

Proofs of Faith for Our Times

Part One

The Status of the Catholic Church

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 already worketh.* (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 also began, including the one begun by Simon Magus. (Acts 8; IPIA 55, 56 and many more; note Impostor Popes and Idol Altars will be abbreviated IPIA throughout this presentation.) 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, Simon Magus sought to reinstitute paganism and lure Christians back into paganism. He also supported heretics who backed the restoration of pagan worship alongside their own sects. Any Christian who doubts or denies an article of the Faith given to us by Jesus is considered a heretic by the Church. (See 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 Savior 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. The Councils of the Church, the Popes and the Fathers and Doctors of the Church committed many of these teachings to writing throughout the centuries.

Jesus Founds the 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 of 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 when convened by the Pope and their decrees are 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 Savior 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 organs. 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 whenever 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.) All Bishops must make their profession of faith before taking over a diocese. Many others must also make this profession when taking a new position of authority in the Church. Converts to the Faith are required to make the 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, Catholics sever themselves from the Church. *A man that is a heretic, after the second warning, avoid,* (Titus 3:10). It is significant 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 papal documents 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 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, (and) 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. IPIA page 196)

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 recognizable characteristics: She is one, holy, Catholic and Apostolic. Any church that does not possess these marks is not the Catholic Church.

Pope Pius IX wrote (September 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 shines 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 St. Thomas Aquinas affirms 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;

<p><i>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, <u>de unitate</u>, DZ 247)</i></p>

Holiness

*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 administered and the Masses offered are fruitful only 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.

Catholicity

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)

Apostolicity

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 doctrine, 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; IPIA p. 189).*

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* (IPIA page 165), priests and eventually bishops appeared to serve them using the old rites of the Mass and Sacraments. There was no discussion about whether these priests and bishops were functioning within the laws of the Church; their validity 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. These two men 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. Those who rejected these two bishops' claims instantly questioned their authority. The rift that occurred between them soon after they established the two dioceses is proof that their claim lacked the requisite validity. 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. In the 1970's all that was stressed was matter, form and intention. In fact

the necessity for a valid minister for the Sacrament was rarely mentioned, for 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, although it was mentioned 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 constitute 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 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 the 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 supplies from a religious goods store that obtains hosts and wine from sources that follow the *Novus Ordo Missae*? How can these be considered trustworthy when they allow the mutilation 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 denied Him. For this, he earned the martyr's 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 right, 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 to the Pope was that of jurisdiction, (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 decreed: *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: from whom did Didymus, who we know also as Thomas receive the power of jurisdiction, 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."*

The Crisis in Brief

Imposter Popes and Idol Altars demonstrated the extent of the crisis, but some small points may have been left uncovered. To this end a newsletter will be issued, but

one point needs to be made abundantly clear. Angelo Roncalli (Antipope John XXIII), Giovanni Montini (Paul 6), Albino Luciani (John Paul I) and Karol Wojtyla (John Paul II) were all heretics prior to their apparent election as Pope. One heresy is sufficient to demonstrate this, although more complete lists of heresies are being compiled at www.VaticaninExile.com/V2antipopes.html.

Prior to Pope St. Pius X's death, Angelo Roncalli was appointed secretary to Bp. Radini, who was originally a protégé of Cardinal Rampolla's. At the time, Radini was under surveillance by the Sodalitum Pianum, the society established personally by Pope Pius X to flush out Modernists. Prior to this appointment, Roncalli had served as a part-time professor of Patrology at the Lateran College in Rome. His appointment was short-lived, however, for after serving only one term, he was purportedly dismissed *for having fallen into Modernism*, according to his friend Dom Lambert Beauduin. Paul Johnson documents this incident in his biography of Roncalli, Pope John XXIII.

While acting as Radini's secretary, Roncalli also objected in writing to the vitriolic speech given by an anti-Modernist who named clerics and politicians alike during his tirade. Following his election as pope in 1958, Roncalli learned that for these and other activities his personal folder at the Vatican was stamped with the ominous warning: *Suspected of Modernism*, (Johnson). Roncalli later would prove this suspicion beyond a doubt when he wrote in his Pacem in Terris that each individual has the right *'to worship God in accordance with the right dictates of his own conscience and to profess his religion both in private and in public. ' He did not merely tolerate the religious rights of others, whether non-Catholic Christians, Jews, Muslims or other sects; he accepted and recognized them fully and completely*, (Johnson). Pope Gregory XVI in Mirari Vos (DZ 1613) and Pope Pius IX in his Syllabus of Errors (DZ 1715), both condemned indifferentism as heresy. Even Johnson admitted *Pope John would have been guilty, in an earlier age, of the heresy of indifferentism*, noting also that *Roncalli frequently contradicted previous popes*.

The Rhine Flows Into the Tiber reports on page 27: *Cardinal Montini also declared his wholehearted support of the principle that "ceremonies must once again be reduced to a more simple form."* Pope Pius VI condemned the following Jansenist proposition (DZ 1533): *The proposition of the synod (of Pistoia) by which it shows itself eager to remove the cause through which, in part, there has been introduced a forgetfulness of the principles relating to the order of the liturgy, "by recalling it (the liturgy) to a greater simplicity of rites, by expressing it in the vernacular language, by uttering it in a loud voice"; as if the present order of the liturgy, received and approved by the Church, had emanated in some part from the forgetfulness of the principles by which it should be regulated,-rash, offensive to pious ears, insulting to the Church, favorable to the heretics against it.* And many more can be given, especially the heresy reported on page 160 of Imposter Popes and Idol Altars.

Montini wrote a book, The Church. On page 74 we read: *I remember the bleak experience I had in visiting certain cathedrals that were born in the Catholic faith, and remained in that faith for centuries, forming a kind of mystical hearth for the devotion and worship of apostles and fathers, or saints and the christian populace. Later, as these cathedrals were taken over by Protestants, their altars were removed, and I saw as it were a huge decapitated body: the hall was still capable of responding to hymn and prayer, yet something vital seemed to be missing, something like a burnt out fire. And I*

remember another impression, more tender and no less sorrowful, which I experienced in England this time. I entered magnificent cathedrals and frequently found them empty: for long periods of time empty of the faithful and invariably empty of the heart that for us dwells in the tabernacle-empty, that is, of Christ's mystical and real body. At evening time however the cathedrals became filled with the sweetest of songs, but whence they came I do not know. The whole cathedral seemed to be filled with its own singing, as a single violin producing sweet melodies that at times are as mournful as plaintive wails arising out of statues and tombs, and at other times as serene and brilliant as voices of invisible angels soaring about under those immense gothic vaults. And isn't this what he has done to us today?

Although Luciani only *reigned* as an Antipope for about a month, he was a heretic prior to his apparent election: *If you come across error, rather than uprooting it or knocking it down, see if you can trim it patiently, allowing the light to shine upon the nucleus of goodness that usually is not missing even in erroneous opinions. (In God's Name, page 24)*

One person has listed 101 heresies of Karol Wojtyla, but it is sufficient to consider one and ask you to look for yourself. Wojtyla gave a retreat to Montini, which has been printed in Sign of Contradiction. *This God is professed in his silence by the Trappist or the Camaldolite. It is to him that the desert Bedouin turns at his hour for prayer. And perhaps the Buddhist too, wrapt in contemplation as he purifies his thought preparing the way for Nirvana. (Page 16) This is Modernism, condemned by Pope Pius X: Here it is well to note at once that, given this doctrine of experience united with the other doctrine of symbolism, every religion, even that of paganism, must be held to be true. (And this is what Wojtyla is implying when we says that God is professed by the Trappist, the Camaldolite, the Bedouin (Moslem) and the Buddhist). Pope Pius X continues: What is to prevent such experience to be met with in every religion? In fact that they are to be found is asserted by not a few. And with what right will Modernists deny the truth of an experience affirmed by a follower of Islam? With what right can they claim true experiences for Catholics alone? Indeed Modernists do not deny but actually admit, some confusedly, others in the most open manner, that all religions are true. Now the religious sentiment, although it may be more perfect or less perfect, is always one and the same; and the intellectual formula, in order to be true, has but to respond to religious sentiment and to the Believer, whatever be the intellectual capacity of the latter. In the conflict between different religions, the most that Modernists can maintain is that the Catholic has more truth because it is more living and that is deserves with more reason the name of Christian because it corresponds more fully to the dogma of Christianity.*

<p><i>Forty days after the Nativity the Church celebrates an event full of spiritual significance. On that day the Son of God, as a tiny child of poor parents, born in a rough out-house in Bethlehem, was carried into the temple in Jerusalem. (Karol Wojtyla, later known as Antipope John Paul II <u>Sign of Contradiction</u>)</i></p>

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 will cease! (IPIA chapter 10, page 205ff)

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. An antipope usurped the Papacy beginning 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 re-established. 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 occupied the See in Rome, (IPIA page 173). 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 the 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 Abp. 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, (IPIA page 171). 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, the pretended pope Angelo Roncalli, issued a Motu Proprio 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. St. 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 www.VaticaninExile.com/Cumex)

The Catholic Church is all those who believe everything taught by 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 a 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 is comprised of 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 lost all rights and any 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 be governed only 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 Gregory 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 additional 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 meantime.

First Elected

Theodoric, the Emperor, when confronted by two claimants to the Papacy, Symmachus and Laurence, enunciated 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 also is applied to the election of Pope Innocent II. As Pope Honorius II lay dying, six Cardinals hovered around his deathbed. As soon as Pope Honorius 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 pretensions 1138, (IPIA page 172 and Will the Catholic Church Survive the Twentieth Century? page 111).

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 same Pope as his pastor did, as Saint Antonine of Florence advised. The principles necessary to determine 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 Cardinals caused the Western Schism. Finally Pope Benedict XIV declares: *Today it is evident that Urban VI, and his successors were legitimate Pontiffs.*

<p><i>Today it is evident that Urban VI and his successors were legitimate Pontiffs.</i></p>
--

Papal Election Law

In 1059, Pope Nicholas II issued a Papal Election law. This was mainly in 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.yale.edu/lawweb/Avalon/medieval/papalel.htm>)

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 10 days, **and no more**, wherever the Pope died. The 10 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 failed 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 prolonged vacancy, because the electors are assembled, but are failing to elect. We have a prolonged vacancy 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.

*They shall not partake of holy things, until a high priest shall arise
for evidence and for truth.*

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, knew the faithful would eventually 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 since 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 the last three *conclaves* held in 1958, 1963 and 1978. Siri allegedly took the name of Gregory XVII. First of all the story has changed over the decades. The first presentation had Siri elected in 1963 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 we 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, regardless 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 held by a minority faction and was not made known to the rest of the world, let us consider the following. 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 worldwide to every *sede vacantist* for which an address could be found. The election was then held as announced. After renewing the Profession of Faith, six people proceeded to vote in the 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 also was 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 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 prophecy 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?

The Pope may be contacted at Pope@VaticaninExile.com or Box 74, Delia, Kansas 66418 USA. [Will the Catholic Church Survive the Twentieth Century?](#) can be ordered from the Pope or from us at betrayedcatholics.com for \$

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*, (Saint John Eudes, page 319, The Admirable Heart of Mary).

Part Two

The New Face of Modernism

You've heard the old saw that a lie repeated often enough is accepted as the truth. When Rev. Altenbach in the 1970s began crusading for the restoration of the Catholic Mass he revived the phrase "It is the Mass that matters." Latin Mass enthusiasts have mouthed that same phrase for the past three decades. Ironically, it was never a Catholic phrase to begin with. In the Catholic Encyclopedia under "Mass," Adrian Fortescue ascribes its origins to the Reformers, not 16th century Catholics. And there's the rub.

Ever since the "Latin Mass" movement began, those rallying behind the priests who declined to celebrate the Novus Ordo (N.O.) believed anything and everything these priests had to say, no questions asked. The priests did not teach adult catechism, ordered by the pre-1959 popes they presumably accepted as their superiors, even though knowledge of the Faith was at an all-time low. They did not organize Catholics into Catholic Action groups to assist them, to help re-establish Christ's Church on earth, another mandate issued by pre-VII popes. They behaved precisely as they pleased, answering to no one but their parishioners, a form of trusteeism, condemned by the Church in the 1800s. They said the Mass and sometimes organized children's catechism classes and traditional schools. But because no one had received the proper training to teach in these schools, the dogma taught children was often only as accurate as the understanding of the adult teaching. In general, these priests operated on the principal that Christ had commissioned them to "Go, therefore and celebrate the Mass." This of course is not what He said. He ordered His Apostles to "Go therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them..." Notice that the administration of the Sacraments is secondary to teaching. Catechumens in the early centuries studied for two years before being admitted into the Church and during their catechumenate were allowed to stay only until the Gospel and Sermon at Mass, then were required to leave. If objections arise in traditionalist ranks, objectors are reminded that after all, they have the Mass. But that also is a fallacy.

Fideism Fosters Modernism

Traditionalists so-called have the APPEARANCE of Mass and Sacraments, no more. Why? The answer is obvious from revealed truth and the infallible magisterium itself. The answer SHOULD be obvious merely based on the circumstances existing today. If Catholics would do their homework, they would discover that the label traditionalists use to distinguish themselves from N.O. church members was used over 100 years ago to describe a heresy condemned by Pope Pius IX - traditionalism. This

heresy, related to fideism, pretends that Catholics are imbued with a sense of divine revelation that will guide them in discerning truths of faith; that they need not study these truths to arrive at certitude concerning what is and is not revealed. Fideists claim that certitude must depend on authority without first determining whether such authority is valid, and no better description of traditionalist reliance on floating priests is available. The Catholic Encyclopedia under this topic states that fideism teaches there is no need of intellectual assent based on objective evidence, observing that "Denying intellectual knowledge, [fideism] ruins faith itself."

Both traditionalism and fideism mutated to become the doctrines of Liberalism and Modernism, already in their infancy in the mid-1800s. Liberalism, according to Rev. Felix Sarda, is characterized by "the absolute independence of the individual...Any institution, no matter what be its character, that is established in complete independence of the magisterium of the Faith is free-thinking...and every freethinker is a logical Liberal...Liberalism is heresy and all the works of liberalism, (are) heretical works...(these are) the greatest sins known in the code of the Christian Law." Sarda reminds Catholics that Liberalism was condemned both by Pope Gregory XVI in "Mirari Vos" and Pope Pius IX in his "Syllabus of Errors." While on the topic of free thought, Rev. Frederick Faber speaks of traditionalists in his "Creator and Creature" when he describes certain Catholics who see no need to study their faith or pursue Christian perfection.

"The teaching of spiritual books and the doctrines of perfection do not recommend themselves to them...They consider that unless they are under the vows of some monastic order, they should aim at nothing more than avoiding mortal sin and the edification of those around them. They are good people. They go to Mass...say the Rosary...frequent the Sacraments. Yet when anyone talks to them of serving God out of personal love to him, of constantly looking out to see what more they can do for God, they feel as if they were listening to an unknown language. They have a jealousy, almost a dislike of such truths...Such doctrines have a sound in their ears of being ultra and extravagant, poetical and fanciful, or peculiar and eccentric. Such people are completely out of harmony with a considerable and important part of the Catholic system...They think differently from the saints and holy men." Rev. Faber finishes his commentary by lamenting that he is afraid at heart they are unbelievers.

Traditionalists and Necessity

While today's traditionalists, prompted by their priests have feigned abhorrence for and freedom from the heresy of Modernism, they yet manifest this very heresy in their actions and their obstinacy. Proof of this can be found in Pope St. Pius X's "Pascendi Dominici Gregis" and the very "Oath Against Modernism," reprinted and circulated following Vatican II by numerous "traditionalist" publications. In Pascendi, St. Pius X identifies Modernism with fideism, which he explains as an impulse that moves one who is already religious minded through the means of a certain special sentiment to union with God. One's desires and tendencies, then, erroneously determine belief, not the assent of the will guided by the intellect. Necessity is the driving force of the Modernists, and St. Pius X explains this as follows:

"For them the Sacraments are the resultant of a double need, for...everything in their system is explained by impulses or necessities...The first need is that of giving some manifestation to religion; the second is that of propagating it, which could not be done without some sensible forms and consecrating acts, and these are called Sacraments...The Sacraments are mere symbols and signs, though not devoid of a certain efficacy."

How often have we heard traditionalists attempt to explain their urgent need for Mass and Sacraments and the graces they bring? Or that for them the Sacrament of the Eucharist is essential to salvation? And when questioned as to how they know whether what they are doing is pleasing to God, have they not often responded that they simply know or "feel" they are doing the right thing? "The Modernists would be speaking more clearly were they to affirm that [the Mass and] Sacraments were given us by Christ primarily to foster the faith," Pope St. Pius points out, and he warns Catholics this has been condemned by the Council of Trent: "If anyone says these Sacraments are instituted for the nourishing of faith alone, let him be anathema," (DZ* 848).

There also is another heresy involved here that can be traced to the Council of Basle and the heretics Wycliffe and Hus. The 1911 Catholic Encyclopedia identifies it as Utraquism, and defines it as the belief that "Man, in order to be saved, must receive Holy Communion when he wishes and where he wishes, under the forms of bread and wine...That this is of Divine precept, continued the Hussite, is further evident from tradition." The article's author, Joseph Hughes goes on to explain that reception of the Eucharist is not by necessity of means ("an imperative must") but by necessity of precept, meaning, "an obligation imposed by a command, and for good reasons that which is prescribed may be dispensed with. The Hussites contended that the Eucharist was a necessary means to salvation, so that those who died without having received the Eucharist, (the young, the insane) could not be saved...(But) the Catholic Church denies the Eucharist is necessary as a means to salvation...(it) is a precept; from it dispensations are possible." While traditionalists do not insist on receiving Communion under both kinds, most of them will probably tell you they need to receive the Eucharist to be saved. One well-respected traditional author even stated as much in a work dating back to the 1970s. But even if the majority of trads only are mistaken about necessity of means, they hold an opinion that at least smacks of heresy or is proximate to it. And it is because they simply do not understand the finer points of faith that they cannot make the necessary distinctions.

Truly Modernism was a synthesis that embraced many heretical "isms." Take away the Mass and Sacraments of the traditionalists, and what have they left? Because they have not based their faith on sound doctrine and the papacy, they are broken reeds and empty vessels.

Scholasticism and Sacred Scripture Scorned

The sainted pope goes onto explain that the Modernists are devoid of logic, which is why they regard dogma so lightly and scorn the scholastic philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas. In order to rebuff those who attempt to follow the Church's example and refute errors by means of Scholastic disputation, they pretended that no one, far less a layperson, could argue from Scholastic principles. This error is specifically condemned

by Clement VI, that "from one matter another matter cannot be inferred," (DZ 554). Pope St Pius X notes: "there is no surer sign that a man tends to Modernism than when he begins to show his dislike for the Scholastic method," (Pascendi). The Modernists even go so far as to claim that errors can be found in Holy Scripture and as Pope St. Pius X comments, "certain arguments adduced in the Sacred Books, like those, for example, which are based on the prophecies, have no rational foundation to rest on." This it would seem is the case with traditionalists who deny the existence of the Church, "unto the consummation," (Matt. 28:20), Christ's prophecies concerning Peter's unflinching faith and the fact that the gates of Hell will never prevail against the Church. Those who do not attend the Latin Mass, or "home-aloners" are equally guilty of denying these prophecies and disregarding dogma and its logical conclusions; of refusing to accept the clear and irrefutable proofs of faith and hence, also are guilty of impeding unity and destroying the Church. Indeed, Pope St. Pius X emphasizes, this is the very target of their entire assault, for:

"They propose to remove the ecclesiastical magisterium itself by sacrilegiously falsifying its origin, character and rights, and by freely repeating the calumnies of its adversaries."

One of the propositions contained in St. Pius X's "Oath Against the Errors of Modernism" reads: "I admit and recognize the external arguments of revelation, that is, divine facts, and especially miracles and prophecies, as very certain signs of the divine origin of the Christian religion; I HOLD THAT THESE SAME ARGUMENTS HAVE BEEN ESPECIALLY ACCOMMODATED TO THE INTELLIGENCE OF ALL AGES AND MEN, EVEN OF THESE TIMES."

It is clear that traditionalists believe themselves incapable of understanding and acting on such arguments. They claim that they cannot possibly assess the situation today and need not pay the slightest attention to any arguments whatsoever, whether based on divinely revealed truths or not, that would pose a solution for the crisis in the Church. They are content with their symbolism, and as long as they can pass for Catholic, this is enough for them. They have no interest in the fact, infallibly declared by Pope St. Pius X and other popes, that they have been duped by some of the most diabolical propagandists the Church has ever known. On this subject, St. Pius X writes:

"For the Modernists, both as authors and propagandists, there is to be nothing stable, nothing immutable in the Church...In the Syllabus of Pius IX, it is enunciated in these terms: 'Divine revelation is imperfect, and therefore subject to continual and indefinite progress, corresponding with the progress of human reason.'" The Vatican Council decreed: "The sense of the Sacred Dogmas which Our Holy Mother Church has once declared [is never] to be abandoned on plea or pretext of a more profound comprehension of the truth."

Rejection of the Papacy

It is this council in particular and its definition of infallibility and the primacy as truths to be accepted as revealed by Our Lord that traditionalists have especially spurned. In their "higher" understanding of how the Church must operate in "these times," they fail to appreciate the fact that in reality the situation is no different than the times encountered

during the Western Schism, Reformation in England and the exile of those priests in France following the Revolution who refused to swear fealty to the state. In fact Catholics today have fewer excuses than in former times, owing to technical advances in communication and the further development of dogma. Speaking on the subject of infallibility, St. Anthony Mary Claret, an Ultramontane attendant at the Vatican Council, noted that if those denying this article of faith would take the time to study Scripture, which the Modernists claim to be full of errors, the teaching of this doctrine would be clearly seen and understood. The saint then went on to explain why Scripture is not understood, and his explanation applies to Biblical teaching on many other doctrines today as well.

- 1.) Men do not really LOVE God
- 2.) They lack humility
- 3.) Men do not wish to understand Scripture simply because they do not wish the good.

Humility is not something readily associated with Modernism. Pride and the Jansenistic "petite eglise" (little church) mentality of previous ages (so suggestive of the traditional movement) were only a preview of the "synthesis of all heresies" that would later present itself as Modernism. And the cause of this heresy, according to St. Pius X in "Pascendi" was "curiosity and pride...Pride sits in Modernism as in its own house, finding sustenance everywhere in its doctrines and an occasion to flaunt itself in all its aspects...It is pride which rouses in them the spirit of disobedience and causes them to demand a compromise between authority and liberty."

While Pope St. Pius X's description of Modernist aims better fits the Novus Ordo church, inclined as it is to religious liberty, autonomy, collegiality, and de-emphasis of Tradition and dogma, he reminds us that there is another side to the Modernists, for "the admirers of symbolism are disposed to be more indulgent on this head." In other words, there are those among them who would tolerate the Latin Mass, particularly if it served their own ends. This explains how the N.O. and traditionalist sects have always been linked and why it is possible to identify both traditionalists and N.O. devotees as Modernists. It is precisely for this reason that there is talk in Rome today about absorbing the traditionalist sect: they were never really dispossessed in the first place.

If we use the teachings of the Church to further unravel the imposture that is traditional catholicism, traditionalists do not respond because it is precisely this teaching that they have traded in for their "needs." Yet by proceeding methodically down the list of the teachings rejected by traditionalists, we can gain a better understanding from what has been explained above, perhaps, of precisely how they reject it and what it means for those trying to convince them of their errors. The real root of those errors lies in their obvious anti-intellectualism and inability to think from a Catholic perspective. The cause can be laid at the door of previous generations, and traditional "priests" are only too happy to tolerate the situation because it serves their own agenda.

The Blind Leading the Blind

It is puzzling to observe the reasoning of traditionalists, for they seize on one set of truths to support their cause and entirely ignore the very set that would free them from their intellectual slavery. Puzzling that is until Pascendi is reread, for there Pope St. Pius X tells us: "In their books you find some things that might well be expressed by a Catholic, but in the next page you find other things that might have been dictated by a rationalist..." Because traditionalists follow their leaders blindly and focus only on the symbolism offered to them, they never succeed in penetrating the truths of faith, parroting only what little they read and understand, and anything they might hear from their "priests." Michael de la Bedoyere comments on this tendency to blind obedience in his "Christianity in the Marketplace," noting that the training necessary to execute the high standards of Catholic existence was available to Catholics then (the 1940s), and by extension was available to later Catholics in the form of Bedoyere's book. The real problem Bedoyere presents as follows: "What too often is lacking is the interest and training in APPLYING those standards and knowledge to every circumstance in life. The man of the world HAS to think for himself if he wants to act intelligently at all, for there is no one to think for him; THE CHRISTIAN IS IN DANGER OF NEVER THINKING FOR HIMSELF BECAUSE HE EXPECTS ALL HIS THINKING TO BE DONE FOR HIM..."(The ideal of action) "is not to act just BECAUSE someone else tells one to, but to act for oneself BECAUSE ONE SEES FOR ONESELF, in the light of God's will and the teaching of the Church or one's lawful superior, that the action IS right..." The appeal of Catholic Action, he states "is for those who want to use their BRAINS, to those who want to be up and doing SOMETHING to make more sense of their lives," (and superiors can be lawful only if they possess the proper training and requisite jurisdiction. See below.)

Bedoyere goes onto explain that in a disordered world, Catholics will be tempted to concentrate only on the salvation of their own souls. Leaving the world to itself and abandoning the duty of charity toward their fellows, they will focus on their own spiritual navels instead and disregard the seemingly hopeless command of the Sovereign Pontiffs to reorder the world. "The tendency will be for individuals to blind themselves to the whole complexity of the situation, remaining content instead to 'follow their leaders' along a safer path to be negotiated under expert guidance...Men who know the essential truth will, under these circumstances, tend to avoid making choices in the light of all the circumstances and they will become accustomed to allow their betters to make safe choices for them. They will seek to escape having to grope their way in semi-darkness and surrounded by every obstacle and danger; instead they will look up to the steadier and stronger light...which only reaches to certain, favored spots."

Heresy and Schism

One of the not-so-favored spots traditionalists pass over is their schismatic stance, something they thoughtlessly and incorrectly assign to others. But as Rev. Ignatius Szal observes in his Canon Law commentary, "The Communication of Catholics with

Schismatics" (1948), pure schism "is rarely found, for the majority of schismatics adhered to some heretical doctrine in order to justify their separation from the Catholic Church. Especially since the definition of papal infallibility by the Vatican Council, it is practically impossible for one to be guilty of schism without being simultaneously guilty of heresy." The definition given in Attwater's "A Catholic Dictionary" somewhat broadens the scope of schism, for he defines it as: "The refusal to submit to the authority of the pope or to hold communion with members of the Church subject to him...Anyone guilty of an external act of schism is ipso facto excommunicated." Szal states that schismatics must "withdraw directly (expressly) or indirectly (by their actions) from obedience to the Roman Pontiff; the withdrawal must be made with obstinacy and rebellion; the withdrawal must be made in relation to those things by which the unity of the Church is constituted, and despite all this, the schismatic must recognize the Roman Pontiff as the true pastor of the Church and he must profess as an article of faith that obedience is due to the Roman Pontiff."

All these qualifications of schism apply to traditionalists, for they both directly and indirectly imply that it is impossible to provide the Church with a pope, impede the actions of those trying to do so by their failure to join them and considerable invective against such efforts and do so with considerable obstinacy and in the spirit of rebellion. All this despite the fact that they will readily admit they believe that a Pope is the true pastor of the Church and obedience is owed to him. But then the "yeah-buts" commence and it is impossible for a pope to be elected in "our times." And Traditionalists do not only steadfastly refuse to believe that papal authority is as relevant for these times as in former ages, they do not even credence the teachings of former illustrious pontiffs such as Pope Pius IX, Pope Leo XIII, Pope St. Pius X or Pope Pius XII. For no matter where the truths of faith are obtained in attempting to prove the error of their stance (and Catholic truth never changes), they classify them as the "interpretation" or "opinion" of the one presenting or quoting them. It is as Rev. Faber said: "They have a jealousy, almost a dislike of such truths." And here we might venture to comment that it is a spiritual jealousy that envies the "nerve" of those who present such evidence, if not the evidence they present themselves, when all along equal application to the study of dogma on their part might produce similar, even superior results.

All their hedging, intractability, and rationalization to preserve the status quo point to only one thing: most traditionalists are unwitting dupes in the grand design of their leaders to entirely falsify the origin, character and rights of the magisterium. Pope St. Pius X explained in *Pascendi* that the Modernists, by "a species of covenant and compromise" between religious authority and tradition, would use the laity to accomplish their goals. He condemns "the introduction of that most pernicious doctrine which would make of the laity the factor of progress in the Church." And how truly prophetic this statement was.

The outline presented below clearly demonstrates that in denying the Church's right and obligation to provide Herself with a head, according to divine revelation as well as Her own teachings, laws, traditions and customs, traditionalists of all descriptions transgress almost the entirety of Catholic doctrine concerning the primacy and infallibility of Her Supreme Pontiffs.

Divine and Catholic Truths Traditionalists Deny

I. Revealed truth (The following truths are classified by all theologians as of Divine and Catholic Faith, meaning a truth revealed by God and proposed for belief by the Church as revealed. The Church condemns the propositions taken from Session III and IV of the Vatican Council as heretical.)

(1) Human reason is so independent that God cannot enjoin faith upon it, (DZ 1810).

(2) Divine revelation cannot be made credible by external signs, (the Church defining, DZ 1812).

(3) When the Church proscribes errors, she cannot exact any internal assent of the faithful, (DZ 2007); Catholics can withhold assent from truths of faith until they have completed investigation proving their credibility, (DZ 1815).

(4) Peter was not established by the Lord Christ as the chief of all the Apostles and the visible head of the whole militant Church or that the same did not receive from (Christ) directly and immediately the primacy in true and proper jurisdiction, (DZ 1823, 1825).

A. The Catechism of the Council of Trent teaches: "It is the unanimous teaching of the Fathers, (hence, infallible, according to the teaching of the Council of Trent, DZ 786) that this visible head is necessary to establish and preserve unity in the Church; "But that the episcopacy itself might be one and undivided, and that the entire multitude of the faithful through priests closely connected with one another might be preserved in the unity of faith and communion, placing the blessed Peter over the other apostles, He established in him the perpetual principle and visible foundation of both unities, upon whose strength the eternal temple might be erected," (Vatican Council, DZ 1821).

1. According to Henry Cardinal Manning, it is also the unanimous opinion of the Fathers that the Holy Sacrifice WILL CEASE, and this was made known to traditionalists in the early 1970s, (see Robert Bergin's "This Apocalyptic Age.") This denial of the Fathers' infallible interpretation of Scripture is the very rejection of revealed truth in Scriptural prophecy Pope St. Pius X attributed to the Modernists.

2. Why is it that anyone is surprised that there are no bishops, or that all traditional priests seem to do is disagree and form new groups? The binding principle cannot bind when it does not exist.

B. Rev. Thomas Kinkead, in the Baltimore Catechism #3, prepared at the request of America's bishops during the Baltimore Council for the purpose of teaching Christian doctrine (an infallible act), states in Q&A #s 520-522 that the three attributes of the Church are authority, infallibility and indefectibility, and without these three attributes the four marks (that is, the Church itself) cannot exist.

C. Pope Pius XII, in his encyclical "Mystici Corporis," taught: "Christ wills His Christian community to be a Body which is a perfect Society...Now since its Founder willed this social Body of Christ to be visible, the cooperation of all its members must also be externally manifest... ABOVE ALL, IT IS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY THAT THE SUPREME HEAD, THAT IS THE

VICAR OF JESUS CHRIST ON EARTH BE VISIBLE TO THE EYES OF ALL, SINCE IT IS HE WHO GIVES EFFECTIVE DIRECTION TO THE WORK WHICH ALL DO IN COMMON IN A MUTUALLY HELPFUL WAY TOWARDS THE ATTAINMENT OF THE PROPOSED END."

D. The following conclusions, then, can be drawn from B and C above:

1. Unless the Church has a visible head, (Christ being the invisible Head), the attributes cannot exist.

2. Unless the attributes can be said to exist, as Rev. Kinkead teaches, the four marks, that is the Church, Herself, cannot be visible or fulfill Her mission to teach and save souls.

3. Given all the above, the only type of church that could possibly exist without the pope is an "invisible, intangible, pneumatological" church comprised of Christians who differ in matters of faith, and Pius XII emphasizes in "Mystici Corporis" that those who believe the Church can answer to such a convoluted description "err in a matter of Divine Truth."

E. Also in "Mystici Corporis" Pius XII taught that bishops are the "divinely appointed successors of the apostles," who feed their flocks in Christ's name. He reminds them that despite their divine commission they "are subordinate to the lawful authority of the Roman Pontiff, although enjoying the ordinary power of jurisdiction which they receive directly from that same pontiff."

(5) "If anyone then says it is not from the institution of Christ Our 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 Blessed Peter in the same primacy, let him be anathema," (Vatican Council, DZ 1825).

(6) The Roman Pontiff has only the power of inspection or direction in the Church and does not possess the full and supreme power of jurisdiction over faith and morals, and the discipline and government of the Church; that this power is not ordinary and immediate or over all the Churches altogether and individually, and over all the faithful and pastors altogether and individually, (DZ 1831, Vatican Council. This is the end of condemned propositions.)

(7) Definition of infallibility: "This gift of truth and never-failing faith was divinely conferred on Peter and his successors in this chair...that the entire flock of Christ (be) turned away by them from the poisonous food of error (and) the occasion of schism removed, that the whole Church might be saved as one, and relying on Her foundation, might stay firm against the gates of Hell...The Roman Pontiff, when he speaks ex cathedra, that is when, carrying out the duty as pastor and teacher of all Christians in accord with his supreme apostolic authority he explains a doctrine of faith and morals, to be held by the universal Church, through the divine assistance promised him in blessed Peter, operates with that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer wished that His church be instructed in defining doctrine on faith and morals; and so such definitions of the Roman Pontiff from Himself, but not from the consensus of the Church, are unalterable, (DZ 1839). But if anyone presumes to contradict this definition of Ours, which may God forbid, let him be anathema," (DZ 1840).

A. "Likewise, with a firm faith I believe that the Church, guardian and mistress of the revealed word, was instituted proximately and directly by the true

and historic Christ Himself, while He sojourned among us, and that the same was built upon Peter, the chief of the apostolic hierarchy, and his successors until the end of time," (DZ 2145 - "Oath Against Modernism").

(8) The Vatican Council also decreed that Peter would have successors "until the end of the ages," or the consummation, as stated by Our Lord, (DZ 1824); and this is but a restatement of a decree made by the Council of Ephesus.

A. That this is the Church's official interpretation of Our Lord's promise is obvious.

B. Nevertheless, some traditionalists today falsely claim that by the consummation is meant various phases of history during which the Church necessarily, and by the will of God, will be headless and must remain so.

1. Rev. W. Wilmers, an Ultramontane theologian at the Vatican Council, states in his "Handbook of the Christian Religion": "By the consummation of the world is meant the end of time...for elsewhere Christ identifies the end of the world with the Last Judgment."

2. In "Mystici Corporis," Pope Pius XII tells us that it was Christ's express will that His Church have a visible head until the end of time.

3. Therefore, until Our Lord is seen coming in the clouds, the Church, as He constituted it, will continue to exist.

NOTE: In denying these Vatican Council teachings and any other teachings issuing directly from revealed truth, traditionalists not only contradict the Church defining, but God, Himself, revealing.

II. Infallible Truths Denied by Traditionalists:

Canon Law and disciplinary decrees

(The truths presented below have been taken from approved theological sources. These include A. Patrick Madgett's "Christian Origins, Vol. II, Adolphe Tanquerey's "Manual of Dogmatic Theology, Vol. I, used in seminaries throughout the United States, Amleto Cardinal Cicognani's "Canon Law" and other sources)

(1) "The Church exercises the fullness of Her infallible teaching authority to demand an irrevocable assent to matters which are not explicitly, and apparently not even implicitly revealed. These definitions and decisions embrace what are usually called matters of Ecclesiastical Faith. They are so intimately connected with Faith that one could not deny them without implicitly denying some article of Faith...They are to be believed...on the word of the Church, God's infallible teacher," (Rev. Madgett). He notes that some theologians refer to these as "implicitly revealed truths." These truths are disciplinary decrees, canonization and religious rules.

A. "From the mind of the Church as expressed in solemn documents, and from the common teaching of theologians, we know that the Church is likewise infallible in Her disciplinary decrees...The reason here is the Church's infallibility as the custodian of morals, rather than of doctrine. When we say that the Church is infallible in laying down these decrees, SUCH AS CANON LAW, all that we mean is that they must be accepted as a good means to achieve the purpose intended — well-regulated Church discipline," (Rev. Madgett).

1. Card. Cicognani writes: "The disciplinary laws issued by the Roman Pontiffs enjoy in a strict sense the note of infallibility...no disciplinary law at variance with orthodox faith or good morals has been or ever will be issued by the Roman Pontiff for the universal Church."

2. Only the Roman Pontiff can make new laws; interpret existing laws, both ecclesiastical and Divine; safeguard and enforce laws, or abrogate, derogate or change human ecclesiastical laws or the laws of Ecumenical or particular Councils.

3. Therefore it must be emphasized here that to deny the power of the Roman Pontiff to bind in disciplinary matters actually involves the denial of Revelation itself, since Christ granted to Peter the power to "bind and loose," in entrusting to him the keys of the Kingdom. The following was condemned by Pope Nicholas I at a Council in Rome: If anyone condemns dogmas, mandates, interdicts sanctions or decrees promulgated by the one presiding in the Apostolic See, for the Catholic Faith, for ecclesiastical discipline, for the correction of the faithful, for the emendation of criminals, either by an interdict or threatening of future ills, let him be anathema," (DZ 326). Henry Cardinal Manning tells us this pronouncement is infallible, and this should be obvious from all that is mentioned above.

B. Even in the case of Canon Law, those Canons that deal directly with Divine Law must be accepted as such. "The New Law, contained in Scripture and TRADITION...is a constituent source of Canon Law in the strict sense," (Card. Cicognani). Canon Law as a whole "is based on doctrines that are immutable and eternal," he continues, while some Canon Laws are "merely doctrinal or even dogmatic in character." Cicognani defines Canon Law as "the body of laws made by the lawful ecclesiastical authority for the government of the Church."

1. Cicognani goes into great detail in his work concerning the age-old sources of Canon Law, which include, Divine Law, Apostolic Law, the bulls, constitutions, encyclicals and decrees of the Supreme Pontiffs, the Sacred Congregations defining under the direction of the Pope, Ecumenical and Provincial Councils and Apostolic Letters. This is not an inclusive list, but it covers all these documents existing since the founding of the Church by Christ.

C. Concerning those Canons based on Divine Law, Pope Pius XII, in an address to the faculty and students at the University of Vienna Law School in 1956, told his audience: "There are Canons which are built into the very structure of the Church by Her Divine Founder...These include laws regulating the constitution of the Church and those defining the powers of the Pope and of the bishops...(and) the indissolubility of a legally contracted and consummated Christian marriage."

(2) In the furor created by traditionalists to legalize their need for Mass and Sacraments outside these infallible laws, something of paramount importance, then, has been overlooked.

A. Under the heading in the 1925 edition of Woywod-Smith's "Practical Commentary on the Code," we find the following in Canon 108: "By DIVINE

INSTITUTION, the sacred hierarchy of orders consists of bishops, priests and ministers; the hierarchy of jurisdiction consists of the Supreme Pontificate and the subordinate episcopate. By institution of the Church, other degrees have been added."

B. And in Canon 196: "The Catholic Church possesses, by DIVINE INSTITUTION, the power of jurisdiction or government. This power is two-fold: that of the external forum, and that of the internal forum, or forum of conscience. Finally the internal forum is subdivided into the sacramental and the extra-sacramental forum."

C. Clearly, the laws concerning jurisdiction are considered of divine origin, since they deal with what Pope Pius XII refers to as "defining the powers of the pope and bishops and regulating the constitution of the Church."

1. By contrast here, the laws that govern the laity's right to demand the Sacraments and other spiritual goods from their priests, Canon 682, is subject to this law, as Rev. Woywod notes in his commentary on the Canon. The laity has no right to demand these goods from men who cannot deliver them without serious personal sin, and who by delivering them commit sacrilege. The priests have the obligation to be aware of their inability to supply these goods where jurisdiction is lacking and to so inform the faithful. They also cannot ignore the injunction of Canon 682 to proceed "according to the rules of ecclesiastical discipline."

2. Here the higher law, instituted by Innocent XI applies. The sacraments cannot be administered when there is a possibility they will be either illicit or invalid, (DZ 1151). This is to safeguard the Sacraments.

(3) Issuing from this group of Canons governing jurisdiction, we find all those laws which regulate the use of jurisdiction by priests when no bishop or a Pope is available to provide it. A summary of these laws and their implications for floating priests demonstrates that traditional priests operate outside the laws of the Church. In addition, they have incurred irregularities from which they must be absolved before functioning as celebrants of the Mass and ministers of the Sacraments.

A. Canon 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." Ordinary power is that granted to the bishop by the Pope. Delegated jurisdiction is the permission given priests by bishops possessing ordinary jurisdiction to function as pastors.

B. This is evident from the teaching of the Church concerning the sacraments.

1. The Council of Trent infallibly declares that, "Therefore, since the nature and essence of a judgment require that the sentence be imposed only on subjects, there has been the conviction in the Church of God...that this absolution, which the priest pronounces upon one over whom he has no ordinary or delegated jurisdiction has NO VALUE," (DZ 903).

2. In his "Super Soliditate," Pope Pius VII condemned the following: That every bishop, no less than the Pope, was called by God to govern the Church and was endowed with no less power..., (DZ 1500).

3. Pope Pius VI, condemning the errors of the Synod of Pistoia: "After the institution of diocese 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...", "(not to be understood in a manner contradicting DZ 903).

C. "The Church supplies jurisdiction both for the external and internal forum 1) In common error; 2) In a positive and probable doubt, whether of fact or law," (Canon 209). Rev. Francis Miaszkewicz, in his "Supplied Jurisdiction According to Canon 209," states that there must be some sufficient reason to believe jurisdiction already exists (in common error) before appealing to Canon 209, and limits doubts of law and fact to infrequent occurrences or cases of extreme necessity.

D. Can. Mahoney, in his "Priest's Problems" condemns the deliberate use of "common error" jurisdiction so abused by traditionalists and their priests. Commenting on a hypothetical case in which priests not having jurisdiction in a particular diocese are asked to give absolution because the faithful normally assume all priests have universal jurisdiction, Mahoney writes: "This view, which justifies hearing confessions in the above circumstances...is a wrong view, because it nullifies the principle requiring jurisdiction, as well as Holy Orders, for the valid absolution of sin, a principle which is DOGMATIC and not merely canonical."

E. "A priest who presumes to hear sacramental confessions without the necessary jurisdiction is automatically suspended 'a divinis'," (Canon 2366).

F. Epikeia, a principle that demands consideration of what is just and good in interpreting the law, cannot be invoked to justify traditionalist appeals for supplied jurisdiction. As Cicognani points out, epikeia is invoked not perpetually, but in certain cases.

1. When the very need to use this principal could be forestalled by consulting superiors (which amounts to re-establishing authority for traditionalists), Cicognani does not seem to favor its use. "When a superior can be easily approached for a dispensation, epikeia should not ordinarily be used, because its use is fraught with danger, and in judging our own case we are accustomed to incline to the milder interpretation." At any rate it must be remembered that when such a decision, even when based on a probable opinion, involves a question of simple licity, (not VALIDITY, but the actual licitness of the one conferring the Sacrament) the safer opinion guarding the sacrament from abuse is to be followed, (Innocent XI, DZ 1151.)

2. The Gallicanists used this very principal to justify the deposition of popes by a General Council according to Walter Ullmann in his work, "The Origins of the Great Schism." This proposition (that a council can depose the pope) is condemned by the Vatican Council, (DZ 1830).

G. Innocent III, in the Profession of Faith he prescribed for the Waldenses (DZ 424) states that unless a priest "be regularly ordained, (and) properly established by a bishop for that office, (he)...cannot consecrate the Eucharist or

perform the Sacrifice of the altar...(he) is a heretic and must be segregated from the entire Holy Roman Church."

1.It can be deduced further from the infallible definitions of the Vatican Council and Innocent III's above-mentioned prescribed profession that a priest, who, in receiving ordination precludes the intention of obedience to the Roman Pontiff, or by a vow or oath promises not to participate in any efforts to provide the Church with a Head is guilty of denying the necessity of the papacy and therefore lacks the intention requisite for ordination.

H. Because all so-called traditional priests have usurped papal powers and have denied the revealed truths taught by the Vatican Council, (that the Church will last unto the consummation and Peter will have perpetual successors), they have, by their pertinacity and their actions:

1. Incurred ipso facto excommunication according to Canon 2314;
2. Tacitly resigned their offices, (Canon 188#4);
3. Demonstrated by their actions (omission to perform a necessary act, since sins are committed by commission AND omission) and their silence that they are indeed heretics, (Canon 1325).
4. Penalties for these censures include prohibition of any acts of jurisdiction, even if it is claimed, (Canon 2264).
5. Irregularity by infamy of fact (formal adhesion to a non-Catholic sect) forbids all reception and exercise of Holy Orders absolutely, (Canon 984). This includes schismatics.

(4) Clearly traditional priests cannot hold any pretensions to jurisdiction; cannot validly absolve penitents from their sins; cannot licitly consecrate the Body of Christ, presuming that their orders, at least are valid, and in fact can do nothing that does not involve serious sin either for themselves or the faithful.

(5) As heretics, presuming their orders are certainly valid (and many traditional priests cannot provide proof of this) they can only administer the Sacraments in danger of death, and according to Rev. Szal, some theologians advise reliance on a Perfect Act of Contrition rather than risk committing the sin of scandal or suffer perversion at the hands of a heretic or schismatic.

A. A normative decision handed down by the Holy Office, reported by Rev. Charles Augustine in his "A Commentary on the Code of Canon Law," answers the question of whether it is permitted to demand absolution from a schismatic priest as follows: "Yes, PROVIDED no scandal is given to the faithful, no danger of perversion threatens the sick person and it may be reasonably presumed that the schismatic minister will absolve according to the rite of the Church."

(6) There is another reason why the Masses and Sacraments of traditionalists should be avoided. While it is not within the scope of this outline to address valid matter for the Consecration in the Mass, grave abuses on this head existed long before Vatican II, owing to the adulteration of flour and the addition of things forbidden in the fermentation of wine, (also olive oil used in Confirmation, Holy Orders, and Extreme Unction). The Church observes strict guidelines to ensure validity for a reason, and any

laxity in the observances of these guidelines means the "Sacraments" received are not Sacraments at all but abominations.

III. Infallible Truths Denied by Traditionalists:

Theological conclusions and dogmatic facts

(1) A theological conclusion is drawn from a revealed truth and a truth known from natural reason; a dogmatic fact is one, which is so connected with a doctrine of the Church that knowledge of it is necessary to understand the doctrine and preserve it safely.

(2) Madgett offers the example of a theological conclusion as follows: "It is revealed that God the Son is the Word of the Father. It is known from reason that the 'word' proceeds from the intellect. Therefore the Son proceeds from the Intellect of the Father."

(3) Rev. Tanquerey writes: "Dogmatic facts can be threefold: historical, doctrinal and hagiographical. Thus, dogmatic facts are the legitimacy of the Holy Pontiff, the ecumenical (universal) nature of a Council...For if the Church could make a mistake concerning the authority of the Holy Pontiff or of a Council, then there would always be grounds for doubting whether their decisions were infallible and accordingly for rejecting these decisions." If traditionalists do not deny the actual legitimacy of certain pontiffs, they deny that these pontiffs were elected in a certain manner, were not clerics when elected, and that some did not receive ordination or consecration before their death, even though these are historical facts.

(4) In order to justify their "apathetic Quietism," (as described by Pope Pius XII in his address to the Second World Congress for the Lay Apostolate, Oct. 5, 1957 - "The Pope Speaks," Vol IV) and refrain from the activity necessary to understand and defend their faith, traditionalists have denied the following:

A. A layman can become pope. (It is a dogmatic fact that over the centuries, several laymen were elected pope.) In his address to the Second World Congress for the Lay Apostolate cited above, Pope Pius XII stated that: "Even if a laymen were elected pope, he could accept the election only if he were fit for ordination and willing to be ordained. But the power to teach and govern as well as the charism of infallibility would be granted to him from the very moment of his acceptance, even before his ordination," (Canon 219).

1. All that is required to guarantee the validity of a papal election is that he be a baptized adult male, willing and able to be ordained. Other theologians state such a male must have the use of reason.

2. However, in issuing the "New Code of Canon Law" in 1983, Wojtyla changed this law to read that only bishops can be elected to the papacy.

a) One author has subsequently removed from the papal lists all those Popes who were not bishops at the time of election. This is a malicious repudiation of dogmatic facts, (that Peter will have perpetual successors and the popes cannot teach anything contrary to faith or morals).

3. While only the Pope can change or interpret human-ecclesiastical law, Wojtyla is no pope. As Card. Cicognani stated above, "...no disciplinary law at variance with orthodox faith or good morals has

been or ever will be issued by the Roman Pontiff for the universal Church."

B. Lay people can elect a lay pope. (Until the laws passed by Nicholas II in 1059, limiting the election to cardinals, the clergy and laity together elected the popes. This provides a custom equally as venerable as election by the cardinals, and Nicholas' law states this custom can be returned to without prejudice if necessary. This is an historical and dogmatic fact, because it involves the validity of papal elections.)

C. Participation in a lay election is in accordance with the laws of the Church whenever the clergy cannot or will not posit such an election.

1. Canon law provides a way to operate when there either is no law or the law no longer applies to the existing situation. Here the "higher law" in Canon Law takes precedence, since Christ, the Supreme Lawmaker, has amply demonstrated that He wills His Church to last until the end of the world.

2. Pope St. Pius X, Pope Pius XI and Pius XII urged the defense of and promotion of the Church and papacy by the laity.

3. Abbo and Hannon, in their "Catholic Dictionary," state that the laity form part of the hierarchy when they are in the midst of pagans and heretics.

D. The man elected in such a canonical lay election, possessing the required, qualifications, is a valid pope and immediately possesses jurisdiction over the whole world, even prior to his ordination and consecration. (These are the dictates of papal teaching and Canon Law. To deny that they apply is to accuse the Church of not providing laws that guarantee the faith and morals of Her subjects.)

E. The Church on several occasions has condemned the proposition that a pope canonically elected is not a true pope.

1. (The following propositions were presented to the Wycliffites and Hussites at the Council of Constance for belief.) "Likewise, whether he believes that the pope, canonically elected, who lived for a time after having expressed his own name, is the successor of blessed Peter, having supreme authority in the Church of God," (DZ 674).

2. "Likewise whether he believes that the authority of jurisdiction of the pope, archbishop and bishop in loosing and binding is greater than that of the SIMPLE PRIEST, even if he has the care of souls, (DZ 675).

3. (Condemned error of John Hus): "The apostles and faithful priests of the Lord strenuously in necessities ruled the Church unto salvation before the office of the pope was introduced; thus they would be doing even to the day of judgment were the pope utterly lacking," (DZ 655).

F. Nor can it be said, without denying historical and dogmatic facts that are infallible, that a pope ruling outside Rome is not a true pope. For as long as he can prove he is the canonical successor of St. Peter, and is prevented only by usurpation from reigning in Rome, he yet validly claims the See.

1. Several popes have ruled the Church from exile or captivity; Pope Innocent II was a true pope living in France for many years during the reign of the anti-pope Anacletus II, and the first round of Avignon popes also reigned from France.

(5) Traditionalists challenging the canonically-based election of a lay pope, in light of the above condemnations, can rightfully inquire only into the following:

A. Prior to any election effort, was it first determined that the See was indeed vacant?

B. As a papal candidate, was such a pope qualified for election? Such qualifications include:

1. Proof of Baptism; proof of departure from the Novus Ordo church and/or severing of any ties with a traditionalist sect; proof that one's errors have been retracted and the opposite of these errors has been distinguished; Profession of Faith before witnesses; proofs of independent study, confounding of heretics and efforts made to defend the Faith.

C. Was the proper canonical procedure followed, according to the canons themselves, in providing the necessary proofs required by law?

D. Did electors abide by other applicable laws regarding the election?

E. Was every effort made to contact potential electors?

F. Did potential electors, on their part, do all in their power to inquire into the proposed election and investigate the proofs provided?

The Bottom Line

As demonstrated above, traditionalists must necessarily deny the definitions of the Vatican Council, Council of Trent and those infallible truths found in other papal documents in order to retain their position. One error most prevalent among them is the belief that a pope can fall into heresy, even concerning matters involving faith and morals, because the ecumenist anti-popes demonstrated it could happen. They fail to understand the true interpretation offered for Canon 188#4 in the Fontes or footnotes to the law, which for this Canon is none other than Pope Paul IV's "Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio." For if they grant infallibility to "Quo Primum," cited at one time or another by all traditionalists to justify their adherence to the Latin Tridentine Mass, they must also grant it to "Cum Ex," since the wording in both these is very nearly identical as far as marks identifying them as infallible documents are concerned. "Cum Ex" states that those who appear to teach heresy to the faithful as a whole must be judged to have been heretics prior to their election, i.e., they never became popes. But traditionalists prefer their own views in this matter and effectively call the Vatican Council Fathers liars. For in the discussions preceding the definition of infallibility, it was decided that no pope had ever intentionally committed heresy, even as a private person (which was the case with Honorius). Citing the teaching of St. Robert Bellarmine on deposing a pope who had (privately and unintentionally) fallen into heresy, they only acknowledged what already had occurred in Honorius' case, and could conceivably occur again.

As Henry Cardinal Manning writes in his "The Story of the Vatican Council, the charism of infallibility bestowed by the Holy Ghost passes through the pope and attaches itself to the definition or condemnation by virtue of the unfailing faith bestowed upon St. Peter and his successors by Our Lord. It is not a personal privilege, but one granted for the benefit of the faithful. The histories of the Vatican Council clearly show that those who refused to give ground on the existence of the "papal heresies" were the very ones opposing the definition of infallibility. Many of these bishops, and among them several Americans, were under suspicion of heresy prior to attending the council and were very nearly excommunicated, according to Rev. Hennessy's history of the council. And those (later excommunicated) Gallicanists who failed to accept the definition went on to create headless churches based on these same heresies, much as the traditionalists have done.

Like many dissidents before them, traditionalists and their clergy deny the necessity and authority of the Roman Pontiff, assuming they do not accept Wojtyla as a valid pope, and they do so by their failure to help re-establish true authority in the Church. They are heretics and schismatics, and as such cannot be recruited in any effort to establish the abiding principle of unity in the Church unless they convert. They ably demonstrate their separation from true Catholics by their lack of charity, for they behave as if they have no obligations to God or their fellows. Ignoring the exhortations of the Popes Pius in the 20th century to assist in the Church's work to save souls, they will smugly announce that that is for others; THEY need not exert themselves by thinking or acting to resolve this situation or participate in any way. Blinded by their attachment to symbolism they will read the above and convince themselves that if it were so, their "priests" would have told them.

By dismissing the dictates of Canon Law concerning their invalid absolution and the illicit consecration of the Host by excommunicated priests, they dishonor and desecrate Christ's Body by participating in the "Mass." They give no credence whatsoever to the Fathers' unanimous concurrence in the early centuries of Christianity (TRADITION!) that the Holy Sacrifice would cease. They behave as though the Mass is independent of the truths taught by the Church, despite the fact that Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical "Apostolicae Curae" addressed to the Anglican Church taught: "They knew only too well the intimate bond that unites faith with worship, 'the law of belief with the law of prayer.'" They wish on one hand to identify Montini (Paul VI) as responsible for the abolition of the Holy Sacrifice and many even brand him an antipope. Yet on the other hand, they stop just short of making the connection between Montini as THE Antichrist, even though Holy Scripture clearly states that by the Antichrist's power alone will the Sacrifice cease. This might be understandable had an antipope in the past ever attempted such a thing, but this is not the case. Despite Our Lady's warnings at Fatima and elsewhere, the clear and unmistakable "signs of the times," the predictions of the saints and holy people identifying this and the past century as the end times, traditionalists will have their Mass, whatever the cost. And that cost is the loss of their souls.

This is true because in order to demonstrate unity of worship under lawful superiors, there is a specific place in the Mass for inserting the names of pope and bishop. Yet traditionalists cannot fill in these blanks without showing their true colors. For they must either recognize JP II as pope to do it or assume, if they are sedevacantists, that there will be no pope inserted into this prayer in the Canon of the Mass, since they believe

there can be no Pope. In the first case they are guilty of heresy, for all the Novus Ordo church has ever taught is heresy. And in the second case, (unless they are actively seeking a solution to the crisis in the Church, i.e, the determination of or election of a Roman Pontiff), they are guilty of injuring the unity of the Church through schism and denying the necessity of the papacy, a heresy condemned at the Vatican Council. This is confirmed by Canon 1325, which states that "silence, subterfuge or manner of acting" determines the commission of heresy. But traditionalists sweep aside all objections to do their own will, not God's signified will revealed through His laws.

The teachings of the true Catholic Church they pretend to honor and serve are ignored and even held in contempt. They are as indifferent to doctrine and things truly Catholic as the Novus Ordo church they so roundly condemn. Having found their comfortable little niche, they refuse to relinquish it, lest they be battered and buffeted in the Enemy's assault. They are determined to make themselves as comfortable as possible during this storm, blithely ignoring the fact that countless martyrs viewed their very niches with contempt and refused to resort to them lest they lose their Faith. They cannot be coaxed or moved from their position, and when approached with the truth have only the greatest contempt for the one approaching. They are those St. Augustine speaks of in his "City of God: "There is that...heartache of seeing heretics, too, using the name and Sacraments, the Scripture and the Creed of genuine Christians...how many would-be converts are driven into perplexed hesitancy because of heretical dissension." And because of their heretical dissension, their schizoid Modernist mentality, they are the ones spoken of in Thessalonians II who rejected the truth, and as a result were sent the operation of error to believe lying. They either declined the wedding feast invitation altogether, or appeared without the wedding garment of true charity. Unless they repent and amend they will, like the guests in the parable, be cast into Hell.

It is never too late to convert, but God warns throughout Scripture that many will wait until the last minute to repent and will be caught unawares. Then God's mercy will no longer be available; only His justice will reign. Whatever the decision of traditionalist pseudo Catholics, the one flock and one Shepherd Christ prophesied will become reality, with or without their assistance.

May Thy kingdom come on earth! Viva Cristo Rey!

*DZ refers to the numbered dogmas of faith found in Henry Denzingers "Sources of Catholic Dogma," available online and at Catholic books stores.

(Copies of all sources referred to in the compilation of this document are available upon request. Info@VaticaninExile.com)