

My Reflections on the 2 forms of Holy Mass

By Jesse Romero M.A.

Introductory remarks:

St Cardinal Henry Newman, in his autobiographical novel, *Loss and Gain*, - “I could attend Masses forever, and not be tired. It is not a mere form of words – it is a great action, the greatest action that can be on earth. It is not the invocation merely, but I dare use the word, the evocation of the Eternal. Here comes present on the altar in flesh and blood, before whom angels bow and devils tremble.”

Venerable Archbishop Fulton J. Sheen - The death of Christ is an eternal act. We temporalize it; we spatialize it. Think of a great log that has been sawed in two. We see a number of circles on either side of that cut log. That’s the sacrifice of Christ. It runs through history, from the very beginning, when God made an animal skin for the first parents to hide their shame; it runs through all the symbolic sacrifices of the Jews; and it runs up to Calvary and from Calvary on into heaven itself. In fact, it began with the Lamb: slain, as it were, from the beginning of the world (‘Through the Year with Fulton Sheen; p.155).

The word Christmas comes from “Cristes Maesse,” an early English phrase that means Mass of Christ. The Catholic Mass is God instituted worship; idolatry is man instituted worship.

The Mass is heaven on earth; the Mass transports us to spiritual Jerusalem. Let me explain, the crucifixion of our Lord on Calvary is to history the equivalent of throwing a rock in a still pond of water, the ripple effect on the water is like the Mass. The Mass is the ripple effect of Calvary, that’s how you and I come into contact with Christ on Calvary. The Blood of Jesus just flows through time and space into eternity through the Mass. Calvary is like a power socket, a power outlet. At Mass we plug into Calvary, the power source which makes Calvary’s effects present to us here and now. Receiving the Holy Eucharist is like reaching back two thousand years and grabbing a hold of the cross and letting the blood of Jesus pour over you and wash you clean. When you walk out of Mass you are walking down the slopes of Calvary. The Jesus of Calvary 2000 years ago and the Jesus in the Holy Eucharist is one and the same, Jesus Christ is the same yesterday today and forever. To understand the enormity of the Catholic Mass, you must understand that the Heavenly Liturgy and the Earthly Liturgy is one in the same.

The marvel comic’s avenger superhero character; ‘the Flash’ is able to run so fast he can go back in time. Well, God is faster than Flash, so God can go back in time as well, actually, ALL TIME is present before God right now. The past, present and future are an eternal Now before God who is outside time. At Holy Mass, God makes the past – the Last Supper & the crucifixion on Calvary present in the altar of every Catholic Mass. That is why there is sacred silence, the ringing of bells to alert us of this great miracle and sacred music is the only thing appropriate at this time. Because at Mass, we stand at the foot of the cross with Our Lady and John the apostle – I believe they were in ‘sacred silence.’ What do you think?

Two Forms of celebrating Holy Mass in the Roman Rite

‘Novus Ordo Missae’ means the ‘New Order of the Mass’ given to us by Pope Paul VI. As I speak about the two forms of the Mass in the Roman rite I will use the abbreviation NOM to

refer to the Novus Ordo Missae, or the New Mass after Vatican II given to us by Pope Paul VI. I will use the abbreviation LM to designate the Latin Mass which was celebrated for centuries and centuries before Vatican II which ended in 1965.

My Broken Heart:

These are my personal heartfelt reflections of my experiences as a Catholic, struggling to be faithful and obedient to Holy Mother Church. I would probably be classified as a neo-con, that's a term to describe 'conservative Catholics' after the 2nd Vatican Council. I have always had a high view of 'Tradition' in all things except the Mass. Why? I never really pondered the fact that there was a Mass before Vatican II. I do remember seeing pictures of my 1st Holy Communion, I received on my knees on the tongue, on an altar rail and the tabernacle was in the center. I was born in 1961, I don't remember ever having gone to a Latin Mass. So far as I know, I have gone to Novus Ordo Parishes all my life. You really have to shop around before you find one that celebrates Holy Mass with the reverence and piety. The timeless words of the Last Supper and the power of the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of Life who changes the bread and wine into the body, blood, soul and divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ. This is "sina qua non" which means, the indispensable element of Catholicism. As I travel around the country to give lectures on the Catholic faith, I am saddened to see with my very eyes the lack of uniformity from Parish to Parish and from Diocese to Diocese. This "diabolical disorientation" which has even penetrated the Sacred Liturgy is a direct attack from the Devil. God is not the author of confusion, but of peace (cf. 1 Cor 14:33). When I was ignorant about the rubrics of the Sacred Liturgy I was bliss, but now that I know the difference between 'reverence' and 'irreverence' I am a Catholic man that lives with a broken heart. All I want is the reverence that is befitting of God, the reverence we use to have before the modernist had their "coming out party" at Vatican II. There are credible sources which demonstrate that Archbishop Bugnini, who was in charge of the Sacred Liturgy (Holy Mass) during the 2nd Vatican Council was a Freemason ('secret society' & archenemies of the Church). Another question, why did we need to have 6 protestants as advisors during Vatican II? It's pretty obvious that their advice was to make our worship (Holy Mass) more amenable to the Protestants by making it more horizontal, community centered, more like a happy meal gathering. 75% of Catholics went to Holy Mass before Vatican II (1965), after Vatican II we have about 21% of Catholics going to Holy Mass on Sunday. The smoke of Satan has entered into the Catholic Church and there has been an auto-demolition of the Catholic faith occurring since the time of the Council according to Pope Paul VI who was there and witnessed it.

Church Militant:

I find myself being drawn more to the Traditional form of the Roman Rite. Whenever I have gone or go to the LM, I feel like a soldier being led to battle by a General who leads us. The Priest in the LM is the tip of the spear leading a platoon of soldiers. The Priest is facing east, towards the risen Christ. Ad orientem was the position for about 1,800 years in both eastern and western Liturgies. The LM feels like the logical extension, transformation & fulfillment of the OT Jerusalem Temple Sacrifice with the High Priest officiating (ad orientem) and assisted by the Levites as his acolytes. The lay people were not allowed in the sanctuary, they were in the courtyard. In the LM the Catholic Priest in persona Christi (who is the everlasting High Priest) is assisted by males acolytes or Altar boys and the

rest of the lay people are in the nave (like the Jewish courtyard). The LM emulates the OT worship with the High Priest ad orientem before the Ark of the Covenant inside the Holy of Holies. Read Sirach 50:1-21, it describes the Jewish Liturgy in the Temple of Jerusalem by the High Priest, you will see how it foreshadows the Catholic Mass. Let's not forget, the type and shadow is never greater than the reality which is Christ in the New Covenant Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

The reverence and piety in the LM is so thick, it feels like you can cut it with a knife. Whenever I come out of the LM and am walking to my car in the parking lot, my soul feels that it was blasted with 'holy radiation' and I look to my wife and say: "Wow, we went to Calvary." At the LM my soul feels protected as the Priest in *persona Christi* prays for me for an hour while I am in a position of receptivity, on my knees and in silence.

Church of 'Active Participation':

The Mass is the once and for all sacrifice of Calvary made present in the eternal now of sacred time and it is also a Sacred Meal (cf. 1 Corinthians 5:7) where we receive the bread of life and the medicine of immortality. "The new form of the Mass is designed to engage the celebrant and the faithful in a communal activity" <http://www.traditionalcatholicpriest.com/2013/02/16/dietrich-von-hildebrand-on-the-holy-latin-mass-vs-new-mass/>. The NOM highlights the Sacred Meal aspect of the Liturgy, with a detached altar in the center which looks more like a table and the Priest facing the people like if you're sitting at a Denny's Restaurant having a dialogue with someone across the table. The NOM is a "dialogue Mass" with occasional jokes, happy birthday, anniversary songs and adlibbed prayers generally added (in violation of Liturgical Rubrics) to spice up the service. You are given the Holy Eucharist in the hand standing up by the one of the waiters called 'Extraordinary Ministers of Holy Communion'. The average Communion at the average Catholic Parish feels like a protestant service, it does not feel mystical, mysterious, reverent or holy. Your intellect is assaulted by the irreverence and casualness at the NOM. You continually tell yourself, "its Jesus, its Jesus, just believe, just believe", there is a battle going on in your intellect because of the lack of piety and reverence that you are witnessing. Here is what you generally experience at St Diversity's Parish, a train of people line up in the sanctuary behind the Priest after each one has pumped the Purell as they prepare to touch the 'Holy Eucharist' with their unconsecrated hands. Remember what happened to a lay man named 'Uzzah' in the O.T., when he touched the Ark of the Covenant which could only be touched by a Levite Priest, God struck him dead. Scripture demonstrates that it is dangerous to act like a ministerial Priest when you are not. In essence, you are a fake Priest. The majority of people do not make an act of reverence as is mandated, instead they snatch the Eucharist like if it's something owed to them. Everything you believe and know to be true about the real presence of Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist is attacked through your senses.

But, the New Mass 'builds community':

"Those who rhapsodize on the new liturgy make much of the point that over the years the Mass had lost its communal character and had become an occasion for individualistic worship. The new vernacular Mass, they insist, restores the sense of community by replacing private devotions

with community participation. Yet they forget that there are different levels and kinds of communion with other persons. The level and nature of a community experience is determined by the theme of the communion, the name or cause in which men are gathered. The higher the good which the theme represents, and which binds men together, the more sublime and deeper is the communion. The ethos and nature of a community experience in the case of a great national emergency is obviously radically different from the community experience of a cocktail party. And of course the most striking differences in communities will be found between the community whose theme is supernatural and the one whose theme is merely natural. The actualization of men's souls who are truly touched by Christ is the basis of a unique community, a sacred communion, one whose quality is incomparably more sublime than that of any natural community" (Dietrich *ibid*).

How would you judge the New Mass?:

I submit that the new liturgy must be judged by this test: Does it contribute to the authentic sacred community? Granted that it strives for a community character; but is this the character desired? Is it a communion grounded in recollection, contemplation and reverence? Which of the two—the new Mass, or the Latin Mass with the Gregorian chant evokes these attitudes of soul more effectively, and thus permits the deeper and truer communion? Is it not plain that frequently the community character of the new Mass is purely profane, that, as with other social gatherings, its blend of casual relaxation and bustling activity precludes a reverent, contemplative confrontation with Christ and with the ineffable mystery of the Eucharist? (Dietrich *ibid*).

Mysterium Fidei:

When have I actually experienced “the mystery of our Faith”? When have I sensed a mystical encounter with the Glorified Risen Christ?

*When my soul is hearing & receiving sacred music, or at a low Mass where there is a silence.

*As I receive Holy Communion on my knees.

*With my hands together like Our Lady of Guadalupe's are in the image on the tilma.

*In front of an altar rail.

*With a paten placed under your chin.

*By a Catholic Priest who prays for me in the language of the Church (Latin), as he places the God Man on my tongue like an angel placed a fiery coal in the mouth of Isaiah the prophet and purified him.

*The ability to kneel down before the King of Kings and Lord of Lords as we all should (cf. Philippians 2:10-11) is a physical manifestation before God of having the faith of a child, that is the faith that saves you. Kneeling down is the way your soul acts through your body and practices humility – (*Latin 'humus' means from the ground*). This was the Tradition for well over a thousand years in the west. A Priest at the LM really exercises his fatherhood, he literally feeds his children the bread of life.

How important is 'Reverence':

In no domain is reverence more important than religion. As we have seen, it profoundly affects the relation of man to God. But beyond that it pervades the entire religion, especially the worship of God. There is an intimate link between reverence and sacredness: reverence permits us to experience the sacred, to rise above the profane; irreverence blinds us to the entire world of the sacred. And did not the Jews tremble in deep awe when the priest brought the sacrifice into the *sanctum sanctorum*? Was Isaiah not struck with godly fear when he saw Yahweh in the temple and exclaimed, “Woe is me, I am doomed! For I am a man of unclean lips . . . yet my eyes have seen the King?” Do not the words of St. Peter after the miraculous catch of fish, “Depart from me, O Lord, because I am a sinner,” testify that when the reality of God breaks in upon us we are struck with fear and reverence? Cardinal Newman has shown in a stunning sermon that the man who does not fear and revere has not known the reality of God” ([Dietrich ibid](#)).

Does the New Mass replace holy intimacy with Christ?:

“The (Liturgical) innovators would replace holy intimacy with Christ by an unbecoming familiarity. The new liturgy actually threatens to frustrate the confrontation with Christ, for it discourages reverence in the face of mystery, precludes awe, and all but extinguishes a sense of sacredness. What really matters, surely, is not whether the faithful feel at home at Mass, but whether they are drawn out of their ordinary lives into the world of Christ – whether their attitude is the response of ultimate reverence: or whether they are imbued with the reality of Christ...Of course our epoch is pervaded by a spirit of irreverence ([Dietrich ibid](#)).

What is piety:

The Latin word, like the German *Pietaet*, has no English equivalent, but may be understood as comprising respect for tradition; honoring what has been handed down to us by former generations; fidelity to our ancestors and their works. Note that pietas is a derivative type of reverence, and so should not be confused with primary reverence, which we have described as a response to the very mystery of being, and ultimately a response to God...A Catholic should regard his liturgy with pietas. He should revere, and therefore fear to abandon the prayers and postures and music that have been approved by so many saints throughout the Christian era and delivered to us as a precious heritage. To go no further: the illusion that we can replace the Gregorian chant, with its inspired hymns and rhythms, by equally fine, if not better, music betrays a ridiculous self-assurance and lack of self-knowledge. Let us not forget that throughout Christianity’s history. silence and solitude, contemplation and recollection, have been considered necessary to achieve a real confrontation with God. This is not only the counsel of the Christian tradition, which should be respected out of pietas; it is rooted in human nature. Recollection is the necessary basis for true communion in much the same way as contemplation provides the necessary basis for true action in the vineyard of the Lord. A superficial type of communion—the jovial comradeship of a social affair—draws us out onto the periphery. A truly Christian communion draws us into the spiritual deeps ([Diedrich ibid](#)).

What is the path to a true Christian communion?:

The path to a true Christian communion: Reverence . . . Recollection . . . Contemplation...Of course we should deplore excessively individualistic and sentimental devotionalism, and acknowledge that many Catholics have practiced it. But the antidote is not a community experience as such...The antidote is to encourage true reverence, an attitude of authentic recollection and contemplative devotion to Christ. Out of this attitude alone can a true communion in Christ take place ([Diedrich ibid](#)).

Holy Mass attendance tanking:

And we wonder why Mass attendance on Sundays is down to about 21% in the United States right now. Before Vatican II which ended in 1965, 75% of Catholics attended Mass on Sundays. If a major company saw their clientele go from 75% of Americans to only 21% of Americans now using their product after 50 years, everybody would be fired, including the CEO. Which makes me think about a joke I once heard which seems to be absolutely true: *What's the difference between a liturgist and a terrorist? Answer - you can negotiate with a terrorist.*

Without catechizing (which means 'Christian instruction) the lay people, they will find Mass boring. The Church specifies that "the Sacred Liturgy does not exhaust the entire activity of the Church. It must be preceded by evangelization, faith, and conversion. It can then produce its fruits in the lives of the faithful..." (CCC 1072). In order for adults to experience the intended fruits of the Mass they must be evangelized, they must have had that intimate sacred encounter with Our Lord.

Men like a Militant Church:

Why have men abandoned the practice of Sunday Mass in spades. Men like organization, structure, uniforms, duty, intellectual stimulation and reverence. Men enjoy participating or watching the troops march in a parade, they enjoy watching the military color guard & the 21gun salute at a funeral, the constant 24 hour vigil over the tomb of the Unknown Soldier by a fellow soldier marching in full regalia regardless of rain, storm, snow or thunder. Men love to watch that discipline, concentration and determination, this is why Men are attracted to the LM. The movements and postures of the Priest are crisp, exact, military like, even his vestments are manly and fitted. Some of the chasubles used in the NOM by Priest look like free-flowing capes, I have seen Priest at charismatic Masses twirl and do ballerina pirouettes during the procession and recession as the chasuble flows in the air, it looks very effeminate, total turn off for a well-adjusted Catholic Man.

Men don't like effeminate Priest:

Fr John Perricone (Professor of Philosophy): "As Hercules, the priest is given strength from Heaven beyond ordinary human capacities. Hercules willingly embraced his twelve labors, bravely overcoming their wickedness. Similarly, the priest encounters the gates of Hell. Clothed in Christ's sacerdotal armature the priest –as alter Christus – vanquishes Hell's terrors with the invincible power of the sacraments. Hercules is always depicted by rippling mounds of muscle. The priest enjoys a more formidable notice, his heroic virtue, which amazes the world more than Hercules' imposing physical frame. This dogmatic picture of the priest has been

obscured by the Great Crisis of the past two decades. In fact, the attenuation of the priest reaches back for some 50 years. After the Second Vatican Council many thought the priest's sacred character ill fitted to modernity's Brave New World. The theological class bullied bishops into accepting a new paradigm of the priest as political actor, social activist, and throughout the South American church, guerrilla Marxist <https://christifidelesnj.com/2019/11/14/the-priest-as-hercules/>.

How did the collapse of the Priesthood happen:

Fr John Perricone (Professor of Philosophy): This collapse was strengthened by the Nouvelle Theologie, which unleashed a model of the priesthood that was effete, saccharine and profoundly secular. The Herculean priest struggles to make men saints summoning them to spiritual warfare. He identifies false ideas and firmly condemns them. He is manfully confrontational when necessary, seeing himself as the protector of God's flock, or in the words of St. Gregory the Great, 'worrying over the incursion of barbarians and fearing the wolves who menace the flock entrusted to my care.' This priest after the Heart of Christ is unafraid of the heat of battle, because, through grace, his manhood remains intact; Not shredded by the jagged teeth of the Modernist Leviathan... 'The full value of this life can only be got by fighting, because if we have accepted everything, we have missed something – war. This life of ours is a very enjoyable fight, but a very miserable truce.' Not so the New Post-Conciliar Priest. He preaches self-affirmation, not battle against vice. Dialogue, not refutation. Ambiguity, not truth. Massages feelings, rather than bringing men to the Cross - <https://christifidelesnj.com/2019/11/14/the-priest-as-hercules/>.

Who do you consider the role model and paradigm for Parish Priest?:

Fr John Perricone (Professor of Philosophy): No one was more Hercules than the Cure of Ars, St. John Mary Vianney. This 19th century saint never left his parish of Ars, France. All he did was offer Mass, hear Confessions and teach the Catechism. Of course, that's like saying all that MacArthur and Patton did was defeat the Axis powers. St. John Vianney engaged men at the only place that matters – the battlefield of their souls. He helped them conquer their sins, and so helped them be men again. No joy compares to that joy... In another time, that is the only kind of priest the world knew. So much so that a 1954 Hollywood produced *On the Waterfront*. The world was richer when such priests strode the earth. How much poorer it is without them. How much more dangerous - <https://christifidelesnj.com/2019/11/14/the-priest-as-hercules/>.

I'm a sinner:

The LM is very penitential, there is a lot of time spent on your knees. Kneeling is very biblical and good for the soul, it reminds you that you're a sinner in need of a Savior.

Revelation 4:10

Daniel 6:11

Matthew 26:39

Philippians 2:10

Pope Benedict writes in the Spirit of the Liturgy that demons that manifested to the desert fathers in the 4th century had no knees, because they are creatures full of 'pride.' *"The old rite fosters greater humility than the newer rituals. This means that the newer ritual as a prayer has*

less of one of the conditions that make prayer efficacious...In this respect the old rite is more meritorious than the new, since prayer has an efficacy based upon how the Faith is manifested in the prayer itself” (The Merit of a Mass by Fr Ripperger). The old rite makes you feel like you’re at Calvary, because metaphysically, Calvary is made present at your Parish. The new Mass makes you feel like you’re at a large happy family meal. The Mass is not entertainment, the Mass is medicine. That’s why we say, “Lord, I am not worthy to receive you, but only say the word, and I shall be healed.”

“Whence comes the disparagement of kneeling? Why should the Eucharist be received standing? Is not kneeling, in our culture, the classic expression of adoring reverence? The argument that at a meal we should stand rather than kneel is hardly convincing. For one thing, this is not the natural posture for eating: we sit, and in Christ’s time one lay down. But more important, it is a specifically irreverent conception of the Eucharist to stress its character as a meal at the cost of its unique character as a holy mystery. Stressing the meal at the expense of the sacrament surely betrays a tendency to obscure the sacredness of the sacrifice” (Dietrich *ibid*).

The NOM is not as penitential, there is a lot more movement and activity (stand, sit, kneel, stand sit). It’s hard to contemplate at the NOM with all the clapping, raising hands, holding hands (sometimes like a chain across the center aisle), the sign of peace which turns into a social hug fest, an army of Extraordinary Ministers of Holy Communion pumping the purell and running around the sanctuary like little clerics, people receiving Holy Communion in their hands or crossing their arms and receiving a blessing (on their head) from a lay person (in violation of the Liturgical rubrics, natural law and biblical revelation).

The Oran’s Position:

The orans position (raising hands up in air) is almost baked into the NOM. Even though this is a position only proper to the Priest in the sacred Liturgy according to the RUBRICS (**Rubrics – do the red and say the black**). This is also the pray posture of the Jewish people. Catholic worship is the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The raising of hands during Holy Mass is known as the 'orans position.' It is a Priestly posture, there is nowhere in the documents of the Sacred Liturgy where Lay people are told to raise their hands during Holy Mass - it was brought into the Catholic Church in the 60's through the Charismatic Renewal with was borrowed from the Protestant Pentecostals. In 1 Timothy 2:8 Paul (an Apostle) is writing to Timothy (a Bishop), he is telling him how a holy man leads public worship. They were both Jews who prayed in the Orans position (a Jewish form of prayer) but now Paul & Timothy are Catholic clergy.

During the Mass the celebrant often extends his arms in prayer as indicated by the rubrics, but in no place are the faithful directed to do the same. The “orans” position of prayer has been maintained in the Catholic clergy as they lead us in the worship of God at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The Church legislates the postures of the Priest and Laity at Holy Mass. St John Paul II wrote an instruction to be promulgated on the Liturgy. He wrote: “*Neither may deacons or non-ordained members of the faithful use gestures or actions which are proper to the same priest celebrant. It is a grave abuse for any member of the non-ordained faithful to “quasi preside” at the Mass while leaving only that minimal participation to the priest which is necessary to secure validity”* (On Certain Questions Regarding the Collaboration of the Non-Ordained Faithful in the Sacred -

<https://www.ewtn.com/catholicism/library/on-certain-questions-regarding-the-collaboration-of-the-nonordained-faithful-in-the-sacred-ministry-of-priest-2094>).

Notice, this is why Deacons do not raise their hands at Holy Mass – because they’re not in ‘persona Christi’. Neither are the laity, only the Priest is in ‘person Christi’ so only he can do the “orans position” at Mass. Outside of Mass, at a conference, at a retreat, in your private time worshipping God you can absolutely raise your hands to God. Those are non-liturgical settings where you have freedom to express your love to God as you desire. Not only can this position be legitimate for lay people in private prayer, it can also be very powerful!

Contemplative prayer – going to God on a jet:

Venerable Fulton Sheen says of the 3 forms of prayer, 1) vocal prayer is like going to God on foot. 2) Meditative prayer is like going to God on horseback and 3) contemplative prayer is like going to God on a jet. At the Latin Mass I enter immediately into meditative and contemplative prayer and stay they’re throughout the Mass. Catholic tradition tells us that the Highest form of prayer is ‘contemplative prayer’, well, the LM is almost entirely contemplative prayer for the lay Catholic. The Priest is praying to God on his and our behalf. As the Priest pray for us, I just close my eyes and see a tidal wave of ‘actual’ and ‘sanctifying grace’ washing over me, it’s like standing underneath a holy water fall. The sacred silence in the LM allows me to contemplate God, heaven, the angels, my beloved dead, the afterlife, my particular judgment, the joy of salvation, the meaning and purpose of life etc. The Sacred Scriptures speak a lot about being silent before the presence of the Lord:

Psalm 28:2; 46:11; 37:7, 62:2

Habakkuk 2: 20

Zechariah 2:17

Zephaniah 1:7

1 Kings 19:9-13

The saints speak about sacred silence:

*St John of the Cross – ““What we need most in order to make progress is to be silent before this great God with our appetites and our tongue, for the language He best hears is silent love.”

*St Teresa of Avila – the sixth mansion is known as the “prayer of quiet,” which is a type of mystical, infused contemplation.

*St Teresa of Calcutta - “In the silence of the heart God speaks. If you face God in prayer and silence, God will speak to you...It is only when you realize your nothingness, your emptiness, that God can fill you with Himself. Souls of prayer are souls of great silence.”

Fr Ripperger says: “The new rite, as a form of prayer, is hard to pray mentally since there are more things said out loud, and the general tenor of Vatican documents on the subject encourages a form of active participation that requires more things occurring on the side of the laity. The old Mass, since it is less activist on the side of the laity, tends to make it easier for them to pray the Mass. While the old rite stresses a more interior active participation, the new rite, with a lack of periods of silence... as exist in the old rite, makes the ritual less meditative. In fact, the periods of meditation in the new rite are somewhat artificial and are not integral to the ritual as such but serve to stop the ritual rather than being a part of it... As a result, in the new rite it is harder for people to lift their minds and hearts to God. The requirement of attention as part of prayer is

more difficult and so, in that respect, the new rite is less meritorious than the old because God is more pleased with those things that easily draw us to Him” (The Merit of a Mass by Fr Ripperger). “Right worship itself is a cause of grace” <https://onepeterfive.com/worship-non-catholics/>.

The NOM takes me to God on foot:

The NOM is more of a dialogue Mass, Father prays, we pray, Father says, we say, etc... The only time I started going into contemplative prayer is after I receive Holy Communion when I go and kneel down and begin to contemplate this mystical union between my soul and Our Eucharistic Lord. However, it is usually very short because the choir will start playing folksy 70’s and 80’s chromatic liturgical music with winged instruments that ignite the passions or disrupt my sacred silence. The “the entire assembly sings songs with easy tunes and familiar lyrics” (Dietrich - *ibid*) that make us feel good. The cacophony of songs are often times heretical or the music is horizontal (we sing about the community instead of singing and worshipping God (which is vertical)). The songs at the NOM are very often written by poorly formed modernist, some of who are openly sexual degenerates. The choir is taken from the back of the choir loft (out of sight) and placed to the side of the sanctuary. It feels like a performance, people in the nave are clapping along, raising their hands, snapping their fingers, bobbing their head to the beat and tapping their toes. When it’s done many people applaud the choir because it feels like a mini concert, or like you just witnessed a performance. At the LM the choir is in the loft and the music is sacred and chanted (sometimes accompanied by an organ). If you didn’t know it, you would think that there were angels chanting the sacred music from the choir loft. “Does the new Mass, more than the old, bestir the human spirit—does it evoke a sense of eternity? Does it help raise our hearts from the concerns of everyday life—from the purely natural aspects of the world—to Christ? Does it increase reverence, an appreciation of the sacred? Of course, these questions are rhetorical, and self-answering” (Dietrich - *Ibid*).

The LM is part of the Tradition of the Church:

The LM is the Liturgy of many of the Church Fathers and the Doctors of the Church, from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance, from Romanesque to Gothic to Baroque, and thus until our days, uninterruptedly. “Many Saints have commented on their love for the Latin language and prayed both publicly and privately in this *lingua sacra*. The most famous Saints including St Augustine, St Ambrose, St Benedict, St Patrick, Pope St Gregory the Great, St Thomas Aquinas, St Charles Borromeo, St Dominic, St Francis of Assisi, St Anthony of Padua, St John Mary Vianney, St Padre Pio, St John Vianney, St Frances de Sales, St Alphonsus Liguori, St Catherine of Sienna, St John Bosco, St Pius X, St Faustina and countless Saints throughout all ages of the Church all prayed in the same sacred Latin language” <https://www.prayinglatin.com/why-pray-in-latin/>. “I emphatically do not wish to be understood as regretting that the Constitution has permitted the vernacular to complement the Latin. What I deplore is that the new Mass is replacing the Latin Mass, that the old liturgy is being recklessly scrapped, and denied to most of the People of God” (Dietrich *ibid*).

Sacred Music vs Folksy Music:

The *sursum corda* – the lifting up of our hearts—is the first requirement for real participation in the Mass. Nothing could better obstruct the confrontation of man with God than the notion that we “go unto the altar of God” as we would go to a pleasant, relaxing social gathering. This is why the Latin Mass with Gregorian chant, which raises us up to a sacred atmosphere, is vastly superior to a vernacular Mass with popular songs, which leaves us in a profane, merely natural atmosphere ([Dietrich ibid](#)).

Fr Chad Ripperger (Exorcist) writes “This is why Gregorian chant which, has an appeal to the intellect and will, naturally begets prayer, which is defined as the lifting of the mind and heart to God. Gregorian chant does not appeal to one’s emotions or appetites; rather, the beauty of the chant naturally draws us into contemplation of the divine truths and the mysteries of the ritual.” <http://walkinginthedesert.com/2013/11/22/renewing-catholic-culture-starts-with-the-mass/>.

Moreover, while it is not part of the newer rituals themselves, some of the forms of music employed in them are used because of some sensible or appetitive pleasure derived from the music rather than for their usefulness in drawing the mind and will into closer union with God. This leads people to confuse the pleasurable experience with actually experiencing God. In effect, it leads people to think that authentic experiences of God are always pleasant. While in the next life they are, in this life the experiences of God are often arduous and exceedingly painful for us – not because of some defect in the way God handles us, but because of our imperfections and sinfulness which cause our pain. As St. Theresa of Avila once said, “God, if this is the way you treat your friends, no wonder you have so few of them”...The point is that music and all of the other aspects of the ritual should be geared toward weaning people off sensible delights and consolations as the mainstay of their spiritual lives. This is why Gregorian chant which, has an appeal to the intellect and will, naturally begets prayer, which is defined as the lifting of the mind and heart to God. Gregorian chant does not appeal to one’s emotions or appetites; rather, the beauty of the chant naturally draws us into contemplation of the divine truths and the mysteries of the ritual. http://www.latinmassmagazine.com/articles/articles_2001_FA_Ripperger.html.

Latin is a Sacred Language:

“When Latin was removed from prayers in the 60s, all hell broke loose throughout the world” (Fr Carota, Latin Crushes the Devil). Here are few examples that can be multiplied exponentially to the 10th power of abuses in the Novus Ordo Missae (New Mass of Pope Paul VI) around the world since 1965.

*Irish Priest rides scooter for Christmas Eve Mass at the procession and recession – <https://churchpop.com/2019/12/26/irish-priest-rides-scooter-during-christmas-eve-mass-recessional-in-viral-video/>

*A Priest in Mexico wears a Wrestlers Mask during the celebration of Mass - <http://tudecidesmedia.com/the-real-nacho-libre-the-unbelievable-life-of-fray-tormenta-p7452-128.htm>

*A Priest flies in the Blessed Sacrament in a drone - <https://whatstrending.com/awesome/25822-video-catholic-church-flies-blessed-sacrament-fr/>

* Just 'google' the Mass ever year at the Los Angeles Religious Education Congress at the Anaheim Convention Center and watch it on YouTube. It is the largest Religious gathering in the world. The modernist Catholic clergy use this as the launching pad to infiltrate every diocese in the USA. All the Liturgical innovations you experience at St Miscellaneous Community or St Diversity's Community was taken from the L.A. Religious Education Congress (irreverent) Liturgies.

* Or just type in 'Liturgical abuse in the Catholic Church' on [youtube.com](https://www.youtube.com) and prepare to weep. The NOM lends itself to innovations, experimentation and abuse.

The Wolves are guarding the hen house:

Unfortunately, before, during and after the Council, the Church had been infiltrated by masons, communist and homosexuals, the *Zeitgeist* — the German term for “spirit of the age” — was largely responsible for the decline in certain key aspects of the Catholic Church in the US: the number of priests and religious, weekly church attendance by its members, and the state of Catholic marriage. The *Zeitgeist* also fostered the rise of dissident Catholic organizations and individuals who have taught ‘the spirit of Vatican II’ in order to promote their own modernist agenda. It has not been difficult to promote ‘the spirit of Vatican II’ since many of the documents of Vatican II were written ambiguously. According to Fr Edward Schillebeckx a Vatican II peritus admitted: “We used ambiguous phrases during the second Vatican Council and we know how we will interpret them afterwards” (cited in Marcel Lefebvre, *Open Letter to Confused Catholics* Kansas City: Angelus Press, 1992, p.106). “Pope Benedict XVI has emphasized the *continuity* of the Catholic tradition, insisting that the teachings of Vatican II must be interpreted in light of the constant teachings of the Church in the preceding centuries” (<https://www.catholicculture.org/news/features/index.cfm?recnum=53500>), but very few theologians have listened.

Demons know the power of the Mass:

Finally, a possessed man whom I know that has gone through 12 sessions of Exorcism with the diocesan Priest told me that part of his healing is gaged by how long he can sit at Holy Mass before the demon reacts with aversion and manifests through his body and begins tormenting him. He said he can sit in the Novus Ordo Missae until the consecration at which time the demon will rage, manifest and begin tormenting him. He said the demon manifests and torments him in the Latin Mass as soon as Father ascends the sanctuary and starts his opening prayer. He said the demon recognizes the power of the Latin prayers and the reverence shown brings forth an avalanche of graces almost immediately.

The devil knows the true and purest form of worship to God on earth, it's the Catholic Mass. That is why the Black Mass is a mockery and the reversal of the Holy Catholic Mass. Satan tries to ape God. Satan is like a Lion (1 Peter 5: 8), Jesus is the Lion (Rev 5: 5)!!

Portals to heaven and hell

In Genesis 28:10-32 Jacob dreamed of a ladder linking God's two realms. We'd probably call it a portal. Jacob's ladder is the name given to the stairway that appears in the dream of the angelic gateway to Heaven from earth. Exorcist also talk about 'portals' which means 'entryways' by which the demon(s) entered into a person or a house. The Catholic Mass is also a 'portal', it is the 'entryway' God has ordained to bring sanctifying grace to a person's soul.

'The Merits of the Mass' by Fr Chad Ripperger FSSP

[file:///D:/Merit%20of%20the%20Mass%20\(Fr.%20Ripperger.%20F.S.S.P.\).pdf](file:///D:/Merit%20of%20the%20Mass%20(Fr.%20Ripperger.%20F.S.S.P.).pdf):

I took an article written by Fr Ripperger on the 'Merits of the Mass' and how we receive them. I added questions to his statements, it makes it more readable.

Q1) We know the Holy Mass is of infinite value. So what type of value do we derive from Holy Mass & how much value does Holy Mass give us?

A1) We must...sharply distinguish between the intrinsic and the extrinsic value of the Mass. As for its intrinsic value, it seems beyond doubt that, in view of the infinite worth of Christ as the Victim and High Priest in one Person, the sacrifice must be regarded as of infinite value, just as the sacrifice of the Last Supper and that of the Cross.

Q2) Is the 'extrinsic value' of the Mass limited?

A2) While we must always regard its intrinsic value as infinite, since it is the sacrifice of the God-Man Himself, its extrinsic value must necessarily be finite in consequence of the limitations of man. The scope of the so-called "fruits of the Mass" is limited.

Q3) What is the distinction between the intrinsic value and the extrinsic value of the Mass?

A3) In discussing the value of the Mass, one must make a distinction between intrinsic and the extrinsic value. The intrinsic value of any valid Mass is infinite since it is Christ, Who is infinite, Who is offered. Hence, in this respect every Mass has an infinite value. The new rite of Mass is just as efficacious as the old rite of Mass in this respect since they are both the same sacrifice of Christ. The Mass, because it is the offering of God the Son to God the Father, gives infinite glory to God. However, the extrinsic value or merit of the Mass is finite.

Q4) Does man receive infinite effects from the fruits of the Mass?

A4) Man, a finite creature, is incapable of receiving infinite effects. In this respect, the value of the Mass is "intensive limited," which means that the fruit of the Mass is limited in its measure. Normally, the liturgical writers state that, as to its impetratory and expiatory value, the Mass is finite, "since the operations of propitiation and impetration refer to human beings, who as creatures can receive a finite act only."

Q5) I thought the effects of the Mass were infinite?

A5) When one considers the actual sacrifice of the Mass, which is the sacrifice of Calvary, it is infinite, but as to its effects, other than the infinite effect of giving God glory, it is finite. In addition to man's finitude, the liturgical writers give other reasons for the limitation of the extrinsic value of the Mass. While the Mass is infinite as to What is sacrificed, nevertheless we derive only finite fruits from the Mass.

Q6) How does the Church effect the extrinsic merits of the Mass?

A6) The Church: If the actual members of the Church are not very holy their lack of holiness has a direct impact on the efficacy of the Mass, since the Mass is offered always as a public prayer, even when it is offered privately. Given the current scandals in the Church among the clergy and bishops, we can begin to see why the faithful are suffering spiritually. The same can be said for mankind as a whole, since the fruits of the Mass can also be applied for those who are not

Catholics. The moral and spiritual depravity of this moment in history has gravely affected this aspect of merit in the Church.

Q7) How does the Priest as Private Person effect the extrinsic merits of the Mass?

A7) The Priest as Private Person: If, therefore, the celebrant be a man of great personal devotion, holiness, and purity, there will accrue an additional fruit which will benefit not himself alone, but also those in whose favor he applies the Mass. The faithful are thus guided by sound instinct when they prefer to have Mass celebrated for their intentions by an upright and holy priest rather than by an unworthy one, since, in addition to the chief fruit of the Mass, they secure this special fruit which springs ex opere operantis, from the piety of the celebrant... This is why the holiness of the clergy has a direct impact on the life of the Church. If the priests are holy, the fruits derived from the Masses they offer are greater and the Church's faithful benefit more thereby. This is also why the faithful have a certain sense that it is better to have a holy priest rather than an unholy priest offer the Mass for their intentions. The fact is that the Mass said by a good priest is better and more efficacious than the Mass said by a bad priest. How the priest offers the Mass also increases merit insofar as it is more meritorious if he offers the Mass reverently rather than irreverently.

Q8) How do the faithful effect the extrinsic merits of the Mass?

A8) The Faithful: This also means that if the faithful have a higher degree of virtue and grace, they will be able to merit more from the Mass... The more fervent the prayer, the richer the fruit... On a pastoral level, this means that the holier the congregation, the more they will be able to merit and therefore the better will be the pastoral life of both priest and faithful. Conversely, if any of the faithful are in the state of mortal sin, it affects everyone else since they are able to merit... In an even worse scenario, if they are receiving Holy Communion in the state of mortal sin, they detract from the goodness of the Mass extrinsically and in this way affect everyone else. This is why the problem of the state of the faithful is such an important issue. The fact that a vast majority of Catholic couples are using contraception as well as the general moral and spiritual decay among the faithful in virtually all areas has left this aspect of merit regarding the Mass anemic, to say the least. Dr Ludwig Ott observes ('Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma', p. 415) that the merit derived from the Mass on the part of the faithful does not work mechanically but is based upon the dispositions of the faithful. Also, the liturgical writers also indicate that **the fruits of the Mass can be received more efficaciously by those properly disposed than by those not properly disposed.**

Q9) How does beauty effect the extrinsic merits of the Mass?

A9) The Decora: Here we see that this also applies to the liturgy. If we use objects that do not fit the majesty and the exalted nature of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, we can actually detract from the extrinsic merit. Ugly things please God less and thus merit less. Also, if we give with the intention of being cheap, we tell God what we really think of Him – that retention of our money is more important than His glory... Often those who offer the new rite use ugly items because they think to do so pleases God. They argue based on the notion of simplicity (which we have already shown in a prior article is not a valid argument). Simplicity is not the same thing as ugliness. The truly magnificent church or liturgical object pleases God both in itself and because a magnificent item more easily moves people to lift their minds and hearts to Him. Objectively, then, we can say that offering Mass in a magnificent church with the vestments and sacred

vessels that suit the level of Mass offered will derive the most extrinsic merit regarding the decora...On the other hand, lack of beauty in the decora will reduce the extrinsic merit. Also, not saying Mass in a church will reduce the merit of the Mass. This does not mean that a priest should forego offering Mass if he cannot get to a church, since there are all kinds of circumstances which may warrant not saying Mass in a church. Nevertheless, a Mass offered in a beautiful church is more meritorious. On a practical level, the laity and clergy must insist that the church and other decora be beautiful and properly suited to the Mass. This is not just a matter of aesthetics...it is a matter of spiritual import since it can directly affect the merit of the Mass... There is probably no layman who has not noticed the differences in their experiences of the Mass when they attended an ugly church as opposed to a beautiful one.

Q10) How does the merit of the Ritual itself effect the extrinsic merits of the Mass?

A10) The Merit of the Ritual Itself: Another reason one ritual can be more efficacious than another is that it is offered with greater solemnity or, as Nicholas Gühr (Liturgical expert) puts it, pomp. The solemnity and pomp give greater glory to God, and are eminently suited to Him since He is the Majesty or Ruler of the whole universe. He is greater than any earthly king and therefore deserves a greater ritual than any earthly king. St. Thomas names: humility and faith. Humility is necessary because we must recognize our unworthiness. Faith is necessary in order for us to know Who and What God is, so that we act rightly. Here the principle of *lex credendi lex orandi* plays a key role. St. Thomas says that prayers must be offered to God and with devotion. Lastly, for the prayer to be meritorious, the person must be in the state of grace...The new rite is “streamlined” in the sense that those who wrote it sought to simplify the ritual. This resulted in less pomp, so in this respect we may say the old rite is more meritorious than the new...the old rite is more ordered to God and less ordered toward the people. This is manifest not only in altar orientation (the new rite can be said oriented) but also in the fact that references to the supernatural were reduced in the proper’s...The ritual of the Mass ought to be ordered to God and not to man, except insofar as man is served in order to serve God. In other words, God is the end of the ritual, not man.

Q11) Are the prayers in the old rite more beautiful than the prayers in the New Mass?

A11) In connection to the clarity of faith, we have also seen that the old rite is more beautiful than the new. The more beautiful a thing is, the more it pleases God... the prayers of the old rite of Mass better express the desires and intentions of an authentic Catholic faith, since they contain the faith in a clearer fashion. The prayers of the old rite of Mass foster a greater sense of our unworthiness and need for humility and sorrow for our sins. The prayers are more ordered toward God and suit Him better since they contain a proper supernatural dimension.

'The Mass of Vatican II' by Fr. Joseph Fessio, S.J.

http://www.ignatiusinsight.com/features2005/fessio_massv2_1_jan05.asp

Fr Joseph Fessio is the best apologist and the most outspoken Priest pushing for 'the Reform of the Reform' of the Vatican II Mass. He was a student of Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger. His celebration of the New Mass is very reverent, it looks like the Latin Mass in English with many of the prayers, chants, doxologies and antiphons still in Latin along with sacred music. The modernist have an aversion to it because they say it resembles the Latin Mass and the trads have an aversion to it because it was the fruits of Archbishop Annibale Bugnini (a modernist freemason) who was commissioned by Pope Paul VI whom some argue was a modernist as well, or at least sympathetic to modernist theologians. I took an article written by Fr Fessio on his explanation and defense of 'Sacrosanctum Concilium' (on the Sacred Liturgy) and added questions to his statements, it makes it more readable.

Q1) Which is the Vatican II document on the New Order of the Mass?

A1) The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, was one of two documents issued on the same day, December 4, 1963, the first two documents issued by the Second Vatican Council.

Q2) Has Sacrosanctum Concilium been successfully implemented?

A2) *Sacrosanctum Concilium* is one of the most important documents of the Council, one that has been the least understood and, I believe, has wrought the most havoc - not by having been fulfilled - but by having been ignored or misinterpreted.

Q3) What was the central intent of Vatican II concerning the Sacred Liturgy?

A3) Now there should be no argument about the central intent of the Council concerning the liturgy. The Council actually spells out its intent, in paragraph 14 of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*: "Mother Church earnestly desires that all the faithful should be led to that full, conscious, and active participation in liturgical celebrations, which is demanded by the very nature of the liturgy." The key words here are "full, conscious, and active participation." The Latin for "active participation" is *actuosa participatio*.

Q4) What does the term "active participation" mean in light of prior Church usage?

A4) I did a little research into previous uses of that expression in papal and other ecclesial documents. The first papal usage was in 1903 by Pope St. Pius X, whose motto was "*Omnia Instaurare in Christo*" (To restore all things in Christ). He considered himself a pope of renewal. He was elected in August of 1903 and in November, he issued one of the first documents of his pontificate, a *motu proprio* called *Tra Le Sollicitudini*, that is, "Among the Concerns." This was a document on the renewal of sacred music. In it, the Holy Father states, "In order that the faithful may more actively participate in the sacred liturgy, let them be once again made to sing Gregorian Chant as a congregation."

Q5) So the term "active participation" means the restoration of Gregorian chant?

A5) That's what the term "active participation" meant when it was first used in a papal document. But it had been used ten years earlier in another document, issued by Pius X before he was pope. He was the patriarch of Venice, and the document - as it turns out - was actually written by a Jesuit, with the wonderful name of Angelo dei Santi ("angel of the saints"). In any case, the first use of *actuosa participatio*, i.e., active participation, referred explicitly and exclusively to the restoration of the congregational singing of Gregorian Chant. In 1928, Pope Pius XI reiterated the point in his Apostolic Letter, *Divini Cultus*. Nineteen years after that, in the *Magna Carta* of liturgical reform, *Mediator Dei*, issued by Pius XII, the same term was used with the same meaning. So, until the Second Vatican Council, the term "active participation" referred exclusively to the singing of Gregorian Chant by the people.

Q6) What was the primary aim of the liturgical renewal?

A6) So, the Council itself defines the primary aim of liturgical renewal: full, conscious and active participation. How does the Council initially intend for the aim to be achieved? That, also, is not something we have to guess at or speculate on: "And, therefore, pastors of souls must zealously strive to achieve it by means of the necessary instruction in all their pastoral work." The Council's idea is clear: the liturgy is to be renewed by promoting more active participation through the means of greater education.

Q7) Did the Council call for all these innovations that we see at the New Order of the Mass?

A7) Nothing whatsoever is said here about any kind of changes or reform of the rite itself. Later, when changes are discussed, the Council states in paragraph 23: "There must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them." So no changes unless there is a real, proven, demonstrable need. Paragraph 23 continues: "And care must be taken that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing." Organic growth - like a plant, a flower, a tree - not something constructed by an intellectual elite, not things fabricated and tacked on...

Q8) What specific paragraph talks about the Mass in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*?

A8) Paragraph 48 begins the chapter on the Mass. And the title of this chapter is interesting. It's not called "The Eucharist" or "The Mass"; it's called "The Most Sacred Mystery of the Eucharist." Even in the chapter title, you have the sense that what's important is mystery, sacredness, awe, the transcendence of God.

Q9) Did the document 'sacrosanctum concilium' want lay Catholics to have a greater knowledge and awareness of 'Holy Mass'?

A9) Paragraph 48 returns to the theme of greater awareness, a greater knowledge of the faithful, in order that they might enter more fully into the mysteries celebrated: "For this reason the Church, therefore, earnestly desires that Christ's faithful, when present at the mystery of faith should not be there as strangers or silent spectators. On the contrary, through a good understanding of the rites and prayers, they should take part in the sacred action conscious of what they are doing with devotion and full collaboration."

Q10) When did the Liturgical Renewal start being discussed in the Church?

A10) Paragraphs 50 to 58 of 'sacrosanctum concilium' contain nine specific changes the Council had in mind for the renewal of the liturgy. But before we consider them, we must recall that when the Council made these proposals, it didn't dream them up overnight. Although this was the first document issued at the Council, it was not issued without long preparation. The modern liturgical movement began in the middle of the 19th century. It was given great impetus by Pius X himself, in the beginning of the 20th century, and by years of study, prayer, and liturgical congresses during the first half of the century. In fact, after *Mediator Dei* in 1947, there were seven international liturgical conferences, attended by liturgical experts, by pastors and by Roman officials. If you read the minutes of those meetings and the concrete proposals they made, you will see that what the Council outlines here is the fruit of those meetings. This is really the distillation of the prayer and reflection that was the culmination of the liturgical movement, which had existed for over a century prior to the Council.

Q11) What are the 9 Liturgical proposals put out by Vatican II's 'sacrosanctum concilium'?

A11) The nine liturgical proposals, or the nine liturgical mandates, of the Council: I. Paragraph 50 says the rites are to be simplified and those things that have been duplicated with the passage of time or added with little advantage, are to be discarded. And, after the Council, this reform did take place in many ways. I think it took place to a much greater degree than the Council intended, but there are certain simplifications in the Mass that the Council clearly intended.

II. Paragraph 51: The treasures of the Bible are to be opened up more fully. That has been accomplished by a greater number of readings from the Bible interspersed throughout the liturgical cycle, both in the Sunday and weekday cycles. Now, especially if you attend daily Mass, you have a much richer fare, if you will - a much expanded selection of Biblical readings.

III. Paragraph 52 says: "The homily is to be highly esteemed as part of the Liturgy itself." The Council called for a greater effort to have good homilies and I think the effort has been made. Whether the homilies are better or not, you can judge for yourselves.

Let me chime in, Fr Fessio is an exception, but, generally speaking the homilies at the average Parish where we have the Vatican II Mass, the homilies are horizontal, with an emphasis on liberation social justice, don't judge anyone, God is mercy, God is love, all are welcome, we are the community, never speak about the devil, never speak about hell, never speak about the 6th & 9th commandment sins, a few jokes here a few jokes there and lets all go and meet in the hall for some coffee and donuts. I have noticed that the homilies at the LM are rooted in Thomistic philosophy, there is a heavy emphasis on the lives of the saints, constant references to the early Church Fathers and Doctors of the Church. The Biblical stories are taken seriously. I walk out and feel like I deserve 3 college units after the LM homilies. If you want to hear a typical homily from a LM Priest go to www.sensusfidelium.us and your knowledge of the Catholic faith will be stretched, your intellect will be stimulated and your will undoubtedly strengthened.

IV. Paragraph 53 says that the Common Prayer or Prayer of the Faithful should be restored, and that's been done, too.

V. Paragraph 54 is a key paragraph: "In Masses which are celebrated with the people, a suitable place may be allotted to their mother tongue." What did the Council have in mind? Let's continue: "This is to apply in the first place, to the readings and to the Common Prayer. But also, as local conditions may warrant, to those parts which pertain to the people." Yet it goes on to

say, "Nevertheless steps should be taken so that the faithful may also be able to say or to sing together in Latin those parts of the Ordinary of the Mass" - (that is, the unchanging parts, the parts that are there every day) - "which pertain to them."

So, the Council did not abolish Latin in the liturgy. The Council permitted the vernacular in certain limited ways, but clearly understood that the fixed parts of the Mass would remain in Latin. Again, I am just telling you what the Council said. VI. Paragraph 55 discusses receiving Communion, if possible, from hosts consecrated at the Mass in which you participate. That is often done or attempted in many parishes today, but it is difficult to do in a precise way. It's hard to calculate the exact number of hosts you will need. Also, you have to keep some hosts in the Tabernacle for the sick and for adoration. **The Council also permits Communion under both species here, but under very limited circumstances.** For example, "to the newly ordained in the Mass of the Sacred Ordination, or the newly professed in the Mass of Profession, and the newly baptized in the Mass which follows baptism." **The Council itself did not call for offering both species to all the faithful all the time, but it did grant limited permission for it.** VII. Paragraph 56 says that there are two parts of the Liturgy, the Word and the Eucharist, and that a pastor should insistently teach the faithful to take part in the entire Mass, especially on Sundays and Feasts of Obligation. That is, to consider the first part of the Mass, the Table of the Word, as a significant and essential part of the Mass, so you don't think you have gone to Mass just by coming after the Offertory and being there for the Consecration and Communion. VIII Paragraph 57 states that concelebration should be permitted. IX. Paragraph 58, that a new rite for concelebration is to be drawn up. That is the sum total of the nine mandates of the Council for change in the ritual itself.

Q12) Are there other pertinent paragraphs worth mentioning from Sacrosanctum Concilium?

A12) In paragraph 112, in which the Council speaks specifically of music, we read: "The musical tradition of the Universal Church is a treasure of inestimable value, greater even than that of any other art." That is a stupendous and shocking statement; the Council actually says that the Church's music is a treasure of art greater than any other treasure of art she has. Think about that. Think about Chartres Cathedral. Think about the *Pieta*. Think about Da Vinci's *Last Supper*. Think of all the crucifixes from Catalonia in Spain, and all the Church architecture and art and paintings and sculpture. The Council boldly says that the Church's musical tradition is a treasure of inestimable value greater than any other art.
Let me chime in again, how did this get replaced by chromatic, folksy, happy clappy, pop your fingers, bob your head, tap your toe, raise your arms in the air music? How did our Liturgical music go off the rails like it has? I will answer my question, the modernist with their false notion of ecumenism and their aversion to Latin have given us the most banal insipid Liturgical music in 2000 years, I would prefer a silent Mass instead of what I have heard in the average Parish.

Q13) What was the preeminent reason why sacrosanctum concilium emphasizes sacred music?

A13) 'The main reason for this preeminence is that, as sacred song united to the words, it forms a necessary or integral part of the solemn liturgy.' What that means is this: it's wonderful to have a beautiful church, stained glass windows, statues, a noble crucifix, prayerful architecture that lift your heart up to God. But those are all surroundings of the Mass. It's the "worship environment,"

as they would say today. But it's not the Mass itself. The Council says that when the Mass itself is set to music, that's what ennobles music, which, itself, enhances the Mass; and that's what makes the musical tradition the most precious tradition of the Church.

Q14) Are the hymns we sing in our Parishes what Vatican II called for?

A14) The Council implies what many Church documents have said explicitly - that the most perfect form of music at Mass is not the hymns, the so-called "Gathering hymn" and its antithesis - I guess you would call it the "Scattering hymn" - at the end. The most appropriate use of music at Mass, as seen by Church tradition and reaffirmed by the Council, is singing the Mass itself: the Kyrie, the Agnus Dei, the Sanctus, the Acclamations, the Alleluias and so on. Again, this isn't Father Fessio's pet theory; this is what the Council actually says. Paragraph 112 adds, "Sacred music is to be considered the more holy in proportion as it is the more closely connected with the liturgical action itself." This reinforces my point... Paragraph 114 adds: "The treasure of sacred music is to be preserved and fostered with great care." Then in paragraph 116 we find another shocker: "The Church acknowledges Gregorian Chant as especially suited to the Roman Liturgy. Therefore, other things being equal, it should be given pride of place in liturgical services." That's what the Council actually said. If you are in a parish which prides itself on living the spirit of Vatican II, then you should be singing Gregorian chant at your parish. And if you're not singing the Gregorian Chant, you're not following the specific mandate of the Second Vatican Council.

Q15) Where did Catholics get Gregorian Chant music? Where does Gregorian Chant originate from?

A15) Just a little footnote on the Gregorian Chant. In reflecting on these things about Church music, I began to think about the Psalms a few years back. And a very obvious idea suddenly struck me. Why it didn't come earlier I don't know, but the fact is that the Psalms are songs. Every one of the 150 Psalms is meant to be sung; and was sung by the Jews. When this thought came to me, I immediately called a friend, a rabbi in San Francisco who runs the Hebrew School, and I asked, "Do you sing the Psalms at your synagogue?" "Well, no, we recite them," he said. "Do you know what they sounded like when they were sung in the Old Testament times and the time of Jesus and the Apostles?" I asked. He said, "No, but why don't you call this company in Upstate New York. They publish Hebrew music, and they may know." So, I called the company and they said, "We don't know; call 1-800-JUDAISM FREE ." So I did. And I got an information center for Jewish traditions, and they didn't know either. But they said, "You call this music teacher in Manhattan. He will know." So, I called this wonderful rabbi in Manhattan and we had a long conversation. At the end, I said, "I want to bring some focus to this, can you give me any idea what it sounded like when Jesus and his Apostles sang the Psalms?" He said, "Of course, Father. It sounded like Gregorian Chant. You got it from us." I was amazed. I called Professor William Mart, a Professor of Music at Stanford University and a friend. I said, "Bill, is this true?" He said, "Yes. The Psalm tones have their roots in ancient Jewish hymnody and psalmody." So, you know something? If you sing the Psalms at Mass with the Gregorian tones, you are as close as you can get to praying with Jesus and Mary. They sang the Psalms in tones that have come down to us today in Gregorian Chant.

Q16) Some Liturgical modernist (liberal Catholics) say that Gregorian Chant takes us back to those horrible middle ages. Your thoughts?

A16) So, the Council isn't calling us back to some medieval practice, those "horrible" medieval times, the "terrible" Middle Ages, when they knew so little about liturgy that all they could do was build a Chartres Cathedral. (When I see cathedrals and churches built that have a tenth of the beauty of Notre Dame de Paris, then I will say that the liturgists have the right to speak. Until then, they have no right to speak about beauty in the liturgy.) But my point is that at the time of Notre Dame de Paris in the 13th century, the Psalms tones were already over a thousand years old. They are called Gregorian after Pope Gregory I, who reigned from 590 to 604. But they were already a thousand years old when he reigned. He didn't invent Gregorian chant; he reorganized and codified it and helped to establish musical schools to sing it and teach it. It was a reform; it wasn't an invention. Thus, the Council really calls us back to an unbroken tradition of truly sacred music and gives such music pride of place.

Q17) What about Sacred Art and Sacred Furnishings, did Vatican II give us any direction or instruction?

A17) I want to quote from the Council is paragraph 128, which talks about sacred art and sacred furnishings: "Along with the revisions of liturgical books . . . there is to be an earlier revision of the canons and ecclesiastical statutes which govern the provisions of material things involved in sacred worship. These laws refer especially to the worthy and well-planned construction of sacred buildings, the shape and construction of altars, the nobility, placing and safety of the Eucharistic tabernacle, the dignity and suitability of the baptistery . . ." and so on.

Q18) So what did the Council NOT SAY?

A18) That's essentially what the Second Vatican Council actually said about the renewal of the liturgy. Let me tell you what it did not say. The Council did not say that tabernacles should be moved from their central location to some other location. In fact, it specifically said we should be concerned about the worthy and dignified placing of the tabernacle. The Council did not say that Mass should be celebrated facing the people. That is not in Vatican II; it is not mentioned. It is not even raised in the documents that record the formation of the Constitution on the Liturgy; it didn't come up. Mass facing the people is a not requirement of Vatican II; it is not in the spirit of Vatican II; it is definitely not in the letter of Vatican II. It is something introduced in 1969. And, by the way, never in the history of the Church, East or West, was there a tradition of celebrating Mass facing the people. Never, ever, until 1969.

Q19) What does Vatican II say about the Priest facing "ad orientem"?

A19) But in any event, I can say without fear of contradiction from anyone who knows the facts that there is simply no tradition whatsoever, in the history of the Church, of Mass facing the people. Now, is it a sin? No. Is it wrong? No. Is it permitted? Yes. Is it required? Not at all. In fact in the Latin Roman Missal, which is the typical edition that all the translations of the Missal are based on (not always translated properly, but at least based on it) the rubrics actually presuppose the Mass facing East, the Mass facing the Lord.

Q20) Have you always celebrated the Holy Mass ad orientem?

A20) For the first 25 years of my priesthood, I celebrated Mass like you see it when you go to a typical parish: in English, facing the people. It can be done reverently; I've seen it done reverently; I've tried to do it reverently myself. But...after study and reflection, I've changed. I actually think the Mass facing the people is a mistake. But, even if it's not, at least this much we can say: there is no permission required to say Mass facing God, facing the tabernacle, facing East, facing with the people. And it should be given equal rights, it seems to me, with Mass facing the people. It's been around for 1800 years at least, and it should be allowed to continue. I happen to think it's symbolically richer.

Q21) What is temptation for a Priest when he celebrates Holy Mass facing the people?

A21) It's true that when the priest faces the people for the celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, there may be a sense of greater unity as a community. But there is also a danger of the priest being the performer and you being the spectator - precisely what the Council did not want: priest performers and congregational spectators. But there is something more problematic. You can see it, perhaps, by contrasting Mass facing the people with Mass facing East or facing the Lord. I don't say Mass "with my back to the people" any more than Patton went through Germany with his "back to the soldiers." Patton led the Third Army across Germany and they followed him to achieve a goal. The Mass is part of the Pilgrim Church on the way to our goal, our heavenly homeland. This world is not our heavenly homeland. We don't sit around in a circle and look at each other. We want to look with each other and with the priest towards the rising sun, the rays of grace, where the Son will come again in glory on the clouds.

Q22) Does the Priest ever face the people in the Novus Ordo Mass Ad Orientem?

A22) The priest does face the people when he speaks on God's behalf to proclaim the Word and explain it. And he does face the people when he receives their gifts. And then he turns to face with the people and to offer those gifts up to our common Father, praying that the Holy Spirit will come down and transform those gifts into the Body and Blood of Christ. And when that most sacred act takes place, the priest turns to offer the gifts back to the people. I think that is much more dramatic...Now strange as it may appear, there is absolutely no permission required to say Mass facing East. The Pope (John Paul II) does it every morning in his chapel. But there is such a taboo against it that most pastors would be afraid to do it for fear they would be exiled to some lowly parish.

Q23) Did Vatican II say anything about removing the Tabernacle from the center?

A23) The Council...said nothing about moving the Tabernacle. It said nothing about removing altar rails. It said nothing about taking out kneelers. It said nothing about turning the altar around. It said nothing about multiple canons. That, too, is an invention; a pure invention.

Q24) What one word describes the Liturgist at Vatican II?

A24) One problem, both at the time of the Council and after, is **rationalism**, which the Holy Father has spoken against. This is the idea that we can do it all with our own minds. The liturgists after the Council tried to construct a more perfect liturgy. But you know something? When you've grown up in a house and a room is added on and a story added on, a garage is added on, it may not be architecturally perfect, but it's your home. To destroy it and try to construct a new one out of steel and glass and tile because that's the modern idea, is not the way you live a human life. But that's what's happened to the liturgy.

Q25) How is the vernacular and Latin supposed to interrelate at Holy Mass?

A25) the Council, as I mentioned, abolish Latin. It specifically mandated the retention of Latin and only permitted the use of the vernacular in certain circumstances. And, finally, the Council did not prohibit Gregorian Chant, as you might be led to think from its absence in your parishes. The Council actually prescribed Gregorian Chant to have pride of place.

Q26) Did Pope John Paul II ask for awe and reverence at the Vatican II Mass?

A26) Pope John Paul II Addressed the Bishops of the United States (from the Northwest) in 1998 in Rome for their *Ad Limina* visit. The Pope, spoke to our bishops, looking toward the new millennium and said: *Here is what I think is the plan God has for all of his people as we move to the next millennium. And, specifically, here is the liturgical blueprint that, I, the Holy Father, believe we are to follow.* "The challenge now," he continues, "is to move beyond whatever misunderstandings there have been and to reach the proper point of balance, especially by entering more deeply into the contemplative dimension of worship, which includes a sense of awe, reverence and adoration which are fundamental attitudes in our relationship with God." What does the Pope say we must do to restore balance? Enter more deeply into the contemplative dimension of worship. Can you contemplate when you've got drummers up in the sanctuary? Where do we find the sense of awe? Not in this "chatty" stuff at Mass: "*Good morning, everybody.*" Does that inspire a sense of awe? "Have a nice day." The Pope mentions reverence and adoration. Standing is a sign of respect; but kneeling is a sign of adoration. The Pope says we must restore the sense of adoration.

Q27) Did Pope John Paul II give Priest the authority to invent or produce innovations in the Liturgy?

A) This is why it's so important that liturgical law be respected, because an objective act is taking place. Pope John Paul II said: "The priest, who is the servant of the liturgy and not its inventor or producer, has a particular responsibility in this regard, lest he empty the liturgy of its true meaning or obscure its sacred character."

Q28) What did Pope John Paul II say about 'Full, Conscious and Active Participation' as it relates to the Novus Ordo Mass of Paul VI?

A28) The Holy Father next discusses three attributes of the liturgy: full, conscious and active participation. First, he talks about the fullness of participation. "The sharing of all the baptized in the one priesthood of Jesus Christ is the key to understanding the Church's call for full, conscious and active participation. Full participation certainly means that every member of the community

has a part to play in the liturgy...But, full participation does not mean that everyone does everything. Since this would lead to a clericalizing of the laity and a laicizing of the priesthood, and this was not what the Council had in mind."

Q29) What does Pope John Paul II mean by "clericalizing the laity?"

A29) What does he mean by "clericalizing the laity"? It's the idea that, for example, the lector, the server at the altar, or the cross-bearer participates more actively than the mother with her child in the back of church. It's the idea that being more like the priest in the sanctuary somehow makes you participate more fully. But the Pope says no to that idea. No, the "clericalizing of the laity" and the "laicizing of the clergy," whereby the priest doesn't do priestly things but sits while lay people are distributing the Eucharist, are not what the Council had in mind, says the Pope.

Q30) Does "active participation" at the Novus Ordo Mass deny "contemplative adoration" according to Pope John Paul II?

A30) The Pope (John Paul II) said: "Active participation certainly means that in gesture, word, song, and service all the members of the community take part in an active worship, which is anything but inert or passive. Yet active participation does not preclude the active passivity of silence, stillness, and listening: indeed, it demands it. Worshippers are not passive, for instance, when listening to the readings or the homily or following the prayers of the celebrant and the chants in music of the Liturgy. These are experiences of silence and stillness, but they are in their own way, profoundly active. In a culture that neither favors nor fosters meditative quiet, the art of interior listening is learned only with difficulty. Here we see the liturgy, though it must always be properly inculturated, must also be counter-cultural."

Q31) Fr Fessio, can you add anything else to what Pope John Paul II has said?

A31) Fr Fessio: Especially in our noisy world, we need to have silence. Especially in our world where it is hard to pray, we need to have contemplative adoration. Conscious participation, then, is not a multiplication of commentators telling us what's happening as the Mass goes along; it's not laid back informality and the trivializing of the liturgy. That's why I think it may seem like a small thing, but it's a very bad to begin a liturgy by saying, "Good morning, everyone." That's not how you begin a *sacred* liturgy. You begin a *sacred* liturgy, "In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," or better yet, "*In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.*"

Q32) Can you describe the 3 ways that Holy Mass is celebrated today post Vatican II?

A32) We have now two extremes and a moderate position. One extreme position is the kind of informal Mass, all in English, facing the people, with contemporary music, which does not at all correspond with what the Council had in mind. But it is legitimate, it is permitted; it is not wrong. And we have on the other extreme those who have returned, with permission, to the Mass of 1962 and, as others have noted, it is thriving and growing. But it is not what the Council itself specifically had in mind, although it is the Mass of the ages. Then you have the moderates. Those in the middle. Me and a few others. But I am going to insist on my right as a Catholic and as priest to celebrate the liturgy according to the Council, according to the presently approved liturgical books, to celebrate a form of the Mass that therefore needs no special permission-and

which in fact cannot be prohibited-what I've called "the Mass of Vatican II."

Fr. Joseph D. Fessio, S.J. is the founder of Ignatius Press. He entered the Jesuit Novitiate in 1961 and was ordained a priest in 1972. He received a Doctorate in Theology in 1975 University of Regensburg, West Germany, where his thesis director was Fr. Joseph Ratzinger.
http://www.ignatiusinsight.com/features2005/print2005/frfessio_massvatican2.html

Sacrosanctum Concilium

A Lawyer Examines the Loopholes

by Christopher Ferrara, Esq., American Catholic Lawyers Association

He founded *Catholic Family News* (CFN) in 1994, a [Traditionalist Catholic](#) monthly publication of Catholic Family Ministries. John Vennari (1958-2017) served as both editor and publisher of CFN. I took an article written by John Vennari on his analyses and critique of 'Sacrosanctum Concilium' (on the Sacred Liturgy) and added questions to his statements, it makes it more readable.

Q1) Does Sacro Sanctum Concilium give Liturgist a blank check for creating a new Liturgy?

A1) No one who reads *SC* carefully in the light of our experience since the Council can deny that it constitutes a "blank check" for liturgical reform, with the amount to be filled in depending entirely upon who is wielding the pen. The few "conservative" norms which seem to limit the possibility of liturgical change are clearly overwhelmed by the far more numerous and pervasive "liberal" norms which create an almost unlimited potential for destruction of the liturgy - <https://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-religion/970035/posts>.

Q2) Does Sacrosanctum Concilium specify a change in the text or rubrics of the traditional Order of the Mass?

A2) Yet, except for restoring the prayer of the faithful in Article 53, *SC* does not actually *mandate a single specific change in the text or rubrics of the traditional Order of Mass*. This would appear to be the main reason the Council Fathers were induced to vote for the document, since it did not threaten any apparent harm to the Latin liturgical tradition. And it is also the reason neither the "conservatives" nor anyone else can determine "the authentic reform desired by the Council" from a reading of *SC* - <https://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-religion/970035/posts>.

Q3) Did Sacrosanctum Concilium mandate any particular reforms? Who did the reforming?

A3) While *SC* opened the way to all manner of possible liturgical reforms, the simple truth of the matter is that it *mandated no particular reform of the liturgy*. *SC* is, quite simply, silent about what kind of reformed liturgy the Council Fathers had in mind, if indeed the Council majority shared any common conception at all about the matter. In practice, however, *SC* unquestionably served as the license for a vast project of liturgical reform and the ceding of effective control

over the liturgy to the national hierarchies, with calamitous results - <https://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-religion/970035/posts>.

Q4) What is the solution to the Liturgical confusion that we find ourselves in? What do you think should be done to bring Liturgical uniformity and reverence back?

A4) The emergence of "conservative" demands for an "authentic reform" of the liturgy demonstrate that unless SC is reconsidered, along with the disastrous changes it engendered, the liturgical crisis in the Roman Rite will never end. The demands for "renewal" by liberals on the one hand, and for "authentic renewal" by conservatives on the other, will continue to revolve around this utterly problematical document so long as it continues to serve as a warrant for the liturgical-reformist mentality, which the Council unwittingly unleashed upon the Church. The only way to restrain that mentality and restore liturgical sanity in the Roman Rite is *full restoration of our Latin liturgical tradition* - taken from us overnight (after Vatican II) - <https://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-religion/970035/posts>.

Final thoughts on the Sacred Liturgy:

What we have today in the NOM is the same confusion that the Israelites had in the days of the Judges (21:25) where it says: "In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did what was right in his own eyes." Today, we have *the modernist spirit of Vatican II* where every diocese, every Parish, every Liturgy committee celebrates the Mass according to *what it right in their own eyes*. There is no uniformity, there is Liturgical confusion. *1 Corinthians 14:33 (RSV) "For God is not a God of confusion but of peace."

We have Pope Benedict XVI, Fr Joseph Fessio, the EWTN TV Mass and a few other notables' clergy who have tried to promote the 'reform of the reform' which means, implementing the NOM precisely as the Council wrote down. The best description has been written meticulously down by Fr. Joseph Fessio, S.J. in his article 'The Mass of Vatican II' http://www.ignatiusinsight.com/features2005/print2005/frfessio_massvatican2.html. The last hope we had to get the Vatican II Mass corrected liturgically was under the Papacy of Benedict XVI, now that he is gone that possibility is gone as well. We will continue to see virtually every Parish Mass have their own nuances and slight differences as they follow their own Liturgical committees and sensibilities. The *spirit of Vatican II* which reigns in the Church today means every Diocese, every Parish follows their own liturgical agenda.

The Latin Mass is Parishes are small in number but they are much more available than ever before thanks to Pope Benedicts Summorum Pontificum (English: "Of the Supreme Pontiffs"). His apostolic letter issued in July 2007, specifies the circumstances in which priests of the Latin Church may celebrate Mass according to what he calls the "Missal promulgated by Blessed John XXIII in 1962" (the latest edition of the Roman Missal, in the form known as the Tridentine Mass or Traditional Latin Mass). The order that offer the LM are the 'Priestly Fraternity of St. Peter' (www.fssp.com), 'the Institute of Christ the King Sovereign Priest' (www.institute-christ-king.org), 'the Society of St. John' (www.ssjohn.org), and 'the Society of St. John Cantius' (www.societycantius.org), these are traditionalist orders that are in communion with Rome. They

accept the legitimacy of Vatican II and the Novus Ordo Missae (also known as the Paul VI Mass).

There is uniformity in this LM, a clear role between Priest and laity, a clear distinction between the sanctuary and the nave, reverence, piety and sacred silence. Is it a coincidence that Pope Benedict XVI called the NOM the ordinary form of the Mass and the LM the extraordinary form of the Mass? I ask this question because the word 'extra' indicates (dictionary.com):
adjective: beyond or more than what is usual, larger or better than what is usual:
noun: something extra or additional: something of superior quality.
adverb: beyond the ordinary degree; done extra well; extra large.

The word 'extraordinary form' indicates the 'superior quality' of the Latin Mass based on the very definition of the word 'extra.' Much like 'possession' is called by Exorcist the 'extraordinary activity of the diabolical' and temptation is called the 'ordinary activity of the diabolical.' In other words demonic 'possession' is much greater and superior in degree than demonic 'temptation.

Is there any silver lining to the post Vatican II Church?:

I believe it is well established that there were modernist, communist, masonic, dissenters and protestant advisors at Vatican II among its experts. Be that as it may, Divine Providence was still at work at Vatican II. By Divine Providence *I mean God gets his way while man gets his way as well.* This is stated in CCC 600 "...For the sake of accomplishing his plan of salvation, God permitted the acts that flowed from their blindness." Whatever good has happened after Vatican II despite 'ambiguity in some documents' and 'modernist theologians' sitting as experts is known in medicine as "collateral circulation." This phenomenon that happens naturally in the human body happens in order to protect the heart. Collateral circulation is where minor blood vessels enlarge to enhance circulation to compensate for damage to large vessels. It is the circulation of blood around a blocked artery or vein by way of another path, such as nearby minor vessels (cf. [How to think like Aquinas](#) - p.127). By way of analogy, the modernist (at Vatican II) attacked the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass which is the heart of Catholicism. *Minor blood vessels kicked in and continued to bring in the grace of God to His Bride the Church. Some of the new blood that came out of Vatican II was EWTN Catholic Radio, EWTN Catholic TV & Catholic Social Media via the Internet, Adoration Chapels, the Chaplet of the Divine Mercy Devotion, resurgence in Apologetics, resurgence in Marian devotion, Pro Life Movement, St Paul's Center of Biblical Theology, certain aspects of the Charismatic Renewal (such as fervor for reading scripture, also lay involvement in healing and deliverance teams), Theology of the Body, orthodox Catholic publications and Lay apostolates such as FOCUS, St Joseph's Communications, the Augustine Institute, Church Militant, Lifesitenews, the Lepanto Institute, Catholic Answers, independent Catholic radio and Catholic Social Media etc...And now there is even a resurgence of the Latin Mass which was almost eradicated by the modernist.*

God had mercy on this sinner, despite all this confusion and dissent since Vatican II, the Lord woke me up and I had an 'interior conversion' to the Lordship of Christ through the Charismatic Renewal and Life in the Spirit Seminars. My doctrinal formation was heavily drawn from Catholic Answers, Dr Scott Hahn, Dr Brant Pitre, Dr Michael Barber and Jeff Cavins biblical

theology courses. Much of my catechesis was drawn from Archbishop Fulton's Sheens 'Life is Worth Living' book and CD's along with Fr John Corapi's verse by verse through the Catechism of the Catholic Church. I thank God for putting all these people in my life to build me up from the life of a low information lukewarm Catholic.

Ultimately, the Church belongs to Our Lord Jesus Christ, it's his bride. Which reminds me of words attributed to Pope John XXIII that he is supposed to have prayed every night before he went to bed: "Lord it's your Church, I'm going to bed"! Having said all of this I will give St Padre Pio the last word: "Pray, hope, and don't worry. Worry is useless. God is merciful and will hear your prayer."

Finally, if you want to see why I spilled so much ink on the topic of the Sacred Liturgy just watch this video on YouTube. It's called 'The Veil Removed' [<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OOLZDaTgIaM>], it's a short 5 minute film, which reveals the coming together of heaven and earth at Mass, as seen by saints and mystics, supported by Scripture and the Catechism of the Catholic Church. It's BEAUTIFUL!!!

Ave Maria...
