

# Bishops Valid? – II

February 27, 2016

A recent study by a competent Society of St Pius X theologian concerning the validity of the Newrite of Consecration of Newbishops introduced in 1969, provides remarkable confirmation of the second point of Freemasonry's three-point plan to destroy the Catholic Church, which the dying Cardinal Liénart (1884–1973) allegedly revealed on his death-bed. The Cardinal was a leading neo-modernist at Vatican II, and surely a Freemason himself. Before quoting from the summary of the Cardinal's testimony which appeared in these "Comments" (#121 of October 31, 2009), let us remind readers that the validity of a Catholic sacrament requires, besides a valid Minister, a valid Form and Matter (words and actions at the heart of the ceremony) and the sacramental Intention to do what the Church does. All other words to be spoken at the ceremony constitute the Rite, surrounding and framing the Form. Now from EC 121:–

*According to the Cardinal, Freemasonry's first objective at the Council was to break the Mass by so altering the Catholic Rite as to undermine in the long run the celebrant's Catholic Intention: "to do what the Church does." Gradually the Newrite was to induce priests and laity alike to take the Mass rather for a "memorial" or "sacred meal" than for a propitiatory sacrifice. Freemasonry's second objective was to break the Apostolic Succession by a Newrite of Consecration that would eventually undermine the bishops' power of Orders, both by a Newform not automatically invalidating but ambiguous enough to sow doubt, and above all by a Newrite which as a whole would eventually dissolve the consecrating bishop's sacramental Intention. This would have the advantage of breaking the Apostolic Succession so gently that nobody would even notice ( . . . )*

*Do not today's Newrites of Mass and Episcopal Consecration correspond exactly to the Masonic plan as unveiled by the*

*Cardinal? Ever since these Newrites were introduced in the late 1960's and early 1970's, many serious Catholics have refused to believe that they could be used validly. Alas, they are not automatically invalid. How much simpler it would be, if they were. They are worse. Their sacramental Newform is Catholic enough to persuade many a celebrant that they can be validly used, but the Newrite and Newform are designed as a whole to be so ambiguous and so suggestive of a non-Catholic interpretation as to invalidate the sacrament over time by corrupting the catholic Intention of any celebrant who is either too "obedient," or is not watching and praying enough. Newrites thus valid enough to get themselves accepted by nearly all Catholics in the short term, but ambiguous enough to invalidate the sacraments in the long term, constitute a trap satanically subtle.*

There is no room left in this week's "Comments" to do justice to the recent article of Fr Alvaro Calderón, but let us present its grand lines (whose justification will have to wait for another issue of these "Comments"): the Newrite of episcopal Consecration is an entirely new Rite. As such, is it valid? It is certainly illegitimate, because no Pope has the right to make such a break with Catholic Tradition. On the other hand in the context of the Newrite and its institution, the Newmatter, Newform and Newintention are very probably valid, because they signify what needs to be signified and most of their elements come from Rites accepted by the Church. But the validity is not certain because the break with Tradition is not legitimate, and because the Newrite is only similar to Rites approved by the Church, and all the changes go in a modernist direction. Therefore the absolute need for certain validity in sacramental Rites applies: until the restored Magisterium of the Church pronounces that the Newrite of Consecration is valid, then to be safe, Newbishops should be reconsecrated conditionally, and Newpriests ordained only by Newbishops should be re-ordained conditionally.

Neo-modernism is “uniquely slippery.” It was designed to be so.

Kyrie eleison.