

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

(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. Furthermore, 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) impence 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.

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 Alphonsus Maria 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 opportunity 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 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.

to him.

ardt was calling all the shots, and you had all placed yourselves under absolute obedience we had no choice but to classify your community as a Throne of Satan. For Francis Schuck-

14. Thus, despite the immense piety and devotion and zeal that we witnessed in yourselves,

as Francis Schuckardt!

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

our solemn convictions about the man.

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

would become divided against itself, and fragmented, and destroyed. "

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

cut off all further correspondence very abruptly, with a short, terse note.

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

A BRIEF HISTORICAL SKETCH

a constructive purpose in mind, which I will explain shortly.

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

anyone at all.

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

Benedict, but he only answered a few times altogether.

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

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 Mussey 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 fiascos, 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 extra 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, dreams, 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 expositions, but really, you have never been here!!!) We have not ended up, after all, mutilated, murdered, totally brainwashed and reduced to helpless protoplasms 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 ABOUNDS 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 sinners, it's 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 willfully, 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!!

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 closest 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 Masey. 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 designs 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,
Rosalia Hottel

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)

.....

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 him- self 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 be- tween 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, industri- ous, without artifice, and full of devotion: for the Blessed Virgin Mary, and for the Cath- olic 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, support- ing, 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 author- ity 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!