

Vezeli's

22 June 1984

Dr. Eberhard Heller  
Anna-Dandler St 5/11  
D-8000 Munchen-60

Dear Dr. Heller,

Thank you for your letter and the copy of Anacleto Flores' article. I must admit that I am astonished at Anacleto's hysterical reaction to slander propagated by Msgr. Musey and his companion, Mr. Fouhy. If Anacleto really believes all that he has written, then he should have the honesty and courage to sign his name. He should be prepared to present the evidence of his accusations.

His article is nothing more than wild and confused statements which have very little foundation in reality. As you already know, it is very easy to make accusations. Malice, jealousy, envy, ambition, greed - all these and many other vices enter into such matters. I have not yet mentioned immaturity and irresponsibility.

We have witnessed in these days an increased activity of evil inspiration for the purpose of destroying the Church. If our conclusions are correct, St. Bonaventure Seminary, is a key and vital center for the future of the Catholic Church. Modest and humble as our situation is presently, we present a serious threat to anyone who has either a direct intention to destroy the Catholic Church, or to use Her for purposes of personal greed and ambition.

Msgr. Musey and his supporters (whether he admits affiliation with them is immaterial; he is immersed in their mentality) the Birchers have been spreading rumors that I am "working too hard" and may be "on the verge of a nervous breakdown". Msgr. Musey - in an attempt to steal our Franciscan seminarian who will be ordained this month - said to the seminarian: "My real concern is for Bishop Louis' mental stability. He has done a lot of work and he does need help. Maybe the pressure has gotten to him." This is the first step in destroying a person.

Msgr. Musey made the following statement to this same seminarian which he repeated twice: "It is my understanding that he has hypnotized everyone at the Friary and through this means has performed acts of immorality." Our seminarian is no fool. He is a man with experience in the world and is in his early 40s. He immediately concluded that Msgr. Musey was lying because he thought to himself: "Msgr. Musey is saying that everyone in the friary was hypnotized and through this means immoralities were performed. But, I know for certain that I was not hypnotized. Therefore, Msgr. Musey is a liar."

On this same subject, Msgr. Musey himself admitted to our seminarian in Milwaukee: "Whether the charges are true or not, I do not know." But, he has chosen to believe them because this is the only way to protect his man, Mr. Fouhy, and to control the entire United States. We know that he has been spreading these stories through his lay-agents. We are all of the opinion that Msgr. Musey's conduct is most hypocritical: he pretends that he does not wish to "expose" the matter for the good of the Church. However, he has done

practically everything to assure the spread of it. In one word, he has manufactured a scandal from a stupid trick of a young man.

It is my view that the young man made the statement to Fr. Altenbach with the express intention that Fr. Altenbach should repeat it to me. The purpose was to provoke me to indignation so that I would finally send him away. He succeeded. But what he did not consider was that I would be so provoked that I would innocently tell Msgr. Musey that I must send the young man away because of what he said to Fr. Altenbach. However, I do not really know what he said to the old man. I only know the old man's version which I now have serious doubts about. However, I told this simply and innocently to Msgr. Musey for the reason that I honestly feared that the young man might, indeed, try something even worse. One never knows about people with inner problems.

We suspect that Msgr. Musey told Msgr. Carmona some kind of twisted story. In fact, we are certain because Msgr. Musey further stated to our seminarian: "As you know, or maybe you do not know, this is why the other four Mexican seminarians left." The Mexican seminarians went wild after they received a telephone call from someone.

When Msgr. Carmona was asked not to take part in the consecrations, he replied "I respect the opinion of Msgr. Musey". What that "opinion" may be, we do not know. The only thing we are now certain of is that Msgr. Musey has no credibility with us. In the matter of the consecrations he has acted in a deceitful manner. He is the one directly responsible for undermining our seminary. He is directly responsible for the destruction of right order by creating his own empire under the laughable title "Primate of the United States."

When Msgr. Musey was in Milwaukee, he explained to Rev. Bro. Bernard "how he was chosen to be a bishop". This is what Msgr. Musey said (substantially, as recalled by Bro. Bernard): "Do you know how I was chosen to become bishop? I went to Guadalupe to pray before the shrine there of our Blessed Mother. I was praying there for several hours (or he may have said about five hours or two hours, I don't exactly remember) and unknown to me, I was being watched by the two Mexican bishops (Zamora and Carmona). They came up to me and said they had been observing me and said they were looking to consecrate a priest from the United States. After observing me, they decided that I was the one to become the bishop of the United States." This story completely contradicts the story he told me and the one that appears in the SWORD OF TRUTH.

Both Msgr. Musey and Mr. Fouhy have been spreading the lie that I "beat up" Mr. Fouhy. Msgr. Musey stated: "When Bishop Louis came to the seminary, in my territory, under my control, he did not even ask me for permission nor let me know he was coming. He sneaked in and eventually went on to Mexico. What happened between him and Fr. Fouhy I believe to be true because Fr. Fouhy showed us the welt marks on his back where Bishop Louis beat him on the back. He also had red marks on the back of his neck. "

Now, the fact that Bro. Francis was a witness to everything (and I insisted that Bro. Francis be present against the objections of Mr. Fouhy) is dismissed by Msgr. Musey by saying that : "...This explains to the satisfaction of my own mind why Bro. Francis did not see what really took place. He was under an hypnotic spell and was oblivious to the reality of what happened. This can

happen to people who are under hypnotic spells."

I would like to make an interesting observation here: on the one hand, Msgr.Musey says that under hypnosis, immoral acts were performed. He later says that under hypnosis, Bro.Francis did not really see what was going on in the room in which only three people were present:myself, Mr.Fouhy, and Bro,Francis. It was important, of course, that some explanation be given by Msgr.Musey to show why Bro.Francis, who was a witness to everything and spoke to Mr.Fouhy,and knows that both men are lying should not be a witness. Two old men arranged the truth between themselves - even though there was another witness there! This shows the boldness of these two and how honesty and truth are not important to them. Question: How could anyone know that "immoral acts were performed" if hypnosis makes it impossible to know what is going on? If a person was hypnotized, according to Msgr.Musey, such a person would not know what is going on. It is all very curious. Perhaps it would be useful to inquire: under which tree was Susanna seduced?

We are very curious to know how Mr.Fouhy received welts (der Rand) on his back. It is even more interesting to know how Msgr.Musey saw Mr.Fouhy's naked back. What Msgr.Musey does not know is that last summer I had an accident that took almost the entire strength from my right arm! Either Mr.Fouhy later beat himself to make the welts or Msgr.Musey is only proving still further that he is a compulsive liar. In either case, any markings on Mr.Fouhy were not put there by me.

We know from eye witnesses that Msgr.Musey is involved with Neo-Nazis and the Klu Klux Klan. We know that Msgr.Musey has allowed the Neo-Nazi and Klu Klux Klan to use the Hofbraugarten facilities in the past for their meetings. We know that he celebrates Adolph Hitler's birthday with great enthusiasm. We know from an eye witness that he fancies himself another Joseph Goebbels (he even enjoys saying that he resembles Goebbels. And this is true!) But, the Life magazine writes of Goebbels:"He was a master of hate; the intellectual of the Nazi hierarchy; possessed an astonishing gift for propaganda." Notice how Musey spreads vicious propaganda! Anacleto has foolishly served to do the dirty work for Musey.

We know that Msgr.Musey left the active priesthood about five years after his ordination , which would mean about 1957-8. This information was given to us from the Chancellery Office of the Diocese in which he belonged. His own cousin, a Monsignor, admits that no one really knows why Musey left.There is no indication of leave of absence and no indication of sick leave in his file. This is most unusual, according to Mgr.Gemaiou (?) Musey had his first heart attack long after he left the active priesthood.It seems that most of his pastoral experience comes from playing the organ in his restaurant business. A classmate of his volunteered the information that Msgr.Musey was never a conservative Catholic and for this reason, when he joined the traditionalists, everyone was astonished.

There is a definite pattern in Msgr.Musey's mental process regarding accusations of immorality against other clergymen. He indirectly accused a Fr.Grant, O.P.(deceased) indirectly by saying to three persons:"One of the men living with him is as queer as a three-dollar bill." I have come to learn that the term "queer" means a homosexual. Fr.Grant was a very good priest. He had been consecrated secretly by a Roman Catholic bishop. Musey tried to get himself consecrated by Fr.Grant, but Fr.Grant refused. Perhaps this explains why Musey wished to defame Fr.Grant with such vicious

calumnies? Fr.Grant allowed someone to stay with him because this helped to pay for the apartment.

Msgr.Musey tried to force the parents of one of our seminarians to go to Beaumont, Texas, and take pictures of people going into the hotel owned by Fr.Khoat, the Vietnamese priest whom you met in Munich. He wanted them to get pictures, and if possible, with Fr.Khoat in them. He said that the hotel was a "house of prostitution"! He spread this dirty rumor to others. Question: why?

He has publicly libeled the clergy of the Society of St.Pius X by accusing them of immorality in the pages of the SWORD OF TRUTH. He assured me that it was true: one priest attempted homosexual abuse of the waiter while two others made obscene advances to the waitress. He absolutely assured me that it was true. I now am convinced that this could not be true. I am ashamed to have printed his lies under our name.

Bishop Musey suggested to Rev.Bro.Bernard that Fr.Dominic Savio is a homosexual. He gives as his proof the following: "I also see in Fr.Dominic some of the same vindictive and vengeful attitude that Bishop Louis has. Fr.Dominic lets people think that he is the most holy person in the world. He is just being a hypocrite." Comment: After admitting that Fr.Dominic was a priest, Musey now denies it. It must be remebered that the sign of a homosexual is that he is spiteful and full of vindictive revenge, according to Bishop Musey.

He also kept talking about a Msgr.Demouliere who had worked for the Pius X Society in New Orleans. Msgr.Musey said he thought that Demouliere was a homosexual. I asked Musey why he said such things. His answer was: "Because he acts like a homosexual." I asked him: "What do you mean?" He answered: "He is very delicate and effeminate. He likes rings and fine clothing." I answered him: "I do not really know whether he is or not. I do know, however, that the easiest way to destroy a priest's good name is to accuse him of something like this." I did not tell Musey that his criteria were absolutely ridiculous and that some football players are homosexuals. Some of the most "masculine" looking men are homosexuals. Musey would know this if he spent some time studyng psychology instead of drinking beer most of the night. He manifests a strange and peculiar interest in sexual matters of this kind.

Judging from the above attitudes of Bishop Musey, I am honestly fearful that perhaps Musey (and Fouhy ?)may have sexually abusedthe young man whom I sent to Texas thinking that I was sending him to a safe place. When I saw the young man he was visibly in a state of anxiety. I learned that Musey had given orders to Mr.Fouhy "not to let the boy go with them". So, there was something already going on that even if the boy wanted to leave with us, he could not. What did Musey and Fouhy do to him in a few months?

There is some question about Msgr.Musey having been consecrated and proclaiming himself to be an "Archbishop". This appears in the "Sword of Truth" but his explanation is very superficial. The fact remains: I have had (and still have somewhere among my papers) a newspaper ad where "Archbishop Musey " is advertised as going to give a talk in Kansas. Whether he was consecrated by some schismatics, I do not know yet, but I do know that Msgr.Carmona consecrated him and this would make my own consecration valid. In fact, the presence of Msgr.Zamora would assure the validity of my

5

consecration because Pope Pius XII declared that all three bishops act as consecrators.

I am also enclosing a copy of a "pastoral letter" which I was forced to prepare by the actions of Msgr. Musey. You will notice that there is real question even of Fr. Altenbach's orthodoxy as far as Catholic doctrine is concerned. There are also the two following points:

1. Claiming 'jurisdiction' as a 'bishop-elect' (Msgr. Musey assured him he had jurisdiction!) Fr. Altenbach permitted, contrary to my express warnings concerning the moral seriousness of his actions, on two occasions that schismatic/heretical priests to celebrate Mass for the people. Both individuals are 'bishops' and connected with schismatic and heretical organizations that pose as true Roman Catholic organizations. When Fr. Altenbach was told this, he simply answered: "We cannot look into all of these matters." However, he was warned and in conscience he has a duty to assure that the priests are acceptable.

2. This same warning was communicated to Msgr. Carmona, viz., the question of orthodoxy of Altenbach and the clear unorthodoxy of the priests that Altenbach was using. These same bishop-priests were present in the sanctuary during the consecration ceremonies. I do not see any difference between this situation and the one we had in Rochester, NY where the Novus Ordo bishop allowed the cathedral to be used for the consecration of Anglican bishop. Msgr. Carmona's answer was: "I respect the opinion of Msgr. Musey." He also said: If Msgr. Musey asks him to come to the United States for the consecrations, he will come.

It is interesting to note the confidence with which Msgr. Musey manipulates Msgr. Carmona: Msgr. Musey had already told Fr. Altenbach to announce in the bulletin that Msgrs. Carmona and Zamora would come for the consecration. This was almost one month before Msgr. Carmona was actually asked to come! How is it that Msgr. Musey is so certain of Msgr. Carmona's response?

At this time, I consider the following bishops excommunicated by virtue of canon 2338 #2b.

Regarding the John Birch Society: When Bishop Musey first read the pamphlet SWORD OF TRUTH where Anacleto Flores strongly attacks the Birchers, eye witnesses said that "Bishop Musey was visibly disturbed by the remarks made against the Birchers." An apology to the Birchers was made in the Sunday bulletin of the Christ the King Chapel in Lafayette, Louisiana. Also, I understand that a commentary excusing the Birchers was inserted in the pamphlet distributed by Musey.

These are only a few of the observations that I have made of this entire matter. There is no point in pursuing it any further because it is a waste of time. Musey's agents have spread the story in Milwaukee, but no one believes it. It has done more harm to Musey and Altenbach than to us. The only ones who wanted to believe it were the Mexicans. And, I am sure there is a reason for this. One suggestion: I have not accepted Msgr. Carmona as "Primate of Mexico" and do not think that we must ignore Msgr. Zamora and Msgr. Martinez. I cannot understand why Anacleto are repeating the story of Musey. Is it because Musey pretends to agree with their ideas to consecrate

62

everyone? Also, the seminarians, because they are Franciscans, are not under the direct control of any bishop. They would be under the control of their Franciscan Superiors. This, I think, Carmona and the others do not wish. Then, there is the personal ambition and vanity of some of the seminarians who thought they could do everything by themselves after one year of training. Also, the one who childishly spoke of "falling in love" was very, very jealous of the young man who was made responsible on week-ends.

I do not wish to bother with this matter any more because it only wastes valuable time. In the entire matter, I am very concerned for the spiritual welfare of the young man. I do not think he fully realized what he was doing. He was truly obsessed (under the influence of the evil spirit). If not this, then he was just crazy. In either case, I feel compassion for him and do not have feelings of anger against him. I know that the Devil would triumph if I would give into the temptation of hatred. I fight this temptation every day and look for ways to excuse the terrible imprudence of that young man. The guilty ones in this entire affair are those vainly ambitious old men, half dead, who may have more to hide in their past than we can imagine!

I know that you are eagerly awaiting some word from me, Dr. Heller, and I am truly sorry to have taken so long. Perhaps what I have written will give you some idea of what we are dealing with over here. I send you, your wife and children my good wishes and blessings.

+ Fr. Louis Vezelis, O.F.M.

Nachtrag:

For your information, the enclosed excerpt PAX was written by fr.Nugent who was accused publicly and to the police of the similar thing. Msgr.Musey 'claims' that he went out there to investigate and found that Fr.Nugent was completely innocent of the charge. It is very interesting to note that Fr.Nugent is now in Virginia somewhere with one of his monks. I see the day when fr.Nugent will not longer be useful to Musey and then Musey will start having second thoughts about the charges made against Nugent. As long as Nugent serves Musey's purposes, he will be "innocent". As soon as Nugent becomes a threat to Musey's ambition, he will become "guilty".His seminarians were ordained by Msgr.Musey even though Fr.Nugent does not believe the Sede Vacante position.

The need for Msgr.Musey to have more bishops is so that he might get some money to pay for the "seminary" in Texas which is run by Mr.Thomas Fouhy. Also, so that his Primacy may be glorious, it is necessary to have auxiliary bishops. This great man needs lesser men so that his greatness may become more apparent.