



# Father David C. Trosch

Post Office Box 850307  
Mobile, AL 36685-0307 - USA

Telephone: 1 251-639-7456    <http://www.trosch.org>    E-mail: [fr.david@trosch.org](mailto:fr.david@trosch.org)

July 26, 2002

Most Rev. Oscar H. Lipscomb  
The Catholic Center  
P. O. Box 1966  
Mobile, Alabama 36633

Re: Renewed demand under Canon 384 – reply to your letter of June 28, 2002.  
Recommendation for the favoring of the Church with your resignation.

Archbishop Oscar Lipscomb,

Rather you would reply was in doubt, but your actual reply was as would be expected. How it is that you expect to get into Heaven is difficult to comprehend. Perhaps you believe that bishops all go to Heaven! Your continual prevarications alone are condemning, the more so considering the rank you hold in the true Church. At the retreat of 1965 1995 you stated that I was not restricted from concelebrating at daily Mass as they were not considered public. I considered concelebrating and went to the sacristy to see if I could find an extra alb. While there I noticed the whole wheat hosts that had the consistency of hardtack and rejected the thought of concelebrating or receiving. I later notified you by letter of my reason for not concelebrating stating that according to Scripture such hosts would be insulting to Jesus. I believe I even stated that I would write an article on the subject, but, other than collecting data I have not yet done so.

Your statement in your letter is flawed. It reads as follows: “the first inkling that I think I have had that you consider that the matter of the Eucharist to be invalid” (I do not recall using the term, “invalid”). . . Your letter of July 11, 1995 acknowledges that you had clearly understood the position I had taken in this regard. What you are apparently presenting is that you were not and are not concerned with possible offenses against Jesus.

The thesis should however be obvious. White represents purity. Brown symbolizes lack of refinement, that is, impurity. Chaff is to be thrown into the fire and burnt as with those who are disobedient to the Word of God. The kernel, representing that which is good and holy, is symbolized as food for the soul. The bone crushing chewishness of most presently used hosts is in contradiction to the melt in the mouth hosts I remember thirty and more years ago.

Then the LORD said, "Go outside and stand on the mountain before the LORD; the LORD will be passing by." A strong and heavy wind was rending the mountains and crushing rocks before the LORD--*but the LORD was not in the wind*. After the wind there was an earthquake--*but the LORD was not in the earthquake*. After the earthquake there was fire--*but the LORD was not in the*

*fire. After the fire there was a tiny whispering sound.* When he heard this, Elijah hid his face in his cloak and went and stood at the entrance of the cave. A voice said to him, "Elijah, why are you here?" He replied, "I have been most zealous for the LORD, the God of hosts. But the Israelites have forsaken your covenant, torn down your altars, and put your prophets to the sword. I alone am left, and they seek to take my life." [1 Ki. 19:11-14]

The presence of Jesus is not in the crunchy chewishness of the hosts with bran, but in the simple purity of the fine white hosts that were used when there was still faith in the Church. The Lord was not in the strong heavy wind, the earthquake, or the fire. Elijah recognized the Lord in the tiny whispering sound seen as paralleling the delicate, melt-in-your-mouth hosts that of old were received by people of faith. As you should well know, there is no infallible doctrine that authorizes the use of whole wheat bread for hosts. Minimalistic Canon Law cannot be said to endorse your position. At best it does not refute it. Keep in mind there is no universal/infallible defined doctrine concerning the content or the making of communion bread. Do not pretend that there is such doctrine.

Referring to your statement concerning having dropped only two consecrated Hosts (considered to be the living Jesus), while I did not see the number of Hosts on the floor, the movement of your arms suggested that you were either fumbling the Hosts (picking up the same Hosts repeatedly) or that the number was significantly greater. Whether there were visible particles of Hosts on the floor or not, the sign value of protecting the area until cleaned would have been very great. You could easily have instructed any priest present – and there were many – to get a purifier and clean the area. This ability/authority would not in any way have caused pain to your recently replaced knees. Actions of faith speak louder than words of belief – Epistle of St. James.

It has long been published that about seventy percent of Catholics no longer believe in the real presence of Jesus in the Eucharist. One liberal priest professor in seminary gave me a failing grade because of a statement I made on a paper. I had stated that Jesus was “materially” present in the Eucharist. It was only after considerable discussion with the faculty that the grade was replaced with a “C” by the rector. The academic dean claimed that she was not qualified to make a decision on the subject. On a trip to Israel a former spiritual director of hers acted as tour guide. He also held that Jesus was not materially present in the Holy Eucharist. A priest on the retreat told me that a recent survey indicates only about twenty percent of Catholics now believe in the real presence of Jesus.

As you may remember, my ordination to the priesthood was on hold until I questioned a friendly faculty member as to why, stating that I would appeal to you if the problem was not clarified. A panel of inquiry was assembled and *both liberal and conservative professors* opposed me. Their questions to me were so basic that a Catholic grammar school graduate should have been able to answer them correctly. It was apparent that they had no doctrinal grounds for opposition to my ordination, though the conservative’s question was at least more to the point than the liberals.

You state that you have not changed in regard to matters of faith and morals. I remember that you once told me you were liberal. Therefore I expect that your statement is true concerning your lack of change. Particularly I have noted your continual reluctance to do anything concerning homosexuals in the diocese – unless and until their positions become publicly disturbing. Your support of active homosexual priests includes former priest, Father Vernon Dahmen – *he said Mass wearing his own canary-yellow vestments* – who became an active apostate and eventually died of aids in South Carolina. In spite of his apostasy and clear statement that he wanted no contact or association with the diocese, you pleaded that the usual Masses be said for the repose of his soul.

Your published statement in the *Mobile Register*, June 19, 2002 relating to the new policy by the USCCB that it was “too rigid in barring from ministry any priest who has ever sexually abused a minor,” following up your similar doleful public statements at the conference in Dallas, is revealing. You also stated to the press that “Recidivism is not necessarily a given.” Your complete lack of acceptance that not only did a great offense take place against God, but that grave scandal would always be present, for so long as such priests remained in the priesthood, is inexcusable.

“It would be better for him if a millstone were put around his neck and he be thrown into the sea than for him to cause one of these little ones to sin.” [Luke 17:2]

Your known association with publicized homosexual activists such as Father Augustine Moore lends easily to the belief that you are now, or at least were yourself, an active homosexual and possibly a pederast. This would also explain your opposition to teachings of the Old Testament that severely condemned active homosexuality with the death penalty.

You have priests in the diocese who often, even publicly, take the Lord’s name in vain. On one occasion I have personally heard you do the same, though you did by letter apologize to me. –*Did you ever confess your sin and do penance?*– For one who has been in the priesthood as long as you have been, you long ago should have overcome such tendencies, even prior to entering a seminary. The sad part is that I do not believe that you are any worse than most bishops. Noteworthy also is the failure of bishops to discipline errant priests. John Paul II is no different in regard to errant bishops and cardinals, and I accept that his fault is the greater for not teaching by example what is expected of you bishops. His reversal of direction on the death penalty is heresy.

Are Pope John Paul II, most cardinals, bishops and priests homosexuals? The probability is high. This is reinforced by books over-viewed on my web site by various highly believable authors. – *A well known priest of the diocese once stated, without ambiguity, that 35% of diocesan priests were homosexuals.* The position of corruption in the Church has long been held by myself and others, and includes the high probability of extensive infiltration by Freemasons into the hierarchy with the probability that the greatest infiltration has taken place in the Vatican. Homosexuals, themselves deviant, are seen as dupes for Freemasons and their Overlords, the Illuminati and their kindred.

My demand for assignment and back compensation is founded upon the position that I have never opposed doctrinal teachings. The only grounds for removing me from Saint John’s parish or for removing my faculties is the existence of anti God humanism. I did no more than proclaim the “Word of God” from the “Housetops.” [Mt. 10:27] The Church teaches that abortion is murder. On August 14, 1993 Pope John Paul II issued an uncompromising declaration of church principles. . . summoning Catholics to . . . battle abortion. Did he mis-speak? He also states that abortion is murder.

CCC 2258 "Human life is sacred because from its beginning it involves the creative action of God and it remains for ever in a special relationship with the Creator, who is its sole end. God alone is the Lord of life from its beginning until its end: no one can under any circumstance claim for himself the right directly to destroy an innocent human being."

Under no circumstance can active abortionists or accomplices be considered innocent.

CCC 2265 Legitimate defense can be not only a right but a grave duty for someone responsible for another's life, the common good of the family or of the state.

- “and you shall **purge** from your midst **the guilt of innocent blood**, that you may prosper for doing what is right in the sight of the LORD.” [Deut. 21:9]

- “Thus says the LORD: Do what is right and just. ***Rescue the victim from the hand of his oppressor.*** Do not wrong or oppress the resident alien, the orphan, or the widow, and *do not shed innocent blood* in this place.” [Jeremiah 22:3]

CCC 2270 Human life must be respected and ***protected absolutely from the moment of conception.*** From the first moment of his existence, a human being must be recognized as having the rights of a person -- among which is ***the inviolable right*** of every *innocent* being to life.

You repeatedly have failed to furnish explicit doctrine that supports your own position. Even Vatican theologians have been equally divided concerning the position of justifiable defense of the *innocent* unborn (who are incapable of defending themselves). Following your suspension of my faculties you selected two nationally recognized theologians (your words) to sustain your position. You set aside the document provided by Fr. Michael J. Walsh –*who took a full month to respond*– apparently deciding that it did not present defensible positions, such as his denial that God is everyone’s Father and therefore Michael Griffin had no familial relationship with the many children to be slaughtered by a practicing advertised abortionist that day. Fr. Walsh quoted no doctrine of the Church while offering only opinions associated with non pertinent circumstances.

Ninety days after the publication of the controversial ad, you sent me the opinions of Fr. John Boyle, your second highly regarded theologian. Since you had no doctrinal foundation of your own you declared his to be your own position. As with Fr. Walsh’s, this document contained no official Church teaching covering the relevant currently existing circumstance. His, now your’s, position that practicing abortionists were innocent persons in the same category as those who have never had the opportunity to sin –no other inference can be made– is both ludicrous and satanic.

It is imminently clear that by the end of ninety days you felt compelled to publish a defense for your position. Considering the prevalent lack of meaningful homilies by most priests –*with focus on human love in opposition to the required primary love of God*, it is easily understood why so many accept opposition to God’s stated will and allow innocent blood to be shed in spite of the predictable punishment seen to be forthcoming at the hands of God. Granted, the position is not politically correct, but, since when has it been a positive act for the faithful to deny truth for the sake of political correctness – *with the expectation of entering Heaven.* Neither Jesus or His disciples, nor the prophets, practiced political correctness.

The position you have been holding is the equivalent of that taken by the congregation in Germany who “sang louder” to drown out the cries of Jews and others being shipped in box cars to concentration camps to be slaughtered. Self-defense and the defense of other innocent persons have always been theologically acceptable in the Catholic Church and in society. What has not been dealt with theologically is the condition of present society wherein innocent persons can legally be slaughtered. How can political correctness in relation to their murderers be justified? Why is society, including Catholics, willing to enforce penalties protecting lower forms of life, but are not willing to protect unborn human beings? Why has injustice become a higher law than God’s will?

As legitimate prolife believers know, pro-abortionists (*pro-choicers*) and homosexual activists work together. The Church hierarchy only pays lip service in opposition to the evil of abortion. This reinforces the beliefs that there are many homosexuals in the Church hierarchy. Homosexual activity is in itself a morally condemning problem. The homosexual proclivity for sin, safeguarded by Freemasonry,

serves the Masonic desire for a one world Satanic religion –*open to any belief in a god, including Lucifer*– that enhances their ultimate goal for a one-world government.

As far as my ever having preached the position of justifiable homicide, this is a fabrication. Not until Sunday, August 15 (*the Solemnity of the Assumption*), 1993, did the subject ever come up at Mass. The only reason anything was then said was to prepare the congregation for what they would be reading and hearing about. I had been told by the Mobile Register that my ad was not acceptable, and did not expect anything further to take place. When I heard that an article was going to appear in the paper, I believed that it was important at that time to make comments.

As for my deliberate act of disobedience, as you refer to it, I left Saint Bernard's Abbey because you had not kept your word and showed no indication that you intended to do so. In reference to this I make note of the fact that in correspondence, dated September 23, 1998, I clearly documented opposition to your false assertion now repeated.

Your protestations favoring the former Jesuit priest, now Judge Raymond Novak, who repeatedly imposed unjust imprisonment on non-violent (*Gandhi style*) prolife activist, Joan Andrews Bell, is another strong indication that you are anything but a worthy bishop. Both you and another person protested my published statements. Yours was a statement in his defense. The other objection, dated May 5, 1998, reads as follows:

“I can not understand why anyone would write to [*Judge*] Raymond A. Novak concerning the unborn. The man is well known for being a racist and *a homosexual who solicits young boys* off of the Pittsburgh streets for purposes of having sex with them. He does the same with prisoners at the Allegheny County Jail. He is a delusional liar who is supported by the police since they protect him when he is committing sex crimes against young boys. He has no regard for the unborn

Mailed by: Gioconda

The consistency with which you have sought to protect the guilty over the innocent is the reason that I now openly recommend that for the good of the Church you tender your resignation. You have too often failed to defend the righteous while protecting the guilty such as the known gay priest, Father Eamon Miley. I was told by different priests, still in active ministries, that they had visited with him in New York and asked him to return to active ministry. You readily approved his return, *gold necklace* and all, and assigned him to Corpus Christi parish where I had been asked to leave because I had *once taught* (a Spiritual Work of Mercy) against the evils of abortion in a Sunday homily.

Canon 384 – He (bishop) is to have a special concern for the priests, to whom he is to listen as his helpers and counselors. He is to defend their rights and ensure they have the means and the institutions needed for the development of their spiritual and intellectual life. He is to ensure that they are provided with adequate means of livelihood and social welfare, in accordance with the law.

As there has not been found a love of truth or justice in you I do not really expect that you will respond or do the ultimate right thing of resigning. Know however that this is primarily a brotherly admonishment that seeks for you to repent, and to the degree possible make restitution to the multitudes that have been led into sin by your failure to properly teach through word and example. I recognize that it is probable you will reject this presentation and will spend eternity in Hell. I do however pray for your conversion in the hope that you are not already beyond redemption.

“If anyone sees his brother sinning, if the sin is not deadly, he should pray to God and he will give him life. This is only for those whose sin is not deadly. There is such a thing as deadly sin, about which I do not say that you should pray.” [1 John 5:16]

In relation to the difference between “legal” and “moral” priesthood, I do not expect that one who commonly prefers temporal law over faith would be capable of understanding the position. Your continued and unsubstantiated gratuitous statements about my positions are condemnatory.

I again demand that you satisfactorily bring this complaint to a just conclusion or forward it to appropriate Vatican authorities for possible honest review. I will await your response with some patience.

Sincerely in Christ,

Fr. David C. Trosch  
*Memorial of Joachim and Anne*

dc: Most Rev. Gabriel Montalvo + corresp