

New Mass or Protestant Service?

NOVUS ORDO SACRILEGES, PART 1

Since 1969, the Catholic Church has been bound by Church law to use the new rite of Mass approved by the Vatican and promulgated by Pope Paul VI. Before that, the law was that only the Latin Mass sanctioned by the Council of Trent, called the Tridentine Mass though it is much older, and enforced by Pope St Pius V in 1570 in the bull, Quo Primum Tempore, could be used. The Latin Mass required that the priest keep his back to the people while at the altar, it had many prayers to saints in it, it made transubstantiation absolutely clear, forbade the vernacular, forbade communion in the hand or under both kinds. The New Mass changed all this. The Latin Mass just had one prayer for turning the bread and wine into God and offering it to God but the New Mass has four basic ones and many others have been added.

In the Apostolic Constitution - Missale Romanum, Paul is alleged to have made it the law for the new form of celebrating Mass to be used. There are three ways the law commanding the Latin Mass could be done away. One is by repealing it. The other, derogation, is partly abolishing it by modifying it. The last is by abrogation, replacing existing legislation with new.

Not far from the end, he declares that he and the commission give the force of law to what he has set forth concerning the new Mass. This however is a perversion of the original Latin version. The original says that they just want to draw attention to one major thought about the new Roman missal which happens to be its ability to bind the Church together in unity.

It seems that in his Apostolic Constitution, the only thing Paul could have done to make the new mass legal was derogation. The last line says that they order the prescriptions in the document to go into effect on November 30 that year. The derogation would mean then that the law of Pius V was still in force and the Latin Mass couldn't be banned or done away with and used alongside the New Mass. Yet the pope and the Vatican enforced the New Mass on the Church and banned the old Latin Mass which was definitely heretical and uncanonical. Pius V commanded that there should only be one rite of Mass and that if any printer altered it even a bit they were to be excommunicated and fined and the purpose of all this was to "preserve incorrupt the Church's public worship and we have strived with God's help by every means given to us to make that happen" in Quo Primum Tempore. The reason for this was to make sure the Mass preserved and incorporated Catholic dogma without any error or ambiguity. There can be no doubt that because the faith comes first any pope who opens the way to corrupted masses and new prayers being added that could be heretical is disobeying Pius V and his activities are condemned and invalid if he tries to enforce them as if they were law.

But was the derogation valid? It could be argued that the derogation was invalid because he just says we order which may or may not mean that this is a command with full legal force. A law that is not enacted right is not binding for you can't be sure if it is a law. Nothing then in the Apostolic Constitutions carries the force of law. Also, he did not say what was happening to the previous law. Was the new law temporary? Was the old law to be kept alongside the new one? The order is not explicit on this so it was not legally binding or was not a law. Read Society of St Pius X, St John's Bulletin, April - June 1994 chapter 5 THE LEGAL STATUS OF THE TRADITIONAL LATIN MASS. Paul VI said that the new Mass is to be celebrated for it preserves the substance of the old rites - this isn't true so when his reason for asking that it be celebrated is mistaken his asking cannot have any valid force of law even should he attempt to make it law.

The law of the Church says that only good laws are truly legal. If the new Mass is evil or heretical or harmfully ambiguous then the pope broke the law and made a fake law.

The Constitution says that the new Mass is in keeping with the wish of Vatican II (in its document, Sacrosanctum Concilium) to make the Mass express what it means better. It says this wish is to be agreed with. But we cannot agree with this statement from Vatican II and agree with the new Mass which is ambiguous and abandons much Catholic dogma. This makes the Constitution invalid for it makes a law and then unmakes it. It is devoid of any legal power. Another proof of this is that the Constitution claims that the substance of the Mass is to be kept though it commands a new rite of Mass that can be recited by a heretic who denies that the bread and wine literally become Jesus and that he is sacrificed for sins in the Mass.

Read the Society of St Pius X article proving that there is nothing in current Catholic Canon Law or since Vatican II that makes it illegal for a priest to celebrate the Tridentine Mass without his bishop's permission.

Top Canon Lawyers of the Novos Ordo Church one of whom is Professor Neri Capponi has found Paul VI's alleged decree making the New Mass binding to be just an alleged one. Other problems are alterations of the pope's document. The only

thing that the pope decreed was that the bishops could decree when the new Mass should be used. A Commission of 9 cardinals in 1986 found that the Tridentine Latin Mass was not abrogated or illegal.

Nothing in the pope's decree does away with the old Mass. Read it www.communicate.co.uk/ne/tradition/page9.phtml.

A more serious problem is that the pope's decree only says about the changes to the words of consecration that are to be enforced and what the three new Eucharistic prayers are to be but doesn't say who must use this new revised Mass which means that it is not legally binding. You can't make valid or real laws unless you make it clear who these laws are binding on.

Disobedience to Paul VI would certainly be permissible legally and morally when he didn't even know his own mind. He was like a liberal who changed his mind all the time. In such cases the true Catholic would have to obey him only in so far as his rules were legal and fitted the outlook required of the Church by tradition, tradition being considered a form of the word of God in addition to the Bible.

Here are the abominations of the new Mass.

The bread and wine are offered to God at the offertory. The prayers make this clear. In the old Mass, the bread and wine are symbols of Jesus and are used to offer him but the bread and wine are not literally offered. Christians are not allowed to offer anything other than Jesus and what he does in them (Hebrews 10:11, 12, 18).

One of the responses made after the alleged turning of the bread and wine into God tells Jesus that when we eat this bread and drink this cup we proclaim his death. This implies that what went before was symbolism.

Eucharistic Prayer II asks God that the bread and wine will become for us the body and blood of Christ. This for us appears in the Roman Canon, of the Tridentine Mass as in the new one, when much the same prayer is made. In a Mass that is not clear about transubstantiation such as the new one it can be taken as a denial of the doctrine. Protestants hold that the bread and wine are to or for us the body and blood of Jesus, i.e. symbolically. The Latin Mass made transubstantiation clear so the same cannot be said of the for us in it.

Some heretics hold that the bread and wine don't become the body and blood of Jesus until the worthy person is about to eat and drink. The unworthy only get bread and wine. This new Mass is perfect for them.

The Prayer offers the saving bread and cup to God when they are supposed to be the resurrected Jesus. It is nonsense to do this if Jesus is really present. It makes more sense to offer his sacrifice instead of his resurrected body.

The Prayer praises God for making the congregation worthy to stand before him and serve him. Read Luke 18 on the parable of the Pharisee and the publican which condemns people who do that. This denies the Catholic doctrine that man cannot deserve salvation and grace. This is the Pelagian heresy so cherished by Modernists and Liberals.

Eucharistic Prayer III, says that all creation gives God praise. This implies that all are God's friends and will be saved. Presumably, sinners are only venial sinners.

The Prayer is careful not to make it clear that the sacrifice of Jesus is present and is the sacrifice that is offered to God. God is asked to accept the offering and then to see the victim who has put us right with him by dying. It is like saying, "Accept this offering of thanksgiving but see the other sacrifice, the one that Jesus made."

The preface of Eucharistic Prayer IV says that God leads all men to Heaven which denies the doctrine of Hell and if God wanted to lead all to Heaven he would have kept Jesus on this planet longer. And nobody would be dying in mortal sin.

The account of salvation history in it seems to say that Jesus came only to save us from physical death. Orthodox Roman Catholicism says that his main purpose was to save us from spiritual death, the condition of not being friends with God.

Again, after the consecration, the body and blood are offered. This may mean the body and blood on the cross not the altar which is orthodox enough.

The prayer does not mention the notion of the Mass being the sacrifice of Christ. It asks for the Church to become a sacrifice of praise and then it offers a sacrifice to God for it which must be the same one. If the sacrifice of Jesus is present then it is rude to concentrate on offering a lesser one. The prayer seems to be against the notion of the Mass and Calvary being the same.

The prayer says that the faith of the dead is known to God alone which denies the Roman doctrine that the saints and the

angels know what is inside us which infers that they cannot pray for our intentions.

The prayer ends with saying that we will sing to God forever with every creature which once more challenges the dogma of eternal punishing.

Before taking communion, the celebrant puts a piece of the host in the chalice and asks that this mingling of the body and blood of Jesus Christ may bring eternal life to those who receive it a prayer that was only introduced in the new rite. This is a strange prayer that can only mean that you cannot receive Jesus unless you take both kinds. This denies that Jesus is really present for where the body is the blood will be and affirms the Protestant heresy that communion under one kind is no use.

Thanks to that prayer, when the priest gives the host saying, "The Body of Christ", he means that the body of Jesus becomes present at that point but not necessarily that the bread is the body.

The New Order of Mass embodies heresy and its ambiguity itself is heresy for the Church is supposed to be clear and well grounded in the truth. It is not Catholic.

NOVUS ORDO SACRILEGES, PART 2

The Catholic Church has drawn up three Eucharistic prayers just for children and very young people.

The notion of the Mass being the sacrifice of the cross is not clearly mentioned.

In the first prayer, God is asked to care for everybody who is sick or in sorrow. "Remember everyone who is suffering from pain or sorrow." But God cannot help everybody if some deserve what they suffer. The God of this Mass is a God who does not punish and so does not seriously condemn sin. In that case, the notion of Jesus paying for our sins would be nonsense.

There are two Eucharistic Prayers for Reconciliation. One of them is the most unCatholic of the Eucharistic Prayers.

It is the Eucharistic Prayer for Reconciliation II.

It's first error is the theme of humanistic benefit captured perfectly in this quote, "Your Spirit is at work when understanding puts an end to strife, when hatred is quenched by mercy and vengeance gives way to forgiveness. For this we should never cease to thank and praise you". It is for the more important things that one should be eternally grateful for. God claims to be the most important thing in our lives so it is reconciliation with him that we must be forever thankful for and not reconciliation with one another. The prayer conflicts with Christ's command to love God with all one's strength. It is man-centred and not God-centred. A Mass celebrated by a priest who is inclined that way is invalid. He does not have the proper intention to celebrate the Mass right. He may intend to give grace but grace that misleads.

This Eucharistic Prayer is unique because of instead of asking God to make the gifts become the body and blood of Jesus it simply says, "We ask you to sanctify these gifts by the power of your Spirit, as we now fulfil your Son's command". It is prayed, "Fill us with his Spirit through our sharing in this meal". This Eucharist is a meal. If it is a sacrifice with the same value as Calvary then it is wrong to concentrate on the meal aspect instead of what is more important. When people go to take communion that is enough to show that it is a meal.

The sacrifice offered is the "sacrifice of reconciliation". This gift has been given to us. Reconciliation is offered not the offering Jesus made on the cross.

Prayers for the dead are completely dropped from this canon. There are no prayers to the saints.

The prayer can be recited by a Protestant who regards the Catholic Church and the pope as brethren in Christ.

The New Mass is heresy. Even if only one of its rites is heresy the whole thing is heresy when you are obliged to use the whole liturgy as if it were a whole. By using one of the Masses you are saying that it is all authorised and in concord with the designs of the Holy Spirit.

The Church used to teach that it is wrong to attend the Masses of heretics and schismatics except for a grave reason. Today, the pope and his Church are schismatics for they have left the Catholic Church by way of automatic excommunication. To attend their Masses is to encourage their turpitude. One would have more respect for the Mass by staying in the house and reading a good Catholic book and praying. God says he gives graces to compensate those who cannot go to Mass. There is no justification.

In 1984, the Church, or rather the Congregation for Divine Worship, permitted the celebration of the Latin Mass under strict conditions. Such a Mass is called the indult Mass. To celebrate it a priest had to have permission. This means the Church is saying that it is not right to celebrate it freely though it is. To celebrate under such circumstances is to understand that it is an exception which is evil. To celebrate it is to recognise the New Mass. The new law is a bait to lure traditionalists into the errors of the pope's new religion which makes it wrong for them to support it.

BOOKS CONSULTED

- Apologetics and Catholic Doctrine, Book 2, Most Rev M Sheehan DD, MH Gill & Son, Dublin, 1954
Apologetics for the Pulpit, Aloysius Roche, Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd, London, 1950
Born-Again Catholics and the Mass, William C Standridge Independent Faith Mission, North Carolina, 1980
Catholicism and Fundamentalism, Karl Keating, Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 1988
Confession of a Roman Catholic, Paul Whitcomb, TAN, Illinois, 1985
Critiques of God, Edited by Peter A Angeles (Religion and Reason Section), Prometheus Books, New York, 1995
Documents of the Christian Church, edited by Henry Bettenson, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1979
Eucharist, Centre of Christian Life, Rod Kissinger SJ, Liguori Publications, Missouri, 1970
Fifty Years in the Church of Rome, Fr Charles Chiniquy, Chick Publications, Chino, 1985
Is Jesus Really Present in the Eucharist? Michael Evans, Catholic Truth Society, London, 1986
Handbook to the Controversy with Rome, Vol 2, Karl Von Hase MD, The Religious Tract Society, London, 1906
Living in Christ, A Dreze SJ, Geoffrey Chapman, London-Melbourne, 1969
Martin Luther, Richard Marius, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1999
Radio Replies, Vol 2, Frs Rumble and Carty, Radio Replies Press, St Paul, Minnesota, 1940
Roman Catholic Claims, Charles Gore, MA, Longmans, Green & Co, London, 1894
Salvation, The Bible and Roman Catholicism, William Webster, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh, 1990
Secrets of Romanism, Joseph Zaccello, Loizeaux Brothers, New Jersey, 1984
The Catechism of the Catholic Church, Veritas, Dublin, 1995
The Early Church, Henry Chadwick, Pelican, Middlesex, 1987
The Mass, Sacrifice and Sacrament, William F Dunphy, CSSR, Liguori Publications, Missouri, 1986
The Primitive Faith and Roman Catholic Developments, Rev John A Gregg, APCK, Dublin, 1928
The Student's Catholic Doctrine, Rev Charles Hart BA, Burns & Oates, London, 1961
This is My Body, This is My Blood, Bob and Penny Lord, Journeys of Faith, California, 1986
Why Does God...? Domenico Grasso SJ, St Pauls, Bucks, 1970

The Web

- Transubstantiation, Is it a True Doctrine?
http://www.geocities.com/christian_apologist2001/

BIBLE QUOTATIONS FROM:

The Amplified Bible