

138
Tom Summers <papasummers@gmail.com>

Ecclesia Dei and Father Bolduc

4 messages

Tom Summers <papasummers@gmail.com>
To: François Laisney | FSSPX <f.laisney@fsspx.email>

Wed, Dec 16, 2020 at 7:05 AM

I hope you have a Blessed and Holy Christmas time.

I would appreciate it if you could look at the attached document that Father Bolduc signed. If an English translation is available, I would appreciate it. This, Father Bolduc signed after leaving the SSPX.

My son, Father Summers says you have some thoughts on this document and might share them with me. I am trying to understand the issues with signing this document. Why would he sign it and what are the reasons for and against.

Again, thank you for taking the time to help me out on this small project.

Prayers,

Tom Summers

Ecclesia Dei.jpg
3631K

François Laisney | FSSPX <f.laisney@fsspx.email>
To: "papasummers@gmail.com" <papasummers@gmail.com>
Cc: Patrick Summers | FSSPX <p.summers@fsspx.email>

Wed, Dec 16, 2020 at 7:40 PM

Dear Mr Summers,

Very many thanks for the document you enclosed. I had never seen it. This is the document which the Ecclesia Dei commission asked all those who left the SSPX at that time to sign for their "reconciliation". Here is a quick translation:

1. I, N.N., promise fidelity towards the Catholic Church and towards the Roman Pontiff, the Supreme Shepherd of the Church, Vicar of Christ, Successor of Peter in his Primacy and Head of the Episcopal College.
2. I receive the doctrine, which is taught in n.25 of the dogmatic Constitution "Lumen Gentium" of the second Vatican Council concerning the Magisterium of the Church and concerning the adherence due to it.
3. Concerning some doctrines, which the second Vatican Council taught, or concerning the posterior renovations either in Liturgy or Canon Law, which seem to some people to be able to be reconciled with difficulty with precedent declarations of the Magisterium, I assume the

obligation to follow a positive line of study and communication with the Apostolic See, avoiding all polemical note.

4. I also declare to accept the validity of the Sacrifice of the Mass and of the Sacraments celebrated with the intention to do what the Church does and according to the rites which are found in the typical edition of the Roman Missal and of the Rituals published by the Sovereign Pontiffs Paul VI and John Paul II.
5. Lastly, I promise that I will adhere to the common discipline of the Church and to her laws, above all to those contained in the Code of Canon Law published by the Sovereign Pontiff John Paul II, being safe those which have been conceded by the Apostolic See in the constitutions [...]

Done at Rome, on the 22nd September 1988 – name of the person making the declaration: Fr Hector Bolduc.

After the motu proprio *Ecclesia Dei*, he was the only priest formerly of the SSPX in the USA to have signed this document, as far as I know. The FSP only arrived in the US after some time. Fr Arnaud Devillers joined the FSP only in 1989 and went to Germany/France for a while before returning to the USA. I knew Fr Bolduc had joined the *Ecclesia Dei*, but had not seen that document. I also knew some US priests who had received a *celebrate* from the *Ecclesia Dei* commission (e.g. Fr Miceli), but I doubt they had to sign any such document. Fr Bolduc returned to the US and for a while it seemed that he acted as if he had a mission to promote *Ecclesia Dei*, but it seems that he did it so freely that he must have upset some bishops and soon after settled in his previous apostolate (Wisconsin and New Hampshire). At that time, there was very little contact with him, and I heard of all this only second hand, so my testimony is not worth much.

Not a single SSPX priest of the district left the SSPX in 1988 (Fr Bolduc had left earlier, Fr Arnaud Devillers left the next year, and Fr Petit left from the seminary, not from the District). So our apostolate did not suffer at all of the efforts of the Vatican to get people away from us, and Fr Bolduc joining the *Ecclesia Dei* commission did not have much effect on us at all – and I do not know how much effect it had on his own faithful.

Now later on, he reconciled with the SSPX, and even asked for our bishops to perform confirmations in his chapels.

As for the document itself, it is loaded with dangerous things.

For the first paragraph, apart from the last four words, all the SSPX priests have virtually done that in the antimodernist oath with an interesting nuance: in the antimodernist oath, it is to the FAITH of the Church and the definitions of the Councils and Popes (Trent, Vatican I...) that we pledge our faith and attachment: such attachment is not an abstract attachment to an abstract faith, separable from the Church (see sedevacantism); it implies the attachment to Church itself, founded on this Faith; it is a binding with "Peter Professing the Faith". Now in this declaration of the *Ecclesia Dei* commission, one promises fidelity to the PERSONS with no reference to the Faith itself – and that is

dangerous.

The last words of the first paragraph are new, and presuppose a permanent "college of bishops", with all the ambiguous new doctrine of Collegiality on the matter, and this is not good.

The second paragraph introduces the ambiguous notion of "authentic" magisterium (in *Lumen Gentium* 25), somehow between the solemn magisterium (defining the doctrine) and the ordinary magisterium – that again, is a new and certainly not defined doctrine, under which they want to push the novelties. And that is most dangerous.

The third paragraph accepts that there "appears to be" some passages in the novelties that are "difficult to reconcile" with previous magisterium; but on those matters, one may not denounce clearly the novelties, one rather pledges to avoid any "polemic". Practically after more than 30 years now, it appears that the "*Ecclesia Dei*" societies have done near nothing to denounce those novelties.

The fourth paragraph accepts the validity of the new rites, but fails to state that there are often many reason to doubt – in practice – such validity due to many abuses, either the lack of proper matter (e.g. confirmation without olive oil for the Chrism, which the new rubric allow), or lack of proper intention because many modern priests are taught the wrong thing (e.g. that the Mass is not a proper propitiatory sacrifice...) which open the door to distorted intention.

The fifth paragraph is all on the new code of Canon Law, as if there were nothing problematic with it (e.g. can. 844!)

I hope this helps you to understand the issues with signing this document. It happened some four years after Fr Bolduc left the SSPX.

Yours sincerely in Jesus and Mary,

Father François Laisney

Tom Summers <papasummers@gmail.com>
To: François Laisney | FSSPX <f.laisney@fsspx.email>
Cc: Patrick Summers <fathersummers@gmail.com>

Thu, Dec 17, 2020 at 9:35 AM

You are very welcome. Thank you for the quick and thorough answer. I think by signing this, Father Bolduc had an organizational connection to Rome which I think is mandatory for any priest? I also have a document (attached) from Cardinal Mayer which I believe gives Father the ability to say the latin Mass. In Father's diary notes, he comments that after much abuse from the American Hierarchy, Cardinal Mayer asked for the celebrate back. Father Bolduc said he didn't ask for it and would not be returning it.
Prayers

P.S. I am completely unqualified to undertake this biography. I have gathered much information (press articles, original documents, diaries, Angelus, Interviews, etc) on Father Bolduc, arranged it chronologically in prose form with footnotes to source documents. I am looking for a religious that might review for accuracy. Would you be willing to help??? I am also looking for a person to take my poor English and make it much more interesting and readable. I consider Father Bolduc a person who made mistakes but during his 10 years with the SSPX, but also accomplished much for Tradition..

SCAN0128.JPG
881K

François Laisney | FSSPX <f.laisney@fsspx.email>
To: "papasummers@gmail.com" <papasummers@gmail.com>
Cc: Patrick Summers | FSSPX <p.summers@fsspx.email>

Thu, Dec 17, 2020 at 3:23 PM

Dear Mr Summers,

Very many thanks for the additional document. Yes, I think you are right: this document was required by the Ecclesia Dei commission in order to "regularise" the canonical situation of Fr Bolduc.

The Society of St. Pius X was properly canonically erected by Bishop Charrière in Fribourg on 1st November 1970. But it was uncanonically suppressed by Bishop Mamie on 6th May 1975: Archbishop Lefebvre had appealed against that suppression, and, according to Canon Law, such appeal is "suspensive", i.e. it suspends the decision of the bishop until the appeal is judged: thus the "suppression" was ineffective, until the appeal would be judged. Now the appeal has never been judged (in fact there was a double appeal: to the first appeal, they responded that the Pope took the matter in his own hands; to this, Archbishop Lefebvre appealed to the "Apostolic Signature", the supreme court of appeal in the church, asking for the proper documents showing that the Pope would have taken the matter in his own hands, and this second appeal was never answered. They never showed any proper document.)

So ever since 1975, there was an appearance of uncanonical situation for the SSPX, because of that apparent suppression by Bishop Mamie, but in reality the SSPX was not suppressed (because of the invalidity of that document of Bishop Mamie, he did not have the authority to do so, according to Canon Law). The protocol of May 1988 was supposed to correct that anomaly, but failed because Rome failed to their promise of a bishop (postponing and postponing without any end in view such consecration; even when giving the date of 15 Aug. 1988, they knew it was an impossible date because at the very same time they were asking for new candidates and there was not enough time for them to do their normal preparation of the dossiers).

The Ecclesia Dei commission then required of those who left the SSPX at that time to sign the

document you sent me in your last email, in order to get back into a normal canonical situation. Practically that meant for them, to be back under the authority of the local bishops, with a special permission to say the traditional Mass... but, as the document you just sent me testifies, they were practically under the thumb of the local bishops. At first, these could not prevent Rome from giving these "celebrates", but within a few months, the bishops complained so much to Rome that Cardinal Mayer was replaced by Cardinal Innocenti who then required all these priests to follow the regulations of their local bishops – much more restrictive of the Traditional Mass. You might check in Father's diary whether it was Cardinal Mayer or Cardinal Innocenti who "asked for the celebrate back".

I am interested to read that it was the Cardinal who asked for the celebrate back: it is worse than just putting restrictions on its use! I can understand Father Bolduc's response. Mr Michael Davies, who after the Consecration was of the opinion that one should give a chance to Cardinal Ratzinger to prove himself (with the *Ecclesia Dei* commission "solution"), said a few months later (early 1989) that it seemed that Rome was doing everything they could to prove Archbishop Lefebvre was right in not trusting them! Father Bolduc's experience confirms these words of Michael Davies.

I am afraid that I did not know personally enough Fr Bolduc to review the biography you have prepared about him. One priest you might want to contact – if I may suggest – would be Fr Terence Finnegan, who had known him much better than I had. He might be willing to help you in that matter.

(One small – and uninteresting – personal souvenir: once, when he was passing through Paris, Father Aulagnier had asked Fr Bolduc to serve on the weekend the chapel in Rouen, about 100 miles from Paris. That was my city. My parents were housing the priest at the time, and they commented to me later about his visit. It was the late 1970s or early 1980s. I do not remember the content of their comments, but the simple fact; it was simply comments about a good and zealous priest).

I am afraid that I did not know personally enough Fr Bolduc to review the biography you have prepared about him. One priest you might want to contact – if I may suggest – would be Fr Terence Finnegan, who had known him much better than I had. He might be willing to help you in that matter.

(One small – and uninteresting – personal souvenir: once, when he was passing through Paris, Father Aulagnier had asked Fr Bolduc to serve on the weekend the chapel in Rouen, about 100 miles from Paris. That was my city. My parents were housing the priest at the time, and they commented to me later about his visit. It was the late 1970s or early 1980s. I do not remember the content of their comments, but the simple fact; it was simply comments about a good and zealous priest).

[Quoted text hidden]

Tom Summers <papasummers@gmail.com>
To: François Laisney | FSSPX <f.laisney@fsspx.email>

Sat, Dec 19, 2020 at 4:17 PM

The second document allows Father to say the Latin Mass?? Could you translate please?

I wonder if I can use some of your email to explain these two documents in Father's Biography?

Prayers,

Tom Summers

P.S. What years were you district superior in the U.S.?

[Quoted text hidden]

François Laisney | FSSPX <f.laisney@fsspx.email>
To: "papasummers@gmail.com" <papasummers@gmail.com>
Cc: Patrick Summers | FSSPX <p.summers@fsspx.email>

Sun, Dec 20, 2020 at 6:07 PM

Dear Mr Summers,

Here is a simple translation of the second document:

Paul Augustine Cardinal Meyer, OSB 74

By these present [letters] it is attested that Reverend [Father] Hector Bolduc, ordained on the 29th June 1974, has the faculty to celebrate the Sacrifice of the Mass using the Roman Missal published in the year 1962, according to the norms of the Apostolic Letters "Motu Proprio" given on the 2nd day of July 1988.

That faculty will be effective until a Commission established for this purpose will be able to publish general disposition after consulting the local Ordinaries.

Done at Rome on the 22nd September 1988

Augustine Cardinal Meyer, OSB

President of the above-mentioned Commission

(signature): Camille Perl, secretary

You may use some of my email if you wish.

I was district superior of the US from 13th May 1984 till 15th August 1990. Both districts (North East and South West) were reunited on the 13th May 1984, and the announcement was made by Archbishop Lefebvre at the ordination Mass on that same day at Ridgefield.

Yours sincerely in Jesus and Mary,

François Laisney | FSSPX

6:08 PM (2 hours ago)

to Patrick me

Dear Mr Summers,

Here is a simple translation of the second document:

Paul Augustine Cardinal Meyer, OSB 74

By these present [letters] it is attested that Reverend [Father] Hector Bolduc, ordained on the 29th June 1974, has the faculty to celebrate the Sacrifice of the Mass using the Roman Missal published in the year 1962, according to the norms of the Apostolic Letters "Motu Proprio" given on the 2nd day of July 1988. That faculty will be effective until a Commission established for this purpose will be able to publish general disposition after consulting the local Ordinaries.

Done at Rome on the 22nd September 1988

Augustine Cardinal Meyer, OSB

President of the above-mentioned Commission

(signature): Camille Perl, secretary

You may use some of my email if you wish.

I was district superior of the US from 13th May 1984 till 15th August 1990. Both districts (North East and South West) were reunited on the 13th May 1984, and the announcement was made by Archbishop Lefebvre at the ordination Mass on that same day at Ridgefield.

Yours sincerely in Jesus and Mary,

Father François Laisney