

Combined Response

March 19, 2020

St. Joseph, Patron of the Universal Church, pray for us!

Greetings my friends,

Praised be Jesus, Mary, and St. Joseph now and forever. Rather than give the name of a friend who wrote me emails and asked me to correspond and answer questions, in this letter on the public website I am only going to refer to him as my friend. My friend sent me an email March 5, 2020 and asked “What do you think of the following?”; and then he sent information that was mostly taken from the CMRI website. Correspondence went back and forth for a while and I will herein provide some information – although it will not be the complete in depth answers to explain about all of the articles accessed from the hyperlinks my friend sent me. This *Combined Response* is to answer questions asked in the emails.

One of the articles my friend wanted to know what I think about was: *Traditional Priests, Legitimate Sacraments* by Rev. Anthony Cekada. Therefore, let us start with *Traditional Priests, Legitimate Sacraments* by Rev. Anthony Cekada as found on the CMRI website with the statement, “*Reprinted by permission of Rev. Anthony Cekada.*”

In *Traditional Priests, Legitimate Sacraments* Rev. Anthony Cekada wrote:

“In the case of legitimate deputation for confession, divine law requires that for valid absolution of sinners, a priest must also possess the power of jurisdiction in addition to the power of Holy Orders. No traditional Catholic priest I know of disputes this. ... Abps. Lefebvre and Thuc — were **obliged** to confer Holy Orders on worthy candidates who would then continue to provide sacraments for faithful Catholics throughout the world. ... Moreover, those of us who derive our orders from Abps. Lefebvre or Thuc obviously have no appointment to the *cura animarum* (care of souls).”

Please send me your answers to all of the questions with numbers between these kinds of brackets { }.

{1} Do you agree that in other words, Rev. Anthony Cekada is clearly explaining that every traditional Catholic priest and bishop teaches that every priest and bishop must also possess the power of jurisdiction for the valid absolution of sinners; and because they do not have the *cura animarum* (care of souls), none of them possess ordinary jurisdiction?

Let us recall some other very important truths. I quote from page five of Rev. Anthony Cekada's article, *The Validity of the Thuc Consecrations*:

“Since no one in the Traditional Movement possesses ordinary jurisdiction, no one has the power to rule on the legal evidence that a particular sacrament was performed and then establish it as a fact before Church law.”

Rev. Cekada's article has been widely circulated and read by many people in the Traditional Movement. You can still find it on the World Wide Web. Therefore, it cannot be denied that many people know the truth that: “*No one in the Traditional Movement possesses ordinary jurisdiction*”!

There is an article in the Angelus Press, 1997, page 54, titled: *Most Asked Questions about the Society of Saint Pius X*. The quote can now also be found on the World Wide Web. For over 23 years now, those who read this article know that those in The Society of Saint Pius X do not have jurisdiction:

“Only the Pope, who has universal jurisdiction over the whole Church, can appoint a pastor to a flock and empower him to govern it. But Archbishop Lefebvre never presumed to confer anything but the full priestly powers of Orders, and in no way did he grant any jurisdiction (which he himself did not have personally to give).”

Next, we recall that Archbishop Lefebvre publicly, freely, and truthfully told the world at the time he consecrated the four bishops that they would *not* be ordinaries. That is to say, they would *not have ordinary jurisdiction*.

If bishops do not possess ordinary jurisdiction, they will never delegate jurisdiction to priests because they cannot give what they do not have. Consequently, we learn from their own writings that no traditional Catholic

priest disputes that he needs jurisdiction for the valid absolution of sinners, and none of them have ordinary jurisdiction. Furthermore, I do not know any of the Traditionalist Movement bishops that claim they receive their Power of Orders from the Bishop Thuc lineage that also claim they receive delegated jurisdiction from a pope. If a bishop does not have delegated jurisdiction from the Pope, he cannot delegate jurisdiction to any priest; because you cannot give what you do not have. Apparently the *Traditional Priests, Legitimate Sacraments* article by Rev. Anthony Cekada was written to bring about his conclusion that states a brand-new doctrine unheard of before in the Catholic Church, namely:

“The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself.”

{2} Do you agree therefore that according to their own writings and statements; the Traditionalist Movement bishops do not delegate any jurisdiction to the Traditionalist Movement priests?

{3} Do you agree that Traditionalist Movement bishops coming from Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre also teach that they did not receive any jurisdiction from a Catholic Pope?

{4} Do you agree that according to their own writings and statements, each Traditionalist Movement bishop and each Traditionalist Movement priest receives any jurisdiction he possesses as delegated DIRECTLY to him from Christ Himself?

{5} Do you agree that in the *Traditional Priests, Legitimate Sacraments* article; Rev. Anthony Cekada did not provide a single quote from sacred Scripture, a Pope, Council of the Church, Father of the Church, Doctor of the Catholic Church, or even a canonized Saint that teaches the same thing as Rev. Anthony Cekada and the Traditionalist Movement clerics; namely, “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been delegated to us from Christ Himself”?

{6} Do you agree that in his article *Traditional Priests, Legitimate Sacraments* Rev. Anthony Cekada neglects to address that contrary to his conclusion, the teachings of the Catholic Church clearly provide the Catholic doctrine that all jurisdiction comes to the bishops through the successor of St. Peter; and not delegated to bishops or priests directly from Christ Himself?

Bishop Sanborn said the following during his video when he was talking to people in London in 2013:

Why is this so? Because the authority of the Church is the authority of Christ. Pope Pius XII said it in *Mystici Corporis*; that the authority, the power of the Pope is the same as the authority of Christ. There are not two heads in the sense of two different authorities. There is the invisible head, Christ, and the visible head, the Pope. The Pope is the Vicar of Christ; they both have the same authority. So the authority of the Pope is the same as the authority of Christ.

{7} Do you agree that the statements of Bishop Sanborn, “the power of the Pope is the same as the authority of Christ” and “the authority of the Pope is the same as the authority of Christ”, are the correct teaching according to Catholic doctrine?

The following is a partial transcript of some of the things stated by Bishop Pivarunas during a YouTube movie concerning Sedevacantism – starting at about 15 minutes and 20 seconds into the video:

You know the issue is; this is for me the absolute bottom line. Christ said to His Apostles: “He who hears you hears me. Whatever you bind on earth is bound in heaven; whatever you loose on earth is loosed in heaven. Teach all nations everything I have commanded. I am with you all days. I will send the Advocate, the Spirit of Truth who will teach you all things and abide with you forever. He who does not believe what you teach will be condemned.” Christ founded a teaching Church, that teaching Church is infallible. And if we look at Vatican I, which reiterated, right out of the Vatican, we are talking about this quote right here. Vatican I says very clearly: “For the Fathers of the Fourth Council of Constantinople, following closely the footsteps of their predecessors made the solemn profession: The first condition of salvation is to keep the norm of the true faith. For it is impossible that the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, where He says, ‘thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build My Church,’ should not be verified. And the truth has been proved by the course of

history. In the Apostolic See the Catholic Religion has **always** been kept unsullied and its teachings kept holy. ALWAYS! Can we say that now of these modern so-called popes? Absolutely, positively not! And right here on the second page: “Indeed, it was this Apostolic doctrine that all the Fathers held, and all the Orthodox Fathers and Doctors revered and followed. For they fully realize that this See of St. Peter **always** remains untainted by any error. According to the divine promise our Lord and Savior made to the Prince of His disciples: “I have prayed for thee Peter, I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and do thou once confirm, strengthen thy brethren.” Now this Charism of truth and never failing faith was conferred upon St. Peter and his successors in this chair. Okay, it is the infallibility of the Church.

Now we are going to take a moment and give you one more quote here. This is from Pope Leo XIII in *Satis Cognitum*: “If the living *Magisterium*, the teaching authority of the Church, could in any way be false, an evident contradiction follows; because then God Himself would be the author of error.” What he is saying is; Jesus said to his Apostles: “He who hears you hears Me.” Whatever you bind on earth St. Peter is bound in heaven. Go teach all nations, I am with you all days. This is the problem today. We find from the time of Christ and the Apostles, all of the way up to Vatican II; continuity, consistent teaching, constantly the Church referring to Scripture, tradition, and what the predecessors taught before – constantly teaching the SAME thing. Vatican II comes along and completely does a reverse. Officially teaches now things that were condemned by the Church in the past. This cannot be the living magisterium! That cannot be the hierarchy of the Catholic Church! That man cannot be the Pope! If the living magisterium could in any way default, an evident contradiction follows; because God would be the author of that. If Jesus said, “Whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven. He who hears you hears Me. Whatever you say is representing Me.” And we have these men saying, “break the first commandment; worship with the other religions; prayers to false gods do have benefits.” We know very clearly it is not true!

{8} Do you agree that some true statements to keep in mind are the following: “He who hears you [especially the popes when speaking as the highest authority of the **teaching Church** (*Ecclesia docens*) of the ordinary living magisterium] hears me ... He who does not believe what you (especially the popes) teach will be condemned ... In the Apostolic See the Catholic Religion has **always** been kept unsullied and its teachings kept holy ... This See of St. Peter **always** remains untainted by any error ... If the living *Magisterium*, the teaching authority of the Church, could in any way be false, an evident contradiction follows; because then God Himself would be the author of error ... Vatican II comes along and completely does a reverse. Officially teaches now things that were condemned by the Church in the past. This cannot be the living magisterium! That cannot be the hierarchy of the Catholic Church ... That man cannot be the Pope! If the living magisterium could in any way default, an evident contradiction follows; because God would be the author of that. If Jesus said, “Whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven. He who hears you hears Me. Whatever you say is representing Me.” And we have these men saying, “break the first commandment; worship with the other religions; prayers to false gods do have benefits.” We know very clearly it is not true!?”

There is a much higher authority than Bishops Sanborn and Pivarunas who also teaches the truth that the sheep hear the voice of Jesus Christ when they listen to the lawful successors of St. Peter, the visible heads of the Catholic Church, the highest authority of the **teaching Church** (*Ecclesia docens*) of the ordinary living magisterium. Therefore every Catholic can consider that when the lawful successors of St. Peter teach, it is the same as the voice of Jesus Christ talking to everyone who is, and who wishes to remain, a member of His Mystical Body. Pope Pius VI wrote in the decree *Super soliditate*, November 28, 1786:

“The Church is certainly the one flock of Jesus Christ, Who is reigning in heaven, its one Supreme Pastor. He has left it a visible Pastor here on earth, a man who alone is his supreme Vicar, so that in hearing him, the sheep hear in his voice the voice of Jesus Christ Himself, lest seduced by the voice of strangers they be led astray into noxious and deadly pastures.”

The following is not the entire article but only an extract from:

THE RELIGIOUS ASSENT DUE TO THE TEACHINGS OF PAPAL ENCYCLICALS

The American Ecclesiastical Review; Vol. CXXIII, No. 1; pages 65, 66, and 67. By Msgr. Joseph Clifford Fenton. *The Catholic University of America, D.C.*

Those who, on their own initiative, presumed to question or to contradict a doctrinal statement proposed authoritatively in a papal encyclical, even in cases where the Holy Father does not make a definitive decision, may well be said to be striving for something manifestly beyond their competence. No individual, and for that matter, no group of individuals within the *ecclesia discens* can be said to have the competence to dispute with the visible head of the Church militant on a matter connected with the Church's deposit of divine revelation.

At least in an indirect manner, however, every rejection of an authoritative doctrinal pronouncement contained in a papal encyclical is opposed to the theological virtue of faith itself. That virtue empowers a man to accept with complete certitude and on God's own authority the body of truth which the Church proposes as having been revealed by God as His public communication with mankind. It must be remembered that the Church definitely does not teach this divine message in the capacity of an entity in any way separated from or independent of God Himself. The *ecclesia docens* acts as God's instrument. What the Catholic Church teaches is not the Church's message but God's message.

It must be understood, furthermore, that the commission given to and the responsibility incumbent upon the successor of St. Peter must not be considered as limited to the bare presentations of the truth revealed by God and entrusted to His kingdom on earth. The Prince of the Apostles was empowered and commanded to act as a shepherd to Christ's sheep, and feed His lambs and His sheep. He and his successors are thus obligated to nourish and to protect the faith of their brethren within the Church. The task which God has entrusted to them makes it imperative that they authoritatively discountenance tenets or propositions injurious to faith or morals even upon points which they have not as yet issued definitive and absolutely irrevocable decisions.

Thus we lay ourselves open to very serious misunderstandings when we fail to appreciate the fact that the teaching of the Church must be taken as a unit. While it remains perfectly true that not every individual authoritative statement issued by the *ecclesia docens* is to be accepted with the assent of divine faith, we must remember that all the doctrinal activity of the Catholic Church is essentially nothing more or less than the highly complex process of teaching the content of divine public revelation. All the subsidiary or preparatory authoritative pronouncements of the Holy Father or the entire *ecclesia docens*; all of the decisions given by the Church's *magisterium* on matters connected to the deposit of revelation rather than with the formal content of that revealed message, must be considered as a contribution to and as a part of the process of teaching and guarding the divine teaching delivered to the Catholic Church by the apostles.

When an individual or group of individuals presume on their own initiative to deny or to ignore the authoritative doctrinal statements of PAPAL ENCYCLICALS, they are at least in the position of rejecting divinely authorized guidance in the direction of the purity and the well-being of the faith. The fact is some authoritative statements of the Church's *magisterium* are frequently said to demand an adherence of "ecclesiastical faith," while others, again, call for merely "a firm, sincere, and inward religious assent," should not blind man to the paramount truth that all such pronouncements enter into the effective carrying out of the Petrine commission to confirm the faith of the brethren.

Thus, to return to our original question, it would seem that a rejection of a doctrinal statement proposed authoritatively in a pontifical encyclical could be considered censurable as *ad minus temeraria*. Such an unauthorized rejection on the part of individuals or groups of individuals within the Church would violate what Cano termed "the rule of ecclesiastical *modestia*" and would be opposed, indirectly though none the less truly, to the virtue of divine faith, not in such a way as to destroy that virtue, but objectively to constitute an offense against it and to harm it.

{9} Do you agree that it is true that the Traditionalist Movement clerics teach that every Catholic conscience is bound to the teachings of *all* popes from Saint Peter through Pope Pius XII?

{10} Do you agree that every Catholic conscience is bound to believe Pope Leo XIII when he told us: “The teachings of the popes, as found in their Encyclical Letters, can by no means be considered as expressing mere opinions which anyone is free to hold or to reject at will”? (See *The Church Speaks to the Modern World*. Social Teachings - Pope Leo XIII. Edited by Etienne Gilson – 1954.)

{11} Do you agree that Pope Pius XII clearly and without a doubt uses the teaching authority of Saint Peter to proclaim to the entire Catholic world using the authority and the voice of Jesus Christ Himself in *Ad Apostolorum Principis* that: “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”?

{12} Do you agree that Pope Pius XII clearly and without a doubt uses the teaching authority of Saint Peter as the highest teaching authority in his time in the living magisterium to proclaim to the entire Catholic world in *Ad Sinarum gentem* that: “The power of jurisdiction ... comes to bishops ... only through the successor of Peter”?

{13} Do you agree that because the authority of the Pope is the same as the authority of Christ; and because He who hears you (especially the popes when speaking with their teaching authority of Christ of the ordinary living magisterium) hears me; and because He who does not believe what you the popes with the teaching authority of Christ teach will be condemned; and because In the Apostolic See the Catholic Religion has **always** been kept unsullied and its teachings kept holy; and because this See of St. Peter **always** remains untainted by any error; and because If the living *Magisterium*, the teaching authority of the Church, could in any way be false, an evident contradiction follows; because then God Himself would be the author of error; it follows that it is a doctrine untainted by any error taught by the same authority of Christ and the highest teaching authority of the living magisterium, for which they will be condemned who reject it that: “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”?

{14} Do you agree that regardless of whether they speak of themselves as Sedevacantists; Sedevacantists; or non-Sedevacantists; they are all part of the *Recognize and Resist* (R&R) group who recognize Pope Pius XII as a pope and then reject, defy, and refuse to accept the truth that he teaches using his same authority and power of Jesus Christ?

Bishop Sanborn wrote in his *UNA CUM* article: “**Recognize and resist** is **SCHISMATIC**. Pope Pius IX said so.”

Recognize and resist is **schismatic**. Pope Pius IX said so. In the encyclical *Quartus supra*, of January 6, 1873, he said to a group of Armenians who were claiming to be Catholic, yet felt that they did not have to obey the pope:

“In fact, it is as contrary to the divine constitution of the Church as it is to perpetual and constant tradition for anyone to attempt to prove the catholicity of his faith and truly call himself a Catholic when he fails in obedience to the Apostolic See.”

For the Catholic Church has always considered **schismatic** all those **who obstinately resist the authority of her legitimate prelates, and especially her supreme pastor**, and any who refuses to execute their orders and even to recognize their authority. The members of the Armenian faction of Constantinople having followed this line of conduct, **no one, under any pretext, can believe them innocent of the sin of schism, even if they had not been denounced as schismatic by apostolic authority.**”

The same Pope Pius IX, in the encyclical *Quæ in patriarchatu*, of September 1st, 1876, addressed this time to some Chaldeans who were claiming submission to the pope, but who were ignoring his orders:

“What good is it to proclaim aloud the dogma of the supremacy of St. Peter and his successors? What good is it to repeat over and over declarations of faith in the Catholic Church and of obedience to the Apostolic See when actions give the lie to these fine words? Moreover, is not rebellion rendered all the more inexcusable by the fact that obedience is recognized as a duty? Again, does not the authority of the Holy See extend, as a sanction, to the measures which we

have been obliged to take, or is it enough to be in communion of faith with this See without adding the submission of obedience, — a thing which cannot be maintained without damaging the Catholic faith?

In fact, Venerable Brothers and beloved sons, it is a question of recognizing the power [of this See], even over your Churches, not merely in what pertains to faith, but also in what concerns discipline. **He who would deny this is a heretic; he who recognizes this and obstinately refuses to obey is worthy of anathema.**”

Rev. Anthony Cekada proved these rebellious clerics and groups are in schism and apostasy who refuse to accept the truth that “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”:

“These groups promote false doctrine or discipline! They promote in effect error, schism, and apostasy. The notion that you can recognize someone as a pope, but not do any blessed thing he says if you decide not to do that. You set a private judgment over each papal teaching and law. You have the idea, you promote the notion the Church Authority can give evil laws and false doctrine. You maintain it is permissible to defy the man you say is the Pope by maintaining a parallel hierarchy. These notions are **schismatic and embody false doctrine!”**

Bishop Pivarunas also teaches that the Traditionalist Movement clergy are schismatics; as stated in his YouTube movie concerning Sedevacantism:

Okay, it is the infallibility of the Church. This is for me the absolute bottom line. Christ said to His Apostles: He who hears you hears me. Whatever you bind on earth is bound in heaven; whatever you loose on earth is loosed in heaven. He who does not believe what you teach will be condemned.

There we have the truth known: He who does not believe that “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff” will be condemned.

Remember the dogmatic definitions of the Catholic Church as explained at the first Vatican Council, 1870; and by Pope Boniface VIII:

"All those things are to be believed by divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the written Word of God or in Tradition, and which are proposed by the Church, either in solemn judgment or in its ordinary and universal teaching office, as divinely revealed truths which must be believed." And also: "We declare, say, define, and pronounce that it is absolutely necessary for the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff" (Pope Boniface VIII, the Bull Unam Sanctam, 1302).

{15} Do you agree that they certainly are not subject to the Roman Pontiff who do not accept the fact that “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff” as taught by the INFALLIBLE supreme head on earth?

{16} Do you agree that the way clerics receive jurisdiction pertains to faith and morals, and therefore to Catholic doctrine on a matter connected with the Church’s deposit of divine revelation?

{17} Do you agree that No individual, and for that matter, no group of individuals within the *ecclesia discens* can be said to have the competence to dispute with the visible head of the Church militant on a matter connected with the Church’s deposit of divine revelation?

{18} Do you agree that The *ecclesia docens* acts as God’s instrument and What the Catholic Church teaches is not the Church’s message but God’s message?

{19} Do you agree that Pope Pius XII clearly taught the Catholic doctrine when he wrote the truth for the universal Church, namely: “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”?

{20} Do you agree that they in truth and reality reject Catholic doctrine who refuse, deny, negate and repudiate the TRUTH that “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”?

{21} Do you agree that therefore it is contrary to the Catholic doctrine the Catholic Church taught in the past to teach that clerics in the Traditionalist Movement receive their keys (delegated jurisdiction) directly from Christ Himself but not through the Roman Pontiff?

{22} Do you agree that *it was actually the unerring Catholic Church* who taught Her children through Pope Pius XII that, “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”?

I transcribed as follows the sermon: *Faith or Authority, Which Do We Follow* by Father Mary Casimir Puskorius, CMRI found at traditionalcatholicsermons (dot) org. **The Faith cannot change**. The **bold**, **underline**, and *italics* shown in Father Mary Casimir’s sermon and throughout most of the information presented in this letter was added by Patrick Henry.

Father Mary Casimir Puskorius, CMRI = *Faith or Authority, Which Do We Follow*.

Hail Mary... Saints Peter and Paul, pray for us.

Venerable sisters, dear parishioners. We are currently in the Chair of Unity Octave; and this is the week of recommended intense prayer for the conversion of non-Catholics to the faith. And we are going to hear these words prayed as part of the devotion at the Mass: “I say unto thee that thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build My Church.” Hearing those words one may say, “Well, why aren’t you following Peter today, as he seems to be there in Rome.” It is pretty obvious we as traditionalist Catholics are not part of the modern church, modern Catholic Church; and there seems to be a difficulty here! How can we say these words; how can we affirm our faith in the papacy that Jesus Christ founded, to last until the end of time, and at the same time we are not following the man who calls himself Pope in Rome today? I will attempt to answer that question; and to give you information to help you to be able to explain it to others why this is so. And one thing we will have to recognize is we are in a storm. These are not normal times where we could all just easily point to Rome and say whatever is being done there is what we do, we are Catholics – we are Roman Catholics. An article I came across, actually some years ago, and I reread it recently. It was published by Father Donald Sanborn now Bishop Donald Sanborn; he published it in 1992. And the title of this article is very incisive: *Faith or Apostolic Authority, Which Comes First?* In other words, what’s more important? Is faith the most important thing? Or is authority the most important thing? Which do we follow in case of a clash? And he explains very, very well that it is the Faith that is absolutely prior to anything else. The true Church of Christ is an infallible guide, It cannot lead us astray, It cannot give us false doctrine! If It did it could not be the true Church of Christ! I think that is logical enough, simple enough. I think most people would acknowledge that. And as Bishop Sanborn points out in this article, the True Church of Christ cannot give us contradictory teaching! If It did contradictory teaching, It would thereby be giving false teaching; either It was right the first time, or It was right the second time, but It cannot be right both times! Now let me give you a practical example about contradiction. What if I said to you one Sunday, “This pulpit is made out of wood.” And in fact it is. I think you can see that. And next Sunday I said, “This pulpit is made out of marble.” And then I said, “You must believe both.” What would you think of me! You would have to say, you would have to vehemently reject what I just said; that you have to believe this is both marble and wood at the same time. You say, “That cannot be!” It is a contradiction you just told me, it is either made out of wood or it is made out of marble, but it cannot be both. You see the human mind is not capable of thinking in terms of contradiction. In English language we call that oxymoron, or contact ora, or an absurdity; where you affirm and deny something at the SAME time – the mind cannot accept that. Well, if the mind cannot accept contradiction, even more so the true Church of Christ cannot give us contradictory teachings. I want to give you just three examples from Vatican Council II, where we see side-by-side contradiction. And this goes back to the early 60s, my dear brethren. It is sad to realize how long this has been going on and how many have been led astray; but facts are facts. Religious Liberty: before Vatican II the Catholic Church taught that we do not have the right to choose whatever religion we so please; we have to accept the religion that God has revealed. Vatican II nearly word for word has said, “Man is free to choose whatever religion he so desires, or believes he should choose.” Which is right? There is a contradiction here! Another example: before Vatican II the Catholic Church taught that you have to not only be baptized but believe all that Christ teaches to be part of His Church. At Vatican II it was taught that no, you do not have to

believe everything that Christ taught to be part of the Church; there are now degrees of membership. And therefore all the Protestants – they are now our brethren; they are more or less part of the Church. Which is actually a philosophical contradiction, but I will let that alone. So, we see a contradiction there about what does it mean to be a member of the Church of Christ, and this is divinely revealed. Another example: we were taught before Vatican II that it is sinful for us to worship together with non-Catholics, because if we did we would basically be saying, “Your religion is as good as mine, can’t we just get along and worship God together?” Vatican II says, “You can now do this.” So, in three areas; Religious Liberty, the Unity of the Catholic Church, and Ecumenism we see basically word for word contradiction! Now, going back to the pulpit. Were you able to accept the fact that it is and it is not wood; it is and it is not made out of marble at the same time? You cannot accept that, the mind cannot grasp that; it rejects it as a falsehood. Well, in the true Church of Christ we cannot be asked to believe contradictory beliefs. And this is why my dear brethren you are sitting in these pews today. Because the act of Faith that you made in Jesus Christ and in His Church, logically led you to say, “I cannot accept contradictory doctrine, and not only that, I cannot – my act of faith that I made in Jesus Christ and in His Church will not allow me to accept this modern liturgies which are so offensive to God!” The modern mass, and it is not just the abuses, it is the very essence of it as defined in a Protestant and modernist way. If I accept it, I am going to lose my Faith. So this is the crux of the matter. This is what it is all about. It is because of our faith that we are here today. We know the Church cannot give us false doctrine or contradict Herself. And so if there is a contradiction, we have to say, “That cannot be the true Church of Christ.” We have to stick with what the Church taught before, because the truth does NOT change with the times. We hold to the same exact teachings that Jesus Christ gave in His time. There is no evolution of dogma. There is no new understanding of doctrine in a way that contradicts what was previously defined. You see that is our rock! That is our anchor! That is something we can hold onto and grasp. Not, what will doctrine be like 50 years from now? What will it be 100 years from now – of course, we won’t be alive? But we know we have; we are on solid ground. What is impossible is for the Church to contradict Herself. But what is not impossible is for Church leaders, and this means pope and bishops to lose the faith – that is not impossible and theologians talk about that. So that is the explanation. There cannot be contradiction in Church teaching; but yes, popes, bishops, priests, and laity can lose the faith and it has happened many times in history. There is an interesting quote, as Bishop Sanborn points out in his article. He quotes St. Paul’s letter to the Galatians. He says: “If an angel from heaven; well actually he starts off saying if we, if I or an angel from heaven give you any other doctrine than the one that has been revealed to you, you must say anathema – I know I am paraphrasing it.” So, what St. Paul is saying implicitly there; is, “if I ever change this doctrine you need to say anathema to me. If an angel comes down from heaven and preaches a different doctrine than the one revealed by Jesus Christ – you say anathema to that Angel!” Of course, an angel would not do that. It is right there in Galatians, I believe in the first chapter. I recommend that you look that up. So, are we living in difficult times? Yes, but my dear brethren let your faith carry you. It has carried you thus far. It has kept you faithful as a Catholic. And we have to believe in the power of God. Our Lord has obviously let His Church go through triumphs and trials. Just look at the history of the Church. One book I would recommend is *Tumultuous Times* co-written by Fathers Dominic and Francisco Radecki; and you will see the history of the Church is up and down, up and down, up and down – but it is going to last until the end of time. The Papacy will last until the end of time even though there is not always somebody on the throne, the Office is there. We have the intact faith. So, do we have a very tall order during this Chair of Unity Octave? Yes we do. It is not impossible for people to find the faith even in these difficult circumstances. One thing that keeps coming back to me is Father Alexander Krysov. He found out about us on the Internet. And he saw that we were holding to traditional Catholic teaching. He could recognize the modern church is teaching falsehoods. It cannot be the true Church of Christ. And I go back to the miracle of the day when a

Russian was ordained a priest in this sanctuary. As I said at my sermon at Father Krysov's first solemn Mass; "If you had told me 20 years ago that this would happen, I would have never believed you!" But that is my own lack of faith, you see! God can do, not contradictions, but He can do what seems to be impossible. He will make His Church survive; even though It is going through difficult times. Father Michael Oswalt, he found out about us on the Internet too; and was actually going to join up with other traditional clergy. He chose to join up with us. So it can be difficult to find the truth, but it is not impossible. Did not our Lord say, "Seek and you shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you, ask and you shall receive." Today, the centurion is saying in the Gospel, when Jesus is saying, "I will come and heal your son." Lord You do not even need to do that, just say the word! "Amen, Amen I say unto you I have not seen such faith in Israel." That was the faith that Jesus came to see in every person. Not too many people gave it to Him, but that is what Jesus seeks and requires of us. Let us be like the centurion today; he is saying those words while we follow along with the Mass. Lord I am not worthy; Domine, non sum dignus. It is an act of faith. Recognizing that we are poor sinners. But we believe in Jesus. We believe in His power. We believe in His Holy Church. We believe that He has given us His Holy Mother Mary to be our Mother and our special guide through difficult times. Faith is such a powerful thing. So, let our faith keep us strong; and as we hear those words, "I say unto thee, thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build My Church." Let us remember this Church cannot fail. We need only believe, keep growing in our faith. Ask Blessed Mother to help you. St. Louis De Montfort says in his book, *True Devotion to Mary*, we practice this total giving of ourselves to Jesus through Mary; She will allow us to share in Her faith. Just imagine the faith Our Lady had to have when the angel appeared to Her and said, "You are going to be God's mother." And She did not say to the angel, "That is impossible, that cannot happen"; No! "how will this be done." She did not know how, but She knew it would because God was revealing it. Then the angel said and explained to Her. Then the faith that Our Lady needed during the 30 years in the Hidden Life. Then the faith Our Lady had to exercise in the public ministry of Her Son. He was accepted by many but rejected and reviled by many as well; especially by the Powers-That-Be at the time. And then imagine the faith that She needed to have when She saw Jesus dying on the cross; and cooperated in our redemption. So, She will give us a share in Her faith if we draw ever closer to Her and ask Her to help us to be strong and fervent in our Holy Catholic Roman faith. The Catholic faith that is traditional, that cannot change, that cannot error, that cannot contradict itself; our spiritual rock, our anchor, our foundation. May we all grow in our holy Catholic faith. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

{23} Do you agree with Father Mary Casimir and Bishop Donald J. Sanborn that: "The true Church of Christ is an infallible guide, It cannot lead us astray, It cannot give us **false** doctrine ... in the true Church of Christ we cannot be asked to believe contradictory beliefs ... the Church cannot give us false doctrine or contradict Herself ... And so if there is a contradiction, we have to say, "That cannot be the true Church of Christ" ... We have to stick with what the Church taught before, because the truth does NOT change with the times. We hold to the SAME EXACT teachings that Jesus Christ gave in His time. There is no evolution of dogma. There is no NEW understanding of doctrine in a way that contradicts what was previously defined"?

Let us pay special attention to the Sermon from the second Sunday after the Epiphany by Father Mary Tarcisius, CMRI. (Now known as Bishop Mark Anthony Pivarunas, CMRI.) Delivered January 19, 1986. Father Mary Tarcisius, CMRI (aka Bishop Pivarunas) agrees that ecumenism is the main heresy; and Religious Liberty is a false, heretical teaching of Vatican Council II. The following was transcribed by Patrick Henry. You can hear the voice of Father Mary Tarcisius, CMRI, by going to www.JMJsite.com and from there mouse over the AUDIO link. Next, click on the AUDIO BOOKS link; and then scroll down until you come to the tape set (now MP3 files) *Which Bishop Should I Follow*. In those MP3 files you can also hear Bishop George Musey explain very clearly that the man known as Pope John Paul II was not a member of the Catholic Church;

as well as a very lot of other very important information. Now let us read the transcript of some truths taught by Father/Bishop Mark Pivarunas.

And you know when we speak about Unity, we are speaking about a very essential Mark of the Church. We know my dear friends in Christ that the Catholic Church is One, It is Holy, It is Catholic, It is Apostolic. What do we mean when we say the Catholic Church is One? When we say the Catholic Church is One we mean it is One in doctrine. And this is something that is absolutely miraculous through the whole history and whole course of the Catholic Church. That never, ever has the Catholic Church ever deviated in the least bit from what Jesus Christ taught, what the apostles carried down, and what has been carefully kept throughout the whole the course of the Church. What Jesus Christ taught the apostles, and what the apostles carried down is what we call the Deposit of Faith. All that is contained in sacred Scripture, and all that has been handed down from sacred Tradition; that is the Deposit of Faith. And you know this Deposit of Faith has been kept so faithfully, and we know it will always be kept faithfully because Jesus Christ's Church is One. He Himself said it. He Himself said there will be one fold and one shepherd. St. Paul tells us this when he said in his epistle to the Ephesians: "one Lord, one faith – One Faith, one baptism." The Catholic faith is One. It never changes. So we never have something that will be an apparent contradiction. We don't have the Church consistently teaching something for 1900 odd years, and all of a sudden we are told that is no longer true! The Church made a mistake, and now we know better! That could never take place!" [I (Patrick Henry) am interrupting his sermon for a few moments; I am asking you to remember very clearly these last two or three sentences that he just stated. Here is a little bit more from the same sermon just a little ways from where I interrupted it.] "And my dear friends in Christ when we go through this unity, this Chair of Unity Octave Prayers that were prescribed by Pope Leo XIII; we should pray for Unity. But the true Unity that Christ desired. There is a lot of talk about unity, about ecumenism and people are completely missing the boat. What is the true ecumenism that the Catholic Church has always preached? The true ecumenism is that it is the Mission of the Catholic Church to go teach all nations; those who are pagans – to convert them; those who are heretics – to bring them back to the true Church. That is true ecumenism. False ecumenism is to say, "There is salvation outside the Church; **let's get together; let's forget about our differences**; and have this superficial unity." My dear friends in Christ, let us make no mistake! This false ecumenism is nothing but a deviation from the Catholic faith. It is in reality Modernism! You know when you read the documents of Vatican II, how they sometimes have footnotes making references to perhaps St. Thomas Aquinas or to some other Doctor of the Church, or some Pope or some Council. You know, when you stop and look at the opposition between what the Church has always taught and what was taught in Vatican II; there is no reconciliation! And even the theologians in Vatican II have to admit that. They say, "We cannot see the transition between what the Church taught in the past and now Vatican II." They accept Vatican II but they can't see the bridge; because there is no bridge!"

{24} Do you agree that: "The Catholic faith never changes ... we never have something that will be an apparent contradiction ... We don't have the Church consistently teaching something for 1900 odd years, and all of a sudden we are told that is no longer true ... The Church made a mistake, and now we know better ... That could never take place"?

Let us now read a transcription of part of the sermon given by Rev. Anthony Cekada June 22, 2008. I transcribed as follows the sermon found at [traditionalcatholicsermons \(dot\) org](http://traditionalcatholicsermons(dot)org):

"Why Can't We All Just Get Along?"

"Why Can't We All Just Get Along"? These are the very famous words of Rodney King; whose beating in 1991 provoked riots in Los Angeles. And, "I have mercy on the crowd"; – words, my dear friends in Christ, taken from today's Gospel. In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. This past April 27, Sunday, was the 25th anniversary of Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre expelling from the Society of Saint Pius X nine American priests; including Bishop Dolan,

Bishop Sanborn, and myself. At issue were a number of things. The Archbishop and the Pius X Society were trying to get us to accept unacceptable liturgical changes; to accept doubtfully ordained priests – priests ordained in the New Rite; to accept modern marriage annulments and a number of other things as well. This the Archbishop and the Society were doing with a view toward establishing some sort of a compromise solution with John Paul II; and at that time, his right hand man, Joseph Ratzinger. So, we would not stand for accepting these particular changes, and these particular proposals – so we were expelled from the Society of Saint Pius X. Now you recall this year that to commemorate that anniversary we served free champagne to celebrate. The situation was very bad 25 years ago, but we learned in retrospect that it was in fact the hand of Divine Providence that was operating for us. In any event at the reception I heard someone, who was drinking the champagne, say: “Well, why can’t these traditionalists priest just get along”? I felt like interrupting and saying as the kids would say today: “**Oh Hellooooo!!!**” I can’t get along with them because they teach a different doctrine! And they teach a doctrine that is false! Sure, everyone says a form of the Latin Mass and claims to oppose Modernism. But the Rodney King question puts doctrine in the back seat! It reduces it to something that is secondary, or that is an add-on. But doctrine, the Faith, not just the Latin Mass, has to be the primary motive for our combat. And indeed, the only possible source of unity and of agreement. You can get to heaven without the Latin Mass; but you can’t get to heaven without the Catholic Faith! And that is the point! And so, those who are new to the Traditional Movement often ask about the divisions, puzzling divisions among traditional Catholics. So, those of you who have been with it for a while – how should you think about this; how should you understand it? What is your answer to the question; “Why can’t we all just get along?” I would give you two answers. First is the remote cause of the situation in the Church. There is no true pope who exercises authority. And secondly there is a more proximate cause, and that is the one to which I just alluded; that there are substantial DIFFERENCES in doctrine and discipline among different traditionalist groups. The first point: remote cause; no pope who exercises authority. Reason tells us that an organization that is headless disintegrates. And, Our Lord Himself in Holy Scripture says: “Strike the shepherd and the sheep are scattered.” That indeed is the situation of those who try to remain faithful. ... (During this part I did not transcribe, Rev. Anthony Cekada here talks about some divisions in secondary ways concerning conflicts in England and France concerning the Jesuits and things like eating meat in the Cistercian Order. – now let us continue with Rev. Anthony Cekada’s sermon). ... But all the parties agreed on Catholic doctrine. And on this, which of course is the central issue, they did indeed get along very well. So that’s our first point – the remote cause; lack of a true pope to exercise authority. The second issue is this; there is a concrete question: “Why can’t I, Father Cekada, just get along with various other Groups in the say Cincinnati area, that elsewhere promotes the Latin Mass? You know Saint Pius X on the north side; Saint Pius V in Norwood; the Feeneyites in Kentucky; and so on. Why can’t you get along with them?” Now, I am willing to have lunch with the priests from any one of these groups, and I would even pick up the tab. But an inability to be friendly or nice or personally charitable is not the point. These groups promote false doctrine or discipline! First of all Pius X Society; they promote in effect error, schism, and apostasy! The notion that you can recognize someone as a pope, but not do any blessed thing he says if you decide not to do that. **You set a private judgment over each papal teaching and law.** You have the idea, you promote the notion the Church Authority can give evil laws and false doctrine. You maintain it is permissible to defy the man you say is the Pope by maintaining a parallel hierarchy. These notions are **schismatic** and embody false doctrine. And at the same time, the organization promotes union with the one world church of the antichrist with Ratzinger’s constant negotiations with them to achieve this end. And so that is the problem there. Or with the Pius V Society; this idea of error, schisms, and occult like mentality. This Organization stubbornly

promotes grossly ignorant errors regarding the basic principles of sacramental theology. They say that certain sacraments are invalid, and according to all the principles of Catholic moral and sacramental theology the sacraments are valid! And then they refuse sacraments to Catholics who would otherwise have the right to receive them. You go over to Norwood and they find out you are from here, and they will refuse you Holy Communion or refuse you absolution. Or also what must be said of the cult like control over adherence through guilt and fear. The leader of their Organization once told us that, “Well the only thing that the laity really understand are guilt and fear.” So that’s how you have to motivate people. Thanks but no thanks! Or if you take the question of the Feeneyites, the followers of Father Feeney. They deny the Catholic doctrine of baptism of desire, baptism of blood. And they limit the obligation to believe only those things found in ex cathedra papal pronouncements; and this is an idea condemned by Pius IX in the *Syllables of Error*. So just get along with what? The sin of **Schism**; invalidly ordained priests; error and ignorance of sacramental principles; or denials of Church Doctrine? The issue is **Doctrine!** You cannot just say, “Well, just get along and ignore that point.” And here a layman might be tempted to say, “Well, how can I figure that out; how am I supposed to figure that out?” Well, the answer is study! You read and you study, you don’t just throw up your hands – that is what you are supposed to do. You are supposed to know your faith, your faith is important. So to conclude, why are there conflicts among traditionalist priests? Well, there is no functional authority. The lesson of history is that this is inevitable. So in our situation there is no surprise. Strike the shepherd and the sheep are scattered. It is consoling though to look at history and see that in spite of this the Catholic faith survived those times, and it will survive our own time despite these difficulties that we find so upsetting. And why can’t Father Cekada get along with Pius X or Pius V and Feeneyites and so on. Don’t they promote the Latin Mass too? And the answer is simple. Their **Doctrine** is false! And if there is a conflict over doctrine – well there should be a conflict over doctrine! And we should not be surprised, because Our Lord predicted it. “Do not think that I came to send peace upon the earth. I came not to send peace but the sword. I came to set a man at variance against his father, and a daughter against her mother, and a daughter-in-law against mother-in-law, and a man’s enemies shall be of his own household.” Those are words that refer not to personal conflicts or arguments about secondary things, but about Doctrine; about Christ’s teaching. That is the image of the sword. The sword of the truth, the sword of the Spirit, the sword of Catholic doctrine. So there you have it, the explanation why conflict with error is inevitable. So, why can’t we get along? Because our king’s name is not Rodney, it is Christ. God bless you. In the name of the Father and other Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Remember Rev. Anthony Cekada correctly spoke the truth: “**These groups promote false doctrine or discipline!** First of all Pius X Society; they promote in effect error, **schism**, and apostasy. The notion that you can recognize someone as a pope, but not do any blessed thing he says if you decide not to do that. You set a private judgment over each papal teaching and law. You have the idea, you promote the notion the Church Authority can give evil laws and false doctrine. You maintain it is permissible to defy the man you say is the Pope by maintaining a parallel hierarchy. These notions are **schismatic** and embody false doctrine. Or with the Pius V Society; this idea of error, **schisms**, and occult like mentality. This Organization stubbornly promotes grossly ignorant errors regarding the basic principles of SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY. They say that certain sacraments are invalid, and according to all the principles of Catholic moral and SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY the sacraments are valid!”

{25} Do you agree that Rev. Anthony Cekada truthfully and correctly explains that the religion and religious beliefs of the Society of Saint Pius X is **schismatic** and embodies false doctrine?

{26} Do you agree that Rev. Anthony Cekada truthfully and correctly explains that the religion and religious beliefs of the Society of Saint Pius V consists of error, **schisms**, and occult like mentality?

{27} Do you agree that Pope Pius XII was only stating what the unerring Catholic Church consistently taught for 1900 odd years when he reminded every Catholic that “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”?

{28} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas clearly told us that no one will remain Catholic who says that it is no longer true that “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”?

{29} Do you agree that because the Church did not make a mistake in teaching for 1900 odd years, “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”; that no one may now truthfully say “all of a sudden we know that is no longer true” and everyone who wants to remain a Catholic MUST accept the NEW teaching “different from the one which the Church held previously” and say: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself”?

St. John of the Cross wrote:

"Wherefore, if there be revealed to us anything new or different, we must in no way give consent to it, not even though it were spoken by an angel." (*The Collected Works of St. John of the Cross.*)

{30} Do you agree that: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself” is a new and different revealed non-Catholic teaching because it is directly opposed to the truth officially promulgated before by the highest teaching authority on earth correctly representing Jesus Christ teaching us, “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”?

{31} Do you agree that Pope Pius XII as the highest authority of the **teaching Church** (*Ecclesia docens*) of the ordinary living magisterium at his time was teaching Catholic doctrine when he reminded every Catholic that “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”?

{32} Do you agree with Father Mary Casimir and Bishop Donald J. Sanborn that: “The true Church of Christ is an infallible guide, It cannot lead us astray, It cannot give us false doctrine”?

{33} Do you agree that it is a CONTRADICTION to state: 1st: “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff” and 2nd: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us **from Christ Himself**”?

{34} Do you agree that, “the Church cannot give us false doctrine or contradict Herself, and so if there is a contradiction, we have to say, “That cannot be the true Church of Christ” ... We have to stick with what the Church taught before, because the truth does NOT change with the times; We hold to the SAME EXACT teachings that Jesus Christ gave through his valid Vicars because the statements of Bishop Sanborn are true: “the power of the Pope is the same as the authority of Christ” and “the authority of the Pope is the same as the authority of Christ”, are the correct teaching according to Catholic doctrine?

{35} Do you agree that because Pope Pius XII correctly teaches the Catholic doctrine that “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”; those traditionalists set a private judgment over this papal teaching as they promote their NEW and contradictory doctrine: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself”?

In *The Douay Catechism of 1649* by Rev. Henry Tuberville, D.D. it is written:

Q. 168. What think you then of such as accuse the church of errors in faith and idolatry?

A. Truly I think them to be Heretics or Infidels, for our Lord saith, He that will not hear the church let him be unto thee as a heathen and a publican, St. Matt. xviii. 17.

{36} Do you agree that we should also think them to be Heretics or Infidels who teach the contrary of the unerring Catholic Church as taught by the highest authority of the **teaching Church** (*Ecclesia docens*) of the ordinary living magisterium?

{37} Do you agree that the Catholic Church did not err when She taught Her children through Pope Pius XII that, “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”?

Saint Francis De Sales reminds us of this very important truth (*The Catholic Controversy*, p. 70):

“To say the Church errs is to say no less that God errs, or else that He is willing and desirous for us to err; which would be a great blasphemy.”

{38} Do you agree that therefore it would be a great blasphemy for anyone to teach that all jurisdiction in the entire Catholic Church does not pass to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff?

{39} Do you agree that it follows logically that when clerics in the Traditionalist Movement proclaim, announce, and declare that they receive their keys (delegated jurisdiction) directly from Christ Himself; that they proclaim a blasphemy for saying the Catholic Church erred when She teaches that, “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”?

{40} Do you agree this shows that the Protestant Traditionalist Movement very often rejects what the Catholic Church teaches in order to teach the contrary of what the Catholic Church has already taught in the past?

St. Thomas Aquinas, *On the Truth of the Catholic Faith*, Q. #14, art. 12:

Our faith is identical with that of the ancients. Deny this, and you dissolve the **UNITY** of the Church. We must hold this for certain: that the faith of the people at the present day is one with the faith of the people of past centuries. Were this not true, then we would be in a different church than they and, literally, the Church would not be One.

{41} Do you agree that the Traditionalist Movement dissolve the **UNITY** of the Church by teaching contrary to the Catholic doctrine; “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff” when they teach “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been delegated to us from Christ Himself”?

Pope Leo XIII as the highest authority of the **teaching Church** (*Ecclesia docens*) at his time was teaching Catholic doctrine when he wrote:

“Indeed, Holy Writ attests that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were given to Peter alone, and that the power of binding and loosening was granted to the Apostles and to Peter; but there is nothing to show that the Apostles received supreme power without Peter, and against Peter. Such power they certainly did not receive from Jesus Christ. Wherefore, in the decree of the Vatican Council as to the nature and authority of the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, no newly conceived opinion is set forth, but the venerable and constant belief of every age (Sess. iv., cap. 3).”

{42} Do you agree that it is Catholic doctrine that Holy Writ attests that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were given to Peter alone?

{43} Do you agree that Holy Writ is the same thing as the written Word of God?

Remember the **dogmatic** definitions of the Catholic Church as explained at the first Vatican Council, 1870:

"All those things are to be believed by divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the written Word of God or in Tradition, and which are proposed by the Church, either in solemn judgment or in its ordinary and universal teaching office, as divinely revealed truths which must be believed."

{44} Do you agree that it follows with correct logic that they have rejected a **dogmatic** definition of the infallible Catholic Church who refuse to believe that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were given to Peter alone; and therefore it is a rejection of a **dogmatic** definition to teach, preach, and promulgate the heresy that “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been delegated to us from Christ Himself”?

{45} Do you agree that it is Catholic doctrine that there is nothing to show that the Apostles received supreme power without Peter, and against Peter?

{46} Do you agree that it is Catholic doctrine that Catholic bishops are the successors of the Apostles?

{47} Do you agree that therefore it is Catholic doctrine that no Catholic bishop receives either ordinary or *delegated* jurisdiction unless it comes to him THROUGH the **Roman Pontiff**?

{48} Do you agree that therefore it is a NEW doctrine contrary to Catholic doctrine for Traditionalist Movement clerics to teach they receive their jurisdiction delegated DIRECTLY from Christ Himself?

{49} Do you agree that it is Catholic doctrine as taught by the highest authority of the **teaching Church**; and therefore which every Catholic is bound to believe, namely, that bishops certainly do NOT receive from Christ Himself their power of jurisdiction (their keys of binding and loosing)?

{50} Do you agree that regardless of whether they speak of themselves as Sedevacantists; Sedevacantists; or non-Sedevacantists; they are all part of the *Recognize and Resist* (R&R) group who recognize Pope Leo XIII as a pope and then reject, defy, disregard, challenge, resist, and refuse to accept the truth that he teaches?

Remember the truth explained by Bishop Sanborn when he quoted Pope Pius IX, who in turn clearly taught us that all of these Traditionalist Movement members are schismatics:

Recognize and resist is **SCHISMATIC**. Pope Pius IX said so. “For the Catholic Church has always considered **schismatic** all those **who obstinately resist the authority of her legitimate prelates, and especially her supreme pastor**, and any who refuses to execute their orders and even to recognize their authority... **no one, under any pretext, can believe them innocent of the sin of schism, even if they had not been denounced as schismatic by apostolic authority.**”

“In fact, Venerable Brothers and beloved sons, it is a question of recognizing the power [of this See], even over your Churches, not merely in what pertains to faith, but also in what concerns discipline. **He who would deny this is a heretic; he who recognizes this and obstinately refuses to obey is worthy of anathema.**”

Remember how Rev. Anthony Cekada proved these rebellious clerics and groups are in schism and apostasy who refuse to accept the truth that “Holy Writ attests that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were given to Peter alone, and that the power of binding and loosening was granted to the Apostles and to Peter; but there is nothing to show that the Apostles received supreme power without Peter, and against Peter. Such power they certainly did not receive from Jesus Christ”:

“These groups promote false doctrine or discipline! They promote in effect error, **schism, and apostasy. The notion that you can recognize someone as a pope, but not do any blessed thing he says if you decide not to do that. You set a private judgment over each papal teaching and law. You have the idea, you promote the notion the Church Authority can give **evil laws** and **false doctrine**. You maintain it is permissible to defy the man you say is the Pope by maintaining a parallel hierarchy. These notions are **schismatic** and embody false doctrine!”**

Bishop Pivarunas also teaches that the Traditionalist Movement clergy are schismatics; as stated in his YouTube movie concerning Sedevacantism:

Okay, it is the infallibility of the Church. This is for me the absolute bottom line. Christ said to His Apostles: He who hears you hears me. Whatever you bind on earth is bound in heaven; whatever you loose on earth is loosed in heaven. He who does not believe what you teach will be condemned.

There we have the truth known: He who does not believe that “Holy Writ attests that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were given to Peter alone, and that the power of binding and loosening was granted to the Apostles and to Peter; but there is nothing to show that the Apostles received supreme power without Peter, and against Peter. Such power they certainly did not receive from Jesus Christ” will be condemned.

What is this “venerable and constant belief of every age” that Pope Leo XIII says the dogmatic decree of the Vatican Council teaches? Let Pope Leo XIII tell us:

“...there is nothing to show that the Apostles received supreme power without Peter and against Peter. Such power they certainly did not receive from Jesus Christ.”

Remember the dogmatic definition of the Catholic Church as explained by Pope Boniface VIII:

“We declare, say, define, and pronounce that it is absolutely necessary for the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff”

{51} Do you agree that they certainly are not subject to the Roman Pontiff who do not accept the fact as taught by the **INFALLIBLE supreme head** on earth “Indeed, Holy Writ attests that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were given to Peter alone, and that the power of binding and loosening was granted to the Apostles and to Peter; but there is nothing to show that the Apostles received supreme power without Peter, and against Peter. Such power they certainly did not receive from Jesus Christ”?

{52} Do you agree that the Catholic doctrine of the dogmatic decree of the Vatican Council is that just explained by Pope Leo XIII; which is directly contrary to the new teaching of the Traditionalist Movement that their clerics receive their jurisdiction DIRECTLY from Christ Himself?

Pope Leo XIII also told us in his encyclical letter, *Satis Cognitum*:

“If the divine benignity willed anything to be in common between him and the other princes, whatever He did not deny to the others He gave only through him. So that whereas Peter alone received many things, He conferred nothing on any of the rest without Peter participating in it.”

{53} Do you agree that to say: 1st “There is nothing to show that the Apostles received supreme power without Peter and against Peter. Such power they certainly did not receive from Jesus Christ” and “So that whereas Peter alone received many things, He conferred nothing on any of the rest without Peter participating in it”; and 2nd “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself” are contradictory beliefs?

{54} Do you agree that because we have a great contradiction when compared with what the Church has always taught in the past and the teaching and statements of the Traditionalist Movement clerics, and because the Church cannot give us false doctrine or contradict Herself ... And so if there is a contradiction, we have to say, “That cannot be the true Church of Christ”; that every Catholic must agree that the Traditionalist Movement cannot be the true Church of Christ?

{55} Do you agree that because Pope Leo XIII correctly teaches the Catholic doctrine that “There is nothing to show that the Apostles received supreme power without Peter and against Peter. Such power they certainly did not receive from Jesus Christ” and “So that whereas Peter alone received many things, He conferred nothing on any of the rest without Peter participating in it”; those traditionalists set a private judgment over these papal teachings as they promote their NEW and contradictory doctrine: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself”?

Pope Pius IX taught as Catholic doctrine in his encyclical letter *Quartus Supra*:

“Even if Christ willed that Peter and the other leaders have something in common, the other leaders have this only through Peter.”

{56} Do you agree that it is Catholic doctrine that Jesus Christ did not confer jurisdiction, or authority, or a mission on the other Apostles without it coming through St. Peter?

{57} Do you agree that therefore it has always been a doctrine of the Catholic Church that neither jurisdiction or mission is conferred on any bishops in the world unless it comes through St. Peter and his lawful successors?

{58} Do you agree that therefore it is a new doctrine contrary to Catholic doctrine that clerics in the Traditionalist Movement receive their keys (delegated jurisdiction) directly from Christ Himself?

{59} Do you agree that if the 1st statement is true: “Even if Christ willed that Peter and the other leaders have something in common, the other leaders have this only through Peter” then the 2nd contradictory, and opposite statement is necessarily false and a new heretical doctrine: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself”?

{60} Do you agree that something Peter and the other leaders have in common is the Power of Jurisdiction?

{61} Do you agree that therefore the other leaders (Catholic Bishops) have their Power of Jurisdiction only through Peter?

{62} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas taught the truth when he reminded us “He who hears you (Pope Pius IX speaking as the highest authority of the **teaching Church** of the ordinary living magisterium) hears me ... He who does not believe what you (the popes) teach will be condemned ... In the Apostolic See

the Catholic Religion has **always** been kept unsullied and its teachings kept holy ... this See of St. Peter **always** remains untainted by any error ... If the living *Magisterium*, the teaching authority of the Church, could in any way be false, an evident contradiction follows; because then God Himself would be the author of error?

{63} Do you agree that regardless of whether they speak of themselves as Sedevacantists; Sedevacantists; or non-Sedevacantists; they are all part of the *Recognize and Resist* (R&R) group who recognize Pope Pius IX as a pope and then reject, defy, disregard, challenge, resist, and refuse to accept the truth that he teaches?

{64} Do you agree that jurisdiction, authority, and mission from Jesus Christ are all something the other leaders (Apostles and bishops) had in common with Peter?

Pope Pius IX taught as Catholic doctrine in his encyclical letter *Quartus Supra*: “Even if Christ willed that Peter and the other leaders have something in common, the other leaders have this only through Peter.”

{65} Do you agree that it follows with correct logic that the other leaders (bishops) in the Traditionalist Movement do not have any jurisdiction, authority, and mission from Jesus Christ unless they received it from Peter and his lawful successors?

Remember the truth explained by Father Mary Casimir: “What is impossible is for the Church to contradict Herself. But what is not impossible is for Church leaders, and this means pope and bishops to lose the faith – that is not impossible and theologians talk about that. So that is the explanation. There cannot be contradiction in Church teaching; but yes, popes, bishops, priests, and laity can lose the faith and it has happened many times in history.”

Now consider how Bishop Sanborn explained that this same Pope Pius IX who wrote; “Even if Christ willed that Peter and the other leaders have something in common, the other leaders have this only through Peter”; also teaches the world that all of these Traditionalist Movement members are schismatics:

Recognize and resist is **SCHISMATIC**. Pope Pius IX said so. “For the Catholic Church has always considered **schismatic** all those **who obstinately resist the authority of her legitimate prelates, and especially her supreme pastor**, and any who refuses to execute their orders and even to recognize their authority... **no one, under any pretext, can believe them innocent of the sin of schism, even if they had not been denounced as schismatic by apostolic authority.**”

“In fact, Venerable Brothers and beloved sons, it is a question of recognizing the power [of this See], even over your Churches, not merely in what pertains to faith, but also in what concerns discipline. **He who would deny this is a heretic; he who recognizes this and obstinately refuses to obey is worthy of anathema.**”

Remember how Rev. Anthony Cekada proved these rebellious clerics and groups are in schism and apostasy who refuse to accept the truth that, “Even if Christ willed that Peter and the other leaders have something in common, the other leaders have this only through Peter”:

“These groups promote false doctrine or discipline! They promote in effect error, **schism**, and apostasy. The notion that you can recognize someone as a pope, but not do any blessed thing he says if you decide not to do that. You set a private judgment over each papal teaching and law. You have the idea, you promote the notion the Church Authority can give evil laws and false doctrine. You maintain it is permissible to defy the man you say is the Pope by maintaining a parallel hierarchy. These notions are **schismatic** and embody false doctrine!”

Bishop Pivarunas also teaches that the Traditionalist Movement clergy are schismatics; as stated in his YouTube movie concerning Sedevacantism, heretics, and schismatics:

Okay, it is the infallibility of the Church. This is for me the absolute bottom line. Christ said to His Apostles: He who hears you hears me. Whatever you bind on earth is bound in heaven; whatever you loose on earth is loosed in heaven. He who does not believe what you teach will be condemned.

There we have the truth known: He who does not believe that “Even if Christ willed that Peter and the other leaders have something in common, the other leaders have this only through Peter” will be condemned.

Remember the dogmatic definition of the Catholic Church as explained by Pope Boniface VIII:

“We declare, say, define, and pronounce that it is absolutely necessary for the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff”

{66} Do you agree that they certainly are not subject to the Roman Pontiff who do not accept the fact as taught by the ***INFALLIBLE supreme head*** on earth, “Even if Christ willed that Peter and the other leaders have something in common, the other leaders have this only through Peter”?

{67} Do you agree it should be clear to everyone that the Protestant Traditionalist Movement very often rejects what the Catholic Church teaches in order to teach the contrary of what the Catholic Church has already taught in the past?

Pope Benedict XV in *Ad Beatissimi* tells us what the Catholic faith is:

“The Catholic Faith is such that nothing can be added to it, nothing taken away. Either it is held in its entirety, or rejected totally. This is the Catholic faith, which, unless a man believes faithfully and firmly, he cannot be saved.”

{68} Do you agree that the popes throughout the centuries have either taught the Catholic faith or else contrary to the Catholic faith when they UNANIMOUSLY taught the same basic way with the same conclusion as Pope Pius XII that Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff?

{69} Do you agree that the Catholic Faith as taught throughout the centuries and as has already been explained above is that Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff; and therefore, traditionalist priests do not receive jurisdiction directly from Christ Himself?

{70} Do you agree that it follows with correct logic that unless a man believes faithfully and firmly that Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff he cannot be saved?

{71} Do you agree that whatever the Catholic Church taught in the past is the Faith that is either held in its entirety, or rejected totally?

{72} Do you agree that the Faith the Catholic Church taught in the past is that Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff and that He (Jesus) conferred nothing (such as *delegated* jurisdiction) on any of the rest without Peter participating in it?

{73} Do you agree that the purpose of Rev. Anthony Cekada’s article *Traditional Priests, Legitimate Sacraments* was to reach his conclusion that: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself”?

{74} Do you agree that the NEW DOCTRINE: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself” is directly **contrary** to the Faith of the Catholic Church?

{75} Do you agree they are **contrary beliefs** to say FIRST: “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff” and SECOND: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests and bishops possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself”?

{76} Do you agree Father Mary Casimir and Bishop Sanborn taught the truth in teaching that: “The true Church of Christ cannot give us false doctrine ... in the true Church of Christ we cannot be asked to believe **contradictory beliefs**”?

{77} Do you now agree that the Protestant Traditionalist Movement very often rejects what the Catholic Church teaches in order to teach the contrary of what the Catholic Church has already taught in the past?

{78} Do you agree that regardless of whether they speak of themselves as Sedevacantists, Sedevacantists; or non-Sedevacantists; they are all part of the *Recognize and Resist* (R&R) group who recognize Pope Benedict XV as a pope and then reject, defy, disregard, challenge, resist, and refuse to accept the truth that he teaches?

Remember the truth explained by Bishop Sanborn, that Pope Pius IX clearly defined that all of these Traditionalist Movement members are schismatics:

Recognize and resist is **SCHISMATIC**. Pope Pius IX said so. “For the Catholic Church has always considered **schismatic** all those **who obstinately resist the authority of her legitimate prelates, and especially her supreme pastor**, and any who refuses to execute their orders and even to recognize their authority... **no one, under any pretext, can believe them innocent of the sin of schism, even if they had not been denounced as schismatic by apostolic authority.**”

“In fact, Venerable Brothers and beloved sons, it is a question of recognizing the power [of this See], even over your Churches, not merely in what pertains to faith, but also in what concerns discipline. **He who would deny this is a heretic; he who recognizes this and obstinately refuses to obey is worthy of anathema.**”

Remember how Rev. Anthony Cekada proved these rebellious clerics and groups are in schism and apostasy who refuse to accept the truth that, “The Catholic Faith is such that nothing can be added to it, nothing taken away. Either it is held in its entirety, or rejected totally. This is the Catholic faith, which, unless a man believes faithfully and firmly, he cannot be saved”:

“These groups promote false doctrine or discipline! They promote in effect error, schism, and apostasy. The notion that you can recognize someone as a pope, but not do any blessed thing he says if you decide not to do that. You set a private judgment over each papal teaching and law. You have the idea, you promote the notion the Church Authority can give evil laws and false doctrine. You maintain it is permissible to defy the man you say is the Pope by maintaining a parallel hierarchy. These notions are **schismatic and embody false doctrine!”**

Pope St. Sixtus III in *De Jejun* provides the following Faith of the Catholic Church:

“Nothing new is to be allowed, for nothing can be added to the old. Look for the faith of the elders, and do not let our faith be disturbed by a mixture of new doctrines.”

{79} Do you agree that if “Nothing new is to be allowed” to the truth of the Catholic faith that “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”; then it is not allowed to teach that “traditional Catholic priests and bishops possess delegated jurisdiction directly from Christ Himself”?

{80} Do you agree that it is part of Catholic doctrine that we should Look for the faith of the elders, and do not let our faith be disturbed by a mixture of new doctrines?

{81} Do you agree that the faith of the elders, as explained by Pope Leo XIII, is that Holy Writ attests that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were given to Peter alone?

{82} Do you agree that the faith of the elders therefore, is that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven (the keys meaning either ordinary or *delegated* jurisdiction) have never in the entire history of the Catholic Church been given directly by Christ Himself to either bishops or priests?

{83} Do you agree that therefore, it is a mixture of new doctrines to teach or attempt to demonstrate that “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests and bishops possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself”?

{84} Do you agree Father Mary Casimir and Bishop Sanborn state the truth in teaching that: “The truth does NOT change with the times, there is no NEW understanding of doctrine in a way that CONTRADICTS what was previously defined?

{85} Do you agree that the faith of those teaching this new doctrine that they receive their *delegated* jurisdiction directly from Christ Himself, proves they no longer have the first Mark of the Catholic Church, UNITY?

Review again the Catholic doctrine as explained by St. Thomas, “Our faith is identical with that of the ancients. Deny this, and you dissolve the **UNITY** of the Church. We must hold this for certain: that the faith of the people at the present day is one with the faith of the people of past centuries. Were this not true, then we would be in a different church than they and, literally, the Church would not be One.”

{86} Do you agree that the faith of the people of past centuries was and still is: “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”; and not the NEW doctrine: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests and bishops possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself”?

{87} Do you agree that regardless of whether they speak of themselves as Sedeprivationists; Sedevacantists; or non-Sedevacantists; they are all part of the *Recognize and Resist* (R&R) group who recognize Pope St. Sixtus III as a pope and then reject, defy, disregard, challenge, resist, and refuse to accept the truth that he teaches?

Remember the truth that Pope Pius IX with his infallible teaching authority defined, described, classified, and decided that all of these Traditionalist Movement members are schismatics:

Recognize and resist is **SCHISMATIC**. Pope Pius IX said so. “For the Catholic Church has always considered **schismatic** all those **who obstinately resist the authority of her legitimate prelates, and especially her supreme pastor**, and any who refuses to execute their orders and even to recognize their authority... **no one, under any pretext, can believe them innocent of the sin of schism, even if they had not been denounced as schismatic by apostolic authority.**”

“In fact, Venerable Brothers and beloved sons, it is a question of recognizing the power [of this See], even over your Churches, not merely in what pertains to faith, but also in what concerns discipline. **He who would deny this is a heretic; he who recognizes this and obstinately refuses to obey is worthy of anathema.**”

Pope Saint Leo the Great (see: *In Anniv. Assumpt.*, serm. iv.) taught the Catholic doctrine that all Catholics believe:

“If Our Lord willed that there should be something common to Peter and the rest of the princes of His Church, it was only on this condition, that whatsoever He gave to the rest, He gave it to them through Peter.”

{88} Do you agree that jurisdiction is something common to Peter and the rest of the princes of His Church?

{89} Do you agree that therefore, Pope Saint Leo the Great is clearly teaching Catholic doctrine by saying that jurisdiction is not given to any cleric in the Catholic world today unless that jurisdiction came through a successor of St. Peter?

{90} Do you agree that it is therefore the teaching of non-Catholics to state, proclaim, and attempt to demonstrate that the jurisdiction priests and bishops possess has been delegated to them from Christ Himself?

{91} Do you agree that regardless of whether they speak of themselves as Sedeprivationist(s); Sedevacantists; or non-Sedevacantists; they are all part of the *Recognize and Resist* (R&R) group who recognize Pope Saint Leo the Great as a pope and then reject, defy, disregard, challenge, resist, and refuse to accept the truth that he teaches?

Remember the truth explained by Bishop Sanborn, that all of these Traditionalist Movement members are schismatics who *Recognize and Resist* the TRUTH explained by Pope Saint Leo the Great: “If Our Lord willed that there should be something common to Peter and the rest of the princes of His Church, it was only on this condition, that whatsoever He gave to the rest, He gave it to them through Peter.”

Recognize and resist is **SCHISMATIC**. Pope Pius IX said so. “For the Catholic Church has always considered **schismatic** all those **who obstinately resist the authority of her legitimate prelates, and especially her supreme pastor**, and any who refuses to execute their orders and even to recognize their authority... **no one, under any pretext, can believe them innocent of the sin of schism, even if they had not been denounced as schismatic by apostolic authority.**”

“In fact, Venerable Brothers and beloved sons, it is a question of recognizing the power [of this See], even over your Churches, not merely in what pertains to faith, but also in what concerns discipline. **He who would deny this is a heretic; he who recognizes this and obstinately refuses to obey is worthy of anathema.**”

Remember the dogmatic definitions of the Catholic Church as explained at the first Vatican Council, 1870; and by Pope Boniface VIII:

"All those things are to be believed by divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the written Word of God or in **Tradition**, and which are proposed by the Church, either in solemn judgment or in its ordinary and universal teaching office, as divinely revealed truths which must be believed." And also: "We declare, say, define, and pronounce that it is absolutely necessary for the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff" (Pope Boniface VIII, the Bull Unam Sanctam, 1302).

{92} Do you agree that they certainly are not subject to the Roman Pontiff who do not accept the fact as taught by the INFALLIBLE supreme head on earth, "If Our Lord willed that there should be something common to Peter and the rest of the princes of His Church, it was only on this condition, that whatsoever He gave to the rest, He gave it to them through Peter"?

{93} Do you agree it should be clear to everyone that the Protestant Traditionalist Movement very often rejects what the Catholic Church teaches in order to teach its NEW DOCTRINES contrary of what the Catholic Church has already taught in the past?

Pope Saint Innocent I wrote:

"The episcopate, with all its authority, emanates from the Apostolic See." (See his epist. xxix)

{94} Do you agree that this Pope Saint Innocent is just one more Saint from the highest teaching authority in the Catholic Church proving that the Traditionalist Movement clerics are non-Catholics for pertinaciously teaching the heresy that they receive their jurisdiction DIRECTLY from Christ Himself?

{95} Do you agree that regardless of whether they speak of themselves as Sedevacantists; Sedevacantists; or non-Sedevacantists; they are all part of the *Recognize and Resist* (R&R) group who recognize Pope Saint Innocent as a pope and then reject, defy, and refuse to accept the truth that he teaches?

Remember how Rev. Anthony Cekada proved these rebellious clerics and groups are in **schism** and apostasy that refuse to accept the truth that, "The episcopate, with all its authority, emanates from the Apostolic See":

"These groups promote false doctrine or discipline! They promote in effect error, **schism**, and apostasy. The notion that you can recognize someone as a pope, but not do any blessed thing he says if you decide not to do that. You set a private judgment over each papal teaching and law. You have the idea, you promote the notion the Church Authority can give evil laws and false doctrine. You maintain it is permissible to defy the man you say is the Pope by maintaining a parallel hierarchy. These notions are **schismatic** and embody false doctrine!"

Remember the dogmatic definition of the Catholic Church as explained by Pope Boniface VIII:

"We declare, say, define, and pronounce that it is absolutely necessary for the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff"

{96} Do you agree that they certainly are not subject to the Roman Pontiff who do not accept the truth as taught by the INFALLIBLE supreme head on earth, "The episcopate, with all its authority, emanates from the Apostolic See"?

{97} Let me ask again if you agree that the Protestant Traditionalist Movement very often rejects what the Catholic Church teaches in order to teach the contrary of what the Catholic Church has already taught in the past?

Jesus Christ tells us, through Pope Pius VI in his letter *Notre cher fils*, January 20, 1787 that:

"It is an article of faith that the authority and jurisdiction of the bishops is subordinate to that of the Sovereign Pontiff."

The letter of Pope Pius VI, *Post factum tibi*, dated February 2, 1782, tells Catholics of a Catholic DOGMA:

"It is, in fact, a DOGMA of faith that the authority of the bishops, even admitting that it stems directly from Christ, remains dependent on the authority of the Roman Pontiff."

{98} Do you agree Father Mary Casimir and Bishop Sanborn taught the truth in teaching that: "The truth does NOT change with the times, There is no NEW understanding of doctrine in a way that **CONTRADICTS** what was previously defined"?

Saint Francis De Sales reminds us of this very important truth (*The Catholic Controversy*, p. 70):

“To say the Church errs is to say no less that God errs, or else that He is willing and desirous for us to err; which would be a great blasphemy.”

{99} Do you agree that it would be a great blasphemy to deny the fact that it is **a DOGMA of faith** that the authority of the bishops, even admitting that it stems directly from Christ, remains dependent on the authority of the Roman Pontiff?

{100} Do you agree that the authority and jurisdiction of the Traditionalist Movement bishops and priests cannot be subordinate to the Sovereign Pontiff if they actually receive their jurisdiction **DIRECTLY** from Christ Himself?

{101} Do you agree that not one traditionalist bishop or priest received any authority or jurisdiction from any Sovereign, Roman Pontiff?

{102} Do you agree that therefore, the Traditionalist Movement clerics **preach a great blasphemy** and deny **a DOGMA of faith** by proclaiming and teaching their NEW doctrine that they receive delegated jurisdiction directly from Christ Himself?

{103} Do you agree that those who deny or teach contrary to any **DOGMA of faith** thereby prove themselves to be **non-Catholics**?

Please consider carefully, deliberate upon, and ponder over this section of the book, *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* by Father Thomas Cox (Imprimatur and Copyright, 1900), page 173:

“**Those who invent doctrines unheard of before are not the successors of the Apostles.** Novelty and error are children of the same father - the father of lies. Those who have lost the line of valid ministers leading back to apostolic times cannot plead the possession of Apostolicity. Where there is no ordination, no priesthood, no **authority**, no power, Apostolicity is out of the question. **Even if valid orders exist, where jurisdiction is lacking there is no real Apostolicity.** Schism, as well as heresy, destroys apostolic succession.”

{104} Do you agree that where there is no **authority**, Apostolicity is out of the question?

{105} Do you agree that we just reviewed three times Jesus Christ telling us (through His true Vicars) that 1) “The episcopate, with all its **authority**, emanates from the Apostolic See” 2) “It is an **article of faith** that the **authority** and jurisdiction of the bishops is subordinate to that of the Sovereign Pontiff” and 3) “It is, in fact, **a DOGMA of faith** that the **authority** of the bishops, even admitting that it stems directly from Christ, remains dependent on the authority of the Roman Pontiff”?

{106} Do you agree that not so much as ONE Traditionalist Movement cleric has any **authority** that emanates from the Apostolic See?

{107} Do you agree that because where there is no **authority**, Apostolicity is out of the question; that the Traditionalist Movement does NOT have the NECESSARY Mark of Apostolicity?

{108} Do you agree that regardless of whether they speak of themselves as Sedevacantists; Sedevacantists; or non-Sedevacantists; they are all part of the *Recognize and Resist* (R&R) group who recognize Pope Pius VI as a pope and then reject, defy, disregard, challenge, resist, and refuse to accept the truth that he teaches?

Pope Saint Boniface makes it clear in *Retro maioribus tuis* that every Catholic conscience is bound to accept the teachings of the popes when he wrote:

“For it has never been allowed that that be discussed again, which has once been decided by the Apostolic See.”

{109} Do you agree that the Apostolic See has already decided that “The episcopate, with all its **authority**, emanates from the Apostolic See” and where there is no **authority**, Apostolicity is out of the question; should prove beyond all doubt to all doubters that the Traditionalist Movement does NOT have the NECESSARY Mark of Apostolicity?

{110} Do you agree that Pope Saint Boniface clearly condemns the Traditionalist Movement clerics for teaching contrary to that **DOGMA of faith** which has once been decided by the Apostolic See?

{111} Do you agree that regardless of whether they speak of themselves as Sedeprivationists; Sedevacantists; or non-Sedevacantists; they are all part of the *Recognize and Resist* (R&R) group who recognize Pope Saint Boniface as a pope and then reject, defy, and refuse to accept the truth that he teaches?

Do not forget that Bishop Sanborn was kind enough to point out to us that Pope Pius IX condemned all in the Traditionalist Movement as schismatics because although *Recognize and resist* is **schismatic**, Pope Pius IX said so; they *Recognize* Pope Pius VI as a true pope; but then they *Resist* the Dogma he taught: “It is, in fact, a **DOGMA of faith** that the authority of the bishops, even admitting that it stems directly from Christ, remains dependent on the authority of the Roman Pontiff.” And because “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”; the Traditionalist Movement members also *Recognize* Pope Saint Boniface as a true Pope although they *Resist* the truth he taught: “For it has never been allowed that that be discussed again, which has once been decided by the Apostolic See” that “It is an **article of faith** that the authority and jurisdiction of the bishops is subordinate to that of the Sovereign Pontiff.” However, the Traditionalist Movement clerics have discussed again, that which has once been decided by the Apostolic See; and then decided that they would preach a new heresy: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests and bishops possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself”.

Remember how Rev. Anthony Cekada proved these rebellious clerics and groups are in **schism** and apostasy who refuse to accept the truths that, “For it has never been allowed that that be discussed again, which has once been decided by the Apostolic See.” And the Apostolic See has already decided “It is, in fact, a **DOGMA of faith** that the authority of the bishops, even admitting that it stems directly from Christ, remains dependent on the authority of the Roman Pontiff.” And the Apostolic See has already decided “It is an **article of faith** that the authority and jurisdiction of the bishops is subordinate to that of the Sovereign Pontiff.”

“These groups promote false doctrine or discipline! They promote in effect error, **schism, and apostasy.** The notion that you can recognize someone as a pope, but not do any blessed thing he says if you decide not to do that. You set a private judgment over each papal teaching and law. You have the idea, you promote the notion the Church Authority can give **evil laws** and **false doctrine**. You maintain it is permissible to defy the man you say is the Pope by maintaining a parallel hierarchy. These notions are **schismatic** and embody **false doctrine!**”

Pope Pius IX, *Ubi Primum*, teaches the Catholic doctrine:

“Nothing can ever pass away from the words of Jesus Christ, nor can anything be changed which the Catholic Church received from Christ to guard, protect, and preach.”

{112} Do you agree that the words of Jesus Christ as explained by the popes and Fathers of the Church, clearly teach that Jesus Christ founded a hierarchical, monarchical perfect society?

{113} Do you agree that according to the words of Jesus Christ, the jurisdiction given to this Teaching Church will always come to the other Apostles and bishops only through St. Peter and his lawful successors?

{114} Do you agree that therefore, because nothing can be changed which the Catholic Church received from Christ to guard, protect, and preach; it is directly contrary to teach the opposite and say that: The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests and bishops possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself?

{115} Do you agree this is just another proof that the Protestant Traditionalist Movement very often rejects what the Catholic Church teaches in order to teach the contrary of what the Catholic Church has already taught in the past?

{116} Do you agree that regardless of whether they speak of themselves as Sedeprivationists; Sedevacantists; or non-Sedevacantists; they are all part of the *Recognize and Resist* (R&R) group who recognize Pope Pius IX as a pope and then reject, defy, disregard, challenge, resist, and refuse to accept the truth that he teaches?

Remember the truth explained by Bishop Sanborn, that all of these Traditionalist Movement members are schismatics because they *Recognize* as true the Catholic doctrine that nothing can ever pass away from the words of Jesus Christ when He spoke through the pope that: “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through

the Roman Pontiff”; however, immediately afterwards the Traditionalist Movement *Resists* that truth and refuses to accept the fact that it also includes them – because the truth means that no one in the Traditionalist Movement therefore has ordinary, delegated, or supplied jurisdiction at this time.

It is time now to study from *Exposition of Christian Doctrine* by a seminary professor. Imprimatur: Patritius Joannes. Copyright, 1898-1925:

“168. What does the power of jurisdiction determine? It determines precisely the territory, the things, and the persons also, upon which bishops and priests are called to exercise their ministry.”

{117} Do you agree that the Traditionalist Movement bishops and priests do not have a precise territory, that is to say a diocese or a parish to which they are called to exercise their ministry?

{118} Do you agree that it is just another proof that the Traditionalist Movement clerics are heretics because they preach a NEW doctrine contrary to the dogmas of the Catholic Church; when they teach that their priests receive delegated jurisdiction directly from Christ Himself – because therefore nobody ever has or ever will assign them to a precise territory?

169. From whom do priests hold their jurisdiction? From the bishop of the diocese.

{119} Do you agree that therefore, it is directly contrary to what the Catholic Church has always taught when one teaches and promulgates the new doctrine that “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself”?

170. From whom do bishops hold their jurisdiction? From the Pope.

171. From whom does the Pope hold his jurisdiction? From Jesus Christ, the Son of God made man.

172. What sort of bishop would he be who did not hold spiritual powers from the Pope? He would be an intruded or schismatical bishop.

{120} Do you agree that from what the Catholic Church taught in the past we know that She does not change Her teachings; and therefore the Traditionalist Movement bishops are intruded or schismatic bishops?

173. What sort of pastor would he be who did not hold his powers from a lawful bishop? He would be an intruded or schismatical pastor.

{121} Do you agree that *Exposition of Christian Doctrine* by a seminary professor is only expounding, explaining, defending, and clarifying exactly the teachings of the Catholic Church; and that this book is not teaching anything new or contrary to what the Catholic Church taught as Catholic doctrine at the time it received the Copyright, 1898-1925?

{122} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas spoke the truth when he stated: “The Catholic faith never changes ... we never have something that will be an apparent contradiction ... We don’t have the Church consistently teaching something for 1900 odd years, and all of a sudden we are told that is no longer true ... The Church made a mistake, and now we know better ... That could never take place”?

{123} Do you agree that Father Mary Casimir spoke the truth when he stated: “The Church cannot give us false doctrine or contradict Herself and so if there is a contradiction, we have to say, “That cannot be the true Church of Christ” ... We have to stick with what the Church taught **before**, because the truth does NOT change with the times ... We hold to the SAME EXACT teachings that Jesus Christ gave in His time ... There is no evolution of dogma ... There is no NEW understanding of doctrine in a way that contradicts what was previously defined ... The Catholic faith cannot change, cannot error, cannot contradict itself”?

Saint Francis De Sales reminds us of this very important truth (*The Catholic Controversy*, p. 70):

“To say the Church errs is to say no less that God errs, or else that He is willing and desirous for us to err; which would be a great blasphemy.”

{124} Do you agree it follows with correct logic that it would be a great blasphemy to say the Church errs because She teaches that a bishop would be an intruded or schismatical bishop who did not hold spiritual powers from the Pope?

{125} Do you agree it follows with correct logic that it would be a great blasphemy to say the Church errs because She teaches that a pastor would be an intruded or schismatical pastor who did not hold spiritual powers from a lawful bishop who received his jurisdiction **THROUGH** a successor of St. Peter?

{126} Do you agree that intruded or schismatical bishops and pastors are **non-Catholics**?

{127} Do you agree that with their own writings and teachings the Traditionalist Movement clerics proclaimed themselves to be intruded and schismatical **non-Catholics**?

Rev. Anthony Cekada correctly, accurately, and appropriately wrote that all who receive their Powers of Orders tracing back through Bishop Thuc: “will surely become a **schismatic** sect!” Rev. Anthony Cekada therefore correctly, accurately, and appropriately told the truth that all those Traditionalist Movement clerics in Mexico and those coming from Bishop George Musey, Bishop Pivarunas, Bishop Dolan, Bishop Donald J. Sanborn, and many others are now in a **schismatic** sect!

{128} Do you agree that the Church consistently taught for 1900 odd years that they would be an intruded or schismatical pastor who did not hold spiritual powers from a lawful bishop who received his jurisdiction **THROUGH** a successor of St. Peter and therefore We have to stick with what the Church taught **before**, because the truth does NOT change with the times and The Catholic faith cannot change, cannot error, cannot contradict itself”?

{129} Do you agree that all Traditionalist Movement clerics whose lineage goes back to Bishop Guérard des Lauriers or Bishop Carmona do not hold spiritual powers from a lawful bishop who received his jurisdiction **THROUGH** a successor of St. Peter and therefore they are intruded and schismatical **non-Catholics**?

During a sermon on June 22, 2008, (as inserted above) Rev. Anthony Cekada correctly, accurately, and appropriately said that the members of the Society of Saint Pius X, and of the Society of Saint Pius V are **schismatic!**

{130} Do you agree that the first beginning part of CMRI originated from the Old Catholic Church; which is a Schismatic church?

{131} Do you agree that the Traditionalist Movement comes from three major sources: The Old Catholics; the Bishop Thuc lineage; and the Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre lineage?

{132} Do you agree that according to their own statements then the Old Catholics; the Bishop Thuc lineage; and the Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre lineage are all **schismatic** sects?

{133} Do you agree that from their own writings and sermons we learn that everyone in the Traditionalist Movement belongs to a **non-Catholic** *schismatic* sect – and is therefore cut off from the Catholic Church?

Pope Pius XII explains that schism or heresy or apostasy sever a man from the Body of the Church. In other words they are cut off from the Church and outside of the Church when he wrote in *Mystici Corporis*:

“For not every sin, however grave it may be, is such as of its own nature to sever a man from the Body of the Church, as does schism or heresy or apostasy.”

St. Thomas explains that those who receive sacraments from the Traditionalist Movement clerics who are cut off from the Church do not receive grace, because they SIN in so doing. See the *Supplement*, Q. 19, Art. 5, Reply Obj. 3:

“We might also reply that by members of the Dove he means all who are not cut off from the Church, for those who receive the sacraments from them, receive grace, whereas those who receive the sacraments from those who are cut off from the Church, do not receive grace, because they sin in so doing, except in case of Baptism, which, in cases of necessity, may be received even from one who is excommunicated.”

Leo XIII wrote, in the encyclical letter, *Satis Cognitum*, June 20, 1896:

“It is absurd to imagine that he who is outside can command in the Church.”

{134} Do you agree that it follows with correct logic that because the Traditionalist Movement clerics themselves tell us they all belong to various non-Catholic schismatic sects, that it is absurd to imagine that they can command in the Church?

Canon 1258 §1 reads:

It is unlawful for the Faithful in any way actively to be present at or take part in the religious services of non-Catholics.

Pope Saint Leo the Great was clearly teaching the Catholic doctrine that every faithful Catholic must believe when he told us: “If Our Lord willed that there should be something common to Peter and the rest of the princes of His Church, it was only on this condition, that whatsoever He gave to the rest, He gave it to them through Peter.”

{135} Do you agree that the above paragraph explains how the Church gives jurisdiction to bishops and priests?

{136} Do you agree that the clause; “that WHATSOEVER He gave to the rest” clearly means that if Jesus Christ Himself ever gives jurisdiction to any Catholic bishop or priest, He gives it to them only through St. Peter and his lawful successors?

{137} Do you agree that for over 1550 years it has been a clearly defined Catholic doctrine that Our Lord Jesus Christ only gives jurisdiction to Catholic bishops and priests through Peter and his lawful successors?

Recall to mind again the Catholic doctrine when correctly explained by Father Mary Casimir, Bishop Donald J. Sanborn, and Bishop Pivarunas: “facts are facts and The Church cannot give us false doctrine or contradict Herself ... And so if there is a contradiction, we have to say, “That cannot be the true Church of Christ” ... We have to stick with what the Church taught before, because the truth does NOT change with the times. The Catholic faith cannot change, cannot error, cannot contradict itself.” “The Catholic faith never changes ... we never have something that will be an apparent contradiction ... We don’t have the Church consistently teaching something for 1900 odd years, and all of a sudden we are told that is no longer true ... The Church made a mistake, and now we know better ... That could never take place.”

Recall to mind again the words of Pope Saint Pius X taken from *The Oath Against Modernism*: “I sincerely hold that the doctrine of faith was handed down to us from the apostles through the orthodox Fathers in exactly the same meaning and always in the same purport. Therefore, I entirely reject the heretical misrepresentation that dogmas evolve and change from one meaning to another different from the one which the Church held previously ... The purpose of this is, then, not that dogma may be tailored according to what seems better and more suited to the culture of each age; rather, that the absolute and immutable truth preached by the apostles from the beginning may never be believed to be different, may never be understood in any other way.”

{138} Do you agree that: “If Our Lord willed that there should be something common to Peter and the rest of the princes of His Church, it was only on this condition, that whatsoever He gave to the rest, He gave it to them through Peter” is the **absolute and immutable truth that may never be believed to be different, may never be understood in any other way?**

{139} Do you agree that if you answer yes to the question in the above paragraph; then it has to be contrary to reason and Catholic doctrine to say: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been delegated to us from Christ Himself”?

St. Thomas teaches in the Summa , Q. 18, Art. 4:

“In human affairs whatever is AGAINST REASON is a SIN!”

{140} Do you agree that St. Thomas Aquinas speaks the truth when telling us that whatever is against reason is a sin?

In his article *Traditional Priests, Legitimate Sacraments* Rev. Anthony Cekada wrote:

“No one dispenses another person’s property legitimately unless he does so based on that person’s command. Now, the sacraments are Christ’s property. Only those, therefore, who have a mission from Christ — namely, those to whom the apostolic mission derives — dispense them legitimately” (Billot, *ibid.*).

Those whom Our Lord has bound by divine law to confer sacraments, then, simultaneously receive from Him the *legitimate deputation* and the *apostolic mission* to confer them. (Rev. Anthony Cekada).

{141} Do you agree that Rev. Anthony Cekada is attempting to make everyone believe that every traditionalist priest automatically receives, obtains, and gets an apostolic mission and delegated jurisdiction derived, originating, and commencing directly from Jesus Christ at the moment of his ordination?

The Catholic Church teaches the EXACT OPPOSITE of Rev. Anthony Cekada and the Traditionalist Movement clerics. Father Clarence McAuliffe teaches in his *Sacramental Theology* (Imprimatur, April 25, 1958, pages 300-303):

“Conclusion 11. No one except a priest can administer the sacrament of penance. To do so, even a priest needs special faculties.

We treat only of the minister who can validly confer the sacrament. Other conditions are prescribed for licit administration.

Explanation of Terms.

1. No one except a priest. A priest is one who has the priestly character bestowed by the sacrament of orders. Hence both bishops and priests are valid ministers. Deacons, subdeacons, all others are excluded.

2. A priest needs special faculties. This means that even an ordained priest must also receive jurisdiction or ruling power in order to absolve validly. **PRIESTLY ORDINATION IS NOT ENOUGH.** The character of the priesthood confers the sanctifying power necessary for the remission of sins, but NOT the ruling power which every judge must have.

A bishop or priest can receive this power in either of two ways. He may be appointed to a certain office like the bishopric of a diocese or the pastorate of a parish. [Which means they have an appointment to the *cura animarum* (care of souls). Remember Rev. Anthony Cekada told us that: “Moreover, those of us who derive our orders from Abps. Lefebvre or Thuc obviously have no appointment to the *cura animarum* (care of souls).”] Such appointments automatically confer faculties to hear confessions. The same faculties can also be obtained by delegation from a superior, as when a bishop grants them to religious priests. But unless a priest has ruling power, he cannot validly absolve. Mere ordination to the priesthood NEVER confers this power.

The Conclusion, then, has two parts. First, no one except a priest can administer the sacrament of penance.

Second, to do so, even a priest needs faculties.

Dogmatic Note:

The first part is of divine faith from the Council of Trent (DB. 920; CT. 809): ‘If anyone says... that priests alone are not the ministers of absolution... let him be anathema.’

The second part is also of divine faith from the same council (DB. 903; CT. 796) when it states that it ratifies as most true what the Church has always held, namely, ‘that the absolution which a priest confers on one over whom he has neither ordinary or delegated jurisdiction ought to be reckoned of no worth.’

From this statement it follows as Catholic DOCTRINE that a priest does not receive faculties by ordination alone. The Council of Trent supposes that the minister is a priest, i.e., validly ordained. Yet it says that his absolution is of no worth unless he has either ordinary or delegated jurisdiction. Consequently, he did not receive this JURISDICTION by the mere fact of his ordination.

Part 1. No one except a priest can administer this sacrament...

Part 2. Even a priest needs special faculties.

Proof 2. From theological reasoning. The argument follows in form.

Judicial power involves the exercise of jurisdiction;

But the power to absolve or retain sins is judicial power:

Therefore, the power to absolve or retain sins involves the exercise of jurisdiction.

Proof for the major. A judge binds or looses the wills of men by imposing or liberating from obligations. This involves the exercise of jurisdiction, which he cannot assume on his own authority. He must have public power.

Proof for the minor. It is clear from the second Conclusion.

Proof 3. From the practice of the Church as revealed by the prescriptions of canon law.

The Code of Canon Law (Par. 872) states: ‘Besides the power of orders, the minister, to absolve sins validly, must have either ordinary or delegated power of jurisdiction over the penitent.’

From this declaration it is evident that delegated jurisdiction to absolve is not conferred by priestly ordination or episcopal consecration. That ordinary jurisdiction is not granted follows from the fact that no man receives a parish or diocese by his ordination.”

Thus we see how Father Clarence McAuliffe wrote and proved: “From this statement it follows as Catholic DOCTRINE that a priest does not receive faculties by ordination alone. The Council of Trent supposes that the minister is a priest, i.e., validly ordained. *Yet it says that his absolution is of no worth unless he has either ordinary or delegated jurisdiction.*

{142} Do you agree that consequently, he did not receive this jurisdiction by the mere fact of his ordination.”

{143} Do you agree that it follows as Catholic DOCTRINE that a priest did not receive this jurisdiction by the mere fact of his ordination?

We also see how Father Clarence McAuliffe proved this statement: “From this declaration it is evident that delegated jurisdiction to absolve is NOT conferred by priestly ordination or episcopal consecration.”

{144} Do you agree that: “From this declaration it is evident that delegated jurisdiction to absolve is NOT conferred by priestly ordination or episcopal consecration”; is the true and correct teaching of the infallible Catholic Church?

{145} Do you agree that because it is a Catholic DOCTRINE from the *Council of Trent* that a priest does not receive faculties by ordination alone; it follows correctly that it is a heresy and denial of Catholic DOCTRINE to teach that priestly ordination ALONE is enough to receive delegated jurisdiction and mission directly from Jesus Christ Himself?

{146} Do you agree that Father (Bishop) Mark Pivarunas expressed the teachings of the true Catholic Church when he told us: “The Catholic faith never changes ... we never have something that will be an apparent contradiction ... We don’t have the Church consistently teaching something for 1900 odd years, and all of a sudden we are told that is no longer true ... The Church made a mistake, and now we know better ... That could never take place”?

{147} Do you agree that because, “The Catholic faith never changes” it will always follow as Catholic DOCTRINE that no priest or bishop will ever receive their jurisdiction by the mere fact of his ordination or consecration?

{148} Do you agree that the NEW DOCTRINE: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself at the time of our ordination; by the mere fact of receiving ordination” is directly **contrary** to the Faith of the Catholic DOCTRINE from the *Council of Trent* that a priest does not receive faculties by ordination alone?

Remember the TRUTH we learned from Father Mary Casimir and Bishop Donald J. Sanborn: “The Church cannot give us false doctrine or contradict Herself ... And so if there is a contradiction, we have to say, “That cannot be the true Church of Christ” ... We have to stick with what the Church taught before, because the truth does NOT change with the times. The Catholic faith cannot change, cannot error, cannot contradict itself.”

{149} Do you agree that the Catholic Church gave us the TRUE Catholic DOCTRINE at the *Council of Trent* when it taught that a priest does not receive faculties by ordination alone?

{150} Do you agree that because “The Church cannot give us false doctrine or contradict Herself” that it is a CONTRADICTION to believe the FALSE non-Catholic doctrine was actually the truth, namely: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself at the time of our ordination; by the mere fact of receiving ordination”?

{151} Do you agree that there is a CONTRADICTION between the two beliefs; FIRST: “It is Catholic DOCTRINE from the *Council of Trent* that a priest does not receive faculties by ordination alone” and SECOND: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself at the time of our ordination; by the mere fact of receiving ordination”?

{152} Do you agree that it is true to believe: “And so if there is a contradiction, we have to say, “That cannot be the true Church of Christ” ... We have to stick with what the Church taught before, because the truth does NOT change with the times. The Catholic faith cannot change, cannot error, cannot contradict itself”?

{153} Do you agree that from the teachings of Bishop Pivarunas, Father Mary Casimir, Bishop Donald J. Sanborn, and Rev. Anthony Cekada everyone now knows the Traditionalist Movement; “cannot be the true Church of Christ” and that the Traditionalist Movement bishops, priests, and laity belong to a non-Catholic sect?

Learn about the Catholic faith from *The Liturgical Year*, by Dom Guéranger, Imprimatur, 1924, Vol. IV, pages 282-287.

“To-day, let us consider the Apostolic See as the sole source of the legitimate power, whereby mankind is ruled and governed in all that concerns eternal salvation.”

{154} Do you agree that because the Apostolic See is the sole source of legitimate power; traditionalist clerics do not receive legitimate power delegated directly from Christ Himself?

Dom Guéranger here provides the *unanimous* teaching of Catholic tradition:

“Yes, the episcopate is most sacred, for it comes from the hands of Jesus Christ through Peter and his successors. Such is the unanimous teaching of Catholic **TRADITION**, which is in keeping with the language used by the Roman pontiffs, from the earliest ages.”

Remember the dogma of the Catholic Church as explained at the first Vatican Council, 1870:

"All those things are to be believed by divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the written Word of God or in **Tradition**, and which are proposed by the Church, either in solemn judgment or in its ordinary and universal teaching office, as divinely revealed truths which must be believed."

{155} Do you agree that it is the unanimous teaching of Catholic **TRADITION** that the episcopate comes from the hands of Jesus Christ through Peter and his successors; and this pertains to a **DOGMA** of the Church because, “All those things are to be believed by divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the written Word of God or in **Tradition**”?

{156} Do you agree that they teach, preach, and communicate false doctrine that is contrary to the dogma of the Catholic Church who believe and state that Traditionalist Movement bishops are lawful successors of the Apostles although their episcopate did not come from the hands of Jesus Christ through Peter and his successors”

{157} Do you agree that they teach, preach, and communicate false doctrine that is contrary to the dogma of the Catholic Church who believe: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated to us from Christ Himself*” and “Those whom Our Lord has bound by divine law to confer sacraments, then, simultaneously receive from Him the *legitimate deputation* and the *apostolic mission* to confer them”?

{158} Do you agree that the Catholic faith is found in the two great sources of sacred Scripture and Catholic tradition?

Remember what we learned from Father Mary Tarcisius (also known as) Bishop Mark Pivarunas: “And this is something that is absolutely miraculous through the whole history and whole course of the Catholic Church. That never, ever has the Catholic Church ever deviated in the least bit from what Jesus Christ taught, what the apostles carried down, and what has been carefully kept throughout the whole the course of the Church. What Jesus Christ taught the apostles, and what the apostles carried down is what we call the Deposit of Faith. All that is contained in sacred Scripture, and all that has been handed down from sacred **TRADITION**; that is the Deposit of Faith. And you know this Deposit of Faith has been kept so faithfully, and we know it will always be kept faithfully because Jesus Christ’s Church is One.”

{159} Do you agree that it is the unanimous teaching of Catholic **TRADITION** that the episcopate comes from the hands of Jesus Christ through Peter and his successors?

{160} Do you agree that EVERY Catholic should agree that it belongs to the Deposit of Faith which must be believed by divine and Catholic faith because it is contained in the unanimous teaching of Catholic Tradition; that the episcopate comes from the hands of Jesus Christ through Peter and his successors?

{161} Do you agree that the episcopate of Bishop Pivarunas did not come from the hands of Jesus Christ through Peter and his successors?

{162} Do you agree that not one single living Bishop in the Traditionalist Movement can prove that his episcopate came from the hands of Jesus Christ through Peter and his successors?

{163} Do you agree that it follows with correct logic, as found in the “Deposit of Faith which must be believed by divine and Catholic faith”; that not one single living Bishop in the Traditionalist Movement can prove that he belongs to the Catholic Church that is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic?

{164} Do you agree that all reject the Catholic faith who teach that their delegated jurisdiction and mission come directly from the hands of Jesus Christ but not through Peter and his successors?

{165} Do you agree that they are heretics who teach contrary to the Catholic faith and the language used by the Roman pontiffs from the earliest ages; when they proclaim and attempt to demonstrate that their jurisdiction and mission is delegated directly from Jesus Christ Himself without coming through any successor of St. Peter – that is to say, contrary to the Deposit of Faith and the Teaching Magisterium of the Church?

Dom Guéranger sums up what he has been teaching us:

“All spiritual authority comes from Peter; all comes from the bishop of Rome, in whom Peter will continue to govern the Church to the end of time. Jesus Christ is the founder of the episcopate; it is the Holy Ghost who established bishops to rule the Church; but the MISSION and the institution, which assign the pastor his flock, and the flock its pastor, these are given by Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost through the ministry of Peter and his successors.”

{166} Do you agree that the above paragraph is stating and explaining the true Catholic dogma that every Catholic is bound to believe if he is going to remain a member of the Catholic Church?

{167} Do you agree that This turns everything on its head (to use Rev. Anthony Cekada’s expression in *Traditional Priests, Legitimate Sacraments*), and is turning everything upside down when the Traditionalist Movement teaches the exact opposite of what the Catholic Church has always taught?

I now bring Dom Guéranger’s statements and quotes to a close with his own pertinent conclusion:

“We, then, both priests and people, have a right to know whence our pastors have received their power. From whose hand have they received the keys? If their MISSION comes from the apostolic see, let us honor and obey them, for they are sent to us by Jesus Christ, who has invested them, through Peter, with His own authority. If they claim our obedience without having been sent by the bishop of Rome, we must refuse to receive them for they are not acknowledged by Christ as His ministers. The holy anointing may have conferred on them the sacred character of the episcopate: it matters not; they must be as aliens to us, for they have not been sent, they are not pastors.”

{168} Do you agree that the bishop of Rome is not the same person as Christ Himself?

{169} Do you agree that This turns everything on its head (to use Rev. Anthony Cekada’s expression), and is turning everything upside down to accept the heretical position of the Protestant Traditionalist Movement when they teach that Christ Himself is the same person as the bishop of Rome?

{170} Do you agree that it is a very fatal mistake for you to acknowledge as your pastors anyone and everyone who teaches that priests and bishops receive their ordinary or delegated jurisdiction and mission directly from Christ Himself?

{171} Do you agree that Pope Pius XII was, of course, specifically protected by the Holy Ghost to be able to teach infallibly whenever he spoke to the Universal Church on matters of faith or morals?

{172} Do you agree that Pope Pius XII specifically taught the Universal Church on a matter of faith when he explained, expounded, and clarified that: “bishops who have been neither named nor confirmed by the Apostolic See...enjoy *no powers of teaching* or of jurisdiction” (See paragraph 39 of his encyclical, *Ad Apostolorum Principis*, June 29, 1958)?

Pope Pius XII in paragraph 20 of *Humani Generis* – August 12, 1950, explained another important Catholic doctrine:

“Nor must it be thought that what is expounded in Encyclical Letters does not of itself **DEMAND CONSENT**, since in writing such Letters the Popes do not exercise the supreme power of their Teaching Authority. For these matters are taught with the ordinary teaching authority, of which it is true to say: ‘He who heareth you, heareth me...’”

{173} Do you agree that the Catholic Church demands consent from everyone who wishes to remain one of Her members to believe without any doubt that, “bishops who have been neither named nor confirmed by the Apostolic See...enjoy ***no powers of teaching*** or of jurisdiction”?

{174} Do you agree that this turns everything on its head (to use Rev. Anthony Cekada’s expression), and is turning everything upside down to teach bishops who have been neither named nor confirmed by the Apostolic See enjoy ***every power of teaching*** and of jurisdiction because they receive it directly from Jesus Christ Himself?

{175} Do you agree that the Catholic Church demands consent from everyone who wishes to remain one of Her members to believe without any doubt that, “It is, in fact, ***a DOGMA of faith*** that the authority of the bishops, even admitting that it stems directly from Christ, remains dependent on the authority of the Roman Pontiff” (see Pope Pius VI in *Post factum tibi*)?

{176} Do you agree that this turns everything on its head and is turning everything upside down to teach it is, in fact, not a dogma of faith that the authority, jurisdiction, and mission of the bishops is dependent on the Roman Pontiff because their authority, jurisdiction, and mission is delegated directly from Jesus Christ Himself?

{177} Do you agree that the Catholic Church demands consent from everyone who wishes to remain one of Her members to believe without any doubt that, “It is an ***article of faith*** that the authority and jurisdiction of the bishops is subordinate to that of the Sovereign Pontiff” (see Pope Pius VI in *Notre cher fils*)?

{178} Do you agree that this turns everything on its head and is turning everything upside down to teach the exact opposite of an article of faith and proclaim that the authority, jurisdiction, and mission of bishops has nothing to do with the Sovereign Pontiff?

{179} Do you agree that the Catholic Church demands consent from everyone who wishes to remain one of Her members to believe without any doubt that, “The episcopate, with all its authority, emanates from the Apostolic See” (see Pope Saint Innocent I)?

{180} Do you agree that this turns everything on its head and is turning everything upside down to teach the episcopate, with all its authority, does not emanate from the Apostolic See because every Catholic cleric receives his jurisdiction and mission directly from Christ Himself?

{181} Do you agree that the Catholic Church demands consent from everyone who wishes to remain one of Her members to believe without any doubt that, “If Our Lord willed that there should be something common to Peter and the rest of the princes of His Church, it was only on this condition, that whatsoever He gave to the rest, He gave it to them through Peter” (see Pope Saint Leo the Great)?

{182} Do you agree that this turns everything on its head and clearly designates and shows they are heretical, protesting Protestants who teach Our Lord does not will that priests and bishops receive their jurisdiction and mission through St. Peter because Our Lord delegated jurisdiction and mission to them directly from Himself?

{183} Do you agree that the Catholic Church demands consent from everyone who wishes to remain one of Her members to believe without any doubt that, “He conferred nothing on any of the rest without Peter participating in it” (see Pope Leo XIII in *Satis Cognitum*)?

{184} Do you agree that this turns everything on its head and proves that they are non-Catholic Protestants who teach that the Apostolic See does not have the right to make the members of the Catholic Church believe that bishops and priests do not receive jurisdiction and mission delegated directly from Christ Himself?

{185} Do you agree that the Catholic Church demands consent from everyone who wishes to remain one of Her members to believe without any doubt that, “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff” (see Pope Pius XII in *Ad Apostolorum Principis*)?

{186} Do you agree that this turns everything on its head and proves beyond all doubt that they are heretical, protesting Protestants who teach, educate, and instill into the minds of their followers that jurisdiction does not pass to Catholic bishops and priests only through the Roman Pontiff; but rather it is delegated directly from Christ Himself?

{187} Do you agree that the Catholic Church demands consent from everyone who wishes to remain one of Her members to believe without any doubt that, “I sincerely hold that the doctrine of faith was handed down to us from the apostles through the orthodox Fathers in exactly the same meaning and always in the same purport. Therefore, I entirely reject the **heretical misrepresentation** that **dogmas evolve and change from one meaning to another different from the one which the Church held previously** ... The purpose of this is, then, **not that dogma may be tailored according to what seems better and more suited to the culture of each age**; rather, that the **absolute and immutable truth** preached by the apostles from the beginning **may never be believed to be different, may never be understood in any other way.**” (see *The Oath Against Modernism*, Pope St. Pius X)?

{188} Do you agree that the Traditionalist Movement clerics and the laity would rather be castigated, reprimanded, criticized, and condemned by Pope Saint Pius X who speaks of them as Modernists?

{189} Do you agree that “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff” is the doctrine of faith handed down to us from the apostles and all of the orthodox Fathers and true successors of St. Peter?

{190} Do you agree that therefore, to remain Catholics the Church demands our consent to believe that “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff” in exactly the same meaning and always in the same purport, implication, and connotation as was intended by Pope Pius XII and by all former Councils and Vicars of Jesus Christ?

{191} Do you agree that to remain a Catholic each one must entirely reject the HERETICAL misunderstanding that Catholic bishops and priests receive their jurisdiction and mission directly from Christ Himself?

{192} Do you agree that Catholics are not permitted to accept, embrace, adopt, or believe in a NEW teaching (no matter by whom promulgated) different from the one which the Church held previously?

{193} Do you agree that it is a NEW teaching different from the one which the Church held previously to say “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself”?

{194} Do you agree that the **absolute and immutable truth** preached by the apostles from the beginning is, “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”?

{195} Do you agree that the **absolute and immutable truth** preached by the apostles from the beginning (that “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff”) **may never be believed to be different, may never be understood in any other way**?

{196} Do you agree that the Catholic Church demands consent from everyone who wishes to remain one of Her members to believe without any doubt that, “For even if these men by their rash sacrilege could confer the rank of bishop on him, they certainly could not give him a jurisdiction which they themselves do not possess”?

{197} Do you agree with Pope Pius VI in *Charitas*: “The right of ordaining bishops belongs only to the Apostolic See, as the Council of Trent declares; it cannot be assumed by any bishop or metropolitan without obliging Us to declare schismatic both those who ordain and those who are ordained, thus invalidating their future actions”?

{198} Do you agree that the Catholic Church demands consent from everyone who wishes to remain one of Her members to believe without any doubt that, “No one can lawfully confer episcopal consecration unless he has received the mandate of the Apostolic See. Consequently, if consecration of this kind is being done contrary to all right and law, and by this crime the Unity of the Church is being seriously attacked, an excommunication reserved specialissimo modo to the Apostolic See has been established which is automatically incurred by the consecrator and by anyone who has received consecration irresponsibly conferred” (see Pope Pius XII in *Ad Apostolorum Principis*)?

{199} Do you agree that it is an heretical misrepresentation that the Catholic doctrines, stated by Pope Pius VI and Pope Pius XII in the two previous paragraphs, can evolve and change from one meaning to another different from the one which the Church held previously?

{200} Do you agree that the purpose of the Modernists is, then, to teach **that dogma**, and the doctrines of the Catholic Church as explained by popes and councils, **may be tailored according to what seems better and more suited to the culture of each age**?

{201} Do you agree that **another** teaching **different from the one which the Church held previously** under popes Pius VI and Pius XII concerning the need for a papal mandate is now held by the Modernist, protesting Protestant Traditionalist Movement?

{202} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas was explaining and teaching according to the true Catholic doctrine when he says: **“He who hears you hears me”**; especially when Bishop Pivarunas was referring to popes Pius VI and Pius XII concerning the need for a papal mandate when speaking as the highest authority of Jesus Christ and of the **teaching Church** (*Ecclesia docens*) of the ordinary living magisterium?

{203} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas was explaining and teaching according to the true Catholic doctrine when he says: **He who does not believe what you** – popes Pius VI and Pius XII – **teach** concerning the need for a papal mandate **will be condemned**?

{204} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas was explaining and teaching according to the true Catholic doctrine when he says: **In the Apostolic See the Catholic Religion has **always** been kept unsullied and its teachings kept holy**; and that unsullied and holy Catholic religion was taught by the authority of Jesus Christ through popes Pius VI and Pius XII that all bishops consecrating and consecrated without a papal mandate are excommunicated and schismatic?

{205} Do you agree that when Bishop Pivarunas reminded us **“this See of St. Peter **always** remains untainted by any **error**”** that the See of St. Peter did not and could not **err** in teaching that all bishops consecrating and consecrated without a papal mandate are excommunicated and schismatic?

Saint Francis De Sales: “To say the Church errs is to say no less that God errs, or else that He is willing and desirous for us to err; which would be a great blasphemy.”

{206} Do you agree that to say **“this See of St. Peter **always** remains untainted by any **error**”** means it would be a great blasphemy on the part of all those who say that the Church did err in teaching that all bishops consecrating and consecrated without a papal mandate are excommunicated and schismatic?

{207} Do you agree that when Bishop Pivarunas also explained the truth when he quoted Pope Leo XIII, **“If the living *Magisterium*, the teaching authority of the Church, could in any way be false, an evident contradiction follows; because then God Himself would be the author of error”**; that it correctly follows as Catholic doctrine that Almighty God Himself would be the author of error if He now authorized episcopal consecrations without the authority and necessary mandate of the Apostolic See?

{208} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas correctly condemned Vatican II as a non-Catholic religion because they came along and completely did the reverse of what the Church taught in the past?

{209} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas correctly explained that the Vatican II hierarchy and any other clerics who officially now teach things that were condemned by the Catholic Church in the past cannot be the living magisterium?

{210} Do you agree that in the past the living magisterium of the Catholic Church condemned consecrations without a papal mandate and excommunicated those who consecrated and those who were consecrated without this necessary papal mandate?

{211} Do you agree that it is now Bishop Pivarunas correctly teaching the hierarchy in the Traditionalist Movement **cannot be the hierarchy of the Catholic Church**?

Remember what Bishop Pivarunas said while explaining about the ecumenism in the non-Catholic religions: If Jesus said, “Whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven. He who hears you hears Me. Whatever you say is representing Me.” And we have these men saying, **break the first commandment; worship with the other religions.**

{212} Do you agree that this goes on every week in the Traditionalist Movement while the members of the various Groups, Societies, and Communities switch back and forth from one to the other as they break the first commandment; and worship with the other religions?

This hyperlink <https://www.jmjsite.com/v/We-belong-to-the-same-church.mp4> will take you to a short video extracted from the sermon given by Bishop Pivarunas.

During the sermon of Bishop Pivarunas when he consecrated Bishop Daniel Dolan of SSPX; Bishop Pivarunas thereby explained, sealed, confirmed, and finalized the **fact** that the SSPX sect is the **same** church as CMRI, SSPV, FSSP, SSPX-SO, SSPX-MC, as well as all of the other Groups, Societies, and Communities. Bishop Pivarunas said the following: “You know, it is not, the Thuc Bishops or the Lefebvre Bishops or the Thuc Priests or the Lefebvre Priests or this Group or that Group - we are Roman Catholic! It is not this Society or that Society or this Community – we are Roman Catholic; and as such we work together. We belong to the **same** church!”

{213} Do you agree that breaking the first commandment; and worship with the other religions is recommended and approved of by Bishop Pivarunas since he told us: “You know, it is not, the Thuc Bishops or the Lefebvre Bishops or the Thuc Priests or the Lefebvre Priests or this Group or that Group - we are Roman Catholic! It is not this Society or that Society or this Community – we are Roman Catholic; and as such we work together. We belong to the **same** church!”

Let us remember what Bishop Pivarunas truthfully told us (while he was known by the name of Father Mary Tarcisius, CMRI): “False ecumenism is to say, ‘There is salvation outside the Church; **let’s get together; let’s forget about our differences**; and have this superficial unity.’ My dear friends in Christ, let us make no mistake! This false ecumenism is nothing but a deviation from the Catholic faith. It is in reality Modernism!”

As Father Mary Casimir stated: “facts are facts.”

{214} Do you agree that the facts, circumstances, and events, prove those who belong to the **same** church as Bishop Pivarunas are very ecumenical as they get together and forget about their differences every week while changing from Groups, Societies, and Communities to other Groups, Societies, and Communities?

{215} Do you agree that it is not, the beliefs and practices of the Thuc Priests or the Lefebvre Priests that disturbs, disrupts, interrupts, or removes the **UNITY** in this Society of SSPX or that Society of FSSP or this Community of CMRI?

{216} Do you agree that not even this Society of SSPX or that Society of FSSP who offer their *una cum* Mass with Francis; or this Community of CMRI or that Group at SGG who say it is a mortal sin to offer the *una cum* Mass with Francis that disturbs, disrupts, interrupts, or removes the **UNITY** in the Groups, Societies, and Communities of the Traditionalist Movement – because even with their differences concerning **SUBSTANTIAL** beliefs about the Catholic Church they all belong to the SAME church?

{217} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas’ admission that all of these Groups, Societies, and Communities all belong to the SAME church as himself is in one sense very astounding and amazing; while in another sense it is a reasonable, logical, and understandable admission that none of them belong to the Catholic Church founded by Jesus Christ?

{218} Do you agree that when Bishop Pivarunas says: “You know, it is not, the Thuc Bishops or the Lefebvre Bishops or the Thuc Priests or the Lefebvre Priests or this Group or that Group - we are Roman Catholic! It is not this Society or that Society or this Community – we are Roman Catholic; and as such we work together ... We belong to the **SAME** church”; that Bishop Pivarunas is saying in reality: “let’s get together; let’s forget about our differences; and have this superficial unity”?

{219} Do you agree that, “This false ecumenism is nothing but a deviation from the Catholic faith. It is in reality Modernism”?

Because all of these Groups, Societies, and Communities belong to the **SAME** church; let us refresh our memory with what we learned from Rev. Anthony Cekada about these Groups and Societies that

belong to the **SAME** church as SSPX and SSPV: “These groups promote false doctrine or discipline! First of all Pius X Society; they promote in effect error, schism, and apostasy. The notion that you can recognize someone as a pope, but not do any blessed thing he says if you decide not to do that. You set a private judgment over each papal teaching and law. You have the idea, you promote the notion the Church Authority can give evil laws and false doctrine. You maintain it is permissible to defy the man you say is the Pope by maintaining a parallel hierarchy. These notions are **schismatic** and embody false doctrine. Or with the Pius V Society; this idea of error, schisms, and occult like mentality. This Organization stubbornly promotes grossly ignorant errors regarding the basic principles of SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY. They say that certain sacraments are invalid, and according to all the principles of Catholic moral and SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY the sacraments are valid!” ... “So just get along with what? The sin of **Schism**; invalidly ordained priests; error and ignorance of sacramental principles; or denials of Church Doctrine? The issue is Doctrine! You cannot just say, “Well, just get along and ignore that point.” ... “And why can’t Father Cekada get along with Pius X or Pius V and Feeneyites and so on. Don’t they promote the Latin Mass too? And the answer is simple. Their Doctrine is false!”

{220} Do you agree the bishops and priests of all of these Groups, Societies, and Communities themselves truthfully teach, preach, and proclaim that they all belong to the SAME church; and it is a fact that these groups promote false doctrine or discipline; and they promote in effect error, schism, and apostasy; and their notions are **schismatic** and embody false doctrine; their Doctrine is false?

{221} Do you agree that Rev. Anthony Cekada spoke of the society of Saint Pius V as: “This Organization stubbornly promotes grossly ignorant errors regarding the basic principles of SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY. They say that certain sacraments are invalid, and according to all the principles of Catholic moral and SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY the sacraments are valid”?

{222} Do you agree that Father Clarence McAuliffe teaches the Catholic doctrine in his Sacramental Theology which is the opposite of the *Theology* of Rev. Anthony Cekada?

Father Clarence McAuliffe teaches: “A priest needs special faculties. This means that even an ordained priest must also receive jurisdiction or ruling power in order to absolve validly. PRIESTLY ORDINATION IS NOT ENOUGH. The character of the priesthood confers the sanctifying power necessary for the remission of sins, but NOT the ruling power which every judge must have. But unless a priest has ruling power, he cannot validly absolve. Mere ordination to the priesthood NEVER confers this power... delegated jurisdiction to absolve is not conferred by priestly ordination or episcopal consecration.”

{223} Do you agree that Rev. Anthony Cekada, “promotes grossly ignorant errors regarding the basic principles of SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY” directly opposed to the Catholic *Sacramental Theology* presented by Father Clarence McAuliffe when Rev. Anthony Cekada teaches “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself at the time of our ordination; by the mere fact of receiving ordination”?

{224} Do you agree that people who study their faith, as Rev. Anthony Cekada exhorted them to do, will logically now be using Rev. Anthony Cekada’s other expression: “**Oh Helloooooo!!!**”?

Have you been drinking so much champagne or “Kool-Aid” provided by the Traditionalist Movement clerics that you do not now see the truth?

It is beneficial to read the entire book, *The History, Nature, and Use of EPIKEIA in Moral Theology*, by Father Lawrence Joseph Riley, Imprimatur 1948. We find this important truth on page 447.

“A priest has that jurisdiction to absolve which the CHURCH gives to him; he has neither more nor less!”

{225} Do you agree therefore that everyone who teaches: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself” is simply stating in another way that they do not have any jurisdiction whatsoever from either Jesus Christ or the Catholic Church?

Father Thomas E. Cox published his book, *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* Copyright 1900, with the imprimatur of Bishop Patrick A. Feehan. On page 54 Father Cox wrote this truth to explain in part what is necessary to belong to the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church founded by Jesus Christ:

“One thing is sure, we can NEVER arrive at the ONE TRUE CHURCH by shaving the corners off discordant creeds and then pasting the residue together.”

Remember what Rev. Anthony Cekada said when he was speaking about the discordant creeds that make up the Traditionalist Movement. “I can’t get along with them because they teach a different doctrine! And they teach a doctrine that is false! These groups promote false doctrine or discipline they promote in effect error, **schism**, and apostasy! So just get along with what? The sin of **Schism**; invalidly ordained priests; error and ignorance of sacramental principles; or denials of Church Doctrine? The issue is **Doctrine!**”

Also remember what Bishop Pivarunas believes, preaches, and wants everyone else to believe concerning the discordant creeds of the Traditionalist Movement and Novus Ordo Groups, Societies, and Communities: “We belong to the **SAME** church!”

{226} Do you agree that Bishop Francis Schuckardt claimed his Powers of Orders originated through the Old Catholic Church; which have a discordant creed from the Catholic Church?

{227} Do you agree that the CMRI Community that split away from Bishop Francis Schuckardt at this time have a different discordant creed then that which they believed while they were part of the Community of Bishop Francis Schuckardt?

{228} Do you agree that the discordant creed of the CMRI sect founded by Bishop Francis Schuckardt, as well as the split away sect of CMRI now under the leadership of Bishop Pivarunas, included the belief that the men known as the Popes of the Novus Ordo Conciliar church are not true popes?

{229} Do you agree that Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre’s SSPX sect holds the exact opposite belief and state that the men known as the Popes of the Novus Ordo Conciliar church are true popes?

{230} Do you agree that Bishop Guérard des Lauriers, Bishop Robert McKenna, Bishop Donald J. Sanborn and others teach yet another theory as this new sect espouses papa materialiter non formaliter ideology that the Novus Ordo papal claimants do not hold the fullness of the Papacy due to their modernist views, an idea that has come to be called Sedeprivationism?

{231} Do you agree that Bishop Thuc seemingly believed all three of the above theories as well as many others?

Consider the astonishing, surprising, and amazing lineage of Archbishop Thuc! These “Catholic” priests and bishops, *all claiming* to possess valid orders, (and according to Rev. Anthony Cekada and Bishop Pivarunas and CMRI, they all receive jurisdiction and mission directly from Jesus Christ Himself) probably hold the broadest conceivable spectrum of theologies and **discordant creeds** ever witnessed during the lifetime of any bishop starting a lineage. His lineage and their theologies and **discordant creeds** include the new Cassiciacum Thesis or Sedeprivationism; Sedevacantists; non-Sedevacantists; a self-proclaimed false pope; the French Satanist sect; covert, clandestine, underground ordinations; Old Catholics; Russian Orthodox; “women priests”; young boys ordained as priests; visionaries; to the strictest Traditional Roman Catholics! It also includes *many* second attempts of conditional re-ordinations and re-consecrations from another bishop in the *same* lineage! Nevertheless, Bishop Pivarunas publicly states in his sermon that all of these Groups, Societies, and Communities are all Roman Catholics belonging to the **SAME** church!

However, remember what Father Cox wrote: “One thing is sure, we can NEVER arrive at the ONE TRUE CHURCH by shaving the corners off **discordant** creeds and then pasting the residue together.”

When speaking of the Unity of the Church, Father Cox also wrote to explain in part what is necessary to belong to the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church founded by Jesus Christ:

“All its members should believe the same truths; they should partake of the same Sacraments, and be **governed under the same head.**”

{232} Do you agree that the members of the many DISCORDANT creeds in the sects of the Novus Ordo and/or Traditionalist Movement non-Catholic sects do NOT believe the **SAME** truths or partake of the **SAME**

Sacraments and that they are governed under about as many heads as there are bishops and priests in these non-Catholic sects?

{233} Do you agree that an obvious proof the Traditionalist Movement sect is not the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church founded by Jesus Christ is the FACT that they do not believe the SAME truths?

{234} Do you agree that Rev. Anthony Cekada explained that the Society of Saint Pius V does not partake of the same sacramental theology as himself and some of his friends?

{235} Do you agree that there is no designated head among the leaders in the Sedevacantists church by which they are governed?

{236} Do you agree that the SSPX is not governed by the Novus Ordo Conciliar popes – knowing as we do that they disobey them over and over and over again and again and again and reject what their popes teach them?

On page 58 Father Cox reminds us of what is also necessary to belong to the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church founded by Jesus Christ:

“It is not enough that the Church should be LIKE the Church Christ founded: it must be the SAME that Christ founded. Nor is it enough that the Church was the Church that Christ founded, but it must CONTINUE TO BE the Church Christ founded ... Union excludes division, unity excludes plurality, whether simultaneous or successive ... The Church of Christ MUST be the same all over the world, and it must be the same down through all time.”

{237} Do you agree that if the Traditionalist Movement church was the SAME that Christ founded; then its clerics would receive their authority, jurisdiction, and mission from and through the lawful successors of St. Peter?

{238} Do you agree that although Bishop Pivarunas said all the Groups, Societies, Communities belong to the SAME church; the truth is that they are not united but very much division is obvious among these different groups?

{239} Do you agree that the obviously TRUTHFUL fact is that the church memberships that make up the Sedevacantism, Sedevacantists, and non-Sedevacantists sects are POSITIVELY not the SAME in their thinking all over the world; and that they positively are not **governed under the same head**?

{240} Do you agree that it is just these many Groups, Societies, and Communities of the Traditionalist Movement that are divided into exactly opposite, contrary, conflicting, dissimilar, and divergent beliefs by which they have become known, recognized, distinguished, and designated as Sedevacantism, Sedevacantists, and non-Sedevacantists sects?

On page 58 Father Cox reminds us of what is also necessary to belong to the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church founded by Jesus Christ:

“For the present, we are justified in assuming that the Church continues to be whatever it can be proved to have been in its own nature at its inception.”

Pages 71 and 73 from *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* remind us of these other very important truths necessary to belong to the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church founded by Jesus Christ:

“The Church is not only essentially one, but also visibly one. One thing is certain: the true Church has no sect which is part of it. The unity of the Church is NOT a union of sects. If one Church is true, all sects are false.”

{241} Do you agree that VISIBLY the many Groups, Societies, and Communities that Bishop Pivarunas claims belong to the SAME church to which he belongs; that make up the Traditional Movement and Novus Ordo churches most certainly are not one in Government, nor one in Faith, nor one in Liturgy?

{242} Do you agree that those who belong to any part of the Sedevacantism, Sedevacantists, non-Sedevacantists, and Novus Ordo sects are POSITIVELY not the SAME in essentially having the same laws, liturgy, and head for their religion?

{243} Do you agree that unfortunate though it is; the members of the Sedevacantism, Sedevacantists, non-Sedevacantists, and Novus Ordo sects are weekly if not daily switching back and forth between one to the other

although very, very few of them ever officially make a Profession of Faith or abjure their errors for belonging to a sect that is non-Catholic?

{244} Do you agree that seemingly one of the main goals of the SSPX sect is simply to have unity with the Novus Ordo sect regardless of the strange teachings of the man they accept as Pope Francis?

{245} Do you agree that the many Groups, Societies, and Communities coming from Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre and the Old Catholics are made up of a variety of different sects with different beliefs and different heads?

{246} Do you agree that it most frequently happens that the members of these many Groups, Societies, and Communities coming from Bishop Thuc, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, the Novus Ordo sect, and the Old Catholics continually switch around and go from one Group, Society, and Community to another one of them without ever having to acknowledge that at any time they belonged to a non-Catholic sect?

{247} Do you agree that the people in the various sects, are permitted to switch around and go from one to the other because of the truth of the theology expressed by Bishop Pivarunas that they all belong to the SAME church?

{248} Do you agree that we know “If one Church is true, all sects are false”; and therefore all of these many Groups, Societies, and Communities coming from Bishop Thuc, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, the Novus Ordo sect, and the Old Catholics are all false sects separated from the Catholic Church founded by Jesus Christ?

{249} Do you agree that about the ONLY unity they have among them is when they truthfully admit THEY ARE NOT UNITED?

{250} Do you agree that no sect among them or all of them combined together can be the TRUE CHURCH? Pages 140 and 141 from *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* remind us of this truth:

“If, however, the sects taught every truth, of those which Christ taught, except one, they could NOT claim Catholicity of truth; and the fact of their closer resemblance to Christ's Church in doctrine would only make them more to be dreaded as counterfeits. For, says the writer of a tract on the orthodox faith, against the Arians, ‘There is nothing more dangerous than those heretics who admit nearly the whole cycle of doctrine, and yet by one word, as with a drop of poison, infect the real and simple faith taught by Our Lord and handed down by the Apostolic tradition.’ It is nothing to boast of that the sects teach some truth - of course they teach SOME truth, but the Church which all are commanded to hear must teach ALL TRUTH.”

{251} Do you agree that some of the sects that make up the Traditionalist Movement have a closer resemblance to Christ's Church in doctrine than others of them – and for that very reason make them more to be dreaded as counterfeits?

{252} Do you agree that: “the Church which all are commanded to hear must teach ALL TRUTH”?

{253} Do you agree that the Sedepriovationism section of the Groups, Societies, and Communities to which Bishop Pivarunas belongs; teaches that the Catholic Church demands us to hear them when they teach St. Peter was only the Pope materially but not formally?

{254} Do you agree that the Sedevacantists section of the Groups, Societies, and Communities to which Bishop Pivarunas belongs; teaches that the Catholic Church demands us to hear them when they teach the See of Peter has been vacant for a long time, therefore we have this NEW theology that; “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself”?

{255} Do you agree that the non-Sedevacantists section of the Groups, Societies, and Communities to which Bishop Pivarunas belongs; teaches that the Catholic Church demands us to hear them when they teach the Sedevacantists are wrong, and the Vatican II popes are still Catholics and heads of the church no matter how heretical they speak and teach things?

{256} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas teaches that regardless of how much heresy is preached and how different the doctrines are of the various Groups, Societies, and Communities they all have perfect **UNITY**, and all belong to the SAME church, because all these matters only pertain to OPINIONS and not to doctrine and dogma?

While writing about the Apostolicity of the Church, Father Cox wrote on page 154 concerning other things necessary to belong to the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church founded by Jesus Christ:

The word “Apostle” signifies “one sent.” It is a term that implies a relationship, for in some way it connotes both the messenger and the sender. As applied to the Church, it expresses its ministerial cause, the Apostles, and it implies its dependence on the primary cause, Christ. To say that the Church is Christian, is to name its primary cause; to say that it is Apostolic, is to tell its ministerial cause.

{257} Do you agree that because, The word “Apostle” signifies “one sent”; the bishops in the Catholic Church must be sent by a successor of St. Peter to work in the vineyard of Jesus Christ?

{258} Do you agree that is the big difference between: 1st; those bishops in the Traditional Movement and Novus Ordo sects who call themselves Catholics today and 2nd; the true bishops in the Catholic Church?

{259} Do you agree that we know Traditional Movement and Novus Ordo bishops have never been sent by a successor of St. Peter to work in the vineyard of Jesus Christ?

While writing about the Apostolicity of the Church, Father Cox continues on page 155 concerning other things necessary to belong to the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church founded by Jesus Christ:

“The term ‘apostolic,’ when applied to the Catholic Church, is synonymous with ‘genuine,’ ‘accredited,’ ‘authorized,’ ‘true.’ A church which is not Apostolic is confessedly spurious, and at once proclaims itself an upstart, an imposter, a sham.”

{260} Do you agree that “A church which is not Apostolic is confessedly spurious, and at once proclaims itself an upstart, an imposter, a sham”?

{261} Do you agree that generally speaking the Novus Ordo church teaches the Traditionalist Movement church is confessedly spurious, and at once proclaims itself an upstart, an imposter, a sham?

{262} Do you agree that many of the Traditional Movementist clerics teach the Novus Ordo church is confessedly spurious, and at once proclaims itself an upstart, an imposter, a sham?

{263} Do you agree that before mid-1984 all of the CMRI clerics certainly taught and believed that the Novus Ordo church with ALL of its hierarchy was false, bogus, illegitimate, phony, an upstart, an imposter, and a sham?

{264} Do you agree that the CMRI Church founded by Bishop Francis Schuckardt teaches all churches originating with Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre (SSPX, SSPX-OC, SSPX-MC, FSSP) are confessedly spurious, and at once proclaims itself an upstart, an imposter, a sham?

{265} Do you agree that the CMRI Church founded by Bishop Francis Schuckardt teaches all of the churches originating with Bishop Thuc are confessedly spurious, and at once proclaims itself an upstart, an imposter, a sham?

Rev. Anthony Cekada, writing under the pseudonym “Peregrinus,” provided an in-depth analysis and critique of the Thuc-line branch of the Traditionalists in his 1983 article, *Two Bishops in Every Garage*, printed in *The Roman Catholic*.

In *Two Bishops in Every Garage*, Rev. Anthony Cekada had this to say about the consecration of Bishop Musey by Bishop Carmona: “The photos of the event reveal some departures from what is prescribed in the Roman Pontifical.”

After stating also that Archbishop Thuc started a **schismatic** sect, Rev. Anthony Cekada continued on to explain more about Archbishop Thuc: “Nor were Mgr. Ngô’s activities limited to the consecration and ordination of SCHISMATICS. A French newsletter which supports him states that on Holy Thursday, April 15, 1981, he concelebrated the New Mass with Mgr. Barthe, the bishop of Toulon. The author explains: ‘He said it was because on that day he could not celebrate alone... It happens that it was a false concelebration, because he said he didn’t receive communion. For, when a priest does not communicate, there is not a Mass. (17)’

Mgr. Ngô’s justification for his action by maintaining that he only simulated the celebration of Mass – simulation of a sacrament, incidentally, is a grave sin – does not increase our confidence in his grasp of sacramental theology.

Mgr. Ngô seems to have some rather unusual ideas on liturgical and disciplinary matters.

A section of his autobiography appeared in a recent issue of *The Seraph*, (57) and the index page notes it is ‘from the French by Bishop Vezelis.’ Mgr. Ngô says that: ‘...among the intellectuals, we admit unity of dogma in matters of Faith, but with diversity in the spheres which do not touch dogma.’

Speaking of the situation in the Church before Vatican II, he continues: ‘*This explains to some extent my disaffection for the invasive enterprises of the Vatican to impose points of liturgy and canon law – in a word – reducing the particularity of every civilization to a common denominator... Diversity is the ornament of the universe. Why impose only one manner of celebrating the Holy Mass, which consists uniquely of the consecration? And to impose it under the penalty of suspension and even excommunication – is this not an abuse of power?*’

Mgr. Ngô seems to have forgotten that the reason the Church insisted on liturgical uniformity was because she viewed it as a reflection of doctrinal unity, in any case, he continues: ‘*The Vatican invents regulations in order to choke any peculiarity, be it liturgical, or be it canonical, of the local Churches. It wishes uniformity everywhere without thinking that the liturgical peculiarities of the oriental Churches date back to the apostolic age, and without considering that each people has its characteristics just as respectable as those of Rome.*’

The oriental customs he enumerates are the social customs of pagan Asian cultures, and not those of the eastern Uniate churches. The reason the Church ‘invented’ regulations, by the way, was to preserve the faith and to ‘choke’ error.

He observes that Our Lord celebrated the Last Supper according to the Jewish Passover customs, and continues: ‘*Presently the priest consecrates while standing and receives Holy Communion in an inclined position. Why should he do that, since one eats while sitting? The Japanese eat while sitting on their heels; Hindus eat while sitting on the ground and the food spread out on a banana leaf. The Chinese and Vietnamese eat with chopsticks.*’

He goes on to make the curious argument that, in light of this, Paul VI was illogical in condemning those who celebrate the traditional Mass because he condemned ‘those who celebrate in a different manner.’

Thus, Mgr. Ngô, the head of this ‘hierarchy’ views the uniformity which existed in the Church prior to Vatican II in matters of canon law and liturgical practice as ‘invasive’ and undesirable. It was an ‘abuse of power.’ Mgr. Ngô, on the other hand, views diversity in these areas as ‘an ornament of the universe.’ It all sounds a bit like the documents of Vatican II.

(As an aside, it is interesting to note that in the same article Mgr. Ngô uses the words ‘good Pope John XXIII,’ which would no doubt come as a surprise to his Mexican ‘bishops,’ who seem to believe that the Apostolic See has been vacant since the death of Pius XII. Perhaps the phrase is simply a manifestation of the ‘diversity’ which ornaments the particular universe under discussion.)

To take these self-styled bishops to task on the basis of either theological opinion or canon law would only dignify what they have done – and discussions based upon mere opinion tend to draw our attention away from the facts.

Consider the history of the affair as a whole: private revelations, the Palmar affair, reconciliation with the Vatican, involvements with French ‘Old Catholics,’ concelebrating the New Mass, together with a sudden involvement with someone who believes it’s invalid, ‘secret consecrations,’ a sudden ‘Declaration’ about the Holy See, high-sounding ‘Oaths of Unity,’ a Latin teacher who has problems with Latin, a disappearing priest who ends up a ‘bishop,’ ‘Father’ DeKazel, Franciscans ‘whose Bishop is the Pope in Rome,’ a one-priest monastery-seminary-convent-retreat house, sudden hairpin turns on ideology, mysterious ‘offers of the episcopacy,’ claims of ‘tacit consent,’ self-proclamations of universal ordinary jurisdiction, and so on. Can we really take all this seriously and suppose that the ‘bishops’ involved in such goings-on are the future of the Church? Impossible. Even to refer to them as ‘traditional Catholic bishops’ lends too much respectability to the whole business, which is, in this writer’s opinion, very disrespectful indeed.

One theme which dominates the affair from beginning to end is a gross and dangerous lack of prudence regarding the transmission of Apostolic Succession – a matter in which the slightest lack of prudence is inadmissible. St. Paul reminds us: ‘Lay not hands lightly on any man’ – he does not say: ‘Lay hands quickly on anyone.’

What is far more serious, however, is that these men claim that they are the ‘only legitimate authority’ of the Catholic Church and that Catholics are ‘bound’ to obey them. Further, they pretend to exclude from the Catholic Church those traditional priests and laymen who refuse to recognize their ‘authority’ – something no traditional organization we know of presumes to do. By making such claims, these ‘bishops’ have set up their own religion, with its own ‘magisterium,’ its own ‘episcopal hierarchy,’ and its own beliefs. It is a **new** religion, in spite of its trappings – and all its ‘episcopal consecrations,’ self-important proclamations and inflated claims of ‘canonical authority’ cannot make it into the Catholic religion. It is at the very least in the process of creating what will surely become a **schismatic** sect.

The story will not end here – it is probable that ‘instant bishops’ will continue to multiply exponentially, as among the ‘Old Catholics.’ Our missionary friend in Mexico offers us his opinion on this rather gloomy prospect: ‘We should have within a few years hundreds or thousands of bishops... without true vocations, the one more ignorant than the other, and an unavoidable cause of more division among traditionalists.’

It is not impossible that one day these men will decide that their ‘authority’ allows them to elect a ‘pope’ from among their number. Perhaps we will see them trudge along the path already taken by Palmar de Troya, following some man who wears a tiara that looks like a lampshade and who cranks out ‘encyclicals’ by the dozen. If such a day comes, we will then see the ultimate consequences of the movement which, for the moment, seems to promise ‘a prelate in every pot, and two bishops in every garage.’”

†††JMJ†††

And there we have the correct understanding, insight, grasp, and comprehension of all those clerics coming from Bishop Thuc – as presented by Rev. Anthony Cekada.

{266} Do you agree that in 1983 Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, Rev. (Bishop) Dolan, Rev (Bishop) Kelly, Rev (Bishop) Donald J. Sanborn, and Rev. Anthony Cekada taught all of the churches originating with Bishop Thuc and Bishop Francis Schuckardt were confessedly spurious, and at once proclaimed themselves an upstart, an imposter, a sham?

{267} Do you agree that although they held the **opposite** view before mid-1984; now Rev. Anthony Cekada, Bishop Dolan, Bishop Kelly, Bishop Donald J. Sanborn, and all of the CMRI clerics with Bishop Mark Pivarunas teach us some of the bishops while members of this false, bogus, illegitimate, phony, and upstart Novus Ordo church always remained faithful to tradition as long as their name was Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre?

{268} Do you agree that before mid-1984 all CMRI clerics, including Mark Pivarunas, brought forth very strong, rational, logical, reasonable, and obvious reasons from the teachings of the Catholic Church that Bishop Carmona and all the others stemming from Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre and the Novus Ordo sect belonged to a false, bogus, illegitimate, phony, upstart church?

{269} Do you agree that by 1985, the other CMRI clerics together with the man now known as Bishop Pivarunas brought forth very strong, rational, logical, reasonable, and obvious reasons from the teachings of the Catholic Church that the original CMRI church to which they belonged was nothing less than a false, bogus, illegitimate, phony, an upstart church?

{270} Do you agree that although from its very beginning the CMRI church has always been nothing less than a false, bogus, illegitimate, phony, and upstart church; not one lay person or “Religious” Brother or Sister of this CMRI church ever made a public Abjuration of Error or Profession of Faith for belonging to a false religion when they joined the other false, bogus, illegitimate, phony, and upstart Thuc church or SSPX church or FSSP church or SSPX-SO or SSPX-MC or Novus Ordo church?

{271} Do you agree that although from their very beginnings the CMRI and SSPX and FSSP and SSPX-MC churches have correctly been exposed as nothing less than false, bogus, illegitimate, phony, and upstart churches; very seldom if ever do the members of these sects ever make a public Abjuration of Error or Profession of Faith for belonging to a false religion when they join the other false, bogus, illegitimate, phony, and upstart Thuc churches or Novus Ordo church?

{272} Do you agree that although the Novus Ordo church has correctly been exposed as nothing less than a false, bogus, illegitimate, phony, and upstart church; very seldom if ever do the members of these churches ever

make a public Abjuration of Error or Profession of Faith for belonging to a false religion when they join the other false, bogus, illegitimate, phony, and upstart Thuc or CMRI or SSPX or FSSP or SSPX-MC churches?

{273} Do you agree that we should remember what Bishop Pivarunas truthfully told us: “You know, it is not, the Thuc Bishops or the Lefebvre Bishops or the Thuc Priests or the Lefebvre Priests or this Group or that Group - we are Roman Catholic ... It is not this Society or that Society or this Community – we are Roman Catholic; and as such we work together ... We belong to the same church” and also: “False ecumenism is to say, ‘There is salvation outside the Church; **let’s get together; let’s forget about our differences**; and have this superficial unity.’ My dear friends in Christ, let us make no mistake ... This false ecumenism is nothing but a deviation from the Catholic faith ... It is in reality Modernism”?

{274} Do you agree that all this shows that the entire Novus Ordo sects and the Traditionalist Movement sects are simply, obviously, and undeniably professing an unadulterated Modernism, Protestant mentality and approach?

{275} Do you agree that they have no problems with changing around from one belief to another?

One day they belong to one sect and the next month they switch to another sect. First they condemn as a **schismatic** sect those to whom they do not belong at that time; and shortly thereafter they are bishops, priests, clerics, and laity of the **schismatic** sect which they condemned just a short time previously. Just like the beliefs of the Traditional Protestants; the Protestant Traditionalists in theory and practice teach, preach, and proclaim: “You know, it is not, the Thuc Bishops or the Lefebvre Bishops or the Thuc Priests or the Lefebvre Priests or this Group or that Group - we are Roman Catholic! It is not this Society or that Society or this Community – we are Roman Catholic; and as such we work together. We belong to the same church!” Just go to the church of your choice, but DO GO TO CHURCH! Whatever else you do; do NOT just stay away from all of the Traditional Protestants and the Protestant Traditionalists and the Novus Ordo sects!

While writing about the Apostolicity of the Church, Father Cox continues on page 155:

It follows, then, that the Church which is directly derived from the Apostles is the only true Church. By direct derivation or lineal descent, we mean coming down in unbroken succession from the Apostles, and having its orders, doctrine and **mission** from them.

{276} Do you agree that Father Cox wrote the truth in the above paragraph?

{277} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas spoke the truth when he said: “The Catholic faith never changes ... we never have something that will be an apparent contradiction ... We don’t have the Church consistently teaching something for 1900 odd years, and all of a sudden we are told that is no longer true ... That could never take place”?

{278} Do you agree that Father Mary Casimir and Bishop Donald J. Sanborn explain the truth in teaching: “The true Church of Christ is an infallible guide, It cannot lead us astray, It cannot give us false doctrine ... in the true Church of Christ we cannot be asked to believe contradictory beliefs ... the Church cannot give us false doctrine or contradict Herself ... And so if there is a contradiction, we have to say, “That cannot be the true Church of Christ” ... We have to stick with what the Church taught before, because the truth does NOT change with the times. We hold to the SAME EXACT teachings that Jesus Christ gave in His time”?

{279} Do you agree the actual Catholic truth is: “That the Church which is directly derived from the Apostles and having its orders, doctrine and **mission** from them is the only true Church”?

{280} Do you agree that the NEW teachings, “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself” and “Those whom Our Lord has bound by divine law to confer sacraments, then, simultaneously receive from Him the *legitimate deputation* and the *apostolic mission* to confer them” are nothing less than a great **contrary contradiction** to what the Church taught previously; and the pretension to an **extraordinary mission** independent of apostolic authority because in the Catholic Church all bishops derive their authority, jurisdiction, and **mission from the Apostles** and all Catholic priests derive their authority, jurisdiction, and mission through a Catholic bishop?

While writing about the Apostolicity of the Church, Father Cox continues on page 155:

“The Church that is really Apostolic must have in itself everything that the society of the Apostles originally had. It must be **IDENTICAL** in doctrine, in orders and in authority. It must teach all the truths committed to the Apostles, and it must succeed as an organization in such a manner as to be strictly the same society.”

{281} Do you agree that all of the other bishops and priests in the Church to which the Apostles belonged received their jurisdiction, authority, and mission only through St. Peter; and not delegated to them directly from Christ Himself?

Remember that Bishop Pivarunas said all of the Groups, Societies, and Communities that make up the Roman Catholics of the Traditionalist Movement and Novus Ordo sects belong to the SAME church.

{282} Do you agree that is sufficient proof to every person with logic that none of them are part of the Catholic Church founded by Jesus Christ; unless you prove that all of them are truly **IDENTICAL** in doctrine, in orders and in authority?

{283} Do you agree that the SSPX church is not truly **IDENTICAL** in doctrine, in orders and in authority with the Novus Ordo church although both churches recognize the same man as the Pope in charge of their church?

{284} Do you agree that the original CMRI Community is not truly **IDENTICAL** in doctrine, in orders and in authority with the other split away CMRI Community where Bishop Pivarunas is now in charge – although Bishop Pivarunas said both of these Communities belong to the SAME church – and it is very obvious that a large portion of the current split away CMRI Community are the same people that belonged to the original CMRI Community?

{285} Do you agree that neither the original CMRI Community or the split away CMRI Community are truly **IDENTICAL** in doctrine, in orders and in authority with the SSPX, FSSP, or Bishop Williamson’s Resistant church?

{286} Do you agree that the SSPX church and the FSSP church are not truly **IDENTICAL** in doctrine, in orders and in authority with each other although they both originate with Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre?

{287} Do you agree that Bishop Williamson’s Society of St. Pius X of the Strict Observance (SSPX-SO) is not truly **IDENTICAL** in doctrine, in orders and in authority with the other SSPX bishops; although they were all consecrated the same day by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre?

{288} Do you agree that the Society of St. Pius X of the Strict Observance (SSPX-SO) is not truly **IDENTICAL** in doctrine, in orders and in authority with the FSSP; although both of them are split away from the same SSPX?

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SSPX_Resistance provides information: go to the bottom of the page and the hyperlinks tell you about all these different peoples in the Groups, Societies, and Communities that all belong to the SAME Roman Catholic church as all clerics associated with Bishop Pivarunas, Bishop Dolan, Bishop Kelly, Bishop Donald J. Sanborn, Bishop Richard Williamson, Bishop Bernard Fellay, the Institute of Christ the King Sovereign Priest, Priestly Fraternity of St. Peter, Latin Mass Society of England and Wales, Personal Apostolate Administration of St. John Mary Vianney, Ukrainian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, Institute of the Good Shepherd, Sons of the Most Holy Redeemer, Fraternity of St. Vincent Ferrer, and the rest!

{289} Do you agree that, The Church that is really Apostolic must teach all the truths committed to the Apostles, and it must succeed as an organization in such a manner as to be strictly the same society?

{290} Do you agree that among the truths committed to the Apostles, is the fact that all of the Apostles taught that Jesus Christ gave the Keys to Peter alone, and that throughout all the history of the Catholic Church the successors of the other Apostles would always receive their jurisdiction and mission ONLY through Peter and his lawful successors – and not receive delegated jurisdiction directly from Christ Himself?

While writing about the Apostolicity of the Church, Father Cox continues on pages 155 and 156:

“It is not enough to teach all the doctrines of the Apostles, if it lacks either their orders or their jurisdiction. Nor is it enough to have the orders of the Apostles if either their doctrine or mission is

wanting. ‘*Bonum ex integra causa, malum ex quocumque defectu,*’ is an axiom that has application here. A thing is good only when good in every way, a thing is bad if bad in any way.”

{291} Do you agree that the doctrines taught by the Apostles were that all Powers of Orders and Powers of Jurisdiction and the mission of every bishop in the Catholic Church can only be received through the mediation of St. Peter and his lawful successors?

{292} Do you agree that neither Rev. Anthony Cekada or CMRI or any other sect, group, society, or community will ever prove that the doctrines of the Apostles is that after October 9, 1958, the Catholic Church would **CHANGE** Her doctrines; and from then on all priests and bishops will receive their delegated jurisdiction and mission directly from Christ Himself?

While writing about the Apostolicity of the Church, Father Cox continues on page 156:

“No church is truly Apostolic that teachers a doctrine at variance with those taught and handed down by the Apostles.”

{293} Do you agree that not one of the Apostles taught that St. Peter was only the pope materially but not formally?

{294} Do you agree that the NEW doctrine taught by Bishop Guérard des Lauriers, Bishop Robert McKenna, Bishop Donald J. Sanborn, and others that has come to be called Sedeprivationism; is a doctrine at variance with those taught and handed down by the Apostles?

While writing about the Apostolicity of the Church, Father Cox continues on page 156:

“Finally, no church is Apostolic that is not authorized and commissioned by the apostolic continuity.”

{295} Do you agree that the Traditionalist Movement bishops whose lineage comes from Bishop Guérard des Lauriers and Bishop Carmona are NOT authorized and commissioned by the apostolic continuity since none of them received their authority, mission, or jurisdiction from a valid successor of St. Peter?

{296} Do you agree that no church is Apostolic that is not approved, endorsed, and sanctioned by a direct link to a successor of St. Peter by which every bishop in that Church receives his orders, authority, jurisdiction, and mission?

On pages 163 and 164 from *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* we read:

“If they have taught us wrong, Christ is the author of error.”

{297} Do you agree that the true Vicars of Jesus Christ did not teach us wrong when they repeatedly told us that the authority, jurisdiction, and mission bishops receive comes through St. Peter and his lawful successors; and it has never been delegated to anyone directly by Christ Himself?

{298} Do you agree Pope Pius VI in *Charitas* did not teach us wrong when he wrote: “The right of ordaining bishops belongs only to the Apostolic See, as the Council of Trent declares”?

{299} Do you agree that everyone who refuses to accept the truth that, “The right of ordaining bishops belongs only to the Apostolic See, as the Council of Trent declares” are actually accusing Jesus Christ and His infallible Church to be the Authors of error?

Saint Francis De Sales: “To say the Church errs is to say no less that God errs, or else that He is willing and desirous for us to err; which would be a great blasphemy.”

On pages 165 and 166 from *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* we read:

“St. Paul did not establish an independent community, nor a people’s church, nor a Paul’s church, simply because he was called differently from the rest. He was not a bushwhacker in the war for truth. All his lifetime he recognized the authority of the other Apostles, and submitted to the constituted head.”

{300} Do you agree that unlike St. Paul, traditional Protestants, such as Lutherans, Methodists, Baptists, Seventh-day Adventist, and etcetera all started their independent churches without recognizing the authority of the Apostles and their lawful successors; and none of them submitted to one constituted head?

{301} Do you agree that unlike St. Paul, Bishop Francis Schuckardt started the independent CMRI community without recognizing the authority of the Apostles and their lawful successors; or submitted to one constituted head?

{302} Do you agree that the independent CMRI community split up again into two separate independent communities without recognizing the authority of the Apostles and their lawful successors; or submitted to one constituted head?

{303} Do you agree that unlike St. Paul, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre started his own independent Society of Saint Pius X without recognizing the authority of the Apostles and their lawful successors; or submitted to one constituted head?

{304} Do you agree that unlike St. Paul, later nine priests from the split away SSPX church split away from Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre to start the independent SSPV church without recognizing the authority of the Apostles and their lawful successors; or submitted to one constituted head?

{305} Do you agree that this independent SSPV church split up again into more independent societies and groups without recognizing the authority of the Apostles and their lawful successors; or submitted to one constituted head?

{306} Do you agree that unlike St. Paul, there are many Traditionalist Movement priests and bishops who started their own independent Group, Society, or Community without being submitted to any constituted head?

{307} Do you agree that basically every Traditionalist Movement church is independent and on its own – making as many independent churches as there are bishops in the Traditionalist Movement without any of them submitted to the constituted heads of the true Vicars of Jesus Christ?

Remember that Rev. Anthony Cekada said: “Reason tells us that an organization that is headless disintegrates.”

{308} Do you agree that no one in the Traditionalist Movement can state or prove who is the constituted head of all the Traditionalist Movement sects to whom each bishop and priest therein should be submissive as its one constituted head?

{309} Do you agree that the traditional Protestants set the examples of establishing independent Communities, Groups, and Societies; and now the Protestant Traditionalists prove beyond all doubt that they are simply Protestants with their many independent Communities, Groups, and Societies with nobody under one constituted head?

In *Traditional Priests, Legitimate Sacraments* by Rev. Anthony Cekada we read:

“Further, “as regards legitimacy... all authority to dispense the sacraments originates from the **mission given to the apostles**” by means of the same divine commands cited above (to baptize, absolve, offer Mass, etc.) (Billot, *De Ecclesiae Sacramentis* 1:179). This is because:

“No one dispenses another person’s property legitimately unless he does so based on that person’s command. Now, the sacraments are Christ’s property. Only those, therefore, who have a mission from Christ — namely, those to whom the apostolic mission derives — dispense them legitimately” (Billot, *ibid.*).

Those whom Our Lord has bound by divine law to confer sacraments, then, simultaneously receive from Him the *legitimate deputation* and the apostolic mission to confer them.”

{310} Do you agree that “as regards legitimacy... all authority to dispense the sacraments originates from the **mission given to the apostles**” as Billot **obviously, distinctly, and noticeably** taught; and this clearly enough gives a Catholic teaching that all legitimate authority, jurisdiction, and mission originates from the authority, jurisdiction, and mission the Apostles received through St. Peter?

Just exactly how did the Apostles receive their **MISSION** from Jesus Christ? Pope Leo XIII referring to the dogmatic decree of the Vatican Council clearly explains it:

“...there is nothing to show that the Apostles received supreme power without Peter and against Peter. Such power they certainly did not receive from Jesus Christ.”

Dom Guéranger clearly explains how Catholic bishops get their MISSION, and how and where the legitimate authority to dispense sacraments originates:

“All spiritual authority comes from Peter; all comes from the bishop of Rome, in whom Peter will continue to govern the Church to the end of time. Jesus Christ is the founder of the episcopate; it

is the Holy Ghost who established bishops to rule the Church; but the MISSION and the institution, which assign the pastor his flock, and the flock its pastor, these are given by Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost through the ministry of Peter and his successors.”

{311} Do you agree that no one can legitimately dispense the sacraments unless he has a mission that originated with the apostles; and that this mission given by Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost to the Apostles was only through the ministry of Peter and his successors?

Let us study better the Catholic theology explained by Billot: “No one dispenses another person’s property legitimately unless he does so based on that person’s command. Now, the sacraments are Christ’s property. Only those, therefore, who have a mission from Christ — namely, those to whom the APOSTOLIC MISSION derives — dispense them legitimately.”

{312} Do you agree that only those have a mission from Christ to whom the apostolic mission derives, originates, stems, begins, and commences?

{313} Do you agree that this apostolic authority and mission derives, originates, stems, begins, commences, and comes from Peter; and every bishop in the entire Catholic world receives his **mission** THROUGH Peter and his lawful successors?

{314} Do you agree that no person legitimately dispenses Christ’s property without the permission and a mission from Christ; and that Jesus Christ has never given this mission directly to any bishop in the history of the Catholic Church without it coming through St. Peter and his lawful successors?

{315} Do you agree that Rev. Anthony Cekada's conclusion: “Those whom Our Lord has bound by divine law to confer sacraments, then, simultaneously receive from Him the *legitimate deputation* and the apostolic mission to confer them”; is contrary to what Cardinal Billot actually taught, namely: Only those dispense the sacraments legitimately who have the APOSTOLIC MISSION which derives, originates, and descends upon them through Peter and his lawful successors, and that the Eternal Truth who could never lie or deceive told the world infallibly through Pope Leo XIII that “Such power they certainly did not receive from Jesus Christ”?

Recall again the truth that was correctly taught by Bishop Sanborn when he was telling us what another Vicar of Jesus Christ, Pope Pius XII, taught in *Mystici Corporis*: “the power of the Pope is the same as the authority of Christ” and “the authority of the Pope is the same as the authority of Christ.”

{316} Do you agree that it follows as Catholic doctrine that Jesus Christ, True God and True Man, clearly told everyone the infallible truth that bishops do not receive their power, authority, mission, or jurisdiction from Jesus Christ except as and when it comes through St. Peter in his lawful successors?

Let us now study to see how Cardinal Billot actually teaches the direct contrary of what Rev. Anthony Cekada wants everybody to believe.

Nonetheless, says Cardinal Billot, while this is true in the temporal political sphere, that is, in societies derived from the natural order, it is not true for the Church, a society of divine origin. Indeed, he states that the Church was not born from the bottom up like civil society but was founded from the top down, directly by Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who established Her definitive form.

For authority [in the Church] comes directly from God through Christ, and from Christ to his Vicar, and from the Vicar of Christ it descends to the remaining prelates without the intervention of any other physical or moral person. [Louis Cardinal Billot, S.J., *Tractatus De Ecclesia Christi* (Rome: Aedes Universitatis Gregorianae, 1927), Vol. 1. p. 524.]

{317} Do you agree that Cardinal Billot is teaching according to the Catholic DOGMA that the authority [in the Church] comes directly from God through Christ, and from Christ to his Vicar, and from the Vicar of Christ it descends to the remaining prelates (bishops)?

{318} Do you agree that Rev. Anthony Cekada is deceitfully quoting Cardinal Billot in order to make people think that his NEW heretical doctrine is the truth, namely: “Those whom Our Lord has bound by divine law to confer sacraments, then, simultaneously receive from HIM the *legitimate deputation* and the *apostolic mission* to confer them” and “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself”?

Thus, Cardinal Billot reasons, the Church's form of government is that of a "pure monarchy coupled with an aristocracy." Cardinal Billot calls this a "full and perfect monarchy." His concluding definition reads, "by divine institution, the Church's form of government is that of a *full and perfect monarchy*." ("*Et ideo regimen Ecclesiae dicendum est divina institutione exactum ad formam plenae perfectaeque monarchiae*," *ibid.*, p. 535.)

Father Salaverri attests to this: "On the institution of the Church as a monarchy: Christ specifically chose the monarchic regime for the Church and designated the person of Saint Peter as the subject of supreme authority." (Salaverri, *De Ecclesia Christi*, in VV.AA, *Sacrae Theologiae Summa*, Vol. I, no. 162.)

Father Pesch does likewise: "Christ, by establishing the apostolic college under the primacy of Peter, with authority of jurisdiction and order, founded a religious, **hierarchical**, and monarchic society that we call His Church." (Pesch, "De Ecclesia Christi" in *Compendium Theologiae Dogmaticae*, p. 145)

The Church's "Full and Perfect Monarchy" Will Last Until the End of Time

This "full and perfect monarchy" of the Church cannot change.

Cardinal Billot explains in the study mentioned above that the Church's form of government was established by God not in an indirect and *indistinct* manner as was the case in the civil sphere, but in a *direct* and *precise* manner. Thus, it (that is to say, the Church as a perfect and **hierarchical** society) is perfect and permanent. It cannot be modified. (Billot, *Tractatus De Ecclesia Christi*, p. 526.)

On this unchangeability, Pope Leo XIII teaches: "Only the Church of Jesus Christ has been able to preserve, and surely will preserve unto the consummation of time, her form of government. Founded by Him Who was, Who is, and Who will be forever (Heb. 13:8), She has received from Him, since Her very origin, all that She requires for the pursuing of Her divine mission across the changeable ocean of human affairs. And, far from wishing to transform Her essential constitution, She has not the power even to relinquish the conditions of true liberty and sovereign independence with which Providence has endowed Her in the general interest of souls." (Pope Leo XIII, Encyclical *Au Milieu de Sollicitudes*, Feb. 16, 1892, n. 17.)

{319} Do you agree that the Church of Jesus Christ has been able to preserve, and surely will preserve unto the consummation of time, Her form of government?

{320} Do you agree that Her form of government is the perfect hierarchical, monarchy society; consisting of the Church teaching and the Church taught?

{321} Do you agree that Pope Leo XIII is teaching with the very authority of Jesus Christ that the perfect hierarchical, monarchy society; consisting of the Church teaching and the Church taught will persevere and endure unto the consummation of time?

{322} Do you agree that the NEW teachings, "The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself" and "Those whom Our Lord has bound by divine law to confer sacraments, then, simultaneously receive from Him the *legitimate deputation* and the *apostolic mission* to confer them" are nothing less than the pretension to an **extraordinary mission** independent of apostolic authority?

On page 167 from *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* we read more concerning other things necessary to belong to the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church founded by Jesus Christ:

"The pretension to an **extraordinary mission**, independent of apostolic AUTHORITY, by would-be guides of mankind, is but one phase of a human insanity that is more common than many of us have any idea of."

Let us join St. Francis De Sales, and accept the teaching of this great Doctor of the Catholic Church. We read in *The Catholic Controversy* by St. Frances de Sales 1567-1622. Translated by Rev. Henry Benedict Mackey O.S.B. Under the direction of Right Rev. John Cuthbert Hedley, O.S.B. Bishop of Newport and Menevia. Tan Books & Publishers (See page 26):

"He then who would be so rash as to boast of extraordinary mission **without immediately producing miracles**, deserves to be taken for an imposter. Now it is a fact neither the first nor the last ministers have worked a single miracle: therefore they have no extraordinary mission."

{323} Do you agree that in the above paragraph St. Francis De Sales states the truth to be believed by every Catholic concerning everyone who claims an extraordinary mission?

{324} Do you agree that anyone who accepts the proclamations, announcements, and assertions that: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself” and “Those whom Our Lord has bound by divine law to confer sacraments, then, simultaneously receive from Him the *legitimate deputation* and the *apostolic mission* to confer them” is in reality claiming that every traditionalist bishop and priest claims to have an EXTRAORDINARY mission?

{325} Do you agree it follows as a truth to be believed by every Catholic that each and every single traditionalist priest and bishop must immediately produce miracles?

{326} Do you agree that because not a single traditionalist bishop or priest has produced miracles it follows as Catholic doctrine that they deserve to be taken for imposters?

{327} Do you agree that St. Francis de Sales makes it clear for everyone who believes what the Catholic Church teaches, that because no traditionalist bishop or priest has immediately produced miracles, that the truth is they do not have either an ordinary or an extraordinary mission?

The previous quote of St. Francis De Sales was provided from the book published by Tan Books & Publishers. Let us reflect on the 4th Chapter taken from an older copy of this important book.

From the Library of St. Francis De Sales

III. The Catholic Controversy

Benziger Brother - 1909

CHAPTER IV

“AN ANSWER TO THE TWO OBJECTIONS WHICH ARE MADE BY THE SUPPORTERS OF THE THEORY OF IMMEDIATE MISSION.

I have not been able hitherto to find but two objections amongst your masters to this reasoning which I have just made, one of which is taken from the example of Our Lord and the Apostles, the other from the example of the Prophets.

And as to the first—tell me, I pray, do you think it right to place in comparison the vocation of these new ministers and that of Our Lord? Had not Our Lord been prophesied as the Messiah? —had not His time been determined by Daniel? —did He do a single action which had not been described almost exactly in the books of the Prophets, and prefigured in the Patriarchs? He changed the Mosaic Law from good into better; —but had not this change been predicted? He consequently changed the Aaronic priesthood into that of Melchisedech, far better is not all this according to the ancient testimonies? Your ministers have not been prophesied as preachers of the word of God, nor the time of their coming, nor a single one of their actions.

They have made a revolution in the Church much greater and bolder than Our Lord made in the synagogue; for they have taken all away, only putting back certain shadows: but testimonies to this effect have they none. At any rate they should not elude their obligation of bringing forward miracles in support of such a change, whatever pretext you may draw from the Scriptures, since our Lord dispensed NOT Himself from this, as I have shown above. But whence will they show me that the Church was ever to receive another form, or a like reformation to the one which our Lord made?

And as to the Prophets, I see many persons under a delusion. It is supposed that all the vocations of the Prophets were extraordinary and immediate. A false idea: for there were colleges and congregations of the Prophets approved by the Synagogue, as may be gathered from many passages of the Scriptures. There were such in Ramathia, in Bethel, in Jericho where Eliseus dwelt, on Mount Ephraim, in Samaria; Eliseus himself was anointed by Heli; the vocation of Samuel was recognized and approved by the High Priest; and with Samuel the Lord began to appear again in Silo, as says the Scripture: whence the Jews regard Samuel as the founder of the congregations of Prophets.

It is supposed that all those who prophesied exercised the office of preaching; —which is not true, as appears from what occurred with the officers of Saul and with Saul himself: in such sort that the vocation of the Prophets has no bearing on that of heretics or schismatics. For (1.) it was either ordinary, as we have shown above, or else approved by the remainder of the Synagogue, as is easy to see in their BEING IMMEDIATELY

RECOGNIZED, and in their being **HIGHLY** esteemed **EVERYWHERE** amongst the Jews, who called them “men of God:” and he who will attentively examine the history of that ancient Synagogue will see that the office of priests was as common among them as that of preachers amongst us. (2.) Never can be pointed out Prophet who wished to **overthrow** the **ordinary power**; on the contrary, **all followed it**, and spoke nothing contrary to the doctrine of those who sat upon the chair of Moses and of Aaron; indeed, some of them were of the priestly race, as Jeremias son of Helcias, and Ezechiel son of Buzi. They have always spoken with honour of the priests and the **sacerdotal succession**, though they have reprehended their lives. Isaias, when about to write in a great book which was shown him, took Urias the priest, though the things were yet to come, and Zacharias the prophet as witnesses, as if he were taking the testimony of all the Priests and Prophets. And does not Malachy bear witness that *the lips of the priest shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law at his mouth: because he is the Angel of the Lord of hosts?* —so far were they from ever having withdrawn the Jews from the communion of the Ordinary. (3.) **How many miracles did the Prophets work in confirmation of the prophetic vocation?** I should never end if I were to enter upon the computation of these: but at such times as they did a thing which had an appearance of **EXTRAORDINARY** power, **immediately miracles followed**. Witness Elias, who, setting up an altar on Mount Carmel according to the instinct which the Holy Spirit had given him, and offering sacrifice, **showed by miracle** that he did it to the honour of God and of the Jewish religion. (4.) And finally, it would well become your ministers to usurp the power of the Prophets—they who have never had either their gift or their light! It should rather be for us to do so; — for us, who could bring forward an infinity of Prophets on our side. For instance, S. Gregory Thaumaturgus, on the authority of S. Basil; S. Anthony, on the testimony of Athanasius; the Abbot John, on the testimony of S. Augustine; S. Benedict, S. Bernard, S. Francis, and a thousand others. If, then, there is question between us of the prophetic authority, this is on our side, be it ordinary or be it extraordinary, since we have the reality; not with your ministers, who have never given the **shadow of a proof of its possession**; — unless they would call a prophecy Zwingli's vision in the book called, *Subsidium de Eucharistid*, and the book entitled *Querela Lutherii*, or the prediction he made in the twenty-fifth year of this century that if he preached two years more there would remain no Pope, nor priests, nor monks, nor belfries, nor mass. Truly there is but one defect in this prophecy—**just want of truth**. For he preached nigh twenty-two years longer, and yet there are still found priests and belfries, and in the chair of Peter sits a lawful Pope.

Your first ministers then, gentlemen, are of the prophets whom God forbade to be heard, in Jeremias: Harken not to the words of the prophets that prophesy to you and deceive you: they speak a vision of their own heart and not out of the mouth of the Lord. ... **I did not send prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied** I have heard what the prophets said, that prophecy lies in my name, and say, I have dreamed, I have dreamed. Does it not seem to you that it is Zwingli and Luther, with their prophecies and visions? That it is Carlostadt, with his revelation which he pretended to have had about the Lord's Supper, and which gave occasion to Luther to write his book *Contra scelestos prophetas*. **At any rate they certainly possess this property of not having been sent**; it is they who use their tongues, and say, The Lord saith it. **For they can never prove any right to the office which they usurp; they can never produce any legitimate vocation**. And **how then shall they preach?** One cannot enroll oneself under any captain without the approval of one's prince: how then were you so ready to engage yourselves under the command of these first ministers, without the permission of your ordinary pastors, and so far as to leave the state in which you were born and bred, which is the Catholic Church? They are guilty of having made this disturbance **by their own authority**, and you of having followed them, **in which you are inexcusable**. The good little Samuel, humble, gentle, and holy, having been called thrice by God, thought all the time that it was Heli who was calling him, and only at the fourth time addressed himself to God as to the one calling him. It has seemed to your ministers that God has thrice called them, (1.) by peoples and magistrates; (2.) by our bishops; (3.) **by his extraordinary voice**. No, no Let them not bring this forward, that Samuel was called thrice by God, and in his humility thought it was a call by man, until, instructed by Heli, he knew that it was the divine voice. Your ministers, gentlemen, allege three vocations of **GOD**, by secular

magistrates, by the bishops, and by His extraordinary voice. They think that it is GOD who has called them in those three ways: but you do not find that when they are instructed by the Church they acknowledge that theirs is a vocation of man, and that their ears have tingled to the old Adam; by no means do they submit the question to him who, as Heli did, now presides in the Church.

Such then is the first reason which makes your ministers and you also inexcusable, though unequally so, before God and men in having left the Church.

On the contrary, gentlemen, the Church, who contradicted and opposed your first ministers, and still opposes those of the present day, is so clearly marked on all sides that no one, blind as he may be, can pretend that his is a case of ignorance of the duty which all good Christians owe her, or that she is not the true, sole, inseparable, and dearest Spouse of the heavenly King, which makes the separation from her all the more inexcusable. For, to leave the Church and disregard her commands is evermore to become a heathen and a publican, let it be at the persuasion of an angel or a seraph. But, at the persuasion of men who were sinners on the largest scale against other private persons, who were without authority, without approval, without any quality required in preachers or prophets save the mere knowledge of certain sciences, to break all the ties of the most religious obligation of obedience which is in the world, namely, that which is owing to the Church as Spouse of our Lord! —this is a fault which cannot be covered save by a great repentance and penitence—to which I invite you on the part of the living God.”

†††JMJ†††

{328} Do you agree that St. Francis De Sales provides ample evidence that anyone (such as Traditionalist Movement clerics who are the last ones) who claim an **extraordinary Mission** should be **IMMEDIATELY RECOGNIZED** by immediately working miracles?

{329} Do you agree that for everyone in the true religion; “At such times as they did a thing which had an appearance of extraordinary power, **immediately miracles followed**”?

{330} Do you agree that as soon as Traditionalist Movement clerics announced, argued, and proclaimed: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself” and “Those whom Our Lord has bound by divine law to confer sacraments, then, simultaneously receive from Him the *legitimate deputation* and the *apostolic mission* to confer them”, which is an extraordinary Mission, that **immediately miracles should have followed**?

{331} Do you agree St. Francis also explains that the extraordinary mission and jurisdiction claimed by the Traditionalist Movement clerics makes them self-appointed, false prophets, by their proclaiming they have delegated jurisdiction and a mission received from outside the ordinary magisterium of the Catholic Church?

{332} Do you agree that St. Francis rebukes those who follow the Traditionalist Movement clerics by writing: “They are guilty of having made this disturbance by their own authority, and you of having followed them, **in which you are inexcusable**”?

Malvenda, a theologian and advisor to the cardinal, employed in revising the Dominican Breviary, confirms that all the Church Fathers taught the holy sacrifice of the Mass, without qualification, will cease in the reign of Antichrist:

“The Holy Fathers who have written upon the subject of Antichrist, and of these prophecies of Daniel, without a single exception, as far as I know, – and they are the Fathers both of the East and of the West, the Greek and the Latin Church – all of them unanimously, – say that in the latter end of the world, during the reign of Antichrist, the holy sacrifice of the altar will cease. (de Antichristo, lib. viii.)”

{333} Do you agree that if all the Fathers both of the East and of the West, the Greek and the Latin Church unanimously, without a single exception, teach that in the latter end of the world, during the reign of Antichrist, the holy sacrifice of the altar will cease; that Catholics should accept this as a doctrine of the Church as taught by tradition?

Providentissimus Deus - On the Study of Holy Scripture - Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII - November 18, 1893.

3. Among the reasons for which the Holy Scripture is so worthy of commendation -- in addition to its own excellence and to the homage which we owe to God's Word -- the chief of all is, the innumerable benefits of which it is the source; according to the infallible testimony of the Holy Ghost Himself, who says: "All Scripture, inspired of God, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good work." That such was the purpose of God in giving the Scripture The Holy Fathers, We say, are of supreme authority, whenever they all interpret in one and the same manner any text of the Bible, as pertaining to the doctrine of faith or morals; for their unanimity clearly evinces that such interpretation has come down from the Apostles as a matter of Catholic faith. The opinion of the Fathers is also of very great weight when they treat of these matters in their capacity of doctors, unofficially; not only because they excel in their knowledge of revealed doctrine and in their acquaintance with many things which are useful in understanding the apostolic Books, but because they are men of eminent sanctity and of ardent zeal for the truth, on whom God has bestowed a more ample measure of His light. Wherefore the expositor should make it his duty to follow their footsteps with all reverence, and to use their labors with intelligent appreciation.

Let us read the words of a great Doctor of the Church, St. Robert Bellarmine: "Second. I say that, as you know, the Council (of Trent) prohibits expounding the Scriptures contrary to the common agreement of the holy Fathers."

On page 168 from *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* we read:

"All innovators take for a first principle that the provisions which Christ made for continuing His work in the world were inadequate for the purpose. They take for a certainty that the promises of Christ have failed. But what evidence do they bring to prove their claim? What credentials or authority do they produce to show their MISSION? What work do they perform that is calculated to move a sensible person to an act of faith? The world never produced a fool that could not find another to follow him."

{334} Do you agree that present-day innovators take for a certainty that the promises of Christ have failed?

{335} Do you agree that rather than accept as a doctrine of the Church as taught unanimously by all the Fathers that the continual sacrifice of the Mass will cease; the innovators take it upon themselves to SAVE the Church because they claim the promises of Christ have failed, therefore they insist and maintain they have EXTRAORDINARY delegated jurisdiction and a mission received from outside the ordinary, living magisterium of the Catholic Church?

On page 171 from *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* we read:

"Therefore, brethren, stand fast; and hold the TRADITIONS which you have learned, whether by word, or by our epistle."

{336} Do you agree that the TRADITIONS of the Traditionalist Movement are NOT the TRADITIONS of the True Church?

Please consider carefully, deliberate upon, and ponder over this section of the book, *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* by Father Thomas Cox (Imprimatur and Copyright, 1900), page 173:

"Those who invent doctrines unheard of before are not the successors of the Apostles. Novelty and error are children of the same father - the father of lies. Those who have lost the line of valid ministers leading back to apostolic times cannot plead the possession of Apostolicity. Where there is no ordination, no priesthood, no authority, no power, Apostolicity is out of the question. Even if valid orders exist, where jurisdiction is lacking there is no real Apostolicity. Schism, as well as heresy, destroys apostolic succession."

{337} Do you agree that no sect can carry on the Apostolicity of the Catholic Church whose bishops have never had authority, *jurisdiction*, and mission in the Catholic Church?

{338} Do you agree that if Jesus Christ gives jurisdiction to bishops, they receive it *only* through Saint Peter and his *lawful* successors? Please review again the words of Pope Pius XII (*Ad Apostolorum Principis*):

“...bishops who have been neither named nor confirmed by the Apostolic See...enjoy no powers of teaching or of jurisdiction since jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff.”

Remember the true teaching is: “Even if valid orders exist, where JURISDICTION is lacking there is no real APOSTOLICITY.”

{339} Do you agree that the Traditionalist Movement clerics are claiming an EXTRAORDINARY mission and jurisdiction when they proclaim their mission and jurisdiction are delegated directly from Christ Himself – instead of the normal way of receiving it through a lawful successor of St. Peter and of the Catholic Church through a living magisterium ?

{340} Do you agree that St. Francis de Sales clearly explained that when anyone claims extraordinary mission they must immediately work miracles to prove their extraordinary mission is from God?

{341} Do you agree that because none of the traditionalists have worked these NECESSARY immediate miracles; not one of them has an extraordinary or ordinary jurisdiction or delegated jurisdiction or mission from Christ Himself or from the Catholic Church?

{342} Do you agree that therefore because their jurisdiction and mission are lacking, there is no real Apostolicity in their churches?

{343} Do you agree that because they do not have this Fourth Mark of Apostolicity, they belong to a non-Catholic religion?

“Since He *conferred nothing on any of the rest without Peter participating in it,*” as we have seen in Pope Leo XIII’s *Satis Cognitum*, no bishop receives authority, or jurisdiction, or mission without Saint Peter and his lawful successors participating in it! Without jurisdiction they do not have the Fourth Mark of the Catholic Church, Apostolicity. Without Apostolicity the sect is a non-Catholic religion. Now this is an extremely serious thing to consider since Canon 1258 states:

“It is unlawful for the faithful to assist in any active manner, or to take part in the sacred services of non-Catholics...”

On page 174 from *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* we read:

“**Schism**, as well as heresy, destroys APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

Now I hold that there is one Church, and only one, that can vindicate its Apostolic title, which ought to be done by showing its origin and the unbroken succession of its orders and **mission from the Apostles**, and by proving its doctrinal identity with their teachings.”

{344} Do you agree that Rev. Anthony Cekada was correct when he told us about the Bishop Thuc line of succession: “These ‘bishops’ have set up their own religion, with its own ‘magisterium,’ its own ‘episcopal hierarchy,’ and its own beliefs. **It is a new religion**, in spite of its trappings – and all its ‘episcopal consecrations,’ self-important proclamations and inflated claims of ‘canonical authority’ cannot make it into the Catholic religion. It is at the very least in the process of creating what will surely become a **schismatic** sect.” ... and about the Societies of Saint Pius X and Saint Pius V: “These notions are **schismatic** and embody false doctrine. So just get along with what? The sin of **Schism**; invalidly ordained priests; error and ignorance of sacramental principles; or denials of Church Doctrine? The issue is **Doctrine**”?

{345} Do you agree that not one bishop or priest in the Traditionalist Movement has or can prove that he received his MISSION from a successor of the Apostles?

{346} Do you agree that Father Cox, on this page 174, is again only stating what the Catholic Church has always taught as handed down from the Apostles and explained by the true successors of St. Peter and the Councils of the Catholic Church?

Let us recall again what was said by Bishop Pivarunas, Father Mary Casimir, and Bishop Donald J. Sanborn when they were clear, unblemished, unbiased, impartial, clearheaded, logical, realistic, sensible and fair-minded in teaching the Catholic truth: “The Catholic faith never changes ... we never have something that will

be an apparent contradiction ... We don't have the Church consistently teaching something for 1900 odd years, and all of a sudden we are told that is no longer true ... The Church made a mistake, and now we know better ... That could never take place" "The true Church of Christ is an infallible guide, It cannot lead us astray, It cannot give us **false** doctrine ... in the true Church of Christ we cannot be asked to believe contradictory beliefs ... the Church cannot give us false doctrine or contradict Himself ... And so if there is a contradiction, we have to say, "That cannot be the true Church of Christ" ... We have to stick with what the Church taught before, because the truth does NOT change with the times. We hold to the SAME EXACT teachings that Jesus Christ gave in His time. There is no evolution of dogma. There is no NEW understanding of doctrine in a way that contradicts what was previously defined."

"He who hears you (especially the popes when speaking as the highest authority of the teaching Church (*Ecclesia docens*) of the ordinary living magisterium) hears me ... He who does not believe what you (the popes) teach will be condemned ... In the Apostolic See the Catholic Religion has **always** been kept unsullied and its teachings kept holy ... this See of St. Peter **always** remains untainted by any error ... If the living *Magisterium*, the teaching authority of the Church, could in any way be false, an evident contradiction follows; because then God Himself would be the author of error ... Vatican II comes along and completely does a reverse. Officially teaches now things that were condemned by the Church in the past. This cannot be the living magisterium! That cannot be the hierarchy of the Catholic Church ... That man cannot be the Pope! If the living magisterium could in any way default, an evident contradiction follows; because God would be the author of that. If Jesus said, "Whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven. He who hears you hears Me. Whatever you say is representing Me." And we have these men saying, "break the first commandment; worship with the other religions; prayers to false gods do have benefits." We know very clearly it is not true!

{347} Do you agree that many fractions, branches, and components of the disunited sections of the Traditionalist Movement Officially now teaches things that were condemned by the Church in the past; when for example, they claim to receive delegated jurisdiction WITHOUT receiving anything from the successor of St. Peter?

{348} Do you agree that many fractions, branches, and components of the disunited sections of the Traditionalist Movement offer their *una cum* Masses with the "pope" and/or "bishop(s)" that many other fractions, branches, and components of the disunited sections of the Traditionalist Movement claim are heretics and not members of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ?

{349} Do you agree that the above paragraph is another proof that there is no true UNITY among the members of the Traditionalist Movement?

{350} Do you agree that it is contrary to the way Catholic bishops receive their delegated jurisdiction and delegated mission; when the Protestants teach, preach, and proclaim that they receive it directly from Christ Himself?

{351} Do you agree that not one Traditionalist Movement cleric has proven their doctrinal identity of how they receive ordinary or delegated jurisdiction and mission from the teachings of the Apostles and the true successors of St. Peter?

Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre made many statements like the following – of which this is only a partial list: **"The See of Peter and the posts of authority in Rome being occupied by antichrists**, the destruction of the Kingdom of Our Lord is being rapidly carried out even within His Mystical Body here below (...) This is what has brought down upon our heads persecution by the Rome of the antichrists." (Archbishop Lefebvre, Letter to the future bishops, August 29, 1987)

"Rome has lost the Faith, my dear friends. Rome is in apostasy. These are not words in the air. It is the truth. Rome is in apostasy... They have left the Church... This is sure, sure, sure." (Archbishop Lefebvre, Retreat Conference, September 4, 1987, Ecône)

“If it happened that the pope was no longer the servant of the truth, he would no longer be pope.”

(Archbishop Lefebvre, Homily preached at Lille, August 29, 1976, before a crowd of some 12,000)

“While we are certain that the faith the Church has taught for 20 centuries cannot contain error, we are much further from absolute certitude that the pope is truly pope.” (Archbishop Lefebvre, *Le Figaro*, August 4, 1976)

“For as long as the Vatican continues their apostate ecumenism we can affirm that they remain in open, official rupture with the Church's entire past and with its official Magisterium. It is therefore, a strict duty for every priest wanting to remain Catholic to separate himself from this Conciliar Church for as long as it does not rediscover the tradition of the Church and of the Catholic Faith.” (Archbishop Lefebvre's last book, *Spiritual Journey*)

“We must not be afraid to affirm that the current Roman authorities, since John XXIII and Paul VI, have made themselves active collaborators of international Jewish Freemasonry and of world socialism. John Paul II is above all a communist-loving politician at the service of a world communism retaining a hint of religion.” (Archbishop Lefebvre's last book, *Spiritual Journey*)

“It seems inconceivable that a successor of Peter could fail in some way to transmit the Truth which he must transmit, for he cannot – without as it were disappearing from the papal line – not transmit what the popes have always transmitted.” (Archbishop Lefebvre, Homily, Ecône, September 18, 1977)

“Now some priests (even some priests in the Society) say that we Catholics need not worry about what is happening in the Vatican; we have the true sacraments, the true Mass, the true doctrine, so why worry about whether the pope is heretic or an impostor or whatever; it is of no importance to us. But I think that is not true. If any man is important in the Church it is the pope.” (Archbishop Lefebvre, March 30, 1986, text published in *The Angelus*, July 1986)

Please study with me the official statement of Archbishop Lefebvre on the occasion of his suspension, *a divinis*, by Paul VI, June 29, 1976:

“That Conciliar church is a schismatic church, because it breaks with the Catholic Church that has always been. It has its new dogmas, its new priesthood, its new institutions, its new worship, all already condemned by the Church in many a document, official and definitive.”

“This Conciliar church is schismatic, because it has taken as a basis for its updating, principles opposed to those of the Catholic Church: such as the new concept of the Mass expressed in numbers 5 of the Preface to (the decree) *Missale Romanum* and 7 of its first chapter, which gives the assembly a priestly role that it cannot exercise; such likewise as the natural - which is to say divine - right of every person and of every group of persons to religious freedom.”

“This right to religious freedom is blasphemous, for it attributes to God purposes that destroy His Majesty, His Glory, His Kingship. This right implies freedom of conscience, freedom of thought, and all the Masonic freedoms.”

“The church that affirms such errors is at once schismatic and heretical. This Conciliar church is, therefore, not Catholic. To whatever extent Pope, Bishops, priests, or faithful adhere to this new church, they separate themselves from the Catholic Church.”

Bishop George Musey told the CMRI Community that Bishop Thuc said “there is no authority in Rome.”

{352} Do you agree that Archbishop Lefebvre and Bishop Thuc as well as other bishops and priests of the Traditionalist Movement have told us the Novus Ordo church is in **schism** and heresy; and that they have provided an abundance of evidence from the teachings of the true Church to PROVE their statement is true?

{353} Do you agree that since the Novus Ordo sect is in schism, those who acknowledge its head to be a true Vicar of Jesus Christ are also in schism?

{354} Do you agree that the SEDEVACANTIS part of the Traditionalist Movement say the SCHISMATICAL other part of the Traditionalist Movement are also Members of the SAME church?

{355} Do you agree that the members of the various sects are weekly changing back and forth from church to church; and that none of them are united under one head who received his jurisdiction and mission from a successor of St. Peter?

{356} Do you agree that this practice, policy, and conduct among the Protestant Traditionalist Movement sects proves they are just as non-Catholic as the Traditional Protestants; and that none of these sects have the Four Marks of the True Church?

Keep in mind everything that has been written above; and then review again the teachings of the true Catholic Church as expressed in the quotes you provided by Pope Saint Pius X:

"I sincerely hold that the doctrine of faith was handed down to us from the apostles through the orthodox Fathers **in exactly the same meaning** and **always in the same purport**. Therefore, I entirely reject the **heretical misrepresentation that dogmas evolve and change from one meaning to another different from the one which the Church held previously** ... The purpose of this is, then, **not that dogma may be tailored according to what seems better and more suited to the culture of each age**; rather, that the **absolute and immutable truth** preached by the apostles from the beginning **may never be believed to be different, may never be understood in any other way.**" (see *The Oath Against Modernism*, Pope St. Pius X)

Pope Pius IX will now instruct us in *Quartus Supra*:

"However it has never been possible to prove oneself a Catholic by affirming those statements of the faith which one accepts and keeping silence on those doctrines which one decides not to profess. But without exception, **all doctrines which the Church proposes must be accepted**, as the history of the Church at all times bears witness.

For any man to be able to prove his Catholic faith and affirm that he is truly a Catholic, **he must be able to convince the Apostolic See of this**. For this See is predominant and with it the faithful of the whole Church should agree."

{357} Do you agree that because "**all doctrines which the Church proposes must be accepted**"; and because "it is **a DOGMA of faith** that the authority of the bishops, even admitting that it stems directly from Christ, remains dependent on the authority of the Roman Pontiff"; and because "The Catholic faith never changes"; and because "**We don't have the Church consistently teaching something for 1900 odd years, and all of a sudden we are told that is no longer true**"; and because "We have to stick with what the Church taught before, because **the truth does NOT change with the times**"; and because "We hold to the **SAME EXACT teachings** that Jesus Christ gave in His time"; and because "There is no evolution of dogma"; and because "There is no NEW understanding of doctrine in a way that contradicts what was previously defined"; and because "if there is a contradiction, we have to say, 'That cannot be the true Church of Christ'"; and because "To conserve the **Unity** of the Church, the power of the keys **must be passed on through Peter** to the other pastors of the Church"; and because "**Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff**"; and because "the **absolute and immutable truth** preached by the apostles from the beginning **may never be believed to be different, may never be understood in any other way**"; that the absolute and undeniable **truth** must be accepted as Catholic doctrine and a dogma of the Faith that any bishops claiming jurisdiction that has not been received from the Roman Pontiff, no longer have the characteristic and identifying Marks of UNITY and APOSTOLICITY in the sects to which they belong?

{358} Do you agree that any and every sect that no longer has the characteristic and identifying Marks of UNITY and APOSTOLICITY is a non-Catholic sect?

Some of the quotes and actions of John Paul II

You can find a lot of necessary information to understand concerning John Paul II by using this hyperlink <https://jmjsite.com/johnpauliandjudas-lettersizeformat.pdf>

The following information about John Paul II was transcribed from a video sermon of Bishop Sanborn. In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

I am sure this week you have seen in various news reports the celebration of John Paul II's 25 years; and I just feel that it is my duty to point out to you the true side of his 25 years of attempting to be the Pope, and so that you do not lose sight of what this man is and what he has done to the Catholic Church. It is very easy to be taken in by the strong elements of propaganda in the news, and to have your mind be led into some thought that this is a great man.

They are praising him for the sole reason that he has abandoned the Catholic Faith. They praise him for his ecumenism. They praise him for getting everyone together, and for other purely humanistic motives. They never praise him for upholding the Catholic Faith. In fact, if ever he does anything that smacks of upholding the Catholic Faith, he is immediately criticized by these same people; but, I just want to review his 25 years briefly, and have you consider the state of the Church in these past 25 years.

Let us look at his heretical statements and practices:

- * The kissing of the Koran publicly and solemnly; a book which denies the divinity of Christ and the fact that he died on the Cross.

- * The removal of a crucifix from an altar, and the replacing it with a golden statue of Buddha, and the incensing of the said statue by Buddhist monks, which act he permitted under his own eyes in Assisi in 1986.

- * The praise of voodoo, which he himself did! Voodoo, which is the worship of demons and the worship of snakes.

- * The praise of Martin Luther, the man who said that our Lord Jesus Christ committed adultery three times. Calling him a deeply spiritual man.

- * The praise for the joint declaration on justification with the Lutherans. The document signed with this heretical sect which blatantly denies the teaching of the Council of Trent on justification.

- * The declaring that non-Catholic religions are means of salvation, which is directly contrary to the Catholic dogma that outside the Catholic Church there is no salvation. And this he said in an official document where he said that children should be taught that non-Catholic religions are means of salvation.

- * The promulgation of the ecumenical directory, which permits abominable acts of communication in sacred things with heretics and schismatics. It permits, for example, Catholics to go before Lutheran ministers and be married, and it permits the giving of Holy Communion to non-Catholics.

- * Permitting that zoroastrian priests worship fire at Assisi (this was about two years ago); this worship of fire is the oldest form of idolatry, and it is the very reason why God called Abraham out of Ur in the Old Testament in order to found upon him the True Faith; to remove him from that very idolatry. And he purposely permitted that idolatry to be done at Assisi.

- * The beatification of Mother Teresa who did not strive to convert Hindus to the Faith, but rather encouraged them to be good Hindus; and that is recorded in Time magazine.

- * The promulgation of the document concerning communion in which heretical and schismatic sects are referred to as particular churches which belong to the Church of Christ, and in which, to quote, "all the essential elements of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of the Creed are found"; which is directly contrary to the teaching of the Church, the Creed itself, which is that we believe in One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. And the Church has always understood that to mean the Roman Catholic Church and no other Church. And so, he has destroyed the very belief that we have concerning the nature of the Church itself.

- * The approval as valid of a mass of Nestorian heretics in Iraq with no words of consecration, with the permission to Chaldean Catholics that in case of necessity, they attend this heretical and schismatic service in order to fulfill their Sunday obligation. Imagine a Mass with no words of consecration!

- * Saying that there is no fire in hell.

- * Calling Jews our big brothers in the Faith, and the approval of a Vatican document which states that the Jews' expectation of the Messiah is not in vain. And permitting American bishops to say that we should not attempt to convert the Jews because they have their own covenant with God (which is a blasphemy).

* Saying that Muslims, Christians, and Jews all worship the same God even though they, Jews and Moslems, deny that our Lord Jesus Christ IS God.

* Drinking a ritual potion (part of a pagan ceremony in the Fiji Islands).

* Permitting himself to be marked by the sign of Shiva – the cow-dung symbol on the forehead – Shiva, who is the Hindu god of destruction.

* Permitting innumerable times, that heretics and schismatics perform their rites in Catholic churches, and permitting them to give blessings to the congregation; people who are no more priests, in certain cases, than your mailman.

* Declaring that non-Catholic religions have apostolic missions – some mission from God descending from the Apostles to themselves – even though they are schismatics and heretics.

* The promulgation of the new code of Canon Law, which contains the Vatican II heresy concerning the Church and which approves of the sacrilege of giving Holy Communion to non-Catholics, and of the mortal sin that Catholics actively participate in the worship of non-Catholics.

* Saying in a Lutheran Church in Rome that the miracles of Christ do not prove his messianic dignity; which is directly contrary to the teaching of the Vatican Council in 1870.

* Repeated approval of the heresies of Vatican II, particularly that concerning the Church and that concerning religious liberty.

* The use of a bare-breasted eighteen-year-old American college female student to read the epistle in a mass in New Guinea.

* The giving of the pectoral cross to Anglican bishops and permitting Cardinal Kasper to tell them that *Apostolicae Curae* must be reevaluated. And let me explain that: *Apostolicae Curae* was the document of Leo XIII in 1899, whereby he said that Anglican orders are invalid and that this question can never be brought up again. That this is the final decision concerning it; that they are null and void; that the Anglican bishops and priests are merely laymen; they have no valid orders like the Greek Orthodox do, but they are merely lay people. And this Woytila has given them (only in the beginning of this month) pectoral crosses. The pectoral cross is a sign of a mission as a bishop. When you are consecrated a bishop, part of the ceremony is to hand over to the bishop and to place on him the pectoral cross. And this is the same pectoral cross that he gave to the Catholic bishops on the occasion of his 25 years. And, at the same time, during the early part of this month, he permitted a ceremony in the church of Santa Maria Sopra Minerva in Rome, whereby an Anglican bishop was installed as a representative to the Holy See. During this ceremony, the Anglican bishop gave his blessing to the people. This is the very same church in which the Rosary processions were organized by St. Pius V in 1571 for the defeat of the Turks in Lepanto. It is the very church in which the coat of arms of Saint Pius V are on the front. The very same church where under the high altar St. Catherine of Siena rests, and St. Victoria on a side altar, and the remains of Pope Paul IV. In this church, is where Anglicans have been permitted (an Anglican bishop who was nothing else than a layman running around in a costume of a bishop) to give a blessing and to receive a pectoral cross as if he were something legitimate. And, as well, Cardinal Kasper said in London in August to a group of Anglican bishops, that *Apostolicae Curae* has to be reevaluated. You know what that means? That the next thing on the list is that the Anglicans will be considered valid – the first step to accepting these people.

Now understand who these Anglicans are. These are the Anglicans who just recently in the news cannot figure out from their own bibles that sodomy is a sin! They cannot open the Bible and read it, and figure out that sodomy is a sin! These are the Anglicans who have women priests; and these are the people getting pectoral crosses from this heretic who inhabits the Vatican. And Cardinal Murphy O'Connor, who is in charge of relations with the Anglicans, said that this gesture of giving the pectoral cross is, as he says, in a way that is hard to define, means that the Catholic Church has already passed beyond the position of *Apostolicae Curae*. And these things are knowingly and willingly permitted by this man who claims to be the head of Catholicism.

And add to all of these things the general condition of the Church. Look around at the Church since Vatican II, for we must add to the 25 years of this man the 15 years of Montini, the five years of Roncalli – forty years! Look around. Consider the condition of the Church since Vatican II:

* The general abandonment of orthodoxy.

* The fact that most Catholics use artificial birth control and believe that it is perfectly all right – and the percentages are in the 80th percentile.

* Look at the condition of the priests. Their crimes are so unspeakable we cannot even mention them from the pulpit; they have sunken into such dirt and filth.

* Consider the condition of the nuns, how they are for abortion. How they are feminists. They are unrecognizable as nuns, completely destroyed with regard to their faith and with regard to their piety. Completely opposite from what they should be and what they were before the council.

* Consider the state of Catholic education in which heresy reigns. Whether it should be the seminaries, whether it should be the Catholic universities, whether it should be the Catholic schools (the high schools and grammar schools) – the reign of heresy! All of the ecumenical acts which I just described being repeated on a local and small level in all of these institutions where immorality reigns, for example, in Catholic seminaries and in Catholic universities (of the grossest form); just think of all of that! Put that all together in your mind of what Vatican II has given us.

* Consider the state of the sacred liturgy, what Vatican II has done to the liturgy. The AWFUL, AWFUL thing that you see if you merely go to someone's funeral or to someone's wedding. And the heretical and scandalous bishops! Who appointed them? Who maintains them? Who keeps them going? And those of you who have ever worked for a large company like Ford or General Motors or Chrysler, you would know that if they put out a new product that caused so much destruction as Vatican II has caused to the Church; if they suffered so much economic loss as Vatican II has caused for the Church with regard to faith and morals, the people responsible for that new product would be fired. They would have to leave the company and find a new job. But we see these bishops AGAIN and AGAIN and AGAIN and AGAIN appointed to be leaders of the flock, leading the sheep into the mouths of wolves; and again they are appointed. They are praised. They go to Rome and they receive honors; and even though they have presided over these priests who have preyed upon the young people, these bishops are maintained in existence and bring down upon the Church SCANDAL upon SCANDAL upon SCANDAL!

That is the 25 years of Wojtyla. We may not understand why God permits this, but we do understand our Catholic duty. The Catholic duty that we received at Baptism and at our Confirmation; and that is to give this heretic, Wojtyla, and those whom he has appointed, the full measure of Catholic resistance to heresy that the Church has always shown to heretics throughout her glorious history.

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

†††JMJ†††

Such is the partial outline and history presented by Bishop Sanborn of the man Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre and the other Novus Ordo clergy acknowledged as their pope and with whom they offered their *una cum* Mass. Such is the partial outline and history of the church that the well-educated Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre voluntarily, freely, and willingly helped bring into existence after knowing its teachings were contrary to Catholic doctrines and dogma.

Some quotes of Francis (Jorge Bergoglio)

Most of the information in this next section was taken from FrancisQuotes.com; but edited as shown herein

Teachings of Francis I (Jorge Bergoglio)

Atheism

On Heaven and Earth², pp. 12-13: *"I do not approach the relationship in order to proselytize, or convert the atheist; I respect him... nor would I say that his life is condemned, because I am convinced that I do not have the right to make a judgment about the honesty of that person... every man is the image of God, whether he is a believer or not."*

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

"If any one deny the one true God, Creator and Lord of all things visible and invisible, let him be anathema" (Conc. Vatican., Sess. III, "De fide", can. i).

"If anyone shall have said that the one true God, our Creator and our Lord, cannot be known with certitude by those things which have been made, by the natural light of human reason: let him be anathema" (First Vatican Council, Sess III,

can. 2/1: Denz. 1806; cf. D. 1785).

"And to you who are troubled, rest with us when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with the angels of his power, in a flame of fire, giving vengeance to them who know not God, and who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall suffer eternal punishment in destruction, from the face of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." II Thessalonians I: 7-9

"...faith is the beginning of human salvation, the foundation, and the root of all Justification; without which it is impossible to please God..." Council of Trent, Chapter VIII

Teachings of Francis

Blessed Trinity

Interview with the Italian newspaper La Repubblica¹, September 24, 2013: *"I believe in God, not in a Catholic God, there is no Catholic God, there is God and I believe in Jesus Christ, his incarnation. Jesus is my teacher and my pastor, but God, the Father, Abba, is the light and the Creator. This is my Being."*

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

Comment: Our Catholic God is the Trinity, which is different from the Gods professed by non-Christians: *"the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, and yet there are not three Gods but one God."* Athanasian Creed
"Q. 1400. Name some of the more essential religious truths we must know and believe. 2. (2) That in God there are three Divine Persons: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and these Divine Persons are called the Blessed Trinity."
Baltimore Catechism

Teachings of Francis

Capital Punishment (The Death Penalty)

Letter to the President of the International Commission against the death penalty⁹, March 20, 2015: *"Today capital punishment is unacceptable, however serious the condemned's crime may have been. It is an offence to the inviolability of life and to the dignity of the human person which contradicts God's plan for man and for society and his merciful justice, and it fails to conform to any just purpose of punishment.".....*

"All Christians and men of good will are thus called today to fight not only for the abolition of the death penalty, whether legal or illegal, and in all its forms, but also in order to improve prison conditions, with respect for the human dignity of the people deprived of their freedom"

To participants in the meeting promoted by the pontifical Council for promoting the new evangelization²⁴, Oct 11, 2017: *"It must be clearly stated that the death penalty is an inhumane measure that, regardless of how it is carried out, abases human dignity. It is per se contrary to the Gospel..."* L'Osservatore Romano, October 13, 2017, pp. 7,11

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

"The same divine authority that forbids the killing of a human being establishes certain exceptions, as when God authorizes killing by a general law or when He gives an explicit commission to an individual for a limited time. The agent who executes the killing does not commit homicide; he is an instrument as is the sword with which he cuts. Therefore, it is in no way contrary to the commandment, 'Thou shalt not kill' to wage war at God's bidding, or for the representatives of public authority to put criminals to death, according to the law, that is, the will of the most just reason" St. Augustine, The City of God, Book 1, chapter 21

"Therefore if a man be dangerous and infectious to the community, on account of some sin, it is praiseworthy and healthful that he be killed in order to safeguard the common good, since "a little leaven corrupteth the whole lump" (1 Cor. 5:6)" St. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica, Whether It Is Lawful to Kill Sinners?

"Even in the case of the death penalty the State does not dispose of the individual's right to life. Rather public authority limits itself to depriving the offender of the good of life in expiation for his guilt, after he, through his crime, deprived himself of his own right to life" Pius XII, Address to the First International Congress of Histopathology of the Nervous System, 14 Sep 1952, XIV, 328

"The infliction of capital punishment is not contrary to the teaching of the Catholic Church, and the power of the State to visit upon culprits the penalty of death derives much authority from revelation and from the writings of theologians"
Catholic Encyclopedia, Capital Punishment

Teachings of Francis

Cohabitation / Concubinage

Address to the Diocese of Rome's Pastoral Congress, Q&A Session¹⁴, Jun 16, 2016: *"They prefer to cohabit, and this is a challenge, a task. Not to ask 'why don't you marry?' No, to accompany, to wait, and to help them to mature, help fidelity to mature."..... "I've seen a lot of fidelity in these cohabitations, and I am sure that this is a real marriage, they have the grace of a real marriage because of their fidelity."*

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

"It is a grievous sin for unmarried men to have concubines ...Wherefore, the holy Synod, that it may by suitable remedies provide against this exceeding evil, ordains that these concubinaries, whether unmarried or married, of whatsoever state, dignity, and condition they may be, if, after having been three times admonished on this subject by the Ordinary, even ex officio, they shall not have put away their concubines, and have separated themselves from all connection with them, they shall be smitten with excommunication; from which they shall not be absolved until they have really obeyed the admonition given them." Council of Trent, Ch. VIII, Concubinage is severely punished

"13. But in all these affairs, one of your aims should be to instill in the faithful a greater aversion for sins which scandalize others; your priests should share this aim. You are aware of the increase in the number of those who sin in a scandalous manner: those who blaspheme the heavenly saints and the holy name of God as well; those who live in concubinage.....So, make the faithful consider the seriousness of sins of this kind and the heavy penalties for them, both for the guilt of the sin itself and for the spiritual danger in which they place their brothers by the infection of their bad example. For it is written: "Woe to the world because of scandals . . . Woe to that man by whom the scandal comes!"
Pope Pius IX, On the Church in the Pontifical States, December 8, 1849

"The scandal of concubinage is removed by marriage, which should be made known to those who were scandalized, either by the pastor or by the parties themselves." Canon Law 1043

"Hence if both parties intended and expressed the intention in some way or other to enter upon a mere Concubinage, there would be no marriage." Canon Law 1082

"If a marriage is found invalid, as, for instance, among the Gallas, where slaves contract a contubernium or legalized concubinage, the parties must be separated until they are lawfully married" Canon Law 1084

"Therefore concubinage must be given up because incompatible with Christian morals" Canon Law 1124

Teachings of Francis

Communism

Conversations with Jorge Bergoglio⁴, p. 39: *"It's true that I was, like the rest of my family, a practicing Catholic. But my mind was not made solely for religious questions... I read Our Word and Proposals, a publication by the Communist Party, and I loved every article ever written by Leonidas Barletta, one of their best-known members..."*

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

"See to it, Venerable Brethren, that the Faithful do not allow themselves to be deceived! Communism is intrinsically wrong, and no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever. Those who permit themselves to be deceived into lending their aid towards the triumph of Communism in their own country, will be the first to fall victims of their error. And the greater the antiquity and grandeur of the Christian civilization in the regions where Communism successfully penetrates, so much more devastating will be the hatred displayed by the godless" Encyclical On Atheistic Communism by Pope Pius XI, 1937

"To this goal also tends the unspeakable doctrine of Communism, as it is called, a doctrine most opposed to the very natural law. For if this doctrine were accepted, the complete destruction of everyone's laws, government, property, and even of human society itself would follow." Encyclical On Faith and Religion by Pope Pius IX, 1846

Teachings of Francis

Contraception

In-flight interview from Mexico¹⁵, Feb 17, 2016: *"The great Paul VI, in a difficult situation in Africa, permitted nuns to use a form of artificial contraceptives in cases of rape.....On the other hand, avoiding pregnancy is not an absolute evil. In certain cases, as in this one (the Zika virus outbreak), or in the one I mentioned of Blessed Paul VI, it was clear."*

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

"But no reason, however grave, may be put forward by which anything intrinsically against nature may become conformable to nature and morally good. Since, therefore, the conjugal act is destined primarily by nature for the begetting of children, those who in exercising it deliberately frustrate its natural power and purpose sin against nature and commit a deed which is shameful and intrinsically vicious."

"...any use whatsoever of matrimony exercised in such a way that the act is deliberately frustrated in its natural power to generate life is an offense against the law of God and of nature, and those who indulge in such are branded with the guilt of a grave sin."

"...No difficulty can arise that justifies the putting aside of the law of God which forbids all acts intrinsically evil." Pope Pius XI, Encyclical On Christian Marriage, Dec 31, 1930

"A negative precept of natural law which prohibits a thing intrinsically evil can never be lawfully transgressed not even under the influence of the fear of death, (Lib. I, tr. ii, c. iv, dub. 2, n. 1) So that it is not lawful to do a thing which is wrong in itself, even to escape death" Catholic Encyclopedia, Hermann Busembaum

Teachings of Francis

Conversion/Proselytizing

Church of the Assumption, Tbilisi, Georgia¹⁶, Oct 1, 2016: *"Never fight! Let the theologians study the abstract realities of theology. But what should I do with a friend, neighbour, an Orthodox person? Be open, be a friend. 'But should I make efforts to convert him or her?' There is a very grave sin against ecumenism: proselytism. We should never proselytize the Orthodox!"* L' Osservatore Romano, October 7, 2016, p. 11

Discourse to Priests, Men and Women Religious, Seminarians²¹ Sep 9, 2017: *"On one of my trips, World Youth Day in Poland [Krakow 2016], during a lunch with 15 young people and the Archbishop, one of them asked me: 'What can I tell my young friend who is an atheist, who does not believe, what reasoning can I use?'. And it struck me how to reply: 'Look, the last thing you must do is say anything'. He just stared at me."* L'Osservatore Romano, Sep 22, 2017, p. 10

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

Comment: If proselytizing is a grave sin, why did all of the Catholic missionaries throughout the history of the Church dedicate their lives to it?

"... St. Francis De Sales had volunteered to re-evangelize the Chablais, a region in France south of Geneva consisting of some 72,000 souls, almost all of whom were now Calvinists, since their ancestors had succumbed to Protestantism 60 years before... St. Francis' first few months saw mostly failure, as he spent a very cold winter tramping over the countryside, receiving a frigid welcome and sometimes sleeping in hay lofts at night. So he resorted to writing pamphlets - which he posted on walls and slipped under doors. By this method he was able to reach the souls he was after, such that at the end of 4 years, almost the entire population of 72,000 had returned to the ancient Catholic Faith." The Catholic Controversy, St. Francis De Sales

"Having protected their persons (the Jews), St. Vincent now proceeded to the salvation of their souls. He preached to them, held controversial meetings with the most learned of them, and converted them by the thousand. In 1391, he converted 7,000 Jews in Valencia alone, and 10,000 more throughout the kingdom." The Angel of the Judgment - A Life of St. Vincent Ferrer (imprimatur 1953)

Teachings of Francis

Ecumenism & Religious Freedom

Address in St. Peter's Squares, May 18, 2013: *"... promote religious freedom for everyone, everyone! Every man and every woman must be free in his or her profession of religion, whatever it may be."* L' Osservatore Romano, May 22, 2013, p. 11.

General Audience with representatives of the world's various religions¹¹, Oct 28, 2015: *"the Church regards with esteem the believers of all religions, appreciating their spiritual and moral commitment...Now, to conclude this Audience, I invite everyone, each one on his or her own, to pray in silence. May each one do so according to his or her own religious tradition."* L' Osservatore Romano, October 30, 2015, pp. 3-4

Evangelii Gaudium⁶, November, 2013: *"Non-Christians, by God's gracious initiative, when they are faithful to their own consciences, can live 'justified by the grace of God', and thus be 'associated to the paschal mystery of Jesus Christ'"*

Address to members of the Diplomatic Corps accredited to the Holy See²², Jan 8, 2018: *"Among the human rights that I would also like to mention today is the right to freedom of thought, conscience and of religion, including the freedom to change religion..."* L' Osservatore Romano, January 12, 2018, p. 9

Address to the representatives of the Yazidi community²³, Jan 24, 2018: *"Every person has the right to profess his or her own religious creed freely and without constraint..."* L' Osservatore Romano, January 26, 2018, p. 1

Vatican radio message⁸, May 24, 2015: *"I feel like saying something that may sound controversial, or even heretical, perhaps. But there is someone who "knows" that, despite our differences, we are one. It is he who is persecuting us. It is he who is persecuting Christians today, he who is anointing us with (the blood of) martyrdom. He knows that Christians are disciples of Christ: that they are one, that they are brothers! He doesn't care if they are Evangelicals, or Orthodox, Lutherans, Catholics or Apostolic...he doesn't care! They are Christians."*

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

"The Catholic Church is alone in keeping the true worship. This is the fount of truth, this the house of Faith, this the temple of God: if any man enter not here, or if any man go forth from it, he is a stranger to the hope of life and salvation." Encyclical "Mortalium Animos" (On Religious Unity), by Pope Pius XI in 1928

"Certainly such attempts can nowise be approved by Catholics, founded as they are on that false opinion which considers all religions to be more or less good and praiseworthy, since they all in different ways manifest and signify that sense which is inborn in us all, and by which we are led to God and to the obedient acknowledgment of His rule. Not only are those who hold this opinion in error and deceived, but also in distorting the idea of true religion they reject it, and little by little turn aside to naturalism and atheism, as it is called; from which it clearly follows that one who supports those who hold these theories and attempt to realize them, is altogether abandoning the divinely revealed religion." Encyclical "Mortalium Animos" (On Religious Unity), by Pope Pius XI in 1928

"Now We consider another abundant source of the evils with which the Church is afflicted at present: indifferentism. This perverse opinion is spread on all sides by the fraud of the wicked who claim that it is possible to obtain the eternal salvation of the soul by the profession of any kind of religion, as long as morality is maintained. Surely, in so clear a matter, you will drive this deadly error far from the people committed to your care. With the admonition of the apostle that "there is one God, one faith, one baptism"." Encyclical On Liberalism and Religious Indifferentism, Pope Gregory XVI, 1832

*"**CONDEMNED:** Every man is free to embrace and profess that religion which, guided by the light of reason, he shall consider true."* The Syllabus of Errors 1864 - Pope Pius IX

*"**CONDEMNED:** Man may, in the observance of any religion whatever, find the way of eternal salvation, and arrive at eternal salvation."* The Syllabus of Errors 1864 - Pope Pius IX

"...because the preceding errors and many others are contained in the books or writings of Martin Luther, we likewise condemn, reprobate, and reject completely the books and all the writings and sermons of the said Martin, whether in Latin or any other language, containing the said errors or any one of them; and we wish them to be regarded as utterly

condemned, reprobated, and rejected. We forbid each and every one of the faithful of either sex, in virtue of holy obedience and under the above penalties to be incurred automatically, to read, assert, preach, praise, print, publish, or defend them. They will incur these penalties if they presume to uphold them in any way, personally or through another or others, directly or indirectly, tacitly or explicitly, publicly or occultly, either in their own homes or in other public or private places.” Condemning the Errors of Martin Luther (Exsurge Domine), Pope Leo X, June 15, 1520

Teachings of Francis

Evolution of Doctrine

To participants in the meeting promoted by the pontifical Council for promoting the new evangelization²⁴, Oct 11, 2017: *“Doctrine cannot be preserved without allowing it to develop, nor can it be tied to an interpretation that is rigid and immutable without demeaning the working of the Holy Spirit.”* L' Osservatore Romano, October 13, 2017, pp. 7,11

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

“I sincerely hold that the doctrine of faith was handed down to us from the apostles through the orthodox Fathers in exactly the same meaning and always in the same purport. Therefore, I entirely reject the heretical misrepresentation that dogmas evolve and change from one meaning to another different from the one which the Church held previously.” Pope St. Pius X, Oath against Modernism

“Nor do We merely desire that Catholics should shrink from the errors of Modernism, but also from the tendencies or what is called the spirit of Modernism. Those who are infected by that spirit develop a keen dislike for all that savours of antiquity and become eager searchers after novelties in everything: in the way in which they carry out religious functions, in the ruling of Catholic institutions, and even in private exercises of piety. Therefore it is Our will that the law of our forefathers should still be held sacred: “Let there be no innovation; keep to what has been handed down.” Pope Benedict XV, Ad Beatissimi Apostolorum (Appealing for Peace), Nov 1, 1914

Teachings of Francis

False Gods

In 2012, Cardinal Bergoglio held an interreligious prayer meeting in the Cathedral of Buenos Aires with the leaders of false religions including Judaism and Protestant sects. In this prayer meeting he allowed the members of these false religions to pray aloud to their false gods in the Cathedral. Bergoglio has been known to organize other similar meetings (similar to his two predecessors) that are well documented and photographed in the news.

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

“First Commandment of God: I am the Lord thy God, thou shall not have strange gods before Me” “Q: What else does the First Commandment forbid? A: The First Commandment also forbids all dealings with the devil, and all association with anti-Christian sects.” The Catechism of Saint Pius X, The First Commandment

“When it is said: Thou shalt not have strange gods before me, it is equivalent to saying: Thou shalt worship me the true God; thou shalt not worship strange gods.” The Catechism of Trent, The First Commandment *“As the true God can tolerate no strange gods, the true Church of Christ can tolerate no strange Churches beside herself, or, what amounts to the same, she can recognize none as theoretically justified.”* Catholic Encyclopedia, Religious Toleration

Teachings of Francis

Hell

Interview with the Italian newspaper La Repubblica²⁵, Mar 28, 2018: When asked where bad souls are punished, Francis replied: *“They are not punished, those who repent obtain the forgiveness of God and enter the rank of souls who contemplate him, but those who do not repent and cannot therefore be forgiven disappear. There is no hell, there is the disappearance of sinful souls.”*

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

“Moreover, we declare that according to the common arrangement of God, the souls of those who depart in actual mortal sin immediately after their death descend to hell where they are tortured by infernal punishments...” Pope Benedict XII, Benedictus Deus, 1336

Teachings of Francis

Islam

Evangelii Gaudium⁶, November, 2013: *"We must never forget that they *the Moslems+ 'profess to hold the faith of Abraham, and together with us they adore the one, merciful God, who will judge humanity on the last day'."*

Address to the President of Religious Affairs in Turkey and Muslim and Christian political and religious leaders¹², Nov 28, 2014: *"We, Muslims and Christians, are the bearers of spiritual treasures of inestimable worth. Among these we recognize some shared elements, though lived according to the traditions of each, such as the adoration of the All-Merciful God, reference to the Patriarch Abraham, prayer, almsgiving, fasting... elements which, when lived sincerely, can transform life and provide a sure foundation for dignity and fraternity."*

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

Comment: Catholics and Muslims do not adore the same God (Catholics adore the Blessed Trinity):

"But he that shall deny me before men, I will also deny him before my Father who is in heaven." Matthew 10:33

"For he that shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him the Son of man shall be ashamed, when he shall come in his majesty, and that of his Father, and of the holy angels."

Luke 9:26 *"Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father."* 1 John 2:23

"Q. 1400. Name some of the more essential religious truths we must know and believe. 2.(2) That in God there are three Divine Persons: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and these Divine Persons are called the Blessed Trinity."

Baltimore Catechism

"The doctrines of Islam concerning God — His unity and Divine attributes — are essentially those of the Bible; but to the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Divine Sonship of Christ, Mohammed had the strongest antipathy" Catholic Encyclopedia, Mohammed and Mohammedanism

Teachings of Francis

Judaism

On Heaven and Earth², page 188: *"The Jewish People can no longer be accused of having killed God, as they were for a long time. When one reads the account of the Passion, it is clear."*

Francis' response to open letter³ published Sep 2013: *"What I can say, with the Apostle Paul, is that God has never stopped believing in the alliance made with Israel and that, through the terrible trials of these past centuries, the Jews have kept their faith in God."*

Evangelii Gaudium⁶ n. 247: *"We hold the Jewish people in special regard because their covenant with God has never been revoked"*.

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

"Therefore let all the house of Israel know most certainly, that God hath made both Lord and Christ, this same Jesus, whom you have crucified." Acts of the Apostles (2:36)

"And Pilate seeing that he prevailed nothing, but that rather a tumult was made; taking water washed his hands before the people (the Jews), saying: I am innocent of the blood of this just man; look you to it. And the whole people answering, said: His blood be upon us and our children." Matt 27:24-25

"Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned." Matthew 16:15

"Jesus saith to him: I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No man cometh to the Father, but by me." John 14:6

"By these salutary instructions it desires to provide measures whereby Jews and other infidels may be converted to the orthodox faith and converts may remain steadfastly in it." Council of Basil 1431-1435

Teachings of Francis

Omnipotence of God

Address to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences¹⁰, Oct 27, 2014: *“When we read about Creation in Genesis, we run the risk of imagining God was a magician, with a magic wand able to do everything. But that is not so.”*

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

“And Jesus beholding, said to them: With men this is impossible: but with God all things are possible” Matt 19:26

“Behold I am the Lord the God of all flesh: shall any thing be hard for me?” Jer 32:27

“Q: How can Jesus Christ be present in all the consecrated hosts in the world? A: Jesus Christ is present in all the consecrated hosts in the world by the Omnipotence of God, to whom nothing is impossible” Catechism of Saint Pius X - The Blessed Eucharist

Teachings of Francis

Prayer in Common

Conversations with Jorge Bergoglio⁴, p. 208: *“Not long ago I was in a synagogue taking part in a ceremony. I prayed a lot and, while praying, I heard a phrase from one of the books of wisdom that had slipped my mind: ‘Lord, may I bear mockery in silence.’ It gave me much peace and joy.”*

Common Declaration with Archbishop of Canterbury¹⁷, Oct 5, 2016: *“Nor should our (Catholic and Anglican) differences come in the way of our common prayer: not only can we pray together, we must pray together, giving voice to our shared faith and joy in the Gospel of Christ, the ancient Creeds, and the power of God’s love, made present in the Holy Spirit...”* L’ Osservatore Romano, Oct 14, 2016, pp. 7-8

Common Ecumenical Prayer at the Lutheran Cathedral of Lund¹⁸, Oct 31, 2016: *“As Lutherans and Catholics, we pray together in this Cathedral, conscious that without God we can do nothing. We ask his help, so that we can be living members, abiding in him, ever in need of his grace, so that together we may bring his word to the world...”* L’ Osservatore Romano, Nov 4, 2016, pp. 3,6

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

“If any ecclesiastic or layman shall go into the synagogue of the Jews or to the meeting-houses of the heretics to join in prayer with them, let them be deposed and deprived of communion. If any Bishops or Priest or Deacon shall join in prayer with heretics, let him be suspended from Communion” Third Council of Constantinople

“It is not permitted at all for the faithful to assist in any active manner at or to have any part in the worship of non-Catholics.” 1917 Code of Canon Law, Canon 1258

“The Code declares the following persons as suspect of heresy: 1. The propagators of heresy and those who participate with non-Catholics in divinis (Can. 2316)” Commentary on Canon Law (Augustine, 1918)

“Speaking generally, the faithful are forbidden to take part in any religious rites, considered as such, of pagans, Mohammedans, or Jews, and all the more to practice them through a kind of survival of their primitive superstitions. If this prohibition is inspired not so much by a fear of the danger of perversion as by the law forbidding the faithful to communicate in sacris with non-Catholics, aversion to false religions and especially from idol worship justifies the rigor of the law” Catholic Encyclopedia, Infidels

“Canon 33: No one shall join in prayers with heretics or schismatics” Council of Laodicea (372)

“None must neither pray or sing psalms with heretics, and whosoever shall communicate with those who are cut off from the communion of the Church, whether clergyman or layman, let him be excommunicated” Council of Carthage (398)

“So, Venerable Brethren, it is clear why this Apostolic See has never allowed its subjects to take part in the assemblies of non-Catholics: for the union of Christians can only be promoted by promoting the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who are separated from it” Pope Pius XI, Mortalium Animos (1928)

Teachings of Francis

Protestant Reformation

“Joint Statement on the occasion of the Joint Catholic Lutheran Commemoration of the Reformation^{18”} Oct 31, 2016:

“With this Joint Statement, we express joyful gratitude to God for this moment of common prayer in the Cathedral of Lund, as we begin the year commemorating the five hundredth anniversary of the Reformation... While we are

profoundly thankful for the spiritual and theological gifts received through the Reformation..." L' Osservatore Romano, Nov 4, 2016, pp. 3,7

Address to participants in the pilgrimage of Lutherans (commemorating the 500th anniversary of the Lutheran Reformation)¹⁹ Oct 13, 2016: *"I am very happy to meet you on the occasion of your ecumenical pilgrimage which began in the land of Luther, Germany, and ended here at the See of the Bishop of Rome... The Apostle Paul tells us that, by virtue of our baptism, we all form the one Body of Christ. The different members, in fact, form one body. This is why we belong to each other and when one suffers, everyone suffers, when one rejoices, all rejoice (cf. 1 Cor 12:12, 26). Let us continue with confidence on our ecumenical journey... At the end of this month, God willing, I will go to Lund, Sweden, and together with the Lutheran World Federation, we will commemorate, after five centuries, the beginning of Luther's reformation..."* L' Osservatore Romano, Oct 21, 2016, p. 11

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

"CONDEMNED: *Protestantism is nothing more than another form of the same true Christian religion, in which form it is given to please God equally as in the Catholic Church"* Syllabus of Errors, Pope Pius IX, 1864

"These reasons suffice to show superabundantly by how many roads Modernism leads to atheism and to the annihilation of all religion. The error of Protestantism made the first step on this path; that of Modernism makes the second; atheism makes the next." On the Doctrine of the Modernists, Pope St. Pius X, 1907

Comment: How can Catholics commemorate one of the greatest disasters ever to befall the Church?

"The Reformation destroyed the unity of faith and ecclesiastical organization of the Christian peoples of Europe, cut many millions off from the true Catholic Church, and robbed them of the greatest portion of the salutary means for the cultivation and maintenance of the supernatural life. Incalculable harm was thereby wrought from the religious standpoint. The false undamental doctrine of justification by faith alone, taught by the Reformers, produced a lamentable shallowness in religious life. Zeal for good works disappeared, the asceticism which the Church had practiced from her foundation was despised, charitable and ecclesiastical objects were no longer properly cultivated, supernatural interests fell into the background, and naturalistic aspirations aiming at the purely mundane, became widespread. The denial of the Divinely instituted authority of the Church, both as regards doctrine and ecclesiastical government, opened wide the door to every eccentricity, gave rise to the endless division into sects and the never-ending disputes characteristic of Protestantism, and could not but lead to the complete unbelief which necessarily arises from the Protestant principles..." Catholic Encyclopedia, 1913, Results and Consequences of the Reformation

Teachings of Francis

Sacrament of Confession

Vatican radio⁷ June 15, 2013: *"True reconciliation means that God in Christ took on our sins and He became the sinner for us. When we go to Confession, for example, it isn't that we say our sin and God forgives us. No, not that! We look for Jesus Christ and say: 'This is your sin, and I will sin again'. And Jesus likes that, because it was his mission: to become the sinner for us, to liberate us."*

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

"In the Sacrament of Penance the repentant Christian confesses his sins to a duly authorized priest, who, standing in the place of God, pronounces the absolution by means of which they are forgiven." The Catechism Explained (Spirago Clarke, 1899), Sacrament of Penance

"Q: How many conditions are necessary to make a good confession?"

A: To make a good confession five things are necessary: (1) Examination of conscience; (2) Sorrow for having offended God; (3) A resolution of sinning no more; (4) Confession of our sins; (5) Satisfaction or penance" Catechism of Saint Pius X, The Sacrament of Penance

Teachings of Francis

Sacrament of Marriage

Address to the Diocese of Rome's Pastoral Congress, Q&A Session¹⁴, Jun 16, 2016: *"....the great majority of our sacramental marriages are null. Because they say 'yes, for the rest of my life!' but they don't know what they are saying. Because they have a different culture. They say it, they have good will, but they don't know."*

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

"Marriage enjoys the favor of the law; therefore, in case of doubt, its validity ought to be maintained until the contrary be proved..." Canon Law 1917, Canon 1014

Teachings of Francis

Same-sex marriage / Homosexuality

Press conference on flight from Brazil, July 28, 2013¹³: *"If someone is gay and he searches for the Lord and has good will, who am I to judge?"*

On Heaven and Earth², p. 114: Concerning same-sex marriage: *"Religion has the right to give an opinion as long as it is in service to the people." "The religious minister does not have the right to force anything on anyone's private life. If God, in creation, ran the risk of making us free, who am I to get involved? We condemn spiritual harassment that takes place when a minister imposes directives, conduct, and demands in such a way that it takes away the freedom of the other person. God left the freedom to sin in our hands."* He later adds: *"I insist that our opinion about the marriage between two people of the same sex is not based on religion, but rather on anthropology."*

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

"Q: Which are the sins that are said to cry to God for vengeance?"

A: The sins that are said to cry to God for vengeance are these four: (1) Willful murder; (2) The sin of sodomy; (3) Oppression of the poor; (4) Defrauding laborers of their wages." The Catechism of Saint Pius X, The Vices and Other Very Grievous Sins

"As Sodom and Gomorrha, and the neighboring cities, in like manner, having given themselves to fornication, and going after other flesh, were made an example, suffering the punishment of eternal fire" Jude 1:7

Teachings of Francis

In-flight press conference from Azerbaijan to Rome²⁰, Oct 2, 2016: *"Last year I received a letter from a Spanish man who told me his story from the time when he was a child. He was born a female, a girl, and he suffered greatly because he felt that he was a boy but physically was a girl....He had the operation....He changed his civil identity, he got married and he wrote me a letter saying that it would bring comfort to him to come see me with his bride: he, who had been she, but is he. I received them. They were pleased."* L' Osservatore Romano, Oct 7, 2016, pp. 8-9

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

Comment: It's possible the Church has not taught specifically on something so perverse. Requires more research

Teachings of Francis

Sex Education

Conversations with Jorge Bergoglio⁴, p. 111: *"The Church is not opposed to sex education. Personally, I believe that it ought to be available throughout children's upbringing, adapted to different age groups. In truth, the Church always provided sex education, although I acknowledge that it hasn't always been adequate."*

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

"Another very grave danger is that naturalism which nowadays invades the field of education in that most delicate matter of purity of morals. Far too common is the error of those who with dangerous assurance and under an ugly term propagate a so-called sex-education, falsely imagining they can forearm youths against the dangers of sensuality by means purely natural, such as a foolhardy initiation and precautionary instruction for all indiscriminately, even in public; and, worse still, by exposing them at an early age to the occasions, in order to accustom them, so it is argued, and as it were to harden them against such dangers." Pope Pius XI, Dec. 31, 1931

Teachings of Francis

Suicide

On Heaven and Earth², pp. 92-93: *"There was a time when they did not perform funerals for those that committed suicide because they had not continued on towards the goal; they ended the path when they wanted to. But I still respect the one who commits suicide; he is a person who could not overcome the contradictions in his life. I do not reject him."*

Scripture or Past Church Teaching

"Q: Why does God, in the Fifth Commandment, forbid the taking of one's own life or suicide?"

A: In the Fifth Commandment God forbids suicide, because man is not the master of his own life no more than of the life

of another. Hence the Church punishes suicide by deprivation of Christian burial.” Catechism of Saint Pius X, The Fifth Commandment

†††JMJ†††

Baltimore Catechism: “Q. 554. Could a person who denies only one article of our faith be a Catholic?

A. A person who denies even one article of our faith could not be a Catholic; for truth is one and we must accept it whole and entire or not at all.”

Galatians 1:8: “But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.”

Pope Innocent III: “The Pope should not flatter himself about his power nor should he rashly glory in his honor and high estate, because the less he is judged by man, the more he is judged by God. Still the less can the Roman Pontiff glory because he can be judged by men, or rather, can be shown to be already judged, if for example he should wither away into heresy; because he who does not believe is already judged, In such a case it should be said of him: ‘If salt should lose its savor, it is good for nothing but to be cast out and trampled underfoot by men.’”

“Know you not that the unjust shall not possess the kingdom of God? Do not err: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor the effeminate, nor liars with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor railers, nor extortioners, shall possess the kingdom of God.” 1 Corinthians 6:9-10

“Neither fornicators nor adulterers, nor the effeminate nor sodomites shall possess the kingdom of God.” Catechism of the Council of Trent, The Sixth commandment, Other Sins Against Chastity Are Forbidden

Footnote 1: The interview as printed in La Repubblica can be seen here:

http://www.repubblica.it/cultura/2013/10/01/news/pope_s_conversation_with_scalfari_english-67643118/

Footnote 2: “On Heaven and Earth” is a book by Francis I containing conversations he had with Rabbi Abraham Skorka when he was Cardinal Bergoglio. The book can be found in many online bookstores

Footnote 3: In mid-2013, newspaper editor and atheist Eugenio Scalfari had written two open letters to Francis I, both of which were published in Scalfari’s Italian daily La Repubblica. Francis I replied with a 3-page response which was published in the same paper September 2013

(http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/it/letters/2013/documents/papa-francesco_20130911_eugenioscalfari.html)

Footnote 4: “Conversations with Jorge Bergoglio” is a biography of Francis I published in April 2013, and can be found in many online bookstores

Footnote 5: This address is published on the Vatican website here:

http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2013/may/documents/papa-francesco_20130518_vegliapentecoste.html

Footnote 6: Evangelii Gaudium was an “Apostolic Exhortation” given by Francis I to all the clergy and faithful of the world in November 2013. It can be found on the Vatican website here:

[Http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazioneap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazioneap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium.html)

Footnote 7: This address made on Vatican radio can be found on the official Vatican network website here:

<http://www.news.va/en/news/pope-the-christian-life-proclaims-the-road-to-reco>

Footnote 8: This address made on Vatican radio can be found on the official Vatican network website here:

<http://www.news.va/en/news/pope-sends-greetings-for-us-christian-unity-event>

Footnote 9: Letter to the President of the International Commission against the death penalty, which can be found on the Vatican website here:

http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/letters/2015/documents/papafrancesco_20150320_lettera-pena-morte.html

Footnote 10: Address to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences:

http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2014/october/documents/papa-francesco_20141027_plenariaaccademia-scienze.html

Footnote 11: General Audience with representatives of the world’s various religions:

<https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/audiences/2015/documents/papa->

[francesco_20151028_udienzagenerale.html](#)

Footnote 12: Address to the President of Religious Affairs in Turkey and Muslim and Christian political and religious leaders:

http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2014/november/documents/papafrancesco_20141128_turchia-presidenza-diyamet.html

Footnote 13: Press conference on flight from Brazil:

http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2013/july/documents/papa-francesco_20130728_qmgconferenza-stampa.html

Footnote 14: Address to the Diocese of Rome's Pastoral Congress, Q&A Session:

http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2016/june/documents/papa-francesco_20160616_convegnodiocesi-roma.html

Footnote 15: In-flight interview from Mexico:

http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2016/february/documents/papa-francesco_20160217_messicoconferenza-stampa.html

Footnote 16: Church of the Assumption, Tbilisi, Georgia:

https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2016/october/documents/papa-francesco_20161001_georgiasacerdoti-religiosi.html

Footnote 17: Common declaration with Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury

<https://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/en/bollettino/pubblico/2016/10/05/161005g.html>

Footnote 18: Common ecumenical prayer at the Lutheran Cathedral of Lund

https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/homilies/2016/documents/papa-francesco_20161031_omelia-svezialund.html

Footnote 19: Address to participants in the pilgrimage of Lutherans

https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2016/october/documents/papafrancesco_20161013_pellegrinaggio-luterani.html

Footnote 20: In-flight press conference from Azerbaijan to Rome

https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2016/october/documents/papa-francesco_20161002_georgiaazerbaijan-conferenza-stampa.html

Footnote 21: Discourse to Priests, Men and Women Religious, Seminarians in Colombia

https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2017/september/documents/papafrancesco_20170909_viaggioa-postolico-colombia-clero.html

Footnote 22: Audience with the Diplomatic Corps accredited to the Holy See for New Year greetings

<https://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/en/bollettino/pubblico/2018/01/08/180108b.pdf>

Footnote 23: Address to the representatives of the Yazidi community in Germany

https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2018/january/documents/papafrancesco_20180124_comunita-yezidi.html

Footnote 24: To participants in the meeting promoted by the pontifical Council for promoting the new evangelization

https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2017/october/documents/papafrancesco_20171011_convegno-nuova-evangelizzazione.html

Footnote 25: Interview with the Italian newspaper La Repubblica

<https://rorate-caeli.blogspot.com/2018/03/there-is-no-hell-new-francis-revelation.html>

†††JMJ†††

Catholic Church Quotes on Popes and Heresy

- "In the case in which the pope would become a heretic, he would find himself, by that fact alone and without any other sentence, separated from the Church. A head separated from a body cannot, as long as it remains separated, be head of the same body from which it was cut off. A pope who would be separated from the Church by heresy, therefore, would by that very fact itself cease to be head of the Church. He could not be a heretic and remain pope, because, since he is outside of the Church, he cannot

possess the keys of the Church." **Summa Theologica, cited in Actes de Vatican I. V. Frond pub. St. Antoninus (†1459)**

- "The Pope should not flatter himself about his power nor should he rashly glory in his honor and high estate, because the less he is judged by man, the more he is judged by God. Still the less can the Roman Pontiff glory because he can be judged by men, or rather, can be shown to be already judged, if for example he should wither away into heresy; because he who does not believe is already judged, In such a case it should be said of him: If salt should lose its savor, it is good for nothing but to be cast out and trampled underfoot by men." **Pope Innocent III, 12th century**

- "In addition, [by this Our Constitution, which is to remain valid in perpetuity We enact, determine, decree and define] that if ever at any time it shall appear that any Bishop, even if he be acting as an Archbishop, Patriarch or Primate; or any Cardinal of the aforesaid Roman Church, or, as has already been mentioned, any legate, or even the Roman Pontiff, prior to his promotion or his elevation as Cardinal or Roman Pontiff, has deviated from the Catholic Faith or fallen into some heresy: (i) the promotion or elevation, even if it shall have been uncontested and by the unanimous assent of all the Cardinals, shall be null, void and worthless..." **Cum ex Apostolatus Officio - Apostolic Constitution of Pope Paul IV, 1559**

- "Now when [the Pope] is explicitly a heretic, he falls ipso facto from his dignity and out of the Church, and the Church must either deprive him, or, as some say, declare him deprived, of his Apostolic See." **St. Francis de Sales, "The Catholic Controversy" (16th century)**

- "...a pope who is a manifest heretic by that fact ceases to be pope and head, just as he by that fact ceases to be a Christian and a member of the body of the Church; wherefore he can be judged and punished by the Church. This is the judgment of all the early fathers, who teach that manifest heretics immediately lose all jurisdiction." **St. Robert Bellarmine, "On the Roman Pontiff" (16th century)**

- "If God permitted a pope to be notoriously heretical and contumacious, he would then cease to be pope, and the Apostolic Chair would be vacant." **St. Alphonsus de Liguori, "The Truths of the Faith" (18th century)**

- "A pope can only be deposed for heresy, expressed or implied, and then only by a general council. It is not strictly deposition, but a declaration of fact, since by his heresy he has already ceased to be head of the Church..." **A Catholic Dictionary, 1951. Pope, Deposition of a**

- "No canonical provisions exist regulating the authority of the College of Cardinals /sede Romana impedita/, i.e., in case the pope became insane, or personally a heretic; in such cases it would be necessary to consult the dictates of right reason and the teachings of history" **Catholic Encyclopedia, 1913. [Vol. III. p.339] Cardinal**

- "The councils of Constance and Basal, and Gallican theologians, hold that a council may depose a pope...(2) /ob fidem/ (on account of his faith or rather want of faith, i.e. heresy). In point of fact however, heresy is the only legitimate ground. For a heretical pope has ceased to be a member of the Church, and cannot, therefore, be its head." **Catholic Encyclopedia, 1913. [Vol. IV p.435] Councils**

- "An heretical pope necessarily ceases to be head of the Church, for by his heresy he is no longer a member thereof: in the event of his still claiming the Roman see a general council, improperly so-called because without the pope, could remove him. But this is not deposition, since by his own act he is no longer pope." **A Catholic Dictionary, 1951. Deposition**

- "466. Q. Is a Pope who falls into heresy deprived, ipso facto, of the Pontificate? A. 1. There are two opinions: one holds that he is, by virtue of divine appointment, divested, /ipso facto/, of the Pontificate; the other, that he is, /jure divino/, only removable. Both opinions agree that he must at least be declared guilty of heresy by the Church - i.e., by an œcumenical council of the College of Cardinals." **Elements of Ecclesiastical Law, 1887**

- "A simoniacal election of this kind is never at any time to be made valid by a subsequent enthronement or the passage of time, or even by the act of adoration or obedience of all the cardinals. It shall be lawful for each and all of the cardinals,...as well as for all the clergy and the Roman people,... to withdraw without penalty and at any time from obedience and loyalty to the person so elected even if he has been

enthroned (while they themselves, notwithstanding this, remain fully committed to the faith of the Roman church and to obedience towards a future Roman pontiff entering office in accordance with the canons) and to avoid him as a magician, a heathen, a publican and a heresiarch." **Pope Julius II, Council of Lateran V. 1513**

- "Finally they cannot be numbered among the schismatics, who refuse to obey the Roman Pontiff because they consider his person to be suspect or doubtfully elected on account of rumors in circulation..." **Wernz-Vidal: Ius Canonicum, Vol vii, n. 398**

- "Nor is there any schism if.....one suspects the person of the pope or the validity of his election, or if one resists him as the civil head of a state." **Szal, Rev Ignatius: Communication of Catholics with Schismatics, CUA, 1948, p.2**

- "Neither is someone a schismatic for denying his subjection to the Pontiff on the grounds that he has solidly founded ['probabiliter'] doubts concerning the legitimacy of his election or his power [refs to Sanchez and Palao]." **de Lugo: Disp., De Virt. Fid. Div., disp xxv, sect iii, nn. 35-8**

- "The question was also raised (at the First Vatican Council) by a Cardinal, "What is to be done with the Pope if he becomes a heretic?" It was answered that there has never been such a case; the Council of Bishops could depose him for heresy, for from the moment he becomes a heretic he is not the head or even a member of the Church. The Church would not be, for a moment, obliged to listen to him when he begins to teach a doctrine the Church knows to be a false doctrine, and he would cease to be Pope, being deposed by God Himself. If the Pope, for instance, were to say that the belief in God is false, you would not be obliged to believe him, or if he were to deny the rest of the creed, "I believe in Christ," etc. The supposition is injurious to the Holy Father in the very idea, but serves to show you the fullness with which the subject has been considered and the ample thought given to every possibility. If he denies any dogma of the Church held by every true believer, he is no more Pope than either you or I; and so in this respect the dogma of infallibility amounts to nothing as an article of temporal government or cover for heresy."

A Bishop John B. Purcell, quoted in Rev. James J. McGovern, Life and Life Work of Pope Leo XIII [Chicago, IL: Allied Printing, 1903], p. 241; imprimatur by A Bishop James Quigley of Chicago

†††JMJ†††

An interview with Bishop Daniel Dolan and Father Anthony Cekada by [Stephen Heiner](#) · March 27, 2009
This is a brief joint interview I did with Fr. Cekada and Bishop Dolan while I was visiting Cincinnati in August 2008. The interview I did with Fr. Cekada was released earlier and was posted [here](#). The interview with Bishop Dolan is forthcoming.

Stephen Heiner: It has been said over the years that you have gotten progressively "hard-line" about *una cum* (a Mass that mentions Benedict XVI as Pope - Ed.) and other things and that this is a territorial issue. If you aren't hardline about it people will leave your church and go to other churches. So it's really a money issue — you want to keep the money here and the parishioners here so that's why you've gotten more hardline. The *una cum* thing was not that big of deal to Fr. Cekada and Bishop Dolan ten years ago.

Bp. Dolan: It's a purity of doctrine issue...

Someone has quoted you as saying it is a mortal sin to go to an *una cum* Mass...

Correct. I believe it is a mortal sin, under normal conditions.

You'd have to really know...

Yes, and how many people fall into that category today? Probably not many...

Probably just your parishioners.

No, I don't think so. And that's humbling, isn't it? That some of your own people don't care about it. You can speak about it until you are blue in the face. Fr. Cekada has given the brilliant, clear, step-by-step sermons, he's brought in all of these references and reading material. It's too much for them to be able to process. It's really beyond them, for most people, it really is. People are doing the best they can. At the very beginning of the Vatican II changes, I thought to myself: "this can't be the Catholic Church that is doing this." I've always felt

that way, since I was a seminarian. Our position is simply a logical outgrowth of that. If that isn't the Catholic Church, and you are a Catholic, you can't be worshipping there. That's the long and short of it.

So what is going on at these *una cum* Masses?

There are at least two things going on: 1) there is the historical, dogmatic, and morally unacceptable practice of declaring yourself to be in communion with a heresiarch. From any point of view as a Catholic you can't do that. No one has ever done that before. That's totally forbidden by all the Fathers and the Saints and all the canonists who have ever treated of it from that day till this. 2) the *Motu* Mass trap — and that really lights my fire. You have this One World Church which Benedict and his boys are building up. And these chumps, people like Fr. Dardis (the Prior in Cincinnati - Ed.) and the SSPX, and even some sedevacantist priests, these chumps are playing right into it. It's really spooky, scary stuff. This is a temple where all religions are the same and it doesn't really matter as long as you get to worship the way you want to.

So on the one hand, it is an unpleasant prospect of the implantation of a kind of High-Church Anglicanism... we did not fight and suffer for all these years to become High Church Anglicans. I could become a high-church Anglican if I wanted to, find myself a nice church, some fortress parish on the East Coast somewhere, as long as I could make an accommodation with the lady bishop. I'm not interested in being that, I want to be a Catholic, thank you very much. Or, on the other hand, far worse, far scarier, the One World Church of Benedict. He's an antichrist. Being in communion with an antichrist, by your presence. By our people going to an *una cum* Mass, they are adding credence, they are putting one more brick in the building of the One World Church. Dogma doesn't really make any difference. You have your beliefs and I have mine and we are all going to find a place here. That is what they are doing and it disgusts me.

This is not some late-breaking development, the One World Church. We saw it with the late JP II, but you really see it with the smooth Bavarian, he knows what he is doing and he is doing it well...

I see bumper stickers all the time that say "I love my German Shepherd"...

(laughing) Well, of course, and isn't he cute in that velvet and fur camuro that he brought out of mothballs? Does he really get shoes at Prada, they might wonder?

I understand His Excellency's points about compromising with the New Order, do you feel you have gotten stricter, Father?

Fr. Cekada: It's a question of principles. Especially, what drives the logic and what forces you to look at the issue is the Indult Mass and the *Motu* Mass. Unless there is a doctrinal content behind it, unless this question (the *una cum* question) is brought to bear, you have a Latin Mass-ism, and then religion just becomes a question of the externals. And I keep on pounding on that point in my sermons, that *Ratzinger will let you have the Latin Mass — but he won't let you have the Catholic Faith*. That approach fits in fine with the Modernist program — have the sort of worship that appeals to you — Tyrell would have been very, very happy with that. The old Mass appeals to your aesthetic sense, to your emotions, and you check your doctrine at the door. So if you realize what's going on with the Modernists, then you simply apply the principles to the *una cum* question.

Bp. Dolan: It's been Latin Mass-ism for a long time, and for many years people would tell you, "We're here for the Mass." I remember thinking this through once in a parking lot in Springfield, Missouri, in the late 1970s. It's not a question of the Mass. It's a question of the *Church*. If you are a Catholic, you have your Mass — you may not have access to it right now, but you have your Mass and your Sacraments and you have everything, because you have the Church of Christ. If you *don't* have the Church, as Augustine says, you can sing *Alleluia*, and you can read Scriptures, and you can give the Sacraments, but you don't have Christ. You don't have Christ in this new One World Church.

If we have become a little more strict over the years, it's partly because when we left the Pius V Society in 1989 we reacted to this very partisan, "Don't talk to them, they go to the wrong church" kind of a mentality. Fr. Kelly had told us (and we had believed his lies) that all these other people were really horrible, like the CMRI, etc. And you would meet them and be totally edified. People from a totally different background and line who are quite Catholic. Quite different, but Catholic. Refreshing. Wonderful. For a while, when we left the SSPV in 1989, there was a conscious sort of pulling back, of this "I will deny you Communion or I will cut you off if you don't..." sort of attitude. All of these things were motivated by Clarence Kelly in the functioning of his cult. Once we realized that, we wanted nothing to do with that. But, even less do we want to have anything to do

with Benedict and his One World Church. If there is anything I can do to save my people from ending up there, and not making void everything that we have done for the last 40 years, I'm going to do it. I think it's a question of saving their souls.

I think that the amount of people who still come to church here says a lot about the number of people who *do* get it. The penny has dropped. For some people it might still be convenience — they've always gone to Mass here and they'll tell you they don't really agree with Fr. Cekada or Bp. Dolan on the question of the Pope. But I think a lot of people have listened to the sermons and I think a lot of people have understood. And good, God love them!

If you treat the *una cum* question as a matter of indifference, your last state is worse than your first. You end up in this false religion. That's the essence of everything Ratzinger and company are doing today. It's a question of false ecclesiology, and a One World Church. And how could we ever end up there, but that's where some people end up. When they go over to Fr. Dardis they are in the antechamber of the Church of the antichrist. It's scary. God forbid that Jesus comes back and He finds you there. You have to confess Christ.

This is where most of our confreres and fellow Catholics won't. They won't confess Christ. Lefebvre called JPII an antichrist — what would you say about Ratzinger? He's an antichrist, no doubt about it. St. Jerome call your office, this is really bad. Why won't you confess Christ? That's my answer to them. If you want to get me down to the bottom line here, it's not a matter of jurisdiction, or money, or keeping people in your chapel — how ridiculous and unworthy to say that.

†††JMJ†††

The 'Una Cum' Mass by Bishop Sanborn – March 7, 2020

[Taken from the January issue of the MHT Seminary Newsletter]

I am sure that most are familiar with our strict stance on attendance at the *una cum* Mass. We, the clergy of the [Roman Catholic Institute](#), hold that it is objectively sacrilegious to actively participate in a Mass in which Bergoglio (or the local N.O. bishop) is mentioned in the canon.

Let me review the reasons. In order that a Mass be a Catholic Mass, it is not sufficient that it be merely valid, but it must also be offered in union with and in submission and obedience to the hierarchy of the Catholic Church. Just as you cannot divorce Catholicism from the Catholic hierarchy, so you cannot divorce the Mass, the central act of worship, from the Catholic hierarchy.

When a true pope is reigning, the Mass must contain the name of the true pope in the first prayer of the Canon, the *Te igitur*. If the bishop of the diocese is living, his name must also be pronounced in the same place. This is a profession of communion with the Roman Pontiff and with his representative, the bishop of the diocese, and therefore of submission and obedience to them as well. This small but very important gesture is what distinguishes a Catholic Mass from a schismatic Mass.

The Greek schismatics (so called "Orthodox") have a liturgy which is entirely Catholic inasmuch as it is the ancient liturgy used before the break from Rome. But by the simple fact of leaving out the name of the pope, their Mass, although valid, is not Catholic and is sacrilegious. Why sacrilegious? Because it is to use a sacred thing, the Holy Eucharist, in an improper manner.

How is a Mass Catholic, then, when there is a vacancy in the Roman See? In order that the Mass be Catholic in the Roman vacancy, it is necessary that no name of a pope be mentioned in the Canon for as long as the See is vacant. There is still a profession of communion, submission, and obedience to the Roman Pontiff inasmuch as the faithful are awaiting the election of a new pope, to whom they will be duly submitted.

These things said, now let us look at the case of Bergoglio. Bergoglio is **necessarily** not the true Roman Pontiff. The reason is that he has promulgated to the Church heresies and condemned doctrines in his magisterium. The Church's gift of indefectibility, doctrine, worship, and discipline, makes it impossible that a true pope deceive the faithful by false doctrines and evil liturgy. Indefectibility pertains to faith, and consequently we *must* conclude, directly from the Faith, that it is **impossible** that Bergoglio be pope, and therefore **necessary** that his name not appear in

the Canon. Only in this way would the Mass be a Catholic Mass. For to place the name of a false pope in the Canon makes the Mass schismatic.

{359} Do you agree that Bergoglio is **necessarily** not the true Roman Pontiff because he has promulgated to the Church heresies and condemned doctrines in his magisterium?

{360} Do you agree that, “The Church’s gift of indefectibility, doctrine, worship, and discipline, makes it impossible that a true pope deceive the faithful by false doctrines and evil liturgy”?

{361} Do you agree that, “Indefectibility pertains to faith, and consequently we *must* conclude, directly from the Faith, that it is **impossible** that Bergoglio be pope, and therefore **necessary** that his name not appear in the Canon”?

{362} Do you agree that to place the name of a false pope in the Canon makes the Mass schismatic?

{363} Do you agree that Paul VI (Montini) and John Paul II (Wojtyla) were **necessarily** not the true Roman Pontiffs because they have promulgated to the Church heresies and condemned doctrines during their magisterium?

{364} Do you agree that both Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre placed the names of false popes in the Canon during their *Una Cum* Masses; and thereby making their Masses schismatic?

{365} Do you agree that: “Just as you cannot divorce Catholicism from the Catholic hierarchy, so you cannot divorce the Mass, the central act of worship, from the Catholic hierarchy”?

{366} Do you agree that it follows with correct logic that Bishop Sanborn and all others must conclude that Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre divorced themselves from Catholicism and became formal schismatics in this new schismatic Novus Ordo sect; because they offered their *UNA CUM* Masses for many, many years with the non-Catholic heads of a schismatic religion?

{367} Do you agree that Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre cannot be excused on the grounds of not knowing the Novus Ordo was a non-Catholic church and its popes were non-Catholic; because, as quoted above, he often told people that the Novus Ordo Conciliar church was not Catholic but rather schismatic and that the popes of this non-Catholic sect were antichrists?

{368} Do you agree that Bishop Thuc cannot be justifiably and validly excused for not knowing there was no pope or Catholic hierarchy in Rome; because as Bishop George Musey reminded the CMRI community: Bishop Thuc publicly professed in 1976 that, “There is no one with authority in Rome to receive me”?

{369} Do you agree that Bishop George Musey also reminded the CMRI community that Bishop Thuc was a very learned man and a seminary professor who also had a Doctorate in Canon law, and a Doctorate in philosophy, and a Doctorate in theology?

{370} Do you agree that therefore it follows logically that Bishop Thuc could not be excused because of ignorance, illiteracy, or unfamiliarity of what the Catholic Church teaches; and therefore he cannot be excused for not understanding that the religion of Vatican II and its “Popes” was a new non-Catholic religion?

Let us continue now with the article by Bishop Sanborn on the subject of *Una Cum*:

I should say here that I am sure that nearly all those who attend the *una cum* Mass do so in good conscience. They are ignorant of these principles, and attend only with some vague idea of remaining faithful to the pope. If such is the case, they are excused from sin.

An *excusing* cause, however, is not a *justifying* cause. This is a principle of moral theology which means that ignorance excuses from guilt, but it does not justify the act. If a man shoots something moving in the woods, thinking it is a deer, and is actually a man, he is excused from guilt, but his act is not thereby justified. In itself it is a bad act.

What goes hand-in-hand with the *una cum* Mass, which in most cases is that of the Society of Saint Pius X, is the doctrine of *recognize and resist*, which necessarily flows from their position. For on the one hand they profess submission to Bergoglio, but on the other hand they resist him in practically all things, as if he did not exist.

Recognize and resist is **schismatic**. Pope Pius IX said so. In the encyclical *Quartus supra*, of January 6, 1873, he said to a group of Armenians who were claiming to be Catholic, yet felt that they did not have to obey the pope:

“In fact, it is as contrary to the divine constitution of the Church as it is to perpetual and constant tradition for anyone to attempt to prove the catholicity of his faith and truly call himself a Catholic when he fails in obedience to the Apostolic See.

For the Catholic Church has always considered **schismatic** all those **who obstinately resist the authority of her legitimate prelates, and especially her supreme pastor**, and any who refuses to execute their orders and even to recognize their authority. The members of the Armenian faction of Constantinople having followed this line of conduct, **no one, under any pretext, can believe them innocent of the sin of schism, even if they had not been denounced as schismatic by apostolic authority.**”

The same Pope Pius IX, in the encyclical *Quæ in patriarchatu*, of September 1st, 1876, addressed this time to some Chaldeans who were claiming submission to the pope, but who were ignoring his orders:

“What good is it to proclaim aloud the dogma of the supremacy of St. Peter and his successors? What good is it to repeat over and over declarations of faith in the Catholic Church and of obedience to the Apostolic See when actions give the lie to these fine words? Moreover, is not rebellion rendered all the more inexcusable by the fact that obedience is recognized as a duty? Again, does not the authority of the Holy See extend, as a sanction, to the measures which we have been obliged to take, or is it enough to be in communion of faith with this See without adding the submission of obedience, — a thing which cannot be maintained without damaging the Catholic faith?

In fact, Venerable Brothers and beloved sons, it is a question of recognizing the power [of this See], even over your Churches, not merely in what pertains to faith, but also in what concerns discipline. **He who would deny this is a heretic; he who recognizes this and obstinately refuses to obey is worthy of anathema.**”

{371} Do you agree with Bishop Sanborn and Pope Pius IX that *Recognize and resist is* **schismatic**?

{372} Do you agree that it was pointed out a number of times earlier in this letter, that very often the Traditionalist Movement clerics regardless of whether they speak of themselves as Sedevacantists; Sedevacantists; or non-Sedevacantists; they are all part of the *Recognize and Resist* (R&R) group who recognize true successors of St. Peter as a pope and then reject, defy, and refuse to accept the truths that they taught using their authority and power of Jesus Christ?

Rev. Anthony Cekada proved these rebellious clerics and groups are in schism and apostasy who refuse to accept the truths taught by the valid and licit successors of St. Peter.

“These groups promote false doctrine or discipline! They promote in effect error, **schism, and apostasy. The notion that you can recognize someone as a pope, but not do any blessed thing he says if you decide not to do that. You set a private judgment over each papal teaching and law. You have the idea, you promote the notion the Church Authority can give **evil laws** and **false doctrine**. You maintain it is permissible to defy the man you say is the Pope by maintaining a parallel hierarchy. These notions are **schismatic** and embody **false doctrine!**”**

{373} Do you agree that although Bishop Sanborn, Bishop Dolan, Rev. Anthony Cekada, and many other members in the Traditionalist Movement state and believe that *Recognize and Resist is* **schismatic**, they nevertheless *recognize* Pope Pius XII as a valid and licit pope, and then *resist* him and refuse to accept and follow the changes he made in the liturgy?

Let us continue with the *Una Cum* article by Bishop Sanborn:

The point is that the Society of Saint Pius X’s position, recognizing Bergoglio as pope, but acting at the same time as if he does not exist, falls under these severe condemnations of Pope Pius IX. Attendance at their *una cum* Mass, therefore, is an open profession of what is precisely condemned by Pope Pius IX.

The SSPX is on the horns of a dilemma. For Bergoglio is either pope or not pope. If he is pope, the SSPX *una cum* Mass is schismatic, since it is not authorized by him. If he is not pope, then the SSPX *una cum* Mass is schismatic, since it is offered in union with a false pope. For despite whatever concessions have been granted to the SSPX, their priests remain suspended, their apostolate is not authorized, and if Bergoglio is pope, it is a mortal sin every time they say Mass.

In either case, therefore, their Mass is schismatic, and those who actively participate in it are objectively committing a mortal sin.

{374} Do you agree that although the Mass of the SSPX clerics are schismatic “and those who actively participate in it are objectively committing a mortal sin”; the CMRI clerics tell their people to attend these SSPX Masses when they cannot administer their own services to those people?

{375} Do you agree that it is a very obvious fact that people do switch back and forth from all the various Groups, Societies, and Communities week in and week out, day in and day out?

Let us now finish the article concerning the *Una Cum* Masses:

I review these explanations with our faithful, since they should understand the underpinning of our position. There is a temptation among many to say, “Well, it is justified to go to the *una cum* Mass if you are in need of the sacraments, and you have nothing else.”

This is false, **because one may never, under any circumstances, posit an act which is schismatic.**

{376} Do you agree that it follows with correct logic that **never, under any circumstances** did it become permissible to posit the acts of Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre and their spiritual offspring to commit the schismatic acts of *recognizing* the teachings and authority of the true Vicars of Jesus Christ; and then schismatically *resisting* that authority of the true Popes by consecrating bishops without the required papal mandate?

{377} Do you agree that John Paul II’s predecessor, Paul VI, was also such an evil and manifest heretic that a number of people think he was the actual ANTICHRIST, the Son of Perdition, and the Man of Sin – as predicted in sacred Scripture?

{378} Do you agree that Bishop Daniel Dolan, Bishop Sanborn, Bishop Pivarunas and some other Sedevacantist bishops and priests clearly teach that it is a mortal sin for any cleric to offer their Mass *una cum* with any other Vatican II men called popes in the Vatican II church; or with any bishop who acknowledged these Vatican II Popes as true Vicars of Jesus Christ?

{379} Do you agree that it follows with correct logic that Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre daily committed mortal sins for offering their Mass *una cum* with Vatican II Popes as true Vicars of Jesus?

{380} Do you agree we know that these are the ones from whom the majority of traditionalist clergy received their lineage; while at the same time these traditionalist clergy teach, claim, and promulgate that Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre ALWAYS believed everything the Catholic Church teaches and kept the Catholic faith?

{381} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn has explained logically, reasonably, and rationally that Wojtyla (John Paul II) was a manifest public and formal heretic; showing by his words and actions that he did not believe what the Catholic Church teaches?

{382} Do you agree that everyone who belongs to a church whose head is a manifest public and formal heretic; thereby belongs to a non-Catholic religion?

{383} Do you agree that it follows with correct logic that Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre belonged to a non-Catholic religion because the head of the church to which they belonged was a manifest public and formal heretic, as clearly explained by Bishop Sanborn?

Some teachings of Bishop Sanborn with comments and questions

The following was transcribed from a video by Bishop Sanborn on SSPX, Resistance, and Sedevacantism; London 2013

So first what are the principles? The fundamental question concerning all of our reaction to Vatican II is this: "Is the religion of Vatican II Roman Catholicism or not?" When I say the religion, I mean the ensemble of doctrines, disciplines, and liturgical practices. Those are the three essential aspects of religion, any religion. Are those three things taken together the entire ensemble? Do they taken together, represent and consist of Roman Catholicism? Is it Catholic or not? And there is a yes or no answer to that question. The answer that we give to that question will determine everything else that we think or do about the problem of Vatican II. And it is very important to situate yourself in that regard concerning that question. Usually the way that we go is by a reaction to the new mass. The Traditional Movement was born out of a reaction to the new mass. But the Mass and liturgical practices of the Church are what we might say; the face of the Church. But they do not constitute the foundation of the Church, doctrine does! And if we remain simply on the level of reacting to a mass that we don't like, that we find something wrong with, but never getting down to the fundamentals we are going to make errors; because that is simply essentially a gut reaction. "I don't like this, this doesn't speak to me as Catholicism or as a Catholic Mass. I don't like it I want the traditional Latin Mass"; that's usually the root of someone who is reacting to Vatican II. It's not wrong but it is insufficient. Now, no one challenges that there have been changes in the Church as a result of Vatican II. Every single person in the world would agree with that statement. Now, let us look at the changes of Vatican II. Principally they are ecumenism; that is at the real bottom of Vatican II. Vatican II was called to consecrate ecumenism. And from ecumenism came various other errors; such as religious liberty; such as a new conception of the Catholic Church; and collegiality in order to conform the Catholic Church through the Greek Orthodox way of doing things. It all comes back to ecumenism; and even ecumenism has a more fundamental principle to it, and that is relativism of truth. Modernism destroys the Catholic notion of absolute truth. The absolute truth of the Catholic Church prevents the Catholic Church from being ecumenical. But once you destroy the absoluteness of Catholic dogma then the door is open to ecumenism which was condemned in 1928 by Pope Pius XI. So there have been many, many liturgical changes; many, many disciplinary changes. I'm sure all of you are familiar with those, I don't have to go over them.

{384} Do you agree that if, "The Traditional Movement was born out of a reaction to the new mass" then the Traditionalist Movement did not exist until after the new mass came into existence with the changes enacted at Vatican II?

{385} Do you agree that the Traditionalist Movement therefore did not exist prior to Vatican II?

{386} Do you agree that it follows in logic that the Traditionalist Movement is a new religion that does not trace its origin back to Jesus Christ?

{387} Do you agree that it follows in logic that those who belong to the Traditionalist Movement, belong to a new church different from the Catholic Church founded by Jesus Christ?

{388} Do you agree that: "ecumenism is at the real bottom of Vatican II"?

{389} Do you agree that: "The absolute truth of the Catholic Church prevents the Catholic Church from being ecumenical"?

Wikipedia describes ecumenism as Cooperation between Christian denominations. The term "ecumenism" refers to efforts by Christians of different church traditions to develop closer relationships and better understandings. The term is also often used to refer to efforts towards the visible and organic unity of different Christian denominations in some form.

In a YouTube movie from a sermon where Bishop Sanborn was talking about ecumenism he said:

Because Our Lord Jesus Christ is true God, there is another single conclusion that is drawn from that; and that is there is no God but Christ, no other true God except Christ; and there is no other Church other than the one He founded. There cannot be two gods. For the same reason, there cannot be two or more divine churches. You cannot have many churches that contradict one

another claiming to be the Church of God... those churches founded by anyone but Christ do not call in the name of God, and indeed, they are not even churches.

{390} Do you agree that: “You cannot have many churches that contradict one another claiming to be the Church of God”?

In his sermon Rev. Anthony Cekada said: “Well, why can’t these traditionalists priest just get along”? I felt like interrupting and saying as the kids would say today: “Oh Hellooooooo!!” I can’t get along with them because they teach a different doctrine! And they teach a doctrine that is false! And so, those who are new to the Traditional Movement often ask about the divisions, puzzling divisions among traditional Catholics. There are **substantial** differences in doctrine and discipline among different traditionalist groups. **These groups promote false doctrine or discipline!**

{391} Do you agree that the many branches that make up the Traditionalist Movement churches very often contradict one another – as Rev. Anthony Cekada pointed out in his sermon; although “You cannot have many churches that contradict one another claiming to be the Church of God”?

{392} Do you agree that therefore everyone who is logical must conclude that the Traditionalist Movement cannot be the Church of God?

Let us review from; *Feeding Souls with the Doctrine of Truth*: by Rev. Benedict Hughes, CMRI.

Over the past few months, the affairs of the Society of St. Pius X (SSPX) have been much in the news. Will they reunite with Rome or not? There is great speculation and interest. And why is this? Because the SSPX for many is the face of the Traditional Movement. They have many priests, churches, schools, and parishioners in various countries throughout the world.

While the size and spread of the SSPX portrays a picture of vitality, not all is well within, particularly in the area of THEOLOGY. Sadly, the exterior visage hides a confusion resulting from an incoherent and self-contradictory theological position. While I do not intend in this brief article to enumerate all of the **erroneous theological teachings** current in the SSPX, the following are a few of the more notable:

- that the ordinary universal magisterium of the Church is not safeguarded by infallibility;
- that the supreme authority of the Church can promulgate laws that are injurious to souls;
- that the supreme authority of the Church can err in canonizations;
- that the faithful must disobey the authority of the Church when they are convinced that it is in their best interests spiritually;
- that the faithful must determine when they can obey and when they cannot obey the Church’s authority;
- that it is up to the faithful to instruct and reform the authority of the Church, when it has gone astray;
- that it is permissible to set up an authority different from and opposed to the Church’s authority for the guidance of the faithful (namely, the superiors of the SSPX);
- and so forth.

This is not in any sense intended to be a complete listing, but rather a simple demonstration of the veracity of my contention, that **THEOLOGICAL ERRORS ARE RAMPANT IN THE SSPX.** Many others have commented on these various errors, which could easily be shown to contradict past authoritative decisions of the Popes and Councils, and to be **contrary** to the unanimous teaching of the theologians of the Church. Further, these teachings are not limited to a few of the priests of the SSPX, but are widespread, as anyone familiar with the Society knows. They have been spread consistently by priests and superiors in the SSPX.

{393} Do you agree that, “THEOLOGICAL ERRORS ARE RAMPANT IN THE SSPX”?

{394} Do you agree that, “The errors in the SSPX contradict past authoritative decisions of the Popes and Councils?”

{395} Do you agree that, “The errors in the SSPX are **contrary** to the unanimous teaching of the theologians of the Church?”

{396} Do you agree that Rev. Anthony Cekada spoke the truth when he said: “they teach a different doctrine, and they teach a doctrine that is false...there are **substantial** differences in **doctrine** and discipline among different traditionalist groups...These groups promote false doctrine or discipline”?

{397} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn spoke the truth when he said: “You cannot have many churches that contradict one another claiming to be the Church of God”?

{398} Do you agree that it follows with correct logic that the Traditionalist Movement cannot be the Church of God?

Nevertheless Bishop Pivarunas said all those in the Traditionalist Movement belong to the **SAME** church; and they have **perfect unity** regarding all “the **THEOLOGICAL ERRORS that ARE RAMPANT IN THE SSPX**” although they teach **substantial** different doctrines, disciplines, and dogmas!

Bishop Pivarunas included the following in his comments concerning *My Petition for Spiritual Help*.

One last issue to be raised is his claim that there is no **unity** among the traditional clergy...His claim, therefore, of lack of unity manifests an ignorance of this difference in theological OPINIONS.

{399} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas’ claim that there is ABSOLUTE **unity** among the traditional clergy, is an absolute proof that “the **THEOLOGICAL ERRORS RAMPANT IN THE SSPX**” only pertains to differences in theological opinions; but it has nothing to do with doctrine or dogma according to Bishop Pivarunas?

{400} Do you agree that Rev. Anthony Cekada spoke the truth as he **contradicted** his bosom buddy and close friend, Bishop Pivarunas, when he said: “they teach a different doctrine, and they teach a **doctrine** that is false...there are **substantial** differences in **doctrine** and discipline among different traditionalist groups...These groups promote false doctrine or discipline”?

{401} Do you agree that because “You cannot have many churches that contradict one another claiming to be the Church of God”; and because many of the traditionalist clergy accept the Vatican II Church as the Catholic Church and the Vatican II Popes as the true Vicars of Jesus Christ; and because if Bishop Pivarunas teaches the truth in stating there is ABSOLUTE **unity** among the traditional clergy; that **all of** the traditionalist clergy must accept the Vatican II church as the Catholic Church although it is a church with substantial changes different from those of the Catholic Church?

Bishop Pivarunas wrote the following in the article on the CMRI website titled; *The Papacy*:

This issue (concerning *The Papacy*) is especially critical in our own times, when we, who have remained faithful to tradition, have been labeled as disobedient to Rome for rejecting the Novus Ordo Mass and the false teachings on ecumenism and religious liberty which have emanated from the Second Vatican Council.

Furthermore, this issue is all the more critical inasmuch as it is the one point that **divides** traditional Catholics today. How many traditional Catholics long for unity, yet are DIVIDED on this **fundamental point** which concerns the modern post-Conciliar hierarchy.

{402} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas himself teaches the exact opposite of his former statement: “One last issue to be raised is his claim that there is no UNITY among the traditional clergy...His claim, therefore, of lack of unity manifests an ignorance of this difference in theological OPINIONS”?

{403} Do you agree that because traditional Catholics long for UNITY, yet are DIVIDED on this **fundamental** point; that the truth is evidently manifested that there is no **unity** among the traditionalist clergy?

{404} Do you agree that it is a contradiction and **against logic and reason**, and therefore a sin to teach: 1st: traditional Catholics long for UNITY, yet are DIVIDED on a FUNDAMENTAL point, proving they have no unity among them; and then to say 2nd: there is **unity** among the traditional clergy on every FUNDAMENTAL point?

Remember, “the True Church of Christ cannot give us contradictory teaching! Either It was right the first time, or It was right the second time, but It cannot be right both times! You see, the human mind is not capable of thinking in terms of contradiction.

{405} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas was right the first time when he said there is unity among the traditionalist clergy; or else Bishop Pivarunas was right the second time when he said traditional Catholics long for UNITY, yet are DIVIDED on this **fundamental** point?

{406} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas cannot be right both times when speaking of contradictory statements?

{407} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas was actually correct, accurate, and truthful when declaring there is no UNITY among traditionalist Catholics on the fundamental point concerning the DOGMA involving *The Papacy*?

{408} Do you agree that the important conclusion is: because there is no UNITY among traditionalist Catholics on the FUNDAMENTAL point concerning the DOGMA involving *The Papacy*; we have sufficient proof they do not have the first Mark of the Church – and are therefore a non-Catholic sect?

Now more from the YouTube movie from a sermon where Bishop Sanborn was talking about ecumenism:

The word “church” in Latin is “ecclesia” and this word ecclesia comes from the Greek word “to call”; but, who is it that calls? It is God that calls. Hence, those churches founded by anyone but Christ do not call in the name of God, and indeed, they are not even churches. They have no legal basis to exist.

For example, if you want to found a business, you must go to the state and found a corporation or a partnership. If you do not go to the state and receive a legal basis from the state for this business, and you open up a business and claim to be a corporation or a partnership and you are discovered, you are considered a fraud. You might even see time in jail for such a thing because you have no legal status. You have no existence from the state. The same is true of churches (so called) who present themselves as churches (as religions) as if they have some license or charter from God. They have no such charter or license. They have not been established by God. They have been established by human beings, and in each of those cases (if you look at their history), you can trace right back to the point where some human being invented them; and so, they should be called collections of heretics or bands of heretics or schismatics, but not churches.

Remember: Hence, those churches founded by anyone but Christ do not call in the name of God, and indeed, they are not even churches. They have no legal basis to exist. They have not been established by God. And in each of those cases (if you look at their history), you can trace right back to the point where some human being invented them; and so, **they should be called collections of heretics or bands of heretics or schismatics**, but not churches.

{409} Do you agree that the Novus Ordo was established by human beings and human beings invented it; and (if you look at its history), you can trace right back to the point where some human beings invented it in the 1960s?

{410} Do you agree that it was Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre together with Paul VI and the other Fathers of the Council who invented the non-Catholic Novus Ordo religion by signing the heretical documents after they were discussed, debated, considered, reviewed, and shown to be heretical?

{411} Do you agree that using the correct logic of Bishop Sanborn, all of those bishops, archbishops, and cardinals who signed the heretical decrees of Vatican II and brought it into existence should be called collections of heretics or bands of heretics or schismatics?

{412} Do you agree that CMRI was established by a human being named Francis Schuckardt; and (if you look at its history), you can trace right back to the point where some human being invented it in about 1967?

{413} Do you agree that using the correct logic of Bishop Sanborn, the CMRI sect should be called collections of heretics or bands of heretics or schismatics?

{414} Do you agree that SSPX was founded and established by a man named Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre; and so, using the correct logic of Bishop Sanborn, the SSPX sect should be called collections of heretics or bands of heretics or schismatics?

{415} Do you agree that the entire Traditionalist Movement has been established by a variety of different human beings since the beginning of Vatican Council II – since Bishop Sanborn correctly reminded us that the Traditionalist Movement was born in opposition to the new mass; and so, using the correct logic of Bishop Sanborn, the entire Traditional Movement sect should be called collections of heretics or bands of heretics or schismatics?

{416} Do you agree that there were no people belonging to the Traditionalist Movement prior to 1965?

Now more from the YouTube movie from a sermon where Bishop Sanborn was talking about ecumenism:

The modern heresy is that; “we all worship the same God.” How many times have you heard that said? That despite all of the differences that people may have about dogma and religion, that we all worship the same God.

{417} Do you agree that the Traditionalist Movement clergy are the ones who teach: “There are SUBSTANTIAL differences in doctrine and discipline among different traditionalist groups... **These groups promote false doctrine or discipline**” and “How many traditional Catholics long for unity, yet are DIVIDED on this **fundamental point** which concerns the modern post-Conciliar hierarchy and the DOGMA involving *The Papacy*” But: “You know, it is not, the Thuc Bishops or the Lefebvre Bishops or the Thuc Priests or the Lefebvre Priests or this Group or that Group - we are Roman Catholic! It is not this Society or that Society or this Community – we are Roman Catholic; and as such we work together. We belong to the same church” “It really does not matter fundamentally what religion we belong to; and this is supremely false and is a blasphemy” But “Despite all of the differences that people may have about dogma and religion, that we all worship the same God, and why would we not all worship the same God since we clearly teach that We belong to the same church”?

Now more from the YouTube movie from a sermon where Bishop Sanborn was talking about ecumenism:

But because subjectivism is the philosophy of the day, **what you think in your head becomes reality.**

COMMENT: Because “what you think in your head becomes reality”, it was not necessary for CMRI people to admit that they belonged to a different church under Bishop Francis Schuckardt than the one to which they now belong. Consequently, none of them made an Abjuration of Error for their association with a non-Catholic religion.

Because “what you think in your head becomes reality”, the nine priests expelled from SSPX never did make an Abjuration of Error for their association with a non-Catholic religion of belonging to the schismatic SSPX; because in their head it becomes reality that they all belong to the SAME church.

The proof is that “what you think in your head becomes reality”, and therefore, because thousands of people who say they belong to the Traditionalist Movement think in their head that they all belong to the SAME church – they switch around and go from one segment, section, and subdivision in the Traditionalist Movement who claim Bergoglio (Francis) is a true successor of St. Peter to another segment, section, and subdivision that believes the opposite. Shortly thereafter they are attending another segment, section, and subdivision in the Traditionalist Movement who claim Bergoglio (Francis) is NOT a true successor of St. Peter. Thereafter they

again switch over to another segment, section, and subdivision in the Traditionalist Movement without ever abjuring their errors or becoming a member of the Catholic Church founded by Jesus Christ!

{418} Do you agree that it is impossible that there be a substantial change in the Catholic Church?

{419} Do you agree that there were SUBSTANTIAL changes that already took place by the time the Vatican II Council ended in 1965?

Wikipedia has this to say of the man known as Pope Paul VI, (Montini): “Pope Paul VI was head of the Catholic Church and sovereign of the Vatican City State from 21 June 1963 to his death in 1978. Succeeding John XXIII, he continued the Second Vatican Council which he closed in 1965, implementing its NUMEROUS REFORMS, and fostered improved **ecumenical** relations with Eastern Orthodox and Protestant churches, which resulted in many historic meetings and agreements.”

{420} Do you agree that the SUBSTANTIAL changes in what was known as the Catholic Church were very obvious for every Catholic to see by the death of Montini August 6, 1978?

{421} Do you agree that thousands of people already belonged to the Traditionalist Movement by August 6, 1978 because it was very, very obvious that by then there were SUBSTANTIAL changes in what was known as the Catholic Church?

{422} Do you agree that by April 15, 1981, there were thousands who could see that the religion of Vatican II was no longer the Catholic Church, including a number of whom were poorly educated Catholics – and even non-Catholics?

{423} Do you agree that although it is impossible that there be a substantial change in the Catholic Church, and yet because there were SUBSTANTIAL changes that already took place by April 15, 1981, that what was known as the Catholic Church by most people in the world, was not the true Catholic Church founded by Jesus Christ?

{424} Do you agree that because of the SUBSTANTIAL changes that had already taken place, everyone who belonged to the Vatican II Church by April 15, 1981 belonged to a non-Catholic religion?

{425} Do you agree that former Catholic bishops and priests who become members of a non-Catholic religion lose their office, authority, jurisdiction, and mission in the Catholic Church?

{426} Do you agree that because they were members of a non-Catholic religion, the bishops and priests who were members of the Vatican II Church by April 15, 1981 lost their office, authority, jurisdiction, and mission in the Catholic Church?

{427} Do you agree that on Holy Thursday, April 15, 1981, Bishop Thuc concelebrated the New Mass liturgy of the Vatican II non-Catholic church with Bishop Barthe, the Novus Ordo Conciliar bishop of Toulon?

{428} Do you agree that both Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre belonged to the Vatican II non-Catholic Church April 15, 1981?

{429} Do you agree that no one in the entire world has thus far provided the proof that either Bishop Thuc or Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre ever Abjured their Errors and were received back into the Catholic Church any time before their death by any cleric who still had jurisdiction and authority to bring them back into the Catholic Church?

How long do highly educated and very intelligent bishops need to belong to a non-Catholic church before they are non-Catholics for belonging to a non-Catholic church according to the teachings of the Catholic Church?

{430} Do you agree that it is a fallacious, mistaken, misleading, erroneous, deceptive, untrue, illogical, irrational, inconsistent, and contradictory statement to say that bishops, priests, and laity who belong to a non-Catholic church at the same time also belong to the Catholic Church?

{431} Do you agree that Bishop Thuc should be considered as a member of the Novus Ordo church when he was concelebrating what was called a Mass according to all of the rites and rubrics of the non-Catholic Novus Ordo church?

{432} Do you agree that it follows logically that Bishop Thuc belonged to a non-Catholic church when he consecrated bishops in 1981?

{433} Do you agree that all of the priests and bishops ordained and consecrated by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre after he joined the non-Catholic Novus Ordo church; were ordained and consecrated by a non-Catholic?

{434} Do you agree that even if they had been brought back into the Catholic Church after belonging to the non-Catholic Vatican II Church; no Catholic pope ever again gave jurisdiction to either Bishop Thuc or Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre?

Jesus Christ tells us, through Pope Pius VI in his letter *Notre cher fils*, January 20, 1787 that:

“It is an **article of faith** that the authority and jurisdiction of the bishops is subordinate to that of the Sovereign Pontiff.”

The letter of Pope Pius VI, *Post factum tibi*, dated February 2, 1782, reminds Catholics of a Catholic DOGMA:

“It is, **in fact, a DOGMA of faith** that the authority of the bishops, even admitting that it stems directly from Christ, remains dependent on the authority of the Roman Pontiff.”

{435} Do you agree that because it is an **article of faith and in fact, a DOGMA of faith** that the authority and jurisdiction of bishops only comes to them through the Roman Pontiff; that no bishop or priest has ever had ordinary or delegated jurisdiction in the lineage of Bishop Thuc or Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre since the time they were members of the non-Catholic Vatican II church?

{436} Do you agree that because it is an **article of faith and in fact, a DOGMA of faith** that the authority and jurisdiction of bishops only comes to them through the Roman Pontiff; that no bishop or priest has ever had ordinary or delegated jurisdiction delegated directly to them from Christ Himself?

Baltimore Catechism: “Q. 554. Could a person who denies only one article of our faith be a Catholic?”

A. A person who denies even one article of our faith could not be a Catholic; for truth is one and we must accept it whole and entire or not at all.”

{437} Do you agree that the TRUTH taught in the *Baltimore Catechism* applies not only to Francis/Jorge Bergoglio, but also to everyone who denies that it is an **article of faith and in fact, a DOGMA of faith** that the authority and jurisdiction of bishops only comes to them through the Roman Pontiff?

My friend sent an email concerning the *Syllabus of Errors* from Pope Pius IX. My friend made the comment: “The following two points are **condemned heresies**, no Catholic can believe either one of them and yet most who would call themselves “Traditional Catholics” believe and advocate both of these **condemned heresies:**”

22. The obligation by which Catholic teachers and authors are strictly bound is confined to those things **only** which are proposed to universal belief as dogmas of faith by the infallible judgment of the Church. — Letter to the Archbishop of Munich, “Tuas libenter,” Dec. 21, 1863.

23. Roman pontiffs and ecumenical councils have wandered outside the limits of their powers, have usurped the rights of princes, and **have even erred in defining matters of faith and morals**. — Damnatio “Multiplices inter,” June 10, 1851.

{438} Do you agree that we can reword these Condemned Heresies without changing their meaning but stated in the affirmative so that they are better understood by some people if we write: “22. The obligation by which Catholic teachers and authors are strictly bound is NOT confined to those things **only** which are proposed to universal belief as dogmas of faith by the infallible judgment of the Church” And the meaning of the Catholic dogma is: “23. Roman pontiffs and ecumenical councils have NOT wandered outside the limits of their powers ... and **have NOT erred in defining matters of faith and morals**”?

{439} Do you agree that it is therefore another DOGMA Catholics must believe that the Roman Pontiff did **NOT error in defining as a matter of faith and morals** that it is an **article of faith and in fact, a DOGMA of faith** that the authority and jurisdiction and mission of bishops only comes to them through the Roman Pontiff?

{440} Do you agree that because Pope Benedict XV, (*Ad Beatissimi*) told us for Jesus Christ that: “The Catholic Faith is such that nothing can be added to it, nothing taken away. Either it is held in its entirety, or rejected totally. This is the Catholic faith, which, unless a man believes faithfully and

firmly, he cannot be saved”; they reject the entire Catholic faith and cannot be saved who do not accept the Catholic truth that it is an article of faith and **in fact, a DOGMA of faith** that the authority and jurisdiction and mission of bishops only comes to them through the Roman Pontiff?

{441} Do you agree that because not one of the traditionalist clerics received his authority, jurisdiction, and mission through the Roman Pontiff; it follows in correct logic as Catholic doctrine that everyone therefore rejects the ENTIRE Catholic faith who teach or believe that the traditionalist clergy actually do have authority and jurisdiction and a mission in the Catholic Church?

Let us continue with the transcript of what Bishop Sanborn said in London in 2013:

We may not like it, but if it is merely accidental change we cannot oppose it on any solid ground. It might be better or worse you could say; it might be less expressive than the traditional rite, or the traditional way of presenting doctrines. It might be more expressive, but if it is accidental it doesn't affect the substance of the Catholic Church!

{442} Do you agree that the changes Pope Pius XII made concerning the liturgy of the Catholic Church were either accidental change or else substantial change?

{443} Do you agree that if they were merely accidental change, then according to their own statements and teachings Bishop Sanborn, Bishop Dolan, Rev. Anthony Cekada and others cannot oppose them on any solid ground?

{444} Do you agree that nevertheless they do oppose the accidental liturgical changes of Pope Pius XII and offer a different liturgy than that prescribed by Pope Pius XII?

{445} Do you agree that if the liturgical changes made by Pope Pius XII are substantial change, then he could not impose them on the entire Catholic Church as he did, any more than the Vatican II popes can impose their ideas on the universal Catholic Church?

{446} Do you agree that if the liturgical changes made by Pope Pius XII are substantial change, then CMRI cannot be part of the Catholic Church because they use these liturgical changes made by Pope Pius XII?

{447} Do you agree that we have a big contradiction here among the traditionalist clerics because one group accepts the liturgical changes of Pope Pius XII that the other group of traditionalist clerics rejects?

Review again what Bishop Sanborn stated during the beginning of his talk in 2013:

So first what are the principles? The fundamental question concerning all of our reaction to Vatican II is this: “Is the religion of Vatican II Roman Catholicism or not?” When I say the religion, I mean the ensemble of doctrines, disciplines, and **liturgical** practices. Those are the three essential aspects of religion, any religion. Are those three things taken together the entire ensemble? Do they taken together, represent and consist of Roman Catholicism? Is it Catholic or not? And there is a yes or no answer to that question.

{448} Do you agree that the doctrines, disciplines, and **liturgical** practices are the three essential aspects of any religion?

{449} Do you agree that according to their own statements and teachings all of the clerics of the Traditionalist Movement must of necessity have the SAME doctrines, disciplines, and **liturgical** practices?

{450} Do you agree that the many Groups, Societies, and Communities of the Traditionalist Movement most certainly do NOT have the SAME doctrines and disciplines concerning *The Papacy*?

{451} Do you agree that the many Groups, Societies, and Communities of the Traditionalist Movement most certainly do NOT have the SAME **liturgical** practices?

Let us continue with the transcript of what Bishop Sanborn said in 2013:

Another question to ask concerning the Novus Ordo is: “Can I save my soul by practicing the Novus Ordo religion?” If I go to the church that Bergoglio wants me to go to, my local parish church; and I practice there the mass and the sacraments and everything that he prescribes for me, is that the path to salvation? Is that pleasing to God? Can I save my soul in that environment? Is the Novus Ordo, and by that I mean the whole ensemble of doctrine and practices and liturgical practices; is that pleasing to God? Is the Novus Ordo pleasing to God or

not? There is a yes-or-no answer to that? Those questions must be answered before you can go anywhere with regard to deciding what to do about it. Soon John Paul II is going to be canonized. This means that a man who made it his life's work to promulgate Vatican II; and who participated in liturgical abominations against the first commandment in the name of Vatican II, namely Assisi, that he is going to be canonized! That means that not only can you save your soul in the Novus Ordo but you can become a saint by promulgating the Novus Ordo. That's going to be a big problem for the Society of Saint Pius X. If he's a saint and he promulgated the Novus Ordo and participated in all of these ecumenical acts then how do they stand? If you can go to heaven and be a saint by doing that, then what is the purpose of the SSPX? So the answer to the question will determine the Catholic response to Vatican II. "Is Vatican II Catholicism or not?" The answer to that question will determine our response. There is a yes or no answer as to whether Vatican II is Catholic or not. There is no gray! There is nothing in between those two things! If the answer is yes, it is Catholicism; then we must accept Vatican II. If it is no; then we must utterly reject it! There is no gray between those two things. There is no middle ground; either it is accidental change or it is substantial change! There is no middle ground between those two things. It is like a fork in the road. If we say yes it is Catholicism, then the proper attitude toward Vatican II is to accept it; submit to the authority of the Church. If the new Mass offends our sensibilities then we can seek the Motu Proprio Mass. We can say to the proper authorities that we would prefer the traditional Mass and they might give us the traditional Mass someplace. That's what they have done by the Motu Proprio. That would be still a Catholic response; that we're saying Vatican II is all correct; the new mass is correct; everything is in order. It's just that our sensibilities prefer this. That is essentially the position of all of the religious congregations that adhere to the Motu Proprio or who have some sort of indult permission to use the traditional mass; like Christ the King; the Fraternity of Saint Peter; others too. If the answer is no; it is not Catholicism, Vatican II is not Catholicism, then we must reject Vatican II and all of its reforms in the same manner as the Church rejected heresies in the past. Then we are in the same position as Catholics in the 16th century. We must reject it so fundamentally and so firmly that we have to be willing to die rather than to participate in any way in this substantial distortion of Roman Catholicism. There is no middle ground between those two positions; because it either is Catholicism or it isn't.

{452} Do you agree that another question to ask concerning the Novus Ordo is: "Can I save my soul by practicing the Novus Ordo religion?"

{453} Do you agree that the Novus Ordo with SUBSTANTIAL changes of doctrine and liturgical practices; is NOT pleasing to God, and it is a non-Catholic religion?

{454} Do you agree that the head of a non-Catholic religion cannot at the same time be the head of the Catholic Church?

{455} Do you agree that if the Novus Ordo with SUBSTANTIAL changes of doctrine and liturgical practices is pleasing to God; then it is the true Church founded by Jesus Christ?

{456} Do you agree that if the Novus Ordo with SUBSTANTIAL changes of doctrine and liturgical practices is pleasing to God; then there is no justifiable reason for SSPX, CMRI, SSPV, FSSP, SSPX-MC, CJM or any other part of the Traditionalist Movement to exist because there is no salvation in those sects because they would be outside of the Catholic Church?

{457} Do you agree that because SSPX, CMRI, SSPV, FSSP, SSPX-MC, and any other part of the Traditionalist Movement do exist; their members must conclude the Novus Ordo is a non-Catholic church not pleasing to God?

{458} Do you agree that if the Vatican II religion is not Catholicism we must reject it so fundamentally and so firmly that we have to be willing to die rather than to participate in any way in this substantial distortion of Roman Catholicism; and There is no middle ground between those two positions; because it either is Catholicism or it isn't?

{459} Do you agree that if the Vatican II religion is not Catholicism, then you must reject Vatican II and its entire hierarchy (especially its popes) and all of its reforms in the same manner as the Church rejected heresies in the past?

{460} Do you agree that because Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre and now his followers do NOT reject Vatican II and its entire hierarchy (especially its popes) as members of a non-Catholic religion; that they themselves are not members of the Catholic Church?

{461} Do you agree that because Bishop Thuc did NOT reject Vatican II and its entire hierarchy, especially its popes, (at least up until 22 days before he consecrated Guérard des Lauriers on May 7, 1981) as members of a non-Catholic religion; that he lost his membership in the Catholic Church and has never received it back in the external forum before his death?

{462} Do you agree with Bishop Pivarunas that: “According to his own position, he cannot consider himself a member of the Mystical Body of Christ ... After all, who absolved him from his membership in the Vatican II Church ... Let him tell us the name of the bishop **with jurisdiction** who received him back into the Catholic Church?”

{463} Do you agree that although Bishop Pivarunas was writing about Patrick Henry; the same truth applies to Bishop Thuc and also to Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre?

{464} Do you agree that everyone who gives a no answer to the above question is just being super hypocritical, insincere, deceitful, phony, deceptive, dishonest, and misleading?

St. Thomas tells us in Q. 94 of the *Supplement* under the first article:

“*I answer that*, now everything is known the more for being compared with its contrary, because when contraries are placed beside one another they become more conspicuous.”

{465} Do you agree that because no cleric **with jurisdiction** absolved Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre from their membership in the Vatican II non-Catholic church; that all the bishops coming from their lineage were consecrated by the bishops in a non-Catholic church?

{466} Do you agree that no cleric with jurisdiction has ever absolved any bishop in the lineage of Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre?

{467} Do you agree that in the external forum, they belong to non-Catholic sects who have been consecrated by a non-Catholic Bishop?

{468} Do you agree that it follows with correct logic that “According to their own position, they cannot consider themselves as members of the Mystical Body of Christ...After all, who absolved them from their membership in a non-Catholic Church after they were consecrated by a bishop in a non-Catholic church... Let them tell us the name of the bishop **with jurisdiction** who received them back into the Catholic Church”?

Let us continue with the transcript of what Bishop Sanborn said:

Another important principle to understand is that it is impossible that the authority of the Catholic Church promulgate to the whole Church false doctrines, evil disciplines, and false liturgical practices. This is the guarantee of Christ to the Catholic Church: “whatever thou shalt bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven.” If this were not true then the Church could and would defect in Her essential mission, which is the salvation of souls. If the Church universally could give to the whole world something that is displeasing to God; false worship, false doctrines, evil disciplines, then it becomes nothing better than the Church of England or any other religious body that has no guarantee or assistance from God. It really should not exist, it has no purpose. We would be better trying to figure out our own religion in such a case than to be led by something that could lead us to hell. Hence if we take the position that Vatican II is a substantial change of the Catholic faith, we must necessarily conclude that it cannot come from the authority of the Church. Because it is a universal teaching, it has made universal practices; it has established universal practices, and universal liturgical observances for the whole Church. If these things are substantial changes of the Catholic faith, we must necessarily conclude that it cannot come from the authority of the Church. Why is this so? Because the authority of the Church is the authority of Christ. Pope Pius

XII said it in *Mystici Corporis*; that the authority, the power of the Pope is the same as the authority of Christ. There are not two heads in the sense of two different authorities. There is the invisible head, Christ, and the visible head, the Pope. The Pope is the Vicar of Christ; they both have the same authority. So the authority of the Pope is the same as the authority of Christ.

{469} Do you agree that it is impossible that the authority of the Catholic Church promulgate to the whole Church false doctrines, evil disciplines, and false liturgical practices?

{470} Do you agree that “the authority, the power of the Pope is the same as the authority of Christ” and “So the authority of the Pope is the same as the authority of Christ”?

{471} Do you agree that it was actually the authority of Christ that delegated to the whole church the liturgical practices and changes made by Pope Pius XII?

{472} Do you agree that therefore those who accept Pope Pius XII as a true Vicar of Jesus Christ cannot say these are false liturgical practices?

{473} Do you agree that there are a number of Traditionalist Movement clerics who in fact do not accept these liturgical practices and changes of Pope Pius XII; and therefore they reject the authority of Christ?

{474} Do you agree that there are very large numbers of traditionalists who do accept the false liturgical practices promulgated by those who are known as popes in the Vatican II Church?

{475} Do you agree that there absolutely is **not unity** among those who claim membership in the Traditionalist Movement on matters of FAITH and MORALS; because it has a very large number of traditionalist clergy who reject what another very large number of traditionalist clergy accept concerning liturgical practices in the Catholic Church?

Bishop Pivarunas’ article concerning *My Petition for Spiritual Help* says: “One last issue to be raised is his claim that there is no UNITY among the traditional clergy ... His claim, therefore, of lack of unity manifests an ignorance of this difference in theological opinions.”

{476} Do you agree that FAITH and MORALS are involved here concerning liturgical practices and the authority of Christ; and therefore this is not merely a difference in theological opinions?

{477} Do you agree that it was actually the authority of Christ that delegated to the whole church the doctrine brought forth by Pope Pius VI that it is an **article of faith and in fact, a DOGMA of faith** that the authority and jurisdiction of bishops only comes to them through the Roman Pontiff?

{478} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn CORRECTLY informs us that the Catholic Church cannot possibly promulgate to the whole Church any article of faith or dogma of faith that is not true?

{479} Do you agree that therefore it is impossible for anyone to remain in the Catholic Church who denies the true Catholic dogma concerning the fact that: it is an **article of faith and in fact, a DOGMA of faith** that the authority and jurisdiction of bishops only comes to them through the Roman Pontiff?

{480} Do you agree that there is no in between, there is no gray matter, it is a yes or no fact that everyone who wishes to remain a Catholic must accept the truth that: it is an **article of faith and in fact, a DOGMA of faith** that the authority and jurisdiction of bishops only comes to them through the Roman Pontiff?

{481} Do you agree that no bishops functioning today in the Traditionalist Movement has ever received authority or jurisdiction through the Roman Pontiff – which therefore means they are schismatics and non-Catholic clerics?

{482} Do you agree that the Catholic Church does not supply jurisdiction to bishops and priests who did not first obtain faculties from the proper authority in the Church from someone who himself had jurisdiction and authority?

{483} Do you agree that the Catholic Church does not supply jurisdiction to non-Catholic clerics so that Catholics could then receive sacraments from non-Catholic clerics; because receiving sacraments from non-Catholic clerics is ruled by Canon 1258 §1 which teaches: “It is unlawful for the Faithful in any way actively to be present at or take part in the religious services of non-Catholics”?

Pope Pius XI, *Mortalium Animos* (# 10):

“So, Venerable Brethren, it is clear why this Apostolic See has never allowed its subjects to take part in the assemblies of non-Catholics...”

{484} Do you agree that during the Great Western Schism any jurisdiction that was provided to bishops and priests actually came through the true pope in the Catholic Church?

Please consider carefully the truth explained in the book, *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* by Father Thomas Cox (Imprimatur and Copyright, 1900), page 173:

“Those who invent doctrines unheard of before are not the successors of the Apostles. Novelty and error are children of the same father - the father of lies. Those who have lost the line of valid ministers leading back to apostolic times cannot plead the possession of Apostolicity. Where there is no ordination, no priesthood, no authority, no power, Apostolicity is out of the question. Even if valid orders exist, where jurisdiction is lacking there is no real Apostolicity. Schism, as well as heresy, destroys apostolic succession.”

{485} Do you agree that Father Cox explained the truth that proves that no Traditionalist Movement bishop or priest has what is necessary for Apostolicity – the fourth Mark of the Catholic Church?

{486} Do you agree that schism, as well as heresy, destroys apostolic succession?

{487} Do you agree that the various branches and heads of the Traditionalist Movement sect have provided sufficient proof that the other various branches and heads of the Traditionalist Movement sect and the Novus Ordo sect are in schism?

An article on the CMRI website talking about their position and beliefs states the following:

IV. MODERN VATICAN II CHURCH: The Catholic Church is identified as the true Church of Christ by her four marks (Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, and Apostolicity). Since the heretical teachings of Vatican II, the Novus Ordo Missae, and the new rites of the sacraments have manifestly been a departure from the Catholic Church’s traditional teachings, it must be concluded that this modern so-called “Catholic” Church no longer possesses the first two marks of the true Church — namely, Unity and Holiness. Its obvious departure over the past twenty-five years from what the Catholic Church has always held can lead to only one conclusion: a new ecumenical Church has been established which stands in contradiction to the true Catholic Church.

{488} Do you agree the CMRI article clearly tells us that 1) the heretical teachings of Vatican II, 2) the Novus Ordo Missae, and 3) the new rites of the sacraments have **manifestly** been a departure from the Catholic Church’s traditional teachings?

{489} Do you agree that 1) the heretical teachings of Vatican II, 2) the Novus Ordo Missae, and 3) the new rites of the sacraments; were easily and clearly manifest, obvious, apparent, evident, visible, noticeable, observable, and established before the death of Paul VI?

{490} Do you agree that 1) the heretical teachings of Vatican II, 2) the Novus Ordo Missae, and 3) the new rites of the sacraments; were easily and clearly manifest, obvious, apparent, evident, visible, noticeable, observable, and established even **far more** during the reign of John Paul II?

{491} Do you agree that therefore, even before the death of Paul VI; the modern so-called “Catholic” Church no longer possessed the first two marks of the true Church — namely, Unity and Holiness?

{492} Do you agree that the new, non-Catholic ecumenical church that no longer had the necessary and essential Marks of Unity and Holiness, had been **manifestly** established in contradiction to the true Catholic Church many years before 1981?

{493} Do you agree that it is therefore **manifestly** evident that Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre were members of a non-Catholic church for many, many years before they consecrated the bishops from whom the majority of the Traditionalist Movement bishops trace their lineage?

{494} Do you agree that especially when well-educated bishops leave the Catholic Church to join a non-Catholic church, that they leave the Ark of salvation?

{495} Do you agree that Catholic bishops who apostatized from the Catholic Church cannot just automatically become members again of the Catholic Church without being put back on the Ark of salvation by someone else who had remained a member the Catholic Church without joining any non-Catholic religion?

{496} Do you agree that unless someone was on the ark of Noe, he could not pull anyone else back out of the floodwaters and put them on the ark with himself?

{497} Do you agree that putting members of non-Catholic religions back on the Ark of salvation is done by the Abjuration of Error and the Profession of Faith; administered by a Catholic bishop or a Catholic priest who has ordinary JURISDICTION and the faculties necessary to do so?

{498} Do you agree that Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre never were brought back into the Catholic Church after they joined the non-Catholic church – as explained by CMRI?

{499} Do you agree that furthermore, even if they repented in their heart and made an act of perfect contrition; Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre never again had an office, authority, jurisdiction, or mission in the Catholic Church?

{500} Do you agree that they were never again sent to work in the vineyard of Jesus Christ by a Catholic Pope?

{501} Do you agree that by definition they were simply now non-Catholic bishops at large; just as all the other non-Catholics that Peter Anson wrote about in his book titled *Bishops at Large*?

{502} Do you agree that all of the spiritual offspring lineage of bishops coming from Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre simply make up a variety of different sects of *Bishops at Large* roaming about the earth without a diocese, or mission, or jurisdiction, or authority to work in the Catholic Church?

CMRI continues with their article in the next paragraph:

V. MODERN HIERARCHY OF THE VATICAN II CHURCH: In the light of the above, it must be concluded that the modern hierarchy who have approved and implemented the errors of Vatican II no longer represent the Catholic Church and her lawful authority. This most certainly includes the one who confirmed, approved, decreed, and implemented these heretical teachings, namely Paul VI (Montini). Likewise included are his successors, namely, John Paul II (Wojtyla) and Benedict XVI (Ratzinger), who have continued to implement these heretical teachings. Despite the lack of canonical warning and formal declaration of loss of office, their repeated acts of ecumenism and their enforcement of the heresies of Vatican II and the new code of Canon Law, which are injurious to faith and morals, are manifestations of their pertinacity in heresy.

THEREFORE, as the First Vatican Council infallibly teaches: “Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build My Church,” these words are proven true by actual results, since in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has always been preserved untainted...the See of St. Peter always remains unimpaired by any error, according to the divine promise of Our Lord.” Further, since John Paul II has manifestly taught heresy, promoted ecumenism and fostered interfaith worship, he clearly cannot be recognized as a successor of St. Peter in the primacy.

{503} Do you agree that it must be concluded that the modern hierarchy who have approved and implemented the errors of Vatican II no longer represent the Catholic Church and her lawful authority; and this most certainly includes the ones who confirmed, approved, decreed, and implemented these heretical teachings?

{504} Do you agree that the hierarchy who approved and implemented the errors of Vatican II are the ones who confirmed, approved, decreed, and implemented these heretical teachings of the errors of Vatican II; and that those ones were obviously and without the least shadow of doubt Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre and the other bishops that worked in union with Paul VI to bring about the finalization and birth of the Vatican II Church – when they signed, authorized, and endorsed the heretical documents and decrees of the Council?

{505} Do you agree that CMRI is obviously teaching clearly, unmistakably, and noticeably enough that the hierarchy consisting of Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre and their offspring no longer represent the Catholic Church and her lawful authority?

{506} Do you agree that CMRI is promoting the truth while saying: “Further, since John Paul II has manifestly taught heresy, promoted ecumenism and fostered interfaith worship, he clearly cannot be recognized as a successor of St. Peter in the primacy”?

{507} Do you agree that it follows with correct logic that Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre recognized a heretic as the head of the SAME church to which they belonged; and thereby proved that they also were non-Catholics who belonged to the non-Catholic religion of which the heretic John Paul II was the head?

Read what Bishop Sanborn said in the video while talking to people in London in 2013:

That is the major premise of the syllogism that I'm going to give you today. The minor premise is: but Vatican II is SUBSTANTIAL change. So we're saying as the first general principle: if it is substantial change then those who have perpetrated it cannot be the authority of the Catholic Church. But Vatican II is substantial change. Look at ecumenism which is condemned by Pope Pius XI. Look at religious liberty condemned by Pope Pius IX. The new ecclesiology that has been condemned by very many popes; the collegiality which was condemned in the 18th century. Look at the new mass, the new disciplines, all of the things that are permitted that are mortal sins in the traditional books of the Church; such as *Communicatio in sacris* where non Catholics can receive Catholic Communion and Catholics can receive non Catholic Communion. But that's considered a mortal sin; you can look up in any moral theology whether it's a mortal sin of confusion of religions. The loss of the marks of the Catholic Church; where is the unity of faith? If you look at polls, most people do not believe that Christ is present in the Holy Eucharist. They do not believe in transubstantiation. All of the polls that you see, they are nearly all the same. Many other dogmas are denied. For example: artificial birth control, that it is wrong is denied by most people that call themselves Catholics. They believe that it is perfectly correct. Many other moral issues are denied by people who call themselves Catholics and nothing happens. There is absolutely a dogmatic chaos in what purports to be Roman Catholicism today. Chaos! There is no UNITY of faith, there is no HOLINESS. Where is the holiness of Catholicism in what we call the Novus Ordo? There is no CATHOLICITY because there is no unity. You have to have unity of faith in order to have Catholicity, because Catholicity is one faith that is communicated to many.

{508} Do you agree that; despite the lack of canonical warning and formal declaration of loss of office, the repeated acts of ecumenism (of Bishop Thuc concelebrating a non-Catholic liturgy *Communicatio in sacris* with a non-Catholic schismatic) and his enforcement, implementation, application, execution, and administration of the heresies of Vatican II and the new code of Canon Law, (see the next paragraph VI of the CMRI article); which means the non-Catholics in the Cathedral of Toulon petitioned the "sacraments" from a "Catholic" bishop Thuc, without the non-Catholics abjuring their heretical beliefs, and such acts are injurious to faith and morals, and are manifestations of the **pertinacity** in heresy of Bishop Thuc?

The CMRI article continues with their next paragraph:

VI. THE NEW CODE OF CANON LAW: In order to implement the teachings of Vatican II, it was necessary that the modernists change the Code of Canon Law (1917), as it contradicted their designs by reflecting the mind of the Church in her past doctrine and discipline. The new code contains a matter which should be most disturbing to the informed Catholic. According to the new law of the Modern Church, non-Catholics can, under certain circumstances, petition the "sacraments" from a Catholic priest (without the non-Catholic abjuring his heretical beliefs), and the priests must administer them. The Council of Florence, as well as the 1917 Code of Canon Law (Canon 731), strictly forbids this.

Remember what Rev. Anthony Cekada stated in his sermon, quoted above:

Or with the Pius V Society; this idea of error, **schisms**, and occult like mentality. This Organization stubbornly promotes grossly ignorant errors regarding the basic principles of sacramental theology. They say that certain sacraments are invalid, and according to all the principles of Catholic moral and sacramental theology the sacraments are valid! And then they refuse sacraments to Catholics who would otherwise have the right to receive them. You go over to Norwood and they find out you are from here, and they will refuse you Holy Communion or refuse you absolution.

{509} Do you agree that Rev. Anthony Cekada implies that the Pius V parishioners from Norwood could come to his Church and receive holy Communion without those SCHISMATIC, non-Catholics abjuring their

heretical beliefs – although, “The Council of Florence, as well as the 1917 Code of Canon Law (Canon 731), strictly forbids this”?

{510} Do you agree that the non-Catholic CMRI “Religious” and laity under Bishop Francis Schuckardt now receive the sacraments from practically all the other Traditionalist Movement clerics although none of them ever abjured heretical beliefs – although, “The Council of Florence, as well as the 1917 Code of Canon Law (Canon 731), strictly forbids this”?

{511} Do you agree that throughout the world there are thousands of people who have switched around from one of the Groups, Societies, and Communities to others of the Groups, Societies, and Communities of the Sedevacantist and non Sedevacantist sects without ever abjuring their errors for belonging to any non-Catholic religion – although, “The Council of Florence, as well as the 1917 Code of Canon Law (Canon 731), strictly forbids this”?

Let us continue with the transcript of what Bishop Sanborn said:

So we would be obliged to say that this distortion, this defection, the substantial change has come down from the authority of Christ, which is blasphemy; if we take the position that Vatican II is a distortion of the Catholic faith, a substantial distortion of the Catholic faith yet it comes from the authority of the Church! We would be obliged to place it right into the will of Christ; that the will of Christ is that we accept a substantial distortion of the Catholic faith. That is blasphemy, so we know that we can't go there! Hence the position that Vatican II is not Catholic, necessarily requires that we say that the perpetrators of Vatican II do not bear the authority of Christ. It follows logically and necessarily. Hence Sedevacantism.

{512} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas and very many other traditionalist clerics hold, embrace, and believe that the true position is the Sedevacantist position because they believe that Vatican II is a distortion of the Catholic faith, a substantial distortion of the Catholic faith?

{513} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn and very many other traditionalist clerics judge, embrace, and believe that it is blasphemy to believe the substantial changes in the Vatican II Church have come down from the authority of Christ?

{514} Do you agree that very many other traditionalist clerics embrace and believe the opposite non Sedevacantist position?

{515} Do you agree that if it is **BLASPHEMY** to believe the substantial changes in the Vatican II Church have come down from the authority of Christ, that this pertains to matters of faith and morals; and not simply difference in theological opinions?

Bishop Pivarunas' article concerning *My Petition for Spiritual Help* says: “One last issue to be raised is his claim that there is no UNITY among the traditional clergy ... His claim, therefore, of lack of unity manifests an ignorance of this difference in theological opinions.”

{516} Do you agree that the Sedevacantist and non Sedevacantist issues and positions are concerned about SUBSTANTIAL changes and not merely ACCIDENTAL changes in the Catholic Church?

{517} Do you agree with Bishop Sanborn that Vatican II is SUBSTANTIAL change?

{518} Do you agree that there absolutely is **not unity** among those who claim membership in the Traditionalist Movement on matters of FAITH and MORALS; because it has a very large number of traditionalist clergy who reject what another very large number of traditionalist clergy accept concerning SUBSTANTIAL change in the Sedevacantist and non Sedevacantist issues and positions?

{519} Do you agree that: “Hence the position that Vatican II is not Catholic necessarily requires that we say that the perpetrators of Vatican II do not bear the authority of Christ”?

{520} Do you agree that the real, actual, original, primary, and factual perpetrators of the Vatican II, Novus Ordo church were those bishops in union with Paul VI who promulgated, declared, decreed, and brought into existence the new religion by signing the heretical decrees, and thereby giving their complete and full approval of Vatican II?

{521} Do you agree that it follows with correct logic that Bishop Sanborn, Bishop Pivarunas, Bishop Kelly, Bishop Dolan, Rev. Anthony Cekada, CMRI priests, and all others who are TRUTHFUL; believe and teach that

all the bishops who signed the heretical decrees and documents of Vatican II did not have or bear the authority of Christ to continue functioning licitly as a bishop of the Catholic Church?

{522} Do you agree that “the position that Vatican II is not Catholic, necessarily requires that we say that the perpetrators of Vatican II do not bear the authority of Christ or of the Catholic Church”; – brings about the logical conclusion that it is blasphemy to say that any one of those still retained their membership in the Catholic Church who signed the heretical decrees of Vatican II, which brought about that non-Catholic religion with its SUBSTANTIAL change?

Let us review again some important information in the transcript of what Bishop Sanborn said:

Sedevacantism does not argue principally from the personal heresies of Bergoglio, or Ratzinger, or anybody else. It argues principally from Vatican II and what the Modernists have done to Vatican II - is it Catholicism or not? If it is not Catholicism it cannot come from the authority of the Church. Therefore, by strict logic those people who claim to be the authority are not the authority of the Church despite whatever appearances they have, or anything else they may have, they are not the authority of the Church! Now those are the general principles of ecclesiology and this is the teaching of the Church and of theologians concerning the very nature of the Catholic Church. That is the major premise of the syllogism that I'm going to give you today. The minor premise is: but Vatican II is SUBSTANTIAL change. So we're saying as the first general principle: if it is substantial change then those who have perpetrated it cannot be the authority of the Catholic Church. But Vatican II is substantial change. Look at ecumenism which is condemned by Pope Pius XI. Look at religious liberty condemned by Pope Pius IX. The new ecclesiology that has been condemned by very many popes; the collegiality which was condemned in the 18th century. Look at the new mass, the new disciplines, all of the things that are permitted that are mortal sins in the traditional books of the Church; such as *Communicatio in sacris* where non Catholics can receive Catholic Communion and Catholics can receive non Catholic Communion. But that's considered a mortal sin; you can look up in any moral theology whether it's a mortal sin of confusion of religions. The loss of the marks of the Catholic Church; where is the unity of faith? If you look at polls, most people do not believe that Christ is present in the Holy Eucharist. They do not believe in transubstantiation. All of the polls that you see, they are nearly all the same. Many other dogmas are denied. For example: artificial birth control, that it is wrong is denied by most people that call themselves Catholics. They believe that it is perfectly correct. Many other moral issues are denied by people who call themselves Catholics and nothing happens. There is absolutely a dogmatic chaos in what purports to be Roman Catholicism today. Chaos! There is no UNITY of faith, there is no HOLINESS. Where is the holiness of Catholicism in what we call the Novus Ordo? There is no CATHOLICITY because there is no unity. You have to have unity of faith in order to have Catholicity, because Catholicity is one faith that is communicated to many. And you don't have the unity of government in as much as what is done cannot be done in the name of Christ. It is not the true government of the Catholic Church. The only thing that you can grant them is a certain organizational and administrative unity that you can grant to General Motors or to any other organization in the world.

{523} Do you agree that the following four statements are correctly following the logic of Bishop Sanborn?

FIRST: If Vatican II is SUBSTANTIAL change it is not Catholicism, it cannot come from the authority of the Church.

SECOND: But Vatican II is SUBSTANTIAL change.

THIRD: Therefore, by strict logic those people who claim to be the authority of the Vatican II, Novus Ordo religion are not the authority of the Catholic Church despite whatever appearances they have, or anything else they may have, they are NOT the authority of the Catholic Church.

FOURTH: Because it is substantial change, then those who have perpetrated the Vatican II, Novus Ordo religion cannot be the authority of the Catholic Church.

{524} Do you agree that by strict logic, those cardinals, archbishops, and bishops who have perpetrated the Vatican II documents to bring about the Novus Ordo religion who claim to be the authority are not the authority of the Church despite whatever appearances they have, or anything else they may have, they are not the authority of the Church?

{525} Do you agree that those who perpetrated the substantial changes are the exact ones who enacted, executed, implemented, finished, and achieved the bringing about of the Vatican II, Novus Ordo religion?

{526} Do you agree that it was none other than the FATHERS of the Vatican II hierarchy that signed the heretical decrees and documents who enacted, executed, implemented, finished, and achieved the bringing about of the Vatican II, Novus Ordo non-Catholic religion?

{527} Do you agree that because it was the FATHERS of the Vatican II hierarchy that brought about the SUBSTANTIAL changes; that they are the most guilty culprits, malefactors, and criminals who cannot be the authority of the Catholic Church?

{528} Do you agree that it is AGAINST logic and reason to blame only the following generations of the Vatican II hierarchy for bringing about the substantial changes; and at the same time to find some flimsy, insubstantial, and inadequate excuse for putting the blame where it belongs on the FATHERS of the Vatican II hierarchy who actually signed the heretical documents and brought into existence this non-Catholic Vatican II religion?

{529} Do you agree that it was Martin Luther who brought about the substantial changes that perpetrated, organized, structured, and started his non-Catholic Lutheran religion?

{530} Do you agree that it would be against reason and logic to even attempt to excuse Martin Luther as not bringing about the Lutheran religion; while if at the same time you accuse the modern-day Lutherans for starting the Lutheran religion?

{531} Do you agree that it is just as much against reason and logic to attempt to excuse Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre for their share in being the FATHERS and FOUNDERS of the new non-Catholic Vatican II religion; and then you attempt and endeavor to blame the later generations of Vatican II hierarchy as the ones who are responsible, guilty, and culpable for the SUBSTANTIAL changes which **started** the non-Catholic Vatican II religion?

Remember that St. Thomas tells us that whatever is against reason is a sin.

Remember also the truth taught by Rev. Mary Casimir Puskorius, CMRI: “You see, the human mind is not capable of thinking in terms of contradiction.”

Remember also the truth taught by Bishop Sanborn: “Something cannot be pleasing to God if it is against reason! Reason is our connection to morality! Whatever is moral, is connected to God's will by reason. If it is unreasonable, it cannot possibly be in accordance with God's will! All moral theology is based on that; the connection of what you do to right reason based on the authority; on principles that are revealed by God, – the Ten Commandments.”

Remember also that anyone commits a sin of scandal just by offering another any unnecessary occasion of sin.

{532} Do you agree that it can easily lead to scandal, because it is against reason, and a contradiction for anyone to continue their attempt to excuse Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre on the arguments, justifications, and grounds they were not being pertinacious; or things were so ambiguous at Vatican Council II that very intelligent and highly educated clerics could not understand, or were IGNORANT of what the Catholic Church teaches?

{533} Do you agree that many traditionalist clergy agree with Bishop Sanborn that: “There is no UNITY, there is no HOLINESS, there is no CATHOLICITY because there is no unity in the Novus Ordo, Vatican II Church?”

{534} Do you agree that many other traditionalist clergy still accept Bergoglio and the previous Vatican II Popes as true Vicars of Jesus Christ; and hence implicitly, indirectly, and even unconditionally imply there is Unity, Holiness, and Catholicity in the Novus Ordo, Vatican II Church?

Bishop Pivarunas' article concerning *My Petition for Spiritual Help* says: "One last issue to be raised is his claim that there is no UNITY among the traditional clergy ... His claim, therefore, of lack of unity manifests an ignorance of this difference in theological opinions."

{535} Do you agree that the matters of the Unity, Holiness, and Catholicity of the Catholic Church pertain to things concerning the very essence of the Church; and far more than simply difference in theological opinions?

{536} Do you agree that there absolutely is **not unity** among those who claim membership in the Traditionalist Movement on matters of FAITH and MORALS; because it has a very large number of traditional clergy and thousands of the laity who are completely divided on the most essential matters of the Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, and Apostolicity of the Catholic Church?

{537} Do you agree that because the traditionalist clergy absolutely lack UNITY of belief in the most essential matters of the Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, and Apostolicity of the Catholic Church; that this proves they are just another non-Catholic religion?

Let us continue with the transcript of what Bishop Sanborn said:

So again, I could spend a great deal of time on that very point, that it is a substantial change; but I want to give you simply the essentials in this talk and to guide you in how to resolve these problems. Hence we must conclude necessarily to Sedevacantism. If we are saying that Vatican II is substantial change we must conclude necessarily to Sedevacantism. Now what are the three positions of reaction to Vatican II? The first is: that Vatican II and its changes, the reforms, everything that you know as the Novus Ordo and in the whole gamut is essentially Orthodox. It may not be ideal, but it is essentially Orthodox. So that is the position of Indult people. People who have followed the Indult and then the Motu Proprio mass – the Fraternity of Saint Peter and others. We accept Vatican II they say; we accept it, perhaps reluctantly, we accept all the reforms, perhaps reluctantly, but we want our niche of traditional liturgical practice within this great Vatican II structure. That's the first way of reacting to it. The second is to say: "Vatican II is not Orthodox, it is substantial defection from Catholicism; therefore it must be rejected and with it the legitimacy of its hierarchy" as we already pointed out. Then there is a third way, and that is of the Society of Saint Pius X, which says that Vatican II is bad. It never really answers the question of whether it is substantial defection from Catholicism or not, but that it is bad. So we reject what we think is bad and accept what we think is good. At the same time we launch a worldwide apostolate in defiance of the persons that we say constitute the Roman Catholic hierarchy; that is Bergoglio and all of the bishops in union with him. So they consecrate bishops, they ordain priests, they set up parishes and schools and convents and religious orders as if the Pope doesn't exist. And the only thing that they do is put a picture of the Novus Ordo pope in the front of their churches; and they put his name in the Canon, and this is their way of saying we recognize him as the pope. Now numbers 1 & 2 that, "Vatican II is essentially Orthodox"; – that is number one. Number two is: "Vatican II is unorthodox"; are at least consistent with the principles of Catholicism because you have that fork in the road. Vatican II is substantially Catholic; Vatican II is not substantially Catholic; – that's the fork in the road. If it is substantially Catholic, then there is a certain logic that flows from that. If it is not substantially Catholic, there is a logic that flows from that. So 1 & 2 are at least logically consistent. So the Fraternity of Saint Peter, although I would disagree with their position because I do not agree that Vatican II is substantially Catholic; I would say are at least consistent that they follow Catholic principles of determining what to do about the problem. They are logical. It makes sense if you admit the orthodoxy of Vatican II. Hence Sedevacantism is consistent and logical if you say Vatican II is not Orthodox, is not Catholicism; as we have seen it necessarily concludes to the fact that it is impossible that it proceeds from the authority of the Catholic Church. Those two lines have consistency and logic in their favor. Number three: the SSPX, is an impossible solution for these reasons. First of all, the act of mounting a worldwide apostolate against the Novus Ordo hierarchy argue that the Novus Ordo is intrinsically evil and that one cannot save his soul in it! Why else would you do that? Why would you set up churches and seminaries and try to attract

people away from the mass and the sacraments and the priests that Bergoglio has sent out; except that you cannot save your soul in those churches! If we can save our soul in those Novus Ordo churches why don't we just go? Why is the traditional Mass or the Traditional Movement necessary if we can go to heaven, just as John Paul II supposedly did, by embracing the Novus Ordo? That's the ultimate end of what we do, is to go to heaven. If we can go to heaven that way, let's go! But to establish such an elaborate apostolate is to say implicitly that you cannot save your soul in it! But if you cannot save your soul in it; that argues necessarily to Sedevacantism. Because, as I said, it is impossible that the authority of Christ promulgate to the whole Church something that leads you to hell! It's like the airplane to hell. That's inconceivable! That the authority of Christ would put you on the airplane to hell! So to make that statement implicitly is what they do; they do make the statement that the Novus Ordo is something in which you cannot save your soul! It concludes necessarily to Sedevacantism. But at the same time they profess to be; the SSPX professes to be in communion with the Novus Ordo hierarchy and professes to seek to be recognized by it and to work with it! They have done this since the beginning!

COMMENT by Patrick Henry: Yes, SSPX has been a non-Catholic religion since the beginning, even while the nine priests who were expelled and who started the SSPV church were part of SSPX. And that brings up a super major problem for them, because they have never Abjured their Errors for being part of SSPX. No cleric with authority and jurisdiction has ever received them into the Catholic Church!

Bishop Pivarunas wrote in his article concerning *My Petition for Spiritual Help*:

“According to his own position, he cannot consider himself a member of the Mystical Body of Christ. After all, who absolved him from his membership in the Vatican II Church? To whom did he abjure his error of being associated with and ordained by Francis Schuckardt? Let him tell us the name of the bishop with jurisdiction who received him back into the Catholic Church. After nearly thirty years, he cannot name him.”

{538} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas and Bishop Sanborn and everyone else must agree, if they are logical and not super hypocritical, that the nine priests who were expelled from SSPX and who started the SSPV church cannot consider themselves as members of the Mystical Body of Christ?

{539} Do you agree that after all, nobody ever absolved them from their membership in the Vatican II Church?

{540} Do you agree that they never did abjure their error of being ordained by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre and associated with him as members of his Society which they now acknowledge was in schism since the beginning?

{541} Do you agree that they cannot tell us the name of the bishop with jurisdiction who received them back into the Catholic Church?

{542} Do you agree that the nine priests expelled from SSPX are just like Bishop Pivarunas who have never found a bishop with jurisdiction to receive them back into the Catholic Church; and even though they have had more than 40 years to find one – they cannot name him?

{543} Do you agree that the act of mounting a worldwide apostolate against the Novus Ordo hierarchy argue that the Novus Ordo is intrinsically evil and that one cannot save his soul in it?

{544} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn and many of the Sedevacantist sect have a worldwide apostolate going against the Novus Ordo hierarchy because they teach it is intrinsically evil and that one cannot save his soul in it?

{545} Do you agree that in opposition to Bishop Sanborn and many other Sedevacantists; there is a very large number of other traditionalist clergy that teach the Novus Ordo is NOT intrinsically evil and that one can save his soul in it?

{546} Do you agree that matters which pertain to something being intrinsically evil and the salvation of souls have been defined by the Catholic Church and true Vicars of Jesus Christ; and therefore it pertains to more than just difference in theological opinions?

{547} Do you agree that there is no true unity among the traditionalist clergy regarding serious matters concerning Faith and Morals because these differences pertain to things that are intrinsically evil?

Let us continue with the transcript of what Bishop Sanborn said:

The SSPX was founded in 1970 as a Novus Ordo congregation. Actually it wasn't even a congregation but a Pious Union in the Diocese of Freiburg in Switzerland. It had a license to exist from the Novus Ordo. It was suppressed by the Novus Ordo in 1974; and ever since they have sought to regain their recognition by the Novus Ordo hierarchy. And they have not stopped; they have not repudiated the idea of being recognized and working with a Novus Ordo hierarchy. So what is the Novus Ordo for them, is it Catholicism or not? And by some of the things they say and do, you would conclude that it is not Catholicism. By some of the things they say and do, you would conclude it is Catholicism. They also say that they are with the Pope. This is impossible since the Pope is not with them. If John says he is with Mary, it is necessary that Mary be with John. You cannot be with somebody unless that person is standing next to you. So they cannot say I am with the Pope when the Pope says you are a **schismatic** sect, I have nothing to do with you! That's simply a false statement to say they are with the Pope. They are not with the Pope because the Pope is not with them; and he is the principle in that relationship. He is the one that holds all the power. He is the one that is the source of Catholic Communion, if he is the Pope. So it is far more important that he be with them, then that they be with him! He is not with them, therefore they are out on their own. And the placing of a picture in the vestibule of the church or the naming of him in the Canon of the Mass doesn't do anything for that essential relationship that is missing; namely, that you are approved by the Roman Pontiff. Because the Society of Saint Pius X position is impossible, it cannot be pleasing to God! Something cannot be pleasing to God if it is against reason! Reason is our connection to morality! Whatever is moral, is connected to God's will by reason. If it is unreasonable, it cannot possibly be in accordance with God's will! All moral theology is based on that; the connection of what you do to right reason based on the authority; on principles that are revealed by God, – the Ten Commandments. So it is impossible to please God by saying on the one hand that: “Well the Novus Ordo is bad and we must fight against it; and draw people away from it; and that people cannot save their souls in it.” And on the other hand to say: “We want to work with it and be approved by it!” None of that makes any sense, and therefore it cannot be pleasing to God! To recognize Bergoglio, or any of these Novus Ordo popes as Pope is to hand him Roman Catholicism; in the end they will be the victor. If they are true Roman Catholic popes, then you are saying that they represent doctrinal and liturgical continuity because it is impossible that a Roman Catholic pope not continue the integrity of Catholic faith, practice, and liturgy. It is impossible. He is the norm of all of those things. So if you hand him the papacy, you hand him authentic Roman Catholicism in the long term; historically you hand it to him. But if Catholics say no! Those persons are not true Roman Catholic popes, then they are stripped of any possible continuity; because you are saying essentially: “if you are not upholding Catholic dogma, Catholic liturgy, Catholic practice, it is impossible that you be the Roman pontiff.” Then they have nothing to stand on. It is a statement in history that because they were discontinuous, because they did not have continuity; therefore true Catholics rejected them. Just as in history the true Catholics of this nation, England, had rejected the new religion; and now we see them as great heroes because even though they were under tremendous pressure both by enticements and by threats to accept the new religion of Henry VIII, and all of the people that came after him, they resisted and made a statement to history that the Catholic Church cannot be altered. The Catholic faith must remain the same. And so also we must say that, and the means by which we do that, is to say this person who claims to be the Pope even if he should have a valid election cannot be a true Roman Catholic pope because he has broken from Catholic doctrine! Saint Paul said: “If I or an angel from heaven should come down and preach to you a gospel that I have not preached to you let him be anathema.” (Galatians chapter 1 verse 7) And then he repeats it, he says it twice to the Galatians in the same chapter! “If I or an angel from heaven.”

And that's what Catholics must say to this Novus Ordo hierarchy if it is a substantial change from Roman Catholicism. The Pope has a gravitational pull on every Catholic just as the earth pulls on the moon and pulls on satellites; eventually those satellites return to Earth. And that is true of anyone that regards the Novus Ordo hierarchy as the Catholic hierarchy; they will eventually go back with the Novus Ordo and the whole battle of the Catholic faith will be lost in them. It is impossible to stay away from the Roman Pontiff if you are a Catholic. Catholics are defined by their submission to the Roman pontiff. It enters into the definition of a Catholic to be submitted to the Roman Pontiff. You cannot call yourself a Catholic unless you are submitted to the Roman Pontiff. And therefore to carry on a worldwide apostolate in defiance of the Roman Pontiff is contrary to being submitted.

{548} Do you agree that oftentimes both the Sedevacantist and non Sedevacantist traditionalist clergy are NOT submitted to the Roman Pontiff? Just look at how often they resist what former popes have taught in the past!

{549} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn has CORRECTLY reminded us that the Novus Ordo, Vatican II popes have clearly said that the SSPX is **schismatic**?

{550} Do you agree that, "Catholics are defined by their submission to the Roman pontiff"?

{551} Do you agree that, "You cannot call yourself a Catholic unless you are submitted to the Roman Pontiff"?

{552} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn is only repeating in his own way the solemnly defined DOGMA of the Catholic Church as explained by Pope Boniface VIII: "We declare, say, define, and pronounce that it is absolutely necessary for the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff"?

{553} Do you agree that they are **not** submitted to the Roman Pontiffs, and therefore by their own words cannot claim they are Catholics who do not accept, consent to, acknowledge, recognize, understand, agree to, and live according to the truths explained, clarified, and expounded by the Roman Pontiffs?

{554} Do you agree that some of the truths explained, clarified, and expounded by the Roman Pontiffs which the members of the Traditionalist Movement do not accept, consent to, acknowledge, recognize, understand, agree to, and live according to are the following? "Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff."; "The power of jurisdiction ... comes to bishops ... only through the successor of Peter."; "There is nothing to show that the Apostles received supreme power without Peter and against Peter. Such power they certainly did not receive from Jesus Christ."; "If the divine benignity willed anything to be in common between him and the other princes, whatever He did not deny to the others He gave only through him. So that whereas Peter alone received many things, He conferred nothing on any of the rest without Peter participating in it."; "Even if Christ willed that Peter and the other leaders have something in common, the other leaders have this only through Peter."; "If Our Lord willed that there should be something common to Peter and the rest of the princes of His Church, it was only on this condition, that whatsoever He gave to the rest, He gave it to them through Peter."; "The episcopate, with all its authority, emanates from the Apostolic See."; "It is an **article of faith** that the authority and jurisdiction of the bishops is subordinate to that of the Sovereign Pontiff."; "It is, in fact, a **DOGMA of faith** that the authority of the bishops, even admitting that it stems directly from Christ, remains dependent on the authority of the Roman Pontiff."

{555} Do you agree that regardless of how they interpret laws, or claim that laws cease to be binding, or invoke one or many Canon Laws and/or Epikeia, or quote and interpret to their own liking theologians and canonists, or claim that things are different because we live in These Times, or claim that things are not going to be the same during the time of the Great Apostasy, nor for any other reason can any Catholic or non-Catholic change, eliminate, eradicate, remove, reject, or purge any formally defined DOCTRINE or DOGMA of the Catholic Church?

Pope Pius IX as the highest authority of the **teaching Church** (*Ecclesia docens*) at his time was teaching Catholic doctrine when he wrote:

For these writings attack and pervert the true power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff ... They obstinately reject and oppose the infallible magisterium both of the Roman Pontiff and of the whole

Church in teaching matters. (Encyclical by Pope Pius IX in 1873, On the Church of Italy, Germany, and Switzerland, under heading of 'Further Heresies')

{556} Do you agree that Pope Pius IX has clearly told us that these writings of the Traditionalist Movement clerics indeed, pervert the true power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff as They obstinately reject and oppose the infallible magisterium both of the Roman Pontiffs and of the whole Church in teaching matters; because the Traditionalist Movement obstinately rejects what numerous popes have taught in the past concerning the jurisdiction, authority, and mission of bishops in the Catholic Church?

Let us continue with the transcript of what Bishop Sanborn said:

Now that said; what are some objections to Sedevacantism? The first is; we cannot judge the Pope! This is a classic case of what is known as begging the question. The question is: "Is this man the Pope or not?" So, you cannot come in with the argument; "well we can't judge the pope." Because that's what we're trying to ask; "whether he is the Pope or not." So that's known as begging the question, so then we just set that aside. Another objection is that the Pope is only a material heretic. First of all I would respond that we're not really talking about his personal heresies here. We are talking about Vatican II and its reforms. The personal heresies of each of these men, and they exist, also argue to there being not popes. But that is not the principle argument of Sedevacantism; that he said this, he said that, or he did this. It all goes back to Vatican II. What is Vatican II? What are its reforms? That is the first thing I would answer. The second thing is; that the only way in which you can pronounce a heresy and not be guilty; that is not be a formal heretic IS BY IGNORANCE. So if a farmer who can't read or write says there are four persons in the Trinity. Anybody in his right mind would say: "Well he doesn't know, he has never been instructed, the poor man just doesn't know, he's a material heretic. That does not corrupt the virtue of faith, if through ignorance you do not know. Are we going to say for one moment that a person like Ratzinger is ignorant; that he doesn't know Catholic doctrine; that he was born in the 1920s; raised as a Catholic? Or Bergoglio, born in the 1930s, raised as a Catholic in a very pious Italian family, that he doesn't know Catholic doctrine? He said for example: I do not believe, (this is a quotation) "I do not believe in a Catholic God, there is no Catholic God!" That is a quotation from Bergoglio, in that interview with that atheist. A quotation: "There is no Catholic God!" Can you say that? Can anyone say that without destroying the virtue of faith in them? That means the object of the Creed of the Catholic Church that we recite, the Nicene Creed, the Apostles Creed, the Athanasian Creed, all of the Creeds of the Catholic Church. That what is described as the true God doesn't exist! So the argument that he is only a material heretic is, I would respond, absurd! Because it is absurd to say that someone like Ratzinger, or Wojtyla, or Bergoglio does not know the Catholic faith! That is absurd!

{557} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn is explaining clear enough that we are not talking ONLY about the personal heresies of the Vatican II popes; but rather, the main issue is: "We are talking about Vatican II and its reforms"?

{558} Do you agree that because it all goes back to Vatican II and whether Vatican II made substantial changes in the Faith of the Catholic Church; that we can make our judgments of whether or not the bishops were formal heretics who were responsible for composing, discussing, debating, and signing the documents and decrees of Vatican Council II in order to bring about the new religion?

{559} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn teaches: "that the only way in which you can pronounce a heresy and not be guilty; that is not be a formal heretic IS BY IGNORANCE"?

{560} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn is basically saying it is ABSURD to believe or to say for one moment that a person like Ratzinger is ignorant; that he doesn't know the Catholic doctrine?

Bishop Sanborn certainly wants everyone to believe with him that: "the argument that he (Bergoglio) is only a material heretic is, I would respond, absurd! Because it is absurd to say that someone like Ratzinger, or Wojtyla, or Bergoglio does not know the Catholic faith! That is absurd!"

Here <https://jmjsite.com/speechofbpmusey4-22-85.pdf> you can read that April 22, 1985 Bishop George Musey reminded the CMRI Community how well educated and informed Bishop Thuc was:

“The fact was, though, that criticized him as they may, Archbishop Lefebvre asked Archbishop Thuc to head up the seminary for him; because the Archbishop, of course, had had previous background in Vietnam of universities and seminary work ... Archbishop Ngo-diem-Thuc had three doctorates. He was a Doctor of Canon Law, a Doctor of Philosophy, and a Doctor of Theology.”

Bishop Pivarunas wrote the following when commenting on *My Petition for Spiritual Help*:

As for the false accusation that Archbishop Thuc was senile, there are many witnesses who have verified that before, at the time of, and after the 1981 consecrations the Archbishop was completely lucid, attentive, rational, offered public Masses, and met with numerous people, etc. A number of these witnesses were traditional priests who, under oath, with God as their witness, verified that the Archbishop was certainly rational.

{561} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn, Bishop Pivarunas, Rev. Anthony Cekada, and a number of other traditional clergy teach that Bergoglio has never been consecrated a bishop or even ordained to the priesthood?

{562} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn, Bishop Pivarunas, Rev. Anthony Cekada, and a number of other traditional clergy teach that the layman Bergoglio (who is oftentimes referred to as Pope Francis) with his cornucopia profusion of abundant statements contrary to Catholic doctrine cannot be accused of **ignorance** of the Catholic faith without absurdity?

{563} Do you agree that it follows therefore to be **contrary to reason** to think that a well-educated Bishop and seminary professor with three doctorates who was born October 6, 1897 could be accused of **ignorance** of the teachings of the Catholic Church; and therefore not know that the documents of Vatican II are contrary to the doctrines of the Catholic Church?

{564} Do you agree with St. Thomas Aquinas that whatever is contrary to reason is a sin?

Remember that Bishop Sanborn spoke the truth when he said: “Because the Society of Saint Pius X position is impossible, it cannot be pleasing to God! Something cannot be pleasing to God if it is **against reason**! Reason is our connection to morality! Whatever is moral, is connected to God's will by reason. If it is **unreasonable**, it cannot possibly be in accordance with God's will! All moral theology is based on that; the connection of what you do to right reason based on the authority; on principles that are revealed by God, – the Ten Commandments.”

{565} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn, Bishop Pivarunas, Bishop George Musey, Rev. Anthony Cekada, and everyone else should agree that according to the Sedevacantist clergy; they should unreservedly and absolutely pronounce that it is absurd to say someone like Bishop Thuc did not know the Catholic faith and could be excused for being **ignorant** on matters concerning the Catholic faith?

{566} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas and traditional priests who, under oath, with God as their witness, verified that the Archbishop was certainly completely lucid, attentive, and rational can never reasonably conclude that Bishop Thuc was senile, or ignorant of what the Catholic Church teaches, and did not know there were heresies in the documents of Vatican II that he willfully, deliberately, and consciously promulgated to the Universal Church; and was therefore formally guilty of public heresy when he signed the heretical decrees of Vatican Council II?

{567} Do you agree that it follows with correct logic that it is **unreasonable**, and cannot possibly be in accordance with God's will to make excuses for Bishop Thuc to come up with the unreasonable conclusion that he is not guilty of formal and public heresy, with no pertinacity involved, for promulgating the documents of Vatican II?

{568} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn, Bishop Pivarunas, Rev. Anthony Cekada, and the other Sedevacantist clergy teach, preach, and proclaim that the reason they have a worldwide apostolate going against the Novus Ordo hierarchy and the Vatican II Church is because the Vatican II documents clearly pronounce heresies; and therefore that the Vatican II Church is intrinsically evil and that one cannot save his soul in it?

{569} Do you agree that according to the Sedevacantist clergy, everyone should express that it is absurd to deny, disagree, or contradict the truth that the Vatican II documents clearly state and declare heresies?

{570} Do you agree that the main issue is: “We are talking about Vatican II and its reforms” “It all goes back to Vatican II and the Vatican II documents that clearly state and declare heresies; and whether Vatican II made substantial changes in the Faith of the Catholic Church”?

{571} Do you agree that if we can determine that Vatican II made substantial changes in the Faith of the Catholic Church; then we can make our judgments about whether or not those who signed the heretical documents of Vatican II were formal heretics?

{572} Do you agree that Vatican II did not just come from no place, and with nobody knowing anything about it until after it came into existence, and that somebody was responsible for bringing this new religion into existence?

{573} Do you agree that all the documents and decrees of Vatican II were well discussed, debated, considered, and reviewed before any bishop or cardinal signed them?

Read again from the article on the CMRI website talking about their position and beliefs:

V. MODERN HIERARCHY OF THE VATICAN II CHURCH: In the light of the above, it must be concluded that the modern hierarchy **who have approved and implemented the errors of Vatican II** no longer represent the Catholic Church and her lawful authority.

{574} Do you agree that the real people actually responsible for beginning this new religion that has brought about substantial changes in the Church, were those who signed the documents and decrees of Vatican Council II?

{575} Do you agree that without the signatures of Paul VI, the Cardinals, the archbishops, and the bishops; the new religion would never have had its official beginning?

{576} Do you agree that therefore, the TOTAL responsibility for the existence of Vatican II goes exactly to those who signed the documents and decrees of Vatican II; as the CMRI website states, “it must be concluded that the modern hierarchy who have approved and implemented the errors of Vatican II no longer represent the Catholic Church and her lawful authority.?”

{577} Do you agree that those who signed these heretical decrees are the very ones who brought into existence this new religion that made substantial changes in the Church?

{578} Do you agree that the Vatican II documents clearly pronounce heresies?

{579} Do you agree that those who willfully signed the documents and decrees of Vatican II thereby acknowledged that they pronounced all the heresies the Vatican II documents contained?

{580} Do you agree that Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre are/were a very predominant, chief, principal, leading, and main part of the modern hierarchy who have approved and implemented the errors of Vatican II, and who after their part in bringing about the non-Catholic church with its substantial change, no longer represent the Catholic Church and her lawful authority?

{581} Do you agree that “the only way in which you can pronounce a heresy and not be guilty; that is not be a formal heretic IS BY IGNORANCE”?

TRUTH: I experienced very much turmoil and knew something was very seriously wrong in the Catholic Church by 1964 and 1965; as the new changes were introduced in the small town where we lived, of less than 1,000 population.

TRUTH: I asked my parish priest, the assistant pastor, my teachers, and the Benedictine Nuns, where I graduated from their high school in 1965, to explain what was going on in the Catholic Church – but nobody gave me logical and clear answers.

TRUTH: in 1966 I went to a Trade School in Spokane Washington. During that time I think I went to about every parish in that area, and in northern Idaho, asking the priests to explain the changes going on in the Catholic Church – but nobody gave me logical answers or good explanations.

TRUTH: after often spending as much as eight hours a day praying in the churches; I was finally led to an article written by a LAYMAN who had compared the teachings of the Catholic Church with the documents of Vatican II. This is the first main article that brought me to understand why I had so much turmoil with the

changes in the Catholic Church. I recognized that some documents of Vatican II were contrary to Catholic doctrine the very first time that I read them in that *Saint Anthony's Hammer*.

TRUTH: after reading that *Saint Anthony's Hammer*, I read a number of other articles written by LAYMAN who explained more about the heresies of the Vatican II documents, and not by any Roman collared cleric in the Catholic Church.

TRUTH: it was only LAYMAN who explained to me why Montini (Paul VI) could not be the head of the Catholic Church; because of his heretical teachings, and the heresies in Vatican II documents that he signed and promulgated.

TRUTH: from being shown the heresies in the Vatican II documents by LAYMAN during one afternoon's conversation; the truth of the heresies in the Vatican II documents was evident to me, and from that day thereafter I have never returned to the Novus Ordo religion or taken part in any more Novus Ordo services.

TRUTH: maybe some clergy were the first ones to show forth the errors in the documents of Vatican II. Nevertheless, all of the articles, pamphlets, and letters that I read at the beginning were composed by LAYMAN.

TRUTH: therefore, I am convinced that the heresies of the documents of Vatican II could easily be recognized just by LAYMAN who read those documents early on after they were signed by the cardinals and bishops.

TRUTH: as you can hear on *Which Bishop Should I Follow* tape one side one; in his sermon Father, (now known as Bishop), Pivarunas pointed out these three facts: 1. The decrees of the second Vatican Council contain heresy. 2. The main heresies of the second Vatican Council are ecumenism, religious indifferentism, and Modernism. 3. It is **very easy** to recognize the Vatican II heresy on ecumenism, if you compare it with the true teachings of the Catholic Church.

TRUTH: if a simple layman like me, with nothing but 12 years of Catholic education, could understand at once that there was heresy and a departure from Catholic dogma in the teachings of the documents of Vatican II; then it becomes difficult to understand how they were so ambiguous that a seminary professor bishop with three doctorates (who was a Doctor of Canon Law, a Doctor of Philosophy, and a Doctor of **Theology**) could not know there was heresy in the documents of Vatican II with their teachings contrary to the **theology** of the Catholic Church; before he signed and promulgated them.

The three volume set of books by Xavier Ryan very clearly testify to the TRUTH that the documents of Vatican II were very well discussed, debated, examined, and reviewed before they were signed and promulgated; with the result that a new religion was brought forth with very SUBSTANTIAL changes opposed to the teachings of the Catholic Church. Consequently, I think it is a lame excuse to bring up the argument that Bishop Thuc, and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre were so stupid and **ignorant** as not to be able to recognize there was heresy in the Vatican II documents and decrees that they signed and promulgated; with the result that now we have this new non-Catholic religion that they helped to start.

{582} Do you agree that Paul VI, John Paul II, Cardinal Siri, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, and Bishop Thuc all willfully signed the documents and decrees of Vatican II; and thereby acknowledged that they pronounced all the heresies the Vatican II documents contained?

{583} Do you agree that Paul VI, John Paul II, Cardinal Siri, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, and Bishop Thuc were all too well educated and intelligent for any of their followers to justifiably, defensively, and validly excuse them on the grounds of being **ignorant** of what the Catholic Church teaches concerning the heresies contained in the Vatican II documents – ESPECIALLY as simply educated laymen could recognize the heresies in the Vatican II documents and decrees as soon as they read them?

Remember what Bishop Sanborn said: "Something cannot be pleasing to God if it is **against reason!** Reason is our connection to morality! Whatever is moral, is connected to God's will by reason. If it is **unreasonable**, it cannot possibly be in accordance with God's will." "the only way in which you can pronounce a heresy and not be guilty; that is not be a formal heretic IS BY IGNORANCE"

{584} Do you agree that therefore, according to the teachings of the traditionalist clergy every reasonable person must conclude that Paul VI, John Paul II, Cardinal Siri, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, and Bishop Thuc all became formal heretics when they signed the heretical documents and decrees of Vatican Council II?

{585} Do you agree that therefore, it follows in correct logic that it is absurd and **against reason** to excuse them on the grounds that they were too **ignorant** to understand the Catholic faith, and not be able to recognize that there was heresy being pronounced by them and by everyone else who signed the heretical decrees of Vatican II – ESPECIALLY since they were well discussed, examined, and debated in advance; and also because simply educated LAYMEN could recognize the heresies in the Vatican II documents and decrees as soon as they read them?

{586} Do you agree that therefore it is absurd to reject the truth that Paul VI, John Paul II, Cardinal Siri, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, and Bishop Thuc became formal heretics and part of the heretical Vatican II church they helped organize and bring into existence?

{587} Do you agree that the Sedevacantist clergy accuse Paul VI of being a FORMAL heretic for promulgating heretical documents that brought about a substantial change in the Catholic Church?

{588} Do you agree that Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre also had their guilty part and share in promulgating, endorsing, and delivering the same heretical documents and decrees as Paul VI; – yes, the very same heretical documents and decrees that brought about the substantial change in the Catholic Church?

{589} Do you agree that it is therefore also absurd to think that Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre remained faithful to tradition since they are also responsible for bringing into existence the new sect that made SUBSTANTIAL changes in the Catholic Church?

Bishop Sanborn certainly wants everyone to believe with him that: “the argument that he (Bergoglio) is only a **material** heretic is, I would respond, absurd! Because it is absurd to say that someone like Ratzinger, or Wojtyla or Bergoglio does not know the Catholic faith! That is absurd!”

{590} Do you agree that with even greater reason the argument that Bishop Thuc is only a **material heretic should be considered as absurd**; because it is absurd and against reason to say that a bishop who was a seminary professor and who had three Doctorates should not know the Catholic faith?

Let us continue with the transcript of what Bishop Sanborn said:

Another objection to Sedevacantism is: “only the Church can declare him a non-Pope.” My response to that is: “Only the Church can take away from him an election.” But it is not true to say that only the Church can declare him a non-Pope. In other words, we have no authority to declare anybody anything. We are not judges, we are not ecclesiastical judges. However, we do have the right and the obligation from what Saint Paul says; to consider non Catholic somebody who is giving to us a false religion. Now again this goes back to saying Vatican II is substantial distortion. If he is feeding us a false religion it is impossible that he have the authority to teach, rule, and sanctify the Church.

{591} Do you agree that we do have the right and the obligation to consider non Catholic EVERYBODY who is giving to us a false religion?

{592} Do you agree that it was not only Paul VI by himself, but also included were **all** of the clerics who signed the heretical documents and decrees of Vatican II which brought about the substantial distortion?

{593} Do you agree that therefore we have the right and the obligation to declare and consider as non-Catholics every bishop who signed the heretical decrees of Vatican II which resulted in and brought about this false religion?

{594} Do you agree that the culprits, perpetrators, and wrongdoers who brought about this false religion of Vatican II with its substantial distortion, were those bishops gathered together with Paul VI in what was purported, alleged, declared, and meant to be an ecumenical Council of the Catholic Church?

{595} Do you agree that because it was those bishops working together with Paul VI who brought about those substantial changes in the Catholic Church; that it is impossible that they have any authority to teach, rule, and sanctify the Church?

Let us continue with the transcript of what Bishop Sanborn said:

So I would give you an example. If you lived next door to someone whom you knew was a child abuser, would you say: "Well there's been no declaration; the law has not caught up with him, therefore I will send my children over to play at his house?" No one in his right mind would do such a thing, because he would say: "I know that that person is a child abuser, and I could not possibly let my children play over there." In other words, he is clearly guilty of the crime. Also, for example, the shooter in the Colorado Theater is clearly guilty of the crime, there is no doubt that that man did that. He has got to be guilty. He has to go through the process, yes a judicial process, but he's clearly guilty. No sane person would say that man is not the one that did it. So also these Vatican II popes are clearly guilty of crimes against the Catholic faith. And we have already seen that they cannot be merely **materially** guilty; **but because of THEIR KNOWLEDGE must be formally guilty!** There is a question about the sanity of that Colorado shooter, and they may put him in an insane asylum for the rest of his life because he's only materially guilty; that may be determined. But there is no room for that with regard to these Vatican II popes!

596} Do you agree that the Vatican II bishops who authorized, endorsed, initialized, signed, and thereby promulgated this non-Catholic church with its substantial changes, are also clearly guilty of crimes against the Catholic faith?

{597} Do you agree that we have already seen that those who signed the heretical decrees of Vatican Council II are the very ones responsible for initiating, originating, introducing, and bringing about this new non-Catholic Novus Ordo Conciliar church with its substantial changes; and therefore they cannot be merely materially guilty; **but because of THEIR KNOWLEDGE must be formally guilty?**

Let us continue with the transcript of what Bishop Sanborn said:

And you can put the same argument that they say; "Only the Church can declare him to be a non-Pope." Well then why do we reject the new mass? Why do we reject the Council? The Church has never condemned the new mass. The Church has never condemned the Council. Why do we reject those things out of hand without any declaration of the Church? So the rejection of the new mass and the rejection of the Council necessarily implies the rejection of the Novus Ordo hierarchy without declaration! If you're going to wait for a declaration you should put on your clown suit, blow up your balloon, and go to the Novus Ordo.

Bishop Thuc did not publicly make any declaration that he did not believe in the new mass and the Vatican Council until the year AFTER he consecrated the bishops in 1981; from which his lineage of Traditionalist Movement clerics receive their Power of Orders! How could a seminary professor with three Doctorates be so ignorant of the Catholic faith as not to know what a child in the sixth grade should know before receiving confirmation? How could Bishop Thuc be ignorant of what took place at Vatican II, although he was present for the discussion, and heard everything that was said, and then (one should presume) read the heretical Decrees before he signed them?

{598} Do you agree that according to Bishop Pivarunas not one of the Novus Ordo bishops ever became a heretic? Remember what he wrote in defense of Bishop Thuc and EVERY other Novus Ordo Pope, Cardinal, bishop, priest, and layperson: "According to Canon 1325, a necessary condition for heresy is pertinacity."

{599} Do you agree that unless he is doing doubletalk, Bishop Pivarunas is explaining why there is no necessity for the Traditionalist Movement to exist; since according to Bishop Pivarunas all the other Novus Ordo bishops were just like Bishop Thuc – all of them have kept the faith and none of them were/are pertinacious?

{600} Do you agree that this belief that all the Novus Ordo bishops and laity kept the faith is also taught by the Bishop who ordained Bishop Pivarunas to the Priesthood?

Let us read what Bishop Musey said concerning the Novus Ordo people:

"They are not people who have been actually raised in heresy in a non-Catholic religion or something. These people were actually raised in the Catholic faith. Later on the Church went into

apostasy. It does not mean that most of these people actually changed their beliefs. The ones that I have met mostly have retained their beliefs, and that is why they wind up coming back to the true faith. They have just not been able to find a place where they could worship. And they did not understand what the Novus Ordo Missae was, and things of this sort. But as far as being heretics; they were not. They have NOT held doctrines that were in conflict with the Catholic faith.”

{601} Do you agree that Bishop George Musey agrees with Bishop Pivarunas, since both of them teach the Novus Ordo people are not raised in a non-Catholic religion or something?

{602} Do you agree that both bishops are teaching the Novus Ordo people are actually raised in the Catholic faith – thereby making the Novus Ordo religion the Catholic Church founded by Jesus Christ?

{603} Do you agree that a church that goes into apostasy pretty much denies every part of the Catholic faith?

{604} Do you agree that however, because nobody was PERTINACIOUS in being in apostasy, according to Bishop Pivarunas and Bishop George Musey, the members of the body of the apostate church were still Catholics?

{605} Do you agree that according to Bishop George Musey and Bishop Pivarunas, Bishop Thuc and all the other members of this **apostate** church have never lost the true faith?

{606} Do you agree that Bishop George Musey and Bishop Pivarunas sometimes will preach, teach, and proclaim that the Novus Ordo members have NOT held doctrines that were in conflict with the Catholic faith; and at other times they will tell us that these doctrines of the Novus Ordo members are in direct conflict with the Catholic faith?

{607} Do you agree that if it is true to say: “the Novus Ordo members have NOT held doctrines that were in conflict with the Catholic faith; then it follows with correct reasoning that there is no excuse for the Traditionalist Movement to exist – because it obviously makes the Traditionalist Movement a non-Catholic religion?”

{608} Do you agree that Father Mary Casimir Puskorius, CMRI, spoke the truth when quoting Bishop Donald J. Sanborn: “And as Bishop Sanborn points out in this article, the True Church of Christ cannot give us contradictory teaching! If It did contradictory teaching, It would thereby be giving false teaching; either It was right the first time, or It was right the second time, but It cannot be right both times! You see, the human mind is not capable of thinking in terms of contradiction”?

Bishop Pivarunas comments on *My Petition for Spiritual Help*

You also wanted to know what I think, and to reply to the comments Bishop Mark A. Pivarunas published on the CMRI website concerning *My Petition for Spiritual Help*.

Bishop Pivarunas began with:

“It is indeed sad that Patrick Henry’s article, “My Petition for Spiritual Help,” is nothing more than a promotion of his erroneous opinion that the faithful no longer have available any bishops or priests to offer Holy Mass and to administer the Sacraments, and his mentality unfortunately resembles that of the late Francis Schuckardt, who claimed to be the sole authority left in the Church.”

{609} Do you agree that it is indeed sad that neither Bishop Pivarunas, nor any other bishop or priest has the courage and charity to answer my questions?

{610} Do you agree that instead of going through the questions I asked in my letter, Bishop Pivarunas simply attacks myself with general sweeping statements without providing a reference to even one place in *My Petition for Spiritual Help* where I stated something that was erroneous or contrary to any doctrine of the Catholic Church?

{611} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas uses the same tactics as Bishop Francis Schuckardt who refused to face reality and answer the questions that many people asked him concerning doctrine and moral issues?

{612} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas does the same as his mentor Bishop Francis Schuckardt, and that they just resort to attacking the people who question them instead of answering the questions?

{613} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas will NEVER have the charity, courtesy, and intestinal fortitude to do what he is asked to do and answer the questions I asked him to answer in *My Petition for Spiritual Help*; and also to answer the questions I am asking him to answer in this letter and publish them on the CMRI website and send his answers to me?

{614} Do you agree that neither Bishop Pivarunas or any other clerics in the Traditionalist Movement will ever do what I have done and profess their faith publicly, as they are obliged to do by the Catholic Church, by answering all the questions I have asked them to answer and show them publicly to the world?

{615} Do you agree that the real reason Bishop Pivarunas and everyone else who wishes to continue in the non-Catholic Traditionalist Movement and Novus Ordo religions do not answer the questions I asked them to answer is because they would then show to the world that they do not believe the Catholic faith; but rather teach contrary to the doctrine and dogmas of the Catholic Church?

Some years ago, Brian Kasbar wrote a well-documented letter concerning jurisdiction and things going on at Mount Saint Michael's.

{616} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas should have addressed the theological and moral issues that Mr. Kasbar brought forth, instead of doing what he should not have done and attack the personality of Brian Kasbar?

{617} Do you agree that it is very strange and contrary to the truth, for Bishop Pivarunas to think that I claim to be the sole authority in the Church?

{618} Do you agree that *My Petition for Spiritual Help* gives the quotations of a number of popes, Doctors of the Church, Saints, approved theologians, the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, some approved canon laws, and other resources that are in direct contradiction to the theology of Bishop Pivarunas and the Traditionalist Movement?

{619} Do you agree that it is Bishop Pivarunas and the Traditionalist Movement that has the new theology in contradiction to the teachings of the Catholic Church?

{620} Do you agree that they are the ones who do not justify how they disregard the teachings of the Catholic Church?

{621} Do you agree that those people who believe and follow the teachings of the Catholic Church are bound in conscience to have nothing to do with the Protestant Traditionalist Movement?

{622} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas cannot explain who is the sole authority in the Traditionalist Movement church to which all of its clerics and laity should be obedient?

{623} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas cannot prove there is any authority whatsoever in the Traditionalist Movement sect or the Novus Ordo sect from any truly Catholic authority?

{624} Do you agree that this is another proof that they are just as non-Catholic as the traditional Protestants with no head and no authority?

Read again the section on the CMRI website confirming the fact that Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre and the others who have approved and implemented the errors of Vatican II when they signed the heretical documents of Vatican II have no lawful AUTHORITY, and they no longer represent the Catholic Church!

V. MODERN HIERARCHY OF THE VATICAN II CHURCH: In the light of the above, it must be concluded that the modern hierarchy who have approved and implemented the errors of Vatican II no longer represent the Catholic Church and her lawful **authority**. This most certainly includes the one(s) who confirmed, approved, decreed, and implemented these heretical teachings.

Please consider carefully, deliberate upon, and ponder over this section of the book, *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* by Father Thomas Cox (Imprimatur and Copyright, 1900), page 173:

“Those who invent doctrines unheard of before are not the successors of the Apostles. Novelty and error are children of the same father - the father of lies. Those who have lost the line of valid ministers leading back to apostolic times cannot plead the possession of Apostolicity. Where there is no ordination, no priesthood, **no authority**, no power, Apostolicity is out of the

question. Even if valid orders exist, where *jurisdiction* is lacking there is no real Apostolicity. Schism, as well as heresy, destroys apostolic succession.”

{625} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas, and every bishop and priest, should answer the questions instead of continuing to refuse to answer my questions so that we can understand why I am wrong?

{626} Do you agree that if they are united and one then they are united in their non-Catholic faith?

{627} Do you agree that it is a true fact that Bishop Pivarunas, and the CMRI priests, have no problem telling their followers they can also attend Mass and receive Sacraments from the Society of Saint Pius X sect and the Society of Saint Pius V sect?

{628} Do you agree that it is an absolute fact that many people do go back and forth week after week between CMRI, SSPX, FSSP, SSPX-MC, SSPV, and the Novus Ordo sects?

{629} Do you agree that those that go to websites, blogs, and forums, concerning the many disunited Groups, Societies, and Communities that make up the Traditionalist Movement, can find hundreds if not thousands of people making comments how they switch around from one of the Groups, Societies, and Communities to other Groups, Societies, and Communities without anyone questioning them about what they believe; and they certainly do not have them take an Abjuration of Error before or after they switch to a new Group, Society, or Community?

{630} Do you agree that everyone who accepts the truth knows that the Society of Saint Pius X sect is a part of the non-Catholic Novus Ordo sect since they have the same man as the pope of their sect?

{631} Do you agree that it is not an erroneous opinion of Patrick Henry, but rather a true fact that the Novus Ordo sect is a non-Catholic religion as taught in the writings and sermons of the CMRI clerics; the writings and sermons of Bishop Donald J. Sanborn; and the writings and sermons of Rev. Anthony Cekada?

{632} Do you agree that it is not an erroneous opinion of Patrick Henry, but rather a true fact that the Society of Saint Pius X sect is a non-Catholic religion as taught in the writings and sermons of the CMRI clerics; the writings and sermons of Bishop Donald J. Sanborn; and the writings and sermons of Rev. Anthony Cekada?

{633} Do you agree that it is not an erroneous opinion of Patrick Henry, but rather a true fact that Bishop Pivarunas and the Traditionalist Movement sect are all part of and connected to the non-Catholic sects?

{634} Do you agree that it is not an erroneous opinion of Patrick Henry, but rather a true fact that the Catholic Church forbids Her children to take part in non-Catholic services?

{635} Do you agree that unfortunately it is the mentality of Bishop Pivarunas and the entire CMRI sect that still has the mentality and who resemble the late Bishop Francis Schuckardt?

{636} Do you agree that they still belong to the religious congregation founded by Bishop Francis Schuckardt?

{637} Do you agree that they still belong to the church of Bishop Francis Schuckardt since they have never abjured their errors or been received back into the Catholic Church by anyone with authority and jurisdiction after belonging to the non-Catholic sect founded by Bishop Francis Schuckardt?

{638} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas and the CMRI “religious” still wear the habit Bishop Francis Schuckardt gave them?

{639} Do you agree that they still sign CMRI after their name, which is the sole and major invention, development, and promotion of Bishop Francis Schuckardt?

{640} Do you agree that Patrick Henry left the CMRI community because, by the grace of God, he saw that Bishop Francis Schuckardt was not the sole authority left in the Catholic Church?

{641} Do you agree that Bishop Francis Schuckardt moved away from Spokane Washington, but the CMRI community NEVER did leave Bishop Francis Schuckardt and his non-Catholic religion?

{642} Do you agree that to this day they still carry on the “religious” congregation, work, and mentality of Bishop Francis Schuckardt?

{643} Do you agree that if anyone asks Bishop Pivarunas who founded the CMRI community, and if he answers truthfully he will acknowledge it was Bishop Francis Schuckardt?

{644} Do you agree that if anyone asks Bishop Pivarunas if he still belongs to the CMRI community that he will answer yes?

Ask yourself what exact day the CMRI community which Bishop Pivarunas now belongs to ceased to be the same CMRI community founded by Bishop Francis Schuckardt. Ask yourself why the CMRI community still has the same name; the same Rule; the same religious habit; the same buildings; and the same claim to religious vows that the members thereof received from Bishop Francis Schuckardt.

{645} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas claims he has religious vows that were received in the name of the Church by Bishop Francis Schuckardt?

{646} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas never made a year of Novitiate in the CMRI community either before or after Bishop Francis Schuckardt left the Spokane area in 1984?

{647} Do you agree that according to the Council of Trent no one can make a valid religious profession without making a full year of novitiate?

{648} Do you agree that neither Bishop Pivarunas or any other CMRI religious who made their Religious Profession while Bishop Francis Schuckardt was still in the community ever made another valid Religious Profession in the CMRI community?

{649} Do you agree that Bishop Francis Schuckardt received all Minor and Major Orders through ordination to the priesthood in one or two days and the next day was consecrated by Daniel Q. Brown who was an Old Catholic bishop?

{650} Do you agree that there was no other priest or bishop present during those ceremonies to absolve Bishop Brown and bring him back into the Catholic Church?

{651} Do you agree that if they will come forth and tell the truth, there are still lay people living who were present when Bishop Francis Schuckardt was ordained and consecrated?

{652} Do you agree that if they will come forth and tell the truth, those laypeople will testify that Bishop Francis Schuckardt had Bishop Brown take an abjuration only before those laypeople to bring him back into the Catholic Church?

{653} Do you agree that if Bishop Brown had actually been absolved and brought back into the Church by some cleric previous to the ordination and consecration ceremonies; that it was very ridiculous to have him take an abjuration before only laypeople who could not absolve him?

{654} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas has not EVER provided any documents or proof that Bishop Daniel Brown was in fact a Catholic bishop with authority and jurisdiction in the Catholic Church at the time he consecrated Bishop Francis Schuckardt?

Remember what Bishop Pivarunas wrote in his article regarding the NECESSITY to be absolved from membership in the Vatican II Church:

“According to his own position, he cannot consider himself a member of the Mystical Body of Christ. After all, who absolved him from his membership in the Vatican II Church? To whom did he abjure his error of being associated with and ordained by Francis Schuckardt? Let him tell us the name of the bishop **with jurisdiction** who received him back into the Catholic Church. After nearly thirty years, he cannot name him.”

{655} Do you agree that according to Bishop Pivarunas, Bishop Daniel Q. Brown could NOT consider himself a member of the Mystical Body of Christ when he consecrated Bishop Francis Schuckardt?

After all, who absolved him from his membership in the Vatican II Church? To whom did Bishop Brown abjure his error of being associated with and ordained and consecrated by Old Catholics? Let Bishop Pivarunas tell us the name of the **bishop with jurisdiction** who received Bishop Brown back into the Catholic Church! After nearly 49 years, he cannot name him!

{656} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas cannot tell us the name of the bishop **with jurisdiction** who received him back into the Catholic Church for being associated with and ordained by Francis Schuckardt?

{657} Do you agree that because it is an **article of faith and in fact, a DOGMA of faith** that the authority and jurisdiction of bishops only comes to them through the Roman Pontiff; that the Traditionalist

Movement clergy teach the opposite of and deny, repudiate, and refuse to believe an *article of faith* and a *DOGMA of faith* when they teach Bishop George Musey had jurisdiction in the Catholic Church?

{658} Do you agree that because it is an *article of faith and in fact, a DOGMA of faith* that the authority and jurisdiction of bishops only comes to them through the Roman Pontiff; that the Traditionalist Movement clergy teach the opposite of and deny, repudiate, and refuse to believe an *article of faith* and a *DOGMA of faith* when they teach that either Bishop Daniel Q. Brown or Bishop Francis Schuckardt had jurisdiction in the Catholic Church?

{659} Do you agree that the Old Catholic bishop, Bishop Brown never did leave his wife, either before or after consecrating Bishop Francis Schuckardt?

{660} Do you agree that consequently the Catholic Church only recognizes Bishop Brown and Bishop Francis Schuckardt as Old Catholics who have not been sent and who have never had an office, authority, jurisdiction, or mission in the Catholic Church?

{661} Do you agree that during a number of court cases that took place AFTER the big CMRI split in 1984; those on the side to which Bishop Pivarunas is now the leader, stated in the courtrooms that they did not believe Bishop Francis Schuckardt was a member the Catholic Church?

{662} Do you agree that I am correct in understanding that Bishop Pivarunas now believes that Bishop Francis Schuckardt was in fact always a non-Catholic Old Catholic bishop who never did have an office, authority, jurisdiction, or mission in the Catholic Church from anyone with authority to grant them?

{663} Do you agree that nevertheless the mentality of Bishop Francis Schuckardt was to deceive his followers into thinking he was a Catholic bishop sent by the Catholic Church with an office, authority, jurisdiction, and mission working for the salvation of souls?

{664} Do you agree that it is the mentality of Bishop Pivarunas to deceive his followers into thinking he is a Catholic bishop sent by the Catholic Church with an office, authority, jurisdiction, and mission working for the salvation of souls?

{665} Do you agree that therefore, in truth, it is the mentality of Bishop Pivarunas and the entire CMRI community that unfortunately resembles that of the late Francis Schuckardt?

{666} Do you agree that part of the mentality of Bishop Francis Schuckardt was to deceive, trick, betray, swindle, mislead, and lie to his followers?

{667} Do you agree that Bishop Francis Schuckardt deceived, betrayed, tricked, misled, and lied as he led people to believe he was a Catholic bishop?

{668} Do you agree that he deceived, betrayed, tricked, misled, and lied as he led people to believe the Catholic Church supplied him jurisdiction to do about anything he wanted to do?

{669} Do you agree that he deceived, betrayed, tricked, misled, and lied as he led people to believe he was consecrated by a Bishop who belonged to the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church?

{670} Do you agree that he deceived, betrayed, tricked, misled, and lied as he led people to believe he could found a religious congregation and receive the vows of those religious in the name of the Church?

{671} Do you agree that he swindled many people into giving him money, property, and other belongings because they thought he was a Catholic bishop working for the salvation of souls?

{672} Do you agree that Bishop Francis Schuckardt deceived many by various ways, means, and threats to take part in his homosexual activity?

{673} Do agree that it is public news widespread via the internet that Rev. Anthony Cekada and Bishop Daniel Dolan who was consecrated by Bishop Pivarunas are deeply involved in scandalous activity?

Now let us examine who still has the mentality of the late Bishop Francis Schuckardt.

{674} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas deceived, betrayed, tricked, misled, and lied as he led people to believe he was a Catholic bishop sent by the Church?

{675} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas deceived, betrayed, tricked, misled, and lied as he leads people to believe the Catholic Church supplies him jurisdiction to do about anything he wants to do?

{676} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas deceived, betrayed, tricked, misled, and lied as he led people to believe he was consecrated by a Bishop who belonged to the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church?

{677} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas deceived, betrayed, tricked, misled, and lied as he led people to believe he could receive the vows of those religious of CMRI in the name of the Church although he has no mission, office, authority, or jurisdiction?

{678} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas and the other Traditionalist Movement clerics have swindled many people into giving them money, property, and other belongings because they thought these clerics were Catholic bishops and priests working for the salvation of souls?

{679} Do you agree that Bishop Daniel Dolan and Rev. Anthony Cekada must have deceived many by various ways, means, and threats to take part in their scandalous activity, according to the great scandal and information about this subject that is being circulated on the Internet?

Is all of this scandalous activity of the Traditionalist Movement clerics the truth? I personally do not know about all of them. But one thing I do know is that a number of people attempted to expose many scandals of Bishop Francis Schuckardt for many, many years before the big split in CMRI in 1984. However, the Traditionalist Movement priest, Reverend Denis Philomena Marie, CMRI, excused and covered for the Bishop for many, many years. If you read the *Mystic Knights of Mumbo Jumbo*, found at these hyperlinks

1) <https://jmjsite.com/mysticknightsofmumbojumbo1.pdf>

2) <https://jmjsite.com/mysticknightsofmumbojumbo2.pdf>

3) <https://jmjsite.com/mysticknightsofmumbojumbo3.pdf>

4) <https://jmjsite.com/mysticknightsofmumbojumbo4.pdf> you will also know that Rev. Mary Benedict, CMRI, also covered up for and defended the scandals and immorality of Bishop Francis Schuckardt. For many years, very many were defending and covering up for very much scandal in the SSPX non-Catholic sect. However, they are nevertheless being exposed. Just do a search on the Internet regarding *Immorality Scandal in SSPX*, *SSPX scandal*, *Michael Gonzalez story and SSPX*, *SSPX scandal hits mainstream media*, *Church Militant report on SSPX scandal*, *Scandal at SGG*, and similar search topics; to find a large amount of information regarding these serious scandals.

{680} Do you agree that the scandalous activity in SSPX, CMRI, and other Traditionalist Movement sects; involve hundreds of boys and girls as well as single and married women that were raped, molested, and bred by Traditionalist Movement clerics?

{681} Do you agree that the scandalous activity in SSPX involves, among the large number of other scandals, a boy who thereafter turned to alcohol, drugs, and eventually shot himself because he was molested by a Traditionalist Movement cleric?

{682} Do you agree that the scandalous activity in the Traditionalist Movement involves CMRI clerics who molested young boys; raped young girls; who brought forth children into this world; and who did the marriage act with women and even married women?

{683} Do you agree that part of the scandalous activity in the Traditionalist Movement involves a CMRI priest who married a CMRI Sister; and then both of them went back to the non-Catholic Novus Ordo sect?

Are the CMRI bishops and priests still doing what they can to hide and conceal the scandalous activity going on among so many Traditionalist Movement clerics and so called religious?

{684} Do you agree that the article on the CMRI website, titled *The History of CMRI*, truly manifests the deceitfulness, dishonesty, and fraudulence which was such a manifest part of the mentality of Bishop Francis Schuckardt?

{685} Do you agree that conveniently it did not even mention who founded CMRI; although it is titled *The History of CMRI*?

{686} Do you agree that CMRI was founded by a layman who later proclaimed that he received the Power of Holy Orders from a bishop consecrated in the Old Catholic sect?

An older bulletin published in 1981 by CMRI tells us that Bishop Francis Schuckardt already gave his episcopal approbation to this newly founded Congregation. The article on the CMRI website tells us Bishop Robert McKenna approved the Rule.

{687} Do you agree that this is another admission, acknowledgment, disclosure, and declaration of CMRI that Bishop Francis Schuckardt did not have any authority or jurisdiction in the Catholic Church since they reject the idea that he gave approbation to the new Congregation?

{688} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas and CMRI nevertheless want us to believe that Bishop Francis Schuckardt actually had authority and jurisdiction to found the Congregation and receive their so-called religious vows?

{689} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas, Rev. Mary James, Rev. Mary Benedict, Rev. Mary Casimir Puskorius, Rev. Francisco Redecki, Rev. Dominic Redecki, Rev. Cordova, Rev. Gerard McKee, Mother Mary Agnes, and a multitude of others who sign CMRI after their name, have never made a Religious Profession?

{690} Do you agree that after all their so-called Religious Vows were only supposedly received in the name of the Church by Bishop Francis Schuckardt whom they now admit, acknowledge, and confess had no authority or jurisdiction in the Catholic Church to receive their so-called Religious Vows?

{691} Do you agree that nevertheless they continue to deceive others and have people give them a very lot of money and other material things because they think they are actually Religious in the Catholic Church?

{692} Do you agree that the information on the CMRI website is deceiving the uneducated people into thinking that Bishop Robert McKenna actually had some kind of authority and jurisdiction in the Catholic Church?

{693} Do you agree that the deceitful Traditionalist Movement clerics will openly profess the truth that they have no authority or jurisdiction and then, for example, they deceitfully attempt to make us believe Bishop Robert McKenna actually had authority from the Catholic Church to approve CMRI?

{694} Do you agree that Bishop Robert McKenna had no authority or jurisdiction in the diocese of Spokane Washington, where the CMRI headquarters is located, or anywhere else in the world?

{695} Do you agree that the article titled *The History of CMRI* continues to bring forth deceitful doubletalk and misleading information as it implies that Bishop Thuc received extraordinary powers which gave him faculties to consecrate bishops in every diocese throughout the entire world?

{696} Do you agree that even if Bishop Thuc received extensive faculties for the country of Vietnam, he lost all his jurisdiction and faculties when he remained a member of the non-Catholic Novus Ordo sect for many, many years?

How many years does a bishop need to remain in a non-Catholic religion before CMRI will admit that he belongs to a non-Catholic church and loses all jurisdiction and faculties which he might have previously held in the Catholic Church? As late as April 15, 1981, (only 22 days before he consecrated Guerard des Lauiers on May 7, 1981) Archbishop Thuc concelebrated a Novus Ordo “mass” on Holy Thursday with the Conciliar bishop of Toulon.

{697} Do you agree that the Conciliar bishop of Toulon was a member of a non-Catholic sect and therefore himself a non-Catholic because he apostatized from the Catholic Church?

{698} Do you agree that we should acknowledge that Bishop Thuc was in the same situation as the Conciliar bishop of Toulon?

{699} Do you agree that we should NOT consider these two bishops as members of two different churches offering two different services, although they were concelebrating “mass” in the SAME church?

{700} Do you agree that it is against reason, and therefore a sin, to refuse to acknowledge that Bishop Thuc was just as much a Conciliar, non-Catholic as his friend – this non-Catholic, Conciliar bishop of Toulon?

{701} Do you agree that CMRI is following the mentality of its founder, Bishop Francis Schuckardt, as they attempt to deceive us into thinking Bishop Thuc was not in truth just as much a Conciliar, non-Catholic as his friend – this non-Catholic, Conciliar bishop of Toulon?

If you want to get another person’s understanding about CMRI; then go to https://jmjsite.com/various_topics.html and after that scroll down and read the PDF files on *Mystic Knights of Mumbo-Jumbo* by Ely Jason. Also read the talk of Bishop George Musey as transcribed by Ely Jason. Therein you will hear some of the hypocrisy, and duplicity that takes place in CMRI.

Ely Jason refers to them as being UNSCRUPULOUS.

For example, Rev. Mary Benedict Hughes, CMRI, said at the public meeting of the Community late in the evening in the gymnasium on April 22, 1985: “**I personally have absolutely no doubts whatsoever about the first ordination: NONE!**” (Speaking about his ordination from Bishop Francis Schuckardt in 1979)

Rev. Mary Benedict Hughes, CMRI, continued and said at the public meeting of the Community: “And so poor Father Mary James ... He knew nothing of this! So I am not normally the one to beat around the bush, so I called Father in my room about three hours ago or so. I said, ‘Father, tomorrow morning you, Father Denis, and I are going to be conditionally ordained; I just want you to know!’ And he accepted it as he accepts everything else, in a beautiful attitude.”

In the talk at that same meeting April 22, 1985, Bishop George Musey said he had **NO DOUBTS** about the validity of the ordinations from Bishop Francis Schuckardt, and yet he conditionally ordained them the next morning.

{702} Do you agree that since poor Father Mary James “knew nothing of this” conditional ordination by Bishop George Musey that would take place the next morning until about three hours before the meeting; that Father Mary James had **no** doubts about the validity of his ordination from Bishop Francis Schuckardt at the time he accepted another conditional ordination?

Did you know that Father Denis Philomena Marie, Father Mary James, Father Raphael Marie, and Father Mary Benedict were all continuing to function as if they had valid orders from Bishop Francis by offering Holy Mass, hearing confessions, and dispensing Sacraments right up until that public meeting April 22, 1985 (the night before they received conditional ordination) – which is a public declaration that ALL of them would say the same as Father Mary Benedict: “**I personally have absolutely no doubts whatsoever about the first ordination: NONE**”

Did you know that John Ellis (also known as, Father Raphael Marie, CMRI) was also ordained to the priesthood by Bishop Francis Schuckardt September 24, 1977 – that is to say, if anybody received a valid ordination from Bishop Francis Schuckardt?

Did you know that Father Raphael Marie, CMRI did not accept or receive any kind of conditional ordination from Bishop George Musey?

Did you know that nevertheless Father Raphael Marie continued to offer Mass and hear confessions in the CMRI community AFTER the other priests were conditionally ordained?

{703} Do you agree that such facts only give the absolute proof that apparently no clerics or lay people in the CMRI community had doubts about the Holy Orders from Bishop Francis Schuckardt?

{704} Do you agree that because no priests had doubts about the validity or the Orders from Bishop Francis Schuckardt, and because Bishop George Musey stated publicly that he had no doubts; that such facts actually leave GREAT doubts that they had the proper dispositions to receive a valid ordination from Bishop George Musey?

{705} Do you agree that Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Orders put an indelible character on the soul, and can only be received once?

{706} Do you agree that when someone says publicly (either in words or by facts): “**I personally have absolutely no doubts whatsoever about the first ordination: NONE**”; that he is either lying publicly or telling the truth?

{707} Do you agree that under the circumstances we should believe and judge that the CMRI clerics and Bishop George Musey were telling the truth?

{708} Do you agree that because Rev. Mary Benedict, (and the other CMRI priests) had **absolutely no doubts whatsoever about the first ordination: NONE** that their receiving conditional ordination the very next morning was a grave sacrilege in which they crucified unto themselves again the Lord Jesus Christ?

Go hear the MP3 files and read the articles. You will learn a lot of things that apparently you do not know about at this time. I will also encourage you to go and read *My Petition for Spiritual Help* and *My Letter to Bishop Giles*. You can find them in printed form and as MP3 files from the hyperlinks on the homepage at <https://jmjsite.com>.

Bishop Pivarunas continues with his article when commenting on *My Petition for Spiritual Help*:

“According to his own position, he cannot consider himself a member of the Mystical Body of Christ. After all, who absolved him from his membership in the Vatican II Church? To whom did he abjure his error of being associated with and ordained by Francis Schuckardt? Let him tell us the

name of the bishop **with jurisdiction** who received him back into the Catholic Church. After nearly thirty years, he cannot name him.”

{709} Do you agree that no bishop with ordinary or delegated or supplied jurisdiction absolved Bishop Pivarunas, and the majority of the CMRI people from their membership in the Vatican II Church?

{710} Do you agree that absolutely nobody even ATTEMPTED to absolve the “religious” Brothers and Sisters and the laity associated with Bishop Francis Schuckardt after they split company with his non-Catholic sect; or as in the case of the majority of them, from their membership in the Vatican II Church?

Have you EVER heard of even one “religious” sister or even one lay person who abjured their errors and was received into the Catholic Church after being associated with Bishop Francis Schuckardt and the CMRI community? Bishop Pivarunas should have access to the Church records. Let him provide the papers of all the CMRI community members who abjured their errors for being associated with Bishop Francis Schuckardt and the CMRI community! Those Church records should show the name of the person who abjured, the date of the abjuration, who the two witnesses were, and the name of the priest or bishop **who had jurisdiction** to receive that abjuration and restore them to the Catholic faith. I challenge Bishop Pivarunas to make these Church records public! After all these many years since Bishop Francis Schuckardt left the Spokane area, Bishop Pivarunas cannot provide the least proof that even ONE lay person abjured their errors to any priest **with jurisdiction** for being a member of the community founded by Bishop Francis Schuckardt!

{711} Do you agree that no one with authority and **jurisdiction** has properly received them back into the Catholic Church?

{712} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas CORRECTLY teaches the Catholic doctrine that I need to have some bishop or priest with **jurisdiction** to absolve me from my membership in the Vatican II Church before I can prove my membership in the EXTERNAL forum?

It is a fact that Bishop Francis Schuckardt, or one of the priests he “ordained” or supposedly provided with delegated jurisdiction, such as Father Clement, attempted to receive not only my Abjuration of Error, but also that of every other person who came to his community who previously had membership in the Vatican II Church.

{713} Do you agree that therefore Bishop Pivarunas has just provided the proof that no one in the Traditionalist Movement had ordinary or delegated jurisdiction either from the Church, or delegated directly from Jesus Christ Himself; and that is why they cannot bring anyone back into the Catholic Church by means of the Abjuration of Error?

{714} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas has correctly informed us that there is an absolute need for everyone who belonged to the CMRI sect or the Novus Ordo sect to be received back into the Catholic Church by means of the Abjuration of Error and Profession of Faith, as explained in the Liturgy of the Catholic Church?

{715} Do you agree that when Bishop Pivarunas wrote: “Let him tell us the name of the bishop **with jurisdiction** who received him back into the Catholic Church”; that Bishop Pivarunas showed it is necessary for Patrick Henry to find a bishop **with jurisdiction** to receive him back into the Catholic Church in the external forum?

{716} Do you agree that because it is an *article of faith* and **in fact, a DOGMA of faith** that the authority and jurisdiction of bishops only comes to them through the Roman Pontiff, that no bishop or priest has ever had ordinary or delegated jurisdiction delegated directly to them from Christ Himself; and that it is necessary therefore to find the bishop **with the jurisdiction** that was received through the Roman Pontiff?

{717} Do you agree that the truth is that no bishop or priest in the entire Traditionalist Movement knows of another bishop or priest that has jurisdiction that was received from the Roman Pontiff?

{718} Do you agree that if there was such a thing as a Novus Ordo bishop or traditionalist bishop **with jurisdiction** that could receive me back into the Catholic Church; that I could very easily have found him?

{719} Do you agree that therefore Bishop Pivarunas has just proved by his statement that there are no traditionalist bishops or Novus Ordo bishops with ordinary, delegated, or supplied jurisdiction?

Now remember what the traditionalist clerics told us: in the true Church of Christ we cannot be asked to believe contradictory beliefs ... the Church cannot give us false doctrine or contradict Herself ... And so if there is a contradiction, we have to say, "That cannot be the true Church of Christ" ... We have to stick with what the Church taught before, because the truth does NOT change with the times. We hold to the SAME EXACT teachings that Jesus Christ gave in His time. There is no evolution of dogma. There is no NEW understanding of doctrine in a way that contradicts what was previously defined" "The Catholic faith is One. It never changes. So we never have something that will be an apparent contradiction. We don't have the Church consistently teaching something for 1900 odd years, and all of a sudden we are told that is no longer true! The Church made a mistake, and now we know better! That could never take place!" "Because the Society of Saint Pius X position is impossible, it cannot be pleasing to God! Something cannot be pleasing to God if it is **against reason!** Reason is our connection to morality! Whatever is moral, is connected to God's will by reason. If it is **unreasonable**, it cannot possibly be in accordance with God's will! All moral theology is based on that; the connection of what you do to right reason based on the authority; on principles that are revealed by God, – the Ten Commandments."

{720} Do you agree that St. Thomas told us that whatever is against reason is a sin?

{721} Do you agree that the statement alone of Bishop Pivarunas that I need to look for this Bishop with JURISDICTION, would completely justify me in writing *My Petition for Spiritual Help* and this letter in my search for that bishop with jurisdiction?

{722} Do you agree that it is against reason, and contrary to justice, and presenting contrary beliefs for Bishop Pivarunas and the other traditionalist clerics to first of all condemn me for not finding the bishop; and secondly to condemn me for looking for one?

{723} Do you agree that it is against reason and contrary to justice to teach that I am guilty for doing what all the other members of CMRI have done; and yet none of the others are guilty, although they committed the same crimes of belonging to that non-Catholic sect?

{724} Do you agree that the logical conclusion is that if I am not a member of the Mystical Body in the external forum, then neither are any of the members that belonged to the Novus Ordo or CMRI or any other part of the Traditionalist Movement – since none of us have ever found a bishop with jurisdiction in either the Traditionalist Movement or the Novus Ordo sects?

Reflect on the following paragraph by Rev. Anthony Cekada, taken from his article on: *Mt. St. Michael & CMRI: Brief Overview*

Here we must give credit where credit is due. On the central issues — the New Mass, for instance, and the defection *en masse* of the hierarchy from Catholic teaching — the members of the St. Michael's group were right. They also preserved intact all those traditions and practices which are now a part of the religious and devotional life of every traditional Catholic chapel in the world. This they did, please note, at a time when most of us — even the group's most vocal opponents — were still going to the *Novus Ordo*, defending Paul VI, and urging "conservative" interpretations of the disastrous Vatican II changes.

{725} Do you agree that Rev. Anthony Cekada is asking everyone to please note that Bishop Thuc, Bishop Dolan, Bishop Sanborn, Bishop Kelly, himself, and the others of the nine priests who were expelled from SSPX were still members of the Novus Ordo for many years after I totally separated myself from them in March 1971?

"Oh Helloooooo!!!"

Rev. clergy and members of the Traditionalist Movement; you have a very serious problem!

You need to apply to yourself the principles expounded, illustrated, and explained by Bishop Pivarunas:

According to your own position, you cannot consider yourselves as member of the Mystical Body of Christ. After all, who absolved you from your membership in the Vatican II Church? Tell us the name of the bishop **with ordinary jurisdiction** who received you back into the Catholic Church.

{726} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas has thus presented a big contradiction for himself and his Roman collared friends, associates, and partners in the Traditionalist Movement?

{727} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas is in reality actually likewise teaching that according to his own statements and position; Bishop Thuc, Bishop Dolan, Bishop Sanborn, Bishop Kelly, Rev. Anthony Cekada and the others of the nine priests who were expelled from SSPX cannot consider themselves as members of the Mystical Body of Christ?

{728} Do you agree that after all, no one absolved them from their membership in the Vatican II Church?

{729} Do you agree that neither Bishop Pivarunas or any other cleric or member of the Traditionalist Movement can tell us the name of the bishop **with ordinary jurisdiction** who received him back into the Catholic Church?

{730} Do you agree that Bishop Thuc, Bishop Pivarunas, Bishop Dolan, Bishop Sanborn, Bishop Kelly, Rev. Anthony Cekada and the others of the nine priests who were expelled from SSPX cannot present the Church records and documents proving they Abjured their Errors and were received back into the Catholic Church by a bishop **with ordinary jurisdiction**?

{731} Do you agree that it is a contradiction and certainly against reason to say 1st: “Patrick Henry needs to tell us the name of the bishop **with jurisdiction** who received him back into the Catholic Church”; but contrariwise 2nd: “Every member in the Traditionalist Movement does not even need to be received back into the Catholic Church after their membership in the non-Catholic, schismatic church”?

Remember: “The Church cannot give us false doctrine or contradict Herself ... And so if there is a contradiction, we have to say, “That cannot be the true Church of Christ.” “Something cannot be pleasing to God if it is **against reason!** If it is **unreasonable**, it cannot possibly be in accordance with God's will!”

{732} Do you agree that the double standards, the doubletalk, and two-facedness promoted by Bishop Pivarunas and the Traditionalist Movement clerics is a manifestation of their hypocrisy, duplicity, and insincerity of teaching and applying the truths of the Catholic faith to everyone involved?

Bishop Pivarunas continues with his article:

In the very publication of his article, he violated Canon 1394 which requires the approval of such writings by a bishop **with jurisdiction**. His article has no *Imprimatur!* Does he think himself above Church law that he can thus disregard it?

{733} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas has never proved that he knows a bishop with jurisdiction?

{734} Do you agree that the last two pages of *My Petition for Spiritual Help* explains why I had permission to write *My Petition for Spiritual Help*?

{735} Do you agree that the truth of the matter is that Bishop Pivarunas does not have any more ordinary or delegated jurisdiction in the Catholic Church than Patrick Henry?

{736} Do you agree that neither of us have ever had any ordinary or delegated jurisdiction either directly from Jesus Christ, or from anyone else in the Catholic Church who himself had ordinary or delegated jurisdiction?

{737} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas writes his articles in violation of Canon 1394 without permission?

{738} Do you agree that nobody gives an Imprimatur to any of his articles?

{739} Do you agree that nobody gave the priests; Rev. Francisco Redecki, CMRI, and Rev. Dominic Redecki, CMRI, permission to write *Tumultuous Times*? The book contains no Imprimatur, Nihil Obstat, no ecclesiastical approval. Do they think themselves above Church law that he can thus disregard Church Law?

{740} Do you agree that their book would absolutely violate Canon 1394?

{741} Do you agree that nobody gave Rev. Anthony Cekada permission to write any of his articles? I challenge everyone to bring forth even one article written by Rev. Anthony Cekada that contains an imprimatur by a bishop **with jurisdiction!** Does he think himself above Church law that he can thus disregard it?

{742} Do you agree that no bishop with jurisdiction provides an Imprimatur to their books and articles?

I request Bishop Pivarunas to bring forth at least one article and publication written by any Traditionalist Movement bishop or priest that contains the required imprimatur! Bishop Pivarunas has written many articles

concerning the Catholic faith, yet not one of them contains an imprimatur! Does he think himself above Church law that he can thus disregard it?

{743} Do you agree that it is another proof that Bishop Pivarunas is part of the Illusionary church to present the idea that Patrick Henry violated Canon 1394 which requires the approval of such writings by a bishop with jurisdiction; while at the same time neither Bishop Pivarunas or any other Roman collared friend of his ever receives approval for their writings from a bishop with jurisdiction?

{744} Do you agree that it is the Illusionary church that deceitfully gives the impression Patrick Henry needs an *imprimatur* to write a response to a friend's email and request spiritual help to understand how any Roman collared fellow functioning today in the Traditionalist Movement is able to give an *Imprimatur*?

Bishop Pivarunas continues with his article in paragraph C:

In his article, he attempted to interpret Canon Law and in particular Canon 209. Surely he must realize that he had no authority to interpret Canon Law. According to Canon 17, only the Pope for the entire Church, and a bishop for **his diocese**, enjoy the authority to issue authoritative interpretations.

Where did I interpret Canon Law and in particular Canon 209? I quoted from a book: *Supplied Jurisdiction According to Canon 209* by Father Francis Sigismund Miaskiewicz, with a 1940 Imprimatur. After quoting from this book with an Imprimatur, I asked questions. Do you think I was interpreting what Father Francis Sigismund Miaskiewicz wrote, as I just asked my readers if they believed what Father wrote?

Bishop Pivarunas just wrote: "According to Canon 17, only the Pope for the entire Church, and a bishop for **his diocese**, enjoy the authority to issue authoritative interpretations."

{745} Do you agree that it is the Illusionary church that deceitfully leaves the impression Bishop Pivarunas, and other Traditionalist Movement clerics such as Rev. Anthony Cekada, enjoy the authority to interpret Canon Law?

{746} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas presents an illusion as he deceitfully attempts to make people think he is a Catholic bishop **with a diocese** and with authority to interpret Canon Law?

Review the popes quoted and the information given on pages 29 and 30 of *My Petition for Spiritual Help*.

{747} Do you agree that information proves the truth that Bishop Pivarunas is an intruder bishop without a diocese and therefore, according to his own statement he does not enjoy the least authority to interpret Canon Law?

{748} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas blames me for interpreting Canon Laws when he has committed far worse crimes in this area than I committed, simply by deceitfully presenting the illusion to make people think he has some kind of authority as if he was a **Catholic** bishop **with a diocese**?

My Petition for Spiritual Help quotes Pope Pius VI, in *Charitas*, as he expounds the true teachings of the Church:

"We therefore severely forbid the... illicitly consecrated men... to assume episcopal jurisdiction or any other authority for the guidance of souls since they have never received it."

The Catholic Church teaches very clearly that Bishop Pivarunas and the other Traditionalist Movement Bishops are illicitly consecrated. Not one of them has a Catholic diocese, and Pope Pius VI clearly teaches they may not assume episcopal jurisdiction or any other authority for the guidance of souls.

{749} Do you agree that apparently Bishop Pivarunas is either claiming to be the pope of the Catholic Church or at least a Catholic bishop with a diocese, since apparently he claims he has the necessary authority to interpret Canon Law?

{750} Do you agree that because no Traditionalist Movement bishop has a diocese, the conclusion would be that Bishop Pivarunas claims to be the Pope of the Catholic Church?

{751} Do you agree that according to the correct teaching presented by Bishop Pivarunas only the Pope for the entire Church, and a bishop for **his diocese**, enjoy the authority to issue authoritative interpretations of canon laws?

{752} Do you agree that all of the bishops in the Traditionalist Movement present the great illusion that they enjoy the authority to issue authoritative interpretations of canon laws?

{753} Do you agree that the true fact is this not even one Traditionalist Movement member who claims to be a bishop is actually a bishop for **his diocese** – because not even one of them actually has a diocese?

{754} Do you agree that the logical conclusion would be that each bishop in the Illusionary Traditionalist Movement church therefore must be claiming that he is the Pope for the entire Church?

{755} Do you agree that you should overcome the delusion and illusion, now knowing that you were deceived by the Illusionary Traditionalist Movement that presented itself as if it was the true Church – although it has as many popes as it has bishops?

Bishop Pivarunas continues with his article in paragraph D:

After thirty years, he still has not found a bishop with **ordinary** JURISDICTION to receive him back into the Church. Before he preaches to others as if he possessed an apostolic mission, he really should return to the Catholic Church himself.

{756} Do you agree that the same applies to Bishop Pivarunas?

{757} Do you agree Bishop Pivarunas has yet to find a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction to receive him back into the Church?

{758} Do you agree that before Bishop Pivarunas preaches to others and continues to fraudulently deceive them with his illusions as if he was a Catholic bishop that has been sent by the Catholic Church with authority, mission, and jurisdiction, he really should return to the Catholic Church himself?

{759} Do you agree that if there was such a thing as a bishop with ordinary jurisdiction in the Traditionalist Movement, that Bishop Pivarunas should answer the questions in *My Petition for Spiritual Help* and to this letter; to let me know who and where that Bishop is located on earth who has ordinary jurisdiction from a true successor of St. Peter?

{760} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas has thus presented the truth and the proof that there is no bishop with **ordinary** JURISDICTION in the Traditionalist Movement or the Novus Ordo?

{761} Do you agree that the Catholic Church clearly teaches that if a bishop does not have ordinary jurisdiction he cannot delegate or supply jurisdiction to priests or anyone else?

{762} Do you agree that it is just one more part of their Illusionary church to sarcastically, sardonically, and scornfully condemn Patrick Henry for not having found a bishop with ordinary jurisdiction who can receive those who have been led astray back into the Catholic Church; while at the same time no cleric in the Traditionalist Movement has found such a bishop?

{763} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas is admitting the truth that because no one in the Traditionalist Movement has found this bishop with **ordinary** JURISDICTION; that it follows with correct logic that none of them are members of the Catholic Church in the external forum?

{764} Do you agree that this just proves that their entire operations, maneuverings, and undertakings are nothing more than an Illusionary church?

Bishop Pivarunas continues with his article:

How sad for Patrick Henry to attempt to mislead others to a dead end: to be a stay-home Catholic without the Mass and Sacraments! Fr. Cekada cleverly identified those who claim to have a monopoly on salvation with the title, “Follow me or die.” Patrick Henry’s opinion is more appropriately, “Follow me and die.”

{765} Do you agree that Rev. Anthony Cekada explained the truth in his sermon “*Why Can’t We All Just Get Along*” when he stated: “**You can get to heaven without the Latin Mass; but you can’t get to heaven without the Catholic Faith**”?

{766} Do you agree that after reminding us “**You can get to heaven without the Latin Mass; but you can’t get to heaven without the Catholic Faith**”, Rev. Anthony Cekada went on to explain why SSPX, SSPV, and the Feeneyites do not have or hold the Catholic faith?

{767} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn presented sufficient evidence that there have been substantial changes in the Catholic Church because of those bishops who brought about the existence of the Vatican II, Novus Ordo religion with their signatures, promulgation, and institution of this new non-Catholic religion?

{768} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn provided sufficient evidence to prove you cannot save your immortal soul in churches that do not teach the entire Catholic faith?

{769} Do you agree that it is very doubtful that you will answer all the questions asked even in this letter; and at the same time conclude you can save your immortal soul in all the branches of the Traditionalist Movement?

{770} Do you agree that it is doubtful that anyone who wears the Roman collar will ever have the courage or charity to provide their answers to the questions asked in *My Petition for Spiritual Help* and in this letter?

{771} Do you agree that sufficient evidence has been provided in this letter to prove that no segment, branch, group, society, or community of the Traditionalist Movement or Novus Ordo possess all the necessary Marks of the Catholic Church?

{772} Do you agree that because none of them qualify as belonging to the Catholic Church, nobody can save their soul in those non-Catholic religions – simply because they do not have the Catholic faith?

{773} Do you agree that the only option left is to do what Rev. Anthony Cekada advised us to do, and stay-home and remain a Catholic without the Mass and Sacraments?

{774} Do you agree that the Catholic Church teaches us not to attend Mass and receive Sacraments when we know they are not licit?

{775} Do you agree that *My Petition for Spiritual Help* provided a number of quotes to prove the clerics in the Traditionalist Movement do not have the Four Marks of the Catholic Church?

{776} Do you agree that you should not follow non-Catholics unless you want to die spiritually?

Please read again *My Petition for Spiritual Help*, especially for now the part on page 16. There we can find that Saint Thomas Aquinas teaches us that those who receive Sacraments from Traditionalist Movement clerics: “do not receive grace, because they sin in so doing, except in case of Baptism...”

Although Bishop Pivarunas refuses to believe and accept that truth as explained by Pope Pius XII, the truth remains the truth. But Pope Pius XII clearly explains in his encyclical letter, *Ad Apostolorum Principis*, that Bishop Pivarunas and other Traditionalist Movement clerics are excommunicated and cut off from the Church. Please remember that St. Thomas Aquinas wrote in the *Supplement*, Q. 19, Art. 5, Reply Obj. 3:

“We might also reply that by members of the Dove he means all who are not cut off from the Church, for those who receive the sacraments from them, receive grace, whereas those who receive the sacraments from those who are cut off from the Church, do not receive grace, because they sin in so doing, except in case of Baptism, which, in cases of necessity, may be received even from one who is excommunicated.”

{777} Do you agree that Catholics must either accept what Saint Thomas Aquinas and Pope Pius XII teach or believe the **new**, contrary, and opposite doctrine of Bishop Pivarunas and the Traditionalist Movement clerics?

Remember that the statements of Bishop Sanborn when explaining what Pope Pius XII said in his encyclical letter, “the power of the Pope is the same as the authority of Christ” and “the authority of the Pope is the same as the authority of Christ”, are the correct teaching according to Catholic doctrine.

{778} Do you agree that it is the authority of Jesus Christ that they reject who refuse to accept the truth explained by Pope Pius XII in *Ad Apostolorum Principis*?

“No one can lawfully confer episcopal consecration unless he has received the mandate of the Apostolic See. Consequently, if consecration of this kind is being done contrary to all right and law, and by this crime the Unity of the Church is being seriously attacked, an excommunication reserved specialissimo modo to the Apostolic See has been established which is automatically incurred by the consecrator and by anyone who has received consecration irresponsibly conferred.”

{779} Do you agree that the Catholic Church when guided by God the Holy Ghost under Pope Pius XII was teaching truths concerning faith and morals to the Universal Church in *Ad Apostolorum Principis*?

{780} Do you agree that the Catholic Church is guided by God the Holy Ghost and therefore, *never* makes a mistake when She teaches truths concerning faith and morals to the Universal Church as expressed by Pope Pius XII, the successor of St. Peter?

Remember the **truths** taught by Bishop Pivarunas when he was quoting Scripture and the popes: “He who hears you hears me.” “He who does not believe what you teach will be condemned.” “In the Apostolic See the Catholic Religion has always been kept unsullied and its teachings kept holy.” “This See of St. Peter **always** remains untainted by any error.” “If the living *Magisterium*, the teaching authority of the Church, could in any way be false, an evident contradiction follows; because then God Himself would be the author of error.”

{781} Do you agree that from their own teachings we can conclude: He who hears Pope Pius XII hears Jesus Christ; Who now with Divine authority proclaims that, “Because of your crime of seriously attacking the **Unity** of the Church for being consecrated and for consecrating without the mandate of the Apostolic See; I, Jesus Christ, now declare you excommunicated and cut off from the Catholic Church”?

{782} Do you agree that because “He who does not believe what Pope Pius XII taught will be condemned”; that they can expect to be condemned (unless they repent) who do not believe that, “Because of your crime of seriously attacking the **Unity** of the Church for being consecrated and for consecrating without the mandate of the Apostolic See; I, Jesus Christ, now declare you excommunicated and cut off from the Catholic Church”?

{783} Do you agree that because; This See of St. Peter **always** remains untainted by any error and because the living *Magisterium*, the teaching authority of the Church, cannot in any way be false that they are not Catholics faithful to tradition who do spiritual gymnastics and have certain laws cease to be binding as they preach their deceitful tricks that do away with the very teachings of Jesus Christ and the Catholic Doctrine?

{784} Do you agree that God Himself would be the author of error if His words are NOT true that the Unity of the Church is being seriously attacked by the cornucopia sects with their totally contradictory doctrines; as they reject the teaching authority of Jesus Christ through His valid Vicars?

{785} Do you agree that according to *The Oath Against Modernism* that all bishops and priests profess before their ordination; that they break, violate, and contravene that *Oath* by **rejecting** the need for the papal mandate, because they profess CONTRARY to *The Oath Against Modernism* that doctrine and dogma **may be tailored according to what seems better and more suited to the culture of each age?**

Pope Benedict XV in *Ad Beatissimi* tells us what the Catholic faith is:

“The Catholic Faith is such that nothing can be added to it, nothing taken away. Either it is held in its entirety, or **rejected** totally. This is the Catholic faith, which, unless a man believes faithfully and firmly, he cannot be saved.”

{786} Do you agree that, The Catholic Faith at the time of the death of Pope Pius XII was that consecrating and consecrated bishops are excommunicated unless they have the necessary papal mandate; and that nothing can be taken away or changed during the vacancy of the Apostolic See?

{787} Do you agree that the new theology and teaching of Bishop Pivarunas is exactly opposite of St. Thomas Aquinas and Pope Pius XII?

{788} Do you believe Saint Thomas Aquinas and Pope Pius XII are teaching the truth, and their teaching leads to eternal life?

{789} Do you agree that no one should receive sacraments from clerics who are cut off from the Church, since they cannot receive grace thereby?

{790} Do you agree that those who receive sacraments from these clerics who are cut off from the Church sin in so doing?

{791} Do you agree that mortal sin is death to the soul?

{792} Do you agree that therefore, the truth of the matter is that such clerics as Bishop Pivarunas very appropriately proclaim, “Follow me and die?”

Bishop Pivarunas continues with his article:

His accusation that Archbishop Thuc became a heretic by signing the documents of Vatican II manifests his lack of knowledge of Canon Law and his “Schuckardt mentality” (one which arbitrarily and irresponsibly accused others of heresy). According to Canon 1325, a necessary condition for heresy is pertinacity — “that is with conscious and intentional resistance to the authority of God and the Church” (*Canon Law*, Bouscaren/Ellis C.1325). Furthermore, according to Canon 2228, “a penalty established by law is not incurred unless the crime was perfect in its kind according to the proper meaning of the words of the law” (Canon Law Bouscaren/Ellis).

Patrick Henry’s accusation of heresy against Archbishop Thuc failed to take into account “pertinacity” as is required by Canon 1325, the effect of which would make it fall short of a crime “perfect in its kind according to the proper meaning of the words of the law” as required by Canon 2228. The unique problem with the Second Vatican Council is that it had the appearance of an Ecumenical Council; it is possible that bishops submitted to it in good faith, not wanting to oppose what appeared to be the “Magisterium” of the Church. Archbishop Thuc did not “with conscious and intentional resistance to the authority of God and to the Church” deny any doctrine of Divine and Catholic Faith. When Vatican II was subsequently implemented, it became clear that there was a serious departure from the Catholic Faith, and traditional bishops and priests, in defense of the Faith, exposed these errors.

Who is here giving Bishop Pivarunas authority to interpret Canon Law? He acknowledges that he does not have a diocese and he reminded us that: “According to Canon 17, only the Pope for the entire Church, and a bishop for his diocese, enjoy the authority to issue authoritative interpretations.”

{793} Do you agree that because Bishop Pivarunas interprets Canon law he must be claiming to be the pope for the entire Catholic Church – since he must demand the truth be known that he is not a bishop with a diocese?

{794} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas cannot claim he is ignorant of Canon 17, since he quotes it in his writings?

{795} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas also knows and acknowledges that bishops only receive a diocese from a true successor of St. Peter?

{796} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas probably rejects the idea, concept, and impression that he and the other Traditionalist Movement clerics have acquired, attained, and developed the “Schuckardt mentality”; knowing that Schuckardt also claimed to be the Pope for the entire Church?

{797} Do you agree that the only logical conclusion is that neither Bishop Pivarunas nor any other Traditionalist Movement clerics enjoy the authority to issue authoritative interpretations of Canon Law?

{798} Do you agree that from his own statement and testimony everyone should conclude that Bishop Pivarunas cannot prove any member of the Novus Ordo is not Catholic?

{799} Do you agree that according to Bishop Pivarunas all the bishops, priests, and lay people do not have PERTINACITY in regard to their non-Catholic beliefs?

{800} Do you agree that they all submitted to the Novus Ordo in good faith and therefore they are all Catholics who kept the faith according to Bishop Pivarunas?

{801} Do you agree that this is the main reason why most all Traditionalist Movement clerics do not require those coming from the Novus Ordo to abjure their errors and profess the true faith when they become members of the Traditionalist Movement?

I encourage you to go listen to the MP3 files from the original cassette tapes of *Another Evident Contradiction*. You can hear them under the AUDIO BOOKS link at <https://www.jmjsite.com>. The need for the Abjuration of Error was explained at length on tape two, side two. The following is part of what you will hear on those tapes, now as MP3 files:

Please allow me to explain the necessity of the abjuration of error from the realistic point of view in a parable form. We have four men who were born June 21, 1946. They are 40 years old today. [NOTE: *they would have been 40 years old the day I recorded this parable.*] The first one is Joseph Marie Catholic. He was baptized one hour after his birth. He has been a true Catholic since the time of his baptism. He has never

belonged in any way to the church of Vatican II, the conciliar church. He has never lost his faith in any way. If he can find someone today who administers valid and licit sacraments; Joseph Marie Catholic, indeed, has no need of the abjuration of error. Next we have Mr. John Paul Conciliar. He was also born a Catholic, and baptized shortly after birth; and raised as a Catholic. He went to Catholic schools; then when Vatican Council II came along, John Paul Conciliar went right along with all the error and heresy. He has remained in it. If today, on his 40th birthday, he could find someone who was administering valid and licit sacraments; John Paul Conciliar indeed, would need to take the abjuration of error because he has belonged to a non-Catholic church. The third man is Marcel Pius X. He belongs to the church headed by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre and the Society of Saint Pius X. He is only a right wing member of the same church that John Paul Conciliar belongs to. Therefore, to my way of thinking, if Marcel Pius X wanted to start receiving true sacraments today, he would also need to take the abjuration of error. The fourth man is a real person I knew in the military, named Philip Niemi. He was a Lutheran. We talked religion at different times, and we discussed even the creed that he prays. He says the words of the same exact creed that I do as a Catholic. He even says: "I believe in the holy Catholic Church." He really did not stop to think what it meant until I talked to him that night. But anyway, here is Philip Niemi always raised up as a Lutheran. If today he corresponded with enough grace to see his error and wanted to join the true Church; and somehow he could find a priest that had the faculties to dispense valid and licit sacraments, and absolve Philip from his errors; yes indeed, because he was a non-Catholic, Phillip Niemi would need to take the abjuration of error. Now I think, at least possibly, Rev. Robert Chicoine and Bishop George Musey and the priests connected with him at CMRI; I think they would agree that this Philip Niemi would need to take the abjuration of error. And yet, they try and tell me that Marcel Pius X and John Paul Conciliar do not! There is the great evident contradiction in my mind! They are saying that the Lutheran church is a false church. But they are trying to tell us that the Conciliar church, now headed by John Paul II, is not an heretical church! And that the church headed by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre is not an heretical church! And yet, they will tell you that it is an heretical church! What more can I say? Maybe kind of like what they answered in the past. This John Paul Conciliar did not really realize that he was being led into error and heresy. He thought he was in the right church. So did Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre's followers, they are mixed up. Well, the answer should be obvious. So did Philip Niemi. He thought he belonged to the right church. He is searching around. If you say John Paul Conciliar does not know he is in a false church; then you are saying in effect that God does not give sufficient grace to everyone to save their immortal soul. That is an absolute denial of the basic doctrine of the Catholic faith.

With that being said, I will now let you hear what Bishop George Musey has to say about the abjuration of error; from our phone conversation January 2, 1986; after I had come back from seeing Father Fouhy at Musey's request.

PATRICK: Do you administer the abjuration of error to many people?

BISHOP MUSEY: No. I do not think it is actually necessary in most cases. In most cases it is actually covered with the absolutions in the confessional anyway; with absolutions for censures and so on. And so I have not used it to help Novus Ordo people. I think their situation is a little bit unique. They are not people who have been actually raised in heresy in a non-Catholic religion or something. These people were actually raised in the Catholic faith. Later on the Church went into apostasy. It does not mean that most of these people actually changed their beliefs. The ones that I have met mostly have retained their beliefs, and that is why they wind up coming back to the true faith. They have never lost the true faith; they have just not been able to find a place where they could worship. And they did not understand what the Novus Ordo Missae was, and things of this sort. But as far as being heretics; they were not. They have not held doctrines that were in conflict with the Catholic faith. They have unknowingly and unwittingly taken part in false worship at the Novus Ordo Missae; but that is covered in confessional absolution anyway.

PATRICK: Did you ever take the abjuration of error yourself?

BISHOP MUSEY: The abjuration of error – I had no reason to.

[End of that part of the conversation with Bishop George Musey]

I am going to just comment: Let us take another person that was born in 1956. He would have just been reaching the use of reason when the Vatican Council was getting, you might say, well under way. And so he

was, to my mind, totally raised up in a false religion. I do not understand any more reason why he should not take the abjuration of error than this Philip Niemi. And yet, this is saying Bishop George Musey and Rev. Thomas C. Fouhy have never met anybody that was younger than 30 years old that wanted to join up with their so-called true Church. So let us take one more person and call him Mr. Lax Catholic Fall-a-way. He was raised a Catholic, and then he fell away into becoming a Lutheran; and by the grace of God he wants to return to the true Church before his death. Does not Mr. Lax Catholic Fall-a-way need to take the abjuration of error? What is the real difference though between his status of falling into the Lutheran church; and another lax Catholic who allowed himself to fall into the false religion of Vatican Council II, now headed by John Paul II. Or to fall into the heretical, schismatic church; as Musey himself and Lefebvre himself correctly defined the Novus Ordo church. Or to fall into the Lefebvre movement. It is all NOT the Catholic Church! It is NOT the church in which I hope to die! And if it is not the true Church, then why do not people have to take the abjuration of error when they get involved in it?

{802} Do you agree that according to Bishop Pivarunas and Bishop Musey the Novus Ordo people are already members of the Catholic Church?

At this time let us learn more about the illusionary, contradictory Traditionalist Movement sects from the talk of Bishop George Musey on June 19, 1986 when he was speaking to the CMRI Sisters about clerics in the Novus Ordo religion as he was explaining Canon 188 section 4. You can hear these audio files on *Which Bishop Should I Follow* tape one side one:

“Now the Church does not go into worrying about whether he is a formal heretic or a material heretic. And it does not really go into worrying about whether he is a **PERTINACIOUS** heretic, or what we might call in Texas, a downright hard case heretic or something like this. It does not go into all those distinctions for which canon law is famous for going into... It blurts out a marvelous, definite point. If **any** cleric, regardless of his **rank**, regardless of what title or **position** he might hold in the Church should publicly embrace heresy; then he loses his position and whatever titles, beneficiaries, and so on that he holds in the Church by tacit resignation!”

{803} Do you agree that the Church does not go into worrying about whether the Bishops who function as clerics in the Novus Ordo are formal heretics or material heretics...the Catholic Church does not really go into worrying about whether the Novus Ordo clerics are pertinacious heretics, or what we might call in Texas, downright hard case heretics or something like this...when they publicly embraced heresy they lost their position in the Church by tacit resignation?

Bishop George Musey goes on to explain about how all the bishops who belonged to the Novus Ordo religion since its beginning, publicly embrace heresy for belonging to this new, schismatic church.

“The same thing has happened in the Catholic Church. We have people being led into a new church; the church which Lefebvre himself has **CORRECTLY** called a **schismatic** church. The church which he correctly identified as NOT the Catholic Church. Yet he himself is bringing these people into that church.”

{804} Do you agree that both Bishop George Musey and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre **CORRECTLY** called the Novus Ordo a **schismatic** church?

{805} Do you agree that both Bishop George Musey and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre **CORRECTLY** taught the Novus Ordo church is **not** the Catholic Church?

{806} Do you agree that Bishop George Musey also said the Novus Ordo bishops lost their membership in the Catholic Church when they became members of the Novus Ordo, schismatic, non-Catholic church?

So what are we to conclude from what we have been reading? Plenty of evidence has been provided to show that the Novus Ordo bishops, and all the priests, and those attending the Novus Ordo services, especially those who signed the heretical decrees of Vatican II lost their office, authority, jurisdiction, and position in the Church when they became heretics. Nevertheless, Bishop George Musey and Bishop Pivarunas say the laypeople, priests, and bishops never became heretics although they did become heretics??? None of them are pertinacious

heretics, although they were all pertinacious, persistent, resolute, stubborn, obstinate, unchangeable, headstrong, and obdurate in their beliefs and observances of the non-Catholic, schismatic religion! What illusionary, inconsistent, paradoxical, absurd, impossible, puzzling, and self-contradictory statements they provide when they explain the Traditionalist Movement church and the Novus Ordo church!

“They are not people who have been actually raised in heresy in a non-Catholic religion or something. These people were actually raised in the Catholic faith.” [Although the same Bishop just told us “We have people being led into a new church; the church which Lefebvre himself has CORRECTLY called a **schismatic** church. The church which he correctly identified as NOT the Catholic Church”] “Later on the Church went into apostasy. It does not mean that most of these people actually changed their beliefs!” [Although they believe a non-Catholic, schismatic church is the Catholic Church. They believe the Antichrist is the Vicar of Jesus Christ. They believe the sacraments are the same; although the matter, form, and intention to make a sacrament valid have been changed in all seven sacraments of the Novus Ordo religion. They believe non-Catholic religions are means to salvation. They believe there is salvation outside of the Catholic Church. They believe Muslims and Jews worship the same God as Catholics. They believe it is all right for Protestants to receive Holy Communion in the Catholic Church. They believe it is all right for naked women to read the epistle and distribute the bread (that they call Holy Communion). They believe it is all right for any Catholic to become a Freemason. They believe it is all right to practice artificial means of birth control thus violating the natural law. They believe the voodoo religion is just as good as a Catholic religion. They believe it is all right to get married, and get an annulment; and then get married again and afterwards get another annulment; and repeat that process as much as you like. The great majority never get married they just live together as if they were married as husband and wife. When I asked Novus Ordo children in grade school and high school – and even those who graduated and were then adults – to simply name the 10 Commandments; very few of them could do it – in fact I cannot remember even one of them that could recite the 10 Commandments, let alone explain what they meant. Very few of the Novus Ordo people I know who were born after 1960 could explain things such as Ember Days, Rogation Days, the Spiritual and Corporal Works of Mercy, the Gifts and Fruits of the Holy Ghost, and the Stations of the Cross. If they believe the same as the man they call the Pope in their church, then they believe there is no God – no Catholic God. They believe that Jesus Christ is happy and pleased when people commit mortal sin. And a huge multitude of other strange beliefs contrary to what the Catholic Church teaches, are everyday manifested in the new Novus Ordo, schismatic, non-Catholic church. Nevertheless, the Traditionalist Movement bishops teach, preach, and proclaim none of them are **pertinacious** heretics; and “They have never lost the true faith.” “They have not held doctrines that were in conflict with the Catholic faith.”] “The ones that I have met mostly have retained their beliefs, and that is why they wind up coming **back** to the true faith. [But if they have retained their beliefs and never lost the Catholic faith how did they wind up coming **back** to the true faith? (Oh! Now I understand! They never did come back to the true faith, they only came back to the illusionary replacement of the True Faith known as the Traditionalist Movement!)] They have never lost the true faith; they have just not been able to find a place where they could worship. And they did not understand what the Novus Ordo Missae was, and things of this sort. [Now however, they can replace the Novus Ordo Missae with a Latin Mass by finding a place where they can worship in the Traditionalist Movement.] But as far as being heretics; they were not. [Although Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre and I told you they belonged to a non-Catholic, schismatic sect] They have not held doctrines that were in conflict with the Catholic faith.”

But now let us listen to Father Thomas Fouhy, the Vicar General of Bishop George Musey, who however does not have unity of belief with his Bishop. This recording was made during the evening meal on November 26, 1985. You can hear this conversation in the MP3 file recorded in *Another Evident Contradiction*. It is toward the end of tape two, side one.

FATHER FOUHY: “We have to give a man like Lefebvre some credit for brains. He is certainly not a fool. He stands up very much for the Catholic faith as it was; and he is hoping, he has tried I think. This is my opinion about him. Everybody does not agree with me; they do not have to. In some quarters they are talking about a failing. They are talking about a heretic – he is nothing of the kind! He has done more in Rome to keep this matter before the Vatican concerning the true Mass; and the rights of Catholics to the true Mass than anybody else in the world. Nobody else has even approached him in what he has done.”

PATRICK: “Well, then do you think Lefebvre still has his Office as an Archbishop?”

FATHER FOUHY: “I do not know, this is the point. I would say he has. Yes, definitely he has if he was validly consecrated. That is the whole point! Any doubt that is in my mind does not come from his association with the Vatican over the last few years, but with the question of Leinart’s consecration. That is the only doubt I have about Lefebvre personally. Bishop Musey does not agree with me! He has spoken out rather strongly against Archbishop Lefebvre.”

{807} Do you agree that they belong to the Illusionary church if they teach and promote the contradiction and fraudulent hypocrisy that the other Novus Ordo bishops became pertinacious heretics while only Thuc and Lefebvre kept the faith?

{808} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas should please come forth with his theological teaching and explain if Joseph Alois Ratzinger “with conscious and intentional resistance to the authority of God and to the Church” denied any doctrine of Divine and Catholic Faith by October 17, 1981?

{809} Do you agree that it is a contradiction to teach Archbishop Thuc was not a pertinacious heretic, but Joseph Ratzinger was a pertinacious heretic this same day Archbishop Thuc consecrated Bishop Carmona?

{810} Do you agree that if Joseph Ratzinger was not a pertinacious heretic this same day Archbishop Thuc consecrated Bishop Carmona, that Bishop Pivarunas should explain if he was a pertinacious heretic early in the morning of 19 April 2005, just before he was chosen to be known throughout the world as Pope Benedict XVI?

{811} Do you agree that if Joseph Ratzinger was not a pertinacious heretic when “elected as Pope” then Bishop Pivarunas should accept Benedict XVI as his pope?

{812} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas really needs to please come forth without any deceit or double-talk and explain why Joseph Ratzinger was a pertinacious heretic although Archbishop Thuc was not a pertinacious heretic for belonging to the same Novus Ordo, non-Catholic, schismatic church for many, many years?

{813} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas really needs to please come forth and explain how Catholics can know for certain if any bishop in the world today is actually a pertinacious heretic?

{814} Do you agree that since Bishop Pivarunas claims to be free to interpret Canon Law let him explain Canon 2200 which states: “when there is the external violation of a law of the Church, malice is presumed in the external forum until its absence has been removed”?

{815} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas should explain how Catholics apply Canon 2200 to Archbishop Thuc since, without doubt, he remained a member of the non-Catholic, schismatic church many, many years before he consecrated Bishop Carmona?

To which church did Bishop Thuc belong on January 11, 1976 when he consecrated bishops?

{816} Do you agree that all those who trace their episcopal lineage to Bishop Thuc teach that he had the correct use of his faculties, capabilities, and intellect when he performed the consecrations and ordinations on January 11, 1976?

{817} Do you agree that if Bishop Thuc did not have the correct use of his faculties, capabilities, and intellect when he performed the consecrations and ordinations on January 11, 1976 the world should consider him to be nothing less than a senile old man?

If Bishop Thuc was senile and did not know that there was no pope in the Catholic Church on January 11, 1976; then when did he get his intellect and common sense together enough to be able to validly consecrate again in 1981?

{818} Do you agree that if Bishop Thuc was not senile in 1976, that he was an apostate from the Catholic Church for returning to the non-Catholic, schismatic Novus Ordo sect – after once recognizing in January 1976 the Novus Ordo to be a non-Catholic religion?

{819} Do you agree that Bishop Thuc should be considered as not only a pertinacious heretic but an apostate?

Remember Bishop Pivarunas it is your own voice that I have recorded on cassette tapes, telling me that Archbishop Thuc became a heretic by signing the documents of Vatican II. Remember also that this was years after you left the Bishop Francis Schuckardt part of the CMRI community that you publicly taught this from the pulpit as a priest. It was after you were ordained by a Bishop Thuc line bishop, – Bishop George Musey. Were you then lying in Church as you taught from the pulpit and explained in clear terminology why they were heretics who signed these heretical, Vatican II documents? Surely you would not want to use the excuse that your sermon manifests your lack of knowledge of Canon Law and your “Schuckardt mentality.” However, Bishop Francis Schuckardt did correctly teach that the Novus Ordo sect is non-Catholic and the bishops of that sect are heretics for belonging to a non-Catholic religion. Is Bishop Pivarunas teaching that the Novus Ordo sect is still the Catholic Church – since he claims there are no pertinacious heretics in the Novus Ordo religion?

{820} Do you agree that apparently or deceptively Bishop Pivarunas teaches that the Novus Ordo is non-Catholic but its bishops are still Catholics?

{821} Do you agree that if Bishop Pivarunas teaches that the Novus Ordo bishops are non-Catholic, he should tell us on what day and by what means they left the Catholic Church – since he vehemently attests they were not pertinacious heretics?

Was it the Bishop George Musey mentality that inspired Bishop Pivarunas to preach, teach, and clearly explain why Archbishop Thuc was a manifest heretic for signing the documents of Vatican II and for belonging to the Novus Ordo religion? Bishop George Musey very clearly explains in his talk to the CMRI sisters, which is recorded on cassette tapes and can now be heard as MP3 files at <https://jmjsite.com>, that those bishops are manifest heretics. Bishop George Musey again spoke the truth concerning the matter of how Catholics should accept Archbishop Thuc’s need to be abjured from his heresies as he was explaining things about Bishop Francis Schuckardt.

Bishop Francis Schuckardt was consecrated by Bishop Daniel Q. Brown, who only abjured his errors in the presence of laymen who could not absolve him or bring him back into the Catholic Church. Bishop George Musey told the CMRI community the truth about Bishop Francis Schuckardt on April 22, 1985, during a question-and-answer period:

“Bishop Francis, as to whether or not he was schismatic? Well, Bishop Francis was consecrated, ordained and consecrated by a Bishop who was a schismatic. He was an Old Catholic Bishop. **The fact of the Abjuration really does not restore the man to the Catholic Church.** The simple fact of making an abjuration is simply a declaration that we have made a mistake. Now who then in Authority in the Catholic Church accepted that abjuration and relieved the man of his censures, and restored him?”

It’s kind of like going to Confession. You might go to Confession, and you might make your Confession, but who is going to give you absolution unless you go to a qualified priest who can actually absolve you from your sins? Confession is only part of it. The priest has to be one who has the power and the faculties, of course, to absolve from the sin; and in case of a censure, also from the censure. The same with the Abjuration of Heresy, it would have had to have been made to one that had the Authority, in and from the Catholic Church, to receive that abjuration; and to absolve the man from his censure, and receive him into the Catholic Church.”

{822} Do you agree that in explaining these things about Bishop Francis Schuckardt, Bishop George Musey correctly explained the need for the abjuration for all bishops who joined the non-Catholic, Old Catholic, religion?

{823} Do you agree that in explaining these things about Bishop Francis Schuckardt, Bishop George Musey correctly explained the need for the abjuration for **all** bishops, INCLUDING Bishop Thuc, who joined the non-Catholic, Novus Ordo, religion?

{824} Do you agree that no person in the entire world has yet produced the document of the Abjuration of Error and Profession of Faith made by Bishop Thuc and received by a Catholic bishop with jurisdiction and faculties to absolve Bishop Thuc for joining the non-Catholic, schismatic, Novus Ordo Conciliar church?

{825} Do you agree that even if such a document which does not seem to exist actually does exist, we still need to ask the all-important question: “Who restored the man to the Catholic Church”; because, “**The fact of the Abjuration really does not restore the man to the Catholic Church**”?

Remember that Bishop George Musey reminded the CMRI community that Bishop Thuc made the statement when he was told that the “Holy” Father (Paul VI) wanted him to come to Rome: “There is no one with authority in Rome to receive me”?

Now who then in Authority in the Catholic Church, with the necessary faculties, accepted that abjuration and relieved Bishop Thuc of his censures, and restored him?

As late as April 15, 1981, (only 22 days *before* he consecrated Guérard des Lauriers on May 7, 1981) Archbishop Thuc concelebrated a Novus Ordo “mass” on Holy Thursday with the Conciliar bishop of Toulon.

{826} Do you agree that we should NOT consider these two bishops as members of two different churches offering two different services, although they were concelebrating “mass”?

No, of course not! Archbishop Thuc was just as much a Conciliar, non-Catholic as his friend – this non-Catholic, Conciliar bishop of Toulon.

{827} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas ordained Father Michael Oswald absolutely and not conditionally; just because the Novus Ordo is a non-Catholic religion with invalid sacraments?

{828} Do you agree that everyone should admit that the Novus Ordo sect is just as non-Catholic as the Old Catholic sect, through which Bishop Francis Schuckardt claims he received his illicit Holy Orders?

{829} Do you agree that the statements of Bishop George Musey should be applied to *every* bishop and priest that was a member of the non-Catholic Novus Ordo sect and offered the Novus Ordo services; “Now who then in Authority in the Catholic Church accepted that abjuration and relieved the man of his censures, and restored him? ...The priest has to be one who has the power and the *faculties*, of course, to absolve from the sin; and in case of a censure, also from the censure”?

A very important point to keep in mind is that Archbishop Thuc has never abjured his errors for belonging to a non-Catholic religion. He made a public declaration on February 25, 1982 that the Holy See was vacant, but this certainly was not an Abjuration of Error or Profession of Faith.

There is very interesting, important, and instructive information in the August-September, and October-November, 1985, issues of the *Reign of Mary* published by CMRI. Both issues state the following:

“The Second Vatican Council did meet during the years 1962-65 to discuss (and pervert) doctrine (witness the ‘*Dogmatic Decree of the Doctrine of the Faith*’). It is important to note that all the decrees of Vatican II were closed by this, or a similar epilogue: ‘Each and every one of the things set forth in this decree has won the consent of the Fathers. We, too, ...join with the Venerable Fathers in approving, decreeing, and establishing these things...’ (There follows the signatures of Paul VI and the Fathers of the Council.) Now these statements, as we have explained in past issues, constitute an exercise of the Teaching Magisterium of the Church.

But there is obvious heresy contained in these decrees. Therefore, those who put their signature to these decrees have made themselves culpable for the heresies they contain. **They are public heretics** and incur penalties as provided for in Church law for all who are guilty of public heresy. Thus we must reject Vatican II as a false council and regard all those who promote and encourage it as public heretics, outside the Catholic Church founded by Jesus Christ.”

To sum it up: 1) The decrees of Vatican II contain obvious heresy. 2) Anyone who signed any of these heretical decrees made himself culpable of **public heresy**. 3) Those who signed did incur penalties and are guilty of public heresy. 4) We must regard all who promote and encourage it as public heretics, outside the Catholic Church founded by Jesus Christ.

The Conciliar bishop of Toulon, Archbishop Lefebvre, and Archbishop Thuc all signed decrees of Vatican II, including the most heretical ones - the decrees on Ecumenism and Religious Liberty.

{830} Do you agree that the Conciliar bishop of Toulon, as a member of the Novus Ordo sect, ceased being a member of the Church that is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic by April 15, 1981? Remember that is the day he and Archbishop Thuc concelebrated a Novus Ordo “mass” together.

{831} Do you agree that the Catholic doctrine is that no one can remain in the Catholic Church and at the same time be a member of a non-Catholic, schismatic, church?

{832} Do you agree that Archbishop Thuc was a member of the *same* religious sect as this Conciliar bishop on April 15, 1981? Think of the facts: 1) They were both part of the Venerable Fathers who signed the heretical decrees of Vatican II. 2) CMRI correctly informed us in their *Reign of Mary* publication that both of them are guilty of public heresy, and thus we must regard them as outside of the Catholic Church founded by Jesus Christ. 3) Both of them accepted Paul VI and John Paul II as their popes. 4) Both of them signed, accepted, and promulgated the teachings, documents, and decrees of Vatican II. 5) Both of them believed in and celebrated the new “mass” and new “sacraments” of Vatican II. 6) Both of them were administering sacraments to the *same* Novus Ordo people, in the *same* church, at the *same* time, to the Novus Ordo people that were members of the *same* religion as Archbishop Thuc and the Conciliar bishop of Toulon.

Will sects in the Traditionalist Movement deceitful and contradicting Illusionary church be so manipulative, deceptive, and deceitful as to find some insubstantial, flimsy, and implausible excuse for Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, while they place the guilt on Bishop Gilles-Henri-Alexis Barthe, Paul VI, John Paul I, John Paul II, Benedict XVI, Francis and the rest for becoming members of a non-Catholic sect?

Bishop Pivarunas continues with his article of commenting on *My Petition for Spiritual Help*:

Along this same line, another example can be cited of those who erroneously claim that the traditional bishops have been *ipso facto* excommunicated because there were no papal mandates for their consecrations. Once again, the 1917 Code of Canon Law asserts that penal laws are to be interpreted strictly, i.e., if conditions are not exactly according to the law, the penalty is not incurred (*in poenis, benignior interpretatio*). When one reads the exact wording of Pope Pius XII’s encyclical where he addressed the situation in Communist China, the following conditions were established:

“Consequently, if consecration of this kind is being done contrary to all right and law, and by this crime the unity of the Church is being seriously attacked, an excommunication reserved *specialissimo* mode to the Apostolic See has been established which is automatically incurred by the consecrator and by anyone who has received consecration irresponsibly conferred.”

There is no parallel between the consecration of bishops in the present crisis of the Church and the consecration of Communist-appointed men by the Chinese government in order to establish a schismatic Church in opposition to the Catholic Church. As Pope Pius XII said in his encyclical *Ad Apostolorum Principis* in regard to the schismatic Chinese consecrations: “...there is no question of vacant sees, as they wish to argue in defense, but of episcopal sees whose legitimate rulers have been driven out or now languish in prison or are being obstructed in various ways from the free exercise of their power of jurisdiction.” The consecration of bishops during this present crisis in the Church is in no wise “contrary to all right and law” and the unity of the Church is certainly not “being seriously attacked.”

By what authority is Bishop Pivarunas again interpreting canon laws since he is not a bishop in the Catholic Church with ordinary or delegated jurisdiction; since he does not have the care of souls or an appointment to a diocese from a Catholic Pope?

{833} Do you agree that the conclusions drawn from the teachings of Bishop Pivarunas is that no bishops have been excommunicated since the death of Pope Pius XII for consecrating or being consecrated without a papal mandate?

{834} Do you agree that now we have the Old Catholic Bishops and the New Catholic Bishops; the traditionalist bishops and the non-traditionalist bishops; the orthodox bishops and the non-orthodox bishops; the Sedevacantist bishops and the non-Sedevacantist bishops; the Lefebvre line bishops and the Thuc line bishops; the Francis Schuckardt CMRI line of bishops and the Pivarunas CMRI line of bishops; the Francis Schuckardt line of bishops and the Alfredo Mendez Gonzalez line; the Clemente Dominguez Gómez line and the Bernard Fellay lines; the Manuel Alonso Corral lines and the Bernard Tissier de Mallerais lines; the Francis Bernard Sandler lines and the Richard Williamson lines; the Manfred Damaso Zewell lines and the Alfonso de Galarreta lines; and now hundreds of others that were started by Bishop Thuc, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, and the Novus Ordo bishops; and each one and all of them together are free to do their own thing –because Bishop Pivarunas said they all belong to the **same** church and according to Bishop Pivarunas none of them are required to do what the Catholic Church says and receive their papal mandate, authority, and jurisdiction from a successor of St. Peter?

{835} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas teaches that the laws of the Catholic Church’s papal mandate do not apply to **any** of them?

{836} Do you agree that all of his theory amounts to nothing except pure, unadulterated Protestantism?

{837} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas is teaching that each one is free to pick and choose what he wants to believe and reject what he does not like concerning the doctrines and dogmas of the Catholic Church?

{838} Do you agree that the Unity in the Traditionalist Movement Illusionary church; is why CMRI under Bishop Francis Schuckardt never did abjure any errors or change any beliefs?

{839} Do you agree that if the other Novus Ordo bishops belonged to a non-Catholic sect, then so did Bishop Thuc since he belonged to their **same** sect?

{840} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas must belong to the same sect in union with the Novus Ordo bishops or else he is outside the Catholic Church if Bishop Thuc and the Novus Ordo hierarchy were/are not in truth pertinacious heretics outside of the Catholic Church?

Bishop Pivarunas wrote: There is **no** parallel between the consecration of bishops in the present crisis of the Church and the consecration of Communist-appointed men by the Chinese government in order to establish a schismatic Church in opposition to the Catholic Church.

{841} Do you agree that there certainly is a parallel between the consecration of bishops in the present crisis of the Church and the consecration of men in order to establish a schismatic Church in opposition to the Catholic Church taking place since Vatican Council II?

Review what Bishop Sanborn said:

Then there is a third way, and that is of the Society of Saint Pius X, which says that Vatican II is bad. It never really answers the question of whether it is substantial defection from Catholicism or not, but that it is bad. So we reject what we think is bad and accept what we think is good. At the same time we launch a worldwide apostolate in defiance of the persons that we say constitute the Roman Catholic hierarchy; that is Bergoglio and all of the bishops in union with him. So they consecrate bishops, they ordain priests, they set up parishes and schools and convents and religious orders as if the Pope doesn't exist.

Review again what Rev. Anthony Cekada said:

They promote in effect error, **schism**, and apostasy. The notion that you can recognize someone as a pope, but not do any blessed thing he says if you decide not to do that. You set a private judgment over each papal teaching and law. You have the idea, you promote the notion the Church Authority can give **evil laws** and **false doctrine**. You maintain it is permissible to defy the man you say is the Pope by maintaining a parallel hierarchy. These notions are **schismatic** and embody false doctrine!”

{842} Do you agree that in China the bishops were consecrating in defiance of the Roman Catholic hierarchy as if the Pope doesn't exist; and the face of the Traditional Movement (as Rev. Mary Benedict Hughes defined the SSPX) has also set up a **schismatic** sect as if the man they claim is the Pope doesn't exist?

{843} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas publicly stated that all the members of the Groups, Societies, and Communities of the Traditionalist Movement belong to the SAME church?

{844} Do you agree that it follows with logic that the Traditionalist Movement does not have enough UNITY among them to even define who makes up the Roman Catholic hierarchy?

{845} Do you agree that because they lack this necessary UNITY they are a non-Catholic sect?

Bishop Pivarunas wrote: The consecration of bishops during this present crisis in the Church is in no wise “contrary to all right and law” and the unity of the Church is certainly not “being seriously attacked.”

Read again the astonishing statement we just read: “the **unity** of the Church is certainly not being seriously attacked.”

{846} Do you agree that there we have it in black and white; that the Traditionalist Movement clerics all have 100% UNITY among them that is certainly not being seriously attacked because they all teach the **same** thing?

{847} Do you agree that, according to THEIR statements, writings, teachings, and professions there is no difference in **any** belief concerning any doctrine of the Catholic Church in the cornucopia contradicting faiths, creeds, philosophies, and convictions of the clergy of the Traditionalist Movement Illusionary church?

{848} Do you agree that the UNITY in the Traditionalist Movement Illusionary church is why: “You know, it is not, the Thuc Bishops or the Lefebvre Bishops or the Thuc Priests or the Lefebvre Priests or this Group or that Group - we are Roman Catholic; It is not this Society or that Society or this Community – we are Roman Catholic; and as such we work together ... We belong to the **same** church; **let's get together; let's forget about our differences**”?

{849} Do you agree that Rev. Mary Benedict, CMRI, and Rev. Anthony Cekada, and Bishop Sanborn all clearly explained that the SSPX sect is SCHISMATIC?

{850} Do you agree that it has already been clearly demonstrated that the FSSP, SSPX, SSPX-OC, SSPX-MC cannot be part of the Catholic Church if there is substantial changes in the Vatican II Church?

{851} Do you agree that Rev. Mary Benedict, CMRI wrote: “Because the SSPX for many is the face of the Traditional Movement”?

{852} Do you agree that the FSSP, SSPX-OC, SSPX-MC, SSPX, SSPV, CMRI, CJM, CSSV sects are all classified as being part of the Traditionalist Movement?

{853} Do you agree that some branches of the Traditionalist Movement sects believe there has been substantial changes in the Vatican II Church concerning matters of DOCTRINE and DOGMA?

{854} Do you agree that some of the other branches of the Traditional Movement sects do NOT believe there have been substantial changes in the Vatican II Church concerning matters of DOCTRINE and DOGMA?

{855} Do you agree that the cornucopia abundance of contradictions in the Traditionalist Movement concerning matters of DOCTRINE and DOGMA; mean it is 100% impossible that they all have the **same** faith?

{856} Do you agree that the only correct logic is that if all of these sects have **UNITY** among them; that all of them belong to a non-Catholic religion?

{857} Do you agree that logically everyone should conclude that the entire Traditionalist Movement is a non-Catholic religion, because Bishop Pivarunas correctly informed us: “It is not, the Thuc Bishops or the Lefebvre Bishops or the Thuc Priests or the Lefebvre Priests or this Group or that Group - we are Roman Catholic; It is not this Society or that Society or this Community – we are Roman Catholic and as such we work together; We belong to the **same** church; **let's get together; let's forget about our differences**”?

{858} Do you agree that the unity of the **Catholic** Church is certainly not “being seriously attacked” in the Traditionalist Movement, because they have provided a cornucopia abundance of evidence that the whole system is a non-Catholic religion; and the UNITY in the Catholic Church is not affected by the diversity of beliefs in non-Catholic churches?

Bishop Pivarunas claims that the unity of the Catholic Church is not seriously attacked when bishops are consecrated without permission of the successor of Saint Peter. His teaching is the exact opposite of the Catholic Church, as explained by Her prince of theologians. Let us now review what the Catholic Church does teach as opposed to the new and erroneous theology of Bishop Pivarunas.

In his *Summa Contra Gentiles*, Lib. IV, cap. 76, Saint Thomas Aquinas teaches:

“To conserve the Unity of the Church, the power of the keys must be passed on through Peter to the other pastors of the Church.”

{859} Do you agree that if the power of the keys **must** be passed on through Peter to the other pastors of the Church to conserve the Unity of the Church; that the UNITY of the Church cannot be preserved UNLESS the power the keys are received through Peter?

Read attentively and believe this dogma of the Catholic Church as taught at the Lateran Council IV, 1215:

“Surely no one can accomplish this Sacrament except a priest who has been **rightly** ordained according to the Keys of the Church, which Jesus Christ Himself conceded to the Apostles and to **their** successors.” (DB 430)

{860} Do you agree that **rightly** ordained means that with his ordination the priest has been sent by the Catholic Church?

{861} Do you agree that the priest has his *Office, Authority, Jurisdiction, and Mission* from the Church?

{862} Do you agree that this can only happen when the priest is ordained by a bishop who himself has his *Office, Authority, Jurisdiction, and Mission* from the Church?

{863} Do you agree that the very serious point to understand is that this has *never* happened for any of the Traditionalist Movement clerics?

{864} Do you agree that *the* “Keys of the Church” *are only passed on from Jesus Christ to a Catholic; and therefore no man is qualified to be a CATHOLIC pope unless he is CATHOLIC at the time of his election?*

{865} Do you agree that *the* “Keys of the Church” *are only passed on to bishops from a Catholic pope?*

{866} Do you agree that *the* “Keys of the Church” *are only passed on to priests from a Catholic bishop who himself received his Keys of the Church from a Catholic pope?*

{867} Do you agree that *not even one Traditionalist Movement bishop living today received the Keys of the Church from a Catholic pope?*

{868} Do you agree that *if the bishops do not have the Keys of the Church, then neither do the priests?*

{869} Do you agree that the Lateran Council IV proclaimed it as a dogma of the Catholic faith that: “Jesus Christ Himself conceded the Keys of the Church to the Apostles and to their successors”?

{870} Do you agree that it follows as a Catholic dogma that no bishop ever receives the Keys of the Church unless those keys were received directly from the successor of St. Peter?

{871} Do you agree that it follows in correct logic that it is contrary to Catholic dogma to accept the NEW teaching: “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been **delegated to us from Christ Himself**” and “Those whom Our Lord has bound by divine law to confer sacraments, then, simultaneously receive from Him the *legitimate deputation* and the *apostolic mission* to confer them”?

Remember this important truth that is part of the Profession of Faith during the reign of Pope Benedict XIV:

Likewise, I revere and accept the **COUNCIL OF TRENT**, and I profess what was defined and declared in it ... (DB 1468)

Bishop Pivarunas’ new theology is also in direct contradiction to the teachings of the Catholic Church as explained by Jesus Christ the Eternal Wisdom through Pope Pius VI and the sacred Council of Trent:

“So today the Pope as a duty of his office appoints bishops for each of the churches, and no lawful consecration may take place in the entire Catholic Church without the order of the Apostolic See (Trent, session 24, chap. 1, de Reformat.)”

{872} While you remember what all Catholics must profess, namely that, “Likewise, I revere and accept the **COUNCIL OF TRENT**, and I profess what was defined and declared in it”; do you agree that it was the *Council of Trent*, session 24, chapter 1 that clearly states the Catholic doctrine that, “no lawful consecration may take place in the entire Catholic Church without the order of the Apostolic See”?

Let us be instructed by Pope Pius VI in *Charitas*:

“The right of ordaining bishops belongs only to the Apostolic See, as the Council of Trent declares; it cannot be assumed by any bishop or metropolitan without obliging Us to declare **schismatic** both those who ordain and those who are ordained, thus invalidating their future actions.”

The Council of Trent teaches the following important truth:

“Those who of their rashness assume them [ordination and consecration] to themselves, are not ministers of the Church, but are to be looked upon as thieves and robbers, who have not entered by the door.”

We find the following as part of the Profession of Faith of the *Council of Trent*, from the Bull of Pope Pius IV, “*Iniunctum nobis*,” Nov. 13, 1565”

I, N., with firm faith believe and profess all and everything which is contained in the creed of faith, which the holy Roman Church uses... Also all other things taught, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and ecumenical Councils, and especially by the sacred and holy Synod of Trent, (and by the ecumenical Council of the Vatican, particularly concerning the primacy of the Roman Pontiff and his infallible teaching), I without hesitation except and profess; and at the same time all things contrary thereto, and whatever heresies have been condemned, and rejected, and anathematized by the Church, I likewise condemn, reject, and anathematize...

NOTE: What is included by parentheses is now to be added from Decr. S.C. Conc. (Jan 20, 1877) (DB 1000)

{873} Do you agree that they cannot truthfully say they profess all and everything which is contained in the creed and especially by the sacred holy Synod of Trent; if they reject the truth that, “The right of ordaining bishops belongs only to the Apostolic See, as the Council of Trent declares”?

{874} Do you agree that the right of ordaining and consecration bishops in the Traditionalist Movement took place without the authority and approval of the Apostolic See and a lawful successor of St. Peter?

{875} Do you agree that they cannot truthfully say they profess all and everything which is contained in the creed and especially by the sacred holy Synod of Trent; if they reject the truth that, “no lawful consecration may take place in the entire Catholic Church without the order of the Apostolic See”?

Bishop Pivarunas continues with his article when commenting on *My Petition for Spiritual Help*:

In 1981 Archbishop Thuc consecrated Bishop Guerard Des Lauriers, Bishop Carmona, and Bishop Zamora. Based on the principles of sacramental theology of Pope Leo XIII in *Apostolicae Curae*, there can be no reasonable doubt about the validity of the Thuc consecrations. In a personal interview of Bishop Pivarunas with Bishop Carmona in 1987, Bishop Carmona stated that he followed with his own *Pontificale* all that Archbishop Thuc did during the consecration ceremony, and affirmed that the Archbishop followed the rite exactly.

As for the false accusation that Archbishop Thuc was senile, there are many witnesses who have verified that before, at the time of, and after the 1981 consecrations the Archbishop was completely lucid, attentive, rational, offered public Masses, and met with numerous people, etc. A number of these witnesses were traditional priests who, under oath, with God as their witness, verified that the Archbishop was certainly rational.

{876} Do you agree that there have been a number of validly consecrated bishops who are nevertheless members of their non-Catholic sects?

{877} Do you agree that it takes more than just a valid consecration to make the man a Catholic bishop?

{878} Do you agree that it is a true fact that throughout history men have been validly ordained and consecrated who nevertheless were in schism and/or heresy?

{879} Therefore, do you agree that there have been validly ordained priests and validly consecrated bishops who nevertheless belonged to non-Catholic sects?

{880} Do you agree that even if Bishop Pivarunas and other Traditionalist Movement bishops are validly consecrated, that fact alone does not automatically make them belong to the Church that is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic?

{881} Do you agree that it is a revelation to learn, “Bishop Carmona stated that he followed with his own *Pontificale* all that Archbishop Thuc did during the consecration ceremony?”

{882} Do you agree that Bishop Carmona must have believed Bishop Thuc was either very senile, or a non-Catholic Novus Ordo bishop, or both; and that is why he had to follow in his own *Pontificale* to check and see if this Novus Ordo bishop was actually consecrating him?

{883} Do you agree that actions speak louder than words, and because Carmona followed with his own *Pontificale* to check on the “senile” Novus Ordo Bishop –these “witnesses who were traditional priests who, under oath, with God as their witness, verified that the Archbishop was certainly rational”; really do not provide, furnish, or impart much authority if actions speak louder than words?

Bishop Pivarunas continues in commenting on *My Petition for Spiritual Help*:

As for the traditional priests ordained and traditional bishops consecrated during this extended time of interregnum, the historical precedent has already been established. During the 40 years of the Great Western Schism, bishops were consecrated and priests ordained within each of the three factions (Rome, Avignon, and Pisa). As theologian Fr. Timothy Zapelena S.J., in *De Ecclesiae Christi* taught: “**THE TRUE POPE** was the Roman one, that is Urban VI and his successors. Therefore he was able to give jurisdiction even to the bishops of the other obediences (on account of common error of the faithful together with the colored title) ... For the rest, if you figure those three popes to be null, you ought to admit that jurisdiction is supplied (on account of the color of title) not indeed by the Church, which lacks the supreme power, but by Christ Himself, who would confer jurisdiction on each of these anti-popes as much as was necessary.” Furthermore, during the protracted interregnum between the reign of Pope Clement IV and that of Blessed Gregory X, bishops were consecrated without papal mandate and functioned as ordinaries in their dioceses. When the interregnum ended with the election of Blessed Gregory X, the Pope ratified these consecrations. This subsequent ratification did not prevent the bishops during the interregnum from functioning as bishops. This is a historical fact. The traditional bishops of today, based on this precedent, also have supplied jurisdiction and also await ratification from a future pope.

Bishop Sanborn made a video concerning the Great Western Schism in which he explains why there is no logical and justifiable comparison between what took place during the Great Western Schism and what is taking place now in the Traditionalist Movement.

{884} Do you agree with Bishop Sanborn that the Great Western Schism was known as the schism without any schismatics?

{885} Do you agree with Bishop Sanborn that during the Great Western Schism all of the papal claimants actually qualified to be true popes as far as holding the correct beliefs in all the doctrines and dogmas of the Church?

{886} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas reminded us that during the Great Western Schism there is no logical and justifiable comparison with the situation since Vatican II; because “**THE TRUE POPE** was the Roman one, that is Urban VI and his successors. Therefore HE WAS ABLE TO GIVE JURISDICTION even to the bishops of the other obediences”?

{887} Do you agree that all jurisdiction was supplied from **THE TRUE POPE**; and not according to the heretical NEW doctrine of the non-Catholic Traditionalist Movement, that their jurisdiction is delegated to them from Christ Himself?

{888} Do you agree that during the Great Western Schism those bishops and priests did not deny articles and dogmas of the faith?

{889} Do you agree that because it is an article of faith and **in fact, a DOGMA of faith** that the authority and jurisdiction of bishops only comes to them through the Roman Pontiff; that the Traditionalist Movement clergy teach the opposite of and deny, repudiate, and refuse to believe an article of faith and a DOGMA of faith?

{890} Do you agree that the Great Western Schism, also called Papal Schism, Great Occidental Schism, and Schism of 1378, was a split within the Catholic Church lasting from 1378 to 1417?

{891} Do you agree that Pope Pius VI was head of the Roman Catholic Church and ruler of the Papal States from 15 February 1775 to his death in 1799?

{892} Do you agree that the added section quoted by Bishop Pivarunas: “For the rest, if you figure those three popes to be null, you ought to admit that jurisdiction is supplied (on account of the color of title) not indeed by the Church, which lacks the supreme power, but by Christ Himself, who would confer jurisdiction on each of these anti-popes as much as was necessary”; was only a speculation and theory but not a true fact?

{893} Do you agree that it was only speculation and theory because now we know that since the Great Western Schism; the infallible Catholic Church through Pope Pius VI has defined it as an article of faith and **in fact, a DOGMA of faith** that the authority and jurisdiction of bishops only comes to them through the Roman Pontiff?

{894} Do you agree that because Pope Pius VI has defined it as a DOGMA of faith that the authority and jurisdiction of bishops only comes to them through the Roman Pontiff; the Great Western Schism can no longer be arguably, rightly, and validly used as “the historical precedent” in Church history that justifies the non-Catholic actions and beliefs of the Traditionalist Movement clergy?

{895} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas explained how he would have everyone understand the Great Western Schism as 1st: “As for the traditional priests ordained and traditional bishops consecrated during this extended time of interregnum, the historical precedent has already been established”; and that historical precedent is the **TRUE FACT** that 2nd: “THE TRUE POPE was the Roman one, that is Urban VI and his successors. Therefore HE WAS ABLE TO GIVE JURISDICTION even to the bishops of the other obediences”?

{896} Do you agree that therefore the historical precedent that has already been established is the fact that “THE TRUE POPE was able to give jurisdiction even to the bishops”?

{897} Do you agree that it follows with correct logic that no bishop in the Traditionalist Movement has any ordinary, or delegated, or supplied jurisdiction delegated directly from Christ Himself or from the **true pope**, unless it can be proved that the Vatican II popes always have been the **true popes** of the Catholic Church?

{898} Do you agree that: “there is a contradiction here” as Rev. Mary Casimir Puskorius told us?

{899} Do you agree that Rev. Mary Casimir taught the truth that: “The Faith cannot change” and “Well, if the mind cannot accept contradiction, even more so the true Church of Christ cannot give us contradictory teachings”?

{900} Do you agree that the traditional priests ordained and traditional bishops consecrated during this extended time of interregnum have absolutely, unquestionably, certainly, undeniably, and definitely supplied a cornucopia abundance of factual evidence to prove beyond doubt that the Vatican II popes are NOT the **true popes** of the Catholic Church?

{901} Do you agree that because even during the Great Western schism all jurisdiction was supplied from THE TRUE POPE; that the traditional bishops of today do not have supplied jurisdiction?

{902} Do you agree that the traditional bishops are not getting jurisdiction from Bergoglio (aka Francis I)?

{903} Do you agree that it is even ridiculous for them to claim that Francis is giving them supplied jurisdiction; unless of course, because the greatest number of them claim that Francis is their Pope?

{904} Do you agree that their claim to fame and supplied jurisdiction is heresy, as they themselves have proven beyond all doubt?

{905} Do you agree that Antichrists are not the Popes of the Catholic Church; and that Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, Bishop Dolan and Rev. Anthony Cekada called, named, designated, identified, and labeled the Vatican II popes as Antichrist?

Review again the beliefs of the traditionalist bishops: “The traditional bishops of today, based on this precedent, also have supplied jurisdiction and also await ratification from a future pope.”

{906} Do you agree that nothing was made legitimate and no jurisdiction was ever granted to anyone during the Great Western schism without a pope?

{907} Do you agree that, according to their own writings, the Traditionalist Movement members all assume that someday in the future there will be another pope *that will justify the actions* of their priests and bishops?

{908} Do you agree that their assumption is NOT prudent and is illogical and deceitful?

Let us read from the bull, *Execrabilis*, where Jesus Christ spoke to us through Pope Pius II in 1459; to testify that everyone should regard as ridiculous to appeal to something that does not exist anywhere, and the future date of whose existence is unknown:

“Who would not regard as ridiculous the appealing to something that does not exist anywhere, and the future date of whose existence is unknown?... We condemn such appeals... if it should be detected that any such appeals are being put forward even now, then We censure them as being erroneous and detestable, destroyed and utterly annulled; and We decree and declare them to be inane and pestilential and of no importance.”

{909} Do you agree that the appeal: “The traditional bishops of today ... await ratification from a **future** pope” is an appeal, endorsement, plea, request, consent, and demand from a pope that does not exist anywhere, and the future date of whose existence is unknown?

{910} Do you agree that Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost writing through Pope Pius II clearly testifies that the claim, right, and entitlement of the traditionalist bishops contention, argument, and assertion to SUPPLIED JURISDICTION is ridiculous, ludicrous, preposterous, absurd, silly, outlandish, bizarre, nonsensical, and unreasonable?

{911} Do you agree that Pope Pius II clearly testifies without a doubt, with his use of the teaching authority of Saint Peter, to proclaim to the entire Catholic world in *Execrabilis* that the infallible Church CONDEMNS the appeal of the traditionalist bishops claim and declaration that they have supplied jurisdiction?

{912} Do you agree that when they make the statement: “The traditional bishops of today ... await ratification from a **future** pope” that it is easily detected that appeals are being put forward even now to something that does not exist?

{913} Do you agree that therefore, these NEW doctrines, policies, principles, and creeds of the traditionalist bishops that they have SUPPLIED jurisdiction has already been CONDEMNED, because the true pope told us: “We censure them as being erroneous and detestable, destroyed and utterly annulled; and We decree and declare them to be inane and pestilential and of no importance.”

{914} Do you agree that because the traditional bishops claim that they have supplied jurisdiction is inane and pestilential and of no importance; then it is also declared to be CONDEMNED by the very highest teaching authority in the Catholic Church as silly, idiotic, stupid, crass, mindless, frivolous, ridiculous, absurd, and of no significance, meaning, or worth?

{915} Do you agree that Canon 2332 reaffirms the Bull of Pope Pius II and says that those who make such appeals to a future Council contract an excommunication which is especially reserved to the Holy See?

Jesus Christ spoke to us through Pope Saint Boniface in *Retro maioribus tuis*: “For it has never been allowed that that be discussed again, which has once been decided by the Apostolic See.”

{916} Do you agree that the Apostolic See has already made the decision to *condemn the appeal* of the Traditionalist Movement to a future pope to justify their episcopal consecrations without a papal mandate?

Recall to mind again the condemned appeal of the traditionalist bishops: “The traditional bishops of today ... await ratification from a **future** pope.”

{917} Do you agree that their writings clearly indicate that the Traditionalist Movement bishops and priests believe they can function many years before a Catholic pope is elected?

{918} Do you agree that they have already been waiting about 62 years; but they have no qualms, uncertainties, or apprehensions that the election of the Pope say, 50 or 100 years from now will solve their problem of having supplied jurisdiction for the past 60 or 160 years?

Who is going to elect the pope? Will it be the Traditionalist Movement bishops coming from who knows where and believing only God knows what? If these Traditionalist Movement bishops do not have unity among themselves at this time, then when will they? If they do not have unity and all the Four Marks of the Catholic Church, how can the non-Catholic bishops elect a Catholic pope?

This section about the Great Western Schism was explained in *My Petition for Spiritual Help*. It might be helpful for all of us to review what I wrote about it therein. Let Bishop Pivarunas give a truthful answer to all the questions I asked in that section of *My Petition for Spiritual Help*. Bishop Pivarunas suggests that the traditionalist bishops all have supplied jurisdiction. Does the Catholic Church supply jurisdiction to all of them at all times under all circumstances? I ask you to again review what Father Francis Sigismund Miaskiewicz wrote in his book: *Supplied Jurisdiction According to Canon 209*. You can find some of the quotes I took from Father's book in *My Petition for Spiritual Help* starting just before question 140. Here is part of the important information Father gave us:

"The matter of jurisdiction, then, is very important. First, the necessity for it supplies the Church with strict sanctions against usurpers and incompetents. The possession of it is important also for the priest who, in acting without it, would not only posit invalid acts, but would run afoul of the rigid sanctions of the Church and of God. Finally, it is especially clear how important the use of it is to the faithful and what a great loss it would be for them to approach a priest adjudged to have faculties to absolve, confess and then upon their confession depart not knowing that they were still unabsolved. ... Upon the presence or absence of jurisdiction, the very validity or the invalidity of the acts will depend."

Bishop Pivarunas continued with his comments on *My Petition for Spiritual Help*:

In conclusion, Patrick Henry should take an honest look at his position. He cannot point to even one person in the world today who is truly Catholic — not even himself!

No, Bishop Pivarunas again does not speak the truth. Everyone that has not fallen into heresy, schism, or apostasy after being properly baptized is truly Catholic, and I know of such people. That is where Bishop Pivarunas is wrong. Some converts and properly baptized children are truly Catholic. They have never left the Catholic Church after becoming a member of it, and I know of such baptized children who are truly Catholics. I also know Catholic adults who have never been part of any non-Catholic religion.

{919} Do you agree that however, Bishop Pivarunas and the CMRI community left the Catholic Church and in the external forum have not returned?

{920} Do you agree that in the external forum, neither can Bishop Pivarunas show me even one person in the world today who is truly Catholic by not being a member of a non-Catholic religion, who at the same time belongs to the Novus Ordo sect and the Traditionalist Movement?

Bishop Pivarunas continued with his comments on *My Petition for Spiritual Help*:

He cannot even present a means by which he can return to the Catholic Church today.

{921} Do you agree that by the grace of God I could make an act of perfect contrition?

{922} Do you agree that an act of perfect contrition forgives all sins, and therefore I could die in the state of sanctifying grace and go to heaven?

{923} Do you agree that outside of the Catholic Church there is no salvation and therefore, if I have a way to go to heaven; I also have a way to return to the Catholic Church?

{924} Do you agree that if I die as a member of a non-Catholic sect; such as the Novus Ordo, CMRI, and the other Traditionalist Movement sects, then I will not be a member of the Catholic Church when I die?

{925} Do you agree that it is better to leave all the non-Catholic sects and die in the state of sanctifying grace?

Bishop Pivarunas continued with his comments on *My Petition for Spiritual Help*:

What a tragedy!

Although Bishop Pivarunas may not believe the dogma that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church, I do believe that dogma. I also believe that those who died after making a perfect act of contrition will go to heaven. I also believe that everyone who left the Catholic Church could pray an act of perfect contrition if they correspond with the grace from God. Therefore, it follows that they can return to the Catholic Church and go to heaven without being part of the non-Catholic Traditionalist Movement.

{926} Do you agree that what a tragedy it is that Bishop Pivarunas teaches that we should belong to non-Catholic sects to obtain salvation?

{927} Do you agree that the CMRI community has never abjured their errors and joined the Catholic Church after belonging to the Bishop Francis Schuckardt sect?

{928} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas tells people to attend the Mass and receive the Sacraments in the Society of Saint Pius X sect although it is a non-Catholic sect as belonging to the same religion as the Novus Ordo sect?

Bishop Pivarunas continued with his comments on *My Petition for Spiritual Help*:

The purpose of this response is to assist anyone confused by the “dead end” theology of Patrick Henry. He should stop his pseudo-ministry of acting as if he possessed a mission from the Church, and he should really figure out how he will, according to his own opinion, some day come back to the Catholic Church by an abjuration of error from a bishop with ordinary jurisdiction. He deserves sympathy and prayers.

Recall to mind what we read earlier as quoted from St. Francis of Sales:

“He then who would be so rash as to boast of extraordinary mission **without immediately producing miracles**, deserves to be taken for an **imposter**. Now it is a fact neither the first nor the last ministers have worked a single miracle: therefore they have **no extraordinary mission**.”

{929} Do you agree that in the above paragraph St. Francis of Sales states the truth to be believed by every Catholic concerning everyone who claims an extraordinary mission; such as the mission of Bishop Pivarunas and the other traditionalist bishops and priests?

{930} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas and the other traditionalist bishops and priests should stop their pseudo-ministry of acting as if they possessed a mission from the Church?

Recall what Bishop Sanborn said during his sermon (transcribed above), while informing us about the heresies and false teachings of John Paul II. Bishop Sanborn is stating that it was heretical for John Paul II to teach that non-Catholic religions have apostolic missions even though they are schismatics and heretics:

Declaring that non-Catholic religions have apostolic missions – some mission from God descending from the Apostles to themselves – even though they are schismatics and heretics.

{931} Do you agree that a number of better-known clerics in the Traditionalist Movement have repeatedly explained in very logical, rational, coherent, and understandable ways; that the various sects and branches that make up the Traditionalist Movement and the Novus Ordo have all been declared to be schismatics and heretics?

{932} Do you agree that we must conclude from their own writings and sermons and teachings that none of these non-Catholic, schismatic, and heretical religions have apostolic mission?

{933} Do you agree that some mission from God descending from the **Apostles** to themselves; shows that the Traditionalist Movement does not have this mission?

{934} Do you agree that to receive a mission from the **Apostles** is contrary and opposite of the teaching of traditionalist clergy who claim their mission comes delegated directly from Christ Himself?

{935} Do you agree that no bishop receives a mission from the **Apostles** unless it came to him through a legitimate pope who was the lawful successor of St. Peter?

{936} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas never did come back to the Catholic Church by an abjuration of error from any bishop with ordinary jurisdiction?

Why does Bishop Pivarunas imply that I claim that I have some kind of a mission from the Church simply because I asked questions of the Traditionalist Movement clerics to explain the huge amount of contradictory teachings in their religions?

{937} Do you agree that everyone should take notice also how Bishop Pivarunas is correctly teaching that bishops need **ordinary** jurisdiction?

{938} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas is also hereby correctly teaching that Patrick Henry needs to find one of these bishops that still has ordinary jurisdiction to be formally received back into the Catholic Church?

{939} Do you agree that neither Bishop Pivarunas nor any other Traditionalist Movement Bishop has this necessary ordinary jurisdiction?

{940} Do you agree that therefore, Bishop Pivarunas should really figure out how he will someday come back to the Catholic Church in the external forum by an abjuration of error from a Bishop with ordinary jurisdiction?

At least the bishops' comments ended with a happy note and true statement with which everybody should agree (**He deserves sympathy and prayers**). Yes, Patrick Henry certainly deserves sympathy and prayers! Therefore, please do not neglect to pray for me as I will pray for you. May the good God grant you all of the crosses, contradictions, sufferings, joys, graces, and blessings you need in this life, so you will live in such a way to be with Jesus, Mary, and Saint Joseph for eternity!

†††JMJ†††

D. 738: Lateran Council V, 1513:

“And since truth never contradicts truth, we declare every assertion contrary to the truth of illumined faith to be altogether false; and, that it may not be permitted to dogmatize otherwise, we strictly forbid it, and we decree that all who adhere to errors of this kind are to be shunned and to be punished as detestable and abominable infidels who disseminate most damnable heresies and who weaken the Catholic faith.”

{941} Do you agree that Pope Pius XII in *Ad Apostolorum Principis* correctly states the truth wherein he writes: “No one can depart from the teaching of Catholic truth without loss of faith and salvation”?

The Douay Catechism of 1649

CHAP. XIX. The Sins against the Holy Ghost Expounded

Q. 915. How many are the sins against the Holy Ghost?

A. Six: despair of salvation, presumption of God's mercy, to impugn the known truth, envy at another's spiritual good, obstinacy in sin, and final impenitence.

Q. 918. What is it to impugn the known truth?

A. To argue obstinately against known points of faith, or to prevent the way of our Lord by forging lies and slander, as Heretics do...

Q. 920. What is obstinacy in sin?

A. A willful persisting in wickedness, and running on from sin to sin, after sufficient instructions and admonition.

Q. 921. How show you the malice of this sin?

A. Out of Heb. x. 26, 27. “If we sin willfully after having received the knowledge of the truth, there is now left no sacrifice for sins, but a certain dreadful expectation of judgment.”

Q. 922. What other proof have you?

A. Out of 2 Pet. ii. 21. “It was better for them not to know the way of justice, than after the knowledge to turn back from the holy commandment which was given them.”

You can read in the Prophecy of Jonas, the Lord told Jonas to “arise, and go to Ninive the great city, and preach in it.” (Jonas 1:2) But instead “Jonas rose up to flee into Tharsis from the face of the Lord, and he went down to Joppe, and found a ship going to Tharsis: and he paid the fare thereof, and went down into it, to go with them to Tharsis from the face of the Lord.” (Jonas 1:3) Later the great storm arose and threatened the lives of

all those on the ship. Jonas told the rest of them to cast him into the sea, and eventually they cast Jonas into the sea, and the sea ceased from raging. “Now the Lord prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonas: and Jonas was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights” (Jonas 2:1). I do not know how many others were on the ship with Jonas. However, we read that there were 276 people on the ship that was transporting St. Paul to Rome, when it also suffered shipwreck: “And we were in all in the ship, two hundred threescore and sixteen souls” (Acts 27: 37). Maybe there were also about 276 people on the ship when they cast Jonas into the sea: “And they took Jonas, and cast him into the sea, and the sea ceased from raging” (Jonas 1:15). Now, do you think even one of those people who saw the great fish swallow up Jonas, thought that the great fish would vomit out Jonas upon the dry land as a very healthy man three days later? No, probably each and every one of them thought that that was the end of the life of Jonas on this earth, when the great fish swallowed up Jonas. However, we must remember: “For my thoughts are not your thoughts: nor your ways my ways, saith the Lord.” (Isaias 55:8) “O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways!” (Romans 11:33)

Read the third chapter in the book of Daniel. Nabuchodonosor commanded that the furnace should be heated seven times more than it had been accustomed to be heated. After that he had the three men cast into the furnace of burning fire. Now do you think that Nabuchodonosor, or anyone else present, thought that these three men would be taken out of that exceedingly hot furnace alive? No, not one person then present would have thought that these three young men would ever again come out of that furnace alive! However, we must remember: “For my thoughts are not your thoughts: nor your ways my ways, saith the Lord.” (Isaias 55:8) “O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways!” (Romans 11:33)

In the book of Genesis we read that Abraham and his wife were already very elderly when Isaac was born. In the 22nd chapter of the book of Genesis, we read how Abraham had bound Isaac his son and laid him on the altar upon the pile of wood. And he put forth his hand and took the sword, to sacrifice his son. Isaac must have already been a fairly old boy (maybe at least a teenager), because he was strong enough to carry enough wood a long distance up the mountain to burn long enough to consume the victim of the sacrifice. Do you agree that this was a great test of Abraham’s faith and hope since God had promised that the same Isaac would be the father of many nations? Abraham’s faith and hope strongly rebukes many today who refuse to believe that there is a hierarchy consisting of bishops, priests, and other ministers still living someplace who have the potential to dispense seven sacraments. Why was Abraham different than the doubters of today? St. Paul gives the answer in Romans 4:18; “Who against hope believed in hope; that he might be made the father of many nations, according to that which was said to him: So shall thy seed be.” When our faith is wavering with regards to believing any truth of the Catholic faith, let us always remember: “For my thoughts are not your thoughts: nor your ways my ways, saith the Lord.” (Isaias 55:8) “O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways!” (Romans 11:33)

Do you agree that the daughters of Lot were very foolish in not believing there was another man on earth besides their father, as we read in chapter 19 of the book of Genesis? What was the result of their doubting the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God and the unsearchable ways of God? Sacred Scripture tells us that they committed the most abominable sins of getting their father drunk and making his two sons also his two grandsons.

In the 32nd chapter of the book of Genesis we read about the wickedness of the older brothers of Joseph, and how they deceived their father to make him believe that an evil wild beast had devoured Joseph. However, later we learn that Jacob found out the truth, and it had a very profound effect on himself and on his life. I pray that those who are lacking in faith will also accept the truth that we should believe there is a hierarchical, perfect society still existing on earth consisting of Catholic bishops, priests, and other ministers – although we do not understand “the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways!”

Remember that there are hundreds of baptized Catholics throughout the world who are part of the Visible Church. In addition to those laypeople, God has the living magisterium of the Church someplace on earth who

make up the hierarchical part of the Visible Church. They are visible to themselves and anybody else who sees them; although the other people who see them may not even know that they are bishops or priests. The Visibility of the Catholic Church is indeed an article of **FAITH** at this time in the history of the Church. Of course you can reject the Catholic Faith and refuse to believe that there is a hierarchical perfect society still existing someplace on earth. However, I believe it on **FAITH JUST** because God said it is TRUE, and not because I can physically prove or demonstrate it, or provide the address of where those Catholic bishops and priests are physically living.

Similarly, I believe in the Real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Blessed Sacrament on **FAITH JUST** because God said it is TRUE, and not because I can physically prove or demonstrate it.

Similarly, I believe in the Holy Trinity on **FAITH JUST** because God said it is TRUE, and not because I can physically prove or demonstrate it.

Do you only have HUMAN Faith – that does not believe unless it can see Catholic bishops living in their own body here on earth, and many people can have access to seven sacraments? Pray for the grace of DIVINE Faith so that you can actually believe it on **FAITH JUST** because God said it is TRUE.

†††JMJ†††

My friend, you also wrote the following in our earlier email correspondence:

“Regarding where the Catholic Church can be found...yes, I would agree with you that there is so much confusion and disagreement even amongst traditionalist clergy, SSPX, CMRI, Bps. Dolan, Sanborn, Fr. Cekada, Patrick Henry, etc.

The confusion arises not because they are not all Catholics; **but rather because Catholics without a shepherd will be scattered...this the chastisement since 1958** when we have no true pope to decide and rule on the theological disagreements of the day and bring us all to one faith and one understanding of past doctrines and one common application of past doctrines on faith and morals.

Just consider that the Dominicans condemned the Franciscans for teaching that Our Lady was conceived FREE from original sin...and the Franciscans condemned the Dominicans for teaching the opposite...

Sts. Bernard, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, those great doctors and Saints of the Church, taught that the doctrine of Original Sin (the doctrine that every human person that exists/will ever exist is a descendant of Adam & Eve after the fall and therefore were conceived in original sin) necessarily included Our Lady. This debate went on for 400 years until Pope Sixtus in 1483 FORBADE either the pro Immaculate Conception preachers and the anti-Immaculate Conception preachers to condemn the other side precisely because the Church had not yet definitively decided the matter...the debate went on until 1854 when Pope Pius IX finally decided the matter infallibly...he taught that although Our Lady is a descendant of Adam & Eve, and although she would have been conceived with Original Sin, God specially and uniquely intervened and spared her from ever being conceived and contaminated with original sin.

Now...there was much disagreement between the Dominicans and the Franciscans but we should never say that either side wasn't Catholic, they were each Catholic but neither side made up the Catholic Church...both sides were simply members of the Catholic Church; but not the Catholic Church by themselves.

The exact same is true today of traditionalist clergy, SSPX, CMRI, Bps. Dolan, Sanborn, Fr. Cekada, Patrick Henry, etc. each are Catholics but because of the chastisement since 1958 when we have no true pope to decide and rule on the theological disagreements of the day and bring us all to one faith and one understanding of past doctrines and one common application of past doctrines on faith and morals, we are scattered sheep without a shepherd.”

My friend, as you wrote: “The confusion arises not because they are not all Catholics... **The exact same is true today of traditionalist clergy, SSPX, CMRI, Bps. Dolan, Sanborn, Fr. Cekada, Patrick Henry, etc. each are Catholics.**” I can agree with you to the point that the members of the groups you have mentioned have the indelible character on their soul as a Catholic since the time they were baptized. However, I do not agree that it is the same situation as with the Franciscans and Dominicans concerning the Immaculate

Conception. As you mentioned, during their discussion that was not yet a dogma of the faith defined by the Church. I cannot agree with you and Bishop Pivarunas that SSPX, FSSP, CMRI, the Sedevacantist and non Sedevacantist all belong to the SAME church. As demonstrated above, the Catholic Church has already declared and stated Her **dogmas** concerning *The Papacy*; and that it is an **article of faith and in fact, a DOGMA of faith** that the authority and jurisdiction and mission of bishops only comes to them through the Roman Pontiff.

{942} Do you agree that after Pope Pius IX finally decided the matter infallibly concerning the Immaculate Conception; that from that day and thereafter, no Catholic could remain in the Catholic Church who denied the dogma; whether or not they were Dominicans or Franciscans or anybody else in the world?

“Oh Helloooooo!!!” Do you really think that all of the different, conflicting, contradictory, self-condemning, incompatible, inconsistent, disagreeing, opposing, and opposite beliefs among the cornucopia branches, divisions, and splits in the Traditionalist Movement do not involve anything pertaining to faith and morals and some **already defined** doctrines and dogmas of the Catholic Church?

{943} Do you agree that it has been shown above that the very bishops, priests, and leaders in the Traditionalist Movement have provided sufficient proof that there are SCHISMS and SCHISMATICS in these churches and religions that combined together to make up the Traditionalist Movement and the Novus Ordo sects?

{944} Do you agree that no one can reasonably conclude that a very much divided and SCHISMATIC church with no authority, mission, or jurisdiction from the Catholic Church can still be the Catholic Church; and that therefore it is against reason to believe the Traditionalist Movement is the Catholic Church?

{945} Do you agree that when a Traditionalist Movement priest says in his sermon as a challenge to those who do not believe he is teaching the Catholic faith: “I hope that those who are accusing *will come forth and do so publicly*”; that he actually wants those who do not believe his teachings to come forth publicly and explain why they disagree with the teachings of the Traditionalist Movement?

Father Denis Philomena Marie, CMRI, said: “I would encourage you, and urge you, and plead with you to make sure that before you make any final decision that you hear all of the facts, from everyone concerned and, that you do a lot of prayer...But I repeat, I ask you this: before you make any decisions, make sure you get the full story. And I think the only way you're going to get the full story is to hear both sides at the same time in your presence.”

{946} Do you agree that people will NOT “hear all of the facts, get the full story, and hear both sides” unless both sides are presented?

{947} Do you agree that it is against reason, and therefore sinful, to say that both sides should not be presented; and that therefore people such as Patrick Henry should not present their side?

{948} Do you agree that people will NOT “hear all of the facts, get the full story, and hear both sides” unless both sides are presented; and that therefore everyone who reads this letter should answer all of the questions numbered between these kinds of brackets { } so that everyone can hear both sides?

{949} Do you agree that you, (my friend), asked me, even more than once, to write and explain to you what I think about many of the subjects and the situations as explained in this *Combined Response* letter?

Did you know that it is for very similar reasons I wrote the *True Church is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic* article (<https://jmjsite.com/thetruechurch-jmjsite.pdf>); the information about geocentricity (<https://jmjsite.com/geocentric-truth-jmjsite.pdf>); *My Petition for Spiritual Help* (https://jmjsite.com/my_petition_for_spiritual_help.pdf); *My Reply to Bishop Giles* (https://jmjsite.com/letter_to_bishop_giles.pdf); the *Rejecters of baptism of desire and of blood* article (<http://www.jmjsite.com/r/rejecters.pdf>); and then the follow up letter to explain again about *Baptism and The Three Anathemas* (<https://jmjsite.com/baptismsand3anathemas.pdf>); My response to Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi (<https://jmjsite.com/fraternalcorrectionrjmiwebsite.pdf>); *No One Will Remain a Non-Catholic Who Believes What the Bible Teaches* (<https://jmjsite.com/nopersonwillremainanon-catholicwhobelieveswhatthebibleteaches.pdf>); the article concerning Father Louis Campbell (<https://jmjsite.com/fatherlouiscampbell.pdf>) was also written just because two people were debating it and

asked me to write to them concerning Father Campbell; and likewise https://jmjsite.com/are_you_still_catholiclettersize.pdf and <https://jmjsite.com/avoidthem.pdf>. People asked me questions and wanted to know information, and I also write for my own better understanding of the subject matter. You will find other information at <https://jmjsite.com/audiobooks.html>: and then listen to *Which Bishop Should I Follow; Another Evident Contradiction*; and *Who Is Right and Who Is Wrong*.

Furthermore, regarding these articles the “other side” has their information posted on the World Wide Web. Because it is true that everyone in the world should have access to: “**hear all of the facts**, get the **full** story, and **hear both sides**”; I therefore put my information on the World Wide Web so that everyone can have access to it who wants to read it.

You and many others might disagree and think I have no right to respond to emails and present my side so that others can “**hear all of the facts**, get the **full** story, and **hear both sides**”.

{950} Do you agree that such reasoning does not make sense because it is against reason and therefore a sin to come to such a conclusion that I should not present my side although the other side asked me to present my side so that others can: “**hear all of the facts**, get the **full** story, and **hear both sides**”?

Saint Alphonsus Maria De Liguori in his sermon on the Sunday after the Ascension wrote the following:

Such should be your answer to all those satellites of Satan: you must despise all their maxims and reproaches. And when it is necessary to reprove those who make little of God’s law, you must take courage and correct them publicly. *Them that sin, reprove before all* (1 Timothy 5:20). And when there is question of the divine honor, we should not be frightened by the dignity of the man who offends God; let us say to him openly: This is sinful; it cannot be done. Let us imitate the Baptist, who reprov’d King Herod for living with his brother’s wife, and say to him: *It is not lawful for thee to have her* (Matthew 14:4). Men indeed shall regard us as fools, and turn us into derision; but on the day of judgment they shall acknowledge that they have been foolish, and we shall have the glory of being numbered among the saints. They shall say: *These are they whom we had sometime in derision. ... We fools esteemed their life madness, and their end without honor. Behold how they are numbered among the children of God, and their lot is among the saints* (Wisdom 5:3).

{951} Do you agree that they make little of God’s law who belong to a schismatic church, or any other non-Catholic religion?

{952} Do you agree that they make little of God’s law who do not accept and live by what Jesus Christ told them through the pen of his true Vicars when they wrote encyclical letters?

{953} Do you agree that they make little of God’s law who teach their new doctrines could be the truth when they are contrary to articles of faith and dogmas of faith?

{954} Do you agree that Saint Alphonsus Maria correctly taught that we; must take courage and correct them publicly?

{955} Do you agree that Pope Pius IX beseeched ALL and even commanded the laity to do their part in **bringing their zeal and labor to arrest and banish errors from Holy Church**?

“And so, fulfilling the obligation of Our supreme pastoral office, by the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, **We beseech all the faithful of Christ**, but especially those who have charge of, or who perform the duty of teaching, and in fact by the authority of Our same God and Savior, **We command that they bring their zeal and labor to arrest and banish these errors from Holy Church**, to extend the light of a most pure faith,” (DZ 1819, the Vatican Council).

Pope Leo XIII also wrote in *Sapientiae Christianae*:

“When necessity compels, not only those who are invested with power of rule are bound to safeguard the integrity of faith, but as St. Thomas maintains: ‘**Each one is under obligation to show forth his faith, either to instruct and encourage others of the faithful or to repel the attacks of unbelievers.**’ To recoil before an enemy, or to keep silence when from all sides such clamors are raised against truth is the part of a man either devoid of character or who entertains

doubt as to the truth of what he professes to believe. In both cases such mode of behaving is base and is insulting to God...”

{956} Do you agree that Pope Leo XIII while quoting St. Thomas provides the correct teaching of the Catholic Church about the fact that every Catholic is under obligation to show forth his faith, either to instruct and encourage others of the faithful or to repel the attacks of unbelievers; and that Catholics should not keep silence when unbelievers teach contrary to doctrines and dogmas of the Catholic Church?

And from Pope Pius XII:

“The initiative of the lay apostolate is perfectly justified **even without a prior explicit ‘mission’ from the hierarchy**... Personal initiative plays a great part in protecting the faith and Catholic life, especially in countries where contacts with the hierarchy are difficult or practically impossible. In such circumstances, the Christians upon whom this task falls **must, with God’s grace, assume all their responsibilities**” (*The Mission of Catholic Women*, Sept. 29, 1957, *The Pope Speaks*, Vol. IV, recorded in the AAS and therefore a document commanding belief by Catholics.)

What Must Be Believed by Catholics by St. Vincent of Lerins

“Also in the Catholic Church itself we take great care that we hold that which has been believed everywhere, always, by all. For that is truly and properly Catholic, as the very force and meaning of the word shows, which comprehends everything almost universally. And we shall observe this rule if we follow universality, antiquity, consent. We shall follow universality if we confess that one Faith to be true which the whole Church throughout the world confesses; antiquity if we in no wise depart from those interpretations which it is plain that our ancestors and fathers proclaimed; consent if in antiquity itself we eagerly follow the definitions and beliefs of all, or certainly nearly all, priests and doctors alike.”

{957} Do you agree that in the Catholic Church itself we take great care that we hold that which has been believed everywhere, always, by all?

{958} Do you agree that as explained above, it has been believed everywhere, always, by all and taught by Pope, after Pope, after Pope that the bishops throughout the world only receive their authority, mission, and jurisdiction through a lawful successor of St. Peter?

{959} Do you agree that they therefore **manifestly no longer believe the Catholic faith** who do not accept the truth that has been believed everywhere, always, by all, namely; that the bishops throughout the world only receive their authority, mission, and jurisdiction through a lawful successor of St. Peter?

{960} Do you agree that they therefore manifestly no longer believe the Catholic faith who do not accept the truth that the bishops in the Traditionalist Movement and Novus Ordo sects do not have authority, mission, and jurisdiction since not so much as one of them living today received his authority, mission, and jurisdiction through a lawful successor of St. Peter?

Pope Clement XIII, Encyclical *Christianae Reipublicae*, 1766:

Cry Wolf! “Reveal to the faithful the wolves which are demolishing the Lord’s vineyard.”

St. Francis de Sales, Introduction to the Devout Life, Part III, Chapter 29:

“The declared enemies of God and His Church, heretics and **schismatics**, must be criticized as much as possible, as long as truth is not denied. It is a work of charity to shout: ‘Here is the wolf!’ when it enters the flock or anywhere else.”

{961} Do you agree that, as has been pointed out above, the Traditionalist Movement clerics are the ones who also repeatedly and CORRECTLY proved beyond all DOUBT that the sects that make up the Traditionalist Movement and Novus Ordo are **non-Catholic** heretics and **schismatics**?

{962} Do you agree that if you are going to follow the teachings of Saint Francis de Sales that you should also share this article with as many as possible to help criticize and expose the declared enemies of God and His Church?

Fr. Felix Sarda y Salvany, *Liberalism is a Sin*, Chapter 20, 1886:

There is no sin against charity in calling evil. "The propagators and abettors of heresy, as well as its authors, have at all times been called heretics. As the Church has always considered heresy a very grave evil, so has she always called its adherents bad and pervert. Run over the list of ecclesiastical writers — you will then see how the Apostles treated the first heretics, how the Fathers and modern controversialists and the Church herself in her official language has pursued them. There is then no sin against charity in calling evil; its authors abettors and its disciples bad; all its acts, words, and writings iniquitous, wicked, malicious. In short, the wolf has always been called the wolf; and in so calling it, no one ever has believed that wrong was done to the flock and the shepherd. If the propagation of good and the necessity of combating evil require the employment of terms somewhat harsh against error and its supporters, this usage is certainly not against charity. This is a corollary or consequence of the principle we have just demonstrated. We must render evil odious and detestable. We cannot attain this result without pointing out the dangers of evil, without showing how and why it is odious, detestable and contemptible. Christian oratory of all ages has ever employed against impiety the most vigorous and emphatic rhetoric in the arsenal of human speech. In the writings of the great athletes of Christianity, the usage of irony, imprecation, execration and of the most crushing epithets is continual. Hence the only law is the opportunity and the truth."

Let us now read from: *A Parochial Course of Doctrinal Instructions Based on the Teachings of the Catechism of the Council of Trent*, prepared and arranged by Very Rev. Charles J. Callan and Very Rev. John A. McHugh, Imprimatur, 1941, Moral Series, Part III, page 73 ff:

"The Meaning of Conscience.

1) - There are two rules or norms according to which a person must shape his conduct, namely the Commandments of God and his own conscience. 2) - Conscience is the judgment of the practical reason which decides that a particular action is in conformity with or opposition to God's law. 3) - We are never permitted to act contrary to the dictates of our conscience, for, as St. Paul says, all that is not of faith, i.e., according to one's conscience, is sinful (Rom. xiv. 23). If we eat certain food, thinking it is forbidden when it is not forbidden, we sin, says the Apostle. 4) - But while one must always act according to the dictates of his conscience, it does not follow that in doing so he may not, under certain conditions, be guilty of sin, for there is such a thing as a false conscience."

"Various Kinds of Conscience.

1) - Conscience may be true, erroneous or doubtful. It is true when it is in conformity with God's law; it is doubtful when it hesitates or is unable to decide whether a certain action is right or wrong; it is erroneous when it is out of harmony with the divine law. 2) - It is never lawful to act with a doubtful conscience, because that would be carelessly running the risk of doing the wrong thing, and so of sinning."

"The greatest charity one can do to another is to lead him to the truth." – St. Thomas Aquinas

Here's freedom to him who would read;
Here's freedom to him who would write;
None ever feared that the truth should be heard,
But those who the truth would indict.

It is now time for all of us to apply this advice given by St Anselm to his disciple:

"You must not so cling to what we have said, as to abide by it obstinately, when others with more weighty arguments succeed in overthrowing ours and establishing opinions against them, and further, if there is anything that calls for correction I do not refuse the correction."

Therefore, please send me your answers to **all of** the questions numbered between these types of brackets { }; and then we will both know if you agree with me. If you do not agree with me then present your more weighty arguments that would thereby overthrow what I have written and bring me to the knowledge of the truth: 1) without contradicting yourself or teaching contrary to that which has been believed everywhere, always, by all; or 2) contradicting any teaching, doctrine, or dogma of the Catholic Church; and 3) without teaching ANYTHING contrary to whatsoever Jesus Christ taught and told us through the true Popes in the past; and 4) without teaching anything contrary to reason. Thank you.

“For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.” Matthew 12:37

“He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned.” Mark 16:16

In Jesus, Mary, and St. Joseph,

Patrick Henry

<https://jmjsite.com>

JMJ@JMJsie.com

As a type of PostScript to help us accept and somewhat understand why Almighty God has permitted the results of Vatican II and the loss of jurisdiction and clerics who function both validly and licitly; let us review a sermon by Father Francis Hunolt. <https://jmjsite.com/v59thafterpentecost-presumptuouslyscrutinizingthed.pdf>

Thank you for visiting: <http://www.JMJsie.com>. Please share this information and tell others about this website.