

FATHER WALLUT: “*A PRIORI*” THAT TOTALLY DISTORT JUDGMENT

Father Wallut:

I think I understand you; I mean that I think you are sincere in the remarks you made with regard to the Army of Mary and its foundress. You know that there are thousands of false doctrines, that the Roman Catholic Church is experiencing the worse schemes of destruction in its history, that, seducing the great ones and the little ones, “*the smoke of Satan has entered into the Church,... raising tremendous pitfalls that threaten the serene and sure navigation of Peter*” (Paul VI).

I do not know if that would be the case with you, but I could personally, with regard to Canada, draw up an endless list of deplorable strayings by or degrading scandals within the poor Canadian Church which disfigure the Countenance of our Holy Mother the Church. But therein is not the problem, for you seem to be a priest faithful to Rome and that says it all.... Assuredly, refusing to profess the doctrinal or pastoral errors of others does not guarantee the integrity of our own profession of faith. However, it is necessary to mention the ruin wrought within the Canadian Catholic Church, for it is precisely the irreproachable nature and the pure Catholicity of the work and its foundress which have drawn upon it the infernal ire of the personnel of the Church. Do not think, either, that I am giving in to a vengeful condemnation. I am well enough aware of human weakness and the power of the prince of this world, not to cast stones. There is strictly no one to blame; they are simply the ignominious schemings of the infernal powers of hell being unleashed and which must be brought down. It is inevitable that we should have to denounce those who have let themselves be taken in by the hateful and subtle pride of hell. The salvation of souls requires that justice be re-established, that the truth be declared and that crucified love be honored.

If I say that I understand you, it is also because I think I have grasped why you have attacked Marie-Paule Giguère’s mental health, applying, by the same token, the term illusion to the beliefs of the Knights of Mary. That there should exist the most striking signs of the mental equilibrium and the heroic virtue of our foundress, all of that is simply *a priori* a fraud and an illusion; under the exterior appearance of a feigned holiness, she is only a very proud person, for she disobeys Church authorities – which is false – to nurture an “exorbitant and excessive” personality cult. You attack the most intimate part of our conscience, without examination, because you know that if we are not deluding ourselves – and we are not –, then Mother Paul-Marie’s mystical life is authentic and her testimony is true, eventually in the face of everyone’s opposition!

Father Wallut, see the mistake you are making which is a result of the same error that has been repeated since the founding of the Army of Mary, violating the innocence of our foundress; without examination, based on the “*a priori*’ of your theological and ecclesiological knowledge,” you reach a **conclusion** that discredits, considers to be false, the mystical life of Marie-Paule when the entire question rests, **first of all**, on the

credibility of her testimony. No “*a priori*” can exempt one from conducting a meticulous enquiry into the credibility of someone’s testimony. Absolutely no “*a priori*”. Must I remind you that it was the “*a priori*” of Caiaphas, according to which God could not have a Son, that caused him to tear his garments rather than his heart before the incarnate Word, one with the Father and the Holy Spirit.

It would simply suffice for you to read the primary documentation of the work in order to understand that what you judge to be worth condemning does not merit condemnation. The same is true here as it is for anything we must judge: in order to guarantee the truth of our conclusion, it is necessary to ensure, sometimes laboriously but with much exactitude and good will, the validity of the premises leading to our conclusion. Father Eric Roy brought that to your attention. And perhaps there is nothing more to add, it being so clear that, on the one hand, the matter of the logical antecedent allowing one to judge of the witness and the life of Mother Paul-Marie is of such a luminous purity and simplicity that it is impossible for there to be any ambiguity with regard to what it means and to the absolute credibility of the one bearing witness. On the other hand, being imbued with inapplicable “*a priori*”, it is quite impossible for you to be willing to tackle all the work such an undertaking would involve, with the exactness and goodwill required, to validate your antecedent and, by that very fact, your conclusion.

Under such conditions what is there to say, since that which permits someone to set out an antecedent rigorously based on truth has already all been said? And by the way, we should mention that this represents tens of thousands of pages of reading, including hundreds of testimonials, as well as **meeting** a person, the main person concerned, with whom Cardinal Maurice Roy took the time to meet in order to verify the odious calumnies which some ecclesiastics were reporting to him about her. What more can be added to what Father Eric Roy said? Your conclusion is not valid in spite of the formal strictness of the reasoning supporting it, because your premises are false!

We know very well where you went, in order to get your premises. Now, the documentation presented by the work of the Community of the Lady of All Peoples proves, beyond any possible doubt, that **the judgments of the Church against the Community of the Lady of All Peoples and its foundress are null and the future will render them null and void.**

The examples François Pillot gave you, or those along the same lines made by any other person writing in *Le Royaume*, had no other purpose than to show that this fact is not impossible: the judgments made by personnel of the Church have sometimes been null and void. And that is all there is to it. Your repeated accusations that we use truncated analogies “striking a clever balance” simply show the total lack of comprehension with which you tackle a subject that is beyond your knowledge and the information you have. The cases in which the Church has been wrong, even among some of its most renowned faithful – we need only think of the great Saint Bernard who did not believe in Mary’s immaculate conception – are not examples of what the Church is facing with regard to the work of the Co-Redemption. There have been, here as elsewhere, errors and

dishonest machinations, but there is no comparison between what the Church or its members had to judge in the course of its history and what, in this time which is our time, Heaven is now offering for their contemplation in the light of God.

It is not a lack of theological arguments, a lack of evidence or deluded ignorance that forces the Sons of Mary Fathers to a **theological silence** before the machinations of Church authorities or before the learned quibblings of ecclesiastics. No, quite the contrary! There is simply no need for the Sons of Mary to gesticulate before the nullity of objections which have no foundation. What they do do is to set right, in a holy manner and minimally, the truth so that charity may be exercised. You are not without having seen the holiness of the actions of the Sons and the Knights of Mary... Instead of giving your attention to the tree from which this fruit comes, you have let your false “*a priori*” inspire you to a “truncated analogy that struck a clever balance”: “most heretics have appeared to be very pious while spreading, at the same time, a false doctrine”.

Poor Father Wallut! In this Work, because of the unimaginable fidelity of the one you do not know, **there has never been any illusion or any duplicity because never has any lie been proffered.** Against any and all expectation! Among other things, I recall that false mystic, Berny Parks, whose statues streaked with blood were truncated, and yet pictures of this with supporting articles were printed in *Le Royaume*. What a divine manner of confounding and teaching! In Marie-Paule’s case **humility prevails over perceptiveness**, although she not only “saw”, “knew” and “felt”, but most of all was **subjected to** the disorders of this poor Berny!

Yes, it has all been said in the Work’s documentation with regard to the perfect obviousness of the absolute credibility of Mother Paul-Marie’s testimony and of the phenomenal abundance of proofs of the divine, celestial origin of all that to which she bears witness.

Empty statements! Oh Lord, forgive them for doing and judging without knowing, as you forgive everything to your wretched witness who is learning to love virtue through the example of your handmaid! I, a wretched witness, who have already responded, in certain articles in *Le Royaume*, written with much difficulty because of my many limitations and a stifling feeling of unworthiness, as well as in a letter addressed to the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops after the publishing of its Doctrinal Note of August 15, 2001, to the main points of the theological arguments which you thought, wrongly, you had the right to have recourse to in brandishing your stunning accusations.

Now, I quite humbly challenge anyone to find, in what I have written, one single solid objection which would authorize him not to defer his judgment of this Work of Heaven and of its foundress.

Daniel Couture, Lac-Étchemin

April 24, 2006