



CAMINO REAL DE TEJAS

Traditionalist Carlist Circle

DFW,

6/3/2022

Carlist Motto: God-Fatherland-Charter Rights-King

1-God:

Carlism invokes God to affirm its theocentric view of the world and of life, in the strictest fidelity to the age-old teachings of the chair of St. Peter, whose mission it adopts as its own. The fundamental basis upon which The Spains were built was its religion: Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman, together with the unity and juridical consequences with which it was traditionally loved and served in our realms.

“Thus, the empire of our Redeemer embraces all men. To use the words of Our immortal predecessor, Pope Leo XIII: "His empire includes not only Catholic nations, not only baptized persons who, though of right belonging to the Church, have been led astray by error, or have been cut off from her by schism, but also all those who are outside the Christian faith; so that truly the whole of mankind is subject to the power of Jesus Christ." Nor is there any difference in this matter between the individual and the family or the State; for all men, whether collectively or individually, are under the dominion of Christ. In him is the salvation of the individual, in him is the salvation of society. "Neither there is salvation in any other, for there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved." He is the author of happiness and true prosperity for every man and for every nation. "For a nation is happy when its citizens are happy. What else is a nation but a number of men living in concord?" If, therefore, the rulers of nations wish to preserve their authority, to promote and increase the prosperity of their countries, they will not neglect the public duty of reverence and obedience to the rule of Christ. What We said at the beginning of Our Pontificate concerning the decline of public authority, and the lack of respect for the same, is equally true at the present day. "With God and Jesus Christ," we said, "excluded from political life, with authority derived not from God but from man, the very basis of that authority has been taken away, because the chief reason of the distinction between ruler and subject has been eliminated. The result is that human society is tottering to its fall, because it has no longer a secure and solid foundation."

When once men recognize, both in private and in public life, that Christ is King, society will at last receive the great blessings of real liberty, well-ordered discipline, peace and harmony.

(Pope Pius XI, *Quas Primas*, December 11, 1925.)

“To allow the masses, invariably uninformed and impulsive, to make decisions on the most serious matters, is this not to hand oneself over to chance and deliberately run towards the abyss? Yes, it would be more appropriate to call universal suffrage universal madness and, when the secret societies have taken control of it as is all too often the case, universal falsehood.” (Pope Pius IX, Statement to French pilgrims, May 5, 1874, cited by Abbe Georges de Nantes, CCR # 333, p. 24.)

The tradition of the Spains is the establishment of the mandates of Christ as the laws of society, reestablishing in present circumstances the intractably Christian spirit of medieval Christendom. This meant seeking the social kingship of Christ and, the crowning of his individual kingship in each soul. For this reason, the tradition of the Spains is not merely the zeal for conservation, but for restoration. An order must be established in the form of the concrete liberties that sprung forth from Christian principles.

Consequently, Catholicism:

- a) It is the religious truth, and, being truth, it is one and indisputable.
- b) It is the skeleton, the spiritual and metaphysical structure of the Spains. The Spanish fatherland is impossible without the internal unity of the Hispanic peoples in the Roman Catholic faith.

We owe our fatherland, understood as a unity of Catholic missionary faith, the same duties we owe our parents (4th Commandment),

St. THOMAS AQUINAS: “*Quod pietas se extendit ad patriam*”. This duty towards our fatherland, equal to our duty towards our parents, obliges us to maintain Catholic unity as the spiritual substance of Spain. The destruction of the Catholic unity of the Spains would mean the destruction of the fatherland, a sin tantamount to encouraging or simply permitting the murder of one’s own bodily parents.

2-Fatherland:

The concept comes from the Spanish word “Patria”. Patria comes from the Latin word “Pater” which means “Father”. Fatherland is a concept rooted in tradition. The father is the head of the household. Hence, the King is the father of the larger household, the land. Carlism invokes the fatherland to signify its support for a traditional and historical federalism, based on the Tridentine idea of concrete and fallen man. Fatherland represents the historical federation of the different kingdoms and their privileges and liberties, integrating the unity of the Spanish fatherland.

Modern parlance uses the word nation to refer to peoples, defining the nation according to physical traits or as manifestations of the will: geography, race, language, the plebiscite habitually renewed, a wall... Tradition, on the other hand, defines peoples as accumulated history, taking the aforementioned physical traits into account only to the degree that they have had an effect on a people’s historical trajectory, but never as relevant in themselves, directly and exclusively. This difference in terminology is not trivial. It is rooted in something of great importance: traditional thought never departs from the Christian view of man, whereas vulgar speech is steeped in positivist ideology. Tradition is based on the doctrine of the classical Spains; On the other hand, positivism is based on the preposterous ideological presuppositions of the 19th century. This is why only modern law and political science speak in terms of nations, ignoring the meaning of tradition as the recognition of living history in modern political problems.

Peoples are traditions. Tradition springs from life. It is, in the words of Enrique GIL ROBLES, “the continuity of life itself.” Indeed, all life condenses into a series of experiences and deeds that endure once the man who carried them out and accomplished them has disappeared from the land of the living. Every human existence builds up a treasure that can be transmitted to those that come after it; it is the fact of being an heir to the treasure accumulated by previous generations that distinguishes man from irrational animals. When we are born, we are not born naked and abstractly. On the contrary, we are born into the possession of certain formulas transmitted by our parents and which constitute what we call our culture and our tradition. This is what DONOSO CORTÉS referred to when he so admirably stated: “Peoples without traditions become savage.”

The concept of tradition arises from this ability to sociologically transmit knowledge. It is simply the essential receptivity of social life, projected through the centuries and made a tangible reality in the historical moment in which we live. It is a direct consequence of the sociable appetite of man, which consists not only in coexisting with others, but also in vertically perpetuating one's own works in the lives of one's descendants. The yearning to become eternal—biologically manifested in the love of parents for their children, a trait shared with animals—is sublimated in tradition, which makes our own works long-lasting, taken up by those who shall complete them. A father who educates his children fulfills the law of tradition, crowning, through a rationally developed scheme, the biological urge to perpetuate the species.

For Carlism, regions are not nations, but rather the various peoples joined in the single Spanish “nation”, the fatherland invoked by the sacred motto of our cause. Thus, Fatherland means that the Spains are at the same time unity and variety. They are a unity because there is only one nation, Spain. But they are also a regional variety because their personality, forged by history, only comes to be on the basis of the integration of each region into the common fatherland. It is therefore not possible to confuse regionalism with nationalism, that is a modern ideology.

3-Charter Rights (Privileges-State Rights):

Carlism invokes privileges to declare that with them it defends the real and concrete juridical-political liberties minted by history.

The Spanish word fuero [privilege] comes from the Latin forum, the name of the place where justice was administered. It later came to refer to the body of precedents issued by the courts. Afterwards, following the universal rule by which the law is formed, it came to denote the body of laws belonging exclusively to a city or estate. It finally came to have the meaning of the body of peculiar laws by which each of the Spanish peoples are ruled.

Privileges imply the following theses:

a) That man is a concrete being and not an abstract entity as the revolution holds.

b) That liberties, that is, each man's circle of activities, according to circumstances, are framed in the case of a specific people within the juridical and social canons resulting from their particular tradition, and become incarnate in norms created by privilege, not in the laws the revolution delights in dictating.

c) That in the opposition "liberty versus equality" that eats away at the heart of revolutionary thought, it is necessary to affirm the primacy of liberty.

d) That the systems of concrete liberties of the various Hispanic traditions are preferable to the abstract liberty of the revolution.

e) And those privileges are the only guarantee of authentic political liberty, and not the declarations of rights or the parchment constitutions.

Carlism understands man as an integral being, born in a terrestrial setting but projected into an existence beyond it. Carlism knows that man is not born as the animals are, to devour food or to win victory in the violent struggle among the species, but to attain a paradise above and to edify here below the terrestrial city through the continuation of a concrete historical lineage. It sees society as vertically ordered in accordance with moral and material interests, not horizontally into one or many political parties. In short, Carlism affirms that political philosophy must begin from the concrete man of tradition, not the abstract man of the revolution.

The mission of politics is not to define unrealizable abstractions, but to make it possible for each man to exercise his liberty in the election of his transcendent destiny, so that his free nature develops in a way that is not harmful to itself or to the social order of which he and his neighbors are a part. But this being so, it is evident that such ends are only attainable when human existence is articulated into organic systems of concrete liberties, which allow all persons, physical or moral, individual or social, to direct their activities toward the realization of peculiar goals.

In sum, that man has the condition of a concrete being, capable of using only concrete political liberties.

Carlism defends the historical reality of privileges as systems of concrete political liberties. Privileges express the liberties that have grown organically, through the ripening of the past into the historical present. They therefore possess none of the characteristics of the liberty of the European

revolution. They are not aprioristic and abstract liberties, for they spring from the living tradition, fashioned by precise historical actions. They are not mechanical guarantees, defended by political checks and balances of power or by equilibria of pressure groups in each sociological circumstance. Privileges are the deep expression of the vitality of the mystical social body, which remains robust as long as it possesses its own energies and does not fall into the anemia of liberal individualism or into the coma of totalitarian statism.

The juridical and political incarnation of society conceived in accordance with traditional criteria. This is why they act as both a barrier and course for social action. They are defensive barriers of the circle of activities that pertain to each man according to the position he occupies in social life: as the father of a family, as the member of a community, as a worker in a profession. They are courses through which that free action of individuals flows, framed sociologically and legally within the margins of their position in common life. Privileges are the guarantee of the use and the impediment to the abuse of human liberties. This is why, in politics, they express the only realist position possible.

Privileges are full legal systems, a fundamental part of the juridical order, equal to any other. In particular, they are equal to decreed legislation or statute, of which many think privileges are nothing but a subordinate table of regulatory exceptions. Privileges are the juridical face of the political order of the Hispanic tradition. In sum, privileges possess both a technical specificity in the science of law and their own peculiar philosophical foundations, as well as decisive consequences in politics. 114. A privilege is a legal norm. The wise king ALPHONSE X OF CASTILE defined privileges as legal norms characterized primarily by their customary and usual preexistence: *“Privilege is a thing in which two things of which we have already spoken abide: use and custom; both must be found in the privilege so that it be firm.”*

A privilege thus combines the value of use (a continuous practice in legal matters) and of custom (unwritten law). Both of these traits make it equivalent to a statute, as the commentator Gregorio LÓPEZ summarized: *“Forus dicitur ius ab usu et consuetudine causatus, quod pro lege servatur”* (“The name privilege is given to a right caused by use and custom, which is observed as law”).

A privilege is therefore a customary law, thus ancient, as opposed to a decreed law or statute, which by definition is new and innovative. A privilege is also a popular norm, that is, whose origin is in the people, unlike the decreed law, in whose formation the community itself does not participate. In its formation, the privilege passes through the hands of the jurists, who gather and fix the customs. In this, it coincides with a decreed law, though the role of the jurists in its formation is much less free and creative than in the latter case. A privilege, finally, is sanctioned by the legislator, just as a decreed law, except that in the case of the privilege the legislator is to a much greater degree subject to the authentic will of the people. The WISE KING already spoke of all this in his delicious Old Spanish, in the most succinct manner, when he admonished that: *“It must be done with the counsel of good and learned men, and with the will of the lord, and at the pleasure of those upon whom it is placed”* (*“deve se fazer con consejo de omes buenos e sabidores, e con voluntad del señor, e con plazer de aquellos sobre que los pone”*). A privilege is therefore a technically perfect norm, for while the decree proceeds from the exclusive will of the lord and the custom from the exclusive will of the subject, the privilege results from a harmonic combination of both: it is sanctioned by the lord, but only as a custom established previously by the people.

The process by which a privilege is configured follows the following steps:

- a) The members of a community spontaneously form legal uses.
- b) The jurists doctrinally fix those uses and give them the technical character of customs.
- c) The members of the community, through public opinion and their representatives (political or not) demand their recognition by the legitimate authority.
- d) The authority grants this recognition (usually after a difficult negotiation and dialogue) by promulgating the privilege as a law, giving it adequate procedures for its enforcement and for the punishment of all conduct contrary to it. It also commits to abstain from promulgating decreed laws that contradict those set down in the privilege, and also to modify those in existence so that they may be compatible with it.
 - a) It is a law, not just a custom, a use, a declaration, a program, or a bill.

- b) It is a general law for the smaller community from whence it originated, and not a mere concession granted to certain physical or moral persons.
- c) It is a normal law, not an exceptional or transitory one.
- d) It is a primary law, and not a secondary one for filling the gaps in the decreed legislation. To the contrary, it has a higher rank than decreed legislation, for the latter must be rejected when it contradicts the privilege.
- e) It is a popular law, for it arises from the initiative of the people without the intervention of its representatives.
- f) It is an enforceable law, very especially enforceable, for it was already obeyed and complied with even before it was formally born as such.
- g) It is a coercive law, not only with regard to the subjects, but also with regard to the legitimate authority itself. It is therefore the prototypical way of attaining that welfare State under the rule of law of which modern constitutional and international legal scholarship speaks.

For Carlism, in sum, natural rights depend on the God-given nature of man, above and before all the historical constructions brought forth by human hands. But these rights only become effective and enforceable when they exist in history, because sociability is a necessary requirement for human nature to attain full development. Privileges recognize these concrete rights and make them into law.

4- King:

Royalty for Carlism is not a person, not even a dynasty—royalty for Carlism is the supreme institution of the Spains. As such, it fulfills a triple service, from the duty for which it derives its right to supremacy:

- a) To represent the external unity of the various Spanish peoples.
- b) To unite all the individuals, families, provinces, and regions of Spain in loyalty to a single monarch.
- c) To rule in the service of the concrete privileged liberties, directing them to the greatness of the fatherland.

Hence, the main characteristics of this Monarchy must be:

- a) Catholic.

- b) Historical: The accumulation of historical rights
- c) Social: A monarchy that is not absolute but limited.
- d) Responsible: There is no distinction between reigning and ruling.
- e) Privilegist: Ruling according to the local law (Privileges).
- f) And hereditary: To ensure the continuity of the institution.

The three primary duties of the Crown:

- a) The duty to subject all policy to the postulates of Catholic morals, especially in the areas of economics and administration.
- b) The duty of adopting an unqualified fidelity to the teachings of the Roman see, in accordance with the corresponding levels of legal and moral obligation implied by the various grades of its magisterium.
- c) And the duty of favoring in all cases the spiritual interests of Christendom, which are those that promote the instauration of the social kingship of Jesus Christ.

Finally, the principle of legitimacy in order to secure the rightful heir to the Crown is twofold: The legitimacy of origin and the legitimacy of exercise. Both required in order to reign.

Conclusion:

“The Spains are an amalgamation of peoples, within and beyond the Iberian Peninsula, each endowed with particular historical, cultural, institutional, political, and juridical characteristics, all of them irrevocably united by two ties: **“faith in the same God and fidelity to the same king.”**”

This is a summary and adaptation of the Carlist motto by Eduardo Ordoñez with excerpts from the book “What is Carlism” written by Francisco ELÍAS DE TEJADA Y SPÍNOLA, Rafael GAMBRA CIUDAD and Francisco PUY MUÑOZ (1971). Translated to English by Pedro José Izquierdo (2016)

Fort Worth, Texas, March 8, 2021

Liberalism & the Liberal Revolution:

If we decide to seriously study the topic of Liberalism, one of the first things that we must realize is that Liberalism is a sin condemned by the magisterium of the Church. It has been condemned multiple times-- in all its variations and degrees. These condemnations begin in the year 1832 when Pope Gregory XVI promulgated his encyclical, "Mirari Vos," and include Pope Leo XIII's "Libertas Praestantissimum," Pope St. Pius X's "Pascendi Dominici Gregis" of 1907, and Pope Pius XII's "Humani Generis" of 1950. Hence, Liberalism is a moral disorder; in this case, mainly originating in the intellect, based on a false but very tempting notion of liberty as we shall see.

The Classical Age began the quest to study things and ideas. Intellectuals directed their first efforts towards the etymology of a word; the study of its name. Thus, we begin our approach. Liberalism came from the Latin word, "liberalis" which meant 'done or made with liberty.' Up until the 20th century the word "liberal" had to do with generosity. Therefore, when someone gave generous alms to the poor, it was said that such a person was very "liberal," meaning 'generous.' It was in the 19th century that the word "liberal" received a different meaning, one of a political nature, that over time replaced the original meaning. Consequently, "liberalism" came to refer to an ideology (or false philosophy). This ideology attacked the truths of the Faith, hence the condemnations of the Church began. The first country to suffer from the transformation of the word, "liberalism" from its original meaning to the ideological one, was Spain through the first "liberal" constitution of Cadiz in 1812.

"Liberal" and "Liberalism" were words which also existed in the Anglo-Saxon countries. Liberalism pre-existed the Spanish experience since at least 1689 when John Locke published the "Two treatises". However, they didn't merge yet with the ideological connotation inherited later on from the Spanish "liberal" experience, and then, only in part. This explains why in the US the political connotation (of "liberal") refers only to the left-leaning progressivists and not to the so-called "Conservatives," even though these are as liberal in essence as the left-wingers. In addition, the word "Liberalism" contained different degrees and extended its ideological meaning over different fields such as religion and economics as well as politics. Therefore, an initial observation of the word "Liberalism" is that it has multiple meanings.

Liberalism has been mistakenly described as a Philosophy. Philosophy is commonly translated according to its etymology as love (Philo) for wisdom (Sophia). This (human) love for wisdom implicitly contains the natural inclination to apprehend external reality as it is. This is the reason why God created us with a conscience. The conscience is the tool to receive, comprehend, and make judgments concerning external objective data. On the other hand, an ideology is a configuration that the mind uses to apprehend reality according to one, two, or more specific pre-selected ideas. This process alters the function for which God gave us Conscience. It no longer directs its effort to understand reality as such. In turn, the ideology modifies progressively the apprehension of reality by the conscience, which could lead to the ultimate replacement of external reality by a man-made scenario of one's choosing, called nowadays, "virtual reality." This is a tragic intellectual process where suddenly, Conscience does not comprehend reality anymore but makes up reality or it pretends to do so. This is the pretension that is behind the desire to mutilate one's body and change one's sex; or for two men or two women to get "married" and have children; or for a mutilated male to compete in and win a given women's sport competition. A society based on this irrationality is doomed to fail. Hence, the description that Professor Miguel Ayuso gives to Liberalism as "Luciferian liberty"; the liberty of those who want to be like God (but aren't and never will be).

All ideologies are false philosophies. Furthermore, from a traditionalist point of view, Liberalism is the mother, the origin, of all modern ideologies; be they liberal democracies, fascism, nationalism, socialism, communism, etc. No matter how different these political movements could appear throughout history they are all the result of the confused logic of the Liberal Revolution.

For now, we will just concentrate on the sources of Liberalism which are three: Protestantism, Naturalism and Vitalism. These three are the main intellectual influences behind Liberalism.

Protestantism infected Christendom with the false notion of "free examination" which broke not only the religious unity of Christendom but the traditional understanding of Conscience and the function it performs for the human intellect. Conscience became the sole referee by which to judge any writings in the Bible -- a judgement held by the idea of the absolute sovereignty of the individual. Consequently, there were as many (and contradictory) interpretations of the Holy Bible as individuals dared to

proclaim. History showed how this erroneous idea destroyed the traditional principle of authority and thus broke the religious unity of Christendom. When this error was secularized and transferred to the society, it brought about other sub-ideas such as proclaiming man to be the “maker (or author) of his own destiny.”

The second influence of Liberalism was Naturalism. Naturalism proposed a pseudo-order of nature devoid of any kind of morality. Naturalism was chiefly applied to New Economics, and you can read about it in Adam Smith’s main work, “The Wealth of the Nations.” These naturalistic “laws” rule human (economic) interactions without reference to (Christian) morality. For example, “the law of supply and demand.” This ‘law’ lacked any reference to morality. It is an example of what makes Naturalism a pseudo, consequently false, order of nature. Liberalism creates a new universe of things that alters objective reality in order to replace it with something else. This constitutes a false logic that permeates all human interactions.

Lastly, we have the influence of Vitalism. Vitalism attempted to explain the nature of life from a constant force. This “vital force” flows and changes according to the times. This concept destroyed the principle of noncontradiction and gave birth to the pseudo-ideas we hear nowadays such as the concept of “fluid truth.” That truth is no longer something objective and unchangeable, not affected by the passing of time but rather it self-identifies as something that progressively changes. Vitalism is what is behind the idea of longing for “progress” in the Church (changing dogmas) and moral progress in the secular society (changing morality), in short-- the rejection of tradition -- tradition understood as the faithful transmission of wisdom from generation to generation, from father to son, from master to apprentice, etc.

Finally, this takes us to the degrees of Liberalism which are also three: radical, moderate, and soft. The radical degree of Liberalism aims openly to deny dogma and its consequences. The moderate degree of Liberalism aims at questioning the validity of dogma. Finally, the soft degree of Liberalism aims at spreading out indifferentism towards dogma. Since the treaty of Westphalia in 1648, we can observe how the political structures of traditional Christian societies in the West began to change to signify a swift new understanding of liberty and the will of the people. Thus, the reign of

Liberalism commenced employing these different degrees and influences according to the specific circumstances of each country.

Destruction of Christendom timeline:

1. The protestant revolution; Luther broke the political and religious unity of Christendom. 1517.
2. Maquiavelli published “The Prince”. This book was key in breaking the moral unity and ethics between the ruler and his people. 1532.
3. Henry VIII appointed himself as the national vicar of Christ for England, rejecting Rome and giving birth to the Anglican heresy. 1534
4. Jean Bodin elaborated the theory of the absolute sovereignty of the State. 1576.
5. Treaty of Westphalia: It gave birth to the state founded on the modern concept of Nation. 1648
6. Thomas Hobbes published the “Leviathan” which constituted the framework of the modern state based on the social contract theory. 1651.
7. John Locke published the “two treatises” in England and became the major proponent of Liberalism and key influencer in exporting this ideology to the 13th North East Colonies. 1689.
8. Rosseau: Redefines the social contract theory. 1762.
9. French Revolution. 1789.

Timeline of Christendom’s resistance in Spain:

1. Spanish war of independence against the liberal Napoleonic invasion. 1808.
2. “Manifiesto de los Persas” against the 1st Spanish liberal constitution of Cadiz. 1812
3. First Carlist war. 1834
4. Second Carlist war. 1846
5. Third Carlist war. 1872
6. War of Liberation or Last Crusade. 1936

Some biographies of relevant carlist figures

Santa Cruz Apaizaren, (1842–1926):

Don Manuel de Santa Cruz was a Basque priest from Guipúzcoa county. He was a feared guerrilla war leader that fought for the rights of God and the legitimate king of Spain, Don Carlos VII, in the Third Carlist War against the Liberal Army (1872-76) in Euskalerrria (Basque land in the north of Spain). He was also a Jesuit missionary in Jamaica and in Pasto (Colombia highlands). He was fluent in Basque, Spanish, French, and English.

D. Manuel Ignacio Santa Cruz was born at 5 am on March 23rd, in the “Zamonea” farmhouse (Basques name their country houses as we do name ranches or farm property) in the rural town of Elduayen. He was baptized that very same day at his town church. His father fought in the first Carlist War (1833-1840) and passed away four months after SantaCruz was born. His cousin who was already a priest brought the priestly vocation to SantaCruz. He himself was ordained a priest in 1866 after training at the diocesan seminary in the city of Vitoria.

His cousin priest Francisco Antonio Sasiain comments that by 1868 his homilies were fired up denouncing the liberal errors and the wicked fruits of the revolution that by then were reaching the north of Spain. “He looked like a lion in a cage roaring and ready to bite.” During this time SantaCruz often mentally recreated the battles fought by General Zumalacárregui (a very famous Carlist general during the first Carlist War) thinking of all the strategies, potential ambushes, and escapes he could manage.

He never thought he was doing anything that could jeopardize his priestly vocation in any way, shape, or form. He was fighting for the rights of God and the true king in a Holy War, like many other priests in the area such as Muñagorri, don Pedro Leñara Lasarte, Macazaga, Orio’s town priest, Canacheverría, Solio, Mekobalde, and an ex-Jesuit father Gorriena from Vizcaya province in addition of other priests from other Spanish territories like Toledo, Avila or Cataluña. For all of them to fight for Don Carlos was to fight for the cause of God.

The Santa Cruz Apaizaren (the priest SantaCruz) was not tall but was strong. He had a distrustful look in his grey eyes and a thick, shiny beard. His clothes were neither of a priest nor of a soldier but of a peasant. They consisted of a small navy blue txapela (beret), a fur coat of wool, and blue pants that

covered his thick and strong calves. He was frugal, chaste, and energetic. He walked incredibly fast through the woods and he was always watching to the point it was impossible to surprise him. His boys (that's how he called his troops) said of him he slept with one eye open like hares.

SantaCruz never coveted war honors, medals, or military recognition of any kind. He was foreign to conventional war and military bureaucracy. He only envisioned war his way and on his terms with independence and minimum supervision from the Carlist Army forces. He wanted to report to the King and expected the Carlist generals to allow him to do the war his own way via blood and fire, ambushes, and social terror. His way was a type of holy war that knows no surrender and that it is above earthly recognitions. His endurance and personal self-giving during times of war and peace as well as his attitude of never surrendering knew no limits. And, that's what made him a model Christian soldier.

Liberals suspected him of conspiracy as early as 1870 when the third Carlist War was about to commence. Liberal troops came to arrest him while he was about to start mass at the Church. He managed to escape disguised as a farmer and that was the beginning of the SantaCruz Troops and the numerous ambushes perpetrated against the Liberal army all over the north of Spain. Liberals were terrified of his sudden attacks and the ability to transfer troops from town to town quickly overnight.

The Carlist generals persuaded king Don Carlos VII to remove SantaCruz from any official post or authority within the Carlist ranks due to his "independence," "insubordination," and war "excesses." They were even able to have him condemned for the death penalty on these accounts. Even though some of it was true, such as the sudden executions of Liberal spies on the spot, including women, the majority of the charges were due to the envy that his success during the war caused in the Carlist generals. These generals wanted to rally their troops through a conventional war much like the British did. SantaCruz and his partida were fast, attacking any time, day or night, and by the time the Liberal army reorganized themselves to repel the attack the SantaCruistas were gone, back into the mountains.

Once the war was lost, SantaCruz had to flee Spain and crossed the border into France. There he came in contact with the Jesuits. He always had a strong devotion to Saint Ignatius of Loyola and his Jesuit vocation was put

on a 3-year test to make sure all done during war time was purged. He became a Jesuit on the feast of Saint Ignatius of Loyola in 1922.

He was sent to England where he advanced his English skills. It is known that once in London, exiled King Don Carlos VII went to Mass. He was impressed by the devotion of the priest who wore a long beard and was thought to be a Spanish Capuchin. King Carlos VII went after mass to say hello to this priest. As he entered into the sacristy, the priest kneeled at his feet and kissed his hand. It was SantaCruz. They spent hours talking and the king invited him to breakfast. Once SantaCruz had the opportunity to explain to the king the war according to him, the King left sad for what could have been and he and SantaCruz became re-acquainted again.

After his time in England, SantaCruz was sent to the missions in Jamaica and in Pasto (Colombian highlands). He converted many, but his evangelical contribution in Colombia was outstanding. He converted the whole tribe populating those mountains and built a beautiful white Church in honor of Saint Ignatius of Loyola that is still standing to this day. He was venerated by the Indians as a saint during his lifetime and miracles of healing from cancer were attributed to him. Don Manuel de SantaCruz passed away in the year 1926 of Our Lord.



Antonio Molle Lazo. Carlist Martyr. (1915-1936)

On May 10th 1931, a major religious persecution began in Spain. Priests, especially Jesuits, started to receive death threats. Churches and convents were burned in Madrid. In a few days, a total of 107 religious buildings were burned down only in the Madrid area. Quickly these acts spread out to other cities like: Cadiz, Seville, Granada, and Valencia. From then on, the attacks against all things Catholic were in crescendo up until reaching its diabolical climax in the Summer of 1936. 13 bishops were killed, 4,184 priests, around 3,000 religious persons including seminarians, and over 300 nuns were also killed, resulting in almost 8,000 killings. Pope Pius XI and Pope Pius XII referred to these events as “True Martyrdom” and celebrated the generosity of those who fought for the rights of Christ and his Church, in accord with the proclamation by the Archbishop of Toledo, Cardinal Goma, and the rest of Spanish bishops that were able to escape from the zone controlled by the Communist and people of the “Popular Front”. From all the martyrs, there is a story we cannot forget. The martyrdom of Antonio Molle Lazo.

Antonio Molle Lazo was born in Arcos de la Frontera (Cadiz, South west coast of Spain) on April 2nd 1915. It was Good Friday. Soon after his mother gave birth, the procession of “Our Father Jesus Nazarian” passed by his house. His parents Carlos and Maria Josefa were fervent Catholics and patriotic. They forecasted his martyrdom. Young Antonio learned from his parents to hold steadfast on principles, religious piety, and the value of family life. When Antonio was 5 months old the family moved to Jerez de la Frontera (Inland Andalucía) for job reasons. The family never enjoyed a prosperous lifestyle. In fact, sometimes Carlos, the father, found himself with no job. Antonio was enrolled in a Christian school managed by the Lasalle Brothers. He was not remembered as an intellectually bright student but a hard worker and as one who put a great deal of effort into finishing his studies, which he did. He received his first communion in 1925, the year Pope Pius XI installed the Feast of Christ the King into the liturgical calendar. This made a big impression on Antonio who devoted himself to learning more about the doctrine of Christ the King. He was also enrolled into the Mount Carmel scapular devotion by the Carmelite nuns who lived close by in a monastery. His personal and public devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary and the daily recitation of the Holy Rosary were constant highlights of his personality. He

started to work at the train station at 11 years old. His classmates said of him that one day he will be a great defender of religion because he could not tolerate evil before his presence. He encouraged his friends to attend Holy Mass in those churches surrounded by a majority of Communists in their neighborhoods. He cut off right away any conversations that could lead to entertaining vice and was a big fan of sports as a practical way to avoid a life of concupiscence. At the age of 16 years old in 1931, he enrolled in the Carlist Youth ministry. His Carlist leaning came from his family's legacy but also from the vivid defense of the Faith, Catholic Spain, and the rights of the Church that the Carlist have sustained for so long. He enjoyed attending the Carlist circle where they discussed present matters, played games, and had "merienda" (Spanish afternoon snack). He also led a group of young spies that infiltrated in the meetings and gatherings of Communist and anarchists' associations with the objective to find out which Churches and convents they should go to protect in advance and what priests should be made aware of any potential assaults coming their way. Antonio Molle Lazo also participated actively in the public propaganda and distribution of Carlist merchandise in the streets when Carlist public gatherings were celebrated. This made him known.

In February 1936, all the left wings groups (Communists, Socialists, Anarchists) joined together in a political coalition called "the Popular Front". This coalition came to power after running a vastly fraudulent election all over Spain. The religious persecution that was already in place took a more violent and hateful turn against all things Catholic then. Antonio Molle Lazo was arrested shortly after for spreading Carlist propaganda while shouting "Viva Cristo-Rey" and "Viva España y Viva El Rey" at the train station. Once in jail, he spent his time singing all the Catholic songs he learned from his childhood as the "Salve Regina". Singing in the jail was forbidden so, when rebuked, he instead wrote Christian prayers with chalk on the walls. Days later, his brother Carlos ended up in the same jail with other Catholics that were arrested for defending the Convent of St. Domingo in the town of Jerez de la Frontera. He missed not to be able to receive Holy Communion so he devoted himself to reciting the Holy Rosary alone in the cell or along with other Catholics arrested in the nearby cells. The few friends that came to visit him, brought books about the martyrs and the Saints at his request. These books gave him great consolation while reinforcing the idea that his sufferings were nothing compared with what the Martyrs of the Church

endured. This is how the martyrial soul of Antonio Molle Lazo was shaping towards his final act of generosity: to give up his life for Christ. On May 16th Antonio Molle Lazo was set free. On July 18th 1936, the uprising of the National Army and the Carlist troops against the Republic and its Popular Front was official. The Carlist troops were able to protect several towns around Seville, like Jerez de la Frontera, and thanks to that, Catholics were able to attend Holy Mass and receive Holy Communion. Antonio Molle Lazo received the Lord in the Eucharist on August 6th, 8th, and 10th. On the 10th, eye witnesses related the deep recollection Antonio Molle Lazo displayed after receiving the Lord in the Chapel of the sisters of the Cross in the City of Peñaflores. Many believed he was offering himself as an immolated victim to the Lord, however this could not be verified. What most likely happened is that he recited the act of accepting death which was very common among Carlists. That very day, the Communists launched a brutal attack against this city and were able to surround the convent where Antonio Molle Lazo was and planned to burn it down with the people inside. Somewhere able to escape the Communist corridor but Antonio stood there with other fellow Catholics trying to protect the nuns and other women that attended Mass, providing an escape for all.

He was the last one and he was finally apprehended by the Communists who beat him, mocked him and brought him outside to the street. They began to torture him attempting to have him deny the Faith and to blaspheme the Lord. They wanted him to shout “Death to Religion and Long life to Russia” and he replied with “Viva España and Viva Cristo-Rey”. The torture increased. They threatened to kill him and drink his blood. He replied, “You can kill me but Christ will triumph.” The Communists went onto cutting his ears and his nose. Antonio’s only words during this excruciating pain were, “Oh, my God” and “Viva Cristo-Rey.” He was receiving blows all over his body, especially in the head, but Antonio did not deny the Faith. At that moment, they pulled out his eyes. They opened his shirt and saw the Carlist “Détente” medal he wore. The medal is an image of the Sacred Heart with the Spanish flag in the background. At that moment, Antonio understood that his final moment had arrived and extended his arms and placed his legs like Our Lord on the Cross and shouted one more time, the last time: “Viva Cristo-Rey.” Then a shot to the chest ended his life. He fell flat in the middle of the road. His body was still moving and some of the killers wanted to shoot him again, but others said, “Let him suffer.” They continued to launch blows

and knife strikes to the body. He stopped breathing, his heart stopped, and he was left alone in the road in a cross position. His killers wore his ears, eyes and nose as trophies in their shirts. It was 4pm.

Miraculously, the Carlist troops and the National Army together were able to conquer back Peñaflor shortly after and Antonio's body was picked up from the road. Eye witnesses related then what they saw and a Mass was offered for his soul the day after as the town was secured. News of Antonio Molle Lazo's martyrrial death spread like fire between the Carlist troops and the faithful. Soon, prayer cards and news of healings due to his intercession were running across Spain and overseas. In 1940, his canonization process was opened. **X**



An Irish carlist Soldier

John Scannell Taylor was a 23-year-old man from Cork, Ireland, who fought and died in the army of King Carlos VII of Spain. He was born around 1850 and was a law student at University College Cork before he left for Spain to enlist as a Private under the Carlist General Don Antonio Lizárraga y Esquiroz. However, he was soon made a Lieutenant in the Cazadores de Azpeitia unit. He was presented to the King by Lizárraga as a young man of much promise. However, in his first action, at the Battle of Ibero (near Iruña, or Pamplona) on 23rd July 1873, he was wounded twice and continued to lead a charge, before being shot a third and fatal time. His gallantry and bravery were lauded by his fellow Irishmen and women, as well as by his Spanish Carlist comrades. He was buried in the Campo Santo of nearby Ororbia, and there is a funerary monument to him in his native city of Cork in St. Joseph's Cemetery.

The Third Carlist War (1872-6) was a popular insurrection in northern and eastern Spain to place the head of the Bourbon dynasty – Carlos María de Bourbon y Austria-Este, duke de Madrid – on the Spanish throne as King Carlos VII, in succession to his great-grandfather King Carlos IV of Spain. The Duke of Madrid also claimed the throne of France as King Charles XI.

Carlism (Karlismo, Carlisme, or Carlismo as it is known in the Basque, Catalan, and Spanish languages) has been an important force in Spanish politics since 1833, especially in north-eastern Spain. Throughout the Third Carlist War the fighting was reported in Ireland by newspapers like The Nation, who supported King Carlos VII's struggle. The Irish people were keenly interested in the fight, and there were many who joined the ranks of the Carlist forces. Three Corkmen were prominent amongst the Irish contingent: John Scannell Taylor, William Nash Leader, and John Smith Sheehan.

Taylor travelled to Spain with Lieutenant John Smith Sheehan, a veteran of the Papal Zouaves who had fought in the 1860 Papal War. Sheehan wrote soon after Taylor's death: "The poor fellow that came with me, John Taylor, is now no more. He fought like a Bayard and died like a hero. At the attack on Ibero, on the 23rd July, he advanced with a company of Castilian guides, and at the first assault he received two wounds – one in the leg and another in the arm. The attack being renewed, and the officer of the company being

hors de combat, poor Taylor limped at their head, when the fatal ball struck him in the head, leaving my poor friend on the field to rise no more. I don't know whether you are aware of the cause of my leaving him at Lekunberri. Knowing that there were a lot of letters for us at Baiona, and fearing that we were about to enter the interior, and consequently would find it more difficult to get our letters, we proposed to have one of us return to Baiona. A favorable opportunity presented itself. The New York Herald correspondent being obliged to return to France I procured permission for three days. After poor Taylor and I "tossing up" to know who would remain, I lost and had to go. I had to walk seventy-five miles the two following days before reaching Donibane Lohizune. I got Masses offered up for him. I have marked his grave, and will keep some of his things for his family.'

Major William Nash Leader rose to become a high-ranking officer on King Carlos VII's staff. He wrote soon after Taylor's death: 'In the attack on the fortified town of Ibero, in this province, Lieutenant Taylor was twice wounded, firstly in the arm, and afterwards in the leg, but, refusing to retire, continued to advance in front of the company, when he was struck by a third ball in the head and instantly killed. The Carlists are high in praise of his undaunted gallantry, and join with us, his compatriots, in deeply mourning his loss. We have had Masses offered from his soul, and on the first opportunity will pay proper respect to his grave.' After describing the late successes of the Carlists, and stating that they are now in almost undisputed possession of the northern provinces of Spain, Mr. Leader says: 'Lizárraga is at or near Azpeitia and tomorrow I start to rejoin him, accompanied by another Corkman, Mr. Joseph Smith Sheehan, a lieutenant of the Papal Zouaves, who joined the Carlist army some time since, and, with me, is about to return to the front, in order, if possible, to avenge the death of poor Taylor, whom the King told, a few days previous to his death, that all Irishmen would be welcome to his standard, and that he felt deeply for our unhappy country.'

Here is The Nation's report of Taylor's death:

'But in the north and east the Carlists have been carrying everything before them the past week, and as we write the important position of Bilbo may have been surrendered to their kingly chief. One trifling repulse, indeed, they have appeared to have suffered near Iruña, but even there the gloom of defeat was lighted up by at least one act of singular daring and heroism, which chances to have been performed by an Irishman. "Lizárraga's men," says the

telegraphic account, “had the folly to rush on a stone wall pierced with loopholes. A former law student of Cork College, of the name of John Scannell Taylor, was foremost in the attack. He gallantly advanced after receiving two wounds, but a third bullet struck him in the forehead and killed him instantly.” Even the curt brevities of the telegraph cannot conceal the heroism of our countryman, who, it is added, was but twenty-three years of age.’

And another report of Taylor’s death:

‘He arrived from England in the middle of June and attached Himself to the partida of General Lizárraga in order to be near his fellow Corkman, Smith Sheehan. Previous to Mr. Sheehan’s returning to Baiona with despatches, he tossed up a coin to decide whether he or Taylor should have the choice of the duty. Poor Taylor won, and elected to remain with Lizárraga, as there was likelihood of fighting at hand. The very next day Ibero, where the enemy held a strongly entrenched position, was attacked, and the young Irish volunteer made himself conspicuous in the onset. While advancing in the open, setting a pattern of bravery to all by the steady way he delivered his fire, the gallant fellow was struck by a bullet in the leg. He kept on limping until he was touched a second time in the arm, but still he persevered with a dogged courage, when a third bullet struck him in the forehead, and he dropped with outspread arms, raising a little cloud of dust. He must have been stone-dead before he reached the ground. His conduct was “muy valiente,” so said his Spanish comrades. He was picked up after the affair, and decently interred side by side with two officers who met their deaths in his company. This was the first time he was under fire, as it was the last; but there is a fatality in those things.

This young Irishman, Taylor, was luckier than some of his fellows in one respect. Short as he had been in the service, he had attracted the notice of Don Carlos. His comrade Sheehan and he were pointed out to the King by Lizárraga as two modest deserving young soldiers who had offered to fight in the ranks—a trait of unselfishness that must have astonished the Carlist leaders, as most of the volunteers they had from France came out with the full intention of commanding brigades, when divisions were not to be had.

“I wish I had a thousand like them,” said Lizárraga, who was a genuine soldier, and one of the few Spaniards not unjust to foreigners.

Don Carlos shook hands with Mr. Taylor and thanked him. His Majesty spoke some few minutes in French with Mr. Sheehan, and, as the conversation gives some insight into Carlism, I may venture to repeat it.

Don Carlos: You have served before?

Sheehan: Yes, sire, in the Pontifical Zouaves.

Don Carlos: Ha! good. In the same company with my brother, perhaps?

Sheehan: No; but I had the privilege of knowing Don Alfonso.

Don Carlos: He is in Catalonia now, and has many of your old companions in arms with him. You are serving the same cause here as in Rome—the cause of religion and of order and of legitimate right.

Sheehan (bowing): I should not be here if I did not feel that, your Majesty.

Don Carlos (smiling): I thank you sincerely. General Lizárraga tells me you are Irish.

Sheehan: I come from the south of Ireland, sire.

Don Carlos. A country I feel much sympathy for. She has been very unhappy, has she not? Are things better now?

Sheehan: For some years Ireland has been improving, sire.

Don Carlos: That is well. She deserves better fortune, for she has a noble, faithful people.

Don Carlos drew back a pace and made a stiff military nod; the Irishman brought his rifle to the “present arms,” turned on his heel, and marched back to the ranks, and thus the interview terminated.’

Dedicated to the memory of a gallant and brave Corkman, Lieutenant John Scannell Taylor.

