

THE MYSTIC KNIGHTS OF MUMBO-JUMBO!

A detailed study of the hilarious and outrageous contradictions that arise, when ordinary men take Canon Law into their own hands, and attempt to speak in the Name of the Roman Catholic Church..... This manuscript is valuable for the following reasons:

1. It gives an historical perspective on this author, both in general and in specific, showing the ridiculous and outrageous contradictions he has been forced to contend with in his Search for Truth.
2. It is a graphic demonstration of the profound danger that exists, when ordinary men take Canon Law into their own hands, and interpret it to their own destruction.
3. Each different author quotes Canon Law, Catholic theology, and Sacred Scripture in defense of his own, unique position. However, that position is a total contradiction of every other author, who is also quoting from the very same sources!
4. Hence, this article is a " reductio ad absurdum " of the Argument from Canon Law. It brings into close firing-range the canonical and theological arguments of bitter opponents, with hilarious and comical results that were totally unforeseen.
5. The logical conclusion is that there is profound difficulty, and profound danger, when ordinary, untrained, unordained individuals take Canon Law into their own hands, like mini-popes, and attempt to expound all the answers to the current Crisis in the Catholic Church.
6. This article uses only a very small selection of authors, due to the demands of space and the cost of printing. Otherwise, we could have extended this treatise very easily into a full-length book, simply by quoting more authors.

God Bless Us All!

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ely Jason". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Ely Jason.....

Table of Contents

1. A letter from Fr. Hector Bolduc (8/23/83), raising numerous charges against Francis Schuckardt and the Spokane community. One specific charge included the practice of homosexuality by Schuckardt..... p. 3-5
2. A second letter from Fr. Bolduc (9/6/83), containing: (a) a notarized document, alleging that Bishop Dan Brown wrote a letter to Marcel Lefebvre, asking him to reordain and reconsecrate him as a priest and bishop, " as he questioned his own ordination and consecration. " (b) 5 pages of canon laws, contesting the ordination and consecration of Francis Schuckardt..... p. 6-11
3. A third letter from Fr. Bolduc (10/10/83), challenging Francis Schuckardt to a public debate, " provided that the public is invited, and the newsmedia is present. " He repeats the charge of homosexuality against Schuckardt..... p. 12
4. A letter of Fr. Mary Benedict, responding to Fr. Bolduc's charges. He says, " His response was nothing more than a scandalsheet filled with the most incredible fabrications, extreme falsehoods, and malicious calumny!..... p.13-15
5. A five page letter I wrote to Fr. Mary Benedict (10/13/83), raising my own theological objections to their position. It was never answered..... p.16-20
6. Statement On The Validity of Holy Orders: a 12-page document issued by the Spokane priests (CMRI), in defense of their Holy Orders. The final five pages consist of 2 letters written by Bishop Dan Brown..... p.21-32
7. An 8-page letter written by Fr. Denis Philomena (6/21/84). This was their official public statement, in the aftermath of the major fallout with Francis Schuckardt. His charges include (1) incompetency, (2) claims to the Papacy, (3) homosexuality and scandal, and (4) absolution of an accomplice in a sin of impurity. Thus, Fr. Denis verified the charge of homosexuality, which Fr. Mary Benedict had implicitly denied. The letter contains much reference to canon laws. The last 2 pages cite canon law exclusively..... p.32A-39
8. A 5-page letter written by Fr. Alphonsus Maria (Barnes), as a rebuttal to Fr. Denis' letter. Fr. Alphonsus is one of those few souls who remained with Francis Schuckardt, when the separation from CMRI took place. He is fiercely angry with Fr. Denis, and disputes his use of canon law..... p.40-44
9. Reply To Rev. Alphonsus Barnes, by Fr. Denis (2 pages). Dated August 5, 1984. He says, " I believe that my previous statement clearly and accurately explains my position. I stand behind it, and I reiterate each and all of the accusations made in it. If one of us is a liar, it is certainly not I "..... p.45-46
10. Another letter of Fr. Denis (August 11, 1984), replying to his excommunication by Francis Schuckardt. There occurs in this letter perhaps the funniest statement I have ever read: " Let us remember that Bishop Schuckardt was never formally nor canonically appointed to the episcopacy. He had recourse to the principle of epikeia to provide legitimacy to his consecration and his episcopacy. I think that we can invoke the same principle of epikeia to justify his removal! " Personal comment: Utterly Hilarious! The Spokane community invoked epikeia to make Francis Schuckardt a priest and bishop - then they invoked epikeia to get rid of him!!!..... p.47-48
11. A 6-page letter I wrote to Rev. Mother Mary Teresa (6/12/85). This was after I had formally separated from the SSPX, and after the Spokane community had dumped Francis Schuckardt. It appeared theoretically possible that I and the Spokane community now shared some common ground; but I still retained many questions, doubts, hesitations, and basic disagreements with them, over a variety of issues. This letter explored the common ground..... p.49-54

12. A 4-page reply of Rev. Mother Mary Teresa, written to me. She admits that there was a " worshipful " attitude towards Francis Schuckardt; she says " we were prevented from communicating... we had vows of obedience, and so we did not question... However, even if his motives were unworthy and he was a deceiver all along, Our Lady used him as an instrument. "..... p.55-58
13. I realized that no amount of letter-writing would ever give me sufficient understanding of the Spokane community. In order to really grasp them and their situation, I would have to go and physically live in their midst. So I flew up to their annual Conference in early October, 1985, and stayed in their midst until March, 1986. I was sorely disappointed, for numerous reasons, and finally left. I wrote a 17-page letter, detailing my objections to their community. It was given to all the priests, Bishop Musey, and Sister Mary Teresa. Not one of them ever answered it. I am not enclosing that letter in this correspondence, because most of the charges were repeated in my letters to Bishop McKenna; and those letters are enclosed. No point in repeating the same thing twice. Only 2 pages of that 17-page letter will be enclosed here..... p.60-61
14. Letter to the Editor: a 10-page letter I wrote to Bishop McKenna, 2 years after leaving the Spokane community. This contains much of what I said in the earlier letter to Sister Mary Teresa. Too long to condense here..... p.62-71
15. The Reply of Bishop McKenna: " Before giving any serious attention to your letter regarding the Mount priests, I would first want to see your reasons for regarding my position on the pope hilarious and outrageous "..... p.72
16. My reply to Bishop McKenna (4/12/88). A concise 2-page summary of my principal charges against the Spokane community. Examples: (1) they never admitted to this very day that they did anything wrong, in all that concerns Schuckardt; (2) McKenna rejects sedevacantism in his writings, implying that it is heretical; but the Spokane community " in obedience to him " is sedevacantist! (3) The priests got conditionally reordained, even though they insisted that they were already validly ordained, etc. My conclusion was that Bishop McKenna must make them (the whole community) take a formal Oath of Abjuration, renouncing Schuckardt, their support of him during all years past, and publicly denouncing sedevacantism. I said, " If they refuse to make that Oath of Abjuration, then they have only separated themselves materially, but not formally, from Francis Schuckardt! "..... p.73-74
17. A letter to me from Patrick Henry, who was formerly a priest in the CMRI... p.75
18. My reply to Patrick Henry (5/2/88)..... p.76-77
19. A letter from me to Bishop McKenna (5/9/88). I enclosed a copy of a letter by Fr. Denis, in which he quotes Bishop McKenna as saying he will not ordain any new priests in the CMRI for a full five years, due to the enormous scandal created by Francis Schuckardt. I pointed out that according to his own word, Bishop McKenna could not ordain new priests for another 4 years. If he did so, I would mass-mail copies of Fr. Denis' letter: " By so doing, I will demonstrate the profound hypocrisy of publicly proclaiming you will not ordain priests for 5 years - then disregarding your own public proclamation, and ordaining priests! You will become a laughingstock from one end of the world to the other! " I concluded with 3 charges against the Spokane priests: (1) they secretly disbelieve your theory of a material versus a formal pope, (2) they secretly believe in sedevacantism to this very day, and (3) the reason they have not told you these facts, is because they want you to ordain their seminarians! " The only way he can disprove my charges, I said, is to make the Spokane priests take a formal Oath of Abjuration. If they refuse, I have spoken the truth..... p.78

20. A copy of the letter by Fr. Denis (June 7, 1987), in which he quotes Bishop McKenna as follows: "... I now see clearly that all circumstances considered, I must await the lapse of five years (before conferring Major Orders on your seminarians).... My main reason for this decision is the prudent necessity for the community to both prove its stability, and recover its reputation after the widely publicized scandal given by Francis Schuckardt. This only time can do, and 5 years I feel to be the minimum...etc. "..... p.79

21. Drug Bust Nets Ex-Tridentine Bishop! - copy of a newspaper article, taken from the North Idaho Handle, May 14, 1987. This widely publicized scandal was undoubtedly the motivating force behind Bishop McKenna's decision to delay ordinations for a full five years..... p.80

22. Reply of Bishop McKenna (May 12, 1988) to my letter, in which I threatened to mass-mail Fr. Denis' letter: " Before you make good your threat regarding the Spokane community, make sure for the sake of conscience that prior to my conferring of any ordinations to the priesthood, no abjuration of Schuckardt has in fact been made. Respectfully, Robert McKenna. "..... p.81

23. A reply from me to Bishop McKenna, in which I said: " I solemnly promise to cancel my plan to mass-mail Fr. Denis' letter, on one condition: that you make the priests, religious, and lay community take a formal Oath of Abjuration, after the following manner: (1) The Oath must be administered at Mount St.Michael, and nowhere else; (2) It must be performed by the priests publicly, in full view of the community; (3) Public Notice should be proclaimed in advance of that Oath, by a variety of means (which I enumerated); (4) I mentioned various points that were essential to the Oath; (5) the Oath should be written down as a prepared statement, which each priest and Sister should read out loud, over a microphone, to the assembled community, etc. (6) After the priests and Sisters have finished, the whole assembled congregation should read the same statement out loud, en masse. (7) I stressed that a quiet, hidden-away-in-the-closet Oath of Abjuration is totally unacceptable; (8) Francis Schuckardt, his priests, and the Spokane community were a major source of public scandal to the Catholic Faith, during their entire existence. The only way to rectify such a major public scandal, is through a major, highly-publicized Oath of Abjuration. Nothing else will do. (9) The priests and religious must take the Oath with one hand on the Bible, and the other hand raised to God..... p.82-
p.84

24. Finally, a letter of Father Vida Elmer (5/22/88) to me, in which he says: " I am afraid Bishop McKenna will not receive your letters before the Spokane ordinations. At present, as far as I know, he is in New Zealand, and from there he will go directly to Spokane. Try to contact him before the ordinations. The Spokane priests think they have satisfied Church laws through Bishop Musey. If this is not the case, I think they have to make a public abjuration because of the schismatic past, although not that cumbersome way you propose...etc..... p.85

CONCLUSION: (1) The letter of Fr. Denis is irrefutable proof that Bishop McKenna announced publicly he would not ordain priests for a full five years, in the wake of the Schuckardt scandals; (2) the reply of Bishop McKenna to me (#22 above) definitely implied that he would make the Spokane priests take a formal Oath of Abjuration, before conferring any ordinations. However, Bishop McKenna lied in both cases. He ordained priests last month, only one year after announcing he would not do so for a full five years; and (2), contrary to the implications of his statement above, he didn't make anyone take an Oath of Abjuration. I have the personal testimony of a community-member who was present at the ordinations. The disaster goes on.

The Mystic Knights of Mumbo-Jumbo! is 90 pages long. It is available upon request, for the cost of zeroxing and mailing it..... price: \$5.00

Also Available:

1. "Concerns Over The Grave Current Status of The Congregation of Mary, Immaculate Queen of the Universe: also known as CMRI." Written by Ken Mock, a friend of mine, who lives here in Los Angeles. He became involved with them at the same time I did, but recently broke with them. His well-written article begins, "As one of the lay-people associated with the abovenamed religious community for a period of over two years; and as one who has recently been forced to separate himself from them for reasons perceived to be extremely grave, I am setting down my thoughts on the leadership of the CMRI community in the interest of souls still affiliated with it, and in the interest of those who might be influenced to join it in the future." Let it be remembered that I made 3 charges against the Spokane priests and community to Bishop McKenna: (1) they secretly disbelieve his theory of a material versus a formal pope; (2) they secretly believe in sedevacantism to this very day; and (3) the reason they do not tell Bishop McKenna these facts, is because they want him to ordain their seminarians. These charges of mine were based upon a logical deduction, taken from my previous experience with CMRI two years ago. The interesting thing about Ken's letter, is that it confirms my charges. He says, "The CMRI priests, while claiming to differ with the Bishop over his theory, still regard it proper to work with the Bishop!" His article is 7 pages long, times 5¢ a page equals 35¢, plus 25¢ postage. price: 60¢

2. The Speech of Bishop George Musey, which he made to the Spokane Community on the Eve of his acceptance as their New Bishop. This speech was available on Mount St. Michael a few years ago, on tape recordings only. I am the only one who ever transcribed those tapes into a typewritten form. It required a solid week of playing 3 tapes word for word, and sentence for sentence, while I typed them up. This is material that is unavailable from any other source, providing a unique glimpse into the thoughts, ideas, and concepts of CMRI and Bishop Musey. One statement made by Father Mary Benedict deserves to go into the Hall of Fame: "I personally have absolutely no doubts whatsoever about the first ordination: none!" (p.23, para.138) Two paragraphs later, he publicly announced to the whole assembled community that he would be conditionally reordained. It is my position that this extremely strong statement, made before hundreds of people, invalidated his conditional reordination, and made it gravely sacrilegious. His attitude and statement were incompatible with the proper intention necessary for receiving the Sacrament of Holy Orders, since he admits he is convinced he was already properly ordained. Fr. Mary Benedict's strong public pronouncement corrupted his ministerial intention in a way that is "adverse to and incompatible with the Sacrament." (Pope Leo XIII, Apostolicae Curae) The same argument applies to Fr. Denis Philomena, and Fr. Mary James. 31 pages..... price:\$2.00

3. Finally, the Inland Register published a series of articles against the Spokane community, back in 1980. It has numerous pictures, and much valuable information. I have a copy, which is 40 pages long.....price:\$2.50
Total cost of everything offered on this page: \$10.00. Attention Readers: I have finally opened a checking account at the Bank of America. Checks are acceptable henceforth. Many readers want to know about my name. I played music professionally for many years, and Ely Jason was my stage-name. It stuck with me ever since. My own family call me Ely. But for those of you who prefer my legal name, send checks to Dennis D'Amico, Box 83490, Los Angeles, CA. 90083. Both names are listed on my checking account (Dennis D'Amico/Ely Jason). Nevertheless, I still hate checks, and prefer cash! Also acceptable: a Postal Money Order to Dennis D'Amico. God Bless the ISCS!



TLRC LEADER — Bishop Francis K. Schuckardt blesses members of the Tridentine Latin Rite Church as he enters the Mount St. Michael gymnasium for a church program. Schuckardt's priestly and episcopal orders are not licit in the

eyes of the Roman Catholic Church. He was consecrated by a schismatic bishop in 1971 after both Schuckardt and his consecrator renounced Pope Paul VI as a true pope.



TLRC CHILDREN — Even the very young wear long dresses and scarves to practice modesty and imitate the Blessed Virgin Mary in the Triden-

tine Latin Rite Church. The two unidentified girls pictured above are waiting for the start of a Mass at Mount St. Michael.

The Society of Saint Pius X.,
SOUTHWEST DISTRICT

③

Post Office Box 1307
Dickinson, Texas 77539
(713) 337-4513

Reverend
Hector L. Bolduc, SSPX,TM
President

August 23, 1983

Mr. Ely Jason
P. O. Box 25667
Honolulu, Hawaii 96825

Dear Mr. Jason:

Thank you for your letter. I was most interested in the news you gave concerning the attempt of the Schuckardt sect to infiltrate the Hawaii islands. I am very familiar with the group.

Schuckardt is, in fact, not a valid Bishop. He is also not a valid priest. He was supposedly "consecrated" under bizarre circumstances by a man posing as a "Bishop" by the name of Dan Q. Brown. It is evident that Brown was not a valid Bishop because following his supposed "consecration" by an Old Catholic, he had the service redone by another sect. At one time following the "consecration" of Schuckardt, he wrote to Archbishop Lefebvre at Switzerland and asked the Archbishop to reconsecrate him and validate his priesthood and bishopric as he was not certain of its validity; therefore, if he didn't consider himself a validly ordained priest or a validly consecrated Bishop, Schuckardt is also not valid. Archbishop Lefebvre refused to have anything to do with him.

I enclose copies of an article which was recently published in hopes that it might help you.

Yes, I did confront them at a public meeting. The fact is that after I spoke, every single person in the room left, and the young man posing as a priest had no audience. He attempted to claim that he knew the third secret of Fatima. I forced him to admit that he did not.

As stated in the article, the group frequently uses devotion to Mary as a means of attracting unsuspecting Catholics. They say as little of their origin as possible trying to palm themselves off as traditionalists and true Catholics when they are, in fact, neither. They are a sect like the Moonies only far more dangerous because they pose as Catholics. They practice bizarre rites and have even declared their own saints.

Schuckardt was a close friend and follower of the Jovites in Canada whose leader declared himself Pope. I have seen a picture of Schuckardt with this fake Pope. They celebrated a Mass at one time, and I presume they still do, in which they claim to consecrate the body and blood of the Blessed Virgin Mary. This was, of course, blasphemous, although Schuckardt admitted to me that he believed in this abomination. I believe he later

Mr. Ely Jason
Page 2
August 23, 1983

downplayed it when he saw the bad effects it had among Catholics. At their so called school, they hold the children there under serious threats, and the parents are often times prevented from seeing them.

They have a group of thugs associated with their group that goes around physically assaulting those who don't agree with them.

This sect is an off shoot of the sede vacante. They do not believe in a Pope "except Schuckardt." They believe the Catholic Church has died and that they are the only survivors. They believe that no one can be saved except through Schuckardt.

I highly recommend that you and other Catholics have nothing to do with this un-Catholic, very dangerous sect. You should make their true situation known to many. If we can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to call on us.

In Mary Immaculate,

Fr. Hector L. Bolduc

Father Hector L. Bolduc

Enclosures

Man who said marriage ruined by church is awarded \$1 million

COEUR D'ALENE, Idaho (AP) — A man who claimed his marriage was destroyed by his wife's indoctrination into the Tridentine Latin Rite Church has been awarded \$1 million in damages.

Jerry O'Neill, who acted as his own attorney in the two-week 1st District Court trial claimed the Tridentines disrupted his eight-year marriage to his ex-wife, Pauline, and caused irreparable damage to the couple's five children. He had asked for \$1.7 million.

After 5½ hours of deliberation Monday night, the jury awarded O'Neill \$500,000 in punitive damages and \$250,000 in compensatory damages. Each of his children is to receive \$50,000.

Several members of the Spokane-based offshoot of the Roman Catholic Church filed out of the courtroom after the verdict was read and refused comment. O'Neill hugged his children and said the ruling was "nice, fine."

O'Neill, of Kalispell, Mont., told the jury he had a good marriage until his wife came to Coeur d'Alene to visit her mother, who lived at the Triden-

tine center there, 10 years ago. The woman gave her daughter church literature to begin "the brainwashing and indoctrination of Pauline," he said.

Tridentines are Roman Catholic dissidents who believe the reforms of Vatican Council II have led the church astray. At the center of their beliefs is the preservation of the Latin mass.

Letters he received from his wife after she entered the church indicated she was staying against her better judgment, he said.

Bliss Bignall, the church's lawyer, argued that Mrs. O'Neill was simply exercising her First Amendment rights when she chose to enter the church movement.

O'Neill claimed his children also had been subjected to brainwashing procedures and that he was not allowed to see them without a church chaperon.

He said church officials told him the only way their marriage could be sanctioned was for him to become a member of the Tridentines.

Francis Schuckardt - self - proclaimed bishop

The article above relates to Francis Schuckardt who is not a valid bishop nor a valid priest. It is not the first such judgement which has been claimed against him for similar wrong doings. Schuckardt uses a false devotion to the blessed mother in order to attract the unsuspecting. While not publically proclaiming himself Pope, Schuckardt lets it be known that he is the only "bishop" in the world, thus in reality, Pope.

Schuckardt has incredible wealth which according to testimony, comes primarily from alimony he receives from married women whom he orders to divorce their husbands and take up residence with him at his "religious" house.

Recently, a number of Schuckardt's seminarians have left his school. A number have admitted that they were approached by Schuckardt and asked to perform unnatural sex acts with him. It is on public record that he has been arrested for homosexual acts.

The Society of Saint Pius X,
SOUTHWEST DISTRICT

Post Office Box 1307
Dickinson, Texas 77539
(713) 337-4513

6

Reverend
Hector L. Bolduc, SSPX,
President

September 6, 1983

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

This is to certify that between September 1 of 1973 and June 29 of 1974, an individual calling himself "Bishop" Daniel Q. Brown wrote a letter to Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre in Switzerland asking Archbishop Lefebvre to reordain and reconsecrate him as a priest and a bishop, as he questioned his own ordination and consecration. During this period of time, I answered Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre's mail which came from english speaking countries. Archbishop Lefebvre's answer to Daniel Q. Brown, which I myself typed and sent to him, stated that Archbishop Lefebvre would have nothing whatever to do with him.

Fr. Hector L. Bolduc
Fr. Hector L. Bolduc
Society of St. Pius X
Southwest District Superior

HLB:MG

Given under my hand and seal of office this 6th day of September 19 83

W. E. Fairbairn
W. E. Fairbairn, Notary Public in and for
Galveston County, Texas

My commission expires the 31st day of August 19 84

According to the Traditional Laws of the Roman Catholic Church... ⑦

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE ORDINATION OF FRANCIS SCHUCKARDT?

A. He received Holy Orders without the necessary divine calling

A divine vocation, or calling, is absolutely necessary in the candidate for Holy Orders. St. Paul writes: "Neither doth any man take the honor [of the priesthood] to himself, but he that is called by God, as Aaron was." (Hebrews 5:4)

Our Lord says: "He that entereth in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep." But, of those who make themselves 'shepherds' in an illegitimate manner: "Amen, amen I say to you: He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up another way, the same is a thief and a robber." (John 10:1-2)

What formally constitutes the divine calling to Holy Orders? The Catechism of the Council of Trent gives the Church's authoritative teaching: "They are called by God who are called by the lawful ministers of the Church." A young man is called to the priesthood when, and only when, after due preparation, a legitimate Roman Catholic bishop summons him to receive that sacrament.

Therefore he who receives Holy Orders without that lawful summons, on his own initiative, "takes the honor to himself," and "entereth not by the door into the sheepfold."

B. He received priestly ordination in an illicit manner

1. He was not incardinated. The Church does not permit 'independent' clerics. Everyone must belong to a given diocese or approved religious institute. This 'incardination' begins with the reception of first clerical tonsure, sometime after the beginning of theological studies (canon 976, §1).

Canon 111, §1. Every cleric must be attached to some diocese or to some religious institute; unattached clerics [vagi] are utterly inadmissible.

2. He was ordained without dimissorial letters. When a candidate for Holy Orders is to be ordained by a bishop other than his own local bishop, formal letters of permission called 'dimissorial letters' must be sent by the candidate's bishop to the one who is to administer the sacrament.

Canon 955, §1. Each one must be ordained by his proper bishop or with legitimate dimissorial letters from him.

3. He was not free from canonical irregularities. An 'irregularity' is a condition or a crime committed by the candidate for Holy Orders which makes him unworthy to receive further degrees of Orders or to exercise those already received.

Canon 968, §1. Only a baptized male can validly receive sacred ordination; only one who, in the judgment of his own Ordinary, possesses the required qualities according to the sacred canons, and is not held back by any irregularity or other impediment, does so licitly.

Canon 985. The following persons are irregular due to the commission of a crime:

7^o. Those who perform an act of orders reserved to clerics in sacred orders, either when they lack the order, or when they are forbidden to exercise an order already received because of a personal, medicinal, vindictive, or local canonical penalty.

4. He had not received a normal seminary formation.
The Church has very rigorous requirements for the training of candidates for Holy Orders.

Canon 972, §1. Care should be taken that aspirants to sacred orders be received in a seminary from their early years; all, however, are obliged to dwell in a seminary at least during the entire period of theological studies unless in special cases the Ordinary for a grave reason shall give a dispensation, for which, however, he shall be responsible in conscience.

Canon 976, §3. The theological course must not be made privately but in a theological school established for this purpose, and it must be conducted according to the course of studies prescribed in canon 1365.

5. The required intervals between the different degrees of Holy Orders were, presumably, not observed. Failure to observe these intervals makes the ordination illicit (canon 974, §1, 6^o).

Canon 978, §1. Between ordinations the proper time intervals must be observed, and during these intervals those promoted to orders should exercise themselves in their order according to the regulations of the Bishop.

§2. It is left to the prudent judgment of the Bishop to determine what interval of time shall elapse between the tonsure and the order of porter, as well as between the single minor orders. Acolytes must wait at least a year before being promoted to the subdiaconate; subdeacons and deacons at least three months in their respective orders before being promoted to the diaconate and the priesthood respectively, unless in the judgment of the Bishop the need or the advantage of the Church demands otherwise.

6. Other requirements for ordination were not observed. Canon 996 prescribes that candidates for ordination must undergo a thorough examination in theology. Canon 998 requires that 'banns' of ordination be published in the candidate's home parish.

C. He received episcopal consecration in an illicit manner

1. He had not been a (legitimate) priest for five years. This is one of the requirements enumerated by canon 331 for a person to be judged suitable for the episcopacy (§1, 3^o).

2. He did not possess the required academic degree. Canon 331 also requires that someone under consideration for the episcopacy must possess a doctorate or at least a licentiate in theology or in canon law from university or other institute approved by the Holy See (§1, 5^o).

3. He was not chosen by the Roman Pontiff. What has previously been said of the necessary calling applies also to this supreme degree of the sacrament of Holy Orders.

Canon 329, §2. They [bishops] are freely appointed by the Roman Pontiff.

Canon 953. Episcopal consecration is reserved to the Roman Pontiff; hence, no Bishop is allowed to consecrate another Bishop unless he is certain that he has a papal mandate.

Canon 331, §3. It belongs solely to the Apostolic See to judge whether someone be suitable [for the office of bishop].

4. The ceremony of consecration was not correctly carried out. Although it is not absolutely required for validity, the liturgical laws of the Church demand that three bishops together administer this sacrament.

Canon 954. A Bishop who is to consecrate another Bishop must be assisted in the consecration by two other Bishops unless a dispensation has been obtained from the Apostolic See.

D. It is illicit for him to exercise the Orders he has illicitly received

1. He neither had nor has any canonical mission. Canon 109 explains that a man receives the power of orders through ordination, but that he receives the power of jurisdiction -- that is, authority in the Church -- by canonical mission, when he is 'sent' (in Latin, 'missus') to a specific post by his ecclesiastical superior.

Canon 147, §1. An ecclesiastical office cannot be validly obtained without canonical provision [appointment].

§2. Canonical provision means the grant of an ecclesiastical office by competent ecclesiastical authority, made according to the sacred canons.

2. He (it is said) had been guilty of a crime that incurs an irregularity. The nature of a canonical irregularity has been discussed above.

Canon 968, §2. A person who is kept back by an irregularity or other impediment is forbidden to exercise the orders already received, even though the irregularity or impediment arose after ordination through no fault of his own.

3. He is suspended and excommunicated because ordained by a schismatic bishop.

Canon 2372. Those who presume to receive orders from one who is excommunicated, or suspended, or interdicted, after a declaratory or condemnatory sentence has been passed upon him, or from a notorious apostate, heretic, or schismatic, ipso facto incur a suspension a divinis reserved to the Holy See; one who in good faith is ordained by any such person, is forbidden to exercise the orders so received until he shall be dispensed.

Decree of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, April 9, 1951. A Bishop of whatever rite or dignity who consecrates as a Bishop one who has neither been named nor explicitly confirmed by the Apostolic See, as well as he who receives consecration, even if they are compelled by grave fear, ipso facto incur excommunication reserved in a most special way to the Holy See.

4. He is suspended because consecrated without the apostolic mandate.

Canon 2370. A Bishop who consecrates anyone as a Bishop without an Apostolic mandate [papal permission], contrary to the provisions of canon 953, and the Bishops, or the priests acting in their place, who assist as co-consecrators, and the one who is so consecrated, are ipso jure suspended until the Holy See shall dispense them.

E. Additional remarks concerning Daniel Brown

Above, we have discussed the person who illegitimately received Holy Orders. A few words are now in order concerning the person who illegitimately conferred them.

For Daniel Brown, a 'bishop' of the schismatic 'Old Catholic' sect, legitimately to confer Holy Orders on anyone, he would have needed:

1) To be absolved in the internal forum, that is, within his soul, through the sacrament of Penance, of the sin of schism, and his other sins.

2) To be absolved in the external forum, by absolution from the competent ecclesiastical authority, for his public crime of schism against the laws of the Church.

3) To receive permission to exercise the Orders he had (presumably) himself received in an illegitimate manner.

4) To receive the necessary permissions to confer the Orders he conferred on this particular person in this particular case.

What, in fact, did Daniel Brown do before conferring Holy Orders on Francis Schuckardt? He recited, before witnesses, the Profession of the Catholic Faith and Abjuration of Error.

In no way was this sufficient to satisfy all four of the above points.

At the very most, if this public act was accompanied by true internal contrition for his sins, and if it was morally impossible to reach a suitable confessor, then Daniel Brown would have obtained the (internal) remission of his sins in the sight of God.

However, until absolution in the external forum, he would still be considered, and treated by the Church as, a schismatic.

This act did not absolve him from his censure(s).

It did not make of him a legitimate Catholic priest and bishop.

It did not give him the authority to confer Holy Orders, especially episcopal consecration, upon Francis Schuckardt or anyone else.

The Society of Saint Pius X™
SOUTHWEST DISTRICT

Post Office Box 1307
Dickinson, Texas 77539
(713) 337-4513

12

Reverend
Hector L. Bolduc, SSPX™
President

October 10, 1983

Mr. Ely Jason
P.O. Box 25667
Honolulu, Hawaii 96825

Dear Mr. Jason:

Concerning Mr. Francis K. Schuckardt, please feel free to publish the fact that I shall be happy to debate this individual in a public place provided that the public is invited and that the newsmedia be also present.

I can assure you that I can provide witnesses and facts to support the accusations made against Mr. Schuckardt.

Recently, charges have been made against Mr. Schuckardt concerning his involvement in immoral practices. The charges of homosexual activity has been made by former members of his cult stressing that they were approached by Mr. Schuckardt to engage in homosexual acts.

This would be an excellent opportunity for Mr. Schuckardt to answer these charges and I for one would relish the opportunity to question Mr. Schuckardt under oath concerning this particular aspect of his life.

Please note that this letter is signed, and if Mr. Schuckardt feels that I cannot prove all allegations made, than he is free to take legal action against me.

In Mary Immaculate,
H. Hector L. Bolduc
Father Hector L. Bolduc

MOUNT SAINT MICHAEL

(13)

Month of the Seven Sorrows of
the Blessed Virgin Mary

Dear Ely,

Praised be Jesus Christ Our King and Mary Our Immaculate Queen!

I wish to thank you for your letters, especially for your "letter of introduction" of March 28th. In that letter you pointed out your happiness and gratitude to the Blessed Virgin Mary for attending our Lecture and meeting the religious. You also indicated in the same letter your intention to come to Our Lady's Community in Spokane, Washington, on a pilgrimage. As I explained to you on the phone, not only have I been traveling most of the time since last March, but have also suffered from physical illness and, of course, have many pastoral duties when home with the hundreds of souls in Our Lady's Community. Despite the inability to answer your letters sooner, I still wish to apologize for the delay, and I hope that you will understand the great difficulty of responding before now.

It seems that in this age of great apostasy, God is punishing mankind by a shortage of priests. For so long, Catholics took the Mass and the Sacraments for granted, and now this complacency is being justly punished. Although I commend your desire for the Mass and sacraments, I cannot but lament your writing to a member of Lefebvre's group asking that a priest be sent to Hawaii. [His response was nothing more than a scandalsheet filled with the most incredible fabrications, extreme falsehoods, and malicious calumny.] We have always noticed that those who reject the Truth have attacked our Bishop and our Community most vehemently - not on doctrinal grounds, for our teachings are irrefutable, but they have attempted to destroy the character of our clergy and religious. This reminds one of the hypocrisy of the Pharisees, who, sated with contempt for that Divine Master who laid bare their inflated pride and egoism, sought to discredit Him in the eyes of others by spreading malicious slander.

The exaggerated tales and mudslinging lies of Hector Buldoc hardly deserve comment; nevertheless, we will respond to those few we can recall. The accusation that we have "made our own saints" is a lie, pure and simple, and I defy him to produce one shred of evidence to that effect. This man never came to Our Lady's Community to meet with our Bishop and priests. The only encounter, which he misconstrues, was his attendance at a lecture by Father Denis Philomena Marie before the latter was ordained to the priesthood in September of 1975. This lecture in Texas was attended by only 15 people, and when Bolduc stood up afterwards to state his disagreement, the fact that a few of the remaining people walked out proves absolutely nothing. The statement that Bishop Daniel Q. Brown was unsure of the validity of his own consecration and then had himself re-consecrated is dead wrong. We have never had anything to do with the "Jovites" and I challenge this man to produce his bogus "photograph" of our Bishop standing side by side with their "pope." The nonsense about consecrating the body and blood of the Blessed Virgin Mary is a revolting accusation, which I will not condescend to answer. That our school is an institution where children are brutally beaten and parents forbidden to see their children is, once again, a base calumny. That we "have our own group of thugs who go about terrifying those who oppose us" is the blackest of lies. Whatever else this inveterate liar told you I do not now recall from our conversation, or it was already discussed. If my indignation has been kindled, it is not for myself, but because of a true concern for the Spotless Bride of Christ, Holy Church, upon which such filth is being flung. How this man can write such missives without trembling at the thought of his judgment is beyond my comprehension.

But who
canonized
St. Joseph?
What's the
muck?

AM
MAY
BOOTH
KATSE
WH
HAPPEN
TO
THEM

But Rev. William Melson said VII is not heretical.

Why was Rev. Mary Benedict, CMRI, going to the services of Lefebvre?

Let me then, Ely, review briefly one more time our position as opposed to Lefebvre's. Firstly, no true Pope would ever teach heresy - for that would be contrary to Christ's promise. How could a true Pope destroy the Mass and the Sacraments and promulgate the heresies of a spurious Council? Lefebvre indeed opposed some of what was said at Vatican II, but nevertheless affixed his signature to all but ^{two} three of the documents of that heretical Council. His establishment of a traditional seminary at Ecône was fully condoned and authorized by the apostate Wright. By acknowledging the heretical usurpers of the Chair of Peter, he has been thus de facto dispossessed of any legitimate authority. His belief that the new religion of Humanism, as taught by the Church of the Beast (Vatican II) is somehow Catholic, is a blasphemy which defies description.

The recent rift in this society with nine priests rejecting the stand of Lefebvre is an interesting subject. They were told to begin saying the Mass of John XXIII, to accept the annullments of the Vatican-II Church as valid, to accept the "sacraments" administered by the Vatican-II hirelings as valid (Baptism, Marriages, etc.), to accept John Paul II, and to cease preaching that the Novus Ordo is per se invalid. Of course, the compromises in the area of Catholic teaching on their part is a subject

What was he doing at their services?

all in itself. [The rampant immodesty that we ourselves have witnessed at their services is completely contrary to Canon Law.] Until recently, the co-education at Mt. St. Mary's, Kansas, produced numberless and serious problems. I personally know a number of stu-

Now they have co-ed at MSM!

dents who have gone there and have reported this pathetic situation. After this situation, which is completely contrary to the teachings of Pope Pius XI, had gone on for a number of years, the students were separated. Needless to say, there are still numberless problems with the students, not to mention the serious lack of unity among the teachers. Other contradictions could be adduced, but time does not permit us to do so now. The primary inconsistency, however, remains their acceptance of John Paul II, Paul VI, et alia as true Popes together with their flagrant disobedience to the same.

The notion that a true Pope, guided by the Holy Ghost, can lead the Church into error, heresy, and apostasy is a most terrible blasphemy against God the Holy Ghost. I cannot understand how the likes of Hector Buldoc can spend his time sitting at a desk and spreading malicious gossip with his pen - malicious gossip aimed at the character of those who exhaust themselves, trying to spread throughout the world devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary and the true Catholic Faith. A true Catholic priest, of which there are so few, should have his "hands full" with the worship of God and the salvation of souls. That one who claims to be such should spend his time in mudslinging does not seem to be in accordance with the pattern set by Christ. As was said above, since they cannot refute our doctrine, they must resort to the attempted destruction of our character.

Yet FMB denied in April 1988 or committed sacrilege & John Elin is married.

[As far as the ordination and consecration of Bishop Francis Schuckardt is concerned, to deny its validity would be a denial of the sacramental theology of the Church.] The acceptance of the Orders of the American Old Roman Catholic bishops by all theologians of any repute before Vatican II is apparently of no weight in the judgment of these self-appointed "popes." That the Catholic Church has always accepted the validity of the Orthodox line - in schism now for nearly a thousand years - seems also to be of no interest to them. The fact of the matter is that Bishop Daniel Q. Brown made a public profession of faith and Abjuration of Error before the ordination and consecration of

What evidence did FMB use to convince himself he could be conditionally ordained again

our Bishop took place [The feeble attempt on the part of some of these "priests" to use the excommunication of Arnold Mathew by St. Pope Pius X as "evidence" that our Orders are invalid is laughable and betrays an utter lack of theological erudition.]

There is so much more that could be said, but we must leave that until a future time. Indeed, discussion, by itself, will never accomplish an entire understanding of the Truth. [The only way to perceive the Truth today, to adhere to it, and to persevere will be with the graces of the Immaculate Heart of Mary] Our Divine Lord gave us a means to determine the truth, which will always remain certain when the clouds of theological debate have dissipated - for, "By their fruits you shall know them."

Your "letter of introduction", which was very touching, wisely pointed out the

need to be wary of too much study and research. The learned Suarez declared that he would gladly sacrifice all of his knowledge and learning for the merit and value of a few minutes of prayer. How many lay theologians have we not seen in the past 20 years fall miserably into error as stars from heaven! Your research has brought you a long way, and your devotion to the³Blessed Virgin Mary, as well as that of your dear mother, brought you to a lecture in Honolulu. My fervent prayer is that your frequent and fervent Rosaries, your earnest prayers to the⁴Immaculate Heart of Mary and the²Sacred Heart of Jesus will lead you to an entire understanding of the Truth. This age of the Great Apostasy is, indeed, "Satan's hour," and the only way to persevere will be through a fervent living of our Total Consecration to the⁵Immaculate Heart of Mary.

In closing, then, I exhort you to leave aside irrelevant accusations. Stick with the issues of our Faith and avoid that dangerous curiosity which has led many astray. Be assured that I will ever commend you in my poor prayers and especially at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. May God bless you and⁶Mary keep you.

In the service of Jesus and Mary,

Rev. Fr. Mary Benedict, CMRI

Rev. Fr. Mary Benedict, CMRI

Ely Jason,
P.O. Box 25667,
Honolulu, Hawaii 96825

Thursday, October 13, 1983

Dear Father Mary Benedict:

Blessed be God Almighty, and praised be Jesus and Mary! I had altogether lost hope that you were ever going to write to me, so you can imagine how happy I was to receive your letter. I am sincerely hoping and praying that this letter of yours will only be the first in a series of letters. Yes, I fully understand that your working-schedule is enormous and overwhelming. However, there are many theological problems that I need to discuss in depth with you. A clear, precise and accurate understanding of these issues is absolutely ESSENTIAL to my own spiritual evolution. Furthermore, it will have a direct influence and impact upon the lives of everyone with whom I come in contact.

You see, I have ads in 10 different newspapers here in Hawaii; so as it turns out, I am directly influencing a growing number of people, from all walks of life. Then too, I am continually conducting an ever-expanding literary correspondence with various people and groups on the Mainland. In short, any letters from you affect not only myself, but a large number of others as well.

I would like to point out that if I were already a member of your community, such questioning would be altogether impertinent: OBEDIENCE AND HUMBLE SUBMISSION are the Prime Directive of any authentic religious Order. Whereas, a marathon-race of endless questioning could lead me away from the goal by leaps and bounds! By the same token, if I were a priest in the Society of St. Pius X, " mine is not to question why, mine is but to do or die! " In either case, whether in your Community, or in theirs, I understand full-well that obedience is the Prime Directive, once I have made that final decision.

However, at this point in time, I am simply a layman who has not taken any vows, or joined any Religious Order. I am honestly doing everything I can to pursue Truth with all my heart, mind, soul and strength. It involves a vast amount of research and study that never seems to end! In practical terms, this means that I have spent the greater portion of this last 4 or 5 years like a hermit, holed up in the silence and solitude of my bedroom, buried beneath an avalanche of books...! Only during this last several months did I finally come forth from my self-imposed exile in the catacombs of ancient theology. I felt in my soul that a new time was at hand....

By some strange coincidence, no sooner did I arrive here in Hawaii than I met you and your Community! Almost immediately, I was dragged into the center of a controversy that I did not create: a controversy between yourselves and the Society of St. Pius X. I am absolutely determined to get to the bottom of all this, no matter how much time and trouble it takes. The struggle to understand is REAL. My heart feels like the rope in a tug-of-war between two opposing forces: the forces of light and darkness! The charges and counter-charges are flying past my head like machine-gun fire in the heat of battle: and I am caught in the crossfire. Hostility and anger are exploding all around me, like bombs on a battlefield!

Amidst the crashing thunder of spiritual warfare, I find myself searching for the still, quiet voice of Truth which says: " This is the Way! Walk in it! Do not turn to the right or to the left, for God is with you! " (Is.30:21).

As I said, I would like to communicate with you at length, and in depth, concerning a number of issues. However, so as not to burden you with too great an overload, I will not immediately ask every single question I can think of! It is far better if we discuss no more than a few problems or questions in any specific letter. This makes it possible for us to discuss those issues with greater depth, detail, and documentation.

I feel that it is far better to discuss one or two points thoroughly, than it is to discuss a multitude of points superficially. Once we have discussed any subject in this manner, there is no need to discuss it ever again. Personally, I love the Scholastic approach to all questions and matters of discussion. True, it is slow and plodding and painstakingly methodical — exact and precise to a fault! However, it has the effect of a steamroller on every subject of discussion and topic of conversation. Hence, it reminds me of a certain Scripture: "Whoever falls against it will be broken to pieces, but on whomever it falls, it will grind him to powder!" (Mat.21:44).

That applies very well to the Scholastic Method! I would like to keep that approach in mind as I write my letters to you; and I encourage you to do the same. Let us proceed! I am enclosing a copy of Father Hector Bolduc's letter to me, which I read to you over the phone (dated August 23, 1983). I believe that it is only fair, just and honorable that you should be presented with a copy of the charges that he has levelled against your Community. This in turn will give you a fuller opportunity to defend yourselves in depth and in detail, concerning the various charges and allegations. Your present letter only addresses 6 or 7 of the points as you remember them. The average comment was about one or two sentences apiece. Hence, your defense was not as thorough as it might have been.

FIRST REQUEST: I INVITE YOU TO PROVIDE A MORE DETAILED COMMENTARY UPON THE SPECIFICS OF THAT LETTER. THERE WERE MANY POINTS THAT YOU DID NOT COVER.

In your letter, you said: "... His response was nothing more than a scandal sheet filled with the most incredible fabrications, extreme falsehoods, and malicious calumny. We have always noticed that those who reject the Truth have attacked the Bishop and our Community most vehemently — not on DOCTRINAL grounds, for our teachings are irrefutable; but they have attempted to destroy the character of our clergy and religious... as was said above, since they cannot refute our doctrine, they must resort to the attempted destruction of our character! "

If I understand you correctly, you are saying that Fr. Hector Bolduc's position is founded upon character assassination, pure and simple; it has no doctrinal basis. However, Father Bolduc sent me a 5-page document analyzing all the canon-laws that were broken by Bishop Francis Schuckardt's ordination. 5 pages! I am enclosing a copy of that document for your inspection. SECOND REQUEST: PLEASE REPLY TO IT IN DETAIL.

Father Mary Benedict, I am very impressed with your intelligence, fire and zeal. Your letter to me was not only precise and to the point, but it was warm and personable. I found you, and all the Sisters and Brothers that I met out here very likeable, sincere, loving and friendly. On a personal level, I feel like you and I would get along extremely well together; and that goes for everyone else that I met in your Community. However, in the interest of theological objectivity, I prefer to let all of that go unsaid. I will not mention it again, but you should always read between the lines of anything that I say, however stern it may be, and you will always find this same spirit of loving concern for yourselves.

When I speak as a human being; or rather, when I speak as a Traditional Roman Catholic, it is allowable to speak of the warmth and love that I feel towards all Traditional Catholics, whoever they might be, and whatever their specific understanding might be. But as a THEOLOGIAN, I am forced to speak another way, which is firm, and forceful, and even at times very stern. I want you to understand that clearly, Father Mary Benedict, because I would be dishonest and deceitful to you if I did not tell you my true feelings and convictions on these theological issues we are discussing! This is a question of TRUE CHARITY, which is not afraid to tell the truth no matter where the chips may fall, for love of the soul you are talking to; versus FALSE CHARITY, which seeks to evade and avoid all controversy, for the sake of a superficial peace!

Pope St. Pius X said that, " Catholic doctrine tells us that the Prime Duty of charity does not lie in the toleration of false ideas, however sincere they may be; nor in theoretical or practical indifference towards the errors and vices in which we see our brethren plunged; but in the zeal for their intellectual and moral improvement, as well as for their material well-being. " I do my best to speak and communicate with that principle in mind. Unfortunately, when put into practice, it tends to make one sound very gruff and stern!

Be that as it may, I would like to comment on something that you said in your letter. You said, " The rampant immodesty that we ourselves have witnessed at their services is COMPLETELY CONTRARY TO CANON LAW. " Although I am not a canon-lawyer by any means, I wonder how it is possible to accuse the Society of violating canon-law in good faith, when the ordination of Francis Schuckardt appears to be a flagrant violation of canon law in EPIC PROPORTIONS, as the enclosed pages show. This would appear to be a case of straining at the gnat, and swallowing the camel; or noticing the speck in your brother's eye, when there is a beam in your own. " Let him who is without sin among you cast the first stone! "

In short, if the argument simply revolves around Canon Law, I don't see how you can possibly win. Never in the entire 2,000 year history of the Roman Catholic Church was it ever heard that a layman could go to a schismatic bishop, who is married and has kids! ... and become ordained as a priest and bishop of the Roman Catholic Church!!! Such an act is surely a violation of Canon Law in epic proportions. From the most uneducated Catholic anywhere, to the most educated canon-lawyer in the world, such a claim must surely appear preposterous and incredible...Truly, such a claim appears to be an ALL-TIME HISTORIC FIRST!

In view of this fact, it seems both strange and comical that you would condemn immodesty in Archbishop Lefebvre's chapels as being " completely contrary to canon law! "

No malice is intended, nor do I want to sound gruff: But from a strictly theological point of view, it would appear that Francis Schuckardt's ordination is even more reprehensible than that of Bishop Arnold Mathew. As you know, Arnold Mathew was at least a valid Roman Catholic priest prior to his ordination at the hands of a schismatic ORCC bishop. Francis Schuckardt wasn't even that! Therefore, the consequences appear to be far more dreadful and serious in the case of Bishop Schuckardt.

Pope St. Pius X EXCOMMUNICATED AND ANATHEMATIZED BISHOP ARNOLD MATHEW, WHICH IS THE CHURCH'S SEVEREST FORM OF EXCOMMUNICATION! BISHOP FRANCIS FOLLOWED IN ARNOLD MATHEW'S FOOTSTEPS, BUT WAS NOT EVEN A PRIEST. THE IMPLICATIONS ARE OBVIOUS!

The excommunication and anathema of Arnold Mathew were uttered by the most famous Pope of this century, a Pope who is also a canonized saint. Furthermore, he is the world's foremost enemy of Modernism! These indisputable facts have DREADFUL implications for Francis Schuckardt. They also have dreadful implications for yourself and Fr. Denis ~~Rakay~~, and the entire Inner Circle of your community. As I said, Arnold Mathew was at least a valid priest before he went to the ORCC bishop. Yet that did not save him from the wrath of Pope St. Pius X! Francis Schuckardt was made both a priest and a bishop. Hence, his situation is far more grave altogether. Strict logic and reason dictate that if Pope St. Pius X were alive today, he would pass the EXACT SAME SENTENCE UPON FRANCIS SCHUCKARDT, AS HE DID UPON ARNOLD MATHEW. IN FACT, HE WOULD PROBABLY THROW THE BOOK AT HIM, SINCE THE CASE IS FAR MORE EXTREME!

By the way, the enclosed documents show that the public abjuration of Dan Brown, (which he has apparently retracted), would not in any way be sufficient to render him an authentic Roman Catholic bishop...

I would like to repeat that no malice is intended in all these subjects that I am discussing, nor do I like to sound gruff! However, another MAJOR POINT HAS JUST OCCURRED TO ME, AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO REPLY TO IT IN YOUR NEXT LETTER. BRIEFLY, IT CAN BE BEST EXPRESSED LIKE THIS:

If the principles and premises behind Francis Schuckardt's ordination are morally blameless, theologically sound, and canonically valid (as you affirm), then the obvious conclusion that can be derived from this premise is utterly hilarious! It would mean that I myself, or you, or any man on the face of this earth, could do the very same thing as Francis Schuckardt: following the same steps, rules and procedures that he followed, and achieving the very same result! If the principles are valid for Francis Schuckardt, than they are valid for everyone else also!

In theory, (if your position is true), then I myself could go to a dissident Greek Orthodox bishop, or to an ORCC bishop along the lines of Dan Brown, following the exact same steps and procedures as Francis Schuckardt, and PRESTO! A PRIEST AND BISHOP OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IS BORN! However, if I did not see eye-to-eye with Bishop Francis on all things, then you would end up having TWO Catholic Churches instead of One! After all, finding followers is not really so very difficult. Then I could tell them: " You are the only true remnant, the true Roman Catholics, among a world full of phony traditionalists! " Furthermore, imagine this exact same procedure being employed by a large number of individuals in America and Europe, and throughout the whole world. Since it is completely impossible that so many individuals would ever see eye-to-eye on all points of theology and discipline, IN THE END, YOU WOULD HAVE AS MANY CATHOLIC CHURCHES AND AS MANY POPES AS THERE WERE INDIVIDUALS WHO HAD FOLLOWED IN FRANCIS SCHUCKARDT'S FOOTSTEPS!

This conclusion is inescapable, once we accept your principles and premises as being valid! For if those principles and premises are valid for Francis Schuckardt, then they are also valid for you and me and everyone else! The end result would be a vast multitude of little Roman Catholic Churches, having no internal unity among-themselves. Such a conclusion is utterly preposterous; therefore, it is utterly hilarious! However, it is also inescapable, once we admit the validity of your premises! If this theoretical possibility were put into action, then it would be a sacrilegious abomination in the extreme.

It doesn't matter that there probably aren't many individuals who would have the nerve, (or the unmitigated gall!), to do such a thing. All that matters here is the PRINCIPLE. If it is morally and theologically valid for Francis Schuckardt to follow such far-out principles and procedures in becoming a priest/bishop of the Roman Catholic Church; then OF NECESSITY it automatically follows that I or you or anyone else can do the very same thing. We can simply follow in his footsteps, if his path is blameless! We can follow the same guidelines and procedures, being held morally and theologically blameless in the eyes of God! Such a conclusion is totally repugnant to human reason!

I have already gone on much longer than I had intended. However, rest assured that I have only covered a minute fraction of the topics and issues I would like to discuss. By the way, Father Bolduc sent me a 40-page manuscript, which is apparently a series of articles that were published in the Inland Register a while back. It contains an immense amount of food for thought, and topics for discussion. I have not yet released the enclosed letter of August 23 into mass-circulation. I am doing everything in my power to verify all the charges and allegations first. That is why Father Bolduc is continually sending me more and more material. I specifically requested some sound substantiation, and he is complying on a regular basis.

Among the many things he has sent me thus far, I will also enclose a copy of a notarized statement by Father Bolduc, concerning Bishop Brown.

In view of your statement that Father Bolduc's letter is " a scandalsheet filled with the most incredible fabrications, extreme falsehoods, and malicious calumny; " and since I don't want to lend myself to a campaign of malicious sl'ander!... I took the liberty of calling Father Bolduc long-distance for his personal comment, to see whether he might want to retract anything that he said. Quite the contrary, he spoke more boldly and powerfully than ever before, and repeated everything that he said TWICE! He said:

" Everything I said in my letter is absolutely true! And you have my permission to give copies of that letter to anyone you want to, including Francis Schuckardt himself! In fact, you can tell them for me that I challenge Francis Schuckardt to a public debate, anywhere, anytime, under the condition that it be a PUBLIC debate, where the press and the public are invited! At that public debate I will produce not only evidence, but witnesses who will personally substantiate everything that I say! "

I am certain of every single word here, because Father Bolduc repeated himself slowly, patiently, and very firmly. In other words, if you feel that you are the victims of a malicious campaign of slander and character assassination, then this is your opportunity to defend yourselves publicly, in a format where all the world will stand up and take notice!

It is written: " Everyone who does evil hates the light, and does not come to the light, lest his deeds should be exposed. But he who practises the Truth comes to the light, that his deeds may be manifested as having been wrought in God! " (John 3:20-21) Father Bolduc has now extended you his personal invitation to debate in a public forum, beneath the glare of lights and the blare of microphones. I am just relaying his message to you, and I will refrain from any further action until I hear from you.

In the meantime, Father Mary Benedict, I hope you realize that for me the crucial and central issue is Francis Schuckardt himself. On a personal level, I feel very close to you, the Sisters, Brothers and other priests of your community. I am convinced that you are all sincere, and dedicated to God, and to the Blessed Virgin Mary! May She Who has chosen to introduce us to each other, deign to solve the enormous problems that presently divide us! With God, all things are possible; and the Holy Blessed Virgin Mary is the Mediatrix of All His Graces! God be with you!

In the Lord Jesus Christ, and His Blessed Mother Mary,

Ely Jason.

P.S. - I just received a written letter of permission from Father Bolduc today. - I am enclosing a copy.

STATEMENT ON THE VALIDITY OF HOLY ORDERS

In the past several months many of you have had various questions in regard to the validity of the Orders of the Priests and Clerics here at Mount Saint Michael's. This statement is an attempt to answer the questions that have been raised. We hope that the information provided will answer any questions that you may have.

Validity of Schismatic Orders

One of the principles upon which the sacramental theology of Holy Orders is based is that once an order has been validly received, the recipient always retains the powers of the Orders received although the right to exercise Orders may be lost or suspended by the Church. The Sacrament of Holy Orders imprints an indelible character upon the soul and it is from this indelible character that the power of the Order flows. It has always been the teaching of the Church that Orders received from or by schismatics are valid as long as the proper matter, form and intention are retained. As we said above, the right to exercise an Order may be lost or may be suspended by the Church, such as in the case of an excommunicant or one suspended for crime; nevertheless, the sacramental character, once validly received, can never be removed. This is clearly seen in the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas. In his Summa Theologica (Supplement Q. 38, Art. 2), he states:

"Since the episcopal power is conferred by consecration, it must endure forever, however much a man may sin or be cut off from the Church."

Again, St. Thomas says (Supplement Q. 64, Art. 9)

"If a man be suspended by the Church or excommunicated or degraded, he does not lose the power of conferring the sacraments, but the permission to use this power."

Modern authors are in complete agreement with St. Thomas. Ludwig Ott, in his Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma, says:

"Every validly consecrated bishop, including heretical, schismatic, simonistic or excommunicated bishops can validly dispense the Sacrament of Orders, provided that he has the requisite intention, and follows the essential external rite."

Father M. D. Forest, in his Why Are Anglican Orders Invalid, states:

"As regards the Sacrament of Orders, not only has the Church never taught that Orders conferred by schismatics or heretics are invalid....on the contrary, She has insisted on the validity of such Orders unless there was some other defect of an essential character."

Finally, Father Pohle-Preuss, in his work The Sacraments, says:

"The Church can take away what She Herself has given, but She cannot take away the power of conferring Holy Orders."

Clearly, then, it is entirely possible and, in fact, is of common occurrence, that heretics, schismatics and excommunicants can possess and validly confer Holy Orders. The determination of the validity of such orders would rest upon the rite employed in the ordination ceremony and the intention of the minister and would be predicated on the assumption that the minister himself possessed valid Apostolic succession. Having laid this groundwork, let us proceed to a discussion of the schismatic Church of Utrecht.

The Schismatic Church of Utrecht

In the 17th and 18th centuries, French Jansenists fled to Holland where they found the Dutch clergy more favorable to the errors of Jansen. In the late 1600's the vicars-apostolic of Holland were cited to the Holy See for their Jansenist leanings, and the ecclesiastical government of Holland was transferred to the papal nuncio at Cologne.

The Dutch Jansenists refused to recognize the authority of the nuncio, and a de facto schism ensued.

In 1718, Dominic Varlet, a priest of the Seminary of the Foreign Missions in Paris, was consecrated in Paris as the coadjutor to the Bishop of Babylon. In 1719, while passing through Amsterdam on his way to the Near East, he conferred confirmation, thereby incurring the censures of the Church. Notice of his suspension was served upon him after his arrival in Persia, and Varlet returned to Europe. Rather than appeal the censure in Rome, he settled in Amsterdam and began to pontificate for the Jansenist dissidents. In October, 1742, Varlet performed the first of four episcopal consecrations which he bestowed at the request of the Jansenists of Utrecht. Thus the consecrations bestowed by Varlet gave valid Apostolic Succession to the schismatic Church of Utrecht.

The Church of Utrecht maintained the Roman Liturgy with the Tridentine Latin Mass. It professes the Catholic creed on almost all points of faith, the major divergence being on the Dogma of Papal Primacy and Infallibility, the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption. They retain the seven sacraments and are very similar to the Roman Catholic Church in ecclesiastical discipline.

The Church of Utrecht has almost certainly retained valid Apostolic Succession. Catholic writers on this subject classify them in the same category as the Eastern Orthodox Churches. The American Ecclesiastical Review in its July 1899 issue carried an article entitled, "Recent Schismatical Movements Among Catholics of the United States." This article says in part:

"Concerning the Jansenist ordinations, we remark briefly that, according to Dens, the Holy See has received priests ordained by the Jansenist archbishop of Utrecht, without reordination, and that Berthier says: 'The ordination of the schismatical Greeks and of the Jansenists is held as valid.' The first Jansenist archbishop was consecrated in 1723, by Varlet, bishop i. p. i., who had been suspended for Jansenistic errors. Since then the succession has been preserved without a break, the Latin rite being maintained intact."

Tanquerey in his Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae, Vol. II (1905) in a discussion on the invalidity of Anglican Orders, writes (page 618):

"In our days, certain Anglicans have gone to Holland to be ordained by the Jansenist bishop, which ordination is almost certainly valid..."

In speaking of the Old Roman Catholic Church, the Roman Catholic Dictionary, by Addison Arnold, says: "They have received valid Orders." A Catholic Dictionary, bearing the imprimatur of Cardinal Hayes of New York, states: "Their orders and sacraments are valid." The Rev. Konrad Algermissen in his work, Christian Denomination, published in 1948, bearing the imprimatur of John Cardinal Glennon, St. Louis, Mo., (page 363) says: "The Old Roman Catholic Church has received valid episcopal consecration..." In reply to an inquiry about the Old Roman Catholic Church, the Far East magazine of June 1928, published by the St. Columban Fathers of St. Columbans, Nebraska, published the reply that "these Orders are valid."

William J. Whalen in his work, Separated Brethren (1958), in dealing with the Old Roman Catholics, writes (page 204):

"While no official pronouncement has been made by the Vatican concerning the validity of Old Roman Catholic orders, we have no reason to doubt that they are valid. The Apostolic Succession does not depend on obedience to the See of Peter but rather on the objective line of succession from apostolic sources, the proper matter, form and the proper intention. This means that Old Roman Catholic priests are probably true priests with the full powers of the priesthood, although they would be exercising these powers unlawfully. Likewise, Old Roman Catholic bishops are bishops in the Apostolic Succession."

The Old Roman Catholic Church in the United States

The Old Roman Catholic schism spread to the United States in the late 1800's and the early 1900's. Although it is still possible to trace Old Roman Catholic Orders through several lines back to the Church of Utrecht, we will discuss here only that line through

which Bishop Daniel Q. Brown derived his Orders.

Arnold Harris Matthews (1851-1919) was an Englishman raised as an Anglican. He studied for the Anglican ministry but prior to ordination entered the Catholic seminary of St. Peter's at Glasgow. He was ordained to the Catholic priesthood but left the Church in 1889. He returned to the Anglican Church where he functioned as a curate, and while an Anglican clergyman, contracted marriage. He was reconciled to the Roman Catholic Church in 1899. In 1907, Matthews began correspondence with the Old Roman Catholics from Utrecht and was eventually consecrated by Archbishop Gul of Utrecht in April, 1908. Matthews returned to England, and in 1910 consecrated two Roman Catholic priests. This double consecration led to a rupture of relations between Matthews and the Church of Utrecht and brought his formal excommunication by Pope Pius X. In 1912, Matthews also consecrated an Austrian nobleman, the prince De Landes-Berghes et de Rache, and then sent De Landes-Berghes to the United States to head the Old Roman Catholic movement in this country. Matthews was reconciled to the Church in 1915 and died four years later.

In 1916, De Landes-Berghes consecrated Carmel Henry Carfora (1878-1958). Carfora, a former Roman Catholic priest, had been born, educated and ordained in Italy. He came to the United States and worked as a missionary among the Italian immigrants in West Virginia. He organized several "independent" parishes after having some problems with his lawful ecclesiastical superiors. After his consecration by De Landes-Berghes, Carfora proceeded to found the North American Old Roman Catholic Church, which became one of the largest Old Roman Catholic Churches in the world; by 1958, Carfora's organization numbered some 85,000 members. William J. Whalen, in his book Separated Brethren (pages 206 and 207) writes:

"This body (the North American Old Roman Catholic Church) acknowledges the Primacy of the successor of St. Peter but denies his infallibility. Its statement of beliefs includes the seven sacraments, the Mass, Transubstantiation, the veneration and invocation of the glorious and Immaculate Mother of God, of the

Angels, and the Saints, and prayers for the dead. While advocating celibacy, it does not forbid its clergy to marry. English is used in the liturgy....This body seems to be closer to Roman Catholicism than its European counterpart.

In July of 1942, Carfora consecrated Hubert A. Rogers. Rogers functioned as Carfora's co-adjutor and upon the death of Carfora in 1958, Rogers became the head of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church. In 1969, Rogers consecrated Daniel Q. Brown to the episcopacy.

A publication of the Old Roman Catholic diocese of Florida states:

"To correct any misinterpretation of what Old Roman Catholics believe, our bishops and priests meeting at the Twelfth General Council of the Old Roman Catholic Church, held at the Benedictine Abbey of St. Paul (Roman Catholic) at Newton, New Jersey, on April 27-28, 1973, made the following unanimous declaration: 'This General Council reaffirms that it holds and teaches all that is held and taught by the Roman Catholic Church in matters of faith and morals.' Clearly, then, lest there be any further misunderstanding, this Church holds and teaches the Catholic Faith without any reservations, condemning all heresies condemned by Rome, and teaching even those doctrines that have been declared by Roman Pontiffs since this Church has been cut off from our Holy Father, the Pope."

Daniel Q. Brown

Daniel Q. Brown was born and raised in the Roman Catholic Church. He became very concerned at the doctrinal and liturgical aberrations introduced by the Second Vatican Council and so left the Vatican II Church and became affiliated with the North American Old Roman Catholic Church under Rogers. Brown studied at the Old Roman Catholic seminary and was ordained and consecrated by Bishop Rogers. For some time Brown functioned as an Old Roman Catholic bishop, but by September of 1970 he had dropped the name "Old Roman Catholic" and had begun referring to himself

(24)

as a Roman Catholic bishop. We first made contact with Brown in early 1970. Our community had just come under attack in the "traditionalist" Catholic press for our rejection of the new Mass and Paul VI. Bishop Brown wrote to us encouraging us to stand firm. Correspondence was begun with him and we learned that his Orders came through Old Roman Catholic lines. When we discovered that he was an Old Roman Catholic, we informed him that we did not want anything to do with him. It was at that point that he told us that he had gone to the Old Catholics to receive Holy Orders, but that he had never accepted their errors and that he still considered himself to be Catholic. In a letter dated September 17, 1970, Bishop Brown wrote:

"We have no connections or intercourse with any other church or group and especially not with "Old" Catholics. It is true that our Apostolic Succession was obtained from a bishop descended from the Church of Utrecht, but this was done because we knew that there was no question as to the validity of their Orders. As a matter of fact, the Roman Catholic Church (pre-Vatican II, that is) has recognized the validity of Holy Orders emanating from the Church of Utrecht.

We are Roman Catholics who feel obligated under pain of mortal sin to make sure that the Church founded by Our Lord Jesus Christ continues to the end of time as He promised. We believe that the "new" Church is not only heretical but is also fast plunging into a form of Unitarianism if not worse. We question the validity of the present Pope since many of the things he has done--as well as things he has left undone--are not indicative of a valid Pope. We are not, however, anti-Papal. As a matter of fact, we commemorate the Pope (without naming the present one) in every Mass we say. We, indeed, look forward to the day when a valid Pope once more occupies the Chair of Peter (and this shall come--whether in ten years or a hundred) and on that very day we shall submit wholeheartedly to the Vicar of Christ on earth."

This position was reiterated by Bishop Brown in a letter of July 10, 1971:

"We are Roman Catholics, nothing more, nothing less, who are forced by circumstances to function temporarily without a Pope. We follow the doctrine, dogma and liturgy of the Roman Catholic Church as She existed prior to the death of Pope Pius XII. Our Holy Orders are descendent from the Church of Utrecht (Holland) whose Apostolic Succession, Holy Orders and Sacraments have been recognized as valid on numerous occasions by the Roman Catholic Church. We are not schismatics, apostates or heretics--on the contrary, we look forward to the day on which we can be united with the valid Holy See. We are not in communion with any other church or denomination."

We corresponded and met with Bishop Brown over a period of about two years. We assured ourselves of his orthodoxy and his good intentions and eventually he ordained and consecrated Bishop Schuckardt in October and November 1971.

Several Objections Answered

Some assert that even though the episcopal consecration of Bishop Schuckardt was valid, the exercise of his sacerdotal and episcopal powers would be illicit. This assertion is usually based on the following presumptions: (1) Bishop Brown incurred automatic excommunication and suspension in receiving orders illicitly in a schismatical-heretical sect. (2) Bishop Schuckardt incurred an irregularity, from which he was not dispensed, when as a layman he distributed Holy Communion on several occasions.

Bishop Brown as layman did in the early 1960's incur ipso facto excommunication by joining the Old Roman Catholic Church. He incurred suspension and excommunication by his reception of Holy Orders and receiving episcopal consecration in this schismatical-heretical sect. However, prior to his consecration of Bishop Schuckardt, he publicly renounced the errors of the Old Roman Catholic Church and made a Profession of Faith. Church History provides examples where schismatic and/or heretical bishops have been received into Catholic Communion

through the Profession of Faith.

"From the ancient institutions of the Fathers we have learned that those who are baptized in the name of the Trinity, although amid heresy, whenever they return to the Holy Church, may be recalled to the bosom of their Mother the Church either with the anointing of chrism, or the imposition of hands, or with A PROFESSION OF FAITH ALONE... without any hesitation receive all whoever return from the perverse error of Nestorius... make no opposition or difficulty in regard to their own orders." (Letter of Pope St. Gregory, Qui Caritati, to the bishops of Spain, Dens. 249)

These objections are also founded on a false application of Canon Law, for Canon Law, due to its imperfect nature, is subject to change. This change is termed equity when applied by a superior, or epikeia, when as exception to the law is presumed by an individual (Canon 18). St. Thomas Aquinas discusses epikeia:

"Every law is directed to the common weal of men, and derives the force and nature of law accordingly. Hence the jurist says: 'By no reason of law, or favor of equity, is it allowable for us to interpret harshly and render burdensome, those useful measures which have been enacted for the welfare of man.' Now it happens that the observance of some point of law conduces to the common weal in the majority of instances, and yet, in some cases, it is very hurtful. Since then the lawgiver cannot have in view every single case, he shapes the law according to what happens most frequently....Wherefore if a case arises wherein the observance of a law would be hurtful to the general welfare, it should not be observed." (Summa Theologica, I-II, Q. 96, Art. 6)

"Since human actions, with which laws are concerned, are composed of contingent singulars and are innumerable in their diversity, it was not possible to lay down rules of law that would apply to every single case.

Legislators in framing laws attend to what commonly happens; although if the law be applied to certain cases it will frustrate the equality of justice and be injurious to the common good which the law has in view.

"Epikeia does not set aside that which is just in itself but that which is just as by law established. Nor is it opposed to severity, which follows the letter of the law when it ought to be followed. To follow the letter of the law when it ought not to be followed is sinful. Hence it is written in the Codex of Laws and Constitutions under Law V.: Without doubt he transgresses the law who by adhering to the letter of the law strives to defeat the intention of the lawgiver."

(Summa Theologica, II-II, Q. 120, Art. 1)

Abbo and Hanna in their work The Sacred Canons, Pg. 39, in treating of epikeia, state:

"Epikeia, a benign interpretation of the human law according to that which is just and good, is said by St. Thomas to be a virtue by which a person, though not observing the strict letter of the law, does comply with the intention of the lawgiver. The legislator is presumed to intend what is good. If, then, in a particular case, literal obedience would be productive of evil or become morally impossible, the presumption is justified that the legislator did not intend to insist upon the enforcement of his law under those circumstances."

Bishop Brown invoked epikeia. If there only had been a legitimate Holy Father, Brown's path would have been obvious. But he knew that Paul VI was not a pope and he knew of no bishops remaining faithful to the Church, so recourse was impossible. Bishop Brown felt strongly the responsibility to consecrate someone to preserve Apostolic Succession. In Brown's certain doubt of the relevant application of Canon Law, his suspension and any irregularities ceased and

jurisdiction was supplied by the Church to render his acts licit. Woywood in his Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law (Vol. I, pg. 10) states:

"When the existence, meaning, or extent of the obligation of a law is doubtful it is called dubium juris...when the majority of moralists maintain that doubtful law is not a law, and has no force to bind in conscience. This is true if the meaning, or scope of the law is in doubt, and the code admits that a law in a dubium juris has no binding force."

Speaking of this doubt of Law, Bouscaren and Ellis in their Canon Law, a Text and a Commentary (pg. 114) say:

"As regards the licitness of the use of jurisdiction which is merely supplied by the Church: (a) in a positive and probable doubt of law the use is simply licit..."

Prior to Bishop Schuckardt's ordination and consecration by Bishop Brown, several priests had reserved the Blessed Sacrament here on condition that Our Lord should be rendered due homage by the Community and that the Sacred Species should be consumed before they could undergo corruption. Again in this instance the principle of epikeia was invoked to make it possible for Holy Communion to be taken to the sick and given to members of the religious Congregation when priests were not present. Certainly such an action was not unprecedented in Church History. In the times of persecution such activity was common, as can be seen from the histories of the Roman persecutions and the persecution of the Church in France during the Reign of Terror. The persecution of the Church in Mexico in the early 1900's furnishes us with yet another example. Pope Pius XI in 1927 granted the faithful in Mexico:

"In view of peculiar and extraordinary circumstances...whenever no suitable and ready priest, deacon, subdeacon, or cleric can be had to administer Holy Viaticum to the sick or dying, a pious layman...may carry the Sacred Species in a vessel, which is

blessed or to be blessed; and the sick person may receive the Sacred Species with his own hands...or they (may be) administered by the man who carried them." (Canon Law Digest, Vol. II, pg.26 ff)

Not only are these actions of the then Brother Francis defensible, in light of precedents in Church History, but because of the extra-ordinary circumstances no irregularities would have been incurred.

"The irregularities from delinquency are unlawful exercise of the powers of Major Orders by a cleric or layman." (Moral Theology, McHugh Callan, Vol. II, pg. 747)

"If the doubt is of law, there is no irregularity." (Moral Theology, Jone-Adelman, pg. 472)

"A law ceases to bind...if the law has become unreasonable." (Canon 20)

Traditional Catholics must remember that many of the 2414 canons in the Code of Canon Law are not strictly applicable in the circumstances that we find ourselves in today. The Church today is certainly in a different position than it was in 1958 and therefore the laws must be interpreted in view of the nature of the times and in light of previous precedents in Church History. That part of Canon Law which is applicable must be applied, and that part of Canon Law whose application would be harmful, impossible, useless or unreasonable, in the present circumstances, ought not be applied. For as St. Thomas says:

"To follow the letter of the law when it ought not to be followed is sinful."

Conclusion

Let us briefly re-capitulate the main points of this article. The Old Roman Catholic Church does possess valid Apostolic Succession and the validity of Old Roman Catholic Orders is recognized by the Roman Catholic Church. Although Bishop Daniel Q.

Brown erred in receiving orders from a schismatic Church he did repent and sought to return to the true Catholic Church. Due to the extra-ordinary nature of our times it was not possible for him to submit to a true and legitimate Pope and so he did the best that he could do in these circumstances. He publicly renounced his error, made a profession of the Catholic Faith, and began to work with those traditional Catholics who sought the true Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the true sacraments of the Church. In sort, Bishop Brown did what any prudent man would have done in the same situation (given the extra-ordinary nature of our times). Bishop Brown invoked Canons 209, 2261, and 2264 to obtain the jurisdiction needed to licitly give the sacraments to the faithful who sought them.

In consecrating Francis Schuckardt to the episcopacy, Bishop Brown invoked the principle of epikeia and judged that the Church would wish that Apostolic Succession be transmitted to others so that the faithful would have the benefit of the Mass and the sacraments. It must be remembered that in granting the so-called "extra-ordinary" or

"emergency" faculties, Holy Mother the Church is providing for the spiritual welfare of Her children, who would otherwise be left without the Mass and the sacraments. Again, it is illogical and ridiculous to argue for a strict interpretation of Canon Law in extra-ordinary times when Canon Law is obviously not strictly applicable or in circumstances when the strict application of the law would deprive the faithful of the sacraments and render the true Mass and Sacraments almost non-existent. It is rather interesting that the same people who argue for a strict interpretation of Canon Law will engage in verbal gymnastics to allow an aged French prelate, in violation of all Canon Law (if strictly applicable), to found a religious society, send priests throughout the world to found parishes in already existent dioceses, openly and scandalously refuse obedience to his superiors, travel into the territory of other bishops to perform pontifical functions even though specifically prohibited from performing these functions etc. etc. ad infinitum.

We here will publish the texts of two letters that Bishop Daniel Q. Brown wrote -- one in defense of the validity of his Orders

and the other expressing his views of the terrible crisis faced by the Church in our days. We thought they would be of interest to our readers.

Open Letter to Reverend Frank Korba
Pastor, St. Mary's Byzantine Catholic Church
December 14, 1975

Rev. Frank Korba, Pastor
St. Mary's Byzantine Catholic Church
101 E. Main Street
Marblehead, Ohio 43440

Reverend and Dear Father Korba:

It has been brought to my attention that a discussion took place among some members of your parish during which the validity of my Holy Orders was questioned. While I realize that it may not be important whether or not the members of the Byzantine Rite accept my validity, it is obvious that their refusal to accept it is due to a lack of knowledge of Church history, theology and Canon Law. I feel, therefore, that they ought to be enlightened on the subject.

As a preface to the examination of this question, I should like to remind you of the Augustinian Principle of "once a priest, always a priest" - a principle accepted by the Catholic Church. As you yourself know, of course, that means that the sacrament of Holy Orders leaves an indelible mark upon the soul of the man receiving Orders. This mark can never be removed - not even by a pope - and is carried on the soul forever. Consequently, if a priest, or a bishop, leaves or even is cast out of the Church or is excommunicated, he still remains a priest or a bishop with all of the powers of a priest or bishop. Now, if he is outside the Church, he is undoubtedly forbidden by the Church to exercise his sacerdotal or episcopal powers. However, if he should defy the Church and say Mass or, in the case of a bishop, consecrate another bishop, such an act would be illegal but it would still be valid. In other words, the Body and Blood of Christ would be truly upon the altar of such a priest at the words of Consecration and a bishop consecrated under such circumstances would indeed be a real bishop. This must be understood by those who erroneously believe that valid Holy Orders cannot exist outside the structure of the Catholic Church. Indeed a number of schismatical and heretical Churches (e.g. Eastern Orthodox, Old Roman Catholic, Coptic, Syrian Jacobite, Nestorian, etc.) possess valid Holy Orders and consequently valid sacraments.

My own Holy Orders and Apostolic Succession come from the Church of Utrecht in Holland, also called the Old Roman Catholic Church. This Church was once a diocese (of Utrecht) of the Roman Catholic Church. Because of political reasons and accusations of heresy, the diocese separated from the Catholic Church. Its first bishop was consecrated by a bishop in good standing of the Catholic Church, Bishop Dominique Varlet, who himself had been consecrated by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Paris. The bishops of Utrecht maintained the valid Apostolic Succession by consecrating their successors down through the centuries. Therefore, I can trace my own consecration and Apostolic Succession in a direct and unbroken line back to the Roman Catholic Church. Critics will say that the Catholic Church has not infallibly pronounced as valid the Holy Orders of the Old Roman Catholic Church. That is true and the reason is that the Catholic Church never infallibly pronounces as valid any Orders other than Her own. She has likewise never infallibly pronounced Eastern Orthodox Orders to be valid and yet nobody in his right mind would question the validity of those Orders. The Catholic Church has, however, officially pronounced Old Roman Catholic Orders to be valid. This has been done by a number of statements printed under the imprimatur declaring Old Roman Catholic Orders to be valid. I

can provide such statements.

There are some who question my validity because of the influence of a paper which was distributed some time ago by one Hugo Kellner, an amateur theologian. Kellner denounced me as invalid because of his faulty interpretation of Canon 2264. This Canon states that "Acts of Jurisdiction by a vitandus are invalid". A "vitandus" is one who has been excommunicated by the most solemn excommunication of the Catholic Church. In this excommunication, the excommunicated person is named and the faithful are warned to avoid him. The Latin for "to avoid" is "vitare", hence "vitandus" or one to be avoided. Since Bishop Arnold Harris Mathew, through whom I receive my Succession, was excommunicated by Pope Pius X as a vitandus, Kellner claims that any consecrations performed by Mathew after his excommunication are invalid. He states that, consequently, my own consecration is invalid. The error in Kellner's reasoning is that Canon 2264 declares Acts of Jurisdiction (such as a bishop granting faculties to a priest in his diocese, etc.) but does not declare sacramental acts (saying Mass, conferring the sacraments - including Holy Orders) to be invalid. This is clearly shown further on in the same Canon with the statement that, in cases of emergency (danger of death, etc.) a Catholic may receive the sacraments from a vitandus. Furthermore, there is irrefutable proof that the Catholic Church accepts sacraments - including Holy Orders - from a vitandus to be valid. This is proven in the case of Bishop Orestes Chornock who was a Byzantine Rite Catholic bishop in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Bishop Chornock became involved in a dispute with the Pope over the Papal decree of 1929 which forbade further ordinations of married men in the Byzantine Rite. Bishop Chornock considered the decree to be discriminatory because it affected only the Byzantines in the U.S. and also felt that it was an imposition of "Latinization" upon the Eastern Rites. The dispute became so bitter that the Pope excommunicated Bishop Chornock - a vitandus - the same excommunication imposed upon Bishop Mathew. After his excommunication, Bishop Chornock went into the Eastern Orthodox Church where he was received as a bishop - without reordination, of course. While a bishop of the Orthodox Church, he ordained a number of priests. Sometime later, some of these priests converted to the Byzantine Rite Catholic Church where they were received as priests without re-ordination, meaning that the Catholic Church accepted them as validly ordained - by a vitandus. I have the names and addresses of some of those priests.

The validity of my Holy Orders cannot be questioned and indeed is not questioned by those who are familiar with Church history and Canon Law. There are, however, those who, although admitting that I am a valid bishop, believe that I am not a legal or licit bishop. They ask how I can claim to be a Catholic bishop when I am not in union with Paul VI. The answer is simply that I, and my followers, cannot accept Paul VI as the valid and licit pope and consequently his Church as the true Catholic Church. We cannot accept as Catholic a Church which permits its members to be Masons, or a Church which accepts Transignification rather than Transubstantiation, a Church which permits heresy to be taught without even a reprimand to the teachers of heresy, a Church whose "pope" promotes the cult of man and secularism, among many other aberrations from true Catholic teaching of which I have documented evidence. In fine, if the "new" Church of Paul VI is the true Church, then the Catholic Church has been wrong for 2,000 years. That we cannot accept. Apologists for the Paul VI Church admit that there are "some" within Paul's Church who are unorthodox but have blinded themselves into believing that a little heresy doesn't hurt much. The truth is that the Catholic Church cannot be a "little bit heretical" any more than a woman can be a little bit pregnant. You yourself have stated that you (the Byzantines) are the most orthodox of any in your Church. That is an admission that there are then in your Church those who are less orthodox than

yourselves. In the true Catholic Church there cannot be those who are more orthodox or less orthodox - one is either orthodox or one is heretical. Catholic Truth is One and any Church which permits some members to be less orthodox than others cannot call itself the Catholic Church. It is true that heresies have arisen in the Church even from the beginning but those heresies were always denounced and the heretics were cast out of the Church - excommunicated. Heresy was never permitted to exist side by side with orthodoxy. I do not make these statements in arrogance, Father, or to start a "religious argument" but only to explain my reason for being.

Before assuming leadership of several parishes of Catholics who have left the Paul VI Church for reasons which I have outlined, I left the Old Roman Catholic Church and made the Profession of Faith and the Abjuration of Heresy in the presence of some 40 witnesses. Since we cannot in good conscience accept Paul VI as pope, we cannot submit to him. We consider the Church to be in Interregnum or a period between popes - a phenomenon which has occurred at other times in Church history. We believe, of course, that there will again be a valid pope in God's own time. When that occurs, we shall submit to the valid pope. More than this we cannot do at the present time and under present conditions. We can justify our position by the application of the Canonical principles of Epikeia and of Intrinsic Cessation - with which you, of course, are familiar.

Since I know that the question of my validity and my position is of some interest to others in your group, I am making this more or less an open letter and am sending out copies to a number of other persons. There is no attempt or desire on my part to proselytize among the Latins of your parish. On the contrary, most of them whom I know could not be accepted by us for various Canonical reasons. Also, if you question anything in this letter or feel that I may have left anything unsaid, it is my hope that you will contact me so that I may answer you. I have documentation for every statement I make.

Before closing, I cannot help noting that the presence of the Latins in your parish, and in other Byzantine parishes, brings up an interesting theological question. It is common knowledge that those people have left the Western Rite and have gone into your parish because they do not accept the Novus Ordo Mass as a valid Mass and because they consider Paul VI to be a heretic. Since they reject the Western Rite (Novus Ordo) of your Church as heretical and since they refuse to accept your pope, they have to be, from your own point of view, heretics. The question in my mind is how you can give the sacraments to those whom you know to be heretics. If that practice is acceptable in your Church, then it must be that you approve the principle of "private interpretation" which is not a Catholic principle but Protestant. I bring this up because I have never been able to obtain a satisfactory answer to the question.

With the hope that this letter may clear up some of the misunderstanding about my background and position, with best wishes I remain,

Sincerely yours in Christ,
(Most Rev.) Daniel Q. Brown

Open Letter to Hugh McGovern, Editor of the Voice
October 13, 1975

Dear Hugh:

This is an attempt to talk common sense to you - always bearing in mind what a Spanish philosopher wisely observed - that common sense is the least common of all the senses.

In recent issues of The Voice, you have been beguiling your readers with speculation that Archbishop Lefebvre will leave the apostate Church and head up the Traditionalist Movement. You say that the Archbishop is "our last hope". If indeed he is your last hope, then you have no hope at all. The Archbishop will not leave Paul VI, nor will he consecrate a bishop for the Traditionalists - and I explain why.

Either you do not know what is going on in Switzerland or you are not telling for reasons which would work to your advantage. Even now, you have many people worked up with the false hope that the Archbishop will become their bishop and that does not hurt your circulation a bit. As you have done so often in the past, you are again going off half-cocked with emotion-packed sensationalism which only serves to confuse the very people who most need the truth.

Over the years Archbishop Lefebvre has been supported financially by a small number of very wealthy people - including at least one American. This financial support has been so generous that the boys who attend the seminary have been able to do so free of charge if necessary. Everything is provided them - even their room and board. However, it must be noted that the people who have been providing this financial aid are Wanderer-type "Catholics" who purport to believe in "Traditionalism" as long as it is confined within the structure of the "Church" - meaning the Church of Paul VI. That is a mockery of Catholic Truth. Now if the Archbishop left Paul VI and consecrated a bishop for the Traditionalists (which he would have to do, otherwise there would be no point to his actions), he would have to do so without the Mandate of Paul VI who would certainly give no permission for the consecration of such a bishop. If the Archbishop defied Paul VI by consecrating a bishop without the Mandate, he would then be excommunicated. At this point, those who are giving him financial aid would immediately withdraw their support from him. This would mean that the Archbishop would be thrown on the mercy of the wolves who call themselves "leaders" of the Traditionalist Movement. It takes little imagination to see what would happen if and when the Archbishop got out of line with those ego-maniacs. They would cut him to pieces. Now, the Archbishop is not a stupid man and he knows what his fate would be at the hands of the neurotic "leaders". He is old and ill and it is doubtful that he could survive that kind of treatment. He needs compassion and understanding.

What has obviously not occurred to you is that, if the Archbishop did in fact agree to head up the Traditionalist Movement, his first act would have to be the excommunication of all of those "leaders" who have been playing fast and loose with Catholic Truth - and that includes you. I can pick up virtually any issue of The Voice and find theological, canonical and/or scriptural errors in your writing. Some of these errors I have already pointed out to you. Of course, you have chosen not to acknowledge my correspondence - just as you ignored my challenge to debate you on the pages of your own paper. One of the most blatant errors appears on the very mast-head of The Voice. There you state that you are dedicated to the "restoration" of the Roman Catholic Church to the status-quo of pre-Vatican II. "Restoration" means bringing back something which has been lost or taken away. The Catholic Church has never been lost or taken away and your

implication that it has been is a denial of Christ's truth. You suggest that Paul VI has "destroyed" the Church when the truth is that nobody can destroy the Church founded by Jesus Christ. To say otherwise is to call Christ a liar. Nor has Paul VI "taken over" the Church as you imply. He and his cohorts have rather merely confiscated the cathedrals, churches and other material wealth of the Church. You are confusing the material image of the Church with the real Church.

What this means is that you, and many other Traditionalists, are living in a dream world. You naively believe that someday, somehow, somebody is going to wave a magic wand over the city of Rome, or perhaps flick a switch in the Vatican, and suddenly everything will be as it was before. That will never happen. The great material wealth and worldly prestige of the Catholic Church was built up over centuries. We do not have that much time left. I do not claim to be a prophet or seer but everything points to the probability that the end of time may be closer than we realize. The physical Church as you and I knew it is probably gone forever. It seems clear that the true Catholic Church will consist of a very small number of real faithful who will not even have church buildings but will hear Mass in the living rooms of homes. Many adjustments will have to be made and true Catholics will have to adapt to conditions unheard of in the Church of more prosperous times - without, of course, giving up Catholic truth. More than once the principles of Epikeia and of Intrinsic Cessation ("when it is morally impossible to follow a man-made law of the Church, then one may do what the Church would do or one may resort to former laws of the Church") will have to be applied and Catholics must educate themselves so as to recognize the circumstances under which these principles may be used. In fine, true Catholics will find themselves in a status not at all unlike that of the primitive Church. Left behind will be the compromisers with Truth - those cowardly souls who refuse to leave the "pope" and who insist upon attending his illicit Byzantine Masses as a sop to their consciences, the wretched CUF'ers who whimper that the "Holy Father" says this or that, the amateur theologians (mostly bitter old men who hate everybody) who get their kicks by writing long treatises on theological minutiae, the editors of "Traditionalist" newsletters who bend whichever way the wind blows in an effort to please as many subscribers as possible, "Traditionalist" priests who try to stand with one foot in orthodoxy and the other in heresy (an impossible balancing act) by saying the Tridentine Mass on one hand and on the other refusing to denounce their apostate "bishops" and their heretical "pope", lay owners of "Catholic" parishes who are breaking Canon Law and at the same time are blindly obsessed with the fine points of the law, ad infinitum et ad nauseum.

When will you ever learn, Hugh, that as long as you keep hiding your head in the sand, you are not facing the truth? Time is running out. God will not be mocked.

In Christ,
(Most Rev.) Daniel Q. Brown

(32) - A

Mount St. Michael
North 8500 St. Michael's Road
Spokane, Washington 99207

Feast of Corpus Christi
June 21, 1984

Dear friends in Our Lady,

Praised be Jesus and Mary!

I am writing this rather lengthy letter in an attempt to clearly explain the position that I have been forced to take during the last few weeks. This is not an easy time for any of us, and I feel that I have an obligation to be completely open with you, the laity, and explain my position in a clear and forthright manner. I am forced to write this letter since Bishop Schuckardt has labelled myself and the other priests at Mount St. Michael's as Satanic and excommunicate. These allegations are of a very serious nature and have been made publicly. As many of you may be approached in the coming weeks by lay people or religious who have sided with Bishop Schuckardt, I feel that it is imperative that you understand fully the real issues at hand.

1) Inccmpetency

Most of you are well aware of the fact that over the past several years Bishop Schuckardt's health has grown increasingly worse and that he has become more and more dependent upon his medication. In the past several months, the medical professionals who have worked with Bishop Schuckardt for many years, and who are totally aware of his complex medical problems and history, have approached me several times and indicated that Bishop Schuckardt takes far too much medication that the medication is having a disastrous effect on his general health, and that the medication is actually causing the problems that it is supposed to relieve. (The side effects of the medication that Bishop Schuckardt takes are: euphoria, dysphoria, headaches, excitement, hypersensitivity, agitation, confusion, hallucinations, convulsions, facial flushing, dry mouth, nausea, vomiting, and phlebitis.) The doctors who have worked with Bishop Schuckardt have said that, if he does not moderate the amount of medication he is taking, he will be dead within a year. It is my opinion that this problem with medication is causally related to many of the other problems we will discuss.

You are all aware of the fact that for the past several years things in the Community have been in complete and utter chaos. It is my feeling that the vast majority of this chaos is caused by Bishop Schuckardt's inability to physically function and because of the various emotional and psychological side-effects of the medication he takes. We all realize that as remnant Catholics we are to be followers of Christ Crucified, and that we will have certain crosses and contradictions in our daily life that we have to accept in a spirit of humility and resignation. The problems we will discuss are not merely crosses and contradictions, but proofs that Bishop Schuckardt is not capable of administering the affairs of the Church and of providing for the spiritual needs of the people.

Several cases in point:

a) Church law provides that pastors make the sacraments available for the people at times when the people are able to receive the sacraments and attend the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. In the past year it has become the norm, here in Spokane, that Mass times for Sundays and Holydays of Obligation are not even announced until Sunday morning or the morning of the Feast. On many occasions, announced Masses for Sundays or feasts have been cancelled at the last minute or their location changed at the last minute. On the Feast of the Assumption, 1983, and on the Epiphany of Our Lord, 1984, (both days of obligation) Masses were not scheduled for the laity until late in the evening. On the Feast of the Assumption the priests were instructed to say private Masses at 9:00 p.m. Mass was finally provided for the laity at 11:00 p.m., but the vast majority of the religious did not attend Mass on that day as they were to wait for Bishop Schuckardt's Mass, which was never offered.

On the Feast of St. Joseph the Worker, 1984, three different phone messages were sent out within a four-hour period that the day was not, was, then was not a holyday of obligation.

On Easter Sunday, 1984, Mass times were not announced until 3:00 p.m. with the Masses scheduled at such times that by the time the message was disseminated among the laity some of the Masses had already been said. The solemn ceremonies of the Easter Vigil were delayed for over two full weeks so that Bishop Schuckardt could be present.

My concern is not the fact that the laity are often obliged to wait long hours for Mass and for ceremonies. My concern is that many of the laity are deprived of the opportunity of assisting at Mass and receiving the sacraments even on feasts of obligation, simply because Bishop Schuckardt will not schedule Masses at an hour and place where the laity can attend Mass.

When I mentioned my concern to Bro. Fidelis, one of Bishop Schuckardt's aides, I was told that he (Bro. Fidelis) would not worry if the priests all had private Masses on Sundays and, if the Bishop was unable to say Mass, the people missed Mass. The laity would just have to "offer it up."

b) Liturgies have been scheduled and re-scheduled over the past few months to the point of absurdity. The Brothers and Sisters still have not had the solemn ceremonies of vows for 1983; Christmas ceremonies were constantly postponed during Christmastide to the point that we were told to combine Bishop Schuckardt's Christmas Mass with the Ash Wednesday Liturgy; when Sister Mary Gertrude died, her funeral was scheduled for four successive days; the ceremonies for the Feast of the Purification and for Epiphany were scheduled on a number of dates, and at this time the Purification candles still have not been blessed. This year we kept Christmas decorations up two weeks into Lent, and Passiontide decorations were kept up into the third week after Easter. All of these abuses are of grave concern to me since a Bishop by law is supposed to see to the regularity of the liturgical life of his diocese.

c) Most of you have been told time and time again about the urgent financial needs that the Church has; you have been asked time and again to help support the missions of the priests and Bishop. After we re-obtained possession of the Priory and started to go through the boxes of mail that had been accumulated over the years and simply stacked in corners and out-of-the-way places, we found a large amount of cash and over \$15,000 in out-of-date, uncashed checks. Many of these checks and much of the unanswered mail dates back to the early 1970's.

Other results of the mail not being processed have been the lack of communication between the religious and their relatives and friends in other parts of the country; the lack of follow-up in contacting and keeping contact with people reached in missions; the total lack of regular processing of mail and book orders at the Center.

After the recent O'Neill legal suit, over \$13,000 in Church funds were seized by Mr. O'Neill simply because mail at P. O. Box 1207 was not processed and we were not made aware that Mr. O'Neill was seizing these funds.

d) Bishop Schuckardt and some of those religious with him may contend that none of these problems are at all that serious. As a priest I feel that it is a very serious matter that the laity are not able to attend Mass and receive the sacraments regularly. The other problems that I have mentioned are a direct result of the dependency that Bishop Schuckardt has on his medication. I feel that the man is so physically sick that he is not capable of functioning in a reasonable manner.

e) Those of you who have attended the Conference or the Retreat-Seminars in recent years are aware of the problem to some degree. You will remember that the Fall Conference in 1983 was re-scheduled the day after it was to have started, in spite of the fact that people had travelled here from out of state. When the Conference was finally held, the keynote address was scheduled four nights in succession without success. At the San Diego Seminar in 1983, the people were not assigned rooms until 1:00 in the morning, and the Seminar dragged on until Tuesday morning. At the Ohio Seminar in 1984, the room assignments were not made until 3:00 in the morning. On the pilgrimage to Germany in December, 1983, the pilgrims spent two extra days in one city because Bishop Schuckardt refused to let the group go on without him. The added expenses for these two extra days were, of course, paid by the pilgrims themselves, in spite of the fact that they had already paid for lodging and meals in two other cities. Many excuses were made for these delays and re-schedulings. The real reason was that Bishop Schuckardt, because of the quantity of medication he was taking, was unable to function properly.

2) Claims to the Papacy

I have become aware recently that on several occasions Bishop Schuckardt made the claim to several people that he was the Pope. The claim seems to have been based upon the reasoning that he was the "only Catholic bishop in the world" and that on pilgrimage in Rome at the shrine of Our Lady of the Snows he was mystically crowned by Our Lady. In the past when I asked Bishop Schuckardt about these claims I have always received an evasive answer.

a) I have in my possession a booklet written by a member of the Community which bears the Nihil Obstat of Bishop Schuckardt. This booklet contains an erroneous history of Bishop Schuckardt's life, of his episcopal consecration, and makes reference to Bishop Schuckardt as Pope Hadrian VII and has a chart showing Our Lady of Guadalupe presenting the Papal tiara to Bishop Schuckardt.

b) I have in my possession sworn statements by several persons whom Bishop Schuckardt told personally that he was the Pope. (These same persons were instructed not to tell myself and other priests and clerics since we "did not have the grace to accept it.")

c) Bishop Schuckardt has worn and wears a white cassock in the manner of a Pope (not an episcopal white cassock trimmed in red piping, but a papal white cassock trimmed with gold piping). Bishop Schuckardt has allowed pictures of

INSERT

Page 34, paragraph 1 is badly faded. It should read: " Other results of the mail not being processed have been the lack of communication between the religious and their relatives and friends in other parts of the country; the lack of follow-up in contacting and keeping contact with people reached in missions; the total lack of regular process of mail and book orders at the Center. "

Page 36, paragraph 1 is badly faded. It should read:

Absolution of an Accomplice in a Sin of Impurity

One of the most severe censures in the Canon Law of the Catholic Church is reserved for a priest who attempts to absolve an accomplice of his in a sin against the Sixth Commandment. This crime carries a penalty of Excommunication Latae Sententiae which is Most Especially Reserved to the Holy See. To incur this penalty, a priest must commit a sin of impurity with some other person and then attempt to hear the confession of that person. If such a crime occurs, the absolution is invalid and the minister incurs the excommunication Latae Sententiae. "

himself in a papal cassock to be made and disseminated among the religious and laity.

d) Two religious superiors have deposed under oath that they were given a chart showing Bishop Schuckardt being mystically crowned as Pope and told "under obedience" to have duplicate copies made and displayed in every religious house and school. (The charts were made, but never displayed. Copies of the charts are in the Church files.)

e) On several occasions in the past Bishop Schuckardt has shown me letters from different lay and religious in which he is addressed as the Pope. My impression was that he wanted me to agree with him that he was the Pope. It is my belief that in the near future Bishop Schuckardt would have proclaimed himself Pope.

f) As this claim is based in part on a "vision" that Bishop Schuckardt had, I would like to remind you that one of the side effects of the narcotic that he has been taking for quite some time is hallucinations.

g) Bishop Schuckardt also has allowed his aides to address him as "Your Holiness" in private.

3) Immorality and Scandal

Over the last several years certain charges have been publicly made that Bishop Schuckardt has in the past and continues to have sexual contact with some of his young aides. I have in the past on three or four occasions gone to Bishop Schuckardt about this problem. I was left with the impression that it had been resolved, but obviously it was not. Several years ago when I made a very forceful stand with Bishop Schuckardt on this point and was on the point of making the problem a public matter, I found that Bishop Schuckardt had told the religious and laity (who were for the most part totally unaware of the problem) that I had suffered a nervous breakdown and was in a very bad mental state. Obviously at that time I was not able to get the problem resolved once and for all since Bishop Schuckardt had effectively destroyed any backing that I might have had. Thanks be to God, I have had the opportunity this time to explain the true situation to the laity and religious, and have the backing of the overwhelming majority of the Community for the actions that I have taken.

a) I have sworn statements from several young men that while working with Bishop Schuckardt as "medical aides" they were seduced by and sexually abused by Bishop Schuckardt.

b) I and Father Mary Benedict have talked with three young men who are presently with the Bishop and who function in a capacity as his personal aides at great length about this problem. All three of the young men have told Father Mary Benedict and myself, either separately or jointly, that they either have in the past or presently still do engage in sexual activity with Bishop Schuckardt as part of his "medical treatment." All of these young men assured us that Bishop Schuckardt has told them that there is nothing at all morally wrong with what they are doing. When I told one of them that the moral teachings of the Catholic Church forbade such activity, I was told that I, as a priest, must conform my mind to that of Bishop Schuckardt.

4) Absolution of an accomplice in a Sin of Impurity

One of the most severe censures in the Canon Law of the Catholic Church reserved for a priest who attempts to absolve an accomplice of his in a sin against the Sixth Commandment. This crime carries a penalty of Excommunication Latae Sententiae which is Most Especially Reserved to the Holy See. To incur this penalty a priest must commit a sin of impurity with some other person and then attempt to hear the confession of that person. If such a crime occurs, the absolution is invalid and the minister incurs the excommunication Latae Sententiae.

a) I have in my possession a statement sworn under oath from a young man who claims that he was seduced by Bishop Schuckardt, that he was used by Bishop Schuckardt for immoral purposes, and that afterwards Bishop Schuckardt heard his confession. In my opinion, and that of the priests and clerics that I consulted, Bishop Schuckardt clearly has incurred the penalty of this crime.

b) I know from the statements of Bishop Schuckardt's current aides that some of these young men are currently involved in sins of impurity with him, and I also know for a fact that they are accustomed to confess to Bishop Schuckardt and not to any other priests. One of these young men told Father Mary Benedict that Bishop Schuckardt told him he may not discuss this matter in confession or in counselling with any priest or superior.

While it is very difficult for me to bring these problems into the public view, I feel that I have a moral obligation as a religious superior and as Vicar General to protect the souls under my care and to try to repair this scandal which has already gone on for too long. I feel that I am well within my rights as Vicar General to declare that in accordance with the terms of Canon 429, Bishop Schuckardt has abused his authority as Bishop and that in accordance with Canons 78, 336, 1261, 1324, 1332, 2218, 2300, 2317, 2343, 2359, 2367, 2383, 2394, and 2404 I have a moral and legal obligation to warn the faithful that they should have nothing whatsoever to do with Bishop Francis K. Schuckardt and those religious and laity who are following him. Those religious are: Fr. Alphonsus Barnes, Fra. Phillip Mangold, Fra. Clement Kosch, Fra. Matthew Krier, Bro. Isaac Jogues Gorbet, Bro. Jose Rojas, Bro. Fidelis Jacobs, Bro. Matthias Horvath, Bro. John Francis Belzak, Bro. Stanislaus Ward, and Bro. Longinus Borodin. The Religious Sisters are: Sr. Dolorosa Mangold, Sr. Veronica Jacobs, Sr. Celestine Brazill, and Sr. Louise Schoenhofen. The laity are: Steve Belzak, Mitch Belzak, Mr. and Mrs. Mike Jacobs, Mrs. Mary McCullough, Irene Hom, Tony Constable, and Seraphim Rocha. If these people arrive in your area and wish to discuss this problem with you, please encourage them to get in touch with me at Mount St. Michael's. I would be more than willing to talk with any of them in your presence, so that you can hear both sides at the same time and then make a prudent and informed judgement as to who is telling the truth. I can assure you that I have nothing at all to hide; I doubt that they can make the same claim.

One final point that I would like to discuss. I am now told by several people that Bishop Schuckardt has excommunicated myself and all of the priests for the actions that we have taken. I would ask you to consider the following points. Excommunication is a censure imposed by the Church for grave exterior faults after the culprit has been warned by proper authority and is obstinate in his sin. While not in the least disparaging the power of the Church to excommunicate, I would like to point out the following:

- (a) it is the determination of myself and the priests that Bishop Schuckardt does not have the mental competency to govern (because of his problem with abuse of medication); if he is not competent to govern, then he certainly cannot issue a valid excommunication;
- (b) even if Bishop Schuckardt were mentally competent, there is no cause for the present excommunication and the proper canonical form was not observed in its issuance, therefore it is invalid;
- (c) if Bishop Schuckardt is mentally competent and responsible for his actions, it is my belief that in accordance with Canon 2367 he has already incurred an excommunication Latae Sententiae reserved in the most special manner to the Holy See for absolutio complicem in peccato turpi and is not able to excommunicate anyone, being himself excommunicate.

I have also been told that I am about to be excommunicated for bringing a legal action in secular courts against Bishop Schuckardt in violation of Canon 120. This Canon forbids the suing of certain prelates in secular courts without permission of the Holy See or of the ordinary. My reply to this is that Canon 120 specifically states that this permission is not to be refused "without a just and grave cause." The reasonable man, in view of the unique circumstances of time and place that we find ourselves in, and in view of the unique aspects of this case could, I feel, in clear conscience invoke the principle of epekeia (Canon 18) and assume that the Holy See would grant permission in this case. I am also able to reasonably apply Canon 21 on the "Intrinsic Cessation of Law" to this case. Canon 21 states in part, "A law ceases to exist when it ceases to be reasonable; for then its whole purpose of promoting the welfare of the community is defeated." In this case I can also apply the principle of "Moral Impossibility", that is, if it is morally or physically impossible to obey a merely human law, then that law ceases to be binding in that particular instance. I am also within my rights in applying the principle enunciated by Canon 15, "in a positive doubt of law, ecclesiastical laws are not binding." In this case I would argue that the binding force of Canon 120 in this particular instance is not clear; therefore, in accord with Canon 15, Canon 120 would not be binding.

I am not a canon lawyer, as you all well know. I am a simple priest who is trying to correct a scandal which has grown public over the last few years and has led to the destruction of many souls. In no way do I question nor doubt the validity of Bishop Schuckardt's orders, nor do I differ with him in regard to the principles upon which this Catholic community was founded. I am not led by a thirst for power nor do I have any improper motives in pursuing this line of action. The priests at Mount St. Michael's and I have tried to correct this problem privately and quietly. We tried on many occasions to talk with Bishop Schuckardt and work these serious problems out. It was not I who started the battle, but once committed to the battle I will not stop halfway. There are many souls at stake here, yours and mine. As God is my witness, I have taken this action only to fulfill the obligations imposed upon me in my office as Vicar General, Religious Superior and Priest. Let us all pray for those who have fallen away from the true Catholic Faith that they may quickly and speedily be reconciled to our Holy Mother the Church. Let us pray for one another that we may have the grace and courage to persevere in our Faith, and let us always recall that eloquent axiom - Salus animarum suprema lex, "The salvation of souls is the highest law."

In Jesus and Mary,

Very Rev. Fr. Denis Philomena Marie, CMRI

Very Reverend Father Denis Philomena Marie, CMRI
Vicar General

APPLICABLE CANONS

"The bishop must urge the observance of the laws of the Church, and he cannot dispense with the common law except in so far as Canon 81 allows.

CANON 336.

"The bishop has the duty to guard ecclesiastical discipline against abuses, especially in reference to the administration of the sacraments and sacramentals,. He must watch over the integrity of faith and morals, and must see that the people are properly instructed..."

CANON 336; A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY ON THE CODE OF CANON LAW.

"The vicar-general has, by virtue of his office, jurisdiction over the entire diocese in spiritual and temporal matters to the extent of the bishop's ordinary jurisdiction..."

CANON 368; COMMENTARY ON CANON LAW. (Woywod and Smith)

"It is the duty of the local Ordinaries to see that the precepts of the Sacred Canons regarding divine worship are faithfully observed, and that neither into public nor into private worship,... anything (be) admitted that is contrary to faith or discordant with ecclesiastical tradition..."

CANON 1261.

"On Sundays and other feasts of obligation the pastor must, at an hour which he judges most convenient for the attendance of the people, give catechetical instruction..."

COMMENTARY ON CANON LAW. (Woywod and Smith)

"Persons who stubbornly teach or defend, either publicly or privately, a doctrine which has been condemned by the Apostolic See or by an Ecumenical Council, not however as formally heretical, shall be barred from the ministry of preaching the Word of God and of hearing sacramental confessions, and from every office of teaching..."

CANON 2317.

"It is not sufficient to avoid heretical error, but one must also diligently shun any errors which more or less approach heresy.

CANON 1324.

"If a pastor is gravely negligent in the administration of the sacraments,... he shall be punished by the Ordinary according to Canons 2182-2185."

CANON 2383.

"Abuse of ecclesiastical authority shall be punished according to the prudent discretion of the lawful superior according to the gravity of the fault..."

CANON 2404.

"If they have committed an offense against the sixth commandment with minors under sixteen years of age, or been guilty of adultery, rape, bestiality, sodomy traffic in vice or incest with blood-relatives or relations by marriage in the first degree, they shall be suspended, declared infamous, deprived of every office, benefice, dignity, or position that they may hold, and in more grievous cases they shall be deposed."

CANON 2359, 2.

"If they have sinned against the sixth commandment in other ways, they shall be corrected with appropriate penalties in proportion to the gravity of their sin, even with deprivation of office or benefice, especially if they have the care of souls."

CANON 2359, 3.

"Besides other aggravating circumstances, a crime is more serious: 1) in proportion to the greater dignity of the person who commits the crime... 2) because of the abuse of authority or office in committing the crime... Thus clerics are more severely punished than the laity for certain crimes..."

CANON 2207.

"Penalties should be decreed with due proportion to the crime, taking into account imputability, scandal, and damage; hence not only the object and gravity of the law should be considered, but also the age, knowledge, education, sex, condition, and state of mind of the delinquent,..."

CANON 2218, 1.

"A priest who absolves or pretends to absolve his accomplice in a sin of impurity automatically incurs excommunication reserved in a most special manner to the Apostolic See. ...The same penalty is incurred by a priest who absolves or pretends to absolve his accomplice, who does not even confess the sin of complicity from which he (or she) has not yet been absolved for the reason that the confessarius complex has directly or indirectly induced the penitent to omit confessing the sin."

CANON 2367.

"If a person by his own authority takes possession of an ecclesiastical benefice, office or dignity,... incurs the following penalties: ...suspension from or deprivation of any benefice, office or dignity which he had previously obtained, and even by deposition, if the gravity of the offense calls for it..."

CANON 2394.

"...those who without canonical provision (cfr. Canons 147, 1-2; 332, 1), seize or allow themselves to be illegitimately thrust into, or who retain an ecclesiastical office, benefice or dignity, and all who take part in this, incur ipso facto excommunication reserved in a special manner to the Apostolic See."

COMMENTARY ON CANON LAW, (Woywod and Smith)

"Infamy of fact is contracted when a person, either because of a crime he has committed or because of corrupt morals, has, in the judgment of the Ordinary, lost his good repute among upright and solid members of the faithful."

CANON 2293.

"Consequences of infamy of fact: the person must be held off from receiving orders... and from ecclesiastical dignities, benefices, and offices, and also from exercising the sacred ministry and from legitimate ecclesiastical acts."

CANON 2294.

Feast of Our Mother
of Perpetual Help
June 27, 1984

Dear friends in Our Lady,

Praised be Jesus and Mary!

I am writing this letter as a personal rebuttal to a letter of Rev. Denis Chicoine dated June 21, 1984, and to reveal my stand in regard to the present tragic situation. Hopefully this letter will be instrumental in helping others to take the right stand also.

First I must remark that in reading Rev. Chicoine's letter, I almost expected to find John Tamplin's signature at the end. Rev. Denis Chicoine admits that he is not a canon lawyer, but then proceeds to pose as one, with results that can only be classified as ridiculous. I will simply proceed to answer his letter point by point.

1) Incompetency

All of us priests have certainly been concerned about His Excellency's health and the problems in Our Lady's community. The existence of problems, however, does not prove incompetence. Canonically, incompetence is defined as habitual insanity and as inability to communicate (Canons 88, 3 and 429). I lived at the Priory, however, and I know His Excellency to be habitually lucid, and that he has and does regularly communicate with the souls under his jurisdiction. I must further point out that His Excellency uses medication prescribed for him by the same medical professionals referred to in Rev. Chicoine's letter. Finally, no mention is made of the critical element of the chronic illness and severe continual pain suffered by the Bishop on our behalf. This pain and illness are an essential factor in considering almost every allegation by Rev. Chicoine and his associates.

2) Claims to the Papacy

I can hardly believe that Rev. Denis Chicoine is serious. The book referred to in his letter, is undoubtedly by Sr. Mary Ermyntude. I myself made His Excellency aware of the fact that this woman had fabricated "Nihil Obstat"'s for her books before they were copied. His Excellency forbade such presumption and cautioned against the reading of these books without specific permission. I regard the remainder of Rev. Chicoine's arguments as ridiculous and not worthy of serious consideration by anyone possessed of right reason and grace.

3) Immorality and Scandal

If Rev. Denis Chicoine is so sure that His Excellency is incompetent, why does he even go into this matter? Why indeed, when even a grade school student of the Baltimore Catechism knows that to publicize accusations of another's alleged sins, regardless of whether they be true or false, is itself a most serious sin! Indeed, it is a moral teaching of the Church that even though a priest is convinced that a certain person is guilty of mortal sin and is still in the state of mortal sin, he may not refuse that person Holy Communion if there is a danger the person's reputation may be damaged. Why? Because the sin of the priest in damaging that person's reputation would be far greater than the sin of the person receiving Holy Communion unworthily. Now this should give one an idea of the magnitude of Rev. Chicoine's public sins of rash judgment, slander, and/or detraction. I say of Rev. Denis Chicoine much the same that Robert Louis Stevenson said of the critics of Fr. Damian of Molokai: even if all the accusations against the Bishop were true, what Rev. Chicoine has done in repeating them is far worse. Irreparable harm has been done, not only to the reputation of His Excellency and his assistants, but also to the reputation of Holy Mother Church. If it is argued that the accusations were already made publicly, I reply it was only by the sinful slander of others, which most of the members of Our Lady's Community had refused to listen to. As Rev. Chicoine himself is fond of saying: "Two wrongs don't make a right."

4) Absolution of an Accomplice

I must say that Rev. Denis Chicoine has exaggerated even the most vicious accusations of our enemies. What utter hypocrisy! Rev. Chicoine complains that the Bishop has not followed canonical procedure in excommunicating him. What canonical procedure was followed in determining the Bishop to be guilty of this crime?!

a) A major contradiction appears here. If the Bishop is supposedly incompetent, he could not be responsible for his actions. If he is not responsible for his actions, then he could not be excommunicated for them (Canon 2201).

b) I know for a fact that one of the priests and one of the clerics who are now siding with Rev. Chicoine, were counselling Brothers who were assisting the Bishop that there was nothing to the accusations of immorality made by Rev. Chicoine and others in years past. Now this fact obviously contradicts the very flimsy evidence being used by Rev. Chicoine. In

-3-

(42)

other words, actions previously judged to be moral, are now being judged to be sinful by the same persons! (The rationalization for this abrupt change is based upon serious lies and exaggerations told to Fr. Benedict and Fr. Denis, and the incredible falsehoods spread by a subdeacon known to be a notorious liar.) I am certain that even if these were normal times and an ecclesiastical trial could be held, it would be impossible, because of the conflicting evidence, to find the Bishop guilty of anything, much less of "absolution of an accomplice". (It should here be noted that as the Bishop's confessor and personal advisor, I know the Bishop far better than the other priests and clerics.)

c) Even if a prelate commits a crime for which he is automatically excommunicated, according to Canon 2232,1, until a declaratory sentence has been passed (by a higher authority only), he is excused from observing the penalty whenever he is unable to observe it without infamy, and in the external forum no one can exact from him its observance unless the crime is canonically notorious. Furthermore, Bishops are exempt from all penalties except those inflicted or declared by the Roman Pontiff (Canon 2227). Now, we all know that the Holy See is apparently vacant. And since His Excellency denies culpability and has tried to prevent this slander against him, and above all, since guilt has not been proven by competent authority, the crime he is accused of is neither notorious in law nor in fact. Therefore, according to Canon 2264, even if the Bishop were guilty, his acts of jurisdiction (including the power to declare Rev. Denis Chicoine excommunicated) are valid.

The bottom line is this: with no apparent true Pope, there can be no justification for anyone to disobey or rebel against his Bishop, unless the prelate commits public apostasy, heresy, or schism. For in these latter cases the prelate ceases to be Christian and automatically loses jurisdiction. Further, under no circumstances does the Church permit the lower clergy to attempt to depose their Bishop; such drastic action can be taken only by a higher authority after all proper canonical procedures have ascertained culpability beyond any doubt. We did not leave the Vatican II Church because we thought the Bishops were immoral or incompetent; we left because of their public heresy!²

2 The feeble allegations of heresy made by Rev. Chicoine against His Excellency are ridiculous beyond belief and betray an obvious lack of theological competence. Further, "heretical" statements attributed to His Excellency are absolute fabrications based on second hand mis-information

5) Rev. Denis Chicoine's Excommunication

I can assure Rev. Chicoine that canonical procedure is quickly forthcoming. Apart from that he has incurred automatic excommunication for the following:

- a) contrivance against ecclesiastical authorities (S.C. Conc., 29 June, 1950);
- b) impedece of the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction with recourse to lay authority (Canon 2334);
- c) usurpation of Church property (Canon 2345);
- d) summoning a Bishop before a lay tribunal (Canon 2341).

Concerning the latter, Rev. Denis Chicoine has tried to excuse himself. First, he misquotes Canon 120. This Canon does not state that the Holy See should not refuse permission to take prelates to civil court "without a just and grave cause". The Canon states this of Ordinaries refusing permission to take "other clerics" (i.e. not Bishops) to a civil court. Next, Rev. Chicoine invokes "epikeia". I reply that "epikeia" cannot be invoked in this case, as the mind of the lawgiver is to prevent secular interference with the Church. Now, Rev. Chicoine's lawsuit would have the state intervene to confiscate all Church funds, without which His Excellency could not function as Bishop. Then Rev. Chicoine misquotes Canon 21. What he does quote is commentary on Intrinsic Cessation. I don't think Rev. Chicoine even realizes what he is doing in invoking Intrinsic Cessation, for, according to his letter, he believes that Canon 120 has ceased to exist. In other words, according to Rev. Chicoine, anyone may take any cleric to a civil court without any permission. Next he invokes "Moral Impossibility". What is so morally impossible about not summoning a Bishop to a civil court?! Lastly, Rev. Denis Chicoine is not within his rights when he invokes Canon 15 on positive doubt of law. According to Canon 17, authoritative interpretation of Church law is made by the legislator or his successor in office. In our situation, the legislator is the Bishop. Now, the Vicar General shares some of the jurisdiction of the Bishop, but not those powers which the Bishop reserves to himself (Canon 368). It is well known that His Excellency has reserved authoritative interpretation to himself. Therefore, Rev. Denis Chicoine has no right to call Canon 120 into doubt, nor to interpret any of the Canons he has invoked in his letter. By the way, Canon 2220,2, prohibits a Vicar General from inflicting ecclesiastical penalties without a special mandate.

-5-

In conclusion, I must protest the lies being told. It is not true that three of the Bishop's assistants admitted to sexual activity. It is not true that the Bishop was abducted by or is in any way controlled by his assistants. In fact, almost the entire letter is composed of outright lies and half-truths. Indeed, as Our Lord condemned His own accusers, the authors of this slanderous letter are well identified as eminent sons of the Father of Lies.

This unfortunate and devastating incident would not have taken place if everyone involved were living their Total Consecration to Jesus through Mary As Slaves of Mary (and let us not forget that we were introduced to this spiritual way of life by Bishop Francis Konrad Maria!), we are supposed to really and truly depend on Our Lady. Problems begin when we rely on self and take matters into our own hands. As a slave of Mary, I am going to continue to do what I have been doing for many years: live my religious life and fulfill the duties of the priesthood under the jurisdiction of my Bishop His Excellency is not a heretic; there is no one who has the authority to tell me to do otherwise. My conscience is clear and my soul is in peace. How about yours?

Ad Jesum per Mariam,

Reverend Father Alphonse Marie CMRI
Reverend Father Alphonsus Maria (Barnes), CMRI

REPLY TO REV. ALPHONSUS BARNES

Feast of Our Lady of the Snows
August 5, 1984

Dear Fr. Alphonsus,

Praised be Jesus and Mary!

I received your letter of June 27 and wished to write a short reply to it. It is not my intention to engage in a long, drawn-out debate over the actions that I have been forced to take in recent weeks, but I feel that for the good of souls and in the interest of truth, I should attempt to explain some of the issues which you have so subtly obscured or glossed over. I promise that this shall not be a long dissertation.

In discussing Bishop Schuckardt's incompetence you overlook the fact that it was Bishop Schuckardt's own medical advisors who stated that he was not competent to function as a bishop. It was these same advisors who have refused to prescribe medication for Bishop Schuckardt because of the serious problem with drug abuse. I find that your citing of Canon 88, 3 is inaccurate. This canon does not define incompetence but states that the habitually insane are incompetent and are to be classified as children without the use of reason insofar as Church Law is concerned. Canon 429 does not define incompetence either, but deals with the quasi-vacancy of the diocese. My purpose in citing Canon 429 was to show the mind of the Church in similar instances. The many serious pastoral problems that I cited in my first letter illustrate my point and are positive proof that Bishop Schuckardt is not competent to exercise the care of souls.

The allegations I made concerning Bishop Schuckardt's claims to the Papacy cannot be lightly passed off. The "nihil obstat" that I referred to was not fabricated by anyone but was written in Bishop Schuckardt's own hand. All the allegations I made on this point are documented by the sworn testimony of eyewitnesses. I notice that while you dismiss the charge lightly you do not deny that Bishop Schuckardt does believe and has led others to believe that he is the pope.

It is indeed unfortunate that I had to publicly denounce Bishop Schuckardt for his crimes of sexual perversion and for his absolution of an accomplice. The scandal that results must be laid squarely at his doorstep, not mine. I tried for a long period of time to resolve this problem quietly, Bishop Schuckardt refused to resolve it. I could no longer stand idly by and watch souls destroyed and vocations lost. The scandal that I have tried to correct is already public knowledge. It has been broadcast by the media and talked about among the laity. As a priest and superior I had a moral obligation to repair the scandal that has been caused, safeguard the morals of those souls under my care, and attempt to restore the good name of the Church. While I find your arguments full of sophistry and equivocation, I had a serious moral obligation to act as I did. Again, all the allegations that I have made are documented by the sworn testimony of eyewitnesses. The cumulative evidence is so overwhelming that, if these were "normal times", Bishop Schuckardt would have been removed from office long ago. I notice that while you cloud the issue you do not unequivocally deny the truth of the allegations that have been made.

Much of your letter is spent discussing Canon Law in an attempt to justify your position. Father, we both know that in these times Canon Law is not strictly applicable, but is rather a norm for our guidance. My point in citing the various canons was to show the mind and spirit of the Church - that criminals

are to be punished for their crimes. We could each cite Canon Law to defend our positions, but this situation reminds me of a quote from Shakespeare: "the Devil can cite Scripture for his purpose." If, however, we look to the life of our Divine Lord we will recall that Jesus condemned the Pharisees for clinging to the letter of the law while ignoring its spirit. Is it not pharisaical to allow someone to use the laws of Holy Church as a shield to protect the deliberate perversion of unsuspecting souls? You claim that Canon 2227 exempts bishops from all penalties except those inflicted or declared by the Roman Pontiff, the commentaries on the Code that I have read state that this applies to suspension and interdiction but not to excommunication.

Father, I find your appeal to your role as Bishop Schuckardt's confessor to be totally improper. If, as you say, you "know Bishop Schuckardt better than the other priests and clerics," you must know the truth of the accusations that have been made. I find it interesting that while Bishop Schuckardt continues to protest his innocence you do not.

Finally, let me say that I have not run away. I am not in hiding. I have not forbidden the laity to listen to both sides of the question and then make an informed decision. What is it that you are afraid of? I have many times made the offer, and it still stands, to meet you publicly and discuss these problems in an open forum in the presence of the laity. You know that I am not motivated by an ambition for power. You know that I am not a liar. You know that my whole priesthood has been totally dedicated to the service of the Church and souls. You know too that I will not sit idly by while souls are destroyed and the Community is ruined. I am sure that Bishop Schuckardt does not realize how painful this action has been, and it has been very painful for me, but it was truly necessary - necessary for the good of souls, necessary for the Church, and necessary for Bishop Schuckardt. In summary I believe that my previous statement clearly and accurately explains my position. I stand behind it and I reiterate each and all of the accusations made in it. If one of us is a liar, it is certainly not I.

St. Thomas Aquinas, in his SUMMA THEOLOGICAE, in speaking of the duties of subjects to their superiors states:

"It must be observed that if the Faith were in danger, a subject ought to rebuke his prelate even publicly. Hence Paul, who was Peter's subject, rebuked him in public, on account of the imminent danger of scandal concerning the Faith...as Augustine says on Gal. 2, 11, 'Peter gave an example to superiors, that if at any time they should stray from the straight path they should not disdain to be reproved by their subjects....We must allow that when a man reproves his prelates charitably, it does not follow that he thinks himself any better, but merely that he offers his help to one who, being in the higher position among you is therefore in greater danger.'" (Q. 33 Art. 5, II-II)

In conclusion, Father, may I remind you of the words of Dante: "the deepest pits of Hell are reserved for those who, in time of moral crisis, do nothing!"

In the Sorrowful Heart of Mary,

Very Rev. Fr. Denis Philomena Marie, CMRI, V.G.

Very Rev. Fr. Denis Philomena Marie CMRI, V.G.
Vicar General

Mount Saint Michael

North 8500 St. Michael Road
Spokane, Washington 99207

Feast of St. Philomena
August 11, 1984

Dear Friends in Our Lady,

Praised be Jesus and Mary!

Some of you have recently received a copy of the decree of my "excommunication" issued by Bishop Schuckardt. Several of you have asked me to write a short response to this decree. I dislike having to engage in a debate with Bishop Schuckardt and Fr. Alphonsus, but I feel that I have an obligation to the laity to explain my position.

First of all I would like to remind you that, in my opinion, and that of his medical advisors, Bishop Schuckardt is not competent to function in any official capacity. I certainly do not need to review all the reasons that have led us to this conclusion. These reasons are evident to anyone who has observed Bishop Schuckardt and/or the complete chaos and confusion that has reigned in the Community over the past two years. Since Bishop Schuckardt is not competent to function as a bishop none of his judicial actions in the external forum (such as excommunication) is valid. As you will remember, this whole situation arose in the first place because we questioned Bishop Schuckardt's competency to function as a bishop - the issues of Bishop Schuckardt's immorality and the scandal he has caused were really secondary issues.

If Bishop Schuckardt were competent and these were "normal" times, he would have been removed from office long ago. Fr. Alphonsus in his letter claims that proper authority to remove Bishop Schuckardt from office does not exist in these extraordinary times. Let us remember that Bishop Schuckardt was never formally nor canonically appointed to the episcopacy. He had recourse to the principle of "epikeia" to provide legitimacy to his consecration and his episcopacy. I think that we can invoke the same principle of "epikeia" to justify his removal. To adhere to the letter of the law in this case and to allow souls to be perverted and the Church destroyed would be eminently unjust and opposed to the common good of the Church.

In short, I believe that he is incompetent, and therefore his "excommunication" of me is invalid; if he were competent then I believe that he has forfeited his authority to govern the Church because of his abuse of office, his abuse of the Sacrament of Penance and because of his immorality. Even without the competency factor the "excommunication" would be invalid for several other reasons.

Bishop Schuckardt in the decree states that he is both judge and plaintiff. Now, Canon 201 specifically prohibits someone from exercising jurisdiction in his own behalf. In other words, you cannot, in Church Law, be both judge and plaintiff in the same action; therefore, the decree is invalid according to law.

Secondly, this decree was made without any attempt at holding a canonical trial or allowing me a fair hearing. For this reason - that a decree was passed without hearing both parties in the dispute - the sentence would be null and void. Cardinal Cicognani in his commentary on canon law makes the following very pertinent comment:

"Viewed broadly , the natural law constitutes a source for the Canon Law for the reason that certain precepts of the natural law are common to all mankind and are found in every legal system, e.g., 'the accused must be given a fair oportunity to defend himself.' Accordingly, a sentence passed without hearing the other party would be contrary to the natural law and legally null, for among all nations this maxim is held to be sacred, 'the other party should be heard.' Moreover, the natural law is the root and and rule of every system of law. ... Consequently, legislators of Canon Law cannot ordain anything contrary to the natural law, for then their legislation would not be in accordance with reason, and therefore, would be no law at all."

In the decree of "excommunication" Bishop Schuckardt tries to reserve absolution for my supposed "crimes" to himself. However, this is strictly forbidden by canons 2245 and 2247 which state that reservation is not an effect of a declaratory sentence and that the ordinary cannot reserve to himself censures reserved to the Holy See. Therefore, if the excommunication were valid, which it is not, Bishop Schuckardt could not reserve the censures to himself.

Furthermore, the first three counts of the sentence cite crimes that basically involve interference with legitimate ecclesiastical authority. My point is that, at this point in time, Bishop Schuckardt is not legitimate ecclesiastical authority. As I have explained to you in the past, we had to take legal action in this matter in order to prevent Bishop Schuckardt from embezzling Church money and property, money and property which you donated, and converting them to his own personal use.

The fourth count of the decree cites canon 2345 which punishes usurpation of the property of the Roman Church (the Holy See). Now, the only possible way that I could have usurped property of the Holy See is if Bishop Schuckardt were the Pope, a claim which Fr. Alphonsus in his letter seems to deny.

For all of the reasons cited above I believe that Bishop Schuckardt's "canonical excommunication" of me is null and void. It is not only at variance with the practice and law of the Church but is contrary to the fundamental principles of justice and the natural law. In my opinion it is one more indication of Bishop Schuckardt's inability to function rationally.

I would like to thank you for your prayers and your support during the recent crisis in Our Lady's Community. Please continue to pray for me and for all of our priests and clerics that we may have the graces necessary to know and do the Holy Will of God.

Yours in the service of Jesus and Mary,

Very Rev. Fr. Denis Philomena Marie, CMRI, V.G.

Very Rev. Fr. Denis Philomena Marie CMRI, V.G.
Vicar General

Ely Jason,
10942 Fairbanks Way,
Culver City, California 90230
June 12, 1985.

Dear Reverend Mother Mary Teresa,

1. Hello! Mom forwarded your recent letter to me from Hawaii, wondering if I have any ideas or comments to pass on. She had also sent me a copy of her long letter to you, but that was several weeks ago, and I seem to have misplaced it. That should not be an obstacle to writing this letter, however, because I remember my impressions about her letter very clearly. While some things were well said, many statements that she made left our true position very muddled and confused. As a result, I would much rather start all over again from scratch with this present letter. I will send a zerox-copy of this letter to Mom, and then she can write her own letter to you after reading it (in case I miss something important to her).

2. Well, I guess we've all come a long way down the Road of Life since our first meeting 2 years ago in Hawaii! Where does time fly? At that time, as you know, Mom and I were believers in Marcel Lefebvre and his Society; while you were still under the authority of Francis Schuckardt. But today, in 1985, all of that has changed. We are no longer under Lefebvre, and you are no longer under Schuckardt. In theory at least, we have taken a giant step closer towards each other; and for this I rejoice!

3. It grieves me greatly that traditional Catholics are divided against each other into a thousand different cults and factions and theological orientations. For as Jesus said, " A house divided against itself cannot stand! " Despite those words, there appears to be a profound lack of concern for CATHOLIC UNITY among all the various factions of Trent-oriented Catholics. It is my solemn conviction that, just as we must struggle with all our heart, mind and soul to understand Catholic Truth in its crystal purity; and just as we must struggle even harder to live it in our lives! (may God forgive us our incredible failures!); So too should we struggle with all our heart, mind, soul and strength to obtain Catholic Unity among God's Chosen Souls.

4. Obviously, I am not referring to that false, diabolical, ecumenical unity that the Whore of Babylon, Vatican 2 Conciliar Church is striving so hard to achieve! No, I am referring to True Catholic Unity, a unity that is founded upon the Faith of 2,000 years, and is centered around traditional Catholic Truth, in all its inviolate purity. Our Lord Jesus Christ prayed to the Father, " that all may be one, even as Thou, Father in Me and I in Thee. " (John 17:21) Since that was His prayer, and His fervent desire, we who wish to walk in His footsteps should also make it our prayer to the Father, and our fervent desire.

5. On a practical, down-to-earth basis, this means that we must willingly take up the Cross of theological dialogue, with strangers near and far: with those who are close to our hearts, and those who are distant from our lives. We must do everything in our power to overcome all obstacles that divide us into warring factions, praying to the Lord for His Strength, and to Mother Mary for an abundance of Divine Graces. We must strive with all our heart and mind and soul to achieve a true theological Unity that is centered and founded upon God's Roman Catholic Truth.

6. It is not an easy cross to carry, by any means! For one labors with great groanings of the heart, mind and soul, yet usually sees very little in the way of concrete results. We have all had this experience, and at times it is very frustrating: even exasperating! Yet with each new day, we must once again take up the Cross of Theological Dialogue, and carry it a few steps further down the Road to Golgotha.

7. With all of that in mind, I am undertaking once again this correspondence with you and your community; just as you yourself have already reached out to us, with simple faith and trust. Reverend Mother, let me say first of all that I have always wanted to have a Dialogue with your community from the very first. However, the majority of my letters were never answered, for whatever reasons. I usually wrote them to Father Mary Benedict, but he only answered a few times altogether.

8. I now have exactly the same problem with the Society of St. Pius X. For now that I have renounced them publicly to their face, in a series of letters; they don't answer me when I write to them, either. That is what I meant when I said that it can be very frustrating and exasperating to carry the Cross of Theological Dialogue. For usually no-one will carry it with you, and so you end up just talking to yourself! By the way, I invite you to share this letter, and all my letters, with Father Mary Benedict, and with anyone at all.

9. I intend to comment on your letter to Mom; but before I get to that, it is necessary to clear the air on a few old problems. Then I promise to bury the hatchet, forget about it, and start all over again on a whole, new basis. Please bear with me; it is not easy to dig up the past, nor is it pleasant to air dirty laundry. However, I am doing it with a constructive purpose in mind, which I will explain shortly.

A BRIEF HISTORICAL SKETCH

10. Getting back to Fr. Mary Benedict: when he had discovered my "falling out" with the Society of St. Pius X, he reached out to me with 2 letters. The first one I never received. It must have been lost in the mail. The second one I did receive. I replied by sending him copies of my Letters to the Society, in which I formally challenged and repudiated their position. However, Fr. Mary took offense at one which concerned your own community, so he cut off all further correspondence very abruptly, with a short, terse note.

11. You see, Reverend Mother, Mom and I were absolutely convinced from the very first month after meeting him, that Francis Schuckardt was and is a diabolical monster, a son of Satan, and a wolf in sheep's clothing. So in the simplicity of our Faith, we prayed on every Rosary for up to a full year "that the Francis Schuckardt Cult of Washington/Idaho would become divided against itself, and fragmented, and destroyed."

12. Our prayers were answered on June 27, 1984, when we received a mailing from Dennis Philomena (dated June 21, 1984). It revealed the major division and disruption which has since taken place in your community. Now, Mom and I were thrilled and overjoyed, so much so that we danced and sang and praised the Lord from one end of the house to the other! For as I said, we were and are convinced that Francis Schuckardt is a diabolical monster, and a ravenous wolf in sheep's clothing. Our exuberance was a natural result of our solemn convictions about the man.

13. On the other hand, and in direct opposition to our feelings about Francis Schuckardt, we were very favorably impressed by yourself and all the members of your community that we met. (At least I was; I will let Mom speak for herself). In truth, I have never met another group which seems to have such devotion, fire and zeal as yourselves. So then, I have never had any doubts about your personal piety and devotion to Mary and Love of the Lord, both individually and collectively. For this very reason, it saddened me immensely to see your whole community giving their absolute allegiance to such a diabolical monster as Francis Schuckardt!

14. Thus, despite the immense piety and devotion and zeal that we witnessed in yourselves, we had no choice but to classify your community as a Throne of Satan. For Francis Schuckardt was calling all the shots, and you had all placed yourselves under absolute obedience to him.

15. In short, the immense piety and devotion of your community was completely overwhelmed, and rendered null and void, by the immense evil of the man that you chose for your leader. My charges against Francis Schuckardt are corroborated by Denis Philomena himself, in his letter of June 21, 1984. Incidentally, I mailed copies of that letter throughout the Society of St. Pius X. Perhaps that is what angered Father Mary Benedict, I don't know.

16. Anyway, in his last letter to me (dated Nov. 22, 1984), Fr. Mary Benedict said, " By the way, I am curious to know - if you reject us and Lefebvre, then who has the truth? Perhaps you should look into the ' sedevacantiste ' Bishops. I would be interested to know your answer to this query. " I never answered him, although I do have an answer; and the reason why I never answered him was because he left entire letters of mine unanswered. Also, in that same letter where he asked the foregoing question, he said, " While I appreciate your correspondence, I can see no reason for me to keep up regular communication. " What an attitude!

17. This was an exact reversal of the attitude he demonstrated in his previous letter of October 13, 1984. It was four pages long, handwritten, and ended by saying, " Please let me hear from you soon! Remember to also include your new phone number so that I can call. Please give my regards and assurance of prayers to your mother! God bless you both! etc. "

18. My point in mentioning this is not to open up old wounds, simply for the pleasure of argument! I have no joy in digging skeletons out of the closet, nor in hanging out dirty laundry. Far from it. My point is that these flip-flops in attitude have had a very negative impact upon us; and they also reflect very negatively upon your whole community. It is as if you were all saying, " Now I'm friendly, now I'm not; now I'll write, now I won't! " By sharp contrast, I have consistently reached out for a straight-forward dialogue with all of you from the very beginning; but most of the time I had no answer at all; and when I did get replies, as I've just shown, the attitudes demonstrated were in sharp contrast to each other.

19. Now, all of that is past history, so I want to bury the hatchet, forget about it, and start over again on a whole, new basis! Let us not look backwards, unless it is to learn by our mistakes. For those who do not learn the lessons of history are condemned to repeat them.

20. Let me now turn the conversation to myself and Mom. Normally, our views on all theological matters tend to be identical. However, we have been apart from each other for almost a year now, which means that we had little or no theological conversation with each other during the space of that time. Mom's daily life routines with Patty and Roman and Steve, and all kinds of activities, makes it very difficult for her to read or write very much. Also, when she does write, it happens occasionally that she has a perfectly good thought in mind, which doesn't quite translate properly onto the paper.

21. We used to review and criticise each other's letters when we were together, on the principle that, " Where two or more are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them! " At the present time, and under the present circumstances, this is no longer practical or possible. So I will simply speak for myself, and as I mentioned earlier, will mail a copy to Mom. Then she can write her own letter separately. I will now review your letter, and insert personal comments as needed. But first...

22. A VERY SPECIAL COMMENT: I don't think you realize it, but when I turned away from Lefebvre and his Society, at that very same time I ceased believing that the Vatican 2 popes are true popes. I now believe and am convinced that there was an automatic excommunication of those " popes, " and of the entire V-2 hierarchy, and of all lay-Catholics who followed eagerly in their footsteps. This is all spelled out very clearly in the Letters that I mailed to the Society, especially #3. If Father Mary Benedict still has those copies that I sent him, then perhaps he will lend them to you. On the other hand,

perhaps he threw them away! If so, please ask and I will send you more copies. There is a 6th Letter which is the most explicit of all. It was mailed to Fr. John Emerson of Dublin, Ireland. Father Mary doesn't have that one.

23. Turning now to your letter to Mom. In your second paragraph, you asked Mom to tell me that you have a " new Bishop, and he is 100% Catholic, orthodox, etc. He received his Orders from Roman Catholic bishops; and to clear up anyone's doubts about our priests, he conditionally re-ordained them. " I have a comment and also a request. First the comment. Someone I know here in Los Angeles told me last week that your bishop is George Musey of Texas. Also, I was told that he was made a bishop by Thuc! Now, I have never researched Bishop Thuc in any great detail, although I have much information available at my fingertips if I want to dig it out of the closet. However, what little information I have heard is that he was responsible for some disastrous fiascoes, relative to ordinations and consecrations. He subsequently repented of his errors, and apologized to the V-2 pope. Then he changed his mind again, and went forth on another tangent. I am simply repeating unconfirmed information at this point, but I intend to learn more soon.

24. That leads logically to my request. Would you, or Fr. Mary Benedict, please send me whatever literature you have, which can shed light on this issue? Specifically, who is your bishop; what are the circumstances of his consecration; what is the historical background of the bishop who consecrated him; and what is his own historical background, etc. Where did this happen; when did it happen; who were the three bishops; and in general, please tell me everything that you know. I do not want to form any conclusions one way or the other until I have considered all the information, all the literature, and all the documents that shed light on this issue.

25. Moving on in paragraph 2, you say (quoting Mom), " so many little groups, but the Church must be somewhere; and as we cannot accept that harlot in Rome, as you call it (and I agree!), we know there will be that visible structure somewhere until the end of time, as Jesus promised. " COMMENT: I will now reply to Father Mary's question, " If you reject us and Lefebvre, then who has the truth? " This will shed light on the sentence just quoted from your letter: " there will be that visible structure somewhere..." My position is best expressed by Anne Catherine Emmerick. She has a whole lot of things to say, but briefly, here is what she says about our days:

26. " I saw almost all the bishops in the world, but only a very few were perfectly sound. I saw that few of the priests were still godly, and only a few had sound views on things. I was also told that very few Christians, in the true sense of the term, are to be found anymore. In the future, Religion will fall so low that it will be practised only here and there in farm-houses and in families protected by God during the horrors of war. I saw around me, far and near, over the whole earth, countless scenes of sorrow and desolation; the sick and the dying, the wandering and the imprisoned, all without priests, without Sacraments! "

27. So then, what is she telling us? Does she mean that the Catholic Church will cease to exist? No, she does not say that at all, nor does Anne Catherine intend for anyone to draw that false conclusion from her writings. For she states very explicitly:

28. " Were there but a single priest on earth rightly ordained, Jesus Christ would live in His Church as God and Man in the Most Holy Sacrament of the altar; and whoever would receive this Sacrament, after being absolved by the priest, would alone be truly united to God!... And if there were left upon earth but one Catholic, he would be the one, universal Church, the Catholic Church, the Church of Jesus Christ against which the gates of Hell shall never prevail! " (Life of A.C. Emmerick, Vol.1, page 398-399). So then, in my opinion, before things get better, they're going to get a whole lot worse. We will end up a few people here and there, scattered out in farm-houses and remote places, praying to God with all our heart and soul while He chastises the earth with natural and supernatural punishments!

29. I want to point out something here concerning Fr. Mary Benedict's question: " If you reject us and Lefebvre, then who has the truth? " There seems to be an unspoken assumption here. Let me try to put it in words. It is as if he were saying, " Surely, some group somewhere has the fullness of Catholic Truth. If it's not our group or Lefebvre's group, then which group is it? " This unspoken assumption is made explicit in the sentence just quoted from your letter, Reverend Mother: "... we know that there will be that visible structure somewhere until the end of time..."

30. However, it would appear that Anne Catherine Emmerick does not quite agree with you. For she said very explicitly, " In the future, Religion will fall so low that it will be practised only here and there in farm-houses and in families protected by God during the horrors of war! " Assuming that this prophecy is true, then your assumption is completely false. For under those circumstances that she foretold, an external, visible, hierarchical structure is completely out of the question. Furthermore, her prophecy could easily be fulfilled very soon, in a nuclear Third World War with Russia. According to the 3rd Secret of Fatima, which I know you believe, this will occur before the year 2000 A.D.

31. This conclusion is reinforced by Anne Catherine's words in paragraph 28. Read that paragraph again very carefully. How indeed are such words compatible with " a visible structure somewhere until the end of time "? Why indeed did Sister Emmerick say, " If there were left upon earth but one Catholic, he would be the one, universal Church, the Catholic Church, the Church of Jesus Christ against which the gates of Hell shall never prevail! " Why indeed did Our Lord Jesus Christ say, " When I come again, will I find, do you think, faith on earth? " Such words make null and void this concept of an external, visible, hierarchical structure somewhere on earth until the end of time.

32. However, I should also point out that this is only one, single aspect of my apocalyptic and eschatological views. A full exposition of my views on this subject is gradually unfolding in an ongoing series of chapters titled, " The Future of the Roman Catholic Church. " I will return to that subject later in this letter, Reverend Mother; for I have some exciting news that I believe is going to make you very, very happy! I will now return to your letter.

33. I agree with virtually all of paragraph 3, which is extremely long. It takes up the last half of page one, and the first half of page two! There are a few details that I cannot accept, but by and large your arguments are in order. In case you did not make a zerox-copy of your letter for yourself (something you should always do!), I will quote what you said:

34. " I wish the destruction of the Mass were the only horribly destructive thing perpetrated by Paul VI and John Paul 1 and II... but you know as well as I, it isn't. You may really believe that their error is not a matter of Faith but only discipline. I disagree, but were it so, it would not change the fact that the Novus Ordo is only ONE of incredibly heretical beliefs, changes, aberrations, abominations advocated, taught, pronounced by these false popes. Ecumenism is heresy; one who believes and teaches heresy is severed from the Mystical Body, June, he is no longer a Catholic. You cannot say that the pope can believe and promulgate heresy and still be a pope, because the pope has to be a Catholic! This may sound simplistic to you, and I do not mean to be, but listen for a minute, please? Martin Luther was a heretic, right? He believed heresy. He taught heresy. He was outside of the Mystical Body, right? Heresy does that, severs one from the Mystical Body, isn't that right? There is no distinction between ex cathedra teaching, or big or little teaching. If you deny one article of Faith, you are a heretic. Those men believed, taught, promulgated heresy; they are heretics. June, if you tell me that a heretic can be a pope, I will not believe you can call yourself a Catholic! Your distinction between ex cathedra and ordinary teaching is so much intellectual hairsplitting, a ruse of the devil to keep intellectuals and simple folk in the Mystical Body of Antichrist, because (over)

(continued) if you accept them as your popes, you accept their authority, you belong to that " church " no matter how much you protest that you don't. "

35. Before continuing on with that long paragraph, Reverend Mother, let me make this passing comment. You are arguing against Mom, and by implication me, as if we were still believers in Marcel Lefebvre! In fact, we have both rejected Marcel Lefebvre, and that includes his whole theological program. I do not find anything wrong with anything you have said thus far, and I think Mom is probably in agreement with me. I feel that this whole argument is blown up way out of proportion to reality, because Mom's theological position is normally very close or even identical to mine. After she reads this letter, either she will agree with it and say so to you in her next letter; or if she has any reservations, she will tell you that also. Now let's get back to that long-winded paragraph!

36. " You know, I'm not as bright as Ely, nor have I studied these matters or read Canon Law or any such thing. But if he can honestly come to a conclusion like that, that the pope can be a heretic, I am glad I do not study and am not bright; because God reveals His truth to little ones; and it seems to me to be a thing so plain, one need not be able to be very intelligent to understand it. "

37. Obviously, this deserves a COMMENT! I never in my life said that a pope can be a heretic. Mom wrote in her own handwriting on your letter, " Where did I say that you concluded that? " This is a false assumption, and a false presumption, on your part. I don't know where you got it from, but it sure wasn't from either one of us! Furthermore, we have both rejected Lefebvre, which means that Michael Davies and their entire theological approach has gone out the window. They are the ones who teach a distinction between ex cathedra pronouncements, and ordinary pronouncements. It seems indeed to be one of those hair-splitting tricks for keeping everyone in the Mystical Body of Antichrist. However, someday I will study that issue further. Concerning the last part of your quotation above, where you said: " God reveals His truth to little ones; and it seems to me to be a thing so plain, one need not be able to be very intelligent to understand it...", Mom wrote in her own handwriting on your letter, " How can she be so confident of being led by the Holy Ghost, one who obeyed Schuckardt! " I personally will add, " Yea, and for 10 or 15 years! Or even more! "

38. The rest of your long paragraph takes up the first half of page two! There is no point in quoting it, since I accept the premises, arguments and conclusions. You see, Reverend Mother, we have more in common than you realized! In the last part of that paragraph, you said, " One of the Popes says in an encyclical that the expression ordinary teaching and extra-ordinary teaching are equally binding on Catholics; there can be no distinction, according to the words, ' He who hears you, hears Me; ' with nothing added like, ' except when I speak in an ordinary way. ' My request: please send me a copy of that encyclical whenever you find it. I would like to study it. Your letter continues:

39. " When I find that encyclical, I will send it to you underlined, unless you don't accept encyclicals if they aren't solemnly promulgated? Dear June, I hate to say this, but you have reasoned your way right out of the Church if you draw conclusions such as these! " Comment: once again, I think you are putting words in Mom's mouth, and are passing sentence upon her based upon false premises. Please forgive me, but I am forced to take Mom's defense against your serious charge above.

40. Now Reverend Mother, although you see many issues very clearly, and express yourself very well on points of Catholic theology; nevertheless, Mom and I are shocked that you and your entire community could not see in 10 or 15 years, what we ourselves saw in no more than a single month, concerning Francis Schuckardt! What is this strange and marvelous mystery whereby an entire community can understand Catholic theology with great depth of vision; and can follow the Path of Truth with profound fire and zeal; yet cannot realize that their leader is a diabolical monster, a son of Satan, and a wolf in sheep's clothing?

(remainder of Letter is Lost)
E. J.

Mary Immaculate Queen of the Universe Center

P O Box 40025 * Spokane, Wash 99202

Feast of the Precious Blood
of Jesus, 1985



Ely Jason
10942 Fairbanks Way
Culver City, California
90230

Dear Ely,

A most blessed feast to you! It was SO good to hear from you and to read your long letter. I appreciate it immensely, plus your comments, corrections where needed and the true charity you have shown me. I mean that!

I want to start out by apologizing for the conclusions I apparently jumped to regarding your positions. Please convey this to your dear Mother. I had not read your correspondence to Father. I really did believe that you were both involved with Le Febvre and wished to pop a few holes in that big water balloon they call a theological position. The part about the True Devotion made me very, very happy. (What a gift from Our dear Lord on such a beautiful feast! Your letter arrived last week but I was not home to read it until just today.) Our Mother has been so very good to all of us, no?

Also, please forgive anything that sounded unkind and the serious accusations you said I made regarding you and your Mom and your beliefs. I realize that I get very excited when I write and increasingly so as I think of all these things I want to say! Some of it obviously does not come out very prudently. One must be very careful when writing, for spoken words are more easily cleared up on the spot if misunderstood; not so written words. And whatever I said, you know my intention. It is the same as yours, animated by the same feelings and deep respect. So with that...

I will give your letter and enclosures to Father Mary Benedict to read. Ely, please realize that we have been under a most unbelievable pressure these past three years (since around 1981 to June of 1984). However Father may have "turned you off" as the saying is, I can only ask you to try and understand. I have enclosed a paper written shortly after all that happened last June, regarding the validity of orders of Bishop Brown and Bishop Schuckardt. (PLEASE read prayerfully!) This will help you to see why we stuck it out so long. We really did believe, and DO now, that the orders of both were valid. Bishop Musey has very little doubt about this as well. So we were laboring under a situation that was not unprecedented -- valid authority, correct theology, personal sin. Bishop Schuckardt never taught heresy. We were also under an impression that there were no other Bishops in the world, or if there were, we could not find them. We were prevented from communicating with any or we were told they were not good bishops. We had vows of obedience, and so we did not question. We may have questioned, rather, but did not venture to disobey or argue. This is the virtue of obedience where it is not a matter of SIN. Now when it came to that, the crisis came. I hope this does not sound stupid to you, Ely, that we could be misled like that, only it is a principle when authority is legitimate, that is, orthodox. We distinguish between personal sin and what is taught. Father Denis regrets that nothing was done sooner to prevent the harm done to souls, but he is also pretty sure that if he had tried, the feeling about Bishop Schuckardt was so strong, the image of him so shall I say -- worshipful? you know what I mean -- that Father would have been driven out as the Judas. Things had to get bad enough so that everyone could see for themselves, which we did when the time came. But for all this, Bishop Schuckardt

was an instrument of Our Lady in founding a Religious Congregation, a fervent lay community, a Catholic school. There has been so much said about what went on here, reams, no doubt; things about child-abuse, barbed wire fences, etc. Some unfortunate incidents may have occurred, isolated instances of corporal punishment carried too far, (and right now I can think of two or three in fifteen years) but you always find things not right when you have human beings involved. Such behavior was not the policy. To call him a monster, to label our community a throne of satan is totally unfair and incorrect and I owe you the charity of my feelings in this regard. I was here from the start. I do not know his motives in founding the community. In my opinion they were good, as so much good has come out of it. (I can visualize your expostulations, but really, you have never been here!!!) We have not ended up, after all, mutilated, murdered, totally brainwashed and reduced to helpless protoplasm of unthinking idiots. And you must admit that people like Father Mary Benedict are pretty sharp. A number of our priests are incredibly so. I will not say that brilliance ABOUND here, but most of us still have some wits about us. However, even if his motives were unworthy and he was a deceiver all along (I highly doubt that and besides GOD is the Judge!) Our Lady used him as an instrument. You cannot possibly think that the piety, devotion, fervor and adherence to the teachings of our Faith -- all is from the devil. The Pharisees accused Our Lord of casting out devils by the prince of devils, and you surely remember His answer. So please be fair and Christian.

To conclude above, whatever disorder, confusion there was over the past four years or up until June of 1984, seems an almost small price to pay for the great blessings we have here, the Mass and the Sacraments. If you were saying things like the above to Father in your letters to him, which I only conjecture, having never read them, it is no wonder he ended it abruptly. We were all, and the priests most of all, making an admirable attempt to be obedient and to shield the sins and faults of a true Catholic Bishop. Ely, you cannot speak of priests and Bishops as you did of Bishop Schuckardt. It hurts Our Lord very much, for no matter what they may be personally, they still bear the character of Priest, Alter Christus. Judas-Bishops who deny the Faith -- that's one thing. Weak and wretched sinner, is quite another. Bishop Schuckardt was not a heretic. You could listen to any one of his sermons or instructions and not find anything unorthodox there. You'd have to say our priests are absolute fools to go along so long with such a crushing situation if Bishop Schuckardt were in heresy! No way!! He certainly had a problem. It could have been overcome -- we never have to succumb. But, believe me, the Francis Schuckardt I knew way back in 1967 was not the Francis Schuckardt of recent exposure. And I will say that to my dying breath. Do me the favor of not thinking I could wilfully, stupidly put myself under the direction of that type of person, live in absolute confusion and chaos for 18 years and still be here? I repeat, it just didn't start out that way, Ely. I loved him very much, and I still do pray for him and all those misled by him. Please retract all that! It is so unworthy of all the rest of what you say and believe!!

Yes

So much for the past. Bishop Musey's address is: 1410 San Sebastian, Houston, Tex. 77058. Now, Ely, do me a great favor. I gave your Mom my prized "possession", the True Devotion I had had from the start. That was a good thing, right? If, as you say, I am in some tiny way, a spiritual mother to you, please do me the favor of writing to Bishop Musey! Ask him to explain everything to you, and all about Archbishop Thuc -- so unkindly referred to as Madman Thuc. Maybe he'd make you a tape if you write out all your questions. I have nothing in print to send you, as yet. The information in your closet may be partially correct, may be totally incorrect, I do not know. There is just so much MISinformation abounding to deceive the elect, and so we are BOUND in conscience not to take everything that comes along as gospel truth. Go to the source! If you don't and are misled, it's your own fault, right?

Bishop Musey came to Spokane to visit our community in April. He had a meeting

with the lay and Religious, opening the floor for questions, discussions, etc., and giving us all a chance to hear his story, background, beliefs from himself, not as what is circulated or misconstrued. He was not consecrated by Archbishop Thuc but a Mexican Bishop, His Excellency Carmona y Rivera, who had been consecrated by the Archbishop. He told us the real story behind the Archbishop's "recanting his errors", how he had been kidnapped by a group of Vietnamese, drugged up, kept certainly against his will, how he had died after supposedly apologizing for his mistakes and errors. Bishop Musey said it could not have been of his own free will, for he would have done a complete about-face to what he had always believed and taught. Both Bishop Musey and Archbishop Thuc consecrated bishops who after went over the deep end, so to speak -- Dominguez in Palma de Troya and Vezelis in New York, but as Bishop Musey asked us, are we to reject Christ because He consecrated Judas? What Judas did with his graces is Judas' fault, not Our Divine Lord's! Certainly both Bishops were trying to entrust the talent of their episcopal orders to worthy men and did their best to find them. They are not infallible, certainly, and did not know at the time how these men would turn out, for at their consecrations, those problems did not exist or were not apparent. But if mistakes are made, acknowledged and not made again, should that be held against them? The important thing is the stand they are taking against the Vatican II church. The Archbishop is dead now, but he suffered very much for that position he chose.

I thought your Open Letter #4 very beautifully written. I do not know of Sister Elena Aiello, however. Maybe you could send me some information about her, when she lived, if her revelations were officially approved, etc. It is only, I think, sad that, not having found a priest, you feel that the odds against ever finding one are "overwhelming." As your influence reaches far beyond that of your own family, and many people will read your writings and perhaps base their beliefs on what you say, I beg of you to make VERY VERY certain that what you do write IS absolutely true! As such, you have a moral obligation to investigate, find out for yourself, and not believe everything you may hear. I guess I needn't tell you this. We are without shepherds for the most part; we have the truths and traditions of our Faith, we have Our Blessed Mother, but like sheep we can wander so easily. If we then have influence over others, we shall have a great accounting to make for that talent. Everything you write will have its effect on souls for all eternity! If you tell them there are few priests and the odds of finding any are almost nil, that's quite a statement and you had better have proof 100% to back it up!

Now that you realize what a treasure True Devotion is, what of that other part, most important of all -- the Characteristics of True Devotion? The TRUST that our Mother will feed us, Her children, with the Living Bread that is Her Gift to give? Do you honestly and truly think She has not the power with Her Divine Son to provide us with what we need most of all, lest we spiritually starve? (If it were not for the Blessed Sacrament, Mass, Penance, I would not want to live a moment longer on this earth.) Life would be almost meaningless to me. I know that is not indicative of any amount of spiritual strength and fortitude on my part; nevertheless it is true. My need for priests has not created them for me, as an atheist will say that a man's psychological need for a God has caused him to invent One... Our Lady knows that need. I DO have the Mass and the Sacraments and Holy Communion. And if and when the day comes, which may or may not be too far off, She will allow Him to be taken away, I know She will provide somehow the strength... until then, He is all my life and the only reason there is to live in this vale of tears. There is only suffering and the saving of souls to be done, as long as the chastisement is held off. I guess that means you are much, much stronger than I, but that you, too, could share this immense grace and privilege of knowing your sins are forgiven for sure, of being able to receive Him daily, of being able to attend the sublimest Sacrifice of the Mass!! You admit there are apostles somewhere in the world. "They

stood, at first, widely apart...." This is absolutely fantastic! Never had I read that before! But Our Lady is calling them together, Ely! I'm sure the time is come to unite Her children, because the days are numbered. It makes me think of Holy Thursday. We really should stop all this bickering about our place in the Kingdom and listen to Our Lord! He desires so much that we be one. Those three dark days may be right around the corner, but, Ely, we DO have Him still, our Emmanuel, our Jesus!

Now please send this to your Mom with my apologies for all the punching and beating in the air, so to speak. I realize we are much closer than I thought, only one or two steps to go. I am so glad to correspond with you, but really, I am only a poor nun and you owe it to your intelligence and reason to hash this out with Bishop Musey. I know he would be very happy to hear from you. You both say the same things about the Vatican II church, the conspiracy, Our Blessed Mother.... you surely have questions he could answer far better than I, who am no kind of a theologian. (Ely, I went to public school in California all my life and when I was "confirmed" I really had no idea of what it was! If you lament a foolish youth, I likewise lament. We are partners in crime -- and of these very poorest, our Mother deigns to cut, carve, chisel, form into some kind of instrument for God's glory. The Glory of God! If that is truly all we seek, what matter then how little and poor we are? To make Him happy, to make Him a little more loved and known and served, what else matters?)

I close now, in hopes to hear from you again. I think this is just about the longest letter I've ever written. I promise my prayers, and you do likewise for me? I will remember you at MASS and HOLY COMMUNION too! I will beg Jesus, My Beloved Bridegroom, to bless you often with His graces, from the holy Tabernacle; I will ask Our Lady to bombard you, shower you with all Her light, and She will! If you continue to promote the True Devotion, She will so fill you with graces you will feel hardly able to contain them, and you will also be much tempted and attacked by the devil. He hates that Devotion with all his fiendish "heart," and he despises those who practice it and spread it. It is good to be thus hated, a sure sign we are on the right road, or getting there very soon. Good-bye for now! May She keep you ever in Her loving Heart!

Ad Jesum per Mariam,

Reverend Mother

Rev. Mother Mary Teresa
CMRI

Insert

I realized that no amount of letter-writing would ever give me sufficient understanding of the Spokane Community. In order to really grasp them and their situation, I would have to go and physically live in their midst. So I flew up to their annual Conference in early October, 1985, and stayed with them until March, 1986. I was sorely disappointed, for numerous reasons, and finally left. My primary objections are clearly stated in the letters to Bishop McKenna, which are enclosed here. Pages 60 and 61, which follow after this page, are titled: " Reflections on the Congregation of Mary. " They were formerly part of a long letter I had written to Rev. Mother Mary Teresa, when I left the Spokane Community.

.....

Meditation: Many heretics throughout the centuries practised mortification and self-denial to a degree that far surpassed the Catholic Hierarchy and the masses of Catholic laypeople. This sugar-coating of mortification and self-denial, of pious practices and devotions, was a shrewd disguise for the heresies they were teaching. For the masses of Catholic laypeople are hardly ever brilliant enough to detect abstruse theological heresies, in the realm of dogmatic theology: so they rely upon external appearances. On the one hand, they would see a preacher of reforms, who seemed to be filled with fire and zeal for the Catholic Faith. Moreover, that same preacher of reforms practised mortification and self-denial rigorously, while preaching with the tongue of angels on the profound importance of pious practices and devotions. On the other hand, Catholic laypeople were aware that their priests and bishops were in many cases lazy, soft, and self-indulgent. Sometimes the priests, bishops, and hierarchy were even involved in corrupt abuses and practices. Hence, the laypeople, being deceived by external appearances, went over into the camp of radical heretics, without realizing it. The conclusion that follows from this meditation is very clear, and it is this: one cannot be certain of having discovered a truly Catholic community, merely by the fact that they have a profound degree of pious practices and devotions, or because they have an immense degree of mortification and self-denial. For asceticism is one thing, but true theology is something else. Therefore, the presence of asceticism, pious practices and devotions in a community, does not guarantee the presence of True Catholic Theology.

.....

The case of Francis Schuckardt makes this abundantly clear. Here is a man who recognized that Vatican II was the Great Apostasy foretold by Sacred Scripture; a man who taught the profound importance of holy slavery to the Blessed Virgin Mary, according to the blueprint of St. Louis de Montfort. Moreover, he taught traditional Catholic theology from very old Catholic books, so that there could be no danger of Modernist errors having slyly crept in. Finally, he taught the vast importance of mortification and self-denial, of complete abandonment to the Will of God and the Blessed Virgin Mary; and instilled an immense commitment of his whole community to exaggerated vigils, long hours of prayer, and extraordinary pious practices and devotions. However, despite all these perfectly orthodox external appearances, he had a major failing in the realm of his personal sexuality. He had a preference for men, rather than women. Moreover, both alike were forbidden to him as a priest, and as a bishop. Nevertheless, he ignored this one point of the law, and thus became guilty of breaking all points of the law. He taught many of his male followers that it was not a sin for them to go to bed with him. He afterwards heard their confessions, and forgave them. This was not merely personal sin, but heresy of the very gravest kind possible.

Thus, it is obvious that we must never judge an individual, or a whole community, on external appearances! For Jesus Himself taught us, " Judge not by appearances, but give just judgement. " Here was an individual who taught that Vatican II is the Great Apostasy, who taught true Catholic theology from old Catholic books, who taught holy slavery to the Blessed Virgin Mary according to the blueprint of St. Louis de Montfort, who inculcated exaggerated vigils, long hours of prayer, mortification and self-denial, immensely pious practices and devotions (such as backing out of the Church with your head bowed low, etc.), and yet, despite all these things, he was a heretic. For he taught many of his followers that homosexuality is not a mortal sin, and that it was permissible for them to go to bed with him!

If we look to history, it is easy to find other examples of this same process. In his " Handbook of Heresies, " Mr. Cozens discusses the heresy of Montanism: " Claiming to act under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost, Montanus and his followers first preached a revival of penance and of primitive fervor. Gradually, however, they exalted themselves above the official hierarchy of the Church... Both its emotional character and its severe asceticisms appealed especially to the women..." (p.25)

Mr. Cozens goes on to say, " Tertullian, the writer to whom the Latin Church owes so much, fell a victim to the heresy, and in his later work, De Pudicitia, attacks the Roman Pontiff with extreme bitterness because he refused to sanction the merciless rigorism which Montanism inculcated. " (p.25)

The Albigensians of the higher orders were " bound to perpetual continence, to long fasts, and abstinence from many kinds of food. " (p.62) " No error, however fundamental, can live except by the presence under it, or mixed with it, of some distorted truth. The secret of the influence of the Albigenses and other Catharists lay in their self-denial and mortification of the preachers. The mob then, as now, were slow to reason; slow to detect blasphemy under seemingly pious talk. But all could contrast the poor dress and meager diet of the new teachers with the wealth and, too often, the ostentation of the orthodox clergy. All could see the contrast between the laboring Apostle, and the luxurious Abbot or Bishop. Armies might compel submission, but no brute force could compel men to renounce their admiration for unworldliness and self-denial. " (p.63)

" The heretics were subverting souls by a wrong preaching of asceticism. " (p.64)

Again, if we look at the Jansenists, " This community was renowned, in a time of general laxity, for the fervor and strictness of its inmates..." (p.73)..." As the Jansenists wished to go back in doctrine to the language of the Early Church, so they wished also to apply the discipline of those early centuries in the wholly dissimilar conditions of the 16th and 17th centuries. " (p.76) " Many a soul, meanwhile, wholly unable to appreciate the theological subtleties involved, was discouraged and driven back by the rigorism which these harsh views engendered in preachers and directors..." (p.77)

The point I wish to make by all of this, is that rigorous devotional practices, and long vigils, and exaggerated prayers - even if they are combined with great mortification and self-denial - are no proof at all that one has discovered a truly Catholic community, or a truly Catholic priest, or a truly Catholic bishop. Throughout history, these external practices were often the greatest secret of success in propagating deadly heresies. Hence, all Catholics everywhere should beware of judging by external appearances, but " give just judgement. "

This message especially applies to the Congregation of Mary, in Spokane, Washington! More than anyone else today, they should be aware that these rigorous, pious practices and devotions, these exaggerated vigils and long public prayers, only served to mask the fact that Francis Schuckardt was telling his male followers that it is morally permissible for them to go to bed with him! Further, Holy Slavery to the Blessed Virgin Mary is indeed a lofty, pure, and holy path. Nevertheless, the dangers are enormous, and very real. For in the hands of a corrupt, iron-fisted dictator like Schuckardt, holy slavery became an excuse for absolute, totalitarian mind-control, by a man who can be justly compared to Reverend Sun-Myung Moon.

On the first page of " Abandonment to Divine Providence, " (Rev. Jean Caussade, S.J.), Fr. Ramiere says, " There is no truth however clear which does not become error the moment it is lessened or exaggerated... The virtue of abandonment does not escape this danger. The more holy and profitable it is in itself, the more serious are the dangers we risk by misunderstanding its just limits. These dangers, unfortunately, are not mere possibilities. The 17th Century witnessed the birth of a heresy - the Quietists - which while claiming to teach its followers perfect abandonment to God, led them into the most terrible disorders. (Fatima Crusaders, does this sound familiar?) For a time this sect wrought its ravages in the very capital of Catholicism!..." (p.3-4, Preface)

.....

Ely Jason,
P.O. Box 83490,
Los Angeles, CA.90083
March 29, 1988.

Dear Bishop McKenna,

This is the first time I have written to you, so perhaps a very brief introduction is in order. I am 42, was raised in the traditional, pre-V-2 Catholic Church, and am also a Sedevacantist. Recently, I wrote an article titled, " The Great Apostasy. " Hutton Gibson of Australia ("The War is Now!") condensed it from 55 pages to 16, then made up 1000 copies. He shipped 500 to a distribution-point in Kansas, and kept the other 500 with himself in Australia. I am told that the ones in Kansas are already sold out, so I'm sending you the only copy I have on hand.

However, that's not what I want to talk about in this letter. I just received a copy of " Catholics Forever " (February, 1988), from a friend. I find your distinction between a material pope and a formal pope both hilarious and outrageous. If you have any writings or documents which contain an exact quote of what St. Robert Bellarmine had to say on the subject, I will certainly read them. Nevertheless, this is not the subject that I want to discuss for the moment, either.

In your discussion of Fr. Kelly and his group of priests, you undertook a defense of the priests at Mt. St. Michael, who were " formerly under the schismatically ordained and publicly disgraced Francis Schuckardt. " Those priests are the subject I wish to address, in this letter. I am not without a certain amount of direct, personal experience in this matter. I lived on Mount St. Michael, in their very midst, for a period of 6 months. This was subsequent to the separation and departure of Francis Schuckardt, at the time when George Musey had recently been made their Bishop. To be exact, I was living there from September, 1985, through March 10, 1986... in the same building where they have their seminary, classrooms, etc. During about 3 of those 6 months, I lived among the members of the community. So all in all, I have direct, personal experience of the priests, religious, and community-members themselves.

Before I make any comments or observations about them, let me start by saying that I definitely believe in St. Louis de Montfort's method of " True Devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary. " I believe in the profound importance of Marian devotion, and the Fatima Message. Further, I found the community-members themselves to be simple, honest, industrious, without artifice, and full of devotion: for the Blessed Virgin Mary, and for the Catholic Faith. I wish to make it clear that my biggest arguments in this letter are directed principally against the priests of Mount St. Michael - not the community themselves. Of course, it can truly be said that the community-members bear direct responsibility for approving the ordination and consecration of Francis Schuckardt; for maintaining, supporting, and clinging to him. On the other hand, by pursuing what they believed was Holy Slavery to the Blessed Virgin Mary, they gave their mind and will to the absolute authority of Schuckardt and his priests. Hence, it is almost impossible to carry on a deeply intelligent conversation with the community-members, because they literally allowed Schuckardt and his priests to do all their thinking for them, for about 15 or 20 years.

That sad fact is a reality to this very day. The community in general are like little children, who allow the priests to do all their thinking for them. When they are approached with anything written or spoken which challenges or contradicts their position, they go running like little children to their mommy and daddy. The priests tell them, " It's all right... Mommy and Daddy love you! " Then the community-members settle down again, in the same hypnotic spell of error and illusion that trapped them for two decades under the iron grip of Francis Schuckardt. In short, the Francis Schuckardt community was basically a Catholic version of Reverend Sun-Myung's Moonies.

The after-effects of his iron-grip-ego-trip remain with the whole community to this very day. Let me now quote some of your statements in defense of the Spokane priests, then give my personal comments.

1. " So then, to speak on behalf of the Spokane priests and religious whom the Kelly priests... have identified with their unhappy founder, and projected as doctrinal and moral monsters. The very definite and emphatic separation from Bishop (?) Schuckardt - and that now going on for four years - ought to say something in favor of the community. But by their denouncers little or nothing is said of this. "

COMMENT: I will use a phrase that you have grown to love. The Spokane priests only separated materially, but not formally, from Francis Schuckardt. So far as I know, they have never issued a public statement - before their followers in Spokane, or anywhere else - admitting that they were wrong. They never admitted to themselves, their followers, or the world at large, that their theological position was dead wrong. Can you produce any proof that they ever told their followers, " Folks, we were a cult all those years under Francis Schuckardt. We were schismatically ordained ourselves, by a man who was schismatically ordained and consecrated. Forget the Sacraments that we administered to you during the last two decades: they were worthless, and even gravely sinful! " ??

It is their long-standing practice, when receiving V-2 converts, to make them take an Oath of Abjuration. I submit that the whole community, including the priests themselves, must take an Oath of Abjuration - under the glare of public scrutiny - renouncing their theological position which they held and maintained under Francis Schuckardt; renouncing their wholehearted support of his illegal ordination and consecration; renouncing his claims to the Papacy; renouncing his claim that there is nothing wrong with the practice of homosexuality (a heretical claim quoted by Fr. Denis, in his letter of June 21, 1984.); and in short, publicly denouncing their whole involvement with Schuckardt from the beginning to the end. This is the only way they can ever hope to clear the air, and make a fresh beginning.

Moreover, as their new Bishop, I submit that you yourself bear the responsibility of making them perform this solemn Oath of Abjuration. If they refuse to make this solemn Oath of Abjuration, in a public forum, then I submit that they have only separated themselves materially (physically) from Francis Schuckardt, but not formally. If they refuse to do so, then it is clear they disagree with you, when you say that they were functioning under a " schismatically ordained " Bishop. If they refuse to do so, then it is clear they still believe in their hearts that they did nothing wrong! If they refuse to do so, then they have only separated themselves materially, but not formally, from their former, strong belief in Sedevacantism!

2. " And that the religious and faithful... were never more than materially or unintentionally schismatic - not formally so - seems clear from the fact that in the wake of Schuckardt's flight with some bedfellows, they went in search of a traditionalist Bishop with whom they could work and retain their doctrinal integrity as Catholics. "

COMMENT: What kind of logic is that? You publicly reject sedevacantism, which they as a community endorsed wholeheartedly for two decades! So how is it possible for them to " retain their doctrinal integrity as Catholics, " by finding another Bishop? If, as you assert, sedevacantism is dead wrong - then they have no " doctrinal integrity " to maintain! As a community, they wholeheartedly approved the ordination and consecration of Francis Schuckardt, who you say was " schismatically ordained, receiving Holy Orders irregularly. " Where is the " doctrinal integrity " in that? You appeal to their pursuit of Bishop Musey as proof that they were " unintentionally schismatic. " On this point I can prove you are dead wrong, quoting the exact words of Fr. Mary Benedict, Bishop Musey, and the rest.

Since I was living in Spokane at this exact moment in time, I was naturally very interested in the circumstances surrounding Bishop Musey and the reordinations. Bishop Musey had previously made a speech before the entire assembled Congregation of Mary on April 22, 1985. It was tape-recorded, and made available to the community through their bookstore on Mount St. Michael. I obtained those tapes, and with an enormous ordeal of personal effort transcribed them into 31 typewritten pages, which I have here sitting before me. On page 23, paragraph #138, Father Mary Benedict said: "I personally have absolutely no doubts whatsoever about the first ordination: none!"

He then asked Bishop Musey whether he agreed or disagreed with anything he said. When Bishop Musey replied, he said: "..... to lay again to rest any possible doubts or repercussions, let me reaffirm that I have no problem with the validity of these good Fathers and their Sacraments! As Father pointed out to you, I have asked for their blessing as often as I have given them mine." (page 24, para.145)

So then, Fr. Mary Benedict said he personally has " absolutely no doubts whatsoever about the first ordination: none!" Is that what you call " unintentionally schismatic? " You yourself say that Francis Schuckardt was " schismatically ordained. " It follows logically that the priests themselves were schismatically ordained; and yet Fr. Mary has no doubts, none! Moreover, the priest's Oath states explicitly, and I quote: " Reordination is a sacrilege. " This is one reason why the East Coast Nine rightly reject the Spokane priests. Their answer was, " Since you are absolutely convinced that you had a valid ordination under Francis Schuckardt, it was a sacrilege for you to get reordained by Bishop Musey! " This thought is perfectly logical, and absolutely true.

When the Congregation of Mary assembled together to hear Bishop Musey speak on April 22, 1985, there was a light and festive atmosphere that is plainly obvious to anyone who listens to those tapes. Much of the tapes are filled with mirth, laughter and applause. This festive and lighthearted atmosphere was especially apparent during the announcement by Fr. Mary Benedict that there would indeed be conditional reordinations. I quote him verbatim: " I personally have absolutely no doubts whatsoever about the first ordination: none. Not only for theological reasons, but also because I have seen the grace of God working as we go out on mission. When Bishop Musey first met the Sisters here in the community, he repeated several times: this has to be the work of God! Well, the work of God is not schism, in the normal sense of the word...etc. "

He then asked Bishop Musey if he disagreed with anything he said: " If I am in any way wrong, I would like him to point that out. Secondly, I would like him to set your minds at rest, for any of you who may have doubts about the Sacraments we have administered... In January when he was here we discussed conditional ordinations, and agreed it should be done... etc.... We're not going to wait for a month and a half or two months, and leave you in between wondering what's going on. So it's going to happen tomorrow morning! " (Much applause! At this point, Fr. Mary Benedict continued in a light and breezy, amused tone of voice:) " And so, poor Fr. Mary James, he knew nothing of any of this! So I'm not normally one to beat around the bush. So I called Father in my room about 3 hours ago or so. I said, Father, tomorrow morning you, Fr. Denis and I are going to be conditionally ordained! I just want you to know! And he accepted it as he accepts everything else, in a beautiful attitude..." (laughter and applause) (page 23, para.138-140)

Thus, there was a casual, mirthful, light-and-breezy atmosphere surrounding the announcement of the reordinations. Further, in view of his strong public affirmation that he had absolutely no doubts whatsoever - none! - about the first ordination, this lightness, levity and mirth were sacrilegious in the extreme. For it made light of the fact that they considered themselves already validly ordained, but were getting reordained anyway!

The very meaning of the word " sacrilege " is that you take Sacred Things, and use them in a trivializing, unbecoming, and light-hearted way. Nowhere in Catholic theology is the subject of sacrilege more serious, than in that which touches Holy Orders. For only Holy Orders have the power to turn bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. The Catechism of the Council of Trent makes it perfectly clear that nothing - nothing! - is more serious than offenses committed against the Body of Christ. Thus, to announce publicly that one has a valid ordination from Francis Schuckardt; then in the same breath to announce - in a cheerful and amused tone of voice - that one is getting reordained anyway by Bishop Musey, constitutes a grave sacrilege against Almighty God!

Let me make a comparison, using the Sacrament of Matrimony. Let us suppose for the sake of argument that I went to Europe, and got married to a woman over there by a true, valid, licit Catholic priest. Suppose then that I moved back to America with my wife, to a place where no one knew either one of us. Now, what if all our new neighbors and acquaintances told us, " How do we know that you're really married? We never saw the marriage, and the Marriage Certificate is written in some foreign language. Besides, it could easily have been forged. So in our opinion, you aren't really married to each other, but you're just living together under false pretenses! "

Picture this: My wife and I look at each other and say, " You know we're married, and I know we're married. We are both firmly convinced of it, and don't have the tiniest shadow of a doubt about it. But all these friends and neighbors around us, they don't believe it. So here is what we're going to do: We will get married all over again, right in front of their eyes, so that no one can ever again have any doubts that we are really married! "

Isn't such a thought completely preposterous? And yet, that is exactly what has happened in the priests of Mount St. Michael, with the Sacrament of Holy Orders. The priests were absolutely convinced that they had legitimate Orders from Francis Schuckardt. Bishop Musey himself said that he was convinced of it, and he repeated himself on more than one occasion. Fr. Mary Benedict said that he had " absolutely no doubts whatsoever about the first ordination: none! " Nevertheless, because nobody else outside of themselves believed in their ordinations, they all decided that the best solution was to get re-ordained! The self-contradiction here is enormous and phenomenal. It smacks of dishonesty and deception.

It even resulted in blatant hypocrisy, which I personally witnessed while living in Spokane. The priests and Bishop Musey ended up presenting two faces to everyone: one face to the community in Spokane, but another face to the world at large. To the community in Spokane, they said, " Don't worry about the marriages we performed, and the Sacraments we administered all these years past. They were perfectly valid and acceptable in the eyes of God! " But to everyone else in the world at large - namely, to those who did not accept Schuckardt's ordinations, or the Sacraments resulting from them - the priests and Bishop Musey said, " Don't worry about it! That's all water under the bridge, because the priests have been reordained by Bishop Musey, whose Orders come from Archbishop Thuc! "

That's a pretty far-out way of becoming " all thing to all people! " I dare say that it's not at all what St. Paul had in mind! For sure it is a two-faced, hypocritical, double-dealing, dishonest, self-deceptive example of sheer hypocrisy. It reminds me of a dishonest gambler at a card game, who deals from the top of the deck and the bottom of the deck at the same time. The choice is EITHER/OR: if the first ordinations were valid and acceptable to God - as the priests insist - then their reordinations were a sacrilege. If the first ordinations were not acceptable to God, then the priests and the whole community in Spokane should make a Solemn Oath of Abjuration, as stated on page two.

To the best of my knowledge, the priests, religious and general community have never admitted that they did anything wrong, at any time, in all that concerns Francis Schuckardt. They have never admitted they were dead wrong in supporting the ordination and consecration of Francis Schuckardt. The priests never denounced or denied the acceptability of their first ordinations; but they got reordained anyway. They have never publicly denounced Sedevacantism. They have never said openly and honestly, " Folks, all of us were dead wrong in all that we did. We were a cult for the last 15 or 20 years. Francis Schuckardt's ordination and consecration placed him, and all of us, outside the Catholic Church. Forget all the Sacraments that you received all those years, because they had no spiritual value to you. Rather, they led you deeper and deeper into the whirlpool of sin."

That is the right thing to do, and the honest thing to do. But they've never done it yet. This is why I laugh when I read what you say on page 3: "Why then are they not to be forgiven? Forgiven for a mere mistake at that? For the mistake of condoning their founder's receiving Holy Orders irregularly - from an Old Catholic Bishop (?), who had himself made the same mistake in good faith, and was at heart a traditional Catholic? "

COMMENT: As a priest, I'm sure you must be aware that it's impossible to forgive someone who refuses to admit or acknowledge that he did anything wrong! The conditions for obtaining forgiveness are (1) to admit that one has sinned, (2) to feel deep and genuine sorrow for those sins, (3) to confess one's sins to a genuine, valid, licit, Catholic priest, (4) to enumerate our sins one by one, in all their details, to the best of our abilities, and (5) to perform the prayers and penances given by the priest, upon completion of one's Confession. To the best of my knowledge - as I've already said - the priests of Mount St. Michael have never admitted publicly that they did anything wrong! The whole Schuckardt Affair caused such a grave public scandal, and such devastation in the lives of former community-members, that private Confessions by the Mount St. Michael priests are totally insufficient to right the massive wrongs they aided and abetted.

This calls for nothing less than a public Oath of Abjuration by the priests, religious, and entire congregation throughout the world. If Jimmy Swaggart, an anti-Catholic Protestant, can get up on stage and cry " Oh Lord, I have sinned against you! " - then why can't Catholics do the same thing? This will be a true test - the only true test - of whether they really admit they did anything wrong. This will be the only true test of whether they really reject Sedevacantism, or whether they are just being quiet, letting you think they reject Sedevacantism. This will prove whether they are truly meek, humble and contrite of heart; or whether their long devotions and exaggerated vigils are merely a pious fraud, concealing a heart that cries: " I have done nothing wrong! "

Finally, it will be a glorious test of whether they are truly submissive to you as their Bishop, or are just seeming to be so. After all, they've dumped two Bishops already. How do I know they won't do the same thing to you? Their loyalty and allegiance have not been tested yet. Their full compliance and submission to you have not been proved, for all the world to see. I and many others have gained a distinct impression that the priests of Mount St. Michael give feigned allegiance, so long as it suits their purpose. Their first and foremost loyalty is to themselves. If a Bishop happens to fit in with their concepts, policies and programs, then they will submit to his authority. But if he ever takes a direction they disapprove, they will dump him like Schuckardt and George Musey! There is much more that I could say, but it's been a long day. I've decided not to send my article, " The Great Apostasy " at this time, so that you can concentrate more clearly on what has been said in this letter. I don't wish to bury you alive under an avalanche of reading material! So I'll space it out in future letters, assuming you even write back to me. In Nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.

Ely Jason.

On April 23, 1985, Bishop Musey wrote: " Since I was raised to the episcopate three years ago, one of my fondest hopes and earnest prayers has been that I might be used as an instrument by Our Divine Lord, to help restore unity and peace in His Bride, our Holy Mother the Church. One of the greatest scandals in the Church today is the division among those who call themselves traditional Catholics. How sad it is that instead of joining forces to repel the common enemy, so many traditionalists spend great amounts of time and energy attacking and finding fault with other traditional Roman Catholics. "

I agree that disunity and division among traditional Catholics is a great scandal, and it would be wonderful if we could establish peace and unity among ourselves. I have no doubts that you feel the same way, too. However, in your efforts to establish peace and unity, you have written a defense of the Spokane priests which is shallow and superficial. It glosses over deep and serious problems with a thin coating of verbal varnish. True peace and unity among traditional Catholics can never result by glossing over problems with a thick coating of wax.

Your defense is shallow and superficial for a number of reasons: (1) As their Bishop, you want to keep the Spokane priests and community happy. So you gently stroke their ruffled feathers with kind words, even if the words aren't all together true. In short, you don't want to lose your flock. This shatters your objectivity about the situation, creating a blind-spot in front of your eyes, and making it impossible to correctly assess the full reality surrounding them; (2) Your desire to foster unity between the Spokane community and others, makes you disinclined to take an in-depth approach to the problems that are involved; (3) You fail to realize the depth of the wounds that were caused by Francis Schuckardt; (4) You fail to realize that literally hundreds of his former followers left Spokane - perhaps as much as half their whole community - in a state of shock, anguish and grief; with deep emotional scars. To make matters worse, many of them were left in a state of financial disaster, due to their former all-out financial support of Schuckardt's goals and objectives; (5) Above all, you fail to realize that the Spokane priests and religious played a deep, personal role in the radical abuses and disasters that occurred under Francis Schuckardt. You appear to presume that everything wrong and evil can be blamed exclusively on Francis Schuckardt, while the priests and religious were just an innocent bunch of sweet, little lambs!

Having lived in their midst for half a year, I personally heard numerous horror-stories related by the members there. Not a single case involved Francis Schuckardt alone, acting as a solitary agent. The priests and religious were his eyes and ears, his arms and legs, his hands and feet. Moreover, they had personal vows to him, which made them feel compelled to obey his every whim and wish, however outrageous, however unreasonable. This resulted in the state of chaos and confusion referred to by Fr. Denis, in his letter of June 21, 1984: " You are all aware of the fact that for the past several years things in the Community have been in complete and utter chaos. " The priests and religious share an equal measure of blame for everything that happened under Francis Schuckardt's administration. I know from direct, personal testimony of the community-members themselves, that the priests and religious played a deep, personal role in the radical abuses and disasters that occurred under Schuckardt's " Pontificate. "

That is why I consider your defense of the Spokane priests shallow and superficial, a whitewash and a cover-up, without the faintest trace of objectivity. If you truly want to heal the wounds of that community, you must address their situation squarely and honestly. You should begin by writing an issue of " Catholics Forever ", in which you invite all former members of the Spokane community to send you their horror-stories. This will give you a more realistic and objective perspective. It will also prove that you are concerned, not merely for the members who remained in Spokane, but also for the members who left in shock, grief, anguish and confusion.

Turning to another subject, I am appalled at the way you "pooh-pooh" and downplay "the mistake of condoning their founder's receiving Holy Orders irregularly, from an Old Catholic Bishop (?), who had himself made the same mistake in good faith, and was at heart a traditional Catholic." Since the priests and religious have never admitted doing anything wrong to this very day - so far as I know - it is clear they are unrepentant. Hence, by downgrading the significance of what they have done, you are actually contributing to their further hardening in unrepentance! They can pat themselves on the back with your kind words, saying "The Bishop says it's no big deal!"

You betray a grave lack of scriptural and theological awareness, in having expressed this light-hearted "so what?" attitude. If you look up Ecclesiasticus, Chapter 20, verse 8, it says: "He that taketh authority to himself unjustly shall be hated!" You seem unaware of the Mathew Arnold case. He was a Roman Catholic priest who got himself consecrated by an Old Catholic bishop. Pope St. Pius X excommunicated and anathematized Bishop Arnold Mathew, which is the Church's severest form of excommunication. Francis Schuckardt wasn't even a valid priest, when he decided to follow in Mathew Arnold's footsteps. Moreover, there is evidence that Fr. Denis knew even then that he was a homosexual. As a result, the case of Francis Schuckardt is far more grave than even that of Mathew Arnold. Strict logic and reason dictate that if Pope St. Pius X were alive today, he would pass the same sentence, or even worse. In fact, he would probably throw the Book at him! And here you come skipping down the lane, with your blue-sky pollyanna attitude, proclaiming that what the Spokane community did was no big deal! Since it is certain that this will harden them in their unrepentance, making a substantial contribution to the loss of their souls, you yourself will be held responsible for that fact, before the Throne of Judgement.

If you want to know how God Himself deals with those who illegally assume religious Authority, look in the Bible. There is a scriptural precedent which bears great similarity to the case of Francis Schuckardt. It started off the same way, evolved the same way, and ended up the same way. I refer you to the case of King Saul in the Book of Kings (1 Kings, Ch. 13). It seems that God had raised up Saul as king over the Israelites, and Samuel the Prophet was Divinely designated to offer up the Sacrifices in favor of Saul's battles, etc. But once on the battlefield, Samuel was late; so Saul's army started slipping away from him. Seeing this fact, King Saul himself offered the sacrifice, contrary to the order established by God. No sooner had he done so, than Samuel arrived, saying, "What have you done?"

Saul answered, "Because I saw that the people slipped away from me, and thou wast not come according to the days appointed... Forced by necessity, I offered the holocaust! And Samuel said to Saul, "thou hast done foolishly, and hast not kept the commandments of the Lord thy God, which He commanded thee. And if thou hadst not done this, the Lord would now have established thy kingdom over Israel forever. But thy kingdom shall not continue. The Lord hath sought him a man according to his own heart (David), and him hath the Lord commanded to be prince over His people, because thou hast not observed that which the Lord commanded!" (1 Kings 13:12-14)

Samuel also said to Saul, "Doth the Lord desire holocausts and victims, and not rather that the voice of the Lord should be obeyed? For obedience is better than sacrifices: and to hearken rather than to offer the fat of rams. Because it is like the sin of witchcraft to rebel; and like the crime of idolatry, to refuse to obey. Forasmuch therefore as thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, the Lord hath also rejected thee from being King!" (1 Kings 15:22-23) Now, even though God had rejected Saul from being King, He still allowed him to continue in power for many, many years - just as He rejected Francis Schuckardt for illegal assumption of religious power, while letting him continue in power for many, many years.

The scripture says, " But the Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul (just as He did from Francis Schuckardt!), and an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him. And the servants of Saul said to him: Behold, now an evil spirit from God troubleth thee. Let our Lord give orders, and thy servants will seek out a man skillful in playing on the harp, that when the evil spirit from the Lord is upon thee, he may play with his hand, and thou mayest bear it more easily..." (1 Kings 16:14-16)

Saul's servants sought out David, who " played with his hand " on the harp, bringing relief to Saul. The case of Francis Schuckardt is similar. He also sought out young men, who " played with their hands "; but of course, they weren't playing on the harp! They massaged him in bed, and did other things besides: bringing Francis Schuckardt a very different form of relief altogether. Ultimately, Saul completely lost his rationality, going so far as to invoke a witch, asking her to call up the spirit of Samuel from the dead (1 Kings, Ch.28). And just like Saul, Schuckardt lost his rationality, even to the point of " incompetence. "

For this is precisely the charge that Fr. Denis raised against Francis Schuckardt in his letter of June 21, 1984. On page 1, point #1, it says: " Incompetency... You are all aware of the fact that for the past several years things in the community have been in complete and utter chaos. It is my feeling that the vast majority of this chaos is caused by Bishop Schuckardt's inability to physically function, and because of the various emotional and psychological side-effects of the medication he uses... The problems we will discuss are not merely crosses and contradictions, but proofs that Bishop Schuckardt is not capable of administering the affairs of the Church, and of providing for the spiritual needs of the people...etc. "

In my opinion, Francis Schuckardt, the priests, the sisters, and his whole community, made the same mistake as King Saul... and they used the same excuse: " Forced by necessity, I offered the Sacrifice! " When I lived in Spokane, I heard numerous different members tell me, " We did everything we possibly could to find a bishop who was truly Catholic. We searched high and low, far and wide. But there wasn't one to be found anywhere; and if there was one somewhere, we don't know who he could possibly be! " So the whole community - the priests included - presumed (the sin of presumption) that God would grant them His Divine permission to depart from His laws, rules and procedures, in making Francis Schuckardt a priest and bishop.

So Francis Schuckardt - like Saul long before him - would presumably say, " I was forced by necessity, so I offered the Sacrifice! " But if Samuel the Prophet were alive today, I submit that he would say exactly the same thing that he said to Saul: " Thou hast done foolishly, and hast not kept the commandments of the Lord thy God, which He commanded thee... Thy kingdom shall not continue!... Doth the Lord desire sacrifices and victims, and not rather that the voice of the Lord should be obeyed? For obedience is better than sacrifices! Since thou hast rejected the laws of the Lord, the Lord hath also rejected thee from being leader of this people!!! " (And so it came to pass).

There is another similar example of how God deals with those who illegally assume religious power. See 2 Paralipomenon, Chapter 26. King Ozias illegally went in to burn incense on the altar of the Lord. The priests withstood him; but the King grew angry and threatened them: " And presently there rose a leprosy in his forehead before the priests, in the house of the Lord at the altar of incense... And Ozias the King was a leper unto the day of his death; and he dwelt in a house apart, being full of leprosy..." (2 Par.26:16-21). Comment: by downplaying the significance of what the Spokane priests and community did, you contributed directly to the perpetuation of their unrepentance. Now you share in their collective guilt.

With regard to the priests and religious of the Spokane community, one central issue is all-important. There must be no double-standards, for that would be hypocrisy. They must be judged by the same standard and measure that they apply to others: " For with what judgement you judge, you shall be judged; and with what measure you mete, it shall be measured to you again. " (Mat.7:2) That is the law established by Our Lord Jesus Christ. Now, the Spokane priests have a long-standing policy regarding the reception of newcomers in their midst. They are required to take an Oath of Abjuration, especially if they were former members of the V-2 church. So this same, exact standard must be used with the priests and religious of the Spokane community. They must be required, by you as their Bishop, to take an Oath of Abjuration before the presence of witnesses; solemnly renouncing their approval of Francis Schuckardt's ordination and consecration; renouncing his claims to the Papacy; admitting publicly that they were in error and schism, during his entire administration, from the bright beginning to the bitter end; admitting that the Sacraments they administered had no value, and were gravely sinful; renouncing the theological positions they maintained during his administration; renouncing his claim that there is nothing wrong with the practice of homosexuality, and anything else you can think of; in short, denouncing publicly their whole involvement with Schuckardt, during all the years they spent with him.

If they refuse to make that Oath of Abjuration, then they have only separated themselves materially - but not formally - from Francis Schuckardt! If they refuse to take the Oath, then they convict themselves of still believing they did nothing wrong. They will also prove that they are still in the throes of defiance and disobedience; and this will demonstrate conclusively that their " submission " to your authority is merely a pious charade, a fraud, an illusion: the appearance of submission, without the reality of obedience. As I said earlier, there is every reason in the world to doubt the reality of their wholehearted submission and obedience to you. You are Bishop Number Three. Their sincerity has not been tested. Their honesty has not been proved. Their path is littered with discarded Bishops. That fact speaks louder than any words they have said to you.

CONCLUSION

It would be totally false to assess the Spokane community's holiness, by observing what externally meets the eye. For truly, never have I witnessed a greater degree of pious practices and devotions! Such devotions are essential to the spiritual life - but they are not a substitute for True Catholic Theology. If their Sacraments under Francis Schuckardt were truly valid and acceptable in the eyes of God, then their reordination was obviously a sacrilege. If their Sacraments were not valid and acceptable in the eyes of God, then they must acknowledge this truth publicly. The priests must admit to the whole assembled congregation that they were a brainwashed cult, functioning in blind obedience to a schismatic heretic. " Either make the tree good, and its fruit good; or the tree bad, and its fruit bad! " Anything else is pure hypocrisy; and the community cannot be forgiven - no matter how great their pious practices and devotions are - unless they honestly admit that what they did was wrong.

On the first page of " Abandonment to Divine Providence " (Rev. Jean Caussade, S.J.), Fr. Ramiere says, " There is no truth however clear which does not become error the moment it is lessened or exaggerated... The virtue of abandonment does not escape this danger. The more holy and profitable it is in itself, the more serious are the dangers we risk by misunderstanding its just limits. These dangers, unfortunately, are not mere possibilities. The 17th Century witnessed the birth of a heresy - the Quietists - which while claiming to teach its followers perfect abandonment to God, led them into the most terrible disorders. (Spokane community, does this sound familiar?) For a time this sect wrought its ravages in the very capital of Catholicism!..." I hope to hear from you. Sincerely,

Ely Jason.



Most Rev. George J. Musey, D.D.

Feast of St. George
April 23, 1985

Dearly Beloved in Christ,

Since I was raised to the episcopate three years ago one of my fondest hopes and earnest prayers has been that I might be used as an instrument by Our Divine Lord, to help restore unity and peace in His Bride, our Holy Mother the Church. One of the greatest scandals in the Church today is the division among those who call themselves traditional Catholics. How sad it is that instead of joining forces to repel the common enemy, so many traditionalists spend great amounts of time and energy attacking and finding fault with other traditional Roman Catholics.

Today, on the Feast of St. George, a great step was made on the path to true unity among traditional Catholics. On this day I received under my jurisdiction and bestowed conditional ordination upon three priests, members of the Congregation of Mary Immaculate Queen based at Mount Saint Michael, Spokane, Washington.

These priests had originally been ordained by Bishop Francis Schuckardt, whose orders emanated from Old Catholic lines. After studying the documentation that these priests presented on their orders and after consultation with my advisors I had little reason to doubt the validity of the orders these three priests had received. Nevertheless, since the Holy See is vacant and an authoritative and binding decision on the validity of these orders cannot be made, and mindful that the validity of these orders will always be doubtful in the minds of some, I decided the most prudent course of action would be to bestow conditional ordination upon these men.

Those Catholics who have been receiving the sacraments from Fr. Denis Chicoine, Fr. Benedict Hughes and Fr. James McGilloy should not allow themselves to become troubled or perplexed on account of these conditional ordinations. Personally, I have found no reason to doubt that these men had valid orders and I believe the Church would have supplied the faculties needed in these extra-ordinary times. If any of the faithful are troubled lest anything be wanting in the canonical form of their marriage they should know that I have granted a sanatio in radice supplying for any defects in the canonical form of marriage.

Let us join together in prayers of thanksgiving to Our Divine Lord and His Blessed Mother for this great grace they have bestowed upon us. Let us join in prayer that all traditional Catholics might truly attain that unity which is the hallmark of God's Holy Church. Let us all, united in the one true Faith, stand steadfast under the banner of Mary Immaculate in the combat with the forces of Hell.

In Cordibus Eorum,
George J. Musey
Most Rev. George J. Musey

The Reply of Bishop McKenna to My Letter:

Dear Mr. Jason,

Before giving any serious attention to your letter regarding the Mount priests, I would first want to see your reasons for regarding my position on the pope hilarious and outrageous. As far as Bellarmine is concerned, he merely recognizes the dual aspect of the Pope, which the late Mgr. des Lauriers applies to the situation today. Anyway, I find your rejection of it a bit self-assured. For a layman you must be quite a theologian, for he himself certainly was.

Respectfully,

+ Robert McKenna, OP

Ely Jason,
 P.O. Box 83490,
 L.A., California 90083
 April 12, 1988.

Dear Bishop Robert McKenna,

I was very happy to hear from you at last. On the other hand, I was very disappointed with the quality of your reply. I wrote 10 pages. You wrote a single paragraph! Moreover, I provided precise quotations of the priests themselves, and meticulous documentation.... but you didn't answer a single charge in the letter. You merely changed the subject:

" Dear Mr. Jason: Before giving any serious attention to your letter regarding the Mount priests, I would first want to see your reasons for regarding my position on the pope hilarious and outrageous.... etc. "

I submit that this is merely an attempt to change the subject! What do apples have to do with oranges? What do bananas have to do with watermelons? I have established a firm and powerful case against the Spokane priests, and built it upon a solid bedrock of meticulous documentation. It stands alone on its own two feet, as tall and strong as the Rock of Gibraltar. My opinion of your views on the pope is totally irrelevant to the subject. I can prove it here and now. In my letter, I made the following points:

1. The Spokane priests never admitted to themselves, their followers, or the world at large, that their theological position was dead wrong. That is an objective, historical fact. My opinion of your views on the pope does not change that fact.
2. You personally reject sedevacantism; but the Spokane priests espoused sedevacantism wholeheartedly for the last 20 years. Further, they have never yet proclaimed publicly and officially that they now reject sedevacantism - leaving it doubtful that they really do reject sedevacantism. That is an objective fact, which functions independantly of my opinions on your theological position.
3. You stated that the religious and faithful were " unintentionally schismatic. " But Father Mary Benedict said " I personally have absolutely no doubts whatsoever about the first ordination: none! " That is an objective, historical fact, having nothing to do with my opinions of your views on the pope.
4. The Spokane priests got themselves conditionally reordained, even though they were convinced they were already validly ordained. " Reordination is a sacrilege! " (quoted from the Priest's Oath) That is an objective, historical fact, having nothing to do with my opinions of your theological views on the pope.
5. There was a casual, mirthful, light-and-breezy atmosphere surrounding the announcement of the reordinations. That is an objective, historical fact, which can be proved from tape-recordings that still exist.
6. You stated that Schuckardt was " schismatically ordained, receiving Holy Orders irregularly. " But Father Mary Benedict said " the work of God is not schism, in the normal sense of the word..." It is thus clear that the Spokane priests do not share your views, when you say that they and Francis Schuckardt were schismatically ordained. That is an objective, historical fact, having nothing to do with my views of your theological position.
7. The priests told the Spokane community, " Don't worry about it! Your Sacraments were perfectly valid and acceptable in the eyes of God, all those years under Schuckardt! " But they told everyone else " Don't worry about Schuckardt! We've been reordained by Bishop Musey! " Sheer hypocrisy. That, too, is an objective, historical fact, having nothing to do with my opinion of your views on the pope!

8. Since the priests, brothers, Sisters, and general community have never admitted that they did anything wrong, at any time, in all that concerns Francis Schuckardt, it was silly of you to ask " Why, then, are they not to be forgiven? " Moreover, it was morally blameworthy, because you reinforced them in a bad conscience, by trivializing the significance of what they had done, calling it " a mere mistake. " The whole community knew perfectly well that they were departing from Church theology, in consenting to the ordination and consecration of Francis Schuckardt. They did it with full knowledge, and full consent. Moreover, they continued to give their full, wholehearted consent for a period of 15 or 20 years! And you dare to call it " a mere mistake "? That is an objective, historical fact, having nothing to do with my opinions of your views on the pope.

9. The Spokane priests and religious played a deep, personal role in the radical abuses that occurred under Schuckardt's " Pontificate. " I know this from the direct, personal testimony of the community-members themselves. Hence, your literary defense of them is shallow and superficial. It attempts to lay all the blame for everything on Francis Schuckardt's shoulders, running him off into the wilderness like a Jewish scapegoat; while portraying the priests and religious like a bunch of sweet, little lambs. But the truth is not that simple. They were his eyes and ears, his arms and legs, his hands and feet. Francis Schuckardt handed down his Imperial Commands: they snapped to attention, and obeyed! That is an objective, historical fact, having nothing to do with my opinion of your views on the pope.

10. The Spokane priests must be judged by the standard which they apply to others (see Mat.7:2) Therefore, they must be required, by you as their bishop, to take an Oath of Abjuration before the presence of witnesses: (1) solemnly renouncing their approval of Francis Schuckardt's ordination and consecration; (2) renouncing his claims to the Papacy; (3) admitting publicly that they were in error and schism during his entire administration, from the bright beginning to the bitter end; (4) admitting that the Sacraments they administered had no value, and were gravely sinful; (5) renouncing the theological positions they maintained during his administration; (6) renouncing his claim that there is nothing wrong with the practice of homosexuality; and, in short, (7) denouncing publicly their whole involvement with Francis Schuckardt, during all the years they spent with him.

11. If they refuse to make that Oath of Abjuration, then they have only separated themselves materially, but not formally, from Francis Schuckardt! If they refuse to take the Oath, then they convict themselves of still believing they did nothing wrong. If they refuse, this will prove conclusively that their " submission " to your authority is only a pious charade, a fraud, an illusion: the appearance of submission, without the reality of obedience. I and everyone else have much reason to doubt the reality of their wholehearted submission and obedience to you. You are Bishop Number Three. Their path is littered with discarded Bishops. That fact speaks louder than any words they have said to you, or you can say to us, in " Catholics Forever. "

12. The choice is EITHER/OR: if their Sacraments under Francis Schuckardt were truly valid and acceptable in the eyes of God - as the priests insist to this very day - then their reordination was a sacrilege. If their Sacraments were not valid and acceptable in the eyes of God - a logical consequence of your statement that they were schismatically ordained - then the priests and religious must acknowledge this truth publicly. They must admit to the whole assembled Spokane community that they were schismatics, during all the years they were with Francis Schuckardt. " Either make the tree good, and its fruit good; or make the tree bad, and its fruit bad! " Anything else is pure hypocrisy. Finally, if you can write a reasoned response to this letter, I am willing to explain what I find wrong with your views on the pope. I will also provide in-depth documentation from the Summa Theologica, and other valuable sources. But let's discuss one thing at a time!

Sincerely,

Ely Jason

OLS/AMDG

+
JMJ
HICGD

VSS/AVE MARIA!

Patrick Henry
Rt. 2 Box 957
Safford, Arizona 85546
phone 602 428-1775
April 27, 1988

Dear Mr. Jason,

Praised be Jesus, Mary, and St. Joseph!

Thank you for your letter of April 17, 1988.

No, I have not really put many of my objections about CMRI (or any other group) in a written form. I just have not taken time to do it and, as of today, I do not know if I will ever make time to write it all down. (I do not seem to agree with anybody else in my conclusions etc. anyway. And no matter how well it seems to me that I present my arguments, if people do not want to hear what I have to say- it seems they just will not accept what I have to say.) It takes me a long time to write letters, and therefore, I just communicate with people over the phone, and I ask you to please send me your phone number if you ever write back to me again.

There are things in your letter that I also do not agree with, and many things I do agree with.

You seem to think that if "Bishop" McKenna had the CMRI "priests" make an abjuration of error to him, that that would make everything alright. With that conclusion I do not agree. First, if they are VALIDLY ordained by Schuckardt, they certainly are NOT LICIT. 2nd, all priestly functions under Schuckardt was illicit if not also invalid. 3rd., if Musey is VALIDLY consecrated a bishop, he is still excommunicated, and like Schuckardt and McKenna they do NOT have an Office, Powers, or JURISDICTION of a bishop. 4th., Epikiea does NOT supply JURISDICTION in the external form. 5th., Receiving one back into the true Church after they have made their abjuration of error and profession of Faith requires JURISDICTION IN THE EXTERNAL FORM. 6th., Even if CMRI priests did make an abjuration of error, McKenna does NOT have the necessary JURISDICTION he needs to receive them back into the TRUE CHURCH. 7th., One other reason (among MANY others) that McKenna can NOT receive CMRI back into the True Church, is the fact that McKenna is NOT a member of the true CHURCH himself. 8th., Even if, (for the sake of argument) McKenna could receive CMRI back into the True Church, if CMRI accepts McKenna's NEW THEORY about the dead material, formal pope, than CMRI becomes at least a material heretical sect again with McKenna. And there are many, many other things I could point out, but which I am not going to do now; but I conclude for now by saying, that CMRI has more than one face. By that I mean, when one first comes into contact with them, unless he knows his FAITH, CMRI may very well seem to be a Catholic, Traditional Community. CMRI might seem to be "just what he was looking for"! But, the "bottom line" of the matter is that, CMRI has more than its one good face that might appear on its surface when you first meet with them. If one will truly look into the COMPLETE history of CMRI, they WILL FIND that CMRI is far from being a COMMUNITY that is pleasing to Jesus, Mary, and St. Joseph. And especially if you live with them long enough to know the "inside" (and especially if you get to really know the "mind" of the leaders of CMRI, and the things that they have done, and taught, and are still doing, and teaching,) then you will know that the FRUITS of CMRI (and it is "by their fruits that you will know them.") are BAD and the tree IS BAD, and did not Jesus tell us that a bad tree will NEVER produce TRULY GOOD FRUIT!?

You also said: "they are...filled with a spirit of true devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary." But here I again disagree with you. Yes, it does appear that they are devout to Mary; and they do many devotions and pious things in Mary's honor. But when you TRULY study what St. Louis Marie De Montfort says about those who have a TRUE devotion to Mary and those who have a FALSE devotion to Mary, you will see that CMRI's devotion to Mary is A FALSE DEVOTION!!! Again, what I just wrote probably needs a much deeper explanation, but all that I should explain to you (and to others) would take me days or weeks to type out, and so, if and when I will ever type it out for you- only God knows.

Ora pro nobis,
Patrick Henry

Ely Jason;
Box 83490,
L.A., CA. 90083
May 2, 1988.

Dear Patrick Henry,

I am in total agreement with everything you said in your letter. You failed to detect the rich depths of irony that lurk beneath the surface of my letter, like a subterranean cave. Your letter would be exactly on target, if I honestly believed that a mere Oath of Abjuration before Bishop McKenna could restore the Spokane priests (and community) to the True Catholic Church. Let me now show you the invisible irony of my 2-page summary to Bishop McKenna (& the 10-page one also).

In the 10-page letter, 2nd paragraph, I stated that " I find your distinction between a material pope and a formal pope both hilarious and outrageous. That set the mood for the whole letter. This phrase represents to me: preposterous, ridiculous, filled with theological contradiction. I even told him so in a subsequent letter that you haven't seen. It is therefore obvious that I do not consider Bishop McKenna a true, valid, licit representative of the Holy Roman Catholic Church; but I never told him so yet. I established a premise (his views on the pope are hilarious and outrageous), but I did not draw the logical conclusion. I purposely kept my tongue-in-cheek, and left the rest unspoken.

Next point: notice how I applied his own principle against him in a theological argument. I took his distinction between a material pope, and a formal pope, and applied it against the Spokane priests and community, proving conclusively that they had only separated materially (physically), but not formally, from Francis Schuckardt. I therefore concluded that it was his responsibility as their bishop, to make them take a formal Oath of Abjuration. The rich depth of irony deserves to be explained point-by-point.

1. Since I had already called his position on the pope "hilarious and outrageous," this casts a dark shadow over the whole concept of his making the priests take an Oath of Abjuration.
2. I am firmly convinced that the Spokane priests would refuse to take that Oath of Abjuration, which I outlined in the 2-page summary, page 2, paragraph 10. For they have never yet admitted to themselves, or anyone else, that they did anything wrong, in all that concerns Francis Schuckardt. I am also convinced that they still believe in sedevacantism, and secretly reject McKenna's theory of a material versus a formal pope.
3. Thus, there would be an enormous benefit, if McKenna should demand the priests and community take an Oath of Abjuration. They would be forced to refuse his demands. They would be forced to come out of the closet, declaring their true position regarding sedevacantism and Francis Schuckardt. Like I told McKenna: " If they refuse, this will prove conclusively that their submission to your authority is only a pious charade, a fraud, an illusion: the appearance of submission, without the reality of obedience...etc. " Such a state of affairs would at least be more honest, than what they are doing now... pretending to go along with McKenna, in the hope that he will ordain more priests.
4. On the other hand, I consider it profoundly desirable that they should admit officially and publicly, that they were indeed wrong in everything that concerns Francis Schuckardt. Even if McKenna can't formally receive them back into the true, Catholic Church - the humiliation of their profound pride in a public format (not unlike the recent Jimmy Swaggart ritual), would hopefully set the stage for a true and genuine conversion of heart - something I truly hope and pray they will have someday. Jesus said, " I have come to call sinners, not the just. " I want to get them to the point where they finally stop protesting their innocence, and admit publicly, " We were dead wrong! Lord have mercy on us, for we have sinned against you! " From that point forward, there will be reason to hope for them.

Thus - as I see it - making the priests and community take a formal Oath of Abjuration will have a good result, regardless of which way the wind blows: (1) If (as I suspect) their submission is not genuine, and they don't really believe in his theory about the pope, but are just playing the hypocrite so they can get more seminarians ordained - then the public Oath of Abjuration will force them to come out of the closet, and show their true colors; (2) On the other hand, if they were willing to undergo the humiliating ordeal of a public Oath of Abjuration, admitting to themselves and to the whole world that they were dead wrong - then this would certainly pave the way for a true conversion of heart, and the ultimate salvation of their souls. I consider this second result far more desirable than the first; but either of these 2 results is far more desirable than the present state of affairs, which is sheer hypocrisy.

That is the subtle secret contained in my letters to Bishop McKenna. From what has been said, it should be obvious that I am in total agreement with you, when you said: "CMRI has more than one face... when one first comes into contact with them, unless he knows his Faith, CMRI may very well seem to be a Catholic, Traditional Community. CMRI might seem to be ' just what he was looking for! ' But the bottom line of the matter is that CMRI has more than its one, good face that might appear on the surface, when you first meet with them.... etc. "

I am deeply aware of the truth of what you say, having lived in their very midst for 6 months. One of my most damaging charges against them, which I wrote to Bishop McKenna, is that " The priests told the Spokane community: Don't worry about it! Your Sacraments were perfectly valid and acceptable in the eyes of God, all those years under Schuckardt. But they told everyone else (i.e., those who do not accept Schuckardt's ordination/consecration), " Don't worry about Schuckardt! We've been reordained by Bishop Musey! Sheer hypocrisy! etc. "

I am even in agreement with your final paragraph, where you said CMRI falls in the category of False Devotees, who have false devotion. When I said that they were filled with a spirit of true devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary, frankly, I was trying not to come down too hard on them. I was trying to inject a lighter note into a rather dark discussion. I was looking at all their enormous pious practices and devotions, and trying to imagine how wonderful it would be, if they could be purified of their false theology - while still keeping those pious practices. In conclusion, I really do hope and pray for their conversion - on every Rosary - and that is why I am taking the trouble to make these literary efforts with Bishop McKenna. The CMRI are so hardened in their hearts, that it is impossible to reach them anymore on a direct, personal basis. You and I (and many others) know that from direct, personal experience. The only hope left, as I see it, is to convince McKenna to make them take a formal Oath of Abjuration. This will force them (a) to come out of the closet, and declare their true position; or (b) to repent in dust and ashes, following an example that was set by Jimmy Swaggart. (Jimmy Swaggart is nothing to me but a radical, anti-Catholic, Protestant heretic; but I would dearly love to see the CMRI do what he did, in public! Moreover, they themselves have long demanded that newcomers to their midst take an Oath of Abjuration. Therefore, I consider it only logical and natural that they should experience a taste of their own medicine. It would be such a soul-cleansing experience for them! That should prove sufficient as a reply. I hope to hear from you again, at your convenience. Best Wishes! Sincerely,



Ely Jason
President, ISCS.

Ely Jason,
 Box 83490,
 L.A., CA. 90083
 May 9, 1988.

Dear Bishop McKenna,

Enclosed is a copy of a letter that was written by Fr. Denis on June 7, 1987. He quotes you as saying that you will not ordain any priests in the Spokane community for a full five years. This was an extremely wise decision on your part, for all the reasons you mentioned in that letter. I hope that you will remain firm and unwavering in your decision.

However, there are rumors circulating that you intend to disregard your own decision, and proceed with ordinations of some Spokane seminarians. I sincerely hope and pray to God that this is only a rumor, and nothing more! Still, I have definitely heard this rumor, and it originated with a member of the Spokane community.

If you are a Man of your Word, then God bless you! But if you ordain any seminarians of the Spokane community at any time during the next 4 years that remain, rest assured of the following certainty: I will issue a mass-mailing of Fr. Denis' letter, and I will synchronize that mass-mailing so that it occurs simultaneously with your ordinations.

By so doing, I will demonstrate the profound hypocrisy of publicly proclaiming that you will not ordain priests for five years - then disregarding your own public proclamation, and ordaining priests! You will become a laughingstock from one end of the world to the other.

I am firmly convinced that the Spokane priests are duping you, and deceiving you, for their own, private purposes. I charge them and accuse them - before your eyes, and the eyes of all the world - with the following 3 charges:

1. They secretly disbelieve your theory of a material versus a formal pope.
2. They secretly believe in sedevacantism to this very day; and
3. The reason they have not told you these facts, is because they want you to ordain their seminarians!

In my former letters to you, I proved conclusively that they are capable of sham and hypocrisy. They told the Spokane community, "Don't worry about your Sacraments all those years under Schuckardt. They were perfectly fine and acceptable in the eyes of God!" But they told the world at large, who do not accept Schuckardt's ordination/consecration, "Don't worry about it! We've been reordained by Bishop Musey!" Sheer hypocrisy!

The only way you can disprove my serious charges, is by requiring the Spokane priests to take a Formal Oath of Abjuration, solemnly renouncing (1) their approval of Schuckardt's ordination and consecration, (2) his claims to the Papacy, (3) admitting publicly that they were in error and schism during his entire administration, (4) admitting that the Sacraments they administered had no value, and were gravely sinful, (5) denouncing publicly their whole involvement with Francis Schuckardt, from the bright beginning to the bitter end; and finally (6) denouncing sedevacantism publicly. If they refuse to take the Oath of Abjuration, then it proves I have spoken the truth! I should think you would want to know the truth for your own peace of mind. Are you willing to ordain men who secretly believe in sedevacantism? Look what happened to Marcel Lefebvre. Are you willing to experience the same public humiliation? Sincerely,

Ely Jason.

Pentecost Sunday
June 7, 1987

Dear Parishioners,

Praised be Jesus and Mary!

On the Feast of Mary Immaculate Queen, I announced at the City of Mary of Bishop McKenna's decision to delay ordinations to Major Orders for the period of five years. This was a decision that he came to after much prayer and soul searching, seeking to know the Holy Will of God. I would like to quote from His Excellency's letter to me explaining his feelings in this regard:

"Having previously wished to make no decision regarding the conferring of Major Orders on your seminarians before December, feeling the need to pray and deliberate longer, I now see more clearly that all circumstances considered, I must await the lapse of five years.

This is sad news indeed, and I assure you sad for me too, for I truly esteem and am prepared to defend the honor of the Congregation of Mary Immaculate Queen, and I wish to help and encourage it in every way I can. But I, as I beg you and the community, must humbly submit to the Holy Will of God, and this is what I see it to be.

My main reason for this decision is the prudent necessity for the community to both prove its stability and recover its reputation after the widely publicized scandal given by Francis Schuckardt. This only time can do, and five years I feel to be the minimum. To be sure, I was not aware of the horrendous publicity given by the local press to the immorality of the Bishop until its renewal recently in connection with Bishop Musey.

The disagreement with, and separation from, him too has of course proved to be something of a scandal, coming so soon after the Schuckardt sensation had begun to die down, and along with the chronic lawsuit his public attacks against the community constitute the challenge to its continuance. Not that I don't think you can survive it - indeed I am confident that with the help of heaven you will - but until this stability has passed the test of time, it would be unwise to ordain priests whose support would depend on it.

But if five years seems the minimum, I assure you it will also be sufficient. I am satisfied with the conduct of affairs in the Congregation since the unfortunate falling out with Bishop Musey and your consolidation under a religious Rule...

In the meantime, as I have said, Father, I remain ready and even anxious to help you in any other ways I can. As I wrote Father Tarcisius not long ago, your seminary is the only one actually available to true traditionalists in this country. The devil must not be allowed to destroy it."

When this information was made known to me, before passing it on to the priests and seminarians, I also prayed to Our Lady and her Divine Son in order to be resigned to this disappointing news. How can we be anything but resigned if we profess to be imitators of Christ and as priests -- other Christs? I assured Bishop McKenna that he will not be approached by our people in this regard in question as to why he made this decision. He did so because he believes it to be God's Holy Will.

Please pray for our priests, clerics, seminarians, and religious. God bless you all and Mary keep you in Her Immaculate Heart.

Very Reverend Father Denis Philomena Marie, CMRI

DRUG MUST NETS. EX-TRIDENTINE BISHOP

The deposed head of Spokane's Mount St. Michael has been arrested in California on charges of possessing drugs and stolen property. Francis Schuckardt, the 49-year-old former bishop of the Latin Rite Catholic Church, was one of 12 arrested in three raids Saturday. In Schuckardt's priory - a rented house in a country club - authorities seized Demerol, morphine, Dilaudid (? - the zerox copy is faint), Percodan, and a quarter-pound bag of marijuana labeled "tea", said Detective Sergeant Rod DeCrona of the Plumas County Sheriff's Department.

The raids were executed by a 12-member SWAT TEAM, and a California Highway Patrol helicopter, because officials thought the group might have automatic or semi-automatic weapons. The priory, seminary and convent are near Greenville, about 100 miles northwest of Reno, Nevada. Schuckardt settled there after losing a church power struggle in 1984 to his lieutenant, Denis Chicoine. Chicoine had charged that Schuckardt's drug use crippled his ability to function as bishop. There also were charges that he had sexual relations with many of the boys in the church.

In a 1984 interview, Schuckardt said the charges "sicken me, because there's not a word of truth to it."

Schuckardt founded the church in Coeur d'Alene in 1967. He bought Mount St. Michael, a former Jesuit seminary near Spokane, in 1977. Church members, sometimes known as Tridentines, consider themselves "traditional" Catholics, who reject the modernizations that took place in the church during the 1960's. Mass is still said in Latin, and there are strict dress standards. Dancing and dating are forbidden.

Schuckardt left Spokane in June, 1984, after a run-in at his plush mansion with Chicoine's followers. The mansion was stripped when he left, and church leaders say that involved the theft of church property, paid for by donations. After Schuckardt's departure, a Spokane County Superior Court judge ordered him to return an estimated \$250,000 in cash and property.

DeCrona said the raids produced property that filled half a moving van, including church statues, records, furniture, chandeliers, stereos, religious books, TV's and video equipment. Authorities also seized precious metals and cash valued at almost \$200,000! DeCrona said there was \$75,000 in U.S. currency. The search turned up gold coins, silver bars, German marks, Swiss currency, Canadian money, and records of 15 to 17 bank accounts around the world, he said. The assets in the banks have not been determined.

Authorities found about 8 handguns and rifles in the raid, but no automatic or semiautomatic weapons. Two of Schuckardt's followers, Gabriel Joseph Gorbet, 23, and Joseph Stanley Belzak, 30, were charged with possession of a concealed weapon, when deputies found a loaded pistol under their car seat.

By Wednesday evening, all 12 had been bailed out or released on their own recognizance from the Plumas County Jail. DeCrona said he was tipped off to the drugs last week by an informant.

End of Article

May 12, 1988

Dear Mr. Jason,

Before you make good your
trust regarding the Spokane com-
munity, make sure for the sake
of concision that prior to my
expressions of my objections to the
priesthood, no application of Schuck-
art had in fact been made.

Respectfully,

Robert M. Young, OP

Ely Jason,
Box 83490,
L.A., CA. 90083
May 18, 1988.

Dear Bishop McKenna,

Although I am sorry that you intend to carry out ordinations very soon - despite your public proclamation that you wouldn't do so for five years - nevertheless, I am greatly relieved to know that you will at least make the priests and community take a public Oath of Abjuration. Half a loaf of bread is better than no loaf at all. Making them take a formal Oath of Abjuration is very dear to my heart, because I am convinced the salvation of their souls requires it. By no means should my efforts on their behalf be considered a personal vendetta. The loss or salvation of their souls is at stake. That is my motive.

If you are willing to meet me half way, I am willing to meet you half way. If you are willing to give ground, I also will give ground.

My Promise: I solemnly promise to cancel my plan to mass-mail Fr. Denis' letter during your ordinations, on one condition: that you make the priests, religious, and lay community take a formal Oath of Abjuration after the following manner:

1. The Oath must be administered at Mount St. Michael, and nowhere else.
2. It must be performed by the priests publicly, in full view of the community. The most logical choice of locations is their big auditorium, since it's the largest facility on Mt. St. Michael.
3. Public Notice should be proclaimed in advance of that Oath, by a variety of means: (a) I know for a fact that the Spokane priests have a very large mailing-list of Catholics everywhere, who are both members and non-members of their group. Said notice must be sent to everyone on their list; (b) Whereas the Spokane priests proclaimed publicly and loudly for 2 decades that they had done nothing wrong, in approving the ordination and consecration of Francis Schuckardt; and whereas this was common knowledge throughout all Traditionalist groups and factions, being discussed heavily in the various newsletters - the priests must now rectify that situation, by sending public notice to the various Traditionalist newsletters, to Lefebvre's group, and in general to all Traditional Catholics, regardless of their specific theological affiliation. (c) Whereas it is a historical fact that they employed public newspapers during the last 2 decades, to announce where they would be giving their public lectures; and whereas they proclaimed themselves to have the True Catholic Faith to people far and wide, while acting under full obedience to the authority of Francis Schuckardt - therefore, they should now place a select number of ads in public newspapers, announcing their intention to abjure themselves of Francis Schuckardt, at a certain time, on a certain date; inviting the public to attend. The New York Times, and the Los Angeles Times are good choices.
4. How the Oath is worded and phrased is up to you, but I feel that the Oath absolutely must contain the following points: (1) They must solemnly renounce their approval of Francis Schuckardt's ordination and consecration, stating publicly that this placed themselves, all the religious, and the whole lay community, outside the Catholic Church; (2) They must admit publicly that they were in error and schism during Schuckardt's entire administration, which lasted for almost 20 years; (3) They must publicly denounce Francis Schuckardt's claims to the Papacy; (4) They must admit publicly that the Sacraments which they and Schuckardt administered for 20 years had no value to the community, and further, were gravely sinful; (5) They must denounce publicly their whole involvement with Francis Schuckardt, from the bright beginning to the bitter end; (6) Finally, they must denounce sedevacantism publicly.

5. The Oath should ideally be written down as a prepared statement, which each priest and Sister should read out loud, over a microphone, to the assembled community, and in your presence. I will give you an example of how I think it could be worded; but the final wording is up to you.

6. I, Father _____, (or I, Sister _____), do here proclaim, in the presence of God Most High, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; in the presence of the Blessed Virgin Mary; in the presence of all the angels and saints in Heaven; in the presence of Bishop Robert McKenna; and in the presence of this assembled community, all of the following statements, which I endorse and approve with all my heart, mind, soul and strength: (1) I solemnly renounce my approval of Francis Schuckardt's ordination and consecration. This placed myself, my fellow priests and religious, and the entire congregation, outside the Catholic Church during the entire administration of Francis Schuckardt. (2) We were in grave theological error, and schism, during the last 20 years. (3) I solemnly denounce Francis Schuckardt's claims to the Papacy, and his private assertions that there is nothing wrong with the practice of homosexuality. (4) The Sacraments that Francis Schuckardt and we priests administered to the community had no value, and were gravely sinful. (5) In general, I do hereby denounce my whole involvement with Francis Schuckardt, from the bright beginning to the bitter end. (6) Whereas Bishop Musey approved our Sacraments publicly, to ourselves and to you who are assembled here; and whereas he also was a sedevacantist, approving our stance on sedevacantism, I now proclaim that Bishop George Musey led us, and you, still deeper into the whirlpool of error and schism. (7) Finally, although I believed in sedevacantism for the last _____ years, I do hereby renounce and denounce sedevacantism. I have come to realize that John Paul II and the Vatican II popes are material popes, but not formal popes! "

7. Each priest and sister should step up to the microphone, in front of yourself and the whole assembled community, and read that statement out loud - one by one. Afterwards, the whole assembled congregation should read the same statement out loud, en masse. Copies must be distributed to the community members as they enter the door. The only change would be at the beginning: " We, the community-members who formerly believed in Francis Schuckardt, do hereby proclaim, in the presence of God Most High, etc.." Points #1, #2, and #3 should be followed very closely. Some points require minor modifications. Let me just give a quick rundown, of how that same Oath would be spoken by the community:

8. " We solemnly renounce our approval of Francis Schuckardt's ordination and consecration. This placed ourselves, the priests and religious, outside the Catholic Church during the entire administration of Francis Schuckardt. (2) We were in grave theological error, and schism, during the last 20 years. (3) We solemnly denounce Francis Schuckardt's claims to the Papacy, and his practice of homosexuality, which became common knowledge, and caused public scandal everywhere, among Catholics in all the various groups and factions. (4) The Sacraments that we received from Francis Schuckardt, and his priests, had no spiritual value to us, and were gravely sinful. (5) In general, we solemnly denounce our whole involvement with Francis Schuckardt, from the bright beginning to the bitter end. (6) We solemnly denounce Bishop Musey, who approved Francis Schuckardt's ordination and consecration, and the Sacraments that we received; who nevertheless had our priests get reordained; and who approved of sedevacantism. He led us still deeper into the whirlpool of error and schism. (7) Finally, although we formerly believed in sedevacantism during the entire administration of F. Schuckardt, we do hereby renounce and denounce sedevacantism. We have come to realize that John Paul 2, and the Vatican 2 popes, are material popes, but not formal popes! " Finally, everyone must conclude by making their confessions to you, or to priests of your choice. Then the entire proceeding must be publicly, through mass-mailings and the means just described in #3 above (Public Notice). announced

If you are willing to meet me halfway, I am willing to meet you halfway. If you are willing to give ground, I also am willing to give ground. I repeat: I solemnly promise to cancel my plan to mass-mail Fr. Denis' letter during your ordinations, on one condition: you must make the priests, religious, and lay-community take the Oath of Abjuration, in the manner I have just described. That promise is now in writing, and will be signed by my own hand.

I must stress that a quiet, hidden-away-in-the-closet Oath of Abjuration is totally unacceptable. I am sure that, if the priests were willing to take that Oath, they would say, " Bishop McKenna, we are willing to take that Oath, but not in the presence of our Spokane community, and not in public! Let us do it quietly, privately, in your living-room in Connecticut! " Such an Oath would be a farce and a sham, which is their style, as I've been saying all along. If you agreed to such an approach, they would then downplay their Oath with the congregation back at home; and they would make no mention of it in all their vast travels. Hence, the Spokane community, and their following throughout the world, would continue on in their state of illusion, error, and ignorance. Francis Schuckardt, his priests, and the community were a major source of public scandal to the Catholic Faith, during their entire existence. The only way to rectify such a major public scandal, is through a major, highly-publicized Oath of Abjuration. Nothing else will do. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ely Jason". The signature is fluid and somewhat stylized, with the first letters of "Ely" and "Jason" being prominent.

Ely Jason.

P.S. The priests and religious must take the Oath with one hand on the Bible, and the other hand raised to God. Anything else you can think of, which I might have forgotten, should be included.



Most Rev. J. Vida Elmer
 St. Michael's Chapel
 P. O. Box 85
 Glenmont, NY 12077

85



Mr. Ely Jason
 Box 85490.
 Los Angeles, CA. 90083

From the desk of *Pentecost 1988*
 Father Vida Elmer

Date May 22, 1988

Dear Mr. Jason,

I am afraid, Bishop McKenna will not receive your letters before the Spokane ordinations. At present, as far as I know, he is in New Zealand, and from there he will go directly to Spokane. Try to contact him before the ordination. The Spokane priests think they have satisfied Church-laws through Bp. Masey. ~~If~~ This is not the case,

- I think they have to make a public
- abjuration because of the schismatic
- past, although not that cumbersome way you propose that each priest, brother and nun would read the text individually, separately, after one another.

With prayers & blessing,

Most Rev. J. Vida Elmer
 St. Michael's Chapel
 P.O. Box 85
 Glenmont, N.Y. 12077

J. Vida Elmer