

Ss. Peter & Paul Roman Catholic Mission

P.O. Box 7352
York, PA 17408
(717) 792-2789

www.saintspeterandpaulrcm.com

BACK
HOME

April 24, 2019
+Easter Wednesday
St. Fidelis of Sigmaringen, Martyr

Most Rev. Charles, J. Chaput, O.F.M., Cap.
Archbishop of Philadelphia
222 North Seventeenth Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-1299

Dear Archbishop Chaput,

Reading Bishop emeritus Benedict/Ratzinger's take on the current problem of sex abuse among the clergy was not particularly interesting. Here is a man who by his own claim "*served in a position of responsibility as shepherd of the Church at the time of the public outbreak of the crisis, and during the run-up to it,*" and cannot admit to any personal responsibility in the crisis. He blames the secular and pagan world for the corruption of the Church. The mission of the Church is to convert the world, not the other way around, and then again, perhaps that is what the real 'spirit of Vatican II' was all about. But in the end, it is unfortunate because without admitting responsibility it will be impossible to repent and any attempt at making satisfaction is unthinkable.

This fundamental moral failure is followed by an intellectual failure. He repeatedly describes the sexual abuse crisis as "pedophilia" which it is not. The vast majority of sexual abuse cases is pederasty, that is, homosexuals who have become priests to use the clerical collar as a cover for their perverse predatory abuse of adolescent boys. Benedict/Ratzinger does not even correctly define the problem for which he claims to be offering a solution.

Cardinal Gerhard Müller says that Benedict/Ratzinger angered his critics because he "pierced the boil." He unfortunately did not "pierce" anything. He did not so much as scratch this festering scab for the same reason that Müller indicated during an interview with LifeSiteNews: "With a false diagnosis, one can never find the right therapy, but, rather, one will only worsen the illness." At least Cardinal Müller clearly dismissed the absurd claim of Pope Francis that the abuse crisis is due to "clericalism."

But Benedict/Ratzinger's moral and intellectual failings are not the purpose of my letter. It has to do with you, and what Benedict/Ratzinger calls the "maximum penalty" (laicization), "expulsion from the clergy, which could not have been imposed under other legal provisions." He also discusses the legal doctrine of "guarantorism" which concerns the protection of the legal rights of the accused which were emphasized even to the point of ignoring the rights of the faithful and the faith itself. He therefore said, "In principle, the Congregation of the Clergy is responsible for dealing with crimes committed by priests. But since guarantorism dominated the situation to a large extent at the time.... it was appropriate to assign the competence for these offences to the Congregation for the Doctrine

of the Faith, under the title ‘Delicta maiora contra fidem’” for the purpose of defending the rights of the faithful and the faith itself. Thus, Benedict/Ratzinger argues that both the rights of the accused, and the rights of the faithful and the faith itself, can be protected under the jurisdiction of the CDF, saying, “The severity of the punishment, however, also presupposes a clear proof of the offense — this aspect of guarantorism remains in force.”

This brings me to my case and your actions. You instituted a process of administrative laicization against me while I explicitly made known to you in writing my intention of remaining an active priest within the Catholic Church demanding from you canonical due process which is my legal and moral right. The use of administrative laicization is a process necessarily limited to those who have without question abandoned the priesthood, and for whom you have moral certainty that they have no intention whatsoever of returning. This was done to me because I became a priest aware of Catholic tradition and defended my right and the right of the faithful to these traditions based upon Catholic dogma and Catholic morality. You refused to take my case to the CDF and illegally and immorally denied my right to a formal judgment on my arguments by the CDF and my rights to canonical due process. But what Benedict/Ratzinger makes clear, you also failed to protect the rights of the faith itself.

You committed this injustice against me while at the same time homosexual pederasts, who were corrupting both adolescent boys and the faith itself (Delicta maiora contra fidem), were afforded canonical due process under the doctrine of guarantorism with formal judgment by the CDF. What is worse, not only did you trample upon my canonical rights of due process, you trampled upon the rights of the faith itself to be protected. Apparently, the principle of guarantorism is only selectively applied for those who are to be protected, and decidedly absent for those who are to be destroyed. As for the faith itself you apparently are indifferent. Your action in this matter is morally and legally reprehensible. This sin of yours is grave, and what is worse, even if you repent, it is likely impossible for you to ever make satisfaction which is a necessary attribute of the sacramental matter of penance (Council of Trent) to obtain absolution of sin and mitigation of punishment. This sin against justice is also a sin against the virtues of faith and charity. Faith because my actions are justified by direct appeals to Catholic dogma. Against charity because mortal sin destroys charity in the soul.

A traditional priest friend has been recently diagnosed with metastatic cancer of the pancreas and is not expected to live much longer. He was disappointed that he was unable to spend Holy Week at Ss. Peter & Paul in York this year as he did last year for the Triduum and the singing of Tenebrae which we did in its entirety according to the “received and approved” rites of the Roman Catholic Church. The news of his failing health and his absence were reminders during Holy Week of what we all will soon face: “Remember man that thou art dust, and to dust thou shalt return.” Our personal judgment before Jesus Christ is a fearful thing to contemplate. You had better give yours some thought. St. Fidelis of Sigmaringen, a Capuchin friar, did. He defended dogma and was martyred by Calvinists. That is something you, unfortunately, have never had to worry about.

Sincerely in Christ,



Rev. Samuel Waters

Pastor

Ss. Peter & Paul Roman Catholic Mission

BACK