

The Development of the Mass Since 1960

Part I

(What Vatican II Really Said)

By Leo Darroch

The following is the text of a talk given by the Deputy Chairman of the Latin Mass Society of England and Wales, Leo Darroch, in the parish hall of the church of St. Thomas More, Hartlepool, Cleveland, on 3rd May 1995, to members of the society in that area. The aim of the talk was to provide the members and their friends with a reasonably uncomplicated potted history of the events of the last 30 years without using endless quotations from the niagara deluge of documents issued throughout these years. The great majority of the text has been gleaned, with his permission and approval, from the extensive writings of Michael Davies. Mr Davies is now the international President of Una Voce

Reverend Fathers, Ladies and Gentlemen.

1. If I were to ask you the question ‘what is two plus two?’ everyone would immediately raise their hands and shout ‘four’. A simple question with a ready answer. If I were then to ask you to explain the mysteries of the universe I guess the hands would not be raised as quickly, if at all. The answer does not come so readily. Where do you begin? Do you start with the present day and work backwards? Do you start at the beginning of time and work forwards? Do you start on earth and move outwards to the heavens?, or do you start with the stars of outer space and come back to earth? Not an easy task is it? Where do you begin?

2. And so it is with trying to explain the events in the Catholic Church over the past 35 years or so. Where do you begin? So much has happened, so many words have been written, so many committees, commissions, working groups have met and so many documents have been produced that I could be talking to you till this time next month and still not have scratched the surface of these events. But not to worry, 30 minutes is about my limit. And because of this time limit I can only give you a general outline of the great upheaval that has taken place in our Church since 1962 and all, supposedly, in the name of the Second Vatican Council, or Vatican II as it is more commonly known. I think I can safely say that no Catholic family in the whole world has not been affected by the Second Vatican Council - and, in my opinion, not for the better.

3. The rite of Mass as we all knew it up to the beginning of the Council was the culmination of a gradual and natural development under the Holy Ghost which had lasted for fifteen hundred and seventy years. By the year of Our Lord 1570, at the end of the Council of Trent, it had reached as near perfection as anything on earth could ever be.

“It is,” wrote Father Frederick Faber, “the most beautiful thing this side of heaven. It came forth out of the grand mind of the Church and lifted us out of earth and out of self, and wrapped us round in a cloud of mystical sweetness and the sublimities of a more than angelic liturgy, and purified us almost without ourselves, and charmed us with celestial charming so that our very senses seemed to find vision, hearing, fragrance, taste and touch more than ear can give.”

What a wonderful, wonderful, description that is of the old Mass.

4. Pope St. Pius V in 1570, after the Council of Trent, did not devise a new rite of Mass, as is often claimed by those who devised the new Mass in the 1960s. He was content to codify the Roman Missal which existed at that time (the so-called Tridentine Mass) and extend its use throughout the whole Church as a bulwark against the attacks on the Church from the Reformation which was taking place throughout Europe at that time in the sixteenth century. Its prayers and its ceremonies made the Catholic doctrines of Sacrifice and the Real Presence absolutely explicit in accordance with the principle - *lex orandi, lex credendi*, - the law of prayer is the law of faith, or, what you pray is what you believe. The term Tridentine Mass is a little misleading. Father Adrian Fortescue, England’s greatest liturgical historian, wrote:

“Our Mass goes back without essential change to the age when Caesar ruled the world and thought he could stamp out the faith of Christ, when our fathers met together before dawn and sang a hymn to Christ as God.... there is not in Christendom a rite so venerable as ours.”

AND SO TO THE COUNCIL

5. And so to the Council. We have all been told that Vatican II said this, and Vatican II said that, and it has been used as justification for every novelty introduced over the past 30 years. But what did happen during the Council and what exactly did the Council decree?

6. The inspiration to call a Council came to Pope John XXIII towards the end of 1958. He was wondering what could be done to give the world an example of peace and concord when suddenly he exclaimed - “A Council.” He said later that this was Divine Providence. He revealed his plan to the Sacred College of Cardinals on 25th

January 1959. There was no enthusiasm at all for his plan and, in fact, his announcement was received in absolute silence; not one of the Cardinals had a word to say. Pope John was extremely disappointed that - in his own words "They might have crowded around to express approval and good wishes." However, he described their negative reaction as "a devout and impressive silence."

7. Cardinal Manning of Westminster, at the time of the First Vatican Council, said, "to convoke a General Council, except when absolutely demanded by necessity is to tempt God." He also said, "Each Council was convened to extinguish the chief heresy, or to correct the chief evil of the time."

The one striking fact about the Second Vatican Council is the fact that it was not called to deal with any specific evil or heresy but was simply a pastoral Council convoked to open a few windows and let a little light into the Church. Well, we all know now what happened when they opened the windows. They let in the wind and reaped the whirlwind. Unfortunately, Pope John XXIII died in June 1963, after the first Session, and was succeeded by Pope Paul VI. By as early as 1968 Pope Paul VI was lamenting the fact that the Church was engaged in a process of self-destruction. On 29th June 1972 he said that somehow or other Satan himself had found an opening into the Church, where he was spreading doubt, disquiet and disaffection.

"We thought," he said, "that after the Council there would be a day of sunshine for the history of the Church: instead we found new storms."

We did indeed find new storms and the calamity for the Church is that these storms have come from within the Church itself.

8. For two years before the Council a group of 871 scholars of international repute had been busy preparing all the draft documents of the Council on the instructions of Pope John. These documents were totally orthodox and in complete accord with the traditions of the Church. In July 1962, some four months before the opening of the Council, these preparatory documents were sent to all the bishops of the world for their consideration.

9. Now at that time there was a growing liberal influence among the clergy in the Rhine countries of northern Europe, particularly Germany and Holland, and many of these clerics were appalled by the orthodoxy of these documents. They wished to move towards a much more liberal outlook and greater collaboration with the Protestant religions, and particularly the Lutheran Church (I know that some people are not keen on the word Protestant, especially in these very ecumenical days, but I have used it occasionally throughout this talk simply as a collective name for the

other Christian religions). These liberally minded clerics formed themselves into groups, held secret meetings throughout Europe and arrived in Rome in October 1962 with a plan of action. The Dutch hierarchy issued a commentary on these preparatory documents, attacked them for their content, suggested they be completely re-written and that their own documents be considered first. The great majority of the Council Fathers, the world's bishops, had arrived in Rome with no pre-conceived ideas and were lulled into accepting these well-argued policies by people who were clever and persuasive. They voted to accept the Dutch demands. Well, to cut a long story very short, the original preparatory documents on which the 871 international scholars had worked for two years were thrown out by the Council, the first General Congregation was suspended after only 15 minutes, and only two weeks after the opening of the Council not one of these carefully prepared documents remained. Not a single sentence was retained. All were consigned to the wastepaper basket.

10. Father Ralph Wiltgen, of the Divine Word Missionaries, was head of the independent and multilingual Council News Service. After the Council he wrote a book called "The Rhine flows into the Tiber." It describes in very factual terms how this ruthless group of clerics from the Rhine countries of northern Europe gained control of the Council and moulded it to their own ends - and how they succeeded. "Looking back," wrote Cardinal Heenan, "it is easy to see how psychologically unprepared bishops were for what happened during the first session. Most of us arrived in Rome in October 1962 without any idea of the anti-Italian mood of many Europeans. The Conciliar Fathers for the most part shared Pope John's illusion that the bishops of the world had come together as brothers in Christ for a short convivial meeting."

Well, that short convivial meeting lasted for four long years and its results have been anything but convivial - the Church has been torn apart.

11. After they had achieved their objective of removing the orthodox and traditional preparatory documents the Rhine group of bishops then gained control of the commissions and committees which worked behind the scenes. The great majority of the Council Fathers were amazed when they were all presented with a printed list of names which most of them had never heard of but for whom they eventually voted. These maneuvers resulted in the complete liberal takeover of all the ten commissions that controlled the preparation of the texts which eventually became the official documents of the Second Vatican Council. These have been rightly called 'blitzkrieg tactics' and they succeeded.

"Jesus wept over Jerusalem," remarked Cardinal Heenan in 1968, "and Pope John

would have wept over Rome if he had foreseen what would be done in the name of his Council.”

12. The real problem with this organised group that controlled the Council was that they would not allow anything in the documents that might possibly offend the Protestant churches. Cardinal Heenan called them ecumaniacs. They preferred appeasement to the truth and to clear Catholic doctrine. Everything that was distinctly Catholic was played down. As Catholics, we all know the special place Our Lady has in our Church and in our own devotion. But even Our Lady was not safe. One Bishop declared that certain Council Fathers had carried their ecumenical preoccupations to excess. “It was no longer possible,” he said, “to speak about Our Lady.” Objections were raised against such titles as Mother of the Church and Mediatrix of all Graces, and quite disgracefully among the objectors, were four cardinals from the Rhine countries because these titles were “not in keeping with the ecumenical tendencies of Protestantism” [Professor Oscar Cullmann, Lutheran Observer]. Bishop William Adrian, from Nashville, U.S.A., said, “these liberal theologians seized on the Council as a means of de-catholicising the Catholic Church while pretending only to de-romanise it.”

Part II

THE DECREE ON THE LITURGY

13. There were 16 official documents promulgated by the Second Vatican Council. They covered a wide range of subjects from the liturgy, to ecumenism, to the Church in the modern world. In the short time I have available to me I shall deal with only one - The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (Sacrosanctum Concilium). This is the document that has had the biggest impact on the daily lives of the ordinary Catholics in the pew - people like ourselves. Where to begin?

14. The type of reform aimed for by the Rhine bishops was described by a German-born bishop named Duschak. He wished for an “ecumenical Mass” with the rite, language and gestures to be accommodated to the modern age. The Mass should be said aloud, in the vernacular, and facing the people. He admitted that none of these ideas had come from the people he served but was sure that if they were put into practice they would eventually accept them. What breathtaking arrogance! In a book written before the Council, Archdeacon Pawley, who became an Anglican Observer to the Council, described the changes in the Mass he would like to see; namely, the whole Mass in the vernacular, large numbers of priests concelebrating, the abolition of the prayers at the beginning of Mass, the abolition of the Last Gospel, and Communion under both kinds. Does this not sound familiar?

15. The debate on the liturgy was a tremendous struggle between the conservatives and the liberals. Cardinal Heenan said later that the bishops were given the opportunity of discussing only general principles and that the subsequent changes were far more radical than those intended by Pope John and the bishops. The plain fact is that most of the bishops at the Council were tricked on a number of important issues.

“The great mistake of the Council Fathers,” said Archbishop Dwyer of Portland, U.S.A., “was to allow the implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy to fall into the hands of men who were either unscrupulous or incompetent. This is the so-called ‘Liturgical Establishment’”.

16. About the Liturgy Constitution. How many people here tonight have read it, or even some of it? How many priests or bishops have actually read it? I have some copies with me. Read it for yourselves, see what the Council Fathers actually voted for and then ask yourself why you have the Mass you are now obliged to attend each Sunday. There is absolutely no connection between the two. The Constitution declared:

“in faithful obedience to tradition the Council declares that Holy Mother Church holds all lawfully recognised rites to be of equal right and dignity, that she wishes to preserve them in the future and to foster them in every way (article 4)”.

Has the old Mass been preserved and fostered? The Latin Mass Society does it. Who, then, is being faithful to the Council?

Under the general norms it states:

“Therefore, no other person, not even a priest, may add, remove, or change anything in the liturgy on his own authority (article 22)”.

Well, we all know that the Mass is no longer the Mass these days unless someone adds their own inventions to it. A veritable cottage industry of amateur liturgists has grown up in recent years.

“The use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites (article 36).”

Has it been preserved? We preserve it in the Latin Mass Society. Who, then, is being obedient and faithful to the Council?

“Care must be taken to ensure that the faithful may be able to say or sing together in Latin those parts of the Mass that pertain to them (article 54).”

When did you last sing in Latin in your parish church?

“The Church recognises Gregorian chant as being specially suited to the Roman liturgy. Therefore, other things being equal, it should be given pride of place in liturgical services (article 116).”

When did anyone here last sing the Kyrie, Gloria, or Credo, in their parish church. We in the Latin Mass Society do so. Who, then, is being obedient to the Council?

It has all been a sorry and catastrophic tragedy which has affected the whole Church, and the people who have suffered the most have been the young. They have been deprived of their birthright and robbed of their heritage, their history, and their traditions.

17. In the Constitution on the Liturgy you will see that there is nothing in it which even hints at such novelties as Mass facing the people, or a vernacular Mass, or Communion in the hand, or extraordinary ministers of Communion. All of these changes have been introduced not for the benefit of the Catholic faithful but because those in control - not your honest to goodness parish priests who probably have more problems than anyone in trying to make sense of all this - but unnamed members of faceless and distant liturgical commissions who have decreed that you are all going to be ecumenical whether you like it or not. The reformers will not change their ways because they are right. It is everyone else who is wrong. And they accept no responsibility for empty churches and empty seminaries other than perhaps they have not explained themselves sufficiently well enough. And so the merry-go-round of more meetings, and more documents, and yet more changes switches into action once again.

18. The new Mass was first celebrated in public in the Sistine Chapel on 24th October 1967 before the Synod of Bishops. Afterwards many of the bishops were very uneasy about what they had seen. Only 71 out of a total of 176 voted 'Yes' for the new rite. The rest voted 'No' or had reservations. It must also be remembered that the rest of the world's bishops were not given the opportunity of voting. The fact that their new rite of Mass had been rejected did not deter the reformers because this, in fact, with very minor alterations, became your new Mass.

19. Cardinal Heenan addressed the Synod the day after the experimental Mass had been presented and said he did not know the names of those who had proposed the new Mass but it was clear to him that few of them had ever been parish priests. "At home," he said, "it is not only women and children but also fathers of families and young men who come regularly to Mass. If we were to offer them the kind of ceremony we saw yesterday we would soon be left with a congregation of women and children."

He also said we needed more than ever to stress the Real Presence of Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament and that the faithful were growing restless and disturbed by too frequent changes in the Mass. Remember, this was in 1967! He concluded his speech by stating that the Latin tongue must be preserved. "If the Church is to

remain truly the Catholic Church it is essential to keep a universal tongue.” How tragically prophetic those words were.

20. When the new Mass was finally presented to Pope Paul VI he ordered the General Instruction for the Mass to be submitted to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith for examination and approval. In an act of unprecedented disobedience the Secretary of the Liturgy Commission which had prepared the new Mass ignored the Pope’s request and had it printed. When Pope Paul found out he wept over it from sorrow, shame and anger, said one cardinal. This was yet another example of the liturgical ecumaniacs determination to foist their concocted Mass upon the Church. Not even the Pope was going to stop them. As it turned out, this General Instruction was discovered to be so unrecognisable as regarding Catholic teaching that it required fifteen pages of corrections to make it even barely acceptable. The Mass, for example, was described as the Lord’s Supper being the assembly or meeting of the People of God with a priest presiding. The fact that the Mass is primarily a sacrifice was deliberately omitted.

21. This new rite of Mass, which no-one had asked for, and no-one wanted, was imposed generally upon the Church in 1969. In 1971 over 50 distinguished scholars, writers and historians, under the initiative of The Latin Mass Society, directed an appeal to the Pope, through Cardinal Heenan, to protect the old Latin Mass from extinction. The story is that Pope Paul read through the letter in silence then suddenly exclaimed, “Ah, Agatha Christie!” and then signed it. He must have been one of her fans. The English Indult of 1971 was granted and thus was saved the old Mass. Ever since it has been known informally as the Agatha Christie indult.

MASS FACING THE PEOPLE

22. How many millions of pounds have been spent on re-ordering beloved sanctuaries in this country and around the world so that Mass can be celebrated facing the people. The figure probably runs into thousands of millions. And why? Because the Council ordered it, we are told. This is completely untrue - always ask the person who tells you this for the evidence. They will not be able to provide it. There is not a single word in any of the 16 official documents of the Council suggesting anything of the kind. Well then, is the next line of argument, it is a return to the ancient practice of the Church. This is another untruth. The practice since the earliest days of the Church is that Mass has always been celebrated with the priest and people facing the East towards the rising sun, the symbol of the Resurrection. The priest did not have his back to the people - this is another piece of black propaganda put out to discredit the old Mass. The priest led his people in prayer and EVERYONE faced the same way, the East. Msgr. Klaus Gamber,

Director of the Liturgical Institute of Regensburg in Germany, said in a book published recently, “There never was a celebration facing the people in either the Eastern or Western Church. Instead there was a turning towards the East.” This book, incidentally, has a foreword of support by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

23. In all our churches there was always a crucifix on the altar or on the wall behind the altar. The reason being that when Christ died on the Cross on Calvary He was facing West and therefore, when Mass is being offered we all, priest and people, face the East towards Christ. It also emphasised the fact that the Catholic Mass is essentially a re-enactment of the Sacrifice of Calvary. During the Reformation in the sixteenth century the reformers such as Luther, Calvin and Cranmer, rejected the idea of the Mass as a sacrifice and turned their altars around to place the emphasis on a celebratory meal, and the celebrant, who they said had no special powers, merely presided over the assembly. It follows, therefore, that if the new Catholic reformers of the 1960s wished to become more ecumenical they would have to follow suit, remove the sacrificial altar away from the east wall from beneath the crucifix and turn it into an altar table where the priest ‘presides’ over the assembly.

24. How many people here tonight know that there were six officially appointed Protestant Observers at the Council representing the Anglican, Lutheran, and Taize Communities and the World Council of Churches and that they did more than observe? Msgr W Baum, from the U.S.A., who became Cardinal Baum, told the Detroit News on 27th June 1967,

“They are not simply there as observers, but as consultants as well, and they participate fully in the discussions on Catholic liturgical renewal. It wouldn’t mean much if they just listened, but they contribute.”

There you have it. A statement from a future cardinal explaining that the new rite of the Catholic Mass was prepared with contributions from non-Catholic churchmen - an ecumenical liturgy.

25. The fashion, and it no more than that, of saying Mass facing the people began in 1965 in Holland in imitation of the Protestant services. The Vatican sent out instructions saying that these Masses were not approved by the Holy See. These, like most things nowadays, were simply ignored. The disobedience and anarchy quickly spread and before you could blink an eye everyone was doing it. And why? Because Vatican II said so. If you are going to tell a lie you may as well make it a big one. I will repeat, there is no binding Church law which states that sanctuaries have to be changed in the way that they all have been. Indeed the situation is quite

nonsensical because when the official Latin text of the new rite of Mass was published in 1969 (and from which all vernacular translations have been taken) it was written in such a way that it clearly presumed the Mass would be celebrated in the same way as the old Mass; the priest being instructed to turn to the people for certain prayers. One of the worst aspects of the priest facing the people is that he now is in the unfortunate position of turning his back on the crucifix and the tabernacle. And we all accepted this, priests and people alike. Nearly 2,000 years of history and tradition was turned on its head and we all simply nodded our heads or kept silent. And why? Because Vatican II said so. The Catholic Church's great discipline of obedience turned out to be its most fatal flaw.

26. The new freedom that priests were given when celebrating this new order of Mass gave rise around the world to the most bizarre and often profane celebrations. We have had to suffer Rock'n'Roll Masses, Marxist Masses, Gay Masses, Clown Masses where priests dressed as clowns have leaped out of trunks to celebrate April Fools weekend. We have had two puppets named Noah and Norah being married during Mass. On Palm Sunday, to add realism, we have had a man riding a donkey down the centre aisle and, to cater for the ladies, a woman riding a pony at Christmas. One particular priest sits his dog on the sanctuary during Mass and it gives its paw during the exchange of peace before Communion.

27. In England, Father Michael Richards, editor of the Clergy Review complained as far back as 1975 that until the bishops remove those people responsible for the present day liturgy "The Mass as we have it in English will remain where it has descended, at the level of the bingo hall, the quiz programme and the lucky dip." Well, many did not accept this nonsense and left the Church in their millions. Others, such as the members of the Latin Mass Society will not be forced out of the Church we love. We will fight to restore the old Mass into its rightful place in the Church's liturgy and bring some dignity and reverence back into the worship of Almighty God.

COMMUNION IN THE HAND

28. Can I turn now to Communion in the hand. The Blessed Sacrament, Christ Himself, is God's greatest gift to mankind. Throughout the centuries up to the Second Vatican Council the devotion shown towards this Sacrament grew and grew. And, of course, this reverence became more noticeable in the distribution and reception of Holy Communion. In the very early centuries Holy Communion in the form of bread was given into the hands of the faithful but by as early as the fourth century when people were becoming more aware of the Divine Nature of the

Sacrament they became more anxious lest the tiniest particle should fall to the ground. This anxiety gave rise to the reception directly on the tongue of the recipient and as early as the Synod of Rouen in 650 A.D. the practice of receiving in the hand was condemned as an abuse. The Roman Ordo of the ninth century accepts Communion on the tongue as the normal practice.

29. Then came the Reformation in the sixteenth century. Catholics were accused of worshipping bread, of giving false honour to the Sacrament, and of priests showing wicked arrogance by claiming greater holiness than the people. To rid the people of this superstition and to show rejection of the Catholic belief in the Blessed Sacrament the reformers insisted on the host being placed in the hands of the recipients in that it was only a symbolic piece of bread. Since the Reformation, therefore, the reception of Communion on the tongue by Catholics testified to their belief in the Real Presence within the Sacrament. Reception in the hands by non-Catholics testified to their belief that it was only symbolic bread. This was the situation throughout the world up to the Second Vatican Council.

30. What then did Vatican II say about Communion in the hand? ... Nothing. Absolutely nothing. This practice was introduced soon after the Council by priests in Holland as an ecumenical gesture. It was a flagrant abuse of the established Catholic practice and should have been stopped immediately. Unfortunately it was not and spread to Germany, Belgium and France. Because the bishops failed to exercise their authority it was left to the laity to protest at this scandal and prompt Pope Paul VI to act. After consulting all the bishops of the world he issued an instruction called *Memoriale Domini* on 29th May 1969 and said that the traditional manner of receiving Holy Communion on the tongue should not be changed. He may as well not have bothered. Within the space of two years most of those bishops around the world who had voted in the majority to maintain the traditional practice succumbed to pressure from the liberals and authorised Communion in the hand.

31. A few years ago an American priest asked Mother Teresa what disturbed her most about the Church of today. She said the thing she found most troubling was reception of Communion in the hand. How right she is. We now treat the Body of Christ, the Blessed Sacrament, so casually we hand it around as if it is some everyday commodity.

CONCLUSION

32. So what are we to make of the past 25 or 30 years? I think it is particularly significant that in years gone by people said they were going to Mass. Nowadays, the more common expression is that they are going to church - perhaps, as they are not quite sure what awaits them when they get there, it is best not to be too specific. But what about THE MASS? The new Mass of 1969 is undoubtedly a valid Mass in itself. Unfortunately, as we all know, it allows such freedom to the celebrating priest that many Masses have strayed so far from the guidelines that their celebrations are unrecognisable as THE MASS to those of us who remember the old Latin rite.

33. We, the members of the Latin Mass Society have nailed our colours to the mast. We believe we are being absolutely faithful to the Second Vatican Council as decreed by the Council Fathers themselves. We believe there is no comparison whatsoever between the rite of 1962, which liturgical books we use, to whatever variation of the new rite is being offered in our parishes at any particular time by any particular priest. But we are not all old fogeys who will not, or cannot, move with the times and who are locked pathetically into a particular period in time like some liturgical fossils. Not at all. We have been joined over the years, in ever increasing numbers, by young men and women and converts who have been fortunate to discover the beauty and sheer sacredness of the old Latin Roman rite and have marvelled at what they have seen.

34. We are part of a worldwide organisation called Una Voce - One Voice, signifying, as Cardinal Heenan pointed out to the Synod of Bishops in 1967, the absolute importance of a single language, Latin, as being essential for a universal Church. After small beginnings with the English Indult in 1971 we then, after the election of Pope John-Paul II, obtained a world-wide indult in 1984. Then in 1988, after Archbishop Lefebvre was excommunicated, the Pope more or less removed all restrictions on the celebrations of the old Mass. We now have religious orders around the world who, with the direct approval of the Pope, use only the old Latin books for all their liturgical services. And not only priests but bishops, archbishops and cardinals around the world are now returning to the old Mass. It is a fact that the new Mass continues to decline worldwide and the old Mass is growing in strength. It is the traditional seminaries that are full and are expanding while those training priests in the new rite are empty and closing. I heard it said recently that the future of the Church lies in its past. This is becoming more and more evident as each year goes by.

35. We cannot be complacent, however. It is still imperative that those who love the old Mass continue to ask for it and continue to support it. After many years of struggle, heartache, disappointment, anger, and so many other emotions, we can at last see a chink of light. It is one of the aims of the Latin Mass Society to restore the old Mass once more to our parish churches. If you love the old Mass please help us to do it, and give whatever help and support you can to this society, to those who arrange the old rite Masses, and to those priests who celebrate these Masses for us. If we all show a unity of strength and purpose, combined with charity, then we will surely succeed.

Thank you all very much for coming and giving me your kind attention. I hope you found this little talk of some interest