

Has the Tridentine Mass Been Banned?

Cyril B. Andrade, M.D.

For some 30 years now, the hierarchy and clergy of Vatican II have refused to celebrate the Tridentine Mass and have forbidden anyone else to do so, claiming that this “Mass of the Ages” had been banned by Paul VI and Vatican II – banned, except for old priests who were permitted to celebrate it in private without a congregation. This canard was swallowed hook, line and sinker by almost all the laity who were too indifferent and unconcerned as to the truth of the matter. The Catholic laity, in general, have their minds set on material prosperity and care little about matters concerning the salvation of their souls.

Now, we learn, that shortly before he issued his *Motu Proprio*, “*Ecclesia Dei*”, in 1988, John Paul II appointed a Commission of nine cardinals, including Cassaroli, Gantin and seven others of the Roman Curia, to examine the following two questions:

- 1) Did Paul VI authorize bishops to forbid celebration of the traditional Mass?
- 2) Does the priest have the right to celebrate the traditional Mass in public and in private without restriction, even against the will of his bishop?

On the first question, the Commission was unanimous in finding that Paul VI never gave bishops the authority to forbid priests to celebrate the traditional Mass.

The answer to the second question is important enough for emphasis. The Commission stated that priests cannot be obligated to celebrate the new rite of “Mass”, and the bishops cannot forbid or place restrictions on the celebration of the traditional rite of the Mass, whether in public or in private.

The publication of the Commission’s report raises a number of very pertinent questions:

- 1) From the very first, over 25 years ago, when it was proclaimed that the traditional Mass was banned, traditionalists refused to accept the ban, pointing out that the decree, *Quo Primum Tempore* of Pope St. Pius V emphatically lays down that the Tridentine Mass be celebrated in perpetuity. Why, then, has it taken Rome over 20 years to appoint a Commission to examine the case?
- 2) Are traditional Catholics so stupid and naive as to believe that the “pundits” in Rome, including John Paul II and the 9 members of the Commission, were not aware of the fact that Paul VI had not banned the Tridentine Mass nor authorized bishops to forbid its celebration and, consequently, priests could not be obliged to celebrate the so-called “New Order of the Mass”?
- 3) Were all the Roman “pundits” and the rest of the hierarchy and clergy not aware that the “Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy” of Vatican II? In its Introduction it said, in part . . .

“...in faithful obedience to tradition, the Sacred Council declares that Holy Mother Church holds all lawfully recognized rites to be of equal right and dignity; that she wishes to preserve them in the future and to foster them in every way”?

Surely, all these “pundits” must have known that the Mass is, *par excellence*, a lawfully recognized rite and is, therefore, entitled to equal right and dignity as any other? How and why, then, was the ban imposed perforce?

- 4) What could have been John Paul II’s real purpose in appointing the Commission and promulgating its

findings, now, decades after the Tridentine Mass was, in-fact., banned? It does not require great acumen to fathom his reason. The “New Order of the Mass” is now firmly entrenched in actual fact, and has been swallowed, digested, absorbed and become part and parcel of the very being of the “Yes father, no father, six bags full father” breed of Catholics who form the vast majority of the laity, and who are, therefore, most unlikely now to demand a return to the Tridentine rite.

They are comfortable in their heresy of participating in the so-called “New Mass” which is nothing but a Protestant communion service. If these members of the laity have swallowed the bare-faced heresy of the denial of Christ’s divinity contained in Eucharistic (Canon) Prayer IV, of the “new mass”, which says: “Father in heaven, You alone are God”, then I am sure they will swallow this present revelation of the perfidy of the Vatican II “popes”, “bishops” and “clergy”, most of whom are Freemasons, crypto-Jews, or Modernists.

Surely, the findings of this Commission should not only have resulted in the immediate official revocation of the ban on and the restoration of the Tridentine Mass, but should also have brought home to the bishops and clergy the error of their ways. Alas! they persist in the error of their ways, and with intransigence, unafraid, it, seems, that they could well die in their sin. Despite the fact that it is now clear that these clerics have deliberately and maliciously fed the laity with the monstrous lie that the Tridentine Mass was banned, the true Mass has not been publicly and officially restored, although I have heard that Rome has granted an Indult for this Mass to be celebrated for those Catholics who request it. But

- (1) this Indult Mass is not the original Tridentine rite but one which has undergone some tampering by John XXIII.
- (2) Catholics who request this Mass have first to state in writing that they do not hold the *Novus Ordo Missae* to be invalid. This, obviously is arrant nonsense for, if Catholics hold the new rite to be valid, then they have no right to demand another rite as a mere matter of preference; for the rite of the Mass is not a mere matter of personal preference.
- (3) Even if the “Indult Mass” were the original Tridentine Mass, which member of the Vatican II clergy has the power to celebrate it? All those bishops and priests who have accepted the heresies of Vatican II and, in particular its “Decrees on Ecumenism and Religious Freedom”, are heretics. A heretic is not even a Catholic, let alone a bishop or a priest and, therefore has no power to celebrate the True Mass.

Now that a Commission has examined and published its findings on the matter of the ban on the Tridentine Mass, it is necessary, also, for a similar Commission to examine the question of how and why it has come about that Latin has been totally banned from the liturgy, which is now said only in the profane vernaculars throughout the world.

Nowhere did Vatican II declare or even intend that Latin be wiped out completely and that a “Tower of Babel” be slotted in its place. On the contrary, the Council declared that “Latin is to be preserved in the Latin rite. In addition , the Council directed that the laity should be instructed so as to enable them to say or sing the parts of the Mass pertaining to them, in Latin and that the bishops should consider the holding of one or more Latin Masses, particularly in large cities, to cater to multi-lingual congregations. It is of no little significance that the man who “considered: himself the Father of the Council”, John XXIII, should have issued his *Veterum Sapientia* (Latin, the language of the Church) on the way to this same Council. He points out that Latin is the Church’s living language, maintaining that it is universal and immutable. “It is quite clear,” he

states, “why the Roman Pontiffs have so often extolled the importance and excellence of Latin and they prescribed its study and use by secular clergy, forecasting the dangers that would result from its neglect.” (Emphasis added)

John XXIII was prophetic. We see around us the havoc wrought, not only by the neglect but worse, by the virtual abandonment of Latin. Were it not for resolute traditional Catholics, Latin would by now have completely disappeared from the Roman Catholic Church. But for the traditionalists, no more would Catholics be able to travel to different parts of the world and hear the Mass they knew. If Latin was a unifying factor for the Church, the vernacularization provides the easiest way to disunity. No family can stay united if each member speaks a different language. The Roman Mass in the Latin tongue was the most splendid and eloquent manifestation and demonstration of the world unity of the Catholic faith.

With the banishment of Latin, unity has fled, unity of language has vanished, unity of hearts has disappeared: even between people of one and the same parish, region, community, family. Everywhere unity has given way to acrimonious discussion, disagreement, division and even violence.

History, we are told, repeats itself. Here we have the repetition of the punishment meted out by God to the children of Noe:

“And He said: behold it is one people, and all have one tongue; and they have begun to do this, neither will they leave off from their designs till they accomplish them in deed: Come ye, therefore, let us go down and there confound their tongue, that they may not understand each other’s speech. And so the Lord scattered them from that place into all lands, and they ceased to-build the city.” (*Gen.11: 6,8*)

Let us consider what is most likely to happen if Rome does appoint a Commission to determine whether or not Latin was banned, and comes to the conclusion that it was not, and should now be reinstated. I have no doubt that the result of such a finding would be widespread and with violent uprisings, particularly in India. By establishing the liturgy in the various communal languages, the hierarchy and clergy have created a veritable Frankenstein, fueling communal linguistic passions, such as is the case in Bangalore where the Kanadigas and the Tamils are at each other’s throats.

The enemies of Holy Mother Church — those Freemasons, crypto-Jews, Communists and Modernists in Rome and elsewhere — are aware of this and they know full well that even if a Commission were to declare that Latin had never been forbidden and should now be re-instated, the fanatical vernacularists would never accept this reversion and, thus, the objective of the crafty enemies of the Church to destroy Latin will have been irreversibly achieved as they had pre-planned, for they will be able to say: “See! the people don’t want Latin”.

In view of the Roman Commission’s declaration that the Tridentine Mass has not been banned, consider the following, despotic, unlawful action on the part of a “bishop”, one Hugh A. Donohoe, the local ordinary of the diocese of Fresno, California (USA). Being a “bishop” of the Church of Vatican II (and, therefore, “on the inside” as it were), he must have known — as every other Conciliar “bishop” must have known — that the true Mass had not been banned. Yet this “prelate” had the turpitude to send the under-noted order to all “priests” of the diocese of Fresno:

February 13, 1976

Diocese of Fresno

Chancery Office
1550 North Fresno Street
Fresno, California

Dear Msgr. Father

It has come to my attention that the Tridentine Mass has been more common in the Diocese of Fresno than I had reason to suspect.

I wish you to make it a matter of conscience to discover if such a Mass is being celebrated in any house or wherever within the confines of your parish.

If so, I wish you to definitely confront the priest, if possible, and tell him that he has no faculties or permission in this Diocese to offer any Mass. If any of his followers are present, tell them the Mass is gravely illicit and that they are gravely sinning through destroying the Unity of the Faith by their disobedience.

If such a practice continues, I will be forced to use the ultimate decision of declaring them contumacious and excommunicated. (Emphases added)

Sincerely in Christ,
Hugh A. Donohoe
Bishop of Fresno

Donohoe's letter states:

- (1) That the Tridentine Mass is "gravely illicit". But a Roman Commission has declared that the Tridentine Mass was never banned. How, then, can it be "Illicit" to celebrate it?
- (2) That those attending the Tridentine Mass "are gravely sinning through destroying the unity of the Faith". But, prior to Vatican II, the Faith was ONE, UNIVERSAL. It was with the introduction of the "*Novas Ordo Missae*" that the unity of the Faith was destroyed.
- (3) That the traditionalists participating in the Tridentine Mass are "disobedient". But the Mass has not been banned. How, then, are those who attend it "disobedient", even to the heretical Church of Vatican II?

A postscript appended to "bishop" Donohoe's letter explains that, at the suggestion of the US Catholic Conference, the following petition be included in the general intercessory prayers to be used on March 13 (1976) in all parishes of the Fresno diocese: "That there be an alleviation of the suffering experienced by the Jews in Syria, and that they may be free to move and emigrate as they desire, let us pray to the Lord". (End of letter specifics)

Words fail me! What this "bishop" is saying to his people is that we must relieve the injustice and suffering of the Jews in Syria, even grant them greater freedom to move about as they please, but those of the "household of the faith" whose conscience impels them to cling steadfastly to the old Mass and the Faith of their Fathers must be declared "contumacious and excommunicated." Freedom for the Jews; oppression and persecution — and excommunication — for traditional Catholics.

Originally written in about 1990 — scanned into electronic format in 2009