

THE ENGINE OF CHANGE

An Enemy Hath Done This

What changes the Catholic Church changes the world. When the Catholic Church loses its bearing the whole world loses its bearing. To put the Catholic Church back on path would put the whole world back on the path to stability.

So many times it seems I am caught between two factions with only a traditional feel for things to guide my position. When congregational singing was in vogue it reminded me of when I was a boy and of the changes in the church which brought about so much confusion and discord with many leaving the church. I had been taught not only by the sisters but the faithful around me to be quiet and not attract attention or be distracting. And this congregational singing stood against what tradition had taught me. So I started researching the issue.

In my early readings of Church Music by St. Pius X it appeared that the work was more an instruction against congregational singing rather than for congregational singing like we had been told. After further consideration I realized that congregational singing's label did not come from St. Pius X but was an adaptation of Pius X saying he wanted to see the laity singing and after reading and digesting Pius X's Moto Proprio on Church Music it was obvious he was talking about the laity having their own choir. Some traditional organizations were pushing congregational singing so maybe there was something I hadn't yet seen which gave church leaders the mandate to push congregational singing. I read Pope Pius XII encyclical on music and worship and found that, even though it was less traditional than Pope Pius X, it was not promoting congregational singing as we have it today.

What we have today, which is called congregational singing, is so far from the teachings of St. Pius X's Moto Proprio on Church Music that it is an insult to the saint, to tie him to congregational singing.

Then I read a pamphlet which was published in Cincinnati, OH and which contained the Instruction of 1958, which was a very modernist document issued in the name of the Congregation of Sacred Rites (and which was, supposedly, issued with the approval of Pope Pius XII) and a second document contained in the pamphlet, The New Instruction written by Rev. Low as the vice-Relator for the historical section of the Congregation of Sacred Rites. Talk about Engines of Change (something that drives change) The Instruction of 1958 was the grand-daddy of them all. The reading and study of these two documents led me to write the following.

An Enemy Hath Done This

Supernatural light will, in those days, not only have to withstand the attacks of the children of darkness, who will put forward their false doctrines; it will, moreover, be minimized and falsified by the very children of the light yielding on the question of principles; it will be endangered by the hesitations, and the human prudence, of those who are called far seeing men.

The Liturgical Year by Abbot Gueranger, O.S.B. Vol. 11, p 426

In September of 1958 the Congregation of Sacred Rites issued a Decree on the Participation in the Mass (Instruction) with changes which were radical but claimed to be in line with Pius X, XI and that it was being issued with the full co-operation of Pius XII. But shortly after the Decree was issued there was issued a second Instruction, entitled, The New Instruction, written like a commentary, by a Reverend Josef Low who was the vice-Relator of the Historical Section of the Congregation of Sacred Rites. A Relator according to Second College Edition, Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language, library and office edition is; "2 Law a private person at whose prompting or complaint a public action is begun to bring in question the exercise of an office, franchise, etc." This, first of all, says that something was not in proper perspective with the issuing of the September 1958 Decree otherwise there would not have been a vice-Relator or a New Instruction. In reading the Decree (Instruction) I was certain that Pius XII did not fully support the document because nothing he had written before was even mildly like the Instruction. Reverend Low spent most of his time, in The New Instruction, trying to gloss things over, obviously not wanting to embarrass anyone. Reverend Low said several things which are of interest. 1 That Pius XII had made notations on the document (which he presents as proof that the pontiff was a part of the Decree), which tells possibly two things: a) that the pontiff never saw the final copy; b) that the copy he saw was not changed because of his notations. 2 Reverend Low stated that the part of the Decree (Instruction) which stated that there was to be a three part change process was "not universally obligatory", which tells me Pius XII had noted on the copy of the Decree that this part of the Decree (the part which would have guaranteed that there was no uniformity in the practice of the Catholic faith) he particularly, stood against. If the Pope did not approve the finished document then it was not from the Pope. 3 In this third consideration it is not what Rev. Low said but what he did not say. At the end of the Instruction they stated that Pius XII ordered the publication of the Instruction. Rev Low, in The New Instruction, went to a lot of trouble to push the idea that Pope Pius XII was for the Instruction but never did Rev. Low say that Pius XII ordered the publication of the document. Which could have been his best argument. In fact he said the Instruction had no authority of its own. Which if it would have been with the approval of the Pope it would have had authority of its own although not dogmatic. (If it had been from the Pope it would have had authority of its own as long as it was in line with tradition.)

Pope Pius XII had been very ill for a long time and died a month after the Instruction was issued.

Reverend Low does state several times and in different ways, in the first two pages, that the Instruction is not law and has no force of law. "...The general discipline concerning liturgical language can be changed in basic fashion only by a solemn pronouncement of the

supreme head of the Church-certainly not by a mere Instruction!” page 2 of The New Instruction. It would have been nice if he would have said plainly that the pope did not sign off on the Instruction, but the above quote came pretty close. In total The New Instruction makes it clear enough for at least some people that Pope Pius XII was not an approving part of the Instruction (1958 Decree) therefore it did not come from the Church but rather from men. This, evidently, is the number one message or purpose of his position as vice-Relator. But Reverend Low published The New Instruction after Pius XII died so his allegiance obviously was not to the dead pope but rather to the new regime who were now in control. He did an effective job of ‘talking out of both sides of his mouth’ without anywhere clearly saying the Instruction was not approved by Pius XII which would have been an understatement because the evidence says that the “Good Pius XII” actually stood against it and they (someone, evidently some of the members of the Congregation of Sacred Rites) issued the 1958 Decree as having the full force of Papal Decree. But some good soul stood up against the ill deed (possibly some of the members of the Congregation of Sacred Rites or possibly Pius XII himself but I think someone else) and caused Reverend Low to be appointed vice-Relator to correct the wrong done.

Most persons reading Reverend Low’s, The New Instruction probably didn’t have a clue what it was all about and, for sure, few had the opportunity to read it and even fewer that had that opportunity, took the time to read it. At this point it is not known if it was published any place else but here in the United States and here in the United States it was published in Worship Magazine. The New Instruction evidently did have some impact on some readers because in a later issue of Worship Magazine under “Responses-The New Instruction” in a question and answer format the question was asked; “Does the Instruction of last September 3 require any local promulgation in the individual dioceses before it takes effect?” Obviously someone out there realized that The New Instruction had changed the rules, but the answer that was given nullified The New Instruction. The answer; “No. The Instruction was made effective for the entire Latin Church by its inclusion in the September 22, 1958, issue of the Holy See’s official journal, Acta Apostolicae Sedis. No local promulgation can add to or subtract from its authority, which is that of the Bishop of Rome.” The emphasis is mine. Reverend Low failed in his job. Worship Magazine by publishing the above statement painted over the New Instruction. And the modernists or was it communist marched on.

In the journal Caecilia Volume 85, No. 4 issue labeled Fall, 1958, The New Instruction was published by the Society of Saint Caecilia and as a title of contents on the cover was the title The New Instruction. Within, they published the Instruction and titled it Sacred

Music and the Sacred Liturgy (translation provided by the NCWG News Service) and after the Instruction, was an article entitled The New Instruction of Sacred Music and Liturgy written by Francis A. Brunner, C.Ss.R.. They substituted another article by another author and did not even note that they had done so. The Reverend Low was not ever mentioned or the fact that he was acting in the capacity of the vice-Relator of the Historical section of the Congregation of Sacred Rites and the article was written in such a way as to negate any idea of Reverend Low’s duty. The editor of the journal in his introductory note said; “This journal could well fall upon the Instruction with a certain amount of glee to substantiate certain positions it has taken.” Evidently the journal had put itself out on a limb in support of modernist ideals and was happy to see such a publication so it is no wonder that they would paraphrase The New Instruction in such a way as

to hide its message. No doubt there was some talk about The New Instruction and so to title the journal article after it and then hide the real message of The New Instruction, would keep those who did not receive Worship Magazine's publication of The New Instruction in the dark.

I knew that Cincinnati (the place where the pamphlet about the Instruction and the New Instruction had come from) was one of the most traditionally-minded Catholic cities in the USA and that, due to Cincinnati's Archbishop Alter's understanding that the September 1958 Decree on Participation in the Mass was not what it appeared to be to most people, he therefore had worked to maintain the traditional teachings of the Church while getting along with his superiors. This holding to tradition, would cause a real rift once the Vatican II changes were to come along and especially when the new mass was being forced on the faithful. For, without the changes of 1958, the Vatican II changes wouldn't have had a chance to have been enforced let alone would they have been able to come out with the New Mass and have it accepted. The 1958 changes brought about a great deal of change in the Church and prepared the faithful for more changes to come.

It appears that Archbishop Alter's understanding and work not only caused Cincinnati to remain strongly traditional but Archbishop Alter was probably also the reason that the United States of America, in spite of having very liberal bishops as a rule, is today one of the strongest traditionally Catholic nations in the world. Very few, to be sure, understood exactly what the 1958 Decree was and from whom it came. Archbishop Alter was, in his earlier years, the manager of a Catholic speakers bureau and then later went on speaking tours himself and as a result his influence was much greater than one would think. I believe that time will prove Archbishop Alter to be a hero in defense of tradition and the one who filed the complaint against the Congregation of Sacred Rites as his Msgr. Kennedy was the Papal Chamberlain (a titled position of favor to the Pope as an advisor) to Pius XII and was probably in place at the Vatican during the issuance of the Instruction. .

Judging by what was done and how much control was exercised after The New Instruction was issued to keep it from being publicized and understood, someone with prior knowledge must have had the right people in the right places at the right time to see

to it that the deed was not understood by the Catholic world? It is obvious to me that those in control of The Instruction and the obstruction of the knowledge of The New Instruction was by the communist while using other factions interested in destroying the Catholic Church . An Enemy Hath Done This.

In looking back it can be easily seen that the Instruction was an Engine of Change and it can also be seen that it was illegitimately put into place. The question may be how does that effect us today? If an enemy has done this then the natural reaction would be to oppose it.

It seems to me that this issue may be what the Third Secret of Fatima is about, which was to be published in 1960 less than two years after the issuance of the Instruction. This piece of history may help the pope recognize what the Third Secret is talking about and which may

help him realize that An Enemy Hath Done This. It could, conceivably, move the pope to correct the wrongs that have been done and move the Church back to tradition. This piece of history should be an explanation as to why the Church took such a modernist turn in the past and why now the Church needs to follow the directive of Our Lady and consecrate Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary and return to tradition.