

# Catholic Candle

• March 2016 • [catholiccandle.neocities.org](http://catholiccandle.neocities.org) • [catholiccandle@gmail.com](mailto:catholiccandle@gmail.com)

## Think you have an informed conscience?

Most people who fail to act correctly do so because they *mistakenly* believe they have an informed conscience. A person has a duty to correctly form his conscience (*i.e.*, his judgment, the moral character of his actions) with great care, and he is under a strict obligation to do so. He is bound to fervently pray, plus take all reasonable means of formation with good, honest, and holy men and instructive material, when there is a danger of offending God. Correct formation is the key to virtuous decisions and actions.

St. Thomas defined conscience as “the judgment or dictates of the practical intellect,” avoiding evil, and doing what is good. A conscience is informed (*i.e.*, *correctly* formed) or uninformed (*i.e.*, *not* correctly formed). Most believe they have a conscience that is informed and make no effort to correct their uninformed conscience. They may act incorrectly or fail to act when necessary. An informed conscience draws a line in the sand to ensure against liberalism creeping in unnoticed and unopposed.

An informed conscience is a key to our salvation. A traditionalist with a well-formed conscience would never attend an indult Mass or support an indult group (including the new-SSPX). If you attend an indult Mass or support an indult group, it is understood that you accept the new mass and Vatican II with all their evils and errors. You also set a very bad example which undermines Tradition and scandalizes friends, family, and others. Scandal is like scattering feathers on a windy day. How can one ever collect them again? (That is, each feather scattered to the wind represents a scandalized soul that needs to be found, corrected, and made aware of your bad example.)

It’s time to take stock of your conscience. Informed or uninformed? If you honestly appraise your conscience and find it to be uninformed, you have a strict obligation to correct that shortcoming, as directed above.

# **Bishop de Galarreta contradicts himself about agreement with Rome**

In a January 2016 conference, [<http://www.dici.org/en/documents/bishop-de-galarreta-i-think-the-pope-will-lean-towards-a-one-sided-recognition/>] Bishop de Galarreta sets forth his current position on agreement with Rome:

We do not refuse, you see, in an absolute and theoretical way the possibility of an agreement with Rome. That is what distinguishes us from the 'Resistance'. For them it is a principle. It is a doctrinal question: 'You cannot admit the possibility of an agreement with Rome without being liberal.' Such is not our position.

And again, Galarreta claims to be following Archbishop Lefebvre:

It is important to repeat it: it was not Archbishop Lefebvre's position. He signed a protocol for an agreement with Rome.

Bishop de Galarreta now holds the opposite of what he held four years ago. He distorts Archbishop Lefebvre's teaching to match his own new liberalism. Worst of all, Galarreta rejects the truth, which Archbishop Lefebvre upheld and we must also uphold.

## **Galarreta changed his mind in less than four years**

Bishop de Galarreta used to teach that we cannot join forces with Modernist Rome:

they are not ready to give up the Vatican II Council, nor the liberal doctrines of it, and their intention, their obvious desire, is to bring us back to it. ... it is illusory and unrealistic to believe that we could reach a pragmatic agreement, appropriate and warranted, and even just acceptable to both parties.

October 2011 conference in Albano.

Again, on April 7, 2012, Galarreta and the other two bishops wrote the following to Bishop Fellay:

How will one be able to make an agreement and make this public resistance to the authorities, including the Pope? And after having fought

during more than forty years, will the Society now have to be put into the hands of the modernists and liberals whose pertinacity we have just come to observe?

In other words, as Galarreta correctly declared less than four years ago, we must not agree with Rome, because Rome persists in conciliar errors. In 2016, Bishop de Galarreta teaches the opposite. The confusing double negative notwithstanding, Galarreta now “ ‘admit[s] the possibility of an agreement with Rome without being liberal.’ ”

### **Galarreta twists Archbishop Lefebvre’s position**

As we already saw, Galarreta deceitfully pretends to agree with Archbishop Lefebvre: “It is important to repeat it: it was not Archbishop Lefebvre’s position. He signed a protocol for an agreement with Rome.”

It is true that Archbishop Lefebvre signed a protocol at 4:30pm on May 5, 1988. But he wrote a letter of retraction during the sleepless night that followed: “Oh! How I wanted morning to come so that I could give Fr. du Chalard my letter of retraction which I had written during the night.” See Bishop Tissier’s *Biography of Archbishop Lefebvre*, p. 555. Bishop de Galarreta wants us to determine Archbishop Lefebvre’s position based on a document that he unsigned just hours after signing it.

How quickly Galarreta forgets what Archbishop Lefebvre preached on the day of the consecrations!

Consequently, it is clear that the only truth that exists today for the Vatican is the conciliar truth, the spirit of the Council, the spirit of Assisi. That is the truth of today. But we will have nothing to do with this for anything in the world! ...

Today, this day, is Operation Survival. If I had made this deal with Rome, by continuing with the agreements we had signed, and by putting them into practice, I would have performed “Operation Suicide”.

### **The truth: there are two Romes**

Bishop de Galarreta fails to distinguish between Eternal Rome and conciliar Rome. Therefore, he misunderstands why the Resistance disagrees with him. Look at his words again:

We do not refuse, you see, in an absolute and theoretical way the possibility of an agreement with Rome. That is what distinguishes us from the 'Resistance'. For them it is a principle. It is a doctrinal question: 'You cannot admit the possibility of an agreement with Rome without being liberal.' Such is not our position.

In other words, Galarreta maintains that the Resistance opposes agreement with Rome unqualifiedly, while he does not.

On the contrary, following Archbishop Lefebvre, we distinguish between the Catholic Rome, which we embrace, and the conciliar Rome, which we repudiate:

We hold firmly with all our heart and with all our mind to Catholic Rome, Guardian of the Catholic Faith and of the traditions necessary to the maintenance of this faith, to the eternal Rome, mistress of wisdom and truth.

We refuse on the other hand, and have always refused, to follow the Rome of Neo-Modernist and Neo-Protestant tendencies which became clearly manifest during the Second Vatican Council, and after the Council, in all the reforms which issued from it.

Archbishop Lefebvre, Declaration of 21 November 1974.

In other words, we cannot agree with Pope Francis and his modernist hierarchy, until they come back to Tradition, as Archbishop Lefebvre taught:

It is, therefore, a strict duty for every priest wanting to remain Catholic to separate himself from this Conciliar Church for as long as it does not rediscover the Tradition of the Church and of the Catholic Faith.

*Spiritual Journey*, ch. 3.

These words apply equally well to priests and to laypeople. When may we start dialogging with Rome again? We must have the same clear answer as Archbishop Lefebvre had!

I will put the discussion at the doctrinal level. Do you agree with the great encyclicals of all the popes who preceded you? Do you agree with *Quanta Cura* of Pius IX, *Immortale Dei* and *Libertas* of Leo XIII, *Pascendi Gregis* of Pius X, *Quas Primas* of Pius XI, *Humani Generis* of Pius XII? Are you in full

communion with these popes and their teachings? Do you still accept the entire Anti-Modernist Oath? Are you in favor of the social reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ? If you do not accept the doctrine of your predecessors, it is useless to talk!

*Fideliter*, quoted by Fr. Laisney in *Archbishop Lefebvre and the Vatican*, pp. 223-224.

## The Evil of Participating in the “Holy Year” Commemorating Vatican II

The new-SSPX admits that “*the occasion* for the opening of the Holy Door is the *50th anniversary* of the conclusion of *Vatican Council II* on December 8, 1965.”<sup>1</sup> Yet the new-SSPX encourages the faithful to “benefit from the extraordinary jubilee of Pope Francis to gain the indulgence”. *Id.* The new-SSPX is encouraging evil.

The new-SSPX is telling us that the indulgence is good and we should simply ignore the circumstances surrounding this good thing. But, St. Thomas teaches the opposite, *viz.*, that we must act only when the *circumstances* make the act good:

[An act’s] goodness does not consist wholly in its species [i.e., the type of act it is], but also in certain additions which accrue to it by reason of certain accidents: and such are its due circumstances. Wherefore *if something is lacking* that is requisite *as a due circumstance the action will be evil.*

*Summa*, Ia IIae, Q.18, a.3, *respondeo* (emphasis added).

When the new-SSPX says we should participate in the holy year commemorating Vatican II, the new-SSPX wants us to ignore the fact that the indulgence comes to commemorate Vatican II. But it is a sin to accept something good which is given to commemorate something evil.

This is as if Planned Parenthood was to offer free candy to everyone on the occasion of the murder of its eighty millionth baby. What the new-SSPX is telling us is like someone saying “take the candy! It is real candy, and just ignore what the candy is commemorating.”

But a man *of principle* would tell Planned Parenthood: “Keep your odious candy! I won’t join your celebration!”

It would obviously offend Our Lord to join Planned Parenthood in commemorating the occasion of its eighty millionth murder, by accepting and enjoying the free candy, even though candy is good.

Likewise, indulgences are good. But it is evil to accept this “candy” given in order to commemorate Vatican II. Whereas Planned Parenthood has murdered tens of millions of babies, Vatican II has murdered hundreds of millions of souls.

It is true that as pope, Pope Francis has the authority to declare a genuine Holy Year. However, *he does not have the authority or power to declare a holy year to commemorate something evil like Vatican II* any more than he could grant an indulgence for the act of blaspheming Our Lady. Thus, we are not in a genuine Holy Year now, because the evil commemoration of Vatican II makes the year unholy and offensive to God.

- 
1. Emphasis added. To find this new-SSPX quote, go to this link:  
<http://sspj.org/en/sspjs-participation-jubilee-mercy>

The holy year ends on a date also promoting conciliar error. The holy year ends on the *conciliar* feast of “Christ the King of the Universe” [*Id.*], which is the last Sunday of the conciliar liturgical calendar, moved there to emphasize that Christ’s Kingship will be at the end of the world, rather than His Kingship being a reality now and that all society must obey and honor Him now.

# The “New” SSPX Promotes the Evil of Going into Conciliar Churches to Pray during the “Holy Year”

Pope Francis declared that people can gain a plenary indulgence by praying in one of many churches throughout the world, *viz.*, the cathedral in any diocese plus many other churches. *Misericordiae Vultus*, April 11, 2015.

Bishop Fellay strongly urges the faithful to participate in the so-called “holy year”. He wrote:

Must we then deprive ourselves of the graces of a Holy Year? Quite the contrary. When the floodgates of grace are opened wide, we must receive abundantly!

Bishop Fellay letter #84, May 24, 2015.

For this reason, the “new” SSPX encourages the faithful to pray in these conciliar churches. <http://ssp.org/en/sspxs-participation-jubilee-mercy>

The “new” SSPX has been weakening for a long time and has long blurred the difference between the conciliar church and the Eternal Catholic Church. This causes the “new” SSPX to increasingly promote praying in conciliar churches.

For example, the “new” SSPX was thrilled that one of its priests said Mass in St. Peter’s Basilica in Rome. <http://rorate-caeli.blogspot.com/2014/08/sspx-priest-celebrates-mass-in-saint.html> (Fittingly, this new-SSPX video showing the Mass in this basilica is posted by a person whose user name is “New Catholic”.)

## Conciliar Churches are Most Unfitting Places to Pray

There are three reasons we should not go into conciliar churches to pray:

1. Places of Sacrilege are most *unfitting* places to pray;
2. We should *abhor* and shun places of sacrilege; and
3. We must avoid giving *scandal*.

## 1. Sacrilege Makes a Conciliar Church Unfitting for Prayer

Places of evil are inherently very unfitting places for prayer and for offering the True Mass. The Mass and the Blessed Sacrament are among the very best and most sacred “Things”. To mix these best with the worst (*viz.*, an evil place) is most unfitting and offensive to God. It is like choosing the filthiest, most disgusting vessel as the container for the most precious liquid—it is wholly unfitting.

As always, the *Summa* explains this truth admirably:

Now although, properly speaking, a corporeal thing cannot be the subject of the stain of sin, nevertheless, on *account of sin corporeal things contract a certain unfittingness for being appointed to spiritual purposes; and for this reason we find that places where crimes have been committed are reckoned unfit for the performance of sacred actions therein, unless they be cleansed beforehand.*

*Summa Supp.* Q.74, a.1, *respondeo* (emphasis added).

But sins directed against God are the gravest sins. They are much worse than the crime of murder, for example, because murder is a sin directed against man, not God. *Summa*,IIa IIae, Q.13, a.3, ad 1.

The new mass is inherently protestantized and man-centered and so is always “an irreverent treatment of the Sacred” (the definition of a sacrilege). *Summa*,IIa IIae, Q.99, a.1. Thus, the new mass is objectively worse than murder, since the new mass is objectively a grave offense directed against God Himself.

If a new mass is valid, that makes it objectively worse—by being a valid (rather than invalid) sacrilege. A valid sacrilege even more strongly calls down the wrath of God because a valid sacrilege compels God Himself (Sacramentally present) to take part in the sacrilege.

Thus, conciliar churches are inherent *dens of sacrilege* because the new mass is said there (and for many other reasons). As a *den of sacrilege*, it is a very unfitting place to pray or to offer the True Mass. *Summa Supp.* Q.74, a.1, *respondeo*.

## 2. Informed Catholics Instinctively Abhor Conciliar Churches

In the proportion in which we love Our Lord, we should abhor conciliar churches. This is like a widow who loved her deceased husband. In proportion to her love for him, she would not wish to use as a place of amusement, rest, and comfort the location in which her husband had previously been tortured and brutally murdered. Her love would not permit it.

Similarly, those who love our Lord and realize that the new mass is objectively a sacrilege, would never wish to be in a place which continues to be used for the new mass. And the more an informed Catholic loves Our Lord, the more he finds conciliar churches intolerably odious—more because of the sacrileges that continue to occur there than because of the buildings' conciliar ugliness! This is a second reason informed Catholics do not enter conciliar churches.

## 3. Entering Conciliar Churches Causes Scandal

Scandal is giving the appearance of evil which makes another person more likely to sin. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.43, a.1, ad 2.

To the extent others see us entering a conciliar church, it gives scandal because this would tend to give credence (in their minds) to what goes on there. Most people would not make the distinction *when* we entered a conciliar church, *e.g.*, to pray the rosary but not when the new mass is said there. Each person's presence adds a little to the appearance that the conciliar church is more visited/attended and that what goes on there is more accepted.

Without thinking deeply about the matter, many people would tend to think that those entering a conciliar church approve what is happening there. Therefore, in the eyes of many people, we would indicate our approval generally, for what goes on there, regardless of our real opinion. Because people are social creatures, they would tend to accept the conciliar church because they see other people accepting it. This is a third reason that informed Catholics do not enter conciliar churches.

## Conclusion

For the three reasons given above, Catholics should never go into a conciliar church to pray. It is among the most unfitting places to pray and is among the places that a devout Catholic would least desire to be, because it is a place of continual sacrilege and grave offense to Our Lord.

What a contrast this Catholic position is to Bishop Fellay and the “new” SSPX, who urge us to pray in conciliar churches for the “holy year”! They see no reason why the new mass should make conciliar churches unfitting for prayer because they already say kind things about the new mass and are moving toward accepting it. *See, e.g.,* <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/2013-10-15-fr-themann-ltr.html>

Would the “new” SSPX tell the faithful to stay away from conciliar churches if people regularly and openly spit on a picture of Bishop Fellay there? If so, that means the “new” SSPX is more offended at insults to their superior and their own institution, than at the offense given to Our Lord God in the sacrileges of the new mass.

## **Bishop Fellay’s Latest Interview Exposes How Liberal and Timid He Is**

Bishop Fellay gave a video interview published on March 1, 2016. Here are some of the highlights:

### **Bishop Fellay Is Happy With “A Lot” of What Pope Francis Says**

As quoted and cited in the February 2016 *Catholic Candle*, Bishop Fellay publicly said that he has a “close, close link” to the pope and that the pope is “on our side”. Bishop Fellay followed that up with a more recent statement that he is “very happy” with “a lot” of what Pope Francis says because Pope Francis reminds the world “a lot” about the law of God. Here are Bishop Fellay’s words:

[Pope Francis] is in charge of governing the Church. So he is in charge of having this Church doing [sic] its job and the duty of the Church is to save souls. That’s the main concern. It is to bring the souls [sic] to heaven. And to remind to [sic] this world, God’s Commandment. The Church is the voice of God. And **when he [viz., Pope Francis] does that and he does that a lot, a lot of times, I am very happy.**

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g0eTadAYK6o> watch beginning at minute 15:05 (emphasis added).

Consider this: Bishop Fellay is in charge of negotiating with conciliar Rome’s very tough negotiators.

## Bishop Fellay Implies that He Disagrees with Church Teaching Regarding Unnatural Vice

We assume that Bishop Fellay opposes unnatural vice. But Bishop Fellay did not have the courage to stand against the political correctness of an aggressive interviewer. Bishop Fellay was not strong enough to fearlessly affirm his *own* (assumed) position that homosexuality is evil. Bishop Fellay says that: 1) **if** [!!] we present ourselves as Catholic, then 2) we must **represent Church teaching** *not what we think*. Here are his words:

**Q:** I want to talk with you, if I may, about your attitude towards homosexuality. Why do you rail against people who are attracted to the same sex. Why is that anathema to you?

**Bishop Fellay:** So we distinguish two things: first we are bound, let's say, if we present ourselves as Catholics, we are bound to represent the teaching of the Church on that point and not what we think but really what the Church teaches ....

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g0eTadAYK6o> watch beginning at minute 17:48.

We pity this poor, timid man! Watch the interview yourself. During the whole interview, he weaves and dodges to try to avoid sounding “backward” and traditional. With a nervous smile, he continually looked embarrassed about traditionalist positions and afraid of being trapped. Consider this: the SSPX is relying on Bishop Fellay to courageously hold the line against the pressures of the world and political correctness.

Bishop Fellay is causing great harm to Catholic tradition and this interview shows how pitifully timid he is. Let us pray hard for him!

### **Bishop Fellay Is Too Timid to Refuse to Play the Interviewer’s “Game” of “Tell Your Sins to Everyone”**

Bishop Fellay did not have the courage to decline the interviewer’s request that he tell everyone his sins. (This interview ploy is normally stated “tell me your greatest weakness”). Nor did Bishop Fellay give a serious answer. Instead, he was intimidated, at a loss for words, and gave three pathetic, weak “non-answers”. Here are his words:

**Q:** Bishop, you talk a lot about sin and heresy, and the right way. What are your sins?

**Bishop Fellay:** My sins? Oh, probably, probably, talk a little bit too much. Ya, I would say so.

**Q:** Talking too much.

**Bishop Fellay:** Ya. Giving this impression of being too sure of myself. Ya. Maybe too alone, too—not enough to say [sic] with others; ya, I mean, would say so. Ya, I have to improve a lot, evidently. No problem.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g0eTadAYK6o> watch beginning at minute 24:30.

Talking “a bit” too much? Seriously? Not being with people enough? That is not a serious answer.

We are not suggesting that Bishop Fellay should have made a public general confession. We pity him because he was so plainly out of his league and over-mastered by the interviewer. He was afraid not to cooperate with the interviewer because of how it would appear. Politicians, not manly and virtuous men, are afraid of how they will look.

Can anyone even imagine Archbishop Lefebvre or Pope St. Pius X answering the public media’s question “What are your sins?” While acknowledging the great harm Bishop Fellay is causing, let us pity him and pray for him too.

Lastly, consider this: The SSPX is relying upon Bishop Fellay to avoid compromise by firmly standing up to conciliar Rome.

## **Is Bishop Fellay Truthful with the Vatican or with the Faithful about Religious Liberty?**

On January 17, 2016, Bishop de Galarreta gave a conference about the SSPX’s relations with Rome. 2-26-16 *DICI* #331, p.9. In this conference, Bishop de Galarreta stated that:

- he expects that Rome will “soon” recognize the SSPX. *Id.* at 11.; and
- last summer, Rome offered the SSPX the canonical status of a *personal prelate*. *Id.* at 9.

The SSPX did not disclose that offer last summer (nor did the SSPX publish Bishop de Galarreta's conference) until February 26, 2016—the *same day* on which Zenit.org published substantially the same information, in an interview with “Archbishop” Pozzo.<sup>1</sup>

Regarding this coming recognition, Bishop de Galarreta assured the faithful that Rome does not misunderstand the SSPX's positions because Bishop Fellay wrote an “exhaustive explanation to make it very clear how we are and how we act, what we preach, what we do, what we do not do, and what we are not ready [sic!] to do”. 2-26-16 DIC1, p.10.

We don't know what Bishop Fellay told Rome in this “exhaustive” explanation because the SSPX keeps such content secret from the faithful unless Rome chooses to disclose it.<sup>2</sup> However, Bishop de Galarreta assures us that Rome now has “exhaustive” knowledge what the SSPX preaches and believes.

After Bishop Fellay's explanation to Rome, Pozzo declared that *he understands that the SSPX accepts Vatican II's teaching on religious liberty*. Here are Pozzo's words:

[A]s regards the Lefebvrian criticism on religious freedom, at the bottom of the discussion it seems to me that *the SSPX position is* characterized by the defense of traditional Catholic doctrine against the agnostic secularism of the State and against secularism and ideological relativism but *not against the right of the person not to be constricted or obstructed by the State in the exercise of the profession of religious faith*.

<http://sspx.org/en/news-events/news/where-are-we-sspx%E2%80%9494abp-pozzo-14381> (emphasis added).

So Pozzo is stating that Bishop Fellay supports Vatican II's religious liberty and opposes a nation being a Catholic State. The “new” SSPX published Pozzo's words and *did not deny that the “new” SSPX accepts Vatican II's religious liberty*. *Id.*

## **Bishop Fellay regarding Religious Liberty**

This reminds us that Bishop Fellay has said favorable things in the past about Vatican II's teaching on religious liberty. For example, in 2012, Bishop Fellay says:

[Religious liberty] is used in so many ways. And looking closer, I really have the impression that not many know what really the Council says about it. **The Council is presenting a religious liberty which, in fact, is a very, very limited one: very limited!**

Emphasis added. Bishop Fellay's words are at minute 1:25 of 6:00, in the video found at this link: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DdnJigNzTuY&feature=topics>

Notice that Bishop Fellay is not condemning the error of religious liberty. He says that Vatican II's (false) religious liberty "is a very, very limited one: very limited!" This false notion of liberty for religious errors, has been condemned continually by the Catholic Church since the earliest times of the Church. *See, e.g.*, a catalogue of condemnations of religious liberty at: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/46116957/Social-Kingship-of-Our-Lord>. But, instead of condemning this fundamental, widespread error, Bishop Fellay contents himself with saying that Vatican II's religious liberty "is a very, very limited one: very limited!"

A little later in this same 2012 video interview, Bishop Fellay asks "which principle is involved to" justify Catholics demanding the freedom to practice the true religion. Bishop Fellay answers his own question: "We would argue that there **might be** another principle which would **be more accurate** to justify [seeking freedom for the Catholic Church]." Bishop Fellay interview—listen at minute 2:30 of 6:00, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DdnJigNzTuY&feature=topics> (emphasis added).

Pope Gregory XVI and Pope Pius IX condemned religious liberty as "insanity". *See*, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/46116957/Social-Kingship-of-Our-Lord>. By contrast, Bishop Fellay says that there "might be" [!] another principle which would "be more accurate"!

Not only did Bishop Fellay fail to condemn religious liberty in 2012, but he said that this (false) "right" declared by the council, "is a very, very limited one: very limited!" In this regard also, what Bishop Fellay says is plainly false.

Vatican II itself says that this (false) religious liberty is entirely **unlimited** as long as society does not erupt in violence! Here are the Council's words:

- "[N]or is anyone to be restrained from acting in accordance with his own beliefs, whether privately **or publicly**, whether alone **or in association with others....**" Quoted from *Documents of Vatican II*, Fr. Abbott (General Editor), Document: "Dignitatis Humanae", pp. 679–80 (emphasis added).
- Vatican II teaches that this religious liberty "continues to exist even in those who do not live up to their obligation of seeking the truth and adhering to it." *Id.*
- Vatican II says that religious liberty has "due limits" but makes clear that these limits concern peace and safety: "nor is the exercise of this right to be

impeded, provided that the just requirements of public order are observed.”  
*Id.*

As shown in these three quotes, the Council teaches the same very broad (so-called) “right” espoused by the *Freemasons* in Article 10 of the French Revolution’s 1789 *Declaration of the Rights of Man*:

No one can be molested for his opinions, even for his religious opinions, provided their manifestation does not trouble the public order established by law.

So in summary:

- when Bishop Fellay makes these (false) favorable statements about Vatican II’s religious liberty; and
- when Bishop Fellay “exhaustively” tells Rome what the SSPX believes about religious liberty; and
- when the SSPX then publishes Pozzo’s claim that the SSPX accepts Vatican II’s religious liberty; and
- when the SSPX does not deny Pozzo’s claim,

can anyone doubt Pozzo is correct that the “new” SSPX *does* accept Vatican II’s religious liberty, thereby imperiling the salvation of souls in the new-SSPX?

- 
1. Pozzo agreed that recognition of the SSPX is coming soon: “we are now at a stage ... oriented to achieve the desired reconciliation.” <http://spx.org/en/news-events/news/where-are-we-sspx%E2%80%9494abp-pozzo-14381>

Pozzo is Secretary of *Ecclesia Dei*, the Vatican commission in charge of the “conservative” groups recognized by Rome. In other words, Pozzo is Bishop Fellay’s future superior.

For an explanation why “Archbishop” Pozzo’s conciliar consecration and ordination make it doubtful that he is a valid bishop or even a valid priest, *see these three links*: <https://www.scribd.com/doc/15443209/Comparison-of-Old-and-New-Catholic-Rites-of-Ordination-to-the-Priesthood> ; <https://www.scribd.com/doc/15442729/Comparison-of-Old-and-New-Consecration-Rites> ; <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/new-ordination-doubtful.html>

2. For proof of the SSPX deceiving the faithful in the past (regarding relations with Rome) and only making disclosures when Rome does so, *see*, <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx-lacks-common-honesty.html>

## **New-SSPX says Problem in the Church after Vatican II is Particularly Lack of Priests Hearing Confessions (Rather than the Lack of Faith)**

The crisis in the Church’s human element is a loss of Faith. *All* other conciliar problems flow from that problem. Bishop Fellay does not understand this fact. He instead claims the problem is *particularly a lack of priestly manpower to hear confessions*. He states:

Allow me to make use of an image. When a fire is raging, everyone understands that those who have the means to do so must endeavor to put it out, especially if there is a shortage of firefighters. So it is that *through all fifty years of this terrible crisis that has shaken the Church, particularly the tragic lack of confessors*, our priests have devoted themselves to the souls of penitents, invoking the case of emergency foreseen by the Code of Canon Law.

Bishop Fellay Letter #85, dated November 21, 2015 (emphasis added).

The priest shortage flows from the loss of Faith. But the problem with conciliar confessors is *not* that they are few in number (since most conciliar Catholics rarely go to confession). The truth is, *even one conciliar confessor is too many* because such confessors would not be part of the conciliar church unless they were modernists or compromisers of various “stripes”. “Oh Lord, grant us uncompromising, anti-liberal priests!”

## Bishop Fellay Fears that the Conciliar Revolutionaries don't Guide the Faithful Enough

The members of the hierarchy are all conciliar revolutionaries and are wolves in sheep's clothing. Every one of them accepts the new mass and the core evils of Vatican II. But Bishop Fellay does not fear that the conciliar hierarchy is leading the faithful in the wrong direction. He fears the opposite—that they do not lead the faithful enough! He recently wrote:

Short of a miracle, it is to be feared that now souls will be left on their own even more and will no longer find any support from the hierarchy as a whole, although that guidance is necessary.

Bishop Fellay Letter #84, dated May 24, 2015.

It is true that the guidance of good shepherds is very important. But the guidance of bad shepherds is worse than no guidance at all. The sheep are better off without these wolves (in sheep's clothing).

## The New-SSPX Now Publishes Movie Reviews and Recommends Movies

The SSPX used to tell the faithful to throw out their TVs. The SSPX used to tell the faithful to *read a book!* Now the new-SSPX *hopes* the faithful have a TV so that the new-SSPX's movie reviewer can recommend renting movies and seeing them at home. *See, e.g.*, this recent movie review: <http://angeluspress.org/blog/risen-movie-review/>

Here is a small sampling of what the “old” SSPX used to say against television:

- “[T]elevisions should not even be present in the home.”<sup>1</sup>
- “The television set must go.”<sup>2</sup>
- “No, you can't compromise by having even one TV in your house.”<sup>3</sup>
- “You need to be prepared to be reviled, discounted, and attacked when you say ... to get rid of the TV.”<sup>4</sup>

A person might wrongly assume that the “old” SSPX did not promote abstaining from “religious videos”. But that assumption is false. For example, the “old” SSPX used to advise:

- “Look, Ricardo Montalban starring with the children of Fatima!’ Do you think you can use movies to edify? You can’t.”<sup>5</sup>
- **[Objection:]** “*I always think that Archbishop Lefebvre comes across great on TV!*” **[Response:]** “if you can’t be present at the Bishop’s Mass, then it is God’s will. But if you want to be there, then you will get your priorities straight and make some room in your activities so as to be able to go and see him. TV is not a channel of God’s grace. It stultifies the sacred and belittles good, while enhancing evil.”<sup>6</sup>

Clearly, the “old” SSPX used to set as the ideal and model that Catholic homes should have no TV and Catholics should not watch movies. The “old” SSPX required that its priests, sisters, brothers, and third order members abstain from all television (including movies, DVDs, even “religious” videos.). [http://archives.sspcx.org/Catholic\\_FAQs/catholic\\_faqs\\_\\_traditional.htm#tv\\_in\\_home](http://archives.sspcx.org/Catholic_FAQs/catholic_faqs__traditional.htm#tv_in_home)

Even those faithful too weak to throw out their own TVs, knew that this was the aspiration which the “old” SSPX held before them. All that is different now!

The new-SSPX now publishes movie reviews. *See, e.g.*, <http://angeluspress.org/blog/risen-movie-review/>

In the current SSPX movie review, the reviewer recommends the movie he is reviewing, noting that “the movie is aesthetically well done, and makes use of its historically interesting standpoint with believability and restraint.” <http://angeluspress.org/blog/risen-movie-review/>

In this movie that the new-SSPX recommends, *even the reviewer admits that:*

- “The Blessed Mother ... is shown nearly on the edge of hysteria and collapse”. <http://angeluspress.org/blog/risen-movie-review/>
- After Mary Magdalene has become a disciple of Our Lord, she is depicted as being in a tavern (a place she frequented in her old, sinful life). <http://angeluspress.org/blog/risen-movie-review/>
- St. Bartholomew is depicted “almost as a fool” who is “literally giddy” when he learns Our Lord rose from the dead. <http://angeluspress.org/blog/risen-movie-review/>
- The movie depicts Our Risen Lord as sort of “a happy uncle or pastor with his arms around his congregation’s shoulders”. <http://angeluspress.org>

/blog/risen-movie-review/

- The movie depicts the Romans sealing the tomb and guarding it.  
<http://angeluspress.org/blog/risen-movie-review/>

But the movie's depiction is contrary to the Gospel because the Jews, not the Romans, guarded the tomb. As St. Matthew tells us in his Gospel:

[T]he chief priests and the Pharisees came together to Pilate, saying: Sir, we have remembered, that that seducer said, while he was yet alive: After three days I will rise again. Command therefore the sepulcher to be guarded until the third day: lest perhaps his disciples come and steal him away, and say to the people: He is risen from the dead; and the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate saith to them: You have a guard; go, guard it as you know. And they departing, made the sepulcher sure, sealing the stone, and setting guards. (28: 62-66. )

The reviewer shortens his interview because he says he wants to avoid the “risk of spoiling any enjoyment of our readers” who are going to see the movie. <http://angeluspress.org/blog/risen-movie-review/>

- 
1. [http://archives.sspcx.org/Catholic\\_FAQs/catholic\\_faqs\\_\\_traditional.htm#tv\\_in\\_home](http://archives.sspcx.org/Catholic_FAQs/catholic_faqs__traditional.htm#tv_in_home)
  2. [http://www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsection=show\\_article&article\\_id=2500](http://www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsection=show_article&article_id=2500)
  3. [http://www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsection=show\\_article&article\\_id=1875](http://www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsection=show_article&article_id=1875)
  4. [http://www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsection=show\\_article&article\\_id=2122](http://www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsection=show_article&article_id=2122)
  5. [http://www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsection=show\\_article&article\\_id=1875](http://www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsection=show_article&article_id=1875)

6. [http://www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsection=show\\_article&article\\_id=1875](http://www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsection=show_article&article_id=1875)

## **Fr. Wegner's Lent—a Time for the new-SSPX to Focus on Fundraising**

Around March 1, 2016, Fr. Wegner (SSPX district superior for the U.S.) mailed out a slick and expensive bulletin (full of color pictures), which was professionally printed with each individual recipient's name printed on his own copy of the bulletin.

Without any intent to be ironic, Fr. Wegner writes that Lent is a time for the SSPX and faithful to put away the cares of the world—but look at the poor condition of our buildings. Here are his words:

Lent is a time to turn away from the cares of the world ... St. Therese Church and school buildings ... are in serious need of repair ... the most urgent problem is the church's roof ... winds have taken a toll on the Academy's siding ... the furnace [is] pushed to the limit and a replacement must be obtained within a year ... the repairs to the siding, furnace and roof will cost an estimated \$75,000 ...

Fr. Wegner always begins his letter by some shallow mention of some “spiritual” theme. But as the U.S. district's *fundraiser-in-chief*, Fr. Wegner always predictably “circles back” to his bottom line: “give us money”.

## **Bishops Williamson and Faure Consecrate Bishop Tomas Aquino, OSB**

On March 19, 2016, Bishops Williamson and Faure consecrated Bishop Tomas Aquino, OSB, at the Benedictine monastery in Nova Friburgo, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

Let us pray for all three of those bishops, as they bear the heavy burden of the Episcopacy, that they stand up for the uncompromising traditional Catholic Faith.

Let us pray also that each of them places his duty to the Catholic Faith above all else, even before human respect for the other two and even when their duty involves correcting one another.

# Comparison of Old and New Catholic Ordination Rites

Note: \* indicates that this part of the rite has been changed.

## Old Rite

### 1. Calling the Candidate

**The Call.** The bishop, with his miter on, sits on the faldstool before the middle of the altar. The archdeacon bids the candidates come forward; the notary reads their names:

Let those who are to be ordained to the order of the priesthood come forward: N.N., etc.

Each one answers: *adsum*, goes before the altar and kneels, holding the burning candle in his right hand

### 2. The Inquiry

Is he worthy?

Most Reverend Father,

If the ordaining bishop is a cardinal, the archdeacon says:

Most Eminent and Reverend Father,

Our holy Mother, the Catholic Church, requests that you ordain the deacons here present to the office of the priesthood.

### 3. Consultation of the People

This is a sublime explanation that if any of the faithful know of a reason **not** to ordain this man, let the knowledge be made public now.

The people by **silence** give consent.

## New Rite

### 1. Calling the Candidate

Before the call, the “liturgy of the word” takes place. The readings may be taken all or in part from the Mass of the day.

The profession of faith is not said. The ordination of a priest begins after the gospel. The bishop, wearing his miter, sits at his chair,

The candidate is called by the deacon:

Let N. who is to be ordained priest please come forward.

The candidate answers: Present, and goes to the bishop, before whom he makes a sign of reverence.

### 2. The Inquiry

Is he worthy?

When the candidate is in his place before the bishop, the priest designated by the bishop says:

“Most Reverend Father, holy mother Church asks you to ordain this man, our brother, for service as priest.”

The bishop asks: “Do you judge him to be worthy?”

The designated priest answers: “After inquiry among the people of Christ and upon recommendation of those concerned with his training, I testify that he has been found worthy.”

### 3. Consent of the People\*

The bishop makes a statement to choose the candidate.

When the candidate is in his place before the bishop, the priest designated by the bishop says:

We rely on the help of the Lord God and our Savior Jesus Christ, and we choose this man, our brother, for Priesthood in the presbyteral order.

The **people reply**, “Thanks be to God” as their consent.

**Old Rite****4. Instruction**

The bishop with solemnity explains that a priest is a man chosen from the people in the Old Testament, as a man chosen by our Lord referring to the twelve disciples, as helpers chosen for Moses, as the twelve apostles chosen by our Lord. The bishop explains how the Church ordains some men bishops, others inferior in rank priests, deacons, and subdeacons. The bishop exhorts the ordinands to live edifying, virtuous lives so they will be a cause of reward, not condemnation to the bishop.

**New Rite****4. Homily\***

The homily set forth in the rite of ordination is optional and may be in the bishop's own words. He only has to talk about the duties of the priest. Of course, this requirement is very vague. One such optional version is as follows:

The bishop first speaks to all present. The bishop may say that "God has made his entire people a royal priesthood in Christ. . . . Jesus Christ also chose some of His followers to carry out publicly in the Church a priestly ministry in His name on behalf of mankind." The bishop then explains how the apostles were sent into the world. The bishop says that "priests are co-workers of the order of bishops." The bishop says, "To be ordained to priesthood in the presbyteral order." The bishop refers to Christ as the Teacher, Priest, and Shepherd "in His ministry, which is to make His own Body, the Church, grow into the people of God, a holy temple."

"By consecration he will be made a true priest of the New Testament, to preach the Gospel, sustain God's people, and celebrate the liturgy, above all, the Lord's sacrifice."

The bishop exhorts the candidate to be a teacher and "make every effort to die to sin and to walk in the new life of Christ. . . . When you baptize, you will bring men and women into the people of God. . . . In the sacrament of penance, you will forgive sins in the name of Christ and the Church. . . . With holy oil, you will relieve and console the sick [no mention of the dying]. . . . You will celebrate the liturgy. . . ." [underline added for emphasis]

**Old Rite**

**New Rite**

**5. Examination of the Candidate \*\*\***

“Before you proceed to the **order of the presbyterate**, declare before the people your intention to undertake this **priestly office**.  
 “Are you resolved . . . to discharge . . . the **office of priesthood in the presbyteral order**. . .?”

The candidate replies, “I am.”

When one sees the phrase “office of the priesthood”, one might think that all in this rite is in order, until one looks a little further in this ceremony and sees that nowhere else in the English translation of the Roman Pontifical, not even in the essential Form of the sacrament, is this phrase used. One would think that the conciliar church has an aversion to mentioning the office of the priesthood.

The bishop then asks of the candidate, “Are you resolved to celebrate the mysteries of Christ faithfully and religiously as the Church has handed them down to us for the glory of God and the sanctification of Christ’s people?”

---

*(Does the above refer to the Sacrifice of the Mass? One cannot be sure. If so, how can the Novus Ordo Missae be the mystery of Christ that was handed down to us?)*

---

The candidate answers, “I am.”

The bishop: “Are you resolved to exercise the ministry of the word worthily and wisely, preaching the gospel and explaining the Catholic faith?”

---

*(It is not clear if the bishop means only teaching the Catholic faith. If so, one wonders how the novus ordo priests at large have taken this responsibility to heart.)*

---

The bishop asks, “Are you resolved to consecrate your life to God . . .?” Candidate: “I am, with the help of God.”

**Old Rite**

**New Rite**

*(I have put no remarks here because the promise is fine and not objectionable.)*

**6. Promise of Obedience \* [The Old Rite has the promise of obedience at the end of the ceremony.]**

This is simply the promise of the candidate to be obedient to his prelate. Why this is placed here in the ceremony is unclear.

**7. Invitation to Prayer**

Short prayer of the bishop for the one to be ordained.

My dear people, let us pray, that the all-powerful Father may pour out the gifts of heaven on this servant of his [sic], whom he has chosen to be a priest.

Deacon (except during the Easter season):

Let us stand.

**Old Rite****5. Prostration and Litany of the Saints**

The litany is sung or recited while the ordinands lay prostrate.

**New Rite****8. Litany of the Saints**

Candidate prostrates himself, except during Eastertide. Litany is sung and may be improvised as desired.

The bishop says the following prayer for the candidate:

Hear us, Lord our God, and pour out upon this servant of yours [sic] the blessing of the Holy Spirit and the grace and power of the priesthood. In your sight we offer this man for ordination: support him with your unfailing love. We ask this through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Deacon: Let us stand.

(This prayer probably is meant to correspond to the bishop's prayer in the Old Rite after the imposition of hands. Cf. Old Rite No. 6) Why is this prayer moved from where the Old Rite said it? It mentions "the grace and power of the priesthood". However, why is it placed before the matter of the sacrament, viz., the imposition of the bishop's hands, instead of afterwards, which more fittingly emphasizes this important action? Again, one wonders why the power of orders, the sacrificial power of the priesthood, is not mentioned in the rest of the New Rite.

**Old Rite**

**6. Bestowal of the Office**

The bishop **imposes both hands** on each ordinand in silence. Holding his right hand extended, the bishop prays a prayer asking heaven’s blessing on the ordinand. Then the bishop says another prayer for the ordinands.

Let us pray, dearly beloved brethren, to God, the Father Almighty, that He may multiply heavenly gifts upon these His servants whom He has chosen for the office of the priesthood. May they by His help accomplish what they undertake at His gracious call. Through Christ our Lord.  
R. Amen.

**7. Prayer of Consecration**

Here the responses before a preface are said and the bishop says a preface that is solemn and includes the **essential form of the ordination**. The traditional preface mentions that “teachers” not “fellow-workers” were given to the Son to spread the faith. See essential form given by Pope Pius XII as follows in English and in Latin:

**We beseech Thee, Almighty Father, invest Thy servant with the dignity of the priesthood. Do Thou renew in his heart the spirit of holiness, that he may hold the office next to ours in importance (that is, second in rank after the bishop), which he has received from Thee, O Lord, and by the example of his life, point out a norm of conduct.**

**New Rite**

**9. Laying on of Hands**

The bishop lays his hands on the candidate’s head in silence.

Note: there is no prayer here for the ordinand. In the Old Rite, the **“office of the priesthood”** is specifically mentioned.

**10. Prayer of Consecration\*\*\*\*\***

Looser translation of the old preface. When referring to Aaron this rite **excludes** the word **“priestly”** when speaking of Aaron’s power.

The addition of the words/description **“fellow workers”** is disturbing, again putting priests and bishops on equal footing.

**Almighty Father, grant to this servant of yours the dignity of the priesthood. Renew within him the Spirit of holiness. As a co-worker with the order of bishops may he be faithful to the ministry that he receives from you, Lord God, and be to others a model of right conduct.**

**Old Rite**

**“Da quaesumus, omnipotens Pater, in hunc famulum Tuum Presbyterii dignitatem; innova in visceribus ejus spiritum sanctitatis ut acceptum a Te, Deus, secundi meriti munus obtineat censuramque morum exemplo suae conversationis insinuet.”** [underline added for emphasis]

The Old Rite **clearly** ranks the priest after the bishop and states clearly that the ordinand has received an **“office/post.”**

After the essential form the old rite continues and refers to the new priest being a pattern of justice and his having to render an account to God and if he is faithful he will receive an eternal reward.

**8. Investiture with the Priestly Vestment**

The **bishop** himself arranges the **stole** on the ordinand. “Receive the yoke of the Lord, for His yoke is sweet and His burden light.”

**New Rite**

The New Rite **in English** adds, **“May he be faithful to the ministry,”** which is **not** found in the Old Rite.

“that he receives from You, Lord God” is put right after “May he be faithful . . . ministry” so what “**he receives**” seems to refer to “ministry.” This ambiguity makes it seem that the candidate has received **“the ministry”** and **not** the **priesthood** itself. The word “ministry” is a general term and does not refer to a single office.

The New Rite **in English** clearly makes the priest on equal footing as the bishop, calling them “co-workers.”

After the essential form the new rite **(at least in English)** adds a **part** that sounds so Protestant as is **drastically** different from the old rite.

The words are rather troubling. The new rite states that the new priest **“be faithful in working with the order of bishops . . . so that the words of the Gospel may reach the ends of the earth and the family of nations, made one in Christ, may become God’s one, holy people.”**

This is ambiguous. Does it mean that the nations convert in order to become a family united in Christ and then **become** one Church? Or does it mean (in modernist ecumenical language) that the nations are intrinsically united and a family already and that this “family” may become “God’s people”, merely “Christian” but not necessarily “Catholic”.

**11. Investiture with Stole and Chasuble\***

An assistant arranges the **stole** on the newly ordained. No prayer is said.

**Old Rite**

The bishop himself vests the candidates with the chasuble.

Receive the **priestly** vestment, by which charity is signified; for God is powerful to increase unto thee charity and perfection of work. [emphasis added]

And then the bishop prays a long prayer which states explicitly that the bishop has conferred “the honor of the

**Priesthood**” and also states that the new ordinands “may change by a **holy benediction bread and wine into the body and blood of Thy Son...**”

O God, Author of all holiness, from whom comes true consecration and the fullness of benediction, do Thou, O Lord, pour out Thy gracious blessing upon these Thy servants, upon whom we confer the honor of the priesthood. May they, by gravity of demeanor and strictness of life, prove themselves to be elders, trained according to the principles which Paul set forth to Titus and Timothy. May they keep Thy law before their minds day and night, believe what they read, teach what they believe, and practice what they teach. May they show forth in their persons justice, constancy, mercy, fortitude, and all other virtues, be leaders by their example, inspire strength by exhortation, and preserve the gift of their ministry pure and undefiled; may they change by a holy benediction bread and wine into the body and blood of Thy Son for the worship of Thy people. And having kept their conscience pure and true their faith in never failing charity, may they rise on the day of God's just and final judgment, full of the Holy Spirit, to perfect manhood, in the full measure of the age of Christ. Through the same etc. Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord, etc. R. Amen.

**New Rite**

Again, an assistant arranges the **chasuble** on the newly ordained.

No prayer is said.

**It is interesting to note that the reference to the priesthood and transubstantiation has been removed.**

**Old Rite****9. The Anointing**

The bishop intones the *Veni Creator*. While the *Veni Creator* is being sung the bishop **anoints** the hands of the ordinand in a very symbolic way for the **thumbs** and **index fingers** are anointed first then the whole palm.

[For the **thumbs** and **index fingers** are what will hold the **consecrated Host**] The bishop says the following prayer while anointing:

Vouchsafe, O Lord, to **consecrate** and **sanctify** these hands by this **unction** and our + blessing.

He continues, “that whatsoever they [these hands] shall **bless** may be **blessed** and whatsoever they shall **consecrate** be **consecrated** and **sanctified** in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Contrast the vague prayer of the New Rite to the explicit prayer to confer a power to bless and consecrate (which would include the power to consecrate the Blessed Sacrament)

**New Rite****12. The Anointing \*\*\*\*\***

It is important to note that the *Veni Creator Spiritus* or Ps. 110 **may** be sung during the vesting and anointing. This is totally optional.

The bishop **anoints** the **palms** of the hands in **no significant order**. The bishop says the following prayer while anointing the palms:

“The Father anointed Our Lord Jesus Christ through the power of the Holy Spirit. May Jesus preserve you to sanctify the Christian people and to offer sacrifice to God.”

There is no mention in the New Rite, of the thumbs, index fingers, or the fingers at all, being anointed. This is very significant because it suggests that these digits are not important. Are not these fingers supposed to be ready to hold the Sacred Host?

[It is interesting to note the changes in the anointing prayer. The Old Rite is explicit and says plainly that the ordinands’ hands are being now anointed. The New Rite doesn’t say that the ordinands’ palms are being now anointed. In fact, if one were not watching and only listening, he would never know that the bishop was actually anointing the ordinands’ palms at the moment when the bishop refers to God the Father having anointed his Son. Furthermore, the wording of the rest of the prayer is so general it could easily refer to a layman. “May Jesus preserve you to sanctify the Christian people”, [everyone should help sanctify others] “and offer sacrifice to God.” [It doesn’t mention the Sacrifice of the Mass. What sacrifice does it mean? Aren’t all Catholics supposed to offer up sacrifices to God?]

**Old Rite****10. Bestowal of the Power to Offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass**

The bishop presents each ordinand with a chalice containing wine and water and a paten with a host on it, while the ordinand is touching the paten with the index finger and the chalice with the middle finger.

The bishop explicitly states, “Receive the power to offer sacrifice to God and to celebrate Mass for the living as well as for the dead. In the name of the Lord.”

The bishop washes his hands and continues saying the Mass.

**11. After the Offertory**

The bishop puts on his miter and takes his seat and receives a candle from each ordinand. And then the new ordinands continue to say the Mass with the bishop.

**12. Continuation of the Mass and the Communion of the Ordained**

This takes place and the ordained receive under one species only. After receiving Holy Communion, the bishop finishes the ablutions, then intones the responsories.

**New Rite**

**\*\*\*\* This is omitted. \*\*\*\***

**13. Presentation of the Gifts**

Contrast the Old Rite and the New Rite, where in typical modernist style, the deacon receives the offertory “gifts” of bread and wine from the “people” and prepares the gifts for the new priests. The deacon hands them to the bishop, who gives them to the new priests, saying:

*Accept from the holy people of God the gifts to be offered to him. Know what you are doing and imitate the mystery you celebrate: model your life on the mystery of the Lord’s Cross.*

***The modern rite does not explicitly manifest that the new priest has the power to offer the sacrifice of the Mass. The words above indicate almost a fear of referring to the Unbloody Sacrifice of the Mass.***

**14. The Kiss of Peace \* [This takes place at a different place in the New Rite than in the Old Rite.]**

Lastly, the bishop stands and gives the kiss of peace to the new priest, saying: “Peace be with you.”

The priest responds: “And also with you.”

If circumstances permit, the priests present also give the kiss of peace to the newly ordained.

Meanwhile, the antiphon “You are my friends, says the Lord, if you do what I command you” and Psalm 100 may be sung, repeating the antiphon every two verses. The psalm is interrupted when the priests present have received the kiss of peace.

**Old Rite**

I will not now call you servants but my friends; for you have known all things whatsoever I have wrought in the midst of you. Alleluia.

Receive in you the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete; He it is whom the Father will send you. Alleluia.

You are my friends if you do the things that I command you. Receive in you the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete.

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. He it is whom the Father will send you. Alleluia

**13. Recital of the Apostles' Creed**

The new ordinands now recite the Apostles' Creed as a profession of faith.

**New Rite**

Any other appropriate song may be sung, or "No longer do I call you servants, but my friends, because you know all that I have done among you."

"Receive the Holy Spirit as an Advocate among you: it is he whom the Father will send you. You are my friends if you do the things I command you."

"Receive the Holy Spirit as an Advocate among you. Glory be to the Father . . . It is he whom the Father will send you."

**[After the Kiss of Peace, the "liturgy of the eucharist" takes place and apparently the Novus Ordo Missae is concluded with no other special ceremonies occurring.]**

[It is interesting to note that the responsories of the Old Rite are put after the distribution of Holy Communion, but in the New Rite they are put before the actual concelebration of the Mass's consecration.]

\*\*\*\* Omitted \*\*\*\*

**Old Rite**

**14. Bestowal of the Power to Forgive Sins**

The old rite solemnly declares the power that was already given to the priest in the moment of his ordination.

The newly ordained kneel before the bishop. **The bishop lays his hands on each ordinand and says:**

**“Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins thou shalt forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins thou shalt retain, they are retained.”**

**15. The Unfolding of the Chasuble**

**The bishop unfolds the ordinand’s chasuble.**

Then the bishop unfolds the back part of the chasuble, saying:

May the Lord clothe thee with the robe of innocence.

This is symbolic of the full powers now formally bestowed.

**New Rite**

**\*\*\*\* Omitted \*\*\*\***

[It is interesting to note that this is omitted, which makes the responsories above seem ludicrous, because the Father is to send the Holy Spirit, but yet there is never any indication that the Holy Ghost has actually come to the ordinand, whereas in the Old Rite, there is the prayer invoking the Holy Ghost in actuality to come. This is an appalling omission of the declaring of such an important function of the priest.]

**\*\*\*\* Omitted \*\*\*\***

**Old Rite****16. The Solemn Promise of Obedience**

In the Old Rite it seems more fitting that the new priest can now promise obedience as a priest.

Now the bishop takes both hands of the ordained into his own and asks for the promise of obedience. If he is the Ordinary of the ordained, he says:

Dost thou promise me and my successors reverence and obedience?

If the bishop is not the Ordinary of the ordained, he says:

To secular priests: Dost thou promise to the Bishop, thy Ordinary ...?

To religious priests: Dost thou promise to the Bishop (or Prelate) who will be thy Ordinary for the time being, reverence and obedience? The priest answers: I promise.

**17. The Kiss of Peace**

The kiss of peace is a small ceremonial gesture, which shows the fatherly affection bishop has for his new priestly son, who has just promised to be obedient. This seems more fittingly placed here than where it is placed in the showy modernist New Rite Novus Ordo Mass.

Then the bishop, still holding the newly ordained priest's hands within his own, kisses him on the right cheek, saying:

The peace of the Lord be always with thee.

The priest answers: Amen.

**New Rite**

These promises were made earlier in the New Rite (see No. 6), even before the form of ordination.

\* This was done earlier in the New Rite

**Old Rite**

**18. The Instruction**

The bishop solemnly exhorts the new priest to take care in performing his awesome responsibility of offering the Mass. [It is fitting that the father figure of the bishop should now exhort his son, the new priest.]

The bishop, having received the crosier, now addresses to the newly ordained priests the following exhortation:

Dearly beloved sons, since the office which you will perform is beset with considerable danger, I admonish you to learn carefully from other experienced priests the order of the whole Mass, the consecration and the breaking of the host, and the communion, before you begin to celebrate Mass.

**New Rite**

\*\*\*\* Omitted \*\*\*\*

**Old Rite****19. The Solemn Blessing**

The bishop blesses the new priest as follows:

The bishop rises and blesses the priests kneeling before him:

May the blessing of the almighty God, the + Father, the + Son, and the Holy + Ghost, descend upon you, that you may be blessed in the priestly order, and offer up the sacrifice of propitiation for the sins and offenses of the people to almighty God, to whom be honor and glory forever and ever. R. Amen.

[It is interesting to note that this blessing explicitly states the **sacrificial power** of the priest and that the **New Rite omits it** and **never explicitly states this power.**]

The bishop lays aside miter and crosier and continues the Mass prayers (the Communion verse and Post Communion verse) together with the newly ordained.

**New Rite**

\*\*\*\* Omitted \*\*\*\*

This is a surprising and unexplainable omission in the New Rite.

**It is important to point out that the New Rite of ordination takes place in a sacrilegious Novus Ordo Mass!!!**

**Old Rite**

**20. The Final Admonition**

(After the Last Blessing) With miter on and crosier in hand, the bishop seats himself and addresses all the ordained kneeling before him. If all orders have been conferred, the following admonition is read as it stands; if not, reference to the orders not received is left out. Dearly beloved sons, carefully consider the order which you have received today and the burden which has been laid upon your shoulders. Endeavor to live holy lives devoted to religion and to be pleasing to the almighty God, that you may obtain His grace. May He in His mercy deign to bestow it upon you.

The bishop having put aside the crosier and miter goes to the gospel side of the altar and, together with the newly ordained priest, begins the Last Gospel.

**New Rite**

\*\*\*\*Omitted\*\*\*\*