

The New Mass Is Invalid

Cyril B. Andrade, M.D.

Although there are several serious and scholarly writings arguing that the *Novus Ordo Missae* (New Order of Mass) is invalid because of a radical change in the consecration ‘formula for the wine, most lay Catholics are reluctant to accept this thesis. Everyone agrees that the Church has “changed” but they do not question whether something can be changed so much that it is no longer the same. They seem to assume that, though many things are changed, there has really been no change in doctrine because

- (a) they have been told so by the so-called hierarchy and clergy,
- (b) they don’t know Catholic doctrine anyway so wouldn’t know if it had been changed,
- (c) the changes couldn’t be radical because the bishops and priests would stop that from happening,
- (d) the Church is indefectible: God said He would always be with His Church and the Pope is infallible and so couldn’t let the Church go wrong. And yet it is evident that the Church is in shambles today!

Many lay Catholics in India devote much time and effort to opposing the introduction of pagan practices into the Mass. This is in itself laudable, but they do not realize that the introduction of pagan elements into the rite is of no consequence if the *Novus Ordo Missae* is not a true Mass but is invalid because of the radical defect in the consecrating formula of the wine.

Some well-intentioned but theologically uninformed laymen have stated, emphatically, that the change from “for many” to “for all men” in the consecration formula for the wine is so insignificant as to be non-existent, and that those who hold that this change invalidates the Mass are guilty of “nit-picking”; i.e., unreasonable fault-finding. “For all men” includes “for many”, they say, so why raise frivolous objections?

I would like to point out to these people that even a child knows that “many” no more means “all” than “few” means “none”, and that the change in the consecration form is a monstrous perversion of the sacred text which constitutes the very words of Christ. These same laymen, and many clerics also, express total disbelief that the change of a single word, that is “many” to “all” in the consecration of the wine, could possibly invalidate the Mass. What follows here will, I hope, convince these persons that they are laboring under a great misapprehension.

In the year 867, the *Filioque* controversy was touched off by the Patriarch Photius, who ultimately led the Byzantine Church into schism. Denying that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, Photius accused the Latins of having corrupted the Creed by adding the word “*filioque*” (and the Son). This dispute served as a theological wedge which pried open the Great Eastern schism, that horrendous rupture which still remains today after more than eleven hundred years.

This should make one ponder the importance words have. Yes, even a single word. Moreover, we need only reflect that it is by means of words, and solely through words, that we are able to come to know the Faith and express it. As St. Paul puts it: “Faith comes through hearing” (*Romans* 10:17). Why has the Church always guarded so jealously the words and formulas committed to Her custodianship by Her Divine Master? Precisely because She knows that it is always through words — the misuse of them — that heresy is able to take its toll of the Mystical Body of Christ.

Thus, it is truly foreboding that the subversives should brazenly lay their hands on the form of a Sacrament, should attempt to change the very words of Christ Himself, the Son of God, used in instituting the Most Holy Eucharist, and this heinous crime is committed with impunity. But even more ominous is the fact that so few priests even seem to be aware of it. The false rendering of the word *multis* (“many”) as “all men”, a mutilation of the very Consecration Form, is by no means an inconsequential affair, for the change in meaning conveyed is laden with the most serious implications from the standpoint of sacramental theology. At no time since the ‘*Filioque*’ controversy began has so much spiritual danger been encapsulated in a single word as is now the case with “*multis*”.

One Rev. James A. McNerny, O.P., writing in *The Wanderer* (Dec.18,1969) indicates his disbelief “that a single word change in the English translation” can possibly invalidate the Mass. Obviously, however, in sacramental forms it is not the quantity of words altered that matters, but rather the significance of the change that is made. Is it possible, for example, to baptize with these words: I anoint thee in the name of the Father:... etc”? This is a “single word change”.

Most moral theologians, the Doctor St. Alphonsus Liguori included, teach that if a priest were to say over the bread: “*Hic est enim corpus meum*” (meaning, “Here is My Body), instead of “*Hoc*” (“This is....”) then the consecration would be invalid, and this involves the minimal change of only one letter in a word! The following points are put forward for close consideration.

A. Trent: The Mass and the Sacraments

The Council of Trent (one of the greatest of Church Councils) in its instruction on the form for the Holy Eucharist says: “The words ‘for you and for many’ are taken some from *Matthew*, some from *Luke*, but were joined together by Holy Church under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. They serve to declare the fruit and the utility of Our Lord’s Passion. For if we look to its value we must confess that the Redeemer shed His Blood for the salvation of all: but if we look to the fruit that man has received from it we shall easily understand that this pertains to many and not all. When, therefore, Our Lord said ‘for you’ He meant either those who were present or had been chosen by Him from among the Jewish people, such as the disciples (except Judas) with whom He was speaking. When He added ‘for many’ He wished to be understood to mean the rest of the elect among the Jews or Gentiles. Rightly, therefore were the words ‘for all’ not used, as in this place the fruits of the Passion alone are spoken of, and it is to the elect alone that His Passion brought the fruit of salvation.” (*Catechismus ex decreto Consili Tridentini*, para. 11, Caput IV, Section XXIV) (Emphasis added)

On page 151 of the *Catechism of the Sacred Council of Trent*, under the heading “The Sacraments in General”, we read:

“In this the Sacraments of the New Law excel those of the Old Law that, as far as we know, there was no definite form of administering the latter and hence they were uncertain and obscure. In our sacraments, on the contrary, 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.” (Emphasis added).

In “*De Defectibus*” (Defects in the celebration of the Mass) in the Roman Missal of Pope St. Pius V (1570) we read:

“The words of consecration which are the form of this, sacrament are these: ‘For this is *My* Body’, and ‘For this is the Chalice of my Blood, of the new and eternal testament; the mystery of faith which will be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins’. If anyone were to omit or change anything in the form of the consecration of the Body and Blood, and in this change of words, the words do not mean the same thing, he would not produce the Sacrament. If he were to add anything which did not change the meaning, he would indeed consecrate but he would sin most grievously.” (Emphasis added)

So there it is. A change either invalidates the Sacrament or results in a grievous sin on the part of the celebrant — a sin in which the congregation participates and cooperates. Take your choice.

B. Aquinas and the Sacraments

Thomas Aquinas (Saint, Doctor of the Church, the leading theologian on the Eucharist and probably the greatest mind the Church has ever had), says in his monumental, erudite, theological treatise, *Summa Theologica*: “We must see whether. a. change of words destroys the essential sense of the words , because then the Sacrament is clearly invalid.” (*Summa Theologica*, III ,Q.60,Art.8) (Emphasis added)

It should be obvious that in the *Novus Ordo* consecration formula for the wine, the words “**for all men**”, signifying the sufficiency aspect of Christ’s Sacrifice (i.e., it was sufficient for redemption of all mankind) destroys the essential meaning of the words “for many” which appear in the traditional consecration formula and signifies the efficiency aspect of Christ’s Passion and death. For, as a Decree of the Council of Trent says: “But though He died for all, yet all do not receive the benefit of His death, but only unto whom the merit of His passion is communicated”. (Session VI; Ch. 3)

Can any genuine Catholic seriously hold that the Council of Trent, Pope St. Pius V (under whose direction the *Catechism* was written), St. Thomas Aquinas and *De Defectibus* — all these are guilty of “nit-picking”? Do such Catholics realize that the words. “for all men” signify and give credence to the Protestant belief that all men are saved?

C. Innovative New Mass by Outsiders

The New Order of the Mass that is used these days was composed in 1967 with the active participation of six Protestant clergyman specifically invited by Paul VI to do so. The six clergymen were Dr. George, Canon Jasper, Dr. Shepherd, Dr. Konneth, Rev. Eugene L. Brand and Bro. Max Thurian. They represented the Anglican and Lutheran Churches, the Taize Community and the World Council of Churches. Is it likely that these Protestants would participate in formulating a rite which produced *Transubstantiation* when they, themselves, do not believe in the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist?

D. Protestants and the New Mass

Why is it that the New Order of the Mass is accepted and used by Protestants as their own Communion service? Their theologians have satisfied themselves that the “New Mass” is no longer the Catholic Mass which we used to have. Here is what the Protestant’ theologians say: “It is now theologically possible for Protestants to use the same Mass as Catholics.” (Brother Max Thurian of the Taize Community) (*La Croix*, May 30, 1969) (Emphases added)

E. New Mass Unacceptable for Catholicism

Why in 1969 was the “New Mass” condemned as being unacceptable as a Catholic Mass) on 27 counts by Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci and a group of Roman theologians in a document entitled “A Critical Study of the New Order of the Mass” and commonly known as the *Ottaviani Intervention*? Cardinal Ottaviani was the Prefect of the Holy Office (that department of the Vatican Curia responsible for the protection of Faith and Morals) under four Popes. Cardinal Bacci was the Vatican’s greatest Latinist. Here are a few of the conclusions in the *Ottaviani Intervention* regarding the “New Mass” . . .

1. “It has every possibility of satisfying the most modernist of Protestants.”

2. “The emphasis is obsessively placed upon the ‘supper’ and the ‘memorial’ instead of on the unbloody renewal of the Sacrifice of Calvary.”
3. “The Real Presence is implicitly repudiated.”
4. “Bread and Wine are only ‘spiritually’ (not substantially) changed.”
5. “The New Order has no intention of standing for the Faith as taught by the Council of Trent.”
6. “The New Order of the Mass teems with insinuations or manifest errors against the Catholic religion and dismantles all the defenses of the Deposit of Faith.” (Emphasis added).

So the “New Mass” has been shown by reputed theologians, both Catholic and Protestant, to be **not** the Catholic Mass we used to have.

F. What’s Wrong with the New Mass?

Article 7 of the *Institutio Generalis* (General Instruction or Introduction) of the Apostolic Constitution, *Missale Romanum*, promulgated by Paul VI on April 3, 1969, defined the Mass as follows:

“The Lord’s Supper or Mass is a sacred meeting or assembly of the people of God, met together under the presidency of a priest, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord. Thus the promise of Christ, ‘Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them.’ (Matt 18,20) is eminently true of the local gathering of the Church.”

Is this monstrous perversion the definition of the Holy Mass that we were taught from our childhood? What has been the definition the Church has taught us down through the centuries (until Vatican II) *viz.*, that the Mass is a re-enactment of the bloody Sacrifice of Calvary in an unbloody manner?

Here is the theology of Article 7 . . .

- (1) The Mass is called a “supper” in accord with Protestant terminology, and it is presented solely as the assembly of the People of God.
- (2) The priest is exclusively a “president”.
- (3) The Mass is the work of the entire community. The function of the priest’s presidency consists uniquely in ‘celebrating the memorial of the Lord’, a definition which, in view of the two preceding definitions, has indeed a Protestant sense.
- (4) It is as a consequence of this assembly that Christ is present. Thus you have the definition of the New “Mass”!

What about the millions of so-called “low Masses” (because they were said in a “low tone”) which, before Vatican II, were celebrated daily in thousands upon thousands of churches all over the world, usually without a congregation (community), and sometimes without even a server?” According to Article 7, these were not Masses at all, by implication, because they were not the “work of the entire community.”

But independently of all its omissions, this definition is an inversion of the order of Catholic theology, which affirms . . .

- (1) the Real Presence, of the Body and Blood of Christ under the Eucharistic species;
- (2) that this takes place by the ministry of the priest who offers a Sacrifice, the very Sacrifice of Christ, because he takes His place and acts in His name;

(3) and it is thus that the community of the faithful are brought together in Him.

Now in Article 7, on the contrary, what is first and seems in itself to, constitute the Sacrament, is the assembled community. It is merely a question of celebrating a “memorial” and it is by the prayer of the assembled community that the presence of Christ is realized.

G. Pope and Aquinas on the New Mass problem

It may be argued that the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, extraordinary though it is, is still not the Holy See itself speaking. Well then, let us see what was taught by the Holy Father himself regarding the proper interpretation of the words “**for many**”.

Pope Benedict XIV, commenting on the explicit refutation by St. Thomas of the argument that the words “**for all men**” ought to be used instead of “**for many**”, says:

“Therefore We say that the blood of Christ was shed for all; however, as regards sufficiency, and for the elect only, as regards efficacy, as Doctor Thomas explains correctly: ‘The blood of Christ’s Passion has its efficacy not merely in the elect among the Jews, but also in the Gentiles’ And therefore he says expressly, for you the Jews and for many, namely the Gentiles.” (Book II, Ch. XV, para. 11: *De Sacrosancto Missae Sacrificio*)

Thus we see that the Sovereign Pontiff Benedict XIV, the Vicar of Christ on earth and the ultimate authority on the interpretation of Holy Scripture, has quoted St. Thomas in order to teach us authoritatively that the word “many” in this instance is not to be taken to mean “all men”. This is Peter speaking, indeed!

H. Mass and Sacraments Tamper-Proof

It is an unalterable teaching of the Magisterium that not even the Church Herself — that is, no pope, no bishop, not even all the bishops acting individually or collectively, nor a Council — has the right or the power to “innovate anything touching on the substance of the Sacraments”. Regarding this limitation of rights and powers of the Pope and the Church, there are at least four clear-cut pronouncements of the Magisterium, all four which may be found in Denzinger’s *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, the most authoritative compendium of definitions and declarations relating to matters of faith and morals:

- (1) In the letter *Super quibusdam* (Sept.29,1351), Pope Clement VI taught: “The Roman Pontiff, regarding the administration of the Sacraments of the Church, can tolerate and even permit different rites of the Church of Christ....always without violating those things which pertain to the integrity and necessary parts of the Sacraments.”
- (2) Council of Trent, Session III, Chap.2 : “It (the Council) declared furthermore that this power has always been in the Church, that in the administration of the Sacraments, without violating their substance, she may determine or change whatever she may judge to be more expedient for the benefit of those who receive them or for the veneration of the Sacraments, according to the variety of circumstances, times and places.”
- (3) Pope St. Pius X in the letter, *Ex quo nono* (Dec.26, 1910): “It is well known that to the Church there belongs no right whatsoever to innovate anything touching on the substance of the Sacraments.”

- (4) On November 30, 1947, Pope Pius XII issued the apostolic constitution, *Sacramentum Ordinis*, which reiterates and clarifies the same principle. “As the Council of Trent teaches, the seven Sacraments of the New Law have been instituted by Jesus Christ, Our Lord, and the Church has no power over the substance of the Sacraments; i.e., over those things which, with the sources of divine revelation as witnesses, Christ the Lord Himself decreed to be preserved in a sacramental sign.”

Every Sacrament consists of its ‘ceremonial’ and its ‘essential’ part. In his Bull, *Apostolicae Curas*, Pope Leo XIII lays down an important distinction: “In the rite for the performance and administration of any Sacrament, a distinction is justly made between its ‘ceremonial’ and its ‘essential’ part, the latter usually called its ‘matter and form’.

The Church may change or abolish or introduce something in the non-essential rite or “ceremonial” parts in the administration of the Sacraments, such as processions, prayers or hymns before or after the actual words of the form are recited, but She is forbidden to change or even touch the matter or form of any Sacrament and, as explained by theologians, the “substance” of a Sacrament consists of the “matter and form”, that is, those elements of the Sacrament which are absolutely necessary in order to have the Sacrament. By the matter is meant the specific determinate, sensible thing or things used in the external rite of the Sacrament; for example, water in Baptism, bread and wine in the Holy Eucharist. The form fits the sequence of specific, determinate words pronounced by the minister of the Sacrament.

Addis and Arnold’s *Catholic Dictionary* says:

“The Council of Trent defines that though the Church may change rites and ceremonies, it cannot alter the ‘substance’ of the Sacraments. This follows from the nature of a Sacrament. The matter and form have no power in themselves to give grace. This power depends solely on the will of God Who made the graces promised depend on the use of certain things and words, so that if these are altered in their essence, the Sacrament is altogether absent.”

All this refers to Sacraments in general but here we relate specifically to the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist and whether or not substitution of the words “for all men” in place of “for many” in the consecration form of the wine constitutes a forbidden violation of the substance of the Sacrament. We should therefore consider a certain distinguishing feature of the Sacrament, namely, that it was introduced *in specie*. The *Catholic Encyclopedia* (V. XIII, p. 299, 1913 ed.) says:

“Christ determined what special graces were to be conferred by means of external rites: for some Sacraments (e.g. Baptism, the Eucharist), He determined minutely (*in specie*) the matter and form: for others He determined only in a general way (*in genere*) that there should be an external ceremony, by which special graces were to be conferred, leaving to the Apostles or to the Church the power to determine what He had not determined; e.g., to prescribe the matter and form of the Sacraments of Confirmation and Holy Orders.”

Since the Holy Eucharist was instituted *in specie* (and all theologians agree on this), our Lord Himself at the Last Supper, having specified the exact words of the form, there was absolutely nothing left to the Church to determine in this respect.

Although there is a difference of opinion among theologians of great authority, e.g., St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, and Cajetan, as to what words in the consecration form of the wine are necessary for validity — i.e., the entire form “For this is the Chalice of My Blood... which shall be given up for you and for many unto the

remission of sins,” or the short form “This is the Chalice of My Blood” — virtually all theologians agree that the disputed words (in the longer form belong to the substance of the Sacrament. Yet the Church of Vatican II has ignored and acted contrary to the pronouncement of the Magisterium that no pope, no bishop, nor all the bishops, individually or collectively, nor a Council has the right or the power “to innovate anything touching on the substance of the Sacraments.”

It must be emphasized that more is at stake here than just the validity of the Holy Sacrifice; the very teaching authority is at stake, for “It is a well-known fact that to the Church belongs no right whatsoever to innovate anything touching on the substance of the Sacraments.” When the Magisterium is challenged with impunity on but a single point, the entire authority of Holy Mother Church is thereby challenged. Can you trust the so-called “Church” of Vatican II — which has done just this; i.e., challenged the authority of Holy Mother Church — to provide you with a true, a valid Mass?

I. Violation of the First Commandment

In addition to the weighty objections already raised against the *Novus Ordo*, there is yet another one of very great significance in that it violates the First Commandment, not only regarding the commission of sacrilege (which is a sin against the First Commandment), but also with regard to superstition.

Superstition is not simply the practice of divination or sorcery as is the popular view: from a Catholic theological point of view: “It is a false worship of the true God, or true worship of a false god.” (Rev. Heribert Jone, O.F.M. (Cap) J.C.D., *Moral Theology*, Westminster, Maryland; the Newman Press, 1961, p. 97).

By this definition, false worship of the true God would occur in worship that mixes error with truth. As Fr. Jone puts it:

“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*) (ibid)

As to *Cultus Vanus*, there are many widespread practices that fall into this category. Such things as celebrating the “Mass” on coffee tables; or on a very low table, almost at ground level, with the celebrant sitting cross-legged on the floor; or by introducing pagan practices such as *aarati* (as is done in India); the playing of blasphemous music during these “Masses”; the sacrilegious disregard in handling what is believed to be the consecrated Host, etc.

But here we are not concerned so much with *Cultus Vanus* as to focus our attention on *Cultus Falsus*, which is the mingling of “religious errors and deception with the worship of the true God.”

It can be shown that the vernacular version of the *Novus Ordo*, as used in India and elsewhere, contains explicit and literal religious error. To repeat the accusation: the *Novus Ordo* is an offence against the First Commandment because it mingles religious error with the worship of the true God, and thus falls under superstition. It is necessary to provide some background of Church history so as to enable the reader to understand the nature of this religious error.

Since the earliest years of the Church, there have been attempts to undermine the

doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The various heresies that attacked this central doctrine of the Catholic Faith, approached it in different ways. 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 the so-called Monarchianists taught that there was only One Person in God”. (Ludwig von Ott; *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*. St. Louis, Missouri, B. Herder Book Co. 1957. p.50)

Later, “the Alexandrian Presbyter, Arius”, taught that the Son of God did not exist from eternity but was “a creature of the Father, produced by Him from nothing before all other creatures.” (Ibid, p.50) Thus the Arian heresy taught that the Son of God “is not in the proper and true sense, God, but only in the improper sense, insofar as He, in anticipation of His merits, was adopted by the Father as Son.” (Ibid, p. 51)

In the year 325, “The First General Council at Nicaea’, in opposition to and in condemnation of this heresy, “drafted a creed which confesses Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, His generation from the substance of the Father, His true Divinity and His consubstantiality with the Father.” (Ibid, p.51)

In modern times, the liberal Protestant, A.von Harnack, taught that the doctrine of the Trinity could be reduced to “the polemic between Christianity and Judaism.” At first, only the duplex formula “God and Christ” existed as antithesis to God and Moses; later, the Holy Ghost was added.” (Ibid, p.52) In the Catholic Church, “through the influence of the liberal theology, modernism (which was brilliantly and irrefutably condemned by Pope St. Pius X in his Encyclical *Pascendi*,1907) also denies the Divinity of Christ. (Ibid, p.128)

Now with such a history of heresies which sought to undermine the doctrine of the Trinity, one would think that even vague ambiguities would be totally avoided in any statements about the Divinity of the Three Persons in God; the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. In the Traditional Mass such, of course, is the case. But in the various language versions of the *Novus Ordo*, there are not only ambiguities but there is actually a literal statement and proclamation of the heresy that attributes Divinity to the Father “alone”.

Eucharistic Prayer IV (Canon 4) of the *Novus Ordo* has this to say about who possesses the “Divine Essence”:

“Father in Heaven, it is right that we should give You thanks and glory: You alone are God, living and true.” (Emphases added)

The key word here is “**alone**”, which excludes the Son and the Holy Ghost from the Godhead and attributes Divinity exclusively to the Father. In Webster’s *New Collegiate Dictionary*, the definition of the word “**alone**” is quite clear in meaning: “ (1) Apart from others; all by one’s self; solitary. (2) Exclusive of others; without anyone or anything else; . . .etc.”

Therefore what Eucharistic Prayer IV is saying is that the Father is God “exclusive of others. without anyone or anything else” etc. But this is heresy! It is not the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church but the subversive propaganda of Judaic heretics Cerinthus and the Ebionites, of Arianism, of liberal Protestantism and of Modernism.

It must therefore be concluded that the *Novus Ordo* which Catholics (so-called) are attending “mingles religious errors with the worship of the true God (*Cultus*

Falsus) and is thus worship “in a false manner”. It is a violation of the First Commandment of God and a sin of superstition; for, according to traditional Catholic Theology, superstition is false worship of the true God...

But it is not mere superstitious worship but sacrilege as well. For to put the Mass in such a context is to treat it with irreverence, and to treat a holy thing with irreverence is the very definition of sacrilege.

Let us consider a further point. If the Father alone is God and the Son is not, then when the (supposedly) consecrated Host and Chalice are raised by the priest (sorry, the President of the Assembly) for the congregation to adore, the people are not adoring Christ Who is God, but a mere man, and this is idolatry! How long will the laity continue to participate in and support superstition, sacrilege and idolatry and still call themselves Catholic? Are such lay people not heretics?

It would be appropriate here to deal briefly with the matter of heresy. Most informed Catholics have a reasonably accurate idea of what heresy is, even though not too many may be familiar with St. Thomas’ definition of it as “a species of unbelief belonging to those who profess the Christian faith, but corrupt its dogmas.” The common understanding is that heresy is the denial of some truth(s) or dogma(s) which the Church proposes for our belief and to which we must fully assent in order to be saved. Such a denial is by definition a heinous affront to Almighty God, Who is Truth, and an attack on His Church which His Divine Son founded as the Ark of Salvation which teaches us the truth and enables us to attain everlasting happiness.

It is Satan, the Father of Lies, who begets all heresies; but the mid-wives and the wet-nurses are to be found among “those who profess the Christian faith” (as St. Thomas says), principally theologians, bishops and priests. Of the 60 or so heresies emanating from Catholics, recorded in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 58 were initiated or supported by members of the clergy.

Heresy may be material or formal. A material heretic is one who adheres to error because of inculpable ignorance, mistaken judgment, or failure to adequately comprehend dogmas. Inasmuch as free choice is absent, the material heretic does not deliberately assault the Church, and therefore there is no sinfulness.

In formal heresy what comes into play is the will, which inclines and directs the intellect to cling to that which the Church declares to be false. Two of the common reasons why men become formal heretics is because of their pride of intellect or their tendency to rely too heavily on their own lights and insights. The mark of formal heresy is pertinacity, the obstinate refusal to recant one’s errors even after their deviation from the teaching of the Church has been clearly pointed out.

To conclude this section; it is incumbent on the readers of this essay to check for themselves whether what I have said is true or false; is or is not in consonance with the teachings of the true Catholic Church as they were up to 1962 when the 2nd Vatican Council was convened. Throughout, I have quoted authoritative documents of the Church in support of my statements.

J. Neglect in Study of the Faith

Why do well-intentioned Catholics persist in blindly accepting and regularly attending a rite that is so obviously false? Why do they go along, unthinkingly like sheep, to be aroused at

their parish church by the new emotional climate of “participation” and regimentation? Are all these people ignorant of the basic tenets of the Faith? Have they even tried to find out what the truth is? St. Augustine says: “It will not be imputed to you as a fault that you are ignorant; but that you neglect to seek that of which you are ignorant.” (Emphasis added) Nobody can hide behind the mask of ignorance. No one can claim that it is not his responsibility to know his faith and that he is too busy earning a living to study it. To do so is to liken one’s self to those who were unable to come to the ‘marriage feast because they had to care for their oxen. Don’t delude yourself by taking the easy way out: saying “Christ promised to be with His Church till the end of the world, so there is no need for me to know the Faith by studying Scripture, Catholic theology and by researching the Faith.” The *Baltimore Catechism* — one of the’ most famous and widely used catechisms prior to Vatican II — has this to say about the responsibility to know the Faith: Item 1166: “God will not excuse our ignorance if we neglect to learn our religion” when He has provided us with the means (catechisms, special instructions suited to our age, sermons, missions, retreats, books).

Contrary to what most lay people think, our most constant care ought not to be to seek and to obtain the Sacraments first of all and at any price, but to study the doctrine and laws of the Church, with a view to knowing and observing them. The truths of the Faith, above all those that are indispensable for salvation, are necessarily within the grasp of intelligence. It is for everyone that Jesus revealed what His Father charged Him to say to men. Let us not forget that simplicity and clarity are the first qualities of truth. Although within the grasp of all, the study of the Faith nevertheless requires an effort, not so much to understand it as to study it.

One friend of mine who claims to be a traditional Catholic but continues to follow Vatican II and its false popes and teachings said: “I go along with the changes in the Church because I cannot allow my children to grow up without religion.” The implication seems to be that one must have religion, any religion. My reply to this person was: “If your child asks for bread, will you give him a stone?”

Why have the majority of lay Catholics neglected the study of the Faith? Two of the probable reasons are . . .

- a. They have been completely occupied with materialistic pursuits, achievement and gain and so, could not find time to study the Faith, ignoring Christ’s injunction: “Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His justice and all these things will be added unto you.” In any case, they felt that this study *was* the duty of the clergy whose responsibility it was to instruct the laity. This attitude made them psychologically totally dependent on the clergy, the majority of whom were Modernists, having for many decades been indoctrinated with heretical ideas in seminaries that had been infiltrated by professors and teachers who themselves had been imbued with the principles of Modernism and Freemasonry, and whose one aim was to destroy the Church from within.
- b. They have insufficient love for the truth. St Paul predicted “an operation of error” which would bring on the Scriptural Great Apostasy in the latter days, at which time many would be lost “because they had insufficient love for the truth.” Being totally dependent on the clergy for knowledge of the Faith, and having insufficient love for the truth, the laity were unable to distinguish truth from falsehood, and so fell easy prey to the false teaching of the modernist clergy.

K. Conclusion

Some people have said to me: “You are a layman, so how can we accept what you say when it conflicts with what Vatican II and its clergy tell us?” My answer is that, although what I write is contrary to what Vatican II and its clergy teach, it is not contrary to the teaching of Holy Mother Church down through the centuries prior to Vatican II. Further, it is unimportant who the writer is, but what is important is what is written. I write only what the Church has always taught prior to 1962, and my statements are supported by relevant quotations and references from the Magisterium, official Church documents, encyclicals, books with the Church’s *imprimatur*, the opinions of eminent, orthodox theologians, etc.

Remember that the True Church of Christ can never contradict Herself in matters of faith and morals, dogma and doctrine. The Church of Vatican II contradicts official Church teaching as taught prior to Vatican II. Both these Churches cannot be right. A little reflection will show that the Church could not have taught error for 1962 years.

Some of my readers want to know by what right I have taken it upon myself to write — and have persisted in writing for over 20 years — against what I hold to be the destruction that has taken place in the Church and the Faith because of Vatican II. My answer is . . .

- (1) Every Catholic has not only the right but the duty to defend the Faith.
- (2) Pope Leo I says: “He that sees another in error and endeavors not to correct it, testifies himself to be in error.”
- (3) According to Pope Felix III: “Not to oppose error is to approve it; and, indeed, to neglect to confound evil men when we can do it is no less a sin than to encourage them.”

Earlier in this writing, I have quoted St. Augustine as saying: “It will not be imputed to you as a fault that you are ignorant, but that you neglect to seek that of which you are ignorant.”

It is therefore incumbent on the reader to seek to remove his ignorance by checking whether what has been written in this essay is true or false, is or is it not in consonance with the teachings of the Church down through the centuries? You should recall the definition of a material heretic and a formal heretic given earlier, for if on checking you find that what has been written here is true, then if you continue to accept the false Church of Vatican II with its false popes, “new Mass” and teachings, you will no longer be an inculpable material heretic but a culpable formal one.

But how will you check the truth or falsity of my statements? In these days of almost universal heresy among the hierarchy and clergy — these false shepherds, these ravening wolves in sheep’s clothing — to whom will you turn to find out the truth? You will probably find it impossible to obtain the Church documents, the papal encyclicals, the catechisms, the books, the 1917 *Code of Canon Law*, etc., where the teachings of the True Church are recorded. I suggest that your only safe course of action is “... hold fast to the traditions you have received” (2 *Thessalonians* 2:15), and reject the innovations of Vatican II. For as Tertullian (one of the Fathers of the Church in the second century) said, “Innovation is error.”

Originally written in about 1972 — scanned into electronic format in 2009