



The Catholic Voice

A quarterly newsletter of the Society of Traditional Roman Catholics, produced under the patronage of St. Joseph.

P.O. Box 130
Mead, Washington 99021 USA

Volume 23, Issue 3
September, 2007

Honoring The 100th Anniversary Of The Encyclical *Pascendi Gregis*

By REV. KEVIN VAILLANCOURT
For The Catholic Voice

On September 8 we will honor the 100th anniversary of the promulgation of Pope St. Pius X's encyclical letter against Modernism known as *Pascendi gregis*. This is one of the most important magisterial teachings for our times because it both condemns the heresy of Modernism and it teaches us how to identify Modernist teaching. It is an encyclical that must be *studied*, meaning that it should be read slowly and deliberately. The Holy Father's outline of Modernist errors is very important for our age, for despite these warnings and condemnations, the heresy of Modernism has not disappeared. The central reason for the crisis in the Church today is that Modernism is being taught by the Modernists who are among us.

What Is Modernism?

Depending on who you speak with, *Modernism* is either a movement begun by a select group of individuals and which ended about ten years after Pope St. Pius X issued his encyclical condemning it, or it is a unified, yet very complex set of heretical beliefs and teachings in which many people have been (and still are) engaged for the purpose of *remaking the Church* according

to the "spirit of the age." For the purpose of this Study, we will follow the latter definition, leaving the very simplified explanation of Modernism, and the principle characters in that explanation (Harnack, Tyrell and Loisy among others) for another time.

Modernism is a school of thought, existing for a number of years prior to the pope's encyclical, whose object is to achieve a *complete reversal of Catholicism in its traditional form*. The Modernists work to undermine every dogma of the Faith, destroying the whole structure, while trying to replace it with an *undefinable and unknowable flux*. It is largely *evolutionary* in its design, attempting to convince Catholics that doctrines as they were once believed and taught in the early Church can and must be understood in a different manner today simply because the "scholars" of today have greater knowledge than was available before. The Modernists represent the greatest danger to the Faith, greater than any other heresy to afflict the Church in Her entire history, because their attack is not aimed at a *single* point of dogma or doctrine, but at the *entire edifice*. They are the most dangerous of all the Church's enemies because they operate from within, writing under pseudonyms, and disguising their heresy with Catholic vocabulary. It was for this reason that Modernism

(Continued on Page 3)

Is The *Novus Ordo Missae* A Catholic Mass? Let's Compare Them: Part 5

By DR. RAMA COOMARASWAMY, M.D.
Used with permission of the author

The Rite Of Peace, The Fraction of The Host And The *Agnus Dei*

After the prayer for relief of anxiety in the *Novus Ordo Missae* (NOM), the Doxology mentioned above after the Our Father is said. In the traditional Mass, at this time the priest recites a prayer for "deliverance from evil, past, present and to come," and the bestowal of "peace in our days." This is immediately followed by the *Fraction of the Host*, where the priest breaks the Host in half over the chalice, and then he breaks off another small particle. Dropping this small particle into the chalice he says:

May this mingling and consecration of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ be to us who receive it effectual to life everlasting.

Immediately the priest then bows toward the Sacred Host and says the following prayer, striking his breast each time "Lamb of God" is recited:

Lamb of God who takest away the sins of the world, have

On July 19, 2006, Dr. Coomaraswamy died after a battle with cancer. His writings have helped many to better understand the errors of our times. We continue this sample of his works (with his permission before he died) in memory of the work he had done for the Church in our time. May he rest in peace.

mercy on us; Lamb of God who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us; Lamb of God who takest away the sins of the world, grant us peace.

As part of his preparation to receive Holy Communion, the priest next recites three prayers. In the traditional Solemn High Mass, a ritual kiss of peace was exchanged between the priest, the Deacon and the Subdeacon after the first prayer. Afterwards, the priest concluded the prayers and prepared for the reception of Holy Communion.

In the modern rite, things have changed. The order of events are:

- The "Sign of Peace" is given after a short prayer. Not infrequently the modern priest comes down off the altar and shakes hands with those in the first row, and they pass it along, usually not without exchanging some trite words of greeting, to the point a low rumble of noise is heard throughout the church. Actually, this can be quite disturbing, for while Christ is supposed to be on the altar, people are greeting each other as if He weren't there. It is the participation of the "community" that is important, and indeed this is what most modern Catholics are taught.

- The "Lamb of God" prayer is now recited three times, with no striking of the breast.

(Continued on Page 4)

STRC News: CD And Tape Versions of Serving Set Available

The following are some important announcements of interest to those who support the work of the Society of Traditional Roman Catholics.

Serving At The Altar Tape And CD Set Available

For over ten years, the STRC has provided a special "kit" for those learning how to serve the Roman (Tridentine Latin) Mass. More than 2,800 copies of *Serving At The Altar* have been produced, thus contributing to the work of the Restoration by providing a means for achieving consistency in serving Holy Mass. Up until this time, we have offered a cassette tape with each "kit" so the server-in-training could follow along and perfect his Latin pronunciation. Now, due to many requests, we are offering a CD of this Latin instruction instead of the cassette tape. This is *not* a video presentation for learning how to serve at Mass. It is an *audio* CD for learning to recite the Latin responses. We will continue to offer the cassette tape version *only as long as we can get the material needed to make up these "kits" in cassette form*. So, when ordering your copies of *Serving At The Altar*, *you must specify which media format you prefer*: cassette or CD. *If no preference is given, the cassette tape will be sent*. However, we have enough material to make *only 10 more sets*. Once these are gone, we are not sure how many more cassette tape versions will be available in the future.

Three Important Reprints:

The Mysterious Mysteries of the Rosary:

Reasons for rejecting the "Luminous Mysteries". By James De Piante

A Catholic Reading of the Declaration *Dominus Jesus*

by Paula Haigh

Pontificum Summorum: Is It Traditional Teaching?

by Fr. Kevin Vaillancourt

A critical review of the motu proprio on the Latin Mass

Minimum donation: \$5.00 each, includes postage.

Order now from: STRC, P.O. Box 130, Mead, WA 99021 USA



Serving at the Altar

Learning to Serve at Low Mass with one Server

Available now for a \$14⁹⁵ donation to STRC.

Please specify if you want a CD or a cassette tape. We have only 25 tapes sets left for sale — first come, first served.

Annual Request For Donations

Subscribers to *The Catholic Voice* know that it has been the policy of the Society of Traditional Roman Catholics to offer our newsletter without a set subscription fee. We have always depended on the Providence of God, and the good will of those who read our publication, to supply us with enough money to print and distribute our newsletter, and then accomplish some other works of our apostolate, if possible.

We can be sure that you who read this have experienced increases in your expenses. So have we. Postage and printing costs went up this past year impacting the budget we set aside for each issue. It is not the intent of the STRC Board of Directors to begin requiring a subscription fee to our newsletter, even though our funds have tightened this past year. However, we find it necessary to come to you, our readers, once again, asking for your financial assistance. If you receive some benefit from our publication, could you please take the time *today* to send us a donation to help us defray these essential costs? Any size donation will help. May God reward you.

2008 Calendar Available

As part of our apostolate to promote the traditional Liturgy of the Roman Catholic Church, the Society of Traditional Roman Catholics has, for the past ten years, offered a beautiful wall calendar to those whose annual donation to assist us in our work amounts to at least \$25.00. The calendar will be in the mail in early December. If you would like a copy, please be sure to send us your donation as soon as possible so that we will have a sufficient supply to meet our needs. †

Past Articles Of *The Catholic Voice* Available As Reprints

Are you a new reader of *The Catholic Voice*? Do you want to know where we're "coming from"? Or, would you like more ammunition in the fight to defend the Tridentine Latin Mass? Whatever the case, we have reprinted several articles for those involved in the Traditional Movement. We now have these articles available:

1. Defending The Tridentine Mass

Our case regarding the invalidity of the Novus Ordo fully explained.

2. The Sky Grows Darker

The text of a speech by Patrick Henry Omlor. A great summary.

3. The Ecumenist Heresy

A very important work by Patrick Henry Omlor.

4. The *Special Edition* of *The Catholic Voice*

A perfect introductory piece, produced specially by STRC for distribution among Catholics not familiar with the Traditional Movement of the Roman Catholic Church.

All of these reprints are available for a donation. Please request the article by name. For quantity discounts, contact us by mail at the address on Page 1. †



The Catholic Voice is a publication of the Society of Traditional Roman Catholics, and is published quarterly, as funds are available. There is no subscription fee, but donations are requested to help us continue our work. Board Officers of the STRC are Larry Martin, *President*, James De Piante, *Secretary*, Jim Callahan, *Treasurer*, Fr. Kevin Vaillancourt, *Newsletter Editor*, and Don Donadio. Unsolicited manuscripts are welcome, but are subject to the editorial policy of the STRC Board of Directors. There is no stipend paid for unsolicited manuscripts, and material submitted cannot be returned. *Pro Multis* pins supporting our work can be obtained from STRC for a minimum donation of \$5.00.

At The Heart Of The Modernist Error Is Evolutionary Change

(Continued from Page 1)

is known as the “synthesis of all heresies,” troubling the Church with heresies that were long ago — and for some not that many years ago — condemned.

Two months before the encyclical was promulgated, Pope St. Pius X approved a *Syllabus of Errors Against the Modernists*, also known as *Lamentabili*. In this he explained that, because of the “fever for novelties” which characterized the times, a number of errors were being taught “under the color of science and progress.” They belonged to two main groups: those concerned with the *interpretation of Scripture* and those concerned with the *Mysteries of the Faith*. The pope charged the “Holy Inquisition, Roman and Universal” with the task of noting and reproofing the principal of these errors. There followed sixty-five erroneous propositions, drawn up by the Congregation of the Inquisition, and they had as their purpose to reaffirm the teachings of Popes Pius IX and Leo XIII in the areas of objective revelation as disclosed in the Scriptures and safeguarded by the Church. They also explained the legitimacy of the *development* of the Faith over the centuries, not an evolutionary *change* in dogmatic beliefs.

The encyclical *Pascendi gregis* was the natural complement to the *Syllabus* in that it now took a body of related ideas, isolated them, and called them *Modernism*, pronouncing those who follow such lines of thinking *even in the least* to fall under the condemnation of the whole doctrine. It might be possible for one individual Modernist to say that he does not subscribe to everything the pope condemns as heretical, however the pope anticipated this argument when he taught: “*Their system does not consist in scattered and unconnected theories, but, as it were, in a closely connected whole, so that it is not possible to admit one without admitting them all.*”

Three years after the encyclical letter was published, the *Oath Against Modernism* (as found in the motu proprio *Sacrorum antistitum*, September 1, 1910) appeared on the scene. It is required that all clerics who are promoted to Major Orders, all clergy who exercise any ministerial function, and seminary and university professors take this Oath, that is, until John XXIII eliminated its “necessity.” The Oath includes, in addition to a complete submission to the decree *Lamentabili* and the encyclical *Pascendi*, such declarations that the existence of God can be certainly demonstrated by the light of natural reason, an admission of the external proofs of Revelation, and a declaration that the Church was immediately and directly instituted by Christ during His life on earth.

The Pope finds two errors at the root of Modernism: one is *agnosticism*, according to which God is “unknowable,” so that reason has little to offer in finding a grounding for faith, its arguments and constructions being in mere “intellectualism”. The other is the paramount role of “*Vital Immanence*,” a *need* for the divine existing deep down in our nature, which not only makes us *seek*, but enables us to *find* God. This has its counterpart in humanity as “*Divine Permanence*,” which is the religious tradition of *mankind*, expressed in the Sacraments and teaching of the Church. Taken together, they represent a playing down of

the rational element in religion and a playing up of an intuitional, subjective and romantic element.

The Pope gave an *outline* of the erroneous “reforms” demanded by the Modernists: reform of the history, theology and philosophy taught in the seminaries, a purging of the dogmatic content of the catechism, a reduction in the number of devotions, a reform of ecclesiastical government to bring it “into harmony with men’s conscience, which is turning to democracy,” reform in the realm of morality by the adoption of the principles of the Americanists — the assertion of the superiority of the active virtues, and a return of the clergy to their “ancient poverty and humility.”

What follows is a *summary* of drastic measures the Pope saw necessary to undertake in order to safeguard the Catholic Faith:

1. The scholastic philosophy is to form the basis of all sacred studies.

2. There is to be strict censorship of the opinions of the professors and directors in the seminaries. The regular course in scholastic philosophy is to be required of all candidates for the doctorates of Theology or Canon Law.

3. The bishops are to assist the work of the censor by prohibiting the reading in seminaries of any Modernist literature which, owing to the quantity published, may have escaped the attention of Rome.

4. The bishops must appoint censors in their dioceses to examine all books and periodicals. Their signed *nihil obstat* must precede the granting of an episcopal *imprimatur*.

5. Vigilance committees are to be set up in each diocese to collect any evidence of Modernist writing or teaching, and are to meet every second month and deliberate secretly.

6. These committees are to keep their eyes open especially for Modernist treatment of social questions and social institutions.

7. Bishops are to report to Rome every three years, and under oath, on the doctrines current among their clergy.

Had these directives been kept in their entirety as the Pope wished, perhaps Vatican II would never have gotten off the ground.

Space does not permit a complete review of Modernist teachings since Vatican II. Let’s move ahead to more recent displays of these heresies for the purpose of proving that Modernism is very much alive as the chief enemy we must fight in our time, not one another. Until we unite against this destructive force, God will not grant us the grace of a restoration of the true teachings and worship of the Roman Catholic Church restored for all to see and hear.

The “Questionable Clarifications”

When some traditional organizations entered into “talks” with modern Rome to the end of establishing a reconciliation between them, two important events were required by those traditionalists as a demonstration of modern Rome’s “good faith”: the “universal indult,” allowing all priests to say the Latin Mass, and the elimination of the questionable term “subsists in” as found in *Lumen Gentium* and other documents published after Vatican

(Continued on Page 10)

The Modern Rite Of Communion Varies Greatly With Traditional Rite

(Continued from Page 1)

- Following this, the modern priest takes up the host and breaks it over the paten, saying nothing. A small particle is dropped into the chalice while he says:

May this mingling of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ bring eternal life to us who receive it.

- The modern priest then recites one of two prayers (his choice) as his preparation for “the eucharist.”

For those who say the *Novus Ordo Missae* is the same as the traditional Latin Mass have only to look at the series of events for these prayers to see that this is not true.

The Communion Rite

The “rite of the eucharist” is truly a telling feature of the *Novus Ordo Missae* as to the loss of reverence that modern Catholics have been exposed to.

After reciting his prayer of preparation, the priest-president, facing the people, then holds up the fractured bread over the paten and says:

“This is the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world. Happy are those who are called to his supper.

Lord, I am not worthy to receive you, but only say the word and I shall be healed.”

The last prayer is only said if there are people present, and, unlike the traditional Mass, these are the only prayers that even remotely can count as a preparation for their eucharistic rite. After all, to recite the *Confiteor* (or something like it) at this time would be redundant, and if there is anything Vatican II wanted eliminated was any semblance of repetition, especially words of sorrow and contrition. This is perhaps the only prayer that suggests - only suggests mind you - that something has happened on the table (the reference to table will be explained later). But lest the suggestion be taken too seriously, we are once again regaled with the fact that it is a “supper.” As Paul VI said (in a somewhat ambiguous way) “The Mass is and will remain the memorial of the Lord’s Supper.” (DOL1759).

For the reception of the eucharist for himself, the priest says “May the body of Christ bring me to everlasting life,” and “May the blood of Christ bring me to everlasting life.” For the people it is much more abbreviated. Making no Sign of the Cross, he holds up the bread and says: *The body of Christ*. And the one receiving it says *Amen*, almost as if the Amen/Profession of Faith is necessary on the part of the one receiving their eucharist. This person stands before the table with no Communion Rail to separate the laity from the sanctuary. He stands, arranges his hands according to the manner instructed, and he receives the modern eucharist on the palm of his hand, later placing the bread on his own tongue. And, if the chalice is made available, the person goes to a separate area where a Deacon (man or woman) is standing, who says *The blood of Christ*, to which the communicant responds *Amen*. (Note: Both *Body* and *Blood* are in the lower case in the modern missal). At this time the priest may, of course, let the Eucharistic Ministers do this while he sits in the “presidential chair.”

Following the eucharist service, the priest goes back to the table. There is no clear cut instruction for the priest-president to wash his hands, though many do so either out of habit or to keep their fingers clean. And indeed, how could there be in so far as there is no clear cut rubric stating that they must purify their fingers at the beginning, and no care taken to keep the index and thumb closed except when handling the Sacred Species and over the Corporal at all times once the Consecration has occurred. There are many other points of significance which space and time do not allow us to go into. But a few words must be said about what is called the “Concluding Rite.” The priest-president says “*The Lord be with you,*” and the congregation answers “*And also with you.*” He gives them a simple blessing: “*May almighty God bless you, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Amen.*” (He has a choice of several.) After this the faithful are dismissed in the following words: “*Go, the mass is ended, go in peace.*” or “*Go in peace to love and serve the Lord...*” They answer “*Thanks be to God.*”

The traditional priest doesn’t have it so easy. He is still about God’s business. He has not yet turned away from the altar. He next says three prayers in an attitude of deep obeisance:

O Lord Jesus Christ Who didst say to Thine apostles: Peace I leave you, My peace I give you: look not upon my sins, but upon the faith of Thy Church, and vouchsafe to grant her peace and unity according to Thy will: Who livest and reignest God, world without end. Amen.

The NOM has taken part of this prayer and transferred it to the “Rite of Peace” It is also somewhat modified to make it more communitarian.

Lord Jesus Christ, you said to your apostles: I leave you peace, my peace I give you. Look not on our sins, but on the faith of your Church, and grant us peace and unity of your kingdom where you live for ever and ever. Amen.

The following two prayers of the traditional priest have been deleted in the NOM:

O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, Who, according to the will of the Father, through the co-operation of the Holy Ghost, hast by Thy death given life to the world: deliver me by this Thy most Sacred Body and Blood from all my iniquities, and from every evil; make me always cleave to Thy commandments, and never suffer me to be separated from Thee, Who with the same God, the Father and the Holy Ghost, livest and reignest God, world without end. Amen.

Let not the partaking of Thy Body, O Lord Jesus Christ, which I, all unworthy presume to receive, turn to my judgment and condemnation; but through Thy loving kindness may it be to me a safeguard and remedy for soul and body; Who, with God the Father, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, livest and reignest, God world without end. Amen.

The traditional priest then kneels (genuflects) down in adoration and says:

I will take the Bread of Heaven and call upon the Name of the Lord.

(Continued on Page 5)

The Traditional Rite Of Communion Preserves Sense Of Sacred

(Continued from Page 4)

This is a most significant prayer for the Name of Jesus is most sacred. It was given him at the time of His Circumcision - a feast which has been suppressed - at the time when he first shed His blood for mankind. It is the most powerful Name at the sound of which "every knee should bend, in heaven, on earth and in hell."³³

Then the traditional priest rises, and taking the two pieces of host on the paten between the consecrated fingers of his left hand, adores it and says three times:

Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof, but only say the word and my soul shall be healed.³⁴

Communion

The NOM priest-president says a prayer that is similar to the traditional rite, as we saw above. The traditional priest then takes the Host in the consecrated fingers of his right hand, and holding the blessed paten which is in his left hand, he signs himself and says "May the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul unto everlasting life. Amen" and communicates himself. After this he folds his hand and says a brief prayer - brief because he must proceed to service the congregation. He next kneels again, and taking the paten carefully gathers any particles that may have fallen on the corporal. These he brushes into the chalice with care, again using his consecrated fingers. He then says the following prayer:

What shall I render unto the Lord for all the things that He has rendered unto me? I will take the chalice of salvation and will call upon the name of the Lord. With high praises will I call upon the Lord, and I shall be saved from all mine enemies.

The priest then signs himself with the chalice and says:

May the Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ keep my soul unto life everlasting. Amen.

After consuming the Precious Blood, the priest covers the chalice and unlocks the tabernacle. Again he kneels down in veneration. Rising, he removes the Ciborium (a gold coated vessel usually containing the reserved Hosts from a previous Mass), removes its veil and kneels down again. While he was consuming the Precious Blood, the server repeats the *Confiteor*. This repeated *Confiteor* - the same as that initially said - is appropriate, for during the course of Mass our minds have almost inevitably wandered and been distracted. The priest in turn turns to him and to the congregation and says the *Misereatur* and the *Indulgentiam* - these prayers are given at the start of Mass. The priest then takes the Ciborium, and raising a small Host for all to see, says:

Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world.

Then three times he repeats the statement:

33. Cf. Rama Coomaraswamy, *The Invocation of the Name of Jesus*, Fons Vitae, Ky., USA. 1999

34. These words being taken from the Centurion whose son Christ healed.

Lord I am not worthy that thou should enter under my roof (palate or mouth), but only say the word and my soul shall be healed.

After this he approaches the kneeling faithful, and holding the Host he makes a small sign of the cross and says to each and every one:

May the Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ preserve your soul unto life everlasting.

The server holds a paten attached to a handle under each person's chin lest any crumb should fall, for each and every crumb is in itself the entire Body and Blood of Our Lord. When the priest has communicated all the faithful, he returns to the altar, takes the server's paten and carefully wipes any crumbs into the chalice. He then returns the Ciborium (covered with its veil), to the tabernacle, kneels again, closes the tabernacle and locks it. He then takes the chalice, and the server places more wine in it so that any of our Lord's Blood is diluted and swallowed. When he does this he says the following prayer:

Into a pure heart, O Lord, may we receive the heavenly food which has passed our lips; bestowed upon us in time, may it be the healing of our souls for eternity.

The priest then takes the empty chalice to the Epistle side of the altar. The server meets him and pours both wine and water over his consecrated fingers so that he can wash them of any small and invisible particles that may have clung to them. While he is washing these fingers he says the following prayer:

May the Body, O Lord, which I have received and Thy Blood which I have drunk cleave to mine inmost parts, and do Thou grant that no stain of sin remain in me, whom pure and holy mysteries have refreshed: Who liveth and reignest world without end. Amen.

For the first time after the words of Consecration were recited, and the priest kept is thumb a forefinger together now after what is called the "ablutions" because he purifies his fingers, for the first time, need not keep his consecrated thumb and index finger together. He now wipes the chalice with care and covers it once again. He then folds the corporal and replaces it in the Burse - placing both in the center of the altar. In the interim the server has moved the Missal from the Gospel to the Epistle side and the priest goes to the Missal and says a short Communion verse which is usually related to the Mass said. He then goes to the center, kisses the altar, turns and says: *The Lord be with you*, to which the server answers *And with thy spirit*.

He then returns to the Missal and says one or more Post-communion orations, or prayers, closes the Missal towards the center, and turns to the people and says, *Go, the Mass is ended*. To which the server answers, *Thanks be to God*.³⁵

35. The phrase *Ite Missa est* is usually translated as *Go, the Mass is ended*. An alternative, however, is to consider the Hebrew word *mincha*, which is translated oblation. Nearly always in the Old Testament this word has the specific signification of an unbloody sacrifice, and, though occasionally meaning any sort of real sacrifice, is never used to signify interior acts of worship or
(Continued on Page 9)

Summorum Pontificum: Is It An Expression Of Catholic Tradition?

By REV. KEVIN VAILLANCOURT
Editor, *The Catholic Voice*

On September 14, 2007, the recent *motu proprio* of Benedict XVI will go into effect. *Summorum Pontificum* is the long-awaited declaration on what I have referred to as the “universal indult,” giving any priest in the world the permission to say the Latin Mass according to the 1962 Missal without special permission from the local bishop. Until this July 7, 2007 document was promulgated, the requirements of *Quattuor Abhinc Annos* of 1984 and the *Ecclesia Dei* decree of 1988 (both by John Paul II), left the decision to allow the celebration of the Latin Mass (at the request of the people) up to the local bishop (if he chose to allow it). After July 7, things have changed. As Cardinal Barbarin, the Archbishop of Lyon, states: “The only new element in *Summorum Pontificum* is the decision to comply with the wishes of the faithful, depending henceforth on the *priests*’ authority.” While this is not completely true, as we will see later, it is an expression of the common thought of all who are anxious for new rules for the Latin Mass. They see that *Summorum Pontificum* takes *Ecclesia Dei* to a new level: that is, that any priest can say the Latin Mass at any time without asking special permission, and that the faithful can attend these Masses without need of a petition. If only things were as simple as this, for there is much more to this decree than simply the granting of a universal permission to say the Latin Mass. What follows is an explanation of some of the major points in the *motu proprio*, absent all the subjective euphoria, demonstrating that *Summorum Pontificum* is truly the smokescreen that I have been warning people about for quite some time.

In the days and weeks following the *motu proprio*, people all over the world were anxious to weigh in on the effects of this document. Most hailed it as a “victory for the Latin Mass,” and even the “liberation of the Latin Mass” from the chains that oppressed its public celebration after the introduction of the *Novus Ordo Missae* of Paul VI. Cardinal Karl Lehman, president of the German episcopal conference, had this interesting comment: “I hope that people on all sides will be able to guide the ‘hot heads’ toward a more moderate position.” The “hot heads” are those who prefer the use of the Latin Mass *exclusively* even though, as the Cardinal also remarked, that “the number of Christians, of Catholics, who like the traditional form is not that high.” There were some who expressed words of caution regarding the *motu proprio*. Among them was Bishop Luca Brandolini, Bishop of Sora-Aquino-Pontecorvo: “This day is for me a day of grief. I have a lump in my throat and I do not manage to hold back my tears. But, I will obey . . . However, I cannot hide my sadness for the putting aside of one of the most important reforms of the Second Vatican Council . . . I am living the saddest day of my life as a priest, as a bishop and as a man.” Abe Foxman of the Jewish Anti-Defamation League expressed his “extreme disappointment and deep offense” at the news of the promulgation of the *motu proprio*, calling it a “theological setback in the religious life of Catholics and a body-blow to Catholic-Jewish relations.” “It appears,” wrote Foxman, “the Vatican has chosen to satisfy a right-wing faction in the

Church that rejects change and reconciliation.” However, on the eve of the promulgation (July 6), the Vatican Press Office made it a point to correct this observation by noting that the *Oration* offensive to the Jews in the Good Friday liturgy (calling for prayer for the “perfidious Jews”) was eliminated by John XXIII in 1959, *a full three years before the 1962 Missal was put into effect*. The Press Office was quick to add this remark: “Also eliminated were similar formulas for those converting from idolatry, Islam or a heretical sect.”

Now that a period of time has passed to allow such rhetoric to calm down, the bishops’ conferences of various places throughout the world have issued documents explaining how *Summorum Pontificum* will be observed in their areas. You see, according to the Vatican II notion of *collegiality*, these bishops are co-rulers of the modern church, and so it will be up to them to make their own rules for their own areas, regardless of what the “universal indult” might seem to imply in the minds of some people. These documents give us great insight into the manner in which the *motu proprio* will be enforced, coming as they do from men who have read and studied the entire document: not just the “liberation” of the Latin Mass section, but *everything else* that applies to the use of the Latin Mass in the conciliar church according to this teaching, particularly in the accompanying letter of commentary that Benedict XVI issued along with the *motu proprio*. We would do well to soberly study both of these documents in their entirety. In so doing it will be obvious that the euphoria generated in some circles is not well justified.

The Words Of The *Motu Proprio*

The exact text of the *motu proprio*, and the accompanying letter of explanation, are available for all to read. They have been published and republished in many media forms that are quite easily found. Therefore, I do not deem it necessary to reprint them here. However, I will cite some key sections of these documents to illustrate some very grave concerns Catholics should have regarding *Summorum Pontificum* and the accompanying letter. The warnings I have long given regarding the promulgation of the “universal indult,” and the compromises in worship and beliefs that necessarily follow it, have indeed been well founded.

Right from the start, Benedict XVI attempts to explain that the Sacred Liturgy has *evolved* in practice from the time of Pope St. Gregory the Great, through the promulgation of *Quo Primum Tempore* by Pope St. Pius V, leading up to the *entirely new rite* of Paul VI known as the *Novus Ordo Missae*. He would have us to believe that the great work of St. Gregory in establishing the liturgical norm of worship for the Latin Rite, and the subsequent canonization of this Mass by Pope St. Pius V centuries later, somehow shares some continuity with the corrupted form of the modern “mass.” In fact, Benedict XVI states in his cover letter to the *motu proprio* that “There is no contradiction between the two editions of the Roman Missal.” However, Paul VI’s creation shares more in common with the condemned Anglican worship service of Cranmer from centuries ago than it does with the

(Continued on Page 7)

A Calm, Sober Study Of The *Motu Proprio* Is Quite Necessary

(Continued from Page 6)

traditions of St. Gregory and St. Pius V. Thus, the lie that a “continuity of worship” exists between the Pius V Missal and the rite of Paul VI comes from a purposeful misstatement of history and liturgical observances, to the great deception of all. In true Modernist fashion, Benedict XVI would have us accept the Novus Ordo as part of the Sacred Tradition of Catholic worship *simply because he says it is so*, offering no form of proof to substantiate this claim. He would have us believe the modern liturgy, formed with the cooperation of six non-Catholic ministers, is merely another expression of the same liturgical form of worship used by Catholics for centuries. This is simply *not true*, yet most Catholics have come to believe it is so because the *Novus Ordo Missae* was forced on them after Vatican II, and they have done little to study the many errors it contains. Similar false assertions are to be found in other sections of these two documents.

Since Benedict XVI assured everyone after his election that he would never go backwards in the promotion of the decrees of Vatican II, we should not be surprised that in Article 1 of the Decree he designated the *Novus Ordo Missae* as the “ordinary expression of the law of prayer for the Latin Rite,” while the Missal of John XXIII is the “extraordinary expression of the law of prayer on account of its venerable and ancient use.” The Novus Ordo best expresses the new faith Catholics were forced to accept after Vatican II, this is why it is the “ordinary” form of worship in the modern church. However, both documents explain that we are to assume that there is no division in prayer between these rites simply *because Benedict has told us this is so*: “These two expressions of the law of prayer of the Church in no way lead to a division in the law of prayer of the Church, for they are two uses of the one Roman Rite.” Yet even a casual observer of the two rites knows that there are many differences between the two rites, such as:

- in the prayers of the Offertory (in the Latin Mass these prayers pertain to the *Sacrifice* to be accomplished, while in the modern ceremony much is made of the “gifts of man’s hands” being offered up),
- the corrupted formula for the Consecration of the wine (despite the recent command to change the English translation in the Novus Ordo from *for all* to *for many* sometime in the next two years or so),
- the ever-increasing amount of lay participation in the modern rite belies the very sacredness that must exist in the highest form of Catholic worship, something which *never existed in the traditional rite*,
- the excessive use of concelebrations in the modern rite, something that is nowhere found in the Latin Mass as part of daily use,
- and even the use of communicating under both appearances of bread and wine, so readily accepted in the modern rite, which is something that has been purposely *forbidden* in the Latin Rite for many centuries.

Just these few areas of comparison clearly demonstrate there

is no possible “continuity” between the two rites no matter who tells us otherwise.

We must pause for awhile here to examine the use of the 1962 Missal for this indulgent. In the March, 2007, issue of *The Catholic Voice*, we explained how the insertion of St. Joseph’s name into the prayers of the Canon of the Mass opened the door for further change. This violation of traditional observance began with John XXIII’s “typical edition,” even though it was not continued when the *Novus Ordo Missae* was promulgated. Besides this, there are other novelties in the 1962 Missal that put it out of phase with the Roman Missals in existence before it, most of them involved in the eliminations of prayers and ceremonies that had been in practice among Catholics for well over a thousand years.

One striking novelty in the 1962 Missal occurs before the distribution of Holy Communion. Those who truly observe the rubrics for that Missal are surely aware of this text:

Whenever Holy Communion is distributed within the Mass, when the celebrant has consumed the Most Sacred Blood, the *Confiteor* and the absolution are omitted, but the celebrant says the *Ecce Agnus Dei* and says the *Domine, non sum dignes* three times. (Continued on Page 8)

ANNOUNCE THE BIRTH OF OUR SAVIOR WITH BEAUTIFUL CHRISTMAS CARDS



Keep Christ
in Christmas
New 20 per pack
\$9.00

Madonna and Child
12 per pack
Gold trimmed
\$9.00



To see our complete selection of Christmas cards,
and sample verses found inside these cards,
please look in our online Christmas catalog —
www.asisna.com/cr, or write in for a free catalog.



Silent Night
20 per pack
\$9.00

Infant Jesus
12 per pack
\$8.50



Please do not use the enclosed STRC envelope for orders to the
Catholic Research Institute. Send order, with payment,
ONLY to address below. Foreign orders send US funds only.

MISSIONARY SISTERS OF THE HOLY GHOST
CATHOLIC RESEARCH INSTITUTE
P.O. Box 589
VERADALE, WA 99037
WEB SITE: WWW.ASISNA.COM/CR

POSTAGE NOTICE
PLEASE INCLUDE A DONATION TO
COVER THE COST OF
POSTAGE AND HANDLING.

Will The Real 1962 Missal And Its Rubrics Please Stand Up!

(Continued from Page 7)

This means all who observe the rubrics of the 1962 Missal *as they should be practiced* must omit the *Confiteor* before the distribution of Communion during Mass. *There are no options here*, although many “traditional” priests have taken it upon themselves to add the *Confiteor* (and the prayers that follow) simply because this is what is expected by all who attend a Latin Mass. Since the Indult is granted only for the use of the 1962 Missal, this means that any priest observing the Indult *must follow the 1962 Missal rubrics* or else he is disobedient. But, if he follows these rubrics, he can lay *no claim* to preserving the true Latin Mass. What a conundrum the Modernists have presented those Catholics whose concern is for the “old Mass” in Latin! By September 14, we will see what these “traditional” celebrants will do each time they use the 1962 Missal.

The “Updated” 1962 Missal

While I am on the subject of the 1962 rubrics, here is something interesting. Benedict XVI has indicated his desire to see changes made to the rubrics of the 1962 Missal. For instance, according to article 6 of the *motu proprio*, the Scripture readings may be “proclaimed” in the vernacular (how and by whom it is not indicated). This seems to imply that the vernacular may be used *ad libitum* during the Mass as a substitute for the Latin readings, *provided* the modern scriptural translations are used in these vernacular “proclamations.” Also (taken from the “cover letter”) “new Saints and new Prefaces can and should be inserted in the old Missal” as a demonstration of how “the two forms of the usage of the Roman Rite can be mutually enriching.” Thus, even the 1962 Missal will be changed over time by modern Rome to resemble *nothing* of what it looked like when it was first published and used in 1962. This says nothing of the “approved” Latin Mass institutes (particularly within the Fraternity of St. Peter) and the “adaptations” they have been making to the rubrics of the 1962 Missal long before *Summorum Pontificum*. For years we have heard how some “approved by Rome” practices for the Novus Ordo have been inculcated in those “Latin Mass chapels” such as “communion in the hand” and female altar servers. Some of the FSSP priests are bi-ritual, concelebrating at times using the Novus Ordo. I can hear it now: “Oh, but Father, the Latin will be restored, so it doesn’t matter what else is added or taken away. The Church can do these things, you know.” Ah, but what church is doing all these things? The modern church is developing its own Latin liturgy under the guise of the “1962 Missal”, but as long as there is Latin then somehow everything is OK. Poor Catholics who believe such things! As Rev. John Berg, the Superior General of the Fraternity of St. Peter remarked in an interview on July 5, 2007, the observance of *Summorum Pontificum* will lead modern Catholics to “embrace the bishop more, and become involved in the life of the church much more . . . supporting things like pro-life, catechisis, and other initiatives.” The indult documents of the last twenty years are proclaimed to serve one purpose: keep people loyal to the modern church, its modernist style of catechetical instruction, and the observances of such “initiatives”

as socialist causes for “worker and family,” and similar movements.

The Novus Ordo Forced On Parishes & Priests

The use of the 1962 Missal is allowed any priest when he says Mass in *private*, according to this decree (article 2). This can take place on any day, except during the Sacred Triduum (Holy Thursday, Good Friday, Easter Vigil), when (I assume) the modern missal will be used exclusively, and even those who offer the Latin Mass will be expected to concelebrate with the local bishop on Holy Thursday following the *modern rite*. Should the priest wish to offer the Mass of the indult in *public*, he is regulated by Articles 3 - 7, giving him permission to offer the Latin Mass on weekdays, and only *once* on Sundays. Thus, even in those places where the Latin Mass has been said exclusively for many years, changes need to be made. The Latin Mass community of St. Boniface in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania found this out. In a *Memorandum* published July 7, 2007, by the Diocese of Pittsburgh, their community was singled out specifically as having to conform to this new law as of September 14, 2007 — they can have only *one* Latin Mass on Sundays. Many other churches and chapels throughout the world, where the exclusive use of the Latin Mass under the Indult has been maintained, are being told to conform in the same manner. Thus, the *Novus Ordo Missae* must be recited in all of those churches on Sundays, even where it has never been said before! People of these Latin Mass communities can do nothing to stop this.

Something that is particularly disturbing is found, not in *Summorum Pontificum*, but in the letter to the bishops which accompanied this decree. In order to calm down the fears of the modern bishops who thought the more widespread use of the Latin Mass would bring the death-knell to the *Novus Ordo Missae*, Benedict XVI wrote this:

There is no contradiction between the two editions of the Roman Missal. In the history of the liturgy there is growth and progress, but no rupture. What earlier generations held as sacred, remains sacred and great for us too, and it cannot be all of a sudden entirely forbidden or even considered harmful. It behooves all of us to preserve the riches which have developed in the Church’s faith and prayer, and to give them their proper place. Needless to say, *in order to experience full communion, also the priests of the communities adhering to the former usage cannot, as a matter of principle, exclude celebrating according to the new books. The total exclusion of the new rite would not, in fact, be consistent with the recognition of its value and holiness.*

Translation: For twenty-three years, it has been an important requirement for the permission granted by the 1984, 1988, and now 2007 versions of the Indult that all who make use of them must also recognize the *Novus Ordo Missae* as side-by-side valid with the traditional Latin Mass, in effect and value. The “cover letter” issued to explain the application of the *motu proprio* takes

(Continued on Page 9)

“As A Matter Of Principle”: No More Right To Latin Mass Exclusively

(Continued from Page 8)

this a step further. It is no longer enough to pay mere lip service to the Novus Ordo and its “spiritual value”; now *all priests* — even those in communities where the Latin Mass is said *exclusively* — “cannot *as a matter of principle* exclude celebrating according to the new books.” Thus, *all priests* who will make use of the 2007 Indult *must* also celebrate the *Novus Ordo Missae*. *They must become bi-ritual* to prove by their actions that they accept all that Benedict XVI has taught regarding the “mutual continuity of the different forms of the same rite.” Do not be surprised when you see the various Modernist Bishops’ Conferences of the world enforcing this requirement. Some “traditional theologians” think they can escape this clause because it came in the “letter” and not in the “official” *motu proprio*. This somehow means that what is in the “letter” is not “official” and the modern bishops cannot bind priests to it. Those who believe such things have a very misguided understanding of what is “official” and what is not, and the binding force of both of these documents, even under the command of obedience. Both are proclaimed *universally* in the modern church, and this is what makes them both binding — that is, if you want to say you are “obedient” to modern Rome. In this area you can be sure that these bishops will be careful to follow up on Benedict’s “mind” for the Latin Mass, and some already have. For example, in the August 2, 2007, issue of the *Inland Register*, the newspaper for the modern diocese of Spokane, we find that the “letter” of Benedict XVI is quoted extensively on page 10, making it clear that in that diocese, “*as a matter of principle*,” no priest will be

allowed to celebrate the Latin Mass *exclusively* if he wishes to follow the indult. When the day comes (and it is not far away) that most modern dioceses of the world enforce this same point, those who talk about the “liberation” of the Latin Mass will see at what price it came.

Nothing To Rejoice At

It should be clear that a sober examination of the *motu proprio* of Benedict XVI yields a more worrisome set of circumstances than most Latin Mass “hot heads” have been saying for the past two months. In typical Modernist fashion, what was given with one hand, has been removed quite forcefully with the other. The obvious point from all this is that Benedict XVI is no “conservative,” and that the traditional Faith of the Roman Catholic Church will not be returning via modern Rome any time soon. Those who tell us that the more frequent celebration of the Latin Mass according to the 1962 Missal (which rubrics?) will somehow “force” the Modernists to abandon their errors are engaged in wishful thinking. This is clear from the reactions to the *motu proprio* up to the time I wrote this article. Those who have spent so much time celebrating the promulgation of the *motu proprio* should apologize to all faithful Catholics for their lack of study in so important a matter. They have failed to fully explain what is found in both documents, and I pray it was not deliberate. Our fight for the restoration of the traditional Latin Mass in churches where the traditional Faith of the Roman Catholic Church is taught continues. †

The Novus Ordo Missae Has Eliminated Many Important Prayers

(Continued from Page 5)

Turning back to the altar, he bows low and says:

May the lowly homage of my service be pleasing to Thee, O most holy Trinity: and do Thou grant that the sacrifice which I, all unworthy, have offered up in the sight of Thy majesty, may be acceptable to Thee, and because of Thy loving kindness, may avail to atone to Thee for myself and for all those for whom I have offered it up. Through Christ our Lord.”

The priest then kisses the altar, turns and blesses the people:

May almighty God, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost bless you.

Not finished yet, he next turns with a complete circle and reads the Last Gospel, which is taken from the first chapter of the Gospel of John. This was also dropped by John XXIII - I suspect because it has an implied criticism of the Jews, for as John says,

35 (*cont.*) such exterior oblations as are not real sacrifices. The Prophet Micheas announces the coming abrogation of the old rites and the Council of Trent authoritatively confirmed this interpretation in its decree upon the sacrifice of the Mass: “And this indeed is the clean oblation which cannot be defiled by any unworthiness or wickedness in those who offer; the clean oblation which the Lord, speaking by Malachy, foretold would be offered in every place to his name, which would be great among the Gentiles.” (Ps. cix vii).

He came unto His own, and His own received Him not. It also makes it clear that in so far as *All things were made by Him, and without Him was made nothing that was made.* that current biological theories about the origin of life are hardly compatible with Catholic teaching. This passage is one of the most pregnant doctrinal passages in Scripture and was added during the 1100’s to counteract certain heresies about the Incarnation.

After this the priest says some prayers at the foot of the Altar - prayers originally requested by Pope Leo XIII and in use through the time of Pius XII (but also eliminated by John XXIII). There is a story behind these prayers. After saying Mass at the High Altar in St. Peters in 1878, Leo XIII heard a dialogue between Satan and Christ standing on either side of him. Satan was complaining that he had not been given a free hand to “furrow” (to test) the faithful. Christ informed him that he could have 100 years to do what he wished without restrictions. This thoroughly frightened the Pope and he instituted these prayers to protect the faithful. These prayers were somewhat shortened during the reign of St. Pius X, but their purpose remained unchanged. (Minor variations may be heard in different dioceses.)

It is only then that the priest leaves the altar and the server puts out the candles, starting on the Gospel side. The priest however is obliged, unless Charity dictates otherwise, to say a thanksgiving for the privilege of saying Mass. This is why traditional priests are not readily available after Mass to talk to parishioners. (*To be concluded in our next issue.*) †

“Subsists in” Has No Place In Traditional Catholic Teaching

(Continued from Page 3)

II. On July 7, 2007, Benedict XVI published a *motu proprio* on the “Indult Mass,” and a few days later (July 10, 2007) the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith made public the document *Responses to Some Questions Regarding Certain Aspects of the Doctrine on the Church* under the signature of Cardinal Lavada. Also known as a “Clarification on the Doctrine of the Church,” the chief purpose of this document is to clear up the meaning of “subsists in” by assuring everyone that Vatican II did not change Catholic doctrine when it introduced that term in *Lumen Gentium* as a substitution for the word “is” (“The Church of Jesus Christ IS the Catholic Church” instead of “The Church of Jesus Christ SUBSISTS IN the Catholic Church.”), but that it only did so to “develop, deepen and more fully explain” Catholic doctrine (as if we did not understand it well enough already!). However, when one examines the footnotes of this document, it is readily seen that the “clarification” is done according to the style of the Modernists. They use their own documents and teachings in support of their errors. This means that there are *no references* to *pre-Vatican II* teachings in this document at all! The only “clarification” being made is to add more words to Modernist teachings! One of the opening statements of this document is that Vatican II did nothing to change the traditional teaching on the nature of the Church. *Prove it.*

The American Heritage dictionary defines *subsist* according to this usage as *to exist*. Thus the Modernists can also say “The Church of Jesus Christ *exists* in the Catholic Church,” in much the same way as I could say: “The groceries I need *exist* in the local store,” meaning they can also *exist* in another store that also sells groceries, but maybe not of the same quantity, quality or variety. This fits with this document’s “clarified” meaning of “subsists in”: *subsists in* is used because, when they talk about the Church of Jesus Christ they speak about “elements” (not identifiable Marks!), and (according to the Modernist line of thought) the Catholic Church has all of the “elements” to justify calling it the Church of Jesus Christ. However (they say) “it is possible to affirm correctly that the Church of Christ is present and operative in the churches and ecclesial Communities not yet in full communion with the Catholic Church, on account of the *elements* of sanctification and truth that are present in them.” To justify this statement, Cardinal Lavada turns to the *Decree on Ecumenism* (3.4): “It follows that these separated churches and Communities, though we believe they suffer from defects, *are deprived neither of significance nor importance in the mystery of salvation*. In fact, *the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them as instruments of salvation*, whose value derives from the fullness of grace and of truth which has been entrusted to the Catholic Church.” So, this means that the Holy Ghost is present in the false religions, making them instruments of holiness and salvation for their members. How does one reconcile this obviously heretical teaching with the magisterial teaching of Pope Pius IX in *Jam vos omnes* (September 13, 1868):

Now, anyone who wishes to examine with care and to meditate on the condition of the different religious societies

divided among themselves and separated from the Catholic Church . . . *will easily be convinced that no one of these societies, nor all of them together, in any way constitute or are that one Catholic Church which Our Lord founded and established, and which He willed to create. Nor is it possible, either, to say that these societies are either a member or part of this same Church, since they are visibly separated from Catholic unity.*

The truth is, we cannot reconcile the post-Vatican II errors with the pre-Vatican II teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. Neither are the modern teachings found to be “in continuity” with what Pope Pius XI wrote in *Mortalium animos* (January 6, 1928):

Now those who profess to be Christians cannot believe, it seems to Us, that there is one Church, and only one Church, founded by Jesus Christ; but if they are asked further what, according to the will of the Founder, this Church must be, they no longer agree. Many among them, for example, deny that the Church of Christ must be an external and visible society, and that it must present the appearance of one body of faithful, all united in one faith under a single teaching authority and government. On the contrary, they understand the external and visible Church as nothing more than a Federation made up of various Christian communities, which adhere to different — and sometimes contradictory — doctrines. They add that the Church, in Herself, and by Her nature, is divided into parts, that is to say, made up of many churches or individual communities, which, although separate, hold some points of doctrine in common although they differ on the rest; each Church, according to them, has the same rights . . . *It is therefore inconsistent and foolish to say that the Mystical Body could be formed of disjointed and separate parts; therefore whoever is not joined to it is not a member of it and is not in union with Christ the Head.*

What is more, we find that this recent document “clarifying” the “subsists in” notion sounds more like the doctrine of which St. Pius X warns us in his encyclical letter against the Modernists: How far this position is removed from that of Catholic teaching! . . . Given the doctrine of experience united with that of symbolism, every religion, even that of paganism, must be held to be true. What is to prevent these experiences from being found in any religion? In fact, that they are so is maintained by not a few. On what grounds can Modernists deny the truth of an experience affirmed by a follower of Islam? Will they claim a monopoly of true experience for Catholics alone? Indeed, Modernists do not deny, but actually maintain, some confusedly, others frankly, that all religions are true. That they cannot feel otherwise is obvious . . . In the conflict between different religions, the most that Modernists can maintain is that the Catholic has more truth because it is more vivid, and that it deserves with more reason the name of Christian because it corresponds more fully with the origins of Christianity. No one will find

(Cont. on Page 11)

Modernists Uphold The Teachings Of Science Over Those Of Faith

(Continued from Page 10)

it unreasonable that these consequences flow from the premises.

This recent document from the modern church did nothing to demonstrate its “continuity” with apostolic Tradition. Rather, it clearly stated why they will never abandon the term “subsists in” when talking about the nature of the church.

Attending Interreligious Meetings

As if to boldly demonstrate a firm adherence to Modernist teachings about the “good” found in other religions separated from the True Church of Jesus Christ, on June 29, 2007, Benedict XVI announced that he will attend the annual International Encounters of Peoples and Religions, promoted this years by the ecumenical Community of Sant’Egidio in Naples, Italy. These meetings are composed of about 300 people of various religions from over 70 countries. The International Encounters was inspired by the “World Day of Prayer” held in Assisi in 1986 at the request of John Paul II, so we know what manner of prayer and ecumenical services will be conducted during this time.

Prior to Vatican II, attendance at such events was forbidden to Catholics under pain of *mortal sin* and the pain of *excommunication*. The scandal involved by attending such events makes it seem that the Catholic Church is on equal footing with all of these other religions. Pope Pius XI forcefully explained in *Mortalium animos* (#s 9, 10) why Catholics — and even the pope — would never, *could never* attend such events:

It is clear that the Apostolic See can by no means take part in these assemblies, nor is it in any way lawful for Catholics to give to such enterprises their encouragement or support. If they did so, they would be giving countenance to a false Christianity quite alien to the one true Church of Christ. . . . These pan-Christians who strive for the union of the churches would appear to pursue the noblest of ideals in promoting charity among all Christians. But how should charity tend to the detriment of faith? Everyone knows that John himself, the Apostle of love, . . . strictly forbade any intercourse with those who professed a mutilated and corrupt form of Christ’s teaching: “If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house, nor say to him God speed you. (2 John 1:10)

The Church would never change such an important teaching, but the Modernists do. How, then, can we call the church run by the Modernists the same as the Roman Catholic Church?

Modernists, Science and Evolution

Modernism is alive and well in the modern church. No greater proof of this is found than in the text of the July 27, 2007, question-and-answer session Benedict had with 400 priests of the diocese where he was vacationing. The boldness of his statements in this setting reveals, *not* that he is “conservative” (as some wish to say), *but* that he is truly a Modernist, after the fashion of what Pope St. Pius X gave warning.

The topic came up about the upcoming “Youth Day” in Sydney, Australia. Benedict used the opportunity to opine about

young people’s search for meaning, acknowledging that many youth act as if they do not need God, and that a world without God would be freer and broader. Eventually, he says, “we see what happens when God disappears.” So far, these musings in front of all these clergymen sound acceptable, that is, until he uses these reflections as a means to explain his next topic.

Benedict XVI explained that if God is not present, then “in reality, we have a simple part of evolution, nothing more.” He added that there is a “fervent debate between *so-called* creationism and evolutionism, presented as if one of these alternatives excluded the other: Whoever believes in the Creator cannot think about evolution, and whoever affirms evolution must exclude God.” In his opinion, this *apparent* conflict is “an absurdity.”

Are we reading this correctly? Did Benedict XVI just defend the theory of evolution? Yes he did, and more: “Because on one hand, there is a great deal of scientific proof in favor of evolution *which appears as a reality that we must see* (!), and that enriches our knowledge of life and of being as such. But the *doctrine* (!) of evolution does not answer everything, and does not answer the great philosophical question: Where does everything come from? And, how does everything take a path that ultimately leads to the person? It seems to me that it is very important that reason opens up even more, that it sees this information, but that it also sees that this information is not enough to explain all of reality. It is not enough.”

After the fashion of a Modernist who accepts science above faith, Benedict has explained that the great amount of scientific “proof” for evolution has elevated this atheistic theory to a “doctrine” (as opposed to “so-called creationism”) which we must all believe. However, he sees this new doctrine as incomplete because, from the beginning, it has left God out of the picture. He finds it as his role to show the way how the notion of evolution does not exclude God as the Creator within this system. In this way he is helping “youth discover God, discover true love that becomes great,” even though he supports that which leads us away from the love and Providence of God found in the scriptural account of Creation. This notion that scientific “advancements” can cause us to change what we believe as Catholics was *condemned* in *Lamentabili* (#64):

Scientific progress demands that the concepts of Christian doctrine concerning God, creation, revelation, the Person of the Incarnate Word and Redemption be re-adjusted.

Protestants are far ahead of modern Catholics in the rejection of evolution. Such nearly-authoritative statements scandalize them for they see a professed leader of an ancient church in denial of one of its basic tenets: that, in the Beginning, God created Heaven and earth, and is responsible for all life. It is time that all Catholics see Benedict for what he really is, and stop calling him “conservative.”

Thus a short summary of events over the past few months clearly demonstrates that Modernism is alive and is at the root of all our troubles in the Church. Let us work to inform bamboozled Catholics about such things, and pray they will have the grace to accept the words we speak. †

A Report From Rome: A Traditional Family Experiences New Rome

By JAMES DE PIANTE
For The Catholic Voice

In March of this year, Jim De Piante moved to Rome with his wife and five children on a temporary assignment. The following is a bit of a reflection on their life in modern Rome as a traditional Catholic family.

Like A Scene from a Dalí Painting

This is all rather surreal. Of course, new surroundings, especially in a foreign country, always seem somewhat surreal, but this is different. There is so much that is familiar, in terms of the Faith – after all, Rome is Rome. And yet it all seems so strange. Probably the best way to capture it is to say that Modern Catholicism doesn't fit very well in Eternal Rome, and our traditional Catholicism doesn't fit very well with what the Modernists are doing to Rome.

The Faith is everywhere present, of course. It is tangibly present in the street names, the monuments, the churches, the festivals, the holidays. It even seems that almost every purveyor of bottled water brands his bottles with the name of a Saint. One can scarcely move without being reminded of Rome's Catholic past, Rome's Catholic identity. And yet in the people, the Faith is there rather only vestigially – and less so, the younger the person.

One of the first things we have observed is how few children there are. Having five children in the family, as we do, qualifies us as a *famiglia numerosa*, which immediately makes us something of a curiosity, if not a spectacle. The vast majority of Italian families have two or fewer children.

We often see people bless themselves, out of something of a habit, but we've not seen anyone actually say grace before meals. The fact that we do so is, for our hosts, again something of a curiosity. One good friend asked if this was perhaps due to the fact that people who leave a place (as my ancestors left Italy) often retain the customs of their ancestors where those who remain lose those same customs. I assured him that, no, what we were doing was actually just thanking God for the blessing of a good meal, and that it was a spiritual undertaking rather than a cultural undertaking. On another occasion, a young lady who is a fan of American cinema noted that the only time she had seen anyone bless themselves and say grace before a meal was "in the movies." Another time, an older fellow proudly announced that in his family, they likewise said grace before meals, but they did so only once a year – at Christmas. These are all good and wonderful people, but I think that for them, the Faith is more an artifact of history rather than something vibrant and alive.

Interestingly, and perhaps not surprisingly, Italians (at least those we met) are much more aware of the controversy surrounding the Latin Mass than the typical American Catholic is. All those of us who adhere to Tradition, regardless of stripe, are generically referred to as *Lefevriani*. The recent *Motu Proprio (Summorum Pontificum)* is much in the news, and the people we know seem generally well disposed toward the old Mass. We had one experience, however, that was very much the exception to that. As a vignette of our life in Italy, that experience perfectly captures

the essence of that surreal quality I spoke of earlier.

Your missal or your liturgical calendar will show the feast for August 5th as perhaps *Dedication of the Church of Our Lady of the Snows*, or perhaps, the *Feast of Our Lady of the Snows*, or sometimes *Dedication of St. Mary Major*.

In any case, the feast commemorates the dedication of the oldest and grandest church in the world dedicated to Our Lady, *Santa Maria Maggiore*, or The Basilica of Saint Mary Major, which is on the Esquiline Hill here in Rome. It's a wonderful place and a personal favorite for our family.

The Basilica is referred to by various names, but generally is known popularly (and in the guide books) as *Saint Mary Major*. The title *Our Lady of the Snows* comes from the story about a Roman Patrician and his wife who vowed to donate their possessions to Our Lady. They prayed for a sign as to how they might do this. In response to their prayers, a snow fell on the Esquiline Hill during the night of August 5th. The couple had a church built on the site, which has since been rebuilt many times, but is one of the very few ancient churches in Rome that actually retains their original form.

Naturally (reasonable doubts regarding the authenticity of the story notwithstanding) the feast is commemorated in the Liturgy. Naturally, the feast is commemorated at the Basilica. And naturally, the feast is commemorated in the popular culture here in Rome.

Having missed a few connections on the local public transport, we had to frantically dash from the train station over to St. Mary Major in time to witness the commemoration at the Basilica. This, in itself was something of a spectacle, as the seven of us darted in and out of traffic as the bells of the Basilica began to toll alerting us to the fact that what we were rushing to see was about to begin. We slipped in the door just in time to see the simulated snowfall of white flower petals being dropped from the ceiling as the organ played and a boys' choir sang a beautiful Latin hymn and the bells continued to chime. It was very stirring.

During that week, it turns out, there was a newly minted traditional priest, an Italian-American, visiting Rome from the US. We had previously arranged to meet him at St. Mary Major for the ceremony, and we found each other very quickly there inside the Basilica. The fact that he was wearing a *soutane* (which is to say, he was dressed like a priest) made it very easy for us to find him. On the other hand, it made it very easy for others to recognize him as a *Lefevriano*.

There was an older fellow there in the back of the church – a fellow who clearly was old enough to have known the old Mass as an adult. (Apparently, he was traveling. I could tell because he was pulling a roll-aboard suitcase behind him through the church.) As soon as he spotted the *Lefevriano* priest, he approached him rather aggressively.

Without so much as a "howdy doody" (or the Italian equivalent thereof), he demanded of Father, "You people need to realize that things change." Father (who speaks a fair amount of Italian, was a little taken aback, and asked the fellow what he meant, to which the old fellow replied, "The Pope changed

(Continued on Page 13)

The Historical Significance Of The Leonine Prayers After Mass

By REV. KEVIN VAILLANCOURT
For The Catholic Voice

What follows is a piece I wrote in the parish newsletter a few years ago while reflecting on the recitation of the *Leonine Prayers* at the conclusion of Mass, despite the fact that many traditional priests elsewhere have dropped this practice. Those who follow all of the rubrics for the 1962 *Missale Romanum* have already stopped saying these prayers, while others recite them on occasion despite which rubrics they follow. The importance of the continued recitation of these powerful invocations should never be minimized.

On many occasions, we are visited by some who, coming from the modern church, are curious (or even nostalgic) about the traditional Latin Mass. After Mass, these visitors comment on any number of "radical" differences between the Roman (Latin) Mass and the *Novus Ordo Missae*, and its many variations. Some comment on the use of Latin in our sacred worship of Almighty God, while others remark on the quiet reverence of the ceremonies, the devotion of all who attend, the fact that we *kneel* to receive Holy Communion, the modesty standards of dress, the headcoverings for the women, and so forth. When one comes from the "free-for-all" liturgies of the modern (imposter) church to the traditional rites of the Roman Catholic Church at prayer and worship, it can be understood that the traditional rites and customs may appear to be "radical", if not unnerving, from their lack of activity.

Besides the use of the Latin at Mass, perhaps the most frequent comment made is how our act of worship (Holy Mass) comes to its conclusion with the recitation of the "Last Gospel", and the prayers ordered by Pope Leo XIII — the three *Hail Marys*, the *Hail Holy Queen*, and the *Prayer to St. Michael the Archangel*. You see, since 1964, Catholics who have been bamboozled by the Modernists, and who still associate with the modern church, have not heard these prayers recited after their liturgies. Forty years ago, a Congregation of the Vatican both eliminated and suppressed these prayers, citing *no reason for*

doing so. However, it would not be too hazardous to guess that these prayers were eliminated and suppressed because they strike out against the actions of the Modernists (their desire to no longer publicize the rejection of the Messiah by the Jews), and the desire of the Council Fathers at Vatican II not to condemn Communism for the evil that it is. Since we observe the traditional rites and teachings of Holy Mother Church, we are not only glad to pray this way after Mass, but we also most readily acknowledge their necessity. The "Last Gospel" is similar to a Profession of Faith we make before we leave the church, and the *Leonine Prayers* are our opportunity to pray together for the Church: Her needs and intentions.

In 1884, Pope Leo XIII mandated these prayers to be recited everywhere after Low Masses because the Church (at Rome and elsewhere) was suffering terrible persecutions, and only God's intervention would ensure Her public triumph, and, through this, the spread of the Gospel once more throughout the world. In 1930, Pope Pius XI added a further intention: the triumph of the Church in Russia, and he continued the mandate. While not directly connected with this, Our Lady of Fatima made specific warnings about Russia, and the errors it would spread throughout the world. Even though the chief among these diabolical errors is atheistic Communism, the consequent lack of respect for God and His Church — and even for religion in general — has swept over the world like a foul tide, and is daily renewed by those who promote the Russian "gospel" of dialectic socialism. Russia may no longer publicly profess Communism as its unifying doctrine, but the effects of this atheistic disease are daily felt more and more.

For more that 120 years, Catholics have been praying the *Leonine Prayers* after Mass, and some have had the audacity to say that they have had little effect. Well, don't blame it on the prayers, but on the lack of Faith while praying them. The popes have told us to recite these prayers in a *kneeling* posture — not sitting or leaning. Perhaps if we all renewed this aspect of our prayers after Mass, then God would be more readily moved to assist us. †

Report From Rome: New Traditions Established For A New Faith

(Continued from Page 12)

everything. WE have mass with the priest facing the people, as it should be."

I decided to intervene on Father's behalf, not that he needed me to do that, because he didn't. So I replied to the man, "This good man, who has only recently become a priest, says Mass facing Christ Crucified. He did not come here to this Basilica to be castigated by you. If you find what he does offensive, then I ask you respectfully to merely pray for him, and for me, and we will commit to do likewise for you."

As hard-heads can do, the fellow persisted. And as hard-heads can do, I likewise persisted — in asking the man to desist, to commit to pray for this priest, and to be on his way — to go wherever he was going with his suitcase in tow.

I think the man eventually saw that he had overstepped the

bounds of propriety and so he relented cheerfully and in fact did promise to pray for us.

(It is an interesting side note to this story that the ceremony in St. Mary Major was presided over by an American, Bernard Cardinal Law, presently Archpriest of the Basilica.)

Later that evening, in the Piazza Esquilina in front of the Basilica, the event of the snowfall of August 5th was further commemorated in an outdoor ceremony with an orchestra on the steps of the Basilica, a mix of sacred and secular music, a laser lightshow, and a simulated snowfall, which seemed very realistic, and very appropriately inappropriate for August 5th.

The ceremony finished with an invocation, unabashedly Catholic, after which the announcer said what could be roughly translated as, "Three Cheers for the Blessed Mother."

As I said, surreal. †

*Letters To The Editor***Vatican Directive On *Pro Multis* Translation; A Convert's Opinions**

More About The "For Many" Translation

Editor, The Catholic Voice:

Several months ago I recall hearing that the Vatican had issued a statement correcting the translation of the words *pro multis* found in some Latin versions of the Novus Ordo. Can you tell me more about it?

J.J.

via email

Editor's Note: In the March, 2007, issue of *The Catholic Voice*, we spent some time reviewing this topic, so it is suggested that you look at that issue for a more complete discussion of this topic than what will be mentioned here.

Briefly, last November, Cardinal Francis Arinze, the Prefect of the Congregation of Divine Worship, issued a directive to all the bishops of the modern church that within the next two years all vernacular translations of the *Novus Ordo Missae* must render *pro multis* as "for many," not "for all," as (for example) the ICEL has done for missals for English-speaking people. The main reason for this is that "for many" is "a translation that is more faithful to the Latin text," not that the change in Christ's words invalidated the rite. However, making this change (to satisfy some groups of "traditionalists") is not enough to remove our grave concerns about the invalidity of the new mass of Paul VI. There are still serious errors to be found in the so-called offertory prayers and in the mutilation of the wine-consecration form (more than just the use of "for all") that, according to traditional magisterial teachings would render the ceremony a non-Mass.

There is an interesting development in this story. There are a group of priests who have voted to reject this directive, thus refusing to make the change that has been requested by modern Rome. Kath.net News Service has reported that priests in Rottenberg, Germany, voted to reject the Vatican translation because "the use of 'for many' would be confusing to the faithful in this day and age." The priests said: "The promise of salvation is directed to all people. This truth of the faith is put most clearly in the 'for all.'" Obviously these priests care little for the teaching of the Catechism of the Council of Trent which explains precisely why "for all" is not to be used in the wine-consecration form in the Canon of the Mass.

† † †

An Examination For Traditional Catholics From A Convert

Editor, The Catholic Voice:

If you seriously wonder why traditional Catholics get nowhere, as a convert I am willing to offer my insights after attending various traditional chapels. My daughters were baptized and took catechism lessons via those churches.

1). Party-hardy Catholics are making the same mistakes Catholics made in the 50's which cannot help but add fuel to the fire. Many traditional Catholics smoke and drink in excess. They often "pound" on their children and run them off!

2). Traditional Catholics make little effort to win converts. Many "conservative" Catholics hopped on the apologist bandwagon of the 90's and got very well-versed in Scripture, doctrine,

Church history, and are winning over lots of converts. Traditional Catholics seem ashamed or embarrassed to do this, perhaps viewing themselves as "fanatics."

3). Traditional Catholics are not seriously supportive of one another. They play too many social games and look for negatives. Their gossip is pretty typical of what is found among non-Christians, and it tends to be pure snobbery.

4). Traditional Catholics are not well known for doing charity work outside of their own church. They see it as "us against the world" to some degree. The sermons are all very gloomy, negative and boring. The priests don't address any real issues — only nebulous ones.

It's sad so many parents fail to raise good Catholics. No support system. God bless!

P.S.

Surprise, AZ

Editor's Note: Thank you for taking the time to write in and offer some observations from a convert's viewpoint. Some of what you say has merit, while some other points are rather harsh being based, perhaps, on your convert background. Would that it were so that every Catholic took quite seriously the study, belief and practice of their Holy Faith as they should so that no faults would be found among us. Then the cause for the conversion of sinners and the Kingdom of Christ would be well advanced by all. However (and perhaps you do not see this for what is worth) this is not the case. The pull of the world (the enemy of Christ, as we find in the Scriptures) is strong, and the devil is doing all he can to bring down those who profess to know the Truth and who are trying to practice it. We must know that diabolical temptations are going to be more severe against those trying to preserve the true Catholic Faith than against those who do not possess this Truth. Unless we pray, sacrifice and develop a strong devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, we are all capable of being deceived. No one should think himself immune from the threefold battle we have against the world, the flesh and the devil. Let this letter be an examination for us all, and where certain points may apply, let us work faithfully to correct them.

† † †

A Sacrificial Donation

Editor, The Catholic Voice:

Please accept my donation in thanksgiving for years of reading your most wonderful publication. To me it is like an oasis in the desert. Keep up the good work. I am an old lady who doesn't have much, but I felt I had to give something. May God bless you and all who are doing His work.

A.P., Cortland Manor, NY

Editor's Note: Thank you for your sacrificial donation and your prayers. We survive through offerings of both types. †

Want To Contact Us? Here's How:

By Letter:	P.O. Box 130, Mead WA 99021-0130 USA	
By Fax:	(509) 489-4060	
By email:	tradition@strc.org	Web site: www.strc.org

The Glories Of The Feast Of The Holy Guardian Angels

From the works of: REV. ABBOT GUERANGER, OSB
From: Liturgical Year

Although the solemnity of September 29 celebrates the praises of all the nine glorious choirs, yet the piety of the faithful, in the latter ages, desired to have a special day consecrated to the Guardian Angels. Pope Clement X (1670) established it by precept as a feast on October 2, the first free day after Michaelmas, on which it thus remains in some way dependent.

It is of faith, on the testimony of the Scriptures and of unanimous tradition, that God commits to His angels the guardianship of men, who are called to contemplate Him together with these blessed spirits in their common fatherland. Catholic theology teaches that this protection is extended to every member of the human race, without any distinction of just and sinners, infidels and baptized. To ward off dangers; to uphold man in his struggle against the demons; to awaken in him holy thoughts; to prevent him from sinning, and even, at times, to chastise him; to pray for him, and present his prayers to God: such is the office of the Guardian Angel. So special is his mission, that one angel does not undertake the guardianship of several persons simultaneously; so diligent is his care, that he follows his ward from the first day to the last of his mortal existence, receiving the soul as it quits this life, and bearing it from the feet of the sovereign Judge to the place it has merited in heaven, or to its temporary sojourn in the place of expiation and purification.

It is from the lowest of the nine choirs, the nearest to ourselves, that the Guardian Angels are for the most part selected. God reserves to the Seraphim, Cherubim, and Thrones the honor of forming His own immediate court. The Dominations, from the steps of His throne, preside over the government of the universe; the Virtues watch over the course of nature's laws, the preservation of species, and the movements of the heavens; the Powers hold the spirits of wickedness in subjection. The human race in its entirety, as also its great social bodies, the nations and the churches, are confided to the Principalities; while the Archangels, who preside over smaller communities, seem also to have the office of transmitting to the Angels the commands of God, together with the love and light which come down even to us from the first and highest hierarchy. O the depths of the wisdom of God! Thus, then, the admirable distribution of offices among the choirs of heavenly spirits terminates in the function committed to the lowest rank, the guardianship of man, for whom the universe subsists. Such is the teaching of the School and the apostle, in like manner, says: "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent to minister for them, who shall receive the inheritance of salvation?" (Heb. 1:14)

With regard to the work of salvation, the Guardian Angel has no fear of being left alone at his post; at his request, and at God's command, the troops of his blessed companions, who fill heaven and earth, are ever ready to lend him their aid. These noble spirits, acting under the eye of God whose love they desire to second by all possible means, have secret alliances between them, which sometimes induce between their clients, even on earth, unions, the mystery whereof will be revealed in the light of eternity.

"How profound a mystery," says Origen, "is the apportioning of souls to the angels destined for their guardians! It is a divine secret, part of the universal economy centered in the Man-God. Nor is it without ineffable order that the ministries of earth, the many departments of nature, are allotted to the heavenly Virtues; fountains and rivers, winds and forests, plants, living creatures of land and sea, whose various functions harmonize together by the angels directing them all to a common end."

Let us meditate on this other testimony: "The noble guardian of each one of us sleeps not, nor can he be deceived. Close thy door, and make the darkness of night; but remember, thou art never alone; he has no need of daylight in order to see thy actions." And who is it that speaks thus? Not a father of the Church, but a pagan, the slave philosopher Epictetus.

Blessed be ye, O holy angels, for that your charity is not wearied out by the crimes of men; among so many other benefits, we thank you for keeping the earth habitable, by deigning to dwell always therein. Solitude often weighs heavily upon the hearts of God's children, in the great towns, and in the paths of the world, where one meets only strangers or enemies; but if the number of the just grows less, yours never diminishes. In the midst of the excited multitude, as well as in the desert, not a human being that has not beside him an angel, the representative of universal Providence over wicked and good alike. O blessed spirits! you and we have the same fatherland, the same thought, the same love; why should the confused noises of a frivolous crowd disturb the heavenly life we may lead even now with you? Does the tumult of public places hinder you from holding your choirs there, or prevent the Most High from hearing your harmonies? We also, beholding by faith the face of our heavenly Father, which you ever delightedly contemplate, we wish to sing in every place the praises of our Lord and to unite at all times our adorations with yours. Thus, when our manners have become altogether angelic, the present life will be full of peace, and we shall be well prepared for eternity. †



Would you like the traditional Latin Mass of the Roman Catholic Church offered for your intentions, or those of your loved ones?

Mass requests are being accepted at this time by traditional Roman Catholic priests for any Masses for the living and the dead, including Gregorian Masses.

Please contact us at STRC for details.

Statement of Purpose

The CATHOLIC VOICE is the newsletter of the Society of Traditional Roman Catholics, a non-profit corporation, incorporated under the laws of the State of North Carolina.

The Society is a Catholic Apostolate, of both laity and clergy, established to work for the full restoration of traditional Catholic rites, most especially the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass of the Council of Trent, the ancient Latin Mass.

We, the directors and officers of the Society, pledge our fidelity to the Roman Catholic Church and to her teachings as handed down by the Sacred Magisterium through the centuries. We dedicate ourselves and the works of our apostolate to the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Mother of God.

We place our efforts under the patronage of St. Joseph, Patron of the Universal Church, and offer all we do in the name of Jesus Christ for the greater honor and glory of God. We invite all Catholics to join in our work.

From The Traditional Roman Catholic Calendar

These are only some of the special liturgical feasts we will celebrate in the next few weeks. A complete list of all the liturgical feasts is listed in the calendar which is distributed every year by the Society of Traditional Roman Catholics.

- September 3 Pope St. Pius X
- September 8 Nativity BVM
- September 12 Holy Name of Mary
- September 15 Seven Sorrows of Mary
- September 26 North American Martyrs
- September 29 St. Michael the Archangel
- October 2 Holy Guardian Angels
- October 3 St. Therese of Lisieux
- October 4 St. Francis of Assisi
- October 7 Holy Rosary BVM
- October 11 Divine Maternity BVM
- October 15 St. Teresa of Avila
- October 16 St. Gerard Majella
- October 24 St. Raphael the Archangel
- October 28 Christ the King
- October 29 (*transferred*) Sts. Simon and Jude
- November 1 All Saints Day
- November 2 All Souls Day
- November 21 Presentation BVM
- November 30 St. Andrew
- December 1 First Sunday of Advent

TO:

Change Service Requested

233907

USA

Mead, Washington 99021-0130

Post Office Box 130

The Society of Traditional Roman Catholics

FROM:

NONPROFIT
U.S. Postage
PAID
MEAD, WA
Permit No. 130