

HOME BACK

Ss. Peter & Paul Roman Catholic Mission

P.O. Box 7352

York, PA 17404

www.saintspeterandpaulrcm.com

July 31, 2021

+St. Ignatius Loyola

Dear Bishop Richard Williamson,

Now is a good time to do what should have been done years ago. You have another opportunity to set the Resistance on sound footing. The first absolutely necessary step is dump the 1962 Missal which I will descriptively call the 1962 Bugnini Transitional Missal (1962 BTM) and adopt the “received and approved” immemorial Roman rite of Mass. Furthermore, this adopting must be grounded upon dogma, the proximate rule of faith.

Pope Benedict in *Summorum Pontificum* described this Missal as the Extra-ordinary form of the Mass and the Novus Ordo as the Ordinary form sharing a common *lex orandi/lex credendi*. This is true in the sense that both share a common provenance because the liturgical first principles on which the Novus Ordo were adopted at the beginning of Bugnini’s tenure with the Pian commission in 1948 remained consistent and uniformly applied throughout his tenure (by his own admission, *The Reform of the Liturgy, 1948-1975*). These principles constituted the blueprint for building the Novus Ordo. For the sake of brevity, I assume that you will accept with *judicial notice* that these principles were artificial constructs antithetical to legitimate liturgical development adopted for the intent of destroying the immemorial Roman rite.

1962 marked the mid-point of Bugnini’s liturgical tenure. There was in fact no Missal ever published in 1962. By the end of 1962, in December when St. Joseph’s name was added to the Canon, the 1962 edition simply constituted a series of liturgical changes which began in 1956. It was like a house under construction with the foundation and framing in place but much left to be done.

Bugnini was asked in 1962 if that version of the Novus Ordo Missal was the end of his work of liturgical reform. He replied:

“Not by any stretch of the imagination. Every good builder begins by removing the gross accretions, the evident distortions; then with more delicacy and attention he sets out to revise particulars. The latter remains to be achieved for the Liturgy so that the fullness, dignity and harmony may shine forth once again” (*The Organic Development of the Liturgy* by Fr. Alcuin Reid).

Thus such feasts as the Solemnity of St. Joseph, the Chair of St. Peter at Rome, the Finding of the True Cross, St. John before the Latin Gate, the second Confiteor, the *Benedicamus Domino*, most octaves destroying the liturgical relationships between the feast and the octave day, and many, many other liturgical changes, considered “gross accretions and evident distortions” by those who would eventually give the Church the liturgical “fullness, dignity and harmony” of the *Novus Ordo*, were done away with in the 1962 BTM. Just as a house under construction is an imperfect house, the 1962 BTM is an imperfect realization of the *Novus Ordo* but still in its incipient form constitutes a single *lex orandi* because it contains *in potentia* what the *Novus Ordo* expresses *in acta*. It is unfortunate that the SSPX version of the 1962 BTM contains elements that Bugnini suppressed giving the faithful who use those missals an incomplete realization of how imperfect it is as a realization of the “received and approved” immemorial rite. From either perspective, the 1962 BTM is a deformed missal.

Pope Francis in his Motu Proprio *Traditionis Custodes* has modified Pope Benedict's assertion and affirmed that, “Art. 1. The liturgical books promulgated by Saint (sic) Paul VI and Saint (sic) John Paul II, in conformity with the decrees of Vatican Council II, are the **unique only** expression of the *lex orandi* of the Roman Rite.” The obvious conclusion is that the 1962 Missal *in potentia* is an insufficient expression of the *Novus Ordo's lex orandi*. What is more, the assertion that the *Novus Ordo* is “the **unique only** expression of the *lex orandi* of the Roman Rite” declares that the “immemorial Roman” rite constitutes a **defective expression of the *lex orandi***. (note: The original document written and published in Italian uses the adjective “only” that was translated into English as “unique”.)

Just as the 1962 BTM constitutes a defective expression of the *Novus Ordo lex orandi*, it constitutes a defective expression of the “received and approved” Roman rite *lex orandi*. **For just as much as a building in construction is an imperfect expression of its final form, its final perfection of *being*, so too does the destruction of a building in progress represent a lesser perfection from what it was.**

We know that Rome does not regard the 1962 BTM as the immemorial “received and approved rite.” This is not conjecture but a fact. Why? Because every papal document touching upon this Missal treats it entirely as a subject of Church discipline governed entirely by human positive law, first under the Paul VI changes adopted from 1962 until 1969, and in more modern times, the 1962 BTM has been regulated under the norms of *Ecclesia Dei* as an Indult, under the restrictive legal stipulations of *Summorum Pontificum* as a grant of legal privilege by positive law, and now under the greater restrictions imposed by *Traditionis Custodes*, again as an Indult. At no time in the history of the Church has an immemorial liturgical tradition been reduced to the status of an Indult, which is the permission to do something that is not permitted by the positive law of the Church, or just as insulting, as grant of legal privilege. This constitutes *prima*

facie evidence that Rome does not regard the 1962 Missal as the immemorial Roman Rite. But what is more compelling, Pope Francis in his letter accompanying the Motu Proprio compared his suppression of the 1962 BTM with St. Pius V's suppression of liturgical rites or usages that were less than 200 years old. Pope Francis said:

"I take comfort in this decision from the fact that, after the Council of Trent, St. Pius V also abrogated all the rites that could not claim a proven antiquity, establishing for the whole Latin Church a single Missale Romanum." (i.e.: Pope St. Pius V suppressed any liturgical custom that did not have an established pedigree of at least 200 years.)

The 1962 BTM has been abrogated by Pope Francis because it "could not claim a proven antiquity"! If the 1962 BTM cannot claim "proven antiquity," it cannot be the "received and approved" immemorial Roman rite of Mass. As a matter of historical fact, the 1962 BTM which underwent several changes just in 1962, existed less than two and half year before it was changed again in its progressive realization and perfection of its *being* as envisioned from the beginning by Bugnini in 1948.

It is a grave error to believe that the "received and approved" immemorial rite of Mass is a matter of mere discipline open to the free will of the legislator. It is not and never has been. It is a dogma of divine and Catholic faith that:

If anyone says that the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church, accustomed to be used in the administration of the sacraments, may be despised or omitted by the ministers without sin and at their pleasure, or may be changed by any pastor of the churches, whomsoever, to other new ones, let him be anathema.

Council of Trent, Session VII, On the Sacraments, Canon 13

(NOTE: This clause in this dogma, "may be changed by any pastor of the churches, whomsoever," is commonly mistranslated as 'any of the pastors of the churches' or 'every pastors of the churches' to imply that just not everyone can, but someone can in fact change the "received and approved" rites into "other new ones." The dogma is clear, no pastor of the churches whomsoever" can do it.)

It is perhaps one of the greatest errors of the last century that Catholics have regarded the Liturgy as entirely a matter of Church discipline and forgotten its essential relationship with Catholic dogma. This error is refuted by the following authorities:

"However, the term *disciplina* in no way applies to the liturgical rite of the Mass, particularly in light of the fact that the popes have repeatedly observed that the rite is founded on apostolic tradition (several popes are then quoted in the footnote). For this reason alone, the rite cannot fall into the category of 'discipline and rule of the Church.' To this we can add that there is not a single document, including the Codex Iuris Canonici, in which there is a specific statement that the pope, in his function as the supreme pastor of the Church, has the authority to abolish the traditional rite. In fact,

nowhere is it mentioned that the pope has the authority to change even a single local liturgical tradition. The fact that there is no mention of such authority strengthens our case considerably.

"There are clearly defined limits to the plena et suprema potestas (full and highest powers) of the pope. For example, there is no question that, even in matters of dogma, he still has to follow the tradition of the universal Church-that is, as St. Vincent of Lerins says, what has been believed (quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus). In fact, there are several authors who state quite explicitly that it is clearly outside the pope's scope of authority to abolish the traditional rite."

Msgr. Klaus Gamber, *The Reform of the Roman Liturgy*

"Liturgy and faith are interdependent. That is why a new rite was created, a rite that in many ways reflects the bias of the new (modernist) theology".

Msgr. Klaus Gamber, *The Reform of the Roman Liturgy*

Further evidence that the immemorial Roman Rite, our "received and approved" rite, is not a matter of simple discipline:

The Tridentine Profession of Faith of Pope Pius IV, *Iniunctum Nobis*, prescribes adherence to the "received and approved rites of the Catholic Church used in the solemn administration of the sacraments." The "received and approved rites" are the rites established by custom, and hence the Council of Trent refers to them as the "received and approved rites of the Catholic Church customarily used in the solemn administration of the sacraments (Sess. VII, can XIII). Adherence to the customary rites received and approved by the Church is an infallible defined doctrine: The Council of Florence defined that "priests.... must confect the body of the Lord, each one according to the custom of his Church" (Decretum pro Graecis), and therefore the Council of Trent solemnly condemned as heresy the proposition that " the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church customarily used in the solemn administration of the sacraments may be changed into other new rites by any ecclesiastical pastor whosoever."

Fr. Paul Kramer, *The Suicide of Altering the Faith in the Liturgy*

Pope Pius XII said regarding the error of liturgists:

"They wander entirely away from the true and full notion and understanding of the Sacred Liturgy, who consider it only as an external part of divine worship, and presented to the senses; or as a kind of apparatus of ceremonial properties; and they no less err who think of it as a mere compendium of laws and precepts, by which the ecclesiastical Hierarchy bids the sacred rites to be arranged and ordered."

Pope Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*

"'Lex orandi, lex credendi' -- the law for prayer is the law for faith", and, "In the sacred liturgy we profess the Catholic faith explicitly and openly..... The entire liturgy,

therefore, has the Catholic faith for its content, inasmuch as it bears public witness to the faith of the Church.”

Pope Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*

Pope Benedict XVI, said in his book, *Spirit of the Liturgy*:

The Liturgy cannot be compared to a piece of equipment, something made, but rather to a plant, something organic that grows and whose laws of growth determine the possibilities of further development. In the West there has been, of course, another factor involved. This was the Papal authority, the Pope took ever more clearly the responsibility upon himself for the liturgical legislation, and so doing foresaw in a juridical authority for the forth setting of the liturgical development. The stronger the papal primacy was exercised, the more the question arose, just what the limits of this authority were, which of course, no-one had ever before thought about. After the Second Vatican Council, the impression has been made that the Pope, as far as the Liturgy goes, can actually do everything he wishes to do, certainly when he was acting with the mandate of an Ecumenical Council. Finally, the idea that the Liturgy is a predetermined "given", the fact that nobody can simply do what he wishes with her, disappeared out of the public conscience of the Western [Church]. In fact, the First Vatican Council did not in any way define that the Pope was an absolute monarch! Au contraire, the first Vatican Council sketched his role as that of a guarantee for the obedience to the Revealed Word. The papal authority is limited by the Holy Tradition of the Faith, and that regards also the Liturgy. The Liturgy is no "creation" of the authorities. Even the Pope can be nothing other than a humble servant of the Liturgy's legitimate development and of her everlasting integrity and identity.

Pope Benedict XVI, *Spirit of the Liturgy*

Bishop Williamson, if the Resistance is to defend anything, it must first be grounded in dogma. Dogma constitutes the proximate rule of faith. This should be evident to everyone of the faithful but it unfortunately is not. This truth can be demonstrated simply by the definition of heresy. An *essential definition* is the best of all definitions because it is the most intelligible offering the proximate genus and the species difference. The Code of Canon Law takes its definition of heresy almost verbatim from St. Thomas. The new Code of Canon Law like the earlier code says:

Can. 751 Heresy is the obstinate denial or obstinate doubt after the reception of baptism of some truth which is to be believed by divine and Catholic faith

A “truth to be believed by divine and Catholic faith” is the definition of Dogma. The Catholic Encyclopedia says:

St. Thomas (II-II:11:1) defines heresy: "a species of infidelity in men who, having professed the faith of Christ, corrupt its dogmas".

For both the faithful and the heretic have the same object of divine revelation formally defined. A heretic corrupts dogma while the faithful keep dogma. This affords an essential definition demonstrating the species difference between the faithful and the heretic. Thus dogma constitutes by definition the proximate rule of faith for all the faithful.

The heresy of Iconoclasm denies indirectly the dogmas of our faith by destroying the images of our faith. The Novus Ordo does exactly the same thing. The "received and approved" immemorial holy sacrifice of the Mass is the perfect image of our faith. As the Council of Trent taught:

Since the nature of man is such that without external means he cannot easily be raised to meditation of divine things, Holy Mother Church has instituted certain rites, namely that some things in the Mass be pronounced in a low tone and other in a louder tone. She has likewise, **in accordance with apostolic discipline and tradition**, made use of ceremonies such as mystical blessings, lights, incense, vestments, and many other things of this kind whereby both the majesty of so great a sacrifice might be emphasized and the minds of the faithful be excited by those **visible signs of religion and piety** to the contemplation of those most sublime things which are hidden in this sacrifice.

And therefore, the destruction of these "visible signs of religion and piety" are nothing but revisiting of the heresy of Iconoclasm and the Iconoclasm of Bugnini constituted *in acta* from his first liturgical innovations adopted in 1955 a form of heresy.

The Resistance must be grounded in dogma because dogma, which is divine revelation formally defined by the church, is the only weapon against an abuse of authority for all authority is subject to truth. The Magisterium of the Church is a *universal* and, when engaged by any particular pope, is the insufficient but necessary material and instrumental cause of dogma. It is God Himself who is the formal and final cause of dogma. Only with dogma as our proximate rule of faith can we withstand an abusive authority to their face for we must 'obey God rather than man.'

If the SSPX were grounded in dogma, the 'doctrinal discussion' with Rome that began informally in 1997 with GREC and formally in 2009 would have been concluded in a few hours at most. But they continue to this day. Why? Because both parties at the negotiation table share the same error. The heresy of Neo-modernism like Modernism attacks dogma in its very nature. Neo-modernism differs only in its method, not its end. Neo-modernism postulates a disjunction between the form of dogma, that is, the truth expressed which is from God, and the matter of dogma, that is, its verbal expression, which is seen to be a human creation. It proposes that

dogma must be continually refined in its expression to sift the divine truth from the human historical and contextual accretions. The fact of the matter is that the leadership of the SSPX is just as steeped in Neo-modernism as the Novus Ordo clerics sitting across the table. That is why the SSPX-Rome discussions both formal and informal have been going on for what will soon be 25 years! The doctrinal discussions are in fact just dialogue and dialogue can only arrive at opinion and not truth.

The Resistance cannot be defined simply as “resistance” to the new SSPX but must stand on Dogma as the proximate rule of faith and from this stand embrace the “received and approved” immemorial rite of Mass establishing “resistance” to the Neo-modernist heretics, the new Iconoclasts in Rome. They must demand the recognition that every Catholic possesses a right to the immemorial traditions of the Church because they constitute the “only expression of the *lex orandi* of the Roman rite.” If the Novus Ordo has its own *lex orandi* (which it does, and has now publically declared), their *lex orandi* is not Catholic. The Resistance needs to affirm as a goal the establishment of traditional Mass centers in every diocese of the world looking for priests in those dioceses who recognize a *defacto* schism created by a heretical pope and encourage them to embrace the opportunity to profess the Catholic faith publically and withstand to the face each of their modernist bishops. Help them to undergo a traditional formation such as Fr. Samuel Waters did. The Resistance must affirm that the Faith itself is the principle sign and cause of unity in the Church while the pope, is only secondarily and accidentally the sign and cause of unity in the Church. When the pope falls from the faith, the faithful ‘must obey God rather than man.’

As it is now, many traditional minded priests and faithful will be turning to the SSPX by default and the SSPX cannot defend the Catholic faith because they do not regard dogma as immutable in both its form and matter, and they only regard the liturgy as a matter of mere discipline and not as a necessary attribute of the faith, constituting its perfect image, by which alone it can be known and communicated to others.

I pray that this letter does not seem in any way disrespectful. I am grateful for all you have done in the past but I do not believe that in ten years either one of us will still be around. If there is to be glory in eternity it must be won here in the effort to promote the greater glory of God through the defense of His revealed truth. I would appreciate your sharing this letter with Bishop Gerardo Zendejas, Bishop Jean-Michel Faure and Bishop Thomas Aquinas.

Sincerely in Christ,



David Drew
Ss. Peter & Paul Roman Catholic Mission