



## Proofs of Faith for Our Times

Two millennia ago our Lord Jesus Christ founded a Church to last until the end of time. Throughout the history of this Church, The Enemy has sought by every means possible to destroy her. Saint Paul warned us, *The mystery of iniquity is already working.* (II Thessalonians 2:7; references are provided to enable the reader to study and verify the accuracy of these quotes.)

In the first three centuries, the attack was direct, which led to millions giving up their lives in defense of Jesus' Church. But other attacks were also begun, including the one begun by Simon Magus. (Acts 8) After the recognition of the Church by Constantine, a new type of persecution was instituted under Julian the Apostate. An apostate is the worst type of person on earth, far worse than the pagan emperors, who persecuted the Church. An apostate is a Christian, who abandons the Faith entirely. (Canon 1325; all references are to the 1917 Code of Canon Law) Instead of killing Christians, he sought to reinstitute paganism and lure Christians back into paganism. He also supported any heretic, who would support the legitimacy of restoring pagan worship alongside their own sects. And a heretic is any Christian, who doubts or denies an article of the Faith given to us by Jesus. (Also Canon 1325) Since true Christians know that any false worship is worshipping the devil, who is The Enemy, Christians could not tolerate this and thus were punished. It was some years before two Christians, John and Paul so angered Julian the Apostate that he martyred them. And let us remember that persecution comes not only in the open form of death and imprisonment, but The Enemy also subtly tries to lure us away from the Catholic Faith and from living a moral life, knowing that when we commit mortal sin we come under his perfidious power.

In order to understand this indefectible Church we must understand exactly how Jesus established His Church. And it must be remembered that not everything is reported in the Gospels, but given to us also through holy Tradition. (See John 21:25 and II Thessalonians 2:14 it is interesting that after warning of the *mystery of iniquity*, Saint Paul tells us to *hold fast to the traditions you have received.*) Tradition is not merely a customary way of doing things, but the teachings of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ

transmitted to the Apostles and by the Apostles to us in our own time through the Catholic Church, which is the only true Christian Church. Many of these teachings have now been committed to writing by the Councils of the Church, the Popes and the Fathers and Doctors of the Church.

## Jesus Finds a Church

*And Jesus came into the quarters of Cesarea Philippi: and he asked his disciples, saying: Whom do men say that the Son of man is? But they said: Some John the Baptist, and other some Elias, and others Jeremias, or one or the prophets. Jesus saith to them: But whom do you say that I am? Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answering said to him: Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee: That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. (Matthew 16:13-18)*

First of all it should be noted that the word *church* only occurs in Saint Matthew's Gospel here and two chapters later. The word *churches* does not appear in the Gospels at all. Jesus founded a **single church** to teach **one doctrine**. Why was the Church founded on Peter and not someone else? Jesus tells us: *Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven.* And Peter is chosen as Pope for professing his faith that *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.* Jesus founded the Church **on the Papacy**. The Papacy is the *rock*. In fact, in many decrees of the Church, the reigning Pope is addressed as *Peter*, which means *rock*. In the Latin this is clearer: *Tu es Petrus, et super hand petram aedificabo Ecclesiam Meam.* A literal translation would be: *Thou art Rock and upon this rock I will build My Church.*

## Attributes of the Church

The Catholic Church has several attributes and four marks, by which it is known. Some number four attributes, and others three. They are Infallibility, Authority, Indefectibility and Perpetuity. Since Indefectibility and Perpetuity are related, we shall consider them first. Authority will be discussed with the marks of the Church.

## The Church is Perpetual

There is much to be learned from this portion of Sacred Scripture, but the first point to consider is that the Church is to last until the end of time. *And I say to thee: That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* (Matthew 16:18) The Church was founded by Jesus Christ to last until the end of the world. *And behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.* (Matthew 28:20) The Vatican Council in 1870 infallibly declared that there would be a line of Popes lasting until the end of the world. *If anyone then says that it is*

*not from the institution of Christ the Lord Himself, or by divine right that the blessed Peter has perpetual successors in the primacy over the universal Church, or that the Roman Pontiff is not the successor of the blessed Peter in the same primacy, let him be anathema.* (The Vatican Council as quoted in DZ 1825, being from Henry Denzinger's compilation of doctrinal decisions of the Catholic Church.) And so on the last day there will be a Pope reigning in the Catholic Church, probably lamenting the fact that again people have departed from the road to heaven as prophesied in Sacred Scripture.

*But yet the Son of man, when he cometh, shall he find, think you, faith on earth?* (Luke 18:8)

## Infallibility

There has been much controversy over infallibility. Some wish to limit it to a rare occurrence that happens several times a century at most. If this is truly the case, then these same people should have produced a list of all of the infallible statements of the Catholic Church and made it available. Instead they limit infallibility to three occurrences in the last century and a half, the definition of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception 150 years ago, the definition of infallibility at the Vatican Council and finally the definition of the Assumption in 1950.

For two millennia Catholics have looked to the Roman Pontiff for answers in matters of faith, knowing that the Holy Ghost protects him from erring in matters of faith or morals, when he speaks *ex cathedra*. Councils are only infallible, if they are called by the Pope and their decrees have been confirmed by him. Theologians cite Luke 22:31-32: *And the Lord said: Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren.* This *unfailing faith* has been confirmed by the Popes and finally by the Vatican Council in defining the basis of infallibility.

*For the Holy Ghost was not promised to the successor of Peter that by His revelation they might disclose new doctrine, but that by His help they might guard sacredly the revelation transmitted through the apostles and the deposit of faith, and might faithfully set it forth. Indeed, all the venerable fathers have embraced their apostolic doctrine, and the holy orthodox Doctors have venerated and followed it, knowing full well that the See of St. Peter always remained unimpaired by any error, according to the divine promise of our Lord and Saviour made to the chief of His disciples: "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren" (Luke 22:32), DZ 1836: Vatican Council.* Nothing could be clearer, but still controversy remains.

One controversy is over what statements of the Pope are protected by infallibility. The Vatican Council states that both the extraordinary and the ordinary magisterium of the Church are infallible. The Popes use both authorities, ordinary and extraordinary and both are infallible. Pope Pius XII clarified the infallibility of Encyclicals: *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"; and generally what is expounded and inculcated in Encyclical Letters already for other reasons appertains to*

*Catholic doctrine. But if the Supreme Pontiffs in their official documents purposely pass judgment on a matter up to that time open to dispute, it is obvious that that matter, according to the mind and will of the same Pontiffs, cannot be any longer considered a question open to discussion among theologians. Humani Generis. And so Encyclicals are infallible, when they settle a matter of doctrine. Therefore instead of three incidents of infallibility in the past century and a half, we have over a hundred.*

One of the results of the infallibility of the Pope, which is given to the Church so that we can be absolutely certain on matters of faith, is that the Pope writes the Profession of Faith. Several have been written from the Apostles Creed to the Nicene Creed down to the Profession of Faith of the Council of Trent. This last Profession of Faith was modified by the Vatican Council: *I unhesitatingly accept and profess all the doctrines (especially those concerning the primacy of the Roman Pontiff and his infallible teaching authority), handed down, defined and explained by the sacred canons and the ecumenical councils and especially those of this most holy Council of Trent (and by the ecumenical Vatican Council).* (The words in parentheses were inserted by the Vatican Council and approved by Pope Pius IX.) The Profession of Faith is required by all Bishops before taking over a diocese and by many others in taking a new position of authority in the Church. Converts to the Faith are required to make this profession, if they were baptized in a non-Catholic church, as are heretics, when they are reconciled with the Church.

*The faithful are bound to profess their faith publicly, whenever silence, subterfuge, or their manner of acting would otherwise entail an implicit denial of their faith, a contempt of religion, an insult to God, or scandal to their neighbor. So states the 1917 Code of Canon Law in Canon 1325. The next part of this Canon defines the three crimes that can be committed against the Faith, apostasy, heresy and schism: Any baptized person who, while retaining the name of Christian, obstinately denies or doubts any of the truths proposed for belief by the divine and Catholic faith, is a heretic; if he abandons the Christian faith entirely, he is called an apostate; if, finally, he refuses to be subject to the Supreme Pontiff, or to have communication with the members of the church subject to the Pope, he is a schismatic.*

*For not every sin, however great 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. (Pope Pius XII, Mystici Corporis Christi) Note well that by committing apostasy, heresy or schism, a person severs themselves from the Catholic Church. A man that is a heretic, after the second warning, avoid. (Titus 3:10) Note well that Saint Paul is writing to a Bishop, Titus, whose duty it is to admonish the sinner. For the average Catholic, Saint Paul would have written: A heretic avoid.*

*A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid: Knowing that he that is such an one is subverted and sinneth, **being condemned by his own judgment.** (Titus 3:10-11) This fact has been confirmed by the Popes and Canon Law. In fact, the presumption is so strong, that anyone who is validly baptized outside of the Catholic Church must renounce their heresy, make the Profession of Faith and be absolved from the excommunication for heresy. In the absolution, though, the condition may be added that the absolution is only being granted, if necessary. However, the absolution by the Pope, a delegate of the Pope or the Local Ordinary is required.*

Pope Pius XI reminds us: *Wherefore, if any should presume to think in their hearts otherwise than as it has been defined by Us, which God avert, let them know and*

*understand that they are condemned by their own judgment; that they have suffered shipwreck in regard to faith, and have revolted from the unity of the Church; and what is more, that by their own act they subject themselves to the penalties established by law, if, what they think in their heart, they should to signify by word or writing or any other external means. Ineffabilis Deus, December 8, 1854, Pope Pius IX (DZ 1641) This is not limited to thinking against one doctrine, but against any doctrine of the Divine and Catholic Faith. The Vatican Council teaches: “Further, by divine and Catholic faith, all those things must be believed which are contained in the written word of God and in tradition, and those which are proposed by the Church, either by solemn pronouncement or in her ordinary and universal teaching power, are to be believed as divinely revealed. (DZ 1792)*

The consequences of apostasy, heresy and schism are many. Since a person by committing these crimes visibly departs from the Church, he loses all rights and authority he may have had in the Catholic Church. Canon Law is quite clear that these people resign from all offices they hold in the Church, and this resignation is accepted by operation of law by the very fact of becoming an apostate, heretic or schismatic. Further such a man also becomes irregular on two counts, which forbids him to receive or exercise Holy Orders, and the law gives absolutely no exception whatsoever, as it does in the cases of those merely excommunicated or suspended. And anyone who becomes an apostate, heretic or schismatic is excommunicated by this very fact. There are other consequences, such as being forbidden to participate in ecclesiastical elections.

Although absolution from the excommunication can be performed by the Local Ordinary and in non-Catholic countries, even pastors may receive baptized converts into the Faith, the irregularity for apostasy, heresy or schism is reserved **exclusively to the Roman Pontiff**. He alone can judge all of these cases. (It should be noted that pedophiles also become irregular.)

Until an irregularity is removed, a priest may not exercise his priesthood for any reason whatsoever. The only exception might be absolving a sinner in danger of death. Although the law is silent on this particular matter, any priest may validly absolve any dying person in confession and they may even absolve them from all excommunications, although if the person lives he is required to have recourse to the authority who normally absolves.

*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. As we said before, so now I say again: If any one preach to you a gospel, besides that which you have received, let him be anathema. (Galatians 1:8-9)*

## Marks of the Church

The Catholic Church is *marked* by four marks, one, holy, Catholic and Apostolic. Any church that does not possess these marks is not the Catholic Church.

Pope Pius IX wrote (Septemer 16, 1864, DZ 1686): *The true Church of Jesus Christ was established by divine authority, and it is known by a fourfold mark, which we assert in the Creed must be believed; and each one of these marks so clings to the others that it cannot be separated from them; hence it at the same time shine with the*

*prerogatives of unity, sanctity, and apostolic succession. Therefore, the Catholic Church alone is conspicuous and perfect in the unity of the whole world and of all nations, particularly in that unity whose beginning, root, and unfailing origin are that supreme authority and “higher principality” (Saint Irenaeus” of blessed PETER, the prince of the Apostle, and of his successors in the Roman Chair. No other Church is Catholic, except the one which, founded on PETER, flows into one “body compacted and fitly joined together” (Ephesians 4:16) in the unity of faith and charity. ...*

## Unity

*I pray for them. ... And now I am not in the world, and these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep them in thy name whom thou hast given me: that they may be one, as we also are. While I was with them, I kept them in thy name. Those whom thou gavest me have I kept: and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition: that the scripture may be fulfilled. (John 17:9,11-12) When Jesus prays, His prayer is always heard and he has prayed for unity in His Church. One body and one Spirit: as you are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism. One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all. (Ephesians 4:4-6)*

*Catechism of the Council of Trent: That this visible head is necessary to establish and preserve unity in the Church is the unanimous accord of the Fathers;... As we have seen, Jesus established His Church on Peter and his successors in the Papacy. Saint Cyprian (quoted in Amantissimus by Pope Pius IX, paragraph 3): God is one, Christ is one, the Church established upon Peter by the voice of the Lord is one;*

*Apostles in unanimous agreement, is shown to be one.” And after a few (remarks he adds): “Does he who does not hold this unity of the Church believe that he has the faith? Does he who deserts and resists the chair of PETER, on which the Church was founded, have confidence that he is in the Church? (Saint Cyprian, de unitate, DZ 247)*

## Holy

*The Church is called holy because she is consecrated and dedicated to God; (Catechism of the Council of Trent, which was compiled by Saints Robert Bellarmine and Charles Borromeo by order of the Council of Trent.) And let us continue from this same catechism: Moreover, the Church alone has the **legitimate** worship of sacrifice, and the salutary use of the Sacraments, which are the efficacious instruments of divine grace, used by God to produce true holiness. The Sacraments and the Mass is only fruitful in the Church, hence Saint Jerome states: Whoever eats the Lamb outside this House is profane.*

*Hence, to possess true holiness, we must belong to this Church. Continues The Catechism of the Council of Trent The Church therefore it is clear, is holy, and holy because she is the body of Christ, by Whom she is sanctified, and in Whose Blood she is washed.*

# Catholic

The Church is *catholic*, which means it is universal. The Church is for all men of all times until the end of the world as Jesus said: *Going therefore, teach ye all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.* (Matthew 29:20)

# Apostolic

*The Church is firm. A house is said to be firm if it has a solid foundation. The principal foundation of the Church is Christ: "For other foundation no men can lay but that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus." [I Corinthians 3:11] The secondary foundation, however, is the Apostles and their teaching.* (Saint Thomas Aquinas' Catechism)

The Apostles have successors to their teaching, authority and orders. Heretics have stressed the necessity of *apostolic succession of orders* alone without regard to the apostolicity of teaching and authority, which is required for apostolicity. *The obsession of the 'bishops at large' and their followers with the validity of orders has brought them to the belief that such validity is the sole hallmark of the Church and its authority.* (Bishops at Large)

# Legitimacy of the Sacraments

To truly understand Apostolicity, we must delve into sacramental theology. As people left the Vatican II Church, when it instituted new apostate *sacraments*, priests and eventually bishops came to serve them the old rite of the Mass and Sacraments. There was no discussion about whether these priests and bishops were functioning within the laws of the Church. This was presumed by the laity. The bishops and priests failed to study into the matter to make sure that what they were doing was lawful. In fact, there was no consideration of authority until two bishops descended from Bishop Peter Martin Ngo Dinh Thuc, Musey and Vezelis, divided the United States into two dioceses, declaring themselves to have ordinary and sole authority over these new dioceses. Only the Pope can establish or change the boundaries of dioceses, and he has the sole power to appoint and remove bishops. The question of authority was instantly raised by those who rejected these two bishops' claim to authority. That their claim lacks validity can be seen by the rift that occurred between them soon after they established the two dioceses. One diocese ceased to exist with the death of its bishop and the other is virtually non-existent.

It is absolutely true that for a Sacrament to be valid three things are necessary, matter, form and intention. Theologians have held to this for two millennia. However, this is not sufficient for a Sacrament to be legitimate as the practice of the Church demonstrates. However, in the 1970's all that was heard was a stress on matter, form and intention. In fact, the necessity for a valid minister for the Sacrament was rarely mentioned, it was presumed that these men were truly priests. Actually the stress was laid on form, since the Vatican II Church butchered the form, invalidating the

sacramental rites. Intention was presumed, if a priest used the proper rite, and matter was rarely discussed, except in the chant *matter, form and intention*.

*Professor: "Abuse more or less widespread there may be; custom there is none, for the very good reason that custom properly speaking is law and by its nature must be reasonable. And bad manners, sheer sloth, or lack of becoming reverence cannot possibly constitutes sacramental etiquette to say, nothing of courtly dress before and with Our Lord. (Careless Custodians of the Sacraments, Joseph P. Donovan, Homiletic and Pastoral Review, volume 45, number 3)* This appeared in December of 1944, discussing the duty of a priest to wear cassock, surplice and stole, when administering the Sacraments. However, this is only one form of carelessness, that has become *custom* among the Traditionalists. Yes, those who claim to be zealous for preserving the *old ways* are failing miserably. There is one very serious failure, which effects Sacramental validity that must be addressed. Many Traditionalist priests acquire the wine for use at Mass from the liquor store. Research has shown that much of what is sold for *wine* is not true wine. This problem is so bad that the Church issued a decree (AAS 21-631, March 26, 1929) to warn priests of these serious problems. This decree states: *Similarly that wine, or rather liquor, cannot be regarded as valid matter, which is extracted from apples or other fruits, or which is made chemically, although it have the color of wine, and may be said in a way to contain its elements; nor wine to which water has been added in a greater or equal quantity.* A Traditionalist website gives two recipes for wine. One is to use grapes and crush them and will produce valid matter. The other requires raisins **and water** to produce the wine, and therefore will be at best dubious. And take a look at any book on home wine making. Most recipes call for a quarter or less of grape juice, a similar amount of sugar and he balance water with a little yeast. Tour a winery and one may find a similar recipe being used, and one can be fairly certain most commercial wineries use this kind of recipe.

The Church in the same decree gave the priests practical advice; *Now, in order to be sure of the genuine matter of the bread and wine which is absolutely required in consecrating so great a Sacrament, it will certainly be better, unless the priest have both of these substances made at home, to obtain them from persons who are very expert in them and who actually grind the wheat or press the wine from grapes; and who, besides being above all suspicion, can safely certify that they have absolutely without any fraud, made the hosts from wheat alone, and pressed the wine from grapes alone.*

And let us return to a sad story from Careless Custodians of the Sacraments, *Not so long ago a girl brought her intended husband to a young assistant to arrange for a course of instruction with a view to his becoming a Catholic. Twelve instructions all told were agreed upon. The priest was on hand for four; he excused himself for two; he was neither present nor accounted for in the other six instances. The catechumen became disgusted and said: "What's the use?" ... That instruction-jumper-in his don't-care-ness-the child of sloth-is, I submit, a symbol of all too many priests who only half-keep appointments with their High Priest in His Sacraments of soul-reflecting and soul-healing.* This story was repeated in a Traditionalist seminary, when a catechumen came for instruction. Although the priest who was scheduled to give the instruction was present, he was *too busy*. The seminarian who had answered the door, despite doctor's orders not to talk, could not turn away the catechumen, so when he was unable to get a priest (and several were present) to come, he gave the instruction himself.

## Where Can We Go For Mass?

Can one trust a religious goods store, who obtains hosts and wine from sources that follow the *Novus Ordo Missae*, be considered trustworthy, when they allow the mutilations of Christ's very words in the consecration at Mass? And yet most Traditionalists use these very sources for their hosts and wine, exposing their Masses to invalidity for lack of proper matter.

Once all of these concerns are removed, can we assist at any Mass, provided we are certain that it is valid? The answer of the Church is absolutely not. *A person who of his own accord and knowingly helps in any manner to propagate heresy, or who communicates in sacred rites (a divinis) with heretics in violation of the prohibition of Canon 1258, incurs suspicion of heresy.* (Canon 2316) Canon 1258 states: *It is unlawful for the faithful to assist in any active manner, or to take part in the services of non-Catholics.* We may think this refers to Protestant services, but it applies to **any non-Catholic service**. There are several sects that have valid Sacraments, such as the Eastern Orthodox and some of the old-Catholics. We have always been forbidden to assist at their Masses, despite the fact we can be sure of the validity. However, the Vatican II Church teaches that we may assist and even receive the Sacraments from them, especially if there is no Catholic priest available.

Let us look at an historical precedent. King Henry VIII declared himself head of the Church in England in order to annul his marriage to Catherine of Aragon, when the Pope refused to grant him an annulment. The majority of priests and bishops in England accepted his declaration and stayed with his new *Anglican Church*. However, the rites for the Mass and Sacraments remained the same until after Henry VIII's death. What could true Catholics, such as Saints Thomas More and John Fisher do? Could they assist at these Masses? Catholics had to depart at once from the Anglican Church, because it was in schism, accepting as its *pope*, Henry VIII, and not the Successor of Saint Peter in Rome. Those who assisted at these Masses became suspect of heresy and eventually were led away into heresy by Thomas Cramner, who wrote a *new mass* and *new sacraments*. The same is true of the time of the French Revolution. The revolution required priests to take an oath, which the Pope condemned. Those who took the oath were called the *Constitutional clergy*, and were excommunicated by the Church. Despite the fact that they had the church buildings as did the Anglicans in England, and retained the Catholic forms of the Mass and Sacraments, Catholics were forbidden to assist at their Masses and receive the Sacraments from them.

The Church has always required more than matter, form and intention for the legitimacy of the Sacraments. And it is a mortal sin of sacrilege to assist at an illegitimate Mass. To point this out the Catholic Church has canonized Saint Hermenegild, whose devotion to our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament earns our praise. Saint Hermenegild was a Catholic, son of an Arian (heretic) king of part of Spain. He had gone into exile in order to practice his faith undisturbed. However his father wished him to come home and promised his son that he could practice the Catholic Faith unmolested at home. Hermenegild returned home, but as soon as he arrived his father placed him in prison until he would convert to Arianism. While in prison, Hermenegild was denied the Sacraments. On Easter, Hermenegild's father sent an Arian bishop to

bring him Holy Communion. Hermenegild refused to receive Holy Communion from the bishop, telling him that he could not receive our Lord from someone that denies Him. For this, he earned the martyrs crown, when his father had him beheaded.

With all of this in mind, we go now to the attribute of authority, which is intimately linked to the mark of Apostolicity.

## Authority of the Pope

*Indeed we declare, say, pronounce, and define that it is altogether necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff. (Unam Sanctam Boniface VIII, November 18, 1302) And Jesus said: *And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.* (Matthew 16:19) The authority of the Pope is not limited, but extends to all Catholics, Cardinals, Archbishops, Priests, religious and laity alike. One consequence is *In view of the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, any members of the faithful in the whole world may appeal his case to the Holy See-whether the case be civil or criminal and at any stage whatsoever of the procedure – or take it there in the first place. ...* (Canon 1569) Unless the Roman Pontiff intervenes, though, the original case continues.*

Council of Lyons II states (DZ 466): *Also this same holy Roman Church holds the highest and complete primacy and spiritual power over the universal Catholic Church which she truly and humbly recognizes herself to have received with fullness of power from the Lord Himself in Blessed Peter, the chief or head of the Apostles whose successor is the Roman Pontiff. ... And to her anyone burdened with affairs pertaining to the ecclesiastical world can appeal; and in all cases looking forward to an ecclesiastical examination, recourse can be had to her judgment, and all churches are subject to her; their prelates give obedience and reverence to her.*

Canon 218 of the Code of Canon Law makes this clear: *As the successor to the primacy of St. Peter, the Roman Pontiff has not only the primacy of honor, but also supreme and full jurisdiction over the universal Church, in matters of faith and morals as well as in those pertaining to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the whole world. This power is episcopal, ordinary and immediate, and extends over each and every church, and over each and every pastor as well as over the faithful, and is independent of all human authority.*

Pope Pius XII makes clear the relation of the bishops and the Pope in Ad Sinarum Gentem, (Feast of the Most Holy Rosary, October 7, 1954, paragraph 12): *By virtue of God's Will, the faithful are divided into two classes; the clergy and laity. By virtue of the same Will is established the twofold sacred hierarchy, namely, of orders and jurisdiction. Besides-as has also been divinely established-the power of orders (through which the ecclesiastical hierarchy is composed of Bishops, priests, and ministers) comes from receiving the Sacrament of Holy Orders. But the power of jurisdiction, which is conferred upon the Supreme Pontiff directly by divine rights, flows to the Bishops by the same right, but only through the Successors of Saint Peter, to whom not only the simple faithful, but even all the Bishops must be constantly subject, and to whom they must be bound by obedience with the bond of unity. The authority of the Bishops flows from the*

Pope, so much so that the Pope alone appoints Bishops. This authority is exclusively Papal.

*the power of jurisdiction, ... flows to the Bishops by the same right, but only through the Successors of Saint Peter...* There are two keys in the Church, that of Orders and that of jurisdiction. It is possible for a man to possess one key without the other. Let us look at how our Lord Jesus Christ established His Church. The first power Jesus gave was that of jurisdiction to the Pope (Matthew 16:18-19) *That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.* Upon this Rock, the Church was built, the superior power of jurisdiction being established first. On the first Holy Thursday, Jesus ordained the Apostles and consecrated them Bishops. However, they did not have the power to grant absolution for sins in Confession. This power was granted a week after Easter, when Jesus said: *Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them: and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained.* (John 20:23) The Council of Trent teaches that for a priest to validly absolve from sins he requires not only the power of Holy Orders, but also that of jurisdiction over the penitent. (DZ 902, 919) Pope Pius VI condemned the Jansenist Synod of Pistoia, which taught contrary to Trent and taught: *after the institution of dioceses and parishes, it is fitting that each one exercise this judgment over those persons subject to him either by reason of territory or some personal right, because otherwise confusion and disturbance would be introduced:* And Pope Pius VI clarified what they meant: *since it declares that, in order to prevent confusion, after dioceses and parishes have been instituted, it is **merely fitting** that the power of absolving be exercised upon subjects; so understood, as it for the valid use of this power there is no need of ordinary or delegated jurisdiction, without which the Tridentine Synod declares that absolution conferred by a priest is of no value,*

John 20:24: *Now Thomas, one of the twelve, who is called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came.* And so we may ask, where did Didymus, who we know also as Thomas receive the power of jurisdiction from, since he did not receive it directly from Jesus? This must have been granted from Peter, as was the power given to Mathias after the Ascension. (Acts 1:15-26)

Saint Leo IX on September 2, 1053 states; DZ 353 Chap. 32 . . . *As the hinge while remaining immovable opens and closes the door, so Peter and his successors have free judgment over all the Church, since no one should remove their status because "the highest See is judged by no one."*

## Restoration of the Church

We are infallibly certain that the Catholic Church will last until the end of time as Jesus Christ established it upon the Rock of Peter and his successors in the Papacy. However, at some point in history, she will suffer a terrible crisis, that is so severe that the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass ceases!

*For in those days shall be such tribulations as were not from the beginning of the creation which God created until now: neither shall be.* (Matthew 24:19) The

tribulations the Church and the elect have undergone in the last half a century are unprecedented in history.

The Church must be restored along the same lines it was founded. First of all, we must realize:

1. The Papacy was usurped by an antipope in 1958, and this usurpation lasts until this day.
2. Because these antipopes have been unopposed by a true Pope, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass has completely ceased.
3. Virtually all of the bishops and priests have fallen into heresy and wish to remain there. They cannot return to the ministry, until a Pope reconciles them, as no other power on earth is capable of this task.

*They shall not partake of holy things, until a high priest shall arise for evidence and for truth.* (III Esdras 5:40, used as the Offertory prayer for the Mass for the election of a Pope.) The Mass **cannot be restored**, until the Papacy is. Jesus founded the Church on the Papacy, then he instituted the Mass. The restoration must come along this line, so we ask:

## Where is The Pope?

It has been over 45 years, since Angelo Roncalli usurped the Papacy as the second Antipope John XXIII in history. He and his three successors have created an *antichurch*, that bears no resemblance to the Catholic Church, although it still claims to be Catholic. This usurpation is unlike any other in history. In the past every Antipope was opposed by a true Pope, but this time, Satan has engineered the *reign* of an Antipope, who is not opposed by a true Pope, which caused the Great Apostasy. (See II Thessalonians 2) However, we can be infallibly certain that Pope Pius XII will be succeeded by a true Pope and probably already has been.

*Amen, I say to you that this generation shall not pass until all these things be done.* (Mark 13:30) A generation can be 33 years (the life of Christ), 40 years or at the outside 70 years. *And unless the Lord had shortened the days, no flesh should be saved: but, for the sake of the elect which he hath chosen, he hath shortened the days.* (Mark 13:20) And so let us presume that a Papal Election has taken place and there is now a Roman Pontiff in exile somewhere on earth. And so how are we going to pick the true Pope out of the list of claimants? (There are many claimants, as shall be discussed later.)

## Bishop of Rome

Pope Pius IX condemned the following error: *There is nothing to forbid that by the vote of a General Council or by the action of all peoples the Supreme Pontificate be transferred from the Roman Bishop and THE CITY (i.e. of Rome) to another bishopric and another city.* (DZ 1735 from the Syllabus of Errors of Pope Pius IX) The Bishop of Rome is the Pope and the Pope is Bishop of Rome, even if he is not living there. In fact we have seen the case of Pope Innocent II, who was away from Rome, as opposed to Antipope Anacletus II, who was in Rome. And for a long period of time, called the *Babylonian Captivity*, the Bishop of Rome lived at Avignon in France, but remained both

Bishop of Rome and Pope. Saint Thomas Aquinas (III, Q35 A7 Ad 3) is of the opinion that it was the Will of God that the papacy be established with the Roman Episcopacy, since the center of the secular world at that time was in Rome. However, he also is of the opinion that it was not suitable for our Lord Jesus Christ to suffer and die in Rome, but that His Church be established there to supplant paganism.

*Hence the saying 'Where the Pope is, there is Rome.' It matters not where the Pope is located, or whether he lives in Rome, or has ever seen Rome, his title to the Papacy is his Bishopric of Rome. He may be exiled to Avignon or St. Petersburg, to London or New York, but he remains always Bishop of Rome, and apart from that episcopate he would not be Pontiff. It is not because he is Pope that he is Bishop of Rome, but it is because he is Bishop of Rome that he is Supreme Pontiff and Vicar of Jesus Christ. The function of the electors, whoever they may be-the Cardinals, as at present, or others, as in times past-is to designate the person who is to occupy the vacant See of Rome. The mode of designation has not been determined by God by any divine law, and so it remains free to be determined by ecclesiastical law. But given lawful election, that is to say, election in accordance with laws laid down by preceding Pontiffs, the Bishop-Elect of Rome is **by divine law** Vicar of Christ, from Whom immediately he derives the primacy. Hence the Roman Curia is not tied to the material city of Rome. As in attendance on then Pope, and at the immediate service of the Pope, it remains, wherever it may be, the **Roman Curia**. (Urbs et Orbis, William Humphrey S.J., 1899, pages 271-2)*

*The authority of a bishop does not depend on his residence in his see. Those Pontiffs who resided at Avignon were truly bishops of Rome, having been elected under this title by the College of Cardinals to fill the place of Peter. They governed that see by means of a Cardinal Vicar, whilst they personally applied themselves to the government of the universal Church. (The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated, by Abbp. Francis Patrick Kenrick, Baltimore) At the time of Pope Innocent II, I don't believe there was even a Cardinal Vicar, an Antipope having taken physical possession of Rome.*

*Ubi papa, ibi Rome - the Pope, wherever he may be, is and remains bishop of Rome...The city of Rome may be totally destroyed; for Rome as a city, may perhaps perish, but Rome as a See is imperishable. (Rev. S.B. Smith, Elements of Ecclesiastical Law)*

Now the mode of election is set by ecclesiastical law, but if the one elected is papabile (i.e. capable of being elected Pope), it does not matter if the balance of the law has been violated. Saint Alphonsus states: *It doesn't matter that in past centuries some pontiff has been elected by fraud: it suffices that he has been accepted after as Pope by all the Church, for this fact he has become true pontiff.* We have seen questionable elections, which are accepted by history and subsequent Roman Pontiffs as unquestionably valid. We will consider papabile in a moment

And let us consider another part of being the Roman Pontiff. The Roman Pontiff means just that, Bishop of the diocese of Rome to which is attached the Supreme Pontificate of the papacy, apparently by Divine constitution through the Apostle, Saint Peter. Now as Bishop of Rome, the Pope has ordinary jurisdiction as Local Ordinary over the diocese of Rome, which contains six hills. The seventh hill is in one of the suburbicarian dioceses. This puts a lie to the claim that the Roman Pontiff is the *great*

*harlot*. (Apocalypse 17) True Rome, that is ancient Rome, is a seven hilled city, but the Pope only governs six of the seven hills!

On April 11, 1962, Antipope John XXIII, Angelo Roncalli, issued a Motu Proprio as pretended *pope* that transferred the ordinary jurisdiction over the suburbicarian sees from the Cardinal Bishops to himself, thus taking ordinary authority over all seven hills of Rome, paving the way for the *great harlot*.

## What Is the Church?

This is an important question, because when an extraordinary Papal Election occurs, it must be determined who the Church is. Saint Alphonsus considers that acceptance of the Pope by the whole Church makes up for **any** defect in the form of election. However, Pope Paul IV has legislated that it is impossible for an apostate, heretic or schismatic to become Pope, **even if the whole Church should acknowledge him as such**. (See [Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio](#) URL)

The Catholic Church is all those who believe everything our Lord Jesus Christ without question and who have been Baptized. Catechumens are not members of the Church, but do have some rights. Baptism makes us a member of the Church, unless we depart from it by apostasy, heresy or schism, even inculpable. *For not every sin, however great 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*. (Pope Pius XII, [Mystici Corporis Christi](#))

And so we immediately exclude from the Church all in the Vatican II Church and all who accept Antipope John Paul II as having **any claim** to the Papacy. Of course, all validly baptized Protestants are excluded as well as anyone who has apostatized. The Old-catholic of whatever form and the Orthodox are also excluded.

Should we include the *Traditionalists*. They apparently reject Vatican II. Although Traditionalists are divided into various camps, only those who reject Antipope John Paul II completely have any possible claim to being members of the Catholic Church. And so the majority of *Traditionalists* are excluded. There are two major heresies, common to most *Traditionalists*. The first is that the current *emergency* grants priests and bishops authority to do whatever they think necessary in order to *preserve the Church*. Following this they have far exceeded their authority and virtually usurped Papal Authority, which is a crime punishable by excommunication. This subject is covered in great detail in [Will the Catholic Church Survive the Twentieth Century?](#) (URL)

There is another position, which many hold. There is a group called the *sede vacantists*, which hold that Karol Wojtyla is an Antipope and not true Pope. This group is divided into three classes. One has priests and bishops, mass centers and seminaries, and basically whole church like organization. One would think this group would be united, but throughout the world there could be over a dozen different sede vacantist groups. (There is only **one** true Church.) The second group are those who reject these priests and bishops, because of their lack of jurisdiction. However, this group believes that we are waiting for the final trumpet and the Church will never be restored. Both of these groups hold to the heresy in practice that there will never be another Pope. There is one final group that believes not only that Karol Wojtyla is an Antipope, but that the Church must provide itself with a Pope.

This last group refers to The Vatican Council (DZ 1825), which infallibly declares: *If anyone then says that it is not from the institution of Christ the Lord Himself, or by divine right that the blessed Peter has perpetual successors in the primacy over the universal Church, or that the Roman Pontiff is not the successor of the blessed Peter in the same primacy, let him be anathema.* Therefore to act as if there will never be another Pope is heretical. Remember heresy is not only denial by word, but also by deed.

*Even if Catholics faithful to Tradition are reduced to a handful, **they are the ones who are the Church of Jesus Christ.*** (Saint Athanasius)

## Extraordinary Election

By electing a heretic in 1958, the Cardinals became schismatics by their acceptance of Angelo Roncalli (Antipope John XXIII) as apparent Pope and then making such acceptance known to the world. As such they immediately left the Church, resigned the Cardinalate and thus all right and ability to repair the damage done. (Canon 188, paragraph 4, Cum ExApostolatus Officio) Furthermore they also made possible the Great Apostasy, which was brought to us by Angelo Roncalli and Giovanni Montini as Antipopes John XXIII and Paul VI. (II Thessalonians 2)

And so, as soon as this was done, we needed an extraordinary solution. However, even the vacancy of the papacy was not well known until the early 1970's. And few accepted it until many years later. The first to publicly write on the *sede vacante*, or vacancy of the Papacy, Fr. Arriaga also called for a Papal Election. From his time until now there have always been a valiant few, calling for the election of a Pope to end this *sede vacante*, knowing that it would have to take place in some extraordinary manner. And only these people are members of the Church, and it is possible that even some who claim to be working for a Papal Election may yet hold on to some other heresy.

## Papabile

The qualifications for Pope are governed solely by Divine Law. Jesus established the Papacy as above ecclesiastical law, so the Papacy can only be governed by God Himself. *As the hinge while remaining immovable opens and closes the door, so Peter and his successors have free judgment over all the Church, since no one should remove their status because "the highest See is judged by no one."* (Saint Leo IX on September 2, 1053 DZ 353)

And Peter is chosen as Pope for professing his faith that *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.* (Matthew 16:16) Jesus tells us: *Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven.* (Matthew 16:17) The only qualification is that the man be a Catholic, which means he must be within the Church. Papal Election Law provides that excommunication does not prevent a Cardinal from voting or from being elected, although all of the other effects of the excommunication are still in place. And this of course means that he must be baptized. It is not required that the man be a bishop, a priest or even a cleric, as laymen have been elected in the past, and some Popes were never consecrated bishop.

In the eleventh century three consecutive laymen were elected to the Papacy, becoming Popes Benedict VIII, John XIX and Benedict IX. Saint Grgeory VII was a deacon, when elected. The first bishop elected to the Papacy was Pope Marinus in 882. Prior to this time the man elected Pope was not a bishop yet. In fact the origin of the coronation ceremony was the consecration of the Pope as Bishop, to which ceremonies were added. When it became more common for the Pope to already be a Bishop, then the added ceremonies were added to the Coronation Mass. The last non-Bishop elected was Pope Gregory XVI. Pope Stephen II was never consecrated bishop, but that does not prevent him from having universal jurisdiction and infallibility, since authority does not depend upon Holy Orders. True in the Sacrament of Penance the man absolving must possess both authority (jurisdiction) and Holy orders to validly absolve, as the Council of Trent infallibly teaches.

The Vatican II Church teaches that men must be consecrated Bishop before they can have authority over a diocese, including the diocese of Rome. This is a new teaching never before seen in the history of the Church. Saint Ambrose was a catechumen, when elected as Bishop of Milan, and many times in history a man has taken possession of and governed a diocese without being consecrated bishop, and sometimes without even being ordained priest! True such a one should be consecrated Bishop within a reasonable time, but this does not prevent him from governing his diocese in the mean time.

## First Elected

Theodoric, the Emperor, when confronted by two claimants to the Papacy, Symmachus and Laurence, enunciate the principle that the first man elected is Pope. Therefore, Symmachus, who was elected first on November 22, 498 was held to be Pope. Eventually the schism was ended and the true Pope, Symmachus, accepted by all.

This principle is also applied to the election of Pope Innocent II. As Pope Honourius II lay dying, six Cardinals hovered around his death-bed. As soon as Pope Honourius II died, the Cardinals assembled and elected a Pope, who took the name of Innocent II. February 14, 1130. A Peter de Leone was desirous of the Papacy and had arranged with the majority of the Cardinals to elect him as Pope. However, these six Cardinals completed an election even before de Leone could convene a rival conclave. When de Leone heard of this, he still convened the majority of the Cardinals, who proceeded to elect him as *pope*. There is a lot more to this story, but let us consider a few simple points. First of all it appears that the election of Innocent II was fraudulent, since the Cardinals did not await the rest of the Cardinals before electing. However, history has ALWAYS accepted Innocent II as the true Pope, and he is listed as such in the official list printed by the Catholic Church. The reason the Cardinals proceeded, is that they feared what would happen if de Leone was elected, and they had a great deal to fear. Although de Leone as Anacletus II remained in Rome, Pope Innocent II reigned from exile, until finally Anacletus II successor resigned his pretentions 1138.

And let us not forget the Western Schism. The Cardinals gathered in Rome and elected Urban VI, because the Romans wanted a Roman. In any case, the majority of the Cardinals left, claimed they had been coerced and proceeded to elect Clement VII. Each claimant was succeeded by others, until the Cardinals from both claimants gathered and tried to end the schism at Pisa. (At the time the confusion was such that each Catholic

followed the Pope his pastor did, as Saint Antonine of Florence advises. The principles by which to tell who the true Pope is had not been completely settled. It should also be noted that none of the claimants were heretics and that every Catholic followed one of the claimants, knowing this is necessary for salvation.) The problem with the Council of Pisa is that it proceeded without being convoked by the true Pope. It elected Alexander V, who was followed by John XXIII (not to be confused with Angelo Roncalli the second Antipope John XXIII in history). And so we now have three claimants, Gregory XII, who followed in the line from Urban VI, Benedict XIII, who followed Clement VII and John XXIII coming from the Pisan line. A layman intervened and urged an end, getting John XXIII to call a Council at Constance. This Council proceeded to depose John XXIII and Benedict XIII. Then Pope Gregory XII was called upon to resign in favor of a new election. Pope Gregory XII resigned and Constance held an election with all the Cardinals from all three obediences and representatives from the major Catholic powers. It should be noted that many of the Cardinals would not really be Cardinals, having been appointed by antipopes. However, the Church has the power in an extraordinary situation, to propose and carry out an extraordinary Papal Election, and this election is valid. This election elected Pope Martin V, who concluded the business of the Council of Constance. Note well that the Western Schism was caused by the Cardinals. Finally Pope Benedict XIV declares: *to-day it is evident that Urban VI, and his successors were legitimate Pontiffs.*

## Papal Election Law

In 1059, Pope Nicholas II issued a Papal Election law. This was mainly response to the fact that Antipope Benedict X had *reigned* from April 5, 1058 until January 24, 1059. This law limited the election of the Pope to the Cardinal Bishops. These six or seven men, depending on the time in history are the Ordinaries, that is diocesan bishops, of the suburbicarian dioceses surrounding Rome. And so, although the election of a Pope is the election of the Bishop of Rome, Pope Nicholas II placed the election in the hands of six or seven men, who are not part of the diocese of Rome, but bishops of other dioceses. It should be noted that the cardinal priests are pastors of various Roman parishes, although many are also bishops of dioceses throughout the world. The Cardinal deacons are descended from the first deacons of Rome, and tend to the work of administering the secular needs of the Diocese of Rome. Cardinal deacons are not bishops, and in times have not even been priests. In fact, the Pope can appoint any man as a Cardinal. The election law of Pope Nicholas II provided that in case of necessity, the election could be transferred to some place other than Rome. And it should be noted that Papal Elections have been held in other places. (Complete text can be found at <http://www.catholicresearch.org/PopesCouncils/NicolasII.html>)

Originally the Bishop of Rome was elected by the clergy and people of Rome. Eventually the election was limited to the Cardinals, and as we see at one time, to the Cardinal Bishops alone.

The current law was promulgated by Pope Pius XII and was a modification of the law of Pope Pius X. However, the general principles of Papal Election law have remained rather constant throughout history. The Code of Canon Law (Canon 160) provides: *The election of the Roman Pontiff is governed exclusively by the Constitution of*

*Pope Pius X, "Vacante Sede Apostolica," December 25, 1904.* ... This law gives some exceptions to the standard laws for ecclesiastical elections. Two are noteworthy.

First of all, excommunicates are allowed to vote, whereas they are usually excluded from other elections. The reason is simple, all excommunications that could be incurred by electors in a Papal Election are reserved to the Roman Pontiff, but there is no Roman Pontiff to grant the absolution. Also there are quite a few excommunications that can be incurred by the Cardinals in the actual election process, including one for being late for a ballot. Note well, though that apostates, heretics and schismatics cannot vote, not because they are excommunicated, but because they have departed from the Catholic Church. Since this law has no provision for apostates, heretics and schismatics, the principle of Canon 20 requires us to go to the general law. (Canons 167/4; 188/4 and Cum ex Apostolatus Officio.)

The other provision is that the election is to commence within 15 to 18 days. The general law provides: *If the right to elect to a vacant office rests with an electoral college, the election, unless stated otherwise in the law, shall **never be deferred for more than three months...*** (Canon 161) And note well that this 5 to 18 days is a *liberalization* to allow Cardinals from throughout the world to make it to Rome by ship! Pope Gregory X's law provided that the Cardinals should proceed to an election within ten days, **and no more**, wherever the Pope died. The ten days was to allow for absent Cardinals to arrive. The election of Blessed Gregory X was the longest in Church history, lasting almost three years. The Cardinals convened but fail to elect. In fact they were enjoying good food and drink rather than living up to their solemn duty. The laity again intervened. Seeking advice they were told to board up the doors and windows and put the Cardinals on bread and water. When even this did not work, they took the roof off, which encouraged the Cardinals to finally elect a Pope on September 1, 1272.

One reason for a speedy election can be found in the Mass for the Election of a Pope: *They shall not partake of holy things, until a high priest shall arise for evidence and for truth.* (III Esdras 5:40, used as the Offertory prayer for the Mass for the election of a Pope.) During the vacancy before Pope Blessed Gregory X's election several Episcopal sees fell vacant. Because the Cardinals were electing, but had not completed their job, lest worse evil occur the local chapters, which had the right to elect, elected a successor, but did not wait for Papal Confirmation. However, in our time, the Cardinals presented us with an heretical antipope, and then ceased in their duty to elect, leaving the Church *orphaned*. This may be why Jesus said that this is the worst time in history. (c.f. Mark 13:19) We do not have a prolong vacancy, because the electors are assembled, but failing to elect, but because they assembled, gave us an Antipope and then adjourned, departing from the Church in the process. The Church, therefore not only can, but must provide herself with a Pope.

## Who Is The Pope?

We have laid down the qualifications for the Pope:

1. He must be baptized;
2. He must be a man;

3. He must be in the Catholic Church, which excludes all apostates, heretics and schismatics;
4. If there are several claimants, the first man elected, who has the first three qualifications is Pope.

## Claimants to the Papacy

The Vatican and Antipope John Paul II won't tell you that there is any opposition to them. However, there are more claimants to the Papacy than at any other time in history. The Enemy, realizing that Catholics would eventually determine the full extent of the crisis, would look for a Pope. And so he has provided us with several claimants. And let us give an alphabetical list of living claimants:

Gregory XVII (two living, one dead claimants)  
 John Paul II  
 Linus II  
 Michael I  
 Pius XIII

## Which One Is Truly Pope?

And what should we look for? First of all, Tradition holds that popes are elected. The method of election has varied greatly over two millennia, and in extraordinary cases, the Church has taken extraordinary steps to insure a perpetual line of successors. So we are looking for an election. We can immediately eliminate both Gregory XVII's. Both were appointed by an alleged apparition. One also holds the heresy of women priests. Although John Paul II was elected, he and his electors were all heretics, which made them incapable by Divine Law of electing the dog catcher of Rome, much less its Bishop! The remaining claimants were all elected in some manner.

And a word must be said on the claim of Giuseppe Cardinal Siri, who some claim was elected in 1958, 1963 and both 1978 conclaves and took the name of Gregory XVII. First of all the story has changed over the decades. The first presentation had Siri elected in 1953 and again in both 1978 conclaves and someone other than Angelo Roncalli and Giuseppe Siri in 1958. However the story now is that Siri was elected in 1958, accepted election (which is absolutely required), then was forced to resign. There are several problems to the whole theory, but leaving the theory aside, where would be today, if Siri was actually Pope Gregory XVII? On March 2, 1989, Siri died, never having claimed to be Pope and never publicly appointing Cardinals. Cardinals created *in pectore* (in secret) by the Pope, lose all claim to the rank of Cardinal, when the Pope that appointed them dies, unless their appointment has been made public. (Canon 233) And so, irregardless of whether this theory is true or not, the Papacy was vacant in the 1990's when all the other three elections occurred.

We have seen the principle enunciated well over a millennia ago that the first man elected to the Papacy is Pope. So let us add the dates of election:

Linus II 1994  
 Michael I, July 16, 1990

Pius XIII, October, 1998

It is obvious that Michael I was the first man elected to the Papacy. And lest some think that this was simply an election. The group that finally assembled in 1990 worked for several years to notify every potential elector, that is everyone who rejects Karol Wojtyla as an antipope. To this end a book was written, Will the Catholic Church Survive the Twentieth Century?, which explained the necessity of a Papal Election, refuted some heresies of the day and then set forth how to hold such an election. Copies were sent and hand delivered world-wide to every *sede vacantist* that an address could be found. The election was then held. After renewing the Profession of Faith, six people proceeded to hold an election. *The convocation having been legitimately made, the right to elect rests with those who are present on the day fixed by the notice, and no one has a right to vote either by letter or by proxy, ...* (Canon 163) Yes, this election was extraordinary, but it was also valid. The electors of Victor Von Pentz, who took the name of Linus II were aware of the previous election and several possessed Will the Catholic Church Survive the Twentieth Century?, but either ignored it or followed an unsubstantiated statement by one person that Pope Michael had resigned in favor of this election. In either case, this election is invalid. Likewise the election of Fr. Lucian Pulvermacher OFM in 1998 is invalid. These electors were also aware of the previous elections and had Will the Catholic Church Survive the Twentieth Century?, but failed to address them. On top of this Fr. Pulvermacher was a heretic, whose heresies were refuted in Will the Catholic Church Survive the Twentieth Century? Finally this was a *phone in election*, which violates the letter and spirit of Canon Law and Papal Election Law.

*Indeed we declare, say, pronounce, and define that it is altogether necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.*

## What Should I Do?

Since it is necessary for salvation to be in submit to the Roman Pontiff, then it is the duty of all to find and submit to the true Pope, and not to some heretic that claims he is Pope. And then we must ask the Pope how we can help promote the Church, since this is the duty of all Catholics. *The faithful are bound to profess their faith publicly, whenever silence, subterfuge, or their manner of acting would otherwise entail an implicit denial of their faith, a contempt of religion, an insult to God, or scandal to their neighbor.* So states the 1917 Code of Canon Law in Canon 1325. *He who is content with saving himself and neglects the salvation of others cannot secure his own salvation.* (Saint John Chrysostom, Chapter 18 of Matthew Sermon 60) The Popes in the century prior to the usurpation called for the laity to engage in *Catholic Action*, that is the cooperation of the laity with the hierarchy under the direction of the Pope in spreading the Faith. Saint Thomas Aquinas writes: *In cases of necessity where faith is in danger, every one is bound to proclaim his faith to others, either to give good example and encouragement to the rest of the faithful, or to check the attacks of unbelievers:* (II-II Q3 A2 reply 1) *Catholic Action is not optional.* If we want an *optional church*, then let us go to the Vatican II Church which allows us to do as much or as little as we please, but promises us salvation. But be warned, these are empty promises. Heaven is earned, as

Jesus says: *The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence and the violent bear it away.* (Matthew 11:12) Saints throughout history have told us that we are in *combat*. In fact, don't we read in the basic Catechism, that Confirmation makes us *soldiers of Christ*. In times of peace, soldiers are assigned to various duties from *desk jobs* to the kitchen to the motor pool, with a small fraction trained for combat duty. However, every soldier is trained how to use a gun and what to do in combat, just in case. And when a severe crisis occurs, the general will order everyone to pick up his gun, put down his pen, spatula or wrench and fight the enemy with all of his might. And if this is not a crisis, the severest in the Church's history, then just what is a crisis? The prophesy of Saint Paul has been fulfilled: *For there shall be a time when they will not endure sound doctrine but, according to their own desires, they will heap to themselves teachers having itching ears:* (II Timothy 4:3)

And to fight this battle, we must *take up our cross* as Jesus advises. (Luke 9:23) *And he said to all: If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross **daily** and follow me.* And so what have you done **today** to promote the Catholic Faith?

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

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

Before continuing, I would like to offer some hope: *All the holy Fathers agree that after the death of antichrist the whole world will be converted, and although some of them assert that the world will last but a few days after his death, while others say a few months, some authorities insist that it will continue to exist many years after. St. Catherine of Sienna, St. Vincent Ferrer, St. Francis of Paula, and a number of other saints have predicted this ultimate universal conversion.* Saint John Eudes, page 319, The Admirable Heart of Mary.