

Host's Parasite – I

January 23, 2016

The purpose of saying half a year ago that a priest is not obliged in every case to forbid a Catholic to attend the New Mass (NOM) was obviously not to say that the NOM is perfectly alright to attend. The NOM rite is, in itself, the central act of worship of the false man-centred religion of Vatican II, in whose wake it followed in 1969. In fact the obligation to stay away from the NOM is proportional to one's knowledge of how wrong it is. It has enormously contributed to countless Catholics losing their faith, almost without realizing it.

But there are two factors which even to this day have made it easy for Catholics to be deceived by the NOM. Firstly, it was imposed on the entire Latin-rite Church by what Paul VI did all he could to make look like the full force of his Papal authority, which in 1969 seemed immense. Still today the NOM passes for the "ordinary" rite, while the Mass of all time is officially discounted as the "extraordinary" rite, so that even 47 years later an honest Catholic can still feel obliged in obedience to attend the NOM. Of course in reality there can be no such obligation, because no Church law can oblige a Catholic to put his faith in danger, which he normally does by attending the NOM, such is its falsity.

And secondly, the NOM was introduced gradually, in a series of skilfully graduated changes, notably in 1962, 1964 and 1967, so that the wholesale revolution of 1969 found Catholics ready for novelty. In fact even today the NOM rite includes options for the celebrant which make it possible for him to celebrate the NOM either as a full-blooded ceremony of the new humanist religion, or as a ceremony resembling the true Mass closely enough to deceive many a Catholic that there is no significant difference between the old and the new rites. Of course in reality, as Archbishop Lefebvre always said, better the old rite in a modern language than the new rite in Latin, because

of the diminution or downright falsification of the Catholic doctrine of the Mass in the NOM.

Moreover these two factors, the official imposition of the changes and their sometimes optional character intrinsic to the NOM, more than suffice to explain that to this day there must be multitudes of Catholics who want and mean to be Catholics and yet assume that the right way to be Catholics is to attend the NOM every Sunday. And who will dare say that out of these multitudes there are none who are still nourishing their faith by obeying what seems to them (subjectively) to be their (objective) duty? God is their judge, but for how many years did easily most followers of Catholic Tradition have to attend the NOM before they understood that their faith obliged them not to do so? And if the NOM had in all those years made them lose the faith, how would they have come to Catholic Tradition? Depending on how a celebrant uses the options in the NOM, not all the elements that can nourish faith are necessarily eliminated from it, especially if the Consecration is valid, a possibility which nobody who knows his sacramental theology can deny.

However, given the weakness of human nature and so the risk of encouraging Catholics to go with the new and easy religion by the least word said in favour of its central rite of worship, why say a word in favour of any feature of the Newchurch? For at least two reasons. Secondly, to ward off potentially pharisaical scorn of any believers outside of the Traditional movement, and firstly to ward off what is coming to be called "ecclesiavacantism," namely the idea that the Newchurch has nothing Catholic left in it whatsoever. In theory the Newchurch is pure rot, but in practice that rot could not exist without something not yet rotted still being there to be rotted. Every parasite needs a host. Also, had this particular host, the true Church, completely disappeared, would not the gates of Hell have prevailed against it? Impossible (Mt.XVI, 18).

Kyrie eleison.