

More Rumors About The “Universal Indult”: Are They True? ... And What If They Are?

By Rev. Kevin Vaillancourt

Over the past few months, I have received numerous letters and messages from concerned Catholics asking my opinion on the proposed “universal Indult” which would allow (so it says) any priest to offer the Latin Mass according to the 1962 version of the Roman Missal without specific permission to do so. This concern has been around for a few years now, ever since modern Rome has, like a carrot on a string, dangled the idea in front of Catholics as something that is a “good idea” and “worthy of pursuit.” It was not until the speculation about the granting of a “universal indult” started near the beginning of this year’s Lent [2006] — under numerous versions and from various “sources” — that the document allowing the “universal Indult” was supposed to have been all prepared, needing only the signature of Benedict XVI to make it happen. What is more, as the story goes, the announcement regarding the “universal Indult” was supposed to have been made sometime during Holy Week 2006, a period of time that has come and gone. Since that time, no new rumors have come to light about this supposed document, and that is what has caused the flurry of excitement among many Catholics, hoping against hope, they say, that the rumors are true and that this is not just another opportunity for the modernist hierarchy to get people’s hopes up about a “reform” of the modernist liturgies, only to see them dashed to the ground.

As I begin writing this piece, there has been no new news regarding the “universal Indult.” To try to determine the current status of this document, I went to the Internet — one of the leading sources for instant information available to us today. A quick search for information on the “universal Indult” and “Latin Mass” led me to numerous links for the writings, opinions and meusings (“blogs” they call them) of Catholics throughout the world, including reports from the various news services on this topic as well. While I could not find anything that told me about the current status of the document in question, I did read page after page of opinions and stories about the “universal Indult” — its merits and demerits — that offered no information about the status of the document, but were very revealing about the status of Catholic thought on this subject, including opinions and proclamations from a variety of sources who, for the most part, claim to part of the “Traditional Movement.” While I know most people are often quite willing to give their opinions on various topics presented to them, what I read in the messages of many of these “bloggers” was nothing short of a free-for-all discussion on the Sacred Liturgy (including the “universal Indult”) that rarely cited approved, traditional ecclesiastical sources to back up the opinions being expressed. There were far too many “authoritative” proclamations from these “bloggers” on such subjects as the value of the a *Novus Ordo* ceremony said “reverently”, the “beauty” of the hybrid liturgy found on EWTN, the existence of the “rite of Paul VI” (aka the *Novus Ordo Missae*) as just another “rite” under the umbrella of the Roman Rite, that the “universal Indult” will cause the “rite of St. Pius V” to be numbered among these “approved” rites, and so forth. Not only were the questionable opinions freely posted on these web site discussion groups for all to read (without a demand, in some cases, for an alignment of one’s “opinion” with traditional Catholic teaching on the matter), but there were also messages from those in confusion over the modern liturgical mess who found comfort in the unsubstantiated

This publication combines three articles that first appeared in *The Catholic Voice* (June & December, 2006, and March, 2007, respectively). They were written in response to rumors about the promulgation of the “universal indult” by Benedict XVI — the truthfulness surrounding these rumors, and the principles behind the rejection of such an “indult” as a smokescreen to keep Catholics loyal to the Modernist church. What has been rumored may soon be factual, but that does not lessen the importance of the principles reviewed in this publication. If, as reported, the “universal indult” *motu proprio* of Benedict XVI is soon to be promulgated under the guise that the Roman Rite of worship can take on “ordinary” (*Novus Ordo Missae* of Paul VI) and “extraordinary” (Latin Mass using 1962 Missal from John XXIII) forms to the point that they both “inspire the other,” we are left with another great Modernist deception that true worship can someone take inspiration from that which is false. Many Catholics will fall prey to this deception, for all they want is a Mass offered in Latin, leaving aside the fact that the Modernist church, and the worship service it invented, do not teach the true Catholic Faith. Faith comes *before* worship. The promulgation of the “universal indult” is no cause for celebration by true Catholics.

Universal Indult - Page 2

opinions of this or that person. No wonder so many Catholics feel confused today. As for the “universal Indult,” most of those who posted messages on these “blogs” had their opinions and concerns about it — opinions that increased in variety as the “blog” grew in length.

Concerns About The “Universal Indult”

I would like to share a few of these opinions to give my reader some understanding of what an ever-growing number of today’s Catholics are thinking on this topic. As I see it, we will be wandering into a spiritual never-never land created by these poor souls either through a lack of proper Catholic education and formation, or through a weekly indoctrination from the modern pulpits and the modern “Catholic” media, using whatever formats these people frequent, or both. Don’t worry — I haven’t lost sight of my intent to answer the questions of those who wonder about my thoughts on the “universal Indult.” These will come in due time, accompanied by proper citations from traditional Catholic sources to shore them up. However, allow me to share a few lines about the worries and concerns of those on the Internet on this topic. It is worth reviewing.

As I expected, I was not surprised at the number of people writing in support of the “universal Indult” merely for the novelty of having the Mass in Latin available to them once again. “I personally like the Latin Mass as an art form,” writes one blog member. “It also has the advantage that neither the priest nor the community comprehends what the celebrant and the congregation understand through what is being Proclaimed, i.e., it is perfect for deep meditation. So long as it is not mandatory within a parish, there is no problem.” To this thought another person added: “WWJD,” using the acronym for “What Would Jesus Do” (a trite saying among fundamentalist Protestants and “evangelized” Catholics that is supposed to inspire right behavior in those who read it). In this case, since Jesus spoke Aramaic, and not Latin, it seems that the WWJD is offered up as answer to the argument of those “purists” who prefer Latin to the vernacular in their liturgy: do as Jesus did at the Last Supper and everything will be fine.

There were a good number of “bloggers” who were opposed to the “universal Indult,” and that for a variety of reasons. “I will be deeply saddened if this happens,” I read in one spot. “A minuscule schismatic/splinter group that refuses to follow a valid Council ought not to be accorded the power to impose its cultic throwback to the Latin Mass (however OK and acceptable previously) on the post-Vatican II Church. There is no authority for this.” Another offered this commentary: “I vote ‘no’ because a universal Indult can lead to abuse by priests. Some may choose to only celebrate the Tridentine Mass, and this would divide us into two churches. The ‘62 Missal has, for some, also become a symbol of a revolt against Vatican II. This is not orthodoxy; it is disobedience.” Still another expressed his concerns: “I don’t want to see the Novus Ordo abandoned to the freaks and liberals. There were very sound reasons (!) why it was decided to issue the *Novus Ordo Missae*. What is needed is a renewal of the N.O.” Another said: “I dislike the (Latin) rite, not so much that it is in Latin, but that the dialogue is between priest and acolyte/altar server (male, of course). I sin, therefore I should say ‘Confiteo,’ and take responsibility for my action.” Lastly, I include this well thought out response: “A little ‘competition’ in the religious ‘marketplace’ would either force the liturgy abusers to shape up, or demonstrate that they have become the normative expression of faith. (If that proves to be the fact, I’m going eastern!)”

I am not giving much room here for those “bloggers” who wrote in opposition to the “universal Indult” because accepting it would also mean showing approval for the *Novus Ordo Missae*. While such comments were rare, they express some of my concerns as well, and so I will include them in what I write below.

A Different — But More Correct — Approach

My search through the various Internet links led me to this one: youngtraditionalcatholics.com. The sponsor of this site (a young, late-twenties Catholic, who is a recent “convert” from the Novus Ordo church) wrote his thoughts on a “universal Indult” in an article entitled *It’s Not Just About The Mass!* While welcoming the “return” of the Latin Mass (because it was never abolished anyway, we are reminded), he says that merely returning the Latin Mass will not solve some of the bigger and more fundamental problems that exist in the structure of the modern church. He writes: “One of the main reasons that so many people hold on to the ‘old Mass’ is because it is the crown jewel of everything that was right and wholesome in the world forty-plus years ago, since from the Mass the sacraments

Universal Indult - Page 3

branch out and help us in everyday life. So what does it mean if the Vatican ‘allows’ the usage of a Mass that was never abolished? To be honest: Nothing! When it comes to the majority of post-Vatican II churches, it would be nothing but ‘lipstick on a pig.’ Traditional and true Catholics were living the morals and beliefs of the pre-Vatican II world without such permission for the Mass. The sacraments and the basic moral teachings stem from, and lead to, the ‘Mass For All Time.’ You cannot expect to grant the widening of the use of the Tridentine Mass to do any good if you do not enforce the doctrine and the dogma that stems from it.” The author then proceeds to re-enforce his position by stating that “approved” errors in the modern church, such as rampant liturgical abuses, pedophile clergy, hierarchical approval of the “gay” life-style, false ecumenism, syncretism and so forth must be corrected, for it is not enough to give people a Latin Mass while perverting their Faith at the same time. “If the Vatican truly wanted to grab my attention,” he says, “and have me (as well as many other Traditionalists) think that they are serious about correcting problems within the modern church, the only course of action would be to declare the Second Vatican Council null and void.... Granting the ‘not-needed Indult’ is fine and good, but until the morality direction of the church is corrected, you can say the Mass in Latin all you want, but if you leave your morals and beliefs in the pew, it won’t do a bit of good. Remember: IT’S NOT JUST ABOUT THE MASS!”

I applaud the author of this piece for an honest and worthy Catholic response to this issue about allowing a “universal Indult.” However, let me take this consideration a bit further. Catholics for centuries have never accepted the notion that they were Catholics merely because the Mass was in Latin, and that the Latin Mass was accompanied by beautiful choirs and was offered in lovely churches. No, they were (and are) Catholics because they accept the traditional and apostolic teachings of the Roman Catholic Church as true, and these teachings are re-enforced for them by the way they worship (the Mass in Latin, for Latin Rite Catholics) — *not the other way around*. While the Latin Mass is at the *heart* of our Faith (because it is the most sublime and true form of worship a creature can give to his Creator), it is not the *full measure* of our *entire* Faith. In other words, the Latin Mass is not part of those things we must all *believe* in order to save our souls (the Deposit of Faith), but it is what we must *do* in acting on those beliefs in our worship of the God in whom we believe. After all, the axiom “law of praying is the law of believing” is an important summary of how Faith *enlivens* worship, it is not *replaced* by it. If we think we are pleasing God by merely attending a Latin Mass in a church that teaches doctrinal errors and is a danger to our Faith, then we have set the bar of our standards for worship far too low. Let us not say: *It is the Mass that matters*, but: *It is the Mass offered in houses of worship where the true Catholic Faith is taught and defended that matters*. If we say this, it demonstrates that we are thinking and acting as Catholics have done for centuries.

First Things First

Let me get to the heart of the matter: In order to take advantage of a “universal Indult” in a post-Modernist world, Catholics still aligned with the modern church will have to “strengthen” that alignment in several key areas of the modernist way of doing things in order to attend that Mass in those churches. Such has been the practice ever since the *Ecclesia Dei* Indult was granted in 1988. Let’s review what those requirements are at present, for those in favor of the “universal Indult” must surely know that they will continue to be in force whenever that long-anticipated document is promulgated.

Before we take a look at those requirements, allow me a quick review of reasons leading up to a growing “demand” for the Latin Mass which made the granting of an “Indult” a necessity if Catholics were going to remain loyal to the new church of Vatican II. On April 3, 1969, Paul VI suppressed the Papal Bull *Quo Primum* (written by Pope St. Pius V) with his own Apostolic Constitution on the *Promulgation of the Revised Roman Missal*. This “revision,” he called it, of the Roman Missal was necessary in order to fulfill the decrees of Vatican II, primarily to promote more “participation” in the Liturgy. Just a few words — “previous decrees notwithstanding” — were needed to completely wipe out the centuries-old traditional form of worship enjoyed by Catholics of the Roman Rite, dismissing in particular the Bull *Quo Primum* entirely, something which Pope St. Pius V said could never be done, and which was always respected. It is also worth noting that Paul VI, through this decree, completely changed the form for the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist on his own whim (“Thus in each eucharistic prayer, *we* wish that the words be as follows . . .”) by removing the words *mysterium fidei* from the formula for the consecration of the

Universal Indult - Page 4

wine, and then allowing, at a later time, the ICEL to eliminate the words *pro multis* from that form as well.

In previous issues of *The Catholic Voice*, I (and other authors) have outlined that, while the Church has the power to change those prayers of the Mass which She Herself instituted, it has always been recognized that *no one* — not even a Pope or a Council — *has either the right or the authority to change the form of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist* as found within the Roman (Tridentine) Mass. The form used in the traditional Mass — the *entire* form — has long been demonstrated to be the words *absolutely necessary* for transubstantiation to take place, despite what modern “theologians” may say. They make many claims, after all, but cannot give us dogmatic teachings on this subject to back them up. While Paul VI’s new missal did provide for a liturgy in Latin, it was merely a Latin version of the *Novus Ordo Missae*, so that those who wanted a “Latin mass” could be satisfied. There are some today who wish to call this bastardized missal the “Rite of Paul VI,” and the Roman Missal that was eliminated the “Rite of St. Pius V”. They do this in order to legitimize the corrupted form of worship forced on modern Catholics, and keep them loyal to the modern church. After all, it was never the intent of the Modernists to establish a *new* rite, just to *reform* the old one, so why pretend otherwise? This “double rite” business is something that appears in documents closer to our time, and is another attempt at “revisionist history.”

On October 3, 1984, a document entitled *Quattuor Abhinc Annos*, was promulgated by the Congregation of Divine Worship outlining the conditions under which the “old” Latin Mass could be celebrated in the various dioceses of the world. While many of the Modernist “authorities” were very careful to admit that the Missal of St. Pius V had never been suppressed, either by Vatican II or by the liturgical commissions, still it was no longer considered the norm for Catholic worship. These conditions are: 1. It was up to the bishops of every diocese to allow the use of the Latin Mass (1962 Missal only, even though it violates *Quo Primum* by the insertion of St. Joseph’s name in the Canon of the Mass) in their territories, even if prior approval from the Vatican was obtained. It was also up to them *where* to allow it to be said, and at what *time*. 2. The Latin Mass could be celebrated only for those who requested it. And, 3. That those requesting the use of the Indult did not *in any way* challenge the validity of the modern rites. These three conditions have never been removed or modified, save the one requiring all those attending it to formally request the use of the Indult. Therefore, those who attend the Latin Mass said under the Indult are, *by their presence*, acknowledging that the *Novus Ordo Missae is side-by-side of equal merit, value and validity as the traditional Roman (Tridentine) Mass*. Therefore (again), my first concern about the granting of a “universal Indult” is that more and more Catholics will be bamboozled and will be kept loyal to the modern church, simply because they have an “approved” Mass in Latin to attend. To me, this is equivalent to worshipping in a bubble, looking only at the Latin and the singing and so forth, while attempting to ignore the corruption of the Catholic Faith that is so prevalent all around. These conditions were renewed in 1988, with John Paul II’s letter *Ecclesia Dei* because of the rupture caused by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre. The case for keeping Catholics loyal to the modern church was getting more serious, and so modern Rome made sure it took the necessary measures to guarantee respect for the “rightful aspirations” of a few.

Things get worse. It will only be a matter of time before those taking advantage of the “universal Indult” will see the practices and teachings of the modern church thrown into their midst, and by the principle of “gradual introduction,” they will slowly, but surely, imbibe poison at the fountain that is known as the Modernist church until they absorb the errors that will certainly bring about their spiritual ruin. We can already see this taking place. In previous issues of *The Catholic Voice*, we have outlined abuses already in effect at those churches where the Latin Mass is said with the approval of modern Rome and the local bishop. In several churches, “altar girls” are serving the Latin Mass. Why? Because the use of “altar girls” is approved by modern Rome, and nothing can stop this novelty from taking place. Likewise, the notion of “permanent lay deacons” participating in the Mass like they do in the modern rites is already an established practice in some churches, such as St. Francis de Sales Church in the Atlanta area, operated by the “approved” priests of the Fraternity of St. Peter. The sermons that will be delivered, and the advice given in the confessional (modern rite, not traditional, by the way) in the Indult chapels will mostly follow the modern pastoral methods, including the promotion of the diversity of religious tolerance, the prominence of the “social gospel” of works over the importance of personal sanctification, and so forth. Even now, in churches where the Indult is used along with the modern rites, those in attendance are treated to a mixing of “rites” in such

Universal Indult - Page 5

a way that the calendar of the “old rite” is quietly observed along with the calendar of the “new rite.” The modern church has a new form of worship with a new calendar (ordered by Vatican II) that has changed the traditional dates for the many of the various feasts and festivals. For example, according to the modern calendar, such “recent” feasts as Mary’s Queenship (May 31), the Immaculate Heart of Mary (August 22) and Christ the King (last Sunday of October) have either been *completely eliminated*, or else they are observed on days that are *different* from when they were first established. Can you imagine sitting in one of the “approved” churches where, on the “Last Sunday of Ordinary Time,” the feast of Christ the King is celebrated, only to be thinking, as one who is part of the “traditional group” in that “approved” church, that “we” celebrated this feast one month earlier! Such practices promote spiritual schizophrenia and disunity, ideals so contrary to that spirituality that the Sacred Liturgy has always promoted among faithful Catholics. All of this says nothing of the constant worry good Catholics will have while taking advantage of the “universal Indult” about the validity of the rites they attend. The modern ordination rites are highly doubtful, and many of the hosts used at the Communion granted by the “universal Indult” may have been “consecrated” according to the Novus Ordo formula. One cannot worship God in truth if there is a substantive doubt about the rites of worship themselves.

My Advice: Stay Away

Those who have asked for my thoughts on the proposed “universal Indult” now have some of them. It is time for those Catholics who say they want to preserve the traditional rites and Faith of the Roman Catholic Church to live according to what they say they believe. When the Church has been in trying circumstances in the past, and heretics have occupied the buildings, while at the same time preserving a Latin liturgy, Catholics have *refused* to attend Masses in those churches — *even if they were offered validly* — because the mere attendance at a valid Mass said in Latin *cannot be the minimum standard we hold ourselves to in this time of crisis*. We cannot place our faith in danger by pretending to worship God “in spirit and in truth” where the Apostolic Faith is not upheld. As we have seen in past ages of the Church, when Catholics remained true to the principles of their Faith in every aspect during the time of crisis, such action won graces for them and for the Church as a whole so that God was moved to assist His Church out of that crisis as a reward for the fidelity of the Just. With St. Athanasius, during the years of the Arian heresy, we say: *They have the churches, but we have the Faith!* Like him, and so many others, let’s stay out of those modern churches, even if there is a Latin Mass there, so that we can remain true to our Holy Catholic Faith.

It started up again toward the end of September, 2006. Stories abounded that “sometime soon” Benedict XVI would be making an announcement in which he would grant a “universal indult” for the recitation of the Latin Mass. Those who have followed this story know that the “indult” I speak of is a permission to allow any priest to offer the Latin Mass according to the 1962 version of the Roman Missal without specific permission needed to do this. While the modern church already has the *Ecclesia Dei* Indult for this purpose, the “new” Indult is supposed to make the Latin Mass even more available for those who wish it. But why grant such an indult if one already exists? For the most part, Benedict XVI feels compelled to grant it to fulfill one condition laid down by the superiors of the Society of St. Pius X for this group’s “reconciliation” with the Modernists. [Two other “demands” were made by the SSPX — the lifting of the excommunications placed on the bishops of SSPX and the right to continue to “resist” the heretical teachings of Vatican II while still in the framework of the church that promotes them — but neither of these are publicly discussed as important in order for the “reconciliation” to take place.] *This means that the “universal indult” is not coming about as a result of a new found love for traditional Catholic practices*. Such an idea is quite far from the truth. Nothing has been said that modern Rome will abandon its Modernist ways along with the promulgation of the “universal indult”. In fact, the Modernist hierarchy have all insisted that the principles of the “new evangelization” and false ecumenism will push on even greater than before even if the indult is promulgated. It is clear that the granting of the “universal indult” cannot be seen by traditional Catholics as some sort of “victory” over the Modernists.

An Important Question

Before I go any further about the “universal indult,” I need to pause and ask some very important questions: Just how true is this story about a “universal indult”? Does there exist some sort of document giving its approval? Or, is this all a Modernist sham? I don’t ask these questions lightly, for I write them only a few days before going to press with this issue. Right now, if pressed to give an answer, I would have to say: “I don’t know,” *and* I don’t know anyone or any publication that can give me factual answers to clear up my doubts.

When the story about the “universal indult” first surfaced before Holy Week , 2006, two “facts” kept being repeated:

- the decree for the “universal indult” has already been signed and is sitting on Benedict XVI’s desk, and
- the indult was going to be granted “very soon,” even as soon as Holy Thursday.

Those who remember my article on this topic in the June, 2006, issue of *The Catholic Voice* will remember that, at the time of that writing, little more had been said about the “universal indult” than was said before Holy Week leaving some to wonder if it was all a hoax. I never have thought the story of the “universal indult” was untrue; however, what I have always questioned is the fact that it will ever be granted, and if it will be granted, in what form will it exist? The sole purpose (as I will discuss later) behind this “universal indult” is to appease the “traditionalists” who only want a Latin Mass within the framework of the Modernist church. Repeating what I said above (because it bears repeating): The indult is not being given out of any love for the Tridentine Latin Mass, nor because it is believed that *this* Mass is the only *valid worship* of Almighty God for Latin Rite Catholics while the *Novus Ordo Missae* of Paul VI is *invalid*, sinful and a mockery of all that is holy. As we have pointed out in this newsletter several times, the *Ecclesia Dei* indult was first granted by John Paul II in order to keep tradition-minded Catholics loyal to the modern church. The reasons for granting the “universal indult” are utilitarian — for the accomplishment of the end game of the Modernists, which is the overthrow of the one, holy, Catholic, apostolic Roman Church founded by Jesus Christ. Whatever needs to be done to keep people loyal to the modern church, that is what will be done, including the granting of the “rite of St. Pius V” for those who cannot find comfort in the “rite of Paul VI”. While many traditional Catholics are jumping up and down in anticipation of the “universal indult,” the proverbial fly in the ointment now, and has been for over 20 years, is its acceptance by the Modernist bishops throughout the world in their territories — especially by those who are committed to the “new evangelization” of Vatican II. The bishops of entire countries (including our own) have made it clear that the pathway for the fulfillment of the “new evangelization” does not go through the return of the Latin Mass, to the point that if a “universal indult” is granted, one which takes the collegial “authority” of the bishops out of the picture, these men will disobey, even to the point of open schism to preserve the “spirit of Vatican II.” Benedict XVI knows this, and this is why I question, not the existence of “universal indult”, but that this indult will ever be promulgated to begin with.

Evidence To Support This Abounds

My reader should keep in mind that I do not come by this line of thinking having had too much sparkling apple cider late one evening. I have been raised around politics and the games politicians play, and this whole story of the “universal indult” sounds just like the best (or worst) of any political series of events I have ever seen. There are stories that abound on both sides of this issue — all claiming to come from “credible” sources — that leave one’s head spinning from the claims that are made. This is all part of the Modernist plan, and too many good-minded Catholics are falling right in to the trap they have laid — a trap that makes them think that the Modernists really aren’t that bad and that are “changing” and becoming more “traditional”. Hogwash.

Let me give you a timeline so that you can following my reasoning on this:

- Past few years: The superiors of the SSPX have kept presenting the idea to modern Rome that if there ever will be a “reconciliation”, the first thing they want to see is the granting of a “universal indult”. Modern Rome takes this under consideration.

- Summer, 2005: Benedict XVI meets with representatives of SSPX. Among the matters discussed is the granting of a “universal indult”. The word is that Benedict XVI is in favor of this plan, especially if it would bring about an end to the “Lefebvre schism.”

Universal Indult - Page 7

- March, 2006: Rumors abound that a “universal indult” is in the offing, that the document granting it has already been signed, and that it will be promulgated “soon”.

- September, 2006: After a lengthy silence about the “universal indult,” rumors persist that the “signed document” will soon be made public and the “universal indult” will be granted, followed not too long after that by the reconciliation of SSPX with modern Rome. The biggest proponent of this is *Archivum Liturgicum*, stating they have “numerous informed sources” who said the indult would be granted in November.

- October, 2006: The rumor mills are hard at work about the existence of the “universal indult”. The Associated Press, quoting “a Vatican official,” said a “major concession to the ultraconservatives” was due to take place. The French bishops are “in shock” over the idea of granting a wider authorization to the celebration of the “Mass of St. Pius V”. The former Archbishop of Paris, Jean-Marie Lustiger and the Archbishop of Bordeaux (and head of the conference of French bishops), Cardinal Jean-Pierre Ricard, are received in audience by Benedict XVI. On October 25, the bishops of Strasbourg, Metz and the province of Besancon make their feelings known in a written statement: “The bishops are afraid that the generalization of the Roman Missal of 1962 would attenuate the guidelines of Vatican Council II. Such a decision would also risk endangering the unity among priests, and among the faithful as well.” The French bishops call for a plenary council meeting to discuss this issue.

- November 2006: The French bishops met in plenary council the first week of November to discuss what they see is an attack against the “liturgical renewal” of Vatican II. Cardinal Jean-Pierre Ricard returns from Rome with this important news for the French bishops: *There is no new indult. Nothing has been signed* by Benedict XVI or anyone else. He reassured the anxious bishops that Benedict XVI does not want to renounce the reforms of the Second Vatican Council by reviving the old Latin Mass. “The Church is not changing direction,” Ricard said. “This ‘project’ (the “universal indult”) stems from Benedict’s desire to do all he can to end the Lefebvrist schism. The decision to liberalize the possibility for priests to say Mass according to the 1962 Missal has not yet been made. The announced Motu proprio has not been signed. Its plan will be the object of various consultations. And, beginning now, we can make known our own fears and hopes Contrary to the intentions that some attribute to him, Benedict XVI does not intend to double back along the path that Vatican Council II set for the church. He is solemnly engaged in following it.” These words seem very clear: there is no signed document known as the “universal indult,” and any discussion about it has been met to appease the weak-minded traditionalists (their term, not mine). How, then, could Mgr. Ignacio Barreiro write in the Latin Mass Society’s web site known as *The Road to Restoration* (for November, 2006) that “based on impeccable (!) sources . . . the long-prayed for universal indult will be promulgated before Christmas.” Mgr. Barreiro writes: “In these last three months, we can see a growing series of events that indicate that Benedict XVI is moving on a clear route of doctrinal and liturgical restoration . . . and we can reasonably expect that in the next couple of months, or even earlier, the so-called ‘universal indult’ will be promulgated.” But how can this happen if the “universal indult” doesn’t even exist? Or, is the report to the French bishops the real smoke screen, coming from less trustworthy sources in the Vatican? The Modernists are having a field day with us all, and those who say they are faithful to Catholic Tradition are often the ones letting them do it out of some confused loyalty to the Latin Mass, and *only* the Latin Mass.

To Repeat An Important Consideration

As I said in my June, 2006, article: If the “universal indult” appears on the scene, two questions will need to be addressed by true Roman Catholics: *Is the Latin Mass the most important part of our Catholic lives? Or, is the public expression of the true, apostolic Faith the most important aspect of our Catholic lives?* These questions are neither rhetorical nor unnecessary, for answering them correctly will reveal the correct manner of professing our Faith.

While the Roman (Tridentine) Mass (pre-1962) stands at the heart of our Faith as the correct means by which Roman Catholics express their public worship of Almighty God, it is not the *sum total* of all the truths of our Holy Faith. True, in the Mass, many of the sacred truths of our holy religion are reviewed and even explained, however, we cannot say that we worship God “in spirit and in truth” if the holy, apostolic Faith is not taught and professed whole and entire, with any mixture of error outside the Mass. God will not be pleased with any multitude of Latin

Universal Indult - Page 8

Masses if they are said within the framework of the church of the Modernists. If anyone thinks opposite this, please explain to me how this can be true.

Satan is clever. As the “Prince of Lies,” he can make it appear that all sides of this issue are correct keeping people loyal to the errors he inspired at Vatican II. He can suggest to people various ways to think they are doing good — and honoring God as they do them — while at the same time ensuring their loyalty to his diabolical ways in the Modernist church. What a tragedy this! Only those who desire to remain faithful to *every aspect* true Catholic teaching will avoid his snare.

The New “Pro Multis” Decree Is Another Modernist Red Herring

In recent columns of this newsletter, I have reviewed the deception found in what is known as the “universal indult”: the effort of some Modernists to make the celebration of the Latin Mass (according to the 1962 missal) available to all priests of the world without special permission for this celebration (save for its scheduling). The chief deceptions in this decree (which we are *still* being told will be “any day now”) are found, not in the “red herring” which makes the Latin Mass more available to people, but in the other abuses that are tolerated, and even “approved,” and which are an insult to the traditional liturgy. Among these abuses are the “exceptional status” afforded the Latin Mass while giving the *invalid Novus Ordo Missae* a continued place of prominence in Catholic worship, and the liturgical abuses found in the modern liturgies (lay lectors, liturgical dance, “altar girls” and the like), some of which have found their way into the indult-style Latin Masses. What is more, while accepting this “universal indult,” Catholics somehow are expected to ignore the heresies of false ecumenism, the universal salvation of all mankind, moral and doctrinal relativism and the like as they sit in churches of the Modernists, happy with the notion that they are present for a Latin Mass. This says nothing of the continued contradiction that is found in the dual liturgical calendars used in these churches — a contradiction which clearly identifies the desire of the Modernists to present a new form of worship for Catholics by altering the traditional celebration of feasts and fasts that Catholics have kept for centuries.

As it stands for now, those churches where the “universal indult” will be said will follow one liturgical calendar, while the “non-indulterers” will follow the calendar introduced after Vatican II. For example: not long ago, those using the traditional calendar observed the Sundays after Epiphany, while those of the modern rite (using the new calendar) observed the beginning of the “Sundays of Ordinary Time.” [Note: I have heard from several sources that a revision of the “1962 Missal” has been ordered by the Vatican to coincide with the proclamation of the “universal indult”. All who use the “indult” *must use* the new “Latin missal” because it will bring in line all those who desire the Latin Mass but who now observe the pre-Vatican II liturgical calendar. The new “Latin Missal” will follow the pattern of the modern (post-Vatican II) calendar, with its jumbled up feasts, questionably canonized saints and the elimination of Ember Days, Vigils and the like. Thus, those who use the “universal indult” will cease to be “traditional Catholic” in practice (despite their presence at a Latin Mass), and soon will be so in belief and worship.]

Last November [2006], deception was added to deception. Benedict XVI (through Cardinal Arinze, the prefect for the Congregation for Divine Worship) has ordered that, for all countries where English is used in the modern rites, their missals must be revised to reflect a “new” translation of *pro multis* as found in the words for the consecration of the wine. Thanks to the ICEL (with the approval of modern Rome), *pro multis* has been translated since 1967 as “for all” instead of the correct translation “for many”. For many years, true Roman Catholics have pointed to this obvious mistranslation of the apostolic form for the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, and have clearly demonstrated from Church teachings that such a change *invalidates* the Consecration of the wine at Mass, *thus invalidating the entire Mass*. Up until now, the Modernists have said that true Roman Catholics should not worry about such things, that the words “for all” and “for many” mean the same thing (!), and, besides, this change occurs in a “non-essential” part of the form of the Sacrament. Now, in order to appease Catholics on both sides of the indult issue, the modern church is doing a 180-degree reversal on all this by saying the “historically correct” translation for *pro multis* is “for

Universal Indult - Page 9

many". This says nothing about the *doctrinal correctness* of this translation, as well as the many *other errors* surrounding the celebration of the *Novus Ordo Missae* that continue to render it *invalid* and *sinful* for Catholics to attend.

How Some Defended The Corrupt ICEL Translation

Almost immediately after the promulgation of the *Novus Ordo Missae*, objections were raised against the translation of *pro multis* as "for all" in the Canon. The so-called *Ottaviani Intervention*, as well as the distinguished writings of men of faith like Patrick Henry Omlor (in his *Questioning the Validity of the Masses Using the New All-English Canon* and other important works) and others all raised serious objections to the mutilated form of the wine-consecration, citing magisterial teachings of the Church as the sources of their objections. In reply, the ICEL published *The Roman Canon in English Translation*, in which they advanced the idea that a "study" of the literary texts and linguistics led them to discover that Our Lord, at the Last Supper, in consecrating the wine, really said: "This is . . . My Blood . . . shed for *all men*." What was their proof for this? Quoting the "learned" scholar (and Modernist) Joachim Jeremias, from the work *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, "Neither Hebrew nor Aramaic possess a word for 'all' . . ." therefore it is possible that Our Lord meant to say *all* rather than the "exclusionary" *many* that has been the translation of the text for centuries.

Now, St. Pius X, in his *Syllabus of Errors of the Modernists*, stopped such heretical speculation about the Scriptures years ago. In this work, he condemned as heretical the following proposition: "No. 12. The exegete . . . must first put aside all preconceived opinions concerning the supernatural origin of Sacred Scriptures, and must not interpret it otherwise than merely human documents." In offering their "learned opinions" on the eucharistic texts, the Modernists of the ICEL essentially deny the Divine guidance of the Church in teaching us about the nature of the Holy Scriptures as well as in proposing to us in the Mass, with the words "for many" used as the official translation of the Latin text, the official and infallible form of worship for all Catholics of the Roman Rite. It did not matter that the Church has consistently taught that the entire form used for the Consecration of the bread and wine at Mass in the Roman Rite came to us from Christ through the Apostles. No, for the "teachers" of the ICEL, their learned "opinions" on this matter supercede all other teachings. This heretical frame of mind was perpetuated over and over again to the point that Fr. John Dietzen, writing in the *Catholic New York*, answered a question in his column *The Question Box* about the correct translation of *pro multis* this way: "A key factor to the answer to your question is that Hebrew and Aramaic have no real equivalent in this context for the word 'all.' Hebrew *rabbim*, which literally means 'many', also sometimes conveys the meaning of 'all' – the many who form the whole." This is nearly word-for-word taken from the ICEL book mentioned above. The modern clergy — wittingly or not — often repeat the same lies and heretical teachings over and over again, and nearly all of the Catholic faithful accept their "opinions" without question and without studying their Faith for themselves.

Another "defense" of the invalidating ICEL translation came from the more "conservative" circles over the years. Many authors and "theologians," while admitting that the argument about "*many* and *all* meaning the same thing" was rather weak, said this did not matter in the area of validity. These "learned" men reminded us that all that is strictly necessary for validity in the Mass is for the priest to recite these words "This is My Body," and "This is My Blood," and transubstantiation takes place. This became known as the "short form" argument and is not consistent with the magisterial teachings of the Church in this matter, despite what the Baltimore Catechism (and other such books echoing this new teaching of the "theologians") has to say. I will review a reply to this argument further along.

The Reasons For The Change

Years of defending the use of "for all" in the wine-consecration came to naught when Cardinal Arinze ordered a return to the use of "for many" in the English vernacular liturgies of the modern church. Among the reasons for this change are:

- The Synoptic Gospels (Matthew and Mark) make specific reference to "many" for whom the Lord offered the Sacrifice;
- The Roman Rite in Latin has always said *pro multis* and never *pro omnibus* in the consecration of the chalice;

Universal Indult - Page 10

- The anaphoras of the various Oriental Rites all contain the verbal equivalent of the Latin *pro multis* in their respective languages. (This *includes* the Aramaic-speaking rites. *FKV*)

- “For many” is a faithful translation of *pro multis*, whereas “for all” is rather an explanation of the sort that belongs properly to catechesis. (What? We will see what the Council of Trent taught in this matter, and how the teachings of this dogmatic council are the true “catechesis” that must be followed. *FKV*.)

- In line with the instruction *Liturgiam Authenticam*, effort should be made to be more faithful to the Latin texts in the typical editions. (Is the event pictured above “in line with the instruction *Liturgiam Authenticam*”? *FKV*.)

And when is all of this supposed to take effect? For countries where a change in translation will be required, the bishops are to prepare for the introduction of a new translation of the phrase in approved liturgical texts “in the next one or two years.”

Absent from all this is the most important reason that every traditional Catholic should be looking for: that the translation of *pro multis* as “for all” has violated past Church teachings (not mere *practices*), and has invalidated the Mass whenever it was used. Do I expect the Modernists to admit to this? Honestly, no. However, I do expect that Catholics who understand the sacramental theology surrounding the Holy Eucharist will see that this fact is most obviously missing from the reasons for the change, and thus they will see no cause for rejoicing in Arinze’s letter. Rather, caution is in order.

Since the reasons for this change are not based on validity and traditional sacramental theology, they must have been issued for some merely human motive, meaning that the reasons given above are part of a mere smokescreen to appease the masses. Isn’t anyone curious that after nearly forty years of a sinful translation, this “decree” should come forth right now with some sense of urgency? Don’t you think this has been issued to appease the “traditionalists” by demonstrating how “strong” the Vatican is in keeping the liturgy “authentic”? Numerous blog responses on the Internet demonstrate how too many gullible Catholics have been bamboozled into rejoicing about this change in the texts. They don’t see this as merely a “bait-and-switch” decision to appease, at the same time, those who both do and do not want the “universal indult.” Many of the “approved” traditional clerical communities are admitting that the “universal indult” will never be issued. Therefore, they will “take what they can get.” And, the more liberal factions who oppose the indult will accept this act of “discipline” if it means they don’t have to see a return of the Latin Mass. We can verify this through an “insider’s” series of comments. The London *Sunday Telegraph* published, on January 27, 2007, a story written by Malcolm Moore following an interview with Fr. Reginald Foster, a sixty-eight year old Carmelite, who was appointed the Papal Latinist thirty eight years ago, and who had these comments to make about the “universal indult”. Moore writes:

He said reports that Benedict will reintroduce the Tridentine Mass, which dates from 1570, and is largely conducted in Latin, were wrong — not the least because of Benedict’s desire to avoid more controversies. A speech last year offended Muslims, and more recently he gave initial support to a Polish archbishop eventually forced to resign . . .

“He is not going to do it,” Fr. Foster said. “He had trouble with Regensburg, and then trouble in Warsaw, and if he does this, all hell will break loose.” In any case, he added: “It is a useless Mass, and the whole mentality is stupid. The idea of it is that things were better in the old days. It makes the Vatican look medieval.”

What more needs to be said?

Reply To “All” And “Many” Mean The Same Thing

Let it be understood that when and if the Arinze letter is put into effect, the mere change to “for many” in the wine consecration form will not be enough to render the *Novus Ordo Missae* an acceptable form of valid worship for Roman Catholics. Years of deceiving people into thinking the Novus Ordo is the “same Mass” as the Latin Mass must be exposed, and an accounting must be made. For instance, a very strong retraction must be made regarding the justification for retaining the English “for all” under the reuse that “*many* and *all* mean the same thing.” Even a cursory inspection of the Aramaic rite (the language Jesus spoke — the language supposedly does not know the difference between “many” and “all”) will lead one to discover that, indeed, they do have a word in their language for “many” and a separate and distinct word for “all”. Patrick Henry Omlor reviewed this in his keynote speech at

Universal Indult - Page 11

the 1997 Latin Mass Conference held in Dallas, Texas, and sponsored by the Catholic Research Institute and the Society of Traditional Roman Catholics. This speech is available under the title *The Casualties of Thirty-five Years of Warfare* from the Catholic Research Institute [P.O. Box 589, Veradale, Washington 99037 USA].

Reply To The “Short Form” Argument

Admittedly, the first line of defense by those who justify the use of “for all” in the wine-consecration form (“*many* and *all* mean the same thing”) will lose much of its steam when the Arinze letter is implemented. This is why a thorough understanding of the weaknesses behind the “short form” argument are necessary. Contrary to what these “conservative” apologists tell us, the “long form” — meaning the *entire form* of words for the consecration of bread and the wine in the Canon of the Mass — is *essential* to validity, and *this is a magisterial Church teaching*. Once again, Patrick Omlor has reviewed this subject in great detail, and his works (also available from the Catholic Research Institute) should be a requirement for all to read. I have also reviewed these matters in more detail in past issues of *The Catholic Voice* (most of which can be found on the STRC web site — www.strc.org). These explanations have been around for a long time, it is recent events in the modern church that now make their study a necessity.

In short, here some of the main arguments denying the validity of the “short form”:

- Pope Eugene IV, in the year 1441, while the ecumenical Council of Florence was in session, taught the following. “We have deemed that herein should be laid down the form of words which in the consecration of the body and blood of Our Lord the holy Roman Church, **confirmed by the teaching and authority of the Apostles Peter and Paul has always been accustomed to use**. In the consecration of the Body, the Church uses this form of words: ‘For this is My body’; but in the consecration of the Blood it uses the following form of words’. ‘For this is the chalice of My Blood of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins’.”

Here the Sovereign Pontiff Eugene declares that the Consecration Form found in the Roman Missal is the form that the Roman Church has always been accustomed to use; that is, from the time of the Apostles at the very beginning.

- Pope Innocent III replied to a question by the Archbishop of Lyon who had added the words “the mystery of faith” to the wine-consecration form. In his doctrinal letter *Cum Marthae Circa* of November 29, 1202, the Sovereign Pontiff replied as follows: “You have asked who has added to the form of words which Christ Himself expressed when He changed the bread and wine into the Body and Blood, which are in the Canon of the Mass that the general Church uses, but which we find expressed by none of the Evangelists. In the Canon of the Mass,” Innocent continues, “that expression ‘the mystery of faith’ is found interspersed among His words. . . . Surely we find many such things omitted by the Evangelists from the words as well as from the deeds of the Lord.” And the Sovereign Pontiff concludes, “Therefore We believe the form of words as is found in the Canon [of the Mass] the Apostles received from Christ, and their successors from them.”

- The *De Defectibus* decree (Part V) found in the front of every altar missal of the Roman Rite prior to Vatican II is very definitive in its teaching: “The words of Consecration, which are the form of this Sacrament, are these: ‘For this is My Body.’ And: ‘For this is the Chalice of My Blood, of the new and eternal testament: the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.’ Now if one were to *omit anything* or to *change anything* in the form of the consecration of the Body and Blood, and in that very change of the words the (new) wording would fail to mean the same thing, *he would not consecrate the Sacrament*. If in fact he were to add something that did not change the meaning, it is true he would consecrate, but he would sin most gravely.”

- Contrary to what many “conservatives” will tell us, St. Thomas Aquinas did teach the necessity of the “long form” in his *Summa Theologica*, Part III, Question 78, Article 3, where he states matter-of-factly, “The Church, *instructed by the Apostles*, uses this form.”

- St. Thomas also teaches (*Summa*, Question 60, a. 3, ad. 2) that an important element of sacramental theology is that “a sacrament must signify what it effects, and effect what it signifies.” This is known as the *res* (essential elementary significance) of the sacrament. Pope Leo XIII teaches the same through the ordinary magisterium of the

Universal Indult - Page 12

Church in *Apostolicae Curae*. The wording of the “short form” does not meet this criteria because it never expresses why Our Lord instituted the Holy Eucharist and its relationship to His Passion and Death.

- Thus Dominican theologian Cajetan (1469-1534) emphatically taught and published in his *Commentaries* (1533) that only four words were necessary for valid consecration (*This is My Body* and *This is My Blood*). However, in 1570, Pope St. Pius V authorized the *Commentaries* to be republished in a Roman edition, but he explicitly commanded this particular opinion to be expurgated.

- The Holy Office in 1958 forbade those who were experimenting with the liturgy to attempt to offer Mass without using the words *mysterium fidei* in the wine consecration. They explained that the removal of this phrase from the form gravely affected the *validity* of the Mass.

There is no other Catholic conclusion that can be drawn from this short review than to acknowledge that the “short form” of the Consecration *has never been accepted by the Church for validity*, despite what modern theologians have taught, and despite what even some traditional clerics may write in explanation of such matters. No theologian is allowed to review subjects taught by the Magisterium of the Church (yes, even the *ordinary* magisterium) so as to teach something contrary to that which the Popes and Doctors of the Church have unerringly taught. Pope St. Pius X and Pope Pius XII reminded us in their writings that not even the Church has the *power* or the *right* to change the essential elements of the sacraments which tradition tells us came from Christ Himself through the Apostles. No Pope, no Council, no theologian can change that which makes up the essential form of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, and this is why the implementation of the Arinze letter will do nothing to make the *Novus Ordo Missae* a valid act of worship for Roman Catholics. This is not my opinion but the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church.

Society of Traditional Roman Catholics
P.O. Box 130 • Mead, Washington 99021 USA
www.strc.org