



**THE MOST REVEREND**  
**EDWARD JAMES FORD, T.O.R., S.T.D.**  
*Metropolitan-Primate*  
*The North American Old Roman Catholic Church*

---

24 October 2021  
The Feast of St Raphael the Archangel

**- AN OPEN LETTER -**

The Reverend Monsignor Rey Patilan Maglente,  
Servant Superior of the Missionary Congregation of the Infant Jesus  
71 Millrise Crescent SW  
Calgary, Alberta, T2Y 2H7, Canada

Dear Msgr Maglente,

I have chosen to answer your recent communications, which purport to be valid ecclesiastical documents, all the while, being worthless slips of paper and useless attempts at pretending to be canonical rescripts. It all displays a total ignorance of the Catholic Faith, of Sacramental Theology and of Canon Law which should be, but obviously is not within the ken of yourself or any of the other individuals who hold themselves out to be the principles of an organization known as the “North American Old Roman Catholic Church (Utrecht Succession) Archdiocese of California”. I am embarrassed and ashamed for all of you, as you should all be of yourselves, that not a single one of you ever bothered to thoroughly research and ascertain if any of the drivel that you wrote has even the faintest level resemblance of truth or canonical validity, actions that should be beneath the level of any of you that purport to be Catholic Clergy of the Old Roman Catholic Church. I guess I should not be surprised at this travesty when I stop to realize that the current head of your organization is not really the Metropolitan Archbishop, Joseph Andrew Vellone, but rather Ivan A Castaneda, who has so marginalized and coopted Archbishop Vellone as to make him nothing but a figurehead, who is paraded out in public in an attempt to put a veneer of legitimacy to what is otherwise a tragic parody of the Church, yet bereft of either substance or structure. A visible proof of this can be seen in the video of Bishop Ralan’s consecration where Archbishop Vellone had to be instructed as to where to sit or stand, what to read or say, when and how to proceed with the service. Why, because it was not the Consecration Rite of the Catholic Church either Tridentine (which is the sole Rite which has always been

used in the North American Old Roman Catholic Church since the time of Archbishop Carfora and which has always guaranteed for us the validity of the Holy Orders conferred and the Apostolic Succession of our Church) nor the current Novus Ordo Rite as used in the Roman Catholic Church of today. It was a kind of hybrid rite which had no place within the Old Roman Catholic Church. The image I was left with after watching that video was of Archbishop Vellone being “used and abused”, by the very clergy who should have put his needs before their own, when he could barely stand or walk unaided, all for the sole purpose of providing an “air of legitimacy” to the consecration. A second display of this over-bearing and heavy handedness toward Archbishop Vellone by Ivan Castaneda was on full display at the Provincial Synod called and held at San Miguel Arcangel Cathedral in Los Angeles on the 28-30 September 2021. The “co-adjutor’s” behavior was not only abominable even as standards go for gentlemanly conduct between laymen, but was absolutely reprehensible for that of a cleric, let alone a supposed “Bishop of the Church”. Children are disciplined by their parents for such rude and churlish behavior when they throw a temper-tantrum when they cannot have their own way, as he did that day. He obviously did not treat Archbishop Vellone with any degree of respect or obedience that day and he demonstrated for the whole world to see the kind of vicious and vindictive individual he is when crossed against his will, and when he does not get his own way...even to the point of ignoring Archbishop Vellone’s directive to him to bring him his suitcase from the van, but instead countering it by demanding that Archbishop Vellone obey him and get back into the van so that he and they could leave the Cathedral precincts. **QUESTION:** Exactly who is the real Metropolitan Archbishop in charge of the so-called Archdiocese of California, Archbishop Vellone or Ivan Castaneda? The answer appears to be all too obvious to ignore, (by their fruits [actions] you will know them): Archbishop Vellone was ignored, disobeyed and ordered to conform to the directives of Ivan Castaneda, whereas Ivan Castaneda threw a childish temper-tantrum, ignored and disobeyed Archbishop Vellone’s own directive to him, and then ordered and demanded that Archbishop Vellone comply with his[Castaneda’s] directive and employed the services of yourself and Mother Fatima to enforce that directive, disregarding the physical limitations and disabilities of Archbishop Vellone. Can anyone doubt who is running the show...and it has indeed become a show, not a church. Nor can the rest of you feign ignorance or neutrality. There is an ancient axiom that says: Silence is presumed consent. Thus those of you (yourself, Bishop Madanguit, Bishop Ranalan, Mother Fatima, etc) are all complicit in this disrespectful, uncanonical and duplicitous behavior toward your own Metropolitan-Archbishop and by your silence and failure to act to curb the improper actions and agenda of the “co-adjutor”, become accomplices along with Ivan Castaneda, Thomas Dowling and Betty (Fatima) Jerez in coordinating and supporting a coup against the legitimate canonical authorities of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church, violating your own Oaths of Obedience to Archbishop Vellone and have allowed Ivan Castaneda and his cohorts to marginalize and sideline Archbishop Vellone and to frighten him into concurring with their schemes by preparing phony documents of no canonical validity, while pretending to be canonical rescripts and demanding his signature to give the appearance of legitimacy. However, in the end, God will not be mocked, and all of those actions and documents are futile and null and void.

Now let me set forth the facts to be understood here by all who will read this letter.

## **FACTS**

- 1) Let us examine the document so named the “Ecclesiology of the Archdiocese” dated 10 August 2021.
  - a) The Title of the Archdiocese is correct, The Metropolitan Archdiocese of California. That is the first and last and the only true statement in the entire document.
  - b) The Metropolitan Archdiocese is NOT an autocephalous jurisdiction, as it is impossible and uncanonical for any jurisdiction to designate itself as autocephalous. That is a canonical designation

which must be granted to a jurisdiction by a higher and superior ecclesiastical body and hierarch. No jurisdiction can claim it for itself it must be granted to it by another.

- c) The Archdiocese of California is NOT the valid successor to the Carfora-Verostek apostolic lineage. Its Holy Orders and Apostolic Lineage are derived from Albert Dunstan Bell who was consecrated by William Henry Francis Brothers and who was never consecrated, but rather only licensed, by Archbishop Carfora for a period of several years before being excommunicated and deposed by Archbishop Carfora for deception, disobedience and interference in canonical matters under the jurisdiction of the Primate, Archbishop Carfora. Thus the apostolic lineage of the Archdiocese of California is of the Brothers-Bell-Verostek succession and not of Carfora. The Archdiocese of California was originally established by Archbishop Carfora but within a few years (by 1940) went into schism from the North American Old Roman Catholic Church of Archbishop Carfora. Therefore it is both dishonest and disingenuous to claim any connection with the North American Old Roman Catholic Church of Archbishop Carmel Henry Carfora or to use the name of that venerable Church jurisdiction.
- d) The Title of “Presiding Archbishop” is the terminology of a Protestant Church and definitely not that of a Catholic Church which is what the Archdiocese of California portrays and proclaims itself to be. The term “Presiding Archbishop or Presiding Bishop” was a term specifically coined and adopted by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America and later by several Lutheran Church bodies to designate a “hierarch” with absolutely no canonical power or jurisdiction but simply an office and place holder for organizational not ecclesiastical purposes, because they were terrified of giving the Title Metropolitan or Primate to their presiding hierarch lest it also confer ecclesiastical power upon them. They also ensured this lack of canonical power by limiting the term of office to a set period of years as opposed to the ancient Catholic prerogative of a lifetime tenure unless the Metropolitan or Primate resign, or was deposed for a serious canonical crime. The very name of the Archdiocese (Metropolitan Archdiocese) indicates what the proper title is or at least should be (Metropolitan Archbishop). This designation of Metropolitan Archbishop is employed to distinguish the Metropolitan from other Archbishops who are not Metropolitans. Thus it is clear that the “authorities” of the Archdiocese are ignorant of the theology, history, terminology and canonical foundations for their own jurisdiction.
- e) There is no such title as Coadjutor Archbishop. The canonical term is simply “Coadjutor”. It is the counterpart to the Title of the Bishop of the Diocese which is the “Ordinary”. Just as no one would ever call the Bishop of the Diocese, the “Ordinary Bishop” so too, we do not call the Coadjutor, the “Coadjutor Archbishop”. This is another example of the ignorance of ecclesiastical matters within the Archdiocese of California.
- f) There is no such thing as the “Right to Episcopal Succession”. Again the proper title is “Coadjutor with the right of succession”. First there is no other kind of succession that a coadjutor can have. When one adds the word Episcopal, capitalized as it is, it indicates the right to succession of an Episcopal Church See, not a Catholic See. The term Catholic Church term, “episcopal succession” (lower case), is a reference to the line of Apostolic Succession and not to the succession of successive bishops of a particular See. Once again we find clergy who claim to be and govern a Catholic jurisdiction who don’t even know the proper terminology for themselves or their own jurisdiction.
- g) The following sentence taken directly from the document “Ecclesiology of the Archdiocese” is a direct and definitive judgement upon themselves, imposed by its own declaration, that the authorities of this jurisdiction are in no way cognizant of Catholic Theology or Ecclesiology but rather are playing at it and using terms that they do not understand or realize the full import of. ***“The Archdiocese has no juridical or canonical relationship with any other ecclesial bodies.”***

The absolute idiocy of this statement defies all reason and simply proves that the so-called authorities of this jurisdiction have no sense or understanding of the Catholic Church or of its canonical structure. Every Diocese and Archdiocese has juridical and canonical relationships with other ecclesial bodies. Metropolitan Sees have a definite and essential canonical and juridical relationship with all of its filial or suffragan dioceses and the hierarchs of those suffragan dioceses, not to mention with the other dioceses and hierarchs of their own denomination and jurisdiction. Such an essential juridical and canonical relationship is inherent in the very title of “Metropolitan”. The authors of this document, “Ecclesiology of the Archdiocese” betray their ignorance of theology and canon law, in several ways, first, by making such a statement, they have automatically declared their suffragan dioceses entirely free of any Metropolitan oversight or jurisdiction by any of the so-called “authorities” of the Archdiocese, since they have publically declared that the Archdiocese has no juridical or canonical relationship with them. Thus no “authority of the Archdiocese can have any canonical or juridical authority or jurisdiction over the Suffragan Dioceses or their hierarchs or clergy, and any purported canonical rescripts, censures, penalties, suspensions, excommunications, depositions or other such documents or declarations, are absolutely null and utterly void, BY THEIR OWN DECREE in this document.

- h) The authors of this “Ecclesiology of the Archdiocese” demonstrate their ignorance of the blatant and absolute contradiction of their previous statement when they wrote the next sentence: ***“It does however enjoy fraternal relationships with other churches and jurisdictions”***. The authors seem to again be ignorant of the relationship between Sacramental Theology and the resultant Juridical and Canonical relationship that exists when two or more jurisdictions enter into a fraternal relationship with other churches and jurisdictions. All such fraternal relationships are governed and controlled by, and can only be entered into through, juridical and canonical procedures and between juridical and canonical authorities of the said fraternal bodies and churches, which further entails specific juridical and canonical relationships approved by and in accordance with the Canons of the respective jurisdictions and churches, as well as by their proper juridical and canonical authorities. Thus there can never be a fraternal relationship between churches and jurisdictions that is not governed by juridical and canonical relationships and principles.
- i) The next absolutely ludicrous statement in this document says: ***“It includes communio in sacris”***. The authors again blatantly demonstrate their total ignorance of Catholic Theology, procedures, and the relationship between sacramental theology and juridical and canonical principles. They also demonstrate a lack of understanding of the Catholic term ***“communio in sacris”***. They display an ignorant use of terms which they do not properly understand to pretend to demonstrate a level of theological sophistication that they are bereft of. ***“Communio in Sacris”*** or ***“intercommunion”***, as it is also known, is the act by which one Catholic jurisdiction or church allows or permits members of another jurisdiction or church with whom they already enjoy a juridical and canonical relationship with, to receive Holy Communion in each other’s churches. Thus all such permissions and policies are composed and approved by the juridical and canonical authorities of each church or jurisdiction and in accordance with the juridical and canonical policies and procedures of each church or jurisdiction involved. Thus there can be no ***“communio in sacris”*** in the Catholic sense of the phrase, unless it there exists a prior juridical and canonical relationship between the participating churches or jurisdictions.
- j) The next sentence displays an obvious ignorance of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church’s structure, and at the same time, the real intent and bias of the authors of the “Ecclesiology of the Archdiocese” when it refers to the Old Roman Catholic **Archdiocese** of **Terra Nova**. In the heat of their contempt for the reunification which took place between the Archdiocese of California and the Primatial See of Nova Terra they entirely misnamed the object of their contempt. There is

no such things as the Archdiocese of Terra Nova. ***There is an Archdiocese of New York and New England which is a constituent member of the Primatial See of Nova Terra.*** The Primatial See of Nova Terra is composed of The Archdiocese of New York-New England, The Diocese of the Southeast, The Jurisdiction of the Infant Jesus of Prague, The Old Roman Catholic Church in Burundi, The Old Roman Catholic Church in Cameroon, The Old Roman Catholic Church in Kenya, The Old Roman Catholic Church in South Africa, The Diocese of San Miguel Arcangel, the Archdiocese of California, the Old Roman Catholic Church in Colombia, The Old Catholic Church in the Republic of Poland, and the Patrimony of the Primatial See. Each and every member jurisdiction of the Primatial See of Nova Terra is equal to the others and has canonical independence in all internal jurisdictional matters as long as they are not in conflict with the Code of Canon Law and the Constitution of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church, are in communion with the Primate of the Church and are members of the same College of Bishops of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church.

- k) The final sentence of the “Ecclesiology of the Archdiocese” states: “The Archdiocese of California does not recognize any system of Canon Law outside of its own rules and regulations.” There can be no more definitive statement in their own word than these to publically proclaim that they are in no way the descendants, children or heirs of the Carfora Succession or of his Ecclesiastical Title of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church. Let us look at the original Constitution of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church.

**The Introductory paragraph of the Constitution reads:**

*“Be it ordained by the Episcopal Synod of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church, in Assembly, convened in the City of Chicago, Illinois, on call of the Supreme Primate, His Eminence, The Most Reverend Archbishop Carmel Henry Carfora, Supreme Primate of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church in the United States and Canada, that the following Constitution and By-Laws shall be the laws governing the Church, same to be in effect at once, this 28<sup>th</sup> day of October, 1929.”*

**Part One, Article II reads:**

*“The Official residence of the Supreme Primate shall be in the City of Chicago, State of Illinois, and his Official See shall be known as The Metropolitan See of the United States and Canada, which See shall embrace all Provinces, Archdiocese and Dioceses. All officers of such shall be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Supreme Primate.”*

**Part One, Article XI reads:**

*The Canon Laws of the Roman Catholic Church shall govern this Church insofar as it does not conflict with this Constitution and By-Laws.”*

**Part Two, Article I reads:**

*The Metropolitan See shall be divided into Dioceses. The allotment of the same, and the boundaries thereof, and the necessity therefor shall be decided by the Supreme Primate, They shall be governed by Diocesan Bishops assisted by a Diocesan Synod.”*

N.B. It should be noted that in the current Constitution and Canons of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church, several significant changes have been made: (1) the Title of the Primate no longer includes the word Supreme, it is simply the Metropolitan-Primate. (2) the many powers, prerogatives and privileges that were granted to Archbishop Carfora as Primate, have been

drastically limited and the vast amount of the authority to govern the Church is placed in the hands of the College of Bishops were it should always have been as evidenced in Sacred Scripture. (3) The official residence of the primate is now longer restricted to any particular city or state, but rather the Primate can choose where to live as the Church does not provide an official residence for him. (4) The Metropolitan See of the United State and Canada still remains the Official See of the Metropolitan-Primate but the name was changed by action of the College of Bishops.

*For many years, the North American Old Roman Catholic Church conferred the status of a Titular See upon the Primate, but used the terminology of "The Metropolitan See of \_\_\_\_." The Primate retained his own Diocesan title and administration, but bore also the Metropolitan Title as well. Throughout the years the specific designation changed as circumstances changed.*

*In 2006, the College of Bishops decided to correct this practice and to provide a future stability of title, and to bring to an end the practice of constant change. They decided to formally create a new Titular Title for the Metropolitan See. The name was to be designated as "**The Primatial See of Nova-Terra**". The Metropolitan See did not change.....it has been constant since 1917... only the title was to change.*

(5) All officers of the Primatial See are no longer under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Primate but rather under the joint jurisdiction of the Primate, the College of Bishops and the General Synod. (6) The creation of diocese and the determination of their boundaries is no longer determined by the Primate but rather by joint agreement of the Primate, the College of Bishops and the General Synod.

- 1) Any and all Catholic churches and jurisdictions have and recognize a Code of Canon Law. For the Roman Catholic Church it is currently the 1983 Code of Canon Law, for the Eastern Catholic Churches it is the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches, for the Eastern Orthodox Churches it is the *Pedalion* (The Rudder), for the Episcopal Church it is the Constitutions and Canons of the General Convention. If the Archdiocese of California does not recognize or even possess a Code of Canon Law but only recognizes its own rules and regulations then it definitely does not stand in the tradition of any Catholic Church body or Jurisdiction and forfeits its claim to be a Catholic jurisdiction at all. In 1929 when the Constitution and By-Laws of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church was signed by Archbishop Carmel Henry Carfora, by Archbishop Edwin Wallace Hunter, by Archbishop Harry Frederick van Trump and attested to by the Reverend Stanley Linkus which designated the canon Law of the Roman Catholic Church to be the governing Canons for the North American Old Roman Catholic Church, it was the 1917 Code of Canon Law to which he referred. Thus to this day that same 1917 Code of Canon Law governs the North American Old Roman Catholic Church. When the North American Old Roman Catholic Church (Utrecht Succession) went into schism from the Metropolitan See of Archbishop Carfora the governing Canons would have been the same 1917 Code of Canon Law. When the North American Old Roman Catholic Church (Utrecht Succession) effected the schism and declared their independence they cast aside the Canon Law of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church and the Roman Catholic Church as their governing Canons and never replaced them with anything else except some rules and regulations of their own creation. Thus they cast aside the authority of the Primate, Archbishop Carfora; of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church under Archbishop Carfora; the authority of the Metropolitan See of the United States and Canada under Archbishop Carfora; the College of Bishops under Archbishop Carfora; the General Synod of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church under Archbishop Carfora; the Constitution and By-Laws of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church under Archbishop Carfora; and the 1917 Code of Canon Law designated as the governing Canons of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church by Archbishop Carfora. When looking at these actions, just what part of the identity of the North

American Old Roman Catholic Church did the North American Old Roman Catholic Church (Utrecht Succession) retain to give any credibility or authority to claim to be a successor to the Carfora apostolic lineage or to the title of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church? All they have is an empty and hollow name but none of the substance or tradition of the Church. In fact there is even reason at this point to question the very Catholicity of the present Archdiocese of California under the “leadership and guidance” of Ivan Castaneda. It seems that Ivan Castaneda, though designated as the Coadjutor to Archbishop Vellone, has little to no background in the Roman Catholic tradition and was trained in the seminaries of the Episcopal Church, which might well account for his lack of knowledge or commitment to the Theology, Liturgy, Canon Law and Historical Tradition of the North American Old Roman Catholic Church as a truly traditional Roman Catholic Church body and is more comfortable in the liberal and modernist trappings of the contemporary Novus Ordo where anything goes and everyone does as they please....except when they cross swords with him.