

Validity of Paul VI's Diminished Rites



R. J. M. I.

By

The Precious Blood of Jesus Christ,
The Grace of the God of the Holy Catholic Church,
The Mediation of the Blessed Virgin Mary,
Our Lady of Good Counsel and Crusher of Heretics,
The Protection of Saint Joseph, Patriarch of the Holy Family,
The Intercession of Saint Michael the Archangel
and the cooperation of

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

To Jesus through Mary

*Júdica me, Deus, et discérne causam meam de gente non sancta:
ab hómine iníquo, et dolóso érue me*

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam

Original version: 7/2004; Current version: 7/2004

Mary's Little Remnant
302 East Joffre St.
TorC, NM 87901-2878
Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us
(Send for a free catalog)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
BAPTISM	5
<i>No defect in the Form</i>	5
<i>No defect in the Matter</i>	6
Defect in second way of administration.....	6
<i>No defect in the Intention</i>	6
HOLY ORDERS	7
ORDINATION OF PRIESTS.....	8
<i>No defect in the Form</i>	8
<i>No defect in the Matter</i>	9
<i>No defect in Intention</i>	10
CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS	11
<i>No defect in form</i>	11
<i>No defect in intention</i>	13
<i>No defect in matter</i>	15

Introduction

Apostate Antipope Paul VI approved New Rites for the Sacraments, which includes Baptism and Holy Orders, in his “Apostolic Constitution” *Pontificalis Romani recognitio*, on June 18, 1968, which went into effect in 1970. I have recently obtained the official text of Paul VI’s New Rites (hereafter referred to as the New Rites).

The Rites of the Catholic Church, The Roman Ritual and Pontifical revised by Decree of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council and published by authority of Pope Paul VI and Pope John Paul II, Prepared by the International Commission on English in the Liturgy, A joint Commission of Catholic Bishops’ Conferences, Approved for us in the Dioceses of the United States of America by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and confirmed by the Apostolic See, A Pueblo Book, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 1991.

Being Paul VI was not the pope, his approval and promulgation of the New Rites has no force in the Catholic Church; therefore, they are illegal and would never be acceptable to a true pope because of their diminished reverence and deliberate omissions. The Catholic Rites that were in use before the New Rites are still in force (hereafter referred to as the Catholic Rites). The question, then, is, “Are the New Rites valid, do they confect the sacraments?” Legality and validity are separate issues.

This article is a correction of my former position. I had originally taught that Paul VI’s New Rites of Baptism and Holy Orders for making priests and bishops are doubtfully valid. I trusted what others had written about it. When I investigated the New Rites myself, I discovered that many non-Catholic Traditionalists had lied about them, or, like myself, trusted what others said. I am learning the hard way not to trust what any so-called Catholic says about this or that regarding religious matters, because none of them are Catholic—the Vatican II members (the Liberals, Conservatives, and Traditionalists) and the non-Catholic sedevacantist sects. They are extremely untrustworthy in one point or more when defending their heresies or schisms. They all lie! I say lie because when one investigates their teachings on this topic or that, one discovers that they have deliberately left out necessary information and even lie about what they left out. They mistranslate quotes or take them out of context. And worse, when they are presented with the evidence they omitted that proves them wrong, they ignore it as if it does not exist or mangle its true meaning, which only exposes their extreme bad will to those of good will, to those who have eyes to see and ears to hear.

The valid confecting of the sacraments requires a valid minister and candidate, and the proper form, matter, and intention. For the sacrament of penance, the priest must also have jurisdiction. If any is lacking, the sacrament is invalid.

Baptism

No defect in the Form

There is no defect in the form of the New Rite of Baptism. It is the same as the Catholic Rite.

New Rite: "I baptize you in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." (Christian vol. 1, Initiation of Adults, #226, pp. 159-160; Baptism of Children, #60, p. 387.)

No defect in the Matter

There is no defect in the matter of the New Rite. Water is the matter.

Defect in second way of administration

During the administration of the sacrament of baptism, the water must make contact with the flesh while the words are being recited or the baptism is invalid, does not remit sins and bestow the indelible mark. The New Rite allows for two ways of administering baptism:

New Rite: "The celebrant baptizes each candidate either by immersion, option A, or by the pouring of water, option B." (Christian vol. 1, Initiation of Adults, #226, p. 159.)

In option A, water definitely makes contact with the flesh. However, in option B, the method prescribed for pouring the water is defective in that water may not make contact with the flesh because it is poured upon the candidate's bowed head. If the candidate has a thick head of hair, water may not make contact with the flesh:

New Rite: "**B.** If baptism is by the pouring of water... the celebrant, taking baptismal water and pouring it three times on the candidate's bowed head, baptizes the candidate in the name of the Trinity." (Christian Initiation of Adults, Baptism, vol. 1, p. 160)

The Catholic Rite pours water on the candidate's forehead not his bowed head, which assures the water contacts the flesh while the words are recited. Therefore, if Option B is used in the New Rite and the candidate has a thick head of hair and the water does not contact the flesh while the words are recited, the baptism is invalid. The danger is not as great with infants or adults who do not have much hair.

No defect in the Intention

Those who say the New Rite of Baptism is invalid base their argument upon a deficient intention as expressed in the ceremonial, the non-essential part of the Rite that does not include the form and matter. They teach that it denies original sin by omission, because it does not mention the soul being cleansed from sin. They teach the New Rite only refers to baptism as an initiation rite that makes one a member of the Church. If that were true, then the New Rite would be invalid because the minister lacks the proper intention as explicitly expressed in the deficient ceremonial part of the rite, which omits any mention of sin being washed away by baptism.

However, the ceremonial of the New Rite of Baptism, even though it is much less reverent than the Catholic Rite, does teach baptism cleanses the candidate from sin. Those who teach otherwise either never read the New Rite of Baptism, like myself, or they have and deliberately lied.

New Rite: "God's holy people, set free from sin by baptism. ...By the power of the Holy Spirit give to this water the grace of your Son, so that in the sacrament of baptism all those whom you have created in your likeness may be cleansed from sin

and rise to a new birth of innocence by water and the Holy Spirit. ...Come to us, Lord, Father of all, and make holy this water which you have created, so that all who are baptized in it may be washed clean of sin and be born again to live a your children.” (Christian Initiation of Adults, Prayer over the water, vol. 1, pp. 151-153.)

Therefore, there is no defect of intention, form, or matter in the New Rite of Baptism; thus, it is valid if the water contacts the candidate’s flesh when the sacrament is administered.

Another concern, which does not relate to the New Rite itself, is if the minister made up his own rite that has a deficient intention, or if he did not use the proper form or matter, or if he manifested an intention not to do as the Church does. If so, then his baptisms would be invalid. But this has nothing to do with the New Rite. The same can occur if a minister abuses the Catholic Rite by not following it or manifests a deficient intention.

Holy Orders

The argument against the validity of the New Rites of Holy Orders for making priests and bishops is, for most, not found in a defect of the matter (laying on of the hands) and form (the essential words of ordination and consecration). They believe the defect is in the non-essential part of the rite known as the ceremonial, the part that does not include the form. This defect would make the minister’s intention for making real priests and real bishops deficient as explicitly expressed in the ceremonial part of the rite. If that can be proven, then the New Rites of Orders would be invalid because of an improper intention of the minister, the ordaining bishop. That is the reason Pope Leo XIII decreed that the Anglican, Edwardian Ordinal of Orders is invalid, because the ceremonial part of the rite lacks the proper intention, it does not intend to make true priests and bishops who offer a true sacrifice, consecrate the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, even though the proper form and matter is used.¹

Therefore, if it can be proven that the ceremonial part of the New Rites of Holy Orders does not mention or imply a sacrificial priesthood that confects the Holy Eucharist or a priesthood that has the power to forgive sins, then, even if the proper form and matter is used, the rite is invalid because of the minister’s improper intention to do as the Church requires, which is to make priests that offer a true sacrifice and have the power to forgive sins. If that were true, then the New Rite’s concept of the priesthood would be the same as the Anglican one, which is to make priests who do not offer true sacrifice (confect the Holy Eucharist) or have the power to forgive sins; thus, it would be invalid based upon an improper intention of the minister.

¹ See: my book, *Against the Society of St. Pius X*, “Validity the Non-Catholic Society of St. Pius X Holy Orders, Pope Leo XIII’s Apostolicae Curae.”

Ordination of Priests

No defect in the Form

Popes can make non-essential changes to the form of the sacraments, having more liberty with the forms and matters of the sacraments that Christ did not dictate to the Apostles, such as Holy Orders, Extreme Unction, Matrimony, and Confirmation, which the Church (popes), by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, determined the form, and in some cases, the matter. While Christ did not dictate the details of every sacrament, He instituted all of them:

Catholic Encyclopedia, 1913, Sacraments: “**(4) What does Immediate Institution Imply? Power of the Church.** Granting that Christ immediately instituted all the sacraments, it does not necessarily follow that personally He determined all the details of the sacred ceremony, prescribing minutely every iota relating to the matter and the form to be used. It is sufficient (even for immediate institution) to say: Christ determined what special graces were to be conferred by means of external rites: for some sacraments (e.g. Baptism, the Eucharist) He determined minutely (*in specie*) the matter and form: for others He determined only in a general way (*in genere*) that there should be an external ceremony, by which special graces were to be conferred, leaving to the Apostles or to the Church the power to determine whatever He had not determined, e.g. to prescribe the matter and form of the Sacraments of Confirmation and Holy Orders. The Council of Trent (Sess. XXI, cap. ii) declared that the Church had the power to change the ‘substance’ of the sacraments. She would not be claiming power to alter the substance of the sacraments if she used her Divinely given authority to determine more precisely the matter and form in so far as they had not been determined by Christ. This theory (which is not modern) had been adopted by theologians: by it we can solve historical difficulties relating, principally, to Confirmation and Holy Orders.”

The form of the New Ordination Rite does not contain any essential changes from the form of the Catholic Ordination Rite. Thus, it is a valid form although illegal, because a non-Catholic antipope promulgated it. In the same way the Greek Schismatic form of Holy Orders does not exactly match Pope Pius XII’s one, but because there is no essential difference, the form is valid although illegal; therefore, Greek Schismatic bishops make true bishops and true priests even though its form is not the exact same as the one Pope Pius XII defined. Below are the forms of the Catholic Rite and the New Rite for the ordination of priests:

Form of the Catholic Rite of Ordination, Pope Pius XII, *Sacramentum Ordinis*, 1947: “...the form consists of the words of the Preface, of which these are essential and required for validity: ‘Grant we beseech Thee, Almighty Father, to these Thy servants, the dignity of the priesthood; renew the spirit of holiness within them so that they may obtain the office of the second rank received from Thee, O God, and may by the example of their lives inculcate the pattern of holy living.’”

Form of New Rite of Ordination: “Prayer of Consecration: ...Almighty Father, grant to this servant of yours the dignity of the priesthood. Renew within him the Spirit of holiness. As a co-worker with the order of bishops may he be faithful to the ministry that he receives from you, Lord God, and be to others a model of right conduct.” (Ordination of a Priest, Prayer of Consecration, vol. 2, pp.44-45)

Some argue that the new form does not manifest an intention to make priests because it omitted the words “obtaining the office of second rank.” However, the opening words of the new form clearly ask God to grant the candidate the priesthood—“Almighty

Father, grant to this servant of yours the dignity of the priesthood.” Also, the Homily of the New Rite mentions the candidate is to be “raised to the order of priests.”

Some, using a semantic argument, say that the words “so that” in the Catholic Rite (“so that they may obtain...”) are left out of the New Rite; thus, the New Rite does not mention or imply that God is giving the candidate the power of the priesthood, and this makes it invalid. Yet, the New Rite, using different words, expresses that same thing, that the candidate is being given this power from God when it says, “Almighty Father, grant to this servant of yours the dignity of the priesthood ...the ministry that he receives from you, Lord God.” In both rites, God clearly gives the power to the candidate. After reading the form of the New Rite, only those of extreme bad-will would say that God is not invoked to give the candidate the power of the priesthood.

Therefore, no essential changes have been made to the form of the New Rite for making priests; thus, the form is valid.

No defect in the Matter

The matter of the sacrament of orders for making priests is the laying on of the hands by the ordaining bishop on the candidate’s head. The form (essential words) is said following the laying on of the hands and not during it.

Dr. Ludwig Ott,² *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, The Sacrament of Order: “It is not necessary that they coincide absolutely in point of time; a moral coincidence suffices, that is, they must be connected with each other in such a fashion, that according to general estimation, they compose a unitary sign. ...In the Ordo of priests, in compliance with the declaration of Pius XII referred to, only the first tacitly performed imposition of hands is to be regarded as the matter of the Sacrament, not the continuation thereof by the stretching out of the right hand [when the form is recited]. Further, the second imposition of hands at the conclusion of the Order, which is accompanied by the words: Accipe Spiritum Sanctum quorum remiseras peccata, etc., does not appertain to the matter of the Sacrament. The latter is found in the Latin rite of Order since the 13th century; it is not found in the Greek rite.” (Part 3, VI. The Sacrament of Holy Orders, §3. The Outward Sign of the Sacrament of Order, 1. Matter, p. 454.)”

In both rites, the ordaining bishop lays his hands on the candidate’s head, and then, after his hands are no longer touching the candidate’s head, he recites the form:

Catholic Rite, Catholic Encyclopedia, 1911, Orders: Ceremonies of Ordination: “...The candidates come forward, and kneel in pairs before the bishop while he lays both hands on the head of each candidate in silence. The same is done by all priests who are present. Whilst bishop and priests keep their right hands extended, the former alone recites a prayer, inviting all to pray to God for a blessing on the candidates. After this follows the Collect and then the bishop says the Preface, towards the end of which occurs the prayer, ‘Grant, we beseech Thee etc.’”

New Rite: “20. ...The candidate goes to the bishop and kneels before him. The bishop lays his hands on the candidate’s head, in silence. ...22. The candidate kneels before the bishop. With his hands extended over the candidate, the bishop sings the prayer of consecration or says it aloud.” (Ordination of a Priest, ‘Laying on of Hands’ and ‘Prayer of Consecration,’ vol. 2, 43-44)

² **Warning:** Ludwig Ott is a heretic. He denied the Salvation Dogma in his book *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*. He also denies a teaching that belongs to the Ordinary Magisterium by teaching unbaptized infants who die can be freed from original sin other than by the sacrament of baptism and thus be saved. He may hold other heresies also. (See my book “*Bad Books on Salvation*, Dr. Ludwig Ott.)

Therefore, there is no defect of matter in the New Rite of Ordination.

No defect in Intention

We will now look at the ceremonial part of the New Rite to see how it defines the priesthood. Do its priests offer real sacrifice (confect the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist) and do they have the power to forgive sins.

The argument goes that the New Rite of Ordination does not mention or imply a priesthood that offers sacrifice, which consecrates the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Jesus, and some say it does not mention the priest's power to forgive sins. If this is true, then the New Rite would be invalid because the minister would manifest an improper intention not to do as the Church intends, which is to make true priests who confect the Holy Eucharist and forgive sins. However, the ceremonial of the New Rite, even though it is much less reverent than the Catholic Rite, does mention these dogmas that define the true priesthood.

New Rite: "Homily: ...he will be a true priest of the New Testament, to preach the Gospel, sustain God's people, and celebrate the liturgy, above all, the Lord's sacrifice. ...Let the doctrine you teach be true nourishment for the people of God. In the same way you must carry out your mission of sanctifying in the power of Christ. Your ministry will perfect the spiritual sacrifice of the faithful by uniting it to Christ's sacrifice, the sacrifice which is offered sacramentally through your hands. ...In the sacrament of penance, you will forgive sins in the name of Christ and the Church." (Ordination of a Priest, Homily, #14, vol. 2, pp. 40-41.)

In light of the above text, one wonders how the Radecki brothers, the Reverends Francisco and Dominic,³ who teach the New Rites of Orders are doubtfully valid in their book "What happened to the Catholic Church?" could have made the following statement:

What happened to the Catholic Church? "In the Catholic ordination rite the bishop instructs the candidate that his office is 'to offer sacrifice, to bless, to guide, to preach and to baptize.' This instruction, which specifies the principal functions of the priesthood, has been deleted from the new rite" (The Sacrament of Holy Orders, The New Ordination Rite, p. 233.)

Not only does the New Rite mention a true sacrificial priesthood, priests that offer sacrifice, but it also mentions a priesthood that blesses, guides, preaches, and baptizes:

New Rite: "Anointing of Hands: 24. ...The Father anointed our Lord Jesus Christ through the power of the Holy Spirit. May Jesus preserve you to sanctify the Christian people and to offer sacrifice to God." (Vol. 2, p.45.)

New Rite: "You must apply your energies to the duty of teaching in the name of Christ... Let the doctrine you teach be true nourishment for the people of God... Provide worthy priests... companions to your Son's apostles to help in teaching the faith." ('Homily' and 'Prayer of Consecration,' vol. 2, p. 40-44)

New Rite: "You must carry out your mission of sanctifying in the power of Christ... Are you resolved to celebrate the mysteries of Christ faithfully and religiously as

³ **Warning on the Radecki brothers:** The Radecki brothers are heretics and schismatics. They are not Catholic. They support the heretical and schismatic line of Bishop Noe Thuc; they deny the Salvation Dogma; they believe in the heresy of Natural Family Planning; they do not require abjurations from fallen-away Catholics; and they allow their flock to knowingly pray in communion with heretics, by attending Mass at other churches which they admit are not Catholic.

the Church had handed down to us for the glory of God and the sanctification of Christ's people?" ('Homily' and 'Examination of the Candidate', vol. 2, p. 41, 42)

New Rite: "Examination of the Candidate: "...Bishop: Are you resolved to exercise the ministry of the word worthily and wisely, preaching the Gospel and explaining the Catholic faith?"

New Rite: "Homily: 14. ...When you baptize, you will bring men and women into the people of God." (Vol. 2, p. 41)

One wonders what New Rite the Radecki brothers are referring to. They also present the form of the New Rite dishonestly and deceptively.

What happened to the Catholic Church? President, a New Priestly Role? p. 237:
"The words of the form [of the New Rite] have been essentially changed and, 'do not in the least definitely express the Sacred Order of the priesthood, or its grace and power, which is chiefly the power of 'consecrating and of offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord.' The intention of conveying the power of offering the Sacrifice of the Mass and of the forgiveness of sins, which are essential to the priesthood, is not present."

As shown above, the form of the New Rite has not been essentially changed, and it does mention the priesthood: "grant to this servant of yours the dignity of the priesthood." The Radecki brothers dishonestly said that the form of the New Rite does "not in the least" mention the "priesthood."

They also deceive the reader when they say that the form of the New Rite does not mention "the power of 'consecrating and of offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord,'" or "The intention of conveying the power of offering the Sacrifice of the Mass and of the forgiveness of sins." Yet, the form of the Catholic Rite does not mention these either (See: No defect in the Form, p. 8). To be consistent, the Radecki would also have to invalidate the Catholic Rite for the same reasons. Just because these dogmas are not mentioned in the form of either rite, does not mean they are not mentioned elsewhere in the rites, the ceremonial parts. They are.

Another proof would be to look at what the Vatican II Church actually teaches regarding the Holy Eucharist and the sacrament of penance. As evil as the apostate Vatican II Church is, its official documents still profess belief in the Holy Eucharist and the priest's power to forgive sins in the sacrament of penance, unlike the Anglican Church whose official doctrines deny Christ's real presence in the Holy Eucharist and a priesthood that has power to forgive sins, which is reflected in its deficient Edwardian Ordination Rite.

Consecration of Bishops

No defect in form

Non-essential changes can be and have been made to the form of the consecration of bishops. The form of the New Rite does not contain any essential changes that would affect validity:

Form of the Catholic Rite: "Fill up in thy priest the perfection (fullness) of thy ministry and sanctify him with the dew of thy heavenly ointment this thy servant decked out with the ornaments of all beauty." (Pope Pius XII, *Sacramentum Ordinis*.)

Form of the New Rite: “So now pour out upon this chosen one that power which is from you, the governing Spirit whom you gave to your beloved Son, Jesus Christ, the Spirit given by him to the holy apostles, who founded the Church in every place to be your temple for the unceasing glory and praise of your name.” (Ordination of a Bishop, Prayer of Consecration, vol. 2, #26, p. 73.)

Even though the New Rite does not use the word “sanctify,” it uses other words that indicate the same thing: “pour out upon this chosen one... the governing Spirit.” And, this Spirit is specifically mentioned as the same one “given by him to the holy apostles,” which is the Holy Spirit. This also indicates the candidate is being made a bishop, just like the apostles, even though the New Rite does not use the Catholic Rite’s term “fullness of ministry,” which is just another term for bishops. The New Rite, then, clearly says the candidate is being made a bishop, an apostle, who will thus have the governing spirit. Priests who are not bishops are not apostles and do not have the governing spirit.

In spite of this, the Radecki brothers teach that the form of the New Rite contains no clear reference that candidate is being made a bishop:

What happened to the Church? “We find the words “High Priesthood,” “Bishops,” “perfect (or complete) priest,” and the Episcopate” mentioned in the consecration rite of bishops in the Western Catholic and Orthodox Churches. The new form of Paul VI is vague to say the least. “Neither the rank, nor the power, nor a clear equivalent is present... [Footnote: Rama Coomaraswamy, M.D. *The Problems With the New post-Conciliar Sacraments*, p. 41.]”

Note the first deception, in the first sentence they speak of the rite, meaning the whole rite, the ceremonial and the form. But, in the second sentence, they mention only the form of Paul VI’s rite. If the form is the issue, and not the ceremonial part, the form of the Catholic Rite does not mention High Priesthood or Bishop or Episcopate either, but uses the term the “fullness of thy ministry” to indicate a bishop is being made. However, these other terms are mentioned in the ceremonial parts of both the Catholic Rite and the New Rite. The Radecki brothers give one the impression that they are not mentioned at all in the New Rite, when in fact, they are. The prayer that immediately follows the form, in the New Rite, explicitly mentions the candidate is made a bishop, a High Priest, with the power to govern the flock:

New Rite: “*Then the principal consecrator continues alone:* ‘Father, you know all hearts. You have chosen your servant for the office of bishop. May he be a shepherd to your flock, and a high priest blameless in your sight, ministering to you night and day; may he always gain the blessing of your favor and offer gifts of your holy Church. Through the Spirit who gives the grace of high priesthood grant him the power to forgive sins as you have commanded, to assign ministries as you have decreed, and to loose every bond by the authority which you gave to your apostles. May he be pleasing to you by his gentleness and purity of heart, presenting a fragrant offering to you, through Jesus Christ, your Son, through whom glory and power and honor are yours with the Holy Spirit in your holy Church, now and for ever. Amen.”

And, just before the Prayer of Consecration, in the New Rite, it speaks of the candidate receiving the “fullness of the priesthood” and asks God to anoint him with the “fullness of priestly grace.”

New Rite: “Examination of the Candidate: 19. ...Are you resolved... to carry out the duties of one who has the fullness of the priesthood...? After the Litany of Saints: 22. Lord, moved by our prayers. Anoint your servant with the fullness of priestly grace...” (Ordination of a Bishop, vol. 2, #19, 22, pp. 71,72)

Now to the form of both rites, the Radecki brothers rightly teach that differences existed and exist in the way the different valid rites describe bishops. But, they dishonestly teach that the form of the New Rite does not in the least describe that a bishop is being made. Well, what were the apostles? Were they not the first bishops of the Church? And, do not bishops govern the Church? Therefore, just like the other valid forms that describes bishops in different ways, the form of the New Rite describes bishops in another way also, as “apostles” and men with the “governing spirit.” One can make a better argument, if they are of bad will, that the form of the Catholic Rite is less clear that a bishop is being made. The term “fullness (perfection) of Thy ministry” could apply to any ministry. It does not specifically say what ministry is being spoken of; whereas, the New Rite clearly indicates apostles with governing spirit are being made, which can only be bishops.

The Radecki brothers also attack the form of the New Rite by saying that there is no clear mention of the Holy Ghost. Yet, the form of the Catholic Rite does not mention the Holy Ghost either (See above).

What happened to the Catholic Church? “The form should signify what it effects. By not mentioning the ... powers and graces bestowed on the candidate (i.e. ...the grace of the Holy Ghost, etc.), the new rite does not effect a change in the individual. The term “governing Spirit” obviously is not sufficient.”

The form of the Catholic Rite only says that the candidate is being sanctified, “sanctify him.” It does not mention the Holy Ghost either. The word “sanctify” is sufficient because it implies the Holy Ghost. Yet, they have the audacity to say that the “governing Spirit” mentioned in the form of the New Rite is “obviously... not sufficient,” as if it does not refer to the Holy Ghost that is being poured out on the candidate. In fact, the form of the New Rite clearly defines this “governing Spirit” as the same Spirit of Jesus Christ that was also “given... to the holy apostles,” which is the Holy Spirit.

Form of the New Rite: “So now pour out upon this chosen one that power which is from you, the governing Spirit whom you gave to your beloved Son, Jesus Christ, the Spirit given by him to the holy apostles...” (Ordination of a Bishop, Prayer of Consecration, vol. 2, #26, p. 73)

Could there be any clearer reference that this “governing Spirit” is the Holy Ghost and that the New Rite asks for this to be poured out on the candidate (sanctify him). Yet, the Radecki brothers say that the words “governing Spirit” obviously does not indicate the Holy Ghost. One must conclude that the Radecki brothers obviously have eyes that do not see and ears that do not hear, that they are liars.

Therefore, the form of the New Rite for consecrating bishops is valid.

No defect in intention

There are some who argue that the ceremonial part of the New Rite lacks the intention to make true bishops, because it does not mention the bishop’s duty to ordain priests, consecrate bishops, judge, interpret, offer sacrifice, baptize and confirm. Again, they either did not read the New Rite or lied.

What happened to the Church? Radecki brothers: “There is no clear reference in the new rite to the bishop’s office or ordaining priests which is one of his most important duties.” (The New Rite for the Consecration of Bishops, p. 241.)

Fr. Rama Coomaraswamy,⁴ *The Problems With the New post-Conciliar Sacraments*: “In the traditional rite the consecrator instructs the bishop elect in the following terms: ‘A bishop judges, interprets, consecrates, ordains, offers, baptizes and confirms.’ Now such a statement is indeed important for the significatio ex adjunctis. Its deletion in the new rite is most significant. Nowhere in the new rite is it stated that the function of the bishop is to ordain, or to confirm, much less to judge (to loose and to bind).

... In the traditional rite, after the consecratory prayer, the functions of a Bishop are once again specified. ‘Give him, O Lord, the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven... Whatsoever he shall bind upon earth, let it be bound likewise in Heaven, and whatsoever he shall loose upon earth, let it likewise be loosed in Heaven Whose sins he shall retain, let them be retained, and do Thou remit the sins of whomsoever he shall remit... Grant him, O Lord, an episcopal chair...’ This entire prayer has been omitted in the new rite.” (**Chapter III, Part 10, The Post-Conciliar Rite Of Orders**)

Contrary to what you read above, the New Rite does mention or imply these duties of a bishop:

New Rite: “Prayer of Consecration: “*Then the principal consecrator continues alone*: Father... You have chosen your servant for the office of bishop. May he be a shepherd to your flock, and a high priest... Through the Spirit who gives the grace of high priesthood grant him the power to forgive sins as you have commanded, to assign ministries as you have decreed, and to loose every bond by the authority which you gave to your apostles...” (Vol. 2, #26, p. 73, 74.)

New Rite: “Homily: Consider carefully the position in the Church to which our brother is about to be raised. Our Lord Jesus Christ, who was sent by the Father to redeem the human race, in turn sent twelve apostles into the world. These men were filled with the power to preach the Gospel... ..By laying on of hands which confers the sacrament of orders in its fullness, the apostles passed on the gift of the Holy Spirit which they themselves had received from Christ. ...Gladly and gratefully, therefore, receive our brother whom we are about to accept into the college of bishops by the laying on of hands. ...He has been entrusted with the task of witnessing to the truth of the Gospel... Proclaim the message whether it is welcome or unwelcome; correct error with unfailing patience and teachings Pray and offer sacrifice for the people committed to your care and so draw every kind of grace from the overflowing holiness of Christ. ...Since you are chosen by the Father to rule over his family... In the name of his Son, Jesus Christ, whose role of Teacher, Priest, and Shepherd you undertake...” (vol. 2, #18, pp.68-69.)

New Rite: “Examination of the Candidate: “Are you resolved to maintain the deposit of faith, entire and incorrupt, as handed down by the apostles and professed by the Church everywhere and at all times? I am.” (Vol. 2, #19, p. 70.)

Three of the bishops’ duties, baptism, confirmation, and the power to bind, are implied. The New Rite mentions the bishop’s power to loose, which implies his power to bind. Also, the fact that the New Rite bishops baptize, confirm, and bind (even though very rarely) proves they are not denying these duties. No explicit mention of binding was made to appease non-Catholics and to foster the heresy of non-judgmentalism.⁵ For instance, the Catholic Rite mentions a bishops duty to condemn heresy: “Dost thou also

⁴ **Warning on the Fr. Rama Coomaraswamy**: He is a heretic and schismatic. He is not Catholic. He supports the heretical and schismatic line of Bishop Noe Thuc (he was made a priest by a Thucite Bishop); he denies the Salvation Dogma; he believes in the heresy of Natural Family Planning; he does not require abjurations from fallen-away Catholics.

⁵ See my book “*Bad Books with Imprimaturs*, ‘Non-Judgmentalism: No one can be known to be Guilty.’

condemn every heresy which lifteth itself up against this holy Catholic Church? I do.” The New Rite does not explicitly mention the condemning heresy, but only by implication when it says “Are you resolved to maintain the deposit of faith, entire and incorrupt ...and to correct error.” However, it must be noted that Bishops were not properly judging, condemning heresy, and binding long before Vatican II, when the Catholic Rite was the only one used. The New Rite reflects this in its diminished references to condemning and binding, while not outright denying these duties.

Even though some of the terminology of the sacred rites and duties of a priest and bishop in the New Rites are not as strong or numerous or reverent as in the Catholic rites, they do exist, explicitly or by implication, and the priests and bishops are still supposed to perform these duties, which proves their Church does not deny them. Therefore, there is no defect of intention in the New Rites for priests and bishops.

No defect in matter

Some argue that the matter of the New Rite of making bishops is defective. They say that the bishop after he lays hands on the candidate’s head waits too long to recite the form, the words of consecration. As stated above in the matter for the ordination of priests, the laying on of the hands and the recitation of the form is not simultaneous (See *Ordination of Priests, No defect in the Matter*, p. 9). The same applies to the consecration of bishops. First the consecrating bishop lays his hands on the head of the candidate, and then, with his hands removed from the candidate’s head, he recites the form. The question is, how long can the bishop wait after the laying on of the hands and the recitation of the form without endangering validity? The opinion varies from the time span of one Our Father to the time it would take for a coffee break (15 minutes).

Henry Davis, S.J., *Moral and Pastoral Theology*, New York: Sheed and Ward, 1935: “The matter and form must be united—so far as union is possible—to produce the one external rite, and so to produce a valid Sacrament... However in Holy Orders, moral simultaneity is sufficient, that is, these Sacraments are valid though the proximate matter is employed immediately before or after the use of the word. What interval would suffice to render the Sacrament invalid cannot be determined; the interval of the recital of the 'Our Father' appears sufficient but in such matters we should not rely on probabilities, we should make sure the matter and form are as united as we can make them.”

In both rites, after the consecrating bishop lays his hands on the candidate, the other bishops present lay their hands on him. Then, in the Catholic Rite, a prayer is recited before the prayer of consecration begins, and the form is still not recited until several paragraphs into the prayer of consecration.

Catholic Rite: “The Imposition of Hands: The Consecrating Prelate and the assisting Bishops each touch with both hands the head of the Bishop-Elect saying: *Accipe sanctum*. The Consecrator, standing without the mitre says: Be favorable to our supplications O Lord, and directing upon this Thy servant the fountain of priestly grace, pour down on him Thy efficacious + benediction. Through our Lord Jesus Christ, Who together with Thee liveth and reineth in the unit of the Holy Ghost.” The Consecrating Prelate, with hands extended, continues [with the prayer of consecration].

The New Rite replaces the short prayer before the prayer of consecration in the Catholic Rite with the placing of the Book of the Gospels upon the candidate’s head and then proceeds with the prayer of consecration.

New Rite: “LAYING ON OF HANDS: ...#24. The principal consecrator lays his hands upon the head of the bishop-elect, in silence. After him, all the other bishops present do the same. BOOK OF THE GOSPELS: #25. Then the principal consecrator places the open Book of the Gospels upon the head of the bishop-elect, hold the Book of the Gospels above his head until the prayer of consecration is completed.” (Ordination of a Bishop, ‘Laying on of Hands’ and ‘Book of the Gospels,’ vol. 2, p. 72.)

The span of time in both Rites from the time of the laying on of the hands and the recitation of the form is the same and maybe even shorter in the New Rite. Being the span of time in the Catholic Rite does not endanger validity, than neither does the same or lesser span of time in the New Rite endanger validity. That span is greater than the time it takes to pray one “Our Father” and less than a coffee break. With these facts in mind, we will present another dishonest representation of the New Rite of Orders for making bishops:

Fr. Rama Coomaraswamy, *The Problems With the New post-Conciliar Sacraments*: “In the new rite, the placing of the Gospels on the head of the bishop-elect comes after the superimposition of hands and thus breaks the 'moral simultaneity' between the matter and the form much in the same way as taking a coffee- break at this moment would break it. Once again, one is given grounds for seriously doubting validity.” **(Chapter III, Part 10, The Post-Conciliar Rite Of Orders)**

The span of time in both rites, being about the same, is less than the time it takes for a coffee break (15 minutes). It takes more or equal time to recite the short prayer in the Catholic Rite than to place the Book of Gospels on the candidate’s head. And after that, in both rites, the form is not recited until several paragraphs into the prayer of consecration. So if the New Rite breaks moral simultaneity, so does the Catholic Rite. You would not know this by reading Coomaraswamy ’s dishonest representation of the matter of the New Rite, because he did not compare it to the Catholic Rite, whose time span is the same or greater. Therefore, the New Rite’s matter for consecrating bishops is valid.

Lastly, just like Paul VI’s New Mass, his New Rites are a first step in lessening the importance and holiness (reverence) of the Catholic Rites and the dogmas they proclaim; thus, the New Rites are suspect of implicit heresy and sacrilege because of what they deliberately deleted from the Catholic Rites. Being there is no explicit heresy or sacrilege in the New Rites, it will take a future pope to judge their bad motives in these matters, but the New Rites would still be valid. No doubt, the Catholic Rites, as perfected over the ages, will stand as they are, with only minor changes and embellishments allowed that do not diminish their reverence or the dogmas expressed in them. (See: my book “*Mass Deceptions*”)