

VATICANUM 2 NEW RITES - ARE THEY VALID?

by Eugene A. W. Howson (Surrey, England)

EINSICHT: Juli 1981

Given Here is a brief explanation of the Roman Pontifical for the ordination of Bishops as revised by decree of the Second Vatican Council and published by the authority of Paul VI. Then follows an explanation of the Decree of Pope Leo XIII against Anglican ordinations. What he says in the Church's binding Judgment on the Anglicans can equally be said against the defects inherent in the V-2 ordinations.

I. DISTINCTION BETWEEN BISHOP AND PRIEST

Before considering the V-2 new Ordinal it seems appropriate to make a few remarks on the distinction between a priest and bishop, and thus to determine what power or powers are given to the latter over and above those of the priest.

Whatever may have been the opinions in the past or even in the present to the contrary, it seems abundantly clear to the writer, that as there are only SEVEN SACRAMENTS, of which one is that of ORDER, the priest having received this Sacrament when he was ordained a priest, cannot receive it again when he is consecrated Bishop, for this is one of the three Sacraments which cannot be received more than once. It is also clear from the fact that the Catholic Church insists that a candidate for the Episcopate MUST BE A PRIEST, that the Consecration rite CANNOT IMPART THE CHARACTER of the Sacrament of Order. If it could, then there would be no need for the Church to insist on this condition.

EPISCOPAL POWER AND DUTIES

Apart from the POWER OF JURISDICTION, which is NOT bestowed by a sacramental rite, but by a COMMISSION received from Christ or from the lawful Ecclesiastical authority, since its DIRECT OBJECT is not the Production of the SPIRITUAL EFFECT OF POWER AND GRACE IN THE SOUL, the ESSENTIAL POWER which differentiates the EPISCOPACY from the PRIESTHOOD, is that the former alone has the POWER to transmit the PRIESTHOOD. This opinion is confirmed by St. JEROME and others. Just as the POWER to forgive sins was given by Christ as an ANNEXATION to, and CONSEQUENT to the PRIESTHOOD, so the Priest is elevated to the HIGHEST RANK of the Priesthood, when the POWER TO TRANSMIT the SACRAMENT OF ORDER is ANNEXED in the CONSECRATION RITE to his PRIESTHOOD.

The essentials of the rite whereby the Priest is raised to time Episcopate consists in the Imposition of the Bishop's hands (the MATTER) and the recitation of the prescribed prayer (the FORM); but like the Sacraments, there must be a SIGNIFICATION of what the POWER IS THAT IS TO BE CONFERRED. In other words, what the Church means by MINISTERIUM SUMMUM (the HIGH PRIESTHOOD), which is the RANK of the BISHOP. The Form itself does not specify this in the Old Ordinal, but it does SPECIFY the DUTIES of a Bishop with the words: "Episcopus oportet judicare, interpretari, consecrare, ordinare, offerre, baptizare, et confirmare." A bishop must judge, interpret, consecrate, ordain, offer, baptise, and confirm.

A. DELIBERATE OMISSIONS

In the new rite, the MATTER is still the Laying on of Hands, whilst the Form is more explicit in its SIGNIFICATION than the old. Quoting from the English version issued in 1978 by the INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE ENGLISH IN THE LITURGY, the ESSENTIAL part of the FORM says:

"Father, you know all hearts, You have chosen your servants for the OFFICE OF BISHOP. May they be shepherds to your holy flock, and high priests blameless in your sight, ministering to

you night and day; may they always gain the blessing of your favour and offer the gifts of your holy Church.

Through the Spirit who gives the grace of high priesthood, grant them the power to forgive sins as you have commanded, to assign ministries as you have decreed, and to loose every bond by the authority which you gave to your apostles.

May they be pleasing to you by their gentleness and purity of heart, presenting a fragrant offering to you, through Jesus Christ, your Son, through whom glory and power and honour are yours with the Holy Spirit in your holy Church now and forever. Amen."

B. NO POWER TO ORDAIN, CONFIRM, CONSECRATE

The traditional liturgy and rites were supposed to have needed change in order to simplify and clarify obscurities; yet in the V-2 ceremony, we see the POWER TO FORGIVE SINS being given to BISHOPS, whilst NOT giving this power to PRIESTS. What strange theological reasoning could be behind such a change?

There is no mention of the POWER to ORDAIN, the essence of the HIGH PRIESTHOOD ... or is 'ASSIGN in ministries as you have decreed' supposed to mean this? If so, why not say 'to ORDAIN'? Although the ENGLISH VERSION uses this phrase 'ASSIGN etc.' it does not appear in the ORIGINAL LATIN, where this second power is, "Ut distribuant MUNERA secundum praeceptum". What these 'MUNERA', 'GIFTS', are supposed to be, the rite is silent. WHY? And why this DISCREPANCY BETWEEN the LATIN ORIGINAL from Rome, and the VERSION produced by I.C.E.L.?? There is no prima facie evidence here that the New Rite Bishop has any power to ORDAIN and thereby pass on the powers of the PRIESTHOOD, even if the rite for ORDAINING PRIESTS used was a valid one. And although it is generally agreed that a simple Priest can be authorised to CONFIRM, the Bishop is the Normal Minister of this Sacrament, yet no mention is made of this power, nor of his power to consecrate the HOLY OILS. So even if for the sake of argument, the word 'MUNERA' (GIFTS) was intended to mean these other powers, why does not a revised rite, whose alleged object was to clarify, not say so? In any event, the ENGLISH VERSION, which is the one which would be used in English-speaking countries, has NOTHING which could possibly be interpreted to mean either to CONFIRM or CONSECRATE.

One can therefore only conclude THAT THIS NEW RITE IS LIKE THAT FOR THE PRIESTHOOD: INVALID, since it fails to give the ESSENTIAL POWER belonging ONLY TO THE BISHOP; the POWER TO ORDAIN. This is a Spiritual power, the powers of ASSIGNING AND LOOSING are JUDICIARY POWERS.

How can one draw any other conclusion, when deliberately suppressing the Catholic RITE of APOSTOLIC TRADITION, the Reformers draw up a new one, DELIBERATELY leaving out (some say through INCOMPETENCE) the ESSENTIAL REASON which the CATHOLIC CHURCH had, for raising a priest to the EPISCOPACY!!!

It follows, therefore, not only from the changes in the Ordinal for the Priesthood, but confirmed by the one for the Episcopacy, that this is NOT the CATHOLIC RELIGION, but a new one, a PROTESTANT RELIGION, calling itself Catholic, having NEITHER PRIEST, NOR BISHOP, but only LAYMEN as MINISTERS.

True, the new rite uses MATTER and FORM so as to appear to conform to that of the old (APOSTOLIC) rite; but what is the value of words in the FORM, if the MEANING THEY ARE

INTENDED TO CONVEY, is not stated, either there, or somewhere else in the rite? AND when the PRINCIPAL MEANING is OMITTED, how can one conclude rationally that the MEANING OR INTENTION is, in fact, the same as in the 'OLD RITE'? To maintain that it does, is to make a mockery and nonsense of LANGUAGE, which God has given to man, solely to CONVEY MEANING.

It may be of interest to note, whatever the theological importance of the ceremony is, or is not, that the ANOINTING of the HANDS of the Bishop-Elect, has been abolished!

II. VALIDITY OF V-2 ORDINATION RITE?

Some further reflections on the validity or invalidity of the V-2 New Ordination Rite of 1968, is not only a reasonable and prudent act but also easily accomplished once we come to understand that we have no less an authority than the APOSTOLICAE CURAE, or Bulla, issued on September 18, 1896 by one of our greatest modern day Pontiffs, Pope Leo XIII, to use in testing the validity or invalidity of the "new rite".

Back in the mid 1800's certain Roman Catholic leaders with some Anglican leaders were attempting unity with Rome while entertaining strange illusions as to how this would come about. It was in the Spring of the year 1895, when the great Pope Leo caused the English to see that to become a Catholic one might remain an Englishman but not an Anglican. In closing his very beautiful Letter, this Holy Father recommended prayers to the Mother of God. He did this deliberately for several reasons; one, as a test of the Anglican sincerity. If they were to be united to the One true Church, then it was high time they should show their love and trust in the help of the Mother of God. No namby-pambyism about Pope Leo XIII.

Following his Spring Letter, he gave them another in June of the same year. Pope Leo traces for them and all of us, the image of the Church, sketches Her prominent features, bringing out in relief the characteristic mark of Her Unity. Never did Leo give up any of Her Rights or Perogatives. No compromising, no suppressing truths in favor of conciliating. No never.

It was again Spring, this time, 1896, when this holy Pontiff appointed a commission to re-examine the question of validity of Anglican ordinations. In September 1896 he decreed a most important Church Judgment, "APOSTOLICAE CURAE", showing the Anglican ordinations according to the Edwardine rite had in three centuries been regarded by the Apostolic Church as null and void. The re-examination of Anglican Ordinal proved that the Sacrament of Holy Orders no longer existed in the Anglican Church.

Later that year, Leo settled the matter for all time, answering in detail the intention, and the matter and form of the rite of Ordination.

Those on both sides who had tried for a false unity, fell back on their heels, as they admitted the Judgment had overthrown their whole position.

In Pope Leo XIII's Bulla, declaring the Anglican Orders invalid, we have a powerful weapon to use against the V-2 Montinian rite. Let us use it. As Leo showed the substantial defects, and the corrupt intention of the persons ordaining, such rite and intention manifestly excluding the essence of the priesthood, namely, the power to offer the Divine Sacrifice, and the resulting invalidity of the Sacraments when the form used does not truly signify the effect intended by Christ and therefore the One Church He Founded, let us do likewise to the V-2 Montimmian rite, in proving its complete INVALIDITY.

The decree of Pope Leo XIII, as you might expect, brought forth angry and loud complaints and objections from the Anglicans. Responding to this reaction the Cardinal Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Westminster wrote a "Vindication of the Bulla of Pope Leo XIII".

In their own document the English Bishops back in those days, using the Judgment of Pope Leo XIII, wrote: "CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF THE PRIESTHOOD".

"Priest and Sacrifice are correlative terms with us at all events, and indeed with all nations, except insofar as your own Communion may be an exception. A Priest is one who offers sacrifice; and as is the sacrifice, so is the priest. Since, then, our sacrifice is the Sacrifice of the Mass, our priest is one appointed and empowered to offer up that sacrifice; one, therefore, who has received from God the power, by means of the words of consecration, to cause the Body and Blood of Christ to become present under the appearance of bread and wine, and to offer them up sacrificially. He may have OTHER POWERS ANNEXED TO HIS OFFICE, AS THE POWER TO FORGIVE SINS: and he may be likewise charged with the Duty of preaching the Word of God, and exercising pastoral care over the people. But these other POWERS and duties are SUPERADDED AND CONSEQUENT. They are suitably ANNEXED to the priesthood, but they are NOT OF ITS ESSENCE. The priest would not have been less a priest if they had been withheld from him, nor is he more a priest because Our Lord has thought fit to communicate them to him."

Here is clear teaching of the ESSENCE of the Priesthood, confirmed not only by the manner in which Our Lord instituted the Sacraments of Order and Penance, but by the practice of the Catholic Church in her traditional rite, whereby after the priest is ordained, the Bishop then invokes the Holy Ghost, and by the imposition of hands and the accompanying prayer, transmits to the newly ordained priest, the power to forgive sins.

NOT GIVEN TO V-2 "PRIESTS"

A little later, let us examine the Montinian rite of 1968, to determine if the ordained is truly a valid priest. But for the moment, let us pretend to ourselves that he is, then quite definitely he has not been given the POWER TO FORGIVE SINS, since the V-2 new rite has suppressed the Form and Matter, and is silent also, whereby this POWER was ANNEXED to the PRIEST, in the old (Apostolic) rite. This is itself serious enough. But the real crime, is that from the "POPE" down, through the Bishops, and priests, the laity are permitted to go to these men who unquestionably have no POWER, to have in their belief, their sins forgiven. This treacherous deceit, this sacrilege, this profanation of the Sacrament of Penance, must be one of the greatest sins ever committed by the clergy. The real question to be asked is: Could a true successor of St. Peter promulgate such a rite, and the answer must be a clear NO!

The only conclusion, the only honest assessment, is Montini MUST BE A FALSE POPE to have issued such a rite, and his successor John Paul II also a FALSE POPE for allowing such a rite to be continued in use. And what of the bishops, the ones who use it, can they be considered as true SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES? The answer again must be a clear NO!

How can a true Successor of the Apostles NOT PASS ON this POWER to forgive sins? By using the Montinian rite, that is how. In other words, that is the intention. They are destroying the Sacrament of Penance, for, in time, there will be no Bishop in the Western Church with this POWER to pass on. He cannot pass on what he has not received, any more than the Apostles could have, had they not received this same POWER from Christ. One is therefore forced to come to the conclusion, that these men are not only deceiving the laity, but that they are either APOSTATES or COWARDS. The evidence of decline in confessions in the United Kingdom, and its virtual decrease in Holland, would lead one to think that they belong to the former, rather than the latter designation. It was no oversight or accident that this POWER was excluded from the Ordination rite, because had it been, that omission could have been easily rectified. Twelve years later, and millions of invalid and profane confessions, the rite remains unchanged. The laity do not know, at least only a few, so they cannot be blamed, but the clergy do and they must share the guilt of their bishops. Members of the English Hierarchy, when challenged with this dishonesty, maintain a solid wall of deafening SILENCE.

LEO XIII ON VALIDITY OF HOLY ORDERS

All the foregoing supposes that the men ordained under the V-2 new rite are true priests, but what if their ordination is invalid? If they are true priests, then the lack of the POWER to forgive sins could be remedied, but if they are not, the giving of this POWER would be meaningless, for it belongs by Divine Institution to the Apostolic priesthood ALONE. We must, therefore, consider the validity of the New Rite of Ordination, in the light of the principles laid down by Leo XIII.

Again quoting from the VINDICATION of the Bulla, the Bishops say: "The Bulla, however, when passing over controversies about the matter, lays down that the FORM of Holy Orders must be definite. It is requiring not that the form should always consist of the same words, but that it should always be conformed to the SAME DEFINITE TYPE." Hence it goes on to say in what this definiteness of type is to consist. The FORM it says must always "definitely express the sacred order, OR its grace and power, which is chiefly the POWER of CONSECRATING and OFFERING the BODY and BLOOD of the Lord".

The VINDICATION continues: "But we also notice another and somewhat surprising misconception in your further contention that the particular SIGNIFICATION which the Pope deems essential to Holy Orders is not discoverable in many of the forms which the Holy See, nevertheless allows to be VALID.

After discussing some of these ancient forms to which the Anglicans had referred, the Vindication continues: "What Leo XIII means is that the Order to which the candidate is being promoted MUST BE DISTINCTLY INDICATED either by ITS ACCEPTED NAME, OR by an EXPLICIT reference to the grace and POWER which belongs to it ... Nor is such a disjunctive statement unreasonable, for in the CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC CHURCH the alternative phrases are perfectly EQUIVALENT."

POWER TO OFFER SACRIFICE

"THE CATHOLIC CHURCH has always meant by the term PRIEST (sacerdos) a person appointed and EMPOWERED to offer SACRIFICE. - For the true historical fact, a fact which was carefully investigated in the recent commissions is that not one single Ordination rite which the Catholic Church has accepted is WITHOUT ONE OR other of these alternative modes of DEFINITE SIGNIFICATION.

"A further objection of the Anglicans is then considered. The terms "Priest", "Bishop", it may be said are now declared to be the accepted terms to denote those who have received in SUBSTANCE or in PLENITUDE the SACRIFICIAL POWER. Why then, have they been rejected in an earlier part of this LETTER, as NOT bearing that MEANING when they occur in your prayer. Because Leo XIII ruled in his Bulla that the formula 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest or bishop has no validity being now mere names VOIDED OF THE REALITY WHICH CHRIST INSTITUTED, once a new rite has been introduced denying or corrupting the sacrament of Order, and repudiating any notion whatsoever of consecration and sacrifice. The Pope also said that if an ordination rite IMPLIES the EXCLUSION OF THE POWER TO OFFER SACRIFICE, then it is necessarily NULL, even though it may include EXPRESS MENTION of the word PRIEST. It is impossible for a form to be suitable and sufficient for a sacrament when it SUPPRESSES that which it OUGHT DISTINCTLY TO SIGNIFY".

Further passages from the Vindication should now be noted since they have an important bearing on the Montinia rite of 1968.

"Your Reformers no doubt retained the terms 'priest' and 'bishop' as the distinctive names of the two higher degrees of their clergy - probably because they DID NOT DARE TO DISCARD TERMS SO LONG ESTABLISHED AND SO FAMILIAR.

"They meant not ministers EMPOWERED to offer sacrifice, but Pastors set over their flocks, to teach them, to administer to them such sacraments as they believed in, and generally to tend them spiritually. This meaning they professed to regard as that of Scripture and the Primitive Church."

Quoting Leo XIII the Vindication says: "There is nothing more pertinent than to consider the circumstances under which it was composed and publicly authorised. Being fully cognisant of the necessary connection between faith and worship, the law of believing and the law of praying, under a pretext of returning to the primitive form, | the same argument used by V-2 | THEY CORRUPTED THE LITURGICAL ORDER IN MANY WAYS to SUIT THE ERRORS OF THE REFORMERS.

For this reason in the whole ordinal not only is there no CLEAR MENTION OF THE SACRIFICE, OR CONSECRATION ... AND OFFERING SACRIFICE, but as we have just stated EVERY TRACE OF THESE THINGS WHICH HAD BEEN IN THE PRAYERS OF THE CATHOLIC RITE... WAS DELIBERATELY REMOVED AND STRUCK OUT. Their object in discarding it was to DISAVOW CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC DOCTRINES and not as you contend to render the rites SIMPLER."

"We have already dealt with the use of the word 'priest' ... and have shown that nothing can be inferred in it from the new [Edwardian] rite. Yet where ELSE can any intimation be found that the Graces imparted have any reference to the CONSECRATION AND OBLATION OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST. Nowhere, of course. But your contention seems to be that we must not argue EX SILENTIO. It would be sufficient answer to this plea to point out that at least according to the principles by which the Holy See must judge, an Ordination Rite must CONTAIN, either explicitly or at least implicitly, the DEFINITE SIGNIFICATION of what is essential to the Order conferred. But the silence of your ordinal is not merely neutral; it speaks volumes

"STRIKING SUPPRESSION"

"And yet throughout there is not one word of reference to the powers of consecration or SACRIFICE ... Why was there this striking SUPPRESSION unless it were that the MAKERS of this Ordinal could find no place in their conception of the ministry for elements which in a CATHOLIC ORDINAL are ESSENTIAL? Next look at the CATHOLIC ORDINAL which was superseded. We are not now referring to the Catholic rite in its older and simpler style, such as we find in the LEONINE SACRAMENTARY. Even there, indeed, the sacrificial character of the POWER communicated is NOT OBSCURELY INDICATED, quite apart from the use of the SACRIFICIAL TERM, Priest and Bishop. But we are calling attention to this CATHOLIC RITE, as it was PRESCRIBED AND EMPLOYED in England and on the Continent at the time of the so called Reformation.

"It is this which Cranmer and his colleagues took in hand and REFORMED. It is with THIS, therefore, that their revised rite must be compared if we desire to interpret on rational principles the MEANING of the LATTER. That the CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC RITE in its medieval stage abounded in words and ceremonies giving EXPRESSION to the SACRIFICIAL character of time POWER to be conveyed, is so well known that we do not need to prove it."

"We will content ourselves therefore with recalling to mind the delivery of the sacrificial instruments, the clothing in the sacrificial vestments, the ANOINTING of the HANDS, together with the ADDRESSES to the candidates accompanying these manual ceremonies. We desire to ACCENTUATE that these STRIKING ASSERTIONS of the SACRIFICIAL PRIESTHOOD which at the TIME were in almost IMMEMORIAL POSSESSION, were all STRUCK OUT of the Edwardian Ordinal." Why was this?

"It could not have been as you seem to suggest, because the REFORMERS wished to go back to what was primitive It could not have been... for a rite of great simplicity, for they could have RETAINED SOME SHORT SENTENCE, such as "sacerdotum opert offerre benedicere, praesse, praedicare, conficere, et baptizare" or they could have constructed another short sentence of equivalent meaning. It could not have been for NO REASON AT ALL. In short the ONLY AND SUFFICIENT REASON FOR THE SUPPRESSION is that they disliked THE NOTION OF A SACRIFICING PRIESTHOOD, which they alleged to be without warrant in Scripture, and desired to DISSOCIATE their Ordinal from all connection with it."

"This argument is strengthened when from the Ordinal itself we turn to your Communion service. To put the matter briefly, if the First Prayer Book of Edward VI is compared with the Missal, sixteen omissions can be detected of which the evident purpose was to eliminate the idea of sacrifice ... Again therefore we must put the question: Why these systematic changes and suppressions unless it was that your "Fathers" wished to prevent their rites from continuing to EXPRESS the grace and POWER which is chiefly the POWER OF CONSECRATING AND OFFERING THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST". [These same charges have been leveled against the Montinian rite by no less than the heads of the Curia, Cardinals Bacci and Ottaviani, please note.]

REAL QUESTION

"But the question really raised is as to whether the language of your Ordinal DEFINITELY SIGNIFIES the Orders of priesthood or episcopate, or the respective graces and powers of each, such a definite signification being ESSENTIAL to its recognition by the Holy See as a valid rite. Now to claim that this Ordinal can be interpreted with equal justice and propriety as expressing the opinions of Cranmer on the nature of the ministry, and those of Gardiner, is nothing less than to allow that the rite, SO FAR FROM BEING DEFINITE in its meaning, is INDEFINITE AND AMBIGUOUS, AND THAT WITH AN AMBIGUITY extending so far as to cover both the ASSERTION and the DENIAL of the true priesthood, such as Our Lord instituted."

V-2 RITE AND POPE LEO XIII

In the light of the foregoing quotations from the VINDICATION, let us now examine the new rite of 1968, or Montinian rite, which is more correct, and let us see what the relationship of it is, to the centuries old rite of the Catholic Apostolic Church. In other words, we will be making the same comparison as Leo XIII did with the Edwardian rite of the Reformers of the 16th century to the V-2 Montinian rite of the present time, in our own age, namely 1968.

The ordination rite has through the centuries had prayers and ceremonies added to it, mainly no doubt to express more clearly the Power and Grace which the Sacrament SIGNIFIES. NEVER, according to Leo XIII, has there been any suppression ... not until the time of so-called Reformers.

Nevertheless the new rite of Paul VI does retain the traditional form, as follows, but it must never be looked at in isolation from the statement of the English Bishops in their VINDICATION where warning against omitting or reforming, they state that there is no known historical foundation for subtracting prayers and ceremonies IN PREVIOUS USE. The English translation of the V-2 FORM is:

"We ask you, all-powerful Father, give these servants of yours the dignity of the priesthood. Renew the Spirit of holiness within them. By your Divine gift may they attain the second order in the hierarchy and exemplify right conduct in their lives."

This Montinian rite, this new rite however, has suppressed the following prayers which were in the ancient rite: "Be pleased O Lord, to consecrate and sanctify these hands by this anointing and our Blessing. Amen. That whatsoever they bless may be blessed, and whatsoever they consecrate may be consecrated and sanctified in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ."

When the Bishop then delivers to each priest the chalice containing wine and water, and the paten with a host upon it, he used to say this prayer: "Receive the POWER to OFFER sacrifice to God and to celebrate Mass, both for the living and the dead, in the name of the Lord, Amen."

In the place of the traditional prayer used at the anointing of the hands, the Montinian or new rite has this: "The Father anointed Jesus Christ as Lord through the power of the Holy Spirit. May Jesus keep you worthy of offering sacrifice to God and sanctifying the Christian Assembly."

In place of the suppressed prayer "Receive the power etc." as above, the Montinian or new rite bishop says: "Accept the gifts from the people to be offered to God. Be conscious of what you are doing, be as holy as the actions you perform, and model your life after the mystery of the Lord's cross."

Is this the clear and DEFINITE SIGNIFICATION of the GRACE , TO BE CONFERRED? Certainly not. In fact, as Leo said in his Bulla: "If an ordination rite implies the EXCLUSION of the POWER to OFFER SACRIFICE (and by this he meant the sacrifice of the Altar) then it is NECESSARILY NULL even though it may include express mention of the word PRIEST."

This deliberate DENIAL OF THE SACRIFICE of the MASS [that is the Divine Sacrifice of the Cross and the Altar] which is the ESSENCE OF THE CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC PRIESTHOOD, compels any reasonable person to conclude that this new rite of Montini (Paul VI) is INVALID. Again a. Pope Leo points out: "IT IS IMPOSSIBLE for a Form to be suitable and SUFFICIENT for a sacrament when it SUPPRESSES that which it ought to DISTINCTLY SIGNIFY."

CONCLUSIONS

Do we dare ignore the words of Pope Leo XIII that apply to this [V.21] new rite, this Montinian rite, just as much as to the Anglican Ordinal? Pope Leo XIII, this holy Pontiff reaches across time to NULLIFY all the V-2 rites.

Says Pope Leo XIII: If the rite is MODIFIED with the MANIFEST OBJECT of introducing ANOTHER, not admitted by the [Apostolic] Church, and REJECTING THE ONE WHICH SHE USES, then not only is the NECESSARY INTENTION for the SACRAMENT DEFECTIVE, but there is also an INTENTION CONTRARY AND OPPOSED TO THE SACRAMENT.

So again we must conclude that not only was Paul VI a FALSE-Pope, but the NEW religion OF THE VATICAN II COUNCIL is NOT THE CATHOLIC RELIGION, that those who adhere to it are NOT CATHOLICS, but APOSTATES. No true Pope, no true Catholic Bishop or Priest, could promulgate or use such a rite.

There is however, other important evidence to substantiate this because like the Reformers of the 16th century, the 20th century Reformers of the V-2 CONCILIAR Church altered in a heretical sense, not only the Ordinal Rite but the [forbidden to be altered] MASS MISSAL [and then each and every one of the other Sacraments instituted by Christ]. We must not forget that... the BELIEF of FAITH is EVIDENCED by PRAYER; as we pray so we believe and as we believe, so we pray.

In the foregoing, we have examined together, the V-2 new Ordinal rite and found that all reference to the Sacrifice of the Mass has been ELIMINATED. But the fact remains that the PRIEST and THE SACRIFICE are inseparable; if a priest does not offer the Divine Sacrifice he is useless as a

priest and if he has been "ordained" falsely and not given this POWER, he is no Priest of Christ. Certainly Pope Leo has proven this to all of us. There is no question after examining together, the V-2 new Ordinal rite against the Judgment of a loyal representative of Christ, and we have found that all reference to the Sacrifice of the Mass has been ELIMINATED. The next question we should ask is WHY? WHY? Why the elimination?

Catholics cannot have any part in the INVALID V-2 Liturgy, which forbids the offering of the Sacrifice of the Cross at the Altar of Sacrifice and substitutes a parody of the CLEAN OBLATION. Catholics can have nothing to do with the V-2 men who pose as priests, while lacking the POWER of the PRIESTHOOD of Christ. Neither may Catholics have anything to do with true priests who willfully subject themselves to the V-2 SUPPRESSIONS. However, we ought to pray for these kind because of their terrible crime of deceiving so many Catholics as to the truth of what is going on inside the Catholic Church today under the suppressions and knavery of V-2.

WACK OF SHILLELAGH

To the FALSE-Pope, J.P2 for: sanctioning and continuing to enforce the INVALID and ILLEGAL V-2-Montinian rites, thereby deceiving Catholics world-wide that the new religion with its counterfeit liturgy and rites is the same as those of the One true Church of Christ.

Sanctimoniously calling for renewal of Corpus Christi Processions, when in reality, there is not one single solitary CONSECRATED HOST in any part of the V-2 phoney set-Up. The MONTINIAN rite does not allow Consecration.

Reaffirming Paul 6's "Humanae Vitae" as if it does not preach artificial Birth-Control. [See Veritas November 1972, "What Humanae Vitae" Really Teaches]

To the local empty-See sitter, Thomas J. McDonough, for: falsely "ordaining" men using the INVALID Montinian rite; and allowing such men to believe they have the POWER of Christ's Priesthood; and deceitfully leading the people of Louisville to believe the same untruth

REQUIESCAT IN PACE Leo and S. Donaghue, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.
May God rest their souls.

NOTE: Some of you have remarked on the number of deaths among the subscribers. It is about the only time, a full name & location is printed in this paper. However, there are many many births amongst the subscribers. Some soul go Home; while more arrive. We don't mention the new arrivals often because their proud parents will soon enough have a difficult time educating these wee ones while hopefully keeping them out of the clutches of the anti-Catholic V-2 "new thinking and attitude". Let us faithfully pray for the Holy Souls, yes; but let us also pray for our so vulnerable young ones.

GUARDIAN ANGELS WATCH OVER US...

Most Precious Blood of Jesus Save Us!

Sweet Heart of Jesus Be my Love; Sweet heart of Mary be my salvation...

Mother of God we place all our causes in thy hands...

AMEN