

# Letter to a

On April 3rd of this year, the tenth anniversary of the promulgation of the New Mass, the "Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith" issued a "declaration" criticizing the doctrinal content of a book written by a French priest named Father Pohier. The book is called *Quand je dis Dieu* or *When I say God*. This action of the Congregation was hailed by some in the Catholic press, of conservative tendency, as a great leap back to orthodoxy and away from the heresies of some modern theologians.

The declaration, signed by Cardinal Seper, Prefect of the Congregation, reads as follows: "His Holiness John Paul II, during the audience granted to the undersigned Prefect, approved this Declaration, decided upon in Ordinary Session of the Congregation, and ordered its publication." At the beginning of the document we are reminded that the function of the Congregation consists "of promoting and safeguarding doctrine of faith[sic] and morals in the whole Church," and in fulfillment of this function has examined the book of Father Pohier and has found in it *evident errors* and *ambiguous statements* which "generate uncertainty in the minds of the faithful."

The "more evident errors" and "ambiguous" statements listed by the Congregation are as follows:

*More evident errors consist in a denial of these truths—*

"... the intention of Christ to give to his Passion a redemptive and sacrificial value; the bodily resurrection of Christ and his continuation as a real Subject after the end of his historical existence; life after death, resurrection, and eternal life with God as man's vocation; the presence in Sacred Scripture of true teaching which has an objective meaning that faith can perceive and that the Magisterium of the Church, assisted by the Holy Spirit, can authentically determine."\*

*Ambiguous statements in the book involve "the following important articles of the Catholic faith"—*

"the Christian concept of the transcendent God: the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist as taught by the Council of Trent and, more recently, by Pope Paul VI in his Encyclical *Mysterium Fidei*; the specific role of the priest in effecting this real presence; and the exercise of infallibility in the Church. With regard to the divinity of Christ, the author expresses himself in such an unusual manner that it cannot be determined whether he still professes this truth in its traditional Catholic meaning."

The Declaration notes that the view of the Congregation had been communicated to Father Pohier by his Superior General a year prior to its publication but that "the author replied with explanations which were insufficient." "Moreover," the Declaration continues, "he did not make an explicit profession of the faith of the Church on the points called to his attention." Father Pohier's pertinacious, manifest and grotesque heresy did not elicit in this Declaration either a suspension of excommunication. But take heart, as they say, the Congregation "calls attention to the gravity of the errors here denounced, and to the impossibility of considering them as opinions left to the free discussion of theologians."

The sad truth of the matter is that in "respectable" "Catholic" theological circles, there is a substantial amount of agreement with the views of Father Pohier "here denounced." In the seminaries of the United States and Europe, it is common practice to call into question or openly deny the infallible doctrines of the Church and objective morality. This fact makes one wonder why this individual priest should be singled out for "denunciation." His views are not rare or exceptional. They are not unusual—the mere expression of a fringe theologian who has gone to far. They are, one might say, the common repast dished out to vulnerable young seminarians who in another age would have been God's instruments for the

\*This translation was published in L'Osservatore Romano, Weekly Edition in English, April 17, 1979, p. 12.

# New Church Bishop

*by Father Clarence Kelly*

salvation of souls but who in our time will become the active carriers of the deadly disease of heresy of the modernist strain which is actually not a strain but the synthesis of all heresy.

If this estimation of modern seminaries is true, and I contend it is, and if the Congregation knows what is going on, and we know it certainly does, the question arises, "Why did the declaration of April 3rd single out only Father Pohier and not the bishops of Europe, America etc. who promote the same ideas in their seminaries, through the priest professors that teach there and serve at their pleasure?" In my opinion, the answer is that the real purpose of the Declaration was not to correct the situation but rather to give the impression that (1) such views are isolated and not commonplace, that (2) the Congregation is genuinely protecting the faith of the people and (3) that those who are concerned with the modern trends can rest easy because sound Catholic doctrine is making its return in the new church. Furthermore, I would speculate, that this Declaration concerning the Left could serve as a springboard to condemn the "Right" if the latter persists in its rejection of the Second Vatican Council and the reforms that followed as irreconcilable with the Roman Catholic Faith and therefore unacceptable in the Catholic Church for anyone at anytime under any conditions.

The point of publishing this "letter to a new church bishop" is to demonstrate that there is a radical difference between the Roman Catholic Faith and the new religion, that this new religion is to be found everywhere, that it is a logical expression of the reforms and is acceptable to the hierarchy of the new church, and that it leads to the mockery of God and the destruction of souls. Thus it can be nothing other than the work of Satan, being an unfruitful work of darkness with which, St. Paul warns us, we are to have nothing to do.

Our hope is that Catholics may not be fooled by this

pretense of orthodoxy and concern, and that they be neither deceived nor scandalized by the clever tactics of their enemies. Pohier is no rare exception among theologians, neither is the seminary about which the letter speaks. I realize that when people are trying to prove something, which they already believe, they may tend to stack the evidence and sometimes twist or exaggerate it. Many will surely say that is exactly what I have done. All I can say is, judge for yourselves. What is presented here, together with an *apologia*, are statements, literal and exact, of things which I was taught when I attended an ordinary, perhaps somewhat conservative (by modern standards), seminary: the typical modern Catholic seminary. And I might add that if the more recent reports I have received are true things are much worse, in that, to the destruction of doctrine has been added the increasing destruction of personal morality among many.

The letter is presented exactly as it was sent. The only changes made are a few slight ones in sentence structure, to make it a little more easy to read, and the omission of two quotations which dealt with sensitive subject matter relating to the sixth and ninth Commandments which I think do not belong in the pages of *The Roman Catholic*. I would have made at least one more deletion, which deals with the sin of infidelity in marriage, but have decided to include it because it is less explicit, and because it dramatically demonstrates the gravity of the situation and the radical and substantial alteration of the faith which the new theology constitutes.

Finally, while the quotations presented in my letter were picked almost at random from the pages of my notes, not every professor was guilty of such a radical rejection of the Faith. Indeed I would venture to say that a few would reject the more radical formulas of the new theology espoused by the many and might tell themselves that those quoted here didn't say what they meant or didn't mean what they said or something like that.

# LETTER TO A NEW CHURCH BISHOP

*By Father Clarence Kelly*

---

*This is a letter written in response to a bishop's "condemnation" of the work of the Society of St. Pius X.*

November 7, 1974

Bishop Walter P. Kellenberg  
Chancery  
Diocese of Rockville Centre  
50 North Park Avenue  
Rockville Centre, N. Y. 11570

Dear Bishop Kellenberg:

Father Charles J. Nossler, sometime back, (March 26, 1974) brought to my attention specific objections concerning certain priestly activities. He said that it was a concern for the "Law" and for the principle which says that "silence equals approval" that prompted him to write. I appreciate Father Nossler's concern. I too have great respect for the Law and subscribe to the principle cited above, especially when the silence is on the part of a superior who is responsible for his subjects before the Law and before God. I thank God that I still do have this respect for Law in spite of the fact that I had been subjected to strong forces which sought to destroy all respect for the decrees of God and the Church during my two years at Immaculate Conception Seminary in Huntington.

Therefore, lest I be remiss in my observance of the Law and the hierarchy of laws given by God and the Church, or lest I appear to grant tacit approval or acceptance to conclusions and implications that have arisen concerning me, it is my duty to inform you that for me to respond to the pleas of people of the diocese, who yearn for the true faith, is justified because of prevailing conditions. These poor people are in a state of extreme spiritual need in that they "cannot at all, or only with extreme difficulty, avoid eternal...death." Many of these people have already encountered spiritual death in their children, whose Faith and Morals have been destroyed not in spite of religious training offered in the schools and parishes but because of this "religious" training. This destruction of souls is not a rare thing. Indeed, it is now commonplace.

I realize that it is hard to accept, but it is nonetheless true, that the human element in the Church is not being renewed. It is being progressively corrupted. I know how bad it is and how bad it will become for I know the direction it is going in, having spent two years in the seminary in Huntington. I personally have experienced the quality of teaching and the character of the typical priest who is being ordained. Please forgive my frankness, but from the point of view of the Apostolic Faith, it is nothing less than horrifying. For the most part, the priests who teach there are confirmed radical modernists.\* They are producing a generation of seminarians who are like them. Having taken the oath against Modernism yourself, you know that it is impossible to reconcile unchanging

---

\*Please refer back to my introduction wherein I said: "...not every professor was guilty of such a radical rejection of the Faith, etc."

Catholic truth with the Modernist concept of Dogma that is taught at Huntington. I am keenly aware of the terrible faith-corroding process that is carried on there for I had to resist it and fight it for two years. Hardly a day passed during which my adherence to the Roman Catholic Faith was not under attack. So bad have things become that so “conservative” a priest as Father Tyrrell actually publicly said, in the course of a class discussion group, that he was prepared to accept St. Joseph as the NATURAL father of Christ if the “theologians” came to discover this to be so. If the creation account in Genesis was *not* literally true, he argued, perhaps the Gospel account of the Incarnation is not literally true, either.

The fears, then, of the poor afflicted and suffering Catholics of this diocese are based on fact. They are in grave danger of becoming victims of the Modernist Reformation that has taken hold and is most clearly in control of your seminary in Huntington. Since this is the case, I could no more turn a deaf ear to them than I could to the cries of a drowning child. It is not then a disregard for the Law which permits me to act but a love for the Law which compels me to. Surely I do not have to remind you that the first law of God is the law of Charity. And accordingly, “in extreme spiritual necessity we must assist our neighbor even at the risk of our life.” Must we not do the same at the risk of losing our reputation, or at the risk of incurring the displeasure of powerful people—even powerful “religious” people? It is true that we must “be subject to the higher authorities, for there exists no authority except from God, and those who exist have been appointed by God.” (Rom. 13:1). Yet, when those who possess authority order us to do what is evil and, therefore, to disobey God, we must say with the Apostle Peter: “we must obey God rather than men.” (Acts 5:29). Or, to put it in strictly theological terms: “Common welfare-demands that a law be just, morally good, possible of observance, and necessary for, or at least conducive to the common good. A law that falls short of these qualifications does not serve the common welfare and, therefore, has no binding force.” Rev. Heribert Jone, J.C.D. *Moral Theology* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1962, p. 18).

The changes which you have implemented in this diocese show a substantial deviation from the unchangeable Catholic Faith proclaimed by the Council of Trent. A clear-cut proof of this is the unacceptability of the TRIDENTINE FAITH at Immaculate Conception Seminary in Huntington. Yet that Tridentine Faith is the very one all Catholics were obliged to profess up until just recently. Indeed, it is the Faith you were ordained and consecrated to uphold, and the one you have sworn before God to defend. My actions, then, and those of like-minded priests, who are now beginning the work of the Counter-Reformation, are not the result of disobedience, defiance or disrespect, but rather submission, deference and reverence for the order of things according to Authentic Catholic teaching. This teaching is opposed to the teaching of one or two generations of modernist theologians who have already been long since definitively condemned and anathematized by Pope St. Pius X, who, by the way, is looked upon with contempt at Immaculate Conception Seminary. Our duty to the demands of Christian charity binds us, in spite of the persecution that it might generate in the hearts of the enemies of Catholicism. (Of course it is not just a question of Charity. There is also the matter of justice and the right of a Catholic to insist on “his inalienable claim to the Church’s special solicitude.”)

For it is by a special obligation that God binds us: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." (Mt. 22:39). "This is *My* commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you." (John 15:12). "He that loves his neighbor, has fulfilled the law." (Rom. 13:8). It is also true that since all men who are capable of salvation are our neighbors, our duty is to them all. And it is a duty which compels us to love them and to do to them as we would have them do unto us. With "brotherly love" (Rom. 12:10) we must love them. "From a sincere heart love one another earnestly," says St. Peter. (1 Peter 1:22). And it must be "not love in word nor in tongue, but in *deed* and in truth." (1 John 3:18). We must be practitioners of the works of mercy. We must admonish the sinner for the sake of salvation. We must counsel the doubtful in this difficult and painful situation through which the Church is passing, as well as comfort the sorrowful while we strive to "edify one another." (1 Thess. 5:11). We must bear wrongs patiently "supporting one another in charity, careful to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." (Eph. 4:1-3) We must also practice fraternal correction. If we are duty-bound in Charity to feed the hungry, to give drink to the thirsty, to clothe the naked, to ransom the captive, to harbor the homeless and to visit the sick, what about those who are spiritually hungry and thirsty and naked; what about those who are held captive by doctrinal and moral corruption, or who, unable and unwilling to change their Catholic Faith, have become homeless and sick, thinking that their rejection of Modernism renders them rebels against the Church?

How is it possible that priests who were once defenders of the Faith are now, in this Diocese, preaching naturalism from the pulpits and are replacing the Holy Catholic Faith with the pantheism of Teilhard de Chardin? Before our very eyes, God is being dethroned, and in the pulpits and

schools a distorted notion of humanity is being deified. Parishes which are supposed to be the center of Catholic life are being turned into propaganda mills for this new religion. These are hard things to say and still harder to listen to, but nevertheless they are true. The state of the poor people is one of EXTREME spiritual need. What are we to do? Are we to sit back and turn a deaf ear to the cries of the sheep of Christ as they plead for the voice of Catholicism to guide them? Are we to subordinate the law of Charity to certain precepts of human law (ecclesiastical law *is* human law)? Are we to place human law above the GREAT Commandment? Indeed, we must not for it is always true, and has always been taught by the Church, that "we must obey God rather than men." (Acts 5:29) As St. Thomas put it: "Now sometimes the things commanded by a superior are against God. Therefore superiors are not to be obeyed in all things." S.T. II, Q. 104, ART 5.

How quickly have we forgotten our Catholic teaching! Ecclesiastical law, to state it again, *is* human law and it is not universal, immutable, or absolute. It is rather "the law established by the Church for the spiritual welfare of the faithful." Again, such law must "be just, morally good, possible of observance, and necessary for, or at least conducive to the common good. A law that falls short of these qualifications does not serve the common welfare, and, therefore, has no binding force." It is the *natural* law and not purely ecclesiastical law nor even, for that matter Positive divine law which is universal, (imposed on all rational creatures), immutable (cannot be changed or dispensed from), and absolute (must be observed at all costs). If, then a law becomes harmful, or if the purpose of the law has ceased, the law does not bind. For after all, "a law is a permanent, rational norm for free activity enacted and adequately promulgated by the superior of a public community for the sake of the

common welfare." To state it a third time, "common welfare demands that a law be just, morally good, possible of observance, and necessary for, or at least conducive to the common good." Are the new ways and the new laws and the new doctrines and practices (which are only spring-boards for newer and more radical changes) conducive to the common good of the Church and to the salvation of souls? Is the Faith of the people in this diocese purer? Do they lead better moral lives? Do you think fewer people are going to Hell?

The answer is obvious. The Mystical Body of Christ is not being built up. It is being torn down. And what is worse, this is being done from within. St. Pius X said in PASCEN-  
DI,\* "that we should act without delay in this matter is made imperative especially by the fact that the partisans of error are to be sought not only among the Church's own enemies; but, what is to be most dreaded and deplored, in her very bosom, and are the more mischievous the less they keep in the open. We allude, Venerable Brethren, to many who belong to the Catholic Laity, and, what is much more sad, to the ranks of the priesthood itself, who...imbued with the poisonous doctrines taught by the enemies of the Church, and lost to all sense of modesty, put themselves forward as reformers of the Church." But who is acting today against this onslaught of Modernism which is spreading not just in distant lands but here on Long Island?

The Modernist of St. Pius X's day, like the modernist who rule the domain inhabited by so-called "Catholic" theologians today, claimed that they sought to renew the Church. They said they were loyal to the Church, though they did everything to destroy the deposit of truth delivered to the Apostles and handed down these past twenty centuries. In dealing with these subversives, St. Pius X "had hopes of recalling them to a better mind." He first treated them with

\*This is Saint Pius X's Encyclical on Modernism.

kindness, then severity, and finally he was compelled to publicly reprove them. St. Pius X was successful; but not completely. Lewis Watt, S.J. in his preface to a translation of *Pascendi*, speaking of modernists said: "Outside the Catholic Church, however, they still exist, and so long as they exist they are dangerous." Father Watt may have been right in 1937, when he wrote; but today his statement is not applicable. Modernism "which was prepared by Humanism and eighteenth-century philosophy, and solemnly promulgated at the French Revolution," (*The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. X, 1911*) is stronger, rasher and more powerful now than ever. With only slight modifications it has resurged with a violent ferocity. It would suit all those in positions of authority to follow in the steps of St. Pius X who said: "Wherefore we must interrupt a silence which it would be criminal to prolong, that we may point out to the whole Church, as they (i.e. the Modernists) really are, men who are badly disguised." (*Pascendi*).

So bad has the situation become that the Modernists are the heroes, and are pictured as guilty of only making a philosophical mistake, while their opponents are pictured as the villains. For example on May 3, 1971 in a typical theology class, Father Julian Miller in his discussion of modernism said: "You might say it (i.e. Modernism) was an attempt at aggiornamento." He went on to say that, "the action of (Saint) Pius X was one of totalitarian repression." Father Miller continued: the modernists "were raising all of the right questions." As for St. Pius X's brilliant and holy Secretary of State, Cardinal Raphael Merry del Val, Father Miller said, that he "can best be understood as a Gestapo Chief." And of the great St. Pius X, Father Miller said in class (in the presence of Father William Marrin and Father Francis M. Tyrrell), that he was "the rat who was the head of the ship." (the above are exact quotations which were written down by me at the time of the statements) And such an un-Catholic

attitude is not unusual but common:\*

"No universal law, no universal creed, no universal code of ethics; it is to a state embodying these characteristics that the Christian is called by Jesus." (Fr. Miller, March 8, 1971)

"There is never a fixed moral standard. This is the message of the Gospel." (Fr. Miller, March 8, 1971)

"Christ did not know how victory would come." (Fr. Miller, March 8, 1971)

"Original sin is not something we get from the outside but we get it when we sin personally." (Fr. William Marrin, March 10, 1971)

"The starting point is not God's Revelation but man's religious experience." (Fr. Miller, March 12, 1971)

The death of an infant, is the movement from "a lower level of animal existence to non-awareness." (Fr. Miller, between March 12, 1971 and March 19, 1971)

"Jesus didn't necessarily see what would be the result of His death on the cross." (Fr. Miller, March 19, 1971)

"I have the opinion that all men will be saved." (Fr. Miller, March 19, 1971)

"Another mythic idea is that Jesus has ransomed us." (Fr. Marrin, March 22, 1971)

"Man is in a situation to become God." (Fr. Miller, March 24, 1971)

"I do not see the devil as a person, but as a personification of evil." (Fr. Miller, March 24, 1971)

"It is not because He (i.e. Christ) died that we are saved but because He entered into a new form of existence." (Fr. Miller, March 26, 1971)

"You don't have two separate worlds: a world of nature and a world of grace. The resurrection has accomplished the union of these worlds. In fact there never was a difference. But the Resurrection has made us aware of this." (Fr. Miller, March 26, 1971)

"Christ came to an awareness of Himself as God the Son." (Fr. Tyrrell, March 20, 1971)

"Death, Judgment, Heaven and Hell are not future things but are here and now." (Fr. Miller, April 5, 1971)

"We can't say that Jesus instituted a Church while He was alive." (Fr. Miller, April 7, 1971)

Speaking of the Church's reaction to Modernism under St. Pius X: "What happened of course was integralism, a type of McCarthyism." (Fr. Miller, May 3, 1971)

"My former context was very much limited by my theological education. I am aware of having entered into a new dimension." (Fr. Tyrrell, May 7, 1971)

One typical illustration from Fr. Marrin's Scripture Course: (A paraphrase which is almost an exact quote)

In the Beginning, Jesus preached the coming of the Kingdom; then as He met opposition He reflected on this and His reflections were deepened; certainly He didn't know what He would do at the beginning of His mission; He didn't have this knowledge stored away and just brought out at the opportune moment. (Fr. William Marrin, March 1, 1971)

"No one is so thoroughly consistent that he doesn't say something that disagrees with what he has said in the past. I suppose this even applies to Jesus." (Fr. Marrin, March 8, 1971)

\*The quotations here given are not interpretations of what was said but represent accurately the actual statements uttered by various professors during the course of ordinary classes.

The Communist Revolution in China was "one of the greatest revolutions in modern times. . . ." (Fr. Denis Regan, February, 3, 1971)

"The Church is not going to be judged on contraception. People have already made up their minds. The Church is going to be judged on the question of racism." (Fr. Regan, March 31, 1971)

The same class: "Black Power is necessary." (Fr. Regan, March 31, 1971)

Between April 7, 1971 and April 28, 1971

"When psychiatrists recommend extra-marital sexual relations as a cure for impotency, this presents a problem. It seems to be morally out. Be we have to think about it. I am open in this area and not closed to possibilities." (Fr. Regan)

With regard to "recommending the pill—if there is a therapeutic reason it can be permitted." "If a couple comes to the conclusion that contraception is O. K. in conscience, we are in no position to recommend types of pills." (Fr. Regan, April 28, 1971)

The following was written down after the class but the statements are substantially what were said and were verified by two students in the class. (April 28, 1971 - May 12, 1971)

*Fr. Regan:* "As for therapeutic abortion there is a possible opening here to save the mother's life."

*Seminarian:* "Father it seems to me that you are saying abortion is not intrinsically immoral but that the morality of the act depends upon the persons motivation."

*Fr. Regan:* (This is an exact quote) "Yes, that's right."

Added to this decadence in doctrine and morals, there is the ever-

increasing acceptance of the heresy of religious indifferentism—an indifferentism which has seeped into the minds of Catholics and is destroying their Faith and their Morals and is thereby making them prime candidates for Hell *along with their scandalizers*. It is no wonder that Pope Leo XIII had called religious indifferentism "the great error of this age," (*Humanum Genus*), and Pope Pius XI declared that those who promote it "can meet with no kind of approval among Catholics (for) they pre-suppose the erroneous view that all religions are more or less good and praiseworthy."

Some Catholics, recognizing the true nature of the so-called renewal, have determined to act in self-defense. And no one can deny them that right. To quote St. Robert Bellarmine in the most extreme of cases:

"Just as it is licit to resist a Pontiff who attacks the body, so it is licit to resist him who attacks souls, or who disturbs the civil order, or, above all, who tries to destroy the Church. It is licit to resist him by not doing what he orders and by impeding the execution of his will. It is not licit, however, to judge him, to punish him, or to depose him, for such acts belong to a superior." (*DE ROMANO PONTIFICIE*, Bk. II, Ch. 29)

What then of bishops?

I am neither having recourse to polemics, nor am I exaggerating the problem. The danger is not to overstate the case but to understate it due to the dulling of our religious discernment. You know from your training and your oaths that among your primary duties is the duty to "safeguard the purity of faith and morals." (Canons 335, 336) But it is not being done. It is also the duty of the bishop "to make all proper regulations for the administration, government, and advancement of the diocesan seminary, and to see that they are observed..." Since it is true that the

Bishop "should especially visit the seminary frequently in person, watch carefully over the training of the students, and acquire fuller knowledge of their dispositions, piety, vocation and progress..." (Canon 1357 ff.) our presumption must be (and the law requires it to be, see canon 2200, number 2) that you are responsible for what is going on in the Seminary and in the Diocese and, indeed, that you approve. You are responsible for it before the Law and before God. For it has, as Father Nosser would put it, your "tacit approval."

What is being done against the Catholic Faith at Huntington and in the diocese is no secret; neither is the bizarre behavior of Catholic seminarians who participate actively in Protestant services in Protestant churches, who "make liturgy" (i.e. celebrate "the Lord's Supper") sitting on floors around coffee tables, who go publicly to X-rated movies and who publicly talk about leaving the priesthood even before they are ordained. Immaculate Conception Seminary in Huntington is an instrument for the destruction of souls; the souls of future priests and their victims who will be exposed to them in the parishes of the diocese.

Out of respect for the law, then, may I point out to you certain specific requirements of the law. Canon 1325: "Fideles Christi fidem aperte profiteri tenentur quoties eorum silentium, tergiversatio aut ratio agendi secumferent implicitam fidei negationem, contemptum religionis, injuriam Dei vel scandalum proximi."\*

Canon 1326 "Episcopi quoque, licet singuli vel etiam in Conciliis particularibus congregati infallibilitate docendi non polleant, fidelium tamen suis curis commissorum, sub auctoritate Romani Pontificis, veri doctores seu magistri sunt."\*\*

Canon 2200, Number 2 "Posita

\*The faithful of Christ are obliged to profess their faith openly whenever their silence, backwardness, or manner of acting would involve an implicit denial of the faith, contempt of religion, an offense to God, or scandal for their neighbor.

\*\*Although individual bishops even when assembled in particular councils do not enjoy the prerogative of infallibility in teaching, nevertheless they are also truly doctors or masters, under the authority of the Roman Pontiff, in regard to the faithful entrusted to their care.

externa legis violatione, dolus in foro externo praesumitur, donec contrarium probetur.”\*\*\*

And finally: Canon 188 “Ob tacitam renuntiationem ab ipso jure admissam quaelibet officia vacant ipso facto et sine ulla declaratione, si clericus: .....

4, A fide catholic publice defecerit;”\*\*\*\*.

It is not easy to be a bishop today. I know that. It is an awesome responsibility to have to give an account for so many hundreds of thousands of souls which you will be required to give. This is especially true when so many of these souls are being led away from Catholic doctrine and moral teaching by the priests and religious institutions of this diocese. But it was not easy for the first bishops either. They knew what the cross was and shed their blood accordingly.

It is possible to debate certain theological questions from now until doomsday, but what cannot be debated or disputed is that souls are being corrupted and will eventually be damned here in this diocese on a massive scale—and the worst of this scandal is in the diocesan seminary. Who would dare say that we are not obliged to rescue the spiritually drowning? Who would dare say that to provide them with the means of their spiritual self-defense and salvation is against the “Law”?

I have no fear of a rebuke from Our Blessed Lord when I face Him on Judgment Day concerning the question of coming to the aid of souls who are crying out to be saved from the ravaging wolves which now run freely amidst them. On the contrary, should I not act for fear of displeasing men, whose job

it is in the first place to save these souls, then I would dread His wrath greatly on this account. In light of this I am writing to you to explain and defend my act of Charity toward those who want to hold onto their Catholic Faith and thereby save their souls; for I am reminded myself and would with all due respect remind you that “DIVINE LAW obliges one to profess his faith publicly if silence or evasion would imply a denial of faith, contempt of

religion, an insult to God or scandal to one’s neighbor.” (Canon 1325, Number 1)

Sincerely yours,  
*Clarence Kelly*  
Rev. Clarence Kelly

cc: Rev. Charles J. Nossier

\*\*\*When an external violation of the law occurs, in the external forum the existence of malice is presumed until the contrary is proved, because in the ordinary case man acts knowingly and freely.

\*\*\*\*By tacit resignation through the operation of law, all offices become vacant automatically (*ipso facto*) and without any declaration, if a cleric:

1. ...
2. ...
3. ...
4. Publicly abandons the Catholic Faith.