

# *The Order of Saint Charbel Inc.*

Website: <http://www.shoal.net.au/~mwoa/index.html>

---

161B Koloona Dr. Cambewarra. 2540  
P.O. Box 815, Nowra, 2541  
Fax Line: (02) 44 460832

ARBN 071 970 379; ABN 44 474 679 899  
Email: [mwoa@shoal.net.au](mailto:mwoa@shoal.net.au)  
Phone/Fax (02) 44 460263

## **MY THIRD APPEAL TO THE CHURCH AND MY REPLY TO THE DECREE OF BISHOP INGHAM 22nd June, 2002**

Once again I hereby make an "Appeal" to Rome – specifically, to the Holy Father, Pope John Paul II, through my Local Ordinary. This time it is against the two "Decrees" that have been issued against me; firstly, that of Bishop Philip Wilson, on the 27th September, 1999 – and, secondly, by Bishop Peter Ingham, on the 16th June, 2002. I also include an appeal against the contents of the "Pastoral Letter" distributed by Bishop Murray on the 2nd December, 1984.

This is my third official "Appeal" - in addition to the countless others I have made to the Church - to have my claims heard in an atmosphere of truth and natural justice. I have written extensively on all matters pertaining to the "Decrees" issued by the Church, and it truly saddens me deeply that the Religion to which I have belonged since my birth in 1950 has continued to deny me my rights, both under "Canon Law" and the law of "Natural Justice". That is, those rights as a faithful Catholic, which state that my claims may be heard in full, and under the protection of a full Ecclesiastical Court.

On the 11th September, 1998, Most Rev. Bishop Philip Wilson advised me that he intended to open what he called an "Ecclesiastical Investigation". Twelve months later he publicly announced, in a "Decree", that we were to close down. An Investigation by his Commission had not been carried out at this stage - nor had he, or anyone from his office, interviewed me personally.

I then made an "Appeal" to Rome – through Bishop Philip Wilson himself, as Canon Law requires. I asked him to forward this to the Vatican, within the proscribed time. Twelve months later the Bishop opened a Commission, **which had not been informed that I had lodged an "Appeal"**; this can be clearly seen in their report. They also advised me that this was not an Ecclesiastical Investigation as such, only a Commission of Inquiry. I repeated that I had asked for – and was entitled to - a full Ecclesiastical Investigation. The reply was: "If that is what you desire, we will see what can be done".

Nearly twelve months later, after I had not heard anything more from the Commission, I forwarded a query to Wollongong, asking what had happened to my "Appeal". I received no response. I then contacted my Advocate, Rev. Father John Woods, who advised me to lodge another "Appeal" - which I did - as per Canon Law 1638: I wish to know what has happened to that document.

Bishop Ingham insists that I am in error in claiming that execution of the demands contained in Bishop Wilson's "Decree" of the 27th September, 1999, was automatically suspended by my "Appeal" against it. I cannot be mistaken, because **Canon Law 1638** clearly states this: **An appeal suspends the execution of the judgement.**

I ask you to consider this fact: a Commission was formed on the 5th May, 2000, but it followed a "Decree", in which I was told to close my Order. This was issued on the 30th September, 1999!

From what date in the Church's history has this become the normal procedure? Why would a Commission sit in judgement after a legitimate "Decree" had been exposed to the world. Imagine the outcry if a Judge in a civil action said: *"First we will close you down, and then study the claims later!"*

What is the point of studying a case when, in fact, a judgement has already been made? This "judgement" speaks for itself. It indicates that what we are doing in the Order of Saint Charbel is deemed, in fact, to be not Catholic. So why just a simple Commission of Inquiry? More importantly - why have I not been granted the full Investigation to which I am entitled?

Normally, in such matters, the Church suspends judgement until all the evidence has been studied. Take Lourdes and Fatima: throngs of people continued to go to these Sacred Places until the Church had made its finding public. Latterly, this type of continuing support has also occurred in Medjugorje. Once a matter has been fully studied, only then is a judgement in order. It is also to be noted that – according to the advice I received from my Advocate, Father John Woods - my second "Appeal" was sent to Rome through the Pro Nuncio in January 2001.

The Commission, led by Father Kevin Matthews, presented to Bishop Wilson their findings; they had formed their own conclusions, despite my insistence on having what was lawfully mine to demand. The fact that I had made an "Appeal" was ignored.

On the 24th January, 2001, Bishop Wilson wrote to the Congregation for the Doctrine and the Faith in support of his action taken. Note: it seems that Bishop did not forward my "Appeal" through the proper channel, as is required by Canon Law.

On the 3rd February, 2001, the Congregation for the Doctrine and the Faith informed Bishop Wilson this information:

*"It is quite clear that his so-called Order of Saint Charbel has never had any legal existence in the Catholic Church. Mr. Kamm himself admits that its recognition was done by a schismatic Prelate. Hence your Decree of September 27, 1999, is perfectly valid and binding.*

*"In relation to the diocesan investigation, it is clear that the multiple absurdities contained in the two books published by Mr. Kamm and the information collected by the Comitia, offer sufficient grounds for a decision in relation to the clearly non-supernatural origin (the classical equivalent is: constat de non-supernaturalitate) of the "apparitions" and "messages" promoted by Mr. Kamm. I suggest your diocesan investigation come to a speedy close and the commission present to you a signed written report of their conclusions on this subject. The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith would be pleased to receive and support your decision on this issue".*

This statement from the Vatican was no more than a private statement to the Bishops. It was not relayed to me, nor to my appointed Advocate. Further, I made no such statement that indicated that I "admit" to the Prelate concerned being schismatic. On the contrary, I advised Bishop Wilson that "our" Bishop Schneider was not the same Schneider who was cited in Bishop Wilson's "Decree", as we had checked the Vatican sources to prove this point. In fact, Bishop Bartholomew Schneider - when a Priest of His Congregation - served under Cardinal Marcel Gonzales Martin in the diocese of Toledo, of Spain.

Then, in 1998, he was Consecrated Bishop of the Thuc Line of Bishops - which is currently under

Bishop Athanasius (also a Bishop of the same Line} - had concelebrated Mass with the Pope, in December, 2001, and has been in Rome under the Directorship of Cardinal Ratzinger, to regulate him into the Roman Curia, thus placing “our” Bishop Schneider and the Order of Saint Charbel under the same Line.

In several communiques I proved to Bishop Wilson that, without a doubt, we not only had Ecclesiastical support from Bishops within the Holy Catholic Church, but that they had actually approved the work of the Order of Saint Charbel in their diocese.

Bishop Ingham's statement indicates that the Holy See gave a directive. It states further, on the 22nd March, 2002, through the Most Rev. Tarcisio Bertone, Secretary of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, that the Congregation gives full support to both Bishop Murray and Bishop Wilson who, in their opinion - and on separate occasions - had set up a Diocesan Commission and Investigation.

Firstly, Bishop Murray did not set up a Commission in 1984. It was for this reason I appealed for an Investigation, which was granted eventually by Bishop Wilson many years later, in 1998. By setting up this Commission it is clearly an admission that no Commission had been held before.

Secondly, Bishop Ingham clearly states in his "Decree" that Bishop Murray had issued what is simply a “Pastoral Letter”. In this case the document was not a "Decree", but simply a statement of personal opinion.

To declare that Bishop Ingham has the support of the Holy See is an absurd statement. The Congregation of the Doctrine and the Faith is not the “Holy See”, as such.

Bishop Ingham states: *"...having considered the findings of the legitimate Canonical Investigation initiated by the Diocese of Wollongong....."*

I state, categorically, there has been no Canonical Investigation, for these reasons:

1. An interview does not constitute an Ecclesiastical Investigation, as it is only a preliminary hearing.
2. The Commission of 2000 was invalid, as I had made an "Appeal" in 1999 against a so-called "Decree", which pre-empted a judgement of any kind being made by such a group.
3. An Investigation must seek to study all claims, all writings and all documents submitted, and hear all witnesses.
4. I was the only witness spoken to during this meeting.
5. No one from the Church has come to see us on our property. The fifty thousand letters submitted as evidence of our claim were not considered, nor were the records of thousands of cures and conversions. All the evidence was disregarded.
6. My Advocate, Father John Woods – who was appointed by the Diocesan Commission - was in ignorance of the reasons for the proceedings.
7. Bishop Ingham says in his "Decree" against us that I signed a document of my interview dated 17th November, 2000, with my own version added.

My reply to this is that a transcript of what was said in the Commission was sent to me to be signed. Neither my Advocate, Father John Woods, nor I were informed beforehand of the questions the Church would ask, so I answered them as best I could at the time. When the document came to me I decided that some further detail might assist the Commission's understanding of my claims. I did not alter the questions, nor the original thrust of my answers, but simply elaborated on the latter.

8. It says in the "Decree" - as a finality ".....the Holy See has declared.....".

The Holy See is not the Congregation of the Doctrine and the Faith, per se - the Congregation is only a part of the Holy See.

9. The "Decree" does not stipulate what these "false teachings" are, nor have I been advised by any Church Authority what they are or might be.

10. Also, it is said that my "teachings and action are dangerous and harmful" to the faithful.

What is it that is dangerous and harmful?

11. The "Decree" states that Father Malcolm Broussard "does not possess the faculties as a Priest".

This is not so - since he has been given his Priestly faculties by Bishop Schneider, and a Priest remains a Priest under any circumstances.

12. How can an Order of Religious souls be contrary to the teachings of the Catholic Church when the Order lives according to "Vita Consecrata" of Pope John Paul II?

In the light of what I have detailed above, I hereby emphatically and unequivocally state the following:

That I will not disband the Order of Saint Charbel, nor the work that God gave me to do in 1982.

That I will not accept the "Decree" handed down by Most Rev. Bishop Ingham on the 20th June, 2002 - nor the previous "Decree" by Most Rev. Bishop Wilson dated 11th September, 1999. I reject the "findings" in the Pastoral letter of Most Reverend Bishop William Murray, dated 2nd December, 1984 - and reject the statement by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith handed down by Most Rev. Tarcisio Bertone. The reason being that such "Decrees" and the Pastoral Letter are unlawful, the decision being made by using Canon Law 1638: "*An appeal suspends the execution of the judgement*" - and by referring also to **Canons 1628 - 1417 - 49 - 50 and 221**.

Lastly, as the most recent "Decree" does not contain an edict of excommunication I, as well as the faithful who support my work, remain members of the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church.

And as your actions - and those of your predecessors and the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith - are not only unlawful, but prejudicial, slanderous, defamatory and unjust, my "Appeal" is addressed to His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, who is the only Earthly authority I will now accept in this matter - and only when he alone gives the instruction for me to close down this Order, will I humbly obey.

It is with great sadness that I have undertaken to write this letter. So that all the faithful who have followed me over these years can make an informed decision, I have made available to them a copy of Bishop's Ingham's "Decree".

I pray for all that God's Light will be seen in all this darkness. I pray and forgive all those who have judged me and, therefore, God's Work. If I have sinned against God and His Church, I ask for His forgiveness and mercy.

I harbour no personal vindictiveness or malice against my accusers but, rather, ask for their prayers, and God's Blessings upon them.

Lastly, to my faithful followers: I thank you for your love and support over all these years, and ask for your continued prayers. I ask that you fully inform yourselves through all the information that has been made available, and pray earnestly for God's Light.

My prayers are with you all.

I remain the Church's obedient subject - but God's first.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'William Kamm', written in a cursive style.

William Kamm  
Moderator and Founder of the  
Order of Saint Charbel

Also known as the 'Little Pebble', God's Prophet.