

Authority & Jurisdiction of the Society of St. Pius X

Catholics must assist at Mass on Sundays and Holy days of Obligation. Where there is no Mass there is no obligation. Mass must not be pursued outside the Catholic Church. We cannot and must not go to the Orthodox, or to the genuine Mass celebrated under non-Catholic authority or auspices. Lack of Catholic authority instantly suggests its impossibility. St. Paul established the test: *For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved.* How then shall they call upon him, in whom they have not believed? Or how shall they believe him, of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear, without a preacher? **And how shall they preach unless they be sent?** – Romans x, 13-15 **Who sent the Society of St. Pius X?**

What is its authority?

The Catholic Dictionary of Theology, H. Davis, I. Thomas, OP, J. Crehan, SJ, Nelson 1971. Vol. III, p. 134, **Intention:**

“Philibert Lavardin, bishop of Le Mans, confessed on his deathbed in 1671 that he had in fact conferred holy orders while withholding his intention. December 7, 1690 the Holy Office condemned thirty-one propositions. No. 28 (Denzinger 1318): “Baptism is valid when conferred by a minister who observes all the external rite and form of baptizing, but within his heart resolves, I do not intend what the Church does.”

If the minister is shown involved in devil-worship at the time of the ceremony, an evil intention must be presumed a virtual certainty, especially if the minister’s actions, prior or subsequent, are consistent with his presumed intention.

Pope Benedict XIV condemns the opinion that the neutral will (which is neither agreeable nor hostile to reception of the sacrament) suffices in one receiving Baptism. He declares that Baptism has its effect when its subject either wills or has willed to be baptized; if he neither agree nor disagree, unless he had the intention beforehand, he cannot be baptized. Having established the necessity of the subject’s intention, the pontiff concludes a greater necessity of the **minister’s** intention, and teaches that should it be established that some one has administered Baptism or another unrepeatable sacrament, having applied all external rite, but withholding his intention, or deliberately willing not to do what the Church does, by pressing necessity the sacrament should be administered again conditionally.

“In the nature of things the Church can only judge of these external declarations of intent, but she can legitimately require that an internal association with Christ be present also.”

To uphold the validity of Achille Lienart’s confirmations and ordinations we must believe in a thirtieth degree Freemason’s internal association with Christ, despite his apostasy and long-term habitual enmity toward Christ’s Church. The lack of this internal association is obvious—“established” as required by Benedict XIV, who bound this matter on earth. So it is bound also in heaven, where all intentions are known.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, 1913, Vol. XII, p. 775a: “In 881-2 Pope John VIII prescribed the reordination of Bishop Joseph of Vercelli, who had been ordained by the Archbishop of Milan, then under the ban of excommunication.”

St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Supplement, Q. 39, Art 2: “For the **episcopate the act of accepting the pastoral care of souls is required; wherefore the use of reason is necessary for the validity of episcopal consecration.**”

The Catholic Encyclopedia, 1913, Vol. XIII, p. 304a: “**Only citizens and members of the Church can come under her influence as such; baptism is the door by which we enter the Church and thereby become members of a mystical body united to Christ our head** (Catech. Trid., de bapt., nn. 5, 52). (b) In adults, for the valid reception of any sacrament except the Eucharist, it is necessary that they have the intention of receiving it.”

Moral Theology, Heribert Jone & Urban Adelman, 1946, p. 468: “**638. I. Validity** requires that the candidate for ordination be a baptized male who, if an adult, must have at least the habitual explicit intention to receive the Sacrament of Holy Orders.”

Sacramental Theology, A Textbook for Advanced Students,

Clarence McAuliff, S.J., 1958, pp. 64-5: “The recipient’s intention must be both external and internal. He must intend not only to receive the sacred rite (external intention), but also to receive it **as an act of Christian worship.**”

To receive Orders, we are told again and again, is the right of Catholic Church members only. Certainly the Church has no intention of conferring priesthood or episcopate upon non-members, especially ex-members. Apostasy and excommunication are doors by which we leave the Church, and lose all rights of members, especially title to the episcopate. The bishop, says St. Thomas, **must** have the use of reason because he **must intend** to fulfil the duties of his office.”

We can readily appreciate the utter lack of reason in accepting that a man who has both apostatized by, and been excommunicated for, joining the masons, having attained a lofty devil-worshipping degree, can intend to accept the pastoral care of Catholic souls. Achille Lienart was utterly ineligible for the episcopacy by reason of apostasy and excommunication, and was by reason of 30° Freemasonry utterly incapable of forming the correct intention to receive a sacrament for its proper purpose “as an act of Christian worship.” Indeed, Vatican II’s only benefit that comes to mind is that Achille Lienart there proved his diabolical orientation (grand?)—which Lefebvre and his unordained crew impiously hope never negated his clerical functions. Perhaps they can bemuse themselves about his intention, but they cannot gainsay his perfect ineligibility—which made his intention irrelevant.

Canon law, unless divine, is not dogmatic. Divine law in cases like Lienart’s: “**He that is not with Me is against Me : and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth.**” – Matt xii, 30; Luke xi, 23

We see the Lefebvrites continue to scatter. Unfortunately, they continue also to drag along traditional Catholics, to whom the priest’s word, despite our sad experience, remains law.

Objection—There seems only one lone authority, though widely quoted, for the fact of Cardinal Lienart’s membership in the Freemasons. It seems highly unlikely that such evidence as his signature on a masonic register would exist. An infiltrator would have been more careful than to leave evidence which could trip him up—destroy his usefulness to the craft.

Reply—Why would a Freemason not sign a secret register, never intended for the general public. One must allow for arrogance (and even occasional stupidity) among those too proud to serve God. It could be taken as an indication of their care of secrecy that only one man discovered the primary evidence. A fact is not less true because known to only one man. When a man discovers such a fact he is conscience-bound to publish it. There is no time for corroboration from others, who, if they exist, either fear for their lives or share the plot. Lefebvre himself immediately accepted the fact.

Lienart, Freemason or not, certainly proved at Vatican II and since that he was not Catholic. He worked ceaselessly in the interests of the modernists and Freemasons.

Additional information and deeper analysis have convinced me that Lienart never ordained anyone. No Catholic is required to believe in the validity of Lefebvre’s orders. Even were validity possible, his public heresy insures that his conferred orders are not licit. No one is permitted to use illicitly obtained orders (Canon 2372). Any priest “ordained” since Lefebvre refused to ordain men who differed from his two theological opinions that the *novus ordo missae* is not *per se* invalid and that notorious heretics are or can be popes, is by this refusal proven to have held the same two heresies, as well as to have been responsible, like Lefebvre, for all heresies promulgated by Paul VI and his successors.

If Lefebvre ordained priests, they are not **Catholic** priests—ordained according to Church regulations, at the Church’s orders, to positions in the Church—even should they be both priests and Catholic. All Catholics are bound to shun his “priests”—who are not even excommunicated priests with a proper background to whom we may repair *in extremis*. They have never been legitimately trained or ordained Catholic priests; they have no status to which they can return.

Could this God-hating Lienart have himself intended to receive the fullness of Holy Orders? One may reasonably doubt it. Doubt is not permitted in our sacraments. Even could this “doubt” be resolved, there remain two more, either of which must be avoided: 1) whether an apostate freemason can intend to act in any way for the Church which 2) he certainly tried to destroy subsequently in its unity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity. Why should he neglect holiness, especially Mass and sacraments, holiest of all?

What an insane gamble we take, then, in approaching anyone “ordained” by Lienart or his own “ordinands” (as, for instance, Marcel Lefebvre) for sacramental functions. Let us consider another aspect of association with Lefebvre’s “priests”—an aspect which removes the gamble; no possible chance exists. Or how shall they believe him, of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear, without a preacher? **And how shall they preach unless they be sent?** – Romans x, 14-15 **Who sent the Society of St. Pius X?**

One of freemasonry’s best-known policies, that which initially attracts members, is promotion of the brothers, each in his own field. This may very well account for Marcel Lefebvre’s rise to the episcopacy in the first place. He certainly acted and thought like a freemason. But the experience which solidified my own suspicion, being a matter not of action but rather of omission or inertia, is more difficult to demonstrate. It remains possible, and contributes unnecessarily to the huge doubt clouding all Lienart’s “sacramental” activities. But this is all overkill; Lefebvre had every right to be shunned by all over his proven public heresies.

Econe undergraduate Douglas Laudenschlager’s statement that the Church has recognized validity of orders of certain schismatic heretics cannot extend to cover validity of orders conferred by apostates.

“Apostasy from the faith separates a man from God altogether, as we have seen, which is not the case with other sins.”—*S.T. II-IIae*, 12, ad 3

Laudenschlager by quoting St. Thomas out of context tries to show that a masonic impostor pretending to be Catholic, practising perfect visible-audible valid external intentions, can validly ordain. So he pursues quotation no further:

“The intention of the minister can be perverted in two ways. One way, with respect to the sacrament itself: for instance when some one does not intend to confer a sacrament but to do something deceptively (*delusorie*). And such perverseness takes away the truth of a sacrament: especially when he manifests his intention outwardly.”—*S.T. III*, 64, 10 reply

Especially rules out **exclusively**. Nor does St. Thomas place a time limit on outward manifestation. It makes no difference however much later the defect is discovered.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol VIII, page 69d: “The Church teaches very unequivocally that for the valid conferring of the sacraments, the minister must have the intention of doing at least what the Church does. This is laid down with great emphasis by the Council of Trent. (Sess. VII). The opinion once defended by such theologians as Catharinus and Salmeron (theologians at Trent) that there need only be the intention to perform deliberately the external rite proper to each sacrament, and that, as long as this was true, the interior dissent of the minister from the mind of the Church would not invalidate the sacrament, no longer finds adherents. The common doctrine now is that a real internal intention to act as a minister of Christ, or to do what Christ instituted the sacraments to effect is required. Whatever may be said speculatively about the opinion of Ambrosius Catharinus who advocated the sufficiency of an external intention in the minister, it may not be followed in practise, because, outside of cases of necessity, no one may follow a probable opinion against one that is safer, when there is question of something required for the validity of a sacrament.”

Overwhelming evidence of Achille Lienart's apostasy was capped by his behavior at Vatican II. More than likely, Lienart never in his life validly ordained a priest. All his ordinations lie under a thick cloud of legitimate doubt, which **must** attach to Lefebvre's orders. Lienart made him a priest(?). Lefebvre was, therefore, at best, doubtfully eligible for the episcopacy, for which true priesthood is pre-required. All his own conferred ordinations share the same doubt. Anyone, therefore, who—ignoring Lefebvre's heresies, to which he obliges his ordinands—attends a Mass(?) celebrated by him or any necessarily heretical priests(?) in good standing with his Fraternity of St. Pius X or its breakaways, if aware of the doubt, unnecessarily risks mortal sin; if unaware he risks idolatry. This applies with greater force to the doubtful priests themselves who dare celebrate Mass(?) or administer sacraments(?) under this cloud.

Talleyrand is cited to prove that the Church grants validity to ordinations performed by Freemasons. Talleyrand consecrated **two** bishops in 1791. He was quickly excommunicated, and ceased all ecclesiastical activity. If Pius VII allowed validity to his consecrations, he could have ascribed it to the co-consecrators.

If, despite reams of logical evidence, no one can prove Lienart a Freemason, at least no one can prove he was not. Lefebvre accepted the public disclosure as factual, concerning himself only with the "fact" that an apostate enemy of God can still confer valid orders. But it is characteristic of the masonic plotters that they set up their own phony opposition, so that they need not deal with genuine opposition. Naturally its leader's record varies from that of the ordinary apostate. If Lefebvre's crew is not the phony opposition, where is this vital part of the plot? Who else keeps traditionalists out of the real fight? Many try, but they succeed, despite blatant "strategic" procrastination and inconsistency. Undeniably, people who should fight followed Lefebvre instead, and let him conduct the compromises.

During an illness of St. Gregory Nazianzen (325-389) Maximus the Cynic entered with his followers into the Anastasis church to be consecrated bishop. Word spread and the people came running. Maximus and his friends fled to the house of a flute-player and there the ordination continued. The Council of Constantinople (May-July 381) took up first the question of the see of Constantinople. The scandalous ordination of Maximus the Cynic was pronounced **null** as **contrary to canon law**. The first consequence of this decision was a declaration of **invalidity of all ordinations performed by him**.

"If anyone say that those who have not been rightly ordained by ecclesiastical and canonical power and have not been sent, but come from some other source, are lawful ministers of the word and of the sacraments: let him be anathema." – Trent, Session XXIII

Or how shall they believe him, of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear, without a preacher? **And how shall they preach unless they be sent?** – Romans x, 14-15 **Who sent the Society of St. Pius X? What is its authority?**

Lefebvrites claim St. Eusebius, late-fourth-century bishop of Samosata, as a precedent. **His jurisdiction expanded to fill the vacuum**. But he said quite openly that the bishops he undercut were Arians, that he ordained Catholics to keep the faith alive in his area. Lefebvre's failure to condemn heresies and those who hold them publicly left him without basis for his activities. His practical recognition of Vatican II and the postconciliar "Church" left his St. Pius X Society in practical heresy. When ordaining members of his own Society he ordained not Catholics, but men committed by his own public actions to the support of those who propagate heresy, even in the very heart of the new rites to which he gratuitously accords validity, rites for which he asked only a parallel rite while a Catholic would have demanded abolition.

Lefebvre to *Una Voce*'s Eric de Saventem 17 December 1976: **"For the Universal Church I foresee, as you do, the peaceful coexistence of the preconciliar and the postconciliar rites. Accordingly, it should be left to the priests and to the believers to select the 'family of rites' to which they prefer to adhere. Then, one should wait until the course of time makes known God's judgment on the respective values of truth and salvific effects for the Catholic Church and for total Christianity."**

This "orthodoxy," particularly the ecumenical last phrase, outdoes Vatican II's own ambiguity. **But it is not compromise**. For Lefebvre would **never** compromise. Did he not write JP2 (March 19, 1979): "A solution could not be found in any compromise?" He kept us from the fight. He stood out, attracting the support of the hopeful. But he disclaimed leadership, so that he could shirk responsibility to lead the fight. He talked a good fight, leading to belief that he would eventually live up to the Faith. Day by day we expected; year by year we waited. He temporized enough to set the next stage in our destruction. The exiled traditionalist is to believe he has returned to the oasis when he takes his place in the mirage. We shall all be permitted our traditional rite (according to John XXIII) celebrated in desecrated churches long dedicated to sacrilege and idolatry, by laymen "ordained" according to the new "sacrament of order," men trained in ignorance of the Church's propitiatory intention. To secure this great benefit all we need do is profess to believe that nothing ails the *novus ordo missae*! So why were we not granted this great privilege in 1976? Lefebvre and **Una Voce** had agreed to the conditions beforehand.

Lefebvre listed (Nov. 8, 1979) five fundamental and pertinent dogmas violated by the *novus ordo missae*. "These New Masses are not only incapable of fulfilling our Sunday obligation, but are such that we must apply to them the canonical rules which the Church customarily applies to *communicatio in sacris* with Orthodox Churches and Protestant sects." But where is **his** reason? He acknowledged as legitimate the authority that imposed and continues to guarantee these sacrileges. He never said that this authority has exceeded its competence, or that these sacrileges must be wiped out. He would settle for equal rights for the traditional Mass in the same churches with these sacrileges. You may not attend, but neither may you conclude under penalty of exclusion from his Society invalidity. He who will volunteer priests to local ordinaries, who will allow validity to a non-Mass, will excommunicate you for failure to adhere to his own unnecessary theological opinion.

Lefebvre then tackled the “serious problem of conscience for the faithful,” whether we have a pope. “One can fairly ask oneself how it was possible that a successor of Peter can in so little time have caused more damage to the Church than the French Revolution.” [One could also ask: **Who else could?** Or how could he do it by accident? Or who would try unless allied to the same group that promoted the French Revolution? The freemasons boasted for more than a century that they would eventually set their own man upon our papal throne and accomplish our destruction. Lefebvre viewed the accomplishment and pretended that it had happened by accident. He cited fact: that Paul VI had signed heretical documents, then expected agreement that this made Paul not a heretic but only a liberal. Either way he wasn’t Catholic.]

“A good number of theologians” (again!) “teach that a pope can be heretical as a private doctor or theologian, but not as a teacher of the Universal Church. One must then examine in what measure Pope Paul VI wished to engage his infallibility in the diverse cases where he signed texts close to heresy if not formally heretical.” [Have you ever read such nonsense? Conciliar documents? Popes may teach what they please if they cross their fingers? But wait—there’s more!]

“Does not the exclusion of the cardinals over eighty years of age, and the secret meetings which preceded and prepared the last two conclaves render them invalid?” [He had earlier raised the question of ineligibility to participate of “cardinals” created by public heretics posing as pope, and left the issue in the air, presumably unworthy of settlement.] “Invalid: no, that is saying too much. Doubtful at the time: perhaps. But in any case the subsequent unanimous acceptance by the Cardinals and the Roman clergy suffices to validate it. That is the teaching of the theologians.” [A doubtful election becomes valid when the electors accept their own doubtful vote! Who cares what theologians think? Where are the canonists? Have **either** ruled on rigged elections in which nearly all electors (as fine a gaggle of liberals, modernists, freemasons, communists, and other non-Catholics as ever assembled—an oversize college packed by two of the same type to ensure completion of the destruction so well begun) had no right to participate? Would either hold, with Lefebvre, that a “pope” who did so much damage to the Church would never use his usurped powers to appoint others of his own ilk? Would they insist on a public heretic’s papal prerogatives? Theologians, at and since Vatican II, have put us in this mess.] “The Truth must be affirmed at Rome above all other places. It is of God,” said Lefebvre, “and He will assure its ultimate triumph.” [But when Father Noel Barbara went to Rome in 1976 and proved publicly that Paul VI was a heretic and therefore not possibly pope, where was Lefebvre? Backing the Truth? Or proving that it was not the Truth? He may have been able to settle the entire issue had he taken either side. His media coverage could have brought the matter sufficiently before the public that it might have been resolved. Oh, we don’t know that, we are told, as though he had a choice. It was his place to try. His prominence assured that few others could or would.]

Fr. Lucian Pulvermacher (Sept. 6, 1979): Since Archbp. Lefebvre is subject to John Paul II he is in the one-world religion which John Paul II heads. Hence, all who are served by the Society of St. Pius X are in reality *Novus Ordo* Catholics the right wing of the apostate Church.

Benjamin F. Dryden was asked to furnish an English translation of his letter to Lefebvre, July 18, 1978. Conscience obliged him to warn that parts of the “Conclusion” had been made obsolete by a subsequent proclamation: “..... the Society of St. Pius X cannot tolerate among its members those who refuse to pray for the Pope or affirm that the *novus ordo missae* is *per se* invalid.” Lefebvre and all his Society are now, therefore, clearly members of John Paul II’s Conciliar Anti-Church; and Canon 1258 forbids Catholics to attend their Masses, receive the Sacraments from them, or in any active way participate in religious services with them.

“Paul VI’s schism he himself has been at pains to advertize publicly and scandalously by imposing the *novus ordo missae*, in contempt of the decree *Quo primum*. He advertized it anew on May 24, 1976, in the Consistory, by opposing yesterday’s authority to ‘today’s authority,’ and by arrogating to himself the right ‘to define, among **the numberless traditions**, those which must be considered norms of faith,’ without concern for the definitions already made by true popes.

“We see, then, that Paul VI is quite clearly excommunicated and deprived of all authority and has become an antipope through heresy and schism, in virtue of Canons

2314.1 and 188.4. That is why these canons remain hidden from the public view, buried not only in the sepulchral silence of Paul VI and his Conciliar clergy, but even in the silence of the clergy supposedly traditional but really in collusion with the antipope. If the faithful could read these canons, the whole comedy would be at an end. People would laugh on hearing Paul VI speak of ‘Our authority, willed by Christ.’

“..... your Declaration of Aug. 2, 1977: ‘In the same measure that a pope should withdraw from this tradition, he would become schismatic, would withdraw from the Church. Theologians like St. Bellarmine, Cajetan, Cardinal Journet, and many others have studied this eventuality. It is not, therefore, something inconceivable. it seems to us much more certain that the Faith taught by the Church for twenty centuries can contain no errors than it is absolutely certain that the pope is truly pope. Heresy, schism, *ipso facto* excommunication, invalidity of his election are all causes from which it may sometimes result that a pope has never been or is now no longer pope. the Church would be in the situation she experiences after the death of a Sovereign Pontiff.’

“Comparison of your words with the text itself of the canons shows inaccuracies that seem intentional, to conceal from the public that these are laws, quite precise and obligatory, and give the impression that they are only the subtle, impractical speculations of some theologians.

“Why do not you and priests of the Society explain thoroughly and clearly these canons, which strip all authority from the invaders of our buildings? Why employ so much eloquence in a case entirely theoretical, of a legitimate pope who

might abuse his authority without losing it? Is this not complicity? confirming the error sown by Antipope Paul VI, that his authority exists and is willed by Christ?"

Mr. Dryden asked the right questions. If Lefebvre had followed his advice he might have had a genuine fight on his hands, leaving little time for fund-raising and property-acquisition.

Michael Davies (book review in **The Remnant**, May 31, 1982): "Archbp. Lefebvre is quite happy to accept the services of priests ordained under the new rite, and I would be surprised if theologians of repute could be found to endorse the thesis that the new ordination rite was probably or even possibly invalid." [So what is Ecône's purpose?] It is seriously argued, the best theological opinion holds that the new rite of ordination contains the essentials of *Sacramentum ordinis*. Lefebvre takes each applicant ordained in the new rite on the merits of the case. Some he accepts; others he conditionally ordains. It seems, then, that it is up to the "priest" as much as to Lefebvre or Schmidberger. If he refuses conditional ordination they accept him anyway. But what are the "merits of the case?" How determine whether the applicant is properly ordained? They have all undergone the same new rite, whose various vernacular versions have received "ecclesiastical" approval. The difference must lie in the ordaining bishop: Is he properly consecrated? What is his intention? If the rite contains the essentials why would Lefebvre "re-ordain" or conditionally ordain anyone? The rite is either sufficient every time or insufficient every time. Lefebvre should never entertain the least suspicion of the ordaining bishop's intention. The moment Lefebvre admits relevance of the bishop's intention he casts suspicion upon his own priestly ordination by a subsequently known enemy of the Church, who, it is often argued, never had the slightest intention of doing anything for the Church. He may even have lacked the intention of being consecrated bishop in the first place, and have taken the job purposely to vitiate and invalidate what he could. If, therefore, Lefebvre was not validly ordained priest he lacked the qualification for consecration to the episcopacy, and none of his sacraments would have been validly conferred. So he cannot consistently hold this position.

Is the ordaining bishop's orthodoxy in doubt? Not applicable! The Church recognizes ordinations, consecrations, baptisms, confirmations, etc. of various schismatic sects. We can even call their priests in absence of our own for the last rites.

Perhaps the ordaining bishop is not a bishop! Why not? Is he an apostate? Not good enough; like the schismatics, he retains his sacramental powers. Is he a freemason? What of Lefebvre's own ordaining bishop? Perish the thought!

What's left? The ordaining bishop was invalidly consecrated. How? All three men who consecrated him were not bishops either. Or a defective rite was employed. Of our old rite no one entertains the slightest doubt. So the new rite must have been used. If the new rite "ordination" of a bishop is invalid, why is not the new rite priestly ordination introduced by the same incompetent authority on the same day likewise invalid? So we have gone all the way around the vicious cycle and returned to arc one. The new rite ordination "contains the essentials."

If you (like Montini and Bugnini) intended to destroy a sacrament secretly, would you not retain the words described in *Sacramentum ordinis* as "essential, therefore required for validity?" But the whole rite is necessary to contain what Pius XII called essential. It is nearly all missing from the new rite, despite Pius XII's order that nothing be changed or omitted. He said that the **form** of the sacrament is the Preface, beginning with its first word and ending with its last. The new rite retains the Preface to include the "essential" words, and then replaces the rest with new words conveying new ideas. This constitutes a change in the **form!**—clear cause for doubt (at least). Doubt is not permitted in administration of our sacraments.

As long as the rite of Ordination continued unchanged, the entire rite being administered according to the Roman Pontifical, it made no real difference what was essential, therefore required for validity. But to retain these words and to omit or replace others in profusion will not guarantee validity—guaranteed only the traditional rite. The intention has been removed from the (new) rite itself, and may not be presumed (as though it could affect the matter) in a man attempting to ordain priests in a rite which the Church (as in *Sacramentum ordinis*) has forbidden. He shows his intention to do what the Church intends exactly as in his use of the *novus ordo* or the Book of Common Prayer service. In all cases the intention must be in the rite. If it is in the rite then the intention of the minister is ordinarily presumed, and validity is equally presumed **every time**. If some one must evaluate each bishop's intention, judging each ordination on its individual merits, the rite is defective and **never** works.

Even were the new rite of ordination valid, no reason exists why anyone must, or even should, accept it. There was no necessity to introduce it, except to replace the unquestionable sacrament, to downgrade the clergy, and to service the new "mass" introduced with it. Knowing this, Lefebvre imposed phony priests "ordained" according to this new rite on traditional Catholics foolish enough to support his crusade for equal toleration of old and new. He volunteered them the clear risk (dead certainty, rather) of participation in idolatry. He *had* a choice; he could have refused this problem. He chose wrongly, as so often at and since Vatican II. If the new rites of "mass" and "ordination" are valid, why did he presume to open a seminary supposedly to perpetuate the old rites?

Nine Ecône "priests" made seven charges, March 25, 1983:

- 1) Lefebvre had imposed liturgical reforms of John XXIII in the Mass at the Ridgefield seminary.
- 2) "Over the past few years, the Fraternity has accepted the service of priests ordained by vernacular versions of the New Rite of Ordination of 1968. The English words of the form in the New Rite of Ordination so differ from the ones Pius XII said were essential for validity that they introduce a positive doubt as to its validity. positive enough even in your own mind, Your Grace, so as to justify the conditional ordination of priests ordained in the New Rite. And so you have in fact conditionally ordained at least two priests in America: Father Sullivan and Father [omitted ordinand's request]. Indeed, you even asked Rev. Philip Stark to accept conditional ordination and he, as you yourself told us, adamantly refused. And yet, after

his refusal, you nevertheless allowed and continue to allow him to work with the Fraternity; and he is not the only doubtfully ordained priest that you permit to do so—he is one of many.

“Thus under the aegis of the Fraternity doubtful Masses are being offered, doubtful absolutions are being given and dying people are being anointed with an ‘Extreme Unction’ that may be invalid and of no more value than the anointing with oil done by a Protestant minister. How, one must ask before God, can the Fraternity reject the doubtful sacraments of the new Church only to replace them with doubtful priests? How grave a sin is this! How false a pretense! Furthermore the Fraternity in the South West District has begun to import to the United States priests whose theological training and manner of ordination are under a similar cloud. As Your Grace knows, this has been a source of scandal.

“The employment of such priests strikes at the heart of one of the reasons for the Fraternity’s existence: to provide unquestionably valid sacraments for the faithful—for if a positive doubt exists as to the validity of a priest’s ordination, not only are the sacraments he administers doubtful, but the faithful are put into a position by the Fraternity of choosing between the doubtful sacraments of the new Church and the doubtful priests of the Fraternity. From the standpoint of Catholic morality this is inadmissible.”

[This proves that Lefebvre cared nothing whether his Fraternity provides true Mass or sacraments, any more than he cared for orthodoxy. If he subjected his own congregations to the undoubted risks cited, who can be sure of his honesty, proper intention, or good faith in his own already suspect ordinations? For use of these “doubtfully ordained” what other motive may be imagined than greater, speedier financial returns? Doubtfully? **Impossibly** ordained—swindled by the new rite! He thus procured idolatry! In what else can he be trusted? In his intention to confirm or ordain? In his (disinterested?) assessment of the validity of his own ordination? The signers of this letter should immediately apply this argument to the validity (there is no liceity—no legitimacy) of their own orders—and refrain from their further use. “Doubtful pope, no pope,” says Canon Law *de Personis*. Doubtful priest, doubtful Mass—to be avoided completely. These abuses, too, obviously known, remained unpublished and uncondemned, lived with, condoned by these nine priests(?) until **they** were ejected from the Fraternity. This casts suspicion on their own motives. They have warned the faithful rather late. Morally, this too is inadmissible.]

3) “..... we have always followed the Missal, Breviary, Calendar and Rubrics of our holy patron, Pope St. Pius X, which practice was sanctioned by the First General Chapter. Of late, however, an attempt has been made to force all the priests and seminarians in the United States to accept the liturgical reforms of Pope John XXIII on the grounds of uniformity and loyalty to the Fraternity, thereby implying that adherence to non-reformed traditional Rites of St. Pius X constitutes disloyalty. Can it be that the Fraternity has come to look upon loyalty to tradition as disloyalty to the Fraternity? Most recently, to our shock and dismay, a newly-ordained priest was given an ultimatum—either to accept the reforms of John XXIII and to begin saying Mass according to the John XXIII missal or leave the Fraternity. Is it possible that the Fraternity which has been persecuted because of its loyalty to tradition now persecutes priests for their loyalty to tradition?”

[Possible? Obvious! What can be expected of compromisers? How long have these nine signatories maintained membership in the Fraternity in full knowledge of, among other things, Lefebvre’s public refusal in 1979 to ordain(?) a man who disagreed with his erroneous theological opinion that the *novus ordo* is not *per se* invalid as a Mass, and—despite his contention that, outside of certain conditions seldom met, it is no Mass at all—his willingness to allow its continued use alongside use of the true Mass. Additionally, Lefebvre made it clear that no one who disagreed with his theological misconception could remain in his Fraternity. So nearly four years later, why were these nine men still **in** his Fraternity? They accuse him correctly but tardily. They hope they have no grounds to sue for false ordination. But they know they have no legal ecclesiastical standing, because Lefebvre cannot invoke Canon 209 for his extra-legal activities unless the Holy See is vacant—another “opinion” he will not tolerate in his Fraternity.]

4) legitimate complaint over dismissals from the Fraternity on grounds which don’t hold water. Canon Law provides that no one may be ordained priest or consecrated bishop without a title or benefice—a job. Lefebvre has no authority to provide a job, parish, benefice, or the like. But he remains responsible for his priests’(?) support.

5) Lefebvre’s unwarranted assumption of the Church’s magisterial authority. “Now while in theory the Fraternity may deny any claim to such teaching authority, in practice it has acted as though it did have such an authority. For it has proposed solutions to speculative theological questions and has threatened with expulsion or has actually expelled priests and seminarians who disagree with its teaching.

According to Fr. Noel Barbara: In practice Lefebvre denies the dogma of papal infallibility. By imposing the new mass, ecumenism, and religious liberty, Paul VI and John Paul II erred; they taught doctrines previously condemned by the Church. The Catholic response is both simple and obligatory: A pope cannot err in such matters. Since these men have erred, it is proven that they are not popes. Lefebvre rejects this response of faith. He persists in recognizing John Paul II as legitimate true pope but considers him in error when he commands and teaches the whole Church the new mass, ecumenism, and religious liberty; indeed for this cause he disobeys him. But to say that he who errs in teaching the whole Church is the pope is equal to saying that the pope can err in teaching the whole Church. What is this if not denial of the dogma of papal infallibility? Thus in affirming that the pope errs in his official teaching on faith and morals to the whole Church Lefebvre renders himself in practice responsible for the sin of heresy. Moreover, since he pays no attention to protests, but persists in his errors with foolish obstinacy, Catholic morality requires him to be considered a formal heretic.

Lefebvre's behavior is also schismatic. Everywhere he publicly proclaims John Paul II the legitimate true Catholic pope, but publicly and obstinately refuses to submit to him: He refuses the new mass, ecumenism, religious liberty, and his own suspension *a divinis*. What is this obstinate refusal to submit to the jurisdiction of the man **he says he conscientiously believes to be the pope**, if not separation from the pope and the making of schism?

The November 1983 **Angelus**, official English-language publisher and editor for Abp. Lefebvre and the International Society: "The old Code will be abrogated. We are hoping to publish a commentary on the New Code by Fr. Thomas Glover, JCD, in a forthcoming issue. Fr. Glover is Professor of Canon Law at the Society of St. Pius X seminaries in Europe. Father has pointed out that whatever our personal feelings about the new Code, it comes to us with the full authority of the Pope and that we have no alternative but to accept it as the official Canon Law of the Church."

In December we see a totally opposite position. Letter jointly signed by Bp. Antonio de Castro-Mayer and Abp. Marcel Lefebvre: "..... we utter this cry of alarm, rendered all the more urgent by the errors, not to say the heresies, of the New Code of Canon Law."

This represents a major shift from the spirit of reconciliation with the modernists which Abp. Lefebvre has followed since the election of John Paul II in 1978. It states implicitly that John Paul II is a heretic, since it says clearly that the New Code of Canon Law, which he signed and promulgated, contains heresies.

Major Leonard Hurst's Letter (2) to an Econe Priest (paraphrase): Your illogical, untenable stand appears based on belief that Lefebvre is the wisest, most learned, sole reliable authority within the Catholic Church. Complete truthfulness and consistency are essential to reliability. Is Lefebvre truthful? In his "Reflections on Suspension" he asserts, in effect, that he has refused the *novus ordo* since its institution. But Father Guerard des Lauriers (who names other witnesses) testifies that Lefebvre habitually celebrated the *novus ordo* right up to 24 December 1971 (about two years after I had set up the first Mass Centre. In Bogota in 1973 he concelebrated the same illicit innovation with Father Aulagnier. Either Lefebvre's veracity or his memory falls short of reliability. [Possible confusion of terms: "mass of Paul VI"]

Bringing cases concerning ownership of Mass Centres to civil court directly breaches Canon Law; such disputes must be decided by the Church. Lefebvre characteristically disregards the Law. He spends tens of thousands of other people's money—given to God—to secure possession of property to which he has no right. The money he squanders, like the Centres themselves, came mainly from the savings and pensions of poor old people who gave it to secure the continued celebration of the traditional Mass of the Catholic Church. By imposing a 1962 "Mass rite" in its place Lefebvre has betrayed all these contributors, the true owners! He certainly has no legal, territorial, or ecclesiastical authority over these people, nor has he contributed money toward the acquisition of the Mass Centres.

Declaration (edited excerpts) Following JP2's VISITS to the SYNAGOGUE and to the CONGRESS OF ALL RELIGIONS, Assisi

Therefore we consider as null all that has been inspired by this spirit of denial: all the Post Conciliar Reforms [**but not the council itself! nor Roncalli's violations of *Quo primum!***], and all the acts of Rome which have been accomplished in this impious spirit. [**Why not simply "all acts of these public heretics—not possibly popes or bishops?" Was the *novus ordo missae* imposed in "this impious spirit?" Is it therefore null? If so, why has Lefebvre maintained for so long that it is not *per se* invalid? Are the invalidating changes in sacramental forms "accomplished in this impious spirit?"**]

For centuries a priest underwent a long, strict, weighty course of study and religious formation. After two years of philosophy and four of theology he might be found short spiritually, and rejected. But with good teachers, sufficient library, and durable eyesight he could be ordained. After years as a curate he might run a parish, then perhaps a diocese. After many years' practise he might excel, if led along slowly, steadily, through proven channels.

Vatican II changed all that. Latin and Greek became elective (dropped). This simplified and shortened the seminary course. The candidate never understood the languages in which his philosophy, theology, apologetics, encyclicals, canon laws, and Scripture were written. Seminary education became a joke.

Into the breach leapt the Society of St. Pius X, which began to turn out priests(?) as half-educated as any, who, without long years of drudgery and training, became instant parish priests, seminary rectors, school principals, provincial superiors, professors of theology, philosophy, and canon law, editors of "Catholic" magazines, infallible guides to the traditional Catholic community. They all undergo the same brief, inadequate schooling, under the auspices of a heretical fraternity established in the postconciliar "Church," then emerge and go their various ways. All claim to be Catholic priests, though some will admit being illicitly ordained. They may or may not be priests, depending on the validity of Lefebvre's own priestly ordination, but not **Catholic** priests, ordained as they are(?) without title, ordinary, authority, jurisdiction, nor way to procure them. Several, indeed, victims of Paul VI's new ordination rite, lack even **this** questionable priesthood, yet they celebrate "mass" in the name of their fraternity, bringing certain idolatry to traditional Catholics willing to risk only probable idolatry with traditionally ordained(?) priests(?). And these appear to be not only men accepted by Lefebvre despite refusal of conditional re-ordination, but one or more whom Lefebvre himself "ordained" with the new rite.

The Catholic Cross, July 1985: "Mgr. (Lefebvre) has never been the unswerving defender of the Mass of Trent which we had believed him to be. We also have evidence that, in August '73 he 'ordained' an 'Econe priest' using the New Rite of the Conciliar Church, after telling people that it is **invalid**."

Father Noel Barbara in **Econe Full Stop**: “The muddle over the new rite reaches the level of a joke. Thus the seminarians are unsure of the validity of the ordination of Fr. Cottard. We know for a fact that he was ordained by *Mgr. Lefebvre* according to the *new rite*. After that, opinions differ.” (Re-ordination?) “..... Mgr Lefebvre is unwilling to shed further light on the affair some seminarians carefully avoid assisting at masses of this doubtful priest: to the extent, for example, that a certain functionary at Econe arranged that his friends should not have to assist at the community mass when it was said by Fr. Cottard.”

Why will Lefebvre not clear away this cloud on his orthodoxy—on his good faith? No defense necessary? What **can** be certain about the sacramental intention of a bishop who “ordains” in the new rite, even when subsequently using the proper rite? One rite is as good as the other; **he** has made no essential distinction between traditional and *novus ordo* mass and sacraments. He therefore subscribed to heresies (Arianism, Judaism, apocatastasis) built into these latter by heretics to whom he adhered as popes. He was not Catholic, and no Catholic could approach him for Mass or sacraments, even if undoubted, except on his deathbed. The doubt, of course, rules out even the deathbed. If he really was a bishop, his priests are not Catholic priests, having been ordained in defiance of Church law and of what Lefebvre wrongly supported for years as legitimate authority. When these priests(?) rebelled against him they could not thereby **recover** a status never attained. And what kind of seminary training leaves its recipients only doubting, not condemning, such an “ordination?”

An old priest told me that he had left Econe partly because of its defective curriculum. Gerard Hogan, one of Lefebvre’s priests(?), exposed the deficiency of his own education by telling Toowoomba’s traditionalists how difficult it is to identify heresy these days. Surprising? Not if we appreciate that the trainee is unlikely to exceed his trainer. Lefebvre excused Paul VI’s public heresies on grounds that Paul was a liberal! Patrice Laroche absolved JP2 of teaching heresy because it was only error.

Let us return to **Econe Full Stop**. Econe, says Fr. Barbara, claims to form “true and holy priests,” but succeeds, rather, in graduating complacent men who cover inordinate pride with counterfeit humility. They preach in platitudes. Their inaccurate language barely hides ignorance if not downright heresy. (He includes citations and examples.) But varied are their talents; some enshrine their throttled thought in print, even taking to task traditional writers (Strojie, Kellner, etc.) who knew the Faith before **these** innocents were born.

Lefebvre’s excuse that **first** we must have the sacraments everywhere prefers quantity over quality. Econe takes anybody. There is practically no examination of personal worth, doctrine, or vocation. Far from testing these in the seminary itself, Lefebvre often advanced ordination dates when the filling of new posts or areas required [for the cash flow?].

But the patrons of Lefebvre’s illicit, heretical, schismatic fraternity pass lightly over Major Hurst’s and Father Barbara’s serious charges because the fraternity provides “mass” and “sacraments.” They demand **proof of the charges** instead of **justification from Lefebvre**. They consider Lefebvre innocent till proven guilty, not recognizing that 1) he is a proven heretic, and 2) we are not trying a court case but trying to keep our Faith, without which we cannot be saved.

Lefebvre or Thuc ordinands have no possible jurisdiction, even when (if ever) their orders are valid. No one has the slightest obligation to seek out or support these illicit clerics(?), especially when such actions almost surely involve him in schism, heresy, and idolatry. No one can be obliged to assist at Mass in absence of an undoubtedly Catholic Mass under undoubtedly Catholic auspices.

Lefebvre imposed on Catholics for years, because the appearance of Mass attracts our strongest support. But we trek through a veritable religious Sahara, and we must not veer off toward the mirage. Lefebvre was a schismatic heretic whose episcopal status depended on whether his priestly ordination at the hands of a high-degree mason (an apostate servant of the devil) was valid—whether he was eligible for episcopal consecration—whether apostate Achille Lienart could have himself received the episcopal order intended only for Catholic priests. Even in the hardly possible eventuality that such problems could be resolved to favor Lefebvre’s legitimacy, how can we grant the Church’s sacramental intentions to the Lienart who conspired to vitiate its doctrine and discipline, before, during, and after Vatican II. Dying, he congratulated himself: “Humanly speaking, the Catholic Church is dead.”

In assisting at mass(?) celebrated by Lefebvre or anyone whom he ordained(?) we risk idolatry. We have, therefore, no choice; we **must** avoid it, and any other sacrament(?) administered by the same doubtful priests and bishops. Doubtful sacrament, no sacrament!

But let us suppose that competent authority has ruled in Lefebvre’s favor, and that he could without question ordain priests and consecrate bishops. What jurisdiction had he? Was he a diocesan bishop? **No**. Could he legitimately ordain subjects of diocesan bishops without their approval, their dimissorial letters? **No**. Could he run seminaries in their territories without their approval? Could he found a religious society with approval of a postconciliar bishop and continue it in existence against orders of a postconciliar pope? He could assume such powers only in utter default of competent authority—no pope, no Catholic bishops in the dioceses concerned. This is, of course, the exact situation, but Lefebvre never put this case. He provided grossly insufficient basis for his actions. He continued to recognize legitimacy of antipopes and jurisdiction of an apostate hierarchy. He signed most of Vatican II’s documents—including the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. He would accept all these documents “read in the light of the Council of Trent”—an absurdity advanced seriously—in order to avoid calling antipopes and their followers public heretics and schismatics. But he ever maintained his good standing among these heretical schismatic followers. He has treated with heretical antipopes as though they, ineligible through public heresy, held office legitimately. He even excluded his own priests(?) from his *novus ordo* “Church” fraternity for disagreeing with his inconsistent, untenable position. He founded a society and its seminaries avowedly to train and properly to ordain true priests to celebrate the true Mass,

but apparently as an option. For he refused to condemn the *novus ordo* “mass,” but notoriously sought mere parallel status for the true Mass.

Lefebvre had for twenty years pretended to fight for traditionalism, even repeatedly conveying the message that he knew best and would strike at the proper time. The proper time to fight heresy and apostasy is always NOW! He distracted and undercut genuine traditionalists and kept them from the front lines. At last gone too far for Rome, he still keeps us off the point. He enticed a genuine bishop (illicitly retired—without jurisdiction) into co-consecrating some of his priests(?). If not priests, they cannot be bishops, any more than Lefebvre himself. If priests, then they are bishops, but not Catholic. Either way, they cannot help us to salvation, and they must be shunned.

Lefebvre allowed a whole generation of possible supporters to die out while he temporized with Rome. He could no longer take the required stand. He had changed direction so often that no one could know his stance next month, next week, or next minute.

Lefebvre’s book, **An Open Letter to Confused Catholics**, on page 14 disavows leadership. But he traveled the world, raised funds, enticed his followers into accepting and disobeying apostate antipopes. For years he undermined and opposed action. “Wait for the opportune moment. I have an earth-shaking plan. When it counts, I’ll act.” Even had he acted properly in 1991 he would have outlived most support and all effectiveness. His disavowal matches Roncalli’s “I don’t like to claim special inspiration” to convoke Vatican II.

Page 24: “Why make hosts that are grey or brown? trying to make us forget *hanc immaculatam hostiam*?” [But the Mass offers the Spotless **Victim**—**not** the pure white piece of **bread**.]

Page 35 raises questions about validity of individual *novus ordo* services just after nailing down the lid on them all for offering the wrong things and replacing the consecratory **action** with a **narrative** of institution. “The prayers of the offertory, the Canon and the priest’s communion are necessary for the integrity of the sacrifice and the sacrament but not for its validity.” [A disintegrated but valid Mass! He “proves” his point with]

“Cardinal Mindszenty pronouncing in secret in his prison the words of Consecration over a little bread and wine was certainly accomplishing the sacrifice and the sacrament.” [Supposing this romance factual, or that an isolated consecration can equal Mass, one presumes that Mindszenty, while needlessly violating canon law, intended to consecrate. This vital intention is utterly absent, even actively thwarted, in the new rite itself, which no **priest’s** intention can validate.]

Page 51 consults *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* to cite against the abuses of confession the very antipopes who introduced and promoted them. Others should obey (selectively) while Lefebvre ignores direct orders on ordinations. Each individual is to judge a pope’s prescriptions to decide whether to obey.

Page 58: Lefebvre purports to demonstrate proper form and matter insufficient for a valid ordination in absence of proper intention. But he declared his own ordination unaffected by the intention of the apostate, devil-worshipping, God-hating freemason who performed it.

Pp. 78-88 detail horrors of ecumenism and religious liberty. Lefebvre’s highly publicized attitudes in these fields have caused many to wonder at his professed willingness to sign Vatican II documents interpreted in the light of the Council of Trent. Was he establishing a “reason” against the day of discovery for already having signed most?

In the next chapter, on communism and freemasonry, Casaroli and Wojtyła are charged with saddling Czechoslovakia and Hungary with communist bishops. Bugnini is again unmasked as a freemason. Yet, said Lefebvre, his *novus ordo* remains valid, just like Lienart’s ordinations.

In the next two chapters (pp. 97-113) Lefebvre amassed proofs that the 1789 revolution has taken over the Church, especially since Vatican II. He quoted Montini as he so often promoted the cult of man. Then, astonishingly, without regard for all that has continued to happen, he averred that all this is compensated for and corrected (or at least sanitized) by Montini’s **Credo of the People of God!** “This Credo, drawn up by the successor of Peter to affirm the faith of Peter, was an event of quite exceptional solemnity. he has made an act which pledges the faith of the Church” [to gratitude for Islam and Judaism, among other choice bits]. “We have thereby the consolation and the confidence of **feeling** that the Holy Spirit has not abandoned us. the Arch of faith that sprang from the first Vatican Council” [not Christ and His Apostles?] “has found its other resting point in the profession of faith of Paul VI.” [An arch supported 98 years at one end awaiting a base for its loose end!]

Marcel Lefebvre acted more or less like a Catholic bishop. In a sense his performance excelled JP2’s; he fooled more traditionalists. Many who **act** as though JP2 is not pope refuse to **say** he is not pope (torturing their consciences into absurdity) because that holy Lefebvre also contradicted himself. All Vatican II bishops and cardinals could go wrong, but **not** Lefebvre. When they all condoned liturgical and doctrinal change they proved themselves heretics. They contradict their own former positions, so they must be wrong. But when Lefebvre contradicted both his former and his current positions, **he** was obviously sincere—therefore correct. Think not that Lefebvre fought for the Faith. He led the mock war. He occupied positions to which genuine warriors are entitled. While the Roman usurper apostates can compromise with him or his survivors they need not deal with the true Catholic.

Lefebvre’s death has not helped to resolve matters. Richard Williamson, one of his new “bishops,” has taken over his attempts at justification. His theology contains a few holes, not least of which is his insistence that episcopal consecration will automatically turn a layman (or even a deacon) into a priest. Leo XIII set forth the ancient principle that sacraments convey what they signify and signify what they convey. At no point in the consecration of a bishop are conferred the powers to

celebrate Mass or to forgive sins. Unless already a priest no man can become a bishop through this third stage of the Sacrament of Holy Orders, often termed the **filling up** of the sacrament, or the adult stage which can pass on the properties of its present and former stages. But when a glass is empty you **fill** it; if it is partially full you **fill it up**.

Then, to demonstrate another of his shortcomings, history, Williamson invents the notion that St. Cyprian was made bishop without having been a priest. I find several St. Cyprians treated with their own articles in **The Catholic Encyclopedia**, Vol IV, pp 582 sqq. One, the Bishop of Toulon who died 3 Oct. 546, “was the favourite pupil of St. Caesarius of Arles, by whom he was trained, and who, in 506, ordained him to the diaconate, and, in 516, consecrated him Bishop of Toulon.” So St. Caesarius never ordained him priest, or that would have been mentioned. But no point is made of this. There were ten years between in which any number of bishops were available to ordain him to the priesthood. One of them undoubtedly did so, probably later in 506, or even in 507. St. Caesarius was himself ordained deacon and priest before being consecrated bishop. He would have been extremely unlikely to have skipped an order for some one else. Such skipping, even of minor orders, has always contravened canon law.

Another was martyred at Nicomedia 26 Sept. 304 in Diocletian’s persecution. “He ... became in succession deacon, priest, and finally bishop.”

But the first, after whom the others were probably named, “was certainly only a recent convert when he became Bishop of Carthage c. 248 or the beginning of 249, but **he passed through all the grades of the ministry**.” If Williamson wishes to argue that at that remote time no distinction was made between priests and bishops, the article mentions five priests hostile to St. Cyprian, possibly because they were passed over by his promotion. But we are not confined to the above. In Dom Gueranger’s **The Liturgical Year**, Vol XIV, p 227: “Cyprian was a native of Africa, and at first taught rhetoric there with great applause.

The priest, Caecilius, from whom he adopted his surname, having persuaded him to become a Christian, he thereupon distributed all his goods among the poor. Not long afterwards, **having been made priest**, he was chosen bishop of Carthage.”

So is St. Cyprian’s lack of priesthood the basis for Michael Davies’ learned argument that the traditional position “is having to be abandoned?” Michael believes that another newer rite can repair the *novus ordo* to an acceptable point on which traditional Catholics must compromise, or else convict themselves of that horrible crime, **immobilism**. Michael can find no Arianism in the *novus ordo* and no heresy in Vatican II’s documents. So what worth has his argument that Lefebvre would have been made priest by a ceremony intended to make him a bishop? He concedes its unlawfulness. Behind every Church law was a reason. Why not the obvious invalidity? Even doubtfulness is sufficient.

Lefebvre himself never argued against the Marquis de la Franquerie’s revelation of Lienart’s high-degree freemasonry. Could it be that he knew both men, and that he knew he could not disprove the truth? He certainly knew the dedicated historian’s reputation for responsibility, and the risk he took in revealing what he must, therefore, have regarded as fact.

Was Lefebvre more aware than Williamson and Davies that St. Pius X removed at least three French bishops from their sees (Tarentaise, Laval, Dijon) and had their ordinations redone? The removal of Le Nordez in 1904 is given in **The Catholic Encyclopedia** as the cause of the break in diplomatic relations (1905-20) between the masonic French government and the Vatican. Why would France fight the Church over dismissal of a non-masonic bishop?

Lienart, incidentally, clearly demonstrated his hostility to everything Catholic at Vatican II and thereafter. Why would a thirtieth degree (God-hating, devil-worshipping) freemason intend anything that the Church intends?

Williamson’s citation of the fruits of Lefebvre’s work in Central Africa should depend somewhat on whether all those Central Africans have kept the faith or followed the *novus* bogus. May I suggest a parallel? Father John A. O’Brien, noted American Catholic writer and polemicist (**The Faith of Millions**), had a string of converts and an influential syndication in the Catholic press. But when the changes had taken a tenuous hold he approved them in a disgraceful book, **Catching Up With The Church**. There were hundreds of these “prominent” priests building up “authority” and influence that they might better mislead the faithful when the opportunity inevitably arose. Lefebvre “led” the opposition at Vatican II, but caved in at the end and signed the documents, when his leadership could have had a strong effect. His great “effort” came years too late, and its fruits can now be seen. His priests(?) are nearly as split as the conciliar “Church” itself. In this they only follow him on different days, as the record clearly proves. I would not dream of arguing from only these points that he was or was not a priest; for they show merely that we cannot accept him as Catholic.

Neither Williamson nor Davies had a Catholic education. Nor do they necessarily appreciate the meanings of Catholic teachings, especially on intention. Nor could they have imbibed such from Lefebvre, who held, or at least stated, that a properly ordained priest could consecrate (transubstantiate) in the *novus ordo missae* if he had the proper intention. Williamson, at our only meeting, tried to secure my agreement that a properly ordained priest with a correct intention could transubstantiate in an Anglican “mass.” How does this hypothetical properly ordained priest demonstrate correct intention in his incorrect use of rites clearly forbidden by the Catholic Church?

Williamson wrote (March 5, 1992):

“But the Society insists that for instance the Mass of the *Novus Ordo* is not automatically invalid, and yet it **refuses** to let people attend it.....” If so, this is one more inconsistency. In 1975 or 1976 Gerard Hogan, then a seminarian at Ecône, returned home for a funeral in Melbourne. He then came to Sydney, and I drove him here and there. He said that seminarians away from Ecône were let satisfy their Sunday obligation at either traditional or *novus ordo* mass.

Lefebvre himself used the “mass” of Paul VI in St. Peter’s Basilica at the altar-tomb of his “patron,” Pope St. Pius X, because, he said, by celebrating the traditional Mass he would give scandal. He used the “mass” of Paul VI even at Ecône, and was finally persuaded by his staff priests that it was inconsistent with his “aim” to train priests for the traditional Mass.

I have always used **novus ordo** and “**mass**” of Paul VI interchangeably, so I read others the same way. But Bugnini during Paul VI’s early years, put out in both Latin and vernacular a “mass” which omitted the prayers at the foot of the altar and the Last Gospel. In vernaculars it changed Christ’s words of Consecration. It was a stage on the road to the new rite (*novus ordo*) and deliberately created the chaos to be “corrected” by introduction of the new rite. Both introductions violated Church law as codified in St. Pius V’s *Quo primum*. This “**mass**” of Paul VI, a wanton step toward the *novus ordo*, was imposed with the *novus ordo* intention: **replacement and abolition of the traditional Mass**. It was, therefore, no good either.

So this “mass” of Paul VI, they tell me, is what Lefebvre celebrated at the tomb of St. Pius X, at Ecône until talked out of it, and when in hospital at Bogota (concelebration with Aulagnier). Whether he used Latin or the vernacular is beyond my ken. But either way it was not the traditional Mass for which he supposedly opened his seminaries, **after the *novus ordo*’s introduction**, when clearly it had led to that *novus ordo*, which he would never call invalid.

Williamson’s paragraph 13: “Thirdly, from the very beginning of the Novus Ordo Mass, a handful of wholly competent canon lawyers pointed out that Paul VI **never**, while **instituting** the New Mass, at the same time strictly **abrogated or prohibited** the continuation of the Old Mass.” Jesus Christ instituted our Mass. No human, not even as exalted as Paul VI, can **institute a Mass or a sacrament**. In my book, **Is the Pope Catholic?**, pp. 29-32, I mentioned correspondence with Cardinal Freeman over our projected Tridentine Mass at Santa Sabina School, Strathfield. He wrote “that the Tridentine Mass cannot be celebrated. Neither I, nor any other Bishop, except the Pope himself, has authority to authorize the celebration of Mass according to the old Order.”

So we wrote Paul VI, and you can read “his” answer. Furthermore, in that famous 1976 Consistory which dealt so roughly with Lefebvre, Paul VI expressly stated that he **had** forbidden the Tridentine Mass. Those canon lawyers were correct; he never **legally** killed the Mass, but kill it he did. Is this a typically sneaky act of a genuine pope? He made the *novus ordo* obligatory and permitted no option except for retired priests celebrating privately. According to him, no Catholic could assist at Mass. That supposedly provoked Lefebvre’s foundation of the Society of St. Pius X, albeit within the postconciliar “Church.”

In imposing the *novus ordo* Paul violated the infallible **moral** law of the Catholic Church, while claiming to have done the same thing as the genuine pope who had codified it to defend the Mass against just such attacks as Paul’s. If Paul was pope, and had power to institute a new mass against the law and to impose it as a valid substitute for traditional worship, what possible excuse had Lefebvre to set up an organization to disobey him? Especially **in** Paul’s postconciliar “Church?”

In paragraph 14 Williamson, like any other Protestant, sifts and assays parts of the *Novus Ordo* religion, which he rejects as a whole. Lefebvre, now a yardstick of tradition, signed most of the documents of Vatican II, and often said that he would sign them, read in the light of the Council of Trent, to which they are publicly and, of course, heretically opposed. In signing them he split off, like the rest of those conciliar apostates, from the Catholic Church as eternally constituted. “And then, were he so indispensable, how could the Society have lasted” (but well split) “already **one year** without him?”

On to Williamson’s letter of April 1, 1990, largely an ad for a new book by another Ecône graduate, which makes all those telling abstract points never as recently made by concrete sedevacantists. “..... when, as in this book, the quotations are all put together, one after another,” [the usual method] “so that a coherent pattern emerges, and when this pattern is confirmed by a series of photographs of the man acting in accordance with that thought pattern, then something emerges with devastating clarity: this man does not have a Catholic mind.” He refers, correctly, to JP2. But the same criteria apply to Lefebvre and Williamson.

Williamson now introduces an unfamiliar word, **hereticize**, which he defines as **say or do things which are heretical**, and repeats it five times. The Oxford Dictionary carries one only definition, **to pronounce heretical**. Williamson’s concrete error is somewhat mitigated by abstraction from Webster’s New International Dictionary, under the line among the rare, archaic, and obsolete words, of the definition, **to make, declare, or be heretical**.

“The position of the Society is that despite many hereticizing words and deeds of Popes Paul VI and John Paul II in particular, nevertheless the Society holds them to have been or to be Popes unless and until clear proof emerges to the contrary.” But the Society never admits that Paul VI promulgated more than a dozen previously condemned heresies, despite Lefebvre’s protestations that he could sign the promulgated documents read only in the light of the Council of Trent. If they agreed with Trent there would be no such problem. If they disagreed doctrinally with Trent in any particular they were obviously heretical. It later transpired that Lefebvre had signed most of them anyway, thus approving many of the same heresies which Paul VI publicly promulgated. But Paul VI, Williamson argued in his July 1, 1990 letter, didn’t know these were heresies, because he was a Liberal. But Lefebvre, **not** a Liberal, knew, or he would not have objected. Why was he not a heretic?

But the Society (and many Traditional Catholics) **instinctively** reject sedevacantism. “How could the Catholic Church, designed by Our Lord to be a visible structure, long survive without a visible head?” [Not an argument! We sedevacantists fear the same. Only the facts are relevant.] “..... if the Popes since 1958 or 1963 have been invalid Popes, how can they have appointed valid Cardinals?” [Obviously, they can’t!] “And if there are few valid Cardinals, how can another valid Pope ever be elected?” [Good question! Who guarantees that there will ever be another **elected**?] “Again, if there is no Pope, who will consecrate Russia to the Immaculate Heart? It will be done, said Our Lord in 1931, but it has not yet been done.” [In 1931? Is it

part of the Deposit of the Faith, complete at the death of the last Apostle? Sounds like a private revelation, which can prove nothing, and is therefore no argument. Anyway, some Fatima devotees will tell you that the aforesaid consecration was done by Pius XII.]

Then Williamson begs the question several more times in the same paragraph in even sillier drivel: One may **think** that only the divine promise to Peter has preserved the Church from complete destruction by the recent popes, by means of that famous Note to *Lumen gentium* and by *Humanae vitae* [both dodges of a heretic antipope]. Nor are we to forget that Montini and Wojtyla are still Catholic enough to be hated by ultra-liberals [who hate nearly everyone]. With worthwhile arguments who would trot out these feeble inanities?

The next words to strike the eye are so ridiculous that their very statement refutes them: “To say that the Novus Ordo Mass can be valid is to explain how its poison avoids being rejected outright by Catholics and so how it succeeds in doing so much harm; similarly to say that these liberal Popes are still Popes is to explain precisely how they retain so much power to damage the Church.” [Please consult **The Catholic Encyclopedia** (1913), Vol. IX, 212 on Liberalism, condemned by three genuine popes in terms which excommunicate the Liberal for heresy.]

Williamson then demonstrates how we become sedevacantists: “Step One: the recent occupants of the See of Peter hereticize, i.e. they say and do things which are heretical.” (Step One, he says in the next paragraph, is incontestable—clearly demonstrated by this book he promotes.) “Step Two: He who hereticizes is a heretic.” [Unless we use a definition from the dictionaries.] “Step Three: Every heretic is cut off from the Mystical Body of Christ, or the Church. Step Four: Whoever is cut off from the Body cannot possibly be its head. Conclusion: These hereticizing ‘Popes’ cannot still be Popes.”

“True, whoever hereticizes is at least a **material** heretic who speaks or acts against Catholic truth without realizing it or without meaning to do so; but he is not yet a **formal** heretic who consciously and pertinaciously denies what he knows to be revealed Catholic truth. However, to be cut off by heresy from the Mystical Body, or excommunicated one has to be **at least** a formal heretic. From which it follows that by no means everyone who hereticizes is thereby excommunicated. So both Paul VI and John Paul II may well hereticize” [At Step One this was incontestable.] “but that does not as such cut them out of the Church.” [But the Holy Ghost keeps a genuine pope doctrinally correct in matters of faith and morals. These men obviously lack infallibility.] Williamson then applies Christ’s promise to Peter to these heretics. [A heretic, no matter what **kind**, cannot be pope.]

Williamson’s letter of July 1, 1990 lists “wild explanations” each of which have “a grain of truth,” but he never considers that they may be true. But he continues to tell us that these recent papal heretics retain a grain or two of Catholic truth, which keep them Catholic. [On the contrary, one heresy makes a heretic, no matter how orthodox all his other tenets.]

How, asks Williamson, can intelligent, capable Church leaders, apparently of good will, trained before Vatican II, remain unaware that they flout eternal Catholic truth, without, as he tries to show, becoming **formal** heretics? His answer is **Liberalism** [for which the Church excommunicates. Whether or not these Church leaders (of good will and traditional training) are formal heretics, they are excommunicated *latae sententiae* in holding and teaching Liberal and Modernist views, the public condemnation of which was stressed in their training. And they surely knew enough to hide such views until the time was ripe.] “Pope Pius X did his best to root it out, but it so grew back” [unawares] “that now his successors” [not proven] “are destroying the Church **while convinced they are saving it.**” [certainly not proven, even by this genius at begging questions.]

Wojtyla, it seems, is a compromiser of Church doctrine, a victim of mind-rot, and an active partisan of a five hundred-year-old Apostasy. But being Polish he believes profoundly in the goodness of what the Church does. [So he works sedulously in Poland, at Vatican II, and through the papacy to change it.] He seeks a new synthesis because there must be one, and none of the older syntheses have worked. He entered the seminary not to learn but to modify. [One is not to be satisfied with God’s revealed religion, but must insist on man’s rights and independence—as though God had never thought of free will.]

Williamson next describes Liberalism in terms suited to Satanic pride and rebellion, and easily sees that it “completely unhinges the Catholic Faith” but allows its devotees to remain in the Catholic Church to teach us all our Catholic truth with damning variations, because somehow we cannot discern their public heresy.

The neo-modernism of the 1960’s, more deadly than the turn of the century modernism condemned by Pope Pius X, enjoys the support of current and recent popes. [Is there no contradiction here? Why is this advanced to excuse current and recent popes, when it rather proves that these cannot belong to the Catholic Church?] Williamson even proves the sedevacantist point in the very sentence in which he thinks to refute it: “Thus by the time Karol Wojtyla emerges from the Second Conclave of 1978 as the Conclave’s elected choice and is acclaimed as Pope by the Universal Church, he finds neo-modernism firmly established in the upper ranks of the Church. And so what can he know ‘Catholicism’ to be but this ‘improved’ version which he himself strove with conviction to promote at Vatican II?” [Two years older than Wojtyla, I was raised in a much more modernist climate than Poland. Had I been elected pope in 1978, would I have known that Catholicism was neo-modernism? What about Williamson himself? Is he not much younger and raised in Protestantism? But then, of course, he had further training by Lefebvre and his *novus ordo* Society.] But let him hang himself even higher:

“..... from 1978 on, whom does he find that can get through to him” [what he knows well] “that his ‘Catholicism’ is way off track?” [But still on the railroad, no?] No one above, beside, or beneath him can protest that his thinking [as distinct from his status?] is heretical, because Paul VI has wiped up all opposition to neo-modernism. “Who or what remains to tell him his

thinking is not Catholic?" [Only the entire well-known tradition! Only popes from Gregory XVI to St. Pius X, speaking infallibly and excommunicating for precisely that thinking!]

But Williamson writes that all persuade Wojtyła, a deliberate liberal who strove to promote heresy and compromise at Vatican II, that his stand is not Liberal but altogether Catholic. "How can he know that his ecumenism is flouting Catholic dogma?" [Everyone knows that Catholics have always been forbidden to worship with non-Catholics!] "It takes mind-rot to believe all he teaches" [heresy?] "and to believe it is Catholic, but that mind-rot is in him and all round him, so one may well believe" [or not believe] "he is basically unaware of how he is wholly undermining Catholic dogma. But just as a man who unawares tells an untruth is not properly a liar, so a man who unawares flouts Catholic dogma is not properly (formally) a heretic." [But if we ask a policeman for directions, follow them to the letter, and consistently arrive on the wrong side of town, we conclude that he doesn't know his territory. Who would call him a liar? He thinks he's right. But if we follow his directions we could drive into a reservoir. A policeman is, after all, not guaranteed infallibility.]

But a pope is guaranteed infallibility, to the extent that his teaching of erroneous faith or morals proves him not pope. He is guided by the Holy Ghost, Who is not subject to mind-rot or any other failing.

After fantasizing a bit longer, Williamson congratulates himself that: "Hence the main sedevacantist argument falls to the ground." [No, the fog is too thick.] "John Paul II's faith, one may argue, has massively but not totally failed"; but through it all, Williamson argues, JP2, like Paul VI, remains triumphantly our Pope, our guide, our standard of unity, the Vicar of Christ.

But if we must decide for ourselves when and where to follow him, why do we need him? How can we unite with "the recent occupants of the See of Peter" who incontestably "say and do things which are heretical?" How are we not also heretics? Father Noel Barbara in his final issue (#12) of *Fortes in Fide*, page 13, enters the field of episcopal consecrations lacking papal mandate. June 30, 1988, at Econe, Switzerland, Abp(?) Marcel Lefebvre, assisted by Bp. Antonio de Castro Mayer, consecrated(?) four of his priests(?) without Apostolic Mandate. Three of these did the same for another July 28, 1991 at Sao Fidelis, Brazil.

Pp. 14-15 quote Church law; Canon 953 requires written mandate to precede consecration; Canon 2370 suspends all participants till dispensed by the Holy See; Holy Office decree of April 1951 **excommunicates all participants**. But we live in a crisis, so we may appeal to a future pope for authority to violate Church law with impunity. What guarantees a future pope? Or his reaction?

Reasons for invocation of epikeia (page 16): (1) Impossibility of obtaining mandate due to non-existence of **formal** popes; only **material** popes, deprived (by whom?) of all papal authority, are available. So why not procure a material mandate and materially consecrate a material bishop or two? For a time it appeared that Lefebvre could worry a mandate out of Old Krakus, to whom he publicly adhered as genuine pope. He had at least sense enough not to swallow the *Cassiciacum* thesis which splits our standard of unity into two unequal parts, neither functional.

Lefebvre's consecrations were scandalous in lacking doctrinal justification and in total violation of Church law. "The very first condition, the *sine qua non* for interpreting the intention of the lawgiver, never existed for them. Not only did they recognize but they continue to recognize John Paul II as a true Pope; not only have they offered, but they continue on a daily basis to offer *Mass una cum famulo tuo papa nostro Joanne Paulo*, not only have they excluded, but they continue to exclude from their Fraternity, priests, brothers, religious, and oblates who refuse to recognize him, but they have petitioned and presented their requests to him and have received a formal refusal from him." (Footnote quotes Schmidberger letter 5/28/91 in support.)

Barbara's Open Letter to Lefebvre's Fraternity appears to approve Lefebvre's "consecrations" of 6/30/88, even though Lefebvre had ignored requests (Barbara's & others') to precede the consecrations with "sufficient reason"—a statement denying connection with the "antichrist" JP2. "But such a declaration," said Lefebvre, "would turn too many of the faithful away from us cause harm in my priories and seminaries." What has public opinion to do with objective truth? But it could have cost Lefebvre **money**.

Edited quotations:

I have never encountered anything among you but arrogant indifference to all things unconnected with the Society of St. Pius X.

If JP2 is Christ's vicar, and despite your bishops, seminaries, and university, you avow that you can't prove he's not, you can't resist him as you openly do without mortally offending Christ. (p. 56)

You are obliged to resolve this matter. You are so sure that the popes of Vat II are true popes. If so, they truly possess Christ's authority. And Paul VI ordered you to close your seminaries and disband. (p. 57)

For you infallibility clothes a pope only when correct; at other times he can err. So you recognize the Vat II popes as true Vicars of Christ despite their having publicly—officially—professed the worst possible errors for over twenty years, even joining them in matters of faith—to the degree that you expel members who fail to celebrate mass *una cum famulo tuo Papa nostra Joanne Paulo*. (p. 67)

Those for whom religion is only a collection of practices demand only mass, sacraments, and doctrinal instruction. Those who live their faith intelligently demand also doctrinal justifications of our stand, consistent behavior, and above all a confession of faith on disputed points. Despite your seminaries, convents, Parisian university, five bishops, and several hundred priests, your

organization has never published a single doctrinal work to confound protagonists of the new Church and their formal heresies and to justify resistance. (p. 72)

You pretend to recognize the authority of JP2 and his bishops while exercising your ministry against their express wishes. Logical? You then try to convince those scandalized by such behavior that it conforms with Catholic practice, and is even recommended by Doctors and Saints of the Church. (pp. 72-3)

Of Lefebvre's many declarations let me cite his letter (Oct. 6, 1978) to forty cardinals including Wojtyla of Cracow: "A pope worthy of the name and a true successor of Peter cannot declare that he will dedicate himself to the application of the Council and its reforms. By so doing, he makes it clear that he has broken with all his predecessors and especially with the Council of Trent." Do you not realize how foolish you look since Wojtyla's election? From his first encyclical he made clear that he would completely apply Vat II's decisions. (pp. 77-8)

Lefebvre never drew the conclusions which honor and the faith demanded, but, against all justice, expelled those of his children who believed him sincere, and who had concluded from his aforesaid letter that JP2 is not a true pope. (pp. 78-9)

Why are you not ashamed? you who persist in undermining the Catholic resistance? You betray the Church. You act in a manner which can profit only those who openly aim at her destruction. You lack all judgment in not seeing that to affirm and insist everywhere on the Vat II popes' legitimacy plays into the enemy's hands. You undercut and defame the true resister, who adheres to the entire Catholic faith, and brand him an "extremist." (p. 79)

Without warning Lefebvre made his fratricidal declaration of Nov. 8, 79, and stabbed the Catholic resistance in the back. (p. 86)

Like Lefebvre you refuse to declare that these popes who have for well over 20 yrs. officially taught heretical doctrines are not and cannot be real vicars of Christ. Like him you lack courage to declare that they have themselves provided proof that they are not invested with Pontifical Authority. Whether the issue is religious liberty, or total inversion of Church teaching on liturgy, the Mystical Body of Christ, ecumenism, communism, or a host of other novelties, each of these errors was condemned in pre-existing Pontifical documents. [Footnote cites partial list: Religious Liberty condemned by Gregory XVI in *Mirari vos* & by Pius IX in *Quanta cura*. Ecumenism by an Apostolic Letter of Pius VIII, by Gregory XVI in *Summo iugiter*, & by Pius XI in *Mortalium animos*. The new ecclesiology by Pius XII in *Mystici corporis Christi*, etc. (p. 88)]

Apart from Paul VI who destroyed everything in the Church, and apart from his successors who have codified his "October Revolution," no one has done more harm to the Church than Lefebvre by his dividing, liberalizing, and sterilizing the Catholic resistance. (pp. 93-4)

Lefebvre's contempt for those who disagreed with his thinking was a principal trait of his character—possibly the basic cause of his failure to bear witness to the faith. He never accepted advice from those whose thinking varied from his. He never tolerated or heard objections, even in the gravest issues. In 1970 when I organized the first conference to study doctrinal problems at Tours, he announced that he would not participate if I **invited** Fr. Raymond Dulac. This same mentality governed his behavior toward his ex-members: No more contact—*finis!* (p. 94)

He picked his advisers only from among his admirers: he could not bear to be contradicted. Who then can be surprised that the final result is not Catholic?

He was convinced that I erred. An error in matters of faith must hazard one's salvation. Thus duty obliged him to correct me, especially since I asked for correction, repeatedly citing Ezechiel iii, 17-21. Nor was I alone excluded from his charity, but also all Catholics misled by the new Church. What did he so often request of his "pope?" Not to ban the new rites which would cost them their faith—merely to retain the ancient ways for his Society. [**How else could he retain his near-monopoly on the traditional rites?**] How could he tolerate soul-destroying novelties for his fellow members in the Mystical Body—millions to whom he was bound in charity? Had he received some divine dispensation from loving those outside his Society?

To grant legitimacy to Vat II's "popes" is to affirm that Christ has appointed them His vicars and supported their authority. [Such a course denies papal infallibility, involves one in numerous proven public heresies, and obliges obedience to **all** commands and directives from these "popes."]

Our differences are not mere divergence but direct contradiction. If you are on the right path to salvation, then I am not. If I am correct, you are headed for Gehenna. You have toward me, as I toward you, a grave obligation in charity. This letter fulfils my obligation to you. Can you do the same for me?

One cannot believe in the sincerity of your convictions unless you hold that I am necessarily en route to damnation.

[I doubt that any of Lefebvre's crew will take up this challenge. Like their founder, they lack the requisite charity, as they have demonstrated again, again, and again wherever they settle. Charity is listed first among the fruits of the Holy Ghost. "By their fruits you shall know them."

Lefebvre feared that if he finally took a consistent position his support would evaporate. He had attracted worldwide backing as an archbishop who could deal with Rome. Dealers work better from strength. He had "the only game in town" for a good twenty years, and botched it so badly that he must have botched it purposely. We have seen all too often how poorly educated are his priests(?), how feeble their logic, their apologetics, their theology. Is it possible that he would not have recognized or realized his seminary courses' inadequacy? He had years to rectify such matters, but let his people down at every opportunity.

Would he have lost support had he educated the laity over those twenty years? or given dogma priority over cash?]

Or how shall they believe him, of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear, without a preacher? **And how shall they preach unless they be sent?** – Romans x, 14-15 **Who sent the Society of St. Pius X? What is its authority?**