality'. What is this 'Eucharistic Hospitality'? It means that when a Protestant comes to receive Holy Communion and he says I have the True Catholic Faith in the Real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, and if he says that, then you must give him Communion. That is incredible!! It is impossible, impossible! He has no other Catholic Faith, only in the Real Presence, and so we must give him Communion. He may have no Faith in the Sacrifice of the Mass, he has no Faith in the papacy, he has no Faith in... Sanctifying Grace...and we must still give him Communion? Impossible! It is in the new canon law! We cannot use this canon law. It is the same in all the other books that come from this reform of the Council of Vatican II. If you have some other questions you can ask Fr. Williamson or me...I am ready to give you an answer..."

"I desire to give you the True Catholic Faith"

"My desire, my preoccupation is to give to you and all the seminarians in all our seminaries the True Catholic Faith, and the True Tradition. It is not my opinion. I do not like to hear people say: 'I have the same thinking as Msgr. Lefebvre'..No.No. It is not the thinking of Msgr. Lefebvre, but it is the thinking of the Church. It is the ideals of the Church. Personally I have no ideal, I have no thinking, I am nothing! I only have what the Church taught me in my seminary, during all my life, the True Church's teaching,...and no other preoccupation than this!"

"So, if there is something you have some hesitation over, about what we must think, I give to you the answer of the Church, i.e., what the Church thinks. You can read these things in many books...I say always to the seminarians of Ecône, that you have a big library, with all the books filled with the Tradition, with all the books of the Fathers of the Church, i.e., the Patrology, ...some 245 books of Patrology alone...you can read what is the Tradition, what is the concepts of the Church. You have all the books of Moral Theology...all these books as written before Vat.II. You can consult these books and see if I do not give you the doctrine of the Church. It is not my doctrine, it is not my ideas. That is very important, because that is what gives us the Truth (i.e., Church doctrine) and we are very strong in our Faith by this idea that we continue in the doctrine of the Church, as St. Paul says in his epistles: 'you must conserve the doctrine, you must keep what I have taught you before,' etc.' 'If I have said something against my teaching that I taught you before, then you cannot accept that.' (says St. Paul). And so that is what makes (St. Paul) very strong, very sure, and that is what is useful for us, i.e., what the Tradition says. My preoccupation is to give you this Tradition. Against Tradition nobody can say anything."

"I hope now you shall have here, as before, a good relation with your (new) superior, with your directors, your professors. I do what is necessary to give you the number of professors necessary for your studies, for your preaching, and I hope that you

will be very happy and very strong in your faith, and I hope to return here before the end of the year to give you the ordination. It is my great desire to give you ordinations, as the Church has done during many centuries...."

"(Concerning the Tradition of clerics receiving the 4 minor orders, then the Subdeaconate, a slow approach to the diaconate and finally the priesthood), it is incredible (the Vatican suppressed these, i.e., the minor orders and Subdeaconate). It was so beautiful, this way to go, slowly slowly slowly to the priesthood, to the Altar, to go to the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. This way which begins by the Tonsure, etc., that is very very beautiful! We must thank God that we are able to conserve this Tradition ...all Tradition...God bless you!"

26 April '83

*

ARCHBISHOP MARCEL LEFEBVRE
April 26, 1983 - Conference with the seminarians of
ST. THOMAS AQUINAS SEMINARY (Reproduced from a Tape Recording):

<u>Conference #3:</u>	QUESTION & ANSWER	<u>Page #</u>
Q.1	"What is to become of those priests who have refused to say the Pope John XXIII liturgy, & of those who say, 'we do not have a pope'?"	3.1
Q.2	"What about the priests of the Northeast District?"	3.1
	(a) The Seminary	
	(b) Fr. Bourmaud - Good Obedient Priest	3.2
	(c) Troubles Everywhere!	
	(d) The Father Stark Issue	
	(e) The Question of these Indian Priests	3.3
Q.3	"Would you say something about the Marriage annulments?" (Many people are worried about this)	3.4
Q.4	"Why is there a problem over the 'Schedule of Prayer in the Fraternity', and why don't we also pray Lauds, Terce, None, and Vespers in Common and with Chant?"	3.4
	(a) Common Sense in Prayer	
	(b) Strength in Prayer - THE ROSARY	
	(c) The Breviary - Our Prayer	3.5
Q.5	"Why are we not Religious, in the Society (i.e., with Religious Vows)?"	3.6
	i. To accomodate our missionary work	

ARCHBISHOP MARCEL LEBEVRE

April 26, 1983 - Conference with the seminarians of
ST. THOMAS AQUINAS SEMINARY

"QUESTION AND ANSWER"

Q. "What is to become of those priests who have refused to do the Pope John XXIII liturgy, and of those who say, 'we do not have a pope'?"

A. "Well, I asked them to accept the post I assign them to, (i.e., to accept the use of this liturgy)...and they have two months to think it over and decide...I am waiting for their decision." (NB: They gave it only 24 hours later! cf. Conf.#4)

"I cannot accept a young priest (whom I assign to a post) saying to me, 'I cannot accept going to this place where they do not say the Pope Pius X liturgy.' That is impossible! All young priests must be ready (disposed) to go into the mission, to the priorate, to the seminary, etc., where the Superior General sends us. We must be disposed to (the will of) the Superior General. This attitude: 'I cannot go here because they do not celebrate the liturgy of Pius X', this attitude I cannot accept. If they refuse, well, we no longer have them as members of the Fraternity. It is a pity. That is the reason why I ask you before (your) ordination if you are ready to accept the liturgy of Pope John XXIII."

IT IS TRULY POPE PIUS XII'S REFORM

"It is not really the Liturgy of Pope John XXIII? If the name: 'John XXIII' is sickening to you..((laughter))..then... don't say that name..((more laughter))...don't say 'Pope John XXIII', but call it: 'Pope Pius XII', because really this liturgy is not of Pope John XXIII, but it is of Pope Pius XII. I know that because, as I told you before, I worked (took part) in this reform... Pope Pius XII sent me to distribute questions to four episcopal conferences in Africa, to ask the bishops what is their thinking about a reform of the Missal and Breviary. We discussed this in these episcopal conferences. With 64 bishops I discussed this, in order to give an answer to the pope (i.e., Pope Pius XII). This reform is not the reform of Pope John, but it is the reform of Pope Pius XII. Pope John XXIII signed (into effect) this reform because Pope Pius XII died, but it was ready."

Q. The next question is about the priests of the Northeast District.."

A. "For the moment we hope (or stand) principally by the seminary which is the principle in our mind at this time:

THE SEMINARY

"Well, we now organize this seminary in the same way, in the same attitude, the same thinking as all other seminaries in the Fraternity. We cannot accept that one seminary has another manner of prayer...it is impossible. We have one Fraternity with the same principles, the same manner to educate and give the true formation, the True Traditional Formation to all seminarians. That is very im-

portant, so that all seminarians, young priests, will be ready to go anywhere in the world."

"I ordain 17 priests for the Fraternity on 29 June. In these 17 priests, I do not regard (necessarily) what country they are from, e.g., if this priest is from France, from Germany, from England, etc. I need a priest 'here' or 'there' etc. If I can send them in their own country, then I send them there. But if I need some priest for another country, e.g., I may say to you: 'you go to America', etc."

FOR EXAMPLE: FATHER BOURMAUD

"I phoned this afternoon to a young priest who is in Spain now (a French priest), and I asked him: 'Are you sitting down (for this)? ...((laughter))...before I give you the news? You will certainly be surprised...' (And so I simply asked): 'Are you ready to come to the seminary at Ridgefield?' (He immediately responded): 'Oh yes! If you like then I am ready.' "

"Now that is certainly a good priest! (That is normal!) But I never thought that when I phoned him and asked him: 'Are you ready to come to teach at Ridgefield?' (he would respond so quickly) 'Oh yes, if you like then I am ready.' That is a (good) disposition of a priest! No problem. He has been working an Apostolate in Spain, i.e., he (Fr. Bourmaud) has been ministering in Spain for 2 years, and as soon as he realized I needed a priest in America, he said yes! He did not say: 'Well, what is the liturgy there?' ((...a great laughter...)) Why didn't he ask that? He cannot say that (as a true member of the Fraternity)...whereas, the 2 young priest I ordained in November (1982) did respond: 'What is the liturgy? Ah, no, no, no. I cannot accept that...' (for example)..."

TROUBLES EVERYWHERE

"Now tomorrow I will meet with the Fathers of the Northeast District (in Oyster Bay Cove). I hope that we have a good conference...I know that there is certainly some difficulties...but you know there are difficulties everywhere! For us, you can understand that our first worry is the faithful...If we do something, if we take some decision, what is the consequence for the faithful? That is very important. We cannot say: 'Oh the faithful...oh no, no, we cannot be concerned whether they are happy or not with this, or whether they still have the sacraments, etc., ...that it is not important...' No, no, we cannot disregard them. We must ask always, 'What is the consequence of our decision for souls... We are priests for serving the souls (of the faithful). We have had similar difficulties with other priests, e.g., at Ecône, etc. But we must have patience..."

"THE FATHER STARK ISSUE"

"That is another question, another problem. Fr. Stark said himself: 'My ordination is good.' I am sure he is a priest. He has been a priest for eleven years now, I think. He is a very intelligent man. Not just because he is a Jesuit, no, no, no... ((laughingly))...but certainly he is a very intelligent man. He was a professor. He said to me, 'My word, somebody is discussing

about the validity of my ordination.' They discuss: 'No, his ordination is not valid.' Well, that is the reason why I said to you yesterday, or the day before, that we must do an inquisition, (a study of each case) to know what the situation really is -- in this case -- not in all cases in general (i.e., not a blanket judgment) but in this case, to see if his ordination is valid or invalid. And I... I am responsible, and I make the decision. I can say to him: 'You must be re-ordained.' Otherwise, if I think that his ordination is valid, really valid, then I have no right to repeat the sacrament. (NB: It would be a grave sacrilege to knowingly do so). If the sacrament was valid then I have no right to repeat it. The same principle applies to you when you ask of me Confirmation. I hope that you know if your Confirmation was valid or very doubtful? If there is no doubt, then you cannot ask me to repeat it. You know, that is very important. In Rome, they accuse me of performing many conditional sacraments without having investigated to see if there was sufficient doubt to warrant repeating them! They say that! Now that is most important."

"THE QUESTION OF THESE INDIAN PRIESTS"

"I think they are valid priests. Because I received from Fr. Bolduc, the document of their ordinations... I investigated the bishop, (who ordained them) in the 'Romanum Pontificio', in this diocese in India... that city and diocese is all very Catholic... and so he was a true Catholic bishop who ordained these Indian priests... some of them were ordained before the Council of Vatican II; Fr. Mathias, Fr. Pinto, before the Council... I cannot say that this ordination is invalid. They are true priests, and there is no reason to say they are not true priests. But there is another question involved concerning them -- these priests, what kind of formation did they receive? Especially Fr. Papas (sp?), who came from India... this man, I think is very very modernist! I don't understand how it is possible that Fr. Bolduc could keep that priest. But that is our responsibility, and when we come now to visit Fr. Bolduc, we must discuss this question with him. I know that Fr. Bolduc has begged me for priests... he said, 'I need priests... I have not enough priests;... please send us priests...', etc. I am aware of the need, but it is very important to send true priests, true Catholic Traditional priests. Its worse to send a priest you are not sure of, i.e., priests who have no Traditional doctrine. I visited Fr. Pinto in Fort Lauderdale. My impression was good concerning this priest, and many people said to me they were very happy with this priest... no problem. But yesterday I received some letters about this priest, saying he is not good, etc. We must be careful with all these letters, because it is very difficult with people (who are stirred up)... with the men, and so true with women, e.g., Mrs. so & so likes him, while another does not, etc. It is very difficult to know if all that they say (in these letters) is true. Its difficult, and I gave this letter to Fr. Bolduc, but my impression of Fr. Pinto when I visited him was good. Fr. Pinto was a friend of Msgr. Marceau, who is not very far from our chapel... and Msgr. Marceau was very happy to meet with him..."

Q: Msgr., would you like to say something about the Marriage annulments? That is certainly something that is worrying people.

A: "You know that we do not know exactly the situation here in America. We heard, by Cardinal Seper, who said to me that couples in Spain go to America to get an annulment, and then they return to Spain to 're-marry' in the Catholic Church. The situation here, perhaps in many many dioceses is so bad that we can make a presumption against the validity of the annulments. It is possible. But in Europe, and perhaps in some dioceses of America, where the priests in the Chanceries in charge of these annulments, have a Catholic Conscience and perform them as priests would normally do that. We cannot say: 'Everywhere, in all cases, the annulments do not exist (i.e., are invalid).' We must, also in these cases, we must investigate. We must determine where the annulment comes from: from this diocese in Chicago, or in Toronto, Cincinnati, etc. We know that in Chicago, e.g., the Chancery gives 300,000 annulments per year! Well, the presumption is against this Chancery! It is impossible that so many many marriages are invalid...in an annulment, as you know, the Church says, 'there is no marriage.' That is the conclusion of the inquiry. But, when for example in Cincinnati (perhaps it is not true, but for the sake of an example): in this diocese we know that this particular Chancery gives 3 or 4 annulments per year. And if we ask for the documents and find they are very good and its clear it was done with a good (Catholic) Conscience, then we can presume that a man who received such an annulment in Cincinnati, perhaps its valid, i.e., that no marriage really existed. We must do an inquisition (investigation) of each case. We cannot say before studying each case, that all annulments are not true. When somebody wrote to me in Europe, asking me what I thought about the annulment of the married, we said, 'we must do an inquisition, i.e., make an inquest.' But we must ask the Father in the place to perform the inquiry."

Q. (By the Archbishop himself): "Why do we have this problem of the prayers in the Fraternity?"

"You know our schedule: In the morning - Prime; at noon - Sext; in the evening - Rosary; at the end of the day - Compline. --Why do not we also pray in Common the Divine Hours of Lauds, Vespers, and Terce & None...and with Chant???"

A: "You know I have seen other Congregations, St. Sulpice, and many others: They take their program of prayer in the book of their Congregation..."

"I by my experience in missions, I know that if we ask too many prayers, as the Benedictines, as the Contemplative Fathers, it will be so difficult, that (our priests) will be discouraged... I have tried to give you a program of prayers (in Common) in such a way that when you leave the seminary, and you begin your ministry in the priorate, or elsewhere, you will continue the same program (of public prayers in common). You will have no problem for these prayers. You continue to say Prime, followed by Mass, and then Sext at noon, then the Rosary in the evening, etc."

STRENGTH IN PRAYER: THE ROSARY

"Why the Rosary? We can do that privately. It is true, its possible to do privately. (Why not Vespers?) Answer: I think that it is very important...we must pray to the Blessed Virgin Mary...and we must pray together! She is Our Mother, and its possible so when we do that in our chapels, in the priorate, that many people will come and join us! The sisters come. If we have some laymen in our houses, they too come to pray the Rosary with us! And if some of the faithful are nearby the priorate...they come to pray the Rosary. So, it is a family prayer, and its not only for us. I think its important that we continue as we do in the seminary. If we are too demanding, then we will abandon all, with time! Now I can say that in all priorates (of the Society) they do these prayers. When we say the Rosary, we can now say that in all our priorates, all our brothers and friends (in the Society) say the Rosary together at this time of the day...(to do all these prayers together), that is a consolation, an encouragement! Even if we are alone, we know that we pray in union with all our brothers in the Fraternity! Certainly God and the Angels and all the Saints know that all the people of the Fraternity pray regularly together. It is very nice! We know now that in (the Conciliar) convents and houses, they do not pray the same prayer, they don't pray the Rosary! They abandon the prayer; they abandon the rule! So it is very important that we do the prayer."

"When I was in the Congregation of the Holy Ghost Fathers, we had as the prayer in the morning and evening, the prayers of St. Sulpice; not the prayer of the Breviary, but prayers special for Common recitation. But it was a very great pity...the priest said the same prayers as the faithful and after they had to say the Breviary also...and so many times, I know that our Fathers were so busy that, because of the obligation of the Breviary, they did not say the prayer of St. Sulpice. It is better to have the prayer of our Breviary, i.e., Prime, Sext, Compline, said in public! Some member of the Congregation said, 'But in all missions, we have brothers, e.g., 2 Fathers, and perhaps 3 brothers. The brothers do not know the Latin, and yet they must (in the Society) pray the Breviary with the Fathers and they don't understand! Its better that we take the prayers of St. Sulpice, in the vernacular, so that the brother can pray and understand the prayer with the Fathers.' But that is not true...it is not good! All brothers generally like to say the Breviary with the priest! That is an error to say that the poor brother must say the Breviary and be sad! No, not 'poor brothers', they are happy! If we change and say: 'Oh, poor brother, tomorrow we will say prayers in english because you do not understand', I am sure that 90% of the brothers would prefer to say the Breviary in Latin. It is the prayer of the Church! It is the same for the sisters. They say the prayers in Latin (the Breviary). That is very good! It is the prayer of the whole community, i.e. the Fathers, brothers, sisters, laymen, all pray the same prayer. That is very good, the same prayer of the family...good, good! So we can pray this single prayer:"

Q: "Why are we (the Society) not Religious?" Perhaps some of you prefer to become religious and to take vows of Obedience, Poverty, Chastity. So why is Our Society not a Religious Society?

A: "The answer is drawn from my experience. You know that it is in the same category as in some kinds of Societies in the Church. If you take the book, 'Pontificio', you have the names of all Societies; first societies of Orders, e.g., Benedictine, Dominican, etc. After these, you next have 'Congregations,' (Religious Congregations). After these you have Societies of Community life, without vows, and in this type of society you have, e.g., St. Sulpice, White Fathers, African missions, etc. Our Society of the Holy Ghost Fathers was a religious society, not a community life without vows."

"I think it was better for us to be a Society of Community life without vows, because, from my own experience, I was a religious. I made perpetual vows in my Congregation. I saw that many Fathers, they don't keep the vow of Poverty very well, because they had many things to do in their mission...e.g., they must build things, they must have a car, etc., many things. And they must return to Europe, to America, to raise money to serve and build up the missions, to buy many things. And so they are always handling money, money. But that is not well conformed with the vow of Poverty. The Vow of Poverty is very demanding. We had to always ask permission from the Superior to transact some expense, (to avoid violating the vow)...all expenses we had to always ask the Superior. So I saw clearly that many members of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost Fathers, of the missions, etc., did not keep to the Vow of Poverty; they did not ask the Superior, because the Superior is in Africa and they stayed in America or Europe to raise money. Impossible! And so I think that it was better that we are missionary (Society of St. Pius X); we are all missionary, and we must have money, we spend money, we need money. If we must always ask to the Superior, then its very very difficult for us to operate (efficiently). But, bear in mind that does not signify that we must spend money, waste money, (extravagant) trips or tours, etc. No. But we must keep the Virtue of Poverty, and be careful with money. Thus, I think it was better not to add this obligation of a Vow, thus making the Fathers have to always ask their superior for permission. That poses always a problem of conscience. Because we do not take the Vow of Poverty, we can have property, e.g., if we receive from our parents, some piece of land, or some money, etc., we can keep this and use it for God, for souls, for our missions, etc. But we have this property that Religious cannot have. They must do a testament. And if the Religious receives something from their parents, they must give it to the Congregation; ...they cannot have any property."

"I hope all of you have this desire to practice this Virtue of Poverty, i.e.; to be very careful with expenses. Many times we receive from the faithful who are not very rich, and they give us this money for our Apostolate. We must take care of the expense, especially for our comfort, our pleasure, etc...(we must not be wasteful)."

"Now, for the brother, the Vow is very useful. Its another thing for the brother. For us the brother is a consolation. To be in the hands of their superior, members of the Fraternity."

"For priests, I think that they have by the Sacrifice of the Mass...they must have the Virtue of Poverty, because they behold in their eyes the Cross of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ crucified . CRU-CI-FIED...when we offer the Sacrifice of the Mass. And so we have this example for the priesthood, when we are priests. We have this example of Poverty, Chastity, Obedience. We must take this example of Jesus Christ to acquire these Virtues. But the brother does not offer the Sacrifice of the Mass. For him he is a very good help to souls, and to souls they are an example of Jesus Christ."

+Thankyou.

+

"O CRUX AVE SPES UNICA"

+

ARCHBISHOP MARCEL LEFEBVRE
 April 28, 1983 - Conference with the seminarians of
 ST. THOMAS AQUINAS SEMINARY

THE REBELLION MADE PUBLIC

My dear Seminarians:

"I was writing a letter to a friend (benefactor) of our Fraternity to say to him the events of last night (at Oyster Bay Cove). I said to this benefactor, that it was underground during many years. Many difficulties, many oppositions, many incomprehensions between some priests of the Northeast District and the Fraternity. Now it is no longer underground, but public. These difficulties were very sad. I can say everytime I visited the Northeast district (I would ask them to do something and they would say), 'We are kind to observe',...but in their hearts and their minds it was not good."

"THE ROMAN CATHOLIC": 'attitudes...hard....and polemical'

"Many times I spoke with them about the 'Roman Catholic's' (articles). Many of their attitudes and positions, were hard, hard, always hard & polemical. That is not my attitude. I am firm in the doctrine. I am firm in the Faith. But as Our Lord, I try to get souls, to speak with sinners, with all people, and not always hard, hard, hard! So, that which was underground is now made public by the events of two young priests, i.e., to (not) go where I send them. It is not only this fact (of Fr. Zapp's refusal); this fact was only the end of all this work during years and years! They don't accept! These priests, these 4 or 5 priests of the Northeast district, they don't accept the spirit and mentality of the Fraternity!"

THESE PRIESTS ACCEPTED ECÔNE WHEN AT ECÔNE

"They were at Ecône! They accepted (the Fraternity's attitude) at Ecône! They remained silent at Ecône, until I give them ordination. After this, always these troubles."

"I said to them yesterday: 'Our union slowly, slowly, always becomes less, less. The union of Charity, always less, year by year. But now, it is finished.'"

"You have another mentality"

"It is finished! It is impossible! Impossible! If you are behind the priests desobeying to the Superior General, that is too much...its impossible! Now, (if you are behind them) I ask you to go outside the Fraternity. We cannot remain together. You have another mentality. You are of another mind. This is just impossible."

"I am in charge...not them!"

"They ask to discuss some points...I know these points, such as the point of the 'ordination of Fr. Stark', the point of 'marriage annulments', etc., that is nothing...I agree with them on the principles, i.e., 'I do not accept a priest if he has not a valid ordination,' i.e., I don't accept an invalid priest to help us: that is evident! I cannot accept a priest if I do not know if his ordination is valid or not. That is clear! But they are

not in charge of this priest (Fr. Stark). I am in charge!...I must do an inquisition to know if his ordination is valid or invalid. I am in charge of that, not them. These 5 priests in the Northeast district know that I cannot accept an invalid priest to give the sacraments. This is evident!"

"I know that these Marriage annulments, many of them are not good and not true. I know that. Perhaps here in America, the situation is worse here than in Europe; it is possible. I think it is true, i.e., here in America they give many annulments (very easily) by some money, etc. In Europe, it is not the same. That is the reason why I write to some persons who wrote to us, asking: 'We do not know if this annulment of marriage is valid or not?' I don't know for sure myself. I cannot say if it is valid or not. But you must do an inquisition with your priest.' (Itold them)."

"But you cannot say in principle that in all cases, these annulments are void. You must do an inquisition (inquiry). That is the charge of the priest...of the district, or in charge of the priorate, etc., to inquire before deciding. But that is not saying that is the same (as their orientation) which is more severe... (hard)..."

"NOW THEIR REBELLION IS CLEAR"

"Thus, I wrote to this benefactor: 'Now their rebellion is clear, against the Superior General, and against the Fraternity.' It is now public. That is the result of this state of mind and tendency, i.e., extremist and schismatic! It is a schismatic tendency: in regard to the Liturgy, in regard to the pope, and in regard to the Sacraments of the new reform. Their judgments they have towards these things...they reject and refuse the Liturgy of Pope Pius XII and Pope John XXIII, because (they say) it is bad. They act in practice, and think as if there is no pope, practically. They (in general) suppress all prayer for the pope.."(NB: Father Sanborn told a laywoman in Ridgefield that he does pray for the pope, i.e., in prayers outside of the Mass, but not in the Mass(!?!)). "...They never pray for the pope. Practically (in practice), they think that all Sacraments, (not in theory, but in practice they say): 'all sacraments of the New Rites are invalid', i.e., all are either invalid or at least doubtful, therefore are held as invalid."

"This attitude is not the attitude of the Fraternity. The Fraternity has, as its principle of action in this crisis in the Church, what I gave you before, as found in St. Thomas Aquinas: 'We can be opposed to the pope and authority of the Church, if the pope and authority poses a danger to our Faith', i.e., 'periculum fidei' --that is our principle (cf. Summa II II, Q.33, a.4, ad 2m). Thus, the Fraternity holds that there is nothing dangerous to the Faith in the Rite of the Liturgy of Pope Pius XII & Pope John XXIII. Therefore we cannot refuse, because there is no danger for our Faith. In Ecône, the liturgy (and rule of the Society) is the Liturgy of Pope John XXIII."

"However, it is a danger to our Faith in the Liturgy of Pope Paul VI. This liturgy, we cannot accept. Impossible. Why? Because this liturgy is very 'ecumenical', is very bad."

"For the pope, the Fraternity, in practice, acts and prays as if the pope is truly pope. I do not know...it is up to the judgment of the Church in the future, but in practice we act as if

403

Pope John-Paul II is truly the pope. So we pray for him. I am going to Rome to speak with him. I have written to him...I have offered prayers for him...we do all we can to bring the pope back to Tradition. That is the end of all my actions in Rome: not any compromise at all...they say: 'Oh, Msgr. Lefebvre (with so much dialogue with Rome) certainly will do a compromise with Rome. That is for sure! He is going to take the New Mass.' That is only (their vain) imagination!"

"I am going to fight in Rome. To fight, (and pray) slowly, always with the intention that Rome returns to the Tradition, to the Catholic Tradition. Now, that is the mind of the Fraternity."

"Thus, we do not have the same mind with these priests of the Northeast district. (With few exceptions, the general rule is) they do not ever pray for the pope. They do not say one word in the prayer for the pope.' As for the validity of the Sacraments, I think that many sacraments...are valid if they use the latin form. However with the vernacular translations, there begins the doubt of validity. In practice, we must study each sacrament, each circumstance where these sacraments are given. One bishop said the words of Confirmation, with another form? We do not know. We must investigate and find out what form. The same with what oil he used, etc. Perhaps its valid, invalid...we must do an inquisition. But I cannot say as these priests (of the Northeast) said, that we consider all sacraments of the new rite, practically are all invalid. That is impossible."

"We cannot continue Our Way Together"

"And so, we cannot continue our way together. They are always going towards schism, because on this point, they are against Rome; They refuse the liturgy that the pope gave (the liturgy of Pope John XXIII), without a serious reason! If it was a serious reason, then I too would disobey (Pope John XXIII), but when there is not a serious reason, I cannot disobey. Thus, that is the first point: they disobey to the pope, i.e., they disobey Pope Pius XII and Pope John XXIII. The second point: 'No validity of sacraments, practically' (not in theory, but in practice)."

"Thus, slowly, slowly, they put all the people 'far' from Rome...far from the pope,...far from the Church. That is very dangerous. Many people now have this tendency...they do a sect, a sect. Slowly, slowly, very slowly, they form a sect!! That is a schismatic tendency. I cannot accept that!"

"I tried during many years to say to them: 'No, don't go in this way! No.' They did not understand. One day we were meeting in Oyster Bay Cove on the question of the pope. I said to them: 'At least, at least do not say publicly in your preaching, that there is no pope.' I asked them to sign a document that they accept that. They signed it! But, I said to them in the evening, if you do not sign, you are no longer members of the Fraternity. On the next morning they returned and they accepted. (1980). You know, inspite of their accepting that, there was constantly returning problems (oriented to denying the pope), ...and I finally said to them, yesterday, 'its too much now, its impossible!'"

"I cannot accept it. I give my seminarians the Fraternity.