

## PREFACE (to be read)

This book was written before Paul's death, which has caused changes in tense in a few verbs. But most have been left untouched because the conditions continue to exist. It could never have been written in normal times, not even as fiction. Some will insist it is fiction. More will criticize its bad manners and lack of charity, that improperly defined prime requisite for the new "Catholicism."

Charity is not to be extended the deceiver or robber at the expense of the deceived or robbed. The higher the deceiver's position the greater his chance to deceive. The greater the robber's influence the more he can steal. The corruption of the best is the worst. Refusal to recognize and fight evil, no matter how high its level, is condonation of evil—culpable, sinful, damning!

Subversives have provided the climate and constructed the seed-bed for the luxuriant growth of Modernism, "the synthesis of all heresies." Both contributing to and proliferating from this climate is the notion that it is ill-bred to fight; gentlemen must talk; all must tolerate all views; no one may call error wrong or a thief a thief; gentlemanly methods and the diplomatic approach will accomplish more than a large club or the loud, unvarnished truth; one must be civilized; surely there is a workable compromise; a cool head deserves greater respect than a just cause; it's not whether you win or lose but how you play the game; many subscribe to this heresy. To that extent they are victimized and influenced by subversives. Our "civilization" tolerates open sodomy and condones murder of the unborn, but shrinks in horror from burning incorrigible heretics—essentially a charitable act.

The Church canonizes those whose virtues it wishes to exemplify for the edification and emulation of the faithful. By current standards one would naturally consider the popes our likeliest candidates. Where would you find holier men than the vicars of Christ? Look, for example, at good Pope John and suffering Pope Paul! So not surprisingly our first thirty-five popes fit this category, most of them martyrs for the Faith. After Liberius (352-366) the procession of saints continued, interrupted only by Anastasius II (496-498), for another century and a half till the death of St. Felix, our fifty-fourth pope, in 530. Of the next fifty-one, to St. Nicholas I (died 867), twenty-one have been raised to the altars, including St. Gregory I, who first sent missionaries to the English, and St. Leo II, who condemned Pope Honorius I as a heretic for not settling a dispute over a matter of faith. Over the last eleven centuries only six popes have been recognized heroically holy enough to imitate.

St. Leo IX, noted for sanctity from childhood, often mediator and peace maker, took up arms against the Normans in 1053. He lost, naturally, but sanctity had not prevented his engagement in a necessary war.

St. Gregory VII (1073-1085) was famed for stern measures against clerical abuses and uncompromising treatment of potentates, especially Emperor Henry IV (Canossa). His last

words: “I have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile.”

St. Gregory X (1271-1276) had such zeal for peace among Catholics that he excommunicated the city of Florence to stop a war. He also levied tithes on the Christian community for the support of the Holy Land and the prosecution of Crusades against Catholicism’s enemies.

St. Celestine V (1294), an aged, uncouth hermit, soon realised his incapacity and had the rare good sense to resign.

St. Pius V (1566-1572) infallibly standardized our then ancient Mass against the abuses of the Reformation. His zeal against heresy had procured his election as Inquisitor of the Faith in Milan and Lombardy. In 1557 Paul II gave him the red hat and named him Inquisitor-General for all Christendom. He successfully opposed Pope Pius IV’s attempt to make a cardinal of thirteen-year-old Ferdinand de’ Medici. As pope, he condemned the writings of Baius, excommunicated the English queen, and forged the last Crusade against the Turks, which culminated in victory at Lepanto.

St. Pius X (1903 - 1914) was, if possible, even less tolerant of error. Against his own humble preferences, he upheld the honor due his position. He condemned Modernism in minutest detail, and demanded like condemnation from his hierarchy and clergy, ruthlessly removing those who refused to take the oath he prescribed against this synthesis of all heresies—the same oath that Paul VI violated and then consigned to oblivion.

We are all called to be saints. I cannot recall ever having heard of a cowardly saint, a compromising saint, a saint who placed expediency before truth. I wish I could say the same of all popes, bishops, and priests, especially of my contemporaries. It is no doctrine of the Church that we should have fine manners, or that we receive our heavenly reward by coasting along without a fight. We must fight the battle we have—not the war of 1812, not the Children’s Crusade. If we will not fight for salvation’s ordinary means, we scorn God!

The object of our war is victory. It is no game to win or lose. Shirked wars are irretrievably lost. Limited wars end like Korea or Vietnam. Compromise equals treachery, which requires neither intent nor even consciousness on the part of the traitor. More often it grows out of “normal” mistaken attitudes developed in the modernist climate fostered by subversives. Treachery, then, is not necessarily subjective, overt, or culpable; it remains treachery, nevertheless, in effect.

Why fight? The fight is here! The fight is now! It will not go away! And “He that is not with Me is against Me.” Can I leave room for doubt?

A friend fears that I shall eventually exclude myself from the Catholic Church. “How do you know you’re right,” he demands, “when so many in authority disagree with you?” When told I was about to read John Eppstein’s “Has The Catholic Church Gone

Mad?" the same man exclaimed: "Don't waste your time! Of course it's gone mad!" If the Catholic Church has been correct through the ages then I am correct, for I have changed nothing. To remain correct I need only adhere strictly to what the Catholic Church taught me. I cannot wait upon the judgment of some historian half a millennium hence to decide whether I or these innovators are correct (obviously both can't be correct); I have a soul to save now. I must make my own judgment on the evidence, and on the application of what intelligence God has given me for this purpose. Converts are familiar with this necessity. Born Catholics like me have seldom had to confront it. It stares us in the face now, however, as ominously as during the fourth and sixteenth centuries. In the fourth the laity opposed its own judgment to the Arians in power, and kept the Faith for us. In the sixteenth the laity of England and northern Europe opposed its heretics in high places too little and too late, and all their generations since inhabit a fools' paradise bereft of the Faith and the ordinary means of salvation. I like the earlier example.

HUTTON GIBSON

## Section one

### THE MAJOR HURDLE, PAPAL AUTHORITY

#### Definitions

Let us establish the functions and powers of the papacy. Though essential to the Catholic Church, it has at times been vacant, or filled in such a way that vacancy would have been preferable, and the Church survived. The pope exercises supreme power in the Church, that is to say, greater power than anyone else in his time, but many things are completely beyond his power or control. Election to the papacy cannot confer holiness, moral character, or common sense.

VATICAN I: The Holy Ghost has promised the successors of Peter, not that they may disclose new doctrine by His revelation, but that they may, with His assistance, preserve conscientiously and expound faithfully the revelation transmitted through the Apostles, the deposit of Faith. ....we teach and define that it is a divinely revealed dogma that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*—that is, when exercising his office as Shepherd and Teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine concerning faith or morals which is to be held by the universal Church—thanks to the divine assistance promised to Blessed Peter, he enjoys that infallibility which the divine Redeemer wished to confer on His Church for the definition of doctrines of faith or morals; and therefore the definitions of the same Roman Pontiff are, by themselves and not by virtue of the consent of the Church, irreformable. (*Pastor Aeternus*, July 18, 1870)

THE PAPACY, Wladimir d'Ormesson (Hawthorn, 1957):

“Papal infallibility embraces the whole of divine revelation, but it is confined to that revelation. The pope can impose nothing beyond what forms part of the deposit of revelation. His mission is to profess it, to teach it, to maintain it, and to preserve it. He has an immense task of conservation and exposition. It is not for him to establish new doctrine. The revelation is complete. .... A pope can pronounce only in the name of and for the universal Church. .... The pope knows .... that he is in full agreement with the successors of the apostles. .... he expresses and, so to speak, sums up their wishes. The principle of unity is manifested thereby in all its fullness and all its power. THEY are ONE. ....

“Beyond these boundaries it is clear that the pope cannot exercise his infallibility. It is no less clear that this infallibility can and *must* be exercised throughout the whole area contained within these boundaries. .... the primary object of the papal Magisterium is the deposit of faith. In the implicit as well as the explicit sense, this deposit embraces doctrines concerning the mysteries and dogmas; practical laws concerning natural and supernatural morality; the means of sanctification established by Christ, the sacraments above all; the constitution of the Church; liturgical and juridical order.” (Preservation and unity, remember! VATICAN I, *Dei Filius*, April 24, 1870: “If anyone should say that it is impossible or inexpedient for men to be taught by divine revelation concerning

God and the worship to be rendered to Him, let him be anathema.” We must, therefore believe in both possibility and expedience. These clearly imply factuality, and take us back to Revelation, complete at the last Apostle’s death, for our Mass. No new rite, even if not clearly a grievous breach of Church law, can show this essential connection with Revelation.)

“The secondary object of the papal Magisterium is the conservation, interpretation, and maintenance—in the face of errors which may arise—of all that constitutes this primary object. .... there are unmistakable juridical signs whereby it is possible to tell when the pope intends to speak *ex cathedra*: (1) He must be concerned with a matter of Christian faith or morals. (2) The pope must use terms that leave his intentions immediately clear. (3) He must address himself to the whole Church, and not to a local Church, or the Church of one country or region. (4) He must make clear his decision to bind the conscience of all the faithful.

“Beyond these exceptional cases, the doctrinal and disciplinary Magisterium is exercised ....: (1) Pronounce judgment on theological conclusions drawn from dogmas; conclusions which are not themselves revealed either implicitly or explicitly, but are deduced rationally and theologically from the truths of faith revealed. (2) Censure by appropriate theological notes opinions, hypotheses, or doctrines which are or might be in contradiction with revealed truth, by drawing up lists of condemned propositions, taken from the works of one or several authors. (3) Affirm dogmatic facts which it would be impossible to doubt without endangering the faith. (4) Approve the cultus of a *beatus* or a saint by process of beatification or canonization. (5) Approve religious orders and ensure that their rules conform to the ideal of perfection taught by the Church.” (Edited)

CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA (1913), Vol XII, p. 269: (e) (The pope) dispenses the treasury of the Church, and the grant of plenary indulgences is reserved to him. While he has no authority in regard to the substantial rites of the sacraments, and is bound to preserve them as they were given to the Church by Christ and His Apostles, certain powers in their regard belong to him; ....

CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA, Vol VII, p. 798: The pope cannot delegate his infallible authority to the Roman Congregations, and whatever issues formally in the name of any of these, even when confirmed in the ordinary official way by the pope, does not pretend to be *ex cathedra* and infallible.

CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA, Vol XII, p. 269: Though the power of the pope is very great .... it does not follow that it is arbitrary and unrestricted. “The pope is circumscribed by the consciousness of the necessity of making a righteous and beneficent use of the duties attached to his privileges .... by the spirit and practice of the Church, by the respect due to General Councils and to ancient statutes and customs .... by the traditional mild tone of government indicated by the aim of the institution of the papacy—to feed ....”

JUS CANONICUM DE PERSONIS, *Ioannes Chelodi, Societa Anonima Tipografica*, 1942: “.... we say more briefly what he cannot do than what he can. For limits are not marked for him unless by natural law, by positive divine law, by the purpose of the religion and spiritual society he heads, as regards valid exercise of his power, unless by prudence and the obligation of action to build and not to destroy, as regards its licit exercise.”

CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA, Vol II, p. 138: There are limits to civil obedience, and to the competence of civil authority. As domestic obedience is not to be carried to the extent of rebellion against the civil government, so neither is the State to be obeyed as against God. It is not within the competence of the State to command anything and everything. The state could not command what God could not command, for instance, idolatry. The authority of the State is absolute, that is to say, full and complete in its own sphere, and subordinate to no other authority within that sphere. But the authority of the State is not arbitrary; it is not available for the carrying out of every whim and caprice. Arbitrary government is irrational government; now no government is licensed to set reason aside. The government of God Himself is not arbitrary as St. Thomas says: “God is not offended by us except at what we do against our own good.” (*Contra Gentiles*, III, 122) The arbitrary use of authority is called tyranny. Such is the tyranny of an absolute monarch, of a council, of a class, or of a majority. A legal enactment may be immoral, and then it cannot in conscience be obeyed; or it may be *ultra vires*, beyond the competence of the authority that enacts it, in which case compliance with the law is not a matter of obedience, but of prudence. In either case the law is tyrannical and “a tyrannical law, not being according to reason, is not, absolutely speaking, a law, but rather a perversion of law.” (*Summa Theologiae Ia, IIae*, q, 92, *art 1, ad 4*)

The last time a pope spoke infallibly was in 1950 when Pius XII defined the ancient doctrine of the Assumption.

Heresy is the Greek word for choice. Instead of accepting the entire deposit of faith, all that Christ gave us, we set ourselves up as judges of divine revelation. We select the doctrines that appeal to us and reject those that repel us, whether aesthetically, as though we could judge beauty or fitness better than Christ, or logically, as though our reasoning powers excelled the omniscient omnipotence of God. He has spread out what He wishes us to know of eternity before us. We have no logical choice but to accept or reject it in its entirety. If we refuse to accept any point we have no reason to accept any other point, for they all come from the same Source, guaranteed by the same Authority. Not surprisingly, they all hang together with overpowering logical consistency. No fact in any order can contradict them, though some concern matters which we have no other means of ascertaining. All non-Catholic “Christian” religions are heresy—selective Catholicism.

Schism is separation from the Church, traditionally from the pope, successor of St. Peter, vicar of Christ, visible head of the Church.

Here we have neither quarrel nor problem. We confront a problem, nevertheless, one faced by few former ages of the Church. In the heart of our religion we must choose between opposing popes. How are we to be united with Paul VI and not separated from St. Peter, St. Gregory the Great, St. Pius V, and St. Pius X? We must be united with them all. If this becomes impossible through the words or actions of one of them we are not authorized to follow the dissident, the newcomer, the innovator, the improviser in the slightest detail that opposes tradition. No matter what his reasons, his motives, his powers of persuasion, his wishes, his hopes, his commands, we cannot move single minds, single souls, in opposite directions simultaneously. Could we accomplish this we should not be schismatic but schizoid.

A pope is as obliged as we to maintain union with the pope, even though dead. Doctrine is not a matter of who is alive or dead, not subject only to a reigning pope. If he fails to maintain union he is as guilty of schism as anyone else. If we insist on union with such a leader we are also in schism.

For my stated intention of destroying the *novus ordo* “mass” Eric de Saventem, head of *Una Voce*, charged me with schismatic tendencies. A schismatic tendency is one which seeks to split the Church. The *novus ordo* is a prime example. To destroy a prime cause of schism is hardly to promote schism.

Typically—almost universally—innovators accuse of schism those who have only retained what they had—as though the Church of the ages, not the innovators, had caused the trouble which threatens schism. The rot in the Church is there for all to see. Surely they cannot impute the blame to such a small minority as us, whether or not we are correct. What they appear to say is: “The Church is fragmented, so this little group of cranks is responsible.” We become lunatics, so they absolve themselves of answering our arguments. They can’t hide, so they hide us instead.

Tradition is the indispensable bulk of our religion, upon which even the authority of the Bible depends. Neither Christ nor most of His Apostles left writings. They *preached*. The Gospels were almost afterthoughts. Epistles refer to other unwritten doctrines. St. John’s Gospel states that only a minor portion of Christ’s words and actions—sufficient to prove His divinity—had been recorded. Nothing in the whole Bible guarantees itself. Without the external authority of Tradition it is only a book. Tradition is based entirely on the oral teaching of Christ and His Apostles. It comes to us as well with its traditional interpretation. Untraditional meanings, insights, interpretations are impossible to accept. The Revelation depends in no way on the state of civilization, comparative intelligence, worldly experience, or scientific progress of those to whom it is revealed. It contains all the truths and practices necessary to salvation. It cannot be held that we require more or more advanced doctrine than the earliest Christians, or that they lacked our necessities for salvation.

Innovators, updating the Church, search the past for tradition. They resurrect or invent it and “restore” us to Christianity’s

“pure” beginnings—to the “primitive” Church with few rules, no priests, and none of the distracting “accretions of history.” Discoveries of this nature or method cannot be tradition, whose definition includes that it has been handed down without a break. Salvation’s essentials could not have escaped this requirement. The Holy Ghost forgot traditions? And these innovators compensate for His deficiency?

When I encounter a new doctrine that cannot be logically developed from the Apostolic deposit of Faith I must reject it. I must further consider the purveyor of this contra-rational doctrine not Catholic. Beyond that, everything else he tells me falls under unavoidable suspicion, for one is either Catholic or not. No one—layman, priest, bishop, pope—can be part Catholic.

A human is fallible, however high he may rise. What greater privilege could come to a man than that Christ should choose him for an Apostle? Yet Judas sold his God to negotiate with the chief priests. Of the sixty heresies originated by Catholics listed in The Catholic Encyclopedia fifty-eight came from bishops and priests. The person of a pope is not above error or criticism. One pope was condemned as a heretic. Many, even St. Peter, needed correction in office. Several have led anything but exemplary lives. More have exercised the poorest judgment. Others have been incompetent, one resigning for this reason. Election to the papacy guarantees a man no human perfection. Nothing of which a pope can be accused lacks historical precedent or parallel.

Several priests have said that Paul VI is a heretic, a schismatic, an apostate. These charges were brought to Paul, who stood on the dignity of his position, as though he were not bound to prove his orthodoxy or recant his heresy. He is neither the Church nor above testing. The entire Church is *not* here and now; it is the Mystical Body of Christ and the Communion of Saints; it includes all ages but not all men. Christ Himself was tested. We believe Him because of His Resurrection and on the further test He gave us: “By their fruits ye shall know them.”

CODE OF CANON LAW, 188: All offices shall be vacant *ipso facto* by tacit resignation in the following cases: .... (4) if a cleric has publicly lapsed from the Catholic Faith; .... (If your bishop fits this he can have no claim on your obedience, even should he have official backing. If, for instance, he will take no action against heretical doctrine taught in his diocesan schools after such error has been demonstrated and called to his attention, he has publicly lapsed from the Catholic Faith.)

OBJECTION: “The Lord said: Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not : and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren.” (Luke xxii, 31, 32). Since Christ prayed for Peter, no pope can fail. Therefore Paul VI cannot be a heretic.

REPLY: Have you ever read two verses further in St. Luke’s Gospel? Please explain Peter’s subsequent triple denial of Christ. Jesus also prayed (John xvii, 21 ) “that they all may be one.” Since



Paul VI and Vatican II diluted Catholicism supposedly to accomplish this, even Catholics are no longer one. Since God wills the salvation of all, why is hell? Before confirming his brethren Peter was to be converted. When was Paul VI's conversion?

*Ius Canonicum de Personis* (Chelodi): The pope's power is removed: (a) through death .... (b) through resignation .... (c) through lapse into certain and incurable insanity .... (d) through notorious lapse into heresy. This possibility certain people soberly deny *a priori*, but no reason is speculative which absolutely excludes this. For the pope is not given infallibility as a private teacher. If he infringly (*perfracte*) and publicly deny a dogmatic truth, he is no longer a member of the Church, and therefore cannot be its head, and by the very fact loses jurisdiction. This is done by divine law; for this reason the sentence, which in this case the Church would pronounce, would be not of deposition but of mere *declaration*. .... controversy concerns a heretic pope. Innocent III openly grants the possibility. (*Sermo IV in cons. Pontif.*: "He can be judged by men, or rather be shown judged, if he clearly vanishes into heresy, because he who does not believe has been judged.") This admitted, canonists have differed in various opinions, of which the two extremes are: (1) of those affirming that a pope loses jurisdiction on account of heresy merely *occult*, (2) of those contending that a pope can neither appear nor be deprived of jurisdiction even for public heresy. Both are considered improbable today. And the same judgment (improbability) must be applied to a third, formerly held even by many doctors of great reputation (Cajetan, Suarez), according to whom a publicly heretical pope would not be *ipso facto* deposed, but must be deposed by the Church. For this contradicts the certain principle of law: that a legitimate pope is subject to no human power.

Citing our standard of unity as authority for change is clearly self-defeating, for his authority is confined to preservation of the entire Faith. Citing infallibility is of no more use, for, as Father J. W. Flanagan points out (**Fatima International** 4 Feb. 1975): "If Pope Paul imposed a mass that is 'null and void,' 'immoral,' 'not a mass at all,' and 'a great sacrilege' on the Church and called it 'the will of Christ' and the 'breath of the Holy Spirit,' it should be obvious to all that Pope Paul VI is not a legitimate pope or has fallen into heresy which '*ipso facto*' ends his pontificate." How can infallibility, which he has not pretended to invoke, cover an act which strips him of infallibility? This is as vicious a circle as can be imagined. Whether we recognize Paul VI as valid pope makes no real difference. Nor can all the lawful authority of the lawful successor of St. Peter empower him to bring about unstabilizing innovations in our Mass, our Sacraments, our traditions, or our doctrine. Nor can it be adduced that he can do these things because he has done them. If we are to remain Catholic they must all be undone. If he will not undo them we must. We cannot do it with compromise or faintheartedness. We may not live to see the end of the fight, but fight we must. The Mass and Sacraments are the ordinary means of grace and salvation. We cannot leave such grave matters in doubt. We cannot afford to be wrong. It won't help in hell to say: "But everyone else was wrong, too."

Infallibility, imputed blanket-style to Paul's every whim, covers none of his words or actions. Even a pope speaks infallibly only to the entire Church on faith and morals. Here he may not innovate—what he expounds must be shown held at least implicitly by the Church from its beginning. The purpose and extent of all papal authority is to preserve the essentials (which include propagation) of the Church.

By far the greatest essential is the Mass. The entire purpose of the Church is the worship of God, and subordinately the concomitant salvation it offers men. All else in the Church serves this one end—worship. This above all must be preserved as instituted by Christ, as performed by the Apostles. We may surround it with solemn ceremony, with safeguards of language and doctrine, but we must never change an essential. For as soon as an essential is changed the result is not a Mass, no matter what is intended.

To remove its prime purpose is to stultify the Catholic Church, to disorient it, to turn it into a laughing-stock. It had to be done gradually; no one would believe it at one great gulp. “Theologians” published novel views. They far exceeded the bounds of Catholic doctrine and tradition, and converted many to barefaced heresy. The “pope,” the guardian of truth, said nothing. He shirked his responsibility to guide his flock, to analyze and condemn errors, and called his dereliction “charity.”

Standing in the shoes of the Fisherman, he caught us a red herring—vernacular. The Mass was translated into modern languages, supposedly by experts. A ten-year-old would blush to have done it. But the translators were experts—really. They'd given us something that everyone on earth itched to change further—obviously one could only improve it. And the changes continue; were they to stop some might realize there had been a purpose, now accomplished.

Then Paul violated—but did not abrogate—the infallibly promulgated law *Quo Primum* by the introduction of a new rite, presumably to bring order out of the liturgical chaos for which he was responsible. He imposed it with a wish and a hope, which we were to invest with infallibility and construe as a command. “Ritual and rubrics,” he said, “are not in themselves a matter of dogmatic definition.” Possibly true, but a lie nonetheless, for he implied that his introduction of a new rite—an absurdity in itself—was no more than a change of ritual and rubrics.

Meanwhile back at the herring hatchery some one brought in birth-control. This redolent fish stank for years; talks dragged on, minority reports leaked, everybody wondered what the pope would say. It was a settled issue, and had been all the way back to Genesis. I knew what the pope must say, and so did Paul. But he took his sweet time, and even then took it out of the realm of infallibility so he need not fire brother-modernist cardinals for disagreeing. *Humanae Vitae* was unnecessary except to “prove” Paul's orthodoxy.

Pauline Orthodoxy

I quote Paul VI, citing paragraph numbers in his Encyclical *Populorum Progressio*. 34.... every program made to increase production has .... no other *raison d'etre* than the service of man. Such programs could reduce inequalities, fight discriminations, free man from various types of servitude, and enable him to be the instrument of his own material betterment, of his moral progress, and of his spiritual growth. (What need for religion?) .... man is only truly man in as far as, master of his own acts and judge of their worth, he is the author of his own advancement, in keeping with the nature which was given to him by his Creator and whose possibilities and exigencies he himself freely assumes. (Man is only man if he needs no help? Who shows him these possibilities? To whom is he responsible?) 35 .... an illiterate is a person with an undernourished mind. .... literacy is a fundamental factor of social integration, as well as of personal enrichment, and for society it is a privileged instrument of economic progress and of development. (Worship of God or of paper? No one knows anything unless it is written and he can read! Since a greater proportion of Christians than formerly can read, we must be better and more informed Christians. How inefficient of Christ not to have waited for the invention of the printing press! Readers have well-nourished minds, and therefore fit better into their own social systems, whatever they are?) 77. The peoples themselves have the prime responsibility to work for their own development. But they will not bring this about in isolation. (No increased production?) Regional agreements among weak nations for mutual support, understandings of wider scope entered into for their help, more far-reaching agreements to establish programs for closer co-operation among groups of nations—these are the milestones on the road to development that leads to peace (or war). 78. This international collaboration on a world-wide scale requires institutions that will prepare, co-ordinate, and direct it, until finally there is established an order of justice which is universally recognized. With all Our heart, We encourage these organizations which have undertaken this collaboration for the development of the peoples of the world, and Our wish is that they grow in prestige and authority. ‘Your vocation,’ as We said to the representatives of the United Nations in New York, ‘is to bring not some people but all peoples to treat each other as brothers.... Who does not see the necessity of thus establishing progressively a world authority, capable of acting effectively in the juridical and political sectors?’ (Who does not see, rather, a pope striking at the roots of order by undercutting legitimate governing authority and advocating unworkable political uniformity while simultaneously he destroys religious uniformity, a far more unitive Force?) 37 .... too frequently an accelerated demographic increase adds its own difficulties to the problems of development: the size of the population increases more rapidly than available resources.... It is certain that public authorities can intervene(!), within the limit of their competence .... (Neither limit nor competence are defined for this utterly new public right of intervention. Only the size of the family is limited.)

Paul says many orthodox words, I am told. Look, for instance at his marvellous Encyclical *Mysterium Fidei*! So look at paragraph

35: “The Lord bloodlessly immolates Himself in the sacrifice of the Mass, which represents the sacrifice of the Cross, and exerts its saving power, when through the words of consecration, He *begins to be present* in a sacramental form under the appearances of bread and wine to become the spiritual food of the faithful.” Is it not incumbent upon a teaching pope to speak precisely, especially in such a vital matter? “Begins to be” can mean that Christ is not fully, definitively present until after the elevation—that his presence is induced by the credulous ogling of the bread by the congregation. This agrees with the definition of the *novus ordo*, and with its rubrics, which dispense with the genuflections before both elevations. But even this is not specified; it can mean that Christ becomes fully present, if at all, at the communion “to become the spiritual food of the faithful.”

Paul also said (21 June 1972): “Perhaps the Lord has called me not to govern and save the Church, but to suffer for her, and to make it clear that He, and no one else, guides and saves her. .... We say this in order that you may enjoy the tranquillity that We Ourselves experience at the thought that it is the Lord’s hand that is at the helm of Peter’s boat....” The Lord has broad shoulders, too. On the worst stretch of your bus route, where the slightest mistake can plunge you off either side of the icy ridge to certain death, your driver leaves his seat, suffers mightily, and leaves the wheel to the Lord. Anyone can suffer—on his own time! Christ’s vicar’s job is to run Christ’s Church. Paul VI ran it into the ground and had the colossal gall to milk sympathy for his malfeasance!

April 10, 1970 Paul publicly thanked the six Protestant clerics who had given us our new “mass” for their work on reform of the liturgy. He praised them for imparting an “authentic simplicity” to our new “mass,” for “elevating” divine worship, for “adjusting” the ancient texts to “our way of thinking,” for “correcting” and bringing into these texts “greater theological richness.”

During the General Audience of 20 Nov. 1974 (*L’Osservatore Romano* 28 Nov.) he said: “To undertake the religious effort that the celebration of the Holy Year will ask of each of us, a certain spiritual certainty is necessary. Without it the teaching characteristic of this period would take little hold on us.” (Something new?) “In a preceding elementary talk we mentioned the state of subjective uncertainty, a doubt about our identity, which, if it is not overcome by a logical, psychological, moral state of normal interior certainty, would make unavailing the effort towards explicit and progressive renewal of oneself. It is not possible to build on sand. Sceptical and pessimistic doubt about one’s identity, about one’s life, renders vain all positive effectiveness of religious and moral development. So we said.

“But we must complete this subjective analysis by mentioning an objective analysis, no less general and indispensable; and it is what we would entitle the ‘authenticity’” (what else?) “of our religious thought. Are we sure of possessing sufficient truth to construct the building of our faith upon it?” (Is the speaker not the custodian of Christ’s truth?)

“This observation has a panoramic sweep, because it extends to all matters related to the reality of our religious beliefs. Everything today is invested with an inexorable set of problems, which seem to discourage our claim to give you, adequately, a sufficient and persuasive answer. Our inner doubt thus becomes exterior. It is as if our course, though sincere and courageous, were proceeding in the dark.” (*Lumen Gentium?* Darkness Visible?) “The psychological doubt becomes ontological. The problem of truth assails our conscience, no longer just in its capacity of grasping reality, but in the real conquest and concrete definition that we give of this reality. On this front, too, the modern mentality, in regard to religion, seems to waver in the darkness; what truth can there be, it comments, in this mysterious field?”

Abbe Georges de Nantes in his sixty pages of specifications of heresy, schism, and scandal (*Liber Accusationis*) taxes Paul with ever presenting the difficulty, heresy, or problem at length, deliberately leaving insufficient time for the orthodox remedy. See how Hamlet straightens out everything in one sentence before his fresh assault on reason.

“Apologetics remains, and does not refuse its indispensable and tacit” (because he will not voice it) “service, even when it is not explicitly requested” (relevant?); (problem solved—let’s have another) “but in the religious field today preference is given to experience rather than to reasoning. Charismatic spirituality is preferred to rational dogmatism. We will certainly not depreciate this possible(!) and admirable(!) way to recovery of religious truth, provided this way itself is” (what else?) “authentic. In this connection let us listen to St. Paul, the doctor of charisms: ‘So, my brethren, earnestly desire to prophesy, and do not forbid to speak in tongues; but all things should be done decently and in order.’ (I Cor. xiv, 39, 40).”

The last paragraph translates: “The Pentecostals will recover our pristine truth since we appear to have lost it. Roll on, you Holy Rollers!” Yet so cunning is the phrasing that Paul can deny such intent: “I only call attention to an existing situation and quote Scripture on the point.” I earnestly desire to prophesy: If this man is on our side we need no enemies.

### **Anti-Papal**

The papacy is the office of the vicar of Christ. To be antipapal is to be anti-Christian. There is nothing anti-papal in showing that a man may disgrace his office. We do not condemn the Apostles for Peter’s denial or Judas’ betrayal. Spoiled by our recent succession of great popes, we may not admit the possibility that we, even as remoter ages, can be afflicted with deficient popes. It is not anti-papal to cite historical facts: that Honorius I was condemned as a heretic, that Benedict IX turned his palace into a brothel, “executed” cardinals, and sold his high office, that Innocent VIII and Alexander VI fathered and granted ecclesiastical preferment to illegitimate families, that Clement VII greatly assisted the Reformation by inaction, that Sixtus IV was involved in a successful murder plot, that Sixtus V tried to palm off an incorrect

version of the Bible, that John XXII almost habitually preached erroneous eschatology. We can all see the great abuses Paul VI condones. The papacy's purpose is total preservation of the Deposit of Faith, the Mass, sacraments, doctrine and tradition of the Church. Paul VI has not only not preserved them—he has actively replaced them. How is it antipapal to cite facts? Can we help where the accusing facts inevitably point?

But Paul, we are told, is under unimagined pressures. History teems with popes under pressure. Of the first thirty only the twenty-fifth, St. Dionysius, escaped martyrdom. Persecution, invasion, exile, antipopes, or sweeping heresies faced others. Pressure is the hallmark of the papacy. St. Pius X faced the same Modernism that has nearly swamped us today—successfully—heroically, as the Church has recognized in canonizing him. If Paul VI couldn't stand pressure why did he not resign? He appeared rather to exert than to suffer pressure, as the Econe affair typified.

We can judge results of actions, no matter how motivated. Before John XXIII opened the windows we could all recognize the marks of the Catholic Church. We have since lost 1) unity with our ancestors and with each other, 2) holiness in our holiest ceremonies, 3) universal acceptance by Catholics of Catholic doctrine and tradition, and 4) all missionary or Apostolic endeavor. Are motives relevant?

Again we are told the Holy Spirit guides the conclave of cardinals in papal elections—Paul VI was therefore God's choice. Leo X held the papacy when Luther exploded. He provided the fuse, and failed to blanket the charge. Clement VII refused to call a Council for fear it would censure or depose him. His temporization and cowardice contributed heavily to the “success” of the Reformation. Were these two walking disasters—elected by cardinals in conclave—chosen candidates of the Holy Ghost? They lost whole countries to us for centuries. If this is the work of Divine Providence, why may not another pope or two be involved in similar works of Divine Providence?

Paul VI developed a new use for orthodoxy, the highly successful tactic of foundation removal, or rug-jerking. Paul criticized some current abuse—Pentecostalism, communion in the hand—thus bolstering confidence in the Magisterium. Delighted theologians quoted him for their arguments. What greater authority could they ask? But this authority destroyed himself shortly by some “spontaneous” word or act, leaving the theologian, who could have used firm bases for his arguments, dangling with the rest of us. This technique undermines certainty, destroys faith in permanency, murders tradition and stability, and demoralizes the entire Catholic community, Pavlov's newest dogs.

He also counterfeits orthodoxy, as in his “Creed of the People of God.” First hearing of it, I thought it supererogative; could modern man improve the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds? Now I appreciate its ecumenic properties.

Paul's preamble—which unwarrantably ties this self-serving instrument to the Nicene Creed, and, of course, updates it—

carefully removes the *credimus* from the realm of dogmatic definition. He knew better than to propose this for unquestioning belief, even his own. He both omitted and said too much.

“Creator of things visible such as this world in which our transient life passes, of things invisible such as the pure spirits which are also called angels” (no devils?), “and Creator in each man of his spiritual and immortal soul.... and above every created intellect.” Omission of “all” before each use of “things” has left the possibility of things which God has not created, such as the human body and mind (evolved?) or uncreated intellects (the “god” of freemasonry) to which God is not necessarily superior. Only much later, after several changes of subject, do we find “through Him all things were made,” apparently subject to the prior ambiguity.

Who in Christendom is foolish enough to thank God for Judaism or Islam? Only an unbeliever could have thought of it: “that very many believers can testify with us before men to the unity of God; even though they know not the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity.” Let us thank God that so many violently deny a basic truth revealed by God Himself, and have consequently wiped out whole Christian nations!

“He gave us this new commandment to love one another as he loved us. He taught us the way of the beatitudes of the Gospel ....” Why single out these? Ecumenism? World development? With no axe to grind he might well have included the entire Gospel.

“.... those who have refused them (love and piety of God) to the end going” (for how long?) “to the fire that is not extinguished.” He could not bear to mention hell, nor that eternity of punishment, that impossibility of escape that makes it hell.

“We” believe also (updating with a vengeance) that “Baptism should be administered even to little children.” This serves an urgent need of our time? Or raises another dead issue for re-examination?

“.... and which (infallibility) is assured also to the episcopal body when it exercises with him (pope) the supreme Magisterium.” Here he tries to impute infallibility to Vatican II as well as to his new “advisory” synod of bishops, for which, incidentally, it is the pope’s duty and prescribed function to prepare the agenda, just as the Vatican prescribes the agenda for the various national and regional episcopal conferences, which, despite the general impression, are anything but rebellious and innovative as a rule. But Paul ever avoids sole responsibility, and often any responsibility, for actions or doctrines.

“Recognizing also the existence, outside the organism of the Church of Christ (Catholic?), of numerous elements of truth and sanctification which belong to her as her own and tend to Catholic unity, .... we entertain the hope that the Christians who are not yet” (but formerly were) “in the full communion of the one only” (Catholic?) “Church will one day be reunited in one flock with one only shepherd” (president of the World Council of Churches?). Is

entertainment of hopes of this nature matter for a Creed? The Catholic Church has a monopoly, not on grace, but on sanctification.

How does one achieve less than full communion with the Church? Paul is on “safe” ground here; Vatican II (Ecumenism 3 & 4) had said much the same.

“We confess that the Kingdom of God .... consists in an ever more profound knowledge .... an ever stronger hope .... an ever more ardent response .... and an ever more general bestowal of grace and holiness among men.” How much more fortunate are we than our ever more remote ancestors who received their religious pittance from that inefficient Jesus Christ! Such ever greater privileges must be deserved, probably through evolutionary superiority.

The next four paragraphs beat the drum for world government and largely usurp the functions of Providence. Then:

“We believe that the souls of all those who die in the grace of Christ, whether they must still be purified in Purgatory, or whether from the moment they leave their bodies Jesus takes them to Paradise ....” A Catholic may accept this as a statement of belief in Purgatory. But a Protestant can and will take this to mean that Purgatory is a moot question—that it makes no difference since the final result is identical whether or not Purgatory exists.

Ambiguity cannot be stacked so high by accident. Catholics may read traditional interpretation into these loose phrases. Others will assess them differently.

## Section Two

### BORING CORRESPONDENCE TO ESTABLISH FACTS

#### Catholicism Is Consistent

In 1967 my parish priest was required to travel one evening per week to Fordham University (50 miles distant) to bring his theology up to date. He described the course, which he thought a waste of time. “They keep reading and telling us these strange things. When Father \_\_\_\_\_ objected to some point in a lecture, saying: ‘This can’t be so, because it opposes this and that doctrine of the Church,’ the instructor replied: ‘We don’t *say* these things are true. We merely quote them so that you will know what is being said.’ But they didn’t tell us that to begin with, and would have said nothing but for the objection.” This I have since found typical of innovators.

In 1970 my parish priest at Asquith, N.S.W. was forced to use the *novus ordo*. He was forbidden to say the Mass for which he had been ordained. Not yet realizing what we had lost, I could still assess a howling absurdity. Some one had surely forbidden the Mass of the ages. Whoever he was, he had just as surely exceeded his authority.

Our obligation was no longer assistance at Sunday Mass but participation. Some one had gone to great and unnecessary pains



to translate it into English so I could understand it, and had then decreed that I should sing hymns while the principal parts took place, so that I could not hear them. Of what use, then, was the translation? The parish curate said this was what the archdiocese wanted. We are to chant childish hymns so we shall never notice that parts of the Mass have vanished.

At the same time the innovators recommend us an adult-to-adult relationship with God. We are the acme of evolution. We shall become God, if we haven't already made it. But in our approach to God we are adult only in responsibility for our own beliefs and actions. Christ said that unless we become as little children (childlike—not childish!) we cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven. He gave us the Lord's Prayer, in which He set forth perfectly, as only He could, God's prescription for our attitude: complete dependence on and trust in Our Father. To assume or pursue any semblance of adult-to-adult relationship with God, aside from being stultifying through impossibility, clearly manifests hellish pride, on par with original sin to which Eve succumbed when the serpent said: "You will be like God."

Dependence and trust naturally include realism, not the weak-kneed or soft-headed refusal to believe His word for which He will require an accounting from each of us. Even children expect just punishments as well as love from their fathers.

All my training from childhood emphasized that I must follow the Mass. The priest celebrates Mass, so I must follow his words and actions. It only frustrates me to impose the obligation and then prevent its fulfilment. What I am obliged to do I have an absolute right to do, without distraction by whomever recommended.

I put this to Sydney's Archbishop James Freeman (28 Feb. 1972). "I read recently" (my letter continued) "that Mass may be celebrated in Latin in England if the privilege(!) is not used divisively. It struck me that the language which was the symbol of our unity should be considered divisive, rather than the vernacular, which varies even in English-speaking countries.

"We are told there is room in the Church for every shade of opinion. Where do you fit us who grew up on the Latin Liturgy and had no wish to change? Why is there not at least one Latin Mass in every parish .... on Sunday? Every other type of freak is permitted to modify the liturgy. We are subjected to folk masses, guitar masses, rock and jazz masses, interpretive dancing, Catholic pentecostals, Dutch catechisms, concelebrations with Protestants. We cater for the innovators, the young, the underprivileged, the silly. But we can't attend a Latin Mass in the traditional manner on Sunday. This is absurd. How is anyone benefited by our loss?

"We are discriminated against by our own hierarchy. We are sacrificed for the supposed benefit of people who don't care two hoots for the religion."

I wrote him again (9 June 72): "We should not have to make the best of our worship; we should delight in it. People educated to the usage and beauty of the Latin Mass cannot be expected to

welcome either its abolition or its inadequate substitute, which appears to aim at accommodation to the lowest level of intelligence. Aside from the gratuitous insult to our pride, this is hardly consistent with the Church's mission to raise the spiritual level. Why speak basic English or baby talk to God? Our best is feeble enough.

"I can't understand the complete desertion of the Latin. If the object is uniformity there are far too many vernaculars. One more, the old Roman, could add little to the confusion. If the goal is simplicity it may suit the uneducable, however few, but ours is a religion of mysteries. We can encounter great difficulties by oversimplification.

"The celebration of the mysteries should be surrounded by reverence and ancient ceremony. Both are more easily attained in the language whose sole modern use is sacred. Its loss has severed a bond of continuity with our great ancestors who withstood the devils of the Reformation. We give up voluntarily(?) one of the traditions for which they fought and died, one of their chief marks of identification. What has made it distasteful to God?

"The secular world strives for uniformity as never before. World government is the ideal of the U.N. We adopt foreign systems of mensuration to the point where we can no longer tell the temperature, weight, capacity, girth, height, or speed of our own bodies, all in the interest of accommodation to the world at large. We are pressed to learn other languages in the interest of world communication and trade. So the only institution with a common universal language scraps it and fragments its worship as the Protestants did before us, demonstrating, incidentally, that it did not work too well."

### **The Age of the Laity**

I wrote twice more (9 Aug & 12 Oct 72) to my ordinary. This chapter is quoted from my second letter.

We hear *ad nauseam* of the "spirit of Vatican II." It excuses every experiment in liturgy, discipline, custom, and doctrine. *Aggiornamento* and ecumenism demonstrate our servile agreement with everybody, even to airing manifest heresies, failure to condemn any, and de-emphasis of our own doctrine not to repel Moslem, Buddhist, atheist, Protestant, agnostic, or theosophist. We are all children of God; let's forget our differences, whether or not they arose from obedience or disobedience to God. Let's feed the poor, starving Asiatic. Let's determine our policies and morals by majority vote. Let's respect everybody's conscience, however formed, except that of the traditional Catholic.

Predictably, this has reversed the growth of the Church. "If we are so alike what can I gain by joining you?" asks the non-Catholic. Worse, the Catholic may well say: "Why should I take the trouble to live up to my religion when no one can tell me what it is?" Vocations to the priesthood and religious life fall off. Convents empty; monasteries die. Trying to accommodate the world we lose it. Fearful of antagonizing we throw away our influence.

Our people cry for guidance. Fools and heretics publish statements and write books, retain their standing with Rome, and are neither condemned nor silenced. The ordinary Catholic concludes that Küng, Schillebeeckx, Teilhard de Chardin, or the like speaks for the Church. Their articles appear under Catholic auspices. Their books are sold at the Church door, even by the Legion of Mary. Heretical propositions have always been condemned, for the benefit of those without time or background to weigh the arguments. Now, when communications are better, faster than ever, heresies go unchallenged in mistaken charity. There is no charity for the bamboozled layman.

The layman is the reason for the clergy, hierarchy, pope, and even the crucifixion. You all come from the laity. Your office presupposes the laity. Unless you care for its needs you have no purpose except ornamental.

One of its needs is to worship God. Another, according to Vatican II, is dignity. I should like to see these two needs again combined, as they were for centuries in the Mass of St. Pius V. I would not oppose translation into any vernacular if it helps the laity or any part of it. We have rather removal, or change into another form. Compare!

CONSTITUTION ON THE SACRED LITURGY, Vatican II: 4.  
.... in faithful obedience to tradition, this .... Council declares that Holy Mother Church holds all lawfully acknowledged rites to be of equal authority and dignity; that she wishes to preserve them in the future and to foster them in every way .... (Does this not apply above all to what was then the most widely used rite of the Church, the Latin Rite and its Mass of St. Pius V? It can hardly apply to the new rite, which did not exist.)

23. That sound tradition may be retained .... a careful investigation is always to be made into each part of the liturgy which is to be revised. This investigation should be theological, historical, and pastoral .... (Four centuries ago English priests were forbidden to say Mass in Latin. The public worship was downgraded nearly as much as our new rite vernacular. The English version “improved” the Lord’s own prayer with a tail, wagging kingdom, power, and glory. The heretical fragmentation of the English Church is a matter of record. Next over the horizon we may expect pursuivants, bloodhounds, and the headsman. This retains tradition and satisfies historical investigation with a vengeance.)

23. (continued) There must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them; .... (Which?)

24. Sacred Scripture is of paramount importance in the celebration of the liturgy .... prayers, collects, and liturgical songs are scriptural in their inspiration .... (Scriptural quotations have been deliberately replaced, without semblance of reason, in the *Gloria*, the *Domine, non sum dignus*, and most seriously in Christ’s words in the consecration of the wine, thus creating doubt concerning validity of the new mass. Introduction of basis for such doubt was not only stupid and unnecessary, but inexcusable and criminal.)

36. (1) Particular law remaining in force, the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites. (2) But since the use of the mother tongue may frequently be of great advantage to the people, the limits of its employment may be extended. (It can be of no advantage to Dutch, German, Spanish, Czech, French, Hungarian, Italian, Polish, Croatian, Greek, Latvian, Maltese, Slovak, or Lithuanian migrants to attend Mass in English rather than their accustomed Latin.)

37. Even in the liturgy, the Church has no wish to impose a rigid uniformity in matters which do not involve the Faith or the good of the whole community. (With all the hodgepodge of local variations why is the original excluded? When did it become wrong to celebrate Mass as prescribed forever by Pope St. Pius V? How can the virtual proscription of this Mass promote the faith or welfare of any individual, let alone the community?)

The innovators tell us we've outgrown the Mass of St. Pius V. In the next breath they would have us believe they return us to the customs of the early Church. Supposing some of these customs really existed, has it occurred to the innovators that they may have been superseded for the best of reasons, possibly even that they'd been outgrown?

You told \_\_\_ that a certain priest was suffered to celebrate Mass in the traditional manner because he was too old to change; the new mass would create undue hardship for him. This is the rankest discrimination in favour of the clergy. Have you no concern for the lay people for whom this mass creates undue hardship, distraction, loss of grace, disgust, resentment, and increasing anger as the unnecessary changes multiply? Life is full of trials. We go to Mass, among other reasons, for the strength to withstand them, not to have them exacerbated.

The laity is the Church. You accepted responsibility for the care of its souls. For what conceivable reason do you continue robbing a number of them of their optimum means of salvation? You, yourself, will be judged on your care of the souls in your charge. Are you willing to gamble the questionable changes of the last few years against the carefully preserved tradition of the Church's nearly two millennia? Surely you cannot believe this inadequate, ever-changing new rite essential to salvation. How did our ancestors make out without it?

Proponents of the new liturgy tell us that most people would oppose the return of the Latin Mass. They ignore the fact that such a majority, if it exists, has no more valid effect here than in the sphere of dogma and morals. It is your responsibility to furnish me the traditional Latin Mass. This is no privilege you may grant or refuse me; this is my right, my heritage, as well as my rite.

Remember, no one has excused you—no one can excuse you—from your duty of passing on the entire tradition, doctrine, and faith which was preserved for you.

**Eucharist:c Doctrine?**

Freeman never replied. But I found another adversary in *The Catholic Weekly* (7 Dec. 72). Dr. L. P. FitzGerald, O.P. referred early to a “possibly new vocabulary” perhaps to base his “transignification and transfiguration, though perhaps helpful.” How about heretical?

“We,” wrote Dr. Fitz in unsubstantiated plural, “have come to see that it is not desirable to celebrate Mass at an altar where the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, as this tends to confuse, ....” Whom?

“One of the most encouraging aspects of ecumenical activity...is the FACT that Catholic theologians SEEM to have come to a better appreciation of the Eucharist-as-meal ....” thus doubtless surpassing St. Thomas Aquinas, author of the Mass Proper for *Corpus Christi*.

“Over the last few years the expression ‘transubstantiation’ has come under fire in some theological quarters. It was expressly rejected by the Churches of the Reformation. Now some Catholic theologians consider that it constitutes an unnecessary barrier to Church unity and, in any case, reflects a philosophical mentality no longer widely acceptable.” Again, to whom? The Reformers rejected the Catholic doctrine, however expressed, precisely because they understood it. We’ll not accept their various doctrines by discarding our terms, among the most apt and explicit of which is “Transubstantiation.” Dr. FitzGerald’s treatment is a classic method of selling an idea without taking responsibility for it.

“Perhaps” (again! For a theologian on shaky ground there are few outs like “perhaps”) “nothing should be more obvious than that the Eucharist was instituted as a meal in the context of the Jewish Passover and against the background of Old Testament covenant meals.” All this time I thought God had directed Moses in the establishment of the Passover meal as preparation for saving the Jews from Egypt, in deliberate prefiguration of the institution of the Holy Eucharist at the Last Supper as preparation for and essential unity with the Sacrifice of the Cross, the focus of history, which all ages before awaited and all since offer daily as the means of salvation.

“And so the Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine, issued at Windsor on Sept. 7, 1971, comes as a most hopeful sign in our dialogue with the Anglican Church.” But no one can agree with the Agreed Statement and remain Catholic. It is a sad time when theologians must pretend that error has equal rights with truth.

20 Jan. 73 I wrote to a seminary classmate, now an archbishop: “Not satisfied with butchering the Mass, the innovators have promoted a ‘Eucharistic’ Congress in Melbourne which appears to have for its prime purpose the downgrading of our Blessed Sacrament. The emphasis is on man, as the clergy of Melbourne voted. When a protest was lodged with Archbishop Knox over condemned heretical views in a manual, ‘Unit Three: Eucharist and Life,’ purporting to instruct the faithful on the Eucharist (never the *Holy* Eucharist), he replied that this type of congress is what had

been preferred by the majority. I hope he'll have a better argument on Judgment Day. He can get all the emphasis on man he needs in the nearest pub."

### **"Catholic" Education**

Until recent years nothing in the world was clearer in content than Catholic doctrine. God revealed to man all the necessities for salvation—too difficult to work out unaided in the longest lifetime. He came to earth to redeem us. He founded His Church to lead us to Him, to teach us, to preserve His revelation, to apply the fruits of His redemption. So we withhold this great body of certain knowledge from our children and force them into seeking truth through discussion with their peers who know no more than themselves. Why do we not just condemn them to hell outright?

Times have changed since my day, say the innovators, and are changing ever more rapidly. My sons are being educated for their own time with relevant life situations. But Catholic doctrine does not change. One learns it, then applies it to the situation in which he finds himself. These situations are not the same for all students, yet they all receive the same SHALOM or COME ALIVE to be educated for today. It is of no use to educate them for today, because they will find themselves in entirely different and unpredictable life situations ten, twenty, and thirty years hence.

Current religious instruction texts and methods leave the student ignorant of revealed truths and imbued with the idea that Catholicism is only sentimental slop. The fact will inevitably impinge upon him that he is taught doctrines different from, even contrary to what his parents were taught. It cannot escape him that either he or his parents—or all!—have been taught error in Catholic schools by Catholic priests and religious. Contrary truths cannot exist. The Church appears as authority for conflicting doctrines. Who can guarantee the truth of either? Why bother to choose? Why believe either?

**Baltimore Catechism:** "God made me to know Him, to love Him, and to serve Him in this world, and to be happy with Him in the next." Note the order—first we must know. You can hardly love what you don't know, and seldom enough what you know. When God is known He must be loved. If we reject Him we frustrate our own nature, His creation, properly oriented to Him. When He is loved He must be served—His own test. If not, we can forget about being happy with Him. Salvation depends in the first instance upon knowing God. If I refuse this knowledge, for my own good it must be "rammed down my throat" like many another beneficial dose.

A friend's young son one day plied him with questions—how big, what color, what shape was God? My friend told him: "As far as you are concerned, I am God." Let no father forget this. God gave you this child to be given back to Him. If priests or religious teach him error you must correct it. How can he know God from Arian instruction? How can he love a merely human "Christ?" Logically, Christ is either exactly what He claimed and proved—God—or

the worst faker and liar ever seen. There is no middle ground. You cannot water down divinity—it is an absolute.

If your child goes to hell through ignorance of God, you may expect to service the next boiler. And every now and then you can tell him; “As far as you are concerned, I am Satan!”

### **Who Has Forbidden The Mass?**

Sunday, Sept. 3, 1972, I assisted at a Solemn High Tridentine Latin Mass at Monte Sant’ Angelo in North Sydney, advertised in The Catholic Weekly. I quickly joined its sponsors, The Latin Mass Society of Australia. By Pentecost 1973, when Cardinal Freeman decided we needed his ungrantable permission for such Masses, I had deteriorated to the position of general secretary. The confrontation was confined to paper, from which I quote:

Your (Freeman’s) letter quoted the final paragraph of the Promulgation of the Roman Missal Restored by Decree of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council. May I call your attention to the initial words: “We wish?” What kind of decree is this? His “*volumus*” is not our “*jubemus*,” “*mandamus*,” or “*imperamus*.” Had he meant these words they were available for his use.

“... notwithstanding, to the extent necessary, the apostolic constitutions and ordinances issued by our predecessors and other prescriptions, even those deserving particular mention and derogation.”—same decree.

Here I consulted the Oxford Dictionary, Webster’s New international Dictionary, and several Latin lexicons to see if I had read correctly. I had: *Quo Primum* has not been abrogated.

ABROGATION—Repeal or abolition by authority. (Paul VI avoided the word.)

DEROGATION—Partial abrogation of a law.

Nowhere in this document is the extent of the derogation specified. Only one phrase, “to the extent necessary,” qualifies the derogation in any way. But the corollary that this removal of enough of *Quo Primum*’s authority to allow use of the *novus ordo* completely destroys *Quo Primum* is wholly unwarrantable. We are in no way bound to your interpretation of this anything but specific document.

We are bound, moreover, to ignore it as an unconscionable usurpation of papal authority. An Ordinary may not interfere with privileges universally granted the Tridentine Mass by Pope St. Pius V in *Quo Primum*:

“Furthermore, by these presents, in virtue of Our Apostolic Authority, We grant and concede in perpetuity that, for the chanting or the reading of the Mass in any church whatsoever, this Missal is hereafter to be followed absolutely, without any scruple of conscience or fear of incurring any penalty, judgment, or censure and may freely and lawfully be used. Nor are superiors, administrators, canons, chaplains, and other secular priests or religious, of whatever order or by whatever title designated, obliged to celebrate Mass otherwise than as enjoined by Us. We likewise

declare and ordain that no one whosoever is to be forced or coerced to alter this Missal, and that this present document cannot be revoked or modified, but remain always valid and retain its full force.”

Vatican II, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, 37: “The laity have the right .... to receive in abundance from their sacred pastors the spiritual goods of the Church ....” Is not our traditional Mass first among the spiritual goods of the Church? Was this new “mass” in use at the time the Council spoke?

If the traditional Mass of the Roman Rite is forbidden I am forced contrary to my beliefs to attend its inadequate substitute, and am restrained—see Declaration on Religious Freedom, 2—from acting publicly in accordance with my beliefs. This was your Council. Can you justify flouting it here and in the Sacred Const. on the Liturgy? Can you postulate religious freedom for the human person and then deny it to Catholics?

The *novus ordo* can be celebrated without pang of conscience or alteration of heretical beliefs on the Holy Eucharist by Protestant ministers. It is open, therefore, to interpretation as a Protestant service. A Protestant service is not necessarily a true Mass. If it is not a true Mass it cannot satisfy God or my obligation to worship Him. Where there is doubt the safe course must be taken.

Mgr. James Madden replied, 20 June, for the cardinal: “.... The Tridentine Mass is partially abrogated—or more correctly, it is derogated. If the *Missale Romanum* of Paul VI abrogated the Tridentine Missal, the Roman Canon, for instance, would be completely abolished, so also would all the old Prefaces, and many of the Prayers. ‘To the extent necessary’ obviously means, that where the New Missal is not contrary to the old, it remains. Do you expect the Apostolic letters to spell out the ‘Chapter and Verse’ where the changes occur? Any person conversant with the old Liturgy can easily recognize them, and there is no need for a dogmatic definition on the Liturgical Law. The ‘*Cum Primum*’ (sic) of Pius V was not a dogmatic definition. ‘*Volumus*’ means ‘we wish’ and when the Pope uses it, we, as good Catholics, take it as his command put in a polite way. At any rate, what he has abolished by his derogation can no longer be used in the Liturgy of the Mass.”

We wrote the cardinal (22 June): Your Vicar General states that the Tridentine Mass is derogated. *Derogatio* is applied to laws, legal rights, contracts, etc., not to ceremonies or Masses. If the Promulgation of the Roman Missal Restored derogates anything it is the Bull *Quo Primum*, not the Tridentine Mass.

A derogation, being a restriction, must be taken in its narrowest sense. “To the extent necessary,” then, even if a valid limitation of a derogation (which must be spelled out “chapter and verse”), must be interpreted as having the minimum effect on whatever law (again, to be spelled out, “chapter and verse”) is derogated. This minimum effect is to permit the *novus ordo* in a church.



Such permission in no wise necessitates the suppression or superseding of the Tridentine Mass. There is no effect on the Tridentine Mass, or on the privileges granted priests to celebrate the Tridentine Mass by Pope St. Pius V.

Mgr. Madden now steps up his tempo from simple error to high comedy: a papal wish is a command! In line with all other papal pronouncements over the centuries? It has remained for John XXIII and Paul VI to introduce the fifth mark of the Church—Ambiguity!

The pope has no business phrasing a command in such fashion, even if we could determine what he may have “wished.” Too many of us are not necessarily intelligent, polite, or “good” Catholics (like those, for instance, who forbid the Mass), and will not respect or accede to his desires. If he will not use his authority we cannot, especially against the interests of the entire Church, be expected to supply the deficiency. By definition of the word “derogation” whatever Paul VI may have abolished never was used in the Mass.

The subsequent silence from the “offended” cathedral is unbroken. After waiting five weeks we appealed to Paul VI: “... Though convinced that we need no such permission, we are constrained by the stance of our Ordinary to request .... permission on behalf of .... the entire laity of Australia, for any priest, bishop, archbishop, or cardinal .... at any time .... in any church .... publicly, privately .... Consider Your Holiness’ responsibility in charity for the faithful members of Christ’s Mystical Body who can never worship God properly except in our traditional manner.”

The reply, dated 20 November 1973, came on official stationery of the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship—A FORM LETTER.

Prot. no. 1477/73

To your request of 31 July 1973 as regards that the celebration of the Holy Mass according to the Missal put forth in 1570 be granted, the duty lies with me to tell you that the Missal which is discussed has been abrogated and in its place the Missal promulgated in 1970 must be employed. This decision, in the Apostolic Constitution of Pope Paul VI “*Missale Romanum*” setting forth the will of the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council expressed in numbers 48-54 of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, has been carried out. Wherefore the use of the Missal of Pius V neither continues to flourish nor is conceded through indult of the Holy See. (Official rubber stamp)

We have no clue with whom this duty lies—he or she forbore to sign it. It comes with all the pontifical authority of a rubber stamp. Doubtless this is proper papal procedure, presented with the prime problem of the Church. Perhaps this routine type treatment stems from the large number of requests of this nature.

The whole point of our request was that no indult is necessary for the use of our Missal, but only the recognition of our clearly inalienable rights. We asked in the name of that superabundant

charity which Paul preaches, obviously inapplicable to traditional Catholics.

This correspondence elicited a query on the definition and application of *derogatio* (derogation). My Latin dictionary lists its prime meaning as a legal technical term: repeal of part of a law. (see *abrogatio*) A secondary general meaning: detraction from, diminution.

*Abrogatio* is defined as the repeal of a law. *Abrogare* (verb): To repeal a law, to abrogate wholly (whereas *derogare* means to abrogate partly, *obrogare* to counteract, or supersede by another law). General meaning: deprive, take away.

Difficulty arises from application in two contexts: (1) its misuse by Mgr. Madden (20 June 1973 to L.M.S.A.), “The Tridentine Mass is partially abrogated—or more correctly, it is derogated,” a current misapplication and misunderstanding, probably intentional; (2) its proper use by Dulac in Jurisdiction of the Bull “*Quo Primum*,” Section VII, Second Rule: “At most, Pope Paul’s constitution derogates only certain particular details of the Tridentine Missal” (not Mass) “which will not be discussed in detail here.”

Before it begins to pray the Tridentine Missal contains ten sections which might be held “details” subject to derogation in the legal sense, a decree, four Bulls, calendar regulations, rubrics, *Ritus servandus*, and *De defectibus*. In Paul’s Apostolic Constitution, *Missale Romanum*, “derogation” is used with “apostolic constitutions and ordinances .... and other prescriptions,” not with Masses, Rites, or ceremonies.

In a document of regulatory intent the words that bring about the regulatory effect must convey a precise regulatory meaning. Derogation used in other than its legal sense conveys no intelligible relevant meaning. In both *Missale Romanum* and Jurisdiction of the Bull “*Quo Primum*” it is clearly used in the legal sense, inapplicable to anything not of a regulatory nature. It can be applied to rules, ordinances, laws, prescriptions, even recommendations, but not to the matter these regulations purport to govern, for it would immediately lose its workable regulatory sense. It can then be equated with debasement, depreciation, disparagement, deterioration, or other dictionary definitions. If our opponents wish to say that Paul VI has ordered the deterioration, disparagement, and depreciation of our Mass I will entertain their argument. I’ve already written Cardinal Freeman that some one has debased the coin of our worship.

### **Letter Distributed At Clergy Conference**

27 June 1973, Brighton le Sands, N. S. W.:--

Dear Father: “No man can serve two masters. For either he will hate the one, and love the other; or he will sustain the one, and despise the other.” (Matthew vi, 24) In the past you have served one Master. Now you have been saddled with two more, ecumenism and world development—essentially one.

“Going, therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.” (Matthew xxviii, 19-20) This is the mandate. NOT: Feed, clothe, house all nations. That He has reserved for Himself.

“Be not solicitous, therefore, saying: What shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewith shall we be clothed? For after these things the heathens seek. For your Father knoweth that you have need of all these things. Seek ye, therefore, first the kingdom of God and His justice; and all these things shall be added unto you.” (Matthew vi, 31-33)

The inference is clear; you cannot waste your priestly time on side issues. You must first do that for which you were ordained: teach the doctrine of Christ to men, bring men His sacraments and graces, and above all offer men’s sacrifice of propitiation and worship, our Holy Mass, to God. There is grave reason to doubt that you are performing these duties, especially the last.

“... ritual and rubrics are not in themselves a matter of dogmatic definition.” (*Allocutio* of Pope Paul VI, 19 Nov. 1969) On the pope’s own authority, then, the *novus ordo* mass lacks the backing of his infallibility. The doctrine of Papal Infallibility by its strict bounds admits that in all other areas the pope is completely fallible.

“For the liturgy is made up of unchangeable elements divinely instituted, and elements subject to change.” (Vat. II, Sacred Liturgy, 21) What divinely instituted element is least subject to change? What is the heart of the Mass? Why do the vernacular *novus ordo* masses change Christ’s words and sense in the Consecration? Why was the anamnesis replaced with ambiguous verbiage? Who authorized removal of “*mysterium fidei*” from the formula despite the Holy Office *monitum* (24 July 1958) expressly forbidding such removal?

“If anyone removes or changes anything in the Form of Consecration of the Body and Blood, and by this change of words does not signify the same thing as these words do, he does not confect the sacrament. If anyone adds or takes away anything even if he does not change the meaning of the form, he does confect, but he sins grievously.” (*Missale Romanum, De Defectibus, Cap V, “Formae”*)

Can the Ordinary or the pope command you to sin? Can either prove beyond all doubt the validity or acceptability to God of the *novus ordo* mass? If there is any doubt whatsoever the safe course (the traditional Mass) must be followed.

The burden of proof lies with the innovators, not with us who maintain the universal tradition of nineteen centuries of the Catholic Church. The rule of thumb in religious matters: Innovation is error, as Tertullian demonstrated.

Innovation will continue. Else why are not diocesan liturgical commissions disbanded in the present acute shortage of priests?

Why was each diocese instructed to set up such a commission if not deliberately to court diversity and confusion in our worship?

Recall some reasons advanced for vernacular at Mass: Church attendance was falling off. Latin was a block to conversions. Everyone should understand what takes place. At the new mass I can understand nothing except why attendance has hit a new low, conversions have practically ceased, twenty-five thousand have left the priesthood since Vatican II, and few of our sons evince any desire to replace them.

Such conditions refute the argument that the Mass or the Church must accommodate to the need of modern man or the capacity of the faithful. Modern man is no more modern than medieval or Renaissance man in his day. The Church and its essential worship, the Mass, are rooted in eternity, to which man must conform.

Why are we to be bound by the “disinterested” scholarship of the Consilium’s six Protestant members? Their influence is only too evident, particularly in the “eucharistic prayers,” two of which contradict the doctrine of Transubstantiation in their text, all of which do so in optional “memorial acclamation” C. Eucharistic Prayer number two in dropping all reference to sacrifice adapts itself especially to modernism and Protestantism. The new mass is then demonstrably a tool of ecumenism, not demonstrably a Mass.

(To say that Protestant clergy took an active part in construction of the new rite is not to incite bigotry, but merely to record an indisputable fact. It is self-evidently self-contradictory that a Protestant—who is Protestant because he cannot believe in the Mass—can have any intention of constructing a Mass. The new rite cannot become a true Mass through such nebulous considerations as “papal approval,” still less through legislation of an episcopal conference. Neither function falls within the purview of either infallibility or competence in this field. Approval cannot turn beer into ale, or chicken into tuna. The Mass must first be there; all the approval in the universe will not overcome its absence.

(Protestants use this new rite in their churches. It cannot be a Mass or Protestants could not conscientiously use it, considering the Mass—39 Articles—a blasphemy. If the rite was invented for the purpose of supplanting a true Mass—which it certainly has!—even if only partially, it is unreasonable to impute a proper intention. When it deliberately incorporates doubtful changes why may we not doubt them? When form, matter, and meaning of the Holy Eucharist are doctored, who can compel our belief in their validity? When the intention is obscured or changed—as in the new “offertory”—and we are expected to supply the lack—out of memory, pretence, or sense of propriety—the whole ceremony becomes subjective, and may mean something entirely different to anyone else, including the priest. If this ceremony is not a Mass for any reason whatsoever it is idolatrous. There is no middle ground, no half-idolatry. The Church cannot impose a guessing

game upon us. If it is wrong sometimes we may assume for all practical purposes that it is wrong every time.) ....

You may say the traditional Mass privately. *Cui bono?* Is the laity less Catholic than the priests it produces? You may say the traditional Mass if you are too old to change. Here you had a perfect out, but your pride is touched; you can't be old-fashioned, narrow, or bigoted. Can you not admit the possibility that you have been gulled, even as I, by this gradual subversion? .....

God may not be deprived of His proper worship with impunity. Priests who will not celebrate the traditional Mass, bishops who forbid its celebration (or leave the impression that it is forbidden to their clergy) rob the Almighty God.

Nor can obedience be argued. Our first obedience is to God. Nor is there any law promulgated by competent authority forbidding the traditional Mass. Everything in the *novus ordo* missal is printed in English and Latin (which vary) with one glaring exception: the decree of promulgation. We are all to rely on the honesty and good faith of the incompetent translator for the accuracy of the English version. But who sees the Latin? Is this without purpose? Did some one run out of paper?

Paragraph 13 of the decree is rendered: "In conclusion, we wish to give the force of law to all that we have set forth concerning the new Roman Missal ...." The official text reads: "*Ad extremum, ex iis quae hactenus de novo Missali Romano exposuimus quiddam nunc cogere et efficere placet.*" Correctly translated: "Concerning all that we have just set forth regarding the new Roman Missal, we are pleased to end here by drawing a conclusion." Law? Force? Duplicity!

The entire loosely worded decree commands nothing and abrogates nothing, nor even derogates any specific regulation. Who forbids or impedes the traditional Mass far exceeds his authority. He must not be obeyed in this matter, for the sake of the world, from which God's wrath is averted only by the Mass, celebrated always and everywhere .....

Laymen are equally obliged to eliminate doubt. Many prefer to worship in the traditional manner, since it is the only way to be sure. You may not withhold the right, even though you "know better."

You may place your trust in your bishop, or in the painfully obvious conclusion that the pope knows the situation and consents by silence. You may think you are right in so doing and that we are wrong to question. But if we are correct (and you are on notice to ascertain the truth) you are literally in a hell of a position. Was St. Pius V talking idly in promising the "wrath of Almighty God and the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul?" Will you stake your soul's salvation on a rank innovation against all tradition?

### **Reaction From The Clergy**

Though nearly half the archdiocesan clergy saw this letter, only outsiders answered. “It is rather sickening,” wrote one, “to read ‘NOT feed, clothe, house all nations’ for this is exactly the way Christ said we would be judged.”

This was not the mandate given the Apostles and their successors. For such a command would occupy every bit of their time and leave none for the work for which they were sent. World Development may have its points, though Christlike charity may be exercised with far greater effect and far less waste in one’s immediate vicinity, but this is not the job of the clergy. The job Christ assigned them not only takes precedence, but also, if done properly, all their time, more especially in these days of acute shortage of priests. I underlined the exact situation—no priest is now left alone to do the job for which the priesthood was established; he must waste his supervaluable time on side issues, committees, conferences, innovations, and many other jobs for which he has not the slightest training or aptitude.

A self-styled traditionalist raised issues, some of which I answered: To say that the infallible Church has spoken on “for many” versus “for all men” (which it has in the Roman Catechism) and that it is settled in favour of “for all men” is to ignore the facts. To cite an odd use of “*multi*” by Cicero is surely to beg the question of the meaning the Church has always assigned to it in this particular context. Or has the Church been wrong till our enlightened day? What would you yourself have said to the absurd proposition fifteen years ago? Could the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity have been less than clear in one of the central points of the religion He came to establish? He was and is the clearest speaker of all time.

Now for my jocose translation—not mine, but Father Raymond Dulac’s (whose “Jurisdiction of the Bull *Quo Primum*” I enclose) ... bit by bit, referring you to “A Smaller Latin-English Dictionary” (Dr. Wm. Smith) for corroboration. *Ad extremum* = toward the end. *ex iis* = on those things. *quae* = which. *hactenus* = thus far. *de novo Missali Romano* = concerning the new Roman Missal. *exposuimus* = we have set forth, expounded, or exhibited. *quiddam* = something (indefinite). *nunc* = now. *cogere* = to herd, collect, or assemble. *et* = and. *efficere* = to complete, form, shape, or show. *placet* = it pleases, it seems right and proper, it is approved or resolved. Literally, though more clumsily than Dulac: Toward the end on those things which we have thus far set forth concerning the new Roman Missal it is resolved now to assemble and shape something. *Efficere* can also mean to execute, to accomplish. *Cogere* governing an infinitive, a gerund(ive), an *ut finale* or *in* or *ad* with the name of an action means to force. There is no such construction here. The dictionary cited reads: *cogo* (3) Sometimes = *colligo*, to infer, conclude: *ex quibus id quod volumus efficitur et cogitur*, Cicero—a classic use of the two verbs associated.

... surely unnecessary to cite words of Eucharistic Prayers II and IV opposing Transubstantiation; after the Consecration (II) “we offer you, Father, this life-giving bread, this saving cup,” and (IV)

“all who share this bread and wine.” “Life-giving” means nothing; all bread may be called life-giving—hardly “*hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam, Panem sanctum vitae aeternae, et Calicem salutis perpetuae,*” which it has replaced.

The fact that an approximation of Acclamation C was written in an epistle of St. Paul is not too relevant. St. Paul did not say it at the Consecration of the Mass. You can argue till your teeth fall out that I have placed the wrong interpretation on the words; .... if these words can be so interpreted they will be so interpreted. They are at best ambiguous. Ambiguity in our Mass, as in our faith and morals, is heresy.

Even were it undoubtedly valid, the *novus ordo* is far from our best, which is what we must offer God. We have a perfect sacrifice, the Tridentine Mass. Where was the need to supplant it, especially with something so glaringly defective? In at least one diocese, Campos, Brazil, the Tridentine Mass is permitted. It appears to be forbidden in Sydney. In which of these cases is the Church speaking, whether or not infallibly?

We do not relish your imputation of arrogance. We adhere strictly to the entire tradition and doctrine of the Church. Arrogance is more properly attributed to the innovators, who have preferred their own inadequate understanding to that of, say, the Council of Trent, which labored eighteen years to make sure that it preserved all the doctrine and tradition of the Church. Obviously, what we must dig in the remote past to obtain is not the tradition handed down throughout the ages of the Church, but rather discarded practice which had been found wanting, or had been tolerated out of temporary necessity. The innovators must tie their sacrileges to something, or no one would swallow them. But they lie; they invent history; they ignore the plainest facts.

You are aware of this in the field of catechetics and doctrine. Why should not the same people take the same course with regard to our Mass? They would kill the souls of our children, but they would *not* rob *us* of our sacrifice or God of His due. Again you beg the question: reason balks at the thought. Why? It’s all been done before! We still have the Holy Ghost? So did the people of Britain, Germany, and Scandinavia in the sixteenth century. The Holy Ghost requires co-operation, not presumption of automatic preservation in the Faith. We have been led down the garden path with two great catchwords: 1) Charity covers a multitude of sins which we are to condone rather than condemn—that would be uncharitable! 2) Obedience is especially effective against us stupid Irish. Father is always right. But this is no longer true; you can always find another Father to contradict him. You, as well as I, know priests who are either formal heretics or idiots; the effect is the same. Why do you assume that this same condition cannot occur in higher echelons, even in the papacy? When Paul VI says (page 3, *L’Osservatore Romano*, April 22, 1971, English edition): “We moderns, men of our own day, wish everything to be new. Our old people, the Traditionalists, the Conservatives, measured the value of things according to their enduring quality. We, instead, are actualists, we want everything to be new all the time, to be

expressed in a continually improvised and dynamically unusual form,” are we to forsake our eternal Truth and unchangeable God for obedience to this internally inconsistent, euphemistic blueprint for turmoil, discontent, and conflict? Are these not the earmarks of diabolism?

You quote Cardinal Wright as saying the Tridentine Mass is done. He told our representatives the reason: In the United States people flocked to the Tridentine Mass and avoided parishes where the new “mass” held sway. So the authorities forbade the Tridentine Mass so that the “obedient” churches could find support in their collections. Genuine orthodoxy in action! We knew that Cardinal Wright and Paul VI favor the new “mass.” Neither fact can make the slightest difference objectively, inconvenient as ephemerally they may be in the ever-changing climate of ambiguity fostered by Paul VI.

We used to think of our priests as *men* who would lead us to martyrdom if occasion arose. Few of them would risk being laughed at for such a nebulous thing as fidelity to their oaths against modernism and to the doctrine and discipline of the Council of Trent. And they are obliged before God in such matters.

Why are so many that “have borne the burden of the day and the heat” throwing away their last hours in the vineyard? Why do they expect us not to notice? Will God see less than we?

### **Section Three**

#### **A VALID NOVUS ORDO?**

##### **What Price Sincerity?**

Sincerity in mistaken belief cannot overcome error. Though there remain priests educated in theological understanding of the Mass, their proper intention (precariously granted that it has survived the modernist barrage of the last two decades) affects only a true Mass. The new “mass” is invalid through ritual intention far beyond the power of the celebrant to rectify. In English it is invalid also through change in the words of consecration.

##### **Consecration Formula**

“Questioning the Validity of Masses Using the New, All-English Canon” (Patrick H. Omlor) and “Thesis xxxv, The Context of the Words Needed for Consecration” (Maurice de la Taille, S.J.) prove what should be self-evident: requirement of (1) a preamble to show that in consecrating a priest acts *in persona Christi*, since obviously he is not Christ, and (2) the entire formula (or clear equivalent) as given—THIS IS MY BODY and THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT, THE MYSTERY OF FAITH, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS—if only because Christ followed all this with: “As often as ye shall do these things ye shall do them in commemoration of Me.”

He, all the ages’ clearest Speaker, prescribed the entire formula in the most specific, most solemn act of His life. He could have



inserted this prescription after *blood, shed, you, or many*, each with a different signification, but He did not. Many theologians through the last eight centuries, none before, disagree with one or other of these requirements, very few with both. The Church has never defined the matter for the best of reasons: Nobody says Mass in other than the prescribed manner. Only in our day have “Catholic” clerics dared tamper with the Canon.

What of priests who supposedly have had time to say Mass with only the “bare formula” THIS IS MY BODY, THIS IS MY BLOOD in Russian prison camps? 1. One must allow for a degree of dramatic overstatement. How much more time could a short preamble and the full formula take? And what of Canon 817—“It is forbidden (*nefas*), even in urgent, extreme necessity to consecrate either matter without the other, or even both, outside the celebration of Mass?” Evidently Canon Law does not equate Consecration and Mass. 2. How can such a situation compare with the cold-blooded mutilation of the consecratory formula in a leisurely, free country like Australia? 3. Granting the literal accuracy of such reports, who guarantees these Masses?

THESIS XXXV: “The following statement may be taken as a fixed principle: every sacramental form must signify its own proper effect, not only from the subjective intention of the minister who pronounces the form, but also from the actual objective tenor of the words pronounced. For the form causes by signifying, and the signification is of itself something objective and external; it must be interpreted according to the received values of human speech in general, as well as the rules of the particular idiom used. Now in the making or production of the sacraments, the intention is only concerned with the application of the form, complete in itself as form, to the matter of itself sufficient. One thing, however, the intention can never do. It can never confer on the form a signification which the form in itself does not possess. In other words, should the signification of the form itself be in any way deficient, the intention will not supply this deficiency.

“Therefore it may not be said that such and such a form would not by virtue of the words show such and such a signification, unless the minister intended to utter it in that particular sense or signification, but if the minister intends to utter it with such a sense it does have such a signification. On the contrary, I repeat, the intention of the minister does not correct or govern the sense of the form, it simply causes the form to have effectively that sense which, in given circumstances, it has naturally.

“This principle, I think, should be accepted by every theologian. It underlies the decision of Leo XIII on Anglican orders. The Pontiff, having shown what is the obvious meaning in the Anglican communion of the words of the adulterated Ordinal, goes on to say: ‘By this same argument, even taken alone, is refuted the contention of those who say that the prayer at the beginning of the ritual action: *Omnipotens Deus, omnium bonorum largitor*, can suffice to make the form of the order legitimate: though we admit that the form might perhaps be regarded as sufficient in some Catholic rite of which the Church has approved.’”

The “bare form” THIS IS MY BODY, THIS IS MY BLOOD cannot suffice to effect a Mass. How is sacrifice signified? Or its purpose? And our worship *is* Mass—the sacrifice, not mere consecration, which in any case cannot take place without the sacrifice. This widespread misconception, the “bare form,” suits the Modernist and Reformation doctrine that the Mass is a meal, but cannot satisfy Leo XIII’s requirement that sacraments convey what they signify and signify what they convey. See “Only a Consecration is Needed,” later in this Section III.

Again from the same THESIS XXXV: “Pope Innocent III (*De sacro altaris mysterio*) notes that there are three elements in the narrative not commemorated by the Evangelists: ‘with his eyes lifted up to heaven’ (*elevatis oculis in caelum*), ‘and eternal’ (*novi et aeterni testamenti*, whereas the Gospels give only *novi testamenti*), and ‘the mystery of faith’ (*mysterium fidei*); and these he considers must be derived from Christ and the Apostles, for ‘Who would be so presumptuous and daring as to insert these things out of his own devotion? In truth, the Apostles received that form of words from Christ Himself, and the Church received it from the Apostles themselves.’”

### Whose Sacraments ?

Patrick H. Omlor addressed the L.M.S.A. at Lidcombe, N.S.W. Sunday 21 Oct. 73. His text has been printed under the title **The Sky Grows Darker Yet**. I quote:

“.... on at least four occasions holy Mother Church .... has positively declared that no one has the right or power to innovate anything whatsoever touching upon the substance of the sacraments .... the two most recent .... First: in the letter *Ex Quo Nono* of Dec. 26, 1910, Pope St. Pius X declared: ‘It is well-known that to the Church there belongs no right whatsoever to innovate anything touching on the substance of the sacraments.’ .... second: .... Pope Pius XII in .... *Sacramentum Ordinis*, of Nov. 30, 1947: .... ‘As the Council of Trent teaches, the seven sacraments of the New Law have all been instituted by Jesus Christ, Our Lord, and the Church has no power over the substance of the sacraments.’ The Church has no power! No bishop, no Council, no pope, no one at all .... By the very fact that these pronouncements were made .... it is evident that the Church, always guided by the Holy Ghost, envisaged the possibility at least that .... some one (or ones) calling themselves ‘the legitimate authority of the Church’ .... just might actually presume to attempt to change the form of a sacrament. Now it might be thought by some that certainly our very shepherds, the ones whose chief business should be defending the Faith, would not and could not ever do such a thing. But if such a possibility were entirely out of the question, then St. Pius X and Pope Pius XII—and before them the council of Trent and also Clement VI—would not have bothered to issue their solemn admonition. *De rebus parvulis non curat lex*: the law does not concern itself with trifles, nor .... with impossible situations .... Consequently any ‘approval’—regardless of the alleged source—must have been necessarily null and void at the very outset .... moreover, null and

void in a manner totally beyond the control or powers of any would-be innovators.”

### Whose Mass ?

“.... Ritual And Rubrics are not in themselves a matter of dogmatic definition,” said Paul VI, 19 Nov. 1969. Here, as in promulgating the *novus ordo missae*, he dodges. He conveys that he does not intend to speak *ex cathedra*—infallibly. “Ritual and rubrics” insufficiently describes his new rite. His use of “derogation to the extent necessary” and “Apostolic Constitutions .... issued by our predecessors” (new “mass” promulgation) is designed to be interpreted as effective abrogation of *Quo Primum*, which is not subject to abrogation. He never suggests the probability that our Holy Mass—and even more the introduction of a new rite—fall under moral definition, also within the scope of infallibility.

But why has a man who trades so heavily on imputation of infallibility to his every act and “wish” refrained from claiming infallibility for his promulgation of the *novus ordo*? Because he could then never deny infallibility to St. Pius V’s proclamation, *Quo Primum*, which covered the same moral ground without innovation.

We often hear (1) Paul VI could abrogate *Quo Primum*, though he has not, (2) Paul VI can stop the Tridentine Mass, though he has not, because (3) no pope can bind his successor. He appears, nevertheless, to have abolished both Bull and Mass in effect.

While anyone grants his “right” to stop the Tridentine Mass few question his “right” to substitute a non-Apostolic rite lacking continuity with the tradition of the Church—a rite consequently suspect on its face. No one may force a Catholic to assist at or participate in a suspect form of worship.

A pope can stop the Tridentine Mass only under such circumstances as he can stop all Masses—where conditions warrant an interdict. If, inconceivably, he found the Latin Rite dangerous to faith or morals, he could replace it only with another rite of equal continuity and recognized authority.

In matters of Mass and Sacraments it is not a past pope that binds a present pope, but Christ who binds both. St. Pius V introduced nothing by his Bull; he stopped innovations and variations of the sixteenth century, that of the Reformation. To involve the decayed products of the same Reformation in the reconstruction of our worship—even if warranted—opposes all Catholic dogma and morals.

A mass to suit non-Catholics is the acme of pointlessness. The Mass is the major issue on which we and they differ. We can agree with them only at the expense of our clear doctrine and frustration of our highest moral act, the Holy Mass.

The devisers of the new “mass” also defined it, to the horror of Catholics. “That’s no definition of a Mass!” Certainly not, but with equal certainty it defines the new “mass,” on the authority of its constructors—at least six of whom—never forget—were

beforehand public heretics by definition. Their intention is enough to invalidate their invention. Whatever this new thing is, it is not a Mass.

Ninety-five per cent of the Church including the pope must be right? My conclusion is too horrendous to contemplate? Majorities do not impress me. In less than fifteen years, without change of a single belief or tenet, I have passed from a large majority of Catholics to what the hierarchy tells me is an inconsequential and deluded minority.

When an innovator imposes his innovation upon the Church he must take the position that he acts legitimately. He must teach that what he has done is correct and official. We have the criminal's word there is no crime.

God would not allow us to fall into error, to lose our Mass? He may not withdraw His ordinary means of grace from a generation that has largely scorned them? How are we superior to the northern Europeans of the sixteenth century? Or to the North Africans of the seventh and eighth centuries? Or to the peoples of Asia Minor and the very cradle of our religion? Peoples who have lost the Church have lost it through weakness, and have never recovered it.

God often heavily chastised His chosen people when they turned from Him. He left the entire human race in its sins for millennia. He would seem, then, more than capable of depriving a generation of such little faith and such great toleration of unnatural sins as ours of our ordinary means of salvation. If we lose our Faith we shall lose it also for our children—those we don't prevent or murder. The Church needs none of us. When North Africa fell she gained the Vikings and Slavs. Latin America replaced England and Scandinavia. The world teems with pagans to replace us.

History teaches, it is said, that man learns nothing from history. Numberless battles have been won by the wrong side. It seems incredible that God permitted Cardinal Richelieu to preserve Protestantism against the Hapsburgs. French preeminence meant more to this churchman than unity and peace in Christendom. He could not live with Hapsburgs so he sowed the seed for Bismarck and Hitler.

History records widespread heresies which almost won, or which have won regionally, as well as robber councils and incompetent, evil, even heretical popes. Our time is miraculously saved from history. We're too informed, too advanced, too intelligent to fall under its rules, possibilities, or lessons. God permitted horrible castigations upon our erring, illiterate, uneducated, uninformed, hardly human ancestors. We cannot err, so God would never have cause to chastise us.

We cannot be in this mess because we have done nothing to deserve it. We do our best—we live right. Therefore there is no mess. Why should we suffer?

Look at the crucifix! How did Christ deserve that? Did He not live right? What is our best to His? Was He not betrayed by His own?

Why will we refuse to believe our own can betray us? This cannot be, we tell ourselves, because God would not forsake His Church, the Mystical Christ, any more than He forsook Christ Himself. So why did Christ, dying that horrible death of tortured asphyxiation, cry out “My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?”

Learners from history have established anathemas and tabus, for which they accrue great credit as superstitious, bigoted, or conservative opponents of Progress. But man cannot live with sin and error. Nor can he outlive them. His only option consistent with salvation is to fight.

Cardinal Newman sermonized: “God works by human means. As He employs individual men, and inspires them, and yet they die, so, doubtless, He might employ a body or society of men, which at length, after its course of two thousand years, might come to an end. It might be withdrawn, as other gifts of God are withdrawn, when abused. Doubtless Christianity might be such; it might be destined to expire; it may be destined to age, to decay, and at length to die;—but we know that when it dies, at least the world will die with it. The world’s duration is measured by it. If the Church dies, the world’s time is run. The world shall never exult over the Church. If the Church falls sick, the world shall utter a wail for its own sake; for, like Samson, the Church will bury all with it.”

Communism, freemasonry, or an organization with identical methods, has infiltrated the Catholic Church at highest levels. We see: (1) all the red techniques in action, from driving wedges between generations to removal of all social stability; (2) popes praising and negotiating with communists; (3) a concordat with Spain circumvented; (4) Vatican interference in Portuguese internal affairs, to the prejudice of order in all southern Africa; (5) A Chilean cardinal supporting Allende; (6) Cardinals Slipyj and Mindszenty and their peoples sold out; (7) on the French Church calendar a feast of Lenin!

Communism could not succeed against the Church? The question is: Will it try? It has bored from within professional societies, trade unions, armies, entertainment, education, communications, and local and national governments. Why should it neglect its greatest enemy? Why should it not implement its usual methods -- volunteer for the heavy work, promote the red brothers, take over the sensitive spots, aim for control?

Nor may we discount the possibility that it can succeed—that it *can* kill the Church. The world will end some time.

### **Objection From A Liturgy Expert**

“You say that priests are forbidden to offer the Mass for which they were ordained. They were ordained for the Mass of the Church. There is only one Mass of the Church, which is now the *Novus Ordo* of Paul VI. The priest must use the current form, which is guaranteed authenticity by the living authority of the Church, or he cuts himself off from the community and becomes a dead branch, without grace or hope. You want to return us to

‘proper practice,’ but all the reformers in history have said they were returning us to the purity of the teaching of Christ in the Gospel. The pope and bishops resolved at II Vatican Council that the rite of the Latin Mass should be revised; you are presumptuous in not accepting traditional Catholic faith in the role and authority of the pope and the bishops.”

There is indeed only one Mass—the unbloody Sacrifice of the Cross. While certain of the Eastern rites differ in details from the Latin “Tridentine” Mass, it is noteworthy that none of them is new. Several are simpler than ours, possibly because those who used them were isolated from the mainstream of Christian thought and development. None is more specific than the Tridentine. None contradicts the Tridentine. Further, all these other rites continue in existence by permission (undeniable) of St. Pius V’s Bull *Quo Primum*:

“Let all everywhere adopt and observe what has been handed down by the Holy Roman Church, the Mother and Teacher of the other churches, and let Masses not be sung or read according to any other formula than that of this Missal published by Us. This ordinance applies henceforth, now, and forever, throughout all provinces of the Christian world, to all patriarchates, cathedral churches, collegiate and parish churches, be they secular or religious, both of men and women—even of military orders—and of churches and chapels without a specific congregation in which conventual Masses are sung aloud in choir or read privately in accord with the rites and customs of the Roman Church. This Missal is to be used by all churches, even by those which in their authorization are made exempt, whether by Apostolic indult, custom, or privilege, or even if by oath or official confirmation by the Holy See, or have their rites and faculties guaranteed to them by any other manner whatsoever, unless approval of the practice of saying Mass differently was given at the very time of institution and confirmation of the church by the Apostolic See at least two hundred years ago, or unless there has prevailed a custom of similar kind which has been continuously followed for a period of not less than two hundred years, in which cases We in no wise rescind their above-mentioned prerogative or custom.”

The Missal invented nothing; it changed not a word of the Canon, as checked against Pope Innocent III’s twelfth-century documentation of the Roman usage (Migne, Patrology Vol 217). It standardized distribution of Communion and approved the already wide use of the Last Gospel—neither essential to the Mass.

The rites that are guaranteed authenticity by the approval of the Church owe this approval to their antiquity and undoubted direct development from Apostolic liturgy, and not to any legislative power of the Church. The Church cannot guarantee or even approve any rite not Apostolic in origin, purpose, or development.

Back to *Quo Primum*: “... By this present Constitution, which will be valid henceforth, now, and forever, We order and enjoin

that nothing must be added to our recently published Missal, nothing omitted from it, nor anything whatsoever be changed within it under the penalty of Our displeasure. Furthermore, by these presents, in virtue of Our Apostolic Authority, We grant and concede in perpetuity that, for the chanting or reading of Mass in any church whatsoever, this Missal is hereafter to be followed absolutely, without any scruple of conscience or fear of incurring any penalty, judgment, or censure, and may freely and lawfully be used. Nor are superiors, administrators, canons, chaplains, and other secular priests, or religious, of whatever order or by whatever title designated, obliged to celebrate the Mass otherwise than as enjoined by Us. We likewise declare and ordain that no one whosoever is to be forced or coerced to alter this Missal, and that this present document cannot be revoked or modified, but remain always valid and retain its full force.”

Thus the Church, having arrived at the point at which it was necessary to preserve the Mass from heretical attacks and from well-meant, often maudlin experiments, having developed the Mass to its maximum beauty and prayerful content, standardized it for the purpose of preserving it—to have a standard Mass that it could guarantee—while graciously permitting undoubtedly valid and worthy traditional variations. This, then, is the Mass of the Catholic Church.

Consider the manner of its promulgation as the standard. A pope (since canonized) appealing to his Apostolic Authority and speaking to the whole Church on a matter of faith (verbal content and effect of the Mass) and morals (the Mass is our highest moral act, performed in accordance with God’s First and Third Commandments, concerned entirely with morals). This Bull, then, bears all the earmarks of an infallible statement. If not, it is at least the teaching, accepted as such by four centuries of the Church, of the Supreme Magisterium. If I may disobey it where does that leave Paul VI’s hopes and wishes?

It has ever characterized the Church that it does not contradict itself. The “living authority” cannot reverse the accepted teaching. Should it do so it is self-evident that the later statement, condition, or—as the *novus ordo*—experiment is wrong.

The *novus ordo* was introduced by the “wish” and “hope” of Paul VI in “obedience” (not owed!) to Vatican II in a promulgation which did not and could not abrogate *Quo Primum*. The avowed purpose of the new rite was to make our worship acceptable to Protestants so that they could join us, despite the fact that they do not believe in the Mass. Accordingly, Protestants were consulted and took an active part in constructing the new rite. When they had done the deed they defined what they had made, correctly, in words that could not define a Mass. And the whole rite was saddled upon us with the idea that we were being returned, as you quote all the reformers, to the purity of Christ’s teaching in the Gospel, which would now be expounded more adequately to us heathen.

Even as an experiment it was improperly conducted. Who was given the opportunity to choose between the old and the new? What consideration was given the spiritual welfare of those who simply could not accommodate to change even if they had no reason for their preference? There are always such souls, and the Church is obliged to save them as well as those more amenable to earthquakes in their spiritual country. Can you say that such people have cut themselves off from the Church? Would it not be more correct to say that pastoral innovators have alienated people who wish only to remain in the Communion of Saints—to share the faith and worship of their ancestors from time immemorial? These innovations are suspect, to say the very least, by their insidious method of introduction (without proper foundation, in turn leading to the logical assumption that proper foundation is impossible), and by their concomitant unwarranted, absurd proscription of the unquestioned Mass of the Catholic Church. It is hardly reassuring or a mark of orthodoxy to demonstrate such obvious hatred for the Mass.

Let no one pretend that the *novus ordo* is a mere revision of the Mass. It fits far better Adrian Fortescue's description in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol IX, p. 313a: "The various Protestant Prayer-books, Agendae, Communion-services, and so on, have of course no place in this scheme, because they all break away altogether from the continuity of liturgical development, they are merely compilations of random selections made from any of the old rites imbedded in new structures made by various reformers."

There is grave doubt that even were *Quo Primum* not *ex cathedra* even genuine Catholic revision of non-essential parts could legally be essayed. But let us examine how this self-designated "pastoral" council, which refused to define even its own terms of reference, and which went on record in several instances against the doctrine of the Church, voted itself power to overcome the clear provisions of a papal proclamation regarding the central function of the Church.

**The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy**, III. The Reform of the Sacred Liturgy, 21 says that certain things, reported in pejorative, equivocal terms (IF this, IF that), "ought to be changed," and then "establishes the following general norms: 22. 1. Regulation" (not change) "of the sacred liturgy depends solely on the authority of the Church, that is, on the Apostolic See and, as laws" (WHAT laws?) "may determine, on the bishop. 2. In virtue of the power conceded by law" (WHAT law?) "the regulation" (not change) "of the liturgy within certain defined" (by whom?) "limits belongs also to various kinds of competent" (in what field?) "territorial bodies of bishops legitimately" (how?) "established." This is the only "legal" pretext for the entire change. No bishop, no body of bishops is competent in this matter. We see here the perpetrators of a crime assuring us that it is not a crime, and that anyway they have the legal power to commit it. We see here a crew of men so proud of their own intelligence, so presumptuous of the Holy Ghost's backing after contradicting other councils so backed, that they ride roughshod over all the tradition, experience,



and law of the Church. Then we see that, bad as they were, the organizations which they set up to implement the “revision” far outstripped them and their expressed intentions, and continue to introduce further innovations, such as suppression of the Creed. Implementation included destruction of altars—to no apparent purpose except endowment of permanency to the new fluidity, loss of the concept of sacrifice, and diminution of respect for the Sacrament of the Altar.

We accept traditional Catholic faith in the popes’ and bishops’ role and authority, but not the modern view that a pope may disregard his predecessors because he is pope now, nor yet the notion that a pope must not be opposed presumably because his office endows him with divinity. The pope’s authority is not unlimited—nor is it to be presumed exercised in the absence of its clear exercise. Nor can it extend to the present absurdity that the Apostolic Mass may be forbidden while an obviously defective and disruptive rite replaces it. I must not be forced, in order to remain with the pope, to choose between popes. The entire Church is *not* here and now.

You appear to reject that a man (Paul VI) can err in what he so inaccurately describes as ritual and rubrics, or in pastoral judgment. Neither lies within the scope of infallibility or of the magisterium. You ignore the obvious and its obvious fruits. Consider the distinct possibility that we have a bad pope, a heretical pope, or even (tantamount) a non-pope.

He is far from the first in any of these categories. He became a priest with only a few months in a seminary (final year: examinations, retreats, and in his special case selective curriculum, private schedule, and time off whenever his father was home), educated at home in an atmosphere of Modernism, and became an archbishop without a day as parish priest, hardly qualifying him as a pastoral expert. Review his glaringly obvious blatantly unpopal conduct:

He deliberately sows confusion in every phase of the Church’s activities.

He systematically contradicts not only prior popes but even his own words.

He re-opens controversies long settled by popes.

He circumvents legitimate agreements and concordats with Catholic governments.

He sets an example of spinelessness for his bishops by diluting and retiring his authority behind collegiality.

He distracts his clergy from their real work with multiplied “duties” to the community, keeping them too harried to think.

He “searches” for the truth we have ever infallibly possessed.

He negotiates with communist tyrants at the expense of his own people.

He demolishes the safeguards of the Faith.

His every action further debases and disparages his clergy and alienates ever larger segments of the laity.

He continues in the pattern he set in clandestine dealings before his transfer to Milan, where he rendered less than obedience to

legitimate authority in matters of public worship, and in the “re-training” of his priests—even the new ones.

### **Novus Ordo Corrects Tradition :**

**Objection:** You say that the Church does not offer bread and wine, that the Offertory in the Tridentine Mass offers the Body and Blood of Christ. The Tridentine Mass was wrong in this and the *novus ordo* clears up the contradiction. At the offertory there is only bread and wine, and it was wrong to anticipate the consecration at a point where we only prepare for the consecration.

**Reply:** I like the cavalier manner in which you dismiss as “anticipatory” the clear doctrine held by the Church from its beginning, but countenance a rite that refers after the consecration to the accidents in such a manner as at least to confuse the issue as to whether they are not still the substance, thus denying the effect of the consecration. We may not anticipate, but you may turn back the clock all the way to the bakery and winery, and now to the grape juice cannery.

You admit that the Tridentine offertory and the *novus ordo* “preparation of the gifts” oppose each other. “Authority” errs, then, in one case or the other. Since only one can be the teaching of the Church, whoever teaches the other cannot be the teaching Church. Since the *novus ordo* is just that—a new order—it cannot lay claim successfully to the traditional teaching where it opposes the old order. If we apply Leo XIII’s principle that the law of prayer determines the law of belief, we must conclude that our belief is subject to the change in the expressed intent of the prayer.

Enough logic; let’s try historical fact. We establish that our Tridentine Mass offertory coincides with doctrine taught in every age of the Church. We cite first “The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass” by Rev. Dr. Nicholas Gihl, the eminent liturgiologist, first published in 1877:

“Wheaten bread and wine of the grapes are the two elements which are necessary for the accomplishment of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; hence they are frequently called the matter of the Holy Sacrifice. This mode of speech, however, must not be misunderstood. It does not say that bread and wine belong to the Eucharistic offerings, that is, in the same way that the Body and Blood of Christ in their real sense are offered. As on the Cross, so on the altar Jesus Christ alone is our Victim. The substances of bread and wine appertain to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, inasmuch as they are changed into Christ’s Body and Blood; the species of bread and wine serving to make the offering of the Body and Blood of Christ a visible sacrifice.” (46. The Sacrificial Elements) And earlier:

“Yet the Offertory has not exclusively for its object the mere elements of bread and wine, but also the real object of the sacrifice, the true and only sacrifice of the New Law, that is, the Body and Blood of Christ .... From the liturgical prayers of the Offertory .... we may by no means conclude that the offering of the elements of

bread and wine is a real sacrifice, or constitutes a part of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Only Jesus Christ, present on our altars under both species as symbols of His death, is the perpetual Sacrifice of the Catholic Church, our real and true Sacrifice.” (44)

Gehr enlarges (pp. 129-130): “The distinct consecration of the elements of bread and wine, the separate representation of the Body and Blood of Christ under the two species, that is, the mystical shedding of blood, is, in virtue of the institution by Christ, absolutely necessary, not merely for the lawful, but also for the valid celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. If culpably or inculpably but one substance is consecrated .... the Sacrifice is not accomplished, because an essential characteristic and requisite, namely, the twofold consecration, is wanting. Hence it is of divine ordination, that both elements—bread and wine—must always be consecrated, in order that the Eucharistic Sacrifice may take place. Our Lord instituted the unbloody Sacrifice of the Altar in this manner, because He willed that by its very nature it should be a visible representation of the Sacrifice of the Cross, which was accomplished by a violent shedding of blood unto death.”

This point, “under both species as symbols of His death,” should receive intense consideration from those who maintain that the bread is consecrated in the vernacular *novus ordo* even though the wine is not, as though the rite had changed purpose midway and now offers Christ’s live, unsacrificed Body in place of His Sacrificial Death on the Cross, or as though use of the *novus ordo* were not banned under Canon Law 817: “.... forbidden .... to consecrate either matter without the other, or even both, outside .... Mass.”

“We offer no other Victim on the altar than that which was immolated by Christ on the Cross in His mortal Body, whereby He superabundantly satisfied for our sins. The same Victim, I say, we sacrifice, and sacrifice today, the same, but impassible and glorified .... We have .... Christ invisible and impassible in the Sacrament of the Altar, and Him we offer daily to the Father. For since we have nothing else worthy to give back to God for all the gifts He has given to us, we take the Chalice of salvation, that is, the Passion of Christ, or the work of the Redemption, and that according to the command of Christ, Who said: Do this for a commemoration of Me, we place in the sight of God, that by it He may make us partakers of that unique Victim sacrificed on the Cross.”—Joannes Fabri of Heilbronn, *Missa Evangelica*, Paris 1558.

“This sacrifice is not the image and figure of a sacrifice, it is a real sacrifice, it is not the bread that is offered in sacrifice, it is the very Body of Christ”—Nicholas Cabasilas (14th century liturgist), *Liturgiae Expositio*.

Even before the early Fathers and Doctors, the author of the *Epistola Barnabae*: “God therefore abolished these (Jewish) sacrifices, so that the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ .... should have an offering which is not made by man.”—De la Taille, Thesis XVIII.

“For the Passion of the Lord is the sacrifice which we offer”—St. Cyprian.

“The unique and superexcellent sacrifice of the altar .... is formally and only the very sacrament of the flesh offered in the unique Sacrifice for our salvation.”—Thomas of Walden (+1430), *De Sacramentis*.

“In every one of her daily sacrifices the Catholic Church must offer to the Lord God the lamb of all of us, Christ Jesus, and His Passion and most holy Death. For without these we could not ever please God.”—Blessed John Ruysbroeck (+1381), *Speculum Aeternae Salutis*.

“We know, therefore, from St. Thomas, and also from Albert the Great, that in the sacrifice of the Mass the immolation is mystic only, or representative; that the offering is not representative only, but that it is actual; finally that in this sacramental offering the very Victim of the Passion is offered, as such.”—De la Taille, Thesis XIX.

“The Fathers excluded the offerings or the products of the earth, such as it was a common custom among men to place upon the altar (cf. *Ep. Barnabae*, Justin, Tertullian, etc.). [footnote—Thereby showing clearly that the early Christians did not consider that the natural substances of bread and wine were offered, but the Body and Blood of Christ into which they were really changed.] For our Victim is not an earthly victim, it is not alone a rational and immaculate (spotless) victim, but it is also a celestial Victim, in no way subject to the condition of corporeal things” (as, for instance, time), “but given to the world in a sacrificial state by the divine omnipotence alone.... The Fathers excluded every kind of material rite, such as the real offering of material things, they only retained a rite that was spiritual and intelligible; not perceptible to the senses, perceptible only to the intellect of believers by means of sensible symbols; not consisting in any mere material or mechanical action, but in the intelligible virtue of the words uttered by the Lord and directed to God, words not of one directly declaring the action (Cranmer, Luther, *novus ordo*), but performing it, while symbolically he sheds from the Body of Christ its atoning Blood; by which action there is made in the apparent offering of bread and wine, the real offering of Christ Who suffered for us in the past .... unless the visible sacrifice is a symbol of this invisible sacrifice, it is not acceptable (thus practically all the Fathers, Zeno of Verona particularly). (footnote—The summary of the whole teaching contained under these heads will be found in Cyril of Alexandria, in the 9th and 10th books of the work *Contra Julianum*.)”—De la Taille, Thesis XVIII.

Christ’s own Offertory and Consecration were the same action, which just possibly (or by the terms of your objection necessarily) preceded the words ALL YE TAKE AND EAT OF THIS and ALL YE DRINK OF THIS, the Consecration including the Offertory and intertwined with the Communion. All three were essential, as is clear from AS OFTEN AS YE SHALL DO THESE THINGS (not SAID THESE WORDS, exclusively).

There is absolutely no doubt about what He offered, “MY FLESH FOR THE LIFE OF THE WORLD” (John vi, 52). Since He commanded us to do what He did, we had better not change it or we shall not do it. It is as simple as that, and no quibbling about whether the Consecration has yet taken place can make the slightest difference; the Crucifixion HAS taken place. We are restricted by the limitations proper to humanity and time: Communion follows; Offertory precedes. This is not possibly an excuse for saying that the Church offers only bread and wine to God, as did Melchisedech, instead of Christ’s Body and Blood, as did Christ. If we do not intend to do as Christ did and commanded, then we cannot intend to celebrate Mass. Replacement with a useless “preparation of gifts” denies the traditional oblation.

“The Mass can be divided into three parts: --

(1) **Preparation**—From the beginning to the Offertory.

(2) **The Central Action**—From the offertory till the end of the Priest’s Communion.

(3) **Thanksgiving**—From the Communion till the Last Gospel.

If, through carelessness or bad will, a Catholic comes after Mass has begun, or leaves before the end of Mass, he commits a sin which is venial or mortal according to the amount of the Mass he fails to hear. If he comes after the Offertory or leaves before the priest’s communion, he does not fulfil his obligation, and he is obliged to hear another Mass if he can, or he breaks the First Commandment of the Church, and commits a grave sin.”—The Precepts of the Church, Rumble.

Accordingly, if one confessed tardiness for Sunday Mass his confessor would ask whether he had been late for the Offertory, in order to assess the gravity of the sinful matter. Why this fuss over an Offertory signifying a mere “preparation of the gifts?”

The three principal, essential parts have been degraded in the new mass “theology” to vague areas of a “fourfold pattern: 1. Taking the bread and wine (formerly offertory), 2. consecrating the bread and wine, 3. breaking the host (fraction), 4. The giving of (not the priest’s) Holy Communion.” (Peter J. Elliott, *Our Sacrifice—The Mass*) You seldom find a confessor who can tell you what you are entitled to know: At what point are you too late to fulfil your obligation (if any)?

I read this entire chapter to a retired bishop. His lone objection: “We should love to assist at Mass, not be obliged. You display an erroneous, legalistic attitude.”

And so did God in His First and Third Commandments, and His Church. I won’t say that Protestants love God less than we, although they believe they have less for which to love Him. But all history prior to Vatican II showed far greater percentages of us than of Protestants in church on Sundays. The most obvious difference is the Catholic obligation. This difference is far less obvious in our younger generation, instructed in “Catholic” schools that they should attend out of love, not obligation. The

less demanded, the less volunteered. It is only sense to wish to know our obligations. How else can we fulfil them? We won't like the penalty for failure.

### **“Only A Consecration Is Needed”**

“Though the *novus ordo* lacks the intent to sacrifice, it still has a consecration. Since a consecration is all that is required, we still have a Mass.”

**Reply** : Cranmer kept the words of consecration but negated their purpose by removing the *Action* and changing the offertory. By definition the Mass is the unbloody Sacrifice of the Cross. If it is not a sacrifice it is not a Mass. No Mass, no consecration—see Canon 817.

“Christ willed that the rite in bread and wine which He instituted to be celebrated by us should be a sacrificial offering on our part of His Body and Blood. .... For, as Christ offered His Body and Blood at the Supper by way of sacrifice, hence we—commanded to do as He did—offer His Body and Blood by way of sacrifice. Just as Christ offered in the Eucharist the Victim of the sacrifice by which He redeemed us, so now we offer in the Eucharist the same Victim of the same sacrifice already completed in the Passion. .... Certainly no Catholic may doubt that what we receive from God when we communicate is the same as what we offer to God in our sacrifice.”—De la Taille, Thesis XVII.

“.... the consecration and the offering are not two actions, but one, because the consecration is truly oblation, and the offering consecrative, so much so that, should anyone wish to consecrate, and absolutely refuse to offer sacrifice, he would effect nothing [footnote—Such a mental attitude, as Suarez remarks, might be found in the case of a priest tainted with the Lutheran heresy which says that our Lord is present in the sacrament, while it denies the sacrificial action of the Church], having no intention of doing what the Church does and what was instituted by Christ.”—De la Taille, Thesis XXVI.

“Should he refuse to act according to the intention of the Church, but wish to stop at the sole consecration of the matter, in no way acting sacrificially or offering sacrifice, in that event, thus as he refuses to act sacrificially or to offer sacrifice, so, too, he would not consecrate; for the consecration of this sacrament is essentially the sacrificial action or the offering of sacrifice ....; hence, one who simply does not wish to offer sacrifice is convicted of not wishing to consecrate: hence he effects neither of the two.”—*Salmanticenses, disp 13, dub 2, para 2, n. 28.*

“.... (logically) the sacrament of the Eucharist presupposes the sacrifice and not conversely. For the Body and Blood of Christ is in the sacrament only insofar as it is the Victim of the sacrifice which we are to partake of by way of banquet in Communion. Moreover, the transubstantiation is caused by the rite of consecration, and it is formally in the rite of consecration that our sacrificial action consists. Of itself, therefore, and necessarily in the

case of the Eucharist, the concept of sacrifice comes before the concept of sacrament.”—De la Taille, Thesis XXXIII

“The Eucharist form must be immolative; for the Eucharist is not a sacrament except in so far as it is a sacrifice. But the form is not immolative unless it includes the designation of a propitiatory intention; failing this, we have neither a victim of propitiation nor a victim of thanksgiving, nor any victim whatever; nothing in the nature of a theophyte (God’s Victim) is provided by what we do, there is present no victim offered to God; nothing is directed towards or destined for God, indeed no final terminus of any such destination or direction is manifested; it is, however, manifested if it is indicated that God is to be appeased by what we do, and if there is placed before God the real thing offered, manifested to us after the manner of a gift or victim directed to and destined for God as its final term. For this signification or manifestation is practical or pragmatic, and effective of what is signified by it.

“Against our contention it does not avail to say: any words indicating conversion are sufficient to render the form immolative, for .... nothing besides the transubstantiation is required for the sacrifice, as is clear from our examination of the Mass, where we saw that we offer the sacrifice precisely by effecting the consecration. This argument .... is easily answered as follows: We sacrifice in transubstantiating only because we transubstantiate in sacrificing. .... transubstantiation does not of its own nature constitute sacrifice, but only in the Mass, because of the special manner in which it is accomplished. Most certainly, bread and wine could be changed into the Body and Blood of Christ without any sacrifice; for instance, were the conversion to be made by the divine omnipotence without any intervention of man; or again, were it to be made by a human act of Christ without words, but simply by the power of His will to command. Moreover, why could not Christ transubstantiate by words, even by demonstrative words, without thereby offering sacrifice? We see no reason why He could not do this; indeed, the contrary is plain. .... If, however, in the manner and moment of transubstantiating He showed His Body as destined to be drained of its life blood as a propitiatory offering for sin, then He could transubstantiate sacrificially only. For then in that moment He declared Himself and made Himself God’s Victim. ....

“Nor again does it avail against us to say: even if the rite used by Christ did not in itself indicate a sacrifice, nevertheless it would be quite sufficient for the purpose if Christ subsequent to the rite gave us some indication by which He made known to us the intention which He had had of sacrificing, and thus the Sacrifice would be enacted in the transubstantiation, even in the absence of immolative determination there and then at the time of the transubstantiation. For we answer: to argue so is to lose sight of the most essential point, that sacrifice is in the nature of a sign, and of a sensible sign, which by manifesting itself to the senses indicates some other thing of which it is the sign. Hence if the sign is not evident in itself, it is incompetent, ineffective as a sign.

“In other words, if the external act of giving to God, the sign itself, is not self-evident, how will the internal dedication be made known by that sign? Certainly the mere intention of Christ, or such an intention together with the subsequent intimation of that intention, could not suffice to confer on the sign its aptitude and its meaning; but, of itself, the ‘visible word,’ to use the expression of Augustine, that is, the compound of material things and formal words must manifest itself sufficiently to the minds of those present that by such manifestation it may be able to lead their minds to a knowledge of the other thing of which it is a sign. And so it was necessary for Christ when He was actually sacrificing sacramentally to place within the rite itself the determination of propitiatory intention, and this He did in fact place, not in the matter of the sacrament, but in the form.”—De la Taille, Thesis XXXV.

### **Correspondence, Bishop Thomas Muldoon**

13 Dec 1973 to Muldoon:

St. Thomas wrote: “Some have maintained that the words THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD alone belong to the substance of the form, but not those words which follow. Now this seems incorrect, because the words which follow are determinations of the predicate, that is, of Christ’s blood; consequently they belong to the integrity of the expression. And on this account others may say more accurately that all the words which follow are of the substance of the form, down to the words, AS OFTEN AS YE SHALL DO .... Hence it is that the priest pronounces all the words, under the same rite and manner, namely, holding the chalice in his hands.” (*Summa Theologiae*, III, q. 78, art 3) and “In regard to these words which the Church uses in the Consecration of the Blood, some think that not all of them are necessary for the form, but the words THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD only, not the remainder which follows .... But this does not seem suitable; for all which follows is a determination of the predicate: Hence it all pertains to the meaning or signification of the same statement. And because, as has been often said, it is by signifying that the forms of the sacraments have their effect, the whole belongs to the effective power of the form!” (I Cor. xi, lect 6) and “As Christ’s Passion benefits all .... whereas it produces no effect except in those who are united with Christ’s Passion through faith and charity, so likewise this sacrifice, which is the memorial of our Lord’s Passion, has no effect except in those who are united with this sacrament through faith and charity. .... Hence in the Canon of the Mass no prayer is made for them who are outside the pale of the Church.” (*Summa Theologiae*, III, q. 79, art 7)

The point at issue is not what may or may not be the doctrine of the Church, but what words Christ used to effect the Consecration. If we stray from His words we run the clear hazard of straying from His effect, because the Consecration is effected by the words of Christ. All rites in use—Oriental, schismatic, heretic—in any language (even English in the Church of England)



agree on FOR MANY; none but our *novus ordo* in the vernaculars has ever used FOR ALL MEN.

To say that CHRIST DIED FOR ALL MEN is a dogma of the Church is off the point. It is also defined dogma that He is the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, and that He died on the Cross on Calvary, but neither of these extremely relevant dogmas is mentioned in the consecratory formula.

I accuse St. Luke of not saying a valid Mass because his Gospel does not report FOR MANY? He was writing a record, not saying Mass. Sts. Matthew and Mark both recorded FOR MANY and left out St. Luke's FOR YOU. St. John in his lengthy report on the Last Supper mentions no formula at all; would you suggest that he therefore said Mass without a Consecration?

When I quote *De Defectibus, Cap. V, "Formae"* from our old Missal it is no good to tell me that it has been rescinded. "If anyone removes or changes anything in the form of consecration of the Body and Blood, and by this change of words does not signify the same thing as these words do, he does not confect the sacrament." It does not say "He has no permission to confect." This is a statement of plain fact. Facts are not subject to revision by law-givers.

Suppose I were to grant that it is a changeable law. You cannot remove the law enough to change Christ's words or meaning and then re-apply the "law" to a different formula. It has lost all binding power by permitting the first change. The alternative: remove the law entirely. To nullify it you would have to say in effect: "If anyone removes or changes .... he does confect the sacrament." The priest could then consecrate with such words of Christ as "a hundred barrels of oil" or "a hundred quarters of wheat." Absurd? Of course! *Reductio ad absurdum* is the easiest argument against all these damned innovations.

29 Dec 1973 from Muldoon: As regards the expression FOR ALL MEN .... 1) (REV. DR. MAX ZERWICK, S.J.—*Analysis Philologia Novi Testamenti Graeci*): Matthew xxvi, 28: "POLLOI—Semitism. *Potest significare multitudinem simul cum totalitate. I.E. Omnes qui multi sunt.* Cf. Matthew xx, 28; Mark xiv, 24: Polloi—Sem. *Non necessario opponitur 'omnibus', sed potest significare 'Omnes qui multi sunt.'*" (MANY is not necessarily opposed to ALL, but can signify ALL WHO ARE MANY.)

[Maximilian Zerwick was ....—early sixties—removed from the Biblical Institute under suspicion of heresy. Now, of course, like Bugnini, he has been "rehabilitated" or "reconstructed," and writes "learned articles" on *pro multis*.--Omlor]

2) "Both the blood shed 'for many' of Mark xiv, 24 and the further clarification 'unto the forgiveness of sins' of Matthew xxvi, 28 are allusions to Jesus as the fulfilment of the ISAIAN 'SERVANT OF THE LORD' whose vicarious sufferings 'justify' and 'take away the sins of many,' that is, in Semitic idiom, 'AN UNLIMITED NUMBER, ALL' (Isaias liii, 3-6 &

11, 12)”. Thus, and rightly, C. Bernas, Art. Eucharist (Biblical Data), in New Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. 5.

[Douai Version, Isaias liii, 6: “the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.” Verse 11: “By his knowledge shall this my just servant justify many ....” All? 12. “Therefore will I distribute to him very many ....” Obviously, this is more than all.]

7 Jan 1974 to Muldoon: A Semitic construction of *multi* seems inapplicable to St. Mark, who wrote his Gospel in Greek. Such a construction could not be forced here without the same connotation of all being applied in every case in the entire Bible where *multi* is used. Aramaic contains (many) ways in which Christ could unmistakably have said FOR ALL MEN. But His Church, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, has only just discovered that this is what He meant by other words?

St. Thomas’ construction of FOR MANY as opposed to FOR ALL MEN, while, if you say so (and he did say so), not his best work, was accepted and approved by the Council of Trent, and officially and authoritatively expounded by Pope Benedict XIV in *De Sacrosancto Missae Sacrificio*, Book II, Chapter XV, paragraph 11. Benedict also mentions and discounts your objection that “many, after a manner of speaking in the Holy Scriptures, may signify all” in this case. At any rate ALL MEN includes all before and since Calvary, including those in Hell. Or is it a doctrine of the Church that they have or will have ceased to be men? (This refers to the *Res Sacramenti*, the Mystical Body, which can hardly include the lost.)

### Vatican II’s “Commands”

CONST. SACRED LITURGY: “21. .... Holy Mother Church desires to undertake .... a general restoration of the liturgy itself.” (Restoration? To what? What essentials have our Mass and sacraments lacked? Who will “restore” them? Nay, who will discover them? How? Why?) “For the liturgy is made up of unchangeable elements divinely instituted” (Offertory, Consecration, Communion?), “and elements subject to change.” [Who says these unspecified elements either lack divine institution or are subject to change? St. Pius V says the Mass has already (1570) been restored to “the original rite and form of the Holy Fathers,” and forbids further change.] “The latter” (elements subject to change) “not only may but ought to be changed with the passing of time if features have by chance crept in” (during the last seven guaranteed unchanged centuries?) “which are less harmonious(?) with the intimate nature of the liturgy, or if existing elements have grown” (in seven unchanged centuries) “less functional.” (Have the nails rusted out of the Sign of the Cross? Has the priestly knee ankylosed? “If” raised settled questions for modernists to resettle.) “In this restoration(?), both texts and rites should be drawn up so that they express more clearly the things which they signify.” (Supposing the need for clarification, the only safe method is explanatory extension—not removal or replacement.)

“50. The rite of Mass is to be revised .... the rites are to be simplified .... Elements which, with the passage of time” (all more than seven centuries ago), “came to be duplicated, or were added with but little advantage, are now to be discarded. Where opportunity allows or necessity demands, other elements which have suffered injury through accidents of history (and negligence of the Holy Ghost) are now to be restored to the earlier norm of the Holy Fathers.” (That lying St. Pius V!)

What have accidents of history to do with our Apostolic Mass? This incredible document is what Paul VI “obeyed” in foisting upon us a new rite.

## A Valid Novus Ordo? Impossible!

Among my reasons for condemning the *novus ordo* under all conditions:

- 1) It is new. No authority whatsoever can force or persuade me to accept anything new, especially to the exclusion of the traditional, in religion. Else Christ left an incomplete religion subject to human improvements. This new rite is centuries late to claim connection with Christ and His Apostles. The burden of proof lies always on the innovator, and this innovation is utterly impossible to certify or justify.
- 2) The *novus ordo's* reason, accommodation to modern man, is completely untenable. All ages of man must accommodate to the Church, especially in its prime purpose, worship of God.
- 3) The new rite lacks legal basis. It was imposed in violation of Church law, supposedly in obedience to a pastoral council which wrongfully appropriated to itself power to order revision of current rites, and nowhere ordered a new rite.
- 4) *Quo Primum*, the specific law the new rite violates, was promulgated when necessary to preserve the Mass from the first serious threat in centuries, the Reformation, by a pope invoking his Apostolic authority on a matter of faith and morals to the entire Church. It is therefore an infallible pronouncement made to add the support of specific ecclesiastical law to divine law being violated. It was proclaimed with just such abuses as this new rite in view. Divine law cannot be removed or over-ruled, whether or not supported by other law.
- 5) Enough time has elapsed for application of Christ's own test: "By their fruits ...."

The essential form of consecration cannot produce its proper effect in a rite which declares incompatible intention. The *novus ordo* clearly states what it offers, the work of human hands, the produce of the earth, even the people themselves, ALL of them. Its "consecration" is a narrative, not an *action* accompanied by blessing and prayer as required by all proper rites to do what Christ did, not merely quote Him. This change is obvious even in the punctuation. Both points were cited in the Ottaviani Intervention, which Paul VI had the temerity to ignore.

What is essential in addition to make the essential form operative has never, supposedly, been defined because the subject has never surfaced. Priests have adhered to their Missals. But *De Defectibus* (III 5, 6, 7; IV 3, 4; X 3, 13) implies additional essentials through prescription of where the priest must start over in certain types of defects. Canon Law (817) forbids even these essentials outside of Mass. Canon Law, therefore, does not consider the Consecration sufficient by itself. Unlike the innovators, Canon Law would not forbid proper worship.

"To consecrate outside the Mass would not only be a sacrilege, but probably also an attempt at invalid consecration. The priest would certainly not perform that action in the person of Christ,

nor according to the intention of the Church, which is restricted to the celebration of the Mass.”—C. Augustine, OSB, DD, “A Commentary on Canon Law” (1921)

Beyond the intention clearly expressed in the new rite is the clearly implied intention that it replace the true Mass, even if only occasionally, breeding doubt and suspicion, to say the least, even without the insuperable obstacles to validity in the new rite’s origin (not merely human but heretical) and definition: “The Lord’s Supper or the Mass, is the sacred assembly or gathering together of the people of God, with a priest presiding, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord.” This definition, though correct on the authority of its authors, was changed to ambiguity to stop the general outcry, but not a word of the rite it defined was changed.

We obtain further development of the definition from a “Precis of a Circular-Letter from the sacred Congregation for Divine Worship on Eucharistic Prayers” dated 27 April 1973 and distributed to Sydney’s Clergy Conferences 27 June, in which “the following points are offered for the information of the clergy .... 7. The Eucharistic Prayer is the culmination of the entire celebration of the Eucharistic Liturgy” (Mass?). “It is recited” (prayed?) “by the ministerial priest, who interprets the word of God for the people, and places before God the voice of the people offering themselves to Him .... 8. The primary purpose of the Eucharistic Liturgy is to give thanks and praise to God for the mystery of salvation in general; and for the special aspect of that mystery celebrated on a particular day, feast, season, or ritual .... 11. The aspect of petition and intercession in the structure of the new liturgy is secondary; ....” These novelties continued for twenty prolix paragraphs, none of which refer in any way to the essential aspect of propitiation. Whatever the Eucharistic Liturgy may be, it is not a Mass. The Mass is the unbloody Sacrifice of the Cross, the primary purpose of which was propitiation, atonement, redemption. Here is not mere divorce of idea but annulment of intent.

But, it is objected, all required for validity is form, matter, and intention. Matter is there, form is there (it complies with forms that have been held valid, even if no longer legal), and intention can be and unquestionably sometimes is there.

No matter how holy the priest, how strong and orthodox his intention, he cannot overcome the contrary expression of intent in the rite—by definition not a propitiatory sacrifice. No sacrifice, no Mass. No Mass, no Consecration, no Transubstantiation, no Communion—only consumption of bread and wine, exactly what was offered in the Preparation of the Gifts. We know what the Church intends in a Mass. But this *novus ordo* suppresses—therefore denies—the Church’s intention in a ceremony without offertory, consecration, or communion, the three essential parts of a Mass.

Nor has the *novus ordo*; a consecratory form applied to matter, for the *action* comes under one or both of these essentials. It has instead a “narrative of institution” just as the Book of Common Prayer or Lutheran service, without prayer, without blessing,

without any of the actions of Jesus Christ, Who followed all these, not a mere narrative, with: “As often as ye shall DO these things ....” If words alone constitute the form, spoken by a priest at Mass in the presence of the matter, would some one care to maintain that a consecration takes place at the Epistle on Holy Thursday, *Corpus Christi*, and in votive Masses of the Blessed Sacrament, or during the Gospel on Palm Sunday and the following Tuesday and Wednesday? If this type of form, matter, and intention constitute a valid Mass, then a properly ordained priest could use the Lutheran service or the Book of Common Prayer to celebrate a valid Mass. This would, of course, demonstrate faulty intention to act for the Church, as well as constitute apostasy. So no Catholic could assist.

The First Commandment thundered from Mt. Sinai established the necessary base for all the rest, God’s supereminence and entitlement to proper worship, and forbade idolatry. First Commandment = primary purpose of religion = divine worship. God established the feasts and prescribed the rites of the Old Law. He decreed the size, shape, and content of the Ark of the Covenant. He set limits on the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies, and punished King Ozias with instant leprosy for transgression. He showed amply that divine worship is of divine, not human prescription, and the proper province of divine law.

So meticulous in the types and foreshadows, God turned sloppy with the substance. Jesus Christ, we are supposed to believe, when He came to fulfil the Law and the Prophets, left us to our own devices in our divinely revealed religion’s chief purpose—divine worship and sacraments, the rites of religion. Modernists, following the Reformers, deny Christ’s necessary involvement in such trifles; Holy Scripture fails to mention it. Gospels were written, not to document customs and rites with which their first readers were familiar before they were written, nor to record every word or action of Christ, but to prove that Jesus Christ fulfilled the prophecies and is God. But the omnipotent, omniscient, eternal God left great holes in His Revelation for modernists to fill. We may only surmise the fate of nineteen centuries of not quite instructed Catholics.

“Insofar as sacrifice has a symbolical meaning and is a constituent part of public worship, it must positively be instituted by a legitimate authority. The sacrificial service of the Old Law was regulated and ordained by God Himself in its most minute details; in the New Law the essential elements and features of worship proceed directly from Jesus Christ—hence, first of them all, sacrifice, which constitutes the fundamental and central act of divine service. Neither to the Synagogue nor to the Church did God impart the right or the power to institute sacrifices: in His infinite mercy He Himself condescended to prescribe the sacrifices by which He would be honored and propitiated. No mere man, but our Divine Savior alone could institute so excellent a Sacrifice as we possess in the Holy Mass.”—N. Gühr, “The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass” p. 30

The modernists have now plugged the greatest gap of all: they have instituted a “mass” to suit everyone in his own belief. This outdoes the Gift of Tongues! Then they instituted another six sacraments to replace those instituted, *de fide* and by definition, by Jesus Christ. You can’t build a house with a single card; you need reinforcement—you can do *this* because you can do *that*.

But divine law, which governs divine worship, cannot be abrogated even by orthodox and legitimate popes, whether or not they would weasel out by “derogating” unspecified laws “to the extent necessary” and then pretend to have abrogated the first ecclesiastical law necessary to support divine law in protecting the primary purpose of religion, proper worship of God.

When Paul VI and his modernist supporters maintain that he has only done what St. Pius V did—introduce a new rite of Mass in obedience to a council—they only irk the traditional Catholic and the historian, who know as well as they that they lie on both counts. Neither Trent nor Vatican II ever ordered a new rite of Mass, nor did St. Pius V introduce one. *Quo Primum* and *Missale Romanum* both state that they restore the traditions of the Holy Fathers. We are faced with two entirely different, mutually exclusive traditions from the same Holy Fathers. Who lies? The canonized saint so zealous for the Faith, who was reputed never to have sinned seriously? Or the man who thinks so little of pure worship that he permits Catholics to bind themselves under oath to a false religion, Freemasonry, which engages in blasphemous, non-Christian worship on every level, and adores Lucifer in its highest degrees?

Can papal authority validate a new rite of human, heretical origin, impossibly a Mass by definition? No pope can transform condemned heresy into orthodoxy by his approval. Even should Paul VI enjoy such impossible authority, where is his credibility? GONE, with his approval of heresy—in his promulgation of Vatican II’s documented heresies—in his imposition of Arian prayer in Eucharistic Prayer IV’s Preface. Of what use is “authority” that cannot be believed under oath?

Many priests tell us (mail, phone, in person) that they say the *novus ordo* “mass” because they have been ordered to do so, and the Church can’t be wrong. But they would not use the second or fourth (many include the third) Eucharistic Prayer on a bet. They are Protestant, Arian, Lutheran, or otherwise heretical.

But, Father, they are imposed by the self-same “can’t be wrong” authority that gave you the first Eucharistic Prayer, and indeed the whole *novus ordo* “mass.” Why accept part and reject part of their innovation? Is this not the very definition of heresy: selectivity, private judgment? Have not the same heretics the same heretical intent throughout? If they are so broad-minded as to leave you a Catholic option why have they “outlawed” the Tridentine Mass?

Priests have said: The Consecration is effected by the words of Christ. Changing His words to FOR ALL MEN removes validity

or possibility of Consecration. So I use FOR MANY, thus making my *novus ordo* valid in its Consecration.

Realizing, Father, that FOR ALL MEN invalidates and prevents consecration, you must also realize that some one has prescribed this impossible sacramental form for your use. Yet you appear to insist that this same authority has placed this invalid formula in an otherwise satisfactory and valid rite. Whether this authority has acted through ignorance or malice, it has proved itself completely unreliable in the essential heart of the Mass. Why are you so determined to trust it in every other particular?

Faith apprehends God's revealed truth—all of it—on God's authority. If He has revealed the Catholic religion and founded the Catholic Church we must accept it in its entirety. If the postconciliar "Church" is God's, and imposes His truth and orders, logically we must accept it whole and entire (whenever—hopefully—it arrives at such a recognizable state). We may not pick and choose among its doctrines and practices any more than we could in our traditional Catholic Church. Like the Catholic Church, it must be accepted or rejected in its entirety.

#### **Behind The Novus Ordo—Emil Ludvik (paraphrase)**

Mindful of Luther's dictum (to destroy the Church you must destroy the Mass) they tried not so much to change the Mass but rather to replace the Mass with the entirely new ecumenical liturgy, the New *Ordo*. Thanks to a semantic trick, they've succeeded. By calling the new liturgy also a "mass" (though not "holy") they conveyed the impression that 1) the New *Ordo* was only an amended, "updated" Mass, not a total replacement of the real Mass by something wholly new and different, and 2) the only question is whether this New *Ordo* might be a valid or an invalid, a licit or an illicit Mass. This question is completely illogical and irrelevant.

If a man stole your horse, leaving you an ass wearing a sign declaring: "This is your new horse," would you ask whether the replacement was a valid or licit horse? Though there is some resemblance, a horse is a horse, and an ass is an ass, and so are you if you believe the sign.

There is some inevitable resemblance also between the Catholic Holy Mass and the ecumenical New *Ordo* because 1) the services of virtually all Christian denominations have certain common features; thus some parts of the New *Ordo* which may still look "Catholic" to us are actually just generally Christian, and 2) a really ecumenical liturgy must include characteristics of services of each participating Church (naturally only those doctrinally inoffensive to the others), thus the New *Ordo* contains Catholic (and Anglican, Lutheran, etc.) features. In each of the four Eucharistic Prayers of the New *Ordo* the characteristics of one particular denomination are somewhat more pronounced than in the others; the first ("Roman Canon") is relatively the most "Catholic."



All the similarities between ass and horse, or New *Ordo* and Catholic Mass, cannot make an ass a horse or the New *Ordo* a Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. It is not the label that matters, but the concept, the idea, the definition. Consequently the only question logically asked on the validity of the New *Ordo* is: “Is it a valid ecumenical celebration of the Lord’s Supper?” WHO CARES? Not even Canon Law, which provides no norms for non-Catholic services.

Enemies of Catholicism rejoice to see the meaningless “validity” argument go on dividing traditionalists and diverting attention from the question of validity of the new priestly ordination which threatens destruction of the entire sacramental system within one generation—no Penance, no Extreme Unction, no Holy Eucharist, no Mass, no visible Catholic Church. Traditionalists must stop wasting time, energy, and paper worrying the hypothetical validity of the “new mass.” Fundamental logic and an old catechism (for definitions) can release them from the semantic trap and convince them that the question of validity, as far as Catholics are concerned, simply does not apply to the New *Ordo*, because it is not (and was not intended to be) a Catholic Mass, period. Then, our major bone of contention buried, we can take up the hatchet and get on with the war.

#### **Section Four**

#### **Lead us to the Battle**

#### **Australian Episcopal Conference—Confirmation**

I delivered two petitions and a covering letter addressed to the Doctrine & Morals Committee to Bishop Muldoon’s residence Friday 18 Jan 1974. He confirmed by phone Wednesday 23 Jan that both submissions had been distributed to all bishops at the Conference—under the auspices of the Liturgy Committee. Discipline?

#### **An Objection to the new form of .... Confirmation:**

The form of Confirmation in the Latin Church for centuries has been: *Signo te Signo Crucis et Confirmo te Chrismate Salutis: in Nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*. The form currently in use here is: BE SEALED WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT, THE GIFT OF THE FATHER.

This change was guided by the Congregation for Divine Worship because:

- 1) Vatican II has ordered or recommended a change.
- 2) The Greek form is closer to the real meaning, and is preferable.

What has Vatican II ordered? Const. Sacred Liturgy, 62: “With the passage of time .... there have crept into the rites of the sacraments .... certain features which have rendered their nature and purpose less clear to the people of today; .... the need arises to adjust certain aspects of these rites to the requirements of our times.” Taken in conjunction with the words of Paul VI the day after the tenth anniversary of his election .... that the many reforms already

accomplished in the liturgy are only an introduction, this would seem to indicate that we shall have another rite every ten or twenty years to keep pace with the evolution of modern man. CSL specifies (71) “The RITE of Confirmation is to be revised and the intimate connection which this sacrament has with the whole of Christian initiation is to be more lucidly set forth; .... for this reason it will be fitting for candidates to renew their Baptismal promises just before they are confirmed.”

Please note the use of the word RITE, which indicates the whole procedure. Vatican II did not order or recommend revision of the FORM. Such revision carries the clear hazard of removal of validity. The Roman Catechism says: “In our sacraments .... the form is so definite that any, even a casual, deviation from it renders the sacrament null. Hence the form is expressed in the clearest terms, such as exclude the possibility of doubt.”

Is the Greek form preferable? Who can decide between undoubtedly valid forms? The question is made irrelevant by another question: Why was the Greek form, THE STAMP (or SEAL) OF THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, not used?

What consideration can possibly have been served by its rephrasing? “It must be shown that the Holy Spirit is the Gift?” Is this a new doctrine that it should require a new form? Why such a form as this, which is bound—if not, indeed, deliberately designed—to stir up controversy?

Innovations must prove themselves. They are not to be imposed upon reluctant people even if they are possibly correct. The new form can (and *ergo* will) be interpreted as Arian through its pointed slighting of the Son, and as an invitation to another schism over *Filioque*. “The rejection of the *Filioque*, or of the dogma of the double procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, and the denial of the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff constitute .... the principal errors of the Greek Church. The doctrine of the *Filioque* was declared to be a dogma of faith in the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), the Second Council of Lyons (1274), and the Council of Florence (1438-1445).”—Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol V, p. 73.

Defined doctrine should not be deviated from in any subsequent usage, particularly in a time when changes are put forth generally in the guise of improvements and corrections. This form appears deliberately to contradict defined doctrine. A Church which has had so much trouble on this account should at least hesitate before gratuitously presenting itself an opportunity for re-entering such troubles. Or was this done in a spirit of ecumenism, whereby we modify or dilute the doctrines which belong not to us but to God Who has revealed them to us, in order to be charitable to those who have rejected these same doctrines and the Authority behind them?

.... true .... He is the Gift of the Father, but this is dogmatically defined as less than the whole truth. A half- or third- truth is a lie. The Holy Ghost is not less the Gift of the Son or of Himself. (Here I quoted John xv, 26 and xvi, 7; Luke xxiv, 49; Acts ii, 33)

Aside from eternal generation and procession, what is true of the Father *and* of the Son is also true of the Holy Ghost. But this cannot justify contradiction on grounds that it is only apparent contradiction in the form of a sacrament.

The change in FORM of the Sacrament of Confirmation is shown: 1) Unnecessary, 2) Not ordered or recommended by Vatican II, 3) Of a type historically productive of schism and heresy, 4) Possibly invalid. The Holy Ghost will not necessarily be conferred by such a form.

[I have since (1977) noted that the Arian phraseology has been dropped from the Australian form of Confirmation. But nowhere have I heard that all those swindled people “confirmed” while it obtained have been recalled to have it done right.]

1971 Acts of the Apostolic See, pp. 662-663: “In the East during the fourth and fifth centuries, in the rite of Confirmation, there appear the first signs of the words THE SEAL OF THE GIFT OF THE HOLY GHOST. These words were speedily accepted by the Church in Constantinople, and even now are used by the Churches of the Byzantine Rite .... We indeed value with deserved esteem the dignity of the venerable form used in the Latin Church; but rather than it we judge as preferable the most ancient form proper to the Byzantine Rite, by which is expressed the Gift of the Holy Ghost Himself, and the pouring out of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost is recalled. This form therefore, translating it almost(!) word for word, we accept. Hence, so that the revision of the rite of Confirmation may fittingly pertain to the very essence of the sacramental rite also, We by Our Supreme Apostolic Authority decide that in the Latin Church for the future the following be observed, namely: THE SACRAMENT OF CONFIRMATION IS CONFERRED BY THE ANOINTING WITH CHRISM ON THE FOREHEAD, WHICH IS DONE BY IMPOSITION OF THE HAND, AND BY THESE WORDS: ‘RECEIVE THE SEAL OF THE GIFT OF THE HOLY GHOST.’” From the first day of the month of January 1973 the new ceremony alone is to be used by all persons concerned .... Rome .... 15 August 1971 .... Paul VI.”

Note II on the official translation:

“The formula *Accipe Signaculum Doni Spiritus Sancti* can be literally translated: ‘Receive the seal of the Gift of the Holy Spirit.’” A wealth of scriptural allusions underlie the formula. ‘SEAL’ is an echo of Eph. i, 13; ‘GIFT’ is a reference to Acts ii, 30. DONI is capitalized in Latin, clearly indicating that the Gift is the Holy Spirit Himself. The Holy Spirit is the divine person promised by the Father (Luke xxiv, 49; Acts i, 4), and is sent by the Father (Acts ii, 33; John xiv, 26; xv, 26). .... In translation it is desirable to include as much of this scriptural resonance as can be carried in a simple formula. It should suggest (a) the personal nature of the Gift; (b) the origin of the Gift in the Father; (c) the relationship of sonship that is implied in the character of Confirmation. (Baptism—a necessity before reception of all other sacraments—makes us children of God and heirs of heaven. Here is implied that

the one confirmed—made a soldier of Christ—has been baptized. These innovators are deep indeed.) The following translation suggests these concepts: ‘Be sealed with the Holy Spirit, the Gift of the Father.’ A large number of alternatives to this translation were considered. (The field is obviously limitless.) .... The Latin double genitive, *Doni Spiritus Sancti* is misleading if rendered literally. (Nor is it clear in Latin. GIFT and HOLY SPIRIT could be treated as appositives: SEAL OF THE GIFT, THE HOLY SPIRIT.) The fact that those confirmed are sealed by the Holy Spirit, who is the Gift, is more easily understood in the translation chosen.

“The Son is not mentioned, but his active mission of the Holy Spirit is implicit in the whole rite. The theological question of the *Filioque* is not at issue” (NO? Where would it be more at issue? Why was this old Arian heresy expressed and imposed when *Notitiae* says that any formula may be used in the vernacular because it is the Latin that counts? Here the ordinary credibility gap is doubled. One thing is sure: THIS revolution will never dare enthrone a “goddess of reason.”) “: the sacramental form expresses the external mission of the Holy Spirit (in which the exalted Son plays an essential role), and is not concerned primarily with the external processions of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son.

“The suitability of the expression ‘Gift of the Father’ can be seen from the Confirmation rite itself. Before anointing the candidates, the bishop invites the congregation to ask God the Father to pour out the Spirit (no. 25). Similarly, the invitation to the general intercession which follows the anointing refers to the Spirit as coming from the Father (no. 30).”

Nothing supports your error like prayers of your own choosing or composition. We must be right here, they say, because we agree with ourselves there. Brandishing unproven shibboleths (desirability, suitability) these translators show new and more authentic insight into the theology of sacramental forms than the Byzantine Rite from the fourth century till now. “Father is nice; toss it in!”—no matter what tradition prescribed or omitted. Such light treatment, such falsification of essential sacramental form, such irreverence for a sacred thing, fits the very definition of sacrilege. Who guarantees validity to a form which reintroduces heresy? There can be no such authority.

#### **Australian Episcopal Conference—Mass**

Milord: The Catholic Church is hardly recognizable these days. According to Paul VI it is actively engaged in autodemolition. The situation is so bad that laymen are driven to write petitions like this to their bishops .... we have tried for some years to secure the return of our Latin Tridentine Mass .... and have been ignored and frustrated at every turn .... you will certainly hurt no one .... by reintroducing the Tridentine Mass to the churches that were built for it. .... I raise none of these issues for the sake of argument; I believe in each of them without qualification. Holding them true I

have no hesitation in advancing them. To say less would strain my conscience. The Catholic Church, above all, can stand the truth.

Many think all innovations carry recommendation or order of Vatican II. They are therefore to be carried out, because all those bishops and the pope can't be wrong. The introduction of a new rite for celebration of Mass must be correct because it is approved. Anyone who disapproves must be wrong, because such a large part of the Church could not thereby be deprived of its Mass.

St. Paul (II Thess. ii, 3) refers to the "apostasy." Characteristic of the apostasy (*ibidem* 10-12) will be a "misleading influence that they may believe falsehood." An apostasy worthy of prophecy should be rather extensive—probably an overwhelming majority—and should apply, of course, to those who have the Faith. Atheists, Jews, Moslems, etc. simply lack the Catholicity necessary to apostatize. Nor is it likely that a large scale apostasy can take place without the leadership, or its lack, of large segments of the clergy and hierarchy. While this prophecy may not apply to the present circumstances of the Church, highly suspicious though they appear, the possibility may not be discounted .... If anything *will* go wrong, it *can*. ....

All innovations are imposed upon us with the supposed authority of Vatican II. Therefore Vatican II's reasons, intentions, and authority become relevant. Many of its documents appear to be little more than rhetoric. Others concern themselves with the service of modern man to the virtual exclusion of the service of God. Some, such as the Decree on Ecumenism, reverse the doctrine and discipline of the Church (*viz.* Art 8, *Communicatio in Sacris*). The same decree says (Art 6): "If the influence of events or of the times has led to deficiencies in conduct, in Church discipline, or even in the formulation of doctrine, these should be appropriately rectified at the proper moment." .... Where was the Holy Ghost during these deficiencies? .... Surely if the Church has erred previously it can err again, especially when it cuts loose from tradition to embark on the uncharted seas of innovation. Pardon my jaundiced view of Vatican II's authority as it weeps: "We beg pardon ...." (Art. 7) "of our separated brethren," as though the Church were responsible that some rejected the truth. "Catholics need to acquire" (Art. 9) "a more adequate understanding of the distinctive doctrines of our separated brethren," as though these errors by definition could help anyone not actively engaged in refuting them. "Of great value .... are meetings between the two sides, especially for discussion of theological problems, where each can deal with the other on an equal footing." This has led to "agreements" with the Church of England on such matters as the (Holy) Eucharist and the definition of a priest. Can error speak on equal terms with truth? "From dialogue of this sort will emerge still (!) more clearly what the true posture of the Catholic Church is." Let us hope so; whether prone or supine is not presently clear.

While we apologize to all the world for ever thinking it in error we abandon all who ever suffered or died rather than accept the errors of the world, and remove the reason for such stupid attitudes in our own enlightened day.

Vatican II crowned its achievements with that reversal of Pope Pius IX, the Declaration on Religious Freedom, wherein ....: “all men are to be free from coercion on the part of individuals or of social groups, and of any human power, in such wise that in matters religious no one is to be forced to act .... contrary to his own conscience. Nor is anyone to be restrained from acting in accordance with his own conscience, whether privately or publicly, whether alone or in association with others, within due limits” (such as brandishing a poisonous snake in a public square). While I believe in no such absolute right, those who stand on the authority of Vatican II are stuck with it. I call the Council as a hostile witness in support of our own rights in conscience to the Tridentine Mass. The Council says that we are so entitled even if—especially if—we are wrong!

(Here I quoted the Const. Sac. Lit., Art. 4—see The Age Of The Laity, Sec. 2—and Art. 62—see Confirmation, this Section.) One cannot determine whether the Council rates modern man too stupid to perceive what was clear to, or too intelligent to be fooled like, his forefathers. In either case some change or evolution is predicated, and will this stop? In view of the official teaching of the Church (Roman Catechism), “In our sacraments ....” (see Confirmation), we consider such innovations prime examples of foolhardiness, deliberate and unnecessary risks of the spiritual life of the Church and all its members. We apply this *a fortiori* to the introduction (in violation of Vatican II’s prescriptions in Articles 4, 19, 21, 23, 24, 36, 37, 54, 112, 113, 114, 116, & 121 of the Const. on the Sacred Liturgy) of the new rite for mass, which I consider invalid, therefore idolatrous. Not all LMSA members agree; many think it valid, therefore sacrilegious. Some simply cannot stand all the abuses to which it is subject. Others think its validity depends on the intentions of the celebrant or president, and refuse to participate in a guessing game in a matter of such supreme importance. Still others are so angered or disgusted that they can derive no benefit whether or not it is valid.

Reaction of Bishop Helmsing, Kansas City, to a request for the traditional Mass: “It is true that by my authority as a bishop I can dispense from the general law of the Church and I could permit the use of the Tridentine Mass in individual cases. However, in view of the fact of the abusive literature passed around among some of our people condemning the new mass as heretical” (Is THAT all?), “and leading even some of them to cease going to mass” (the new one, obviously), “I would be gravely derelict in my duty if I granted such a dispensation.” This man, responsible before God for the spiritual welfare of all Catholics in his diocese, refuses the true Mass to people with the gravest conscientious objection to its inadequate substitute simply because they have this objection. He had to combat division? Only the sheerest hypocrisy and absurdity lay the charge of division against the traditional standard of unity.

The new mass differs in several ways from the true Mass. The ideas of petition and propitiation are lost in the effusive emphasis on “thanks and praise” to the extent that in Eucharistic Prayer II

even the word SACRIFICE is removed. Supposedly the Anaphora of Hippolytus, though only slightly resembling its quotation in Amiot's "History of the Mass," E.P. II (suitably corrected) might possibly be used by ancient Catholics who were unchallenged in their beliefs; but its present use allows anyone to subscribe to its loose phrases while placing thereon what construction he wishes. This can lead (indeed, has led) to concelebrations with non-Catholic clergy (laity to us) at which either communicating Catholics receive only bread or non-Catholics receive that which they don't believe and for which they are not prepared.

In the new "offertory" we have this bread (this wine) to offer. It will become (will it, now?) the bread of life (our spiritual drink), whatever that means. This is not even equal to burning an ox! We then ask to be received, seemingly as the sacrifice, or part of it, along with this bread and wine to be transmuted into Christ's Body and Blood much in the manner of the changing of water into wine at Cana. Such an exchange, an ordinary miracle, could be effected, though it is not, by the power of God; but there would exist no connection with Calvary, no victim, no sacrifice, and no need of a priest.

The Tridentine offertory never mentions bread and/or wine as offerings.

"Receive, Holy Father, Almighty Eternal God, this spotless Victim ...."

"We offer Thee, Lord, the chalice of salvation ...."

We here anticipate the sacrifice, the true and only sacrifice of the New Law, and spell out its meaning. Nicholas Gihl says, in "The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass": "Wheaten bread ... visible sacrifice." (see NOVUS ORDO CORRECTS TRADITION, Section Three) In the Ottaviani Intervention: "Whatever the nature of the sacrifice it is essential that it should be pleasing and acceptable to God, and accepted by Him. In the state of original sin no sacrifice could have any claim to be acceptable. The only sacrifice which has the right to be accepted is that of Christ. In the *novus ordo* the offering is distorted into a sort of exchange of gifts between man and God; man brings bread and God changes it into the 'bread of life'; man brings wine and God changes it into a 'spiritual drink.'"

It may be argued that an offertory is unnecessary. But when used it determines the intent of the ceremony.

The Intervention underlines (1) the lack of sufficient reason for a new rite (the modernity of man, which applies equally to every age), (2) the definition of the new mass again and again as a supper, a memorial of the Last Supper, never connected with Calvary, and (3) the removal of the clear intent of the consecration itself—this, mind you, in the Latin! In English we have the further invalidating mistranslation of the words of Christ Himself (*pro multis* = for all men) upon which we must rely for the effect, transubstantiation. Change of the form's meaning creates change (loss) of effect. The introduction itself of such changes had a predictably divisive effect,

and must be considered not less than criminal in intent, even if the changes could have been otherwise valid.

The arbitrary imposition of the new mass was accomplished with every earmark of fraud, even to obscuring the fact, apparently to avoid reaction, that certain local ordinaries considered the Tridentine Mass not permissible. When presented reasoned proof that their interpretation of the relevant documents was not universally held by canonists, theologians, or ordinaries, these ordinaries refused further discussion of the matter. Or they heard us to give the impression of weighing the matter before again refusing us our Mass for insufficient, not to say absurd reasons.

Cardinal Heenan excused the insidious, gradual introduction of liturgical changes by admitting that if they had all been brought in together nobody would have accepted them. But the result is identical; what makes him think we accept them now? And there are yet more changes in the offing.

The April, 1973 Newsletter of the U.S. Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy reports that "even now" there is still no official or properly approved English altar missal, nor is there likely to be one until some time in 1974. "Only after formal approval by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and

confirmation by the Holy See will the production of several editions of the official sacramentary/ or altar missal/ be undertaken." If what we have lacks official status how can it be forced upon us? If it fills all requirements why will it be replaced? If it does not, why is it used? "Until the definitive ICEL version is approved and published in 1974 ...." Whose version are we using? Whatever it is, we infer that it is defective in some way. But it is forced upon us to the exclusion of our true Mass.

Those attempting to prevent the true Mass evince (1) supererogative ferocity in proscribing this Mass in suspicious contrast with past toleration shown all varieties and abuses of the new mass, and (2) open hypocrisy in their appeal to democracy ("Most people wouldn't like the Latin back.") against the true Mass after the authoritarian imposition of the new mass. They accustom the faithful gradually with little realization to an easier quasi-Protestant Church, then make the excuse that they will lose their people if they return to true worship, discipline, or doctrine. Wait till they see the loss when the ordinary Catholic discovers the extent of the imposture.

The proposition that the Tridentine Mass can be outlawed is an absurdity. To help decide whether it has been outlawed see "The Jurisdiction of the Bull *Quo Primum*," attached. Published two years ago, it remains unchallenged.

When the original vernacular translations were introduced nearly everyone condemned their incompetence. "My kid could do better!" But the work had been done by experts, who also could have done far better. But that would not have left the excuse for "improvements" to the point where these culminated in a brand new rite. Each change eliminated something of value or diluted—or



improperly emphasized some facet of—our doctrine. The pattern is too consistent to lack a deliberate purpose, the suppression of the never questioned nor questionable Tridentine Mass. The mindless obstinacy and outright hatred we have encountered in our (till recently) mild, inoffensive efforts to secure the return of our Mass have confirmed us in the opinion that only Satan could so hate the Mass. Only he could inspire the horrifying abuses to which the new mass so readily lends itself. And his acknowledged purpose is the destruction of the Church .....

I would not wish to stand, an ordinary of a diocese, away from the security of a Bishops' Conference, before the judgment seat of God and try to explain or justify my exclusion of what all must agree is a true Mass from my jurisdiction, even were I sure the new mass was equally good in every respect .....

You must be aware that the strong Catholic Church of our earlier days has degenerated into a loose confederation of disaster areas. You have seen the trial of numberless experiments in futile attempts to escape the quicksands into which it is sinking. There are even insulting "stupid" masses for children and aboriginals. Operating in the spiritual vacuum left by the loss of our true Mass, all hasten desperately to try anything except the necessary first step to our recovery of sanity and grace (neither attaches to the revolting ritual now in residence), the return of the Tridentine Mass to every parish every Sunday.

This we request of you under the provisions of Canon 682\* of the Code of Canon Law (and, if you like, Article 37 of Vatican II's Dogmatic Constitution on the Church) IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST.

17 January 1974 (signed) Hutton Gibson

(Footnote) \* Canon 682: The laity has the right to receive from the clergy the spiritual goods and especially the necessary means of salvation, according to the rules of ecclesiastical discipline. "A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law," Woywod & Smith, New York, Nov, 1957: "The spiritual goods .... are the ordinary suffrages, sacramentals, indulgences, ecclesiastical burial, etc., while the necessary means of salvation .... are the sacraments, especially those necessary as a means or by precept for salvation. This right is conferred by divine law in reference to the necessary means of salvation, especially the sacraments .... To this right of the laity corresponds an obligation on the part of the clergy." (Divine law is not subject to review or revision by canon lawyers.)

### **Obligation To Idolatry**

Every human creature, no matter what his religion, is obliged to render public worship to God every week. We all depend absolutely on God, whether or not we choose to acknowledge this. Those who lack the benefit of the Mass cannot excuse themselves from worshipping God in the manner available to them. They receive no grace or benefit attributable to humanly instituted rites of worship, but we cannot deny that God grants them certain graces (but solely) on account of their dispositions and good

intentions. Protestants, then, do not actively and individually offend God by their public worship in good faith.

But note carefully that no Protestant believes in the sacramental presence of Christ on the altar. He will not worship a symbol or memorial of Christ. Humanly speaking, in Protestant worship in good faith, no great harm is done.

But to gull Catholic people who believe in the sacramental presence of Christ on the altar—and who consequently and logically adore Him under the appearances of bread and wine—into a Protestantized form of worship which cannot induce this sacramental presence is to produce an intolerable stench in the nostrils of the Almighty God, the first of Whose ten commandments abominates idolatry.

Most sincere Catholics will find it hard to accept my assessment of the new “mass.” Their priests and bishops have gone along with it, and THEY should know. Granted—they should! And they shall not be forgiven their monumental non-feasance—a monument that will shortly mark the grave of the Catholic Church in Australia. In the absence of proper guidance by our proper guides we are thrown back on the doctrine of the Church as we were taught. In these days when it has become fashionable to ascribe good faith and clear conscience to such as Luther and Cranmer, it is difficult to see how we may be denied the same ascription. We are entitled to genuine arguments, if they exist, based on all the traditions of the Church and in harmony with the Deposit of Faith, to correct us when and where we err. It is no argument to say that we create or threaten schism. Schism invariably follows innovation, never unchanged doctrine.

### **Rushian Logic**

Brisbane’s Archbishop Rush to LMSA representative: “Permission for the offering of Mass in the Tridentine Rite may be granted only through a special Indult which lays down the limits within which permission may be exercised.” (How specific the permission! How delightfully ambiguous the “legislation” supposedly forbidding our Mass!) “At their meeting in Sydney last week the bishops of Australia decided not to ask for such an indult. No doubt the reason why most bishops would hesitate to do so would be because of some of the attitudes your society adopts to the Novus Ordo Missae of Pope Paul VI. .... You will readily understand how disturbed I and many others are that you virtually accuse the Holy Father himself of heresy.” Virtually?

Reply (9 March 1974): I have sought in vain .... a .... ruling from Pope Paul VI that makes a Special Indult mandatory. Could (Your Grace) provide .... particulars? .... Also disturbing ... attitudes of some of our members .... had a bearing on the negative decision .... of our bishops .... If the Tridentine Mass has no virtue of its own, the question of restoring it is settled once and for all. However, if it has, indeed, some virtues of its own, it would seem that people should not be deprived of it simply because some members of LMSA are said to hold views that are too extreme. Indeed, the subjective reaction of some .... members can have no influence on

the objective worth of the Traditional Mass. .... views of .... members .... draw authority from .... such .... as Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci .... condemned the New Mass in no uncertain terms (from the Ottaviani Intervention enclosed):

“The New Order teems with insinuations or manifest errors against the purity of the Catholic religion and dismantles all defenses of the deposit of faith.”

“It is evident that the *Novus Ordo* has no intention of presenting the Faith as taught by the Council of Trent, to which, nonetheless, the Catholic conscience is bound forever. With the promulgation of the *Novus Ordo*, the loyal Catholic is thus faced with a most tragic alternative.”

.... (Pope Paul) has been condemned as a heretic by .... Father Saenz y Arriaga, the well-known Mexican Jesuit, and by Father Georges de Nantes of France (who) .... presented Pope Paul VI himself with a “*Liber Accusationis*” where the case was fully documented. No one, so far, has refuted the charges made therein. .... if the orthodoxy of the Holy Father is challenged, it is vital that the charge be exposed as worthless—if this IS the case—otherwise the faithful may be in grave spiritual danger. A flat assertion that Pope Paul cannot be a heretic because he is the pope would simply be an implicit denial of certain facts of history concerning the orthodoxy of some popes. .... For us of the LMS a return to the Tridentine Rite is of paramount importance, so much so that we feel it could well make the difference between whether we are eternally saved or eternally damned. .... we need the help of our traditional Catholic Mass .... proven .... means of salvation and sanctification.

### **The Liturgical Reform And Ecumenism (excerpts)**

To deny that the liturgical reform was conceived and executed for ecumenical reasons is to deny the evidence. Why inclusion of six Protestants in the commission for Mass reform if not to make possible a union in prayer with Protestants, and in the most important act of the Catholic Church? The definition of the mass (introduction to the *novus ordo*) is Protestant. Emphasis is on supper or meal, no longer on sacrifice, a term missing from the new mass booklets, replaced by **Liturgy of the Eucharist, Supper Memorial, Celebration of the Eucharist**, all terms typically Protestant. In the traditional Mass all the priest’s gestures, postures, and attitudes, his words spoken in a low voice, showed that a mystery was being enacted, that the priestly function “par excellence” was being exercised. But henceforth the priest “narrates” that which happened long ago.

All in this reform fosters belief that Mass is essentially a meal: the table replaces the Altar of sacrifice; relics of martyrs who followed Christ in His Sacrifice are no longer needed; the priest faces the people as president of the family meal, no longer minister of Sacrifice offering a Victim to God, face to face with the Cross, symbol of the sacrifice being perpetuated on the Altar. This shift destroys Catholic doctrine which rests on the Sacrifice.

To support this new concept it is asserted that the Mass is above all the symbol of the Last Supper, and that the Last Supper was essentially a meal. Both false! The Mass refers essentially to the Sacrifice of the Cross, as did the Last Supper, itself essentially a Sacrifice, its entire significance bound to—and meaningless but for—the Cross. The danger of losing the holiest reality in our lives, the source of all sanctification, the well-spring of all graces, the fount of every sacrament, the backbone of the priesthood, the cornerstone of the Church must needs make us wary of being taken in by appearances. The liturgical reform clearly threatens faith in the Sacrifice, in the Real Presence, in the priestly function.

Revised texts have reduced the primary propitiatory end of the Mass, the Sacrifice of the Altar which perpetuates the Sacrifice of the Cross and applies its merits to participants and designated beneficiaries—all doctrines anathema to Protestants. Our modern reformers have suppressed nearly all traditional prayers which expressed clearly the propitiatory and expiatory end of the Holy Sacrifice, particularly the Offertory prayers, the prayers at the foot of the altar, the prayer to the Blessed Trinity at the end of Mass, the *Lavabo* prayers, and two of the prayers before the priest's Communion. Propitiation thus fades and disappears from the consciousness of priests and faithful. Without propitiation we lose the need of Victim, Altar, Sacrifice.

The Altar Victim and His offering are the reason for our divinely instituted priesthood's very existence—as also for priestly celibacy, for religious orders, and for martyrs. The entire Catholic spirituality finds justification in the presence of the Divine Victim on the Altar and in His offering. Such is, indeed, the life of every Catholic: a life of offering in communion with Our Lord, and even more the religious life whose profession it is, and the priestly life whose function it is. We cannot afford an Ecumenism which risks supernatural truths—the very essence of the whole life of the Church.

Clearly this liturgical reform has been carried out so irresponsibly, by those qualified in neither theology nor pastoral work, that it surpasses belief. The haste in introducing changes in such vital matter, the very number of the changes, the impracticability of checking translations, the intrusion of the Reform into every facet of the liturgy, even into private devotions such as the Rosary, all exceed comprehension and deny common sense. One cannot see in this frenzied insistence on implementation combined with a phobia for traditional forms the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. These are not legitimate and beneficent reforms carried out by the Catholic Church; we cannot recognize the usual marks of wisdom, moderation, concern for the faith and for pastoral needs. What pastoral need could be served by altering the words of Consecration, and in permitting erroneous translations of these alterations? Or by suppressing two minor orders and the subdiaconate? The priest exercises his function of exorcist in every Baptism, and in all the blessings of the Ritual; he stands in greater need than ever of re-asserting his celibate state which the subdiaconate so aptly epitomized.

All these things have but one justification: an aberrant, senseless Ecumenism that will attract not a single Protestant to the Faith but will cause countless Catholics to lose it, and will instil total confusion in countless minds which will no longer know what is true and what is false.

Obedience can consist only in refusal to accept—not in acceptance of—these reforms. To accept this spurious Ecumenism is to precipitate oneself sooner or later into new Protestant or Pentecostal sects. Obedience intends to direct toward good, not evil. Pretence not to see evil in order not to appear disobedient betrays not only truth but ourselves.

The criterion of Truth in the Church is Tradition. To pass on faithfully the revealed truths is the role of the infallibility of the pope and of the Church. Not by breaking this necessary continuity shall we serve the Church, but by holding to it at all costs, especially in times when all the efforts of the devil bear on shattering it, using the most deceitful pretexts: UPDATING, PROGRESS, and OPENING TO THE WORLD.—Marcel Lefebvre, who inconsistently defends the impossible validity of the *novus ordo*, and for years has asked only for parallel rites.

You will recall how all the changes came—by degrees. Whenever a stupid layman, or even a parish priest, raised an objection it was promptly swamped by degrees—Doctor of Sacred Theology, Sacred Scripture, Canon Law, Philosophy, Archaeology, Sociology, Anthropology, Liturgy, Philology, Palaeontology, Nuclear Physics, Psychology, and Veterinary Medicine! Innovators always provide plenty of sheepskin authority, though they grandly ignore revelation and logic. With all this misapplied knowledge they have largely prevailed. There is a tendency to think the unthinkable: that all these experts must be correct and the Church of the ages wrong.

It greatly behoves us, therefore, to quote, publish, and rub noses in articles orthodox and traditional to the core, articles that face facts rather than construct fictions to bolster innovations. It is high time for bishops to realize who and what they are: successors of the Apostles. Apostles came in just two sizes, MARTYR and TRAITOR.

### **In Dutch Again**

Monday 8 April 1974 I confronted a “conservative” Dutch priest, a multi-lingual Doctor of Sociology, who had once told me that the Dutch Catechism was 85% correct, as fine a recommendation as I can recall for a dogmatic or moral document. Father knows Ed Schillebeeckx personally; Ed is completely orthodox. Paul VI is a very strong pope; look how he jumped on Hans Kueng! (What HAD he done to Hans?) Objections to the new “mass” and insistence on sacramental security he reduced to arrogance in “wanting your own way.” All these changes were necessary, he said, or we would have lost our young people.

No one can deny great losses among the young, resulting from deliberate misrepresentation of Catholic doctrine in Catholic

schools. That we would have lost still more without guitars and simplification is, of course, undemonstrable. It would seem not to have proved out on previous younger generations. Since these changes, however, we have experienced unprecedented losses among the middle-aged and the old. You must work overtime to alienate the old; they're too close to Judgment Day.

### Little Logic

May 10, 1974 seven LMSA members attended a lecture, supposedly on the Mass, at Neutral Bay, Sydney by Father Peter Little, S.J., teacher of dogma at Kensington seminary for late vocations. At last came the question period. "How can the consecration, which must be effected by Christ's words, be effected by some one else's words?" When at last he understood the question he dodged it with the idiom argument: Christ spoke in Aramaic, and FOR MANY signified FOR ALL in that language; we'd have to know the idiom. Nowhere did Father Little advert to Christ's words ALL OF YE DRINK THIS, which preceded SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY, not FOR ALL MEN. It almost seems that He Who could say ALL might have proved equal to the task or saying FOR ALL in the next sentence had such been His intention.

"With reason, therefore, were the words FOR ALL not used," I read him, "as in this place the fruits of the passion are alone spoken of, and to the elect only did His Passion bring the fruit of salvation. And this is the purport of the Apostle when he says: CHRIST WAS OFFERED ONCE TO EXHAUST THE SINS OF MANY; and also the words of Our Lord in John: I PRAY FOR THEM; I PRAY NOT FOR THE WORLD, BUT FOR THEM WHOM THOU HAST GIVEN ME. BECAUSE THEY ARE THINE."

"What are you reading?" asked Father Little. I told him. "That's not the Council of Trent talking! That's only the Catechism of the Council of Trent. That's not correct. That passage led to the Jansenist heresy, and had to be corrected."

The Church taught error in her (still) official catechism! The Church has now corrected it! Blessed be the authority of the Church!

The Jansenists flourished in the seventeenth century. Is it not passing strange that Fathers McHugh and Callan failed to catch this and other corrections while translating the official Catechism of the Church for publication with Cardinal Hayes' *imprimatur* in 1923? Their introduction, perversely, quotes the authority and approval of popes from Pius IV to Benedict XV. Dr. John Hagan, then Rector of the Irish College in Rome, wrote: "The Roman Catechism [its alternate name] is a work of exceptional authority. At the very least it has the same authority as a dogmatic encyclical."

On being told that the Holy Eucharist signified the Mystical Body, Father Little shouted: "Who says so? That's not the doctrine of the Church!" St. Thomas Aquinas in *Summa*

*Theologiae* III, Q. 73 3: “The signification (*res*) of this sacrament is the unity of the Mystical Body, without which salvation is impossible; for to no man is the way of salvation open outside the Church ....”

“The pope,” pontificated Father Little, “is the supreme teaching authority in the Church (unless he’s dead. His doctrine, of course, dies with him.). There is no limit to his power. If anyone should say that the pope cannot outlaw the Tridentine Mass” (he ignored repeated challenges to show where Paul had done so) “he would be limiting the power of the pope and would therefore be a heretic. If you say the pope can be a heretic then you are a heretic.” (And so are Popes St. Leo II and Innocent III, Cajetan, Suarez, St. Robert Bellarmine, the Code of Canon Law, and The Catholic Encyclopedia.) “We must all be in unity with the pope. He says the new mass so if we do not use the same we are not in unity with him.” How are we to remain in unity with previous popes? This should provide the excuse to abolish the Eastern Rites.

### **Priestly Objections**

“My seminary theology textbooks were written in the 1940’s, yet when we dealt with *De Defectibus* regarding the Mass, it was held that a change such as FOR ALL MEN instead of PRO MULTIS certainly would not invalidate the Consecration. It was a question then because every priest is subject to distractions, slips of the tongue, omissions, etc.”

Texts written in the forties are not thereby guaranteed orthodoxy. All the current troubles in the Church did not spring into being full-grown. The seed bed required preparation. Jesuit seminaries in particular were fed the heresies of Teilhard de Chardin as classroom notes, to circumvent prohibition of their publication.

*De Defectibus* is clear enough that anyone deliberately changing the words even if not the meaning of consecration sins grievously, and anyone changing the meaning, whether or not deliberately, does not produce the sacrament, which far more seriously produces idolatry if any believer attends the “mass.”

Distraction? Slip of the tongue? Strictly theoretical! What priest could not recite the words of Consecration in his sleep? A priest is further obliged to say these words of Christ with utmost concentration. Why he should choose the words FOR ALL MEN to insert by mistake is not clear. Why not FOR SOME WOMEN? Was conditioning already afoot?

No man is infallible. But it is not sense to equate a slip of the tongue (with no malicious intent, an involuntary act or omission by its very nature) with a deliberate perversion of the meaning of the central act of religious worship, the words and meaning of which are clearly attested by all ages of the Church.

(We both chose to ignore the presence of the consecratory formulas in large print on the altar chart which leans on the tabernacle door. The Church considered these formulas too essential to be entrusted solely to memory, to leave subject to

slips of the tongue or to mental lapses. Only a blind priest is reduced even to the use of memory.)

“A traditionalist is surely aware of the dangers of small groups who know better than the universal Church.”

These unwarrantable changes, to date, apply almost exclusively to the Latin Church.

“To set yourself up as the official teaching Church, to decry all the bishops, and to declare the last two elected pontiffs as null is surely the setting up of a protesting Church and an enthroning of private interpretation.”

Election to the papacy can't turn a heretic into a Catholic. A pope must be Catholic or the election has no effect. If to teach Catholic doctrine exclusively is to set oneself up as a protesting Church and enthrone private interpretation, we should never have had room to walk prior to Vatican II. We'd have spent all our time tripping over thrones.

“The Latin Mass was never the Mass of the Catholic Church. It was, by order, the Mass of the Latin Rite. The many Catholic Eastern Rites used various languages and various formulas for the words of consecration.”

The Latin Mass was for many centuries the chief Mass of the Church. If you check the other rites' consecratory formulas—as we have—you will find none differing in essentials as does the mistranslated formula so inventively introduced in the English *novus ordo*.

“We accepted the Tridentine Mass on the authority of Pope, Bishops in Council and experts. Now the same authority, Pope, Bishops in Council, and experts have duly authorized another valid Mass with a different formula, and you have the temerity to bellow ‘Invalid, the words have been changed.’”

Nothing could be further from the truth. Our Mass is much older than St. Pius V and the Council of Trent. We accept all aspects of religion from Christ and His Apostles, especially the central fact, the Mass. No pope or Council in history ever introduced a new Mass, nor can they. But, you say, they've done so—with a new formula yet! But they bluffed it. If some one who has such authority that he may change the formula—the historical central fact of Catholicism, the words which Christ spoke so deliberately in the most solemn action of His life, and on which all rites agree substantially, without which such substantial agreement no consecration can take place—has done this impossible deed, please show me where! Form, matter, and intention have all been changed. It is obvious that none of these is subject to change, all being specifically determined by Jesus Christ Himself. We must therefore doubt and resist any change. There is no authority which can stand behind any such change.

“You act like Luther in rebelling against authority; you see the same things.”



You may palliate Luther's deliberate crushing of the Mass, his equation of the Holy Eucharist with excrement, his sacrilegious attempt at marriage with a nun, and his well-documented bad faith, intransigence, and malice. No doubt some allowance for this monster must be made by those who ape him so slavishly. But it is hardly consistent to accuse of such attitudes those who adhere strictly to the Council which condemned his teachings. Innovators often impute their own error to the enemy—draw support by fighting phantoms.

“You should be able to understand Luther, since the same things that drove him, anguish, fear of damnation, and opposition to the papacy, drive you.”

I adhere to every doctrine and tradition of the Catholic Church. Luther chucked them all. He attacked the papacy—not an individual. You seem unable to differentiate between the man and the office he never quite fills. Had Luther been moved by genuine concern for the Church or his salvation most Germans could still be Catholic.

“You face condemnation. You refuse *humble* (not blind) obedience to the legitimate teaching authority of the Church. You are probably in schism.”

Paul VI has never spoken *ex cathedra*. He often contradicts himself or some real pope. I cannot bow down in humility to criminal error, removal of form, matter, and intention from the Mass. Humility is inextricably interwoven with truth. I am not humble but insane if I accept a lie or error from anyone. Your charge is more easily brought home to you: you follow the arrogant innovators—those initiates of the esoteric real mysteries of the primitive, pristine, pure, unadulterated (even by grape juice) early Church—instead of our lowly lay ancestors without whom none of us would be Catholic. The laity must know the Faith to pass it on, even to their clerical children, who no longer preach it nor convert anyone. The legitimate teaching authority of the Church is precisely what I accept. A heretic cannot command my obedience. When one diverges from the doctrine and tradition of the Church he is a heretic. Can it be lack of charity to condemn—or humility to believe—error, even pastoral error of judgment, that will drag men into hell? Must I agree with heresy to avoid schism?

Unless you are of recent vintage (or juice cannery?) you swore two mighty oaths at ordination time, to the Council of Trent and against modernism. It is high time you examined the points in which your bishop and you yourself violate these oaths so essential for the welfare of the Church and all its members.

“We need not obey *Quo Primum* because it was not an infallible pronouncement.”

It bears all the earmarks, but if you disagree you certainly cannot claim infallibility for Paul VI's new “mass” promulgation. According to your argument, then, we need not obey this last either. But, you say, a law does not bind if it is not an infallible pronouncement. If so we can throw away nearly all law not

bearing directly on morals, which have God's own infallibility behind them. *Quo Primum* still binds; whether or not it is infallible. Whether or not it can be abrogated, it has not been abrogated.

“Those six Protestant ministers on the *Consilium* which gave us the *novus ordo missae* were only acting as experts. They made no decisions.”

Experts on what? Catholic worship? It was impossible for them to act as Catholics, or to have any intention of constructing a Mass, since they could not believe in such a beast.

“You must obey the hierarchy's strictures on the Mass and sacraments. God may be removing the means of salvation your sinful generation scorns.”

By trickery and fraud? If God has such intentions He will doubtless encompass them without my help. Nor has He confided them to me. My last mandate was “Keep the Faith.”

“Vatican II was an infallible Council protected from error by the Holy Ghost. Many innovations followed in spite of the Council, through misinterpretation.”

No doubt many words of Vatican II were wrested from their intent. But who did the wresting if not the participants themselves? Could these same men have been correct in what they said and wrong in how they interpreted and applied their own words? No innovation could have been implemented in any diocese without at least passive condonation of the ordinary, a participant (in nearly every case) in Vatican II and (in every case) in Episcopal Conferences heavily loaded with such participants. Vatican II's high-flown, ambiguous words proposed no truth not earlier and better presented. It managed, however, to convey at least eleven heresies. To discern here the action of the Holy Ghost is to share the Council's own presumption.

“I cannot tell what to do. Everything in the Church is so confused.”

No one is confused when our popes and bishops agree with their predecessors, but only when they disagree. All this confusion is deliberately induced. It follows lack of faith in God and too much faith in men.

“You quote us a lot of Canon Laws, But Canon Law is being revised. If the Church can make a law it can change or abrogate it.”

Revision is necessary to grant legality to Vatican II and postconciliar innovations committed against the Code in force. In JP2's Apostolic Constitution (25 Jan 83): The new Code “fully accords with the nature of the Church, particularly as presented in the authentic teaching of the Second Vatican Council seen as a whole, and especially in its ecclesiological doctrine. .... to translate the conciliar ecclesiological teaching into canonical terms. .... the Code is regarded as a complement to the authentic teaching proposed by the Second Vatican Council and particularly to its Dogmatic and Pastoral Constitutions.

“From this it follows that the fundamental ‘newness’ .... found in the Second Vatican Council .... generates also the mark of ‘newness’ in the New Code. ....

“The new Code of Canon Law is published precisely .... when the Bishops of the whole Church are not only asking for its promulgation but indeed are insistently and vehemently demanding it.” They need help—and some shadow of justification for their massive violation of the 1917 Code, which was a codification, not a new set of laws.

Morals, obligations, and facts are not geometrically congruent with the law, but they overlap it in many areas. Of purely human ecclesiastical law the primary source is the Supreme Pontiff, the supreme lawgiver for the universal Church, whose authority extends both to the enactment of new laws and to the repeal or amending of the existing law. Strictly speaking, a lawgiver may abrogate or change his own law, but he will not thereby alter a pre-existing obligation, or remove a fact. Murder of one type or another (e.g. abortion) may be permitted by law, but it remains a crime. Adultery may be condoned by divorce laws, but bigamy will continue to make one (or more) gamy in the nostrils of the Almighty. Certain crimes are so rare no one has thought to legislate against them, as certain doctrines remain undefined because no one has questioned them. No law is required to control non-existent situations. If a law makes the statute books it was usually needed to reinforce pre-existing morals, obligations, customs, or facts, widely transgressed or ignored. Usually removal of such a law will result in further widespread violation of the facts, customs, morals, and obligations to support which the law was enacted in the first place. Good laws and rules are made for our protection. When we remove them we shall discover all too soon from what chaos they protected us. When the Church has gone to the trouble of making a law you may safely assume that it had sufficient reason. This applies to such seemingly minor things as the rubrics in our traditional Mass. Just look at their removal’s consequences.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. IX: The ultimate source of Canon Law is God, Whose will is manifested either by the very nature of things (natural Divine law), or by Revelation (positive Divine law). Both are contained in the Scriptures and in Tradition. Positive Divine law cannot contradict natural law; it rather confirms it and renders it more definite. The Church accepts and considers both as sovereign binding laws which it can interpret but cannot modify; however, it does not discover natural law by philosophical speculation; it receives it, with positive Divine law, from God through His inspired Books, though this does not imply a confusion of the two kinds of Divine law. Of the Old Law the Church has preserved in addition to the Decalogue some precepts closely allied to the natural law, e.g. certain matrimonial impediments; as to the other laws given by God to His chosen people, it considers them to have been ritual and declares them abrogated by Jesus Christ. Or rather, Jesus Christ, the Lawgiver of the spiritual society founded by Him (*Con Trid.*, Sess. VI, “*De justif.*” canon xxi), has replaced them by the fundamental laws

which He gave His Church. This Christian Divine law .... is found in the Gospels, in the Apostolic writings, in the living Tradition, which transmits laws as well as dogmas. On this positive Divine law depend the essential principles of the Church's constitution, the primacy, the episcopacy, the essential elements of Divine worship and the Sacraments, the indissolubility of marriage, etc.

Henry Davis, S.J. (Moral and Pastoral Theology, Vol I): "The divine positive law is superimposed on Natural law, and has been explicitly promulgated. Its existence is known to us only by Revelation, and it comprises the Mosaic Law and the New Law. The Mosaic Law, as such, no longer binds man. It comprised precepts, moral, judicial, and ceremonial. These were abrogated as the formal Mosaic Law, though its moral precepts were confirmed and promulgated in the New Law. .... That it was, as a fact, abrogated, the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem implicitly declared. After such abrogation, therefore, to fulfil the ceremonial laws of the Old Testament would have been and would still be false worship of God, because it would be a repudiation of the Messiahship of Christ. Consequently, when the New Law became .... sufficiently promulgated .... the works of the Old Law were both dead and sinful.

"The New Law was instituted and promulgated by Christ our Lord, as Supreme Lawgiver and Infinite Wisdom, but in such a way as rather to fulfil than to destroy the Mosaic Law. He instituted and promulgated it by enunciating .... numerous precepts .... These precepts are theological, as referring to Faith, Hope, Charity; they are moral, as contained in the Decalogue and confirmed and perfected by our Lord .... sacramental, as referring to the Sacraments and the Sacrifice, and these may be called new moral precepts in a wide sense. Lastly, Christ left to His Church the power of framing such other ordinances as should be vitally necessary for discipline, for divine worship" (differentiated from discipline) "and ecclesiastical order. .... The New Law binds all mankind: 'Going therefore teach ye all nations .... teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you'" (Mt. 28).

"This New Law is not subject to change, and it is to remain in force for all time, because Christ is with His Apostles and their successors for all time, as they expound this identical Law. There is none more perfect to take its place and there is no power that can abrogate it."

The sacrifice of the New Law is the Passion and death of Jesus Christ, as shown in the traditional Offertory. The new Preparation of the Gifts replaces this clear intention with a fulfilment of the Old Testament ceremonial laws (Passover Rite) thereby repudiating the Messiahship of Christ.

### **New Doctrine**

A Capuchin priest, emerging from a "retraining" course to which his order had subjected him after a quarter-century in the priesthood, reported that the course taught indissolubility of marriage as only an ideal. Marriage can be dissolved for four reasons: 1) **death**, 2) **incurable insanity** (one or both parties).

Psychiatrists are naturally infallible. They know when no cure can ever be discovered. Nor could anyone influence the professional opinion of these unanimous men. 3) **life imprisonment** (again, one or both). In these days of increasingly permissive and decriminalizing legislation, increasingly liberal parole boards, and increasingly frequent escapes, what happens when both parties are simultaneously at large? 4) **when love has ceased!** On the part of one or both? What is meant by love? Permanency of emotional attitude cannot be attained this side of the grave. Consider all history's arranged marriages. Often the bride and groom had never met. They began with no emotional involvement. Two persons free to marry consented to their permanent union. Emotion or its absence, immediate or eventual, had no bearing on the case. But our new theology can now remove one of the major safeguards of all society, civilized or not, on the pretext that a certain kind of love is needed. Did not Christ say that we must love our enemies? Can you find greater hostility than in a soured marriage? "When you and your wife cease to love," says Father, since this obviously terminates marriage, "you are involved in fornication!"

Father also points out that properly married Catholics who have been divorced and remarried can now be admitted to the sacraments without correcting their situation (living in adultery). Since priests are not (yet) permitted to marry such divorcees it would seem that the Church now approves (or at least suffers and condones) non-Catholic and registry office "marriages." The Church (can it really be the Church?) now makes new rules to accommodate its disobedient ex-members in its delirious, all-encompassing charity. How much of this same charity is extended the traditionalist, who wishes only to obey the Church of the ages which has been stolen from him? Here some hypocrite will tell us of the Good Shepherd, Who—be it noted—did not slaughter the flock before seeking out the lost sheep.

Father was also taught the new theology of grace: "Grace is a mere relationship between a human and God. Hence an infant never receives grace in or from Baptism. He can have a love relationship with God only after he hits the age of reason"—until his divorce for insanity. (All parents will confirm this; their children cannot love them before the age of seven.) "The same is true for all sacraments. Hence, man is made for a relationship, so the kiss of peace becomes the most important part of the Mass.

"Another good one is process theology. It says: 'God is becoming.' Hence He is incomplete and not perfect. God grows with us.' Or is diminished by a massacre, famine, or forest fire? Who needs an imperfect God? Are we headed for pantheism or atheism?

While on the subject of nonsense, I quote Cardinal Knox' **Concluding Report, Synod of Bishops 1974** (*L'Osservatore Romano*, English edition 28 Nov. 1974), on the Congregation for Divine Worship, which under his prefecture has since "forbidden" the Tridentine Mass world-wide except for priests celebrating in private. He lists its principal activities: "revision of liturgical books

(the Pontifical and the Roman Ritual, the Martyrology (!), Ceremonials for Bishops, Collections of Prayers), and the implementation of liturgical reform, with special reference to these problems: liturgical celebrations presided over by lay people in cases of the lack of a sacred minister, the use of the mass media” (in lieu of the Mass?) “in the liturgy; liturgical adaptation to different peoples, regions, etc.; more profound liturgical preparation to be promoted in the different countries, also to avoid arbitrary and sometimes even aberrant innovation, not only in the progressivist sense” (aberrant progress?) “but also in that of unjustifiable conservatism which is that of those who refuse— notwithstanding the pontifical dispositions” (orders?) “to the contrary to use the new missal, accusing of deviation not only the liturgical books” (too true!) “but the Supreme Pontiff himself.” It would seem to follow; who issued these books?

Note here one of Knox’s very few talents: he can twist adherence to the Tridentine Mass and Conservatism—both essential to the Church—to fit the description “arbitrary, aberrant innovation!” But even this man is good for something, like the animals in a zoo. He epitomizes mental atrophy. Unused talents, ratiocination included, are taken from us. Refusal to face facts often leads to loss of reasoning powers. The effort to reconcile contradictions often leads to schizophrenia. Catholics formerly avoided these hazards through confession. Since Vatican II the confessors themselves have become the psychiatrists’ best customers.

### **New Matter**

Cutting down the clergy continues apace, especially from Rome. ABC Radio News, noon, Friday 24 May 1974 carried a report from the U.S.A. that a letter from the Vatican (Cardinal Seper, Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith) had authorized the U.S. bishops to permit alcoholic priests to substitute grape juice for wine in the mass, if the grapes are of a type that can ferment. (No red wine? Then give us red herring—wine experts assure us there is no other type of grape.) The bishops’ spokesman then estimated the alcoholics as “less than ten per cent” of the U.S.’s 57,000 priests. Glory to Melchisedech!

Destroyers of the Holy Eucharist’s form would hardly balk at destroying its matter. Nor should it surprise us that they further degrade and disparage the priesthood. What surer way to discourage vocations? No one needs Holy Orders and its concomitant psychoses merely to dabble in sociology, or to preside at a Protestantized liturgy. All defenders of the changed form eventually fall back on the undemonstrable “facts” that (1) the pope or Vatican II ordered the change and (2) they could not be wrong. Who or what has ordered the change in the matter? Will the language or idiom argument apply? Have the Jews taken up grape juice for Passover? Will grape juice become “potential” wine, even though pasteurized? Will coal (potential diamond) get the price? Will sand (potential glass) keep the wind from your face in your automobile?

I have quit prophesying ridiculous aberrations for the new ecumenical Church. Too often wry jokes turn into sober, stark, ghastly facts, of which the least comprehensible is that those most affected by the sacraments' graces have stood by and watched—or helped!—the sacraments' degradation and destruction. Can our "*status aliquo*" have driven enough of them to drink to "necessitate" yet another such unprecedented departure as sacramental grape juice?

## Section Five

### NEW SACRAMENTS

(Concerned with sacraments administered in Australia. Words or ceremonies in Latin or non-English vernacular rites—even if valid—are seldom used here.)

Sacraments have clearly defined common requirements: outward signs signifying inward graces, instituted by Jesus Christ—therefore not subject to developments in meaning, signification, or substance.

### Wedding

**Sacred Congregation of Rites**, Prot. no. R23/969, Decree: The rite for celebrating marriage has been revised according to the decrees of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, in order that this richer rite would more clearly signify the grace of the sacrament and that the responsibilities of the married couple would be better taught. This revision has been carried out by the Consilium for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy.

By his apostolic authority, Pope Paul VI has approved this rite and directs that it be published. Therefore this sacred Congregation, acting on the special mandate of the Holy Father, publishes this rite and directs that it be used from July 1, 1969.

Anything to the contrary notwithstanding.

From the Congregation of Rites, March 19, 1969, Solemnity of St. Joseph, husband of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Benno Card. Gut Prefect of S.R.C.  
President of the Consilium

\*Ferdinando Antonelli Titular Archbp.  
of Idicra, Secretary of S.R.C.

(The only words that appear to bind are Paul's direction that this rite be published. A direction that it be used in no way rules out other rites. With all its options this can hardly be called a rite; "rite" should suggest some idea of order.)

Introduction: Importance and dignity of the sacrament of matrimony .....

4. By their very nature, the institution of matrimony and wedded love are ordained for the procreation and education of children and find in them their ultimate crown. Therefore, married Christians, while not considering the other purposes of marriage of less account (This follows Vatican II in contradicting the doctrine and

law of the Church.), should be steadfast and ready to (Why not “shall?”) co-operate with the love of the Creator and Saviour, who through them will constantly enrich and enlarge his own family.

5. The bridal couple should be given a review of the fundamentals of Christian doctrine. This may include instruction on the teachings about marriage and the family .... (Optional instruction on the sacrament and its obligations opens the way for annulments for ignorance of its obligations or permanency. The rings have become “signs of love and fidelity” or “a sign of our love for each other” instead of pledges of lifelong fidelity.)

Throughout the ceremony every reference to children, parents, mother, and father is placed in red parentheses to signify optional inclusion. The question **Will you accept children lovingly from God, and bring them up according to the law of Christ and His Church?** is introduced by the rubric: *The following question may be omitted if, for example, the couple is advanced in years.*

Why such an unheard-of question? The prime purpose of marriage has never been in doubt. Incorporation of this useless innovation, then, just may intend to emphasize not procreation but option, especially omission. This may then be cited, as are new prayers in the new “confirmation,” in support of the new heresy. The right of the sterile to marry stems not from their sterility. When an exception is privileged over the rule there is always danger that it will pervert the rule.

The apparent purpose of all the optional (nuptial?) blessings is to reach old age in the company of friends and worship God in community. In the “mass” is a special *Hanc igitur* (118): Father, accept this offering from your whole family and from N. & N., for whom we now pray. You have brought them to their wedding day: grant them (optional!—the gift and joy of children and) a long and happy life together. (Through Christ our Lord. Amen.—again optional)

Of the five sets of “General Intercessions” from which one may be chosen for the “Prayer of the Faithful” only one mentions children in any way. Coincidence?

These unnecessary innovations certainly leave in doubt the primary purpose of marriage. They open the door even to homosexual “marriages.”

As elsewhere, obvious imperfections in the rite provide the excuse for further change. We may need further concessions to attract Moslems and ZPG’s.

The rite has our bishops’ approval? Recall how our bishops opposed the Family Law Bill, and defended the bond. Did they uphold the law of God? Or offer a weak criticism in hopes of compromise: a year’s separation should be insufficient grounds for divorce; let’s make it two years!? This was nearly as good as Cardinal Freeman’s “Abortion is a crime against democracy.”

## Deading



Catholics, especially bad Catholics, have always looked forward to receiving the last sacraments on their deathbed. Our courageous bishops have allowed themselves and us to be robbed. Not content with outlawing the Mass, the only source of Viaticum, and substituting “Reconciliation” for Penance, they have condoned complete replacement of Extreme Unction. A new order of “Anointing of the Sick” was imposed to the exclusion of the old January 1, 1974.

Vatican II, **Const. on the Sacred Liturgy**: “74. In addition to the separate rites for anointing of the sick and for Viaticum, a continuous rite shall be prepared according to which the sick man is anointed after he has made his confession and before he receives Viaticum. 75. The number of anointings is to be adapted to the occasion, and the prayers accompanying the rite of anointing are to be revised so as to correspond with the varying conditions of the sick who receive the sacrament.”

The new rite prescribes anointing only to head and hands, presumably for simplification and for conservation of the dying man’s limited time, but incorporates them into a rite which includes instructions, blessing of oils by the priest [Council of Trent, Sess. XIV, Extreme Unction, 1--“For the Church has understood the matter thereof to be oil blessed by a bishop, and that the words BY THIS UNCTION, etc. were the form.” Pope Innocent I (402-417) following “Roman custom” explicitly teaches that the sacrament enjoined by St. James was to be administered to the sick faithful who were not doing canonical penance; that priests, and *a fortiori* bishops, can administer it; but that the oil must be blessed by a bishop. (The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. V, 722c)], and even celebration of the new rite of “mass” with its mandatory homily, a renewal of the sick one’s Baptismal profession of faith, and a set of general intercessions before the “preparation of the gifts.” But mercifully, “the general intercessions may be omitted if the sick person has made the profession of faith and appears to be weak.”\* “The priest and those present may give the sick person the sign of peace at the appropriate time during the mass.”\* “The sick person and all those present may receive communion under both kinds.”\* “If the sick person is not confined to bed, he may receive the sacrament of anointing in the church or some other fitting place” (mortuary?), “where there is a suitable chair or place prepared for him and enough room for his relatives and friends” (all Catholics, naturally—communion?) “to take part.”\* Also among those present [“In hospitals the priest should consider the other sick people: whether they should be included in the celebration” (anointing, not mass) “or if they are not Christians, whether they might be offended.\*”] may be teetotal atheists who prefer to receive under one kind only, like the possibly alcoholic priest with his grape juice. The dying man has supported Church and priest all his life for this one purpose: that he may receive the Church’s Holy Sacraments. Now, *in extremis*, he may have his rights if non-Christians are not offended! Even in the natural order this is bare-faced fraud, robbery, and non-fulfilment of contract!

“When the faithful are not present, the priest should remember that he represents the Church to the sick person.”\* Has he some other excuse for invading the sickroom? If others are present, apparently they instead represent the Church (“People of God”). It seems likely they’d do a better job.

“A priest is the only proper minister of the anointing of the sick. When two or more priests are present, they may concelebrate the sacrament of anointing, with the understanding that one of them, acting as principal celebrant, says the prayers, while the others take various parts such as the introductory rites, scriptural readings, invocations, or explanations. They may lay their hands on the sick person, one by one, *and they may divide the anointings.*”\* Yet The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol V. 726a says: “The Catholic position is that either one or several priests may validly administer Extreme Unction; but when several [priests] officiate it is forbidden by Benedict XIV ... (Const. “*Etsi Pastoralis*”, 1742) for one priest merely to anoint and another merely to pronounce the form, and most theologians deny the validity of unction conferred in this way.”

As in the “sacrament of reconciliation,” we have both a communal rite for a private matter and an utterly new concept of “celebration” of a dread occasion. Nothing is lonelier than dying, unless it be that which follows immediately, the particular judgment. But now we can celebrate till the devil comes for us.

Taking the new rite itself, we note first that the priest greets one and all in a friendly manner. (He formerly acted in a subdued and reverent manner out of deference to the Blessed Sacrament in his pyx, and spoke only for necessity.) Then, instead of doing what he came for, he makes a speech to let all know why he came, as though the matter were in doubt. Then he goes into the “penitential rite” that has replaced the *confiteor* in the “mass.” Next he, or anyone handy, reads from the Gospel. There follows a short litany, which may be transferred to after the anointing, or “at some other point”\*(?! Now he lays his hands on the head of the sick person in silence, thus signifying what he is doing—patting a head?

Time out now, while he blesses the oil (he’s a bishop?), which he presumably purchased en route, the presbytery cook having plundered his supply. Prominent in the blessing: “to bless this oil, a work of nature,”\* a useless phrase that raises questions as to its significance and reason for inclusion.

All this rigmarole replaces three short appropriate prayers, the *Confiteor*, and immediate administration of the Sacrament (“*cum ipse Unctionis Sacramentum administrat.*”) Then (old rite), his right hand extended over the head of the sick, he said: “In the name of the Father +, and of the Son +, and of the Holy Ghost +, be there quenched in thee all power of the devil, through the laying on of my hands, and through the invocation of the glorious and holy Virgin Mary Mother of God, her illustrious spouse Joseph, and all the holy Angels, Archangels, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, Virgins, and all the Saints. Amen.” He thus

showed clearly what he and the Church meant by this otherwise indeterminate gesture. Then, his thumb dipped in the holy oil, he anointed the sick in the form of the Cross on the parts described below with the words fitted to the part, saying: Through this holy anointing and through His most tender mercy, may the Lord forgive thee whatever thou hast done wrong through sight, hearing, smell, taste or speech, touch, walking—five or six separate anointings to eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hands, and usually feet. There followed a short responsory prayer which included the Lord's Prayer, and then three additional, highly specific prayers for the sick person.

According to the new rite "the priest takes the oil and anoints the sick person on the forehead" (new, perhaps for professional wrestlers who head-butt) "and the hands" (and that's all) "saying: 'Through this holy anointing and his great love for you, may the Lord fill you with the power of His Holy Spirit' (This approximates the new "ordinations".) 'Amen. In his goodness may He ease your suffering and extend his saving grace to you, freed from all the power of sin. Amen.' There follow the prayer best suited to the person's condition,"\* (Now I lay me down to sleep?) the Lord's Prayer recited by all, and the blessing.

Try as I will, I can determine no specific intent or form in this new "celebration." Recalling Leo XIII's prescription that sacraments signify what they convey and convey what they signify, I am forced to conclude that we have here another destroyed and invalidly substituted sacrament.

It IS different! And that is enough.

\* Anointing The Sick, A Study in Pastoral Liturgy Prepared by the St. Thomas More Centre for Pastoral Liturgy, published by Mayhew-McCrimmon Ltd., Southend-on-sea, England, used in the Sydney archdiocese.

### **Penance ?**

Just as semi-annual episcopal conferences impinge on each bishop's diocesan authority while keeping his nose to the grindstone of Vatican-imposed renewal, so the quarterly clergy conference wastes the time and saps the energy of the parish clergy. These programmed gatherings spawn the useless committees to which priests are appointed in droves to determine why the Church has become less effectual here or how it can invade a new field there. A properly run parish takes all a priest's time, wisdom, and energy. The chief casualty of this innovation, as of most, is the ordinary Catholic. A possible beneficiary cannot be imagined.

At the North Sydney conference Wednesday 27 June 1973 Dr. Patrick Murphy, the liturgy expert, delivered a paper on Penance, defined as the sacrament in which we acknowledge our sinfulness. Adam and Eve were chucked out of paradise, not for disobeying God, but for not acknowledging their sinfulness. (If you can correct Christ's words in the consecration, why balk at Genesis?) At one point Dr. Murphy said that in this sacrament we

acknowledge our sins, but immediately corrected himself—we acknowledge our sinfulness, and to substantiate or illustrate this sinfulness we confess some of our sins. Not once did he even imply that sins might be confessed for the purpose of obtaining forgiveness. This followed the announcement that this archdiocese would keep individual private confession, and shun, for the time at least, the new practice of general absolution without confession.

Within a year Our Lady of Perpetual Succour Church, Coonamble, N.S.W. produced the following:

Communal Celebration Of The Sacrament Of Reconciliation: The Church's rites and discipline in connection with the Sacrament of Penance have at last been modified and reformed in line with the directives of the Second Vatican Council. "The rite and formulas of the Sacrament of Penance are to be revised so that they give more luminous expression to both the nature and effect of the sacrament." (Const. on the Sacred Liturgy—72) "It is to be stressed that whenever rites, according to their specific nature, make provision for communal celebration involving the presence and active participation of the faithful, this way of celebrating them is to be preferred, as far as possible, to a celebration that is individual and quasi-private." (*Ibidem* 27) With this in mind we are encouraged that the Sacrament of Reconciliation (as it will now be known) be celebrated in the reformed communal manner. Revised official rites were approved by Pope Paul VI in December and published by the Holy See on 7 February 1974. (See Bathurst Catholic Observer—10/3/74) In preparation for Easter, therefore, the communal celebration of the sacrament of Reconciliation will be held in this parish on Thursday night 4th April at 7.30 p.m. During Lent, penance should not only be internal and individual but also external and social (*Loc. cit.* 110)

The form of the celebration is as follows: The congregation assembles in the church and begins the rite with a suitable hymn. Following brief prayer there will be an appropriate reading from Sacred Scriptures. There will be a short homily and this will be followed by an examination of conscience. The confessors, after having confessed themselves, will take up their position in the sanctuary and one by one those of the faithful who wish will approach a confessor to make their own particular admission of sin quietly; there is no special formula for the penitent to recite and the examination of conscience should provide each with matter for their particular admission of sin. Absolution will be given and each will return to their place in the church; meantime suitable hymns will be sung. When all have made their confession a communal thanksgiving is made and a "penance" for all will be given. After a final blessing and dismissal a final hymn is sung in celebration.

[Who can recall celebrating the sacrament of Penance? It was never meant to be enjoyed, but rather in its ritual to bring home the gravity of offending God, the individual's sin for which he must make lowly, lonely amends. By this complete departure from tradition, confession is made more difficult for most people. The comfort of a set formula is denied. An apparently public examination of conscience will suggest new crimes to many,

especially if conducted by our more liberal clergy. This new ritual will waste time to no purpose, remove privacy and imperil the seal—the penitent must outshout hymns—of the confessional, the while invading the sanctuary with the laity, impose identical penance on grievous sinners and practically sinless people, thus implying that sin's gravity is of no consequence or that society is responsible for the sins of each member, and confuse and conceal (see next paragraph) the prime purpose of the sacrament, the forgiveness by God of sins against God.]

A study of the early Roman practice of penance in the fourth and fifth centuries has made it clear that recent practice leaves much to be desired. (Observe how the Church has failed us for centuries!) What we have is good, but much of the richness of the Christian heritage has somehow been lost in the past centuries. The Lenten practice of the early Roman Church made much of the connection between forgiveness and the Christian community—the Church. The Sacrament of Penance was a ceremony in which the Christian people of a diocese helped and welcomed a sinner back into their (presumably sinless) midst. The Christians of that era recognized that a sin was something that did damage to the whole Christian community .... they realized that sin was a social thing, an action which not only cut the sinner off from those close to him and his fellow Christians but also reflected upon the integrity of the whole church community. A reconciliation with God demanded a reconciliation with the sinner's neighbor, or it would not be sincere and lasting. (Reconciliation with the Eternal can't last unless also with those who can't last? Believe this novelty, O Catholic, on the same authority that tells us Penance was administered publicly in the early Church. Lenten practices are cited as though extra penitential rites proper to the season were the equivalent of the sacrament, which the innovators know is false. They use the former system of public penance for public crimes in the same deceitful manner. The sacrament was never a ceremony which welcomed the poor sinful slob back into the august company of the holy people of the diocese. The imposition of public penance and the absolution therefrom were non-sacramental.) This ceremony of reconciliation and readmittance into the Christian community was the Sacrament of Penance. Indeed the earliest records of private confession do not occur until the 7th and 8th centuries.

(But the second Council of Nicaea held at this very time (787 A.D.) condemns innovation in these resounding phrases:

**Those therefore who after the manner of wicked heretics dare to set aside ecclesiastical traditions, and to invent any kind of novelty, or to reject any of those things entrusted to the Church, or who wrongfully and outrageously devise the destruction of any of those traditions enshrined in the Catholic Church, are to be punished thus: If anyone rejects all ecclesiastical tradition—both written and unwritten—let him be anathema.**

In such a climate who would dare innovate private confession? Certainly not the priests, whose most burdensome duty it is! Who

would subject himself to it unless it came directly from the Apostles? In any case, who would keep records of what is taken for granted? But just to prove that the statement—though it says nothing—is intended to deceive, the records show that Pope Leo the Great (pope 440-461), himself often “credited” with instituting confession, wrote the bishops of Campania forbidding as an abuse “contrary to the Apostolic rule” the reading out in public of a written statement of their sins drawn up by the faithful, because, he declares, “it suffices that the guilt of conscience be manifested to priests alone in secret confession.”—*Ep. cxxviii* in P.L. LIV, 1210)

Today in the Church there is need for enriching our present sacramental practice in the light of that former communal or ecclesial dimension. This is the reason for the return (!) to common celebrations of penance. (Observe the technique: Invent a “tradition” so you can “return” to it, ignoring the fact that a tradition has been retained, not, if it ever existed, junked.) .... It should be clear then that the communal celebration is not a second class form of the sacrament, on the contrary, it is a form more closely in line with the ancient traditions (again!) of the Church and with the mind of the Church as expressed in the Council: Where opportunity allows .... those elements (in the Church’s rites) which have suffered injury through the accidents of history are now to be restored to the earlier norm of the Holy Fathers.” (*Loc. cit.* 50) Thus the communal rite lays emphasis on the communal as well as the personal dimension of sin and the need which the community as well as the individual has to make reconciliation and acknowledgement(!) of the forgiveness of God.

The Roman Catechism defines CONFESSION: “A sacramental accusation of one’s sins, made to obtain pardon by virtue of the keys.” Pardon for sins (remember the scoffing pharisees) is beyond human competence, because sins offend God, not necessarily humanity. One asks pardon as an individual for his own offences against God, whether or not specific injury to any man is involved. If wrong to another can be redressed, this is usually made a condition of absolution, but the victim need not know of either the injury or the redress. We are to be reconciled to God—not to men whose own relationship to God is at best uncertain, and often all too certain.

One thing only is certain in these changes: they never stop! Each change leads to further changes, either as logical outcomes or as remedies for ills this change has caused. This transition appears to lead on to Communist public self-accusation and abasement as an exercise in dehumanization—probation in the Greek sense—or in exaggerated humility. But if done for the purpose of obtaining divine pardon it is at best an exercise in futility, even should a priest take part and absolve. For this absolution has ever been available in secret.

Papal approval of the new, here as with the Mass, will result in abolition of the traditional.

### **Eldering**

Our innovators, like those of the sixteenth century, made much of the presbyterate. The *ancient*, or elder, helps his bishop. His chief function is to rule—to share in his bishop's authority. He is nothing by himself; he acts for his bishop in every facet of his presbyterate.

All this gives him undisputed sway over the presbytery dog. The laity listens first to the parish council or the charismatic coven, often identical. Should the presbyter oppose them, he can expect at best to see the difficulty put off by his bishop, who lends his authority also to the council and sometimes belongs to the coven.

When this modern tries to perform his duties under Canon Law (469) regarding religious instruction in his parish, he finds the good brothers and sisters, or the laymen who have largely replaced them, brutally brandishing their own version of delegated episcopal authority, even to ordering him off school premises. The episcopal conference has ignored, violated, superseded Canon Law, and given away his job. His authority has gone up in smoke, and the soot has settled on lesser men. Even in the sacramental field his bishop provides him lay acolytes, who perform duties assigned *him* by virtue of his priesthood under Canon 468 (special care of the sick and the dying), and save his precious time by distributing the “eucharist.”

His bishop, often through his clergy conference, pre-empts the time needed to care for his parishioners (under Canon 467) for service on committees, most of which deal verbosely with, but never settle, problems caused by the undermining of his own authority.

It is one thing to aspire to be a humble parish priest; it is quite another to find the parish rubbing the elder's nose in humiliation with the backing of his bishop, the source of his authority and his presbyterate. Obviously one need not receive Holy Orders to share in the bishop's indiscriminately broadcast authority. Can such sharing be the essence of the priesthood? If so, why is not his school principal, parish councillor, or acolyte equally a priest?

Compare this impoverished modern with the preconiliar priest of the ages, the *alter Christus*, ordained priest forever to bring God down upon our altar to sacrifice Him in the person of Christ, in the name of the Church. Privileged and honored beyond all laymen—beyond the Seraphim—this man was called and honored by God to share in His own divine Action.

“The proper and essential office of the priest is the offering of sacrifice.” (N. Gehr, “The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass”)

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA, Vol. XII, p. 415: “The priesthood forms so indispensable a foundation of Christianity that its removal would entail the destruction of the whole edifice.”

Isn't that the whole idea? Paul VI, 9/9/66: “The Council defines parish priests as the chief collaborators of the bishops, and thus in the great mystery of the Church, illustrated by the Council, they appear to be enveloped by a threefold halo of presence: Christ's presence! .... The bishop's

presence! Priests: ‘associated with their bishop in a spirit of trust and generosity make him present in a certain sense in the individual local congregations of the faithful.’ .... The presence of the Church! ‘They make the universal Church visible in their own locality ....’ (by dressing like laymen and melting into the crowd.) ‘We shall have more institutions: a priests’ council and the pastoral council and many other fine initiatives.’

The matter of Holy Orders, according to Pius XII, who went to unnecessary trouble in “*Sacramentum Ordinis*,” is the imposition of hands. The form consists in the words of the Preface, the essential words being: “Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty Father, to this Thy servant the dignity of the priesthood; renew the spirit of holiness within him, that he may hold from Thee, O God, the second rank in Thy service and by the example of his behavior afford a pattern of holy living.”

Leo XIII ruled the intention of the Anglican ordination rite defective because the form was not intended to ordain sacrificing priests in the Catholic sense of the term, that the prayers “have been deliberately stripped of everything which, in the Catholic rite, clearly sets forth the dignity and function of the priesthood. It is impossible, therefore, for a form to be suitable or sufficient for a sacrament if it suppresses that which it ought to signify.” The intention of the new rite was to make a man not a sacrificing priest, but a “faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His holy sacraments,” a phrase used by the continental reformers to describe the Protestant ministry in opposition to the Catholic priesthood.

The Anglican archbishops objected. The Catholic hierarchy of England and Wales issued A Vindication of the Bull “*Apostolicae Curae*.” They decried the very idea of reforming or omitting “anything in those forms which immemorial tradition has bequeathed to us. For such an immemorial usage, whether or not it has in the course of centuries incorporated superfluous accretions, must in the estimation of those who believe in a divinely guarded visible Church, at least have retained what is necessary; so that in adhering rigidly to the rite handed down to us we can always feel secure; whereas, if we omit or change anything, we may perhaps abandon just that element which is essential. And this sound method is that which the Catholic Church has always followed (till when?) .... That in earlier times local churches were permitted to add new prayers and ceremonies is acknowledged .... but that they were permitted to subtract prayers and ceremonies in previous use, and even to remodel the existing rite in the most drastic manner is a proposition for which we know of no historical foundation, and which appears to us absolutely incredible. Hence Cranmer in taking this unprecedented course acted, in our opinion, with the most inconceivable rashness.”

Catholic historians of the Reformation (e.g., Hughes, Messenger, Clark) lay special emphasis on Cranmer’s technique of introducing doctrinal innovation through the liturgy, not by explicitly heretical statements, but by omission of prayers and ceremonies



irreconcilable with Protestant doctrine. Their judgment is unanimous—what is not affirmed is denied.

The old rite has been remodelled in the most drastic manner, principally by subtraction of prayers and ceremonies in previous use, notably those specifying the traditional (Tridentine) definition of a Catholic priest—ordained to consecrate, offer sacrifice, and forgive sins. The new rite follows the very pattern for which Pope Leo XIII condemned Cranmer's ordination rite as invalid.

Too much space is needed to list all the prayers subtracted or transformed beyond recognition in the new English version. Among those omitted:

“Theirs be the task to change with blessing undefiled, for the service of Thy people, bread and wine into the body and blood of Thy Son.”

“Be pleased, Lord, to consecrate and sanctify these hands by this anointing and our blessing. Amen. That whatsoever they bless may be blessed, and whatsoever they consecrate may be consecrated and sanctified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

As the Chalice and Paten are handed over (*traditio*): “Receive the power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Mass for the living and the dead, in the name of the Lord.”

At the second laying on of hands (also omitted): “Receive the Holy Ghost. When you forgive men's sins they are forgiven; when you hold them bound, they are bound.”

“May the blessing of God enable you to offer propitiatory sacrifices for the sins and offences of the people to Almighty God.”

At the “presentation of the gifts” (new rite), the bishop presents the Chalice and Paten and says: “Accept the gift of the people to be offered to God. Realize what you are about, be as holy as your ministry, model your life on the mystery of the Cross of our Lord.” At the anointing of hands: “May Jesus Christ, our Lord, Whom the Father has anointed through the power of the Holy Spirit, keep you worthy to offer sacrifice to God and to sanctify His people.”

Could those who intended only to ordain, or to be ordained, as a “faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His holy sacraments” accept “worthy to offer sacrifice?” Cranmer taught the sacrifice which does not reconcile us to God, which is offered by the already reconciled (“... to testify our duties unto God, and to show ourselves thankful unto Him. And therefore they be called sacrifices of laud, praise, and thanksgiving.”). Hooper, who said: “If we study not daily to offer these sacrifices (of thanksgiving, benevolence, and liberality to the poor) to God, we be no Christian men,” also said: “I believe the Holy Supper of the Lord is not a sacrifice, but only a remembrance and commemoration of this holy sacrifice of Jesus Christ. Therefore it ought not be worshipped as God, neither is Christ therein contained; who must be worshipped in faith only, without all

corruptible elements. Likewise I believe and confess that the popish Mass is an invention and ordinance of man, a sacrifice of Antichrist, and a forsaking of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, that is to say, of His death and passion; and that it is a stinking and infected sepulchre, which hideth and covereth the merit of the blood of Christ; ....” The use of the word “sacrifice” within the new rite must be taken in the context of its “native character and spirit.”

*Even the Preface defined by Pope Pius XII as constituting the form has been changed:* “.... dignity of the priesthood. Renew the spirit of holiness within him. By Your divine gift may he attain the second order in the hierarchy and exemplify right conduct in his life.” Nothing here could repel an Anglican, particularly in view of the immediately following change: “May he be our fellow worker, so that the words of the gospel may reach the farthest parts of the earth, and all nations gathered together in Christ, may become one holy people of God.”

We must refer to the climate, the historic circumstances, surrounding compilation of this rite. It follows introduction of an ambiguous, invalid rite of “mass”—perfectly acceptable to Protestants—and the signing of a joint statement on the Eucharist by an Anglican-Roman Catholic Commission, in which commitment to the doctrine of transubstantiation and the sacrificial nature of the Mass were deliberately avoided.

To quote an Anglican member of the Commission: “The (Windsor) Statement spoke explicitly of the sacrifice of Christ, but it never described the eucharist as a sacrifice. Even a ‘substantial agreement’ did not require that.”

The new Catholic Ordinal has also been followed by the “Agreed Statement on the Ministry,” in which not only is there no clear teaching on the Real Presence and the sacrificial nature of the Mass, but it is nowhere stated that the Apostles appointed bishops and established an unbroken chain down to the twentieth century, nor that ordination confers a “character” which empowers an “ordained man to do something which no layman can do.” (E. Messenger, “The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood”)

One thing is absolutely certain: There could have been no Windsor Agreement on the Eucharist and no Canterbury Agreement on the Ministry had the old Mass and the old Ordinal still been in use. Catholics who try to defend the new Ordinal will, as when defending the new “mass,” base their case on the notion that it can be used validly. Even were this true, it is impossible when the “ordaining” bishop is himself improperly consecrated. His rite is wrong, too.

### **Matter And Form Are Necessary To The Sacraments**

But it does not follow that they are the only essentials, that the bare matter and form suffice. The Holy Eucharist, for instance, is produced only in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The correct verbal form of Consecration has no effect on the correct matter unless prayed in the rite which clearly shows that the priest acting

in the person of Christ offers the Church's Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood unto the remission of sins.

A sacramental rite is an entity. It did not fall together by chance. It surrounds the form and matter with purpose and intent. To cancel out parts of sacramental rites, especially parts which clearly specify the intention of the sacrament, on grounds that such parts do not occur in other rites or other times, is absurd. Before authoritative definition of sacramental matter or form there may have been disagreement on what part(s) constituted the form. But disagreement based on another integral rite is complete beggary of the question. The rites and forms are simply different, as in Confirmation, Extreme Unction, or Holy Orders. We can be sure of the efficacy of the form when the entire rite is preserved.

A form stripped of its setting and reclothed in rites which vitiate or suppress its intention arouses reasonable doubt—unnecessary doubt from unnecessary change. When changes create rites which approximate heretical rites, especially rites repeatedly declared invalid, why are we to trust the motives or explanations of those who impose these changes? Can it follow that changes obviously unnecessary to validity intend less than suspicion or destruction of the sacrament?

If the bare words designated as the form of Holy Orders in a rite systematically stripped of specification of intent and definition of object is enough, then the “communion service” from the Book of Common Prayer, recited by a properly ordained priest, would miraculously become a Mass despite removal of intent from the rite.

Pope Pius XII, after determining the form and matter of Holy Orders (*Sacramentum Ordinis*, 30 Nov. 1947), continued: “Finally, what we have above declared and provided is by no means to be understood in the sense that it be permitted even in the slightest detail to neglect or omit the other rites which are prescribed in the Roman Pontifical; on the contrary we order that all the prescriptions laid down in the said Roman Pontifical be religiously observed and performed.”

This new “ordination” ousted the traditional rite 6 April 1969, the day the *novus ordo* was promulgated. Valid orders are not required to celebrate a non-Catholic service.

### **No Bishops, No Clergy—No Clergy, No Mass!**

If the new “orders” are used to the exclusion of the sacrament of Holy Orders—as Knox and Montini intended—within twenty years it will not matter what rite is used for worship. Not only will there not be a properly ordained priest capable of celebrating a true Mass, but there will be no possibility of obtaining one. For there will be no bishops either.

It is well-known that the sacraments of the New Law, being sensible signs which cause invisible grace, must both signify the grace which they cause and cause the grace which they signify. Now this signification, though it must be found in the essential rite as a whole, that is, in both matter and form together, belongs

chiefly to the form; for the matter is by itself the indeterminate part, which becomes determinate through the form. This is especially apparent in the sacrament of Order, the matter of which ... is the imposition of hands. This by itself does not signify anything definite, being used equally for the conferring of certain orders and for administering Confirmation” (and lately for “anointing of the sick”).—Leo XIII, *Apostolicae Curae*, 24.

“Now in all things composed of matter and form, the determining principle is on the part of the form, which is as it were the end and term of the matter. Consequently for the beginning of a thing the need of a determinate form is prior to the need of determinate matter, for determinate matter is needed that it may be proportioned to the determinate form. Since, therefore, in the sacraments determinate sensible things are required, which are as the sacramental matter, much more is there need in them of a determinate form of words.”—*Summa Theologiae*, III, q 60, 7.

“Since in the sacraments, the words produce an effect according to the sense which they convey ... we must see whether the change of words destroys the due sense of the words, because then the sacrament is clearly rendered invalid. Now it is clear that if any of these things which are of the substance of the sacramental form be suppressed, that the due sense of the words is destroyed, and consequently the sacrament is invalid.”—*Summa Theologiae*, III q 60, 8.

“The form of a sacrament should contain all those things that explain the nature and substance of the sacrament itself.” --Catech. Conc. Trent (1566) II, ch 3, q 11.

“... the power of a sacrament consists not in the matter only, but in matter and form together, which two are one sacrament; hence however greatly the matter of a sacrament is applied to a man without the necessary form of words and other things which are required for it, the effect of the sacrament does not follow.”—St. Thomas Aquinas, *De Veritate*, q. 27, 4, ad 10.

We can multiply quotations of this nature from recognized authorities of all ages of the Church indefinitely. Let us apply them to the superseded rite of consecration of a bishop, and to the new rite of ordination of a bishop-elect. Observe even in the title of the ceremony a diminution—another unnecessary innovation—in the dignity of the office. The Ordination completely replaced the Consecration by “order” of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (Prot. no. R 19/967) Easter Sunday, April 6, 1969, in another of these actions beyond its competence in response to a non-mandatory approval by a “pope” acting beyond his competence in “obedience” to a pastoral council acting beyond its competence.

We quote the Apostolic Constitution Approval of a New Rite for the Ordination of Deacons, Priests, and Bishops, Paul VI, June 18, 1968:

... the apostolic constitution *Sacramentum Ordinis* ... (of) Pius XII, Nov. 30, 1947 ... declared that “the sole matter of the sacred Orders of diaconate, presbyterate, and episcopate is the

imposition of hands; likewise the sole form is the words which determine the application of this matter, which univocally signify the sacramental effects—namely, the power of Order and the grace of the Holy Spirit—and which are accepted and employed by the Church as such.” Having said this, the document determines what imposition of hands and which words constitute the matter and form in the conferral of each Order. IT WAS NECESSARY in the revision of the rite to add, delete, or change certain things, either to restore texts to their earlier integrity, to make the expressions clearer, or to describe the sacramental effects better. We therefore think it necessary, in order to remove all controversy and to avoid anxiety of conscience (neither of which would have arisen but for the revision), to declare what in the revised rite should be said to pertain to the nature of the Order. By our supreme apostolic authority we decree and establish the following with regard to the matter and form in the conferral of each Order .... (deacons) .... (priests) .... Finally, in the ordination of a bishop, the matter is the imposition of hands on the head of the bishop-elect by the consecrating bishops, or at least by the principal consecrator, which is done in silence before the consecratory prayer; the form consists of the words of the consecratory prayer, of which the following pertain to the nature of the Order and therefore are required for the validity of the act: “Now pour out .... be praised and glorified.”

In the traditional rite the Consecrator and both Co-consecrators touch with both hands the head of the consecrand, saying: “Receive the Holy Ghost,” thus coupling an intent with the matter. If the matter of the sacrament, even if sufficiently determined by a proper form, may be applied by the principal “consecrator” only, what is the purpose of the other two? How are they insuring apostolic succession?

The traditional rite of Consecration follows the prescriptions of *Sacramentum Ordinis*, naturally enough, since it preceded and furnished part of the basis for this document: “The imposition of hands is the matter, and the words of the following preface, the last sentence of which is essential for the validity of the Consecration, are the form by which the episcopal order is conferred.”

TRADITIONAL CONSECRATION FORM—All: It is truly fitting and just, right and profitable unto salvation that, at all times and in all places, we should give thanks to Thee, O Holy Lord, Father Almighty, Eternal God, source of honor to all dignitaries who in their sacred orders serve Thy glory. Thanks to Thee, O Lord Who, in the privacy of familiar conversation, didst instruct Moses, Thy servant, concerning, among other things of divine worship, the nature of sacerdotal garments, and Who didst order that Aaron, Thy chosen one, should be clad in mystic robes during sacred functions, so that generation after generation might learn from the example of their forebears, and so that knowledge derived from Thy instruction be not wanting in any age. Among our forebears the very display of symbols would excite reverence; AMONG US, however, THE REALITIES THEMSELVES

MEAN MORE THAN THE SYMBOLS. WHEREAS THE GARB OF THE ANCIENT PRIESTHOOD IS MERELY A DISPLAY FOR OUR MIND, NOW THE SPLENDOR OF SOULS RATHER THAN OF VESTMENTS MAKES THE PONTIFICAL GLORY ATTRACTIVE; because even those things which THEN were pleasing to the eyes of the flesh had to be grasped by the mind as to their inner meaning. Therefore, we beseech Thee, O Lord, shower upon this Thy servant, whom Thou hast chosen for the ministry of the HIGHEST PRIESTHOOD, this grace, namely, that whatever those garments signify in the lustre of gold, the beauty of jewels, and the varied skill of craftsmanship, may shine forth in their conduct and deeds. **Give to Thy priests the perfection of ministry, and sanctify them, decked out in ornaments of glory, with the dew of Thy heavenly ointment.**

NEW Ordination “FORM”—Principal Consecrator: Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, merciful God, bringing comfort to all, from your heavenly home you look with care on the lowest of your creatures, knowing all things even before they come to be. Your life-giving revelation has laid down rules for your Church, *the just people of Abraham* upon whom you had set your mark from the beginning: in that Church you have established a government and priesthood, so as not to leave your sanctuary without its liturgy; and from the beginning of the world it has pleased you to be gloried by the ministers whom you have chosen.

(All the consecrating bishops): **Now pour out upon this chosen one that power which flows from You, the perfect spirit whom you gave to your beloved Son, Jesus Christ, the Spirit Whom He gave to the Apostles, who established the Church in every place as the sanctuary where Your Name would always be praised and glorified.**

(Principal consecrator continues alone): Father, you know what is in every heart. Inspire the heart of your servant whom you have chosen to make a bishop. May he feed your holy flock and exercise the *High Priesthood* without blame, ministering to you day and night to reconcile us with you and to offer the gifts of your Church. By the spirit of this Priesthood may he have the power to forgive sins, as you commanded. May he assign the duties of the flock according to your will and loose every bond by the power you gave the apostles. May his gentleness and singleness of purpose stand before you as an offering through your Son Jesus Christ. Through him glory and power and honor are yours, with the Holy Spirit in the Church, now and forever. (All): Amen.

In the old rite the Old and New Laws are deliberately contrasted; in the new form they are unified, so that *High Priesthood* seems to refer to the priesthood of Aaron (non-sacramental by definition—instituted by Christ?) rather than to anything relevant. This new (not *Highest*) priesthood (Why not *Episcopacy*? This would “make the expression clearer,” as Paul’s Apostolic Constitution rationalized the revision.) is defined in functions which lie completely within the power of the ordinary priest.

Divine power poured out is not the same as conferral of active use of divine power. No specification in the entire new “form” exceeds what may also characterize Baptism, Confirmation, or the new “anointing of the sick.”

The old form was not that specific either? As in the Mass, we cannot divorce the form from the rite. The old form is sufficiently specific in a rite that clearly conveys its intent. The Consecrator (old rite) explicitly defines his new office to the bishop-elect in words removed from the new rite: “*A Bishop is charged with the duty to judge, interpret, consecrate, ordain, offer, baptize, and confirm.*”

The new rite otherwise manifests defect or deliberate suppression of intention of conveying the sacrament. Instances:

1. In the Examination, by introduction of:

a. “to remain united with (the Church) by your link with the order of bishops.” This appears to constrain the ordinand to subordinate his authority to those other innovations, the episcopal conference and the instruction’s “collegiate body of bishops,” rather than to refer to Apostolic Succession.

b. “to show kindness .... in the name of the Lord (replacing “for the Lord’s sake”) to the poor and to *strangers*” (replacing “to the homeless”).

The bishop is “ordained” for his own flock? Ecumenism first!

c. “to carry out the highest duties of the priesthood ....” “Episcopate” is available. The excuse for reform is clarification.

d. “in co-operation with the priests and deacons who share your ministry.” He is to co-operate with subordinates, not run his diocese. Nor is the extent of the sharing clarified. He may be first among equals, in the general trend of spiritual devaluation.

2. In the Examination, by deletion of:

a. “Will you receive, teach, and keep with reverence the tradition of the approved Fathers as well as the decrees and laws of the Holy .... See?”

Teaching and tradition must go. *Quo Primum* and Canon Law ignore or forget!

b. “Will you, in all things and **in accord with Canon Law**, show to Blessed Peter the Apostle, who received from God the power of binding and of loosing, to His Vicar, our Holy Father, Pope N., and to his successors, the Roman Pontiffs, fidelity, submission, and obedience?”

This is replaced with “to be loyal in your obedience to the successor of St. Peter the Apostle?” Loyalty to only one contemporary man is required.

3. (Prayer of Consecration, third paragraph) “.... loose every bond ....” without mention of “binding” promotes the ecumenical, non-Catholic bias of most innovation.

4. Deletion of the anointing of hands, by which the matter (laying on) of several sacraments is applied, and its accompanying prayer: “May God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath Himself willed to raise you to the dignity of the Pontifical Order, flood you with chrism and with the symbolical ointment, and make you fruitful with the richness of spiritual benediction. Whatsoever you shall bless may it be blessed, and whatsoever you shall sanctify may it be sanctified; and may the imposition of this consecrated hand or thumb be profitable to all unto salvation. Amen.”

5. Reversal of the ritual order of gifts (crosier, ring, Gospels) leaving the “staff” of authority last, as a “sign” of the “office” accompanied (old rite only) by the caution: “neglect not strictness of discipline through love of peace.”

6. Substitution of the (old rite) prayer “May your head be anointed and consecrated by heavenly benediction in the pontifical order” with “God has made you a sharer in Christ’s *priesthood* (required for eligibility for this ceremony). May He pour upon you this oil of mystical anointing and make you fruitful with spiritual blessing.”

7. Elimination of the entire long prayer which follows the anointing, and ends: “Grant him, O Lord, an episcopal chair for ruling Thy Church and the people committed to him. Be Thou his authority; be Thou his power; be Thou his strength. Shower upon him Thy blessing and Thy grace so that .... he .... be faithful to his charge.”

But then this man has neither authority nor charge.

“.... one argument has the value of them all: namely that these prayers have been stripped of everything which in the Catholic rite clearly sets forth the dignity and functions of the priesthood (read: episcopacy). It is impossible, therefore, for a form to be suitable or sufficient for a sacrament if it is silent on that which it ought distinctively to signify.”—Leo XIII, *Apostolicae Curiae*, 27.

A retired bishop weaseled out of adverting to these issues thus, his sole attempt at refutation: “You strain your credibility by singling out such a small thing as the order of the gifts. Reversing the order of Gospels, ring, and staff can have no effect.”

The innovators strain our credulity every time we look. “I see it but I don’t believe it!” has become our password. What great need arose to reverse the order? Could some one have said: “Let’s change every slightest thing, lest some one ask why we have neglected **this** opportunity?” Or was it pure perversity—seen in old witch tales where spells must be cast backwards, the castle must be circumnavigated counter-clockwise, the Sign of the Cross is reversed—to signify satanic, universally applied malice? Or is this tampering with traditional order utterly meaningless? It demonstrates, if not the undermining of authority, either malice or frivolity.

Meanwhile back at the herring hatchery another ruby-red finny creature was committed to the deep. Only the deep will



understand this one. The Congregation for Divine Worship, papal purveyors of quality fiction, outdid itself in *Notitiae* 100, December 1974, pp. 410-411: Studia “*Spiritus Principalis*” (Formula of Episcopal Ordination). The expression “*Spiritus Principalis*” used in the formula of episcopal ordination raises some difficulties and leads to different translations in modern languages. The question can be solved provided a sound method is used.

There are in fact two problems not to be mixed up. The first is the meaning of the expression in the original text of Psalm 50. This is a matter for exegetes and Hebraicists. The second is the meaning ... in the prayer of the rite, which is not necessarily bound to the first one. To assume that the words have not changed in meaning after twelve centuries is an error of method. It is even more serious an error in this case, as the expression is isolated from its psalmic context. Nothing indicates that the author of the prayer intended to bring closer the situation of the bishop to that of David. The expression has, for the Christian of the third century, a theological meaning which has nothing in common with the thought of a king of Juda(?) twelve centuries earlier. Even assuming that “*principalis*” is a mistranslation, it is not important here. The only problem is to know what meaning the author of the prayer wanted to give the expression.

The solution must be sought in two directions: the context of the prayer and the use of *hegemonikos* in the Christian language of the third century. It is clear *Spirit* means the person of the Holy Ghost. The whole context so indicates: everyone keeps silent because of the descent of the *Spirit*. The real question is: why, among other relevant adjectives, has *Principalis* been chosen? The research must be widened here.

The three hierarchies have a gift of the spirit, but it is not the same for all. For the bishop it is the “*Spiritus Principalis*,” for the priests, who are the counsellors of the bishop, it is the “*Spiritus Consilii*,” and for the deacon, who is his assistant, it is “*Spiritus Zeli et Sollicitudinis*.” It is clear that these differences are made according to the duties of each minister. It is therefore clear that *Principalis* must be related to the specific duties of a bishop. It is sufficient to re-read the prayer to be convinced of that. (This may explain the change, effective 12 Aug. 1977 with approval of an English translation, from *perfect* to *governing* spirit in the “form” of the new rite. How sad to lose perfection in only nine years!)

The author takes from the typology of the Old Testament: God has never left His people without a chief nor His sanctuary without a minister; it is the same for the new Israel, the Church. The bishop is at the same time the chief who must lead His new people, and the high priest of the new sanctuary which is established in all places. The bishop is the chief of the Church. Therefore the choice of the word *hegemonikos* is understandable: it is the gift of the Holy Ghost which falls to a chief. The best French translation would perhaps be: “*L’Esprit d’autorite*” (the Spirit of Authority). However, the translation *may be anything* but

the meaning is certain. This has been very well demonstrated by an article of Fr. J. Lecuyer (1953).—B. Botte, O.S.B.

These spirits, then, would seem the essential differences of the three ordinations—therefore vital to the sacramental form and formulary. Do they then appear in the vernacular rites used in Australia. Not for nine years in the case of a bishop, and in a rite that deliberately suppresses his new “governing spirit.” Even when he “ordains” a “priest” he acknowledges the reduction in his dignity: “You filled the sons of Aaron with their father’s power, to make them worthy priests for the offering of saving victims and the celebration of sacred rites. By your Providence, Lord, your Son’s apostles had companions of the second rank, to help them preach the faith to the whole world” (but apparently not, as Aaron’s sons, for sacred rites and sacrifice). “We” (bishops!) “cannot compare with the High Priests, with Moses, Aaron, and the Apostles.” (Apostles I’ll grant, as did the old rite.) “Weaker than they, so much the more are we in need of help. Grant us that help, O Lord. We ask you, all-powerful Father, give these servants of yours the dignity of the presbyterate” (changed 12 Aug. 1977 to priesthood). “Renew within them the Spirit of holiness.” (*Spiritus Consilii*? Of counsel? Is holiness exclusively priestly? Is not the Spirit of holiness given every Catholic in Baptism and again in Confirmation?)

Though the “ordination” rite for deacons plays all around it, it seems deliberately to avoid the Spirit of zeal and solicitude. All three “ordinations” evade, or have till recently evaded *Notitiae*’s requisites. Are they therefore suspect?

Perish the thought! The same issue of *Notitiae* carries, from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, a Declaration on the significance to be attributed the vernacular translation of sacramental formulas. The Church (it says) has the power to change a sacramental formula, as was done recently for Confirmation and for Anointing of the Sick, provided that the new formula continues to signify the special grace conferred by the sacrament. This meaning is given in the Latin text. Difficulties can arise when trying to express the concepts of the original Latin formula in translation. It sometimes happens that one is obliged to use paraphrases and circumlocutions. A diversity of expression results which can give rise to various interpretations. To obviate this, the Declaration points out that the Holy See approves a formula because it considers that it expresses the sense understood by the Church in the Latin text. The formula is understood in this sense. If there is any ambiguity, this is best understood in the light of the Latin text.

Now, apparently, we may use Paul VI’s original Latin text of *Missale Romanum* to determine the meaning of the fraudulent translation. This fortuitous decision supposedly forestalls the question: Why are the victims of improper forms not recalled for valid conferral of sacraments?

### **Joining the Mob**

Baptism is harder to destroy. It may be validly conferred by anyone using proper form and matter and intending what the Church intends, even though he consider it useless. But the explanatory homilies inflicted by many of the younger clergy demonstrate apparent ignorance of the Church's intention. They present the ceremony as joining the People of God, with never a mention of original sin or its remission, the sacrament's necessity for salvation, or such traditional phrase as "child of God and heir of heaven." Not a few parents have taken newly baptized(?) infants straight from the parish church to the kitchen sink and baptized them properly, and not even conditionally. No parent deliberately trifles with this necessary sacrament.

According to **The Catholic Encyclopedia**, not all baptism officially administered by heretics is invalid, even though these heretics have no formal intention of baptizing according to the Catholic rite as such. The Church legislates for Catholics, but baptism cannot be received twice. Each adult convert from Protestantism thus presents an individual problem. Not only is there no uniform Protestant doctrine or practice, but even among those whose ritual suffices, validity is often doubtful. Practically, converts in the U.S.A. were almost invariably baptised either absolutely or conditionally, not because baptism administered by Protestants is held invalid, but because it is generally impossible to discover whether they have ever been properly baptized. Even where a ceremony had undoubtedly been performed, reasonable doubt of validity would generally remain, either for the administrator's intention or the mode of administration. Orientals and "Old Catholics" generally baptize accurately. Socinians and Quakers do not baptize. Baptists use the rite for adults, treat it as more of an initiation, and separate matter and form. Congregationalists, Unitarians, and Universalists deny the necessity of baptism, hence the presumption of inaccurate administration. Methodists and Presbyterians baptize by aspersion or sprinkling, thus creating a reasonable doubt that water has flowed upon or even touched the body. Among Episcopalians, the Anglicans liberated by the American Revolution, many consider baptism an empty ceremony. Consequently a well-grounded fear of careless administration arises. Nor, even in the same religion, do ministers everywhere follow an identical method.

All this is extracted from a 1913 book to demonstrate the Catholic care of a sacrament essential to salvation, whether or not the article applies everywhere. Only since Vatican II and its false ecumenism has what passes for the Catholic Church signed unnecessary agreements with Anglicans on the eucharist and Methodists on baptism. What is achieved? Ecumenical compromise all goes one way. Religions that split off the Catholic Church, or off the original splitters, see no need to give up their characteristic differences. Only Rome has faced about and given ground. If it now formally recognizes what it formerly questioned, it has at least put its own present position in question before its own members.

Catholicism has never tolerated doubt in salvation's essentials. Doubtful sacrament, no sacrament. Doubtful Mass, no Mass.

Doubtful pope, no pope. Doubtful religion, no religion. It is impossible to innovate in matters of religion without creating doubt, at least. Ecumenism is an utter waste of time. We can convert people, not religions—which have no minds to change, no souls to lose. A changing religion loses its identity. A changed religion is dead. It has no authority, no measure of orthodoxy. Without these a religious organization quickly degenerates into anarchy. Initiation into such groups may be termed JOINING THE MOB.

The Catholic religion's purpose is to worship God as He has shown He wishes to be worshipped, to teach and baptize all, for their salvation. Since it has deserted and contradicted its former teaching and practice, what is its purpose? To show us new, man-made routes to heaven? If new presentations are more authentic, is not the newest the most authentic? If the spirit blows where it will, how can we arbitrarily condemn Joe Blow, the Jehovah's Witless at the door? How can there be a heresy? When no standard exists, how can any doctrine be judged? What force has any law? Is this religion?

"How are you helping?" I am asked. "Why won't you pray more?" as though my schedule were public property. "Why must you scandalize? Take it up with your priests and bishops. They can answer you."

But they cannot! No one, no matter how responsible, ever answers. The best reply is that some one else can answer. Some bishops have even admitted in writing that they are not well enough versed in the religion which they must teach to argue with me.

Some of my more recent correspondence with the bishops of Australia, New Zealand, and India is included in Appendix III. Should you ask the learned bishops why they have not attempted to reply, they will not admit they cannot because they would thereby answer and contradict themselves twenty-five years ago. They may tag me a bigot or fanatic upon whom they cannot waste valuable time. And they *are* busy. Look at the hordes they convert!

## **Section Six**

### **The Authority of Contradiction**

#### **Vatican II's Authority**

All innovations must be correct, we are told, because they are "by order of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council." An Ecumenical Council cannot err. Remember Seleucia and Rimini? The Fourth Council of Ephesus (the Robber Council) held in 449 was condemned by Pope St. Leo I. Pope Pius II, in his Bull *Execrabilis* (1460): any council called to make drastic change in the Church is beforehand decreed to be void and annulled. Vatican II was avowedly convoked for this purpose. Even if not, it would have become void and annulled when such a purpose surfaced, or if shown afterward (as by citation of the Council's orders or authority for drastic changes) that it had, among others, such a

purpose. Either Vatican II ordered these changes, and is therefore annulled, or it did not order these changes, and our innovators, including Paul VI and his successors, have lied to us. Or both!

Marcel Lefebvre, who for two years attended all sessions of the Council Preparatory Commission as a working member, reports sixty-two preparatory schemas, “most meticulously and conscientiously done, completely orthodox, none requiring the slightest re-drafting.” A fortnight after the Council opened, of these two years of conscientious work there remained not a single sentence.

Council rules provided that a two-thirds vote was needed to reject a proposed schema. An early session voted on whether to accept them for discussion (as though this were even to be suggested, much less seriously considered). Sixty per cent voted to reject, forty per cent, to accept. By the rules they should have been discussed. But the powerful, highly organized European Alliance pressured John XXIII: “It is inadmissible that you should insist on our discussing schemas which have not been passed by majority vote; they must be rejected.” It worked! Incredibly, the Council began, then, without an agenda.

Consider the ordinary bishop’s range of episcopal acquaintance—probably two or three. Of this flood of bishops from everywhere what could he know, how judge their suitability for Commissions on Priesthood, Liturgy, Canon Law? What more reasonable than that Cardinal Ottaviani compile a list of members of the pre-Conciliar Commissions, men chosen by the Holy See, already experienced in the work of the Commissions? But the European Alliance called the list “intolerable pressure” from the *Curia* to secure the nominations of its choice, completely surprising the Secretary, Mgr. Felici, who announced adjournment till the following afternoon. The Episcopal Conferences (still in embryo) were asked to furnish lists of nominees in twenty-four hours—insufficient time even to meet! But the European Alliance had its list prepared in advance. This, in the absence of alternatives, passed with a very large majority. Means had been found to dominate and completely to re-orient the Council.

Choice of Moderators awaited the end of the Second Session, when Paul VI named Cardinals Dopfner, Suenens, Lercaro, and Agagianian. He thus showed the Council its direction; this greatly influenced most of the Council Fathers.

During the Council clear definitions were not wanted. This absence of definition, this unwillingness to investigate subjects philosophically and theologically, allows us to describe them only faintly. Often traditional definitions were falsified. Now we confront a whole system we cannot grasp, and find difficult to oppose, because traditional (true) definitions are no longer accepted.

The traditional definition of marriage, for instance, holds that its first object is procreation, the second, conjugal love. Cardinal Suenens wanted to change this, pretending these objects have equal value. Obviously, all said nowadays on marriage links with this

false idea. By right to sexuality every evil is permitted: contraception, then anything to prevent births, eventually abortion—all from one bad definition.

The definition of the Church itself was falsified. No longer the necessary means of salvation it is merely “useful.” Christians must penetrate total mankind already headed spontaneously for salvation, contribute a bit more “union” and “Charity,” etc. Thus the whole Constitution of the Missions was undermined. Priests back from the missions don’t want to return. In “renewals,” in “*cursillos*,” in general get-togethers, and from special deputies they are hammered: “Don’t proselytize! Understand that all religions have great values. Interest yourselves only in development and progress—social of course --” no longer in real evangelization, or its object, sanctification. Christians must not think themselves better than others; we do not alone possess the truth; we must be useful to mankind.

*Gaudium et Spes* begins with a long tale of changes within mankind, the perpetual justification for innovation. Everything changes, the world, time, but especially mankind, which ever progresses. Conclusion: our concept of religion must change. The Catholic religion no longer bears its former relation to other creeds.

What is an Episcopal Conference? Whom does it represent? What is its authority or purpose? Again, no definition. Paul VI himself said that eventually in practice it would become clear how to define it and demarcate its powers. So, ignorant of their objective, our bishops went straight into conferences. This is terribly serious. The greater the importance and power these Conferences assume, the more the individual bishops are eliminated. The episcopacy, the real structure of the Church of Our Lord, disappears into committee.

This was not a dogmatic Council, as both its “popes” had stated. During the sessions when asked for definitions of subjects under discussion—religious liberty, ecumenism, collegiality—the Commission secretaries replied invariably: “We are not here to discuss dogmas or philosophy, but to deal with pastoral matters. We are a pastoral Council; it is useless to give definitions which would not be understood.” So your Council is unique! All other Councils sought to combat error. Here completely inadmissible things happened. The Council was inspired by the Holy Ghost? Not necessarily. A pastoral, non-dogmatic Council is merely a kind of instruction or sermon which, of itself, involves no infallibility.

Why cite Lefebvre? He was there; I was not. One should also read Ralph M. Wiltgen’s “The Rhine Flows Into the Tiber.” This factual report by the man who ran the Divine Word News Service, which specialized in detailed Council reporting, should convince any unbiased reader of the illegitimacy of Vatican II. It chronicles extensively, even approvingly, the activities of the European Alliance, which came to the Council to control it. A month before the second session this Alliance of German, Swiss, Austrian, French, Belgian, Scandinavian, and Dutch bishops met at Fulda,

Germany. Their work, says Father Wiltgen, was very impressive. Regrettably all episcopal conferences were not so dedicated and purposeful; they might not have found it necessary to accept the European Alliance's positions with so little questioning. A less one-sided Council's achievements could have shown world-wide effort. (?)

The German-speaking bishops' position was regularly adopted by the European Alliance. The Council regularly adopted the Alliance's position. The whole Council, then, could accept the views of a single theologian who had the ear of the Germans. There was such: Karl Rahner, S.J. Technically Cardinal Koenig's consultant theologian, he was consulted by many members of the German and Austrian hierarchy; he might well be called the most influential mind at Fulda. Cardinal Frings called him "the greatest theologian of the century."

Wiltgen reports that on Dec. 3, next last day of the Second Session, Archbishop Geraldo Sigaud of Diamantina, Brazil gave Cardinal Cicognani petitions addressed to Pope Paul, signed by over two hundred Council Fathers from forty-six countries, requesting a schema in which "the Catholic social doctrine would be set forth with great clarity, and the errors of Marxism, socialism, and communism would be refuted on philosophical, sociological, and economic grounds." Paul's only response, "*Ecclesiam Suam*" (Aug. 6, 1964), called for dialogue with atheistic communism, despite ample reasons (he said) which forced him, his predecessors, and all who care for religious values "to condemn the ideological systems which are often identified with economic, social, and political regions." (para 172).

Paragraph 177 tells us that some of the atheist's "many and complex" motives "arise from the demand that divine things" (an atheist?) "be presented in a purer and worthier way than is, perhaps, the case in certain imperfect forms of language and worship" (WHOSE?), "which we ought to try and purify" (they must be OURS!) "so that they express as perfectly and clearly as possible the sacred reality of which they are the sign." Here the reputed head of the Catholic Church proclaims our duty to overcome aspects of our official worship which displease those who deny any reason for worship, and terms "imperfections" the existence of such necessary aspects.

The German-speaking and Scandinavian bishops in official comments on "The Church in the Modern World" schema declared "probably desirable" a "more distinct treatment .... of the problem of atheism, and of dialogue with it." Discussion of atheism (carefully avoiding the word **communism**) came up Oct. 24, 1964 (Session III). Archbishop Paul Yu Pin, Nanking, China, requested addition of a chapter on atheistic communism. The Council must treat it to satisfy all, "especially those who groan under the yoke of communism and are forced to endure indescribable sorrows unjustly." Cardinal Beran received a Czecho-Slovak newspaper cutting boasting successful communist infiltration of every commission at Vatican II.

April 7, 1965 Paul VI set up a secretariat for Non-Believers (filling the vacuum left by the former missionary effort), placing in charge Cardinal Koenig of Vienna, frequently Vatican spokesman to communist governments, to foster dialogue with atheists, presumably on “equal footing.”

The schema revision presented at Session IV again avoided “communism.” Twenty-five bishops signed Bishop Carli’s letter of Sept. 29, 1965 detailing ten reasons why the Council should treat Marxist communism. After all the Holy Office and late popes had said, silence would be “equivalent to disavowing all that had been said and done .... tomorrow the Council will be reproved—and justly so—for its silence on communism, which will be taken as a sign of cowardice and conniving.” Archbishops Sigaud and Lefebvre, non-signers because of great liberal and press antagonism, distributed the letter and a written intervention requesting such treatment. October 20 Father Wiltgen reported four hundred fifty signatures, and three of Rome’s largest dailies carried the story front page.

The new revision, distributed Sat., Nov. 13, again failed to mention either communism or the intervention and its four hundred fifty signers. Bishop Carli protested to the Council Presidency, responsible for enforcement of Council rules. The rules of Procedure required all amendments printed and submitted to the Council Fathers for admission or rejection. This illegal manner of treating amendments—and here even without giving reasons—turns a commission of no more than thirty into a judicial body against which there is no appeal. For all practical purposes the true judges were merely asked whether they were pleased with the commission’s decision; “the commission members .... constitute the Council.”

The International Group hastily prepared a qualification, the last hope of changing the schema’s text, and invited signature and submission during the next Monday’s ballot. No new condemnation of communism was sought, but only a “solemn reaffirmation .... of long-standing doctrine of the Church on this matter.” It didn’t help that five hundred Council Fathers were in Florence (Dante festival) that weekend.

Nov. 16 *Il Tempo* quoted a “prelate official” of the commission that the intervention had arrived late and was therefore disregarded. Nov. 17 Archbishop Sigaud told the press that he and Archbishop Lefebvre had personally delivered the signed interventions to the General Secretariat at noon Oct. 9, within the time limit. Nov. 18 *Il Tempo* confirmed the date. The General Secretariat had at once phoned the commission secretary and told him the interventions would be held till Monday to check signatures. A commission member later admitted this commission had tabled other interventions as well, but that it had been stupid to side-track these.

Nov. 23 at 5 p.m. Paul VI received the bishops of Latin America and delivered an address in which he called attention to “Marxist atheism,” identifying it as a dangerous, prevalent, most harmful



infiltrating force in Latin America's social and economic life, and stating that it considered "violent revolution as the only means for solving problems."

The Nov. 24 morning papers featured Mgr. Achille Glorieux and his burial of the interventions on communism; the same morning Paul VI ordered insertion of a **footnote** on the Church's teachings on communism. In addition to the footnote citing encyclicals of Pius XI, Pius XII, John XXIII, and Paul VI, the commission incorporated "just as it has already done" into the schema, viz., "In her loyal devotion to God and men, the Church cannot cease repudiating, just as it has already done, sorrowfully but as firmly as possible, those poisonous doctrines and actions which contradict reason and the common experience of humanity, and dethrone man from his native excellence." The added words, as explicitly stated in the commission's official report to the general assembly, were inserted to allude "to the condemnations of communism and Marxism" (two different things? To save Paul from explicit condemnation of communism and communist governments?) "made by the Supreme Pontiffs."

(Should you incline charitably to place the blame on misunderstandings or on officious interference of minor officialdom you may disabuse yourself by reading the details of the plot, the deliberate sell-out to Russian Communism by John XXIII as the price of Russian Orthodox observers at Vatican II, in **In the Shadow of the Cross**, by Jozef Mackiewicz, Contra Publishing, New York, 1973. This book finishes: "The successor and heir to the great task of John XXIII, Pope Paul VI, broadened his achievement considerably. In this way he contributed to the partial decomposition of the Catholic Church, and opened a new chapter in its history. This new chapter should be given the heading '**In the Shadow of the Red Star.**'")

Dec. 3 the international Group fired its last shot, a letter to its mailing list of eight hundred, giving five reasons why the sections on communism, marriage, and war were still defective, and appealing for a negative vote on the entire schema, since it could no longer be amended. But only 131 voted against the atheism section, and 75 against the entire schema on "The Church in the Modern World" in the final vote of December 7.

Father Wiltgen reports many more shenanigans, as you may discover in the original English version, particularly on pages 15 to 23, 42, 43, 46 to 59, 74 to 90, 107 to 109, 114 to 119, 128 to 130, 136 to 141, 145 to 150, 152, 153, 220 to 222, 228 to 239, 242, 243, 247 to 251, and 268 to 277, all inclusive.

### **Vatican II Versus Catholicism**

We now compare words of Vatican II with established doctrines which they contradict. One self-styled theologian criticized this approach—I had failed to quote where Vatican II agreed with the Church! One swallow may not make a summer, but one heresy makes a heretic, however orthodox all his other beliefs.

Vatican I (Dogmatic Const. on the Catholic Faith, 34): The mysteries of faith cannot be fully grasped by natural reason, but revealed truth can never contradict the positive results of the investigation of reason. Contrariwise, however, every assertion is false that contradicts the truth of enlightened faith. Faith and true learning are not in hostile opposition; they rather support each other in many ways. Yet faith is not the same as a philosophical system of teaching that has been worked out and then turned over to the human mind to be further developed, but it has been entrusted as a Divine deposit to the Church for protection and for infallible interpretation. When, therefore, the Church explains the meaning of a dogma this interpretation is to be maintained in all future time, and it can never be deviated from under pretence of a more profound investigation.

Vatican II (Decree on Ecumenism, 6): Therefore, if the influence of events or of the times has led to deficiencies in conduct, in Church discipline, or even in the formulation of doctrine (...) these should be appropriately rectified at the proper moment. (**The Documents of Vatican II**, Abbott & Gallagher, American Press, 1966)

Vat II here states that the Church has previously erred in formulating doctrine, but that we shall not correct these errors now, though to be taken seriously we must know what they are, but at the “proper” moment. This blanket license for “correction” is no more to be trusted than the original “error.” Can we take the word of a group that has here destroyed its own authority? If the Church erred previously why can it not err now?

I omit the parenthesis which showed what the Council really meant? *In parentheses?* These words, “which must be carefully distinguished from the deposit itself of faith,” are supremely irrelevant. How is deficiency in formulation of doctrine anything but error? Even if not, the argument remains: If these people say their predecessors formulated deficiently, on whose authority shall we believe their own formulation? What can we then believe in the entire structure of Church doctrine? If these words stand our whole religion falls.

Vatican II (Decree on Ecumenism, 8) quotes John xvii, 21: “That all may be one,” but refrains from continuing the verse: “as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee; that they also may be one in Us,” because this would lead to unity also in doctrine, not mere outward organization. It is here used to introduce common worship with non-Catholics in the very phrase, *communicatio in sacris*, prohibited by Canon Law 1258 as formal co-operation in an evil act, forbidden by the natural law. (Canon Law, Bouscaren & Ellis, p. 704)

Leo XIII (*Immortale Dei*): .... absolutely bound, in the worship of the Deity, to adopt that use and manner in which God Himself has shown that He wills to be adored.

Vatican II in Ecumenism, 9 directly opposes Pius XI (*Mortalium Animos*): With this object, congresses, meetings, and addresses are arranged .... where all without distinction .... are invited to join in

the discussion. Now such efforts can meet with no kind of approval among Catholics. They presuppose the erroneous view that all religions are more or less good and praiseworthy .... Those who hold such a view are not only in error; they distort the true idea of religion, and thus reject it, falling gradually into naturalism and atheism. To favor this opinion, therefore, and to encourage such undertakings is tantamount to abandoning the religion revealed by God. They assert their readiness to treat with the Church of Rome, but on even terms, as equals with an equal. But even if they could so treat .... they would do so only on condition that no pact into which they might enter should compel them to retract those opinions which still keep them outside the one fold of Christ .... the Apostolic See can by no means take part in these assemblies, nor is it in any way lawful for Catholics to give such enterprises their encouragement or support. .... they would be giving countenance to a false Christianity quite alien to the one Church of Christ. Shall we commit the iniquity of suffering the truth, the truth revealed by God, to be made a subject for compromise? For it is indeed a question of defending revealed truth.

Leo XIII (*Immortale Dei*): The Church judges it not lawful that the various kinds of Divine worship should have the same right as the true religion.

Leo XIII (*Libertas Praestantissimum*): It is contrary to reason that error and truth should have equal rights.

Vatican II (Church in the Modern World, 50): Marriage and conjugal love are by their nature ordained toward the begetting and educating of children .... Hence, while not making the other purposes of matrimony of less account, the true practice of conjugal love, etc. (Footnote: The Commission charged with drafting this text made every effort to avoid any appearance of wishing to settle questions concerning a hierarchy of the “ends” of marriage.)

So they pretended that no such hierarchy had been established—or reinforced by Canon Law (Canon 1013).

Decree of the Holy Office, April 1, 1944, approved by Pope Pius XII, March 30, 1944: Can we entertain the opinion of some modern authorities who deny that the primary end of marriage is procreation and education, or teach that the secondary ends are not necessarily subordinate to the primary one but are equally important and independent? The members of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office have decided to reply in the negative.

St. Thomas Aquinas (*Summa Theologiae*, Supp III, q. 41, 1): .... for its principal end, which is the good of the offspring .... for the secondary end of marriage, which is devoted mutual compliance by the spouses in domestic matters.

Vatican II (Ecumenism, 3 & 4): .... separated from full communion with the Catholic Church .... are born into these (separated) communities and are instilled therein with Christ’s faith .... into a

certain, though imperfect, communion with the Catholic Church .... obstacles to full ecclesiastical communion .... all those justified by faith through Baptism are incorporated into Christ (Footnote cites for corroboration the Council of Florence, “*Exultate Deo*,” which teaches exactly opposite.) .... Moreover some, even very many, of the most significant elements or endowments which together go to build up and give life to the Church herself can exist outside the visible boundaries of the Catholic Church: the written word of God (on whose authority?); the life of grace; faith (in heresy?), hope (or presumption?), and charity (let’s be charitable?), along with other interior gifts of the Holy Spirit and visible elements. .... The brethren divided from us also carry out many of the sacred actions of the Christian religion. Undoubtedly .... these actions can truly engender a life of grace, and can be rightly described as capable of providing access to the community of salvation.

(The Church has always tried to convert non-Catholics—not to soft-soap them with how well off they are. What they retain of truth they took with them when reprehensibly they rejected the rest. “Brethren divided” includes SOME [Orthodox] who “carry out sacred actions” and have kept genuine sacraments. Whether these greatly benefit them in their separation is a moot point. The Mass, for instance, belongs to the Catholic Church, and is either Catholic Mass or no Mass; to award the channeling of its graces to the schismatic Churches that kidnapped it when they left the Catholic Church is gratuitous nonsense. The ordinary means of grace, Mass and Sacraments, benefit all recipients solely through the Catholic Church.

We note that the innovators, and many priests who call themselves traditional and celebrate the true Mass, refuse us the spiritual goods because we recognize the fact that we have no pope, as against their opinion that they have one. We must have been divided further than the “brethren.” Here Vatican II advances an irrelevancy true in a limited sense, to be deceptively employed in its widest sense. The Council pretends to teach, but rather promotes a huge confidence game to deceive Anglicans—and Catholics—into setting aside Leo XIII’s infallible “*Apostolicae Curae*.”)

.... unity dwells in the Catholic Church .... and we hope that it will continue to increase until the end of time. (Can unity increase? Like Catholicity and Apostolicity it is an absolute—it either is or is not.)

Pius XII (*Mystici Corporis Christi*): 14 .... not only must it (Church) be one and undivided, it must also be something concrete and visible .... It is therefore an aberration from divine truth to represent the Church as something intangible and invisible, as a mere “pneumatic” entity joining together by an invisible link a number of communities of Christians in spite of their differences in faith.

21. Only those are to be accounted really members of the Church who have been regenerated in the waters of Baptism and profess the true faith, and have not cut themselves off from the structure

of the Body by their own unhappy act or been severed therefrom, for very grave crimes, by the legitimate authority. .... Hence, as in the true community of the faithful there is but one Body, one Spirit, one Lord, and one Baptism, so there can be only one faith. .... It follows that those who are divided from one another in faith or government cannot be living in the one Body so described, and by its one spirit.

22. .... Schism, heresy, or apostasy are such of their very nature that they sever a man (and a Council?) from the Body of the Church.

102. .... invite them (non-Catholics) all .... to .... strive to extricate themselves from a state in which they cannot be secure of their own eternal salvation, for, though they may be related to the Mystical Body of the Redeemer by some unconscious yearning and desire, yet they are deprived of those great many heavenly gifts and aids which can be enjoyed only in the Catholic Church.

The Church has no partial memberships. One is or is not Catholic.

Vatican II (Declaration on Religious Freedom, 11): In the end, when He completed on the Cross the work of redemption whereby He achieved salvation and true freedom for man, He also brought His revelation to completion.

This bald statement, in no way modified by context, is unnecessary in and completely unrelated to context. It is either incredible stupidity or devious purpose, and opposes Catholic doctrine. It contradicts Christ Himself at the Last Supper: "I have yet many things to say to you but you cannot bear them now." (John xvi, 12) It removes from His revelation (1) His resurrection, (2) His explanation of His fulfilment of the prophecies, (3) His establishment of the sacrament of Penance, (4) St. Thomas' skepticism and its dissipation, (5) John xxi, 15-17 (Feed My sheep), used to establish the primacy of St. Peter and the papacy, (6) His mandate and mission to His Church, (7) His Ascension, and (8) the descent of the Holy Ghost. Choosing revelation is heresy.

Vatican II (Religious Freedom, 2): .... the human person has a right to religious freedom .... all men are to be immune from coercion .... in such wise that in matters religious no one is to be forced to act in a manner contrary to his own beliefs. Nor is anyone to be restrained from acting in accordance with his own beliefs, whether privately or publicly, .... alone or in association .... within due limits. .... right .... has its foundation in the very dignity of the human person, .... known through the revealed Word of God and by reason itself. This right .... is to be recognized in the constitutional law whereby society is governed (Is it, now?). Thus it is to become a civil right.

Pius IX (*Quanta Cura*, Dec. 8, 1864): .... from this wholly false idea of social organization they do not fear to foster that erroneous opinion, especially fatal to the Catholic Church and to the salvation of souls, called by .... Gregory XVI insanity; namely, that "liberty of conscience and worship is the proper right of

every man, and should be proclaimed.... by law in every correctly established society ....”

The Council appears to desire establishment of man’s legal right to go to hell.

**Objection:** Religious liberty is essentially different from the liberty of conscience condemned in the nineteenth century. On this point the Declaration on Religious Freedom (*Dignitatis Humanae*) does not contradict *Quanta Cura*.

**Reply:** An honest Declaration would have made such a point, if tenable. Its new “doctrine” was certainly phrased to be taken as correcting and updating Pius IX and Gregory XVI. By mistake? *Aggiornamento* was the name of the game, the reason for convocation of the council, which had already (Ecumenism 8) introduced common worship with non-Catholics in the exact phrase, *communicatio in sacris*, condemned and penalized with “suspicion of heresy” in Canon 1258. This objection takes no account of the Declaration’s applications in the Acts of the Council, published twelve years later. Nor of John Courtney Murray’s immediate reaction to its promulgation. He knew it directly opposed *Quanta Cura*, because he wrote most of it. So he left it openly to future theologians to explain. This Declaration has granted nothing whatsoever to Catholics. “All men” somehow excludes us, as we discovered immediately when requesting access to our traditional rights and rites under Article 2. These “rights” are granted only to those for whom the Church has never legislated—non-Catholics and anti-Catholics. We are discriminated against in favor of God’s enemies. (He that is not with Me is against Me.— Luke xi, 23) “The rights of the true religion are based, not only on merely natural rights, but also, and to a much greater degree, on the rights which flow from revelation,” said Cardinal Ottaviani in opposition to this Declaration. These new “rights” flow rather from freemasonry, not from revelation, are not part of revelation, and therefore cannot be dogmatically defined, as was *Quanta Cura*. Anyone can rephrase a heresy, but that has not, in this case, changed the concept. Human dignity is based on divine creation and redemption, neither of which is new. If freedom of action is essential to human dignity, why did the Apostles not campaign to abolish slavery in the Roman Empire?

Vatican II (Const. Sacred Liturgy): 34, The rites should be distinguished by a noble simplicity; they should be short, clear, and unencumbered by useless repetitions (of prayer?) ....

50. The rite of Mass is to be revised .... the rites are to be simplified .... Elements which, with the passage of time (but all more than four centuries ago), came to be duplicated, or were added with but little advantage, are now to be discarded. Where opportunity allows or necessity demands (!), other elements which have suffered injury through accidents of history (and, presumably, the negligence of the Holy Ghost) are now to be restored to the earlier norm (?) of the Holy Fathers. (But all things were so restored, said *Quo Primum*, following the Council of Trent, with the outlawing of all new rites. We are now blessed

with different, mutually exclusive restorations of the same Holy Fathers.)

Similar aims of the Synod of Pistoia, “recalling (the liturgy) to a greater simplicity of rites, by expressing it in the vernacular language, by uttering it in a loud voice” were condemned by Pius VI (*Auctorem Fidei*, Aug. 28, 1794): rash, offensive to pious ears, insulting to the Church, favorable to charges of heretics against it .... As if the present order of the liturgy, received and approved by the Church, had emanated in some part from the forgetfulness of the principles by which it should be regulated. The proposition asserting that “it would be against apostolic practice and the plans of God, unless easier ways were prepared for the people to unite their voice with that of the whole Church”; if this be understood to signify the introduction of the use of the vernacular language into the liturgical prayers, it is condemned as false, rash, disturbing to the order prescribed for the celebration of the mysteries, easily productive of many evils. (Q.E.D.?)

Vatican II’s Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions is one long paean of praise for every kind of error, even ascribing holiness to these false religions. It waxes lyrical over Islam and post-Christian Judaism—religions founded on outright rejection of Christ.

The Decree on the Missionary Activity of the Church propounds the nonsense that the living testimony of the devoted missionary will more easily achieve its effect if given in unison with other (heretical) Christian communities, according to the norms of the Decree on Ecumenism.

*Gaudium et Spes* (Church in the Modern World) tells us, contrary to all ages of Catholic teaching, that (16) “Christians are joined with the rest of men in the **search** for truth,” rather than differentiated from the rest of men by its possession. Paragraph 21 promotes “dialogue” and co-operation with God’s enemies. 41 proclaims the rights of man, and greatly esteems the dynamic movements of today by which these rights are everywhere fostered. No wonder we can now join the Freemasons! “The Church requires special help” (44), “particularly in our day, when things are changing very rapidly and the ways of thinking are exceedingly various.” 82 uses the threat of war to promote world government, signally refusing to recognize the probable atheistic or masonic character of such a government. “Christians cannot yearn for anything more ardently” (93) “than to serve the men of the modern world ever more generously and effectively .... Christians have shouldered a gigantic task demanding fulfilment in this world. Concerning this task they must give a reckoning to Him Who will judge every man on the last day.”

Baltimore Catechism: God made me to know Him, to love Him and to serve HIM in this world, and to be happy with Him in the next.

Should you somehow not agree that Vatican II has erred, you can hardly deny that it has contradicted previously held doctrine, so the question of error is almost irrelevant. Contrary truths cannot

exist. Can the Church support both sides of a contradiction and retain credibility?

### **Conciliar Precedent**

Philip Hughes' **A Popular History of the Catholic Church:**

“From the moment of his condemnation Arius falls into the background and the leader of the movement, for the next decisive fifteen years, is Eusebius (bishop) of Nicomedia. He was too shrewd to attempt any direct reversal of what had been decreed at Nicaea. The new policy was to propose, in place of its rigid, unmistakable definition, new formulae purposely vague and all-embracing, which Catholics could interpret in a traditional sense and the Arians in an Arian sense. So the Arians would be able to remain within the Church .... In 350, however, Constantius was murdered and the next few years saw his Arian brother and successor make a bold bid to subdue the West also to this new court religion. The methods adopted were those that had been used in the East—no open denial, anywhere, of Nicaea but the acceptance of the new compromising formulae, packed councils where the emperor and his officials presided and where troops appeared to enforce their will, deposition and exile for the bishops who remained unconvinced, while Arians were installed in their place.

“The peak of the imperial success was the joint council held in 359, at Rimini for the West and Seleucia for the East, where, under pressure, practically the whole episcopate consented to sign an ambiguous definition of the faith that could be interpreted in an heretical sense.”

### **Who Is Responsible?**

Not all abuses can be blamed directly on Vatican II. We have been steadily buffeted by the “spirit of Vatican II,” which far outstrips its schizophrenic body in “progress.” Nor do we desire to minimize or excuse the personal responsibility of Paul VI. Not only did he give direction to the Council through his appointments and leaked attitudes; he was largely responsible in the first place for the modernist bias of the European Alliance.

McGregor-Hastie's biography, “Paul VI,” carries this significant passage (pp. 159-160): “An urgent problem for Mgr. Montini was the refurbishing of the priesthood in Germany. There were only two sorts of priests in what was left of the Third Reich—those who had not compromised themselves, and had been therefore so persecuted that they were unfit to tackle the enormous problems of moral reconstruction, and those who had collaborated with Hitler and had to be removed. It was necessary to graduate a whole new generation of priests as quickly as possible. Mgr. Montini's solution to this problem was nothing if not ingenious. Hitler had conscripted into the armed forces all those seminarians who had not shown any enthusiasm for his war. There were thousands of them in 1945, in prisoner-of-war camps all over Europe. The fact that they had been hauled off to fight instead of preach made them politically irreproachable and the



Church had in them a ready-made army of future priests against whom no uncomfortable accusations could be made. Mgr. Montini made contact with prominent American Catholics and learned that in Paris the Church had many friends staffing the various Allied occupation formations. It was an easy matter to instruct Mgr. Roncalli (future John XXIII) to ask for permission to have lists of the names of the German seminarians prepared, then to ask that all of them be transferred to a group of camps in France under the Nuncio's (Roncalli's) protection. The lists were prepared and the seminarians gathered in. Books and teachers were sent to every 'barbed wire seminary' as soon as it opened. The standards set were Montini's own and for this reason the 'middle clergy' in Germany were, by the time Mgr. Montini was elected pope, among the best in the world." He had provided his own climate and organization.

This climate largely accounted for the *periti*, the experts, whose off-beat doctrines eventually met with the approval of the Council. Acceptance by the Council cannot change the nature of an idea. If it is a heresy it remains heretical, no matter who approves it. Whoever approves a heresy becomes a heretic, whether singly or in concert with others, no matter who those others may be. Councils have been condemned before, so the mere fact that bishops agree (though not unanimously) is not by itself conclusive. Any Catholic, even a pope, who approves or publicly condones a heresy becomes a heretic, and can then no longer, until he recants, be Catholic. To cite conciliar or papal approval of a heresy does not substantiate or prove the heresy, but only that the approver is not true Council or pope. It is useless to cite infallibility to support an action that necessarily removes infallibility. A Council that overrules or corrects Trent cannot pretend to infallibility. It merely removes the basis for its own credibility. When you admit four centuries of error you can't expect to be taken as an authority now.

Paul VI signed and promulgated the doctrines of this Council which had fallen eleven times into blatant error and undeniable heresy. A more public demonstration of his own heresy would be hard to imagine.

But even could a heretic be pope, and could a pope reverse divine law as finally spelt out in *Quo Primum*, Paul's imposed innovations have needlessly driven millions from the Church, heedlessly, deliberately placed their salvation in imminent jeopardy. Many more are imperiled unknowingly through loss of their Mass and sacraments. For all these souls Paul is responsible. It is inconceivable that Paul does not know what he has done. It is inconceivable that a true shepherd of souls would not administer an immediate remedy.

## Section Seven

### **Administration of Remedies**

#### Paul's Heroic Efforts

**The Brisbane Catholic Leader** (16 Sept. 1973): Castelgondolfo —Pope Paul has put forward 10 rules for prayer and for the Church's official prayer, the liturgy. .... He called them a "sort of 10 commandments of suggestions." .... the first is to follow the Second Vatican Council's liturgical reforms "faithfully, intelligently (?), and diligently." The second is to learn the scriptural, theological, and pastoral teachings of the Church about divine worship. (This would effectively cancel out the first.) "Prayer is not a blind sentiment, but rather the projection of a soul enlightened by truth and moved by charity," he said, paraphrasing St. Thomas Aquinas. The third urges "Great caution in reforming traditional religious customs of the people." Otherwise, he said, one might "extinguish religious feeling in the very act of clothing it with new and more authentic" (What else?) "religious expressions." (Were I to say this after committing Paul's universal assaults on religious customs I would expect to be charged with hypocrisy.) The fourth says: "The family must be a great school of piety, of spirituality and of religious fidelity. The Church has great trust in the delicate, authoritative action of parents in the field of religious education. For their action there is no substitute." (For his beautiful words where are the corresponding acts?) The fifth says: "The precept of Mass on Sundays and holy days maintains, more than ever, its gravity and its basic importance. The Church has made concessions to make its observance easier. Whoever realizes the content and role of this precept must consider it not only a primary duty but a right." (Which he continued to deny us!) The sixth .... reaffirms the right of "the constituted community"—by which he seemed to mean the parish (even his own reporters could not figure him out here)—to the presence of all its faithful. "If it has allowed to some a certain autonomy of distinct and homogeneous groups in religious practice, they must not fail to understand the genius of the Church, which is to be a people with one heart and one soul," he said. (I wish I had said that; I can usually understand my own words.) The seventh was directed to priests. It declared that the celebration of Mass must be prepared and carried out "with great care, under every aspect." (It has, indeed, been carried out of most places.) The eighth was directed to those hearing Mass. Pope Paul urged "punctuality, quiet dignity, and, above all, participation." He called participation "the principal point of liturgical reform." (Or the reddest herring of them all? A principal point of liturgical reform must diverge from tradition. If, as Paul wrongly but clearly implies, we had no participation in worship previously, obviously it is not needed. He can't have it both ways. Nor does his enthusiasm for "participation" in public worship ring true after his destruction of public penance in which all Catholics participated. We weren't called fish-eaters and mackerel-snappers for nothing. And whatever happened to vigils, ember days, and the Lenten fast? This mania for participation, liturgically pushed by merging priest's and people's communions and by requirement of a homily at every "mass," discourages many priests from celebrating on weekdays. There's a bright side to nearly everything.) The ninth noted that the fullness of prayer should be both personal and collective. (A good communist word!) ....

“Tenth, singing!” he said. “What a problem! But don’t lose heart. It is not insoluble. A new epoch of sacred music is arising. Many are asking that the Latin Gregorian chant be preserved in all countries for the *Gloria*, the *Credo*, the *Sanctus*, the *Agnus Dei*. May God grant that it be thus.” (God removed Gregorian chant? Or Latin?) “Just how it can be done might be restudied.”

Eventually came forth *Jubilare Deo* to implement *Gloria*, *Credo*, *Sanctus*, and *Agnus Dei* chanted in Latin at the new “mass.” Incredibly this was hailed as a great step forward by ***Una Voce in the United States***. What would you say to an invader who evicted you from your home and then expected your fawning gratitude when he returned your gas stove? To what would you connect your gas stove? You could go through the motions of cooking till the stove rusted away in the weather, but no food would be cooked. If you deluded yourself that normalcy had returned you would soon starve to death.

The graft of Gregorian chant onto the new “mass” is intended only to drive the final spike into the coffin of the Tridentine Mass—to dilute and split resistance.

### **Do We Need A Creed?**

Re-introduce Latin in *Gloria* and *Credo*? The liturgical commissions will settle the issue—by dropping them! They’re not essential, didn’t you know?

Until reading the last quarter 1973 **Liturgy News** (Bulletin of the Brisbane archdiocesan Liturgical Commission) I had wondered idly how the innovators would deal with the return of the Latin (Nicene) *Credo*; it and the creed recited in the new order vernacular don’t completely agree. Singers should not disagree with the president and the tone-deaf. Could they return to the ancient practice? Never! The dilemma is solved by manufacturing cause to eliminate the *Credo*.

“**Purpose of the Rite**—A response and an assent to the word of God .... the singing of the *Credo* has great symbolic value. It gave a vivid image of the unity of the Church. It was a jubilant and elating experience for all to unite in the same melody and in the ‘sacred’ language of the Roman Church. Yet there was probably more romance here than anything else, in that many people mistook the Latin of the Roman Church as being the language of the Church, and, theologians excepted, would have been unable to explain the deep theological content of what they were singing.” (Words can hardly express my eternal gratitude to these adepts and deep thinkers who can tell me about all these things I believe on God’s authority without being able to explain. Maybe one of them will oblige by explaining the Blessed Trinity.) “.... the pastoral usefulness of such a recitation is now in doubt. The absence of the Creed .... in no way endangers the balance of the celebration” (though it permits participation by avowed non-believers) “.... If it is necessary to proclaim our faith” (Whosoever shall confess Me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God.—Luke xii, 8), “could it not be done in other ways and with different rites or words?”

Next they advance the dates of the Nicene Creed, proving it was not recited at the Last Supper, and formed no part of the “primitive” rite—as handy a reason as any to drop it. It is not only not primitive; it is outdated, viz., “The Creed is a profession of theological and polemic faith in which orthodoxy attacks past errors—which are completely unknown at the present time.”

Is theological and polemic faith erratic or erroneous? I should have thought past errors had first attacked orthodoxy. Is there some reason why orthodoxy should not attack error? If these errors are completely unknown today it is through constant recitation and understanding of the Creed. But who can ignore the resurgence of Arianism in our own day? It is taught in our schools, infects the new “sacrament” of Confirmation, and even invades the new “mass” to begin the Preface of the Fourth Eucharistic Prayer.

“Its anti-heretical statements” (truths?) “had the advantage of barring the road to heresy; .... but the question has to be asked—Are these really appropriate for a parish congregation on a Sunday morning?” (Is Saturday evening preferable?) “Should the Creed be anti-heretical or pro-Christian?” (There’s a difference?) “The undefined truths of our faith are often more meaningful than those defined in opposition to heretics.”

Undefined truths? Here we enter a nebulous field where every Catholic is free to hold his own opinion (such as mine that the new order “mass” is idolatry), since the Church has not spoken. Is there a sneakier way to introduce private judgment, to emphasize where we differ instead of where we agree? This is all for ecumenism, which seeks to agree with everybody?

“If it is good to proclaim that Christ is consubstantial with the Father, is it not better—more alive, and more rich theologically—to know that God is a Father filled with tenderness, that his eternal mercy has come to us through his Son, and that his spirit lives in our hearts?” (No one can fault the LC with lack of questions.) “Besides, the word ‘substance’ does not have the same meaning for the contemporary man as it did for the Greek of the fourth century. The correct act of faith, then, is not necessarily conserved through the simple repetition of ancient formulas.” (A profession of faith is no mere repetition, nor can it be formulated without a formula, the more ancient the surer.) “And when we say that ‘Christ descended into hell’ a large majority” (how determined?) “of the faithful incorrectly understand a statement which is basically correct” (comforting!), “but whose meaning has now evolved” (into what?). “The Church must speak in the language of today.”

(In today’s uninhibited parlance, then, Christ “descended into hell” in the **Apostles’** Creed, stupid!)

“An act of faith cannot be reduced to a mere musical formula.” Musical setting has been known to embellish and emphasize a formula. “Christian faith is not recited or sung. It is LIVED.” Can you live it before learning its Formulas? But is it not a beautiful sentiment? Let’s apply it further: prayer is not recited or sung; it is LIVED. Offering sacrifice to God is not recited or sung, Mass

itself is not recited or sung. So let's LIVE them and dispense with their superfluous expression.

"The real Creed of the Mass comes and is realized by the Christian when he receives the Body and Blood of the Lord." He evidently need exercise no faith at the "consecration." But, then, the new "mass" is a memorial meal.

But LC solves all: "The Apostles' Creed is pastorally better than the Nicene one." (Genuine dogma!) "But the New Testament presents various professions of faith that were once used in Baptism." (Another resurrected "tradition!") "These have the enormous advantage of being simple and of being able to lay claim to the incomparable dignity of the word of God and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit." (But we've just finished the Gospel! Who inspired the Council of Nicaea?) "They may now be used as a Creed for ecumenical celebrations or for other celebrations of the word. One of the oldest formulas" (old enough for Luther to twist) "comes to us from the Epistle to the Romans: 'For if you confess with your mouth' (not LIVE?) 'that Jesus is the Lord, and believe in your heart that God has raised him from the dead' (Why not one of the plentiful texts where He rose?), 'you will be saved' (Rom. 10:9)." (Since we are to LIVE it, why not "Faith without works is dead?") "Another profession of faith is found in the Epistle to the Ephesians: 'One Lord, one faith, one Baptism; one God the Father of all, who is above all, and throughout all, and in us all.' (Eph. 4:46)" (For ecumenical celebrations? Whose faith?)

LC then for two paragraphs indecisively faces the problem: Shall the Creed be sung or recited while we throw it out?

Under **Final Comments**: "The history of the Church teaches us that the creeds of faith were always formulated in reaction to errors threatening the faith at a particular time in history. In accord with tradition," (Honestly?!)" "the following questions should be asked: What are the errors threatening the Church today? How can we formulate our Faith when confronted with these errors?" (Consult *Lamentabili*? Certainly not Paul's Creed of the POG!) "For example: In a world torn apart by war, divided by social and racial segregation, when so many people are dying of hunger," (never before!) "wouldn't it be of advantage to formulate a Creed about Christ whose incarnation brings us peace (Luke 4: 14), who came to unify the children of God scattered by sin (John 11:52) and who was sent to announce the good news to the poor (Luke 4:18) Such affirmations would surely engender more faith than the simple fact of singing that Christ 'descended into hell,' a mystery which no one contests and which is not found to be directly threatened now by a heresy?" Nor found in the Mass Creed.

No matter if our Creed goes, we know what we believe? What of our defectively educated children? Let LC go! When a liturgy commission stops introducing changes it is dead. It has no other reason for existence. While its members implement so creatively they do nothing else—no hearing confessions; no visiting the sick. Prominence and promotion reward originality, a la Hannibal Bugnini.

## Our Friends, The Clergy

We know that many priests think as we do, that they prefer tradition to innovation, that their hearts are with us—because they *tell* us so! We can cite Bishop Fulton Sheen, who tells us that as in the fourth century the laity must save the Church. “Go get ’em, boys! We’re with you! But **YOU**’ll have to do it; our hands are tied.”

We also hear: “Don’t carry the whole Church on your shoulders.” This advice we could welcome if we could see some of the burden on those who should carry it, those whom we educated and supported for this purpose, our learned bishops, our friendly clergy. We look in vain for shackles on their wrists, bonds on their hands, clamps on their lips and larynxes. We see no legitimate cause for their trepidation; have they not always preached trust in God?

They see all manner of unwarrantable change in their unchangeable Church, and they swindle their own consciences into keeping vows of obedience to communities or bishops that lead or “force” them astray, that enjoin silence on them. They forget the purpose of their vows or pretend that the vows themselves exceed this purpose in importance.

No man can be obliged by an improper vow. For a Catholic to vow obedience in matters of religion to a non-Catholic community or authority is obviously improper, not to say criminal to the point of apostasy. Vows made to Catholic authorities or Communities must not be kept after these have demonstrated that they are no longer Catholic; continued observance of the vow is equivalent to making the vow, and carries the same responsibilities. The glory of God and the good of His Church must take precedence over vows whose observance militates against these. An oath to uphold Catholic teaching and practice as prescribed and defined by the Council of Trent binds far more than a vow of obedience which impedes adherence to this oath. One must focus on the whole picture, not on individual or parochial concerns.

To such obvious points our friendly priests oppose logic(?): that we are mere laymen, congenitally unable to appreciate their nice points of conscientious difficulty or to comprehend the law or theology involved—though they tell us with equal logic that WE must save the Church because of their self-imposed impotence. We are charged with saving the Church, but we don’t know enough! Those who, by their own admission, **do** know enough **hide** their knowledge, keep their guilty silence, broken only by wails of “obedience.”

We laymen know—though it appears to have escaped our friendly priests—that when we follow the tradition of the Church and the doctrine of the Council of Trent we cannot go wrong. We know that our religion is passed on from generation to generation by the laity, often enough in spite of our clergy and hierarchy, the source of most of our heresies. It ill becomes these superior ones, who will not face their duty to God or the laity, to downgrade their own origin. Nor, considering the chaos they have generated

over the past fifteen years, does it become them to fault their victims.

The laity—indispensable to the Church in these days when one may not “insult” the religious beliefs of non-Catholics by trying to convert them—has inalienable rights to its traditional religion. It must maintain UNITY with the Church, which cannot be pretended to exist only in our time. Or what happened to the Apostles’ Creed’s Communion of Saints? Canon Law upholds these rights (see CIC 682). Our rights necessarily oblige our clergy to satisfy them. Priests were ordained for this purpose, not for their own private vows or salvation. If they refuse us they deny their own purpose and contribute to our damnation, and we may confidently expect God to avenge us.

Even should they consider themselves bound completely by rules and laws, there exists one law in the Church’s code that all may invoke: Canon 209—In common error or in positive and probable doubt whether of law or of fact, the Church supplies jurisdiction for both the external and the internal forum. Here is a law made for just such circumstances as prevail. A priest who refuses to invoke it when necessary to fulfil the duties for which he was ordained rationalizes our spiritual murder in the words of Cain: “Am I my brother’s keeper?”

For dialogue and ecumenism Paul VI invites emphasis on similarities. Under LAMAISM (Encyclopedia Britannica): “The elaborate ritual of the religious services, the ceremonial dresses of the monks, their organization in hierarchical ranks, and the local divisions into dioceses, dependent on a central authority, have been often noticed and compared with similar features in the Roman Catholic Church.” Currently we note more essential parallels: LA MA means “superior one,” and Lamas come (as do our own bishops and priests) in two main types, so called by the color of their hats: the **red** and the **yellow**.

### **Paul Rises To The Occasion**

When the new “mass” had befouled our churches Marcel Lefebvre established the Fraternity of St. Pius X, supposedly to train and ordain traditional priests traditionally to celebrate the traditional Mass. Unfortunately he obtained canonical approval from the official postconciliar “Church.” He refused to condemn the new “mass” or “orders,” though he obviously had something against them. He worked toward parallel status and recognition for the traditional and the new illicit, invalid substitutes. Unaware, I defended him when Paul VI finally cracked down on him, probably because he had received too much publicity. But my support embarrassed both Lefebvre and *UNA VOCE*, and I lost my positions in the affiliated Latin Mass Society of Australia.

*UNA VOCE* backed Lefebvre fully and openly in word and deed while at all costs it could not admit a direct confrontation between truth and falsehood, between the orthodoxy of twenty centuries and the modernism of one, between the Catholic Church *annorum Domini* and the desacralized, Protestantized, ecumenical sect of Vatican II, run by the poorest excuse for pope in twenty centuries.

We found Paul VI, guardian of the Catholic Church's treasury—of which the greatest asset is the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass—with his fine Italian(?) hand to the armpit in the till for all to see, stealing not merely our Mass but even the sacrament necessary to produce it, and we were to hush this up to save his face, in the fond hope that he would make anonymous restitution. This mass-hater finally presented us a Crusader's sword, and Lefebvre **dropped** it. For **what?** To avoid hardening an attitude case-hardened for decades! To avoid further reprisals when nothing more could be done short of assassination! Condemnation? (Dutch Catechism?) Excommunication? (Hans Küng?) Such measures cannot avail against orthodoxy and truth. But for all Lefebvre's temporizing he has eventually been excommunicated. Too bad it was over the wrong issues.

It was and remains high time *UNA VOCE* began to fight instead of diverting energy. Without the Mass the Church may not survive. Without the Church the world cannot survive. *UNA VOCE* failed to capitalize on Paul's overt misuse of power. How can we correct a situation when we will not admit it exists? Saving face should not concern us, nor should our credibility, but only the truth. If we obfuscate it for any reason who will ever believe us again?

*UNA VOCE* cared far too much for the feelings of these apostates, heretics, innovators, and liars. It follows Vatican II that would not tell the truth in public to pacify observers who should never have been let in.

Innovators retreat to their rat holes when firmly opposed. A spirit of compromise invites the communist compromise. If we must play games, if we are to hesitate or vacillate in pursuit of absolute rights guaranteed by Jesus Christ Himself, we can do this individually; we need no organization to help.

A negotiator must examine whether the matter lies within his power to compromise: is it solely his? He should next consider desirability or necessity. It may be a "communist" compromise, in which some one takes something, then offers partial return in exchange for another concession.

Compromise breeds compromise. Though I compromise only one point my son will follow precedent and compromise another. Even in the secular field, a position is eventually eroded into extinction. The spirit of compromise is the spirit of death.

Compromise cannot even be considered in the heart of our religion, the Mass and the sacraments. These belong, by definition and by institution, to Christ. He established His Church to preserve them for men of all ages. If we dilute what He left us we may be sure that future ages will go further. Even without the current mania for change, our Church would be unrecognizable within four or five generations.

## **Section Eight**

### **THERE MUST BE A SOLUTION**

#### **Agreement At Last**



I agree with the innovators: The Tridentine Mass and the *novus ordo* “mass” cannot co-exist. One Church cannot support the true and the false. We can keep our Church and our chance of salvation only with the true Mass. We cannot tolerate the “new and more authentic” idolatry.

I have been a convinced Catholic since I understood the meaning of the word, and my father explained it early. It takes utter conviction to make me fight, contradict, and damn my superiors in the Church; all my training was to love and respect them. Their few and useless arguments only strengthen my conviction. Had they genuine replies to my genuine objections they would certainly publicize them in their controlled press. They fear to reply; even mention of the issues might awaken other Catholics. They hide instead behind **charity**, **humility**, and **obedience**, and will not allow my charity in trying to correct them, my humility in continuing to believe as I was taught as a child, or my obedience to the Church of the ages. They tell me I am a heretic if I say the pope could be a heretic. Yet seven popes have been heretics, and twenty-eight more could be charitably called sub-standard. Even St. Peter needed correction in office, as recorded in the Bible. The law of averages is against us, spoiled as we are by more than a century of outstanding popes. More than one of each eight has left much to be desired. To all intents and purposes we have the worst series of all. Intentionally or not Paul VI largely destroyed the Church—at least by culpable failure to take readily available effective action to preserve it.

Nor is it coincidental that his archdiocese of Milan was the testing ground for “re-training” the clergy—ALL the clergy, even fresh from the seminary. If the doctrine remains the same (as the innovators insist) what need for retraining? Or for its continuation through quarterly clergy conferences? Or bishops’ conferences? We can all remember when all priests taught identical doctrine—without the help of conferences!

### **Subterfuge?**

To circumvent the Knox-Bugnini Mass murder a friend suggested assisting at a Mass that looks like a *novus ordo*, so our cardinal can’t catch us. The theory seems to be that the priest is at least bringing us the true Mass, which we could not otherwise attend—unless, of course, this priest exercised the graces and privileges conferred on him at ordination or the courage of a cornered rat.

This subterfuge must surely have been overworked—with better excuse, the headsman—in the early stages of the English Reformation. With what result? Erosion. If the priest compromises here how far will habitual cowardice preserve his “proper intention?” When does he lapse from mere deceit and sacrilege into occasioned idolatry? How will the watcher know if or when he tires of the game and changes his mind? His present performance guarantees little stability. He leads his people in deception when they require genuine leadership.

We must not only attend an unmistakably Catholic Mass; we must be seen to attend an unmistakably Catholic Mass. We will

have no catacombs! We will operate honorably in the light of day, unashamed of our religion and those who preserved it for us. We will confess our belief and act in accord with it. We are obliged to preserve the means of salvation for ourselves and for our children.

Nearly all will admit that one or another innovation is wrong; selectivity rides again. All are wrong, even those within the power of the Church, even those of most innocent or beneficent appearance. For these are essential to the propagation of more noxious innovations. Without the confusion "harmless" innovation creates, without its cover and climate, introduction of the malevolent would be impossible; few of us will accept what is demonstrably all bad.

If we really wish to remain ONE (a mark of the Church) with the Catholics of all ages, the Mystical Body of Christ, the Communion of Saints, we must eradicate all these innovations. We must condemn Vatican II, that unnecessary Council whose words, correctly or incorrectly interpreted, lend themselves so readily to institution and support of innovation.

In the Catholic Church **new** and **more authentic** are contradictory terms. The man who equates them is a damnable liar!

### **Judge Not ?**

I am told I must await history's assessment, and not judge lest I be judged. How is the judgment of history any less a judgment than that exercised here and now, except that it will probably be less informed and certainly less effective? If every man in history had awaited the judgment of history, history would not exist. No one could have acted under any circumstances for fear of exercising judgment till some future generation could tell him what he should have done. Since his own inaction would certainly have affected the future generation and its appreciation of his circumstances, he would appear to have entered a large vicious arc which he cannot complete even into a vicious cycle. He can never see the end of his action so he may not begin.

Suppose the Apostles had awaited the judgment of Flavius Josephus. Suppose St. Athanasius had held off to see how history evaluated Arius? Suppose St. John Fisher had awaited history's judgment on Henry VIII's divorce. (He might have enjoyed Henry's Church's vindication in Mrs. Simpson's case of the stand he could have feared to take.) Suppose the Church had never judged a heretic. Suppose no murderer were ever tried, because we could not judge his act or his motives lest we be judged.

Obviously, we must judge what concerns our salvation. Refusal to face facts in this area is suicidal. We shall not save or lose our souls on what some historian, even the best informed, determines centuries hence. We can affect our salvation only by our own voluntary actions or omissions, based on our own motives, arrived at by our own conscious judgments.

When I drop a rock into a pond I may reasonably assume it causes the ensuing splash and eddy. When I see that my Mass and

sacraments, the ordinary means of salvation, are gone beyond recognition, why may I not assume that some one is responsible for my loss? Or must I believe in spontaneous spiritual combustion? The more diffused this condition, the higher the responsibility. If universal, the responsibility is papal. Must I impute noble motives or good conscience to the destroyer of the Mass? Without the Mass may I assume there will even be a historian two centuries hence to make my judgments for me?

When we see a man betray whole nations of Catholics so that he may dialogue with avowed active enemies of God, why should we think him incapable of betraying Christ as well? He himself told us to look for God in man.

Will an army led by an enemy agent win by respect for the agent's uniform, badge, or rank? Its only chance even to survive lies in disobedience to his orders and speedy neutralization of his position.

To be of use to the enemy he must act outside his normal routine, while largely following routine to avert suspicion. Among his more likely acts:

- 1) Frequent change in general orders and operating procedures, so that guards watch each other's observance instead of the enemy.
- 2) Relaxation of discipline and training so the army will not be ready for the enemy.
- 3) Retirement or demotion of conscientious officers.
- 4) Promotion of guardhouse lawyers who will talk but not fight with the enemy.
- 5) Instability of territorial boundaries to be defended.
- 6) Betrayal of friendly populations and areas to the enemy.
- 7) Complete cessation of patrols, combat, and recruitment.
- 8) Fraternalization with enemy leaders.
- 9) Reluctance to offend the enemy.
- 10) Reluctance to detect and punish treachery.
- 11) Wide, public diffusion of responsibility to hide the source of the general breakdown of morale and discipline.

When, in addition, one finds that the officers are no longer required to take the statutory oath of allegiance, and that the general has broken his own oaths publicly, there seems no alternative—he is a traitor; he has sold out to the enemy. Or else he IS the enemy, and never was one of us.

Shall we complain to our platoon leader? He will shake in his shoes and mumble "obedience." Even if he joins us we still have the overall problem—our hostile general controls the chain of command that serves so well in ordinary circumstances. The army still obeys his orders because he is there. And he cannot allow our platoon to spread strange ideas. He just may stage a limited war to distract or kill us. The best distraction is a legitimate attack, such as on abortion or contraception. But these battles cannot be won without the whole war. Otherwise they are fought in a vacuum, like the Berlin Airlift. We must win the whole war. If necessary we must fight our own general. The issues must be resolved. We

cannot wait for orders that will never come while this general is in command.

I have pinned or helped pin three bishops and numerous priests to the wall. They have all fled in disorder behind the final argument that they must stay with the pope or they are not Catholic (They will not see that this obligation also binds a pope *vis-a-vis* his predecessors!), that their unprecedented acts and doctrines are obviously what the pope wants. We can respond only by cutting the ground from under this argument or by admitting defeat. It is absolutely necessary to show by Paul's own words, acts, omissions, and responsibility for these that he contradicts tradition. We should not need to specify each of the numerous instances—to prove one is enough. One departure from essential tradition removes the strayer from the Communion of Saints. Unfortunately, incredibly, not all can see the absurdity of Paul's campaign to stamp out and replace the Mass, so it is necessary to show as many other instances of nonfeasance or malfeasance as possible. We must know not only why and for what we fight; we must know where and whom to fight. To recover our Church we must know who stole it and force his or his successor's restitution.

It is inconceivable that we have no defense against these men—that we must put up with them because of legal niceties till they die. The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. III, 339a: “No canonical provisions exist regulating the authority of the College of Cardinals *sede Romana impedita*, i.e. in case the pope becomes insane, or personally a heretic; in such cases it would be necessary to consult the dictates of right reason and the teachings of history.” It is not right reason that a heretic rule over Catholics. Consult St. Jerome.

For strict legality see Canons 188 and 2314. Obviously an antipope would claim the privilege of legitimacy in office. Paul could often be found in vocal support of the orthodoxy his actions destroyed, even though nearly as often such orthodoxy became apparent only after tortured interpretation. But none can gainsay his approving signature on eleven undeniable heresies of Vatican II. He cannot dodge responsibility for the *novus ordo*, complete with Arian statements and “correction” of intention and definition of both Mass and Sacrifice.

Definition of a heretic as one whose superiors have officially admonished him and he has refused to recant falls down on four counts. (1) A public heretic is already excommunicated before admonition. (2) Delay in excommunication until after admonition applies, under Canon 2315, to *suspicion* of heresy, a separate offense with a separate penalty for actions almost necessarily implying heresy without verbalizing it. (3) What if the heretic has no superior? (4) No one who deliberately promulgates doctrine known to vary from all ages of the Church, from all tradition, from Ecumenical Councils, from divine and other recognized law, can plead that he has not been formally notified by his superiors. This is the irrelevancy of the millennium.

For holding many of his heresies Paul incurred excommunication *latae sententiae*, which also removes jurisdiction and authority.

The “absence” of legal machinery to cover a case without exact precedent cannot justify Catholics in tolerating the rule of heretics. It may be time to establish a precedent.

Even were an antipope to recant all publicly declared or applied heresies, all not quite specifically heretical words or actions displaying modernist bias, all innuendos against tradition, all disruption of religion and stable government, we are in no way bound to obey him as pope, for his heresy was sufficiently manifest at the time of election to the office for which manifest heresy makes him ineligible. Repentance and recantation would not constitute a *sanatio in radice*, a healing in the root, as for a marriage improperly performed. Papal election is not a sacrament, to which withheld graces accrue when a recipient in mortal sin regains God’s friendship, as in Confirmation, Holy Orders, and Matrimony.

How can we get rid of such an albatross? We consult the dictates of right reason and the teachings of history. Let’s try St. Paul: “A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid: Knowing that he that is such an one is subverted and sinneth, being condemned by his own judgment.” (Titus iii, 10-11) Innocent III said that such a pope vanishes (*evanescit*) into heresy—he simply is not there. We ignore this man and all his works and all his pomps. We accept neither his wishes nor his orders. We act in every way as though he never existed. We throw out all his decisions, orders, permissions, legislation, appointments, rites, and interpretations. We refuse to attend his worship or use his sacraments. We sever all connection with bishops, priests, and parishes that continue to use his new rites. We contribute nothing to support these, for we are not allowed to support false religion. We place this man in a vacuum, physical and spiritual. If we are fortunate enough to attend the Mass he has nearly stamped out, we strike his name from prayers for the pope. He is neither entitled to nor appreciative of the benefits of a real Mass.

No one can win a war in which he limits his sphere of action, in which he refuses to attack the enemy at home. The enemy merely uses that stupid concession as a base for his own offensive. He went well out of his way at his May 1976 consistory to attack traditionalists, even naming Lefebvre and his seminary as horrible examples, in a display of “papal” conduct not seen since the disastrous pontificate of Anacletus II (1130-1138), whose regime bore the closest resemblance to Paul’s. Anacletus, though elected by more than the required majority of cardinals, is listed among the antipopes for his destruction of tradition. After his papal funeral all his appointments were annulled (Second Lateran Council, 1139) to recover the Church for Catholics. But this came about through the efforts of St. Bernard and St. Norbert, who did not hesitate to fight for justice and tradition despite very shaky legal bases.

We were all taught the four marks of the Church. None remains in Paul’s postconciliar, ecumenical Church, as we see demonstrated anew daily. It has far greater affinities with the Four Marx

Brothers. How, then, is it the Catholic Church? How, then, is its head a genuine pope? Even were he, how would he be immune from attack for abuse of authority? Several popes have been rightly corrected for the same offence, Paul's abuses have the effect of diluting, of destroying our Faith.

We have arrived at a point where we must fight for the faith or it will disappear. Any man who will not fight for his Faith wherever the fight leads him will not keep his Faith. For he will not deserve it.

St. Matthew's Gospel, chapter xiii, relates the parable of the man who sowed good seed in his field. Under cover of night, when no man watched and all slept, his stealthful enemy slunk in and sowed cockle. When the cockle sprang up the man did not beat his breast and say that he had planted poor seed—he knew better. Nor did he blame his methods. He went to the heart of the matter: an enemy had done this!

He made no excuses for the enemy. He did not worry whether the enemy had acted in good faith, or could not have foreseen the consequences of his act, or had even tried to improve the crop by cross-fertilization. The interloper had come deliberately into a field not his own, and disoriented a successful planting. He was objectively, unmistakably hostile—an enemy.

Throughout the centuries the field—the world—has suffered continuous cockle-sowing by the enemy, “and the enemy that sowed them is the devil.” (Matthew xiii, 39) Often enough the cockle all but replaced the seed. The enemy used many hands, and cockle sprang up in abundance, whether or not the hands acted in good faith. He nearly wiped out the crop with Arius, by denying, however plausibly, the divinity of Christ. But the good seed prevailed to such an extent that Christ's divinity was never again called into question until Modernism, Vatican II, and their innovations.

Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Cranmer denied and replaced the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the sacraments, and cockle overgrew the good seed in corners of the field. But the good seed prevailed in the centre, thanks to the Council of Trent. And never came there more trouble on these matters in the Church until Vatican II, John XXIII, and Paul VI. Now our Mass and sacraments are denied and replaced, and Christ's divinity is scoffed at in our “Catholic” schools. The same cockle that nearly wiped us out twice has been sown again.

It is a mathematical axiom that if two quantities are each equal to a third, they equal each other. If  $a = c$  and  $b = c$ , then  $a = b$ . It follows that if  $a$  is to  $c$  as  $b$  is to  $c$  ( $a:c = b:c$ ), then  $a = b$ .

Arius was to Christ's divinity as Vatican II (and its “spirit”) and Paul VI (at the very least, permissively) are to Christ's divinity. Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, and Cranmer were to the Mass and sacraments as Paul VI to the Mass and sacraments. The “good faith,” the intent, the motives of each and all are equally irrelevant.

The fact remains—to the point of stinking stagnation—that John XXIII, Vatican II, and Paul VI have sown the cockle of the enemy.

Many Catholics refuse to see this. They say in effect that the Church can be wrong, but not Paul VI or the Council, who now correct, and continue to correct, the Church. They tell us the Council has been misinterpreted, thus “accounting for” the multitude of sacrileges, but they will not recognize the misinterpreters, often participants in the Council and Paul VI himself. They pretend that abuses based on Vatican II’s words are due to faulty reading of these words. They show us no abuses based on words of the Council of Trent; Trent, speaking—unlike Vatican II—precisely, definitely, unmistakably, could not be misinterpreted or incorrectly read.

The wilfully blind include too many traditionalist leaders. If we follow the blind, or those who counterfeit blindness to avoid giving offence, shall we not fall with them into the pit? But these men pretend to lead the fight for the Church against this or that abuse, this or that heretic, this or that hierarchy, and will not discern and fight the enemy. Why not, pray? Fear that they may lose support or credibility? They will lose their sober, judicious image; they will seem rude, outspoken, bigoted, fanatical, insane. The truth, being “unthinkable,” will place them beyond the pale, make the authorities refuse to parley or compromise with them.

Neither parley nor compromise is desirable, necessary, or possible. What truth can we water down? What effect could its dilution by us have on reality? How can we permit this hellish new *ordo* in our churches, even part of the time? How can we permit Arian travesties of our sacraments? Even for others? Who are these innovators that we must compromise or deal with them? What have we to gain by skirting or obscuring truth? Our “leaders” have applied the soft pedal for years, and the situation worsens daily. Their superior judgment, tactical sense, overall strategy, all must take precedence, because the ordinary Catholic supposedly won’t accept the truth! Has he accepted our “leaders”’ disguised or palliated “truth?”

We cannot shirk our responsibility by throwing its onus onto God—by predicating divine intervention. God will more likely intervene directly when no men will be His instruments—His ordinary means. If we occasion His intervention by our cowardice or failure will He not include us in His target?

We have had bad popes before, though some may not have realized their effect on the Church. In these days of lightning communication Paul VI certainly knew how much his failure to act against heresies and abuses has hurt the Church. But he did nothing to correct the situation and much to add to its gravity. Be this “coercion,” poor judgment, or malice, it must stop! It will never stop until he is seriously, firmly opposed.

We only blunt or fragment opposition by taking positions against particular evils here or there. We must all unite, and unity is possible only on the truthful assessment of the entire picture.

Until we unite we shall merely treat symptoms, not address the cause of the Church's dire debilitation.

We must stop mollicoddling the poor, ordinary, middle-of-the-road Catholic, as though he were really stupid. If he were he would not be staying away from church in unprecedented numbers. We cannot force him, but we must show him his choice. We must show him the spiritually bankrupt source of these departures from traditional practice and doctrine, that all these "innovations" have been tried before, that these are the very innovations for which heretics have been condemned, the very doctrines and deceptions which placed the Reformers outside the Church, and, above all, that the imposers of these disastrous innovations know well their disastrous history, that they do not impose these things on him in good faith, but with every intention of destroying his civilization, his Faith, and his immortal soul.

We must show him the cowardice of his priest, the thespian talent of his bishop, the charismatic freemasonry of his cardinals, the treachery, duplicity, and hypocrisy of his "pope."

There is no possibility that Paul VI did not know what he had done, nor that his successor lacks equal knowledge of what he continues to do, to us all. Should the remotest possibility exist, it is our duty to see that he is informed. We cannot do this by pretending that he is correct.

While it is the fashion to concede all power to the pope, supreme power and omnipotence are not identical. In the final analysis the pope cannot teach us anything we do not already know, nor oblige us to—nor excuse us from—any worship to which we were not previously obliged by divine law.

May God keep us all in His Eternal Church, the Church we all knew.

**FINIS**



## Appendix I

**Objection:** I hate this *novus ordo*. But I am obliged to assist at Sunday Mass. The Church is obliged to provide Sunday Mass. So I go to church and read from my old missal and ignore the priest. But you say I must avoid this thing.

**Reply:** Somewhere in Rome sits a faceless “Congregation of the Imposition,” whose unfathomable, unidentifiable decrees drip with supreme contempt. Its motto is: “Let’s see how much these stupid sheep will take.” As long as you take it they’ll give it.

Let me refer you to **In Defense of the Faith**, published by the Confraternity of Traditional Catholicism, East Meadow, New York, which makes several pertinent points: Change of *for many* to *for all* violates and falsifies the consecratory words of Christ, therefore the traditional Catholic understanding of the Mass. The infamous notion that all men are necessarily saved gains increasing acceptance. Even the funeral vestment color change reflects this distorted view. White celebration replaces black mourning. Why black, sadness, or prayers for the dead? What is the need of a Sacrifice for many unto the remission of sins?

The postconciliar Church has made the central act of the Catholic religion into a tool of false ecumenism “tantamount to abandoning the religion revealed by God.” (*Mortalium Animos*) This misuse is nothing less than sacrilegious.

The new order “mass” violates the First Commandment of God, not only in occasioned idolatry, not only in commission of sacrilege, but also in superstition. (**Superstition**—a vice opposed to religion .... because it offers worship to beings other than God—to unconsecrated bread and wine, for instance—or offers worship to God in an improper manner. —S.T. II-II q xcii, 1)

False worship of the true God occurs in worship that mixes error with truth. “God is worshipped in a false manner if one mingles religious errors and deception with the worship of the true God (*cultus falsus*), or if God is worshipped by the practice of senseless, very unusual, or ridiculous ceremonies (*cultus vanus*).”—Rev. Heribert Jone, OFM Cap. J.C.D., Moral Theology, The Newman Press, 1946, 163 (p 104)

*Cultus vanus* flourishes daily in “Catholic” seminaries. “Mass” is celebrated on coffee tables with seminarians sitting around on the floor. Blasphemous “music” accompanies it. The reputed consecrated host is handled sacrilegiously. But focus on *cultus falsus*. The new order English “mass” contains explicit and literal religious error—besides its content of false notions through serious omissions, dilution of doctrine, and incorporation of Protestant liturgical practice.

From the earliest times heresies attacked the Trinity. At the end of the first century Judaic heretics, Cerinthus, and the Ebionites, holding rigidly to the doctrine of one person in God, denied the divinity of Christ. Towards the end of the second century Monarchianists taught that there was only one person in God. Later, Arius taught that the Son of God was a creature of the

Father, produced by Him from nothing before all other creatures. Mohamet denied the Trinity, and the “religion” he founded still teaches the same heresy. Modernism also denies the divinity of Christ. Even the slightest ambiguity on this doctrine should be avoided like the plague.

In this historical setting compare the Catholic belief in the Blessed Trinity with the opening words of the Preface to Eucharistic Prayer IV of the new “mass”: “Father in heaven, it is right that we should give you thanks and glory. YOU ALONE ARE GOD, living and true.”

But, say our conservative priests, no heresy is intended (Experts did this?), and since they believe in the orthodox doctrine they do not embrace any heretical notions. They may even refuse E.P. IV in favor of E.P. I, the “Roman canon,” the relevant, meaningful ceremony from which three hundred fifty English words have been removed or mistranslated. It was all done by the same crew of heretics, who have clearly demonstrated their heresy, the heresy of the Judaic heretics, of Cerinthus and the Ebionites, of Arius, of Mohamet, of liberal Protestantism, and of modernism. We must conclude that the new *ordo* attended by American (and Australian) Catholics mingles religious error with worship of the true God (*cultus falsus*). A sin of superstition, it violates the First Commandment of God.

Use of a doubtfully valid consecration form—mortally sinful—justifies rejection of the new “mass.” “Matter and form must be certainly valid. Hence, one may not follow a probable opinion and use either doubtful matter or form .... ( or) one commits a sacrilege.”—*ibid.*, 445 (p 323) One is obliged to choose the certainly valid form (or rite) over the doubtfully valid form (or rite).

“In a conflict of obligations the higher takes precedence. Duties conflict when two laws apparently oblige simultaneously and only one can be observed .... only the more important .... obliges .... Among laws of nature a law that prohibits precedes a law that commands.”—*ibid.*, 70 (p 32) “Negative or prohibiting natural law never ceases to oblige in case of moral impossibility. Such laws forbid actions .... intrinsically evil. Therefore, idolatry, blasphemy, onanism, perjury, etc. are not allowed even to save one’s life. All other laws cease to oblige when it is morally impossible to observe them.”—*ibid.*, 69 (pp 31-32)

The new *ordo* is, at the ultimate minimum, irreverent, hence sacrilegious. Sacrilege is intrinsically evil. The obligation to assist at Mass on Sundays and Holy Days is an ecclesiastical law, from which the Church often dispenses. The Church cannot dispense from the First and Third Commandments; we must still render honor to God and keep His Day holy. Divine law and natural law are superior to purely ecclesiastical law. While grave difficulty excuses us from observance of ecclesiastical laws, nothing excuses us for violating the natural law, thus committing an unjustifiable, intrinsically evil act. If grave inconvenience excuses rendering a specific type of public worship, avoidance of irreverence in public

worship is a far greater excuse. Irreverence to God contravenes natural law; consequently no power on earth, not all the bishops in the world, not all the popes who ever lived, can compel us to commit it. We are not merely excused; we are obliged not to assist. Similarly, a priest is obliged not to celebrate the new “mass.”

Even were a pope to abrogate *Quo Primum* and to order the use of the new “mass,” a priest must disobey the pope—who is unquestionably and absolutely bound by divine law—and obey the law of God; for it transgresses the First Commandment to treat the sacred with irreverence. Nothing is more sacred than the Most Holy Sacrifice and Sacrament of the Altar.

To invoke obedience to excuse participation in the new “mass” will not help on Judgment Day; the Catholic Church has always taught that obedience ends when authorities command evil.

I hold the new “mass” not possibly valid—therefore idolatry. The sole alternative is sacrilege. Either way it violates the First Commandment. The new “mass” is the shortest, surest route to hell.

## Appendix II

**Objection:** You quote Marcel Lefebvre at length. Do you follow him?

**Reply:** I follow no one and nothing but the doctrines, traditions, laws, and practices of the Catholic Church. I agree with and often quote anyone in proper support of these. Where I have quoted Lefebvre he is unmistakably orthodox. I also quote Fathers J. W. Flanagan and Ralph M. Wiltgen, both hostile witnesses, whose testimony I consider weightier for its hostility. I quote even Paul VI.

Lefebvre voted for many of Vatican II's documents, even the Liturgy fiasco. He has for years insisted that the *novus ordo missae* is not in itself invalid, and asked for an optional traditional Mass in all dioceses.

Such an option, besides risking idolatrous counterfeits of the true Mass staged by recipients of the new substitute for Holy Orders, would countenance and condone the outright idolatry of a parallel rite—the *novus ordo missae*—would commit traditional Catholics to support of blatant heresy, sacrilege, and idolatry.

For it is not the Catholic Faith to tolerate heresy and heretical worship “inside” the Catholic Church—to condone pluralism, superstition, sacrilege, and idolatry.

Lefebvre has palmed off *novus ordo* “priests” on traditionalists for no other possible motives than occasioned idolatry or more collections. His motives and intentions in ordaining(?) religious illiterates, who cannot determine what constitutes heresy these days, consequently attract at least suspicion—probably sufficient to invalidate his conferred orders even were they otherwise unquestionable.

Neither Lefebvre nor Schmidberger, nor any member of their society, which up to excommunication time recognized JP2 as pope, thereby condoning his long list of public heresies, can be Catholic. Not only their ordinations(?) but all their masses(?) and sacraments(?) are illicit in their roots. Their fruits are of the nature of Luther's—progressive splintering.

Masons oppose Lefebvre? A mason ordained(?) him priest(?). Part of the act! They always set up their own phony opposition. Naturally its leader's record varies from that of the ordinary apostate. If not Lefebvre, where IS this vital part of the plot? Who else keeps traditionalists out of the real fight? Many try, but HE SUCCEEDS, despite his blatant “strategic” procrastination and inconsistency. Undeniably, people who should fight follow him instead, and let him conduct the compromises. Even a round dozen of his priests(?) rebelled at his doctrinal shortcomings, just as clearly visible to ordinary laymen. Would a genuine Catholic bishop, truly concerned for our souls, permit a whole generation to die while he temporized with apostate Rome? Lefebvre has veered so often that no one can predict his stance next month, next week, or next minute, except that it will have changed yet again.

June 30, 1988 Lefebvre induced retired Bishop Antonio de Castro Mayer from Campos, Brazil to co-consecrate four bishops without proper ecclesiastical permission or direction. Having undoubted(?) Apostolic Succession, these four may possibly, like Ngo Dinh Thuc's second line, claim jurisdiction. (Of what use is a jobless bishop?) These men enjoy Lefebvre's exact episcopal status: doubtful through sacerdotal ordination. Who ordained them? Were they priests? Were they eligible for consecration? Episcopal consecration nowhere confers the power to celebrate Mass. Would it not be the crowning irony of all time if those who have taken the law into their own incompetent hands have thereby inadvertently (let us hope!) brought on idolatry under the cloak of tradition?

The faithful are bound (Canon Law 1325) to profess their faith publicly, whenever silence, subterfuge, or their manner of acting would otherwise entail an implicit denial of their faith, a contempt of religion, an insult to God, or scandal to their neighbor.

In a near-universal apostasy it devolves upon me to profess the Catholic Faith publicly. Catholic bishops and priests, whose job it is to preach the Faith, the entire Faith, in season and out, would appear equally obliged. Silence and subterfuge violate also both oaths they all took freely, to the Council of Trent and against modernism.

Yet some expect me to treat these perjured apostates with the respect due the offices they usurp.

### Appendix III

More one-way correspondence, Gibson to the hierarchy of Australia, copies to hierarchies of New Zealand and India, more than 160 apostates in all. The first quoted was written 24 January 1980 and mailed immediately.

#### AUSTRALIAN ALLIANCE FOR CATHOLIC TRADITION

Your Lordship:

As you know, you, the teaching authority in your diocese, are responsible for the doctrine taught from your parish pulpits and in your schoolrooms. You have the care of souls. On your exercise of this care you will be saved or lost eternally. You will not be judged on how the episcopal conference votes, recommends, or decrees, or even on what belches forth from Rome. You were trained and confirmed in the Faith. Whose fault if you don't know it? So why not practice it? Why silence and inertia while heresy infests classroom and shrieks from pulpit?

Why is the Mass replaced in your diocese? How reconcile its loss with love of God? Or with compliance with His law? Or with the doctrine of the Communion of Saints? Or with ordination oaths against modernism and to Trent? Who has taken oaths to Vatican II and its doctrines? Why act as though the Church had suddenly discovered truth in the last twenty years? A properly consecrated bishop vows obedience to the popes "in accord with Canon Law." A true pope has no need to suspend or rewrite Canon Law to render this possible.

Was Paul VI a pope? Before you answer, please ponder these points:

It is beyond dispute that:

- 1) In nearly every diocese in the world the traditional Mass is wiped out. Be this ordered or legally bluffed, be it by design or accident, full credit accrues to the Holy See. Fully cognizant of the situation, even where not actively involved in supplanting and suppressing our Mass, it consents by silence concerning this chief end of religion, divine worship, preservation of which is the Holy See's chief end.
- 2) The traditional Mass of the Latin Rite is true worship of God, preserved through the centuries pure and free from error (Trent), the way in which Almighty God has shown that He wishes to be worshipped. (Leo XIII)
- 3) Anyone who proscribes, supplants, prevents, or in any way hinders true worship of God is God's enemy.

It is further inescapable that:

- 1) The service that supplants our Sacrifice of the Mass is not pure and free from error, is not a traditional rite, and cannot, therefore, be the way in which God has shown that He wishes to be worshipped.
- 2) The "sacrificial" intention expressed in the replacement "offertory" is not Christ's intention, nor the necessarily identical intention of His Church.
- 3) The essential Action of Jesus Christ has given way to a non-

formal “narrative of institution”—of no more intent or effect than pious(?) Scripture reading—which falsifies Christ’s own words, essential to effect consecration, necessarily creating grave doubt concerning the imputed Transubstantiation.

4) Eucharistic Prayer IV’s Preface contains explicit Arianism: “Father .... You alone are God ....”

5) Whether or not he believes this classic error, no Christian can be honestly deceived, or propose it by mistake. It is not new, not peripheral, not possibly inadvertent.

6) Whoever proposes or promulgates this most hateful heresy, condemned since the fourth century, is necessarily a condemned heretic.

7) All bishops and priests necessarily recognize this heresy, unless (like Paul VI) they by-passed all seminary training.

8) Those who permit this heresy in any form in their dioceses, parishes, or missions, in their books, in their usages, in their silence, join the proposers and promulgators in condemned heresy, and become likewise condemned heretics.

9) Public heretics (Could they be more public?) by the very fact of their public adherence to heresy lose all office, authority, jurisdiction, and membership in the Catholic Church, according to both Canon Law and common sense.

10) The imposition of this new rite of “mass” that infests our churches has removed the authority of all who imposed it, all who connived at its imposition, and all who permit it in their own former jurisdiction.

11) They also bring this judgment upon themselves who accept this new rite selectively—who correct words in the “narrative of institution” or abstain from use of one or more “Eucharistic Prayers”—for the entire rite is imposed by the same self-destroyed authority, obedience to which constitutes condonation of condemned heresy.

12) Silence on the part of those supposedly in authority in the Church when faced with heresy is correctly held to signify consent to the heresy and to its propagation.

Canon 1325 obliges all Catholics, especially priests and bishops, to public profession of the Faith under such conditions as ours. We should indeed chafe under the slightest restraint upon our freedom to comply. Did not Jesus Christ say: “Every one therefore that shall confess Me before men I will also confess him before My Father Who is in heaven?” Why do we hesitate? How much time or effectiveness have we left?

Spirago-Clarke CATECHISM EXPLAINED, New York 1927, pages 648-649: “7. It is the duty of the faithful to pray God to send them good priests. .... Remember that a priest is the salvation or perdition of his flock. In the Old Testament we read that when other scourges were of no avail to turn the people, hardened in sin, from their evil ways, God sent upon them the heaviest scourge of all, wicked and corrupt priests. .... unless a priest is enlightened by the Holy Spirit we may apply to him the words: ‘If the blind lead the blind, both fall into the pit.’ Matt. xv, 14).”

On a worldwide basis you must admit the aptness of the quotation. Whatever the state of your conscience, this is objectively the state of affairs, the condition to which the laity is reduced, through your failure to keep your ordination oaths.

Many bishops, I am sure, continue in this postconciliar fraud because they cannot bear to draw the conclusion and apply it to themselves. But their final argument, aside from obedience—misplaced and sinful—for suppression of the undeniable traditional Mass has been in effect that St. Pius V, who supported it by decree when at last necessary, is dead, and that Paul VI could reverse him. But such reversal is beyond even a true pope's competence. And this "final" argument died with Paul.

The fashion is to say that all is in God's hands—that our portion is prayer. But the most powerful prayer, the Church's official prayer, Christ's own Sacrifice of Calvary, is not permitted in your diocese —**through your ignorance, cowardice, connivance, or downright malice**. What holds you down while your parish churches stink with sacrilege and reek with idolatry? Action, your action, is required to restore the Church—at the very least that portion for which you are solely responsible.

Don't waste time waiting for your leader. He has bought himself some cheap temporary orthodoxy in dealing summarily with acknowledged heretics like Kueng and Schillebeeckx—who have no possible defense. Until he wipes out the new "mass" and "sacraments" and restores the rites universally and officially practiced before John XXIII he remains God's enemy. The sooner you exclude yourself from this large class, the better your and your flock's chance for salvation. A saved flock, not a saved face, should be a bishop's sole concern.

Even Theodore Roosevelt, visiting a mere national park, said: "Leave it as it is .... a product of the ages .... You cannot improve on it. Preserve it for your children, your grandchildren, and for all those who come after you."

We owe our Faith to those who preserved it for us. What are we preserving?

If I am wrong please make some one prove it. And please look as critically at his proof as you look at mine. This subject cannot be left safely to theologians. Salvation hardly depends on glib rationalizations. We cannot change our mistakes. Nor can we correct them until we recognize them. As Christian civilization disappears, largely because its Mother has decided to accommodate rather than discipline it, ask yourself who has brought this about—your generous and loving crowd, or our thin, ineffectual line of traditionalists?

You have robbed God of His people and his people of Him. God doesn't need you. We do—for restitution! Even were your renewal harmless in itself, it has driven millions from the Church. It is not fitting that you should escape their fate.

May God show you more mercy than I would. (signature)



14 Feb 80

Your Lordship,

.... the only possible motive for such a letter IS charity. I don't want to see you .... all your flock go to hell .... (nor) what a hell the world will finally become when you have suffered the Church to die. .... "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, with thy whole soul, with thy whole mind, and with thy whole strength." (Mark xii, 30) When I love God with my whole mind I perceive that He is unchangeable. Therefore, .... what I have learned of Him and His Revelation is unchangeable. If, therefore, I adhere to it with my whole strength I must be correct. My whole mind tells me that when I know something, particularly my Faith, if it is necessary for me to change then I was not correct in the first place. But twenty, thirty, forty, fifty years ago you all agreed with me. Before that all our ancestors agreed with me. We were all dead-centre in the Catholic Church. Can you tell me how, without a single change of belief or practice, I have now become wrong? Or even how I find myself out here on this right wing? .....

.... read the enclosed book, "PAUL VI's LEGACY: CATHOLICISM?" .... should convince any properly instructed Catholic. ....

25 June 80

.... my book .... is either truth to which you must adhere or lies and heresies which you must demolish. You have the care of souls—you may not shirk your responsibility. ....

26 September 80

Your Lordship,

The Congregation for Divine Worship and the Sacraments' circular (Prot 1224/80, 20 June 1980) asked whether individuals or groups in your diocese insist on having Mass in Latin in the old rite, the size and make-up of these groups, and reasons advanced for their position or requests. If your diocese boasts none it is uniquely unfortunate. So hurry your report; gladden the hearts of Knox, Noe & Co. Do not wait for the deadline (Halloween); something eerie may crop up.

Has it struck you that:

1. A catastrophic drop in church attendance followed replacement of the traditional Mass?
2. People stay away in millions because the new rite repels them?
3. Heavy losses among graduates of the Catholic school system follow their not having been taught the Catholic Faith?
4. They recognize the absurdity of what they have been taught, under Catholic auspices in Catholic schools, and therefore think is Catholicism?
5. You are chiefly responsible for this tragic apostasy?

Has false doctrine entered the schools of your diocese without your knowledge or permission? Could the traditional Mass have been replaced in your diocese over your objection? If either

question can be answered “yes” who runs your diocese? What are you doing there? When will you take charge?

Those who deal with the public figure that for each unsolicited letter of praise or criticism a few non-writers share the views expressed. If fifteen write similar views their complaints receive consideration. You fit a different frame of reference. Catholics, accustomed to authority, see little hope of ever swaying their bishops, and have seldom indulged in correspondence with them. Most never thought of their Catholic Church being influenced by lay doctrinal, moral, or liturgical opinions. Further, they consider the clergy and bishops better informed and educated, and have somehow swallowed the infamous notion that better information and education give bishops and priests a right to update, adapt, and correct Jesus Christ and His Revelation.

Thus when the Melbourne Guidelines were questioned priests faced down properly concerned parents with: “They were approved by the Archbishop of Melbourne. You would not accuse HIM of heresy, would you?” So opposition melted away through habit and scandalous suggestion. The ordinary Catholic simply cannot cope with the idea that his bishop should be burned as a heretic. If the Guidelines are wrong—and they are—NO authority can stand behind them. Any that pretends to guarantee them undermines itself—proves that it is not Catholic.

But the sheep will not question, even when consciously right. They can see error in education, because they were taught Catholicism, and know that what is now taught is not what they were taught. But they back down.

Changes to the liturgy supposedly authorized by Vatican II are “beyond their competence.” They seldom realize that these liturgical changes are also far beyond the competence of their imposers. They back down when they know they are right; will they dare question on matters outside the scope of their education? So they go along with impossible changes; they accept proven doctrinal liars’ word that “nothing is really changed—all the essentials remain” at the new heretical service that has almost completely replaced our Mass. In this climate you may rate letters to views unwritten, not to a few as in politics or entertainment, but closer to a few thousand.

Even this figure is far too low. We have not calculated the huge and growing number who no longer attend church. These people know in their hearts that no bishop will entertain their arguments, however compelling. They are sure that nothing will ever return to normal, that should any bishop wish for normalcy he lacks the courage to strive for it. These bishops are too far gone even to listen to St. John (xii, 25): “He that loveth his life shall lose it : and he that hateth his life in this world keepeth it unto life eternal.” Craven to the core, they are not worth the postage.

So why write? Should you who have deserted the Catholic Faith retain Catholic office and its authority unchallenged? Have you the slightest intention of consulting traditional groups for their reasons? Will you even report the existence of these groups or

individuals? In three months you have not consulted the Australian Alliance for Catholic Tradition. You certainly know we exist.

The Congregation, of course, knows all the reasons. It has received and replied by form letter to innumerable complaints from around the world. So what is its circular's purpose? Excommunication? Compromise? Noe-Knox petrol? Or just the old oil?

We expect a ruling that no one may have the traditional Mass because WE few deny the acceptability, Catholicity, and validity of the idolatrous, sacrilegious, heretical *novus ordo* promulgated in 1969 over the objection of the 1967 Roman Synod of bishops and (secretly) made compulsory to the exclusion of the true Mass BEFORE anyone in Australia publicly stated such denial.

A corporation trying a new sales system periodically evaluates results. Call in the auditors on the "new economy of the Gospel," ecumenism, and Renewal. Such far more pertinent figures should be sent Knox and his infamous, incompetent Congregation.

Sincerest condolences for your dead ordination oaths!

(signature)

I sent copies of these four letters to James R. Knox, Prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Sacraments, Rome, enclosed with my letter of 19 October 80: Milord, We write to place the truth on record, though we expect you to reject it. You have, after all, rejected the message, sacrifice, and divinity of Jesus Christ in imposing the new rite to replace our traditional Mass .... Relatively few will have heard of your call for reports on traditional Latin Mass groups. Most men repelled by the new ecumenical service simply avoid it, and will have been neither consulted nor calculated. They, like all Catholics, are entitled to Mass. You have blocked it for years on "authority" usurped by a new congregation set up for the purpose. The Congregation of Rites, which it replaced, was established to regulate—not oust—ancient existing rites. .... what possible excuse can you offer for actively suppressing true worship of God? .... Merely to recover our own true Mass we Catholics cannot condone sacrilege and idolatry. Our direct embroilment would be only a matter of time .... Your "priests" and "bishops" "ordained" since Easter 1969 can neither celebrate Mass nor confer sacraments. .... how many can even read the Latin rubrics? How many have been taught the Church's traditional purposes and intentions, sacramental or sacrificial? How many parishes retain their old missals? If the old and the new are placed on parity will not most who attend the new continue to believe the old and new identical? .... We believe that you, having driven so many Catholics from their Church with the new, now intend to "demonstrate" that no one wants the traditional by appealing to those who have put up with the new. .... that you intend to bury the traditional forever with another rigged experiment and a rigged "popular" reaction.

Nothing, you say, will suit us. We didn't want our Mass stolen, and now we don't want it back. .... You had no right to steal the Mass, nor .... to reintroduce it conditionally or on parity with sacrilege and idolatry. .... We hold little hope that you will believe us—you have not believed St. Pius V or St. Pius X. .... We are, unfortunately, too few to constitute St. Paul's prophesied apostasy. .... (signature) (As usual, no reply.)

11 August 1981 I tried a new approach, Scripture. I quoted the Rheims-Douai-Challoner translation: II Timothy iv, 1-5; I Peter iii, 13 & 15; I Thess. iv, 2 & ii, 4; Ps. 118, 89-90; Galatians i, 8-12; I Thess. ii, 13-16; I Cor. xv, 1-2; Colossians ii, 8; I Timothy iv, 1 & vi, 20; Mark xiii, 10; Matthew xxiv, 14; Jeremias xxiii, 1-2; Ezechiel xxxiv, 8 & 10; Hebrews vi, 4-6; and Luke xii, 56-57, among others. I threw in Leo XIII in *Divinum illud*, 4 May 1897: "... as Christ is the Head of the Church, so is the Holy Ghost her soul. .... This being so, no further and fuller manifestation and revelation of the Divine Spirit may be imagined or expected; for that which now takes place in the Church is the most perfect possible, and will last until that day when the Church herself, having passed through her militant career, shall be taken up into the joy of the saints triumphing in heaven." (Still no answer!)

Last try to date: 1 June 1984

Your Lordship,

I have written all you who rejoice in the title bishop several times (17 Jan 1974, 24 Jan 80, 14 Feb 80, 25 June 80, 11 Aug 81) detailing improper bases for and heresies in the new rite which has ousted our Mass, and documenting heresies proclaimed by Vatican II and Paul VI. I have pointed out your episcopal responsibility to teach proper, traditional, Catholic doctrine and to refute public heresy, whatever its source. You are obliged to show me where I err or to correct your own manifest errors which I have cited. You have no right to ignore truth, especially religious truth, which is a particular reason for and province of your office.

You cannot ignore your responsibility for the salvation of your flock, even of those who have left in disgust or disillusionment with innovations in worship, doctrine, and practice which you have permitted or imposed in your diocese. You are, furthermore, responsible for those in your area who were never Catholic; you must provide the reasonable standard to which they may be converted. You are responsible even for me if I err.

The new "code of canon law" follows and accommodates the other impossible changes in our religion, founded in its entirety by Jesus Christ in His complete Revelation confided to His Church for complete preservation and preachment to the end of time. Any doctrinal or moral innovation is therefore, not Catholic, and when promulgated by authority proves that authority not Catholic. When such violations can be introduced only in violation of both Church law and the clergy's ordination oaths, required when necessary for the total preservation of the religion, and dropped

(though never dispensed) as part and parcel of the innovations, it becomes impossible not to condemn at least the morality of the innovations. The promulgating authority must thereby be convicted of officially teaching non-Catholic morals. It is hard to separate or differentiate such erroneous teaching from heresy. At the very least we must refuse obedience to immoral innovations. These cannot be divorced from the automatically discredited promulgating authority. The Church and its visible head, the pope, Christ's vicar, whose office was instituted by Jesus Christ for the total preservation of His Revelation, Church, Faith, are infallible when teaching the whole Church on faith and/or morals. The "Church" and its "pope" which promulgate immoral innovation the world over work against and contradict their God-given purpose and mandate. They are obviously not infallible, certainly not holy, certainly not one with the Apostles and the Catholic Church of all times, certainly not preaching Christ's undiluted, complete message to all nations as He commanded. They are, therefore, having none of the marks of the Church, not Catholic, have no authority over Catholics, and must not be obeyed in any manner or field. For the Catholic Church cannot be unholy; it cannot preach contradictory morals, situation ethics, broken clerical oaths. Church law can seldom if ever be violated morally.

Councils are called in the face of necessity—some dire emergency, such as the Arian heresy, which almost won because the hierarchy succumbed—not because some "pope" received a personal "inspiration from the Holy Ghost." Convocation of Vatican II violated Pius II's *Execrabilis* (any council called to make drastic change in the Church is beforehand decreed to be void and annulled.), a binding law to help preserve the Faith, bound also in heaven (that is, in eternity), as Jesus Christ said. He never said "What you shall bind in 1460 or 1570 you can loose in 1963."

Indeed the entire idea, *aggiornamento*, behind Vatican II's convocation fell under condemnation in at least five errors of the modernists anathematized by Pope St. Pius X (*Lamentabili sane*) July 3, 1907:

"53. The organic institution of the Church is not immutable. Like human society, Christian society is subject to perpetual evolution.

"54. Dogmas, Sacraments, and hierarchy, both their notion and reality, are only interpretations and evolutions of the Christian intelligence which have increased and perfected by an external series of additions the little germ latent in the Gospel.

"58. Truth is no more immutable than man himself, since it evolved with him, in him, and through him.

"59. Christ did not teach a determined body of doctrine applicable to all times and all men, but rather inaugurated a religious movement adapted or to be adapted to different times and places.

"64. Scientific progress demands that the concepts of Christian doctrine concerning God, creation, revelation, the Person of the Incarnate Word, and Redemption be readjusted."

Vatican II's first great achievement, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy,

(1) ignored and contradicted the Vatican council's Dogmatic

Constitution on the Catholic Faith, April 24, 1870, Canon 2 on Revelation: “If anyone shall say that it is impossible or inexpedient that man should be taught by the divine revelation concerning God and the worship to be paid to Him; let him be anathema”;

(2) violated Canon 2 of the Code: “All liturgical laws heretofore decreed for the celebration of Holy Mass, the recitation of the Divine Office, the administration of the sacraments and sacramentals and other sacred functions, retain their force, except insofar as the Code explicitly corrects those laws,” Canon 733: “In the celebration, administration and reception of the sacraments, the liturgical rites and ceremonies prescribed in the rituals approved by the Church must be accurately observed ....,” and Canon 1261, \*1: “It is the duty of the local Ordinaries to see that the precepts of the sacred canons regarding divine worship are faithfully observed, and that neither into public nor into private worship, nor into the private lives of the faithful, any superstitious practices are introduced, or anything admitted that is contrary to faith or discordant with ecclesiastical tradition, or has the appearance of sordid profit-making”;

(3) offended grievously against several provisions of Liturgical Law to which the 1918 Code refers respectfully as retaining its binding status. This law, recorded at length at the beginning of our traditional Missal, covers our highest moral duty, worship of God. *Quo primum tempore* of St. Pius V fills all the requirements for infallible definition, and is through its subject matter nothing less (see Canon 2 on Revelation, above) than divine law codified when necessary. (Canon 6, \*6: All other disciplinary laws of the old law which were in force until now, and which are neither explicitly nor implicitly contained in the Code, have lost all force of law with the exception of laws contained in the approved liturgical books and laws derived from the natural and the positive divine law.”) Clearly Leo XIII (*Immortale Dei*) considered liturgical law divine: “ .... absolutely bound, in the worship of the Deity, to adopt that use and manner in which God Himself has shown that He wills to be adored.”

Vatican II continued to oppose doctrine, tradition, and law, most blatantly in its Decree on Ecumenism (paragraphs 3, 4, 6, 8, & 9), its Declaration on Religious Freedom (paragraphs 2 & 11), and its *The Church in the Modern World* (Karol Wojtyla helped write it) (paragraphs 44, 50, & 93)—all quoted, documented, and proven heretical in my previous letters and enclosures.

Now Paul VI promulgated all these previously condemned heresies as Catholic doctrine to the whole Church over his “papal” signature and called upon the Holy Ghost to back him in self-contradiction, one of the very few things impossible to God. He is thus, at least from that time, a public heretic—it is indeed hard to see how his heresy could be more public. The papacy’s purpose is preservation, not innovation.

Canon Law, with the same essential purpose, provides: Canon 1322: “Christ our Lord confided to the Church the deposit of faith, in order that she, with the perpetual assistance of the Holy

Ghost, might faithfully preserve and expound the revealed doctrine. Independently of any civil power whatsoever, the Church has the right and duty to teach all nations the evangelical doctrine, and all are bound by the divine law to acquire a proper knowledge of this doctrine and to embrace the true Church of God.” Canon 1324: “It is not sufficient to avoid heretical error, but one must also diligently shun any errors which more or less approach heresy. Wherefore all constitutions and decrees by which the Holy See has condemned and prohibited such opinions must be observed.”

Canon 1325: “The faithful are bound to profess their faith publicly, whenever silence, subterfuge, or their manner of acting would otherwise entail an implicit denial of their faith, a contempt of religion, an insult to God, or scandal to their neighbor. Any baptized person who, while retaining the name of Christian, obstinately (*pertinaciter*) denies or doubts any of the truths proposed for belief by the divine and Catholic faith, is a heretic; ....”

Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi*, 22: “.... Schism, heresy, or apostasy are such of their very nature that they sever a man from the Body of the Church.”

Canon 2314, \*1: “All apostates from the Christian faith and each and every heretic or schismatic incur the following penalties: (1) *ipso facto* excommunication; (2) if they have been admonished and do not repent, they shall be deprived of any benefice, dignity, pension, office, or other position which they may hold in the Church; they shall be declared infamous, and, if they are clerics, they shall after renewed admonition be deposed; (3) if they have joined a non-Catholic sect or have publicly adhered to it, they incur infamy *ipso facto*, and, if they are clerics and the admonition to repent has been fruitless, they shall be degraded. Canon 188, \*4, provides, moreover, that the cleric who publicly abandons the Catholic faith loses every ecclesiastical office *ipso facto* and without any declaration.”

IUS CANONICUM DE PERSONIS; “The pope’s power is removed: (a) through death .... (b) through resignation .... (c) through lapse into certain and incurable insanity .... (d) through notorious lapse into heresy. .... if he .... publicly deny a dogmatic truth, he is no longer a member of the Church, and therefore cannot be its head, and by the very fact loses jurisdiction. This is done by divine law; for this reason the sentence .... would be not of deposition but of mere declaration.”

But no declaration is needed—“by the very fact.” Not a matter of discipline, heresy by its nature excludes its public adherents from God’s Holy Church. It is in essence refusal to believe God. “But he that believeth not shall be condemned.”—Mark xvi, 16

Paul VI’s successors, John Paul I and II, both subscribed, along with nearly all the world’s bishops, to the heresies of Vatican II as publicly proclaimed by Paul VI. Both heretics, on usurping office, dedicated their reigns to further implementation of Vatican II, though each had the opportunity to disclaim it without penalty.

Some say a pope is not subject to Canon Law, therefore not to Canon 188 \*4. So JP2 IS pope. The argument depends, in the first place, upon his being pope so that he can be above the law. But we refuse to grant the first premiss, which is also the argument's conclusion. We are more likely to grant JP2 freedom from Canon Law on grounds that Canon Law is for Catholics, and is concerned with heretics only to exclude them. JP2 was certainly a public heretic before, therefore ineligible for, his election. Papal privileges accrue only to popes.

A pope must profess the Catholic Faith. A pope is subject to divine law, natural or positive. He is therefore subject to canons which express such doctrine and law, obviously including Canon 188, \*4, which states undeniable fact: a heretic is not a Catholic; a Catholic is not a heretic—by definition.

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA, vol VII, p 261, published the substance of Canon 188, \*4 eight years before the Code was promulgated: "Heretical clerics and all who receive, defend, or favor them are *ipso facto* deprived of their benefices, offices, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The pope himself, if notoriously guilty of heresy, would cease to be pope because he would cease to be a member of the Church." Volume XI, page 457 spells out the consequence: "Of course, the election of a heretic, schismatic, or female would be null and void."

Clearly, therefore, Canon 188, \*4 embodies a doctrine already received, an essential feature of the divinely instituted Church, as defined by Pope Innocent III in 1215, in the Fourth Lateran Council: "There is one universal Church of believers, outside which no one at all is saved." A publicly unbelieving pope, a pope that is a public heretic, would be incompatible with the nature of this Church of believers.

Our problem is unity. No one seems to know what it is or where it lies. But this has always been easy: with the priests, the bishops, the pope. All we need is agreement among them. That's the problem. Priests no longer agree. Many turn schizoid in attempts to reconcile their training with their bishops' orders and policies. Bishops no longer run dioceses. They convene to discuss interminably what Rome tells them to discuss before voting as Rome indicates. But surely the papacy is the standard of unity?

The Catholics of Japan kept the faith more than two centuries without priest or bishop, without contact with the popes. When priests were again admitted to Japan, these isolated Catholics recognized them by their identical doctrine and tradition. If such a group were found today, isolated for only fifty years, how would they recognize a priest? Where is the identical doctrine? What has become of tradition? A standard is necessary. We could survive without priests, bishops, or popes, as the Japanese Catholics did. The papacy has been vacant before. The problem is that we APPEAR to have a pope, unfortunately a faulty standard to which mutually exclusive groups adhere on different days, a four-foot yardstick, a collapsible gauge. This seems an essential



constituent of the revolt before the end, as predicted infallibly by St. Paul.

We find Paul VI and his successors often on the side of orthodoxy—usually as feebly as possible—to maintain their infallible image. But they permit whole hierarchies to disagree in word and practice and suffer no penalty, no correction, no mention, and still hold their offices.

We find a new rite of “mass” introduced under the mask of translation, immorally—in violation of ecclesiastical and divine law—in “obedience” not owed to a heretical council which never ordered it. We find incorporated in this utterly new rite (1) a return to an ancient, pre-Christian concept of insufficient sacrifice which the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity deliberately replaced with His own efficacious Sacrifice, renewed in our traditional Mass, and (2) a bald statement of the Arian heresy, well-known as such to all collaborators in this new rite’s concoction, which denies divinity to Him Who instituted the Mass, thereby removing its worth and efficacy, and plunging believers misguided enough to assist at this new rite into idolatry. It is beyond all bounds of possibility that these changes are Catholic, or actions of the Catholic Church or its laws, councils, or popes—unless truth is variable and self-contradictory authority can prove anything, that is, unless Christ is the outstanding liar and con-man of all time and His Church is in error from its foundation (good Talmudic doctrine!).

But these and other unwarrantable, invalidating sacramental innovations HAVE been made. It follows inescapably that those who made them and continue them in effect are not merely non-Catholic but anti-Catholic robbers of our Catholic ordinary means of salvation. They hate us almost as much as they hate Jesus Christ, Whom they dare to correct while pretending to His authority for their robbery.

“By their fruits you SHALL (not MAY IF YOU CARE TO LOOK) know them.” The Vulgate reads *cognoscetis*, future tense. The Greek *epignosesthe* can be either future indicative or present imperative. Either way it is not subjunctive, optative, permissive. Its English version is future imperative, with good reason. One MUST recognize what is there, not wring his hands in indecision, torment, or imagined future solubility.

The incontrovertible facts are:

(1) In Rome and around the world those posing as pope, Catholic hierarchy, and Catholic clergy teach under the “ordinary magisterium” other doctrine and morals than the Catholic Church taught always and everywhere before Vatican II.

(2) All popes, cardinals, bishops, and priests who have not publicly condemned Vatican II or who have permitted its (actually or spiritually) consequent innovations have publicly defected from the Faith and have thereby without any declaration forfeited all offices in the Church. Not merely the Holy See but all sees are vacant.

You lie under the gravest moral obligation to rejoin me in the Catholic Church or to refute me. To prove me wrong you must guarantee and prove:

- 1) Vatican II is orthodox on all points, especially on the glaring inconsistencies cited.
- 2) The morality of the violation of canon and divine law and of the breaking of oaths administered for the preservation of the Church, its doctrine, and its morals.
- 3) None of Vatican II's and its antipopes' innovations violated Catholic doctrine, morals, traditions, or oaths.
- 4) All those innovations are traditional—handed down without interruption from the Apostles.
- 5) The laws the Church found necessary to codify cannot be applied to modern times.
- 6) Our requirements for salvation differ from those of all our ancestors.
- 7) Believing and worshipping differently we can belong to the Communion of Saints.

Please weigh these matters well. Arianism alone will damn you eternally. "But he that shall deny Me before men, I will also deny him before My Father Who is in heaven." (Matt. x, 33)

Sincerely (signature)

## Postscript

**Objection:** Why all the fuss? Paul is dead. Let us hope that life will become easier for traditionalists under his successors.

**Reply:** “The evil that men do lives after them ....” A successor to an antipope is another antipope. Conditions may appear to ease, but only to mousetrap the harassed traditionalist in the general apostasy. It would take a genuine pope only half an hour to straighten everything out—to proclaim again the decrees of past popes and councils, to wipe out new rites and institutions, to condemn Vatican II and its promulgators, to cancel appointments *en masse*. The possibly resultant turmoil could not begin to approach that created by John XXIII, Paul VI, and Vatican II. When a man has held the papal office for more than half an hour and has not indicated even an intention to correct things we must consider him also an antipope—either a plant or a traitor. John Paul II has confirmed this estimate in his useless, unnecessary encyclicals, in his public commitment to continued implementation of the reforms of Vatican II, and in his treacherous, unnecessary approaches to Orthodox, Anglicans, Lutherans, Moslems, and Jews.

We can expect no change of direction from “popes” who assume office with even more innovations (two names—and what names! --, no coronation, to demonstrate personal humility and further downgrade the world’s highest office), who look as did Paul VI to the future instead of the Revelation for salvation, who continue the revision of Canon Law—a revision necessary only to the modernist apostasy. First John XXIII, then Paul VI packed the electorate with their own kind. Then Paul deprived the Catholic minority (too old) of its franchise. Who but modernists could have been elected?

Paul VI is dead, but that fortunate fact cannot by itself undo all his damage. It confers relevance, however, on the modernist argument that we may jettison definitions and pronouncements of past popes because they are past. For now Paul has joined them in the past, and the authority for all his change has gone with him, depending as it did on just this argument. Who are we to reject a classic modernist argument?

March 25, 1979 revised August 26, 1988