

Post

See new posts

Conversation



E. Michael Jones

@EMichaelJones1

Archbishop Vigano has been excommunicated for the "crime of schism." Quo vadis, Taylor Marshall? Quo vadis, John-Henry Westen? Quo vadis, Michael Matt? Quo vadis, Robert Moynihan? Are you going to put your money where your mouth is and follow Vigano into schism? Or are you going to apologize for supporting him and leading your followers into the sin which got him excommunicated? Non datur tertius. Join me tonight at five at cozy.tv/emichaeljones for my podcast discussing this.

3:08 PM · Jul 5, 2024

AUDIO LINK:

[EMJ Live 78: Archbishop Vigano Excommunicated - Culture Wars Podcast | Lyssna här | Poddtoppen.se](#)

Bullet Points:

1. Extra judicial process is an administrative action that cannot be used without the permission of the accused in any hearing where the juridic standing in the Church of the accused will be changed.
2. Excommunication changes the juridic standing in the Church.
3. All heretics are schismatics.
4. Since Vatican I, all schismatics are heretics.
5. There is only one act that manifests schism and that is manifest heresy.
6. Absent manifest heresy a canonical trial is necessary to establish a schismatic intent.
7. The essence of schism is denial of the universal jurisdiction of the pope.
8. Absent the existence of manifest heresy no Catholic can be accused of schism without the proof of denial universal jurisdiction of the pope.
9. Faith is related to heresy as Charity is related to schism.
10. Faith precedes charity. Without faith there is no charity therefore all heretics are schismatics.
11. Dogma is the proximate rule of faith for all the faithful.
12. E. Michael Jones is a Neo-modernist and makes the pope his proximate rule of faith and not dogma. This error leads to conservative Catholicism and Sedevacantism.
13. Archbishop Vigano's denial that Pope Francis is a legitimate pope is essentially different from the claims of sedevacantists and will become moot at the death of Pope Francis.
14. Pope Francis is a manifest heretic and therefore a schismatic.
15. Those that make Pope Francis their proximate rule of faith will follow him in schism and ultimate damnation.

Open Letter to E. Michael Jones: Defense of Archbishop Viganò for the benefit of E. Michael Jones, who in the end, does not know what schism is because he does not know the Catholic faith

Let those be hard upon you who do not know what labour it is to reach the truth and turn away from error. Let those be hard upon you, who know not how rare a thing it is, and how much it costs, to overcome the false images of the senses and to dwell in peace of soul. Let those be hard upon you, who know not with what difficulty man's mental eye is healed so as to be able to gaze upon the Sun of Justice; who know not through what sighs and groans one attains to some little knowledge of God. Let those, finally, be hard upon you, who have never known seduction like that whereby you are deceived.... As for me, who have been tossed about by the vain imaginations of which my mind was in search, and who have shared your misery and so long deplored it, I could not by any means be harsh to you.

St. Augustine, Letter to a Manichean heretic

It has been about 30 years since your debate with Michael Davies on the question, Is the SSPX in Schism, Yes or No? The debate reflected two entirely different understandings of the crime of schism, its essential attributes, and its imputability. You affirmed that Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre was guilty of schism because that was the canonical opinion of Pope John Paul II who declared Archbishop Lefebvre to have been excommunicated *latae sententiae*, that is, excommunicated by the law itself for having consecrated bishops. You did not address the objection that the consecration of bishops without a papal mandate is not under the canonical heading of schism. You ignored the contention that a state of necessity exists. You ignored the fact that there was no canonical hearing or determination of imputability beyond the opinion of Pope John Paul II. You affirmed that schism was a manifest sin similar to abortion. You declared yourself the winner of the debate in a article published in Fidelity Magazine some say was written before the debate occurred. This debate was referenced by you in your introductory remarks in your recent video, Archbishop Viganò Excommunicated!, as evidence of your competency to address the question of schism. In the video you affirmed that Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò is likewise guilty of schism and excommunicated, however, you did not address that this was done by means of an "extra-judicial" process. You then called upon the "Guild Prophets", Catholics with traditional sentiments, to apologize to their followers for having defended this excommunicate prelate because "there is no salvation outside the Church".

Although you have been addressing schism for more than 30 years, your understanding of schism, its necessary attributes, its imputability, and its relationship with the virtues of faith and charity is as deficient today as it was 30 years ago. You have learned nothing. Ignorance is not commended but rather compounded on the grounds of being long-standing. There is a reason for your complacency and the purpose of the letter is to hopefully flush it out and explore its other implications for the state of the Church today.

In the Davies debate you argued that schism was a manifest sin making a direct comparison to the crime of abortion. Since you held that schism is a manifest sin you therefore accused Davies of corrupting moral theology as liberals typically do by making the subjective motivation of the person the primary determinate of moral guilt rather than the objective nature of the act itself, as liberals do in justifying abortion on the personalist grounds of the psychological burden of an unwanted pregnancy. That is what liberals always do and why they are called

'liberals', such as, the liberal Pope Francis who recently admitted divorced and remarried Catholics to the sacrament of Holy Communion without repentance based upon their subjective disposition. Davies ignored your equating the manifest sin of abortion with schism but he should not have because it is essential in understanding what schism is. Davies should have demanded from you examples of acts that are always and everywhere schismatic acts that can only be done with a schismatic intent. He should have asked you to produce citations from moral theologians to support whatever examples you offered. Unfortunately, that did not happen.

The answer to the question is that there are no acts that always and everywhere manifest a schismatic intent with one important exception that is entirely invisible to you, and will be discussed below. Even the act of consecrating bishops without a papal mandate is not necessarily a schismatic act. There is no authoritative reference in Catholic moral theology manuals that claim that any specific act is in and of itself always and everywhere evidence of schism. If Davies had asked you this question, you would have ended up falling back on the claim that schism is a spirit, a pattern, an attitude, a flavor that is unmistakably recognized by the initiated such as John Paul II and yourself? In the end your answer would have been, "The pope said so, so it is."

Unlike schism, abortion and blasphemy are manifest sins because they are acts that can never be done with a morally right intention; the act itself reveals the intent in the internal forum as being vicious. These are always and everywhere necessarily mortal sins. As St. Paul says, "Some men's sins are manifest, going before to judgment: and some men they follow after" (1Tim 5:24). St. Paul gives specific examples of "manifest sins": "Nor the effeminate, nor liars with mankind (sodomites), nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor railers, nor extortioners, shall possess the kingdom of God" (1 Cor 6:10). What exactly is the schismatic motive that a contentious canonical process must discover for conviction and attribution of imputability of the crime of schism? This is question a that has never crossed your mind.



Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò was subjected to and convicted by an "extra-judicial" administrative tribunal of schism and excommunicated for the purpose of avoiding a contentious canonical trial. Such an excommunication is not possible in the Catholic Church employing extra-judicial means.¹ The reason for this is that no Catholic, particularly *a fortiori* Catholic bishop, can be forced against his will to submit to an administrative process,

forgoing his canonical rights of due process, when the outcome of that process changes his juridic standing in the Church. The crime of schism and excommunication necessarily change the juridic standing in the Church. The administrative process was employed for the very purpose of denying Archbishop Viganò his contentious canonical rights while giving the public the impression that his legal due process rights were respected. Canonical due process is a contentious forum and it requires for conviction and punishment both objective acts of schism and the subjective imputability of the crime establishing schismatic intent. In a contentious trial the defendant can insist on written charges that can be answered in writing. The ultimate purpose of the canonical contentious process is to determine truth and direct those in error back to truth.

The canonical definition for both heresy and schism are taken directly almost verbatim from St. Thomas Aquinas: "Schismatics are those who refuse to submit to the Sovereign Pontiff, and to hold communion with those members of the

Church who acknowledge his supremacy." Schism is the repudiation of the "supremacy", that is, the universal jurisdiction of the Sovereign Pontiff, and communion with those who accept his supremacy. It is the burden of the prosecutor in a contentious canonical trial, in proving the charge of schism for a specific act, to demonstrate a rejection of the universal jurisdiction of the pope as the motive for the specific act. While all schismatics are disobedient to the Sovereign Pontiff, not all who are disobedient to the Sovereign Pontiff are schismatics. St. Thomas in his examination identifies schism as a specific *species* of sin. St. Thomas says, "Hence the sin of schism is, properly speaking, a special sin, for the reason that the **schismatic intends to sever himself from that unity which is the effect of charity**: because charity unites not only one person to another with the bond of spiritual love, but also the whole Church in unity of spirit." The *genus* to which schism belongs is acts opposed to peace which is the fruit of **"that unity which is the effect of charity."** Regarding peace, St. Thomas continues: **"Peace implies a twofold union... The first is the result of one's own appetites being directed to one object; while the other results from one's own appetite being united with the appetite of another: and each of these unions is effected by charity."** Acts that disturb the fruit of peace that are directed against the cause of peace which is charity are sinful. Acts that disturb the fruit of peace that are not directed against charity are not sinful.

Acts of disobedience against properly constituted authority are only acts of schism when the intention is to reject the universal jurisdiction of the Sovereign Pontiff and thus overturn the peace of unity caused by charity. This intention constitutes the *species* difference of schism from other acts opposed to peace, as St. Thomas says, the schismatic **"intends to separate himself from the unity that charity makes"** (Q.39, a.1.) among the faithful. St. Thomas is offering an *essential definition* of schism which is the best of all definitions because it is the most intelligible. Schism, just as other acts opposed to peace enumerated by St. Thomas which includes discord, **contention**, war, strife and sedition, requires contextualization. All these acts disturb the peace which charity makes. There exists situations of a false peace that is not the work of charity. Thus acts that disturb peace can also be done from a motive of charity, such as a just war. Specifically for the case of Archbishop Viganò, St. Thomas says that morality of **contention**, which is the "opposition to another in speech" that disturbs the peace, is determined by the intention: "As to the intention, we must consider whether he contends against the truth, and then he is to be blamed, or against falsehood, and then he should be praised." Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò's "contention" against Pope Francis, while disturbing the "peace", is the contention of truth against falsehood and is therefore praiseworthy and not schismatic. This is why a canonical trial is called "contentious" for it is intended to reveal who is contending for truth.

But the question of truth or falsehood with regard to contention between Pope Francis and Archbishop Viganò is as immaterial to you now as it was at the time of the Davis debate on the excommunication for schism of Archbishop Lefebvre. The proximate motivation for the consecrations by Archbishop Lefebvre was the Prayer Meeting at Assisi by John Paul II. The poles of contention are truth-falsehood which is the same for dogmas of faith. As St. Jude admonishes: "I was under a necessity to write unto you: to beseech you to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints" (Jude 1:3). Schism is the rejection of the divinely revealed truth of papal universal jurisdiction, a dogma of faith since Vatican I. As previously said, schism is manifested by disobedience, but all disobedience is not schism. Obedience to God is unqualified. All other acts of obedience are necessarily qualified. Acts of obedience are morally good only to the degree that they are properly regulated by the virtue of Religion which is the primary subsidiary virtue under Justice. Any act of obedience that violates the virtue of

Religion is a sin. The virtue of Religion above all requires that we "give unto God the things that are God's." This first and necessary act of obedience is to believe all that God has revealed and to keep his commandments. This is the virtue of justice. Without this first necessary condition, it is impossible to keep the greatest commandment to love God above all things and it is impossible to have "the unity that charity makes." Any state of peace that is unjust is a false peace and is not the work of charity. The question that you have never asked which requires your attention: In a state of true peace caused by charity, what is the primary sign and cause of unity in the Church?

Schismatics "refuse to submit to the Sovereign Pontiff" because they deny that the pope possesses universal jurisdiction conferred by God for the legitimate exercise of the papal office which is a cause and sign of unity and peace. Universal jurisdiction of the pope is a divinely revealed truth that was dogmatized at Vatican I Council. St. Thomas says:

"Heresy and schism are distinguished in respect of those things to which each is opposed essentially and directly. For heresy is essentially opposed to faith, while schism is essentially opposed to the unity of ecclesiastical charity. Wherefore just as faith and charity are different virtues, although whoever lacks faith lacks charity, so too schism and heresy are different vices, although whoever is a heretic is also a schismatic, but not conversely."ⁱⁱ

Since the universal jurisdiction of the pope became a dogma at Vatican Council I, a schismatic is now also conversely always a heretic. Importantly, faith necessarily precedes charity. The Church is the society of the faithful. A person becomes a member of this society through the sacrament of Baptism. In the reception of Baptism, the priest meets the candidate in the narthex of the church where the candidate is asked by name, "What are you asking of God's Church?" The reply is, "Faith"! The priest then asks, "What does faith hold out to you? The candidate answers, "Everlasting life." Before entering the Baptistry the candidate recites the Creed, the Profession of Faith. "Without faith, it is impossible to please God" (Heb 11-6) because, as St. Thomas says, "whoever lacks faith lacks charity." Recall from St. Thomas that without charity, there can be no peace effected because "Peace implies a twofold union.... The first is the result of one's own appetites being directed to one object." For the faithful, that "one object" is God and this union causes peace. The second "results from one's own appetite being united with the appetite of another (who shares the same True Faith): and each of these unions is effected by charity." Sins against faith destroy charity and the consequent loss of peace because there can be no peace in a souls separated from God and there can be no peace with another because there can be no unity of appetites with a heretic. Any "peace" with a heretic is a false peace that is unjust and opposed to true charity. Faith then is the primary and essential cause and sign of unity in the Church. The pope is secondarily and accidentally a sign and cause of unity of Christ's Church.

The keys of universal jurisdiction were promised to St. Peter after his open profession of faith which is its proximate formal cause. Many Church Fathers, such as St. Augustine and St. John Chrysostom, describe an analogical identity of the rock (petra) with divine faith, with St. Peter, with Jesus Christ the "cornerstone," and the Church itself. The faith precedes and is the proximate cause of the universal jurisdiction conferred by Jesus Christ because faith is indispensable to the bond of unity which is charity. Cardinal Henry Edward Manning wrote:

"The interpretation by the Fathers of the words 'On this rock; etc. is fourfold, but all four interpretations are not more than four aspects of one and the same truth, and all are necessary to complete its full meaning. They all implicitly or explicitly contain the perpetual stability of Peter's faith...:'

“In these two promises [i.e. Lk 22:32, Mt 16:18] a divine assistance is pledged to Peter and to his successors, and that divine assistance is promised to secure the stability and indefectibility of the Faith in the supreme Doctor and Head of the Church, for the general good of the Church itself.”

Cardinal Henry Edward Manning, “The Vatican Council and Its Definitions: A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy”, p. 83-84, 1870

All this is nicely summed up by St. Paul who admonishes "that you walk worthy of the vocation in which you are called; With all humility and mildness, with patience, supporting one another in charity. Careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. One body and one Spirit; as you are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph. 4:1-5). The primary and essential cause and sign of the unity in the Church is the faith. The pope is only secondarily and accidentally the sign and cause of unity in the Church. If the pope falls from the faith he is to be confronted as St. Paul did to St. Peter when he "walked not uprightly unto the truth of the gospel" and accommodated the Judaizers leading others into "dissimulation" (Gal. 2:11). **If the pope is a heretic he necessarily, as St. Thomas says, "lacks faith (and) lacks charity... (and) whoever is a heretic is also a schismatic." The heretic, without charity, breaks the bond of unity in the Church and necessarily becomes schismatic. Therefore, the one *genus* of acts that are necessary signs of schism are acts of manifest heresy. This truth is invisible to those who err by holding the pope as their proximate rule of faith.**

You would have accused St. Paul of schism for contending with St. Peter because the pope for you is the proximate rule of faith, so whatever he says or does is what you will say and do. Consider this, how did St. Paul know that St. Peter "walked not uprightly unto the truth of the gospel"? He knew it from the Council of Jerusalem where St. Peter presided as our first pope where he engaged the attribute of infallibility which Jesus Christ endowed His Church to teach without the possibility of error on this matter of faith which was not, as some claim, a matter of mere discipline. We know that the judgment was infallible because: "For it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay no further burden upon you than these necessary things" (Acts 15:28). St. Paul contended, with this canon of faith, with this dogma, against the error of St. Peter. This is the first recorded example of a Catholic subject to the Roman pontiff employing dogma against the pope. It would not be the last. It should be remembered that the famous dictum of St. Augustine that "Rome has spoken, the case is finished," was indirectly addressed to the reigning Pope Zosimus, who in the presence of the Roman clergy, recognized as orthodox heretical statements of Pelagius, which had been previously condemned by Pope Innocent I and the two Councils of Carthage.

Pope Zosimus was deviating from the judgment of his predecessors in the See of Peter regarding the Pelagian heresy. The pope is subject to dogmatic truth as much as every other Catholic. The principle sign of and cause of unity in the Church is the faith. The remote rule of faith is divine revelation found in Scripture and Tradition. The proximate rule of faith is dogma which is divine revelation infallibly defined and proposed to all the faithful as a formal object of divine and Catholic faith. The pope is the material and instrumental cause of dogma. It is God who is the formal and final cause of dogma in both the truth expressed and the words chosen to express that truth. It is as St. Pius X said, "A truth fallen from heaven" (*Lamentabili*). The pope is only secondarily and accidentally the sign of and cause of unity in the Church. If this were not so St. Paul could not have corrected St. Peter.

The fact that dogma constitutes the proximate rule of faith for all Catholics can be proven from papal citations, the documents from ecumenical councils (the First Canon of the Fourth Council of Constantinople referenced directly at Vatican I Council), and theological authorities such as Scheeben:

"Hence the original promulgation is the remote Rule of Faith (i.e. Scripture and Tradition), and the continuous promulgation (i.e. Dogma) by the Teaching Body (Magisterium) is the proximate Rule."

Scheeben, Manual of Catholic Theology

Yet, the simplest, surest and most self-evident is the definition of heresy. St. Thomas (II-II:11:1) defines heresy as: "a species of infidelity in men who, having professed the faith of Christ, corrupt its dogmas". The canonical definition is taken almost verbatim from St. Thomas. This offers an *essential* definition. The *genus* is the baptized who "professed the faith of Christ". The *species* difference: the heretic "corrupts its dogmas" while the faithful do not. Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò has "withstood" Pope Francis "to the face, because he was to be blamed" (Gal 2:11), but for you, "blame" has nothing to do with it. The act of contention alone defines schism in your mind because you hold Pope Francis as your proximate rule of faith.

The heresy of Modernism condemned by St. Pius X has as its end the corruption of dogma. The heresy of Neo-modernism has the same end but employs different means and is more subtle. While Modernism denies the objective reality of all dogma, Neo-modernism denies dogma by driving a wedge between the truth (the form) of dogma and the words (the matter) used to define that truth. It claims that the truth is revealed by God while the words are a human approximation of that truth that must be distilled perpetually in a never ending effort to arrive at a more perfect understanding and expression of God's revelation, that is, dogma must evolve. Consequently, the Neo-modernist will in dogmatic propositions 1) subjecting dogma to historical criticism, 2) alter definitions of terms, 3) change propositions from categorical to non-categorical, and 4) move propositions from the category of truth/falsehood to the category of authority/obedience and then apply the conditions that excuse from complying to laws, commands, injunctions, precepts, etc. to excuse from conforming the mind to revealed truth.

A clear example of Neo-modernism in action was the censoring of Fr. Leonard Feeney for preaching that there is no salvation outside the Church, a thrice defined dogma of faith. The 1949 Holy Office Letter signed by Cardinal F. Marchetti-Selvaggiani sent to Cardinal Richard J. Cushing of Boston and subsequently published by him teaches the novel doctrine of 'salvation by implicit desire'. The Letter teaches that "good-willed" Jews as Jews, Hindus as Hindus, Moslems as Moslems, Protestants as Protestants, Orthodox as Orthodox, etc. have, by virtue of their good-will, an explicit belief in a god who rewards and punishes thereby demonstrate an implicit desire to be in the Church. Furthermore, this "implicit desire" to be a member of the Church is effective for producing a state of grace and ultimate salvation. The Catholic dogmas that belief in revealed articles of divine faith are necessary for salvation (i.e. cannot be a heretic), reception of the sacraments are necessary for salvation (i.e. must be a member of the Church), and being subject to the Roman pontiff (i.e. cannot be a schismatic) are necessary for salvation were uniformly reduced to human axioms that need not be taken literally and, if overly burdensome, can be entirely set aside. This Letter was eventually added to the 1962 edition of Denzinger's edited by Fr. Karl Rahner and footnoted in the Vatican II constitution *Lumen Gentium*. The new ecclesiology bore its full fruit at the Prayer Meeting at Assisi where all the participants, including Pope John Paul II, holding potted plants, prayed to their common god who rewards and punishes. The only thing lacking was a credo of implicit faith.

When you reminded the "Guild Prophets" that schism is a serious matter because there is "no salvation outside the Catholic Church," it is not clear to what version of that dogma you actually subscribe. The sorry truth of the matter is that the Guild Prophets, like yourself, do not take the dogmas on salvation literally and the common opinion among the Guild Prophets and their followers, including the

SSPX, is that only those who insist that dogmas actually mean what they say are outside the Church and beyond the pale of salvation.

You end up in this mess because you and the Guild Prophets and the SSPX are all Neo-modernist. None hold dogma as the proximate rule of faith. There is of course a wide variance how liberal or strict a Neo-modernist is in practice but they all agree in first principles. Archbishop Lefebvre's belief in the salvation for "good-willed" " Jews as Jews, Hindus as Hindus, Moslems as Moslems, Protestants as Protestants, Orthodox as Orthodox, etc. is indistinguishable from John Paul II excepting that John Paul II included "good-willed" enemies of the Catholic Church, yet John Paul II faithfully followed his principles to the Prayer Meeting at Assisi while Archbishop Lefebvre recoiled from it in horror. Some like Karl Rahner believed that everyone is saved excepting those who have made a fundamental option for evil. You and the Guild Prophets accept the principle that dogma evolves and must continually be interpreted by the "living magisterium" of the pope to discern new and hidden meanings. Pope Francis' new understanding that capital punishment is intrinsically evil and the eternal punishment of hell is contrary to the spirit of the gospel and the dignity of the human person are recent examples of neo-modernist doctrinal development.

You are standing so close to the heresy of Neo-modernism that you cannot recognize it. You deny that dogma is the proximate rule of faith and replace divinely revealed truth with the person of the pope whom you end up divinizing by making the divine attributes of the Church the personal attributes of the pope. For you the pope is the primary cause and sign of the unity of the Church. Any disobedience is schism by definition and therefore, like abortion, schism becomes a manifest sin. But this is not so! This is a corruption of the Catholic faith. The primary sign and cause of the unity of the Church is the faith. St. Peter by and from his profession of faith was made the foundation of the Church. His authority and its exercise is prescribed by the faith. The pope is judged by no one excepting if he falls from the faith. Gratian's Decretum also says that the First See is judged by no one excepting in case of heresy. It is the teaching of popes Paul IV, *Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio* and Pope Innocent III, *Si Papa*. There is admittedly no mechanism universally accepted by which a declaration of heresy can be made against the pope, but for those who keep dogma as their proximate rule of faith, the storm can be weathered.

Try looking at the problem from God's perspective. God founded the Catholic Church and endowed it with the attributes of Infallibility, Indefectibility and Authority that correspond to the three duties of teaching, sanctifying (the faithful and correct worship), and governing that Pope Pius X identified in *Pascendi*. These are attributes primarily and essentially of God and only attributes of the Church because the Church is a divine institution. Infallibility is the power to teach without the possibility of error. The pope is not infallible *per se*. He stands *in potentia* to the Church's attribute of infallibility which he alone can engage *in actu* under specific conditions for specific ends. When the pope teaches infallibly he is engaging the Magisterium of the Church teaching by God Himself as opposed to teaching by his personal magisterium grounded upon his grace of state. The Magisterium of the Church is one thing and every pope, from St. Peter to this present day, when teaching by the Magisterium of the Church is engaging the one divine power. As Pope Pius XI (*Divini Illius Magistri*) said, "God Himself made the Church a sharer in the divine Magisterium and by His divine benefit unable to be mistaken." It is when the Magisterium is engaged that we can repeat with Jesus Christ, "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me" (Luke 10:26).

Indefectibility is the power to sanctify the faithful. It is not as many theologians have taught a negative infallibility that preserves the pope from all error in the exercise of his personal magisterium. Indefectibility is a divine guarantee that the Church will never fail in the use of the "received and approved" rites to offer fitting worship to God and sanctify his faithful. The "received and approved rites solemnly used in the administration of the sacraments" was dogmatized at Trent and incorporated in the Tridentine Profession of Faith. Any pope who would overthrow the "received and approved" rites of the Church is by definition a heretic, and thus, lacking charity, attacks the peace of the Church, the very cause of schism.

Authority is the power to govern delegated from God to His Church for the ends of salvation by teaching truth, proper worship of God, and sanctifying the faithful. No pope, cardinal, bishop, or priest can legitimately exercise authority to teach error, corrupt worship, deny the sacraments, or impede the salvation of anyone. The faithful are obligated to resist any unjust abuse of authority because there is an obligation to do good and avoid evil. You may choose to personally suffer injustice but you are not permitted to ignore the injustice visited upon others. The salvation of souls is the highest law of the Church, the greatest good. The faithful are also obligated in avoiding evil not to be an accessory of others' sins either by counsel, command, consent, concealment, participation, praise or flattery, or defense of the crime. You often rhetorically ask if we are tainted by a particular pope's or bishop's sins. Your question implies that we are not, but that is not entirely true. Let me relate one example, the Catholic faith in the True Presence (the dogma of Transubstantiation) is believed by about 28% of all Novus Ordo Catholics as determined by multiple choice questionnaires from a PEW poll in 2019. It is 26% for all Catholics under 40 years of age and 63% of those who go to Mass at least once each week.

The USCCB was scandalized by these result so they conducted their own poll in 2023 which focused on regular Novus Ordo attendees and found that 66% believed in the True Presence. They criticized the PEW results on the grounds that PEW used theological precise language which apparently confused modern adult Catholics. The USCCB poll gave fewer options in the questionnaire and used multiple descriptive questions. They then took "each respondent's answers collectively" to arrive at a gestalt impression that they in fact believed what the Church teaches. Still a 66% belief in the True Presence by regular attendees at the Novus Ordo service is pathetic. The bishop's own poll demonstrates that most modern Catholics are unable to articulate the truths of our faith beyond vague notions that approximate orthodoxy.

The USCCB has not proposed any cause or solution for the shameful ignorance. Let me suggest one. There is every right to believe that an important cause of this collapse in faith is the Indult requested by and granted to the USCCB by the Vatican that grants the privilege to set aside the immemorial Catholic norm for receiving Communion and allow the novel practice of distributing Communion in the hand, standing, by lay ministers. The USCCB has no right to request and the Vatican has no right to grant any Indult that damages the faith by lessening the belief in the True Presence. This is not the exercise of the delegated Authority of God for the salvation of souls but the human abuse of authority that leads to the loss of faith and loss of souls. Those that participate in this are tainted by the sins of their ecclesiastical superiors by their willing participation and silence. The two greatest test by God for His creatures, Lucifer and the angelic hosts and the Jews at the time of Christ, required the faithful to act in opposition God's constituted authority. God takes the virtue of Religion seriously and you will not be able to excuse yourself for just following orders. But you seem incapable of doing that because the pope is your proximate rule of faith. For you he is the sign and of unity

and therefore any disobedience is schism. You would side with the Pharisees against the man born blind who was excommunicated from the Temple for professing his faith in Jesus Christ.

Remember that without the faith there is no charity. Without charity there is no unity with the pope or the faithful. St. Thomas not only says that direct denial of dogma is the essence of heresy but anything that can lead to the denial of dogma is heretical. Furthermore, heresy can be expressed in actions alone without words. The heresy of Iconoclasm is the destruction of images of the faith. The immemorial ecclesiastical traditions that you treat as matters of mere discipline subject to the free and independent will of the pope are not in fact merely matters of discipline at all but rather images that are necessary attributes of the faith alone by which it can be known and communicated to others. These traditions were incorporated in the Tridentine Profession of Faith. It is the reason why Iconoclasm is a heresy. The example given above of standing to receive communion in the hand from a lay woman signifies a belief in the nature of the Blessed Sacrament that is contrary to what is signified by kneeling to receive communion on the tongue administered by a priest with paten and linen cloth over the altar rail. These acts signify a different belief in the nature of Blessed Sacrament and the Indult that permitted the current practice is a form of Iconoclasm.

You said introducing your video against Archbishop Viganò:

"What did Jesus Christ have to say about the Latin Mass? Nothing. What did Jesus Christ have to say about unity? He said a lot!"

From what has been said these questions can be better answered. Jesus had plenty to say about unity but that unity is grounded upon faith and forged by charity. Regarding worship what is clear from all scripture and tradition is that God is the author of all right worship. Even the word "orthodoxy" translated into Slavonic literally means "right worship". Heretics cannot worship God because they cannot worship "in Spirit and Truth". The "received and approved" immemorial Roman rite of Mass was dogmatized at the Council of Trent and any pastor of the churches whomsoever who wants to change them into other new rights is anathematized. The "received and approved" rites are icons, images of the faith by which it is known and communicated to others. These images are immemorial because their exact origin is unknown. They are the work of God and not man. Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò has called for the restoration of these images against the neo-iconoclasts. This is the real irony: you Dr. Jones have been imposing traditional meanings on the Novus Ordo images since Vatican II because you hold the pope as your proximate rule of faith and not Catholic dogma. The meanings of these Novus Ordo images are for you a "category of the mind" because the images themselves do not have a natural referent to Catholic truth that you impose on them. A Catholic does not receive the faith from these images. For Catholics formed by these images they are "categories of reality" and the reality formed is not the Catholic faith. And here is an even greater irony: Iconoclasm is a heresy instigated entirely by Jews. This is evident from the writings of St. John of Damascus on Holy Images as well as the writings of other Church Fathers he quotes. You are the author of *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit* and the Neo-iconoclasm since Vatican II is entirely lost on you!

Unless a child has been formed in the Catholic faith by his parents using traditional images, pre-Vatican II catechism for children, daily Rosary, homeschooling, and other traditional images in the home like the Crucifix, the Sacred Heart and the Immaculate Heart of Mary, he will not learn the Catholic faith. It has been twenty-two years since the publication of Kenneth Jones, *Index of Leading Catholic Indicators* and there are no indications of any reversal of the trends. Yet, with all this staring you in the face, you said in an interview with an Irish interviewer that you opposed the Latin Mass because it divided conservatives

and diluted their united influence. Influence for what? If the pope is the proximate rule of faith why bother about "influencing" anyone about anything? What Jesus Christ had to say about unity begins with the faith. "He who believes and is baptized will be saved. He who believes not will be condemned." "If anyone preaches a gospel different than what you have received, let him be anathema. I say again, etc." When St. Peter fell from the faith with the Judaizers he was confronted by St. Paul with what? The dogma determined at the Council of Jerusalem where it was declared that the Holy Ghost had spoken. You would have joined the dissimulation and accused St. Paul of schism.

You often cite Sun Tze's *Art of War* dictum concerning the necessity of knowing your enemy and knowing yourself. SunTze says that if you know yourself but you do not know your enemy and will lose as often as you win. He does not say anything about the converse where you know your enemy but are ignorant about yourself. I would guess that in this case the losses would far surpass the victories. The very heart of our culture war is the conflict between Satan and his followers contending against God and His Church. You know the enemy, but I contend that you do not know the faith and the Church, and therefore you do not know what you are defending. You are corrupting the Catholic Faith and no matter how well you know the enemy you will lose more often than win. By making the pope your proximate rule of faith, you are unable to distinguish the moral manifest imputability of abortion as distinguished from schism. For the same reason you do not see the relationship between schism and heresy saying in your recent video **"There is no point of debating doctrine with a schismatic because that is not the issue."** As St. Thomas says, himself quoting St. Augustine, "all heretics are schismatics," so doctrine is materially the issue for "all heretics are schismatics" and since Vatican I's dogmatic declarations, all schismatics are heretics. Without the faith there is no charity so it is just as pointless to say to you, "There is no point in discussing schism with heretics because schism is not an issue!"

From the perspective of a Catholic faithful to tradition you have added important historical information regarding the enemy but have added little to the essential outlines and even less toward knowing the faith and the Church. In the 1970s a modestly educated Catholic trying to keep our traditions knew the enemy and Church better than you. From the common literature available and circulating in traditional communities he knew about the meaning of Catholic culture and civilization from Dr. Christopher Dawson. He knew from Dr. John Senior that western culture formally known as Christendom was grounded upon and developed from the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the True Presence from which developed all western music, art, architecture, poetry, literature, social and political structure. He knew about the enemy from Maurice Pinay, Vicomte Leon de Poncins, Fr. Charles E. Coughlin, and especially from Fr. Denis Fahey. Fr. Fahey who wrote about the Jews, the Talmud, Kabbalah, Free Masonry, organized naturalism, the evils of usury, monetary and banking financial scams in their never ending purpose to corrupt the faith and destroy the Church. Fr. Fahey importantly provided the necessary means to combat the enemy through the social kingship of Jesus Christ. The writings of Historical revisionism were common knowledge in traditional Catholic circles including the origins of Communism, Nazism, Liberalism, modern wars, the Holocaust, and political assassinations and more. You were addressing none of these issues in the 1970s.

The common aphorism is that the popular style is invisible to its contemporaries. Neo-modernism is the popular style. Neo-modernism is the common heresy underlying the Vatican II Church. It was in fact the purpose of the Council announced by Pope John XXIII at the opening ceremony when he said the truths of the faith are one thing and how they are expressed another. The Holy Ghost, unlike the Council of Jerusalem and all other ecumenical councils, was never

invoked. The Council, as Pope Benedict/Ratzinger said remained at a modest pastoral level defining no Catholic doctrine or moral truth. The Vatican II council has more in common with the Synod on Synodality than the all the previous ecumenical councils because it never rose above churchmen teaching by their grace of state. It was from the beginning to the end an extra-ordinary exercise of the ordinary magisterium of churchmen relying upon their grace of state. Its erroneous and ambiguous statements have no impact upon the Church's attribute of Infallibility so you do not have to keep defending it to save appearances. The Council did have a real purpose. Pope Benedict XVI in his last address to the clergy of Rome in December before his resignation said that up to that present time we had seen the 'Council of the Media' but hereafter we will see the 'True Council' in all its glory.

Pope Francis is the "true council" and you must sense this by the way you have defended *Fiducia Supplicans*. You said, "By issuing *Fiducia Supplicans*, with its traditional affirmation of the Church's teaching on marriage, the Vatican cut the ground from under the feet of those Catholics who wanted to use the synod to promote gay marriage." You enroll Fr. Brian Harrison into your camp saying: "Father Brian Harrison defended *Fiducia Supplicans* in spite of the fact that (he said that the) declaration is 'scandalous in the theological sense of the word, i.e., it is apt to become an occasion of sin for many by causing serious confusion about basic Christian moral teaching and shaking some Catholics' confidence in the papacy.'" The pope is your proximate rule of faith so somehow everything he says has to be doctrinally and morally correct or at least free from error. The absurdity is lost on you. It is impossible for anything to be "scandalous... apt to become an occasion of sin for many... causing serious confusion about basic Christian moral teaching and shaking ... confidence in the papacy" and at the same time, be an "affirmation of the Church's teaching on marriage... (that) cut the ground from under the feet of those Catholics who wanted to use the synod to promote gay marriage." This is an overthrow of the First Principle of the Understanding from which all right thinking follows.

Michael Hoffman is correct in saying you are asking the wrong questions. Unfortunately, the "Guild Prophets" were asking the wrong questions as well. The sacrament of marriage is contracted by a baptized man and woman in the public exchange of their vows. The Church provides the blessing and canonically requires the priest as a witness, however, Catholic couples can and have historically married in front of witness alone without the priest if the priest could not be obtained within a period of thirty days. With *Fiducia Supplicans* as the new standard, a married couple and a homosexual couple can approach the same priest asking for the Church's blessing and he will say, "Liturgical or non-liturgical"? Marriage is the metaphor used by God to describe His relationship with each of the faithful both individually and the Church collectively. To so much as discuss the qualities of Holy Matrimony instituted by God in the same document with Sodomites taints by association and is a gross profanation of what is holy.

The damage that will follow from *Fiducia Supplicans* is analogous in some respects to *Humanae Vitae*. **The nature of a thing is known by what it does and what can be done to it and not by what it claims to be or what it claims to be doing.** *Humanae Vitae* of Paul VI was criticized in an article by Mr. John Galvin and published in 2002 in the Latin Mass Magazine by its editor, Fr. James McLucas. Fr. McLucas said that never before had he experienced such virulent and unremitted animosity from conservative Catholics in his life for any other published editorial. Mr. Galvin argued that *Humanae Vitae* ultimately undermined Catholic teaching on the evils of artificial contraception by 1) opening to theological examination a closed moral question, 2) doing so over an extended period of time (several years), and most importantly, 3) while endorsing the correct minority opinion published

by the theological *ad hoc* committee that artificial contraception was an intrinsically evil act, it did so without the minority opinions theological arguments on which that judgment was grounded which were God's revealed truth and the constant tradition of the Church. The majority opinion of the committee endorsed the use of artificial contraception based upon subjective personalist arguments. Paul VI inverted the personalist subjective arguments used in the majority opinion and used them as the theological grounds to defend the immorality of artificial birth control. These personalist subjective arguments were wholly inadequate to the task of defending Catholic truth. In the end what followed the publication of *Humanae Vitae* was a collapse among Catholics in following Catholic moral norms governing the sexual act in marriage and that collapse continues to this day.

A priest in my diocese many years ago was dismissed from his duties as assistant pastor for preaching a sermon on the sinfulness of artificial contraception. If you want the truth, the fact is that *Humanae Vitae* undermined Catholic morality by faint praise for truth, sloppy theology, and equivocal language. **What it did should be understood as what it intended to do.** A PEW poll from 2016 found only 13% of Catholics who attend Mass at least once a week say artificial contraception is sinful. *Fiducia Supplicans* will do far more damage. The 2016 PEW poll reported that only 50% of regular church attending Catholics "see homosexual behavior as morally wrong." Now that homosexuals can get "non-liturgical" blessings you will see that number decline until sermons against sodomy are as rare as sermons against artificial contraception. But all this will be as invisible to you because *Fiducia Supplicans* as you naively say, is an "affirmation of the Church's teaching on marriage... (that) cut the ground from under the feet of those Catholics who wanted to use the synod to promote gay marriage."

Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò has called into question the papacy of Pope Francis. Unlike sedevacantists (and sedeprivationists) he does not hold that Pope Francis *ipso facto* lost the office by heresy. This doctrinal sedevacantism follows from their believing, like you, that the pope is the proximate rule of faith. Unlike you, who 'strain the gnat and swallow the camel' defending the pope, they remove him from office. This version of sedevacantism is hopeless because it expects everyone of the faithful to independently impose *ipso facto* penalties with an unauthorized "extra-judicial" processes. They all want to be the "lord of the harvest" and end up in a church of their own making that is not only missing a necessary attribute of the Catholic Church, but has not the material or instrumental means to ever correct the problem. They are permanently in a church of their own making with no back door.

Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò questions the papacy of Pope Francis on two grounds.ⁱⁱⁱ The papacy is an office created by God and no man has the authority to change the nature of the office. The resignation of Pope Benedict XVI is questionable because there is evidence that he did not resign the office completely. If he did not resign the papacy entirely, he did not resign it at all.

Examining the motive of the resignation of Pope Benedict XVI calls into question whether or not it was forced upon him. The Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunications (SWIFT), which is a member-owned cooperative providing secure messaging for international transfers of money between participating banks, froze all Vatican financial transactions. The journalist Marco Tosatti reported on April 12, 2020:

Few days before Pope Benedict XVI unexpectedly and inexplicably resigned in February 2013, the Vatican Bank (IOR) had been suddenly excluded by SWIFT (the international system of bank identification codes). By this action, it was impossible for the Vatican to carry out any international financial transactions, and the Church was essentially treated as if it were a terrorist

state like Iran. This economic destruction of the Vatican had been long and well prepared ...

And then, as soon as the resignation of Benedict XVI was announced, the SWIFT system was unblocked for the Vatican, without waiting for the election of his successor.

And so we see that Benedict XVI was blackmailed by means of SWIFT, although we do not know from where it originated. The deeper reasons underlying this story have never been clarified, but it is clear that SWIFT intervened directly in the affairs of the Church.

Without SWIFT there is no other means to transfer money. The freeze was lifted within hours of the resignation of Pope Benedict. Does financial blackmail force the resignation and then determine its character?

Following his resignation as pope in 2013, Benedict XVI became the first pope to step down from office since the resignation of Gregory XII in 1415. But unlike his predecessors who resigned, he continued to live in the Vatican and to be adorned with the clothing and regalia of a pope. Archbishop Georg Gänswein, the private secretary of Pope Benedict XVI, said after his resignation that Benedict would continue to fulfill the spiritual duties of the papacy. Journalist Edward Pentin reported in July 8, 2017 (National Catholic Register) that Gänswein said that Francis and Benedict are not two popes "in competition" with one another, but represent one "expanded" Petrine Office with an "active" member and a "contemplative" one. He said that Benedict had not abandoned the papacy like Pope Celestine V in the 13th century but rather sought to continue his papacy in a more appropriate way given his frailty and that **"Therefore, from 11 February 2013, the papal ministry is not the same as before. It is and remains the foundation of the Catholic Church; and yet it is a foundation that Benedict XVI has profoundly and lastingly transformed by his exceptional pontificate."** This division of the papacy is impossible for the papacy is of divine institution.

In light of his decision to resign, Cardinal Andrea Cordero Lanza di Montezemolo, the designer of the Benedict's papal coat of arms, suggested the need to create a new coat of arms for the former pope. **According to the cardinal, the coat of arms of the retired pope should retain all the symbolic elements found on the shield, but all the external elements, such as the two crossed keys and the mitre, should be removed or modified as they represent an office he no longer holds.**



Cordero presented a hypothetical design shown above of how he believed the new coat of arms of the pope emeritus should look, replacing the bishop's mitre with a white galero with 15 tassels, removing the two crossed keys, and placing the pope's episcopal motto "Cooperatores Veritatis" below the shield. **The new coat of arms was offered to but never adopted by Benedict.** He continued to use his papal coat of arms for the rest of his life and it is the papal coat of arms which was also displayed by his catafalque during his funeral at St. Peter's.

The second ground Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò questions the papacy of Pope Francis is that the office Pope Francis accepted is not the office of the papacy either by entering into the office as a co-papist with Benedict, or agreeing to accept the duties of an office the nature of which he rejects, specifically, the papal office exercises universal jurisdiction of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church founded by Jesus Christ. There is evidence Pope Francis denies the universal jurisdiction of the pope by his documents and preliminary meetings on the Synod on Synodality.

The Vatican published, with the direct approval of Pope Francis, on June 13, 2024 from the Dicastery for Promoting Christian Unity headed by Cardinal Kurt Koch, a working document entitled, "The Bishop of Rome: Primacy and Synodality in Ecumenical Dialogue and Responses to the Encyclical *Ut Unum Sint*." The document identifies theological problems surrounding papal primacy taken from ecumenical dialogue and then provides possible solutions "for a ministry of unity in a reunited Church," including "a differentiated exercise of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome" that recommends "a synodal exercise" of papal primacy. It includes the recommendation from the Orthodox representative who said that "any restoration of full communion between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches will require, on both sides, a strengthening of synodal structures and a renewed understanding of a universal primacy – both serving communion among the churches." The document specifically proposes "a Catholic 're-reception', 're-interpretation', 'official interpretation', 'updated commentary' or even 'rewording' of the teachings of Vatican I." It calls for a "rewording of the dogma of papal infallibility."

The document, in perfect Neo-modernist form of doctrinal development, said that the decrees of Vatican I "were deeply conditioned by their historical context" and suggested that "the Catholic Church should look for new expressions and vocabulary faithful to the original intention but integrated into a *communio* ecclesiology and adapted to the current cultural and ecumenical context."

Cardinal Mario Grech, the secretary-general of the General Secretariat of the Synod on Synodality, said that this is a "convenient time" for the document so it can be used for the second session of the Synod beginning this fall (2024). He said that in the first session theologians were asked to study "the way in which a renewed understanding of the episcopate within a synodal Church affects the ministry of the Bishop of Rome and the role of the Roman Curia." In a Catholic News Service article June 14, 2024 Grech said, "If there is a place, a context where there can be - and where there is - seen a new mode of exercising primacy, it is precisely in the synodal process... Pope Francis 'affirmed the necessity and urgency of thinking about a conversion of the papacy.'" "Conversion of the papacy"? And we thought Francis hated proselytism. We will soon see the fruit of this theological speculation. Dogma for faithful Catholics is the end of theological speculation, but for the Neo-modernist it is a new beginning.

Cardinal George Pell in his last publication before his unexpected death describes the Synod on Synodality as being both doctrinally and morally a corruption of the Catholic faith and undermining of the universal jurisdiction exercised by the papacy. Its relator-general, leading organizer and one of the nine "Council of Cardinals" advisors appointed by Pope Francis, Jesuit Cardinal Jean-Claude Hollerich, according to Cardinal Pell, rejects the Catholic teaching on homosexuality on the grounds that they "contradict modern science" and is open to the eventual ordination of women. This should not surprise anyone. In an interview published in the German magazine Herder Korrespondenz, Hollerich said that his experience in Japan changed him profoundly:

"I am a bishop who comes from Japan, and I think many in Luxembourg have not yet fully understood that. In Japan, I got to know a different way of thinking. The Japanese don't think in terms of the European logic of opposites. We say: It is black, therefore it is not white. The Japanese say: It is white, but maybe it is also black. You can combine opposites in Japan without changing your point of view."

The entire process of the Synod employs encounter group psychology techniques that were used in Pope Francis' own formation in the 1960s and 70s to forge correct group-think in forming a pre-directed artificial consensus. From Cardinal

Pell's analysis it will take real magic to produce an orthodox interpretation. The Synod on Synodality is on course to overturn papal primacy altogether so the very notion of schism will only refer to those who believe in papal primacy with divine and Catholic faith as a revealed truth of God, like Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò. But if *Fiducia Supplicans* was no problem, the Synod on Synodality with small bites, well chewed might be eventually digested by those holding the pope as their proximate rule of faith. Archbishop Viganò may or may not be correct in his opinion regarding Pope Francis' papacy but unlike other sedevacantists, this problem will be moot with the death of Francis when God takes him to his eternal reward.

So you and the sedevacantists hold in common the belief that the pope is the proximate rule of faith. Your disagreement concerns what to do about it. The "Guild Prophets" are in the same boat but now thinking about jumping ship. Both of you offer loosing propositions because you do not know the faith. You are not protecting the Church by trying to bend everything the pope says into a tortured 'orthodoxy'. It is not your duty to conform to the pope when the pope does not conform to the faith. It does not require any careful sifting of Pope Francis to find direct heresy. Pope Francis has directly offered his unqualified endorsement of the Lutheran doctrine of Justification condemned at the Council of Trent. Francis said:

“I think that the intentions of Martin Luther were not mistaken. He was a reformer. Perhaps some methods were not correct. But in that time, if we read the story of the Pastor, a German Lutheran who then converted when he saw reality – he became Catholic – in that time, the Church was not exactly a model to imitate. There was corruption in the Church, there was worldliness, attachment to money, to power... and this he protested. Then he was intelligent and took some steps forward justifying, and because he did this. **And today Lutherans and Catholics, Protestants, all of us agree on the doctrine of justification. On this point, which is very important, he did not err. He made a medicine for the Church....”**

Pope Francis, public interview, June 26, 2016

Excerpt from *Exsurge Domine*:

Moreover, because the preceding errors and many others are contained in the books or writings of Martin Luther, we likewise condemn, reprobate, and reject completely the books and all the writings and sermons of the said Martin, whether in Latin or any other language, containing the said errors or any one of them; and we wish them to be regarded as utterly condemned, reprobated, and rejected. **We forbid each and every one of the faithful of either sex, in virtue of holy obedience and under the above penalties to be incurred automatically, to read, assert, preach, praise, print, publish, or defend them. They will incur these penalties if they presume to uphold them in any way, personally or through another or others, directly or indirectly, tacitly or explicitly, publicly or occultly, either in their own homes or in other public or private places.....**

Therefore we can, without any further citation or delay, proceed against him to his condemnation and damnation as one whose faith is notoriously suspect and in fact a true heretic with the full severity of each and all of the above penalties and censures.....

Therefore let Martin himself and all those adhering to him, and those who shelter and support him, through the merciful heart of our God and the sprinkling of the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ by which and through whom the redemption of the human race and the upbuilding of holy mother Church was accomplished, know that from our heart we exhort and beseech that he

cease to disturb the peace, unity, and truth of the Church for which the Savior prayed so earnestly to the Father.

If, however, this Martin, his supporters, adherents and accomplices, much to our regret, should stubbornly not comply with the mentioned stipulations within the mentioned period, we shall, following the **teaching of the holy Apostle Paul, who teaches us to avoid a heretic after having admonished him for a first and a second time, condemn this Martin, his supporters, adherents and accomplices as barren vines which are not in Christ, preaching an offensive doctrine contrary to the Christian faith and offend the divine majesty, to the damage and shame of the entire Christian Church, and diminish the keys of the Church as stubborn and public heretics.**

Pope Leo X, 1520, *Exsurge Domine*, Condemning the Errors of Martin Luther

The condemnations of Luther from the Council of Trent are much stronger and more authoritative. This quotation from Pope Leo X is only to demonstrate how Pope Francis as a "supporter, adherent and accomplice" of Luther shares in his condemnation and that applies to every Catholic today who with Francis agrees with the heretical doctrine of justification taught by Martin Luther. While Pope Leo X called Luther's doctrine a "deadly poison.... a pernicious poison" , Pope Francis calls it "medicine for the Church." As St. Benedict would say, "Drink your own poison." Those who hold Pope Francis as the proximate rule of faith instead of dogma are confronted by the division you described to the Guild Prophets about Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò: 'You are either in the Church with Francis or outside of the Church with Viganò'. That is an utterly false alternative offered to faithful Catholics. Or rather, it is a limited choice among those who make the pope their proximate rule faith and have their "own appetite ... united with the appetite of Pope Francis." This is the union of the damned who have no charity and no peace.

Unless you get first things first you will lose more often than win. The Culture War requires you to know yourself and this self knowledge requires a proper understanding of the correct hierarchical ordering of the truths of faith, doctrines, dogmas, and images by which the faith is known and communicated to others. Only those who keep the faith can have charity. As long as you want unity without charity you will have neither. Which, by the way, is why modern ecumenism is utterly heretical. It seeks unity in accommodation of error which destroys charity. And thus we arrive at the hoped for unity of Pope Francis who said:

"All religions are paths to reach God. They are—to make a comparison—like different languages, different dialects, to get there. But God is God for everyone. If you start to fight saying 'my religion is more important than yours, mine is true and yours isn't', where will this lead us? There is only one God, and each of us has a language to arrive at God. Some are Sheik, Muslim, Hindu, Christians; they are different ways to God."

Pope Francis, Singapore, addressing children on September 10, 2024

You have said and defended repeatedly the indefensible Vatican II attribution that everyone who worships one God worships the same God. So this is your new church. Unity without charity where everyone can find salvation except those who hold dogma as their proximate rule of faith and insist upon obeying God rather than man, like Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò. Should I ask: What god do you worship? For those that make the divine attributes of the Church the personal attributes of the pope have divinized the pope and are guilty of idolatry, and so, we should not be surprised to find them seeking unity with other idolaters. It was Walter Mayr, in *Der Spiegel* in December 23, 2016 (Criticism of Francis "The Pope is boiling") reported this attribution to Pope Francis: **"It is not to be excluded that I will enter history as the one who split the Catholic Church."** Pope Francis is a heretic and therefore, a schismatic. Mr. Mayr may prove to be the greater prophet

than Francis when he said, "The Pope is boiling". Those that follow him as their proximate rule of faith will merit the same reward.

David M. Drew
York, PA

i

A press release from the Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith declares the excommunication “*latae sententiae*” incurred by the former nuncio to the United States, who does not recognize the legitimacy of Pope Francis or of the Second Vatican Council.

Vatican News



Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò, the former apostolic nuncio to the United States of America, has incurred the penalty of excommunication for having abandoned communion with the Bishop of Rome and the Catholic Church.

A press release issued by the Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith states: “On 4 July 2024, the Congress of the Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith met to conclude the extrajudicial penal process referred to in canon 1720 CIC against the Most Reverend Carlo Maria Viganò, titular Archbishop of Ulpiana, accused of the reserved delict of schism (canons 751 and 1364 CIC; art. 2 SST).”

The communiqué continues, “His public statements manifesting his refusal to recognize and submit to the Supreme Pontiff, his rejection of communion with the members of the Church subject to him, and of the legitimacy and magisterial authority of the Second Vatican Council are well known.

“At the conclusion of the penal process, the Most Reverend Carlo Maria Viganò was found guilty of the reserved delict of schism.”

Further, the press release notes, “The Dicastery declared the *latae sententiae* excommunication in accordance with canon 1364 § 1 CIC. The lifting of the censure in these cases is reserved to the Apostolic See.”

Finally, the statement says, “This decision was communicated to the Most Reverend Viganò on 5 July 2024.”

The case against Viganò

It was Archbishop Viganò himself who, on 20 June, revealed the process against him. The prelate took to social media platform "X" to publish the full text of the decree summoning him to Rome to answer the charges against him. **The summons offered Viganò the opportunity to defend himself or to appoint an advocate to do so, and to appear in person or present a written defence. As he did not choose to avail himself of these means within the specified time limit, he was assigned a public defender who undertook Viganò's defence according to the norms of law.**

On several occasions in recent years, the former nuncio to the United States had declared that he did not recognize the legitimacy of Pope Francis or of the Second Vatican Council. Certain crimes in canon law incur an automatic (“*latae sententiae*”) penalty from the very fact of having committed the offence; for the delict of schism, the penalty is excommunication.

According to the Code of Canon Law (canon 1331, paragraph 1), an excommunicated person is prohibited from celebrating the Sacrifice of the Eucharist and the other sacraments; receiving the sacraments, administering sacramentals and celebrating the other ceremonies of liturgical worship, and from taking an active part in the celebrations listed above. Further, they are prohibited

from exercising any ecclesiastical offices, duties, ministries, or functions; and from performing acts of governance.

The second paragraph of canon 1331 lists consequences that follow from the *latae sententiae* excommunication being formally declared.

Excommunication is considered a “medicinal” penalty that aims at inviting the offender to repentance. As such, there is always the hope that the subject of excommunication will return to communion.

ⁱⁱ St. Thomas' affirmation that "all heretics are schismatics" is a true and certain deduction that necessarily follows from other revealed truths. A heretic is a baptized person who rejects one or more Catholic dogmas. A dogma is a revealed truth of divine revelation that has been formally defined as an object of divine and Catholic faith by the Magisterium of the Church. The Magisterium of the Church is the teaching power exercised by the pope through the universal jurisdiction conferred upon St. Peter that engages the Church's divine attributes of Infallibility and Authority. All popes from St. Peter to the present day hold the keys to the Magisterium because they exercise the universal jurisdiction over the Church. The pope is therefore the material and instrumental cause of dogma and God is the formal and final cause of dogma. When a baptized person rejects a dogma, he becomes a heretic and as a heretic, he is indirectly rejecting the universal jurisdiction of the pope as the material and instrumental cause of the dogma that he rejects. Therefore, every heretic is also a schismatic because the definition of schism is the rejection of the "supremacy" of the pope, that is, rejecting his universal jurisdiction. Therefore, "all heretics are schismatics."

ⁱⁱⁱ Not addressed in this defense of Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò is the objection based upon the general opinion of many theologians that in cases where there is manifest irregularities in the papal election, the sure sign that a pope is the legitimate pope is his "peaceful and universal acceptance" as so by the Church. This theological opinion is nicely expressed by Cardinal Louis Billot (1846-1931) who taught:

Whatever you still think about the possibility or impossibility of the aforementioned hypothesis (of a Pope heretic), at least one point must be considered absolutely incontrovertible and placed firmly above any doubt whatever: **the adherence of the universal Church will always, in itself, be an infallible sign of the legitimacy of a determined Pontiff,** and therefore also of the existence of all the conditions required for the legitimacy itself. It is not necessary to look far for the proof of this, but we find it immediately in the promise and the infallible providence of Christ: ‘The gates of hell shall not prevail against it,’ and, ‘Behold I shall be with you all days.’ For the adherence of the Church to a false Pontiff would be the same as its adherence to a false rule of faith, seeing that the Pope is the living rule of faith which the Church must follow and which in fact she always follows. As will become even more clear by what we shall say later, God can permit that at times a vacancy in the Apostolic See be prolonged for a long time. He can also permit doubt to arise about the legitimacy of this or that election. He cannot however permit that the whole Church accept as Pontiff he who is not so, truly and legitimately.

Therefore, from the moment in which the Pope is accepted by the Church and united to her as the head of the body, it is no longer permitted to raise doubts about a possible vice of election or a possible lack of any condition whatsoever necessary for legitimacy. For the aforementioned adherence of the Church heals in the root all fault in the election and *prove infallibly* the existence of the required conditions.

Cardinal Louis Billot (1846-1931), *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi* (Third Edition, 1909), Tomus I, Question XIV, Thesis XXIX § 3.

The first error of Cardinal Billot, and other "peaceful and universal acceptance" theologians, is that he holds that pope as the proximate rule of faith. His presupposition is that a pope cannot be a manifest heretic and therefore, a manifest schismatic, and thus Billot believes that indefectibility of the Church would be overthrown and Satan would prevail against God's Church. For the faithful who hold dogma as their proximate rule of faith a heretic/schismatic pope can be weathered and the weathering of this crisis will be the sign of the indefectibility of the Church that continues to worship God and sanctify the faithful with the "received and approved" rites of the Church. Those who believe that the pope is the proximate rule of faith and share a common appetite with Pope Francis will follow him in his heresy and schism. Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò objections to Pope Francis deny that there has been a "peaceful and universal acceptance" of his papacy by the faithful, but rather only by those who share with him a common appetite of heresy and schism.