

MARC BOSQUART'S REPLY TO HIS EXC. ARCHBISHOP PRENDERGAST

Archbishop Terrence Prendergast
Archbishop of Halifax
P.O. Box 1527, Halifax (N.S.) B3J 2Y3

Lac-Etchemin, May 22, 2005

Your Excellency:

I received your letter of May 13 and I thank you for it. I was pleased to see that you have finally begun to consider the mystery at the origin of the Work of the Lady of All Peoples, and the explanations that were given me to propose. However, given that in addressing yourself to me, it is in fact the Community of the Sons of Mary that you wish to get at – and through them, Marie-Paule, whom the Church wishes to silence – I believe that it is both necessary and my duty that I reply to you in a complete and detailed manner.

To begin with, I must tell you that I would have been pleased to be able to rejoice over the path already covered. In fact, you speak of our meeting of last January 13. I do not know if we were able to “*serenely discuss*” things on that day, but I remember that, at that time and as you yourself admitted, you were in the process of reading or had only read the first volume of *Life of Love*. I don't know if that was enough to foster serenity, but it certainly had not facilitated your comprehension of what is being lived within the Work and which is the direct consequence and even, in a sense, the realization of *Life of Love*.

The fact that now, three and a half months later, you have reached the point of qualifying as “*heresies*” the explanations I proposed of this mystery can only signify one of two things: either you have been reading in double quick time (in fact, if you take such a serious action, that means that you think you have a good knowledge of everything) or you are basing your judgment on the work (?) of other people... who are rather poorly informed, something I will establish and give proof of below. But before doing so, here are a few considerations of a general (and sometimes personal) nature that are likely to provide you with some information which you may still not be aware of.

1. – *Life of Love* and the Explanation of *Life of Love*

The “*four statements*” mentioned in your letter and which are the subject of your questions, criticisms and reprobation, are taken from texts that bear my signature. Now, normally, it is Marie-Paule herself, as well as her writings, her work and her realizations, that ought to be at the center of all questions raised. What it was given me to present is, in fact and for the most part, but a possible explanation – with its consequences and its developments – of various phrases addressed by the Lord to Marie-Paule and related in *Life of Love*.

On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the writings I have authored also exist – be they in the form of books or articles in *Le Royaume* –, and that, for the moment, they are the ones that seem to “*pose a problem*”. That is easy to understand. They take up again the most surprising expressions to be found spread through the volumes of *Life of Love*, pulling from them the strongest meaning and drawing conclusions from this... And that would frighten anyone! Nevertheless, if the explanation of a written text owes everything it contains to the text itself, this latter owes nothing to the explanation that is proposed of it. Therefore, even if, in what I did, I was “all wrong”, that would not prevent *Life of Love* from being “entirely true”. Do not forget that; otherwise you may be aiming at the wrong target and miss your mark.

As a consequence, everything that I have written should, in itself, be considered as secondary (whether it deals with the person of Marie-Paule, her work or her mission, with the Immaculate with whom she shares some of the characteristics, or even with the divine Reality in which she would also seem to have a part), but it remains no less true that, although we can believe in *Life of Love* without understanding everything in it, it nevertheless needs to be explained. The explanation that it was given to me to propose is perhaps not the only explanation possible, but it is, to this day, the only one that exists. Furthermore, it has the advantage of placing *Life of Love* in a global vision of the relationship between God and men, and making of it a fundamental element in God’s plan for our world and our humanity.

2. – A Few Other Necessary Distinctions

You also wrote that you had to “*pay particular attention to the quality of the witness given by the Sons of Mary as they accomplish their apostolate*”. You are the one who knows that, Your Excellency, but, in this regard, I can reassure you immediately. To my knowledge, not one single Son of Mary confuses the traditional Catholic faith with the new ideas which I have authored and not one has, in any way whatsoever, incorporated these new ideas in his teaching.

On the other hand, there are in the Church in Canada many faithful who would appreciate it if you were to “pay attention to the quality of witness” of certain priests who instruct the faithful. In this regard, homilies were mentioned to me that must be the result of a new cult inspired by some sort of “festival of horrors”, whereas the preaching given by the Sons of Mary and their celebrations are of an orthodoxy that is perfect and luminous. Therefore, there is no reason to fear that my writings might “*cloud the ministry of the Sons of Mary*”... If you have any doubts about this, Your Excellency, then inquire of those who listen to them and whose spiritual life is constantly enriched by their contact with the Sons of Mary. In any case, a veritable investigation worthy of the name should include that kind of verification, without which it would lose both its value and its credibility.

Whatever the case may be, Marc Bosquart is not the Community of the Sons of Mary and this latter is not Marie-Paule or the Work of the Lady as a whole or the Army of Mary in particular. I beg you, Your Excellency, do not play the same game as Cardinal Vachon did who, in the 1980s, used my first books as a pretext to get at the Army of Mary! The one is not the other, and what was true at that time is still true today. Furthermore, he acted on the basis of malevolent interventions and base calumnies to the point where I had to send him an *Open letter to Cardinal Vachon refuting completely* – *because of a general lack of respect of the text, numerous errors in the reading and*

understanding of the text, base misrepresentations, untrue accusations and an absolute lack of basis – the arguments given by His Eminence... And I published this document in the form of a booklet which had as a title: “Pour l’amour de la vérité”.

Remember that, at our meeting last January 31, I was pleased to give you a copy of that booklet which, unfortunately, you had never heard any mention of during all the time you were making enquiries. Now, as I did then, I must react: “*To not react would amount to giving up before error and injustice, and that is certainly not what the Church expects of its sons*” (page 14). Therefore, I ask you to read what follows with the same spirit of openness you expected of me.

3. – Like a Little Fellow in the Big Boys’ Yard

Before commenting on your statements, Your Excellency, I think it is important for you to know the circumstances which led me to write about *Life of Love* and how I see myself with regard to my own writings, the reactions they aroused in certain Church authorities and the consequences they have had on the Work. It seems to me that it might be “useful information for the dossier”, perhaps even more useful than if I were to reformulate again, but in other words, at least in part, what is already to be found in the books or the articles in *Le Royaume*. Allow me to begin by recounting a childhood memory...

Thus, when I was six or seven years old, the school I attended had two spacious school yards separated by a median strip in which a few trees were planted; there was the yard for the younger children (primary students) and the yard for the older students (secondary). For the younger children, the yard for the older students was very impressive, especially since its access was forbidden them. However, one day, during recess, I had to bring a document to the principal’s office which was at the other end of the older students’ yard. I was very worried, but the message was important and I had to deliver it. I crossed the whole yard and I remember having felt for what seemed interminable minutes like “a little fellow, lost in the big boys’ yard”, as the well-known saying goes.

Why am I telling you this? Because that is exactly how I feel when I must write or reply to Church authorities, like “a little fellow, lost in the big boys’ yard”. Furthermore and strangely enough, I always have a message that needs to be delivered “at the very end of the yard”. And I believe, the most humbly and as lucidly as I possibly can, that the message is important, really very important.

4. – The Starting Point and the Developments

When the French edition of *Life of Love* was published in 1979 and 1980, Marie-Paule personally sent me each volume at my address in Belgium. She must have received the order or an indication to do so, for she had no real reason for doing it. I immediately believed in it, quite simply, without understanding everything and without asking myself any further questions on the matter.

Later, in 1984, when I had immigrated to Quebec, married, and we were expecting our second child, the springtime had been very difficult. In fact, I am still not able to really explain what happened at the time, but one thing was certain, and that was that I had never experienced anything like that before. And then one day it was all over, but from that point on, I had a sort of “formula”,

an “equation” etched in my mind. It had all the elements to cause surprise. It meant: “*Marie-Paule is to Mary what Jesus Christ is to God the Father.*”

Well, I understand it now. Everything that followed, all I was brought to write about Marie-Paule and her Mystery (with all its “extensions” even into the Mystery of the Immaculate, and even into the Mystery of God), can all be deduced from this simple “formula” or induced from it and from what we know, moreover, from within our religion.

I will not take up again the proof I gave of this in the little booklet entitled *Marie-Paule and Co-Redemption* (beginning on page 27). However, it is clear:

- that this “formula” associated with the reality of the Incarnation of God in Jesus Christ leads to the explanation of the Reincarnation of the Immaculate in Marie-Paule;
- that the fact of this Reincarnation presupposes in turn that Mary-Immaculate was more than just a simple woman and that, being divine, She shares with God certain “divine attributes”;
- that the same new idea, associated with the reality of the Divine Trinity, leads to the “establishment” of a Trinity of the Immaculate that is very closely complementary to it;
- that the bringing together of all these “discoveries” makes it possible to make the statement that the union of God and of the Divine Immaculate constitutes what can be referred to as a “Divine Couple”;
- that this idea of the Divine Couple, associated with the reality of the Divine Trinity and the reality of the Trinity of the Immaculate leads to conceptualizing the Divinity in the form of a “Quinternity”;
- that, in that context, Marie-Paule, as the Co-Redemptrix, is really “*the feminine equivalent of the Redeemer*” (according to the expression taken up by Cardinal Ouellet in his recent intervention), and that, for that very reason, she participates in the “*new Eucharist of the Kingdom*” in the same manner as Jesus Christ.

5. – The Feeling of Having Absolutely No Hand in the Matter

Everything fits together, all elements complement one another and “*are linked with perfection*” – here I have dared repeat the expression from a reader, for I attribute nothing to myself. Besides, how could I attribute anything whatsoever to myself? I am not a theologian, or a philosopher, exegete or metaphysicist; I do not have an educational background that would have predisposed me in any manner whatsoever to “pick apart” mysteries and, especially, I have not completed any studies or done any research in order to explain any element whatsoever of *Life of Love*.

The explanation I proposed, I never sought it; it literally – pardon the expression –, “fell upon me”! Not all at once, but progressively, like a “solve-the-mystery” game where one has to understand

well the preceding clue before being given another one. In all that followed, I can assure you that I never wanted anything, sought anything, organized anything or decided anything! To such an extent that, from the very beginning to this very moment, I have always had the feeling of having absolutely no hand in the matter.

If I am writing this to you, Your Excellency, it is simply to try to make you understand how I feel: not like the “inventor” of an explanation of *Life of Love*, of a novel approach to the Mystery of the Immaculate, of another manner of perceiving the Mystery of God – in short, of a new vision of the world integrating and prolonging the Co-Redemption –, but rather as the mere “agent of transmission”, the one who announces, or the messenger of something which by far surpasses me.

I am “the little fellow, lost in the yard of the big boys” of the Church and I drag along a message that is as heavy to carry in the day-to-day life as, in times of evidence and light, it can dilate the soul. In the capacity of simple messenger, I have no more the right to declare false that which I must transmit than I have the authority to declare it to be true. That does not fall within my competence. My responsibility is limited to formulating things clearly, to not be afraid to do so, and to ensure that, inasmuch as this is possible, everything be well understood. As for the message today, I must address it to you, for your accusing letter requires a reply that is devoid of all ambiguity.

6. – The Serious Accusation of “Non-Catholicity”

In your letter, in fact, there is one element which “encompasses” all the rest, that is to say, the accusation of “non-Catholicity”. Here are a few of the forms under which this accusation presents itself:

- “... *four statements published in ‘Le Royaume’ ... pose a problem in relation to the Catholic faith.*”
- “*For your sentence to be acceptable within the Catholic Church, we would need...*”
- “*It must be repeated: one cannot, in the Catholic Church, affirm...*”
- “*This kind of thinking cannot simply be added to Catholic dogma; rather, it denies it.*”
- “*Already that is incompatible with Catholic dogma...*”

At any time other than this particular time in the life of the Church, Jesus Christ, its Principle and its Founder, would most certainly have blessed you for having defended the Catholic faith in this way. And it is partly thanks to defenders like you that it has lasted to this day and permitted that so many souls within all the nations of the Earth be saved. Yes, but what emerges from *Life of Love* today is that we have entered into new times, as was the case with the coming of Christ and the founding of the Church.

Try to remember: what you have written about us, did not the Jews say it of the Apostles? We can just about hear them: “*These statements pose a problem in relation to the Jewish faith.*”

“That kind of thinking cannot simply be added to Jewish dogma; rather, it denies it.” “That is incompatible with Jewish dogma.” Was it really that way? You will tell me that it was not that way, but the Jews believed it to be. And yet, Jesus Christ was a Jew, an irreproachable Jew, who was nevertheless at the origin of the faith which is ours today, as much for you as it is for me! In a similar manner, Marie-Paule is an irreproachable Catholic and, she is nevertheless at the origin of the faith... which today is mine and which, unfortunately, is not yours.

7. – Is Catholicism Above God?

In reality, Your Excellency, what did the Jews do? They placed “Jewish dogma” above God who was speaking through Jesus Christ! He Himself could repeat to them, clearly state to them, *“the Father who sent me”* (Jn 12:49), it had no effect. And you, today, what are you doing? You are placing Catholic dogma above God who is speaking through Marie-Paule. She herself can repeat to you and affirm just as clearly, *“It is the Father who sends me”* (*Life of Love*, III, 269), it has no effect. You do not believe her just as they did not believe Him. You do not try to discover whether the “new ideas” which have appeared in the wake of Marie-Paule are true, if it is possible that they could be true (even possible just a little bit); no, you measure them against the only yardstick of Catholicism, a Catholicism that has closed in upon itself, and you reject them because they do not seem to you to be Catholic!

And what about God in all of this? For, finally, Your Excellency, by acting in this manner, you and your confreres, confine God to Catholic dogma – according to which the Church asserts that Catholicism is the end result of history and that God has nothing new to tell us – and you subordinate God to the Catholicism you represent. And yet, it is acknowledged within the Church today that even the non-Christian religions were *“positively willed”* by God. Thus, the least there could be would be that the very Catholic Marie-Paule and the Catholic Army of Mary should be allowed to benefit from the same treatment. But that is not the case; because in your eyes there is no place for Marie-Paule within the very “narrow” Catholicism that dominates today, you have declared that it is impossible for her to speak in God’s name.

However, is God not greater than the Catholicism which He Himself established? Cannot God make it pass to a new stage, having in mind the new plans of His love and mercy? If it is true, as I believe it is, that Marie-Paule is God’s envoy for our time, that it is He who is presiding over the bursting forth of His Mystery, then, Your Excellency, you and your confreres risk finding yourselves in the very uncomfortable position of condemning God because He would not appear to you to be Catholic! And, in that case, the warning issued by Gamaliel takes on all its significance: do not risk *“finding yourselves fighting against God!”* (Acts 5:39)

Your Excellency, if you were to accept – even for a few short moments of prayer and intense openness to the God-of-all-possibilities – not to raise Catholicism like a wall against the action of God today, you would be subjugated by the coherence of our “ideas” and you would be filled with wonder in realizing that they are, at one and the same time, absolutely Catholic... and yet already somewhat beyond the present Catholicism, of this “narrow” Catholicism “turned in upon itself” that declared that Revelation is closed once and for all and that God has nothing more to reveal to us until the end of the world.

And do not think that I am writing all of this to you without realizing what I am doing. The truth is that I tremble interiorly – and oh so much! –, but is it possible for me not to answer your terrible accusation of “heresy”? Thus, this letter is the form that takes, today, the message that is to be transmitted, carried “to the end of the big boys’ yard”. I know that it is fraught with consequences and I am afraid that you will not accept it.

8. – “*What does this mean?*” “*What does that mean?*”

Now that the context has been established, I can deal with the “*four statements*” which you mention in your letter and in which you begin by writing the following:

- *In issue no. 143 of “Le Royaume” (July 1, 2000, p. 11), you published a “Credo” in which it is written: “I believe that the Immaculate is co-eternal with God and that she is the divine Spouse of God.”*

What does the expression “Immaculate” mean? Is this a person? A quality? An idea? What does “co-eternal” mean? Is it a matter of a different type of eternity than that of the Father? Of another dimension? Of an eternity that “depends” upon the divine eternity? What does “Spouse of God” mean..., for God is not a male and therefore cannot have a female counterpart.

Oh, Your Excellency, how great a weakness your accusation brings to light!... Thus, you are referring here to issue no. 143 of *Le Royaume*, and a little further on to issues no. 145 and 146... and that’s all! And yet, you have referred many times to “my writings” as a whole (when they consist of a dozen or so books and several dozen articles), and three times you ask the question “*What does this mean?*” Well, Your Excellency, please forgive my straightforwardness, my outspokenness, but if you had read, you would have known!

First of all, one cannot, within the inevitably restricted context of an article in a paper, always define every time all the terms that one must use (moreover the same is true in a letter and you do not define the expressions “*Word*”, “*heresy*”, “*gnostic theories*” and “*ontological consistency*”). The fact is that the readers of *Le Royaume* understand well this kind of constraint, and they know that the detailed explanations are to be found elsewhere, in books or in other articles to which they can easily refer.

What is most surprising is that when we refer to these books or articles, we find precisely the answers to your questions in the very terms you used to formulate them. If you had read attentively or even just simply read, you would not have been able to miss it. It is almost “made to fit”, to the point where certain explanations which preceded your questions by a few years appear to have been written only after the questions were asked. Here then, excerpted from “my writings”, are a few definitions of terms about which you were querying (I will list the references at the end of the letter, putting in bold and underlining the words that refer to your questions).

ATP: • *What does the expression “Immaculate” mean?*

- MB:
- The term “Immaculate” is nothing more than a Latin term “Immaculata” transposed into French [in this case English], signifying without stain, without blemish (“macula” = stain).(1)
 - *“It must be noted here that the **expression ‘immaculate’** has two meanings which closely resemble each other but that are different. When we say that the Virgin was conceived ‘immaculate’, we mean that she was preserved, in time, from the stain of original sin, the sin she should have incurred as a daughter of Adam. However, in designating a perfection of the divine life..., the term ‘immaculate’ is taken in a positive sense even if it is formulated negatively.... Immaculate because she was conceived through the ‘negation’ of sin, the Virgin is ‘in a positive way’ the Immaculate Conception; ‘it is a part of her nature,’ said Father Kolbe.” [Quotation from Father Manteau-Bonamy](2)*
 - *The Immaculate was neither “begotten” nor “made” by God, but – and this is like another “modality of being” – the Immaculate was EXTRACTED by God from God “Himself”!(3)*
 - God and the Immaculate are like the two Poles of a unique Divine Reality.(4)

- ATP:
- Is this a **person**?
 - A quality?
 - An idea?

- MB:
- IN ITSELF: *The Immaculate is “a figure slightly inferior to God”. [Quotation from Saint Maximilian Kolbe](5)*
 - IN MARY: *The divine Immaculate, co-eternal with the eternal Father, became “incarnate” in the **person** of Mary, making of the daughter of Anne and Joachim, Mary-Immaculate, the divine Spouse of God.(6)*
 - *This Incarnation of the Immaculate in Mary was total, absolute, such that there has not been since then, the One and the Other – Mary on the one hand and the Immaculate on the other –, but one only **Person**: Mary-Immaculate...(7)*
 - IN MARIE-PAULE: *The **Person** who is reincarnated [in Marie-Paule] is, as was the case with Mary, the divine Immaculate.(8)*
 - WITHIN THE TRINITY: *We have indeed Three Persons in God and one Immaculate in Three **Persons**...(9)*
 - WITHIN THE QUINTERNITY: *The “Divine Reality” in 5 **Persons**.(10)*

- ATP:
- *What does “co-eternal” mean?*
 - *Is it a matter of a **different** type of eternity than that of the Father?*
 - *Of another dimension?*
 - *Of an eternity that “**depends**” upon the divine eternity?*

- MB:
- *With regard to the point of the “eternity” of the Immaculate, the essential **difference** lies in the **dependence** – and what a **difference** that is in reality! Consequently and in relation to the Divine Trinity, there will always be, next to the Creator, the CO-Creatrix, next to the Redeemer, the CO-Redemptrix, next to the Sanctifier, the CO-Sanctificatrix! And, in fact, the Lady of All Peoples drew our attention to this: “I insist particularly on the ‘CO-’ ” (32nd message), because it is in the little “co-” that the truth on the nature of the Immaculate is revealed, that is to say, divine and not of God, co-eternal and not eternal of herself!(11)*
 - *That is why, if we can say that the Immaculate is eternal in relation to the “temporal” beings that we are, we can also say that the Immaculate is co-eternal with the eternal God.*
 - *The prefix “co-” (from the Latin “cum” which means “with”) here denotes the adjunct and the complementary: the Immaculate is not eternal “in herself” but She is eternal “in association with” the Eternity of God.(12)*
 - *And this **difference** is at the origin of the **difference** in “status”: God and the Immaculate are, the One and the Other, eternal – since They form an eternal Unity –, but God is so by Himself whereas the Immaculate is so by God and through God.(13)*
 - *Thus, the Conception of the Lord Jesus Christ in Mary’s womb constitutes a proof in itself of the divine nature of the Immaculate, as it is, as a consequence, of her personal participation in this “modality of being” of God which is Eternity.(14)*

To this must be added various quotations that have been quoted in my writings.(15)

ATP: *What does “**Spouse of God**” mean?*

For God is not a male and therefore cannot have a female counterpart.

This intervention on your part calls for two observations, Your Excellency, beginning with a little linguistic re-arranging. To the words “*male*” and “*female*”, I must in fact substitute the words “*masculine*” and “*feminine*” because it is not possible in French, as it is in English, to qualify human beings as being “*male*” or “*female*”. All the more so, we will not use those words to qualify God and the Immaculate.

The second observation is of a totally different nature. I must react to your statement that “*God is not masculine*”, reminding you that, at the very least, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is well and truly masculine. I remark as well that He called God His “*Father*”, and that by the nature of things, a father is a masculine being in all languages and for all inhabitants of our planet. And this same Jesus Christ had for His “*Mother*” Mary-Immaculate, the perfect Woman which no one, it would seem to me, would even think of representing in any other way than as a feminine figure. And it is obviously in that way that She manifested herself during her apparitions in Fatima, Lourdes and everywhere else.

If Jesus is truly the Son of God His Father and of the Immaculate His Mother – if, in short,

He is really the “Son-of-God-and-Son-of-Mary” –, then His Mother is the Spouse of His Father and therefore the **“Spouse of God”**, the *“feminine counterpart”* of God according to your expression. Of course, such an unprecedented privilege seems incompatible with Mary’s human nature. That is why Mary is not only an “ordinary human being” but a Woman who, according to the definition of Saint Bernardine of Siena, was *“elevated to a certain equality with God Himself”*.(16) That is why Mary-Immaculate is not only the Spouse of God, but **“the Divine Spouse of God”** as the very title of one of my little books and its contents from the first to the last page indicates. And the fact that this was not understood sooner does not pose a problem, for was it not necessary to wait for millennia and for the coming of Jesus Christ in order to learn that God was a Father? In the same way, today, it is thanks to the coming of Marie-Paule that it was revealed to us that Mary-Immaculate, her Mother, was divine.

9. – A Few Errors in Reading and Comprehension

There you have established, proven, that I have defined many, many times the terms which you referred to in your questions *“What does [it] mean?”*, and that I have explained them abundantly. What is to be concluded from this? One thing for sure: that you have not read (or at the very least, not read well) the writings I have authored and from which you extract sentences and expressions, to then accuse me of **“heresy”**. That, Your Excellency, is not a serious way of proceeding! And that alone, in my eyes, discredits all that you could subsequently say, imagine in the form of tendentious interpretations, or draw as inaccurate conclusions.

In fact, I could even end my reply here, so true is it that I would almost have to write another book in order to reply to the questions you would not ask if you had only read. However, I do not want to advance anything without being able to prove it. Therefore, I propose to give you a few examples of the “tendentious interpretations” and “inaccurate conclusions” that have formed the basis of your repeated accusations of “non-Catholicity”.

ATP: • *To write that there is something else which is eternal, outside of God, is **heresy**.*

MB: I did not say that the Immaculate would be eternal in the same manner as God. I said: *“The Immaculate is not eternal ‘in herself’ but She is eternal ‘in association with’ the Eternity of God,”*(17) *“co-eternal and not eternal of herself”*.(18) This possibility had simply not been foreseen by the *“dogma of the Catholic Church”*, and that is quite normal, for it could not even have been envisaged before we came to know more about the Immaculate through Marie-Paule (in the same way that we came to know more about God through Jesus Christ).

ATP: • *To claim that in God there is something other than the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is a **heresy**.*

MB: I did not say that, but rather this: *“The fact of ‘placing’ the Trinity of the Immaculate ‘alongside’ the divine Trinity(19) takes absolutely nothing away from this latter:*

– *There are always ‘Three Persons in one only God’;*

- *There are always a Father, a Son and a Spirit;*
- *There is always the Incarnation of God in Jesus Christ.*

“Consequently, it should be evident to everyone that the fact of believing in a Trinity of the Immaculate does not contravene the fundamental dogmas of our faith.”(20)

On the other hand, if there are always only Three Persons in God, the divine Trinity can henceforth be considered as forming, with the Trinity of the Immaculate, a kind of Reality of a different order and which I have named *“Divine Reality”*.(21) It is clear that this change in perspective takes absolutely nothing away from the divine Trinity and that it only adds to the Mystery of the Divinity that which we could not have known before the Immaculate became reincarnate in Marie-Paule in our time.

When, furthermore, the Immaculate declared at Three-Fountains in 1947: *“I am She who am in the Divine Trinity”*, that did not mean that She would be a Person “constituent” of the divine Trinity (in which case there would no longer be a TRInity), but that She was at the center of the Mystery of the Three Persons in one only God.

ATP: • *It could be thought that your inspiration is marked much more by the teachings of Hinduism on reincarnation than by the teachings of the Church.*

MB: By writing that, Your Excellency, you provide evidence once again that you have not read well what I have written, for that is a fundamental point and I was very clear on this matter.

• *To begin with, we must be on our guard with respect to this word “reincarnation”. Why? Because today it is on everyone’s lips, and because, as a consequence, there is often a tendency to give it a “pre-defined” meaning in accordance with what one knows, or what one believes one knows, about certain oriental teachings, whereas **there is really no connection**.(22)*

• *Let us remember that we must enter upon this subject with a wide open mind, totally banishing from it what we believe we know on the subject of reincarnation under whatever form it may be known. What is to follow here **HAS NOTHING TO DO** with any of that.(23)*

• *The word “Reincarnation”, in the context of the mystery of the Immaculate, should be written with a capital “R” in order to distinguish it from the “reincarnation” as it is commonly understood and to which **it is in no way related**.(24)*

- – **NO to reincarnation** as it is commonly understood (that is to say, the eventual return of the soul of someone deceased into the body of someone living).
- *But YES to the Reincarnation, in Marie-Paule, of the Immaculate, the divine Spouse of God.*(25)

ATP: • *In the number 145 of “Le Royaume”, (September-October 2000, p. 7), you assert: “In the*

Beginning, God-Creator fecundated the Immaculate-Co-Creator, and this latter gave birth to a universe constituted of three 'worlds' or 'degrees': the physical world, the psychic world and the spiritual world (from the lowest to the highest). This was the Father's Creation."

We cannot see how such a statement can be interpreted so that it is consistent with the teaching of the Church. Dogma clearly states that it was through the Word, the second person of the Trinity, that God created the world. "We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, eternally begotten by the Father... Through him all things were made" (the Nicene Creed).

MB: Admittedly, that is the way it is to a certain extent... And yet, if you can quote the middle of the *Credo*, I can quote the beginning: "*We believe in one God, the **Father**, the Almighty, **maker** of heaven and earth...*" Unless the words no longer have any meaning, this truly makes of heaven and earth "the Father's Creation" before being that of the Son. That the Immaculate Co-Creatrix could have collaborated in it was not even conceivable in Christian lands at the time the *Credo* was formulated.

On the other hand, once we were permitted to enter into this Mystery, it becomes as impossible to ignore the role of the Immaculate in the creation of the world and humanity as it is to ignore the role of the mother in the conception of any and all children on Earth. Thus, it is through the father who fecundates her and through the child that develops in her womb that every woman becomes a mother. The same is true of the Creator, the Co-Creatrix and Creation. When we say, in reference to the Son, that "*through him all things were made*" we are referring to the "correspondence" between the Son and Creation, One and the other being the result of the Love of God Creator and of the Immaculate Co-Creatrix (incarnate in Mary for the conception of the Son).

ATP: • *Your thinking on this point resembles the gnostic theories of the third century which considered the Word as a sort of demi-god. Besides, that is the thinking of the Jehovah Witnesses with regard to Christ. The difference is that, although you respect the dogma of the Trinity, you postulate another sort of demi-god whom you call "the Immaculate Co-Creator".*

MB: You are right, Your Excellency, it "*resembles*" certain "*gnostic theories*", but it merely resembles them. In fact, I have never written or even thought that the Word would be "*a sort of demi-god*". Therefore, I do not see why you have written "*besides, that is the thinking of the Jehovah Witnesses*". Especially since, in the sentence that follows, you immediately differentiate my thinking from theirs. Would it be then because, in your mind, the Army of Mary makes you think of a sect? It is absolutely not a sect and you know this very well, even if it is effectively in this manner that it may well be defined and qualified in the near future. However, there is no reason to worry about that because that was also how the Jews considered the first Christians, and yet that did not stop Christianity from conquering the world.

Finally, you acknowledge that I “*respect the dogma of the Trinity*”. I was happy to read that, for that is not what you seemed to be saying at the beginning. However, I must rise up against what follows and repeat that the Immaculate is not “*another sort of demi-god*”, but “*the divine Spouse of God*”. Her Person is the result of the eternal bursting open of the “primordial” Divinity into God on the one hand and into the Immaculate on the other. And when the two Poles meet in eternity, it is “all at the same time” that They create the world of the beginning and “beget” the Son of 2,000 years ago.

ATP: • *These passages, written with reference to Mrs. Giguère affirm that she does not need grace because she “sanctifies” herself. Already that is incompatible with Catholic dogma which teaches that no one can save himself.*

MB: I have never “*affirmed that [Mrs. Giguère] does not need grace*”. She “*sanctifies herself*” in the same way that all of us are called upon to sanctify ourselves. The role that grace plays in this sanctification seemed to me so obvious and impossible to get away from that I did not think it necessary to render the phrasing more cumbersome. It is in the same manner that, in a Christian life, we speak of “personal sanctification” in reference to the efforts each person must make and which cannot bear fruit without the assistance of divine grace. It is no less true – and *Life of Love* abundantly bears witness to this – that Marie-Paule has the tremendous merit of never having erected barriers to grace, to the point where the efforts she made corresponded in a perfect way to the will of God in her regard and that she was thus “sanctified”. However, what for others would constitute their “point of arrival” was for her like a new point of departure in her ascension to God.

ATP: • *These passages also assert that Mrs. Giguère would be present in the Eucharist in the same manner as Christ, or at least in a similar manner. And yet the dogma of the Church is clear: the substance of the bread and wine is transformed into the body and blood of Christ. A reality from this world cannot have two substances. In the case of the Eucharist, the risen Christ alone is the substance of what we see, taste and eat.*

MB: Your Excellency, I do not understand why you wrote: “*And yet the dogma of the Church is clear: the substance of the bread and wine is transformed into the body and blood of Christ,*” for I have never said the opposite! In fact, I believe so strongly that the Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ that I have written it, recalled it, and developed it several times.

• *./.../ the bread and the wine transubstantiated in the hands of the priest at the moment of Consecration are effectively from that moment on the Body and Blood of Christ, something no Catholic can ever doubt for even one second.(26)*

• *The Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ. This is one of the most fundamental elements of the Catholic faith and we will never call it into question – far from it.(27)*

• *In effect, everything begins with the first degree of matter – the physical bread and wine – and finishes with the ultimate degree of matter, of matter glorified, of matter*

transfigured, of matter transubstantiated into the Body and into the Blood of Christ. The absolute miracle!(28)

- *Marie-Paule did not ‘institute’ a Eucharist, either similar, different or additional; **there is only one Eucharist**, as it was founded by Jesus Christ.(29)*
- *And so Jesus Christ and Marie-Paule are well and truly two Persons to constitute the “new” Eucharist, but **there is still and always only one, unique and sublime Eucharist**.(30)*

But the clearest explanation of all is to be found in the article from which you excerpted the sentence included in your letter. All you had to do was turn the page.

- *Even though I have already explained it above, I believe it is good to repeat it: **there is only one Eucharist**, instituted by Jesus Christ at the Last Supper. It is the prodigious result of the personal transformation of the “Son of Man” into a new Being unprecedented in all the history of humanity.*

Two thousand years later, Marie-Paule, in obedience and on the cross, submits herself without even knowing it, to the same process of personal transformation to the point of becoming a new Being, but no longer unprecedented.

*To the one who offered herself totally to Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ allows her to share His “Eucharistic nature” [and this then places grace right back at the center of things]. Henceforth both come under it, **but the Eucharist has not changed: it is always the Body of Christ** that we receive – but the Body of the Total Christ. This is not an addition of Persons (the One and the Other) [therefore, there was never question of there being “two substances”]; it is a Victory of Love. She gives Herself to Him, He shares Himself with Her. They are **Two in One**.(31)*

Finally, when I read, written by you, that “*in the case of the Eucharist, the **risen Christ** alone is the substance of what we see, taste and eat,*” I could not help wondering what He gave them to see, taste and drink then on Holy Thursday, on the eve of His death... (But be reassured, Your Excellency, even if you suggest that the Eucharist would not have been instituted before the Resurrection, I will not accuse you of “heresy”...)

10. – “The Purification of the Memory” according to John Paul II

I have finally come to the end of your letter and to the “*appeal*” you made to me. I will leave to the end the “*statements... written up by a bishop theologian*”, pausing first of all over something that is quite surprising. You wrote:

- *The difficulties, the misunderstandings, the regrettable comments that have arisen in the past should not stop us from advancing along the road to communion. The purification of the memory presented with such depth by Pope John Paul II in very difficult situations*

indicates to us the path to follow.

Oh! how elegantly you express yourself, Your Excellency, and what subtleties, you succeed in putting together in a few words! What are you really trying to tell me? (I will speak in my own personal name, of course, but I think that the Sons of Mary and the Work of the Lady of All Peoples as a whole could say the same thing, and even more!) In all honesty, what have I done wrong “*in the past*”? Since Paul VI, the Church itself acknowledges that any author has the right to deal with religious topics in his writings without receiving a preliminary authorization from ecclesiastical authorities. And in everything that has followed, I have only always defended myself against untrue and often malevolent accusations. Where is the wrong in this? Nowhere do I find “*regrettable comments*” in anything I have written, given that I have always replied in a polite manner – firmly if required, but always politely – to all Church authorities and when I showed a bit of firmness, it was sometimes quite something else that the accuser or calumniator would have merited! I cannot regret the wrong I have never committed. On the other hand, I have had to endure so much harm! Especially from you...

So, do you believe that accusing me of “*heresy*” on the basis of books which you have not read is a means of “*advancing on the road to communion*”? Or on the basis of excerpts which were brought to your attention, but which you have not understood or even sought to understand? Therefore, please have the propriety of not invoking the “*purification of the memory*” so admirably advocated by Pope John Paul II! First of all, he was referring especially to the memory of nations and peoples in relation to various events in history and their effects on the present. Then, he said: “*It is not a matter of forgetting what happened, but of looking at it once again with new sentiments*” which means, primarily, that those who, at all levels, are responsible for the reprehensible attitudes or actions must become conscious of their errors... and not ask their victims to forget them!

As I have never subjected anyone to anything, but have been subjected to much, draw, Your Excellency, your own conclusions. It remains that if, after having already forgiven, one must nevertheless forget, then I agree. As soon as the Church authorities (who especially accused me of “*heresy*”, “*blasphemy*” and “*sacrilege*”) will have recognized the injustices they have committed against me, I will strive to forget them.

11. – “*I believe that God is greater than all things.*”

Finally, concerning the “*statements... written up by a bishop theologian*”, what I think of most of them is to be found in the preceding pages, and, on the specific point of “*individual bishops*”, you will understand that I am somewhat wary of them after all the harm some of them have done me.

However, what you would particularly wish me to adhere to is the statement by the “*bishop theologian*” stipulating that “*one cannot expect any new doctrinal revelation*”. To this, Your Excellency, I can only reply... that I know nothing in this regard. How can one claim that God would not have anything more to say to humanity? Is that not placing oneself above God? Is that not shouting “*Silence!*” to God? For my part, Your Excellency, God can very well do as He pleases; I will not pretend to limit His freedom. Furthermore, I am convinced that we are very far from

knowing all there is to know about Him, that He may still have, perhaps, an infinite number of things to reveal to us. Let us not reduce God to what we can or think we can understand about Him!

Basically, Your Excellency, I do not think that you are calling into question the fact that God is a Being infinite in the strictest sense. That is why “*along the road to communion*” which you advocate, I suggest that, to begin with, we agree on what follows (they are a few basic truths which are so obvious that every human being should be able to spontaneously adhere to them):

I believe that the Mystery of God is unfathomable and that it will always be unfathomable. It is so far above our intellectual capacities and our possibilities of representing them that we will never be able to fully comprehend it.

I believe that God is absolutely free to reveal to us whatever He wishes, as He wishes, when He wishes. Never will any man in particular or humanity as a whole be able to claim that God has nothing more to reveal to him.

I believe that no one here below can “annex” the Mystery of God, make it fit into his own limitations or reduce it to his own perceptions. That is why God can be invoked to convince someone, but never to constrain him.

I believe that everything can speak to us of God. I believe that God, in a certain way, is in our regard: we can see Him everywhere just as we can not see Him anywhere. But He is always on the side of the Light and the Truth.

I believe that God is greater than all things, that He is the master of history and that He guides humanity in such a way as to draw it to Him. I believe that God loves us and that in return, He expects that we should live... a life of love.

Marc Bosquart

- (1) *Le Rédempteur et la Co-Rédemptrice*, p. 42.
- (2) *Id.*, p. 43-44.
- (3) *The Immaculate, the Divine Spouse of God*, p. 22.
- (4) *Id.*, p. 22, text in a frame.
- (5) *Id.*, p. 25.
- (6) *Marie-Paule and Co-Redemption*, p. 35.
- (7) *The Immaculate, the Divine Spouse of God*, p. 81.
- (8) *Marie-Paule and Co-Redemption*, p. 35.
- (9) *Id.*, p. 49.
- (10) *Id.*, p. 52, the title of a diagram.
- (11) *En l'honneur de la Co-Rédemptrice*, pp. 37-38.
- (12) *The Immaculate, the Divine Spouse of God*, p. 24.
- (13) *Id.*, p. 24.
- (14) *En l'honneur de la Co-Rédemptrice*, p. 35.
- (15) Cf. *Marie-Paule and Co-Redemption*, p. 81, and *The Immaculate, the Divine Spouse of God*, p. 25 (among others).
- (16) *The Immaculate, the Divine Spouse of God*, pp. 26 and 83.
- (17) *Id.*, p. 24.

- (18) *En l'honneur de la Co-Rédemptrice*, p. 38.
- (19) Cf. diagrams in *From the Divine Trinity to the Trinity of the Immaculate*, p. 108 and in *Marie-Paule and Co-Redemption*, pp. 44 and 48.
- (20) *Marie-Paule and Co-Redemption*, p. 45.
- (21) Cf. diagram in *Marie-Paule and Co-Redemption*, p. 52.
- (22) *Id.*, p. 27.
- (23) *Id.*, p. 31.
- (24) *Id.*, pp. 39-40.
- (25) *Id.*, p. 41.
- (26) *Le Rédempteur et la Co-Rédemptrice*, p. 362.
- (27) *Marie-Paule and Co-Redemption*, p. 84.
- (28) *Id.*, p. 87.
- (29) *Id.*, p. 93.
- (30) *Id.*, p. 94.
- (31) *Le Royaume* ["The Kingdom"], no. 146, November-December 2000, p. 6.

cc: To whom it may concern