
Most Holy Trinity Seminary Newsletter



JANUARY 2024

Published by Most Holy Trinity Seminary, 1711 Hampden Boulevard, Reading, Pennsylvania 19604. This newsletter is sent free of charge to all Seminary benefactors who contribute \$75.00 or more annually. If you would like to be on our mailing list, please contact us by mail, or at piuspapax@gmail.com. Please visit our website at mostholytrinityseminary.org

My dear Catholic people,

The flashpoint in December was Bergoglio's permission to bless sodomitic couples. The subject hardly needs comment or explanation. I will comment only with a few words.

The malice of this new Novus Ordo discipline is that these sinners are being blessed *as couples*.

It is permissible to bless sinners *as individuals*, not with the idea of blessing their sin, but as an invocation to God that He grant them the grace to repent of their sins.

The very fact that these sodomites present themselves *as a couple*, many of them already in "civil unions," a woke mockery of the state of matrimony, means that the implicit request is to bless them in this union which they have.

We all know that this is not a simple friendship, but an erotic relationship in which they are living together precisely to engage in unnatural sex acts.

For it is possible to bestow blessings on persons who are *legitimately* connected in some form or other, e.g., a family, pilgrims on a pilgrimage, retreatants, a congregation of nuns. Blessings cannot, however, be given to those who are united illegitimately, except if they are penitents. So a priest cannot bless a couple, *as a couple*, of two persons invalidly married.

Persons who are living in sin must first be told that they must abandon the sinful state, separate, make a good confession, and lead a virtuous life. They must

promise to avoid all occasions of sin, including the company of those with whom they have sinned. If they sincerely promise to do these things, they could be blessed *as individuals*, as an invocation of God's mercy upon a penitent sinner.

The prodigal son did not return to his father with a prostitute in each arm, seeking his father's blessing. And when Our Lord showed mercy to the woman caught in adultery, did He not say to her, "Go now, and sin no more?"

The Novus Ordo conservatives, always vigilant to try to see Catholic clothing on the naked emperor known as the Novus Ordo, had to press the emergency damage control alarm in order to whitewash this latest deviation of Bergoglio. They are trying to pass it off as merely the blessing of individuals. We know, however, that the proposed fix is a failure, since these sodomites are approaching priests *as couples*, and are seeking blessings *as couples*.

To grant a blessing to a sodomite couple is to give consent to their sexual relationship, and is therefore a very grave sin of cooperation through consent, as well as a sin of *grave scandal*, whereby others will be induced to enter into these evil relationships and commit the same sins.

I will not be surprised at all if Bergoglio soon permits these "couples" to receive the Novus Ordo bread wafer, which they style as the "Eucharist." Bishop Barron, by the way, recently pointed out that 70% of [Novus

Ordo] Catholics do not believe in the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. He was quick to add, however, that this loss of faith cannot be attributed to Vatican II. No, of course not. It must be something else.

Goody two shoes. Cardinal Müller, the former head of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (which we call the Congregation for the Destruction of the Faith), said recently that Benedict XVI (Ratzinger) would never have authorized the blessing of sodomitic couples.¹

He is probably right, for Ratzinger, himself a radical arch-modernist, was clever enough to know that Vatican II and the Novus Ordo had to be cloaked (literally) in tradition. So he set about in his “papacy” to revive many sartorial traditions of popes: the red shoes, the furry red skullcap, the velvet red shoulder cape trimmed with white fur, the magnificent miters, the gorgeous encrusted vestments, carrying a traditionally styled cross, instead of the monstrosity of Paul VI, which was a sagging, twisted cross which appeared to have on it not Christ in His victory over sin, but an unfortunate deceased lizard. Paul VI *loved* modern art.

Novus Ordo conservatives fell for Ratzinger’s allurements with great enthusiasm. Even the Society of Saint Pius X attempted a reconciliation with him, but it failed because, as Ratzinger himself said, “there were doctrinal issues.” It meant that the only thing which Ratzinger would concede to the Novus Ordo conservatives were the trappings of tradition, without the substance. In other words, Vatican II, which is the constitution of the New Religion, must stand, but we are willing to give you Latin and nice vestments.

A general reconciliation with the conservatives would have also given the appearance of continuity to an ailing Vatican II religion. Continuity with the past is essential to Catholicism, and Ratzinger was intelligent enough to understand that Vatican II was badly in need

of the blessing of those who had reacted against it as a rupture with tradition.

Bergoglio, on the other hand, lacks the intellectual acumen to understand the problem, and is driving the conservatives into a camp of resistance, and even to sedevacantism.

Resistance is schism. It is to be recalled, from what I pointed out in my last newsletter (December) that resistance to papal decrees concerning discipline is schismatic. Pius IX said: “For the Catholic Church has always considered schismatic all those who obstinately resist the authority of her legitimate prelates, and especially her supreme pastor, and any who refuses to execute their orders and even to recognize their authority.”²

Resistance to the authority of the Roman Pontiff is schism. It does not differ from the stance taken by Martin Luther or by Henry VIII.

Instead of following the path of schismatics, Novus Ordo conservatives should see this latest decree of the Vatican authorizing the blessing of sodomitic couples as proof positive that Bergoglio is not a true pope. For by the principle of the Church’s indefectibility, it is impossible that the universal discipline of the Church could prescribe – or even permit – a discipline which would be sinful to practice. But the blessing of sodomitic couples *as couples* is contrary to the natural law, which is the same as the law of God, and would therefore be a sinful act of sacrilege. For a blessing is a sacramental. But to use a sacramental for an evil purpose, in this case the blessing of sodomy, is a sacrilege.

Since it would be heresy to deny the indefectibility of the Church in her disciplines, one must draw the conclusion that it is Bergoglio who has defected, in such a way that he is manifesting to everyone that his decisions and teachings are not protected from error by the Spirit of Truth.

¹ Cardinal Müller, ironically, is himself a modernist, reducing the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin Mary to a mere symbol, and a theological theory developed to promote celibacy. “The mariological ideas of the Church Fathers concerning the virginity of Mary after the birth [of Christ] were formed in particular in connection with the Christian ideal of celibacy for the sake of the kingdom of heaven (Mt 19:12) and the evangelical counsel to this Christian way of life “for the sake of the things of the Lord.” (From his book entitled *Katholische Dogmatik*. (Translation courtesy of *Novus Ordo Watch*). It is Catholic dogma that Our Lady was and is a virgin – physically – before, during, and after the birth of Christ. To doubt or deny this dogma is heresy.

² Encyclical *Quartus supra*.

The roots of Vatican II. The following is a passage from a book which we are reading in our refectory (dining room). The book is entitled *The History of the Catholic Church from the Renaissance to the French Revolution*. It was published in 1914. The author is a Father James MacCaffrey. In it he describes the attitudes of many Catholic scholars who were influenced by the eighteenth-century rationalism:

They [the many Catholic scholars in the 18th century] were convinced that Scholasticism, however valuable it may have been in the thirteenth century, was antiquated and out of harmony with modern progress, that it should be dropped entirely from the curriculum of studies, and with it should go many of the theological accretions to which it had given rise. Catholicism, it was thought, if it were to hold the field as a world-wide religion, must be remodelled so as to bring it in better line with the conclusions of modern philosophy. Less attention should be paid to dogma and to polemical discussions, and more to the ethical and natural principles contained in the Christian revelation.

Now listen to Saint Pius X, writing in *Pascendi* in 1907:

They [the Modernists] wish philosophy to be reformed, especially in the ecclesiastical seminaries. They wish the scholastic philosophy to be relegated to the history of philosophy and to be classed among absolute systems, and the young men to be taught modern philosophy which alone is true and suited to the times in which we live. They desire the reform of theology: rational theology is to have modern philosophy for its foundation, and positive theology is to be founded on the history of dogma.

There is no surer sign that a man is tending to Modernism than when he begins to show his dislike for the scholastic method.

It should be explained here that scholastic philosophy and theology is that of Saint Thomas Aquinas and of the school which followed him. It is noted for its objectivity and clarity.

Modern philosophy, on the other hand, is that of Immanuel Kant and of his followers in the nineteenth century, and is known for its subjectivism, rationalism,

obscurity, and the primacy of the human conscience regarding what is good and bad.

The modernists who devised Vatican II, such as Ratzinger, Rahner, Küng, and many others, *detested* scholastic philosophy and theology, and substituted modern systems in which they could promote their heretical ideas concerning the evolution of dogma, religious liberty, ecumenism, collegiality, the new ecclesiology, and other false ideas.

Our position concerning the changes of Vatican II is that the perpetrators of these changes intended – and still intend – to eradicate pre-Vatican II Catholicism, and replace it with a reformed religion which, precisely, is based upon “ethical and natural principles which are contained in the Christian revelation,” as Father MacCaffrey stated above. So, for example, Novus Ordo “popes” in their documents and speeches promote purely natural concerns, such as peace in the world, migration, climate change, socialistic “remedies” to poverty, redistribution of wealth, etc. Bergoglio is virtually incapable of saying anything religious or pious. The only time he talks about religion, it seems, is to deny a Catholic doctrine.

Because the Vatican II “popes” intended and do still intend to overthrow the Catholic Faith, and replace it with a naturalistic religion, the Vatican II “popes” failed to obtain the authority of Christ to rule the Church because of their *defect of intention* in accepting the papacy. Just as a marriage would be invalid if a spouse failed to make the intention of an indissoluble bond until death, so the acceptance of the power of the papacy, despite the externals of acceptance, would be invalid owing to this perverted and pernicious intention.

Thanks to our benefactors. We again thank our benefactors for their loyal and generous gifts to the seminary. By giving to the seminary you empower it to accomplish the absolutely essential task of providing priests for the future, uncompromising priests, priests who will not seek a reconciliation with the modernists. Indeed, the most important of all our apostolates is the training of future priests.

Ordinations. We are looking forward to ordaining one man this year to the priesthood, Aedan Gilchrist, who, although originally from New Zealand, is now a

citizen of the United Kingdom, where his family resides. His ordination will take place in Nantes, France toward the end of June. The date, as yet, has not been fixed. He was ordained to the subdiaconate on December 23rd.

He will be stationed with other priests of the Roman Catholic Institute in France, but will service primarily the United Kingdom from there. We do not place priests in situations in which they would be alone. Nonetheless, the future priest could spend a good deal of time in the United Kingdom. It is our goal to give the people there Mass every Sunday. Now they are receiving it twice a month.

Slated for the following June, that is, of 2025, are three more men, Andrew Nowrouz of California, Christian Ingham, originally from Maine but now from Florida, and José Santos Casas from Spain.

Andrew Nowrouz will serve on the seminary faculty. Christian Ingham will be stationed in Brooksville, Florida, and José Santos Casas will be stationed in Nantes, France, from where he will service Spain, where we recently have founded a Mass center.

By June 2025, therefore, Nantes will have a community of five RCI priests: Fr. Dutertre, who is the RCI superior of that house, Fr. Chappot de La Chanonie, who is the priest in charge of the Mass center, Fr. Orasch, and the future Frs. Gilchrist and Santos Casas. Among them the following languages will be spoken fluently: French, German, Spanish and English.

The 2025 ordinations will coincide with the 50th anniversary of my ordination, “if God lends me life,”³ as Archbishop Lefebvre always said (and which made us all

shudder when he said it). My cardiologist and my vascular surgeon, upon seeing them recently for my check-ups, both gave me very good news as to the present state of my health. So despite the usual problems of old age, I have a founded hope of making it to my fiftieth anniversary. I will turn seventy-four in February.



*Bishop Sanborn and Rev. Mr. Aedan Gilchrist
on the day of his ordination to the subdiaconate.*

Increased internet presence.

You may have noticed that the clergy of the seminary can be seen more often on YouTube. This is due to the energy of Stephen Heiner, who now lives at the seminary as a volunteer lay helper. Through his activity, we are able to publish more frequently and widely the truth about the changes of Vatican II. It also gives us a forum by which to explain and defend our theological and pastoral positions in regard to our rejection of the New Religion. We are furthermore enabled to make available to the public our sermons, spiritual conferences, and some seminary courses which would be of interest to the lay people. We are grateful to Mr. Heiner for his efforts in this regard.

He also takes out the garbage.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

+ Donald J. Sanborn

Rector

³ “Si Dieu me prête la vie.”

