

# LEFEBVRE

*The Final  
Unmasking*

Hugo Maria Kellner

[We received this article recently. Mr. Kellner, a former seminarian from Austria, died years ago, so he can't object to the large cuts, which little concerned the main argument. We received none of the exhibits to which he refers, but he quoted some of them in his own text.

He sometimes expresses wonder at the lack of effective confrontations between Lefebvre and Montini. We can conclude that he had not realized that they were on the same side; they both sought the death of the Catholic Church. All their battles were sham.]

## THE FINAL UNMASKING OF "ARCHBISHOP" LEFEBVRE'S SATAN-INSPIRED, "TRADITIONALIST" IMPOSTURE BY THE DETECTION OF THE INVALIDITY OF HIS OWN ORDERS

No. 72, issued July 1977

By Hugo Maria Kellner

As I have proved in my article No. 70 of January 15, 1976, the apostasy of the almost complete Catholic Church "organization from true God-centeredness and God-centered morality following Vatican II was the concluding stage of the apostasy of mankind. This apostasy started on a worldwide basis with the Protestant "Reformation" in the sixteenth century and will end according to the prophecies of Holy Scripture, with the annihilation of mankind.. This annihilation is already ominously heralded by the nuclear weapons which are stocked by the military superpowers in quantities sufficient to destroy mankind hundreds of times at any time.

Chapter 11 of the Apocalypse is of particular interest in our days, because it indicates that, after the apostasy of the overwhelming part of the Catholic Church in the aftermath of Vatican II, Christ's Church will be revived. As documentary proof, I subsequently give details of the parts of the text of chapter 11 of the Apocalypse concerned here:

The chapter deals with the story of the two "witnesses" who, at a time when the influence of Christ's Church is already extremely curtailed due to the apostatizing mankind, are empowered by God to bear witness to the true faith and warn in prophetic terms against the enemies of the Church who have already "trampled under foot" vast parts of its previous sphere of influence (verses 1-3).

Later, the Scriptural text continues as follows: "And when they have finished their testimony, the beast that comes out of the abyss [Antichrist] will wage war against them and will conquer them and will kill them and their dead bodies will lie in the streets . . . and the inhabitants of the earth will rejoice over them and make merry . . . because these two prophets tormented the inhabitants of the earth (verses 7 - 9).

"And after three days and a half, the breath of life from God entered into them. And they stood up on their feet and a great fear fell upon those who saw them. And they heard a great voice from heaven saying to them, "Come up hither"" (verses 11,12).

But the fact that, according to the figurative language of the Apocalyptic prophecy, the bodies of the killed witnesses were not removed and buried, but were left on the streets and were soon revived, by God and taken to heaven, is a prophetic indication that the true Catholic Church, represented by the orthodox Catholic teachings of the two popes concerned (Pius IX & Pius X), is presently not really dead, but only in a dormant state and will soon be revived and will perform its divine task with all its essential functions in the remaining eschatological time of the history of mankind according to Christ's prediction in Matthew 16:18.

“The gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

But, because of the eschatological state of universal apostasy of mankind, the revived Catholic Church will be only an extremely small organization serving the few remaining true Catholics. For, only such a dwarf-like Church fits the words of Luke 18:8: “Yet when the Son of Man comes, will he find, do you think, faith on earth?”

The preceding deliberations assume presently a specific significance in the face of the fact that, since 1970, former Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre pretends that, with the aid of his “International Priest-Brotherhood of Saint Pius X,” set up within the framework of the “Modernist-Catholic” church organization and dedicated to the fight against Modernism, he will eventually reconvert this “Modernist” church organization to the true Catholic faith.

Due to the fact that Marcel Lefebvre uses one of the “witnesses” alluded to in the above-discussed chapter of the Apocalypse, i.e., Pope St. Pius X, as the patron saint of his priest-brotherhood, as its name demonstrates, even the impression could be created that he is destined by Divine Providence, in accordance with the above-discussed Apocalyptic text, for the revival of the Catholic Church in the end time of human history. But nothing could be further from the truth than such an assumption. For, as demonstrated in the following pages with irrefutable documentary proofs, Lefebvre’s activities serve an ecclesiastical bogus enterprise obviously contrived by Satan by which the latter, in a diabolic perversion of the above-discussed Apocalyptic prophecy increases the number of his victims in the apostate “Catholic” church organization by either preventing the remaining true Catholics from leaving the apostate “Catholic” church organization or even by luring conservative Catholics who had already left this organization back into its soul-destroying sphere of influence and, in so doing, tries to prevent the organization of the remnant Catholic Church. In this scheme, Satan obviously makes use of the power hunger, the spell-binding pious attitude, and the apparent, but demonstrably non-existing ecclesiastical powers of conferring Holy Orders of “Archbishop” Marcel Lefebvre.

#### I. Marcel Lefebvre’s Ecclesiastical Career Before and Immediately After Vatican II Ending with His Loss of Any Ecclesiastical Position of Power.

Marcel Lefebvre was born in Turcoing in the Diocese of Lille in northeastern France on November 29, 1905.

On September 21, 1929, he was ordained a priest by Achille Lienart, Bishop of Lille, and served first as a secular priest in the Diocese of Lille. Later, he entered the missionary Order of the Holy Ghost Fathers and, on September 18, 1947, was consecrated a bishop by the same Bishop of Lille meanwhile created a Cardinal by Pope Pius XI.

The ordination and consecration of Marcel Lefebvre by Bishop and/or Cardinal Lienart has a specific significance, as will be demonstrated ...

On September 22, 1948, Marcel Lefebvre was promoted to the rank of a Titular Bishop of Arcadiopolis of Europe and, on September 14, 1955, to the position of the residential Archbishop of

Dakar in French Africa. In this capacity, he was the president of the Missionary Episcopal Conference and a papal delegate in French Africa.

As Lefebvre mentioned in a lecture given in Montreal, Canada, on May 27, 1976, of which I have the complete wording reproduced from a tape recording, he had hoped to be created a cardinal by Pope Pius XII if the latter would have lived two more years. He says so in a manner which suggests his aspirations to the papal throne. In this connection, he mentions that he was nominated an assistant to the papal throne and a member of the commission consisting of 20 archbishops and bishops which prepared Vatican II in the years 1961-1962 (see page 9, lines 54-59 and page 10, lines 1-2 of the just-mentioned text of his lecture in Montreal). His pride of having belonged to the commission preparing Vatican II is unmistakably recognizable from his lecture in Montreal. But his effort to indicate that this commission was orthodox Catholic must be firmly refuted as incorrect. For, this commission had, of course, been destined by John XXIII to organize the Council, convened by him in breaking the Antimodernism Oath sworn by him, on whose apostatic-ecumenical goal there could not be any doubt from the beginning, in particular since the Protestant apostates had been invited to the Council as guests of honor. The fact that the evil spirit of John XXIII, Cardinal J.B. Montini, also belonged to the commission preparing Vatican II was conveniently suppressed by Marcel Lefebvre in his Montreal lecture. Contrary to the impression Lefebvre wants to give, it is likely that he, as a comparatively unimportant missionary bishop, was selected as a member of the commission preparing Vatican II because there was reason to assume that he would promote the goals of John XXIII and of Montini.

A decisive turn in Marcel Lefebvre's ecclesiastical career which he, significantly, does not mention in his public utterances, but which is documented in the papal yearbooks, is the fact that, on January 23, 1962, he was transferred from the Archdiocese of Dakar in French West Africa to the ordinary Diocese of Tulle in the center of France, while he was permitted to continue to use his title of Archbishop as a personal title. Since the transfer to France did not only mean a lowering of his rank, but made it impossible for him to continue his missionary activities, this transfer must be regarded as a transfer by way of punishment. As far as I know, Lefebvre has never commented on the reasons for this transfer. The following criticism which appeared in the Canadian paper "The Montreal Star" on August 26, 1976, page A-12, might give an indication: "It was in Africa, where he reigned as an uncrowned and mainly undisputed king of the bush."

Marcel Lefebvre's reaction to his punitive transfer, characteristic for him, was that he, only a few months later, i.e., on August 11 1962, resigned as Bishop of Tulle. Subsequently, he was nominated a Titular Archbishop of Synnada in Phrygia and was elected Superior General of the Holy Ghost Fathers in Rome. His abdication as the Bishop of Tulle had the important consequence that he lost the jurisdictional power (of course pertaining only to the territory of the Diocese of Tulle) of a residential bishop, in particular his jurisdiction of ordaining priests, and never recovered it, a fact important in connection with his subsequent illegal ordinations of priests.

Marcel Lefebvre participated in Vatican II as the Superior General of the Holy Ghost Fathers. Today, a number of years after the Council, he criticizes correctly that the Council apostatized from God-centeredness and God-centered morality to apostate man-centeredness and man-centered morality and that this apostasy expresses itself in the liturgy, too, by the replacement of the Latin-Tridentine Mass by the "Novus Ordo Missae." If this was his conviction already during the

Council, as he wants to make it believed today, he would, of course, have had the obligation to give to this conviction loud expression at the Council, and, if he would not have been successful in this effort, he would, of course, have had the obligation to leave the Council under loud protest. And, if he had seen in the years immediately after the Council, as he was liable to see, that the apostate doctrines of the Council were consolidated and were accepted not 'only' by Paul VI, but by all residential bishops without any exception, it would have been his duty to leave the "Catholic" church organization. But nothing of this kind was done by Marcel Lefebvre who, today, puts on an air of complete Catholic orthodoxy. He continued his position of the Superior General of the Holy Ghost Fathers until October 1968. In a lecture given in Canada to the "Vers Demain" group several years ago, he aroused the impression that he had resigned the position of the Superior General of his order voluntarily because of dogmatic differences. That this is not in agreement with the facts is evident from a letter dated May 15, 1975, and addressed to me by the present Superior General of the Holy Ghost Fathers, Franciscus Timmermans. As this letter demonstrates, Lefebvre 'had served completely his term, of office determined by his election to the position of Superior General and had, afterward and only afterward separated himself from his order and changed his residence from Rome to Switzerland.

## II. Marcel Lefebvre Gains, by Supporting the "Traditionalists" with the Aid of Almost Incredible, Canonical Impostures, Again a Certain Position of Power in the Apostate "Catholic" Church Organization

Marcel Lefebvre did not use the expiration of his term of office as the superior general of his order as a suitable occasion to separate himself from the so-called "Catholic" church organization which, according to his own assertions, had apostatized from the essential elements of the Catholic faith, and to devote himself to the spiritual needs of the numerically extremely few remaining true Catholics as would have been his duty. What he really did, after he had lost his position as a superior of his order and, as a consequence, any influence in the "Catholic" church organization, was to try to win again a position of power in the same apostate church organization. As a basis for his efforts of gaining power, he used and he uses the promotion of the so-called "traditionalists," a conservative, but, for this reason, not orthodox Catholic splinter group in the apostate "Catholic" church organization.

### a. The non-Catholic "Credo" of the traditionalists

The "traditionalists" in the apostate "Catholic" church organization recognize correctly the falling away from the faith in the teachings of Vatican II, it is true, and they see correctly in the replacement of the Tridentine Mass by the Protestant "Novus Ordo Missae" the liturgical expression of the falling away from the faith introduced by the Council. But what they do not see in their incredible blindness agreeing with the blindness Scripturally predicted (St. Paul in 2 Thess. 2:10-12) is the apostatic character of this falling away from the faith which, according to Catholic doctrine, is irreversible (see, e.g., St. Paul in Hebr. 6:4-6) and is confirmed, e.g., by the fact that not one of the apostate Protestant sects has ever returned as a sect to the Catholic Church. They do not see the eschatological significance of this apostasy in the history of mankind. They do not see or do not want to see, not even their theologically educated leaders, that this apostasy is the concluding stage of the revolt of mankind against God and His commandments predicted in Holy Scripture which started with the Protestant "Reformation" in the sixteenth century and now will lead to the

Scripturally predicted, punitive annihilation of mankind. They are blind to the scientific fact known for several decades and, in recent years, discussed almost daily in the popular press, that this annihilation is unmistakably announced by the stockpiling of nuclear weapons by the military powers in quantities able to destroy mankind hundreds of times at any time.

b. The worst problem of the “traditionalist” movement: its lack of priests

The “traditionalist” groups which, after Vatican II, have originated in the apostate “Catholic” church organization and are largely led by conservative priests, found their attractiveness among conservative Catholics to a large extent by the apparent opportunity of finding in these groups still valid Latin Tridentine Masses. The extension of the “traditionalist” groups soon, however, came to a halt since the number of “traditionalist” priests was very restricted from the beginning, since no appreciable additions from the “Catholic” clergy took place and newly ordained priests could not be won, since the “traditionalists” did not find any episcopal support.

c. Marcel Lefebvre finds the attention of the “traditionalists” by the foundation of his Swiss “traditionalist” seminary

Marcel Lefebvre succeeded, by publicizing in “traditionalist” publications the Swiss priest seminary founded by him and first existing only in a rudimentary form, and his “International Sacerdotal Brotherhood of Saint Pius X” forming the basis of his seminary, in attracting the attention of the “traditionalists.” For his seminary promised to abolish the chronic lack of priests of the “traditionalist” groups in an effective form. The just-mentioned publicity also attracted the necessary “traditionalist” seminarians who, together with their parents, regarded it obviously as a matter of course - to their great detriment - that titular Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre is also entitled to ordain his seminarians.

d. The canonically foundations of the Swiss enterprises of Marcel Lefebvre 1) of his “International Sacerdotal Fraternity of St. Pius X” established in Fribourg, Switzerland  
2) of his priest seminary in Ecône, Canton of Sitten (Sion), attached to his Fraternity.

As the beginning and basis of his fraudulent post-conciliar, ecclesiastical activities, Marcel Lefebvre succeeded in inducing Mgr. François Charrière, Bishop of Lausanne, Geneva and Fribourg, to sign, on November 1, 1970, shortly before the latter’s retirement as a residential bishop, a document which forms the basis for the just-mentioned enterprises of Marcel Lefebvre in Switzerland. Because of its importance, I record subsequently the wording of the French document of which Mgr. Nestor Adam, Bishop of Sitten (Sion), in whose diocese Ecône is situated, has placed a photocopy at my disposal.

Anyone who reads the name of the Sacerdotal Fraternity founded by this document and considers that it is founded under the title of a “Pia Unio,” i.e., of a pious union, has to assume that the foundation of a pious prayer union is concerned. The main purpose of the erection decree, the foundation of a priest seminary, is, so to speak, introduced only by the back door in a veiled form by mentioning, after the juridical part proper of the erection decree, in the form of a pious wish: “We implore the divine Blessings on this Sacerdotal Fraternity so that it attains its primary goal which is the formation of holy priests.”

The formulation of the erection document represents, therefore, a deceiving veiling of the main purpose of the document, the foundation of a priest seminary.

From the standpoint of Canon Law, the document concerned means that, by it, under the harmless-looking pretext of the foundation of a "Pia Unio," i.e., of a pious union on the diocesan basis, Bishop Charriere "grants" an "international" seminary unknown before Vatican II in his diocese to a mere titular archbishop, though neither the international seminary granted nor the titular archbishop has anything to do with his diocese. Since, here, the violation of the most elementary foundations of Canon Law is involved and the two partners involved had decade-long episcopal practice behind them, in the agreement conscious canonical fraud must be assumed which becomes, in addition, a shameless farce in that, in the erection decree, after the, invocation of the holy. name of God, it is stated expressly that, in the decree, all canonical prescriptions are observed.

According to the canonical prescription here involved, the jurisdiction of a residential bishop is restricted to the territory of his diocese (canons 198, 201.2). He can, therefore, not give permission for an institute whose activities exceed the limits of his own diocese or, as in the case here involved, has international character and violates the jurisdictional rights of other bishops.

Moreover, it is a basic canonical principle that, as far as not seminaries are involved which are directly subject to the Holy See, each diocese maintains its own priest seminary which is subject to the jurisdiction of the residential bishop (can. 1354, per. 1, and can. 1357, par. 1) and that only if it is impossible to erect a diocesan seminary can the bishop send his students into the seminary of another diocese. But, in this case, his jurisdiction over these students is maintained. Moreover, the erection of interdiocesan or regional seminaries is subject to papal permission (can. 1354, par. 3)

The decree on priestly training "Optatam totius" of Vatican II which is mentioned in the introduction of the above-quoted decree of Bishop Charriere on the erection of the "International Sacerdotal Fraternity of Saint Pius X" has not made any essential changes in the erection of seminaries, as the following wording of the here involved paragraph 7 of chapter III of, the Council Decree proves:

"7. Where individual dioceses are unable to institute their own seminaries properly, seminaries for many dioceses or for an entire region or for a country are to be set up and developed, so that the sound training of the students, which must be considered the supreme law in this matter, can be taken care of in a more effective manner. These seminaries, if they are regional or national, are to be regulated according to directives set down by the bishops concerned and approved by the Holy. See."

As is evident from the just-quoted wording, the Council Decree "Optatam totius," too, provides for regional and national seminaries the maintenance of the jurisdiction of the bishops involved and the permission by the Holy See.

According to this evidence, the assertion contained in Charriere's Decree of Erection to the effect that the Council Decree "Optatam totius". provides for international seminaries and for a priest distribution corresponding to such seminaries and that the seminary approved by him is a realization of this Council decree, has to be regarded as a crass canonical fraud which fittingly adds to the

previously mentioned fraud. It is an astonishing fact that these frauds were not detected long ago and duly pilloried.

I would still like to direct attention to the fact that the text of Charriere's erection decree gives in an ominous way no data on the leader of the approved institution and his competence, on the requirements for the membership and on the canonically decisively important questions on where the seminary approved is to be erected, who performs the ordinations of the trained seminarians, and how the ordained priests are to be employed.

In consideration of the fact that, as was demonstrated above, Charriere's erection decree is based, in spite of the pious expressions used in it, on a series of canonical frauds, it has no juridical significance so that the "International Sacerdotal Fraternity of Saint Pius X" and the priest seminary connected with it have no canonical basis.

Finally I would also direct attention to the fact that the "International Sacerdotal Fraternity of Saint Pius X" is by no means a priest order as is evident from its designation as a "Pia Unio," though Marcel Lefebvre tries to give this impression by designating himself as the Superior General of this Fraternity and, in so doing, assumes the same title which he had as the Superior General of the Order of the Holy Ghost Fathers. In his lecture which he gave in Powers Lake, N.D., U.S.A., on August 28, 1971, and whose text is here enclosed, he also tried to give this impression by comparing his Fraternity to the Order of Maryknoll missionaries and to the Society of the priests of St. Sulpicius. He creates the same false impression by designating the chapels served by his "priests" as "pries." "

e. The assertion of Marcel Lefebvre that he has for his Swiss seminary the permission of Cardinal Wright - a falsification

It is possible that Marcel Lefebvre himself had some doubts about the canonical validity of his above-treated agreement with Bishop Charriere and this is the reason why he, soon after the conclusion of this agreement, tried to give the impression that he has for his Swiss enterprise also the permission of Cardinal Wright, the prefect of the Vatican Congregation for the Clergy. As proof for my assertion, I point to the following sentences in the report on his just-mentioned lecture in Powers Lake, N.D.:

"In the foundation and operation of his seminaries, he [Marcel Lefebvre] cooperates with His Eminence, Cardinal Wright, Prefect of the Congregation for the clergy in the Vatican. He has nothing to do with Pope Paul VI, but only with Cardinal Wright, from whom he has a permission in a written form."

Obviously the same, alleged agreement was meant when Marcel Lefebvre declared to persons well known to me and whose reliability is absolutely certain that his Sacerdotal Fraternity is so secured by a contractual agreement with the Vatican that it can only be dissolved by a measure taken by the pope. When I asked Cardinal Wright with my letter of June 3, 1972, in which I directed the Cardinal's attention to the above-mentioned Powers Lake report, to inform me on whether he has given his permission for Lefebvre's priest seminary in Switzerland, I received from the Cardinal, under the date of June 9, 1972, a fairly extensive telegram which contains the following sentences:

“This Congregation has no competence whatever regarding seminaries. The archbishop you mention is in no way working with our Congregation or with me. On this entire matter, there are no permissions of any kind coming from here.” When I made use of the telegram, the accusation was brought against me by the Canadian “Vers Demain” group (adherents of Marcel Lefebvre) in a press article that the telegram is a falsification invented by me. As my response, I gave the people the address of Cardinal Wright in order to enable them to make an inquiry, whereupon the episode came to an end.

When I finally submitted the claim of Marcel Lefebvre of having the permission of Cardinal Wright for his Swiss seminary to Mgr. Nestor Adam, Bishop of Sion (Sitten), in whose diocese Lefebvre’s seminary is situated, he sent me as his answer which he himself had obviously received from Marcel Lefebvre as proof of the latter’s claim a photocopy of the Latin letter which Cardinal Wright had directed to Marcel Lefebvre under the date of February 18, 1971. I attach a photocopy of this letter to this article. As the content of the letter shows, Marcel Lefebvre told the Cardinal that the Bishop of Fribourg, Francois Charriere, approved his Sacerdotal Fraternity on November 1, 1970. He also enclosed in his letter to the Cardinal the statutes of the Fraternity, but according to the wording of the answer of the Cardinal, it must strongly be doubted that he sent to him the above-analyzed erection decree with its canonical frauds. The fact that Lefebvre has created, with his letter, in Cardinal Wright the impression that his Sacerdotal Fraternity “transgresses already the borders of the Swiss nation,” gives the impression that he made, contrary to the truth, the Cardinal believe that his Sacerdotal Fraternity was first destined only for local Swiss needs. In agreement with this opinion is the fact that the cardinal uses for the Fraternity of Lefebvre only the designation “Sacerdotal Society,” but not the designation “International Sacerdotal Society” used in the erection decree. Moreover, the remark used in Lefebvre’s letter to Cardinal Wright that bishops in all parts of the world praise and approve his Sacerdotal Fraternity must have created the impression that the bishops mentioned had the intention of sending young people of their dioceses into Lefebvre’s seminary in order to ordain them later as priests for their dioceses.

In his answer, Cardinal Wright informs Marcel Lefebvre in friendly words that he expects from his enterprise, in agreement with the aims of the Council, good results for the distribution of the clergy in the world, but to interpret this answer as a permission in writing for his seminary by Cardinal Wright, as Lefebvre has done, e.g., in Powers Lake, obviously in order to make an impression on his financial backers badly informed on clerical matters, must be designated as an insolent deception, especially since he certainly knew very well that Cardinal Wright as the prefect of the Vatican Congregation for the Clergy is not competent for the permission of seminaries.

The probability that the just-treated correspondence of Lefebvre with Cardinal Wright was only the introduction for a subsequent correspondence in a matter in which Cardinal Wright is actually competent will be discussed later on.

f. The fruitless efforts of Marcel Lefebvre to found seminaries outside Switzerland with the agreement of the local residential bishops

Only four months after the decree for the erection of his seminary in Switzerland was drawn up by Bishop Charriere, Marcel Lefebvre came, via Spain and Canada, to Covington, Kentucky, U.S.A.,

where the local bishop, Mgr. Richard Ackermann, a member of the Order of the Holy Ghost Fathers, had obviously given Lefebvre hope for allowing him the erection of a seminary in his [Ackermann's] diocese. But when Lefebvre appeared personally in Covington, his request was denied. Another attempt in the Diocese of Little Rock, Arkansas, which he had hoped to bring to a conclusion on the same America trip, also failed. Very serious attempts which he made in the spring of 1972 at establishing himself in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles were refused, as Archbishop Timothy Manning informed me with his letter of June 1, 1972. Moreover, his efforts to erect a house in Aosta, Italy, with the permission of the local bishop failed to the best of my knowledge, as probably many other attempts which did not come to my knowledge.

After such experiences, Lefebvre erected pre-seminaries in Armada, Michigan, U.S.A., and in Weissbad, Switzerland, without the permission of the local bishops.

g. Lefebvre's Swiss seminary erected in a Swiss diocese without the permission of the local bishop

Though Marcel Lefebvre had obtained, by the previously discussed erection decree, permission for his "International Sacerdotal Fraternity" and the seminary connected with it only for the Diocese of Lausanne, Geneva and Fribourg, Lefebvre used Fribourg only for the seat of the Fraternity, whereas he erected his seminary in Ecône which belongs to the Swiss Diocese of Sitten (Sion). When I asked the bishop of this diocese, Mgr. Nestor Adam, whether he had given his permission for the erection of the seminary in his diocese, I received from him with his letter of April 19, 1974, the following answer:

"Mgr. Lefebvre has not obtained permission for the seminary in Ecône: Permission was given to him for a pre-seminary in which the candidates were intended to be prepared for being able to follow the courses at the University of Fribourg."

Obviously, Lefebvre started indeed his activities in Ecône with such a pre-seminary. Soon, however, he erected in Ecône a full-fledged seminary with a large and increasing complex of buildings without having taken the trouble to get the permission of the local residential bishop. The relation between Lefebvre and Mgr. Nestor Adam which originated by this fact is evident from the concluding sentence of the just-mentioned letter of Mgr. Adam reading: "For the rest, I have no relations to the seminary in Ecône."

As is evident from the preceding account, the information published by Lefebvre's secretary, Mr. Peter J. Morgan, in the American magazine "The Remnant" in its edition of February 28, 1971, and the assertion made by Lefebvre himself in Powers Lake to the effect that Lefebvre had the permission of the Bishop of Sitten (Sion) for his seminary were untrue.

h. Lefebvre's ordinations of his seminarians performed within the framework of the apostate, "Catholic" church organization are illicit and invalid

Lefebvre's fraudulent agreement with the Swiss bishops to have his seminarians ordained by two foreign residential bishops

After I had already heard that Marcel Lefebvre had performed the first ordinations of his seminarians himself, I asked Mgr. Nestor Adam, Bishop of Sitten (Sion), whether the permission

for a seminary given to Marcel Lefebvre also included the permission to ordain the graduates of his seminary, whereupon I received, under the date of April 15, 1972, the following answer:

“No! Mgr. Lefebvre does not have permission to ordain the seminarians; but he has asked two foreign, residential bishops to incardinate the new priests into their dioceses and has told them that he would supply to them the dimissorial letters for the ordination.”

For the sake of explanation, I would like first to mention that dimissorial letters are discharge-papers to be made up by a residential bishop if a priest candidate who belongs to his diocese is to be ordained by the residential bishop of another diocese. Attention has to be paid to the fact that the exchange of dimissorial letters can, according to canonical principles, only take place between residential bishops.

I would also like to mention that the foreign, residential bishops meant by Bishop Adam are Bishop Georges Guibert of Reunion, a former auxiliary bishop of Marcel Lefebvre in Dakar, West Africa, and Bishop Castan Lacoma of Sigüenza-Guadalajara, Spain.

If Marcel Lefebvre would have had the intention to adhere to his above-mentioned agreement with the Swiss bishops, he would have had to procure, according to the canonical prescriptions, from the bishops of the home dioceses of the seminarians to be ordained, the dimissorial letters and to transfer them to the one or the other bishop in Reunion or Sigüenza. Subsequently, the bishop of Reunion or Sigüenza would have been able to ordain the priest candidates and to incardinate them into their respective dioceses.

His use of this procedure for the ordination of the priest candidates of his seminary was intimated by Lefebvre in his lecture in Powers Lake on August 28, 1971, as the related enclosure proves. But, there, he has in addition indicated that the ordained priests would be placed by the bishops who had performed the ordinations at his disposal for their assignment.

The procedure mentioned could have led at least to legitimate priest ordinations, though the use of the priests in dioceses other than those in which they were ordained and into which they were incardinated would have been canonically forbidden.

Lefebvre ordained his first priest candidates himself by using a fraudulent “delegated” power.

In reality, impostor Lefebvre did something completely different from what he had promised to the Swiss bishops. When he, on August 28, 1971, told his audience in Powers Lake that his priest candidates would be ordained and incardinated by residential bishops, as he had also promised to the Swiss bishops, he, in June 1971, had already himself ordained his secretary, Mr. Peter J. Morgan, an Englishman, as well as a Frenchman (probably the son of the French writer Louis Salleron), as I found out later on.

As a canonical reason for the licitness of these ordinations for him, a mere titular bishop without any diocese and, therefore, without episcopal jurisdiction, Lefebvre has said that he has received from the above-mentioned two residential bishops a delegated power. The claim of such a “delegated” power is, of course, as Lefebvre himself must know very well, plain fraud; for, even a residential bishop has jurisdiction only within the territory of his own diocese and cannot even delegate his ordaining power to a mere titular bishop in his own diocese if he is not an auxiliary bishop commissioned by the Vatican. Lefebvre’s first ordinations performed by claiming a canonically non-existent delegated power are, therefore, illegitimate, and the priests ordained in this

manner have to be regarded at any rate as suspended priests. To the invalidity of these ordinations, I shall return later on.

After the detection of his original ordination fraud, Lefebvre continues his illegitimate ordinations with false, fraudulently acquired dimissorial letters which give his ordinations even criminal aspects. When I had received knowledge of Peter J. Morgan's ordination by Lefebvre, I passed this knowledge on to Mgr. Nestor Adam, through which the latter obviously heard for the first time that Lefebvre ordains his seminarians himself. Obviously due to Bishop Adam's remonstrances, Lefebvre subsequently changed the canonical reason for his ordinations, as Bishop Adam informed me with his letter of May 29, 1972, by saying:

“According to my knowledge, Mgr. Lefebvre ordains seminarians by virtue of dimissorial letters supplied to him by residential bishops.”

Any reader versed in Canon Law who does not regard Marcel Lefebvre forthwith as an ecclesiastical impostor has to interpret this communication in such a manner that Lefebvre has told Mgr. Nestor Adam that he ordains his seminarians by virtue of dimissorial letters which he has procured from the residential bishops of the home dioceses of the seminarians to be ordained. The same reader must, however, have immediately justified doubts on whether Lefebvre could be successful in obtaining even from a single one of the residential bishops concerned the desired dimissorial letters since these bishops must, of course, know that Marcel Lefebvre is only a titular bishop without a diocese and jurisdiction and, in this position, is not authorized to make use of his ordaining power, not even with dimissorial letters which can lawfully be exchanged only between residential bishops. In order to remove possible doubts on the part of Mgr. Nestor Adam, I mailed to him, with my letter of September 3, 1972, a small canonical dissertation on dimissorial letters which I have made the subject of my article No. 59. A copy of it is attached to this article.

It must, of course, no longer be stressed specifically that, even if Lefebvre would receive from one or the other of the competent residential bishops who does not know the canonical laws involved, dimissorial letters, the ordinations performed with them would be illegal and that the priest so ordained would be a suspended priest. But Lefebvre, in his unscrupulousness, has not even exposed himself to the possibility of a refusal of the issue of dimissorial letters by the competent bishops of the home dioceses of his seminarians. In order to obtain his goal at all costs, he agreed on a criminal plot with his previously named hierarchical friends in Reunion and Siguenza, according to which they furnish the dimissorial letters desired by Lefebvre by acting in a fraudulent way as if they were the bishops of the home dioceses of the seminarians to be ordained. In the ordinations performed with the aid of the dimissorial letters supplied by the bishops of Reunion and Siguenza, two grave canonical violations are involved: First of all, the dimissorial letters used are false papers procured by fraud. Secondly, Marcel Lefebvre, as a mere titular bishop, is not entitled to perform priest ordinations even with valid dimissorial letters.

As proof of the fact that Lefebvre-priest Gregory Post, whose home is Post Falls, Idaho, U.S.A., and who, therefore, belongs to the Diocese of Boise, Idaho, was fraudulently ordained by Marcel Lefebvre with the aid of dimissorial letters furnished fraudulently by the Bishop of Siguenza, Spain, I enclose a photocopy of the letter of December 7, 1972, addressed to me by the Bishop of Bismarck, N.D., U.S.A., Mgr. Hilary B. Hacker.

I have submitted photocopies of the same letter to the papal nuntii in Switzerland and Spain. It is unknown to me whether the Vatican has done anything against the fraudulent practice of Lefebvre's ordinations. At any rate, Lefebvre has continued his illicit ordinations to an increasing degree.

Do Lefebvre's seminarians have an opportunity to inform themselves on the illicitness of their ordinations?

The Lefebvre seminarians would have a normal opportunity to inform themselves on the illegitimacy of their seminary education and of their forthcoming ordinations by Marcel Lefebvre if the study of Canon Law, which is prescribed for priest seminaries in canon 1365, par. 2 of Canon Law, would actually be part of the seminary training in Ecône. That this is true is at least very doubtful. For, as I know positively, Gregory Post, who, as mentioned above, was ordained illicitly with fraudulent dimissorial letters in Powers Lake, N.D., U.S.A., was sent back after his ordination to Switzerland in order to hear lectures on Canon Law at the University of Fribourg. He obtained, therefore, only after his ordination a normal opportunity of informing himself on the illegitimacy of his ordination. Since Gregory Post was accommodated for the continuation of his studies at the University of Fribourg in Maison St. Pie X in Fribourg (Switzerland), he had no easy opportunity to converse with the Lefebvre seminarians in Ecône in Canton Sitten (Sion) in order to exchange his canonical experiences with them.

"Fr." Clarence Kelly, to be referred to later, was also sent back to Switzerland after his ordination by Lefebvre and after a short activity near New York City "for the continuation of his studies."

All this points to the conclusion that it is the deliberate intention to defer the study of Canon Law prescribed for seminaries until after the ordination of his seminarians in order to hide his canonical frauds as long as possible from his victims until he has a firm grip on them by their ordinations.

Lefebvre's ordinations not only illicit, but also invalid

Lefebvre's ordinations are not only illicit, as was demonstrated above, but are also invalid because, among the conditions necessary for a valid ordination, i.e., the use of the right matter, form, and intention, the intention overshadowing his ordinations is dogmatically defective. This intention is correct only if it agrees with the intention Christ had in the creation of the priesthood of His Church, that is the intention that it act as the propagator of the unfalsified faith taught by Him and as the dispenser of his redeeming graces. In order to preserve the purity of the faith preached by Him, Christ installed Peter and his successors and the bishops subordinated to them as the government of His priesthood and of His Church. The orthodoxy of the popes and of the bishops is, therefore, an essential part of the intention of Christ in the creation of the priesthood of His Church. The faith in the necessity of the orthodoxy of the pope and of the bishops of the Catholic Church must, therefore, be an essential component in the intention of a Catholic bishop in the ordinations of priests, in order to make these ordinations valid. This essential component in the intention is, however, completely lacking in the ordinations of Lefebvre. For, in a downright schizophrenic manner characteristic for "traditionalists," he accuses, it is true, Paul VI and the bishops of the present "Catholic" church organization of an apostasy from the faith, but, in spite of it, he recognizes Paul VI as the legitimate pope and the bishops as the legitimate bishops of the Catholic Church.

Another reason for the invalidity of Lefebvre's ordinations consists in that his intention contradicts Christ's intention regarding the dispensing of His redeeming graces insofar as he, in spite of his stress on the Latin-Tridentine Mass, in a dogmatically non-permissible, compromising attitude, also recognizes the validity of the "Novus Ordo Missae" and, in so doing, besides other dogmatically false doctrines, the falsification of Christ's words in the transubstantiation.

As proof for these statements, I first point to the fact that Lefebvre, in his above-mentioned lecture in Montreal, Canada, referred about three dozen times to Paul VI by calling him the "Holy Father" and "the Pope." Moreover, it must be regarded as a recognition of the papal authority of Paul VI by Lefebvre that he, when Paul VI proceeded against his Swiss enterprise, defended it in a canonical process in Rome and negotiated with Paul's emissaries. When, last year, his excommunication by Paul seemed to be imminent, Lefebvre even asked for an audience with the "Holy Father" which was granted to him.

The recognition of Paul VI as the legitimate pope of the Catholic Church by Lefebvre has a specific significance insofar as Paul VI is not any of the numerous devious "popes" in Church history, but the illegitimate pope who brought the apostasy of mankind from God-centeredness and God-centered morality, which had started in the Protestant "Reformation" and then spread all over the earth, to a conclusion by causing, by his diabolic activities at Vatican II and in the postconciliar time, the almost complete apostasy of Christ's Church, the last large, though already punctured bulwark of genuine devotion to God. In so doing, he introduced the eschatological time of the history of mankind (see St. Paul in 2 Thess.) whose reality is underlined by the terrible nuclear threat to humanity developed in the last decades. In the face of the unique role which Paul VI played in this unique situation of mankind and of Christ's Church and still plays, one hardly goes wrong by assuming that he is the Antichrist predicted in Holy Scripture. Lefebvre's recognition of Paul VI as the legitimate pope of the Catholic Church and the invalidity of his ordinations caused by it give to his activities a particularly ominous character in the eschatological history of the Church, as was already mentioned in the preamble to this article.

His recognition of the bishops of the present apostate "Catholic" church organization as the legitimate bishops of the Catholic Church running against the intentions of Christ and, in so doing, making also his ordinations invalid, is proven by his above-mentioned close collaboration with a series of these bishops and his declaration made in Powers Lake that he has no intention whatsoever of operating outside the framework of the present Catholic (!) church organization.

As proof of the fact that Lefebvre also recognizes the validity of the "Novus Ordo Missae" and, in so doing, makes his ordinations invalid, I quote two excerpts from an article which appeared under the title "Wildcat Seminary Provokes Controversy" in the February 8, 1974, issue of the weekly "The Pilot" of the Archdiocese of Boston (U.S.A.) and which was written by Patrick Riley, a reporter of the Catholic press agency in Washington, D.C., U.S.A.:

1.) "It is evident, it is clear that today's liturgical reform tends - note I am saying tends - to replace the notion and the reality of the sacrifice by the reality of a meal,' he told a crowd of some 1,500 persons in Paris last March."

2) "He [Lefebvre] said Catholics could be sure that the Pope would never mislead the whole Church in its prayer life, especially where prayer is so closely bound up with doctrine and where the central act of the Church's worship is concerned."

The second quotation also contains an additional proof for the fact that Lefebvre recognizes Paul VI as the legitimate pope of the true Catholic Church and the present apostate church organization as the true Catholic Church. In agreement with the just-mentioned quotations is the fact established by me that priest-professor Mason in Lefebvre's seminary in Econe taught in March 1972 that a Catholic who has, on a Sunday, no opportunity to attend a Latin Tridentine Mass has the obligation to hear a "Novus Ordo" Mass.

Since, as was demonstrated, the ordinations performed by Marcel Lefebvre are invalid according to orthodox Catholic principles, his priests are, in spite of their priestly costumes, ordinary laymen, making Lefebvre's work a diabolic mummery.

i. Marcel Lefebvre starts his Utopian, "traditionalist" experiment allegedly aimed at the reconversion, by the use of his "priests" of the apostate "Catholic" church organization to the true Catholic faith.

The numerically and dogmatically Utopian character of Lefebvre's alleged action plan

The alleged action plan of Marcel Lefebvre consists in forming, within the framework of the present, apostate "Catholic" church organization, with the aid of his "priests" without the permission of the local bishops, "Tridentine" communities whose members give, as he hopes, such a good example to the apostate members of the "Catholic" church organization that, finally, a reconversion of this organization to the true Catholic faith takes place.

The Utopian character of this assumption becomes already clear by the following, purely numerical consideration: If Marcel Lefebvre, who will become 72 in November 1977, could be active for 10 more years and if he, contrary to all probability, could ordain during this decade on the average two hundred priests per year, he would have not more than 2,000 priests at his disposal in ten years. This would mean that he has, after ten years, only one priest for each of the about two thousand dioceses of the present "Catholic" church organization at his disposal. The belief that he, by this method, could obtain the expected, striking success would be foolish. It has to be added that the Lefebvre "priests," because of their invalid ordinations, are not priests at all so that they cannot procure the effects of grace of real priests.

The decisive, Utopian characteristic of Lefebvre's action plan consists, however, in that the dogmatic "illness" of the present, "Catholic" church organization is not a reversible heresy like the Arian heresy, but consists in an apostasy from God-centeredness and God-centered morality which, as was mentioned already and was discussed in my article No. 70 in greater detail, is no longer reversible according to Catholic dogma and proves the eschatological character of our time which will end with the annihilation of humanity as predicted in Holy Scripture.

Marcel Lefebvre's high-handed, worldwide use of his "priests," a sneering contempt for the canonical prescriptions concerned

Marcel Lefebvre's custom of sending, as a mere titular bishop without any jurisdiction, his "priests" to any locality of the earth selected by him for the foundation and care of his communities without the assent of the local bishops concerned represents an insolent violation of the canons concerned. According to them, even a residential bishop endowed with jurisdiction can use his priests only within the range of his own diocese, whereas Marcel Lefebvre as a mere titular bishop without any jurisdiction usurps a worldwide jurisdiction belonging only to the pope.

In order to understand the situation correctly, it has to be stressed that Marcel Lefebvre does not exercise his activities in his own right outside the jurisdictional range of the apostate "Catholic" church organization, but inside this organization.

Immediately before he put to work his first "priest," his previously-mentioned, former secretary Peter J. Morgan, Marcel Lefebvre tried, in an obvious attempt at avoiding conflicts with the residential bishops concerned, to obtain from Cardinal Wright with his letter of May 13, 1971, permission to use his "priests" without the agreement of these residential bishops according to his own discretion. But, as is evident from the Latin answer of the cardinal 'of May 15, 1971,' placed at my disposal by Bishop Nestor Adam and here enclosed in a photocopy, the cardinal has given Lefebvre to understand in an unmistakable form that he has to observe the existing canon law, i.e., that his priests can be used only by their incardination into the existing dioceses and by placing them under the jurisdiction of the residential bishops concerned: But since this would have destroyed his egocentric plans fundamentally, Lefebvre decided, as must be concluded from his deeds, to realize his above-explained plan by disregarding all opposing prescriptions.

He started the employment of his "priests" in England; in the U.S.A., and France.

In England, Lefebvre "priest" Peter J. Morgan satisfies "traditionalists," but does not convert the apostates in the "Catholic" church organization.

Lefebvre started his work by sending his former secretary, illicitly and invalidly ordained in June 1971, to Guildford, Surrey in southern England. The reason why Lefebvre sent him to this place was, as I heard, that he had not to expect any serious resistance from the local residential bishop. Moreover, Morgan did not have to do groundwork, because he could take over "traditionalist" communities from a Fr. Clarence Duffy; but he increased them considerably with his praiseworthy zeal by instituting an extended itinerant pastoral care. But, as an invalidly ordained priest, he could not and cannot transmit to his "traditionalist" community members sacramental graces in spite of his Tridentine Masses. In particular, it must be doubted strictly whether he has succeeded, outside his "traditionalist" communities, in making any appreciable orthodox Catholic invasion into the dogmatic-moral structure of the apostate "Catholic" church organization - the alleged true aim of Marcel Lefebvre.

In the U.S.A., the first generation of the Econe-priests turns out to be a miserable failure The first personal representative of Marcel Lefebvre in the U.S.A. was Anthony Ward, a native of Brooklyn, N.Y., and "ordained" by him in April 1973. Ward established in the U.S.A. the first Latin-Tridentine Mass center for the Lefebvre organization by converting a garage into a chapel, the Pius X chapel in Wantagh, L.I., N.Y. Later, he founded for the Lefebvre Fraternity without the

permission of the competent Archbishop of Detroit a small pre-seminary called St. Joseph's House in Armada, Michigan. Religious instruction classes for children are connected with this pre-seminary. For this instruction, there is used as a textbook, as I found out - of all things - "The New St. Joseph's Baltimore Catechism." For, this catechism uses the "kerygma" doctrine which, in the protestant manner, puts the stress on the person of Christ and not on the doctrines and commandments of Christ. This doctrine was disseminated, as I have proved in previous articles, by the Austrian Jesuit Josef Andreas Jungmann in his book issued in 1936: "The Good News and Our Proclamation of the Faith" by relying heavily on the doctrines of the Swiss Protestant theologian Karl Barth and was later made, with the sacrilegious support of the Vatican, the basis of the "Catholic" religious instruction on a worldwide basis. It was a decisive device in preparing the apostasy of the Catholic Church organization at and after Vatican II.

In consideration of this fact, the use of the above-mentioned catechism in Lefebvre's pre-seminary in Armada must be designated downright as a means of bringing unaware, conservative-Catholic people to apostasy from their faith! When an alarmed father brought the doubtful orthodoxy of the catechism concerned to the attention of "Fr." Ward and the latter later answered that he, in spite of the study made by him, could not find anything wrong with the catechism, the father withdrew his children from the religious instruction and stopped attending the Tridentine Masses in Armada.

The support of the just-discussed, Protestantizing catechism by "Fr." Ward hardly lies on the line of the realization of the alleged goals of Marcel Lefebvre.

The fact that "Fr." Anthony Ward leaves open the question of the validity of the "Novas Ordo Missae" is documented by his speech at the "Assembly of Catholic Traditionalists" in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in May 1975 (see "The Voice," June 28, 1975). In agreement with this fact is the fact credibly reported to me that, in Armada, obviously due to a policy of the Lefebvre Society, nothing is said, neither privately nor publicly, on the legitimacy of Paul VI and his diabolic activities, on Vatican II, and on the "Novas Ordo Missae." It stands to reason that such an attitude cannot agree with the declared goal of Marcel Lefebvre to reconvert the apostate "Catholic" church organization to the true Catholic faith. Significant for "Fr." Ward's personal way of thinking is the remark he made to a person known to me to the effect that he "likes money." This remark allows the conclusion that he did not fully reach in Econe the priestly saintliness which Marcel Lefebvre has designated as the goal of the seminary education in Econe. The fact that the reaching of the dogmatic goals of his master has not become the goal of his heart has to be concluded from the fact that he left his position as the director of the pre-seminary in Armada and his membership in Lefebvre's Sacerdotal Fraternity when, last fall, Lefebvre appointed another "priest" of his Fraternity stationed in the New York area as his representative in the U.S.A. The fact that "Fr." Ward was accompanied by several of his seminarians when he left Armada might be an indication that he, aged around 30 years, has hierarchical plans.

Since the ordination of Anthony Ward by Marcel Lefebvre was invalid for the reasons previously mentioned, he, too, was not able to transmit to his community in Armada Christ's sacramental graces.

A second "priest" employed by Marcel Lefebvre in the U.S.A. is Hector S. Bolduc, a native of Portsmouth, New Hampshire. According to the data at my disposal, he was a brother of the Society

of Mary, a student at the Catholic University in Washington, D.C., in the years 1967-1969. In this capacity, he assisted in cataloging the University's museum collections, an activity which later played a role in a criminal investigation. In the period of time between the second half of 1973 and the end of 1974, he obviously was in the seminary in Econe and was ordained - of course invalidly - by Marcel Lefebvre.

In the U.S.A., he was first active under Anthony Ward in Armada, Michigan. Obviously, he also was, for a short time, a priest of the "traditionalist" community of St. Athanasius in Vienna, Virginia, where, according to obviously authentic information, he received for a strange reason the real estate of the community as a personal property under the condition that it would be transferred to the "International Sacerdotal Society of Saint Pius X" after a year. This condition is said to have been observed by Bolduc, but he is still one of the administrators of the real estate property of St. Athanasius. But according to another source of information, Bolduc is still listed as the owner of the property.

Later, Bolduc obtained the position, regarded as permanent, of a chaplain of the large "traditionalist" community of the St. Jude Shrine in Stafford near Houston, Texas. But, soon, serious complaints were raised against him, as I heard from the president [Gary Giuffr ] of the board of directors of the community. The main objection was obviously that he did not restrict himself to the priestly care of the community, but also wanted to dominate the real estate and the finances of the community [duplication of larceny]. Another complaint was that he did not place himself enough at the service of the community during week days and that his absences could not only be explained by priestly services outside his community. One of these absences was explained, obviously by himself, by his illegal entry into German communist East Berlin under adventurous circumstances. In this connection, it may be mentioned that Bolduc bragged about having parachuted, obviously at a previous time, into Cuba (and Portugal) 17 times for a non-governmental intelligence agency and having carried a pistol during an air trip without encountering objections by the controllers.

Significantly, in the apartment placed at Bolduc's disposal, pornographic literature was found. A complaint in the same matter was made by Anthony Ward to Marcel Lefebvre in Econe, but was responded to by him only with a shrugging of the shoulders. This reaction, however, is not surprising in consideration of the personal attitude of Marcel Lefebvre in this matter reported later in this article.

As a theologically educated witness reported, the sermons of "Fr." Bolduc rarely have spiritual content. As an example, he mentioned that Bolduc told how he used to spy at "black masses." The same witness also reported on the incredibly bad Latin Bolduc uses in his Tridentine Masses. He omits complete words, changes the endings in other sentences, and inserts words which do not appear in the prescribed text. This gives an indication of serious shortcomings in the Econe seminary regarding the Latin language instruction and the examination requirements concerning this subject. This is a reproach chargeable to Marcel Lefebvre with special severity since he stresses the Latinity of the liturgy in a particular manner. I myself tried to examine the correctness of one of the probable accusations made against Bolduc. As the result of my efforts, I enclose a photocopy of a letter of Vice President C. Joseph Nuesse of the Catholic University of America of February 28,

1977, which shows that Bolduc sold books of obviously high historical value in Canada which were stolen from the university, but that the identity of the thief could not be established.

The “irregularities” of “Fr.” Hector Bolduc finally caused the directors of the “traditionalist” community in Stafford, Texas, to dismiss him.

After Bolduc’s dismissal, an undeveloped, photographic film spool was found in his apartment which, after its development, showed its pornographic contents. Bolduc, too, did not bring, as an invalidly ordained priest, Christ’s sacramental graces to his “traditionalist” community and he did not convert any apostates of the apostate “Catholic” church organization in following up the alleged final goal of his master, Marcel Lefebvre.

After his dismissal by the community of the St. Jude Shrine, Bolduc turned up sporadically at different places of the U.S.A. obviously without having found a permanent position up to April 1977, when he was charged by Lefebvre with another position, as will be reported later.

Another of the “priests” used originally in the U.S.A. by Marcel Lefebvre is Gregory Post who was already previously mentioned in connection with his ordination in Powers Lake, N.D., U.S.A., performed by Lefebvre with the aid of falsified dimissorial letters.

Gregory Post was previously a teacher in the school operated by “Fatima Crusader” and now “Bishop” Francis K. Schuckhardt in Idaho, U.S.A., but was dismissed by Schuckhardt reportedly because of his Teilhardian ideas.

After his ordination in Powers Lake and after he had attended lectures in Canon Law at the University of Fribourg (Switzerland), he was entrusted with the position of a chaplain of a “traditionalist” group and its chapel in San Jose, California, where he moved with his parents and a brother and a sister. According to the information given me by a competent source, Gregory Post shows a dependence, unusual in a grown-up person, on his mother which even influences his priestly decisions decisively. It is understandable that this fact was disapproved of by the members of his community.

When Post took up his priestly functions, the members of his community found out that he had mastered some rites so badly that he had to ask a bystanding layman how to continue.

It was found to be especially disturbing that, during the consecration, he stood at the altar for 5 to 10 minutes without saying a word, behavior which was interpreted by the community as a gesture of Post to give the impression of his particular piety which he did not give enough in the other parts of the Mass. Particularly irritating was Post’s unusual unreliability and unpunctuality. Often, he did not come for his Sunday Masses at the set time and the excuses made by him turned out in many cases to be untruths. But even if Post was present punctually, he made the community wait for the beginning of his Masses for 5 to 10 minutes, behavior which the members of the community interpreted as a means of proving to them his importance. The community members who wanted to hear Post’s Masses provided during week days in his apartment at a set time found Post often still in bed.

Post's unreliability turned out to be dangerous if it was necessary to bring him to the sick bed of dying persons. Often he could not be found. A case is reported in which he was called to a dying old man. In this case, he could be reached immediately in his apartment by phone, it is true, but he kept the caller waiting for two hours, though he could have been present in twenty minutes.

In an obviously restricted number of cases, Gregory Post celebrated Tridentine Masses also outside his own community and, in these cases, too, it happened, as I was informed, that he simply forgot promised Masses. The priestly services performed by Post during the week were so few that the members of his community came to the idea that he uses up his time by reading books. Prominent members of the community expressed their grievances about his irregularities in private talks with him. He responded by telling them in his public sermons that they were slandering a priest of the Lord.

When, finally, the leading community members had found another conservative priest not belonging to the Lefebvre Fraternity, they told Gregory Post that they would no longer attend his Masses. Post had meanwhile found his own fundraiser, who later turned out to be a member of a syndicate of criminals who were prosecuted for large-scale theft and trade in stolen goods.

It is, of course, also true in the case of "Fr." Gregory Post that he could not provide his community with Christ's sacramental graces because he is not a validly ordained priest. He, too, has, in the pursuit of the alleged final goal of Marcel Lefebvre, reconverted not a single "Catholic" apostate to the true Catholic faith.

"Fr." Clarence Kelly has to be mentioned as the last of the "priests" originally installed by Lefebvre in the U.S.A. He was "ordained," together with Anthony Ward, in 1973. He first took care of the St. Pius X Chapel in Wantagh, N.Y., created by Anthony Ward and, subsequently, went, as was already mentioned above, back to Switzerland for the continuation of his studies in October 1973. After his return, he organized in Wantagh the "traditionalist" Catholic "School of Holy Pius V" But his specific significance for the Lefebvre cause consisted in having become, obviously with Lefebvre's permission, a member of the non-Catholic, anti-communist "John Birch Society" tabooed in Catholic circles and having written, on orders of the president of this society, Robert Welch, the book "Conspiracy Against God and Man." Significantly, the book is dedicated to Robert Welch, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, and Father Francis Fenton, the president of the "traditionalist" ORCM and a member of the John Birch Society. In the Rocky Mountain rallies of the John Birch Society in June 1974 and in July 1976, young Clarence Kelly took part as one of the main speakers ... I shall return later to the effects of this fact on the Lefebvre cause in the U.S.A.

In connection with the just-discussed case, it is important to mention that Marcel Lefebvre, who has permitted Clarence Kelly in a manner disreputable from an orthodox Catholic standpoint to connect himself very actively with a political, non-Catholic association, has strictly declined to collaborate with "traditionalist" movements which are not dominated by himself. This applies especially to the "Catholic Traditional Movement" (CTM) of Fr. Gommaer A. De Pauw and the "Orthodox Roman Catholic Movement" (ORCM) of Fr. Francis E. Fenton. In particular, he declined to ordain priest candidates for the ORCM who were planned by the ORCM to be trained in an already started seminary. This demonstrates unmistakably that Lefebvre intends to promote

the training of priests only in his own organization and to force the other “traditionalist” groups to die out so that he finally dominates the “traditionalists” alone.

The above-reported experiences with the Lefebvre “priests” in the U.S.A. show clearly that it is practically impossible to entrust, without effective controls, young people, who are for the most part below 30 years of age and have, partly at least, adventurous tendencies, with religious tasks which exceed their knowledge, their moral qualities, and their experiences of life, in particular since they are not equipped with priestly graces for lack of valid ordinations.

#### The Lefebvre organization in France

It can safely be assumed that Lefebvre has begun, in his own homeland of France, to build up his organization with the aid of the Frenchmen “ordained” by him. Unfortunately, I am not able to report any details in this matter since the French, “traditionalist” Catholic magazines at my disposal advocate enthusiastically the Lefebvre cause, it is true, but they do not report details on the organization of the Lefebvre cause in France. Moreover, I do not have the necessary connections with informed individual persons.

#### The Lefebvre organization in Italy

In Italy Lefebvre maintains, a convent for women in Albano Laziale near Rome which can be suspected to be a good listening post for him to find out what is going on in Rome with respect to him. But one also probably does not go wrong in assuming that Lefebvre wanted to secure a place for himself where he hopes that his most secret hopes will materialize. “My hour has not yet come,” he has said on two occasions reported to me, at one occasion in direct connection with the papal Chair.

The activities of Marcel Lefebvre so far reported aim obviously at the organization of a “traditionalist” or “Tridentine” church organization within the framework of the apostate “Catholic” church organization. This new organization has, of course, as its absolute leader in a pope-like position Marcel Lefebvre.

k. The intervention of “Pope” Paul VI against the “traditionalist” activities of Marcel Lefebvre within the apostate “Catholic” church organization

The direct challenge of the authority of Paul VI by Lefebvre, on belated intervention of the Vatican against his activities

I have documentary proofs that not only the Swiss bishops concerned, but also the highest Vatican authorities including the Vatican Secretariat of State were well informed since 1972 on the canonical frauds of Marcel Lefebvre. But the Vatican did not react to the activities of Marcel Lefebvre until he started attacking the authority of Paul VI directly. He did that with his article entitled “Oui a la Rome. eternelle Non a la Rome moderniste” [Yes to the eternal Rome No to modernist Rome] which appeared in the French magazine “Itinéraires” edited by Jean Madiran in January 1975. He continued this direct challenge of Paul by participating in the “pilgrimage to

Rome” organized by a French group and by Dr. Elisabeth Gerstner in May 1975 and celebrating Latin-Tridentine Masses connected with this pilgrimage.

In the same May 1975, Mgr. Mamie, Bishop of Lausanne, Geneva. and Fribourg, revoked the permission for his “International Sacerdotal Fraternity of Saint Pius X” and for the priest seminary connected with it granted to Marcel Lefebvre by Mamie’s predecessor, Bishop Charriere. The revocation took place within the experimental period established in the erection decree so that Lefebvre had no canonical reasons for his loud protests.

A direct interference of the Vatican with the Econe operation. took place when Lefebvre had announced the ordination of eight seminarians for February 2, 1975, and, shortly in advance, Cardinal Secretary of State Villot warned the bishops of the world against doing anything for Lefebvre’s seminarians and issuing disiplinary letters for them. As a consequence of this warning, Lefebvre delayed the planned ordinations without fixing a new date.

Lefebvre publicly censured by Paul VI and suspended by him after the execution of the forbidden ordinations

When, in May 1976, Lefebvre travelled to the U.S.A. and Canada, performed there confirmations without consulting the local bishops, and gave lectures his lecture in Montreal, Canada, on May 27, 1976, was already mentioned - he was criticized by name in strongest terms by Paul VI in a consistory of cardinals which took place in Rome on May 24, 1976, and, when Lefebvre, in spite of an explicit prohibition, ordained 13 priests and 13 subdeacons (of course invalidly!) in his seminary in Econe on June 29, 1976, he was prohibited by Paul VI from performing any priestly functions (suspensio a divinis) on July 22, 1976

Lefebvre’s reaction: Celebration of a public, Tridentine Mass in Lille, France and demand to give his movement Catholic churches

In a crass challenge of his suspension, Marcel Lefebvre, on August 29, 1976, celebrated in Lille, northeastern France, where he himself had been ordained and consecrated, a solemn Latin-Tridentine High Mass in front of 7,000 “traditionalists” who had come in haste from the surrounding countries. As is evident from a press report (Times-Union, Rochester, N.Y., August 30, 1976), the previously mentioned Lefebvre “priest” Hector Bolduc, who had been dismissed by his community in Texas, U.S.A., because of serious irregularities, assisted at Lefebvre’s Mass in Lille. It is probable that he acted on this occasion as Lefebvre’s bodyguard.

On the occasion of his Mass in Lille, Lefebvre preached an hour-long sermon in which he, according to a report at my disposal (W.F. Strojic Letter No. 17 of December 7, 1976), significantly mentioned: “All these problems could easily be solved, if each bishop would give a church to the faithful Catholics.” This remark suggests that, at this time, the immediate goal of Marcel Lefebvre consisted in gaining for his movement the official recognition as “the Latin Tridentine Rite” within the present “Catholic” church organization and, as a consequence, to secure for him the position of a kind of “secondary” pope which would enable him to increase his dogmatic influence in the “Catholic” church organization more and more and, finally, to realize his more far-reaching goals, “if his hour has come.” The dogmatic impossibility of the reconversion of the apostate “Catholic”

church organization to the true Catholic faith was already discussed previously. This impossibility is an essential element of the present eschatological situation of mankind whose dreadful seriousness, as cannot be stressed enough, is confirmed by the phantastic magnitude of the nuclear threat to mankind. This eschatological way of thinking is well-known to Marcel Lefebvre, as I shall demonstrate later on. But its consideration stands in the way of his ambitious, Satan-inspired plans to regain a position of power in the vast "Catholic" church organization.

Marcel Lefebvre's audience with Paul VI on September 11, 1976

After Marcel Lefebvre, by the celebration of the Mass in Lille forbidden to him, had challenged the authority of Paul VI, a rupture between him and Paul seemed to be inevitable. But, surprisingly, he was granted by Paul a requested audience in Castelgandolfo on September 11, 1976. In this audience, Lefebvre voiced, as is evident from the subsequent letter of Paul VI addressed to Lefebvre on October 11, 1976, his desire already expressed in Lille that certain churches in the "Catholic" church organization be accorded to him and to his "traditionalists" and that the continuation of his seminary in Econe be allowed to him. But, obviously, Paul did not give any assurances in this respect. It is interesting and significant that Paul, according to a statement made by Lefebvre (see "Itinéraires," "Supplement-Voltigeur No. 47 of April 15, 1977) said to Lefebvre in this audience (in English translation): "What should I do, if you condemn me? Should I present my resignation? Is it this that you want? You want to take my place."

Paul's words indicate what he thinks of his younger companion in the same Satanic business. On the other hand, the fact that Lefebvre himself has publicized the imputation by Paul makes it probable that he felt honored by this imputation and is interested in making this imputation the subject of a public discussion.

Paul VI, in his letter of October 11, 1976, orders Marcel Lefebvre to stop his activities against Vatican II

Since Marcel Lefebvre did not follow up his audience with Paul VI with additional approaches, Paul sent him, exactly one month after the audience, i.e., on October 11, 1976, a private, 15-page letter by which he apparently closed all doors to a compromise. The full text of the letter was published in Jean Madiran's "Itinéraires" Supplement-Voltigeur No. 42 of November 15, 1976.

In this letter in which Paul again and again raises the false claim that he is the legitimate successor of St. Peter and discloses, in his discussion, his apostate, modernist thinking, he refuses Lefebvre's "traditionalist," Tridentine arguments without any compromise and calls him a rebel.

As a consequence, Paul demanded from Lefebvre, as part A of his letter, a declaration by which the latter confirms that he subjects himself unconditionally to Vatican II and its texts which were accepted by the Council fathers and were approved and published by his (Paul's) authority, that he (Lefebvre) recognizes the decisions which he (Paul) has made in order to apply them by recognizing expressly the legitimacy of the renewed liturgy, in particular the "Ordo Missae" and his (Paul's) right to demand its acceptance by all Christian people.

Paul also demanded that Lefebvre recognize in his declaration the authority of the present Canon Law without excepting the part which deals with the canonical penalties, and stop and revoke the grave, public accusations and insinuations made against him (Paul), the orthodoxy of his faith, and his fidelity to his obligations as the successor of Peter and against his immediate advisors. Paul also demanded that Lefebvre, in his declaration, recognize the authority of the bishops in their respective dioceses by desisting from preaching in their dioceses and performing there sacraments (the Sacrament of the Altar, confirmations, ordinations, etc.) if these bishops have expressed their formal opposition.

Finally, Paul demanded that Lefebvre make it the subject of his declaration to desist from all initiatives not agreeable with his declaration (meetings publications, etc.) and that he disavow formally all attempts at appealing to him which do not agree with the declaration demanded.

Paul made the delivery of the declaration a condition for the lifting of Lefebvre's suspension.

As part B, Paul demanded the juridical suppression of the "Sacerdotal Fraternity of Saint Pius X" and the transfer of Lefebvre's seminaries into his (Paul's) hands. The same is demanded regarding the other institutions of Lefebvre whose future destiny will be decided, according to Paul's demand, in agreement with the local bishops.

The repeal of the canonical penalties of the priests illicitly ordained by Lefebvre is considered, if these priests sign the declaration demanded from Lefebvre. Paul expresses in his letter his opinion that Lefebvre is in a state of mind which makes it difficult for him to see clearly and to change his behavior with the necessary submissiveness. He recommends, therefore, to him to undergo spiritual exercises. Moreover, he warns him to beware against pressures exercised by people who want to induce him to maintain his untenable attitude.

Marcel Lefebvre's new provocation of Paul VI by his celebration of a Tridentine Mass in Friedrichshafen and his ordination of 12 deacons

Marcel Lefebvre first left unanswered the above-discussed letter of Paul VI of October 11, 1976, and provoked him anew by celebrating again a public, Latin Tridentine Mass for 7,000 of his adherents in Friedrichshafen on Lake Constance on the southwest border of Germany on October 24, 1976. His sermon was aimed at the friendly attitude of Paul VI to the communists. On October 31, 1976, Lefebvre ordained 12 deacons in another provocation of Paul VI.

Lefebvre's answer of Dec. 1, 1976 to Paul's letter of Oct. 11. 1976:

His assertion that his priest distribution corresponds to the desires of Vatican II, a barefaced lie  
His argumentation a good documentation of the heretical-apostatical character of "traditionalism"

It was not until December 3, 1976, that Lefebvre answered Paul's letter of October 11, 1976, in a letter whose introductory words are as follows:

"Holy Father: His Excellency, the Nuncio of Bern has just conveyed to me the last letter of Your Holiness. May I say that each of these letters is like a sword which penetrates me inasmuch as I

would like to be in full agreement and in full subservience to the Vicar of Christ and Successor of Peter as I was, as I believe, during my whole life.

But this submission can only exist in the unity of faith and in the 'true tradition' as Your Holiness say in your letter. . . ."

Then, the usual, justified accusations of Paul's deviations from the traditional, Catholic truths follow as usual in Lefebvre's remarks on Paul VI. Lefebvre concludes his letter as follows: "As my statements show, I accept everything that, in the Council and in the reforms, is in full agreement with tradition, and the work I have founded proves this abundantly. Our seminary corresponds completely to the desires expressed at the Council and in the ratio fundamentalist of the Holy Congregation for Catholic Instruction. Our apostolate corresponds completely to the desire for a better distribution of the clergy and to the anxiety expressed by the Council for its sanctification and regarding its life in community.

The success of our seminaries among the youth makes it completely clear that we are no sclerotics, but that we are completely adapted to the necessities of the apostolate of our time. For this reason, we implore Your Holiness to consider above all the great benefit which the souls receive from our priestly and missionary apostolate which, in collaboration with the residential bishops, can bring about a true, spiritual renewal.

The attempt to force our work to accept a new orientation which will have disastrous consequences in the whole Church means to force it to disappear as so many other seminaries.

Hoping that Your Holiness in reading these lines, will understand that we have only one goal, i.e., to serve our Lord Jesus Christ, His glory, His vicar and to procure the salvation of souls, we beseech You to receive kindly our respectful and filial sentiments in Christo et Maria.

Marcel Lefebvre

former Archbishop of Tulle

Ecône, on the feast of St. Francis Xavier December 3, 1976'

First of all, I would like to remark in connection with the preceding letter that Marcel Lefebvre calls himself, after his signature, the former Archbishop of Tulle. This is incorrect, since Tulle (in central France) is only a diocese, not an archdiocese, so that there cannot be an Archbishop of Tulle. The truth is, as was already mentioned previously, that, in January 1962, Marcel Lefebvre was transferred from the Archdiocese of Dakar to the ordinary Diocese of Tulle in a lowering of his rank while he was allowed to continue to use his title of an archbishop as a personal title. This fact would have to be taken into account by Marcel Lefebvre according to ecclesiastical customs by designating himself as the "former Archbishop-Bishop of Tulle.". This form of addressing him is also used by Paul VI. The fact that Marcel Lefebvre designates himself as the "former Archbishop of Tulle" must, therefore, be regarded as an expression of his unrestrained pride which will not admit that he was actually degraded. For the verification of the truthfulness of Lefebvre's assertion that his ecclesiastical enterprise "completely corresponds to the desires of the Council for a better distribution of the clergy," I quote here the applicable wording in chapter II, section 3, No. 10 of the only Council decree here concerned, "De Presbyterorum Ministerio et Vita": "Priests of such dioceses as are rich in vocations should show themselves willing and ready, with the permission of their own ordinaries (bishops), to volunteer for work in other regions, missions or endeavors which are poor in numbers of clergy.

Present norms of incardination and excardination should be so revised that, while this ancient institution still remains intact, they will better correspond to today's pastoral needs. Where a real apostolic spirit requires it, not only should a better distribution of priests be brought about but there should also be favored such particular pastoral works as are necessary in any region or nation anywhere on earth. To accomplish this purpose there should be set up international seminaries, special personal dioceses or prelatures (vicariates), and so forth, by means of which, according to their particular statutes and always saving the right of bishops, priests may be trained and incardinated for the good of the whole Church."

As the just-quoted wording of the Council decree concerned proves, the assertion of Marcel Lefebvre, a former bishop without jurisdiction, to the effect that his arbitrary dispatch of his illicitly trained and invalidly ordained "priests," undertaken by the illegitimate claim of a worldwide, papal jurisdiction, into any diocese arbitrarily selected by him "corresponds completely to the desires of the Council for a better distribution of the clergy," represents a barefaced lie of an ecclesiastical impostor obviously not bothered by any moral considerations.

From a dogmatic standpoint, Marcel Lefebvre's letter to Paul VI of December 3, 1976, represents an excellent, documentary proof of the own heretical-apostatic apostasy from the true Catholic faith of "traditionalist" Marcel Lefebvre and of all adherents to "traditionalism." For, in the same letter in which Lefebvre justly accuses Paul VI and the "Catholic" bishops of modernist, and therefore apostatic, falling away from the faith at Vatican II, he recognizes Paul VI as the "Holy Father" and as the "Vicar of Christ" on earth and leader of His Church, a Satan-inspired blasphemy of specific graveness since Paul VI has to be regarded as the eschatological Antichrist. In so doing, Lefebvre himself has apostatized from the true faith. This "traditionalist" apostasy was taught already before him by "traditionalist" priests such as Fr. Gommaar A. De Pauw in his "Catholic Traditional Movement" founded in the years 1964 and 1965 though it is in crass contradiction to simple logic. But it obtained in the eyes of the "traditionalists" a kind of hierarchical recognition when "Archbishop" Marcel Lefebvre adopted it. The fact that he adopted it at least with the secondary intention of obtaining again a position of power in the vast "Catholic" church organization, can, according to the preceding argumentation, hardly be doubted.

Marcel Lefebvre establishes his own church organization in the framework of the apostate 'Catholic' church organization

While Marcel Lefebvre was involved in a tug of war with Paul VI on the question of the recognition of his organization he established, in the last months of 1976 and the first months of 1977, his own "traditionalist" church organization within the framework of the apostate "Catholic" church organization. His "church" presents itself, according to official reports, as follows:

Most Reverend Marcel Lefebvre Superior General and Founder

Reverend Paul Aulagnier District Superior of France and First Assistant

Reverend Peter Morgan District Superior of the United Kingdom and Second Assistant

Reverend Clarence Kelly District Superior of the United States of America

Reverend Klaus Wodsack District Superior of Germany

Reverend Denis Hoch Economic General

Reverend Bernard Tissier de Mallerais Secretary General

In this church government, “Rev.” Morgan is 6 years, “Rev.” Kelly is 3 years, and “Rev.” Wodsack is just 1 year past their respective ordinations. None of the four “country leaders” is, of course, a real priest, because their ordinations are invalid for the already previously mentioned reasons. Another surprising reason will be discussed later.

The replacement of Anthony Ward, the director of Lefebvre’s pre-seminary in Armada, Michigan, by Clarence Kelly as the “country leader” for the U.S.A. probably caused Ward to leave the Lefebvre organization. The reason for this change has probably to be explained by the assumption that Lefebvre tries to find the (financial?) favor of the non-Catholic, anti-communist John Birch Society of which Clarence Kelly is an active member.

As the successor of Ward as the director of the pre-seminary. in Armada, Michigan, Lefebvre selected “Fr.” Donald J. Sanborn who, this year, became 27 years old and who was “ordained” in 1975.

Some years ago, Marcel Lefebvre changed the original, juridically established name of his “International Sacerdotal Fraternity of Saint Pius X” into “Society of Saint Pius X,” a measure by which the name assumes more the appearance of an Order of the kind of the “Society of Jesus” (S.J.). Moreover, in so doing, he has eliminated the controversial designation “international.”

#### The Lefebvre case in February 1977

At the end of February 1977, Marcel Lefebvre performed, in spite of his suspension, in Econe lower, ordinations on 30 students. At the same time, the Vatican confirmed that Paul refused to receive Marcel Lefebvre since the latter had made “no serious act of repentance” for his traditionalist activities. (Boston “Pilot,” 3/11/77)

On February 27, 1977, adherents of Lefebvre occupied by force the Catholic church of St. Nicolas de Chardonnet in Paris for its use by traditionalists. The occupation was still going on at the beginning of July 1977. It underlines the demand, made by Lefebvre at his Mass in Lille and at his audience with Paul VI on September 11, 1976, to place Catholic churches at the disposal of his movement. (Boston “Herald American,” 2/28/77)

#### The Lefebvre case in May 1977

On May 10 and 11, 1977, Marcel Lefebvre had discussions with two representatives of the Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, the Jesuit Father Edouard Dhanis and the Dominican Father Benoit Duroux. The discussions were significantly called “a dialog with a deaf person.” After the conclusion of these discussions, Lefebvre announced that he would perform the ordinations of 14 priests planned for June 29, 1977, but he denied that he would consecrate bishops. (Boston “Pilot,” 6/17/77)

About this time, Lefebvre submitted, as is evident from a report by Eric M. de Saventhen, the president of the “Una Voce” (London Times, July 7., 1977; Boston “Pilot,” July 15, 1977), to Paul VI a series of conditions under which he would, “as a sign of his respect to the Holy Father and the

Church,” be prepared to defer his ordinations announced for June 29, 1977, but Paul refused these conditions as “absolutely unacceptable.”

On May 20, 1977, Rev. Romeo Panciroli, speaking for the Vatican, again cautioned Lefebvre against the execution of the ordinations planned for June 29, 1977, since they could lead “toward a separated Church depending on him alone.” (Boston “Pilot,” May 27, 1977)

On May 22, 1977, Lefebvre confirmed, in another provocation of Paul VI, about 150 children in the Church of St. Nicolas de Chardonnet in Paris, occupied by “traditionalists.” On this occasion, he assured the confirmands that they could be quite certain about the validity of the sacrament they were receiving, while he cast doubt on the validity of Confirmation as administered elsewhere. (Boston “Pilot,” May 27, 1977) This remark of Lefebvre assumes a particular interest in the light of the canonical statements made in the fourth chapter of this article on the validity of the own ordination and consecration of Marcel Lefebvre.

On May 30, 1977, Lefebvre confirmed 35 children in Genev (Switzerland), celebrated there a Tridentine Mass, and founded there a “priory” of his Society under the protest of the local bishop, Pierre Mamie. (Boston “Herald American,” May 31, 1977)

On June 6, 1977. Lefebvre’s attempt at winning the Roman nobility to his side

Shortly before June 29, 1977, the day Lefebvre had fixed for the ordination of 14 priests in Econe which, according to Vatican announcements, should bring about his excommunication, Lefebvre attempted, in a clear allusion to his papal aspirations, to bring the Roman nobility to his side. The elderly princess Elvina Pallavicini sent invitations to about 400 members of the Roman nobility to whom Marcel Lefebvre was supposed to speak on his ecclesial views. Lefebvre gave his lecture. But the event was, according to press reports, boycotted by the majority of the nobility, obviously not least because Paul VI was not inactive behind the scenes.

On June 2. 1977 an ordination performed by Lefebvre in France

On June 26, 1977, Lefebvre performed an ordination in Flavigny-sur-Ozerain, a former Dominican monastery now controlled by Fr. Louis Coache, an adherent of Lefebvre (Boston “Pilot,” July 3, 1977). The significance of this ordination which, obviously, did not concern an Econe seminarian, might become known later on.

In the consistory of cardinals which took place on June 27, 1977, Paul VI did not mention this ordination, but gave to understand that his patience with Lefebvre was wearing thin.

1. In the absence of punitive actions after his ordinations on June 29. 1977 Lefebvre continues his customary course in the apostate “Catholic” church organization

Lefebvre’s ordinations performed in Econe on June 29. 1977

When Marcel Lefebvre, in spite of all threatened punitive measures, including excommunication, performed the announced - of course invalid - ordinations of 14 priests, no intervention by Paul VI took place, to the boundless amazement of Lefebvre's friends and foes.

Among the ordained, mostly Frenchmen, there was only one American "priest," Anthony Cekada, 26, of Milwaukee, and an American subdeacon, Terrence Finnegan, 34, of Rapid City, S.D.

On the occasion of the ordinations, Lefebvre repeated in his public utterances the well-known, non-Catholic, "traditionalist" Creed that his movement represents the non-apostatized part within the Catholic Church. "Mercenaries, wolves and thieves have invaded the Church due to Vatican II. We do not intend to join hands with them. We do not want to collaborate with them in the destruction of the Church." "You are the fighting Church," he said to his audience, but added: "We are and want to remain in full community with the holy Roman Catholic Church." Lefebvre also remarked that Pope Paul has accused him of pursuing personal goals - an obvious reminder of Paul's accusation made in his previously reported audience with him to the effect that he (Lefebvre) intends to take his place as pope. Lefebvre's public answer in Ecône to this accusation was: "I deny that. I believe that I work for the best of the Church. We want to preserve the faith. We do not want anything else." (Rochester "Times-Union," June 29, 1977; Boston "Herald American," June 30, 1977)

Lefebvre's benediction of the "Queen of Angels" chapel in Dickinson, Texas, U.S.A. on July 10, 1977

\*) The following report is based on press reports in the Boston "Herald American" July 10 and 11, 1977; Boston "Pilot," July, 15, 1977; "Patriot Ledger," July 12, 1977; Philadelphia "Evening Bulletin," July 11, 1977; and Dallas "Times Herald," July 10, 1977.

On July 10, 1977, Lefebvre performed in Dickinson, a suburb of Houston, Texas, U.S.A., in the presence of 400-500 persons, the solemn benediction of the "Queen of Angels" chapel, a former mission chapel whose value with the appertaining rectory, school, and parish hall is estimated to be \$400,000 and which represents, therefore, the highest-valued property of the Lefebvre Society in the U.S.A.

Lefebvre used, of course, the benediction as an opportunity to set forth his well known, "traditionalist" standpoint. Worth mentioning were his following remarks: "Even if his dispute with Pope Paul led to excommunication, he could not accept the action because, 'to be excommunicated, you must commit a mortal sin.' I have not committed a mortal sin."

"They have told me so many times they were going to excommunicate me, but they have not done it. It would be very extraordinary for them to excommunicate one who upholds the tradition of the Church, when at the same time they are lifting excommunications from the enemies of the Church." "I am not against the Pope in any way. I am for the Pope. But the attitude of the Vatican against us does not come from the Holy Ghost. It comes from a bad spirit. The orientation which began with the Second Vatican Council is making us Protestant."

"If a division exists in the Roman Catholic Church, it is not because of us, but because of the Vatican."

“We are not a movement or a group within the Church, and we are not a rebellion. We are the Catholic Church. We continue as we did 20 or 30 years ago. In 1950, all Catholics thought as we do now. If, at that time, the Catholic faith was good, the sacraments were good, the Mass was good, I don’t know why today they are not good.”

“The new Mass is a meal, not a sacrifice. Mass should be a true sacrifice.” The last-mentioned statement sounds orthodox Catholic, but cannot be taken seriously as long as Lefebvre does not revoke, by an express canonical abjuration, his previously mentioned recognition of the validity of the “Novus Ordo Missae.”

Regarding his continuing quarrel with Paul VI, Lefebvre remarked: “In the near future, we hope we can have good relations with the Vatican. We have nothing in our heart against the Vatican, but we cannot accept the loss of the true Catholic faith.”

In this connection, he repeated his proposal already previously made by saying that “his conflict with the Vatican could be eased, if the Pope permitted the Tridentine rite in those churches that so wished. This would be the first step to peace.”

Behind this wish of Lefebvre mentioned already previously hides his endeavor to win, within the framework of the present “Catholic” church organization, a pope-like position, e.g., that of a patriarch of the Tridentine branch church from which he, in his imagination struck by dogmatic blindness and blindness to the coming destruction of mankind, obviously hopes to reconvert the apostate “Catholic” church organization to the true Catholic faith, not least - at least in the already mentioned opinion of Paul VI - for the greater glory of - Marcel Lefebvre.

He expressed his pious hope of the significance of the benediction of the Queen of Angels chapel with the words: “May this chapel become the center for the true Catholic faith all over America.”

The appalling reality behind the just-mentioned pious wish of Lefebvre is indicated by the fact that Lefebvre has appointed as the pastor of the “Queen of Angels” community, of all people, his already previously characterized “priest,” Hector Bolduc who, not long ago, had been dismissed for grave reasons by the only 50-miles-distant community of the St. Jude Shrine in Stafford, Texas. He is described in the press reports as Lefebvre’s deputy for 10 chapels in the U.S. states of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri, and for 4 chapels in Mexico. This would mean that 14 “traditionalist” communities in the just-mentioned states which are not staffed by Lefebvre “priests” have submitted themselves to the Lefebvre Society and are now supervised by “Fr.” Bolduc. In consideration of Lefebvre’s just-mentioned hope that the “Queen of Angels” chapel in Dickinson might become the center of the true, Catholic faith in the whole of America, it has to be assumed that Lefebvre has even a still more important role for “Fr.” Bolduc in mind and, in so doing, will expose even more conservative Catholics to Bolduc’s influence.

Astonishingly, “Fr.” Clarence Kelly, Lefebvre’s “District Superior of the United States of America,” was obviously absent from the event in Dickinson in spite of its seeming importance.

Part of the reports given to the press on the occasion of the Dickinson event came from a lady who designated herself as the official spokeswoman for the “Queen of Angels” chapel. She is, as I heard from a reliable source, a divorced and remarried woman. I hold documentary proof that she testified that she got an annulment of her first marriage by the assistant pastor of “Fr.” Bolduc, a Fr. Pulvermacher! The fact that a lady of such a past can act as the official spokeswoman for the “Queen of Angels” community and that an assistant priest of this community can act as judge in grave marriage cases raises strong doubts on whether in this Tridentine community in the spiritual care of Mr. Bolduc the high moral rigor prevails for which his master allegedly fights.

### Lefebvre forbidden to enter Mexico

Lefebvre had planned to visit, after the benediction of the chapel in Dickinson, Texas, his adherents in Mexico, but he had to give up this intention since he was informed immediately after the benediction that the Mexican government had forbidden him the entry into Mexico for not specified reasons. The overtired Lefebvre will now, as the above-mentioned “spokeswoman” for the Dickinson community informed the press representatives, visit his sister in Bogota, Colombia, for his relaxation.

### III. Marcel Lefebvre’s “Traditionalist” activities in Eschatological Sight

As was previously demonstrated, Marcel Lefebvre has held the leading position in the “traditionalist” movement within the apostate “Catholic” church organization for a number of years. He owes this position doubtlessly in the first place to his, so-far undoubted hierarchical position and to the ordination power connected with it, but also to the incredible, partly even criminal, fraudulent methods used by him and, finally, to the monopolization of “traditionalism” in his own person used in the pursuit of personal goals. In so doing, he is, therefore, mainly responsible for the diabolic role of “traditionalism” in our eschatological time.

This role consists, as cannot be repeated often enough, in that the “traditionalists,” headed by “Archbishop” Marcel Lefebvre, do not get tired, it is true, in pointing, in a dogmatically correct manner, to the fact that the Catholic Church organization represented by its hierarchical leaders has, at Vatican II, fallen away from true God-centeredness and God-centered morality to man-centeredness and man-centered morality and, in so doing, has become an apostate, Protestant sect. The Protestant character of this apostasy has become even the favorite theme of Lefebvre in his condemnation of Vatican II. In so doing, he admits, of course, that this falling away represents not only a schism, but an apostasy in its full dogmatic sense which, according to Catholic dogmatics, cannot be reversed, a dogma whose correctness is confirmed by the fact that never has a Protestant sect as a sect returned to the Catholic Church. Catholic theologians like Marcel Lefebvre and his clerical “traditionalist” collaborators should not have any difficulties in seeing the eschatological significance of the apostasy of the giant Catholic Church organization due to Vatican II as the concluding stage in the apostasy of mankind which started on a worldwide scale with the Protestant Reformation. For, the Catholic Church has, of course, as the carrier of Christ’s redeeming graces in the pre-Christian and in the post-Christian era of the history of mankind, in God’s plan of the creation and redemption of mankind a unique significance so that, by necessity, the end of the worldwide effect of Christ’s work of Redemption must coincide with the end of the world. The predictions of Holy Scripture on the end of the world say the same, and the dreadful nuclear threat

to mankind, which has meanwhile become generally known, points in the same direction. Moreover, I have set forth the just-indicated thoughts to Marcel Lefebvre in great detail in the correspondence conducted with him around 1971 and at my visit in Fribourg (Switzerland) on October 1, 1971. Significantly, the only “positive” religious statement I ever heard from Marcel Lefebvre was his declaration given to me in Fribourg: “I do not agree with your eschatological standpoint.”

The anti-eschatological attitude of Marcel Lefebvre, caused by his personal interests, is in crying contradiction to the eschatological attitude of Pope Saint Pius X which he expressed in his first encyclical (“E Supremi”) of October 4, 1903. He characterized, as I wrote already in my article No. 70 of January 1976, the woes of humanity at his time as “the rejection of God and apostasy” and expressed their eschatological significance with the words:

“Whoever weighs these things has certainly reason to fear that this perversity of minds may be, in a manner, a foretaste and perhaps even the beginning of the evils to be expected at the end of time; and that the ‘Son of Perdition’ of whom the Apostle speaks (2 Thess. 11:3) may be already in this world. Such in truth is the audacity and the wrath employed everywhere in persecuting religion, in combating the dogmas of the faith, in a resolute effort to uproot and destroy all relations between man and the Divinity. While this, on the other hand, and this according to the same Apostle, is the distinguishing mark of Antichrist, man has with infinite temerity put himself in the place of God, raising himself above all that is called God; in such wise that although he cannot utterly extinguish in himself all knowledge of God, he has contemned God’s majesty and, as it were, made of the universe a temple wherein he himself is to be adored. ‘He sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God’ (2 Thess. 11:14).”

Pope St. Pius X voiced these forebodings though he had not even lived to see the ravages of atheist communism, the arising of the nuclear threat to mankind, and the passive collapse of the magisterium of the Church in the pre-Vatican II era.

After we have, meanwhile, lived to see the apostasy of the Catholic Church organization as a fact which cannot happen again and is, therefore, unique, and could establish that Paul VI was the driving force behind this apostasy, we can and must state that Paul VI is the Antichrist predicted in Holy Scripture (2 Thess. 2:3,4) and that St. Pius X, in the year 1903, correctly predicted that he “may be already in this world,” since Paul VI was born in 1897.

In the face of these undeniable facts, the already started attempt of Marcel Lefebvre to create within the framework of the apostate “Catholic” church organization, i.e., in the realm of the Antichrist and with his permission, by invoking Saint Pius X as a patron and using his antimodernist teachings, a coexisting church dominated by him, must be regarded as a trick of Satan. For, the precepts which were given by Saint Pius X for the salvation of the Catholic Church and of its members in the eschatological time of mankind and, as the above-discussed apocalyptic prophecies on the two witnesses prove, finally will actually serve this purpose, serve the purpose of the destruction of souls if they are used by Lefebvre and his helpers. For, by them, conservative Catholics who either had already separated themselves from the apostate “Catholic” church organization or attend its “divine” services only reluctantly, are lured back into the apostate church organization or are detained there to their spiritual damage. For the Tridentine Masses attended in the “traditionalist”

communities and the sacraments received there are invalid, even if validly ordained, older priests are concerned, if they exercise their priestly actions under a wrong intention by recognizing in a sacrilegious manner Antichrist Paul VI as the true vicar of Christ on earth and Antichrist Paul VI and the bishops subject to him as the legitimate hierarchy of the Catholic Church. The sacramental actions of the “priests” ordained by Lefebvre are invalid from the start, since their ordinations are invalid for the previously mentioned reasons. Moreover, it has to be considered that a good part of all “traditionalist” priests including Marcel Lefebvre also recognize the validity of the “Novus Ordo Missae,” so that their sacraments are also invalid because of a wrong intention in this respect. As an immediate consequence, the members of the “traditionalist” communities do not receive the hoped-for sacramental graces of Christ - to Satan’s delight. The next consequence consists in that the conservative Catholics are kept, by the Satan-inspired “traditionalist” maneuver, under the spell of the apostate “Catholic” church organization and, therefore, do nothing for the organization of the true Church of Christ and, as a consequence, for the restoration of the distribution of Christ’s sacramental, redemptive graces.

This is not only true for the conservative Catholics in the Lefebvre organization, but also for the members in Fr. Fenton’s ORCM and in Fr. De Pauw’s CTM. The only reason that these three organizations do not cooperate is the fact that Lefebvre, due to his monopolizing power hunger, has declined such a collaboration. Also among the “Tridentine” communities operating outside the three organizations mentioned, not one is known to me which has officially separated itself from the apostate “Catholic” church organization and from the devastating consequences for the salvation of souls connected with it. The sympathies of the priests of the last-mentioned communities for Marcel Lefebvre are well known.

Another proof for Satan’s role in Lefebvre’s “traditionalist” movement has to be seen in the fact that Antichrist Paul VI supported the cause of Lefebvre at least passively in a manner damaging his personal interests and, therefore, in an unusual manner, by doing nothing serious during the seven years of the rebellious activities of Lefebvre. Though the Vatican was correctly informed about the fraudulent character of the Operation of his seminary, of his ordinations, and of his priest distribution, a fact for which I have documentary proofs, Paul VI did nothing against it for years. He never pilloried this fraudulency, an action which would have lowered Lefebvre’s prestige in the eyes of his adherents. It took almost six years until Paul VI suspended Lefebvre “a divinis,” and when Lefebvre, on June 29, 1977, ordained 14 “priests” in spite of the excommunication threatened for this case, Paul VI failed to take any punitive action against Lefebvre, to the heavy detriment of his own prestige. The conservative Catholics who had hoped that Lefebvre, after his expected excommunication, would take over their hierarchical leadership, were not only disappointed by the fact that Paul did not impose on Lefebvre the threatened excommunication in spite of the ordinations performed by Lefebvre, but even more by the fact that Lefebvre, as reported above, declared in Dickinson, Texas, that he would continue his activities in recognition of Paul VI as the legitimate pope of the Catholic Church within Paul’s church even in the case of his excommunication since he would regard such an excommunication as invalid.

The result of Lefebvre’s “traditionalist” maneuver which claims in a sacrilegious manner Saint Pius X as patron and has the appearance of a diabolic persiflage of the apocalyptic prophecy on the “two witnesses,” is the again and again stressed, paramount fact that the conservative Catholics, retained by his diabolic maneuver in the apostate Church, make no efforts at organizing the true Church. By

this fact, its salvific action has come to an almost complete halt which is symbolized in the prophecy mentioned by the fact that the bodies of the “witnesses” (identified with the Popes Pius IX and St. Pius X) lie on the street and are mocked by the apostates. But the apocalyptic prophecy telling us that the teachings of the “witnesses” identified with the just mentioned popes will be revived after a short while and Christ’s prophecies in Matth. 16:18 and Luke 18:8 to the effect that His Church, though in a tiny form, will continue to the end of time, give us the assurance that the organization of the true Catholic Church will start soon in spite of the Satan-inspired machinations of Marcel Lefebvre and of his accomplices.

It has to be assumed that the proof conducted in the next chapter showing that the own ordination and consecration of Marcel Lefebvre are invalid will decisively contribute to this effect.

Pasted from above, as it is not footnoted properly

In this connection, I would like to mention an incident I experienced when I, together with my wife and a friend from Munich, Germany, visited Marcel Lefebvre at the seat of his Fraternity, Maison Pie X, in Fribourg, Switzerland, on October 1, 1971, with the intention of converting him to my orthodox Catholic and eschatologic standpoint and of winning him for the hierarchical leadership of the Remnant Catholic Church.

During my visit, I participated with my companions at two meals. They were served at a long table at which, in addition to Lefebvre and my group, some older seminarians and a number of priests were seated. The meals were served by a young lady dressed or rather undressed in a miniminiskirt. She was designated by Lefebvre to my wife, who sat beside him, as a Spaniard. This incident proves what you have to think of Lefebvre’s assurances pronounced with a pious mien that he educates “holy” priests.

#### Lefebvre’s Invalidity Exposed

In a preceding part of this article, I already referred to a lecture given by Marcel Lefebvre in Montreal, Canada, on May 27, 1976, and quoted excerpts from this lecture. I have come to attribute providential significance to the fact that my French-speaking collaborator in Montreal placed at my disposal not only these excerpts, but, in a tremendous effort, the total written text of this lecture based on a tape-recording. For, this fact gave me an opportunity to detect in Lefebvre’s lecture a passage which furnishes the basis for the proof that his own ordination and consecration are invalid.

With this proof, the future ecclesiastical career of Marcel Lefebvre should come to an end at once at least in the judgment of dogmatic and canonical experts of good will. Inclusion in this category is not necessarily given in the case of the obstinate “traditionalists” who regard Antichrist Paul VI as the legitimate Vicar of Christ and regard Paul VI and the apostate bishops as the legitimate hierarchy of the Catholic Church and believe, contrary to Catholic dogma, that the apostate “Catholic” church organization can be reconverted to the true Catholic faith, and, in so doing, prove that they are blind to any dogmatic and canonical argumentation.

Because of its importance, I shall now pursue the proof of the invalidity of the ordination and consecration of Marcel Lefebvre in great detail the wording of the passage in Lefebvre's lecture which forms the basis for the invalidity of his ordination and consecration.

“The Holy Father was educated in a Modernist environment ... and, therefore, one cannot be surprised that in the Council, the Pope did not react as Saint Pius X would have reacted, as Pope Pius IX would have reacted, or as Leo XIII. As a consequence, an atmosphere prevailed at the Council of a kind that there was no resistance against this Modernist influence which exercised itself by a group of cardinals, in particular which was commanded, which was directed in some sort by Cardinal Lienart .... Now, two months ago, in Rome, the traditionalist periodical “Chiesa Viva” [= Living Church] published - I have seen it in Rome with my own eyes - on the back side of the cover, the photograph of Cardinal Lienart with all his Masonic paraphernalia, the day of the date of his inscription in Masonry ..., then the date at which he rose to the 20th, then to the 30th degree of Masonry, attached to this lodge, to that lodge - at this place, at that place. Meanwhile, about two or three months after this publication was made, I heard nothing about any reaction, or any contradiction. Now, unfortunately, I must say to you that this Cardinal Lienart is my bishop, it is he who ordained me a priest, it is he who consecrated me a bishop. I cannot help it ... Fortunately, the orders are valid ... but, in spite of it, it was very painful for me to be informed of it.”

As is evident from the preceding quotation, Marcel Lefebvre himself admits that Achille Lienart, who ordained and consecrated him, was a high-grade Freemason, but would like to create the impression that his ordination and consecration were, nevertheless, irreproachable, because they were valid. But he has not told his audience in Montreal that his Orders were, under the prevailing circumstances, at any rate illicit, a condition which made the ordinations performed by him at any rate illicit, and that he had knowledge of this illicitness at any rate already before the foundation of his Econe seminary, as will be proved later on. The fact that Lefebvre's Orders performed by Lienart were not only illicit, but also invalid, will be demonstrated subsequently.

The proofs for the fact that Achille Lienart was a high-grade Freemason

I have meanwhile procured the issue of the Italian periodical “Chiesa viva” mentioned by Marcel Lefebvre in his lecture in Montreal. It is No. 51 of March 1976. The article concerned printed on page 2 of the periodical is entitled “Il Cardinale Achille Lienart era Massone” [Cardinal Lienart was a Freemason] Instead of the picture of Lienart in a Freemasonic outfit expected, according to Lefebvre's description, as the main item of proof, a completely normal picture of the head of the cardinal in usual ecclesiastical attire appears beside the text of the article concerned. Below this portrait, another picture is printed which shows a monumental entrance door to a building around which Freemasonic symbols are grouped. The picture carries the designation: “Entrance door to a Freemasonic temple.”

The article, whose author is not named, says that the article represents the reprint of data which is given on pages 80 and 81 of the book, authored by the French writer Marquis de la Franquerie, entitled “L'INFAILLIBILITE PONTIFICALE” [Papal Infallibility]

I could confirm this statement when I studied this book which is issued by the publisher Jean Auguy, Editeur, “Diffusion de la Pensee Francaise” Chire-en-Montreuil - 86190 Vouille, France

and of which my collaborator in Montreal placed a copy at my disposal. Here, the second edition of the book, issued 1970, is at stake. The full name of the author is Andre Henri Jean Marquis de la Franquerie. The Marquis is a papal Secret Chamberlain who lives in Luçon, Vendée, France, and is a recognized, learned historian with special knowledge in the field of the penetration of the Catholic hierarchy by Freemasonry in France and of the Freemasonic activities of Cardinal Rampolla, as his above-mentioned book proves. The book discloses the “traditionalist” attitude of the author.

The Marquis discusses, as is correctly stated in “Chiesa viva,” Cardinal Lienart on pages 80 and 81 of his book, of which I enclose photocopies. He says on page 80 that Lienart was a Satanist who attended “black Masses.” After his description of the well-known role supporting Modernism which he played at the opening of Vatican II and of which the author says that he (the author) had obtained, at that time, exact information that it took place on orders of the “Occult Power,” he writes (in English translation): “This attitude of the Cardinal could not surprise those who knew his membership in the Freemasonic and Luciferian lodges. This was the reason why the author of this study always had refused to accompany Cardinal Lienart in the official ceremonies as Secret Chamberlain.

“The Cardinal had been initiated in a lodge in Cambrai whose Venerable was Brother Debierre. He frequented a lodge in Cambrai, three at Lille, one in Valenciennes, and two in Paris, of which one was in a special way composed of parliamentarians. In the year of 1919, he is designated as “Visiteur” (18th degree), then, in 1924, as 30th degree. The future Cardinal met in the lodges Brother Debierre and Roger Solengro. Debierre was one of the informers of Cardinal Gasparri who had been initiated in America, and of Cardinal Hartmann, Archbishop of Cologne, a Rosecrucian.

..... “It was given to us to meet in Lourdes a former Freemason who, on July 19, 1932, had been miraculously cured of a wound suppurating on his left foot for fourteen years - a cure recognized by the Verification Bureau. This miraculously healed gentleman, Mr. B..., told us that, at the time when he frequented a Luciferian lodge, he met there the cardinal whom he recognized, and was dumfounded.”

The Marquis does not disclose the source of the details of Lienart’s membership in Freemasonry which he gives in the first section of the preceding quotations from his book. But I would not be surprised if his source would be - Marcel Lefebvre.

Lefebvre is quoted in connection with the description of the beginning of Vatican II by the Marquis on page 80 of his book (see top of page 80 of the enclosed photocopy). Moreover, his book contains on page 112 excerpts from a letter of appreciation written by Marcel Lefebvre, dated May 14, 1970. This might indicate intimate relations between the Marquis and Marcel Lefebvre. But, in this connection, the fact is important that Marcel Lefebvre has probably to be considered as one who knew the Freemasonic background of Cardinal Lienart. For Lefebvre was born and grew up in the Diocese of Lille, Cardinal Lienart’s diocese, and made the personal acquaintance of Lienart and of the latter’s way of thinking when he studied in the priest seminary of Lille, where Lienart was professor before he was appointed as Bishop of Lille. Moreover, it has to be considered that Marcel Lefebvre descends from a rich and, therefore, influential textile industry family, whose knowledge of Freemasonic relations in Lille has to be assumed, especially since in Lille Freemasonry is

obviously especially developed, as is evident from the above-mentioned fact that in Lille at least three Freemasonic lodges exist.

It is, at any rate, an established fact that Lefebvre knew the membership and the rise of Cardinal Lienart in Freemasonry treated in the Marquis' book already before May 14, 1970, the date of his above-mentioned Letter of appreciation addressed to the Marquis. On the basis of this fact, the impression which Lefebvre tries to give in his lecture in Montreal that he obtained, to his surprise, knowledge of Lienart's connection with Freemasonry first from the Italian periodical "Chiesa viva" in the spring of 1976 must be regarded as a conscious deception of his audience. Obviously he wanted to avoid disclosing that he has known the Freemasonic background of Lienart for a long time, in particular that he knew it at least before the foundation of his seminary in Econe in November 1970. He knew, therefore, already at that time that his consecration, by Lienart, even if he regarded it falsely as valid; was at any rate illicit according to canon 968:2, CIC. This illicitness has, therefore, even increased the degree of illicitness of his ordinations deriving from the fact that he, as a mere titular bishop without jurisdiction, was forbidden to perform ordinations. The fact that, in spite of the presence of two forbidding canonical reasons, he founded, of all things, a priest seminary also illicitly and made the ordination of priests the main attraction of his importance among "traditionalists," is an additional proof of the unscrupulousness of this ecclesiastical impostor.

The dates important for the judgment of the validity of the own Orders of Achille Lienart and Marcel Lefebvre are given in table form below Cardinal Achille Lienart born in Lille, France February 7, 1884, ordained June 29, 1907 entered Masonic lodge at Cambrai 1912, "Visitor" in Masonry - 18th degree 1919, arrived at 30th degree 1924, was, before his consecration, professor in the priest seminary in Lille, consecrated bishop December 8, 1928, created cardinal by Pope Pius XI June 30, 1930

Lefebvre born in Tourcoing, Diocese of Lille, France November 29, 1905, attended the priest seminary in Lille in which Achille Lienart was professor, ordained by Bishop Lienart September 21, 1929, consecrated a bishop by Cardinal Lienart September 18, 1947

The dogmatic-canonical reasons for the invalidity of the consecration of Achille Lienart

One of the reasons why Marcel Lefebvre has to be regarded as an invalidly ordained priest and an invalidly consecrated bishop is the fact that the man who ordained and consecrated him, i.e., Achille Lienart, was himself an invalidly consecrated bishop.

As is evident from the preceding table, Lienart was consecrated a bishop in 1928 at a time when he, after a 16-year membership in Freemasonry, had reached the thirtieth degree. This consecration was at any rate illicit since Lienart, by his membership in Freemasonry, had performed his apostasy from the Catholic faith and in so doing had contracted, according to canon 2335 CIC, an automatic excommunication and, according to canon 968 CIC, a perpetual impediment forbidding primarily the reception of Orders and secondarily the exercise of Orders already received.

The wording "A perpetual impediment forbidding the reception of Orders" at first glance seems to indicate, at least in connection with apostasy, that Orders performed in the presence of such an

impediment are invalid. But, as is evident from the text of canon 985.1 CIC which, strangely enough, designates apostasy only as an “irregularity,” they are only illicit, but not invalid. This is probably the reason why Lefebvre regards his Orders received from Lienart as at least valid, though he has to regard them as illicit and, therefore, has also to regard as illicit the Orders performed by him.

In an obvious dogmatic contradiction to canon 985.1 CIC which, as was just mentioned, represents apostasy only as an “irregularity,” but not as an impediment to the reception of valid Orders, the canonical experts and Jesuits Lincoln Bouscaren, Adam C. Ellis, and Francis N. Korth, the authors of *CANON LAW, A Text and Commentary* which was used at least before Vatican II as a textbook in the American priest seminaries and which is at my disposal in its fourth revised edition of 1963, stress, in application of a general dogmatic principle, that, as a supplement to the conditions for a valid ordination mentioned in canon 693 CIC, i.e., the male sex and a valid baptism, the candidate to be ordained must have the explicit and right intention to receive the sacrament.

This intention can, of course, in the case of the consecration of a bishop, only be regarded as valid if the candidate concerned has the intention to exercise the office to be received by the order “in persona Christi” as a genuine successor of the Apostles. But such an intention can, by no means, have been present in the case of Achille Lienart, a thirtieth degree Freemason who, in addition, is described as a satanist and frequenter of “black Masses.” He was obviously an agent of Freemasonry planted by it in the Catholic Church in order to destroy its divine character from inside as, in particular, his activities at Vatican II have proved. Since, accordingly, Achille Lienart did not exhibit, at his consecration, the intention necessary for a valid reception of the sacrament, his consecration has to be regarded as invalid / and, as a consequence, also the ordination and consecration of Marcel Lefebvre performed by him are invalid.

The preceding argumentation would, of course, also be correct and, accordingly, Marcel Lefebvre would be an invalidly consecrated bishop, if Lienart would not have been a Freemason, but “only” a Modernist apostatized from the true faith by the breaking of the antimodernist oath sworn by him.

The consecration of Marcel Lefebvre by Cardinal Lienart would also be invalid even if, due to a reason hardly imaginable under the prevailing circumstances, Lienart would have been, at the consecration of Lefebvre, a bishop validly consecrated. For, even under these circumstances, it would have been necessary for the validity of Lefebvre’s consecration that Lienart at his consecration of Marcel Lefebvre, would have acted “in persona Christi” i.e., with the intention of Christ, a condition which, at the Freemasonic and Modernist way of thinking of Lienart, was completely impossible.

On the basis of the above-given proofs, it has to be regarded as absolutely certain that Marcel Lefebvre’s own Orders were invalid and that, therefore, all ordinations performed by him, in particular also his priest ordinations performed in the framework of his “International Sacerdotal Fraternity of Saint Pius X,” are invalid.

I

His last-mentioned ordinations are also invalid for the reason already previously mentioned.

In consideration of the just-developed arguments, the dogmatic correctness of the stipulation of canon 985.1 CIC determining that the apostasy of a candidate for Holy Orders represents only an irregularity making his Orders only illicit, but not invalid must be doubted strongly. The suspicion arises that here a dogmatic falsification brought about by Freemasonic influences in the “Codex Juris Canonici” edited in 1917 is at stake by which it was made possible to smuggle easily Freemasons into sacerdotal and episcopal positions of the Catholic Church in order to destroy it. Cardinal Lienart would be a good example for this assumption. The possibility of the exertion of such an influence cannot be denied in the face of the fact that, at the time at which the Canon Law of 1917 was prepared, a proven Freemason in the person of Cardinal Rampolla succeeded in reaching the second highest position in the Catholic Church as the Secretary of State of Pope Leo XIII and that he almost succeeded in 1903 in usurping the Chair of Peter.

I have started an investigation of the circumstances involved. In this connection, I direct the attention to the recognition of the validity of the Protestant baptisms by the Canon Law of 1917 which contradicts a definition of the Council of Trent (Denzinger 863) and, therefore, Catholic doctrine, as I mentioned in my article No. 70, pages 12ff. This case, too, could have been caused by Freemasonic influences.

The address of the periodical is “Chiesa viva, “. Editrice Civiltà, 25100’Brescia (Italy) Via Galileo Galilei, 121.

#### IV. The Unmasking of Lefebvre’s “Traditionalist Imposture, God’s Hint for the Organization of the Remnant Catholic Church

The unmasking of Marcel Lefebvre’s “traditionalist” imposture, in particular the proof of the invalidity of his own ordination and consecration invalidating his priest ordinations is obviously a hint of God indicating that the standstill in the functioning of the Catholic Church predicted for the eschatological time of the history of mankind in the apocalyptic prophecy on the two “witnesses” is drawing to its end.

This standstill started when, in agreement with the above-discussed apocalyptic prophecy, as a consequence of the Modernist apostasy of the whole Catholic Church organization after Vatican II, the main task of the Catholic Church, to act as the distributor of the redeeming graces of Christ, had ceased. This was mainly brought about by changes in the matter, form, and intention which are necessary for the performance of valid sacraments. The most important change consisted in the replacement of the Latin-Tridentine Mass by the sacramentally invalid “Novas Ordo Missae.”

Under these circumstances, it could be expected that the percentage-wise extremely small number of the non-apostatized Catholic priests and laymen would separate themselves from the apostate church and mould form their own orthodox Catholic communities. But Satan succeeded in his effort to make also those Catholics who had remained loyal to their faith subservient to his goals, by retaining most of them in the apostate “Catholic” church organization to their spiritual harm, using the “traditionalist” leaders as his instruments. They succeeded in making themselves and their adherents believe that a priest acting in the framework of the apostate Church who recognizes apostate Paul VI as the true Vicar of Christ on earth and who recognizes this apostate and the

bishops subservient to him as the legitimate hierarchy of the Catholic Church, can celebrate valid Masses and effect valid sacraments if he only maintains the external Tridentine forms (matter and form in liturgical terminology). But they and their deceived victims do not see or do not want to see, to their spiritual harm, that these Masses and these sacraments cannot procure sacramental graces because the “traditionalist” priest does not act “in persona Christi,” i.e., in the true intention of Christ.

It has to be said for the partial excuse of the founder of “traditionalism,” Fr. Gommar A. De Pauw, that, at the time when he founded his CTM (1964/1965), the apostasy of the Catholic Church organization was not yet an accomplished fact. But this excuse does not apply to Fr. Francis E. Fenton (ORCM) and “Archbishop” Marcel Lefebvre who founded their respective organizations after the introduction of the “Novus Ordo Missae.”

The CTM and later on the ORCM diminished in their significance obviously because of a lack of priests. But Satan found in “Archbishop” Marcel Lefebvre an even better, “traditionalist” tool to retain the conservative Catholics to their spiritual harm in the apostate “Catholic” church organization and to prevent the organization of the Remnant Catholic Church.

Marcel Lefebvre could, as an attraction for the “traditionalists,” bring to bear his hierarchical position, his power of ordination, though it was illegitimate, and his spellbinding powers. As an indication of his conscious collaboration with the apostate, “Catholic” church organization, he sought and found for his Sacerdotal Fraternity and for his seminary the permission of the Bishop of Lausanne, Geneva, and Fribourg (Switzerland). The erection decree is, as was demonstrated above, a masterpiece of lying and cheating. Also the “ordinations” of his “priests” are based, as was also proven above, on a series of frauds, partly of a criminal nature, and are, for several reasons, not only illicit but also invalid so that the conservative-Catholic members of the “traditionalist” communities served by these fictitious priests are deceived if they believe that they receive sacramental graces by them.

In the final analysis, Marcel Lefebvre’s “traditionalist” enterprise represents a Satanic perversion of the teachings of the antimodernist popes Pius IX and Saint Pius X and a diabolic persiflage of the aforesaid apocalyptic prophecy on the two “witnesses,” which finds its sacrilegious crowning in the fact that Lefebvre has made Saint Pius X the patron of his Sacerdotal Fraternity. This perversion of the antimodernist teachings of the apocalyptic “witnesses” consists in the fact that he correctly quotes the teachings of the witnesses fitting his goals, it is true, but at the same time recognizes apostate and Antichrist Paul VI who treads underfoot their teachings as the Vicar of Christ on earth. This he does not only by designating him indefatigably as “the pope” and the “Holy Father” - about three dozen times in his above-mentioned lecture in Montreal - but also by maintaining an extensive exchange of letters with him, by having had an audience with the “Holy Father,” and by having applied for more audiences. But his main betrayal of the antimodernist teachings of the popes Pius IX and Saint Pius X allegedly defended by him consists in that he tries to obtain the permission of apostate and Antichrist Paul VI to establish within the apostate “Catholic” church organization a “Tridentine” branch of the Church headed by Paul. The fact that Paul VI has voiced in an audience with him his opinion that Lefebvre’s final goal is to replace him as pope was mentioned already previously.

Satan's intentions to retain the non-apostatized Catholics in the apostate "Catholic" church organization by the machinations of the "traditionalist" leaders and, in so doing, to prevent the organization of the Remnant Catholic Church can obviously not be successful much longer. For, the apocalyptic prophecy on the two "witnesses" to be identified with the popes Pius IX and Saint Pius X indicates that their teachings will, after their extinction by the vast eschatological apostasy from the faith, soon be revived and that, therefore, the functions of the Catholic Church after their temporary shutdown by the vast defection from the faith, will again be at the disposal of the remaining faithful Catholics in the Remnant Catholic Church. This means that, in the near future, the collapse of Lefebvre's "traditionalist" church has to be expected.

This has to be assumed if for no other reason than that Paul VI will obviously not support Lefebvre's ultimate goals. Moreover, as was already mentioned, the existing Lefebvre communities already show unmistakable symptoms of decay produced by the facts that the Lefebvre "priests" are no priests at all, that tasks are confided to them to which they are not equal in their youthfulness, and that they do not have the "saintliness" - which Lefebvre had promised to his adherents. As a result, one of the Lefebvre "priests" has already left the Lefebvre organization and two of them were dismissed by their communities because of serious "irregularities." Moreover, it is certainly not a promising sign that Marcel Lefebvre has meanwhile entrusted one of the "priests" dismissed because of "irregularities" with a much more extensive task than he had before. The revealing of the "irregularities" of the Lefebvre "priests" must raise the impression that there must be something basically wrong with the selection and education of Lefebvre's priest candidates.

The proof of the fact that the ordinations: performed by Lefebvre are not only illicit because he does not have the permission (jurisdiction) necessary for ordinations, but are also invalid for several, above-mentioned reasons, should cause any orthodox Catholic to leave immediately any community led by a Lefebvre "priest" since his sacramental actions are invalid. This situation is even underlined by the fact that the Lefebvre "priests" share with their master the false intention also making their sacramental actions invalid that apostate and Antichrist Paul VI is the Vicar of Christ on earth and that the "Novus Ordo Missae" is also valid.

The fact most crushing for the further existence of Lefebvre's "traditionalist" enterprise is, of course, the proof, presented above at full length, of the invalidity of his own ordination and consecration which withdraws the essential basis from his enterprise, for it proves that he is only an ordinary layman without any ecclesiastical powers.

After this proof which, at the present situation of the Church, has all the signs of a hint of Christ to begin the organization of the Remnant Catholic Church, the older, validly ordained, basically orthodox-Catholic priests who, so far, have served "traditionalist" communities should, together with their lay supporters, proceed to eliminate in their communities all "traditionalist" characteristics by which their membership in the apostate "Catholic" church organization is indicated in an open or veiled form. In particular, it has to be avoided to use in the canon part of the Mass the names of Paul VI and of the local bishop of the apostate "Catholic" church organization. ... The preaching and confessional practice has, of course, to be adapted to the new situation without any compromises and express the eschatological character of our time.

By the return to true, Catholic orthodoxy, the previously orthodox intention of the validly ordained priests which had been falsified by the defection to “traditionalism” and had made their Masses and their sacramental actions invalid, is restored, so that their sacramental actions become valid again to their own and their communities’ spiritual benefit. These considerations should first and foremost induce them to start the formation of communities of the Remnant Catholic Church immediately.

The considerations do not apply, of course, to the Lefebvre “priests” because they are, because of their invalid ordinations, no priests at all. In order to provide the communities so far served by them with true, validly ordained priests and in order to relieve other critical situations, I implore those, probably not few priests who, internally, have not fallen away from their faith, but, due to fear of men or other reasons, have not left their positions in the apostate “Catholic” church organization - and now celebrate, troubled by qualms of conscience, under mental reservations and with changes not observed by anybody, “Novus Ordo” Masses, to take the liberating step out of the apostate church organization and to place their priestly services at the disposal of the Remnant Catholic Church.

The realization of the proposals made leads, of course, first only to the formation of isolated communities of the Remnant Catholic Church which miss the united bond of a hierarchical leadership. This can, under prevailing circumstances, come only from a conservative-minded bishop of the apostate “Catholic” church organization who, after a public abjuration, returns to Catholic orthodoxy. That this will happen, can, according to the apocalyptic prophecy on the two “witnesses” and Christ’s promises that His Church will last to the end of time, not be doubted. That this may happen soon, I ask for the fervent prayer of all priests and lay people concerned. - Quod Deus bent(?) vertat!

#### Postscript

After this article was concluded, the following events happened in the Lefebvre case according to press reports.

After the benediction of the “Queen of Angels” chapel in Dickinson, Texas, U.S.A., Marcel Lefebvre traveled to Buenos Aires, Argentina, where he had a “stormy” press conference. From Argentina he went to Colombia.

Of particular interest is an article which appeared in the Rochester “Times Union” on August 12, 1977: “Vatican City - Pope Paul VI has refused to answer a letter from rebel Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre in a move to isolate him and force his breakaway movement to wither and die, Vatican sources said today. The Vatican announced yesterday that the pontiff would not respond to Lefebvre’s letter, requesting a private meeting to settle their differences until the French prelate bows to papal authority.”

This press report supports the above-expressed opinion that the main instrument of Satan in the destruction of the Catholic Church, Antichrist Paul VI, does not actively put out of action the secondary instrument of Satan, Marcel Lefebvre, who destroys spiritually even the remaining conservative Catholics by keeping them within the apostate “Catholic” church organization and thus preventing the reorganization of the Catholic Church by these remaining true Catholics.

The cat and mouse game between Paul VI and Marcel Lefebvre is, therefore, likely to go on, if it is not ended by an act of God and/or by the desertion of the deceived Lefebvre adherents. For this desertion there cannot be a better reason than the proof of the invalidity of the own Orders of Mr. Marcel Lefebvre.

Attention

Note this document is reproduced for informational purposes. It is recommended that the information be verified.

[The passage of time has verified it. By their fruits!]