

# THE ASTOUNDING AND EPIC APOSTASY OF ERIC HOYLE

-He swears that the Vatican II “Benedictines” are the true Order of St. Benedict-

**He became *radical* against MHFM when it suited the Devil's desires; then he became a *liberal*, Vatican II *sect-endorsing apostate* when it suited the Devil's desires for him to continue to oppose MHFM.** It has become quite clear to us that he is simply a tool.

By Bro. Peter Dimond

\*\*\*\*NOTE: This article concerns our recent lawsuit with Eric Hoyle, which we won. All of his fraudulent, false and mortally sinful claims were dismissed. People can read the judge's official order [here](#) [pdf file]\*\*\*\*

A few of our readers are familiar with Eric Hoyle. We recently won our lawsuit against him. Summary Judgment was granted in our favor dismissing all of his baseless claims and accusations. In the course of discovery, Hoyle gave a number of official sworn responses to interrogatories. In those responses Eric Hoyle declared that the “persons and monasteries” of the Vatican II sect’s “Order of St. Benedict” are the legitimate members of the Order of St. Benedict. As I will expand upon in this article, this is an astounding and remarkable development for a variety of reasons. For approximately the last five years, Eric Hoyle claimed to reject Benedict XVI as an antipope. He also claimed to reject the Vatican II sect as a non-Catholic sect. He also condemned countless others as heretics and mortal sinners for supposedly holding communion with Antipope Benedict XVI. For those and other reasons, his recent act of apostasy is an epic one. I will offer more comments on this below, but first it's necessary to quote his relevant responses in full.

In reading Hoyle's responses below, please notice that he describes the "publicly recognized Order of St. Benedict" *as the one which has departed from Catholic doctrine*. This demonstrates that he's referring to the Vatican II/Novus Ordo "Order of St. Benedict." The fact that he's referring to the Vatican II/Novus Ordo "Order of St. Benedict" is obvious; but I felt it was important to emphasize this point in case anyone attempted to defend this execrable apostate. He then goes on to say that, after a period of "puzzlement" and further consideration, he has developed his position on the Order of St. Benedict. He then declares that **the "persons and monasteries" in the aforementioned group (i.e., the Vatican II "Order") are the legitimate members** of the Order of St. Benedict! Here it is:

## ERIC HOYLE'S SWORN RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER OF ST. BENEDICT, DATED DEC. 3, 2010

“Interrogatory # 5: Identify the monasteries that you consider to be legitimate members of the Order of St. Benedict.

**[ERIC HOYLE'S SWORN STATEMENT]** **“Response:** Upon information and belief, all monasteries of the Order of St. Benedict, i.e., those monasteries founded in accordance with the Order's applicable rules and procedures, are listed in two annual publications: *The Official Catholic Directory* and *The Catalogus of the Benedictine Federation*.

**Supplemental Response:** I consider monasteries to be legitimate members of the Order of St. Benedict (OSB) if their foundation and operations follow the procedures of the Order.

My conception of these procedures is not expert **and has been developing in the years since I departed MHFM.**

When I was under the influence of MHFM, I believed that one could lose his membership in the OSB by openly departing from the Catholic faith. I believed, and still believe, that such departure from the Catholic faith has generally occurred in the monasteries whose membership in the OSB dates back to the times before the Second Vatican Council and the New Mass.

I have firmly resolved not to belie this religious belief in the course of the present lawsuit. To avoid any appearance of doing so, I said the following in my affidavit of August 8, 2008:

12. My own belief is that the publicly recognized Order of St. Benedict organization has in recent decades departed from authentic Catholic religious doctrine on certain matters, and that this undermines its Benedictine legitimacy.

The lack of clarity in the word “undermines” reflects **my puzzlement at the time about how to describe the persons and monasteries that are now publicly recognized as the OSB. Now, after further consideration, I consider these to be legitimate members of the OSB** in contradistinction to persons or groups who falsely claim to have been admitted into the OSB or who simply declare themselves Benedictine monks. The essential element to their legitimacy is their adherence to the procedures of the Order. This agrees with my reply to Interrogatory 22.

Because I lack personal knowledge of the circumstances surrounding each monastery's founding and operations, my testimony regarding their membership in the OSB would be secondhand. I can only assume that documents published by the OSB give an accurate record of the persons and monasteries that have followed the procedures set forth by the OSB to become its members.

This should serve to clarify my previous response, which was as follows:

Upon information and belief, all monasteries of the Order of St. Benedict, i.e., those monasteries founded in accordance with the Order's applicable rules and procedures, are listed in two annual publications: *The Official Catholic Directory* and *The Catalogus of the Benedictine Federation*.

**Interrogatory 6.** Is St. Vincent's Archabbey in Latrobe, PA a legitimate Benedictine monastery at present, and was it a legitimate Benedictine monastery in 2005, at the time you entered Most Holy Family Monastery?

**Response:** Upon information and belief, St. Vincent's Archabbey in Latrobe, Pennsylvania, is listed in the aforementioned works as a monastery of the Order of St. Benedict.”

-----END OF QUOTE FROM ERIC HOYLE'S RESPONSES -----

In this sworn statement, Eric Hoyle declares that the “*persons and monasteries*” of the Vatican II sect’s “Order of St. Benedict” are the true and legitimate members of the Order of St. Benedict. This

is complete and total apostasy; it's flabbergasting actually, when we consider what Hoyle has been saying and doing for approximately the last five years.

According to Hoyle's new position, the most radical heretics in the Counter Church are the true members of the Order of St. Benedict. This would include someone like Sr. Joan Chittister, "O.S.B.," the notoriously heretical Novus Ordo nun who favors women "priests" and other heresies. She's so heretical, in fact, that many in the Counter Church even ostracize her; yet she's truly "O.S.B.," according to the apostate Eric Hoyle.

According to Hoyle's new position, the "Benedictines" at Saint John's Abbey in Minnesota are legitimate members of the Order of St. Benedict. As documented in our book, *The Truth about What Really Happened to the Catholic Church after Vatican II* (a book Hoyle read and agreed with when he was here), the apostates at St. John's "Benedictine" Abbey held a "Monks in the West" meeting with Buddhist "monks." Their magazine states: "**We devoted two full days to sharing our personal spiritual journeys... attending the Buddhist community's chanting services**, meditating together and enjoying superb Chinese vegetarian cuisine."<sup>1</sup> These idolaters are true members of the "O.S.B.," according to the apostate Eric Hoyle.

According to Eric Hoyle, the countless apostate "Benedictines" who embrace salvation outside the Church, Assisi-style interfaith worship, all the heresies of Vatican II, false ecumenism with Protestants, Zen-Buddhism in their communities, attacks on the inerrancy of Scripture, attacks on the historicity of Jesus Christ, the acceptance of homosexuality, etc. *ad nauseam*, are truly members of the Order of St. Benedict. In some ways, Eric Hoyle's apostasy is worse than Martin Luther's.

While Martin Luther was more heretical, blasphemous and obviously more influential, after he had been formally excommunicated and taken his full stand against the Catholic Church, Luther was basically consistent in his rejection of the Catholic Church. It's not as if after 1520, Luther would sometimes pretend that he regarded the Catholic Church as legitimate, if he thought it might redound to his benefit.

Eric Hoyle, on the other hand, has spent approximately the last five years denouncing Antipope Benedict XVI and the Vatican II sect. Some of those years were spent denouncing as mortal sinners and/or heretics all those he considers to be in any way in communion with Antipope Benedict XVI. He even made a concerted effort to call people all over the country – including some he only spoke with one time – to "warn" them about becoming heretics for being in any way in communion with Antipope Benedict XVI. He also sent out a public letter warning hundreds of the same. But now this unspeakable (other-worldly) hypocrite and apostate turns around and professes that Antipope Benedict's "Benedictines" are the true ones. It's incredible.

#### WHY DID HE DO IT?

Before explaining how there is poetic justice and divine irony in this turn of events, we must consider the question: why did he do it? The answer to that question is the most revealing part of this true story. Eric Hoyle changed his position on whom he considers to be Benedictines because he thought it would help him win a lawsuit. He was confronted with a choice. He was directly asked which persons and monasteries he considers to be legitimate Benedictines and legitimate members of the Order of St. Benedict. He feared that if he professed his "faith," and stayed

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Abbey Banner – Magazine of St. John's Abbey*, Winter, 2006, p. 24.

consistent with his previous position (i.e., that there are no true Benedictines that he knows of, since he considers them all to be heretics), it would damage (if not completely eliminate) *any chance* he had to prevail in a lawsuit. So, he had a choice: 1) sell his soul and acknowledge the religious order of Antipope Benedict XVI or 2) stay consistent with his religious beliefs. Eric Hoyle chose to sell his soul and deny his belief.

The following statement is relevant in this regard. Hoyle says: "The lack of clarity in the word 'undermines' reflects **my puzzlement at the time about how to describe the persons and monasteries that are now publicly recognized as the OSB. Now, after further consideration, I consider these to be legitimate members of the OSB** in contradistinction to persons or groups who falsely claim to have been admitted into the OSB or who simply declare themselves Benedictine monks."

What was this "further consideration" that caused Hoyle to so radically alter his position? In my opinion, it was the consideration that his chances in a lawsuit would be severely damaged, if not altogether eliminated, if he did not acknowledge the Vatican II sect's "Benedictines" to be legitimate. Simply put: he changed his position because he thought it would help him in court. Hoyle's dastardly deed subjects him to eternal shame and a depth of disgrace that puts him arguably on a par, in terms of one's willingness to deny the truth of Christ, with Lucifer and Judas.

Hoyle probably hoped that his deplorable denial of Christ and acceptance of the Vatican II sect would go unreported or unnoticed by his few sedevacantist friends. It's amazing to think that he probably still converses with sedevacantists who purport to be uncompromising traditional Catholics. Apparently, while conversing with them he presents himself as an uncompromising traditional Catholic who rejects the Vatican II Church. He obviously doesn't want people to know what he did. Before making more comments on this point, a bit more background is in order.

#### HOYLE'S DARK DESCENT INTO SCHISM AND HERESY – HIS ATTEMPTS TO TAKE DOWN MHFM

After residing at MHFM for well over two years, taking vows and outwardly demonstrating contentment and agreement during the entire period, Eric Hoyle abruptly and without notice departed Most Holy Family Monastery on Dec. 31, 2007. Hoyle decided to depart MHFM because one day in 2007 he suddenly and radically changed his religious beliefs. What happened was that about 24 hours before he departed Hoyle read writings by a "traditionalist" named R.I. who claims to be a prophet. The so-called "prophet" denounced MHFM, as well as our positions on various issues. After reading "the prophet's" writings, Hoyle was deeply moved and (wrongly) concluded that MHFM's position on where people may receive sacraments is heretical, evil and mortally sinful.

This "religious experience" of reading "the prophet's" writings, and discovering what he considered to be life-altering information, sparked a sudden and drastic change within Eric Hoyle. As we've mentioned before, we believe that Hoyle fell into actual schism and was overtaken by the Devil. The change was so sudden, in fact, that Hoyle instantly went from one of MHFM's strongest supporters to its sworn enemy. Eric Hoyle had been an enthusiastic proponent of MHFM for over two years, but now he was committed to "taking down" Most Holy Family Monastery. Joseph Myers, who spent time with Hoyle at the hotel in the days immediately following Hoyle's departure from MHFM, testified:

A. When we got to the hotel, his [Hoyle's] determination was that these guys are heretics and I'm going to take these guys down. So that was his determination.

Q. Did he say that to you, sir?  
A. Say again?  
Q. Did he say that to you.  
A. Absolutely.  
Q. He said he was going to take these guys down?  
A. Yes. As soon as he was convinced that these guys are heretics, when we got to the hotel, that's when he was like, 'Listen, these guys are heretics, and I'm going to take these guys down. I'm taking them for all their worth. I'm taking them down.'  
Q. Did you have an understanding to whom he was referring?  
A. Yes, I did.  
Q. What was that?  
A. That was Bro. Michael and Bro. Peter and the whole monastery basically.  
Q. Most Holy Family Monastery?  
A. Most Holy Family Monastery... (Sworn Testimony of Joseph Myers)

Facts confirm this striking testimony. Within a few days of Hoyle's abrupt departure from MHFM, he tried to 1) steal the monastery's money, 2) have me and Bro. Michael Dimond arrested for theft and, when that didn't work, 3) for "reckless driving." He then 4) embarked on a maniacal campaign to contact MHFM customers and supporters, even verbalizing the desire *to contact every single person he spoke with while at MHFM* to warn them about MHFM's "heresy," "theft," and/or "fraud."

When his attempts to steal the monastery's money and have us arrested for theft and reckless driving proved unsuccessful, Hoyle then sued us in federal court on ten different counts, including "racketeering, wire fraud, mail fraud and bank fraud," among other things. Hoyle even stated that one of his goals was to have facts or accusations that generated bad publicity circulated widely in the traditional community in order to negatively affect people's view of MHFM.

Hoyle admitted under oath to attempting to transfer the monastery's money to himself.

Deposition of Plaintiff Eric Hoyle, Feb. 8, 2011, pp. 64-68: "**Q. Do you remember trying to make a transfer out of the Scottrade account away from the monastery to yourself? A. Yes.** Q. And when did you do that? A. In the morning of the day I left I tried to do so online, and in the afternoon I tried to do so on a telephone call... Q. And could you please describe the nature of the transaction you attempted to initiate? A. I attempted to transfer cash from the Scottrade account to an account in my name. Q. And where did you have an account in your name? A. USAA Federal Savings Bank... Q. And could you tell me how much money you wanted to transfer out of the monastery's account? When I say money, I mean cash, stocks, bonds, any sort of investment. How much were you attempting to transfer out of the monastery's account into your own? A. I don't recall. Q. Was it more than a million dollars? A. No. **Q. Was it more than five hundred thousand dollars? A. I don't recall. Q. So it could have been more, you're not sure? A. I'm not sure.**"

A police report, telephone call and recording all confirm that on Jan. 2, 2008 Eric Hoyle reported a theft to Trooper Larry LaRose, with the goal of having me and Brother Michael Dimond arrested for theft. A document also confirms that Eric Hoyle contacted the police with the intention of having Bro. Michael Dimond arrested for "reckless driving." Hoyle even informed the police of the roads on which we travel when we go to the store, with the hope that officers would stake out the area and catch the "reckless driving."

Joseph Myers Testimony, p. 79: "Q. Did there come a time when you were staying at the hotel in Mt. Morris when you either saw or learned that Mr. Hoyle had communicated with the New York State Troopers? A. Yes. Q. Can you tell me about that, please? A. Yes. I don't remember which day it was, **but I remember he was really wanting to take - you know, take Brother Michael and Brother Peter down, take the monastery down and get them in some kind of criminal charge or some kind of criminal act...**" (cscr no. 12585; file no. 09-11204)

Notes also indicate that Hoyle considered writing to our banks, the mayor of our town, and others informing them about MHFM's supposed "fraud" and/or the withholding of his money (a claim now proven in court to be baseless). It was appalling to hear conversations of Hoyle with people who at any point over the past twenty years had contact with me or Bro. Michael. In speaking to them Hoyle was desperately searching, digging futilely to the bottom of the barrel, for any kind of "dirt" he could find, so that he could use it in his attempt to "take down" MHFM.

In his effort to tarnish MHFM's reputation, Hoyle contacted hundreds if not thousands of MHFM's readers and supporters. He alleged that Bro. Michael Dimond and I stole his money. He said that we violated contracts, cheated him, engaged in repetitive fraud, and more. These claims have all been proven false. Upon reviewing the record in evidence, the judge concluded that Hoyle donated the money he transferred to MHFM. There are many facts mentioned in the judge's order which prove this point.

Perhaps the most prominent of Hoyle's false claims about the money he donated was one he stated in his lawsuit and elsewhere, which was picked up by many newspapers, blogs, websites, etc. In fact, *The Buffalo News*, the largest newspaper in western NY, ran a cover story on Hoyle's lawsuit. Hoyle claimed that there was a document which guaranteed him a large amount of money should he depart MHFM. This was circulated widely in the traditional community, on websites and forums, with opponents of MHFM concluding that we are criminals who cheated Hoyle. It served to greatly tarnish our reputations. But Hoyle's claim was false. When he was questioned about this alleged document during his deposition, Hoyle admitted that he: 1) didn't have a copy of it; 2) didn't know what it said; 3) didn't know what Bro. Michael said about it, if anything; 4) didn't know if it was signed.

#### HOYLE'S ABRUPT CHANGE

Hoyle also admitted that he transitioned from being a strong supporter and member of MHFM to MHFM's avowed enemy *within just one day*. E-mail documents confirm that Hoyle was enthusiastically recommending MHFM and our material to others just a few days prior to departing MHFM.

Prescinding from the interesting consideration given to us by a Catholic saint: that radical and sudden decisions – i.e., those which are not carefully and soberly considered, but instantly arrived at and which drastically alter one's life or course of action – frequently come from Satan, suffice it to say that the man whose writings Hoyle read is clearly a false prophet. The so-called "prophet" who converted Hoyle (named R.I.) has admitted to falsely identifying another "prophet." He has also admitted to being a condemned heretic and faith-denier while simultaneously claiming to be a "prophet." The man also embraces a variety of outrageously heretical and schismatic views, including his condemnation of certain canonized saints of the Catholic Church as heretics. He also threatens to kill people who disagree with him; he hands out penances to people who live in his small religious community in the southwest; he even said that, as a penance for one of his followers,

he would have her “blow a cat’s brains out.” “The prophet” also believes that St. Thomas Aquinas is in Hell and should be “pulled out of Hell” *and tortured* – no kidding. With all of this considered, it’s not hard to ascertain which spirit was behind Hoyle’s life-changing experience. Here’s a [link to shocking audio of the false prophet.](#)

## HOYLE’S THEOLOGICAL VAGARIES AND TELEPHONE RECORDINGS

After being “catechized” via the false prophet’s writings, Eric Hoyle became a full-fledged radical schismatic and decided to depart MHFM. After he left MHFM, Hoyle toyed with, and ventured into, a variety of schismatic positions. He became friendly with, and influenced by, a certain clique of radical schismatics. We actually have recordings of many of the conversations Hoyle had with these people *after he left MHFM*. They are very interesting in so far as they document Hoyle’s uncertainty and unbelief on the issues of faith. Hoyle made the recordings and was required to turn them over to MHFM. This is something he probably never dreamed would happen at the time he recorded the calls. It’s apparent that Hoyle recorded dozens of telephone conversations he had with others, including conversations about personal matters<sup>2</sup>; and, in almost every case, the other party was unaware the call was being recorded. We have recordings of conversations (again, all turned over by Hoyle to us) that Hoyle had with people in states ranging from Florida, to Michigan, to Oklahoma, to Alabama, to Texas, to Illinois, to Arizona, to New York, to New Mexico, to Vermont, to New Jersey, to Delaware, and so on.

Some of the people Hoyle communed and conversed with, and was even instructed by, have now fallen into the schismatic position that Popes Leo XIII, Pius X, and Pius XI were heretical antipopes. That’s just one example of a dark end to their prideful schism. “There is a way that seemeth to a man right: and the ends thereof lead to death” (Proverbs 16:25). Documents and recordings also prove that in the last few years Hoyle embraced, *among many other things*: the ridiculous “no-jurisdiction-position”; the position that canonizations are not infallible; the idea that Fatima is or might be of the Devil; and the position that Padre Pio is in Hell, to name a few. Hoyle also composed a preliminary abjuration, *in which he denounced the positions he held on water baptism and NFP* while at MHFM. He condemned as non-Catholic the true position: that any idea of salvation without water baptism for unbaptized catechumens is contrary to dogma. He also condemned the idea that NFP is necessarily sinful. He articulated the position that [the sinful birth control practice of NFP](#) is acceptable, while adding that he’s still looking into it.<sup>3</sup>

It’s fascinating, however, that during these conversations it’s clear that Eric Hoyle (like other radical schismatics) actually believes in nothing. For example, while he’s composing a preliminary abjuration, it’s interesting to hear him discuss how he’s not even sure he’s a Catholic *or if he ever became one*. Almost everything he says about his positions is prefaced by: “I’m still studying,” or “I’m not sure,” or “I’m still formulating my position” or words to that effect. He is truly ever-searching and never coming to the knowledge of the truth (2 Tim. 3:7).

What became so clear to me, in analyzing his descent into roaming schism, is that he has no internal faith at all. Perhaps he never did. His brief acceptance of, or inclination toward, certain positions ***is simply an intellectual endeavor devoid of any real internal conviction. His confidence in the***

---

<sup>2</sup> As just one example, Hoyle recorded a man describing his suspicions of adultery about his wife, and how infrequently they have marital relations.

<sup>3</sup> Hoyle Document, Bates No. 00005414, assertion #10.

***positions he adopts or leans toward is only temporarily bolstered in direct proportion to the confidence he places in the people around him who believe in those positions.*** In other words, when he had confidence in the Dimond Brothers, he adopted the position of the Dimond Brothers. When he lost confidence in the Dimond Brothers, he rejected the position of the Dimond Brothers. When he was friendly with radical schismatics, who served as his telephone pals, he leaned toward the position of the radical schismatics. When he was forced to stop communicating with many of the radical schismatics, following the temporary restraining order we won against him in 2008, he became much more liberal, as his deposition testimony shows.

#### HOYLE'S LIBERAL PHASE AND HIS DECLARATION THAT ATTENDEES OF VATICAN II CHURCHES ARE NOT NECESSARILY HERETICS

For instance, during his deposition Eric Hoyle was questioned about his theological views. He was questioned about the concept that everyone on Earth is either in the Kingdom of Christ (the true Church) or in the Kingdom of Satan (outside the true Church). He was asked whether R.I., the radical schismatic cult leader mentioned earlier, is in the Kingdom of Christ or in the Kingdom of Satan. As I alluded to above, R.I. is a false prophet with absurdly heretical and schismatic views. Those views include the position that numerous canonized saints are in Hell and that he would like to torture St. Thomas Aquinas if he could, to describe just a few. Based on Hoyle's claim to reject communion with heretics and schismatics, one would think that it would be very easy for him to answer the question about whether R.I. is in the Kingdom of Satan: i.e., he is. But Hoyle, consistent with the vain lack of conviction I described above, responds with total uncertainty. According to Hoyle's deposition testimony, R.I. might be a true Catholic, residing spiritually in the Kingdom of Christ.

Deposition of Plaintiff Eric Hoyle, Feb. 8, 2011, pp. 91-92: "Q.... You and I had some discussions about the kingdom of Christ versus the kingdom of Satan, and you identified people you thought fell within the kingdom of Satan. **How about... [R.I.] would you identify him to be in the kingdom of Satan?** A. **I don't know.** Q. I'm not asking you to state as a fact whether he is or he isn't, but this has to do I guess with the Roman Catholic religion as you've defined it. And based on its teachings as you know them, do you believe, does Eric Hoyle believe that... [R.I.] finds himself within the kingdom of Satan? A. I don't have the information to make that kind of judgment in this regard"

Even though Hoyle was very familiar with the details of R.I.'s theological views, including the horrible positions described above, he doesn't know if R.I. is in the Church. In Hoyle's empty, dark and faithless world, there is no settled ground (Colossians 1:23). Instead, he is carried to and fro by the wind of multiple opinions (Ephesians 4:14), never resting surely in the truth.

During his liberal period, when he gave his deposition testimony, Hoyle also contradicted the super-radical theology he adopted when he departed MHF and immediately thereafter. To see just how radical he was at the time of his departure from MHF and in the months that followed, consult his "Preliminary Abjuration," quoted later. In his deposition Hoyle contradicted this theology by stating that attendees of Vatican II churches, *including adherents of the Vatican II Church's "Benedictine Confederation,"* might be true Catholics and not heretics.

Deposition of Plaintiff Eric Hoyle, Feb. 8, 2011, pp. 26-29: "Q. And to the extent that they have people within their organization that adhere to their teachings and follow their leadership, **those individual members of the Benedictine Confederation would also be heretics in your view?** A. **I believe that question requires some inquiry into the**

**knowledge and intentions of the individuals in the organization... Q.** Okay. I asked whether or not someone who is a member of the Vatican Two church – in your view those individuals are non-Catholics, is that correct? A. As I was trying to say before, the matter can't be stated in my opinion so bluntly as that... Q. Okay. And if an individual attends Mass regularly at a church that associates with and adheres to the Vatican Two church or religion that you referred to, is such an individual Catholic? A. I believe that the judgment of that matter cannot be made on the basis of the simple fact that they attend a certain church. Q. **What if they attend a church and take communion and have the sacraments at a Vatican Two church, does that make them non-Catholic? A. I believe it depends on their knowledge and intentions and that it would be possible for such a person to be Catholic.”**

While the theological vagaries of Eric Hoyle involved constant alterations of his positions and doubts concerning many of the matters described above, one point about which Hoyle claimed to remain steadfast during the period after he departed MHFM was his rejection of the legitimacy of the Vatican II sect. Obviously while Hoyle resided at MHFM, he fully agreed with us that the Vatican II sect is not Catholic. He did not leave to become a member of the Vatican II sect, but rather to become a radical schismatic. Thus, *it would be expected* that he would remain consistent with his position that the Vatican II Church is not the Catholic Church, and that its leaders and heretical members hold no authority or position in the Catholic Church or in a Catholic order. However, as we saw above, Hoyle denied that position in the lawsuit (e.g., when he specifically declared that all the members of the Vatican II “O.S.B.” are the legitimate members). This should prove, once and for all, to any who might have entertained doubts on this point, that Eric Hoyle is a despicable character with no credibility. Indeed, the review of a document containing his twisted thoughts confirms this point.

#### HIS DIABOLICAL “THOUGHTS ON THE OSB” DOCUMENT

One of the most revealing examples of Hoyle’s apostasy, dishonesty and, in particular, *his ability to self-deceive* came in a document he authored during the lawsuit called, *Thoughts on the Order of St. Benedict (OSB)*. In this privately-composed document, which Hoyle e-mailed to a “friend” but was eventually forced to turn over to us, Hoyle attempts to rationalize his decision to recognize as legitimate the Vatican II sect’s “Benedictines.” Eric Hoyle actually convinces himself that he’s not lying, committing sin, denying the faith or committing apostasy when he recognizes the Vatican II sect’s “Benedictines” as legitimate *FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE LAWSUIT AGAINST MHFM*, even though he personally doesn’t believe they are the true Benedictines!

Hoyle convinces himself it’s justified to say the Vatican II sect’s Benedictines are the legitimate members of the O.S.B. because, according to him, they are such “in the eyes of US law,” even though they are not “in the sight of God.” According to Hoyle, it’s permissible to declare as true in a legal case that which is not true in the eyes of God.

Eric Hoyle, *Thoughts on the Order of St. Benedict (OSB)*: “If a social club changes its beliefs and practices, it does not change its name or legal identity. US law treats religious groups the same way, even if their beliefs and practices change substantially. So, in US law, the Vatican II OSB retains its name. The Court presumes that the commonly-acknowledged OSB [i.e., the Vatican II OSB] is the legitimate OSB. I cannot prevent this, and I will not withdraw my suit because of it... **So, I do not encourage or agree with the idea that the persons commonly acknowledged as OSB are legitimately such in the sight of God. I accept the presumption that they are such in the eyes of the US law.”**

Before I expose the tortured and truly devilish reasoning behind this conclusion, note that Hoyle was asked about this heretical document during his deposition. He confirmed that he indeed authored it:

Deposition of Plaintiff Eric Hoyle, Feb. 8, 2011, pp. 293-296: "Q. Take a look at Exhibit 44. Right there. This is an attachment to an e-mail that you sent to Bridget... regarding thoughts on the Order of Saint Benedict. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. You prepared this document? A. I believe so. Q. At the end of the second block of paragraphs in the middle of the page **you write, so I do not encourage or agree with the idea that the persons commonly acknowledge as OSB are legitimately such in the sight of God. Do you see that statement? A. I do.** Q. And OSB refers to the Order of Saint Benedict? A. Yes.

... Q. Let me be clear. I want to back up here. You say Benedictines who are commonly acknowledged. In other words, you're referring to the Vatican Two Benedictines, right? A. Yes. That's what I'm referring to here, yes. Q. And you're saying that you don't encourage or agree with the idea that they're legitimately Benedictine in the sight of God, right? A. That's what I said here, yes."

When he wrote this document in 2008, Hoyle did not realize it would become public. It's a remarkable insight into *the disastrous effects of spiritual blindness* to realize that Eric Hoyle convinced himself that there is no problem, but a consistency, in the position described above. Bro. Michael and I frequently remarked in wonder about the staggering depth of spiritual blindness with which God punished Hoyle as a result of his schism; for Hoyle, who naturally speaking has intelligence, doesn't see the problem in his conclusion, even though it's so obvious.<sup>4</sup>

Let's refute and expose his rationale. If it were not a sin, but justified, to say you believe something to be true because it is true in the eyes of a country's law, *even though it is false in the sight of God*, then the early Christians could have justifiably worshipped the Emperor and the false gods of the Romans; for the Emperor and the false gods of the Romans were the true and legitimate gods *in the eyes of the Empire's law*, but they were false in the eyes of God. In fact, the Empire's laws even compelled people to worship the Emperor and the false gods of the Romans. So, if Hoyle's course of action were justified, there was no need for martyrdom in the early Church. The Christians could have, like Hoyle, walked in, worshipped the false gods and declared within themselves: "*Yes, I will not withdraw my incense from them because they are the true gods in the sight of the Empire's law, even though I do not encourage or agree with the idea that such gods are legitimate in the sight of God.*"

Obviously anyone who followed such a course would have denied Christ and become an apostate, just like Hoyle did in saying that *he believed* all the apostate members of the Vatican II sect's religious order are the true and legitimate members. Any honest and clear-thinking Catholic can see that Hoyle's position is evil, dishonest, heretical and apostate. It is the position of a liar – a man who justifies almost everything he does, at least when it comes to a dispute with us. Acknowledging false gods would never be justified. It doesn't matter what a law says. What matters is *what is true*, and that means what is true in God's sight.

---

<sup>4</sup> Other examples of his staggering blindness can be seen in his amazing contradictions with respect to his financial claims in this case (more on these in a bit). He was apparently oblivious to the massive inconsistencies in his (false) story.

Furthermore, under Hoyle's diabolical reasoning, you could answer a question in a legal case about whether you believe abortion is okay by stating that you believe it is; for abortion is not wrong *in the eyes of the US law*, even though it is murder in the sight of God. Does anyone fail to see the devilish blindness that allows such false reasoning? It should be obvious. Hoyle's adoption of this false reasoning further demonstrates that he is a liar and **a master at self-deception** – i.e., at convincing himself that he is justified when he is not simply *in order to be right*.<sup>5</sup>

It should also be emphasized that Hoyle's apostate recognition of the Vatican II sect's "Benedictines" came in response to a question about which persons and groups he believes are the true and legitimate members of the Order of St. Benedict. It was not a commentary about a legal decision that was reached by a US court of law many years ago; and in fact, no court could ever reach a decision on that matter; for US law does not recognize any one religious group as true, thus refuting the premise of Hoyle's false argument, the one which served as the genesis of his apostate rationale.

---

<sup>5</sup> We first saw the potential of Hoyle's dishonesty when he resided at MHFM. **Specifically, it was his penchant for convincing himself that he is factually correct or justified when he is actually factually incorrect or unjustified.** We had asked him to read over the book, *Outside the Catholic Church There is Absolutely No Salvation*, for typographical errors and similar mistakes. We only wanted clear typos and similar mistakes. He read it over carefully, and spotted some good ones. However, probably as a result of pride, he went way overboard and listed many things as errors which were not errors. In a response e-mail, we listed ten examples of things he listed as errors which were not errors, and we explained why they were not errors. Many months later, in a conversation about a different matter, those "ten errors" came up. Hoyle admitted that for a long time *he had convinced himself that we were wrong about all ten of the points we corrected him about, but that he had been lying to himself*. He said that he had convinced himself they were errors, despite the fact that they were not; *but he now realized that we were right about all ten, or at least nine out of ten*. We were puzzled, shocked, and disappointed that he would be so dishonest; for up to that time we considered him honest. We didn't understand why or how he would convince himself he was right *when knew he wasn't?*! That was a mystery I personally did not understand. He explained that *since his pride was injured* by our refutation of the "ten points," he convinced himself he was correct and that we were wrong, even though the facts showed otherwise. He admitted that *he deceived himself in order to satisfy his pride, in order to "be right."* Thinking back on the way he articulated it, with the full expectation that his explanation was comprehensible, it now becomes clear that it was something he probably did frequently and thought others did as well. I did not understand how a Catholic could do such a thing, for it is not a practice I employ. But since he acknowledged his mistake, and we considered him a fellow Catholic, we moved on. Contrary to the opinion of some, we are forgiving. However, after he left the monastery, fell into radical schism and sued us, it became clear that that little episode actually provided great insight into his soul: his true motives, his *modus operandi*, and his dark character. For the same dishonest practice of justifying almost everything he does – of convincing himself he is right when he clearly is wrong – was at work when he convinced himself that he could try to steal MHFM's funds, and then claim MHFM was criminal; that money he donated to MHFM was actually stolen from him; that MHFM violated a written agreement that didn't exist; that something can be true for the purpose of a lawsuit, even though it is a false in the eyes of God; that he is somehow justified in recognizing the Vatican II "Benedictines" as legitimate, despite claiming to anathematize any communion with the Vatican II Church, solely in order to continue a lawsuit against MHFM. He is, sadly, an abominable liar at heart.

I would be remiss in moving away from the “Thoughts on the Order of St. Benedict” document without mentioning that Hoyle e-mailed it to his radical schismatic friend named Bridget. She’s another example of someone who became convinced of the sedevacantist position after reading and viewing MHFM material, but through pride and bad will became a radical schismatic. This evil woman – one could call her Bridget the Apostate – actually helped convince Hoyle that it was not a denial of the faith to say the Vatican II “Benedictines” are the true ones for the purpose of the lawsuit against MHFM! Hoyle, being unsure of basically every position he adopts, naturally wanted her opinion. Of course, since Bridget claimed to reject the Vatican II sect, one would have expected her to say: *“No, in the lawsuit you must not acknowledge the Vatican II sect's 'Benedictine' order as true, even if it means dropping the case.”* But no, she instructed Hoyle that it's not a denial of the faith to acknowledge the Vatican II “Benedictines” as true! Of course not: it's not a denial of the faith if it concerns an attempt to bring down Bro. Michael Dimond, Bro. Peter Dimond and Most Holy Family Monastery; but any other time it would be mortal sin and heresy.

For such dupes of the Devil, acknowledging the Counter Church somehow becomes justified when it concerns an effort against Most Holy Family Monastery. Frankly, that's how evil these radical schismatics are and how much they have been influenced by Satan to hate us and our work. Needless to say, even though she was already a schismatic, by encouraging Hoyle in his apostasy Bridget became the Apostate as well.

#### ERIC HOYLE'S MASSIVE CONTRADICTIONS WITH RESPECT TO HIS FINANCIAL CLAIMS

##### ERIC HOYLE SAYS THAT, WHEN TALKING TO THE STATE TROOPER, HE WASN'T SURE HE HAD A LEGAL RIGHT TO RECLAIM ANY OF THE MONEY HE TRANSFERRED

For another confirmation that Eric Hoyle has no credibility, consider that Hoyle admitted under oath that when he approached a New York State Trooper to have us arrested for “theft,” he didn’t know if he had a legal right to any of the money he tried to have us arrested for supposedly stealing.

On Jan. 2, 2008, Eric Hoyle contacted Trooper Larry LaRose and attempted to have us arrested for supposedly stealing money he donated. An official police report was filed on his behalf reporting a “theft.” Early in his deposition (pp. 69-72), Hoyle testified that he believed he had a right to reclaim about \$470,000 of the money he transferred to MHFM. That contradicts his lawsuit which declares that he executed a document guaranteeing him \$750,000. Well, Hoyle contradicts himself again later in his deposition when he says that, when talking to the trooper and reporting an alleged theft of his money, he wasn’t sure he had a legal right to reclaim any of it.

##### HE FIRST CONTRADICTS HIS LAWSUIT BY CLAIMING THAT HE WAS OWED SOMEWHERE AROUND \$470,000, NOT \$750,000 (THE FIGURE MENTIONED IN HIS LAWSUIT)

Deposition of Plaintiff Eric Hoyle, Feb. 8, 2011, pp. 69-70: “Q. And when you left on the 31<sup>st</sup>, what percentage, roughly, of that one point five million dollars did you believe you were entitled to get back? A. I believed I was entitled to get back, as a matter of the agreement I had with Frederick Dimond, the amount of money that was stated as having been received by Most Holy Family Monastery from me. And if he were to break his word on that agreement, **I believed I had a right to demand the return of the money that I gave that was not acknowledged as a donation, which was in the neighborhood of four hundred and seventy thousand dollars or thereabouts.**”

HE THEN IMMEDIATELY CONTRADICTS HIMSELF AND SAYS HE WAS OWED \$750,000

Deposition of Plaintiff Eric Hoyle, Feb. 8, 2011, pp. 71-72: "Q. And you're claiming that you reached some sort of an agreement on that with him, as to the amount? A. Yes. Q. And you're claiming that amount is approximately four hundred and seventy thousand dollars? A. No. **The amount was I believe seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars.** Q. That's what you were supposed to get back? A. Yes."

HE ALSO SAYS HE DIDN'T THINK HE HAD A LEGAL RIGHT TO ANY OF IT

Deposition of Plaintiff Eric Hoyle, Feb. 8, 2011, p. 69: "Q. Now, when you left the monastery on that day, was it your belief that they owed you an amount of money? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And how much money did you believe, on that day that you left the monastery, that they owed you? **A. I don't recall.**"

Deposition of Plaintiff Eric Hoyle, Feb. 8, 2011, pp. 211-212: "Q. And he [Trooper LaRose] specifically asked you whether you had a written agreement with the monastery that you would get any money back, and you told him no, right? A. No. I believe what I told him was that I couldn't think of one and I'd have to think about what documents I had. Q. Okay. **So at the time you called him, you were unable to produce a written agreement for him to get the money back, right?** A. That's right. Q. **And you also couldn't specifically recall one way or the other whether there was a written agreement to get any of the money back?** A. That's correct. At the time I didn't recall"

Deposition of Plaintiff Eric Hoyle, Feb. 8, 2011, pp. 243-245: "Q. That stock that you gave to the monastery was liquidated at some point, 2005, or 2006, right? A. I believe it was. Q. Okay. And the portion that you claim was legally yours, the four hundred eighty thousand, did you ever file a report of taxable income with respect to the gain on the portion you claim was legally yours? A. **I think there's an assumption in here that I never agreed to, which is that it was legally mine.** My understanding was that I hoped that I had some way to get it back when I realized what had happened when I spoke to Trooper LaRose.

"Q. You were talking about what your tax preparer told you and what you understood your legal rights were, right? Your legal rights. **And when you say legally, you believed, as you claim you reported to the State Trooper, that you had a right - enforceable right to take four hundred eighty thousand dollars back, correct? A. No, because I wasn't sure about it.** I didn't understand what exactly the situation was. I knew that the money had not been in the seven fifty that was acknowledged on the tax report, the tax papers. Q... You weren't sure what right, if any you had to reclaim any of the one point two million? MR. EATON: At what time? MR. RITTER: When he was talking to the trooper. THE WITNESS: **When I was speaking to the trooper, I was not sure what legal right I had to claim the money. Q. Any of it, right? A. Yes.**"

So, Hoyle admits under oath that shortly after he left MHFM, he wasn't sure if he had a legal right to reclaim any of the money. (That's because he knows he donated the money, and he had no legal right to any of it.) Yet, he still attempts to have us arrested for "theft," accuses us across the country of stealing from him, and files a lawsuit specifically alleging that there was a documented agreement that would give him back \$750,000 (a document he now says he doesn't have *and doesn't know what it said* – because it doesn't exist). Hoyle also admits that even though he went to a state trooper about a "theft" he said MHFM committed, he simultaneously did not know if he had any right to the money he claimed MHFM had "stolen" from him.

So much for his repeated assertions to MHFM contacts and others all over the country: that we had “stolen” from him, “cheated” him, “violated verbal and written agreements” to give him money, and more. Here are just a few examples of how the liar and fraud Eric Hoyle told people that we stole from him; and he made this false accusation about money he admitted under oath he had no right to.

- On January 2, 2008, Eric Hoyle told Trooper Larry LaRose it is MHFM’s “policy” to unlawfully refuse to return the money that belongs to others. (Bates No. 0001315)
- Hoyle told Joseph G. that MHFM unlawfully withholds money that belongs to him (Bates No. 0001312).
- In a conversation of February 19, 2008 (Bates No. 0001299), Hoyle told Christy A. that MHFM unlawfully keeps money that belongs to him.
- In January of 2008, Plaintiff told Stephen H. that MHFM stole money from him and from another person.
- In the early part of 2008, Hoyle contacted David B. and said that MHFM had lied to and cheated him.
- On March 22, 2008, Plaintiff conducted a telephone conversation with a man in Oklahoma (Bates No. 0001332). In the conversation, Plaintiff told the man that MHFM is guilty of a pattern of “repetitive fraud.”
- In a conversation with Rosemary A. (Bates No. 0001298), Plaintiff said that MHFM operates and conducts itself in a “fraudulent” way. He also told her that MHFM illegally withheld money that belongs to him and that he hoped to put MHFM “out of commission.”
- In an e-mail of Jan. 21, 2008 (Bates No. 00010006), Hoyle told a man that Bro. Michael Dimond violated “verbal and written agreements” to pay him money he was owed.

There are numerous other examples of Hoyle’s false allegations, all of which are contradicted by his own deposition testimony and the facts of the case. He doesn’t have any agreement (simply because there never was one); he doesn’t know if one existed or what it said (because it didn’t exist); and he doesn’t know if he has any right to any of the money (simply because he donated it and had no right to any of it). But he still says that we stole it. Consider the sin such a false accusation entails.<sup>6</sup>

In addition to his massive contradictions, the clear factual record shows that Hoyle donated the money. The judge’s order reflected this fact. Some of these facts are quoted in Bro. Michael’s affidavit (available on our website). For instance, in an email to his tax advisor, dated January 18, 2006, Eric Hoyle provided his tax advisor with numbers for his 2005 taxes, which expressly included under “Gifts” “Stock \$1,233,100.00” and “Cash [\$]65,700.00.” On January 19, 2006, Hoyle’s tax advisor responded to Hoyle’s January 18, 2006 email and confirmed that he understood and treated Plaintiff’s \$1.2 million transfer to MHFM as a gift to a qualifying 501(c)(3) organization. Hoyle even testified that these emails reflected his intention that these donations were gifts to MHFM (Hoyle T.

---

<sup>6</sup> Hoyle’s totally false, gravely sinful and now-dismissed allegation that we committed theft, which he originally made to a state trooper and also broadcast to his friends and acquaintances – ***but was forced to completely contradict and retract when questioned under oath, as we see above*** – is analogous to how liars and false traditionalists confidently spread their lies and dishonest arguments in e-mails, on websites and from behind a computer. However, when they are questioned one on one, in detail, and in a forum where their answers matter, ***where consistency in their claims becomes critical, what they were previously so confident about saying in private to a receptive audience they suddenly become unwilling to defend***. That’s frequently how liars and dishonest men operate.

194: 22 – 195: 2). In his deposition, Eric Hoyle also acknowledges a receipt from MHFM for his donation of \$307,989 worth of stock, the other large donation he made to the monastery.

Numerous e-mails written by Hoyle also confirm that he donated the money he transferred to MHFM. As quoted in the *Judge's Decision* granting us Summary Judgment, Hoyle wrote that he planned "to give the vast majority of my holdings as an outright gift" to MHFM and that he wished to receive "around \$30,000" if he departed MHFM, noting that, "Even that sounds excessive..." Hoyle also wrote, among other things, that MHFM "deserved some serious money"; that he fully intended to "give away the vast majority of my money to good Catholic persons and organizations"; that his "financial plan for the future is quite literally to give my money away"; and more (*Judge's Decision and Order*, pp. 7-8).

Even though the facts above document his stunning contradictions and disprove his false allegations with respect to money he donated, before leaving this matter it's important to quote Hoyle's revealing testimony about his primary financial assertion. Hoyle's explicit and central financial assertion in his Amended Legal Complaint was that he executed a document guaranteeing him \$750,000 if he should depart MHFM. His lawsuit clearly made this allegation, and we always denied it.

Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, 4/9/09: "42. On or about November 4, 2005, the plaintiff transferred 1,045,000 shares of Guinor Gold Corporation, valued at \$1,233,100.00 to MHFM. This transfer was made by wire from the plaintiff's account number 506-66358-1-3 at TD Waterhouse, Inc. 43. The plaintiff retained sufficient assets to pay his capital gains taxes for 2005. 44. In the late-spring/summer of 2006, **Frederick Dimond renewed his request that the plaintiff specify in writing the amount of the plaintiff's transfers that must be returned to him if and when he left MHFM.** 45. **The plaintiff chose the amount of Seven Hundred Fifty Thousand (\$750,000.00) Dollars, executed a document stating how much would be returned to him on his departure from MHFM, and delivered it to Frederick Dimond.**"

In the following quote, you will see that Hoyle's own testimony under oath destroys this claim. It proves that there was no document indicating that he would get \$750,000 returned to him if he departed MHFM. Thus, his central claim about money that was supposedly owed to him is proven false by his own testimony.

Deposition of Plaintiff Eric Hoyle, Feb. 8, 2011, pp. 74-75: "Q. All right. Let's just cut right to it. Your testimony was that in April of '06 you reached some sort of understanding with Brother Michael about how much money you would get back if you left? A. Yes. Q. And you claim that he then instructed you okay, type up a document memorializing that? A. **No, he didn't instruct me to type it. And as it happened, I didn't type it.** Q. **Did he ask you to prepare it? Or how did it come into being?** A. **I don't recall what he said about it, if anything,** but it came into being by my writing it with my hand.

Q. You wrote out an agreement that purports to indicate you're supposed to get back seven hundred fifty thousand dollars if you left the monastery? A. That was the import of the document. **I don't know that it said that,** but what it said was that Most Holy Family Monastery had received from me that amount. And I was given the understanding that it was to be the official record of monies received from me that, as a matter of policy, would be refundable if I were to depart. Q. **Do you have a copy of that agreement?** A. **No.** Q. Do you remember what it said other than what you just described? A. As best I recall, it didn't say anything besides what I described. A. And you wrote it out longhand? A. Yes. Q. **And**

**you claim, then, that you signed it? A. I don't recall. Q. Do you recall whether Brother Michael signed it? A. I don't believe he did.**

Q. Now, take a look at paragraph forty-five of your Complaint that's right in front of you. This is referring to that spring, 2006 time frame. You can look at paragraph forty-four right above it if you'd like. Okay? And it indicates with regard to your allegation that you were to designate money to be returned to you. You allege that you chose the amount of seven hundred fifty thousand dollars and that you executed a document stating that you would receive that if you left the monastery. Do you see that allegation? A. Yes. Q. **As you sit here today, is it fair to say that you don't remember whether or not you signed that document? A. No, I don't recall for certain whether I signed it or not. Q. Do you have any copies of that document? A. Not that I know of.**

First, notice that Hoyle contradicts his own Complaint by stating that Brother Michael Dimond did not instruct him to type the alleged document entitling him to \$750,000. He also cannot remember whether Brother Michael Dimond said anything about such a document. Yet, his complaint stated that Brother Michael Dimond requested him to prepare such a document.

Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, 4/9/09:  
"44. In the late-spring/summer of 2006,  
**Frederick Dimond renewed his request that the plaintiff specify in writing the amount of the plaintiff's transfers that must be returned to him if and when he left MHFM.** 45. The plaintiff chose the amount of Seven Hundred Fifty Thousand (\$750,000.00) Dollars, executed a document stating how much would be returned to him on his departure from MHFM, and delivered it to Frederick Dimond."

Deposition of Plaintiff Eric Hoyle, Feb. 8, 2011, pp. 74-75: "Q. All right. Let's just cut right to it. Your testimony was that in April of '06 you reached some sort of understanding with Brother Michael about how much money you would get back if you left? A. Yes. Q. **And you claim that he then instructed you okay, type up a document memorializing that? A. No, he didn't instruct me to type it. And as it happened, I didn't type it. Q. Did he ask you to prepare it? Or how did it come into being? A. I don't recall what he said about it, if anything,** but it came into being by my writing it with my hand."

Second, Hoyle admits that 1) he has no copies of this alleged document specifying that he will receive \$750,000 upon departure; 2) he doesn't believe Brother Michael Dimond signed it; and 3) he doesn't recall for certain whether he [Hoyle] even signed it! There were over ten thousand documents exchanged in discovery as evidence in this case. Hoyle has produced many duplicate documents; yet, he does not have a copy of an alleged agreement that allegedly guarantees him \$750,000. He also doesn't even know if he or Brother Michael Dimond even signed this supposed document. He further doesn't know if Brother Michael Dimond said anything about it. The reason Hoyle doesn't have a copy of this document, and doesn't know if he or Brother Michael Dimond signed it, or if Bro. Michael said anything about it, is because no such document exists. In sum, his central claim about a document guaranteeing him \$750,000 is false. His testimony contradicts his Complaint, which specified that such a document existed and was executed at the behest of Brother Michael Dimond. His claim about a document guaranteeing him \$750,000 also contradicts many other pieces of evidence that show he donated the money he transferred to MHFM.

## A TOOL

Of course, in light of the facts about his dishonesty and his apostasy, no true Catholic will consider him to have any credibility; but no one else should, either. For example, here's a quote from the preliminary abjuration Hoyle composed while he roamed through the empty wastelands of radical schism:

Preliminary Abjuration, "**I, Eric Hoyle, reject, and condemn:** 4. The falsehood that those who have professed heresy or adhered to **non-Catholic churches, including members of the Vatican II sect** and those involved in false traditionalism, should be presumed not guilty of heresy or schism."

As we see, he rejects the idea that any person in the Vatican II sect or who attends one of its churches should be presumed not guilty of heresy. He also identifies their churches as non-Catholic. During this period Hoyle also recorded a conversation he had with a radical schismatic. In the conversation Hoyle assured the person that in going after MHFM he would not make an argument that implied the Vatican II Benedictines are true.<sup>7</sup>

But now, he declares *and swears*:

Eric Hoyle, formal response to Interrogatory: "... My own belief is that *the publicly recognized Order of St. Benedict organization has in recent decades departed from authentic Catholic religious doctrine on certain matters*, and that this undermines its Benedictine legitimacy. The lack of clarity in the word 'undermines' reflects my puzzlement at the time about how to describe the persons and monasteries that are now publicly recognized as the OSB. Now, after further consideration, I consider these to be legitimate members of the OSB...."

We quote this again, after citing his preliminary abjuration, to illustrate the true depth of his hypocrisy and apostasy. Not only does Hoyle's interrogatory response recognize the Vatican II apostates as "legitimate Benedictines," but it necessarily, and by extension, acknowledges Benedict XVI to be the pope. For if all the Vatican II "Benedictines" are legitimate, then the "authority" under which they all currently place themselves, and with whom they all obstinately hold communion (Benedict XVI), is also legitimate.

If there was any doubt in anyone's mind about why Eric Hoyle left our community, this act should obliterate it. His decision to leave our community, and relentlessly attack us after the fact, *was not about fidelity to the faith*. That fact was cemented when he completely denied his "faith," and by extension the very issue over which he left MHFM, in the responses to interrogatories quoted. His decision to leave MHFM, and then become MHFM's enemy, was also not about a person sincerely trying to do the right thing. It was about a man who succumbed to the influence of the Devil by accepting radical schism, completely lost his faith in the process, and subsequently became a supple instrument in the hands of the enemy of mankind. **He became radical against MHFM when it suited the Devil's desires; now he has become a liberal, Vatican II sect-endorsing apostate when it suits the Devil's desires for him to continue to oppose MHFM.** It has become quite clear to us that he is simply a tool.

---

<sup>7</sup> Hoyle conversation, Bates No. 0001313.

Ephesians 6:12- "For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood; but against principalities and power, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness in the high places."

As I alluded to above, there is a divine irony, a poetic justice, in all of this. It is that Eric Hoyle's decision to leave MHFM began with his *false* conclusion that our position on where people may receive sacraments and attend Mass is heretical and involves an acceptance or acknowledgment of Benedict XVI and the Vatican II sect. For, it is our carefully considered position, defended and explained on our website that – in this unique crisis, in accordance with canon law and past papal decrees on this issue, as well as the teaching of St. Thomas and Catholic sense – Catholics may receive sacraments from certain (not all) undeclared heretics who offer the *traditional sacraments* but accept Antipope Benedict XVI, *if* the person approaching the priest for the sacraments doesn't agree with or support the priest, and *if* the priest in question is not so notorious about his heresy that it "can in no way be *concealed* or excused in law." That is consistent with traditional Catholic teaching on this matter, as well as the principle that necessity makes licit that which is illicit (or rather, in necessity, one may do things he normally would not, as long as the faith is not denied).

For a full defense of our position on this matter, please consult our : "[Sacraments from Undeclared Heretics" Debate - The Important Quotes](#) [article] [Sacraments from Undeclared Heretics - Debate](#) [video]. This debate utterly refutes the position of the radical schismatics, and destroys the arguments advanced by people who think as Hoyle does on this issue. In this video, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NYv0zhdV3vo>, we also discuss and refute the false position of the radical schismatics, that the reception of Communion at any Mass where Benedict XVI is named as pope necessarily entails an acknowledgement of him as pope. Their conclusion in that regard is totally wrong.

By wrongly taking Satan's bait to condemn an acceptable position as heretical and evil, and to falsely accuse people of holding communion with Antipope Benedict XVI *when their position involves none*, God allowed Eric Hoyle to fall into radical schism and file a lawsuit which wound up putting him in a position to profess that Antipope Benedict XVI, his sect, and its Benedictine Order is legitimate! In other words, the punishment for, and the end result of, his evil schism was that *the very heretical position he feigned concern about, communion with the Counter Church, is exactly what he fell into*. If you think this is just a coincidence --- well, you are wrong.

God frequently acts in this way. In Numbers 11, for example, the Israelites complained about not having flesh to eat. They declared: "Give us flesh that we may eat" (Numbers 11:13). Since this desire equated to a rejection of what God had provided, God declared that *their punishment would involve the very flesh they illicitly demanded*:

Numbers 11:18-20, 33- "And thou shalt say to the people: Be ye sanctified: tomorrow you shall eat flesh: for I have heard you say: Who will give us flesh to eat? it was well with us in Egypt. That the Lord may give you flesh, and you may eat: Not for one day, nor two, nor five, nor ten, no nor for twenty. But even for a month of days, till it come out at your nostrils, and become loathsome to you, because you have cast off the Lord, who is in the midst of you, and have wept before him, saying: Why came we out of Egypt?... As yet the flesh was between their teeth, neither had that kind of meat failed: when behold the wrath of the Lord being provoked against the people, struck them with an exceeding great plague."

Since their offense involved desiring flesh to eat, God arranged it so that they would perish by that very flesh. Since Eric Hoyle committed schism by falsely accusing people of communion with the antipope, when in fact they held none, God allowed him to fall into apostasy and *swear that the antipope's religious order is the true one.*<sup>8</sup>

#### A FEW OTHER POINTS

It's also interesting that, in his apostate response to the interrogatory, Hoyle makes reference to a compliance affidavit he filed on 8/08/08. The bolded portion is where he makes reference to that affidavit.

Eric Hoyle, formal response to Interrogatory: "When I was under the influence of MHFM, I believed that one could lose his membership in the OSB by openly departing from the Catholic faith. I believed, and still believe, that such departure from the Catholic faith has generally occurred in the monasteries whose membership in the OSB dates back to the times before the Second Vatican Council and the New Mass. I have firmly resolved not to belie this religious belief in the course of the present lawsuit. To avoid any appearance of doing so, **I said the following in my affidavit of August 8, 2008: 12. My own belief is that the publicly recognized Order of St. Benedict organization has in recent decades departed from authentic Catholic religious doctrine on certain matters, and that this undermines its Benedictine legitimacy.**

The lack of clarity in the word "undermines" reflects my puzzlement at the time about how to describe the persons and monasteries that are now publicly recognized as the OSB. Now, after further consideration, I consider these to be legitimate members of the OSB in contradistinction to persons or groups who falsely claim to have been admitted into the OSB or who simply declare themselves Benedictine monks. The essential element to their legitimacy is their adherence to the procedures of the Order. This agrees with my reply to Interrogatory 22."

Just before he commits full-fledged apostasy by recognizing the Vatican II "Benedictines" as legitimate, he makes reference to a portion of his 8/08/08 affidavit. However, he leaves out an important part. The bolded portion below is the sentence Hoyle omitted.

Hoyle Compliance Affidavit, 8/08/08: "My own belief is that the publicly recognized Order of Saint Benedict organization has in recent decades departed from authentic Catholic religious doctrine on certain matters, and that this undermines its Benedictine legitimacy. **I understand that the defendants share this belief, which they have stated publicly since before my entrance into Most Holy Family Monastery.**"

Why is this significant? It's significant because it shows that Hoyle shared our belief on the Order of St. Benedict before and while he was here, and that we made our position on this matter publicly clear. (Anyone who is at all familiar with us knows this is true, of course, and the idea that we are not clear about where we stand is absurd.) He didn't want to quote that sentence again, in his

---

<sup>8</sup> Since I referenced the Book of Numbers, it's somewhat interesting to note that Eric's radical schism, which led him into the depths of apostasy and unbelief, involved three people (himself, and two others with whom he spent time at the hotel after they left MHFM). Another schism, the Schism of Core, recorded in Numbers 16, was also led by three people (Core, Dathan and Abiron) – with Core being the leader.

response to the interrogatory, because he doesn't want to emphasize (i.e., he desires to hide) the fact that he knew what he was joining. He desires to perpetuate the *false* impression that he was deceived about what he was joining.

In fact, Hoyle stalled and tried to avoid directly answering the interrogatory posed above (about which monasteries he considers Benedictine) for quite some time. He only did so when he was ordered to. This is a denial of faith in itself. If someone directly asks you a question about your faith – e.g., whether you believe the Vatican II “Benedictines” are legitimate monasteries and members of the Order of St. Benedict – and you avoid or dodge that question *in order to perpetuate the false impression that you believe something different from what you truly believe*, it is a denial of faith. This is just another example of his bad will, dishonesty and hypocrisy.

Despite Eric Hoyle's best efforts to obfuscate his position on the Order of St. Benedict; despite his willingness to deny the faith and acknowledge Antipope Benedict XVI and his false order as legitimate for the purpose of winning a lawsuit and “taking down” MHFM, Hoyle still lost miserably.

In the process of this case, Hoyle's devilish pride was also humbled. For after he left the monastery Hoyle boasted that he hoped to put MHFM “out of commission.” He also expected that, once he was done with us, MHFM would be bankrupt and unable to continue its apostolate. He exuded blind confidence and extreme arrogance in his initial communications with us and others after his departure. I recall one event in particular, on Jan. 8, 2008, a little more than a week after Hoyle's departure. Hoyle returned to MHFM to get some things. He had two hired helpers with him, to assist him in moving. I began to speak with the two men about the Catholic faith, and I gave them a DVD.

As it turned out, the men were non-Catholics. As I was speaking to them, Hoyle arrogantly said that the men worked for him and that I don't have his permission to speak to them. I immediately responded by saying: I don't need your permission, and I continued to speak to them. Hoyle replied by mumbling words to the effect of: *okay, I will add that to my complaints* – the implication being that when he sues us he will also include a cause of action on this matter, and we will have to pay up for it. He was so vainly confident, so convinced, in his blindness, that he had the upper hand, as if we were going to account for all of his claims including talking to his workers against his will. How deceived he was indeed; but the Devil often gives his servants insufferable pride and a temporary confidence in their baseless positions.<sup>9</sup>

It's interesting that just a few days before the Jan. 8, 2008 meeting, we wrote a letter to Hoyle (dated approximately Jan. 6 2008) to warn him about the disgraceful activity he engaged in after departing MHFM. We told him that we were saddened by his decision, but that we've moved on and he should leave us alone. We added that if he should bring a legal action against us, “*we will defeat your... case in court.*” This turned out to be true. Not only did that imaginary claim about talking to his hired help never come to fruition, but all of his baseless claims were dismissed, just as they should have been. Hoyle sold his soul to win, and the God of Justice made sure that he lost, as the truth and facts of the case dictated.

[www.vaticancatholic.com](http://www.vaticancatholic.com)

---

<sup>9</sup> There's even more extremely revealing information about Eric Hoyle, which we will release in the near future if we deem it necessary.