

**Why the
“Conciliar Church”
cannot be the Catholic
Church and why the new
“Mass” cannot be the
True Mass**

... and

*How the Church may still function even when reduced to a
handful and exiled from her visible structures*

By Jim Condit Jr.

Introduction

A monstrous deception has been perpetrated upon mankind in this, our day, thanks to subtle but profound and substantial changes made to Catholic worship ceremonies by Paul VI, who malevolently occupied the Chair of Peter from 1963 to 1978.

– Jim Condit Jr. –

Cincinnati, Ohio

January 31, 2010

Section 1:

The Infallibility of the Church

**With a focus on her “ordinary and universal Magisterium”
as defined at the First Vatican Council.**

Chapter 1

The Twofold Infallibility of the Church as Defined by the First Vatican Council (1870)

In 1870, the First Vatican Council, convened under the authority of Pope Pius IX, declared that the Church enjoys a twofold infallibility as constituted by Our Lord Jesus Christ:

“Wherefore, by Divine and Catholic faith all those things are to be believed which are contained in the word of God as found in Scripture and Tradition, and which are proposed by the Church as matters to be believed as Divinely revealed, whether by her solemn judgment or in her **ordinary and universal Magisterium.**” (First Vatican Council I, Session III, Ch. 3, para 8)

Thus, the First Vatican Council infallibly declared the Church to be infallible under two aspects: first, in her extraordinary Magisterium (solemn definitions on Faith and Morals either by the Pope acting by himself when speaking *ex cathedra*, or in issuing a solemn definition at a General Ecumenical Council in union with the world’s bishops) – and, secondly -- in her “ordinary and universal Magisterium” (the daily life of the Church as promulgated for the faithful, such as especially the rites of Mass, the rites of the sacraments, official prayers, canon law, canonized saints, and everything in the documents of General Ecumenical Councils which touch on Faith and Morals, even those parts of these documents which are not solemn definitions).

The “ordinary and universal” Magisterium includes every liturgy of Mass ever promulgated by the Church. It also includes all officially promulgated prayers, novenas, disciplines, canon laws, and canonized saints. (Where would the infallibility of the Church be if it could direct the faithful to recite a prayer that contained heresy, or could direct the faithful to pray for the intercession of a person who was not a saint in Heaven, but was in Hell?)

In Chapter 2 we will see one example of a Pope in an encyclical explaining that the rites of Mass must be “perfect” and without error under the “ordinary and universal” Magisterium of the Church.

Chapter 2

Pope Leo XIII tells us in an Encyclical that the prayers of the Mass are “perfect” and infallible under the Church’s “ordinary and universal Magisterium”

At this point it should be stated that, as Catholics, we will have an attitude of trust in what the true Church and her true Popes promulgate. We will be eager to give internal and external assent to Her teachings through the voice of Her true Popes (as opposed to antipopes, who have no authority whatsoever over Catholics or anything concerning the Church; there have been at least 39 major antipopes in history). See last quote from Pope St. Pius X in Appendix I on trust in the Pope.

In the first sentence of the following quote Pope Leo is speaking of Vatican Council I, which took place from 1868 to 1870). Here is a part of that Encyclical from paragraph 9:

“For this reason the Fathers of the Vatican Council laid down nothing new, but followed divine revelation and the acknowledged and invariable teaching of the Church as to the very nature of faith, when they decreed as follows: ‘All those things are to be believed by divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the written or unwritten word of God, and which are proposed by the Church as divinely revealed, either by a solemn definition or in the exercise of its ordinary and universal Magisterium’ (Sess. iii., cap. 3). Hence, as it is clear that God absolutely willed that there should be unity in His Church, and as it is evident what kind of unity . . . It is then undoubtedly the office of the church to guard Christian doctrine and to propagate it in its integrity and purity. But this is not all: the object for which the Church has been instituted is not wholly attained by the performance of this duty. For, since Jesus Christ delivered Himself up for the salvation of the human race, and to this end directed all His teaching and commands, so He ordered the Church to strive, by the truth of its doctrine, to sanctify and to save mankind. But faith alone cannot compass so great, excellent, and important an end. **There must needs be also the fitting and devout worship of God, which is to be found chiefly in the divine Sacrifice and in the dispensation of the Sacraments, as well as salutary laws and discipline.** All these must be found in the Church, since it continues the mission of the Savior forever. **The Church alone offers to the human race that religion - that state of absolute perfection - which He wished, as it were, to be incorporated in it.** And it alone supplies those means of salvation which accord with the ordinary counsels of Providence.”
(End of Quote from Pope Leo XIII from his encyclical *Satis Cognitum*.)

Let's continue:

Pope Leo explicitly states that not only matters of Faith, but also matters of Divine worship, *especially the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacraments*, fall under the Church's infallibility. For he states in this encyclical that the Church must be everywhere and always unified in essential matters, and here he states that the Church must bring both the Faith (as a whole, and in all its parts) and the liturgy (the daily life of the Church) to the world in -- "that state of absolute perfection" -- which Christ willed.

So, from this it is clear that the Church's liturgies of Mass -- all of them -- must be in perfect conformity with the Faith, because the Church tells us that we can attend any of these liturgies of Mass to fulfill our Sunday obligation. For instance, while Catholics of the Western Rite should attend the Tridentine Mass where possible, if one of us were visiting Lebanon and could only find a true Maronite Rite Mass to fulfill our Sunday obligation -- we have the assurance of Holy Mother Church that our attendance at the Maronite Rite would be acceptable and praiseworthy, and would fulfill our Sunday obligation. And, again, under what category is the Church infallible when she promulgates a liturgy of Mass? Answer: Under her "universal and ordinary Magisterium" as defined by Vatican Council I, and reiterated in *Satis Cognitum* by Pope Leo XIII.

Thus, these Popes (Pius IX, who signed the First Vatican Council, and Leo XIII, as well as all of their true Predecessors back to St. Peter) erect an impossible barrier against any future usurpers of the Chair of Peter who would attempt to promulgate or impose a Mass with a falsehood in it, especially a falsehood on an essential matter. For to mix error with truth in the worship of the true God -- is one of the two very definitions of false worship. The other definition is to worship a false god. (See Fr. Jone's "Handbook of Moral Theology", or any other book on moral theology with an imprimatur before 1958).

In Chapter 3, we will see that this idea of the Church's infallibility in Faith and discipline go back to the earliest centuries, and even, of course to the New Testament and the words of Christ Himself.

Chapter 3

The Formula (or Rule) of Pope St. Hormisdas

This idea of the infallibility of the Church and the Holy See under the Pope was proclaimed emphatically -- in writing -- as early as 515 AD -- 1500 years ago -- by Pope St. Hormisdas -- when he stated, in “The Formula of Hormisdas” that the Holy See, the Church of Rome, has always been without blemish or stain with regard to the Faith, and that all other churches must conform to the Apostolic See, i.e., the Church in Rome.

This document of Pope St. Hormisdas was heavily cited at Vatican I to show that the concept of Papal infallibility was nothing new, and that all the churches (or dioceses), were to conform to the Faith of Rome.

Here is what Pope St. Hormisdas stated in response to innovations (i.e., adding to the canon of the Mass the names of individuals who had not been approved by Rome) in the Canon of the Mass by certain Bishops in one of the eastern rites:

“The first means of safety is to guard the rule of strict faith and to deviate in no way from those things that have been laid down by the Fathers. And indeed the words of Our Lord Jesus Christ: “Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church” [Matthew 16:18], cannot be disregarded; these things which were spoken are demonstrated by the results, **for the Catholic religion has been preserved ever immaculate (i.e. without stain) in the Apostolic See. . . .**

“From this hope and faith we by no means desire to be separated and, following the doctrine of the Fathers, we declare anathema all heresies, and, especially, the heretic Nestorius, former bishop of Constantinople, who was condemned by the Council of Ephesus, by Blessed Celestine, bishop of Rome, and by the venerable Cyril, bishop of Alexandria . . .

“Following, as we have said before, the Apostolic See in all things and proclaiming all its decisions, we endorse and approve all the letters which Pope St Leo wrote concerning the Christian religion. And so I hope I may deserve to be associated with you in the one communion which the Apostolic See proclaims, in which the whole, true, and perfect security of the Christian religion resides. **I promise that from now on those who are separated from the communion of the Catholic Church, that is, who are not in agreement with the Apostolic See, will not have their names read during the sacred mysteries.** But if I attempt even the least deviation from my profession, I admit that, according to my own declaration, I am an

accomplice to those whom I have condemned. I have signed this, my profession, with my own hand, and I have directed it to you, Hormisdas, the holy and venerable pope of Rome.”

As stated, above, this formula, signed by Pope St. Hormisdas himself, was sent to the offending Bishops in the eastern rite, and these Bishops were directed to sign the formula to indicate their conformance to the Faith and the rulings of the Pope and the Holy See in Rome.

For our purposes, please note that Pope St. Hormisdas was refusing to allow a deviation in the names mentioned in the canon of the Mass. This indicates that any substantial deviation in the prayers of the Mass cannot be allowed, for, as Pope Leo XIII state in his encyclical, “On the Unity of the Church” – the mass must be a perfect prayer.

In harmony with Pope St. Hormisdas and all true Popes, the First Vatican Council under Pope Pius IX promulgated this infallible statement:

“For in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has always been preserved unblemished, and sacred doctrine been held in honor.”
(Session 4, Chapter 4, paragraph 2; The First Vatican Council, 1870)

Chapter 4

Pope Pius VI Teaches Deception Must be Exposed, and Doctrinal Ambiguities Treated as False Teachings

What we are going to deal with in this paper is not a doctrinal ambiguity, but an outright denial of what the Church has always taught about the essential form of the consecration of the wine. What we are going to deal with here is a simple contradiction, and not a subtle deception. However, there are some who say that if it takes more than one sentence or one page to expose a deception against the Catholic Faith, then it cannot be called an outright false teaching. To answer that objection, we produce the teaching of Pope Pius VI in 1794:

“[The Ancient Doctors] knew the **capacity of innovators in the art of deception. In order not to shock the ears of Catholics, they sought to hide the subtleties of their tortuous maneuvers by the use of seemingly innocuous words such as would allow them to insinuate error into souls in the most gentle manner.** Once the truth had been compromised, they could, by means of slight changes or additions in phraseology, distort the confession of the faith which is necessary for our salvation, and lead the faithful by subtle errors to their eternal damnation. This manner of dissimulating and lying is vicious, regardless of the circumstances under which it is used. For very good reasons it can never be tolerated in a synod of which the principal glory consists above all in teaching the truth with clarity and excluding all danger of error.

“Moreover, if all this is sinful, **it cannot be excused in the way that one sees it being done, under the erroneous pretext that the seemingly shocking affirmations in one place are further developed along orthodox lines in other places, and even in yet other places corrected; as if allowing for the possibility of either affirming or denying the statement, or of leaving it up the personal inclinations of the individual – such has always been the fraudulent and daring method used by innovators to establish error. It allows for both the possibility of promoting error and of excusing it.**

“It is as if the innovators pretended that they always intended to present the alternative passages, especially to those of simple faith who eventually come to know only some part of the conclusions of such discussions which are published in the common language for everyone's use. Or again, as if the same faithful had the ability on examining such documents to judge such matters for themselves without getting confused and avoiding all risk of

error. **It is a most reprehensible technique for the insinuation of doctrinal errors and one condemned long ago by our predecessor Saint Celestine** who found it used in the writings of Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, and which he exposed in order to condemn it with the greatest possible severity. **Once these texts were examined carefully, the impostor was exposed and confounded, for he expressed himself in a plethora of words, mixing true things with others that were obscure; mixing at times one with the other in such a way that he was also able to confess those things which were denied while at the same time possessing a basis for denying those very sentences which he confessed.**

“In order to expose such snares, something which becomes necessary with a certain frequency in every century, no other method is required than the following: **Whenever it becomes necessary to expose statements which disguise some suspected error or danger under the veil of ambiguity, one must denounce the perverse meaning under which the error opposed to Catholic truth is camouflaged.**” (Pope Pius VI, Apostolic Constitution “Auctorem Fidei”, 1794)

So no one can say that they are not responsible for trying to understand a deception or denial of Catholic teaching because the destroyers cloaked their intention under a barrage of clever words.

The above passage would apply especially to the false moral teaching in the Vatican II document, *Dignitatis Humanae* (the document on Religious Liberty), in which Paul VI signed a document that had both true doctrine in it in the opening paragraphs, but then an unambiguous false moral teaching in paragraph #4. Above we see that Pope Pius VI infallibly teaches that in such a pernicious document “one must denounce the perverse meaning under which the error opposed to Catholic truth is camouflaged.”

Again, the sacrilege against the form of the consecration of the wine in the English translation of the “New Mass” is a direct contradiction of settled Catholic teaching and truth, not merely an ambiguity. So let’s continue.

Chapter 5

Pope Pius VI Teaches that the Church cannot approve a bad discipline that is harmful to the faithful, or that leads the faithful into Sin

Foreshadowing the teaching of the First Vatican Council on the Church's infallibility under her "ordinary and universal Magisterium", Pope Pius VI taught in his Apostolic Constitution, *Auctorem Fidei*, paragraph 78, that the Church cannot establish a bad discipline that is harmful to the faithful, or that leads the faithful into sin:

"78. The prescription of the synod about the order of transacting business in the conferences, in which, after it prefaced "in every article that which pertains to faith and to the essence of religion must be distinguished from that which is proper to discipline," it adds, "in this itself (discipline) there is to be distinguished what is necessary or useful to retain the faithful in spirit, from that which is useless or too burden-some for the liberty of the sons of the new Covenant to endure, but more so, from that which is dangerous or harmful, namely, leading to superstition and materialism"; in so far as by the generality of the words it includes and submits to a prescribed examination even the discipline established and approved by the Church, **as if the Church which is ruled by the Spirit of God could have established discipline which is not only useless and burdensome for Christian liberty to endure, but which is even dangerous and harmful and leading to superstition and materialism,— false, rash, scandalous, dangerous, offensive to pious ears, injurious to the Church and to the Spirit of God by whom it is guided, at least erroneous.**"

The entire text is above, but the relevant part to our discussion are the last lines in bold, where this great Pope calls "false" and "at least erroneous" the idea that "the Church while is ruled by the Spirit of God could have established discipline . . . which is even dangerous and harmful and leading to superstition . . ."

Be it noted that superstition is a sin against the First Commandment, and would constitute false worship.

Here is another scholarly quote from a saintly priest writing in the 1890s:

Edmund J O'Reilly, S.J., "The Relations of the Church to Society", 1892, John Hodges [Publishers] London:

"The Pope cannot err in universal discipline, in this sense, that he cannot impose on the body of the Faithful a command to do what is wrong, or to

abstain from what is obligatory or necessary for salvation. The impossibility of his being allowed to do so is, perhaps, referrible rather to the Sanctity of the Church than to the Infallibility properly so called, as we are speaking of it (page 45).

While some may object that the mistranslation in the consecration in the New Mass imposed on the Western rite was not universal in the sense that the eastern rites did not use it, we have already seen that Vatican Council I ruled that **“in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has always been preserved unblemished”**, thus showing that the Apostolic See could not impose such a falsification on any portion of the faithful. (By the way, some of the Canon Laws in the 1983 code of canon law do impose erroneous universal disciplines, such as that it is sometimes permissible to give communion to Protestants.)

As we will see, “the Vatican II Popes” Paul VI, John Paul I, John Paul II, and Benedict XVI have appointed or maintained in power Bishops who imposed a false discipline on the faithful in the matter of the form of the consecration of the wine. For instance, in the late 1970s, if the bishops appointed or maintained in control of dioceses, found a priest adhering to the true formula of consecration of Pope St. Pius V, and rejecting the false translation of “pro multis” in the “New Mass” in English, then such a priest would be taken out of public view, and/or kicked out of his position in the diocese, and/or cut off from his pension.

And as we will see, this was a bad discipline that was dangerous and false, and therefore led the faithful into objective sin (i.e. false worship), which a true Pope could never do. John Paul I, John Paul II, and Benedict XVI have upheld Paul VI’s practice in this regard, as we will see.

Chapter 6

Christ and the Apostles on the infallibility of the Church in essential matters, taught and explained by the true Popes, the Successors of the Apostles, over the centuries

16 Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. **17** And Jesus answering, said to him: Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. **18 And I say to thee: That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. 19 And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.** – Gospel of St. Matthew, Chapter 16, v 16 - 19.

16 And if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more: that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may stand. **17** And if he will not hear them: tell the church. And if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican. **18** Amen I say to you, **whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven.** – Gospel of St. Matthew, Chapter 18, v 16-18

14 At length he appeared to the eleven as they were at table : **15** And he said to them: **Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature. 16 He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned. . . . 19** And the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken to them, was taken up into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God. – Gospel of St. Mark, Chapter 16, v. 14 through 19

16 He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me. – Gospel of St. Luke, Chapter 10. (In this verse is speaking to the Apostles and disciples, who rejoice.)

16 And the eleven disciples went into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them. **17** And seeing him they adored: but some doubted. **18** And Jesus coming, spoke to them, saying: **All power is given to me in heaven and in earth.** **19** **Going therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.** **20** **Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.**
Gospel of St. Matthew, Chapter 28, v. 16-20 (Christ speaking to the Apostles and disciples)

16 **And I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete (Holy Ghost), that he may abide with you forever.** **17** The spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, nor knoweth him: but you shall know him; because he shall abide with you, and shall be in you. **18** **I will not leave you orphans,** I will come to you. **19** Yet a little while: and the world seeth me no more. But you see me: because I live, and you shall live. **20** In that day you shall know, that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you. . . . **26** **But the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you.** – Gospel of St. John, Chapter 14, v. 16 through 26.

(Note: *In verse 16 Christ says the Holy Ghost, or Paraclete, will abide “Forever”. . . Hence it is evident that this Spirit of Truth was not only promised to the persons of the apostles, but also to their successors through all generations. – This explanation is found here <http://www.drbo.org/chapter/50014.htm> -- a website with the Douay-Rheims Bible in searchable form.)*

* * * * *

And a few verses of what the Apostles wrote in the New Testament about what Christ taught them:

15 But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, **which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.** – St. Paul, I Timothy, v. 16

(Note: not many churches, but one Church is the pillar and ground of truth.)

(NOTE: Explanation found at <http://drbo.org/cgi-bin/d?b=drb&bk=61&ch=3&l=15&f=s#x> about the phrase, “The

pillar and ground of the truth”... Therefore the church of the living God can never uphold error, nor bring in corruptions, superstition, or idolatry.

(The progression of these Scriptures regarding Christ establishing only One, Infallible Church to guide Christians throughout the centuries – was taken largely from the talk entitled, “The One, True Church” by Fr. Arnold Damen, the Jesuit missionary to the United States of America, born in Holland in 1915; the lecture I was consulting was delivered in the American West in 1888, two years before Fr. Damen’s death.)

“There shall be one fold and one shepherd.” (John 10:16). – and –

33 For God is not the God of dissension, but of peace: as also I teach in all the churches of the saints. 1 Corinthians 14:33 – St. Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians.

(Note: Some Bibles translate “dissension” as “confusion”, i.e., God is not the author of confusion. So, one Faith, in one Church that is the Pillar and Ground of Truth, was established by a God that was not the author of dissension or confusion, and by a God who promised to be with that one Church always, until the end of time. Thus, all the later “Christian” denominations adopting teachings opposite and against the teachings of the Catholic Church cannot be from God, who is not the author of confusion or dissension, but must come from the devil. If the doctrines established by the Catholic Church in the early centuries are wrong, then Christ did not keep his promise to be with His Church always. Thus, all logic and Scripture points to the Catholic Church as the One, True Church.)

And three more scriptures proving that Christ commanded the Apostles and disciples to pass on Apostolic succession to future generations:

1 For every high priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God, that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins: 2 Who can have compassion on them that are ignorant and that err: because he himself also is compassed with infirmity. **3 And therefore he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins. 4 Neither doth any man take the honor to himself, but he that is called by God, as Aaron was. . . . 6** As he saith also in another place: **Thou art a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedech.** – Hebrews, Chapter 5, v 1-6 (St. Paul to the Hebrews)

27 For I have not spared to declare unto you all the counsel of God. **28 Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops, to rule the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.** – Acts of the Apostles, Chapter 20, v 28

11 These things command and teach. **12** Let no man despise thy youth: but be thou an example of the faithful in word, in conversation, in charity, in faith, in chastity. **13** Till I come, attend unto reading, to exhortation, and to doctrine. **14 Neglect not the grace that is in thee, which was given thee by prophesy, with imposition of the hands of the priesthood.** **15** Meditate upon these things, be wholly in these things: that thy profiting may be manifest to all.

16 Take heed to thyself and to doctrine: be earnest in them. For in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee. (1 Timothy, Chapter 4, v 11-16) St. Paul's first letter to Timothy.

(NOTE: These New Testament verses show clearly that the Apostles and disciples carried on the hierarchy of the Church by making priests and bishops, who would then in turn make priests and bishops, to carry on and serve each generation as Christ's Church until the end of time.)

Section 2:

**The Absolute
Responsibility of the Pope
to preserve the Faith and
the Sacraments**

Chapter 7

The Papal Oath and Papal Obligation to Uphold and Protect the binding rulings of Previous Popes

This Papal Oath was taken from at least the time of Pope St. Agatho in 678:

“I vow to change nothing of the received Tradition, and nothing thereof I have found before me guarded by my God-pleasing predecessors, to encroach upon, to alter, or to permit any innovation therein;

“To the contrary: with glowing affection as her truly faithful student and successor, **to safeguard reverently the passed-on good**, with my whole strength and utmost effort;

“To cleanse all that is in contradiction to the canonical order, should such appear; to guard the Holy Canons and Decrees of our Popes as if they were the Divine Ordinance of Heaven, because I am conscious of Thee, whose place I take through the Grace of God, whose Vicarship I possess with Thy support, being subject to severest accounting before Thy Divine Tribunal over all that I shall confess;

“I swear to God Almighty and the Savior Jesus Christ that I will keep whatever has been revealed through Christ and His Successors and whatever the first councils and my predecessors have defined and declared.

“I will keep without sacrifice to itself the discipline and the rite of the Church. I will put outside the Church whoever dares to go against this oath, be it myself, or be it another.

“If I should undertake to act in anything of contrary sense, or should permit that it will be executed, Thou wilt not be merciful to me on the dreadful Day of Divine Justice.

“Accordingly, without exclusion, **We subject to severest excommunication anyone -- be it Ourselves or be it another -- who would dare to undertake anything new in contradiction to this constituted evangelic Tradition and the purity of the orthodox Faith and the Christian religion, or would seek to change anything by his opposing efforts, or would agree with those who undertake such a blasphemous venture.**” (Papal Coronation Oath: Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum, P.L. 105, S 54.)

After taking the oath himself in 1963, Paul VI dared to purport to “abolish” this Papal oath for the future, and it was not taken by John Paul I (1978), John Paul II (1978), or Benedict XVI (2005).

While the entire Papal Oath is worth reading many times, let’s take special note of these lines:

“I swear to God Almighty and the Savior Jesus Christ that I will keep whatever has been revealed through Christ and His Successors and whatever the first councils and my predecessors have defined and declared.”

“I will keep without sacrifice to itself the discipline and **the rite** of the Church.”

(End of Quote from the Papal Oath.)

Every Catholic would admit that the Popes are bound by the words of Christ and the words of Holy Scripture, the inspired word of God.

What many may not be aware of is that the new Pope is ALSO bound by what previous Popes have defined and declared, either by themselves or in union with a General Council, in both the extraordinary Magisterium (solemn definitions) and in the “ordinary and universal Magisterium” (such as the rites of Mass, the principles behind canon laws expressing an essential truth, the truths behind published prayers and devotions, and the canonizations of saints).

What previous Popes have ruled on essential matters falls under “whatever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven”, and is just as binding as the words of Christ and Holy Scripture. (Of course, there are also many non-essential matters that Popes can change regarding discipline, feast days, canon laws, non-essential prayers in the Mass, etc.)

Let’s continue to see a brief sampling which shows that this also is the constant teaching of the Church:

“Wherefore, by the will of its Founder, **it is necessary that this Church should be one in all lands and at all times.** to justify the existence of more than one Church it would be necessary to go outside this world, and to create a new and unheard-of race of men.” (On the Unity of the Church, Leo XIII, 1896, paragraph #4)

(Note: Here we see Leo XIII stating explicitly that the Unity of the Church is not only in all lands at one time, but also throughout all times, meaning that the Church is indefectible and will never contradict herself from one period to another. In other words, once a Pope has ruled on an essential issue, no later Pope will contradict the previous Pope on that matter. We are going to see that this is exactly what Paul VI, John Paul I, John Paul II, and Benedict XVI have done on the consecration of the Mass.)

“The Church of Christ, therefore, is one and the same for ever; those who leave it depart from the will and command of Christ, the Lord - leaving the path of salvation they enter on that of perdition. “Whosoever is separated from the Church is united to an adulteress. He has cut himself off from the promises of the Church, and he who leaves the Church of Christ cannot arrive at the rewards of Christ. ... He who observes not this unity observes not the law of God, holds not the faith of the Father and the Son, clings not to life and salvation” (S. Cyprianus, De Cath. Eccl. Unitate, n. 6). (On the Unity of the Church, Leo XIII, 1896, paragraph #5)

Note: The above are two passages from “The Unity of the Church”, or “Satis Cognitum” by Leo XIII. One can find supporting material all throughout that encyclical, as well as in countless other places. Notice in the above passage, “The Church of Christ, therefore, is one and the same for ever . . .” Again, we see that on essential matters, the Church will hold true, without contradiction, throughout the ages, from Pope to Pope to Pope. We are going to see that Paul VI revealed himself as an usurper and an antipope with his contradiction of Christ Himself and 2000 years of Popes on the matter of the form of the consecration of the wine.

This from chapter 69 of “My Catholic Faith”, entitled, “The Indefectibility of the Church”, an imprimatured Catechism:

“Christ intended the Church to remain *as He founded it*, to preserve the whole of what He taught, and the shining marks which He gave it in the beginning. If the Church lost any of the qualities that God gave it, it could not be said to be indefectible, because it would not be the same institution. Indefectibility implies *unchangeability*. . . .

“Because of its indefectibility the truths revealed by God will *always be taught* in the Catholic Church. St. Ambrose said: “The Church is like the moon; it may wane, but never be destroyed; it may be darkened, but it can never disappear.”

(Note: Notice that the truth revealed by God will ALWAYS be taught in the CATHOLIC CHURCH. This is another proof that somehow antipopes got onto the Chair of Peter after the 1958 conclave, for after 1969, Paul VI promulgated a practice in his “New Mass” in the vernacular [English, German, Italian, etc.] which contradicted the very words of Christ in the New Testament, as well as 2000 years

of teaching by Popes and Councils that “for many” must be used in the form of the consecration of the wine in the Western Rite for validity and holiness, and that “for all” must not be used to avoid false worship, sacrilege, and the invalidation of the sacrament. Paul VI imposed on the Catholic faithful what no true Pope could ever impose.)

Here is what the 1914 Catholic Encyclopedia says on Infallibility and indefectibility:

Infallibility:

“As the Divinely appointed teacher of revealed truth, the Church is infallible. This gift of inerrancy is guaranteed to it by the words of Christ, in which He promised that His Spirit would abide with it forever to guide it unto all truth (John 14:16; 16:13). It is implied also in other passages of Scripture, and asserted by the unanimous testimony of the Fathers. The scope of this infallibility is to preserve the deposit of faith revealed to man by Christ and His Apostles (see INFALLIBILITY.) The Church teaches expressly that it is the guardian only of the revelation, that it can teach nothing which it has not received. The Vatican Council declares: “The Holy Ghost was not promised to the successors of Peter, in order that through His revelation they might manifest new doctrine: but that through His assistance they might religiously guard, and faithfully expound the revelation handed down by the Apostles, or the deposit of the faith“ (Conc. Vat., Sess. IV, ch. iv). The obligation of the natural moral law constitutes part of this revelation. The authority of that law is again and again insisted on by Christ and His Apostles. The Church therefore is infallible in matters both of faith and morals. Moreover, theologians are agreed that the gift of infallibility in regard to the deposit must, by necessary consequence, carry with it infallibility as to certain matters intimately related to the Faith. There are questions bearing so nearly on the preservation of the Faith that, could the Church err in these, her infallibility would not suffice to guard the flock from false doctrine. Such, for instance, is the decision whether a given book does or does not contain teaching condemned as heretical. (See DOGMATIC FACTS.)

“It is needless to point out that if the Christian Faith is indeed a revealed doctrine, which men must believe under pain of eternal loss, the gift of infallibility was necessary to the Church. Could she err at all, she might err in any point. The flock would have no guarantee of the truth of any doctrine.”

Indefectibility:

“Among the prerogatives conferred on His Church by Christ is the gift of indefectibility. By this term is signified, not merely that the Church will

persist to the end of time, but further, that it will preserve unimpaired its essential characteristics. The Church can never undergo any constitutional change which will make it, as a social organism, something different from what it was originally. It can never become corrupt in faith or in morals; nor can it ever lose the Apostolic hierarchy, or the sacraments through which Christ communicates grace to men. The gift of indefectibility is expressly promised to the Church by Christ, in the words in which He declares that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. It is manifest that, could the storms which the Church encounters so shake it as to alter its essential characteristics and make it other than Christ intended it to be, the gates of hell, i.e. the powers of evil, would have prevailed. It is clear, too, that could the Church suffer substantial change, it would no longer be an instrument capable of accomplishing the work for which God called it in to being. He established it that it might be to all men the school of holiness. This it would cease to be if ever it could set up a false and corrupt moral standard. He established it to proclaim His revelation to the world, and charged it to warn all men that unless they accepted that message they must perish everlastingly. Could the Church, in defining the truths of revelation err in the smallest point, such a charge would be impossible. No body could enforce under such a penalty the acceptance of what might be erroneous. By the hierarchy and the sacraments, Christ, further, made the Church the depositary of the graces of the Passion. Were it to lose either of these, it could no longer dispense to men the treasures of grace.”

Note: The above passages all teach us that a true Pope could never change the form or matter of a sacrament in an essential way so as to place a falsehood in that sacrament. That would make the sacrament false worship, and a sacrilege (treating a holy person, place or thing with disrespect). Notice that in the above passages it is stated: “By the hierarchy and the sacraments, Christ, further, made the Church the depositary of the graces of the Passion. Were it to lose either of these, it could no longer dispense to men the treasures of grace.” And with regard to the sacraments and all other essential matters entrusted to the Church, the First Vatican Council teaches that, “The Holy Ghost was not promised to the successors of Peter, in order that through His revelation they might manifest new doctrine: but that through His assistance they might religiously guard, and faithfully expound the revelation handed down by the Apostles, or the deposit of the faith“ (First Vatican Council, Sess. IV, ch. iv). And immediately after that the First Vatican Council stated: “Indeed, their Apostolic teaching was embraced by all the venerable **fathers** and revered and followed by all the holy orthodox **doctors**, for they knew very well that this see of St. Peter always remains unblemished by any error, in accordance with the divine promise of our Lord and Savior to the Prince of his disciples: ‘I have

prayed for you that your faith may not fail; and when you have turned again, strengthen your brethren.’ “

Needles to say, a true Pope could never inject an error into the very consecration of the Mass, thus leading the faithful into false worship, a mortal sin against the first commandment. But as we are going to see, this is exactly what Paul VI did, and exactly what Paul VI, John Paul I, John Paul II, and Benedict XVI have done and enforced on a worldwide scale for now going on 41 years as of the beginning of 2010.

The reason I have dwelt so long on the matters of infallibility and indefectibility in regards to the Mass, which is the foremost treasure in the Church’s infallible “ordinary and universal Magisterium” involving the daily life of the Church, is to lay the groundwork to show that those of us who have stood by the **necessity** of the “for many” translation in the form of the consecration of the wine – are defending and standing by all the Popes of the first 2000 years of the Church, as well as the words of Christ Himself at the Last Supper as infallibly recorded by Holy Scripture. Those who have been deceived into following the sacrilegious and invalidating “for all” translation in the consecration of the wine in the English “New Mass” of Paul VI – are standing opposed to 2000 years of infallible rulings by Popes and Councils, -- as well as in opposition to the words of Christ Himself infallibly recorded in Holy Scripture under the guidance of the Holy Ghost on an essential matter involving the form of the consecration of the wine in the western rite, i.e., in a matter involving the Holy Eucharist itself.

Chapter 8

The Church (i.e., the Pope) Has No Power to Change the Substance of a Sacrament

This chapter shows that the Church (the Pope) has no power to change the SUBSTANCE of a Sacrament. Please note that the Church can allow different forms for a sacrament in the different rites, but that none of these forms will contradict each other, or contain a falsehood.

It may occur to someone trying to defend the “all men” false translation in the consecration of the wine in the English “New Mass” – that perhaps the difference between “for many” and “for all” is not an essential matter, but just a non-essential matter. Chapter 14 will prove that the Church teaches that the words “for many” express an essential truth in relation to the consecration of the wine – and therefore to change those words to “for all” constitute an ESSENTIAL change in meaning in the SUBSTANCE OF THE SACRAMENT – which a true Pope could never do (but which Paul VI, John Paul I, John Paul II, and Benedict the XVI have enforced on the faithful for four decades).

The Sacraments were instituted by Christ and passed on to us through the Apostles:

Q. 574. What is a Sacrament?

A. A Sacrament is an outward sign instituted by Christ to give grace.
(Baltimore Catechism No. 3; lesson 13)

Conclusion: The essentials of the sacrament of the Eucharist came from Christ Himself.

The Church has no power over the substance of the sacraments, i.e, the essential parts of the sacrament, but can allow different rites provided the essential parts of the sacrament are preserved.

In the letter, “Super quibusdam” (September 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 which pertain to the integrity and necessary part of the sacraments.**”

The Council of Trent, session XXI, Chapter 2: “The Council declares 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 Sacrament, according to the variety of circumstances, times and places.”

Pope Saint Pius X in the letter Ex Quo Non (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.”

And finally, on Nov. 30, 1947, Pope Pius XII issued the Apostolic Constitution Sacramentum Ordinis which reiterates and clarifies the same principle as the Council of Trent teaches, that:

“ ... 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’, that is over the things which, as the sources of revelation, witness, CHRIST THE LORD HIMSELF [Bishop Lazo's emphasis] decreed to be preserved in a sacramental sign.” (Dz. 3857)

Emphasizing what these Popes have said: In the confecting of the sacrament two things must be distinguished –the substance and the ceremonies. The ceremonies may change, but **the substance never changes**. The substance is the MATTER AND THE FORM.

Conclusion: Not even the Popes have any power whatsoever over the substance of the sacraments.

Now, clearly, this means that “Archbishop” Bernardin and Archbishop Ackerman, the two bishops in our area at the time of our wedding in 1978, certainly did not have any power to change the substance of the sacraments. Therefore, their imposition, along with all the other American bishops, of the “for all” translation in the consecration of the wine, was a violation of the sacrament and an objective attack on the Mass and the Faith. Since Catholics are made “soldiers of Christ” in the sacrament of Confirmation, it was then the duty of all Catholics alert to this problem to resist it, and to defend the Faith as passed on from the Apostles and all the true Popes over 2000 years.

The fact that this attack on the Faith was coming from within the structures of the Church, i.e., from an anti-pope (Paul VI) who had usurped the Chair of Peter, made it all the more difficult to recognize -- did not lessen the responsibility of those

priests and laymen who were alerted to it to oppose it, just as they would defend the Church against an attack coming clearly from an outside her structures.

Section 3:

**Upholding 1925 years of
true Popes against the
attacks against the Mass
and the Church by the
“Vatican II Popes”**

Chapter 9

The Church has always ruled that “for many” is a necessary part of the form in the consecration of the wine in the Western Rite

Christ Himself used “for many” in the consecration of the wine.

Christ uses the words “for many” at the Last Supper in St. Matthew 26:28; and St. Mark 14:24. Let us look at what the Catechism of the Council of Trent taught on this, quoting Holy Scripture:

“The additional words **for you and for many**, are taken, some from Matthew, some from Luke, but were joined together by the Catholic Church under the guidance of the Spirit of God. **They serve to declare the fruit and advantage of His 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 which mankind have received from it, we shall easily find that it pertains not unto all, but to many of the human race.” (The Catechism of the Council of Trent, TAN Books, 1982, p. 227.)

Note: There is a principle in theology called the “res sacramenti”. Mr. Patrick Omlor has done a scholarly paper on this entitled, “Res Sacramenti.” It is translated the “essence of the sacrament.” The form of a sacrament must say what the sacrament does, and the sacrament must do what the form says. This is logical. But it presents another impossible hurdle for those trying to defend the “all men” translation in Paul VI’s English version of the New Mass. For when “for all” is used, then the form is not saying what the sacrament does, i.e., which is provide the grace profitable unto salvation to the “many” who cooperate with it. The sacrament does not provide the grace profitable unto salvation to those who do not cooperate with the sacrament, so “for all” represents a false reality in the form of the consecration of the wine. This is another reason why the false translation of “pro multis” into “for all” both invalidates the sacrament and turns it into a sacrilege – because “for all” is a heretical expression of the fruits of the Eucharist, which is only fruitful for many, and not all – as the Catechism of the Council of Trent states above.

Pope Leo XIII emphasizes this point in paragraph #24 in his 1896 encyclical, “Apostolicae Curae”:

“In the examination of any rite for the effecting and administering of Sacraments, distinction is rightly made between the part which is ceremonial **and that which is essential, the latter being usually called the “matter and form”.** All know that the Sacraments of the New Law,

as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, ought both to signify the grace which they effect, and effect the grace which they signify. Although the signification ought to be found in the whole essential rite — that is to say, in the matter and form — it still pertains chiefly to the form . . . the words which until recently were commonly held by Anglicans to constitute the proper form of priests Ordination — namely, ‘Receive the Holy Ghost,’ certainly do not in the least definitely express the Sacred Order of the Priesthood, or its grace and power... **That form consequently cannot be considered apt or sufficient for the sacrament which omits what it ought essentially to signify.”**

Pope Leo XIII was talking above about the sacrament of Holy Orders in 1896, but we can see that the principle applies to the “New Mass” English translation as well, since Pope St. Pius V taught through the Catechism of the Council of Trent that “for reason therefore” are the words ‘for all’ not used, i.e., because they do not describe the grace of the sacrament. We will see this in depth in Chapter 14. Thus, for this reason as well, the failure to express the grace of the sacrament, is the “New Mass” in English invalid according to the entire history of the teachings of the Church up until 1958. (Readers are referred to Patrick Henry Omlor’s article, “Res Sacramenti”, for an in depth treatment of this subject.)

Conclusion: If you say that “all men” in the consecration of the wine signifies the grace of the sacrament, then you are committing heresy, as the Catechism of the Council of Trent and Pope St. Pius V defined that “for many” signifies the grace of the sacrament, i.e., the sacrament of the Eucharist is not efficacious for all, but only for many. If you say that “for many” and “for all” mean the same thing – then you are contradicting the entire history of the Church, and especially the Catechism of the Council of Trent and Pope St. Pius V.

All approved Liturgies in the history of the Catholic Church use “for many” in the consecration of the wine, except in a few eastern liturgies where there is no mention of “for many”.

Archdale A. King has authored two books (“Liturgy of the Religious Orders”, 1955; and “Liturgies of the Primatial Sees”, 1956; both show that over 100 approved rites of the Church all agree with the Latin rite that “for many” is part of the form of the consecration of the wine.

Never has Our Lord been falsely “made to say” the term “for all” in the form of the consecration of the wine. In any case, the Church has ruled many times that the essential form of the consecration of the wine in the western rite must include the words, “for many”.

Chapter 10

The Council of Florence decrees that “for many” is part of the essential consecration of the wine in the Western Rite

“For Many” was defined as an essential part of the consecration of the wine in the Western Rite by the Council of Florence, signed by Pope Eugene IV, in Session 11, Feb. 4, 1442, “Cantate Domino”:

“However, since no explanation was given in the aforesaid decree of the Armenians in respect to THE FORM OF WORDS which the holy Roman Church, **relying on the teaching and authority of the apostles Peter and Paul, has always been wont to use in the consecration of the Lord's Body and Blood**, we concluded that it should be inserted in this present text. It uses this form of words in the consecration of the Lord's Body: FOR THIS IS MY BODY. And of His blood: FOR 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.”(Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, Vol. 1, p. 581)

Comment: All Papal decrees meant to bind Catholics are ratified in Heaven. Those who accept the “all men” mistranslation disregard this Papal decree, which is still in effect, and for which there is no counter-decree signed by any of the “Vatican II Popes”, whether Paul VI, John Paul I, John Paul II, or Benedict XVI. Yet these four occupants of the Chair of Peter have allowed this decree to be violated worldwide since 1969 by appointing Bishops who tell the faithful that they can fulfill their Sunday obligation by attending “masses” which use “for all” in the consecration of the wine. (True Popes, as we saw in Chapter 7, don't violate past binding papal decrees; if they change them in non-essentials, they issue a signed document and explain what is happening – this is consistent throughout the history of the Church up until 1958.) If the above decree by Pope Eugene, in union with the world's Bishops in Ecumenical Council, can be ignored, why cannot all other Papal decrees be ignored?

Please note also that Pope Eugene IV and the Council of Florence state infallibly that the form of the consecration of the wine was transmitted to us by “the teaching and authority of the apostles Peter and Paul”, in other words, from Our Lord at the Last Supper through the Apostles – to us.

Chapter 11

The form of the consecration of the wine, including “for many”, was transmitted to the western rite by the Apostles according to St. Thomas Aquinas

172 years earlier, in 1270 AD, St. Thomas Aquinas said in the Summa Theologica, Q. 78, that “for many” belonged to the substance, or necessary part of the sacrament; St. Thomas is often misquoted on this point since the New Mass was introduced in 1969.

Let’ see what he said first:

According to Patrick Henry Omlor, in his essay, “Why the Short Form Cannot Possibly Suffice,” we read:

“The view of St. Thomas on which words of the wine-consecration form are essential for validity is given in three different places: Scriptum Super Lib. IV Sententiarum; (2) In 1 Cor. XI, (lect. 6); (3) Summa Theologica.

“In Scriptum Super Lib. IV Sententiarum (dist. 8. Q. 2. a. 2. q. 1. ad 3) we read: “And therefore those words which follow [that is, which follow 'This is the chalice of My Blood'] are essential to the Blood, inasmuch as it is consecrated in this sacrament; and therefore they must be of the substance of the form.”

“1 Cor. XI, (lect. 6) has the following: “In regard to these words which the Church uses in the consecration of the Blood, some think that not all of them are NECESSARY [emphasis added] for the form, but the words 'This is the chalice of My Blood' only, not the remainder which follows, 'of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.' But it would appear that this is not said correctly, because all that which follows is a determination of the predicate: HENCE THOSE SUBSEQUENT WORDS BELONG TO THE MEANING OR SIGNIFICATION OF THE SAME PRONOUNCEMENT, AND BECAUSE, AS HAS OFTEN BEEN SAID, IT IS BY SIGNIFYING THAT THE FORMS OF SACRAMENTS HAVE THEIR EFFECT. HENCE, ALL OF THESE WORDS APPERTAIN TO THE EFFECTING POWER OF THE FORM [emphasis added].”

In Summa Theologica (III. Q. 78, A. 3): 'There is a twofold opinion regarding this form. Some have maintained that the words 'This is the chalice of My Blood' alone belong to the substance of this form, but not those words

which follow. Now this seems incorrect, because the words which follow them are determinations of the predicate, that is, of Christ's blood; consequently they belong to the integrity of the recitation of the form.

“And on this account others 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 this,' which belong to the use of the sacrament, and consequently do not belong to the substance of the form.”

(End of quote from Patrick Omlor, and his quoting of St. Thomas Aquinas.)

(Please note that St. Thomas is saying that the formula for the consecration of the wine is what was later defined by the Council of Florence, but does not include the words, “As often as ye shall do this . . .”, by which words Our Lord was talking about the USE of the sacrament down through the ages, rather than saying something that was essential for the form of the consecration of the wine.)

Finally, in Question 78: St. Thomas tells us that the consecration of the bread and wine in the western rite came to us directly from Christ and the Apostles:

“ . . . The Church, instructed by the apostles, uses this form.

. . . The words . . . were handed down to the Church by the apostles, who received them from our Lord, according to 1 Corinthians 11:23:

‘I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you.’”

(End of Quote from St. Thomas Aquinas.)

St. Thomas Aquinas clearly states in many places that the long form of the consecration of the wine is necessary, in harmony with 2000 years of infallible Catholic teaching on this subject.

Those quoting him to justify the opposite are guilty of a superficial reading of his words. For St. Thomas stated that WHEN THE CORRECT AND FULL FORM OF THE CONSECRATION IS USED, the bread changes into the Body at “This is My Body” and the wine changes into the Blood at “This is the Chalice of My Blood.” However, he stated emphatically and consistently in several places that the consecration of the wine does NOT take place unless the full form is used. And God knows whether the priest uses about to use the full form of the sacrament, or not.

Now, since 1969, it has been widely spread that St. Thomas taught that ONLY the words, “This is My Body” and “This is the Chalice of My Blood” were necessary to effect a valid consecration. This is not what he taught.

The Summa of St. Thomas Aquinas was placed on the altar alongside the Holy Bible during the beginning ceremonies of the Council of Trent in the middle of the 16th century.

It should be noted that St. Thomas's opinion here, while weighty, did not decide the issue. The Council of Florence signed by Pope Eugene IV, and De Defectibus issued by Pope St. Pius V, among other Papal rulings, did decide the issue once and for all – in unity and consistency with what the Church had always used in the form of the consecration of the wine in the Western Rite, as instituted by Christ and transmitted to us by the Apostles.

In any case, it is important that those trying to justify the New Mass mistranslation of “for all” in the English version are not allowed to misquote St. Thomas Aquinas.

Conclusion: Those who quote St. Thomas Aquinas to try and justify the change to “for all” in the New Mass, are misquoting him. He said the exact opposite. He said that “for many” belonged to the very substance of the sacrament, as instituted by Christ, and as transmitted to us by the Apostles, and the successors of the Apostles.

Chapter 12

The Consecration of the Wine in the Traditional Latin Mass (Tridentine Mass)

Here is the traditional form of the consecration of the wine used in the western rite which has been in use since the time of the Apostles, following the institution of the sacrament by Christ at the Last Supper:

For the consecration of the bread: “FOR THIS IS MY BODY.”

And for the consecration of the wine:

FOR 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.”(Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, Vol. 1, p. 581, -- and unanimously found in all other sources up until 1958.) For instance, this exact form was published in the altar missal used in every Latin Rite church in the world from 1570, the time of Pope St. Pius V’s issuing of “De Defectibus”, until October 1969, when Paul VI issued his “New Mass.”)

Latin words and English translation:

Latin:

Hoc est enim Corpus meum. Hic est enim Calix Sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti: mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et **pro multis** effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.

A correct English translation of these words is, once again:

For this is my Body. For 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.

Chapter 13

Pope St. Pius V, after the constant teaching of the Church, decreed that any substantial change in the words of consecration invalidates the sacrament, while even a minor change is a mortal sin, and hence a sacrilege and a Sin against the First Commandment

As the Church was under constant attack from the Protestant “Reformers” and the Jewish destroyers behind them, many efforts were being made to tear down the Church’s disciplines and unity. In the face of these growing assaults, the Council of Trent was convened. Near the end of the Council of Trent, Pope St. Pius V found it necessary to issue a strong decree enunciating the Church’s constant teaching on the consecration in the Mass, and proscribing any attempts to change this exact formula handed down from the Apostles in the western rite, or to alter its essential meaning.

So, Pope St. Pius V rules in 1570 on the proper form of the consecration of the wine, and says any substantial change in meaning causes the priest to render the sacrament invalid. This takes place in the document “De Defectibus” (Concerning Defects when celebrating Mass), which was also published in every altar missal in every Latin Rite Parish in the world from 1570 to at least 1967:

“Defects on the part of the form may arise if anything is missing from the complete wording required for the act of consecrating. Now the words of the Consecration, which are the form of this Sacrament, are:

HOC EST ENIM CORPUS MEUM, and HIC EST ENIM CALIX SANGUINIS MEI, NOVI ET AETERNI TESTAMENTI: MYSTERIUM FIDEI: QUI PRO VOBIS ET **PRO MULTIS** EFFUNDETUR IN REMISSIONEM PECCATORUM. [Translation: Consecration of the bread: “For this is My Body.” Consecration of the wine: “For 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 the priest were to shorten or change the form of the consecration of the Body and the Blood, so that in the change of wording the words did not mean the same thing, he would not validly confect the Sacrament. If, on the other hand, he were to add or take away anything which did not change the meaning, the Sacrament would be valid, but he would be committing a grave sin.”

Please note that this is not just a ruling of Pope St. Pius V. He was reiterating the infallible ruling of the Council of Florence, and, according to St. Thomas Aquinas, the practice of every Pope back to the time of Christ and the Apostles. This CONSISTENT and UNANIMOUS practice in the daily life of the Church throughout all these centuries in the western rite – falls under the Church’s infallibility under her “ordinary and universal Magisterium” as infallibly taught by the First Vatican Council.

Also, every Pope from 1570 to 1969, even the “Vatican II Popes” John XXIII and Paul VI, promulgated this decree in the front of the altar missal for the saying of Mass by priests in every parish in the western rite. So this use of “for many” is the constant practice and teaching of the Church.

Please also note in the above that Pope St. Pius V says that the words “for many” must not be changed to mean something else, or the sacrament is invalid.

So, the next logical question is: does the change in the translation from “for many” to “for all” constitute an essential change in meaning?

And, incredibly, the Catechism of the Council of Trent, gives us the answer addressing this exact question, way back in the 16th century!

Chapter 14

Catechism of the Council of Trent says that the change from “for many” to “for all” is a substantial change in meaning, and must not be used in the consecration of the wine

Here is a quote from the Catechism of the Council of Trent (published under the authority of Pope St. Pius V) from the Chapter on the Sacraments, which shows how serious the Church takes the exact rendering of the form in a sacrament:

“In ... the Sacraments of the New Law... the Form is so definite, that any, even a casual deviation from it renders the sacrament null; and it is therefore expressed in the clearest terms, and such as exclude the possibility of doubt...”

Please note that the Church, as always, insists on clear, unambiguous meanings that exclude the possibility of doubt or confusion. We will see in Chapter 16 that the First Vatican Council infallibly ruled concerning this matter of clarity once a sacred formula has been established by the Church.

To be specific, the **Catechism of the Council of Trent, compiled under the supervision of St. Charles Borromeo and a team of the best theologians of the day, was published in 1566 by order of Pope St. Pius V. The Catechism of the Council of Trent was compiled to explain the mind of the Fathers of the Council of Trent, and was meant especially for priests to use to teach the faithful.**

The Catechism of the Council of Trent explains why Christ used “for many” in the form of the consecration of the wine, and why Christ did not use “for all” in this place. The Catechism of the Council of Trent also explains that the change from “for many” to “for all” is a SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE OF MEANING, and that therefore the phrase “for all” cannot be used in the consecration of the wine.

Here is exactly what the Catechism of the Council of Trent says on the Form of the Eucharist:

“The additional words for you and for many, are taken, some from Matthew, some from Luke, but were joined together by the Catholic Church under the guidance of the Spirit of God. They serve to declare the fruit and advantage of His 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 which mankind have received from it, we shall easily find that it pertains not unto all, but to many of the human race. When therefore (our Lord) said:** For you, He meant either those who were present, or those chosen from among the Jewish people, such as were, with the exception of Judas, the disciples with whom He was speaking. **When He added, And for many, He wished to be understood to mean the remainder of the elect from among the Jews and Gentiles. WITH REASON, THEREFORE, WERE THE WORDS FOR ALL NOT USED, 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.”** (The Catechism of the Council of Trent, TAN Books, 1982, p. 227.) [Note: Christ uses the words “for many” in St. Matthew 26:28; St. Mark 14:24; also, emphasis has been added using bold and capital lettering in the above passage.]

Comment: As stated earlier, a substantial change of meaning changes the “res sacramenti”, or the “reason for the sacrament”, or the “Substance of the sacrament.” The sacrament must signify its effect. “All men” does not signify the effect of the grace of the sacrament of the Eucharist, which grace is “for many” – that is, for the many who cooperate with the grace of the sacrament. The Council of Trent explains this very clearly. Christ died for all men, and God wills that all men be saved and come to a knowledge of the truth (1 Timothy; Ch 2, v 4), but sadly only “many” of the human race cooperate with the grace of this sacrament, and hence the use of “for many” by Christ at the Last Supper.

Conclusion: The change from “for many” to “for all” is a substantial change, which violates the substance of the sacrament of the Eucharist, something no one, not even a Pope, has the right to do. To use “for all” does not signify what the sacrament effects, and therefore comes under the “invalidity” principle laid down by Pope Leo XIII in his 1896 encyclical, *Apostolicae Curae*.

We might add that when the Catechism of the Council of Trent says, “with reason, therefore, were the words ‘for all’ not used . . .” – we might well ask: “Not used by Whom?” And the answer is: **NOT USED BY CHRIST HIMSELF.**

These words were not used by Christ at the Last Supper, but they **WERE** used by antipope Paul VI in his invalid, sacrilegious, and false worship ceremony, i.e., the “New Mass.”

Chapter 15

St. Alphonsus de Ligouri, Doctor of the Church, in whose writings the Church declares we can have 100% confidence, explains “for many” vs. “for all”

Alphonsus de Ligouri explained, circa 1750, almost 200 years after the Council of Trent, about the effect and meaning of this sacrament:

“The words pro vobis et pro multis (for you and for many) are used to distinguish the virtue of the Blood of Christ from its fruits: for the Blood of Our Savior is of sufficient value to save all men but its fruits are applied only to a certain number and not to all, and this is their own fault... This is the explanation of St. Thomas, as quoted by [Pope] Benedict XIV.” (St. Alphonsus De Liguori, Treatise on The Holy Eucharist, Redemptorist Fathers, 1934, p. 44)

Here is a second source, a Doctor of the Church, whom we are told -- by the Holy See at his canonization – is a safe guide in all things he wrote about.

Comment: Authority, reason, logic, the plain sense of the Latin language, and all Church decrees and rites in history up until 1969 -- tell us that the word “all” does not mean the same thing as the word “many” in the formula of Consecration. As the Catechism of the Council of Trent authoritatively teaches, under the Church’s infallible “ordinary and universal Magisterium” (which applies to the daily life of the Church in her sacraments, liturgies, rites, prayers, and canon laws), “. . . **WITH REASON, THEREFORE, WERE THE WORDS FOR ALL NOT USED, 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.**”

Conclusion: The change from “for many” to “for all” is a substantial change, which violates the substance of the sacrament of the Eucharist, something no one, not even a Pope, has the right to do. As we have seen, all later Popes are bound by the words of Christ and the binding rulings of their predecessors in the Chair of Peter.

Chapter 16

The First Vatican Council Forbids any weakening of Sacred Formulas once they have been established by the Church

The First Vatican Council teaches that the meaning of a sacred formula, once established, is never to be weakened under any pretext of deeper understanding. (Pope Pius XI condemns the mistranslation in the English Version of the New Mass 99 years in advance of its appearance.)

A one sentence summary of this chapter: Once a sacred formula has been established, it is never to be weakened under any pretext whatsoever.

Since already in 1870 the destroyers were known to be in the woodwork of the Church, here is what the First Vatican Council said against anyone who would attempt to weaken a sacred formula already established by the Church:

“Hence, too, that meaning of the sacred dogmas is ever to be maintained which has once been declared by Holy Mother Church, and there must never be any abandonment of this sense under the pretext or in the name of a more profound understanding. (Vatican I, Dogmatic Constitution of the Catholic Faith, Chapter 4, On Faith and Reason)

This solemn definition speaks for itself. Clearly, it embodies common sense, a barrier to destroyers, and the mind of the Church to guard souls against ravaging wolves who seek to destroy.

As a side note, believe it or not, Paul VI quoted this in his purported encyclical, *Mysterium Fidei*, in 1965 – four years before he approved the false English translation in the consecration of the wine to be imposed on the almost all of the parishes in the world.

Here is the quote from *Mysterium Fidei* (Mystery of Faith) in 1965:

“paragraph # 25. They can, it is true, be made clearer and more obvious; and doing this is of great benefit. But it must always be done in such a way that they retain the meaning in which they have been used, so that with the advance of an understanding of the faith, the truth of faith will remain unchanged. For it is the teaching of the First Vatican Council that “the meaning that Holy Mother the Church has once declared, is to be retained forever, and no pretext of deeper understanding ever justifies any deviation

from that meaning.” (11)” (the footnote 11 refers to “Dogmatic Constitution of the on the Catholic Faith, c 4, from the First Vatican Council.)

Comment: The New Mass in English with regard to “all men” does exactly what Vatican I signed by Pope Pius IX condemned. All Popes are bound by the words of Christ and previous solemn definitions by Popes and Councils, as well as the other parts of General Councils which fall under the Church’s “ordinary and universal” Magisterium.” (The Liturgy is part of the Church’s ordinary and universal Magisterium.) It is impossible for a Catholic to discard the decrees of Vatican I.

With regard to Paul VI contradicting the encyclical issued under his name in 1965 with the “for all men” falsification in the consecration of the wine in 1967 and 1969, let us hear from Pope St. Pius X in his encyclical “Pascendi”, issued in 1907;; this is from paragraph #36 regarding the contradictions of the Modernists:

:

“But when they justify even contradictions, what is it that they will refuse to justify?”

Conclusion: In the English “consecration” of Paul VI’s “New Mass”, the “for many” phrase instituted by Christ was changed to “for all” under the “pretext of a deeper understanding”, which was precisely what was condemned by Vatican Council I. Therefore, anyone who recognizes the decrees of Vatican I cannot go along with the “for all” mistranslation in the English and other vernacular language translations of the New Mass. (And whoever does not recognize the decrees of the First Vatican Council – has defected from the Church.)

Chapter 17

The “New Mass” in English Falsifies the Words of Christ at the Last Supper, and defies 2000 years of Popes and Councils

And so, when Paul VI issued his “New Mass” in Latin in 1969 – the Latin version correctly translated used the phrase “pro multis” – in harmony with the words of Christ at the Last Supper as recorded in the Bible, and in harmony with 2000 years of Catholic teaching and infallible tradition in this matter.

(It should be said here that all Latin dictionaries translate the phrase “pro multis” as “for many.” If I had put “for all” down as a translation for “pro multis” as a freshman at St. Xavier High School – my answer would have been marked WRONG. It is only since the mistranslation of this phrase in the English version of the New Mass that mental contortions have been in vogue to justify this gross and juvenile mistranslation.)

You can see the Latin version of the New Mass at the following web page. Hilariously but tellingly, those publishing this Latin Version of the New Mass put the false English translation “for all” side by side with the Latin “pro multis.” Here is the web page: <http://www.frcoulter.com/presentations/LatinMassBooklet.doc>

And now, the punch line: you can go to any parish in the United States on January 2, 2010 -- and pick up a missalette in any pew, and you will find that the words of Christ in the consecration of the wine are still – after 40+ years – falsely mistranslated as “for all” when they should say in that place “for many.”

Below is the false English translation of the Consecration of the Mass that has been found in every missalette in the USA for the past 40+ years (Nov 1969 to Jan 2010), but was actually introduced in 1967, two years before the “New Mass” of Paul VI was unveiled. For clarity, I have put a line through what the New Mass omitted or mistranslated, and have capitalized the new wording and bolded the offending “for all” where “for many” was actually used by Christ at the Last Supper. As we have seen from the evidence in the first 17 chapters of this pamphlet, the use of “for all” invalidates the consecration of the Mass, turns the New Mass in English into false worship, and makes it a de facto sin against the First Commandment, even though 99% of Catholics in the world are still unaware of this change, or of the significance of this change.

The English mistranslation of the Consecration is as follows:
~~For~~ this is my body WHICH WILL BE GIVEN UP FOR YOU.

~~For~~ this is the ~~eternal~~ CUP of my blood, THE BLOOD of the new and eternal testament EVERLASTING COVENANT ~~the mystery of faith which shall IT WILL be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins~~ **FOR ALL SO THAT SINS MAY BE FORGIVEN.** (Additions to the formula are indicated by capitalized words.)

Comment: Here we see in the “New Mass” of Paul VI the exact change condemned by the Council of Florence, the Catechism of the Council of Trent, De Defectibus of Pope St. Pius V (with its subsequent endorsement by all Popes after him until Paul VI; we also see the changing of the actual words used by Our Lord in the Gospel.

And we are about to see that the current occupant of the Papal Chair, through a document issued by his Cardinal Arinze, Benedict XVI, stated that: a) for many is the faithful translation of “pro multis”; b) pro multis has been used throughout history in all the rites of the Church; c) “for all” belongs not in the consecration of the wine, but in catechism explanations; d) “pro omnibus” or “for all” has never been correctly used; and e) the Episcopal conferences should prepare for the translation of “for many” to be enforced in one or two years. We shall list this decree in an upcoming chapter. So even according to the pronouncement of “Vatican II Pope” Benedict XVI, “for all” is a wrong translation.

Conclusion: The change from “for many” to “for all” in the consecration of the Mass was a false translation. Those of us who refused to use it or attend masses using it since 1967 have been correct, those who have used it or attend masses using it – have been wrong. For 1967 years all Catholics embraced the consecration formula which retained “pro multis”. If they were correct then, we are correct now.

Here is another look at the New Mass in Latin and English from another website:

The New Mass in Latin had “pro multis” or “for many.” Here it is, but with the Latin “pro multis” mistranslated as ‘for all’; this is from the Novus Ordo Missae of Paul VI, 1975 edition at www.latinliturgy.com – and can be found in any other place dealing with the new mass:

Before he was given up to death,
a death he freely accepted,
he took bread, gave you thanks.
He broke the bread,
gave it to his disciples and said:

Qui cum Passiòni
voluntàrie traderetur,
accèpit panem et gràtias
àgnes fregit,
deditque discipulis suis, dicens:

TAKE THIS, ALL OF YOU, AND EAT IT:
THIS IS MY BODY
WHICH WILL BE GIVEN UP FOR YOU.

ACCÌPITE ET MANDUCATE EX HOC OMNES:
HOC EST ENIM CORPUS MEUM
QUOD PRO VOBIS TRADÈTUR.

When supper was ended, he took the cup. Again he gave you thanks and praise, gave the cup to his disciples, and said:

Simili modo, postquam cenatum est, accipiens et calicem, iterum gratias agens dedit discipulis suis, dicens:

TAKE THIS, ALL OF YOU,
AND DRINK FROM IT:
THIS IS THE CUP OF MY BLOOD,
THE BLOOD OF THE NEW AND
EVERLASTING COVENANT.
IT WILL BE SHED FOR YOU
AND **FOR ALL MEN**
SO THAT SINS ARE FORGIVEN.
DO THIS IN MEMORY OF ME.

ACCIPITE ET BIBITE
EX EO OMNES:
HIC EST ENIM CALIX SANGUINES MEI
NOVI ET AETERNI TESTAMENTI,
QUI PRO VOBIS
ET **PRO MULTIS** EFFUNDETUR
IN REMISSIONEM PECCATORUM.
HOC FACITE
IN MEAM COMMEMORATIONEM.

And below the New Mass in English with the mistranslation of “pro multis” is repeated in a straight paragraph:

“The day before he suffered he took bread in his sacred hands and looking up to heaven, to you, his almighty Father, he gave you thanks and praise. He broke the bread, gave it to his disciples, and said: Take this, all of you, and eat it; this is my body which will be given up for you. When supper was ended, he took the cup. Again **he gave you thanks and praise, gave the cup to his disciples, and said:** Take this, all of you, and drink from it: this is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant. It will be shed for you and **for all** so that sins may be forgiven. Do this in memory of me.” (End of quote from New Mass in English).

I have bolded above the words where the New Mass says that Christ SAID the words which follow. In fact, he did not say those words (for all) as anyone can check in the New Testament. Patrick Omlor had written an article called, “The Ventriloquists” in which he showed that the concocters of the New Mass in English were like ventriloquists who had the brazen temerity to put words in Christ’s mouth which He did NOT say.

By the way, the mistranslation, “for all men”, which was foisted upon the Catholic world in 1967, two years before Paul VI’s “New Mass” -- was changed to “for all” around 1990 to satisfy feminists who were offended that the reference in the new formula to all mankind was expressed by the customary linguistic abbreviation, “all men”, as if this was suddenly too masculine-gender-specific for their delicate lesbian sensitivities to endure - to which the conciliar authorities instantly capitulated and changed the formula to appease the radicals. The supreme irony here is that if the God-given words of Christ, “for many,” had been faithfully retained, there would have been nothing for the man-haters to complain about.

Chapter 18

A Silly and Dishonest Explanation which tried to justify the “all men” mistranslation in the Consecration

In anticipation of the Paul VI introduction of the New Mass in English and other vernacular languages (German, Italian, Spanish, etc.), which the destroyers (such as anti-pope and destroyer in chief, Paul VI) knew they hoped to impose on the faithful worldwide, an alleged convert from Judaism, Joachim Jeremias, was sent forth as the “scholar” on whose “work” the framers of the New Mass based its brazen, false translation of “pro multis_ into “for all men”, and later “for all.”

Jeremias claimed that the Aramaic language did not have a word for all.

The below shows that this ridiculous claim is false.

Greek, Latin, and Aramaic all have words for both “all” and “many”.

Aramaic: many = ‘saggi’an; all = kol, or kolla;

Greek: many = polloi; all = olio; “all” in ancient Greek was also apan;

Latin: many = multus-a-um; all = omnis, omne;

Fr. James Wathen, in his 1971 book *The Great Sacrilege*, demonstrated what absurdities would take place in Scripture if Aramaic had no word for “all”. For instance, “Many will go out into the desert and say I am the Christ, and they will deceive many” would become “all will go out into the desert and say I am the Christ, and they would deceive all.” Here is a very important passage from Fr. Wathen’s book, “*The Great Sacrilege*” on this subject. The attack on Catholic practice in this case is so absurd, that Fr. Wathen could not resist using a bit of sarcasm and humor in his expose of it.

Begin quote about Dr. Jeremias and the ICEL (International Commission on English in the Liturgy) from “*The Great Sacrilege*” by the late Fr. James Wathen:

“If you are new to this subject, you will surely be asking, “Well, then, how could they change the words as they did, if this is what the documents say?” Well, dear child, you are not supposed to ask questions like that, or have you not heard? Now, would you like me to tell you what explanation the local authorities will give to such a question? Well, fold your hands, sit very still, and listen:

“It so happens that the translation of the English of the “mass” was produced by a crowd who call themselves the International Committee on English in the Liturgy (ICEL). Their justification for translating *pro multis* as “for all men” derives from the curious researches of a rationalist Scripture “scholar” whose name is Joachim Jeremias of the University of Gottingen (Germany). This man’s recondite pontification has it that for lo, these two thousand years, the world of Our Lord at the Last Supper have been misrepresented! And who do you think did the misrepresenting? Why, St. Matthew and St. Mark, who else? Quoting Dr. Jeremias, ICEL explains:

“ ‘Neither Hebrew nor Aramaic possess a word for “all”. The word *rabbim* or *multitude* thus served also in the inclusive sense for “the whole”, even though the corresponding Greek and the Latin appear to have an exclusive sense, i.e., ‘the many’ rather than ‘the all.’ ” (End quote from ICEL and Jeremias)

“The doctor found this out all by himself – I mean, altogether by himself –for absolutely no one else knows about it, not even the Hebrews, nor the Arameans, who could have sworn that they did have words to express the ideas represented in our language by the words “all” and “many”! (Our Lord spoke Aramaic. The word He would have used for all in this language is: *kol*, or *kolla*; the word He would have used for many is: ‘*saggi’an*.)

“Even though St. Matthew and St. Mark both spoke Our Lord’s vernacular tongue of Aramaic, they are both supposed to have made the identical error, neither one daring (or knowing enough) to correct the other. Apparently no one in the Apostolic Church caught the mistake. Nor did any of the early Church Fathers, none of the Doctors of the Church, none of the Popes, not one of the great Schoolmen of the Middle Ages, no one in the whole wide world except one Joachim Jeremias. In fact, to this very day, he alone knows of this mistake, for his all-but-divine revelation has failed to impress scholars, both true and false. Witness not a single translation of the Bible (the countless ones for which this deeply pious age has suddenly found a need) with all their unheard of, outrageous, and heterodox turns of phrases – not a single one of them, I say – indicates acceptance of this crack-pot theory that since Christ, our God, the “Word made flesh,” did not have a way, could not devise a way, to say “all”, he had to be satisfied with saying “many” and waiting two thousand years for Dr. Jeremias to explain it for Him.

“His explanation means, of course, that the word should be “all”, not “many”, in the following scriptural passages: “All are called, but few are chosen.” Matt. 20:16 . . . Speaking of the time of the Great Tribulation, Jesus meant to say, “for all [everybody!] will come in my name saying I am Christ: and they will seduce all [everybody].” Matt 24:5; (My Heavens!)

“And are we not fortunate that those who have translated the Latin of the ‘Novus Ordo’ were alert enough to recognize the brilliance of this momentous discovery, if no one else was?”

“Are you still wondering how “pro multis” came to be mistranslated? Yes, I thought you would be: The reference of the ICEL to the opinion of Dr. Jeremias is all a mendacious ruse. The question at issue has nothing to do with Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek. Further, all the arguments over Scriptural variations, philological findings, or even the decrees of the Council of Trent, are secondary to the main point, which is, that the Latin text of the Missal states that Christ Our Lord said “for many.” The most important fact is that the translation is false, deliberately, unmistakably, and scandalously. There is no excuse for it. . . . In their unabashed impudence, the liars have not bothered to get their story straight to this very day. These vernacular garblements (as I said above, this same forgery is found in [almost all the other vernacular] translations, not just in the English one) first appeared in 1967. But the Novus Ordo was introduced in 1969, after loud attention had been called to the error, and its Latin still has “pro multis.” These words remain even though other words in the sacramental form were altered, as we have seen.

“This translation error is but another sacrilege of immeasurable proportion. You see that nothing is sacred to the “reformers.” How those things which are the most holy the meddlers must perforce make the most absurd and muddled!” (End of quote from “The Great Sacrilege” by Fr. James Wathen, pages 100-102)

We might add that even Hollywood has gotten it right and used “for many” in their movie versions of the life of Christ, including but not limited to, “The Greatest Story Ever Told”, “King of Kings”, “Jesus of Nazareth” and “The Passion of the Christ.”

This was an inexcusable falsehood and mistranslation inserted into the “New Mass” by the enemies of the Church in order to cut off sanctifying grace to the faithful, and to help identify the sharper and more alert priests who would object to this outrage, so that such priests could be suppressed or removed from public view, or treated as “renegades and rebels” if they went out on their own to serve the faithful requesting valid Masses and valid sacraments.

The following should be noted:

When the ICEL translation first saw “the light of day” on “Black Sunday”, October 22, 1967, it was immediately exposed and opposed by Fr. Lawrence Brey in the nationwide journal for priests, the Pastoral and Homiletic Review which went into every parish rectory in the USA.

Fr. Brey then assisted Mr. Patrick Henry Omlor of the USA (who by then had moved to Australia) with his treatise, “Questioning the Validity of the New All English Canon.” The original title was “Proving the Invalidity of the new All English Canon”, but was softened at the request of Fr. Brey, who was very cautious. The original title was justified, as has now been shown by 40 years of silence concerning Omlor’s scholarly work by the destroyers of the holy Mass and those who have been deceived by them.

Chapter 19

Paul VI introduces the “New Mass” like the conspirator and anti-pope that he is

Paul VI issued the New Mass in Latin in 1969, which makes other changes in the consecration formula, but maintains “pro multis” in the consecration of the Wine.

Three different documents are issued in three separate venues by Paul VI to introduce the New Mass. One says it is his “wish” that it be used; one says that it is a command that it be used; and the other uses language in between. Everyone could choose the one they wanted, and still to this day different factions point back to different decrees.

In any case, the New Mass in English is imposed in every parish in the USA and the English speaking world on October 22, 1969.

In 1974, Paul VI issued orders through the bishops that he had appointed or maintained in office, that his New Mass is to be used by every priest, and only older priests are to be allowed to say the “old Mass” in their rooms privately, but not in front of the public. (This is a direct contradiction of Pope St. Pius V in “De Defectibus” in 1570, and all the Popes of until 1958 who published his decree, that no priest could ever be legitimately forced to say Mass in any other way than the traditional [Tridentine] Mass. Pope St. Pius V allowed any rite that was 200 years or older to be continued in 1570, out of respect for other ancient and legitimate rites. Paul VI, as a destroyer rather than a true Pope, demanded that the traditional Mass going back millennia be abruptly forbidden, with only his sacrilegious “New Mass” in English to be said in the USA.

From 1969 until 1982, all Latin Masses, even Paul VI’s “Novus Ordo” in Latin, were forbidden by all the Bishops in the USA. Only the English version with its invalidating and sacrilegious mistranslation of the consecration of the wine was allowed for every day “masses”, for weddings, and for funerals. Those seeking to be married in their parishes are given only one choice for their “Nuptial Mass” -- the invalid and sacrilegious “New Mass.” Whether they realize it or not, couples who would capitulate to the tyranny of the “new Mass” for the sake of being married “in the Church” are forced to defy Christ Himself, all the true Popes in history, and all rulings of every Pope and Council on the proper form in the consecration of the wine.

What does Canon Law and the moral teachings of the Church say when a young couple is confronted with such a situation? That will be covered in a later chapter.

Chapter 20

Paul VI issues the 1974 mandate imposing the New Mass in English exclusively on the USA -- through the Bishops he has appointed or maintained in power

A document called the “Notification *Conferentia Episcopali*um” was issued on 28 October 1974.

This document specifies that when a bishops’ conference decrees that a translation of the new rite is obligatory, “Mass, whether in Latin or the vernacular, **may be celebrated lawfully only** according to the rite of the Roman Missal promulgated 3 April 1969 by authority of Pope Paul VI.” The emphasis on the word “only” (*tantummodo*) is found in the original.

The document further states that Ordinaries (Bishops) must ensure that all priests and people of the Roman Rite, “**notwithstanding the pretense of any custom, even immemorial custom**, duly accept the Order of Mass in the Roman Missal.” (Notice the sneering “pretense of any custom, even immemorial custom” – as if the immemorial custom of the church was a devious excuse or pretense. !!!)

From this it is clear that the “New Mass” of Paul VI has been duly promulgated and is obligatory: there are no exceptions.

(See this webpage for a comprehensive article on this subject: <http://www.traditionalmass.org/articles/article.php?id=19&catname=8>)

Thus, we see Paul VI imposing his “full authority” worldwide to require the faithful to attend the vernacular translations which falsify the words of Christ and therefore cause the faithful to be objectively sinning against the the First Commandment by attending false worship, as well as attending invalid masses.

As we saw in the opening chapters of this pamphlet, this is something that no true Pope could ever do, and that no true Pope has ever done: issue a rite of mass, a canon law, or even an official prayer that leads the faithful into sin, or causes them to sin. This was covered extensively in Chapters 1, 2, and 3 – citing the infallible ruling of the First Vatican Council regarding the Church’s infallible “ordinary and universal” Magisterium, which deals with and covers the daily life of the Church in her liturgies, official prayers, canon laws, and canonizations of saints.”

Chapter 21

How Could this have Happened? How Could Paul VI have gotten on the Chair of Peter if he was an anti-pope? And where was the true Pope?

Many Catholics may not even be familiar with the term antipope. Here is a definition from the 1913 Catholic Encyclopedia:

“A false claimant of the Holy See in opposition to a pontiff canonically elected. At various times in the history of the Church illegal pretenders to the Papal Chair have arisen, and frequently exercised pontifical functions in defiance of the true occupant.” (*Antipope; The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. I, 1913, page 582. The Encyclopedia Press, New York.*)

There have been at least forty-four anti-popes in history, most of whom arose between 217 AD and the 14th century. To this day, thirty-four of the major antipopes are listed each year in the Vatican’s *Annuario Pontificio*.

The last antipope until our time, Felix V, was circa 1449, leaving the existence of an antipope contending against the rights of a true Pope for the See of Peter far out of the memory of any living person, thus setting the world up for what seems to have happened at the 1958 Conclave.

One of the worst periods for the Church was caused by the Antipope Anacletus II from 1130 to 1138 A.D. Anacletus (Cardinal Pierleoni) was buying off the Cardinals and their families with lavish gifts as the then current Pope, Honorius II, was getting closer and closer to death. Several of the Cardinals were aware of this reality, and had the dying Pope appoint a Committee of eight Cardinals to elect his successor. (The changing of the rules to elect the next Pope is within the competence of the reigning Pope. Two popes have even appointed their successors.) These eight cardinals repaired to the castle where the Pope lay dying, and elected Gregory Papareschi as Innocent II as soon as Honorius II had died. 6 hours later the other 17 cardinals elected Pierlioni as Innocent II.

Having bought off or won the favor through money of the most powerful families in Rome, Anacletus II took control of the Vatican, while the true Pope, Innocent II, was forced to flee to France for his own safety. Of this period in the life of Pope Innocent II, it was said, “Expelled by the City, he was welcomed by the world.” St. Bernard of Clairvaux took up the Pope’s cause, and rallied the leaders of Europe.

Even with St. Bernard's help, the true Pope was in exile for eight years, as the antipope held the Vatican. In 1138, the antipope Anacletus died, and St. Bernard led Pope Innocent II into the Vatican to take control of the See of Peter.

Even though this state of affairs has happened several times over the centuries, most Catholics today seem to think that God would never allow this to happen, or that if God did allow such a thing to happen, it would be tantamount to "abandoning His Church." Nothing could be further from the truth.

When an antipope occupies Rome, he is not the Pope, but a usurper. The antipope does not have the special protection of the Holy Ghost, and therefore is not protected from error. When an antipope occupies Rome, God has not failed His Church, but simply stays with the Pope in exile, if any, and the hierarchy and faithful of the Church until a true Pope is restored in Rome. Another period of tremendous confusion and turmoil for the Church was the Great Western Schism which lasted 39 years (1378-1417) with three "Popes" contending for the Papal throne. Future saints were found in each faction.

Eventually, the confusion was ended by the Council of Constance at which all three Papal claimants resigned, and Pope Martin V was elected to heal the schism and unite the factions.

God had not abandoned the Church during these periods of strong antipopes. The antipopes had no authority, and their usurpation of the Vatican meant nothing except increased persecution for the true Pope and the Catholic faithful.

Many prophecies from many saints from many countries and from many centuries have talked about an occupation of the Vatican towards the end of time which would be the worst occupation of all.

Our Lady of LaSalette (1846) gave the message to Melanie Calvet, "Rome will lose the Faith and become the seat of AntiChrist" – and – "The Church will be in eclipse, the world will be in dismay."

Fr. Sylvester Berry and Fr. Hermann Kramer (The Book of Destiny) have contended that Chapter 12 of the Apocalypse talks of the overthrow of the true Pope by an antipope.

Fr. Sylvester Berry circa 1920 wrote that the powers of darkness in those days:

“. . . will introduce ceremonies to imitate the Sacraments of the Church. In fact there will be a complete organization - a church of Satan set up in opposition to the Church of Christ. . . . Their ceremonies will counterfeit the Sacraments . . .”

And this from Bishop Fulton Sheen:

“He [Satan] will set up a counterchurch which will be the ape of the Church, because he, the Devil, is the ape of God. It will have all the notes and characteristics of the Church, but in reverse and emptied of its divine content. It will be a mystical body of the Antichrist that will in all externals resemble the mystical body of Christ. . . .But the twentieth century will join the counterchurch because it claims to be infallible when its visible head speaks ex cathedra” (Fulton J. Sheen, *Communism and the Conscience of the West*, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1948, pp. 24-25).

Bishop Sheen, like Fr. Hermann Kramer, who wrote in 1955, seems to have described the reality in prophetic form, but missed what was happening before their eyes a few years later.

For a long treatment of these astounding analyses and prophecies, see “Prophecies for Searching Souls” at this link:

http://www.realnews247.com/prophecies_for_searching_souls.htm

On October 26th, 1958, white smoke emanated from the conclave in Rome for five full minutes from 5:55 PM until 6 PM. Pope Pius XII had died 17 days earlier, and the conclave had convened to elect his successor. But no Pope emerged, and the world was told a mistake had been made. Padre Pellegrino, the announcer for the Vatican Radio, announced for 30 minutes, “Habemus Papem”, meaning “We have a Pope”. He was then told that there had been a mistake in the perception of the color of the smoke, to which he replied: “The impression of white smoke upon 300,000 people cannot be cancelled out. The answer must be found elsewhere.”

Two days later, Angelo Roncalli emerged as “Pope John XXIII” to the wild cheers of the Judeo-Masonic world press, who dubbed him, “Good Pope John.” Ever since that time, the world in general, and Catholics in particular, have seen ever growing turmoil and confusion within the structures of the Catholic Church.

The answer seems to be, “An enemy hath done this.” (Matthew 13:28)

How did the enemy get in to usurp the Vatican? The answer seems to lie in the suppression of the rightfully elected Pope, Cardinal Joseph Siri, on October 26, 1958, amidst nuclear threats against the Cardinals in the conclave and clever manipulations within the conclave by Cardinals who were secret Jews or secret Freemasons. Malachi Martin in “The Keys of this Blood” states that there were threats against at least one of the post 1958 conclaves that involved “the very existence of the Vatican state.” This could only mean nuclear weapons, which in 1958 were exclusively in the hands of the top wire-pullers of Judeo-Masonry who controlled both the Kremlin and Washington D.C.

The following is taken from a letter written by Mr. Gary Giuffré, who has done more extensive research in this area than anyone else I am aware of:

Begin quote:

In May 1957, the most ferocious series of nuclear bomb tests to have occurred up to that time was unleashed 17 months before the 1958 Papal Conclave by Washington and Moscow, culminating right up until an hour before the apparent election of Joseph Cardinal Siri, when one of the largest-ever hydrogen bombs was detonated at the Nevada Test Site on 26 October 1958, the Feast of Christ the King. The outside intervention brought against the conclave in 1903 that Pope St. Pius X had sought to prevent from ever happening again, so that the outcome of future papal elections would not be vitiated, came back a thousand-fold 55 years later and the world has been turned upside down ever since. In his cryptic comments about the intervention he witnessed during the four conclaves at which he participated, Giuseppe Siri gives us a fleeting glimpse of the ruthless power that was brought to bear from outside the Sistine Chapel to deprive the Church of her lawful head:

“ . . . The law of the conclave rests on two principle points: the exclusive right of the sacred college, and seclusion. The latter did not come at once: it resulted from a response to obvious situations and to grave necessity. These two principle points support one another in the vicissitudes of an election. It is obvious that an election entrusted to an electoral body too large, would be, humanly speaking, more difficult and more impressionable and therefore, there would be little guarantee of reasonableness for, and correspondence to the supreme interests of the Church. Only with a body of men, carefully selected, is it possible that in an election, as in human affairs, the criterion of the true good will prevail. **The seclusion of the conclave is even more necessary today; with modern means, with modern techniques, without complete seclusion, it would not be possible to gain an election against the pressures from outside powers. Today some superpowers (and even some lesser powers) have too great an interest in owning, for their part, through either compliance or weakness [by Church leaders], the greatest moral authority in the world. And they would do everything in their power to accomplish this. The pressures to overturn the substance of the law of the conclave would be driven by the desire to obtain this very result.**” (Giuseppe Siri, *The Election of the Roman Pontiff*, «Renovatio», VII [1972], fasc. 2, pp. 155-156, republished in: *Il Dovero Dell'Ortodossia*, 1991, Giardini Editori, Pisa, pages 52-54.)

Within three days after the Freemason and antipope, Angelo Roncalli, appeared on the papal balcony, the Soviets announced a unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing and within hours the US followed suit. As they say, “the rest is history”, and as a result of that history, most of which has been hidden from Catholics during

these last 51 years, there has occurred the most rapid decline of civilization the world has ever seen.

In this manner, the program of Judeo-Masonry and antichrist has been progressively carried out in the Vatican and in the world, with the voice and sight of the True Church being “eclipsed”, or ALMOST entirely hidden from view by the forces of evil. Indeed, as Our Lady of La Salette stated to Melanie Calvat in 1846, “The Church will be in eclipse; the world will be in dismay.” The Holy Scriptures say: “Where there is Peter, there is the Church.” That the obscuration of the Pope was the prerequisite step for taking away the Mass, and eclipsing the Church, seems to have been foretold by Melanie. She understood that Peter would be eclipsed along with the Church, and that his “eclipse” would be a prelude to the disappearance of the Mass. For, in commenting on this part of the secret, Melanie affirmed to the French Abbot Paul Combe:

“The Church will be eclipsed. **At first, we will not know which is the true pope. Then secondly, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass will cease to be offered in churches** and houses; it will be such that, for a time, there will not be public services any more. **But I see that the Holy Sacrifice has not really ceased: it will be offered in barns, in alcoves, in caves, and underground.**” (Abbot Paul Combe: *The Secret of Melanie and the Actual Crisis*, 1906, Rome, p.137.)

End of quote from Mr. Gary Giuffré

The above explanation of “the crisis in the Church” is the only coherent explanation that has been offered since the 1958 conclave. It is “coherent” because it leaves intact the Church’s visibility (if almost hidden by the eclipse caused by the counterfeit “church of darkness”, as prophesied by Our Lady of La Salette in 1846).

As regards the Church’s visibility at any given moment, the following quote is relevant:

Reverend Francis Spirago & Richard F Clarke, S.J., “The Catechism Explained”, 1899, Benziger Brothers, New York:

“Wherever Catholic priests and people are to be found, there is the Catholic Church” (page 221).

And this regarding the Church’s visibility in time of crisis:

Rev. William Addis & Rev. Thomas Arnold, “The Catholic Dictionary or The Universal Christian Educator and Popular Encyclopedia of Religious Information”, 1896, Christian Press Association Publishing, Co.:

“In a wide and loose sense, when the whole Catholic Church is considered as existing in the midst of heretics, schismatics, and the heathen, even the laity may be considered as forming a portion of the hierarchy” (page 402).

Furthermore, the above explanation leaves in tact both the Church’s indefectibility, and the Church’s infallibility.

PLEASE NOTE: To hold that the “all men” change in the consecration of the wine was promulgated and enforced by true Popes, namely Paul VI, John Paul I, John Paul II, and Benedict XVI – is, as shown by the evidence in chapter 1 through 20 of this pamphlet, to destroy the indefectibility and the infallibility of the Church. With this contradiction on an essential point of the Faith and truth, in the very heart of the consecration of the wine in the Mass, the Church would lose its four marks. The Church would no longer be One, Holy, Catholic or Apostolic. This is why the “Vatican II popes” MUST be anti-popes. A series of antipopes occupying the Vatican does NOT destroy Christ’s promise to be with the Church always. For now as in ages past Christ is with the “Church in exile”, and we can look forward with certainty to the day when Christ will restore the true hierarchy to the Vatican and to the structures of the Church. See Chapter 28 and the Letter of St. Athanasius to his flock issued circa 380 A.D. (The “all men” change is only one example amongst dozens of blatant contradictions to established Church teaching in essential matters of Faith and/or morals, and/or disciplines that have been imposed upon the faithful by the “Vatican II popes” since 1958.)

The above “Siri Thesis” explanation also takes into account the five minutes of white smoke which emanated from the chimney of the Sistine Chapel from 5:55 PM to 6 PM on October 26, 1958. This meant that priests, undoubtedly watching the well orchestrated threats and intimidations that were transpiring in the conclave, kept stuffing dry straw into the Sistine chapel stove in order to alert the world that a Pope had, indeed, been elected. (Five minutes of white smoke is a long time.)

Remember: white straw would only go into the Sistine Chapel stove AFTER a cardinal was elected, had accepted, and had chosen a name. According to a few reports, as yet unproven, Siri chose the name “Gregory XVII.” (See www.October1958 for the article: “Comments on the Eclipse of the Church and October 26, 1958.”)

According to this thesis, the true Pope, Joseph Siri, was validly elected and suppressed on October 26, 1958, -- after which a usurper and antipope, John XXIII, was put in his place by force and threats, with Roncalli, the anti-pope, emerging on the balcony two days later, on October 28, 1958, to the wild hosannas of the world press.

Since we have shown that Paul VI (1963-1978) has to be an antipope or he could not have imposed upon the faithful a false consecration of the wine in the vernacular versions of his “New Mass” (which led the faithful into the sins of false worship and sacrilege), then the above explanation offers the most logical solution to the “Vatican II Church Crisis”, although the “Siri Thesis” remains as yet unproven.

For more information on this take on the current crisis in the Church, see the five articles on these web pages:

www.realnews247.com/crisis_in_the_church.htm or www.october1958.com

I again especially call your attention to the article, “Comments on the Eclipse of the Church and The White Smoke of October 26, 1958”, which also has several items and news stories at the bottom of the webpage.

The spoiled conclave explanation, and the suppression of the rightful Pope, -- seems to be a far more likely explanation than a canonically elected Pope who falls into heresy and schism. St. Robert Bellarmine, one of the greatest theologians of all time, and a Doctor of the Church, stated circa 1600, that since no Pope had ever fallen into heresy or schism up to that time, that fact alone was a strong indication that such could never happen, but that Christ’s prayer that the Faith of St. Peter would not fail – was effective.

Even if the “Siri Thesis” is correct, we are still left with an *apparent* interregnum prolonged now over 20 years as of January 2010. In this regard, the writings of Fr. Edmund James O’Reilly are relevant. He was an eminent theologian who lived at the time of Vatican I. But the follow quote was taken from his writings after Vatican I:

“The great schism of the West suggests to me a reflection which I take the liberty of expressing here. **If this schism had not occurred, the hypothesis of such a thing happening would appear to many chimerical [absurd]. They would say it could not be; God would not permit the Church to come into so unhappy a situation.** Heresies might spring up and spread and last painfully long, through the fault and to the perdition of their authors and abettors, to the great distress too of the faithful, increased by actual persecution in many places where the heretics were dominant. **But that the true Church should remain between thirty and forty years without a thoroughly ascertained Head, and representative of Christ on earth, this would not be. Yet it has been; and we have no guarantee that it will not be again,** though we may fervently hope otherwise. What I would infer is, that **we must not be too ready to pronounce on what God may permit. We know with absolute certainty that He will fulfill His promises...** We may also trust that He will do a great deal more than what He has bound Himself by

His promises. We may look forward with cheering probability to exemption for the future from some of the trouble and misfortunes that have befallen in the past. **But we, or our successors in the future generations of Christians, shall perhaps see stranger evils than have yet been experienced**, even before the immediate approach of that great winding up of all things on earth that will precede the day of judgment. I am not setting up for a prophet, nor pretending to see unhappy wonders, of which I have no knowledge whatever. **All I mean to convey is that contingencies regarding the Church, not excluded by the Divine promises, cannot be regarded as practically impossible, just because they would be terrible and distressing in a very high degree.**” (Fr. O’Reilly, *The Relations of the Church to Society – Theological Essays*, p. 287)

* * * * *

Those of us who accept the “Siri Thesis”, that Cardinal Joseph Siri was elected Pope on October 26, 1958, and then suppressed, shoved aside, and kept out of the way somehow over the next 30 years – are left with a mystery that suggests intrigue of the most malevolent kind, and that brings to mind the warnings of our Lady of Fatima: “The Holy Father will have much to suffer – there will be terrible persecutions against the Church.” To be sure many unanswered questions remain, but even these can be explained, at least in part, by available information (too voluminous to include in this brief work) and by several precedents in papal history, however far into the distant past they may be.

However, whether one believes or does not believe that the “Siri Thesis” points towards the ultimate solution of the present Church crisis, -- those trying to defend the indefensible actions of the “Vatican II Popes” with regards to the falsification of the consecration of the wine, though often motivated by the best of intentions, are left in the position of denying both the infallibility and the indefectibility of the Church.

* * * * *

With the working understanding that only an antipope could have falsified the words of Christ in the consecration of the wine and imposed it upon the Church, then the following chapters will be more understandable.

Section 4:

**The Terrible
Consequences of the
Attack on the Mass and
the Church by antipope
Paul VI**

Chapter 22

The “New Mass” in English is a Sacrilege

The New Mass in English is a sacrilege because it treats a holy thing with disrespect.

The definition of a sacrilege from Baltimore Catechism #2, 1941:

213. When does a person sin by sacrilege?

A person sins by sacrilege when he mistreats sacred persons, places, or things.

They have set thy sanctuary ablaze, they have profaned the dwelling of thy name on the earth. (Psalm 73:7)

Needless to say, the institutionalized mistranslation of Christ’s words in the consecration formula of the New Mass in English, resulting in an invalid sacrament according to the still standing decrees of the Church, is a grave sacrilege, objectively speaking.

Needless to say, Catholics must avoid participating in a sacrilege, and this is why we had to seek legitimate and certain Catholic sacraments from a priest who would faithfully administer the traditional sacraments and rites of the Church, rather than the deformations foisted upon the faithful by antipope Paul VI and his approved Bishops.

Chapter 23

The “New Mass” in English is False Worship, a Sin Against the First Commandment

The New Mass in English is a sin against the First Commandment, i.e., is false worship, because it mixes error with the worship of the True God.

Any pre-1958 theologian could be cited on the question of False worship, which is either the worship of a false God (as the Moslems do), or the mixing of error and truth in the worship of the true God, which is what Paul VI effected in the English translation of the New Mass.

One citation: Father Heribert Jone, an eminent Catholic moral theologian, in his famous “Handbook of Moral Theology”, discussed the sin of “False Worship,” which is one of the offenses against the First Commandment. He said that, “God is worshipped in a false manner if one mingles religious errors and deception with the worship of the true God” (Newman Press: Westminster MD, 1961, p. 97).

Clearly this is what the New Mass in English does: mingles religious errors and deception with the worship of the true God.

The falsifying of Christ’s words “for many” in the consecration of the wine is a prime example, but not the only example.

Chapter 24

The “New Mass” in English is blatant stupidity and blatant dishonesty in regards to the falsification of Christ’s words in the Consecration of the Wine

The blatant stupidity and dishonesty of the mistranslation of “pro multis” in the consecration of the wine:

A quick Latin lesson:

I took Latin for four years at St. Xavier High School in Cincinnati, Ohio, and for three years at Xavier University. From our freshman year, the only translation for pro multis was “for many”. Pro was “for” and multis was the ablative plural form of “many.” The translation for “for all” would have been “pro omnibus.”; pro was “for” and “omnibus” was the ablative plural form of “all.” One can check this by looking into any Latin Dictionary. If as a freshman at St. Xavier High School I would have put down “for all” as the translation of the Latin words “pro multis” – my answer would have been marked 100% wrong. It’s perfectly clear, and in no way a close call. No Latin dictionary in history has ever defined “pro multis” as “for all.”

This is all beside the point, of course, because even if there were two meanings for “pro multis” (which there is not), the Church had already decided that in the consecration of the wine the words “for many” was to be used, just as Christ used at the Last Supper as recorded in the New Testament – and that the words “for all” were most definitely NOT to be used, as noted above in the quotation from Pope St. Pius V’s authorization of the Catechism of the Council of Trent.

Chapter 25

The “New Mass” Presents us with a “New Gospel”, which St. Paul tells us we must reject

Since the New Mass in English falsifies the Gospel of St. Matthew and St. Mark, we are forbidden by Holy Scripture itself to accept this “New Gospel.”

The “for all” mistranslation presents the Catholic who is aware of it with another impossible obstacle to accepting the New Mass in English.

For St. Paul commands us in his Epistle to the Galatians, Chapter 1, v: 1 through 9:

“1 Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead, 2 And all the brethren who are with me, to the churches of Galatia. 3 Grace be to you, and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ, 4 Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present wicked world, according to the will of God and our Father: 5 To whom is glory for ever and ever. Amen. 6 I wonder that you are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, unto another gospel. 7 Which is not another, only there are some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. 8 But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema. 9 As we said before, so now I say again: If any one preach to you a gospel, besides that which you have received, let him be anathema.” (End quote from Galatians.)

The New Mass presents a brazen falsification of the words of Christ at the Last Supper as recorded TWICE in Holy Scripture. This is a “New Gospel”, and we are forbidden by St. Paul to accept it, even if brought to us by an angel from heaven or the Apostles themselves!

Chapter 26

In 2006, “Vatican II Pope” Benedict XVI Says the “for all” translation has never been correct in the form of the consecration of the wine, and that the “for many” translation has always been correct

Has the Vatican said anything about this mistranslation of “for all” in the form of the consecration of the wine since 1967?

From 1967, when the new Consecration in English was imposed – complete with the mistranslation in the form of the consecration of the wine -- in every parish in the United States without any document signed directly by Paul VI to back it up – in fact, with the New Mass in Latin signed directly by Paul VI actually contradicting the mistranslation in the English version – until late 2006 – the Vatican II establishment remained silent on this point, despite numerous, public requests for a correction, and numerous pamphlets and books pointing out how this mistranslation made it impossible for Catholics in good conscience to attend the New Mass in English.

Then, finally, in November 2006, the prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship, “Cardinal” Francis Arinze, issued a statement admitting that the New Mass in English had, in fact, contained this monstrous mistranslation since 1969.

In the December, 2006 issue of Catholic Family News, editor John Vennari wrote an article with this headline: “Post-Conciliar Vatican Finally Tells the Truth about Pro Multis.” Here is part of “Cardinal” Arinze’s written release:

* “The Roman Rite in Latin has always said pro multis and never pro-omnibus in the consecration of the chalice.”

* “The anaphoras of the various Oriental Rites, whether in Greek, Syriac, Armenian, the Slavic languages, etc., contain the verbal equivalent of the Latin pro multis in their respective languages.”

* “For many” is a faithful translation of pro multis, whereas “for all” is rather an explanation of the sort that belongs to catechesis.” (End of quote from “Cardinal” Arinze)

It must be noted that the final line in the Arinze communique soft-peddles the fact that “for all” is a FALSE translation of the words of Christ at the Last Supper, condemned by the Catechism of the Council of Trent under Pope St. Pius V a full 399 years before it came into use in 1969 in English and other vernacular (German,

Italian, etc.) translations of Paul VI's "New Mass." This false translation, as we have seen, has meant that all the New Masses said in English have been invalid, sacrilegious, and false worship, a mortal sin, objectively speaking, against the first commandment.

In any case, after 39 years of this imposed mistranslation in the form of the consecration of the wine, this incredible admission comes forth. The possible reasons for it and what is going on here is beyond the scope of this paper, except to say that such conflicting signals from the Vatican (the invalidating error has still not been corrected in the English New Mass four years later !!!!) serve to keep the "conservatives" in place while Vatican II antipope Benedict XVI runs out the clock on the remaining valid bishops appointed by Pope Pius XII, or ordained before the rite of ordination for priests and the right of consecration for bishops was abruptly changed and corrupted by Paul VI in 1968, without explanation. For more on this subject, see this page:

http://www.realnews247.com/bishop_consecration_by_paul_VI_invalid.htm

So, even those who accept Benedict XVI as a true Pope, must now concede that we were right in 1978 to take the (much) safer course, and to avoid the falsification of Christ's words in the New Mass's consecration of the wine, which meant invalidity, false worship, and sacrilege -- and to follow the spirit of the law, as well as the letter of canon law, and seek a priest, even from outside the diocese, who would perform the Catholic ceremonies, the Catholic Mass, and witness our wedding in the way that the Church prescribes.

* * * * *

THE MEANING OF BENEDICT XVI AND HIS WORK

In fact, anti-pope the job of Benedict XVI (formerly Fr., "Bishop", and "Cardinal" Joseph Ratzinger) is to have Catholics embrace light and darkness, truth and falsehood, at the same time. Thus, those orchestrating the current phase of the counterfeit "church of darkness" occupying the Vatican -- churn out material through Benedict and those around him which can be used by EWTN, the Wanderer, and the Remnant, -- as well as material that can be used by the foremost Modernist destroyers trying to undermine and bury the Catholic Church.

Thus, Benedict above admits that the translation of "for all" in the consecration of the wine is wrong and a substantial change of meaning. Even though the standing decree of Pope St. Pius V states that a substantial change of meaning invalidates the consecration, Benedict XVI makes no serious move to correct the situation, but has now allowed the "for all" consecration falsification to continue over 3 years since the above statement was released. (!!!)

Benedict XVI's other job is to – they hope -- preside over the death of the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church, i.e., the death of the remaining Pius XII appointed bishops, of which only about a few dozen remain. Once these bishops are dead, then the wire-pullers of Judeo-Masonry hope to eventually state publicly that the hierarchy of the Catholic Church has come to an end, and that Christ's promise has failed. (This is the strongest argument why the Great Chastisement is near, for Christ will not allow His Church to fail. Nor will He allow the hierarchy to come to an end, unless, perhaps, in the very last days before the end of the world. For the Church has always taught that if only one Catholic is alive at the end of world, then the Church has survived.)

Humanly speaking, the hierarchy is in danger for two reasons, 1) no bishops have a papal appointment since 1958; and 2) Paul VI changed the millennia old form for the consecration of bishops in 1969, thus clearly invalidating all future bishops "consecrated" with the "Paul VI" formula. After Pope Pius XII ruled on the essential words of that age-old form for the consecration of Bishops in 1947, in response to requests to do so from bishops around the world, -- Paul VI eliminated those essential words, as defined by Pope Pius XII for the consecration of Bishops in 1969 – a mere 22 years later! This is yet ANOTHER reason why Paul VI, John Paul I, John Paul II, and Benedict XVI cannot be true popes, but must be antipopes.

Incredibly, Catholic Saints and holy persons have prophesied about this exact circumstance, i.e., the Catholic hierarchy *appearing* to be at an end. The strongest of these prophecies is this one, found in the book, Catholic Prophecy, by Yves Dupont:

“The Church will be punished because the majority of her members, high and low, will become so perverted. The Church will sink deeper and deeper until she will at last seem to be extinguished, and the succession of Peter and the other Apostles to have expired. But, after this, she [the Church] will be victoriously exalted in the sight of all doubters.” --- (found in paragraph 33 in Catholic Prophecy, compiled by Yves Dupont, 1971) from **St. Nicholas of Fluh, circa 1520.**

And then these ominous lines from Pope Pius XII circa 1957:

“I am worried by the Blessed Virgin's messages to Lucy of Fatima. This persistence of Mary about the dangers which menace the Church is a divine warning against the suicide of altering the Faith, in Her liturgy ... A day will come when the civilized world will deny its God, when the Church will doubt as Peter doubted. She will be tempted to believe that man has become God ... **In our churches, Christians will search in vain for the red lamp where God awaits them, like Mary Magdalene weeping before the empty tomb, they will ask, 'Where have they taken Him?'**... I hear all around me innovators who wish to dismantle the Sacred Chapel, destroy the universal flame of the Church, reject her ornaments and make her feel remorse for her historical past” (Msgr. Georges Roche, *Pie XII*;

Devant L'Histoire, Éditions Robert Laffont, S.A., 6 place Saint-Sulpice, Paris, 1972, pages 52-53).

Based on the evidence in this pamphlet, which is merely a compilation of the teachings and words of Popes and Councils, together with easily verifiable facts, -- St. Nicholas of Fluh and Pope Pius XII were not describing some far off and distant time. No! But rather they were describing the era which we have already lived through, and the times which we are still witnessing before our eyes.

Chapter 27

Catholics in times of persecution, whether physical or mental, still have a right to the sacraments of the Church, if they can find them, and the Church provides for her children who live through such times.

When the Bishops, or people purporting to be bishops who are sitting in the Bishops' chairs, withdraw proper Catholic worship from your parish Church, you still have a right to the true Mass, the true sacraments, and the spiritual helps of the Church – just as you had the day before the Catholic worship was withdrawn.

Catholics in England, circa 1534, were one week able to go to their parish Church, and the next week not able to attend the Church they grew up in, once King Henry VIII declared that every Catholic in England had to recognize him as the head of the Church of England. This was a schismatic act, and no Catholic could go along with it in good conscience.

Even so, only a handful of the prominent, such as St. Thomas Moore and Bishop John Fisher, resisted the blatant schism of King Henry VIII, and were beheaded for their trouble.

* * * * *

Before proceeding, let's look at another period of history, the period of the Arian Heresy circa 380 AD, when those acting faithfully to the Church were reduced to a handful. Like in England under King Henry VIII, or in France at the time of the French Revolution, these times show us that such periods of extreme deception and extreme duress for the faithful do happen, are possible, and in no way adversely affect Christ's promise to be with the Church always. (Nor can one do what a Catholic should do in such periods by just refusing to look into what's going on, and going along with the crowd.)

Chapter 28

St. Athanasius and the apostate Bishops in the time of the Arian Heresy, circa 380 A.D.

In 1970, Catholic author, Fr. William Jurgens wrote:

“At one point in the Church’s history, only a few years before Gregory’s [Nazianz] present preaching (+380 A.D.), perhaps the number of Catholic bishops in possession of sees, as opposed to Arian bishops in possession of sees, was no greater than something between 1% and 3% of the total. Had doctrine been determined by popularity, today we should all be deniers of Christ and opponents of the Spirit.”

“In the time of the Emperor Valens (4th century), Basil was virtually the only orthodox Bishop in all the East who succeeded in retaining charge of his see... If it has no other importance for modern man, **a knowledge of the history of Arianism should demonstrate at least that the Catholic Church takes no account of popularity and numbers in shaping and maintaining doctrine:** else, we should long since have had to abandon Basil and Hilary and Athanasius and Liberius and Ossius and call ourselves after Arius.”

The Arian heresy became so widespread in the 4th century that the Arians (who denied the Divinity of Christ) came to occupy almost all the Catholic churches and appeared to be the legitimate hierarchy basically everywhere.

St. Ambrose (+382):

“There are not enough hours in the day for me to recite even the names of all the various sects of heretics.”

Things were so bad that St. Gregory Nazianz felt compelled to say what the Catholic remnant today could very well say:

“Against the Arians” (+380): “Where are they who revile us for our poverty and pride themselves in their riches? **They who define the Church by numbers and scorn the little flock?**”

“This period of Church history, therefore, proves an important point for our time: If the Church's indefectible mission of teaching, *governing* and sanctifying required a governing (i.e., jurisdictional) bishop for the Church of Christ to be present and operative in a particular see or diocese, then one would have to say that the Church of Christ **defected** in all those territories

where there was no governing Catholic bishop during the Arian heresy. However, it is a fact that in the 4th century, **where the faithful retained the true Catholic faith, even in those sees where the bishop defected to Arianism**, the faithful Catholic remnant constituted the true Church of Christ. In that remnant, the Catholic Church existed and endured in her mission to teach, govern and sanctify without a governing bishop, thus proving that **the Church of Christ's indefectibility and mission to teach, govern and sanctify does not require the presence of a jurisdictional bishop**. (End of quote from Fr. William Jurgens, *The Faith of the Early Fathers*, Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1970, Vol. 2.)

And, in the midst of the Arian persecution and the deception successfully perpetrated on the vast majority of the true Bishops, St. Athanasius wrote this letter to his flock about the situation, himself being in exile from his See at the time:

“May God console you! ... What saddens you ... is the fact that others have occupied the churches by violence, while during this time you are on the outside.

“It is a fact that they have the premises – but you have the Apostolic Faith. They can occupy our churches, but they are outside the true Faith. You remain outside the places of worship, but the Faith dwells within you.

“Let us consider: what is more important, the place or the Faith? The true Faith, obviously. Who has lost and who has won in the struggle – the one who keeps the premises or the one who keeps the Faith? True, the premises are good when the Apostolic Faith is preached there; they are holy if everything takes place there in a holy way ...

“You are the ones who are happy; you who remain within the Church by your Faith, who hold firmly to the foundations of the Faith which has come down to you from Apostolic Tradition. And if an execrable jealousy has tried to shake it on a number of occasions, it has not succeeded.

“They are the ones who have broken away from it in the present crisis. No one, ever, will prevail against your Faith, beloved Brothers. And we believe that some day, God will give us back our churches.

“Thus, the more violently they try to occupy the places of worship, the more they separate themselves from the Church. They claim that they represent the Church; but in reality, they are the ones who are expelling themselves from it and going astray. *Even if Catholics faithful to Tradition are reduced to a handful, they are the ones who are the*

true Church of Jesus Christ.” (End of Letter of St. Athanasius to his flock, circa 380 A.D., found in: St. Athanasius, Letter to the Faithful of Alexandria - Coll. Selecta SS. Eccl. Patrum. Caillu and Guillou, Vol. 32)

And this relevant and important passage:

“Persecution purifies the Church; even if millions fall away, it is not a loss but a cleansing”. (Reverend Francis Spirago & Richard F Clarke, S.J., “The Catechism Explained”, 1899, Benziger Brothers, New York, page 236)

And this:

"Indeed, the true friends of the people are neither revolutionaries, nor innovators: they are traditionalists." (**Pope St. Pius X**, “Notre Charge Apostolique”, 15 August 1910)

(Note: Pope St. Pius X was clearly talking about those who were obeying St. Paul’s command in the New Testament to “hold fast to the traditions you have received”, -- as he could have not been referring to the motley amalgam of people calling themselves “traditionalists” after Vatican II, which includes both pious Catholics, arrogant opportunists, and outright frauds.)

Chapter 29

We must obey our parents and our lawful superiors, EXCEPT in a Command to Sin

**The Following is from the Baltimore Catechism, No. 3, Lesson 33,
“From the 4th to the 7th Commandment:**

Q. 1259. What are we commanded by the fourth Commandment?

A. We are commanded by the fourth Commandment to honor, love and obey our parents in all that is not sin.

Q. 1260. Why should we refuse to obey parents or superiors who command us to sin?

A. We should refuse to obey parents or superiors who command us to sin because they are not then acting with God's authority, but contrary to it and in violation of His laws.

Q. 1261. Are we bound to honor and obey others than our parents?

A. We are also bound to honor and obey our bishops, pastors, magistrates, teachers, and other lawful superiors.

Q. 1262. Who are meant by magistrates?

A. By magistrates are meant all officials of whatever rank who have a lawful right to rule over us and our temporal possessions or affairs.

Q. 1263. Who are meant by lawful superiors?

A. By lawful superiors are meant all persons to whom we are in any way subject, such as employers or others under whose authority we live or work . . .

Q. 1266. If parents or superiors neglect their duty or abuse their authority in any particular, should we follow their direction and example in that particular?

A. If parents or superiors neglect their duty or abuse their authority in any particular we should not follow their direction or example in that particular, but follow the dictates of our conscience in the performance of our duty.

Section 5:

**How the Church may still
function even when
reduced to a handful and
exiled from her visible
structures**

Chapter 30

Canon 2261: The Faithful may ask a Priest to Administer the sacraments for any Just Reason, and when such a legitimate request is made by the faithful, the Church provides the jurisdiction necessary for the Priest to perform the sacrament

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

CANON 2261 – INOPERATIVE OR SUSPENDED PRIESTLY FACULTIES ARE RE-ACTIVATED FOR THE PRIEST WHENEVER THE FAITHFUL IN NEED REQUEST THE SACRAMENTS FROM HIM.

The following canon from the 1917 Code of Canon Law states that Catholics can ask for the sacraments or sacramentals from any lawful, valid priest, for any just reason, especially if there is no other minister available. Here is the relevant canon:

CANON 2261, PARAGRAPH 2

And here is the commentary on it:

Canon 2261 (Rev. P. Charles Augustine’s “A Commentary On Canon Law”) says: “Provided the minister [priest] is not a vitandus [that is, a censured cleric to be avoided] or under a declaratory or condemnatory sentence, the faithful may, for any just reason, ask him to administer the Sacraments and sacramentals to them. This is more especially true if no other minister is available ... the faithful are to judge in such cases whether the reason is just. Any reason may be called just which promotes devotion or wards off temptations or is prompted by a real convenience, for instance, if one does not like to call another minister” (page 182).

Chapter 31

Canon 1098: After a 30 day period of searching, it is lawful to get a priest from outside the diocese to perform a Catholic wedding ceremony, if it is possible to do so

CANON 1098 – WHEN NO LOCAL PRIEST IS AVAILBALE TO WITNESS THE EXCHANGE OF MARRIAGE VOWS AND PERFORM THE RITES OF MATRIMONY A PRIEST FORM OUTSIDE THE DIOCESE MAY BE ENGAGED.

Rev. P. Charles Augustine’s “A Commentary On Canon Law” explains that, according to Canon 1098, WHEN THERE IS NO PRIEST, OR WHEN NO PRIEST WILL SAY A CATHOLIC WEDDING MASS in your area, IT IS LAWFUL AND COMMANDED TO REQUEST A PRIEST FROM OUTSIDE THE DIOCESE TO OFFICIATE AT THE WEDDING.

Here is the Commentary:

Canon 1098 maintains that, “If the pastor, or the Ordinary, or a priest delegated by either [to witness a marriage] ...cannot be had without great inconvenience, then ... marriage may be validly and licitly contracted in the presence of two witnesses ... provided it may be prudently foreseen that this condition of things [unavailability of a local diocesan priest] will last for a month ... [however] ... a priest should be called who can be present. This priest may be any priest, even one ... of some other diocese ...” (Rev. P. Charles Augustine’s “A Commentary On Canon Law” pages 294-95).

Chapter 32

Canon 1101: The Requirement of the Church for couples to get the Nuptial Blessing at the Time of Their Wedding Mass, if possible.

CANON 1101 - THE REQUIREMENT OF THE NUPTIAL BLESSING

Canon 1101 (Rev. P. Charles Augustine's "A Commentary On Canon Law") stipulates that Catholic couples seeking marriage are obliged to receive the solemn Nuptial Blessing (which is ordinarily conferred during the Nuptial Mass). In 1892, the Holy Office ruled that absolution may be denied to those who refuse to receive the blessing (pages 305-306). Catholic couples are obliged to obtain the Nuptial Blessing at the very outset of their marriage. If this is not available to them from a priest from their local diocese then, they have no choice but to seek a priest from outside their diocese who will offer the authentic rites of the Church, provide the couple with the traditional Nuptial Blessing, and witness their marriage.

By disregarding the anti-Catholic commands of today's apostate "bishops", Catholics honor the true authority of the Catholic Church and all the true Popes, from Christ until the present. The heresiarchs of the conciliar church are brazenly defiant of the irrevocable command of a canonized Pope, St. Pius V, by preventing Catholics from having access to the canonized Mass of the Church and by forbidding priests to offer it. The perpetually-binding law of the Church regarding adherence to the ancient Roman and Apostolic Mass is exceedingly clear and the penalties for non-compliance are frighteningly severe:

"Specifically, do we warn all persons in authority of whatever dignity or rank, Cardinals not excluded, and command them as a matter of strict obedience never to use or permit any ceremonies or Mass prayers other than the ones contained in this Missal ... At no time in the future can a priest, whether secular or order priest, ever be forced to use any other way of saying Mass. And in order once and for all to preclude any scruples of conscience and fear of ecclesiastical penalties and censures, we declare herewith that it is by virtue of our Apostolic authority that we decree and prescribe that this present order and decree of ours is to last in perpetuity, and never at a future date can it be revoked or amended legally ... And if, nevertheless, anyone would dare attempt any action contrary to this order of ours, handed down for all times, let him know that he has incurred the wrath of Almighty God, and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul." (St. Pius V, "Quo Primum", July 14, 1570)

Chapter 33

Canon 883: Traveling priests have jurisdiction for 3 days after arriving at their final destination; and if there is no functioning local Bishop, they retain their jurisdiction indefinitely.

Canon 883 – Extension of a Priest’s Faculties beyond his Diocese.

Canon 883 provides for the extension of jurisdiction to priests traveling outside their dioceses while en route, and for three additional days upon arrival at their destination. Senior priests who have had ordinary jurisdiction since before Vatican II and from true and lawful bishops, would be duly authorized to carry out the functions of his priesthood; to absolve penitents, solemnize marriages and administer the Sacraments of the Catholic Church, according to the precepts of Canons 2261, 1098, and 883.

CONCLUSION

Thus for anyone of good will who will study the above material and be intellectually honest, it will be clear to them that it is still possible for valid and lawful Catholic priests to function in a manner consistent with the spirit *AND* the letter of Canon Law and according to the mind of the Church even under the extraordinary circumstances with which we were confronted, namely, during the imposition of false worship on all the dioceses in the USA for all daily liturgies, all funerals, and all wedding ceremonies.

Finally, regarding what the faithful are facing during these last several decades of revolutionary changes, I repeat the line which I believe is the most important sentence written about the crisis in the Church since the beginning of the ecclesiastical crisis spawned by Vatican II and the New Mass:

“This false church of darkness could not deceive the faithful if it did not present to the world its own false ‘pope’ or succession of ‘popes’ as the ‘legitimate’ authority in the Catholic Church.” (From the article: “The Pope Who Will Wear Red”, by Mr. Gary Giuffré, 1988.)

* * * * *

I believe that the present crisis will be resolved somehow by the triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, after perhaps a Great Chastisement.

Let it also be noted that, because of Masonic threats against the Vatican in 1870, the First Vatican Council was never ended, but only suspended. When the smoke clears, the First Vatican Council could be reconvened to condemn Vatican II and all the acts of the Vatican II antipopes. This would show in a way that everyone could understand that Vatican II was NOT an operation of the Catholic Church, but of an anti-Church now occupying the Vatican since 1958.

Let us close with the wonderfully insightful quote from the late Fr. Urban Snyder, the Benedictine Monk who spent his last days in Kentucky.

The late Benedictine monk, Fr. Urban Snyder, gave the definitive answer to any and all who might object to even the discussion of the possibility that a counterfeit church has already usurped the Vatican – or even the Chair of Peter itself:

“ The Church is the Mystical Christ and as such must relive through the ages the mysteries of the Saviour’s life, Good Friday not excepted. Calvary is the essence of the mystery of Redemption . . .

“. . . those writers do a great disservice to souls who assert that this or that thing cannot happen to the Church, or the Papacy, or the majority of the faithful. When Peter spoke like that, the Lord said to him: ‘Get thee behind Me, Satan.’ Mutatis mutandis, anything can happen to the Church, and in fact may be predicted to happen, if it happened in the life of Our Lord. For the Church is His Mystical Body and the disciple is not above the Master . . .

“It follows therefore that the Church can be betrayed and made a prisoner; can be buffeted, spat upon, be made to look a fool; she can be defamed, abandoned, condemned; she can be damaged structurally and disfigured, like the Lord’s physical members were; in a word, she can be crucified and [seemingly] put to death – but not for long!

“From three o’clock on Good Friday until three A.M. on Easter was only thirty-six hours. And as there was a faithful remnant left to Jesus even then, so will it be in the Good Friday of the Church; there will be a faithful few to wait in sorrow for the Church’s Resurrection, which will burst like lightning upon God’s enemies.” (From Kyrie Eleison Newsletter, 19 March 1974)

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ The End ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Appendix I:

Other Important Authoritative Quotes

Pope Gregory XVI, in his 1832 encyclical, *Mirari Vos*, stated:

“. . . nothing of the things appointed ought to be diminished, nothing changed, nothing added; but they must be preserved both as regards expression and meaning.”

Pope Leo XIII, in his *Satis Cognitum* of 1896, declared:

“You are not to be looked upon as holding the true Catholic Faith if you do not teach that the faith of Rome is to be held.”

St. Robert Bellarmine, in his *De Romano Pontifice*, II, 30, taught:

“. . . for men are not bound, or able to read hearts, but when they see that someone is a heretic by his external works, they judge him to be a heretic pure and simple, and condemn him as a heretic.”

Pope Pius IX, in his encyclical, *Quartus Supra* of 1873, declared:

“It has always been the custom of heretics and schismatics to call themselves Catholics and to proclaim their many excellences in order to lead people and princes into error.”

It is well known traditional Catholic doctrine that ecclesiastical discipline can never be harmful or dangerous to the faithful, as was taught by Pius VI's condemnation of the heretical Jansenist proposition to the contrary. (Pope Pius VI, *Auctorem Fidei*, 1794)

According to **Pope Gregory XVI**:

“...the discipline sanctioned by the Church must never be rejected” (Gregory XVI, *Mirari Vos*, 1832)

Pope Gregory XVI admonished those like today's apologists of the SSPX who state:

“... categorically that there are many things in the discipline of the Church... [which] are harmful for the growth and prosperity of the Catholic religion... these men were shamefully straying in their thoughts, they proposed to fall upon the errors condemned by the Church in proposition 78 of the constitution *Auctorem fidei* (published by Our predecessor, Pius VI on August

28, 1794)..... do they not try to make the Church human by taking away from the infallible and divine authority, by which divine will it is governed? And does it not produce the same effect to think that the present discipline of the Church rests on failures, obscurities, and other inconveniences of this kind?

And to feign that this discipline contains many things which are not useless but which are against the safety of the Catholic religion? Why is it that private individuals appropriate for themselves the right which is proper only for the pope?" (Pope Gregory XVI, *Quo Graviora*, 1833)

I also refer you to the 1909 Catholic Encyclopedia, written under the papacy of Pope St. Pius X, from an article entitled "Ecclesiastical Discipline", under the heading "DISCIPLINARY INFALLIBILITY" (<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05030a.htm>)

Here's an excerpt...

"[Disciplinary Infallibility] has, however, found a place in all recent treatises on the Church. The authors of these treatises decide unanimously in favor of a negative and indirect rather than a positive and direct infallibility, inasmuch as in her general discipline, i.e. the common laws imposed on all the faithful, the Church can prescribe nothing that would be contrary to the natural or the Divine law, nor prohibit anything that the natural or the Divine law would exact. If well understood this thesis is undeniable; it amounts to saying that the Church does not and cannot impose practical directions contradictory of her own teaching."

From P. Hermann's *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae* vol. 1, p. 258 (1908), we read:

"The Church is infallible in her general discipline. By the term general discipline is understood the laws and practices which belong to the external ordering of the whole Church. Such things would be those which concern either external worship, such as liturgy and rubrics, or the administration of the sacraments. . . ."If she [the Church] were able to prescribe or command or tolerate in her discipline something against faith and morals, or something which tended to the detriment of the Church or to the harm of the faithful, she would turn away from her divine mission, which would be impossible."

Pope Pius VI, in his 1791 encyclical, *Charitas*, taught:

"Finally, in one word, stay close to Us. For no one can be in the Church of Christ without being in unity with its visible head and founded on the See of Peter."(51)

Pope Leo XIII, in his 1896 encyclical, *Satis Cognitum*, taught:

“Therefore if a man does not want to be, or to be called, a heretic, let him not strive to please this or that man... but let him hasten before all things to be in communion with the Roman See.”(52)

“There is nothing more grievous than the sacrilege of schism....there can be no just necessity for destroying the unity of the Church” (S. Augustinus, *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani*, lib. ii., cap. ii., n. 25).

St Pius X, to the priests of the Apostolic Union, 18th November 1912, AAS 1912, p. 695.

“When one loves the pope one does not stop to debate about what he advises or demands, to ask how far the rigorous duty of obedience extends and to mark the limit of this obligation. When one loves the pope, one does not object that he has not spoken clearly enough, as if he were obliged to repeat into the ear of each individual his will, so often clearly expressed, not only *viva voce*, but also by letters and other public documents; one does not call his orders into doubt on the pretext – easily advanced by whoever does not wish to obey - that they emanate not directly from him, but from his entourage; one does not limit the field in which he can and should exercise his will; one does not oppose to the authority of the pope that of other persons, however learned, who differ in opinion from the pope. Besides, however great their knowledge, their holiness is wanting, *for there can be no holiness where there is disagreement with the pope.*”

Appendix II:

A section from Patrick Henry Omlor on why the mistranslation of “pro multis” to “for all” constitutes a sacrilege, and possible invalidity, even if one looks to those who advocated the now-condemned “short form” consecration (i.e., “This is the Chalice of My Blood” only is enough to achieve consecration of the wine) throughout history

From Patrick Henry Omlor’s article on the “pro multis” issue:

“Not one of all the reputable ‘short form’ exponents, both past and present, would deny that the consecration could possibly be rendered invalid by a substantial change of meaning introduced in the remaining words of the form, even though they did not consider those remaining words essential. A single example will be more than enough to drive home this point. Suppose a priest were to substitute the word “old” for “new” in the wine-consecration:

“For this is the Chalice of My Blood, of the OLD and eternal testament....”

Clearly that substituted word, “old”, now being part of the same utterance that begins with “For this is the Chalice of My Blood,” in effect blasphemously denies the true propitiatory nature of Christ's Sacrifice on Calvary by putting the shedding of His Precious Blood in the same category as the shedding of the blood of animals under the Old Law, which was nowise efficacious for the atonement of sins.

Granting, hypothetically, that the word “multis” is not essential for validity, the substitution of “omnibus” (“all”) in place of “multis” (“many”) nevertheless invalidates the consecration just as would the substitution of “old” for “new”, as will now be demonstrated.

As was seen earlier, the words “pro vobis et pro multis” (“for you and for many”) designate the members of the Mystical Body. The counterfeit word “all” signifies falsely, because it cannot and does not signify the members of Christ's Mystical Body, which consists of MANY members only, not all persons.

In the example given previously it is clear that the word “old” destroys the signification of the propitiatory nature of Our Lord's sacrifice of the New Testament, which is renewed in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. That dogma was thereby implicitly denied, because whenever something that was perennially in place is suppressed, it must be assumed that its denial is intended. In like manner, the words, “for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven,” deny the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ -- whose members are the sole heirs of the Holy Eucharist -- by suppressing the divinely-established signification of that doctrine in the sacramental form of the Holy Eucharist.

Appendix III:

An Important Book on the “Ordinary and Universal Magisterium” given an imprimatur under Pope Pius XII

From a speech by Mr. John Daly entitled, “The Impossible Crisis”, delivered in the USA in New York City in 2002:

“There are a great many books that cover the different ways in which the Church teaches the faithful and the different ways in which her teaching binds them, but the main guide I want to use in this topic is one that very few of you will have heard of – and yet it has the very highest authority. It’s called *De Valore Notarum Theologicarum – On the Meaning of Theological Qualifications* - by Fr Sixtus Cartechini. The special significance of this work is that it was written for the use of the Roman Congregations in evaluating the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of different doctrines. It was published at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome in 1951. It is based on the standard doctrines of the great theologians and of the popes themselves on these topics, and it immediately became a standard work and remained so until John XXIII decided that the era of condemning false doctrines was at an end.

“I shall rely on Fr. Cartechini very heavily, because what he says is standard teaching. Anyone who doubts what he says can check it in countless other sources.

“The first three chapters of Fr. Cartechini’s work are about defined dogmas – extraordinary Magisterium. Chapter 4 is called *What the Ordinary Magisterium is and how dogmas can be proved from it, or concerning divine and Catholic faith founded on the Ordinary Magisterium*. The title is already eloquent – it tells us that dogmas, requiring the highest assent of faith, can be proved from the Ordinary Magisterium as well as the extraordinary.

“Fr. Cartechini explains that there are three different ways in which the ordinary Magisterium can communicate to Catholics what they must believe as of faith.

“*First*, he says, the ordinary Magisterium is exercised through its express doctrine communicated by the pope or by the bishops to the faithful throughout the whole world *without* the use of formal definitions. And he gives a list of doctrines concerning faith and morals infallibly taught by the ordinary Magisterium as divinely revealed. Several of them are simply proposed in papal encyclicals.

“*Secondly*, he says, the ordinary Magisterium is exercised by the *implicit teaching contained in the Church’s life or practice*. He points out that the

Church here follows Christ Himself who also taught certain points by His acts, for instance the duty to honour His Mother Mary. And under this head he refers especially to the colossal doctrinal status of the liturgy. “The liturgy does not create dogmas, but it expresses dogmas because in her manner of praising God or praying to Him the Church expresses what and how and according to what concepts God wants to be publicly worshipped....[so] the Church *cannot* permit that things should be said in the liturgy in her name that are contrary to what she herself holds or believes.” (p.37)

“Fr. Cartechini also mentions the Church’s laws as a source of infallible teaching of the ordinary and universal Magisterium though the Church’s life and practice. “..., neither general councils nor the pope can establish laws that include sin...and nothing could be included in the *Code of Canon Law* that is in any way opposed to the rules of faith or to evangelical holiness.

“*Finally*, there is the *third* way in which the Church exercises her infallible ordinary Magisterium: through the tacit approval the Church grants to the teaching of the fathers, the doctors and the theologians. If a doctrine is diffused throughout the whole Church, without objection, this means that the Church tacitly approves that doctrine. Otherwise the whole Church could and would inevitably err in faith.”

(End of quote from that speech by John Daly)

And here is another source mentioned by Mr. Daly in response to an email from me:

“-----Original Message-----

“**From:** John DALY [mailto:john.daly@wanadoo.fr]

Sent: Wednesday, August 13, 2008 4:53 AM

To: Jim Condit Jr.

Subject: Re: Question from Jim Condit Jr.

“Dear Jim,

“Unfortunately most of the best material on the subject of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium is in French. One good study is Dom Paul Nau's *The Ordinary Magisterium of the Church Theologically Considered*. The English translation of this has been republished by the Angelus Press bound together with a study by Canon Berthod which is quite disastrous, but you could get the Angelus edition and just read the Nau part, ignoring the Berthod part. In French there is Fr Bernard Lucien's *Les degrés d'autorité du magistère*,(La Nef, 2007) which is as complete as they get. In Latin there is Cartechini's *De notis theologicis* which Tradibooks will shortly be republishing.

“I am also attaching my 2002 NY talk which contains a lot on this subject.

(Note : the passage quoted above in this Appendix III is from this 2002 talk.)

“Unfortunately I can't offer you a copy of the Michael Davies book, but I am intending to republish it in several parts, incorporating some adaptations. Again, keep your eye on <http://www.lulu.com/tradibooks> .

“Sorry not to be more helpful.

“In Dño et Dña,

“John”

Appendix IV:

Important Annotations from the ORIGINAL Douay-Rheims Bible in 1582 regarding commentaries of the Douay-Rheims Fathers on the Possibility of the Usurpation of the Vatican by Antipopes who would dare to abolish the Mass:

Cardinal William Allen, Fathers Thomas Worthington, Richard Bristow, John Reynolds and Gregory Martin, “Annotations,” *The New Testament*, 1582, The English College of Rhemes, John Fogy:

“ . . . the abomination of desolation foretold, was partly fulfilled in diverse profanations of the Temple of Jerusalem, when the sacrifice and service of God was taken away. But specially it shall be fulfilled by Antichrist and his Precursors, when **they shall abolish the holy Mass, which is the Sacrifice Of Christ’s Body and Blood, and the only sovereign worship due to God in His Church . . .** By which it is plain that the heretics of those days will be special fore-runners of Antichrist” (commentary on Matthew 24:15, page 71).

(My note: please note that the Douay-Rheims Fathers allowed that the “Precursors” and “special fore-runners” of Antichrist may try to abolish the Mass, not just Antichrist himself.)

“Antichrist . . . shall rule over the whole world, and specifically prohibit that principal worship instituted by Christ in His Sacraments . . . by taking away the sacrifice of the altar . . .” (commentary on II Thessalonians 2:3-4, page 558).

“St. Augustine . . . and St. Jerome . . . think that this sitting of Antichrist in the temple, doth signify his sitting in the Church of Christ, rather than in Solomon’s temple. Not as though he should be a chief member of the Church of Christ . . . But . . . that **this Antichristian revolt here spoken of, is from the Catholic Church: and Antichrist, if he ever were of or in the Church, shall be a renegade out of the Church, and he shall usurp upon it by tyranny, and by challenging worship, religion, and government thereof . . .** And this is to sit in the temple or against the Temple of God, as some interpret. If any Pope did ever this, or shall do, then let the Adversaries [*Protestants*] call him Antichrist” (commentary on II Thessalonians 2:3-4, page 558).

(My note: While the Douay-Rheims Fathers state in the last sentence above that “if any Pope did ever this”, they make it clear below that such a “Pope” would not be the true Pope, but a usurping antipope – for below they state that, “. . . yet even then shall neither the Church of Rome, nor the Pope of Rome be Antichrist, but shall be persecuted by Antichrist, and driven out of Rome . . .”)

“ . . . in the beginning of the Church, Nero and the rest of the persecuting Emperors (which were figures of Antichrist) did principally sit **in Rome, so also the great Antichrist shall have his seat there**, as it may well be (though others think that Jerusalem rather shall be his principal city) yet even then shall **neither the Church of Rome, nor the Pope of Rome be Antichrist, but shall be persecuted by Antichrist, and driven out of Rome**, if it be possible. For, to Christ’s Vicar and the Roman Church he will bear as much good will as the Protestants now do, and he shall have more power to persecute him and the Church, than they have” (commentary on The Apocalypse 17:5, page 731).

Appendix V:

The First Duty of the Faithful in Time of Abnormal Crisis: to find the true Pope

Fathers Charles G. Herbermann, Ph.D., LL.D., Edward Pace, Ph.D., D.D., Condé B. Pallen, Ph.D., LL.D., Thomas Shahan, D.D. & John Wynne, S.J., “The Catholic Encyclopedia”, Vol. IV, 1908, The Encyclopedia Press, New York:

“A council in opposition to the pope is not representative of the whole Church, for it neither represents the pope who opposes it, nor the absent bishops, who cannot act beyond the limits of their dioceses except through the pope. A council not only acting independently of the Vicar of Christ, but sitting in judgment over him, is unthinkable in the constitution of the Church; in fact, **such assemblies have only taken place in times of great constitutional disturbances, when either there was no pope or the rightful pope was indistinguishable from antipopes. In such abnormal times the safety of the Church becomes the supreme law, and the first duty of the abandoned flock is to find a new shepherd, under whose direction the existing evils may be remedied**” (page 426).

(My note: This is obviously not meant to be an endorsement of the crack-pot “conclaves” initiated out of thin air by such as David Bawden or the late Elizabeth Gerstner, and clearly any resolution of the current crisis in the Church will of necessity have to carry the clear stamp of Divine approval. However, the above authoritative instruction written 50 years before the Papal Conclave of 1958, is a stinging rebuke to those who recognize that John XXIII through Benedict XVI are antipopes, but still say: “What difference is all this to me? What is the relevance to me whether or not the “Siri Thesis” is true or not?” This has all too often been the response of “sedevacantist” or “vacant chair” Catholics, especially various “traditionalist” clergy who have adamantly and consistently ridiculed those who are interested in investigating the “scene of the crime”, i.e., the conclave beginning on October 26, 1958. Clearly, the above writers tell us that when the Pope or the location of the Papacy has been obscured, our first duty is “to find a new shepherd, under whose direction the existing evils may be remedied”.)

Appendix VI:

Obstinate Denial of Known Truth: One of the six sins against the Holy Ghost.

Obstinate Denial of Known Truth is one of the six deadly sins against the Holy Ghost.

Those who, after seeing this information and understanding it, obstinately deny that the false translation in consecration of the wine in the English version of the “New Mass” (i.e., mistranslating Christ’s words “for many” as “for all”, consistently condemned by the Popes and the Councils of the Church) – turns the New Mass into false worship, a sacrilege, and an invalid ceremony – are denying known truth.

This sin moves one towards a spiritual condition which includes darkening of the intellect and an inability to achieve final repentance before death.

St. Thomas Aquinas writes about this sin in the Summa Theologica, which can be found at this web page:

<http://www.newadvent.org/summa/3014.htm>

(My note: Those who do see the sinfulness of altering Christ’s words in the consecration of the wine, as was done by antipope Paul VI in 1967 and with more force in 1969, would then acknowledge that we (Jim Condit Jr. and Kathie Kleiner) did the only thing that a young couple could morally do in the USA in 1978 – find a priest, even from outside the diocese, who would witness their wedding, offer the Nuptial Mass and administer the Nuptial Blessing, if that were possible, which, by the grace of God, it was, in our case.)

And, finally, here is a quote from “Pastoral Council” by Gary Giuffré regarding obstinate denial of known truth:

“This may cause them to veer dangerously close to one or two of the ‘Six Sins Against the Holy Ghost’, despair and deliberate resistance to known truth, which can darken the intellect and harden the soul against the inspirations of God’s grace [which often leads to final impenitence – the last and most deadly Sin Against the Holy Ghost].”

Regarding the Church’s teaching on the sinfulness of “for all” in the consecration of the wine – those who have now been shown what is the Church’s clear teaching, yet refuse to acknowledge it, and the consequences which flow therefrom, are flirting with obstinate denial of known truth in this crucial matter, which thus dishonors the words of Christ Himself when He instituted the consecration of the wine. †