

The *Una Cum* Issue & The Honor of God



Translation of a Conference by
Fr. Francesco Ricossa, IMBC

Foreword by Bishop Donald Sanborn, ICR

Copyright 2023 Shield of Faith Press
Permission for translation of the French text into English
given by Fr. Francesco Ricossa, 2022.

Translation 2022 Tristan Berthelot on behalf of Shield of
Faith Press

Cover photo by Stephen Heiner

All rights reserved

ISBN: 979-8-9892024-0-9

Direct inquiries to:
Shield of Faith Press, An AMDG Company
8399 Melrose Drive
Overland Park KS 66214
The United States of America

The book in paper and digital form is available at
ShieldofFaith.Press

**The *Una Cum* Issue
&
The Honor of God**

Translation of a Conference by
Fr. Francesco Ricossa, IMBC

Foreword by Bishop Donald Sanborn, ICR

Foreword

Fr. Ricossa addresses, in this conference given in Milan, the very serious theme of the *una cum* Mass.

Many Catholics tend to think of the Mass as a personal devotion, and not something which is an act of the entire Mystical Body of Christ.

Just as in parishes there are commonly some devotions, for example to Our Lady of Perpetual Help, so many think of the Mass as another devotion, which is a very particular act in a particular time and place.

Many also think that there are only two things required of the priest: that he say a valid Mass and that he follow a traditional rite.

Yet another error is to hold that it is possible to dissent from the priest's offering of the Mass in union with the modernist hierarchy, thereby keeping oneself "clean" of taint of association with this heretical "pope" and these heretical "bishops."

Many sedevacantists are under this impression, and actively participate on a regular basis in the *una cum* Mass.

Very commonly it is thought, as well, that the mentioning of the "pope" in the Canon of the Mass is to "pray for the pope." They think that this is a nice idea, since he needs our prayers.

Then there are those who follow the "bad pope"

theory, as if the problem with the Vatican II “popes” were merely a question of a personal immorality, which did not affect their claim to the papacy. “We have had bad popes before,” they say.

Similar to this is the “bad father” approach, commonly preached by the Society of Saint Pius X. “Just as you would not obey what a bad father told you to do, so you can disobey when a bad Holy Father tells you to do something wrong. But he is still your father!” Hence, they think, it is proper to mention him in the Canon.

Then there is Abp. Lefebvre. Most of those who attend the SSPX Masses are convinced that Abp. Lefebvre is the saint sent by God to guide us through the troubled waters of Vatican II. But he was not a sedevacantist, at least publicly.

Therefore we should not be sedevacantists, and we must “pray for the pope” in the Canon of the Mass, as Abp. Lefebvre himself said.

Fr. Ricossa very astutely explains in this conference the theology of the Mass, pointing out how it is an act of the whole Church, and which therefore must necessarily be in union with the Catholic hierarchy in order to deserve the name *Catholic Mass*.

To place in the Canon of the Mass those who are not members of the Catholic hierarchy, to the extent that they are devoid of the jurisdiction to rule the Church, is objectively to place the Mass outside of the Church.

I say *objectively*, since I am sure that those who

attend the *una cum* Mass do so with the thought that they are being “united to the pope,” as all Catholics should be. But in moral theology there is an axiom which states: *Ignorance excuses but it does not justify*.

Hence all Catholics should read carefully this conference, very easy to understand, about the nature of the Mass and its necessity to be united to the Catholic hierarchy, and conversely, disunited from those who are not true popes or true bishops.

Bp. Donald Sanborn
Rector, Most Holy Trinity Seminary
Reading, Pennsylvania
The Feast of Christ the King, 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword by Bp. Donald Sanborn

Introduction of Fr. Giugni

THE *UNA CUM* ISSUE

1] What Is the *Una Cum* Issue?

Abp. Lefebvre Expels from SSPX the non *una cum* priests

2] Why is Almost Nobody Interested in That Issue?

Because it Does not Concern Man Directly, but the Honor of God

Because it Has Strenuous Practical Consequences

Because it is an Issue Tied to Theology

3] Why Does the *Una Cum* Issue Exist?

The Answer is Strictly Tied to the Issue of the Authority in the Church

Abp. Lefebvre Doesn't Know What to Say to Cardinal Seper

4] The *Una Cum* Issue, According to Canon Law, Liturgy, and Theology

The Canonical and Liturgical Point of View

The Theological Point of View: the Holy Mass, Cause and Sign of the Unity of the Church

The True Sense of the Expression "*Una Cum*"

The Priest, Minister of the Church

The Holy Mass, Cause and Sign of the Unity of the Church

The Catholic Mass Is Obligatorily Offered for the Church

The Priest Can Also, If He So Desires, Apply the Fruits of the Mass to Some People in Particular

The Catholic Mass Is Necessarily Offered for the Pope, Because He is One With the Church

The Catholic Mass Is Necessarily Offered for the Diocesan Bishop, because He Is the Representative of the Pope

The Catholic Mass Necessarily Benefits All the Faithful

The Sin of Sacrilege

"I Celebrate the Mass Because Bergoglio Commands Me To"

The Mass "In a State of Privation"

5] Practical Conclusions

Where Does the Priest Who Celebrates this Mass of Saint Pius V come From?

Attendance at a Liturgical Rite, or Reception of a Sacrament Is, **In Itself**, a Testimony of Faith (Faith Which Is the One of the Rite and not the One of the Faithful Who Attend), Whether we Like it or Not!

Then Comes the Case of the Liar and Perjuring Priest
"Father, You Want To Eliminate the Competitors!"

Conclusion of Fr. Giugni

The *Una Cum* Issue

Translation of a conference held at Milan, on November 23, 2019, under the title: *In difesa della Messa Cattolica Romana*, by Fr. Francesco Ricossa, head of the *Institutum Mater Boni Consilii* (IMBC) and the Seminary of St. Peter Martyr.

The present document is an English version of the French translation.

N.B. The headings have been added by the translator. Moreover, some sentences have been modified to enhance the reader's comprehension, in the absence of the speaker's intonations, even though the spoken style has been kept as much as possible.

"But Father, it is already so difficult to find a Traditional Latin Mass! do not make it even more difficult with your *una cum* issue! Instead of uniting us in charity, you are dividing us!"

What should be answered to this seemingly legitimate reasoning? What if that issue was not just an unnecessary detail, but a thing that pertains to the very essence of our Faith?

"I ask nothing but to celebrate the Mass *una cum*, that is to say: I ask nothing but for the Church to go back to normal, that God, in His mercy, gives us a legitimate Pope."

Fr. Francesco Ricossa

Introduction of Fr. Ugolino Giugni (IMBC)

The second part of the conference¹ will answer the following question:

“What makes the Mass truly Catholic?”

Hence addressing the issues of the *una cum* Mass, the *Motu Proprio*, the so-called “*extraordinary form*.”

It is not enough that a missal of St Pius V be present on the altar for the Mass to be in conformity with the Catholic Faith. Other elements ought to be taken into consideration. Tridentine Rite Masses are proliferating...*una cum*? Non *una cum*?

This is an important question. I leave the rest to Fr. Ricossa, for him to underline the importance of this issue.

¹ The first part explained why the “new Mass” is not a Catholic Mass, summarizing the extremely interesting book of Fr. Cekada: *Work of Human Hands*.

1] What is The *Una Cum* Issue?

What is it about? I assume most of the people here are aware of it, since you know us [the IMBC]. But that doesn't mean everyone here is aware. What is the *una cum* issue? It is not an African word, but a Latin one from the Canon of the Mass, of which we have discussed in length in the first conference.

The Canon is the most important part of the sacrifice of the Mass, in which the Consecration occurs. It starts with these words: *Te igitur clementissime Pater*. Here we are addressing God the Father, to Whom the sacrifice of the Mass is offered through the intermediary of His Divine Son. And it is indicated right after that this sacrifice *quae tibi*, "which we offer up to Thee," is offered *pro Ecclesia tua sancta catholica* — "for Thy Holy Catholic Church" — "that it may please Thee to grant her peace, to preserve, unite, and govern her throughout the world" — *una cum*...that is to say "with, together with, in union with, your servant pope N." — and here the pope's name is said, the name of the pope who governs and reigns over the Church — "and our bishop N." — here the bishop's name is said — "and all orthodox believers, and all who profess the Catholic and Apostolic Faith." This is the first part of the Canon.

Among all those who are still celebrating with the ancient missal, the one of St Pius V, some of them cite Francis/Bergoglio when it comes to pronouncing these words: *una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro Francisco, et Antistite nostro* (here it would be Mario Delpini, the "Archbishop" of Milan). Other priests, including us, rather omit these words. That is the "*una cum* issue."

Abp. Lefebvre Expels From SSPX the Non *Una Cum* Priests

It is an important issue, a very important issue, as shown by this example: in November 1979, while I was myself at Écône, the seminary of Abp. Lefebvre, he issued a public declaration saying that those who refuse to pray for the pope — according to his incorrect and somewhat poor formulation — that is to say, according to his thought, to name him as a pope in the Mass, according to the terms he had spoken about before, could not be tolerated in the SSPX, which he had founded. He also said that could not tolerate those who state that all *Novus Ordo* Masses are invalid. Therefore, the seminarians and priests of SSPX who did not want to cite Wojtyla's name in the Canon of the Mass ought to be expelled from SSPX.

You can see then that these are not light consequences. It is an important issue. And this is the issue I want to address tonight.

2] Why is Almost Nobody Interested in this Issue?

Because It Does Not Concern Man Directly, but the Honor of God

I will start this conference by explaining why, according to me, the topic I am addressing tonight does not interest most of the people who attend, or seek the Traditional Mass as we say. It is an issue that interests almost nobody. Maybe the fact that you are present here is proof that I am wrong! But you are a small drop in the sea! Why does this topic not arouse interest in people? By people I mean the Faithful Catholics, since these issues obviously do not interest the unbelievers, the non-Catholics, and these people think we are wasting our time completely.

So I am speaking about believers, Faithful people; moreover I am talking about those who want to stay Faithful to Tradition, as we say. But even these people – not all, thank God, but a large part – are, so to speak, influenced by the modern mentality, **the mentality of modern man**, who insists on **putting man before God**. The things that pertain to man, that interest him, he places before the things that pertain to God.

I will give you an example that is not pertinent to the *una cum* issue, but to the Mass. If, for example, you were to ask the practicing Faithful who are just coming out of Mass, what is the most important part of the Mass, a lot of those who attend the *Novus Ordo* will say: *the Gospel!* Or: *the sermon!* (which is actually not even part of the Mass...) And this is, actually,

very Lutheran. Others, more devout, more Catholic, will say: *communion!* But what is the correct answer? The *Consecration*, because **the Mass is a sacrifice.**

As you know, the Eucharist is both a Sacrament and a sacrifice. Sacrament, as we receive it in Holy Communion, and as it perpetuates the Real Presence in the tabernacle; sacrifice, as it is offered on the altars, precisely during the Holy Mass. But communion, as holy as it is (it is one of the holiest and most beautiful things ever), is *for man*. The sacrifice is also for man, but to whom is it offered? *To God*. **Indeed, the first goal of the sacrifice, the most important one, is *latria*, that is to say the adoration of God.**

You can then see how it often happens, even among the most pious persons, the best ones — and that is understandable — that a greater attention is given towards what they understand as instituted for them, the nourishment of their soul, their spiritual good, than to what pertains directly to the honor and adoration of God. The *una cum* issue does not arouse interest for that reason, among other things. **This topic, I am saying it again, does not interest people because it pertains first and foremost to the honor of God, the purity of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the true adoration required by the Faith.**

Because It Has Strenuous Practical Consequences

Moreover, people think it is a problem, and an embarrassing difficulty, because it creates an obstacle to what they consider to be a very important thing (and that's understandable), namely the food of

their soul: *"I want to have Mass for my spiritual good (and that's good), so when you start saying to me: 'This Mass...no... you cannot go ...' There are already so few! You are setting obstacles to my spiritual good, you are 'throwing sand in the gears' as we say! We already have to make many sacrifices for going to the Traditional Mass, and then you say there are these issues! No! I do not like that at all! Stop talking about these things that make me tired, and that only serve to create new difficulties for me!"*

Because It Is an Issue Tied to Theology

Another reason why the *una cum* issue doesn't interest a majority of Faithful is that, as all questions relative to religion, even if they can be perceived in an elementary manner by the most simple people, by common sense and a spirit of Faith, developing them requires a certain formation concerning complex matters, a formation that, of course, a lot of Faithful do not have.

That is why, in my opinion, a lot of people are not interested in the *una cum* issue, and consider it as something divisive, something annoying which makes things complicated, and that, maybe, should be put aside, as an obstacle to the spiritual and sacramental life of the Faithful. **This is, unfortunately, a deviation that comes from the fact of putting, even with the best intentions in the world, man in the place of God, the useful in the place of the true:** it is useful to have the Mass, the sacraments... so, this is considered as more important than what pertains to the truth of Faith.

3] Why Does the *Una Cum* Issue Exist?

The Answer Is Strictly Tied to the Issue of the Authority in the Church

"From our holy mother the Church, nothing bad can come."

Now, let us see why the *una cum* issue exists, an issue that is, for example, one for the SSPX, as I already said, a society that is the most important society among all those who want to maintain the traditional liturgy and Faith. Let us remember that all those who are not celebrating *una cum* are excluded from it. See how important the issue is! Obviously, if such a grave decision is taken, it means that it is an important issue. But why is this issue coming up? How could it be that a priest, when celebrating the Mass, should omit this small part of the Canon where it is required to mention the name of the pope and the bishop (not any bishop, but the bishop who has jurisdictional authority over diocese, and here, as I said, it should be Bp. Mario Delpini).

The liturgy, **in order to implement the Faith**, provides for naming the names of the pope and the diocesan bishop in the Canon of the Mass. However, if the Holy See, or the episcopal see, happens to be vacant, the liturgy, still according to the rubrics of the missal, provides that one of the names, or both names, be omitted. Thus four cases are provided: to name the pope and the bishop, or to omit one or the other name, or to omit both. If the Catholic Church were

currently in order, it would be **mandatory** to name Francis, and here at Milan, Bishop Mario Delpini; acting otherwise would be manifesting a schismatic spirit, that is to say a spirit of separation, in the most solemn, most holy moment, which is the Hearth of the Church, namely the celebration of the Sacrifice of the Mass. **It would be separating from the Church.**

But we are not living in normal times, where things are in order. Now, everyone can see it. Then, since Fr. Giugni talked about the *Novus Ordo Missae* when making a review of Fr. Cekada's book, and very briefly and generally talking about the liturgical reform (we would need to talk about the whole liturgical reform, and therefore also talk about the reform of the sacrament of Holy Orders), I relate to what he just explained in order to show (only briefly, because this is not the *una cum* issue, only a preamble to understand its necessity), how (and this is not the only motive or argument) even considering the liturgical reform alone, we necessarily ought to conclude that those who promulgated it, namely Paul VI and his successors who confirmed and endorsed it, cannot be the legitimate authority of the Church. To back up this statement, I would like to recall, briefly enough I hope, some points of the teaching of the Church, that is to say the Magisterium.

Abp. Lefebvre Doesn't Know What to Say to Cardinal Seper

But before that, given that anecdotes attract more attention, I will come back to Abp. Lefebvre.

Abp. Lefebvre (I think it was more or less the

same year I have talked about: I cannot remember exactly) was summoned to Rome, at the Vatican, by Cardinal Seper. Now, you most likely do not know who Cardinal Seper is! This Cardinal, may God rest his soul, was the predecessor of Cardinal Ratzinger as Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, previously named the Holy Office (but what a difference between the one and the other!) So Cardinal Seper, as Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, had to interrogate Abp. Lefebvre over his doctrine and his praxis (his actions), which were contested by the Vatican (Vatican understood as a place, and not as an authority, of course!). This interrogation was published in French first, then in Italian by editor Giovanni Volpe, in a book titled *Monsignor Lefebvre e il Sant'Uffizio*. Cardinal Seper asked Abp. Lefebvre:

"Do you hold that a Faithful Catholic can think and assert that a sacramental rite, especially the one of the Mass (and then also the others), approved and promulgated by the Holy Father, might not be in accordance with the Faith, or "favens haeresim" (that is to say favors heresy)?"

To this question, Abp. Lefebvre did not answer. He said:

"I do not know who promulgated it."

How in the world could he not know who promulgated it! The signature was the one of Paul VI, everybody knew it! He knew it too!

But why did he not answer that question?

He could only answer two things:

1 – I do not have the ideas that you attribute to me, therefore I do not think that the new missal and the liturgical reform, approved and promulgated by Pope Paul VI, could contain something contrary to the Faith, or favoring heresy. No, I do not think that.

But, since he said it, he could not answer that he did not think that! He had said and written it. And he was right! To understand how he was right, it is enough to say that the whole liturgical reform, including the reform of the Mass, had officially and explicitly, by the will of its authors, an ecumenical goal. And what does an *ecumenical goal* mean? It means: to create a liturgy, as explained earlier by Fr. Giugni, that meets halfway with non-Catholics, even on matters that regard the Eucharist, the Mass, the sacraments, the priesthood. This is ecumenism. It was then necessary, in the name of ecumenism, to eliminate, put aside, or diminish everything that both affirms the Catholic Faith and contrasts with the beliefs of non-Catholics, that is to say either the Eastern Schismatics, or above all the Protestants. Therefore, the ecumenical finality of the new missal, explicitly stated, should already let us understand that, as Abp. Lefebvre already said, there are doctrinal problems in the new missal and consequently that we can affirm it is favoring heresy.

2 – But if, on the contrary, Abp. Lefebvre had stated what he was really thinking, namely that this rite (even if promulgated by the one he recognized as Pope) is **favoring heresy**, then Cardinal Seper would have replied to him that such a statement is **contrary to the Faith**. Why? Because the Church Magisterium

teaches (and Abp. Lefebvre knew it well! That's why he did not answer!) **that a rite promulgated by the universal Church, for all Catholics, cannot be bad.**

When St. Thomas, for example, wonders in the Summa if the rite of the Confirmation is convenient, that is to say is rightly made, after having raised all possible objections, he states:

"To answer to all that, it is enough to invoke the use of the Church, who is governed by the Holy Ghost."

And he adds:

"The Lord made to His disciples this promise: For where there are two or three gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them. It is then to be held firmly that the laws of the Church are directed by the wisdom of Christ, we must consequently be certain that the rites followed by the Church for Confirmation, and for the other sacraments, are suitable."

(Tertia Pars, Q. 72, A. 12)

And the Church has always taught this same doctrine. At the Council of Constance in 1415, for example, and after that Pope Martin V in 1418, when he condemned some heretics who were following Jan Hus and refusing the use of receiving the communion under only one species, and despising the rites of the Church. He condemned them! Why? **Precisely because it is impossible not to admit a rite of the Church.** The Council of Trent stated the same about Protestants: it issued a series of condemnations, because they refused the Catholic rite of Baptism, the habit of keeping the Holy Sacrament in the tabernacle,

the Canon of the Mass, the ceremonies of the Missal, the ornaments, the incense, the liturgical words pronounced with a low voice, the communion under only one species...the Council of Trent condemned them (the Protestants), not because all these practices were a truth of Faith, but because no one can say that they are bad. Why is that? Because, again, the **Church can do no wrong.**

This is why Protestants were condemned for their errors regarding liturgy. Later, the Jansenists raised the same objections. These, at the Synod of Pistoia, argued that the Church, through the ages, had corrupted the liturgy. (We have just seen how the modern liturgists have taken up the same ideas). And Pius VI, in 1794, condemned them for having suggested that *"the Church, which is directed by the Spirit of God, could establish a discipline, not only useless, but even dangerous or harmful."*

Therefore, the Church cannot give a useless, or even dangerous or harmful discipline. And in *Quo Graviora* Gregory XVI goes even further: not only can the Church not impose or provide something wrong, she cannot even allow the possibility of doing so in her discipline and liturgy. In the same way, the first Vatican Council (old Denz. 1837) states, in a general manner, that **the Church cannot give poison, that is to say something wrong, to its children.**

There is no way around it: the liturgical reform, and especially the new missal, are something harmful to the souls, something to stay away from. **But in this case, it cannot come from the Church. And if it does not come from the Church, it does not come from a**

legitimate authority.

Or, on the contrary, the new missal and the liturgical reform...come from a legitimate authority, and therefore from the Church, but then **they cannot contain anything wrong**. One could prefer the traditional liturgy, but could never say that there is, in the new missal, anything problematic with regard to Faith or morals.

This was noted by Benedict XVI, Josef Ratzinger, when he conceded the *Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum*. He admitted the possibility (although with great difficulty as you know) of celebrating again with the Missal of St. Pius V. (He even pretended that it was never forbidden. This is false from a historical standpoint, since Paul VI stated in his discourse to the Consistory in May 24, 1976, clearing up all doubts, that it was not licit anymore to celebrate with the ancient missal, and that the new missal replaced the old one. So this is not true, but hold on!) But Benedict XVI stated that anyone wanting to use the old missal, based on the *Motu Proprio*, ought to recognize the validity, the legitimacy, and the sanctity of the new missal. It was then unacceptable that one refused to use it for a matter of conscience, claiming to be morally unable to celebrate the New Mass. According to Benedict XVI indeed, the two missals are supposed to be two versions of the same Roman Rite: the “ordinary” rite, the one of Paul VI, and the “extraordinary” rite, that is to say unusual (such is the sense of this word), the one of St Pius V, of the Council of Trent, but actually much more ancient. This was the absolute precondition, and still is today, for all those who celebrate by permission of

the *Motu Proprio*.

By the very fact that a priest celebrates thanks to the *Motu Proprio*, he accepts the new missal as perfectly Catholic and legitimate, just another form of the Roman Rite. Otherwise, he would not be able to celebrate according to the old rite, precisely because it is impossible that a rite coming from the Church, and therefore from the authority of the Church, could contain something harmful to the souls, something to be avoided. Abp. Lefebvre, on the contrary, at least since 1981, I think, set as an obligatory rule for the seminarians and the priests not to attend a Mass celebrated according to the new missal! That means it contains something wrong! If we cannot attend it, it means that it is not good – and it is actually not good. **But how could he state, at the same time, that one must not attend a Mass celebrated with the new missal, and that this same new missal is promulgated by the pope? Here is the problem.**

4] The *Una Cum* Issue, According to Canon Law, Liturgy, and Theology

Thus arises the *una cum* issue. How to deal with this problem? I would like, in the time left, to study first the *una cum* issue from the standpoint of Canon Law and liturgy — and that is very simple. After that, we will look at the *una cum* issue from a theological standpoint, which is the more difficult but also more interesting, intellectually and spiritually speaking. The two things are related anyway. Finally, we will study the practical consequences.

The Canonical and Liturgical Point of View

Regarding the canonical point of view, the one of Canon Law and Liturgy, I already mentioned it, and we talked about it referring frequently to Fr. Cekada's book, in an article of *Sodalitium*. But the problem with *Sodalitium*, is that it is now seldom published, and that we forgot the numerous issues already published! Thus we sometimes have to repeat things that have already been said! Therefore, as I already explained, in the *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae*, the rite to follow for the celebration of the Mass — in the Roman Missal, Chapter 8, about the Canon of the Mass until the Consecration, Number 2 — we find an answer to our question. It states:

“Ubi dicit ‘Una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro,’ exprimit nomen Papae; Sede autem vacante, verba praedicta omittuntur.”

That is to say: here where the priests says “*una cum...*”,

he must cite the name of the pope ; if the see is vacant, these words are omitted. Of course, the same thing applies to the name of the diocesan bishop. If we are in a time where the two sees are vacant — the Holy Roman and Apostolic See, and the diocesan see — even the words *et Antistite nostro* have to be omitted. Yet, naming the pope and the bishop, or on the contrary omitting them, is not merely a private devotion, it is a true and proper profession of Catholic Faith and unity, on the part of the celebrant. For example, Pope Benedict XIV stated:

“It suffices for us to be able to affirm that the reminder (that the priest does) of the name of the Roman Pontiff during the Mass and the prayers offered for him during the sacrifice, must be understood as a declared sign that he recognizes the same Pontiff as Head of the Church, Vicar of Christ and Successor of Blessed Peter, and that he makes a profession of soul and will, firmly adhering to Catholic unity.”

Therefore, it means that the celebrant adheres to Catholic unity. So, for example, a schismatic priest would not cite the name of the pope, precisely because he is schismatic (he does not consider himself Catholic), even if he were to celebrate with the traditional missal, or with another traditional Eastern rite, would celebrate validly, **but not licitly and legitimately. And the Mass would not benefit the attendants. On the contrary, they would be guilty of sin.** Why? Because it would be a participation in the celebrant’s schism.

If, for example, I were to attend the Mass of an “Old Catholic,”¹ or the Mass of any schismatic priest, like an Eastern priest separated from Rome, given that none of these priests cites the name of the pope, because they do not recognize the pope’s primacy, I would participate in their schism. I participate with the error of the celebrant, at least externally, with the profession of Faith, or rather the counter-profession of Faith. In the same way, if a celebrant were naming the name of an antipope, I would be involved in his schism by the simple fact of attending his Mass, since he is in communion with an antipope. And even if he cited no name, but that all he does is in communion with an antipope, for example regarding the administration of the sacraments, (*or not in communion with the Catholic Church governed by St. Peter, if he does not name the pope because he does not recognize the primacy of Peter*), **I must not attend that Mass.** And if I did, or even if I receive other sacraments through his ministry, I participate in his schism, at least externally, by the actions I take, and (following the example above) I am favorable to an antipope.

When the See is vacant, then, obviously, the expression of Catholic Faith is manifested by the recognition of facts, that is to say, by omitting the name of pope, or the one of the bishop, not because we do not recognize the primacy of the Pontiff over the whole Church, nor because we do not recognize that the hierarchical Church is represented in the diocese by the bishop named by the pope, but rather because at this moment the See, or one or the other sees or

1 The Old Catholic heresy was born in the 19th century, professed by those who refused the dogma of papal infallibility, promulgated by the Vatican I Council. (Translator’s note)

the two, is/are vacant. **This is the reason why the manifestation of the Catholic spirit is expressed by saying, during the Holy Mass, what is in accordance with reality.**

Moreover, it has always been this way; for example, when in 1054 the Byzantines, with Michael Cerularius, separated from Rome, the first thing they did, in the *Hagia Sophia* Basilica in Constantinople, was to remove from the diptychs (tablets in which are written the names of those who ought to be named during the celebration of the Mass) the name of the pope of Rome. And by doing so, they consummated the schism. And Pope Benedict XIV (about that you can find many citations in the website of Carlo di Pietro, *Sursum corda*; I will not read all of them right now), says:

"The only way to restore Catholic unity with those who made schism consists, among other things, in the fact that they insert again the name of the pope during the celebration of the Mass."

Because otherwise, if one says *"I am not schismatic anymore,"* but then does not cite the name of the pope during the celebration of the Holy Mass, no matter what rite he uses, it means that he wants to remain schismatic. You can see then, through this example, how important the issue is.

But if, as we believe, and I gave you an example among a thousand of others, Jorge Mario Bergoglio is not formally the Supreme Pontiff, and therefore holds only materially the See of Peter without being formally the Supreme Pontiff, the inevitable

consequence is that he ought not to be named during the Mass. And it goes the same for the bishops in communion with him, including Bp. Mario Delpini here in Milan.

Therefore, if the expression of our fidelity to the Church, when the Church is in order and everything goes fine, consists in naming the legitimate pope and the bishop in communion with him, the same fidelity to the truth and the doctrine of the Church, at this time, the Church being in a state of privation, will consist in the fact of **not naming** the name of someone who is not the legitimate Pontiff (or bishop) of the Sees of Rome and, since we are here, of Milan.

This is for the canonical and liturgical point of view.

We must then say:

"In primis quae tibi offerimus pro Ecclesia tua sancta catholica: quam pacificare, custodire, adunare et regere digneris toto orbe terrarum, cum omnibus orthodoxis, atque catholicae et apostolicae fidei cultoribus."

Or else Fr. Guérard had another version, that I will maybe explain to you later, but anyway, in normal cases the rubrics of the Missal prescribe this.

The Theological Point of View: The Holy Mass, Cause and Sign of the Unity of the Church. The True Sense of the Expression "Una Cum"

Let us now come, in the time left (before I try to

conclude), to the more **profound theological issue**. And naturally, the thing is especially interesting, even if more difficult. Indeed, we have not said much up to now, so to speak!

To address this, I would like to summarize a few articles that Bp. Guérard des Lauriers, previously known as Fr. Guérard des Lauriers, published in 1980. Why in 1980? Because it was right after the declaration of Abp. Lefebvre, dated 1979. There are two versions of the same article that uses as a title a very beautiful expression from the Council of Trent.

(What I am saying now is also valid in times of peace, in times where everything is in order, that is to say apart from all the discussions and polemics we are speaking about, and that we addressed this evening; this is the doctrine of the Church, very beautiful, that is valid at any moment). The expression is the following:

“Christus novum instituit Pascha seipsum ab Ecclesia per sacerdotes sub signis visibilibus immolandum.”

(We are in session XXII, that is to say the section about the sacrifice of the Mass, Chapter 1.) The Council of Trent states:

“Christ instituted the new Easter (novum Pascha), constituting Himself (seipsum), as a victim to immolate (immolandum), under visible signs (the bread and wine), by priests, at the order of the Church.”

Let us explain this sentence. First, we can see in this declaration of the Council of Trent that in every Mass

celebrated, the **first celebrant is Jesus Christ Himself** (*seipsum immolandum instituit*). He immolates Himself. As in the sacrifice of the Cross, the Priest is Christ and the Victim is Christ, thus in the sacrifice of the Mass, at every Mass, the principal Priest and Victim is Christ. Of course, it is an unbloody victim, since Christ does not die anymore, He cannot die anymore; but even unbloody, His sacrifice is expressed by means of the separated Consecration of the bread and the wine, to express sacramentally His bloody sacrifice, although in an unbloody way. Therefore, above all, it is Christ who offers the sacrifice of the Mass where He is Himself immolated to the Father and the Holy Trinity.

Second, this sacrifice is offered *per sacerdotes*, that is to say *by means of the priests*. The priests, who receive priesthood from Christ, by the words He pronounced at the Last Supper : *Do this for a commemoration of me, that is to say by turning your intention towards what I am doing right now and by doing again what I am doing right now*, the priests, who have no other priesthood but the eternal one of Christ, are secondary and instrumental ministers of the principal minister, who is Jesus Christ.

The Priest, Minister of the Church

In every Mass, Jesus Christ is celebrating through the priest. But the celebrant priest, when celebrating the Mass, and when administering the sacraments (but here we are mostly speaking about the Mass), is he doing it out of private devotion, the highest type of private devotion, one could argue, or rather as a minister of the Church? The celebrant priest does not

celebrate it as a private devotion, as when he makes a meditation, or prays personally. **No, he acts as a minister of the Church.** And this is clearly stated by the Council of Trent, saying: *ab Ecclesia*, that is to say *by the mandate of the Church*.

Christ is immolated by the Church, *ab Ecclesia*, He is immolated by the Church. And this is a very important point to understand, on which Fr. Guérard insisted a lot. But since one could say: "*but Fr. Guérard was just rambling on his own*" (this is not true, or only partially true, but in a good sense! And only partially!), I would like to quote a sentence of Fr. Capello. Fr. Capello was a Jesuit canonist, one of the most famous and popular canonists; he says the same thing, still speaking about the *una cum* issue. He says:

"The schismatic priests, even though they sacrifice validly in nomine Christi (in the name of Christ), however do not offer the sacrifice as ministers of the Church and in the name of the same Church. The priest indeed is instructed by the Church to, in her name, pray, intercede and offer, and as for this, the Church can deprive the schismatic priests in order that they do not sacrifice in her name."

He has a mission, a mandate from the Church, to sacrifice and intercede in her name. That is what is stated by the Council of Trent: *ab Ecclesia*; in other words, the priest receives from the Church the mandate to sacrifice.

Then, you will tell me: "*But what does this have to do with the una cum issue and with the prayer that has to be said for the pope?*" Well, see that one person who, despite being a traditionalist, tries to say: "*But we can*

cite a pope even if he is a bad one, even if he does not teach the Catholic truths, without ourselves being compromised by the things he says, because we do nothing but pray for him! (And this is actually what Abp. Lefebvre used to say: We expel from the Society people who refuse to pray for the pope! For who can refuse to pray for the pope?) Fr. Guérard replies to him:

"As for myself, I always pray for John Paul II ; but we must not pray for him at the Te igitur, namely at the beginning of the Canon, in which we pray for the pope as a pope, but rather in the Memento, in which we pray for all the Faithful, and possibly also for the conversion of those who are not among the Faithful. But in the Te igitur, that is to say at the beginning of the Canon where we pray for the pope, the Bishop and the Church, together with all the Faithful Catholic, Apostolic and Orthodox – namely those who possess the true Faith – I say it again, we must not."

The Holy Mass, Cause and Sign of the Unity of the Church

Let us try to explain this. So, the Holy Mass is celebrated *ab Ecclesia*. What does this mean? **The fact that the sacrifice of the Mass is offered *ab Ecclesia*, that is to say by order of the Church, manifests the unity of the Church.**

It is the Church who says and requires all priests to celebrate the Holy Mass. That is why the priest must have the intention that the Church gives him, by means of the rite with which he celebrates. The priest cannot choose whatever rite pleases him. Thus, in the same way, he cannot have whatever intention pleases him. And, in the same way, it is not he who

decides to celebrate the Mass, but the authority of the Church who tells him to celebrate the Mass and sends him for the celebration of the Mass.

The Eucharist, St. Thomas reminds us (and this, the ecumenists also reminded it, but drawing false conclusions because they forgot an issue), **the Eucharist is the cause of the unity of the Church.**

By the fact that we are all baptized and thus united to the same Body, and that we all receive the same Body and the same Blood, the Church, which is the Mystical Body of Christ, is built. **It is by means of the Baptism and by means of the Eucharist that all Christians are united to Christ and among themselves. This is why the celebration of the Holy Mass builds the unity of the Church.**

And at the same time, it is necessary that this celebration, which builds the unity of the Church (*unless there is the obstacle of schism or heresy in the persons who participate in these rites, and that is what the ecumenists forgot*), be determined by the same Church; it is necessary that the Church give the order to offer this sacrifice, itself cause of the unity of the Church.

The Catholic Mass Is Obligatorily Offered for the Church

So, in this double perspective (the celebration which builds the unity of the Church, and the Church which commands the celebration of the sacrifice of the Mass), we can see that the unity of the Church is built, made, realized and also rendered visible. Then, in the Catholic Church instituted by Jesus Christ,

everything is hierarchical. Thus the Church is a unity of order that presupposes the hierarchy, that is to say the *holy power*. **In this hierarchy, we have the invisible head Who is Christ, the visible head of the Church who is the Roman Pontiff, the pope,** who as Supreme Pontiff must rule, manage and ordain all the worship in the Catholic Church, **together with Christ, *una cum Christo*, as we could say.** It is for this motive, and not because we want to pray for one person or the other, that in the Roman Canon, at the beginning of the Canon, so in the most solemn moment of the Holy Mass, we must offer the sacrifice of the Mass first and foremost for the Church, and this not freely or accidentally, or by mercy, but necessarily, in justice, in a mandatory way, because of the very nature of the Mass and the Church. *Pro Ecclesia tua sancta catholica.*

The Priest Can Also, If He So Desires, Apply the Fruits of the Mass to Some People in Particular

If the priest then wishes to apply the Mass to a person or another, or if the Faithful ask him, with a stipend, to apply the Mass to one person or another, this is accidental, and it changes indeed from Mass to Mass. And this is expressed in another prayer of the Canon: the *Memento*; there is the *Memento* of the living, before the Consecration, and the *Memento* of the dead, after the Consecration. And there we can name the people we wish to recommend especially to God; and by the way, it is not necessary that someone in particular be named.

While on the contrary, at the *Te igitur*, from *in primis*, we must always **and necessarily** name the Church. Because this Mass, which is celebrated *ab Ecclesia*, that is to say by the order, the mandate of the Church (and then of its head who is the pope), **is celebrated first and foremost *pro Ecclesia***, that is to say for the Church, and not for the private devotion of the priest. Indeed, it is in the very nature of things that he who offers the sacrifice also participates in the sacrifice and benefits from it, because the sacrifice of the Mass is the propitiatory sacrifice, that is to say offered in propitiation for us, for the remission of our sins, sacrifice of propitiation, of satisfaction, to make God propitious to us. And so, necessarily, he who offers the sacrifice receives the fruits of the sacrifice. However, the Faithful receive the fruits only accidentally, in a particular way, if the Mass is applied to and offered for them. But the celebrant and the Catholic Church receive them necessarily. The first who benefits from the sacrifice is the Church itself. And indeed, that is why the Mass is offered *pro Ecclesia*; but it is offered *pro Ecclesia* because it is offered *ab Ecclesia*, that is to say by the Church.

The Catholic Mass Is Necessarily Offered for the Pope, Because He Is One with the Church

But right after, who is named? The pope. **The Church is *una cum*, that is to say one with the pope, with** because it is *cum*, **but *una* adds something to *cum*, because the pope and the Church are only one thing**, as the chief, the head, is one thing with the body, and is the principal member, in the absence

of which there is obviously a difficulty, a problem! (Indeed we now have problems, big problems. But there is still the invisible head Who is Christ, thank God). **Therefore the pope is not named as a private person** (*I have a particular devotion for Eugenio Pacelli, I have a particular devotion for Roncalli, or for Karol Wojtyla, so I name him because I like him, I want to help him...*No! This is for the *Memento*! Or I'm asking for the conversion of that person. This is for the *Memento*), on the contrary, **in the *Te igitur* we must pray for him as he is pope** and because he who offers the sacrifice necessarily benefits from the sacrifice, precisely because the sacrifice is offered upon the order of the Church, for the Church, and then first and foremost for the head of the Church.

The Catholic Mass Is Necessarily Offered for the Diocesan Bishop, Because He Is the Representative of the Pope

Secondly, in the same way and in the same unity of the Church, for the diocesan bishop, since the Christian community of the Church of this city is united in the Eucharistic sacrifice, around its bishop, who orders in his diocese the celebration of the Holy Mass (in the same way as the pope orders it in the entire Church, in the entire world). This is why it is mandatory to name the diocesan bishop, not whatever bishop I like (*I have sympathy for him so I name him in particular*). No! I have to name the one who is diocesan bishop. Obviously, I have to name him, provided there is one!

The Catholic Mass Necessarily Benefits All the Faithful

Inasmuch as the sacrifice is offered by the Church, for the Church, it is offered hierarchically for the pope and the diocesan bishop. But then, since all the Faithful Catholics, also known as apostolic and who profess the orthodox Faith, are members of the Church, of the Mystical Body of Christ, they too necessarily participate in the sacrifice, and can do so only if they are Catholic, as St. Thomas says:

"In the Canon of the Mass, we do not pray for those who are outside of the Church."

So that is the situation when the Church is in a normal state. Here you can see the difference between praying for someone, which is done in the *Memento*, and offering the sacrifice for someone in a mandatory way as he is the head of the universal Church, or head of the local Church, that is to say diocesan, for example the one of Milan. **Here is the true meaning of *una cum*.**

The Sin of Sacrilege

But what happens if we do the contrary, that is, when we omit these names while we have to say them? In that case, **it is a schismatic celebration**, that may be valid but **cannot be pleasing to God**, because it obstructs the offering of the sacrifice. The obstacle is sin, the sin of schism, which is against the ecclesiastical charity, or the sin of heresy if we name a heretic.

In the same way, if the Holy See is vacant, at least formally (according to the Cassiciacum Thesis, properly speaking, the Holy See is not vacant, it is occupied but only materially; a distinction is to be made for the sake of precision, but we will not enter into this detail now — which is not a detail! But that's not what I wanted to talk about tonight!), then, **what happens if I name in the Canon of the Mass someone who is not formally pope...and someone who is not formally bishop...stating he is one with the Church...who is integrated into the Church, as head of the universal Church or the local Church, head of the Faithful who profess the catholic, apostolic and orthodox Faith? What is this? It is a sacrilege.** On the one hand, a sacrilege, and on the other hand a participation in the schism that Fr. Guérard calls “capital,” namely operated by the head. **It is a sacrilege. It is a sacrilege, first of all, because we affirm a falsehood that touches the heart of Faith, in the very offering of the sacrifice of the Mass.**

Indeed, violating a sacred thing, and the most sacred of things, the sacrifice of the Mass and the Most Holy Eucharist, is, objectively – I am not talking about the responsibility, because one could be in good Faith and not commit a sin – but **objectively, it is a sacrilege.**

“I Celebrate the Mass Because Bergoglio Commands Me To”

And this is another falsehood in the celebration of the Mass. Because, I say it again, the sacrifice is offered by the Church, *ab Ecclesia*. It is the Church Militant who orders the celebration of the Mass; but what is

the Church for me? It is Bergoglio, because I name him! I name Bergoglio! (before it was Wojtyla; before, Montini). What does this mean? For me, it means that Bergoglio, as head of the Church, commands me to celebrate the Mass. That's it: *ab Ecclesia*.

Thus I celebrate the Mass in communion with him. **And not only in communion with him, but under his order, because he demands it of me, because he wills it! ... and I do what he wants.** And this is a falsehood, if in reality Bergoglio is not that Church which commands me to celebrate the Holy Mass.

The Mass "In a State of Privation"

We have to understand that, since the Church is currently deprived, at least formally, of a visible head, she is in a state of privation of authority. In the same way, the celebration of the Mass, nowadays, for those who do not celebrate *una cum* (and we want to be among those), is "in a state of privation." Because indeed, even if we celebrate by the mandate of the Church, as validly ordained priests, as Catholics, as we want to celebrate the Mass as Jesus Christ wants it to be accomplished, *this command is indeed missing*, in the same way as during the brief periods of vacancy of the Holy See, which always occur in the normal life of the Church.

(Now, I have to go fast and postpone so many things that I want to say, but I have to conclude...) But, I repeat it, **by naming Bergoglio, the celebrant, objectively, participates in what is called capital schism**; capital, because the current occupiers of the Apostolic See, the "elect," are themselves in a

state of schism, not the schism done by the subjects against the pope, but the schism done by those who occupy the Apostolic See, since they are objectively, as explained by the Cassiciacum Thesis, unwilling to accept this election in order to provide objectively, habitually, the good of the Church, by using, among other things, their infallible Magisterium. That's why these occupiers introduce into the Church, from the top, a kind of schism, in which are complicit and participants all those who celebrate under their mandate, and are thereby, as we could say, members of their denomination.

5] Practical Conclusions

And then, what are the conclusions, the practical conclusions, after this too brief overview (but I must, by force of circumstances, put an end to it), so, what can be the conclusion with regard to our duty to attend the Holy Mass? Definitely, I, as a Catholic, want to attend the Holy Mass, fountain of so many graces, but certainly not the *Novus Ordo*, I hope you understood! **It is called a mass, but it is not The Mass.** (By the way, even they call it the Lord's Supper), and this in spite of the *Williamsonian* "miracles" which are put forward with very weird arguments.

Lately, I went on the Internet (we all go to the internet!) looking for information about a schismatic church, the Mexican national church (Perhaps you didn't know it existed, now you do!) I think, but it doesn't matter, that it comes from another national schismatic Brazilian church, of a certain Bp. Duarte Costa (who today would be at least elevated to cardinalate, because he said that the Mass ought to be said in vernacular language, that priests could get married, that the liturgy needs to change, and then, that we have to open up to Communism...poor bishop excommunicated by Pius XII! Nowadays, he would not have had the problems he got at this time!). If you go on the website of this very bizarre national Mexican church, not very widespread I think, on the "Home" page, you can find the description of the "miracle" that happened in their church, etc. *Is it true? Is it false?* Of course it's false! But you see, the "miracles" are proliferating...I end the anecdote.

Where Does the Priest Who Celebrates This Mass of Saint Pius V Come From?

So, I do not attend the *Novus Ordo*. I attend the traditional Mass, in other words the Roman Mass, thus not the "*vetus ordo*," not the "extraordinary rite," all these terminologies must be discarded, but the Catholic Mass. The new missal is an intruder. So I attend the Catholic Mass, with the *Missale Romanum*... *but with which celebrant?*

First, I can find a priest who celebrates with the traditional rite, and *who has been ordained to the priesthood with the new rite*, because they also changed the rites of the sacrament of Holy Orders. Or else, he has been ordained to priesthood with the Catholic, traditional rite, *but by a bishop consecrated with the new rite*. **Are they truly and validly ordained?** Abp. Lefebvre was in doubt about it. And this time, he was right! Can we attend a celebration of the Holy Mass if there is a doubt about the validity of the celebrant minister? **No! This also would be a sacrilege.**

Where can these doubtful priests be found? Virtually, the vast majority of those who celebrate with the *Motu Proprio* are of this kind: they are diocesan priests ordained with the new rite, or by bishops consecrated with the new rite. They can also be found in groups such as the Society of St. Peter, etc. *But even the Society of St. Pius X*, sometimes you find them!

Maybe they are not numerous, but you can find priests, and even a bishop, Bp. Huonder, ordained with the new rite (and consecrated, for Bp. Huonder,

with the new rite), and who celebrate the Catholic Mass, despite their doubtful ordination.

But as for myself, one could say, I know that this priest is 95 years old, so there is no doubt! He has been ordained as God commands it and he says the Mass of St. Pius V, so there is no problem. Yes there is a problem! Sometimes indeed, we find this kind of priests, but they celebrate with both rites, or celebrate under the *Motu Proprio*. What does it mean? If they celebrate according to the *Motu Proprio* given by Benedict XVI, they admit *by this very fact* that **the two Masses are on the same level, that both are good.** And if, then, they even celebrate with both rites (and many do this way), they manifest even more how they are convinced that the two rites are on the same level. That's a problem!

But even if they do not think this way, and even if they are absolutely and totally against all the reforms, and do not admit in any way the new missal, they celebrate *una cum*. So, what does it mean? That's what I told you before. They hold that their celebration is accomplished under the mandate of Bergoglio; they are in the denomination of Bergoglio, even if they are likely to criticize him! ...likely to speak ill of him from dawn to dusk and, it is even worse, because they speak badly of the Pope, Pope at least according to them obviously! **Can we attend these Masses? If, as I said before, this attendance includes a sacrilege and a capital schism, and, moreover, a counter-testimony of Faith, the answer is, once again, no!**

Attendance at a Liturgical Rite, or Reception of a Sacrament is, *in itself*, a Testimony of Faith (Faith which is the one of the Rite and *not the one of the*

faithful who attend), whether we like it or not!

But one could say: *This is the problem of the priest, not mine.* Well! **This is a completely false way of understanding the virtue of Faith and the responsibility in our actions.** Because it is seeing attendance at Mass and reception of the Sacraments *as a private devotion.* It makes it akin to saying the rosary, or doing a meditation, or a spiritual reading, etc. But that's not the case at all. Attendance at a liturgical rite is a profession of Faith, a testimony of Faith. If I am a Lutheran, I go to a Lutheran church in order to testify of my Lutheran Faith. If I have to be baptized, I can only be baptized if I make a profession of Faith and recite the Creed. Why? Because Baptism, as well, is not a private rite, to feel relieved of my sins, for example. It is first and foremost a sacrament *of the Faith.* **The sacraments are sacraments of the Faith, and thus are testimonies of Faith.**

So, attending a Mass or a liturgical rite of any kind, **is an official act of the Church, to which I participate only if I agree with what is done, that is to say if it corresponds to my Faith.**

But one could say again: *But as for me, I can do a thing externally while thinking another thing internally; and so, I attend this Mass (say, in communion with Bergoglio), but internally I do not agree. I skip this part (of the Te igitur). I do not want to hear that name, and I do not hear it because it is said in a low voice! No problem! Except during the Holy Week when it is said out loud. Then, here, I cover my ears! No! The problem is not that! The problem already exists by the very fact that I, by my active participation (for there can be cases*

where the participation is only passive), **manifest my Faith, testify at least externally of my Faith.** The first Christians (and it still happens nowadays), who were asked to reject their Faith, or even just to throw a grain of incense to the idols, maybe maintained the Faith in their hearts. *But if they threw a grain of incense, they were sinning against the testimony of Faith.* They were acting externally as pagans, while being internally Christians. So, I, by assisting at an *una cum* Mass, I act externally as a *bergoglian*, while being internally *anti-bergoglian*, so to speak.

Then Comes the Case of the Liar and Perjuring Priest

But, finally (and here I am concluding with somewhat petty things, after having seen, on the contrary, what Fr. Guérard explained to us in such an exalted way), there are those who say: *But I have found out that this priest, privately, is not una cum!* (It happened recently again, but I have heard it a thousand times...) This priest is not *una cum*. But, I'm sorry, in public, what does he say? That he is *una cum*! Yes, he says that he is *una cum*...and he is part of the Society of St. Pius X! So, ladies and gentlemen, **this priest has sworn, before he became a priest, to recognize the legitimacy of these "pontiffs,"** thus he has sworn to be in communion with these persons and that he would mention them in the Canon of the Mass! *Yes, but to me, he said that it is not true, that he doesn't cite their name!* **Then, he is saying that he is a liar!** Because he says something in public, and another thing in private to you. **But if he is a liar, what can guarantee that what he said in your ear is true?** How could you know? You have to consider not what he

says in private, but what he says publicly.

It would be like saying: *I go to the Lutheran church, but the pastor said to me that he is very Catholic!* Yes, but then, why does he stay with the Lutherans? If you are very Catholic, run away from the Lutheran church and ask to be received in the Catholic Church! If you are a bishop, an Anglican false bishop, but are actually Catholic in your heart, then leave your insignia, your vestments, etc., and become a Catholic! If you are a Modernist, and if you are so officially, publicly, etc., then, you cannot tell me that, in private, you think completely otherwise!

“Father, You Want To Eliminate the Competitors!”

Then, someone would say: *I understand, Father, all that you have explained to me, all these beautiful speeches, ab Ecclesia, pro Ecclesia, per sacerdotes, etc., all that was just for saying: you can only go to my Mass. It is to eliminate the competitors!* **No! It is no such thing! For if there were dozens, hundreds, thousands, millions of priests celebrating non *una cum*, I would be the happiest man in the world!**

I would spare an incredible amount of fuel, a great number of trips, so many toll fees, a lot of fatigue, and of course the world would be much better, and the situation of the Church would be much happier, so it would make me very happy! We do not ask for anything but that! And I would even say: **I ask nothing but to celebrate the Mass *una cum*, that is to say: I ask nothing but for the Church to go back to normal, that God, in His mercy, gives us a**

legitimate pope, not only in potency but in act, and that, eliminating all the errors that spread more and more to the great dishonor of the Church, He restores the truth in the Church; the Church is always in the truth, but let him throw out from her the Modernists, and denounce and condemn the modern errors!

There is no problem with that. But the first thing I desire is this one, to be allowed to celebrate the Mass *una cum*, but obviously not with a “pontiff” who departs almost everyday from the doctrine and morals of the Church, but, on the contrary, with a true and legitimate successor of Peter who, as Pius XII says in *Mystici Corporis*, rules, governs, teaches and sanctifies the Church with Jesus Christ, in other words that Jesus Christ Himself rules, governs, teaches and sanctifies the Church, every day, through His Vicar the Pope. When this truly happens again, I will be the happiest man because I could celebrate *una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro, una cum Antistite nostro*.

AMDG

Conclusion of Fr. Giugni

I thank Fr. Francesco Ricossa for this instruction. He made the issue much more clear. Not only ought we not to attend the new Mass (we cannot go to the *Novus Ordo*: the new mass is an intruder in the Church), but he also explained very well what are the conditions for attending a Mass, to the Catholic Mass, nowadays.

As Catholics, we ought to attend a Mass and receive Sacraments that are in conformity with our Faith. The denial of sacrifice, as Fr. Guérard said, must put us in a state of sacrifice. Let us too make sacrifices for attending a Mass which is pleasing to God, which comes from the Church, and therefore which is celebrated by the mandate of the Church, a Mass, then, that cannot be in communion with those who try to destroy, to annihilate the Church.

Long live Christ the King!

The *Una Cum* Issue & The Honor of God

The topic addressed in this book does not interest most of the people who attend, or seek the Traditional Mass as we say. It is an issue that interests almost nobody. Why does this topic not arouse interest in people?

Because many of these people, influenced by the modern mentality, put man before God! Indeed, the first goal of the Sacrifice, the most important one, is the adoration of God.

For the priest, to mention or not *to mention Bergoglio as Pope Francis*, and the local bishop's name, in the Canon of the Mass, depends on how he conceives the present situation of the Church. Are Bergoglio, and the occupant of the diocesan see, the authority in the Church – or are they not? If they are, then not mentioning them manifests a schismatic spirit. If they are not the authority, then mentioning them makes no sense, and it offends God. Naming the Pope and the Bishop, or on the contrary omitting them at this precise moment, is not merely a private devotion, it is a true and proper profession of Catholic Faith and Unity. Attending a Mass celebrated “una cum Bergoglio” includes a sacrilege and a capital schism, and, moreover, a counter-testimony of faith.

— Fr. Arnold Trauner, IMBC



ISBN 979-8-9892024-0-9

