

Genuflecting to the Jews

– Most Rev. Donald J. Sanborn –
www.traditionalmass.org

Benedict XVI replaces the Good Friday prayer for the Jews in the '62 Missal

IN JULY 2007, Ratzinger authorized the widespread use of the modified form of the traditional Mass contained in the 1962 Missal of John XXIII. One of the most vocal negative reactions to his initiative came from the Jews, who objected to the prayer for their conversion that the Missal prescribed for the Good Friday liturgical service. On Ash Wednesday 2008, in response to a fairly aggressive campaign from various Jewish pressure groups, Ratzinger finally replaced the prayer with another text entirely.

This was the *fourth* change made in connection with the prayer of the Jews. The traditional version is extremely ancient (one of the oldest texts in the Missal), and was used at the Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday:

Let us pray also for the faithless Jews: that Almighty God remove the veil from their hearts, so that they too might acknowledge Jesus Christ Our Lord.

Let us pray.

Almighty and eternal God, who does not exclude from Thy mercy even Jewish faithlessness: hear our prayers, which we offer for the blindness of that people; that acknowledging the light of Thy truth, which is Christ, they may be delivered from their darkness. Through the same Lord Jesus Christ, who lives and reigns with Thee in the unity of the Holy Ghost, God, world without end. Amen.

The reference to the veil on their hearts is directly from St. Paul (II Cor. III: 13-16):

And not as Moses put a veil upon his face, that the children of Israel might not steadfastly look on the face of that which is made void. But their senses were made dull. For, until this present day, the self-same veil, in the reading of the old testament, remaineth not taken away (because in Christ it is made void). But even until this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart. But when they shall be converted to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away.

It should also be noted that in the traditional rite

the priest and congregation do not make the genuflection after the priests says *oremus*, or *let us pray*. The reason is that the Church considered it inappropriate to use, at this point in which reference is made to the infidelity of the Jews, the same gesture – the genuflection – as the Jewish soldiers did to mock Jesus. The same principle is applied on Holy Saturday when there is no *flectamus genua* (*let us kneel*) after the twelfth lesson, in which is commemorated the refusal of the three young men to genuflect, as an act of idolatry, to the statue of Nabuchodonosor.

Changes in the Prayer

(1) **1955: Genuflection Introduced.** In 1955, there was a major revision of the rites of Holy Week, engineered and designed by none other than the author of the New Mass, Annibale Bugnini.

Among other things, a genuflection was inserted in the prayer for the conversion of the Jews. This was probably the first time, in the entire history of the Church, that a rite of the Church was influenced by a “sensitivity” to non-Catholics.

(2) **1959: “Faithless” Removed.** In 1959, the word *faithless* was removed from the prayer by John XXIII.

In Latin the word is *perfidis*, which transliterates, but does not translate, into *perfidious*. I emphasize the fact that it merely *transliterates*, which means that it looks very similar to the English word *perfidious*, but that the Latin does not carry the meaning of the English word *perfidious*. Pope Pius XII had been urged by Eugenio Maria Zolli, formerly Israel Zolli and chief Rabbi of Rome before converting to Catholicism in 1945, to remove the word “*perfidis*” from the Good Friday prayer for the Jews:

For some time the ex-Chief Rabbi and the reigning Pope spoke privately. Zolli later told Dezza [the priest, later Cardinal, who baptized Zolli] that he had entreated the pontiff to remove references in the solemn Good Friday liturgy to “perfidious Jews.” Pius refused to do so and explained to Zolli that the adjective “perfidious” which is ordinarily defined

as “deliberately faithless” or “treacherous” or “deceitful” actually meant “incredulous” in the context of the Catholic prayers.¹

This is the John XXIII prayer, which is contained in the 1962 Missal:

Let us pray also for the Jews: that almighty God may remove the veil from their hearts; so that they too may acknowledge Jesus Christ our Lord.

Let us pray. Let us kneel. Arise.

Almighty and eternal God, who dost also not exclude from Thy mercy the Jews: hear our prayers, which we offer for the blindness of that people; that acknowledging the light of Thy truth, which is Christ, they may be delivered from their darkness. Through the same Lord Jesus Christ, who lives and reigns with Thee in the unity of the Holy Ghost, God, world without end. Amen.

(3) **1970: “Conversion” Goes.** In 1970, Paul VI abolished the traditional prayer entirely, and substituted this prayer, which appears in the 1970 Novus Ordo Missal:

Let us pray for the Jewish people, the first to hear the word of God, that they may continue to grow in the love of his name and in faithfulness to his covenant.

(Prayer in silence.) Then the priest says:

Almighty and eternal God, long ago you gave your promise to Abraham and his posterity. Listen to your Church as we pray that the people you first made your own may arrive at the fullness of redemption. We ask this through Christ our Lord. Amen.

It should be noted that in the 1970 Missal all reference to the *conversion* of the Jews is removed. The prayer clearly states that they can achieve the “fullness of redemption” by merely *continuing* “to grow in the love of his name and in faithfulness to his covenant.” So despite the fact that they deny Christ, they are described as loving the name of God and as being faithful to His covenant. Such statements blatantly contradict the holy gospels and the epistles of Saint Paul. Indeed, it is raw blasphemy.

(4) **2008: A Bizarre Creation.** On July 7, 2007, Ratzinger issued a document, a Motu Proprio, entitled *Summorum Pontificum*, in which he liberally permitted the use of the 1962 Missal, which is substantially, although far from perfectly, the traditional Mass. The Holy Week rites contained in it, however, are not traditional at all, but are the product of the Modernist

and reputed Freemason Bugnini.

Shortly after this dramatic and long-awaited permission of the 1962 Missal, the Anti-Defamation League, (ADL) the Jewish watchdog group which blows the whistle on everything which it perceives to be anti-Jewish, referred to the permission of the 1962 Missal as a “body-blow” to Catholic-Jewish relations.

Moved by such an accusation, Ratzinger recently altered the prayer of the 1962 Missal to read this way:

Let us also pray for the Jews: That our God and Lord may illuminate their hearts, that they acknowledge that Jesus Christ is the Savior of all men.

Let us pray. Let us kneel. Rise.

Almighty and eternal God, who want that all men be saved and come to the recognition of the truth, propitiously grant that even as the fulness of the peoples enters Thy Church, all Israel be saved. Through Christ Our Lord. Amen.

Before we say anything, it must be averred that this prayer takes the first prize as being the most *bizarre* prayer ever to be formulated by anyone.

By the admission of the Modernist inhabitants of the Vatican, the prayer is a reference to Romans XI: 25-26: “*For I would not have you ignorant, brethren, of this mystery, (lest you should be wise in your own conceits), that blindness in part has happened in Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles should come in. And so all Israel should be saved, as it is written: There shall come out of Sion, he that shall deliver, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.*”

St. Paul on the Jews

Does St. Paul save Ratzinger’s prayer? No. For Ratzinger’s prayer makes no mention of the necessity of the Jews to abandon their unbelief (*perfidia*), their darkness, their blindness, and the veil over their eyes. For St. Paul mentions all of these things.

- In Galatians V: 4 he says that the Jews have fallen from grace: “*You are made void of Christ, you who are justified in the law: you are fallen from grace.*”

- In Romans IX: 32-33, he says that they have stumbled through their rejection of Christ: “*For they stumbled at the stumblingstone. As it is written: Behold I lay in Sion a stumblingstone and a rock of scandal; and whosoever believeth in him shall not be confounded.*”

- In Romans XI: 7-8, St. Paul says that the Jews are blinded, and have the spirit of insensibility: “*What then? That which Israel sought, he hath not obtained: but the election hath obtained it; and the rest have been blinded. As it is written: God hath given them the spirit of insensibility; eyes that they should not see; and ears that they should not hear, until this present day.*”

- In Romans XI: 27-30, St. Paul says that the fulfillment of His covenant with the Jews will be the re-

1. Robert G. Weisbord and Wallace P. Sillanpoa, *The Chief Rabbi, the Pope, and the Holocaust: An Era in Vatican-Jewish Relations*, page 171.

moval of their ungodliness, which is their sin, and that they are enemies of the gospel, and that they are guilty of unbelief: “*There shall come out of Sion, he that shall deliver, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob. And this is to them my covenant: when I shall take away their sins. As concerning the gospel, indeed, they are enemies for your sake: but as touching the election, they are most dear for the sake of the fathers. For the gifts and the calling of God are without repentance. For as you also in times past did not believe God, but now have obtained mercy, through their unbelief.*”

• In II Corinthians 13-15, St. Paul says that there is a veil on their hearts, and that the Old Testament is void: “*And not as Moses put a veil upon his face, that the children of Israel might not steadfastly look on the face of that which is made void. But their senses were made dull. For, until this present day, the selfsame veil, in the reading of the old testament, remaineth not taken away (because in Christ it is made void). But even until this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart.*”

According to the reasoning which animates the change in the Good Friday prayer, it would be necessary to rip out these pages from St. Paul.

Indeed it is clear that nothing was in the Good Friday prayer which was not first in St. Paul. Ratzinger cannot cite the authority of St. Paul for his prayer, and at the same time repudiate what the Apostle says in these verses. In fact, his reference to St. Paul invites the reader to look up these texts, only to find statements which the ADL would find outrageous. It should never be forgotten that St. Paul himself was a Jew, indeed a former Pharisee.

Jews Living at the End of Time?

The picture painted by Ratzinger’s prayer is one of all peoples – understand only the *Gentiles*, for that is the sense of his prayer in the original Latin – coming into the Church (*Frankenchurch*, the ecumenical one-world Church) and at the same time the salvation of all Israel. It implies that the Church is necessary only for the Gentiles, since the Jews have their own covenant with God, which gives them salvation. Why, for example, was there no reference to Jews’ *ungodliness* to which St. Paul makes mention in the very same verse from which this prayer is taken? One can only wonder what the prayer would have sounded like if St. Paul had written it.

The section of the epistle to the Romans, to which Ratzinger’s prayer refers, concerns the return of the Jews as a whole (but not absolutely all) to the Catholic Church at the end of time. It therefore refers to a specific point in history in which Jews living at the time will convert *en masse* to Catholicism. A number of exegetes speculate that this will in some way coincide with the loss of faith on the part of the Gentiles, in the

time of the Great Apostasy from the faith. It seems to fit the sense of St. Paul, if you read the entire eleventh chapter of Romans, and compare it to II Thessalonians, where he speaks of the Great Apostasy. In other words, it would seem appropriate that the Jews obtain the faith when the Gentiles lose it, just as the Gentiles obtained the faith at the same time that the Jews lost it.

St. Paul, furthermore, does not envisage a general joining of the Catholic Church toward the end of time. In fact, he foresees the opposite, as does Our Lord Himself. The view that the Church will be reduced to a very small number is supported by many commentators. St. Paul’s reference to the Gentiles’ entry into the Church refers to the fact that the gospel will have been preached to all peoples, and that at least some of each people on earth will have embraced Catholicism, therefore, is restricted to only some Jews in a specific time in the future. It is not a general prayer for the conversion of *all* unfaithful Jews who are now living.

“Cardinal” Kasper, the ultra-arch-Modernist in the Vatican who is in charge of relations with the Jews, confirmed this fact. “...it concerns an invocation which must be understood according to the source of the words used to formulate the prayer: it is a text of Paul the Apostle and expresses the eschatological hope – that is, it refers to the last times, to the end of history – that the people of Israel enter into the Church when all the other peoples will enter. I mean that it expresses a final hope and not an intention to try to convert them.”

In fact it is not a prayer for the *conversion* of any Jews, since it does not speak of their abandonment of unbelief and their entering the Church. It should not be forgotten that in the *Novus Ordo* theology, the Jews have their own covenant with God, still valid despite their rejection of Christ, which covenant will bring them to salvation.

So a prayer for the conversion of the Jews, i.e., those existing here and now in the world, is not compatible with the *Novus Ordo* theology regarding them. Despite this fact, Ratzinger’s prayer is still entitled *For the conversion of the Jews*, as it was in the 1962 Missal. Oddly, it still calls for the “illumination” of their hearts, obviously implying that Jews have darkened hearts.

Insulting the Jewish religion?

Ratzinger has tried to please both sides, traditionalists and Jews, and succeeded in pleasing neither. He tossed a bone to the traditionalists by retaining the title calling for the conversion of the Jews, which angered the Jews, and he tossed a bone to the Jews by removing the reference to the veil over their hearts,

which is, as we saw, also from St. Paul. But this was not enough for the Jews, since they feel that a call for their conversion from Judaism is an insult to their religion.

Indeed it is. But their religion is a false one, and it is the business of the Catholic Church to insult falsehood, as much as it is its business to proclaim the truth. Our Lord said *"For this was I born, and for this came I into the world; that I should give testimony to the truth. Every one that is of the truth, heareth my voice."* (John XVIII: 37) For falsehood, whatever its form, is the product of the devil, coming as it does from ignorance and pride, both effects of original sin.

What need have we of the Catholic Church if it does not clearly distinguish to the whole world what is the true religion, and what is the false? What need have we of the Catholic Church if it does not fulfill the command of Christ to preach the gospel to all peoples, including the Jews, *with the intention of converting them?* Our Lord said to the Apostles: *"Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned."* (Mark XVI: 16) This is an unequivocal order from God to convert the whole world to Catholicism. What need have we of a church which is not faithful to the commandments of its Divine Founder?

But the Jews, aggressive as is their wont, insist that the Catholic Church abandon the commandments of its Divine Founder, whom they consider to be a phony. They will not be pleased until the *conversion* word is gone, and until a prayer is substituted which proclaims their independent and ever valid agreement with God, enabling them to ignore Christ and His Church.

Ratzinger, in changing the Good Friday prayer, did essentially what Pontius Pilate did on Good Friday: in order to appease a crowd of Jews calling for the death of Christ, he had Him whipped and crowned with thorns, in the hope that the half-measure would have the full effect of satisfying the death-demanding rabble. But all he received in return for this cowardly and dastardly act was ever louder cries of *"Crucify Him! Crucify Him!"* He also merited a permanent place of shame in the Nicene Creed.

The Italian Rabbinical Assembly, on the very day after the publication of the new prayer, suspended its dialogue with Ratzinger, saying that the modification of the prayer is "an abandonment of the very conditions for dialogue." Other Jewish groups mounted protests as well. *USA Today* reports:

"We're disappointed. We were expecting language that would make room for the integrity of Jewish faith in its own right. Obviously, Benedict is not

able to do this in terms of his theological outlook – unlike his predecessors," said Rabbi David Rosen, director of interreligious affairs for the American Jewish Committee and head of the International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations, engaged in ongoing dialogue with the Vatican.

"The more we can get constructive positive statements from the Church regarding the validity of Judaism and respect for Judaism, the better we can counteract such exclusivist language," Rosen said.

Abraham Foxman, national director of the New York-based Anti-Defamation League, said that he was "deeply troubled" that the intention to petition God for Jews to accept Jesus as Lord was kept intact.²

The Society of Saint Pius X

The Society of Saint Pius X is also deeply troubled. Fr. Peter R. Scott said: "This prayer consequently favors ecumenism, and is not acceptable to traditional Catholics, nor will it be used. Traditional Catholics will not accept that the traditional Missal be tampered with, and that Benedict XVI succeed in his plan of bringing about an influence of the 'ordinary' form, changing the 'extraordinary form' of the Roman rite, as he calls it. Just as traditional priests retain the words 'faithless' and 'infidelity' that John XXIII tried to remove, so likewise will they retain the traditional prayer for the conversion of the Jews."³

If Fr. Scott is speaking the mind of the leadership of the SSPX, it means that this organization has been set back about thirty years in its negotiations with the Modernists. Others in the SSPX, however, have expressed a favorable view toward the prayer, indicating a divided camp in that group. But this has always been the case. At this writing, Bishop Fellay remains silent. Indeed, he is on the horns of a dilemma. If he refuses the prayer, he will be accused of disobeying the "Holy Father," and will probably cut off thereby any further negotiations with the Vatican for the re-absorption of the SSPX into the Modernist religion. If he accepts it, he will alienate the conservative wing of his group, and will also concede the principle that the traditional Mass is subject to yet further changes.

It should be recalled that what occasioned our 1983 split with them was the John XXIII Mass, i.e., the 1962 Missal. The reason why Archbishop Lefebvre insisted that all take this missal, reversing his previ-

2. February 6, 2008.

3. When we were expelled from the Society of Saint Pius X in 1983, we were accused of not being obedient to the pope, i.e., John XXIII, because we would not accept his missal. Yet Fr. Scott clearly praises those priests who reject the changes which John XXIII made in 1959. Notice the use of the term "tried to remove." Tried? If he was the Holy Father, then he did remove these words. How could his act be a mere attempt, unless for some reason he was not the Holy Father? How times change.

ous position of permitting the pre-1955 rubrics, was that he was in very serious negotiations with Ratzinger to have his Fraternity absorbed into the Modernist religion. He himself told me personally that the Vatican would never accept that we use the pre-1955 rubrics, and I saw myself the documents regarding the dialogue between him and Ratzinger, in which the 1962 Missal was on the table as the missal which would be approved for use by the Fraternity.

The music has stopped, however, in this thirty-year dance with the Modernists. Now the 1962 Missal is no longer in vigor; the 2008 Missal has replaced it. Someone correctly pointed out that the 1962 Missal had only a two-year existence in the 1960's, having been replaced by the reforms of 1964, and then a short five-month existence in 2007 and 2008, only to be replaced now by the Jewish Missal.

So where does the SSPX go now? Ratzinger cannot revert back to the 1962 prayer. If the SSPX does not accept the new prayer, they will have to remain exactly where they are, in a no-man's land of theological absurdity, one in which they are "with the pope," but he is not with them. In fact, I think that they really want to be in this position in any case. I believe that they view this prayer with a sigh of relief, since it gives them a perfect excuse to decline the invitation of Ratzinger to reconcile.

The Wisdom of Resisting in 1983

In 1983, when the nine priests made a stand over the maintenance of the St. Pius X rubrics of the missal, calendar and breviary, few lay people understood the importance of it. The average lay person cannot distinguish the 1962 traditional Mass from the pre-1955 traditional Mass, which is the one we use. But there are significant differences.

Liturgy speaks volumes through gesture and symbolism. So what appears to be a little gesture or word can have great symbolic weight. It is a mortal sin, for example, to deliberately leave out the drop of water in the chalice at the Offertory, or to say Mass without two candles burning. The lay person might think that these are trivialities, but the priest understands their liturgical importance.

For once you admit the omission of one of these symbolic acts, or of a very important word, the path is opened to everything which the change implies. By the adding of the genuflection at the prayer for the conversion of the Jews, for example, the door is opened to alter the Catholic liturgy according as anyone may be offended by it. Indeed, what shall we say of the entire gospel of St. John, which the Jews find anti-Semitic. Shall it too undergo cleansing and bleaching according to ADL standards?

Our painful stand in 1983 was therefore necessary

in order to keep out of the sacred liturgy all of the Bugnini-manufactured changes of 1955, which led quite logically to the Bugnini-manufactured Novus Ordo liturgy of 1969. The SSPX finds itself in a quandary at the present time for the very reason that they did take, in the 1962 Missal, the initial Bugnini reforms. How then does one say "no" to the Old Modernist now, when he requires this concession to the Jews, when they already accepted John XXIII's concession to the Jews in the 1962 Missal?

Where Does It Stop?

A further consideration in the Ratzingerian prayer is: Where does this stop? If the prayers of the Catholic Mass are to be altered according as every false religion finds them offensive, what will be left of the Catholic Mass? What about references to "crushing the enemies of the Church," an obvious reference to both Protestants and Moslems, in the collect of Saint Pius V? Or the prayer in the Mass for the Propagation of the Faith, which prays that all peoples recognize Jesus Christ as the Son of God? Is this not offensive to Jews? If Ratzinger's appeasement of Jews and non-Catholics is taken to its logical conclusion, the Catholic liturgy could be compared to the carcass of a water buffalo in Africa being devoured by a pack of hyenas.

It Was Tried Before...

This very point was realized back in 1928. There was a large group of clergy called the *Amici Israel*, (*Friends of Israel*) back in the 1920's which was calling for the removal of the word *perfidis* from the Good Friday prayer. This group comprised no less than 2,000 priests, 328 bishops, and 19 cardinals, among them the famous Cardinal of Munich, Michael von Faulhaber. The group was formed in Rome in 1926. The purpose was the furtherance of reconciliation of Christians and Jews. It should not be forgotten that the 1920's was a period of feverish ecumenical activity. It met with a very forceful condemnation by Pope Pius XI in 1928, in his encyclical *Mortalium Animos*, which condemned the movement down to its very roots and first principles.

The *Amici Israel* asked Pius XI in 1928 that the word *perfidis* be removed from the prayer for the conversion of the Jews on Good Friday. Pius XI referred the matter to the Congregation of Rites. One of its Consultors, the well-known Benedictine by the name of Ildephonse Schuster, later the Cardinal-archbishop of Milan, urged for the change, saying that *perfidis* had changed meaning in modern languages. He argued that it is easily understood as meaning *perfidious* in the modern sense, that is "wicked," "iniquitous." In this he was perfectly correct; the modern term *perfidious* in nearly all modern languages means some-

thing different from the Latin *perfidus*, and especially in the context of the Church's Good Friday prayer.

As we saw above, the Jewish perfidy, in the Church's view, is the proper term for their form of infidelity. They cannot be called heretics, since they are not baptized. Yet they are distinguished from other infidels, e.g., Moslems, Buddhists, etc., who have never known revelation.

So the term *perfidy* is ascribed to their infidelity, with the meaning that they are unfaithful to their own Law and covenant by not accepting the true Messiah. The relationship of the Jews to God is one of *covenant* or agreement. In Latin, the word *perfidus* is used concerning someone who is unfaithful to his agreement or contract.

The reader would do well to consult Leviticus 26:14-45 to understand God's wrath upon the Jews if they should break the Law and the covenant. It is the teaching of the Catholic Church that the Law and the covenant are fulfilled in Christ and in the His Church, the Roman Catholic Church. The prolongation of Judaism, which is the rejection of Christ as the true Messiah, consists in an infidelity to God as the other party in the solemn and sacred contract of the covenant, which was further ratified by the Mosaic Law.

Rejected by Pius XI

The Sacred Congregation of Rites in 1928 approved of the proposed reform, i.e., to remove *perfidus* from the prayer for the conversion of the Jews. The matter was then referred to the Holy Office.

The Theologian of the Papal Court, Marco Sales O.P., responded that the prayer is so old that it should not be changed. He also said that it is a well that has no bottom, i.e., that if you make this change, many other will be demanded by using the same principle.

But Cardinal Merry del Val, whom St. Pius X considered a living saint, who was then Secretary of the Holy Office, responded with yet greater negativity. He said that what the *Amici Israel* wanted was no longer the conversion of the Jews, but the crossing of the Jews from the kingdom of the Father to the kingdom of the Son. In other words, in such a scheme, it would not be necessary that Jews repudiate Judaism in order to be considered Christians. The Cardinal said that such a position was unacceptable. He said that the prayer for the Jews in the Mass of the Presanctified was venerable for its antiquity, and that it was something that could not be reformed.

The Cardinal further stated that *perfidus* in the ancient rite expresses the "abhorrence for the rebellion and betrayal" of the Jews. The judgment of the Holy Office was: *nihil esse innovandum* — nothing should be changed.

The decree which suppressed the *Amici Israel*

stated that Judaism was "the custodian of the divine promises up to Jesus Christ" and that it is this no more since Jesus Christ. It further stated that the Jews were "the once elected people of God." The obvious implication is that since this election has become invalid, so also the covenant, in which the election of God manifests itself, has been terminated and revoked.

Pope Pius XI approved of the decision of the Holy Office, and went further. He required the petitioners of the *Amici Israel* to abandon the whole idea and the organization was dissolved.

This gesture of Ratzinger to the Jews, which has fallen flat on its face, is an indication of the willingness of the Modernists to continue to toy with the Catholic Mass in the interests of ecumenism. If so, then why have the traditional Mass at all? As some have already said, this change in the prayer proves that the traditional Mass is incompatible with Vatican II.

Is the Breviary Next?

Ratzinger's *Motu Proprio* specifically permits the use of the 1962 John XXIII breviary. In it, the references to the Jews make the Good Friday prayer in the Missal look very tame in comparison.

The Good Friday readings from *Tenebrae*, drawn from the works of St. Augustine, accuse the Jews who crucified Christ of being "evildoers," and "stubborn." The holy Doctor accuses the Jews of being guilty of the death of Christ, killing Him not with swords, but with their tongues: "But O you, His own Jewish people, you in full truth did kill Him. And how did you kill Him? With the sword of the tongue. For like a sword you sharpen your tongue. And when did you strike the blow, but when you cried out: Crucify Him, crucify Him?"

Many other parts of Sacred Scripture and the commentaries of the Fathers speak negatively about the Jewish infidelity, and their participation in the death of Christ. Will these have to go?

Heinrich Heine, the famous pro-communist Jewish literary figure in nineteenth-century Germany said: "Wherever they burn books they will also, in the end, burn human beings."

Modernism and Catholicism: Incompatible

The change made by Ratzinger means that we are back to the 1960's all over again. Anyone who lived in that decade will remember their Mass being cropped, diluted, altered, and truncated little by little, month by month, year by year. The traditionalists who clamored for the 1962 Missal want something that *will not change*. Ratzinger's gesture to the Jews, however, establishes the principle that whatever there is in the 1962 Missal — or breviary — which is not of Vatican II, must go.

The case also shows that Catholicism and ecumenism, which is Modernism, are utterly antithetical, and that any attempt to put them together will flop as badly as this prayer has. Will the Society of Saint Pius X ever understand this?

Furthermore it should be noted that despite Ratzinger's thrilling baroque miters and dazzling florid copes complete with hand-embroidered curlicues — both worn by him on Christmas — he has not taken a single step backward from the real problem infecting our Catholic institutions: ecumenism. The Old Modernist is as determined as ever to force ecumenism down the throats of Catholics, even if he has to administer the poison in a towering baroque miter and a splendid cope. Yet so many traditional Catholics look at these garments, which are nothing but theatrical costumes if they are not clothing the truth, and get goose bumps because of their illusion that, with Ratzinger, the end of Vatican II and Modernism is at hand.

Trappings of Tradition to Save the Revolution

Students of history know that all of the great revolutionaries who succeeded in establishing their revolutions were not the radicals like Robespierre and Julius Caesar, but the moderates like Napoleon and Augustus, who carefully respected existing institutions, traditions, and trappings, but cleverly used these things as grease in order to let pass the substance of their reform.

The same may be said for Cromwell, whose radical regime did not last, but whose principles lasted because they were cloaked in monarchy by the restoration of the Stuarts in the person of Charles II in 1661. The radical Puritans had chopped off the head of their king Charles I in 1649, had established the supremacy of Parliament under their control, and then not long after the death of Cromwell in 1658 invited back a king, Charles II, who became what British monarchs have been ever since: powerless creatures of Parliament who parade in costume from time to time, busying their days in many cases with immorality and luxurious pastimes. The revolution was established under the cover of the lacy and velvety baroque cloaks of Charles II. Proof of this fact is that when James II, successor to Charles, tried to undo what the Puritans had done, he was expelled from the throne in what is dubiously entitled the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688.

Ratzinger's revolution was Vatican II. He was one of its principal architects and mentors. He was its midwife. His revolution is now in trouble, as its effects are being felt: widespread defection of the youth from any religion whatsoever, the "silent apostasy" of Europe, the disappearance of vocations. He is trying to save his revolution by the tried and true methods of old revolutionaries. As history also proves, most of the conservatives fall for it.

Genuflecting to the Jews

This entire debacle started with a single ecumenical gesture in 1955: the adding of the genuflection at the prayer for the conversion of the Jews. Apologists for the 1955 Bugnini reforms, such as the SSPX, argue that one is not genuflecting to the Jews but to God. While it can be rightly argued that the genuflection is meant for God and not the Jews, and that there is no intrinsic necessity to leave out this genuflection, and that it does not offend the faith to insert it, it can also be rightly argued that it is the first time in which the Catholic liturgy was subjected to the demands of ecumenism. It was the first time that a false religion managed to assert itself in the Catholic sanctuary. Is it not, at least symbolically, a genuflection to the Jews?

The strength of the Catholic Church, however, is precisely that it does *not* let any temporal consideration affect its doctrine, its liturgy, or its essential disciplines, whether it be politics, false religions, or wars. The Church sails through human storms and vicissitudes of thought and fashion as if they did not exist. The purpose of the Catholic Church is to give testimony unto the truth, as her Divine Master and Founder said, about to be crucified by those who were not of the truth, none other than the very Jews in Pilate's courtyard crying "*Crucify Him!*"

It does not serve either the testimony of the truth nor the charity which the Church owes to the Jews, to call their rejection of Christ a true religion, or to say or even imply that they have no need of conversion to Roman Catholicism. To fail to will this conversion, to fail to pray for it, to fail to strive for it, is the greatest insult which we can offer Jews, the greatest lack of charity towards them, as well as a blistering blasphemy against the messianic dignity, royalty, and divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

(MHT Seminary Newsletter, March 2008)