

Pre-Vatican II Heretics and Bad Popes

By Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MR. X'S QUESTIONS	1
RJMI'S COMMENT	2
<i>Knowingly versus unknowingly praying in communion with notorious heretics</i>	2
<i>The notorious heretic United States bishops before Vatican II</i>	4
<i>A Catholic church becomes a non-Catholic church when heresy is taught in it</i>	5
<i>Wicked popes needed for heretic bishops and priests to remain within the ranks of the Catholic Church</i>	5
<i>A root cause of the Great Apostasy is bad popes</i>	7
<i>Beware of those who think all was fine before the apostate Second Vatican Council</i>	7
<i>Beware of those who endlessly expose the Vatican II crimes and criminals but are notorious heretics themselves</i>	8

Mr. X's Questions

From: Mr. X

To: RJMI

Date: March 2007

1 – As you point out, the Dimonds are heretics because they teach that we are permitted to attend Masses, etc., celebrated by notorious (albeit *tolerati*) heretics; that is to say, just about every “trad” priest.

2 – The heresies held by these *tolerati*, notorious, heretical priests or bishops are, specifically, regarding the salvation dogma and, generally, “Americanism” (i.e., the general watering-down of the faith).

3 – The problem (or, at least, MY problem) with this is that, since many, many priests and bishops (Carroll, Ireland, Gibbons, Lacordaire, Spellman, come quickly to mind) taught heresies (re: the salvation dogma, etc.) every bit if not more notoriously than Frs. De Pauw, Kelly, et al. —how is it that none of these heretics’ Masses were declared off-limits by the reigning popes (from at least Pius VII through Pius XII)?

4 – It would seem that either: A – Gibbons, Spellman, et al., and therefore Kelly, et al., were, and are, NOT sufficiently notoriously heretical to warrant staying away from their Masses; or: B – Say, Pope Leo XIII, for example, was NOT a valid pope.

I sincerely want to know what you think about this.

As ever, in Christ the King,

Mr. X

RJMI's Comment

Knowingly versus unknowingly praying in communion with notorious heretics

April 2007

Dear Mr. X,

You will notice that I said it is heresy to teach that a Catholic is allowed to knowingly pray in communion with a notorious heretic. That means that if a Catholic *unknowingly* prays in communion with a notorious heretic, he does not sin. A so-called Catholic knowingly prays in communion with a notorious heretic in two ways, explicitly or implicitly:

1. Explicitly: A so-called Catholic knowingly prays in communion with a notorious heretic explicitly when he has been presented with notorious evidence against the heretic but nevertheless prays in communion with this man that he knows is a notorious heretic. This is the case with the apostate Dimonds who teach and practice this heresy.
2. Implicitly: A so-called Catholic knowingly prays in communion with a notorious heretic implicitly when he has good reason to suspect that the person he prays with may be a notorious heretic but he does not attempt to discover the truth or does so insufficiently. His ignorance in both cases is culpable, and hence he is guilty of mortal sins of omission and mortal sins for knowingly praying in communion with a notorious heretic:

Fr. Heinrich Kramer, O.P., and Fr. James Sprenger, O.P., Theologians and Inquistors, 15th century: "For sometimes persons do not know, they do not wish to know, and they have no intention of knowing. For such persons there is no excuse, but they are altogether to be condemned. And of these the Psalmist speaks: He would not understand in order that he might do good. But secondly, there are those who are ignorant, yet not from any desire not to know. And this diminishes the gravity of the sin, because there is no actual consent of the will. And such a case is this, when anyone ought to know something, but cannot realize that he ought to know. As S. Paul says in his 1st Epistle to Timothy (I, 13): But I obtained the mercy of God, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief. And this is technically said to be an ignorance, which indirectly at least is the fault to the person, insomuch as on account of many other occupations he neglects to inform himself of matters which he ought to know, and he does not use any endeavour to make himself acquainted with them, and this ignorance does not entirely excuse him, but it excuses to a certain degree. So S. Ambrose, writing upon that passage in the *Romans* (ii. 4): Knowest thou not, that the benignity of God leadeth thee to penance? Says, If thou dost not know through thine own fault, then thy sin is very great and grievous. More especially then in these days, when souls are beset with so many dangers, we must take measures to dispel all ignorance, and we must always have before our eyes that severe judgment which will be passed upon us if we do not use, everyone according to his proper ability, the one talent which has been given. In this way our ignorance

will be neither thick nor stupid, for metaphorically we speak of men as thick and stupid who do not see what lies directly in their very way."¹

Outlines of Moral Theology: "Ignorance is lack of knowledge in a person who should possess such knowledge. Thus, in a physician lack of medical knowledge is ignorance, but not lack of knowledge of astronomy. From the moral standpoint inadvertence, failure to apply one's habitual knowledge to present circumstances, is equivalent to ignorance.

"Ignorance is *invincible* or *inculpable* when it is not due to one's own fault. Thus, if a person is sick on Sunday and cannot attend Mass and in consequence does not learn that Wednesday is a day of abstinence, he is guilty of no sin if he eats meat on Wednesday, for his ignorance is inculpable, and consequently acts proceeding from it are involuntary or nonvoluntary as far as their morality is concerned. But if on Tuesday a person gets the idea that perhaps tomorrow is a day of abstinence and can easily settle the matter by calling up a neighbor or the priest, but neglects to do so, and then eats meat on Wednesday with the thought: 'I'm not sure about this, so I'll consider myself free.' he commits sin, for his ignorance is *vincible* or *culpable*. It should be noted that the neglect to acquire knowledge necessary to observe the law is sinful (even though one does not wish the ignorance in itself), since in that event the ignorance is voluntary in cause, as in the case of a doctor who neglects to study sufficiently about a rare disease afflicting one of his patients, because the study is too irksome. A person is still more guilty if he directly wills to remain in ignorance, so that he may have greater freedom of action, as in the case of a doctor who will not attend lectures on medical ethics, lest he learn that certain of his practices are condemned by the Catholic Church as opposed to the law of God."²

Hence, if you have good reason to believe that a priest may be a heretic and you can easily settle the matter by speaking to him but neglect to do so, then your ignorance is vincible or culpable. To not investigate an important matter regarding the Catholic faith when one is bound to according to his obligation to profess the Catholic faith and to perform the spiritual acts of mercy of admonishing sinners, instructing the ignorant, and counseling the doubtful is to share in the guilt of the crime and criminals that one is culpably ignorant of. And it also shows a disdain toward the Catholic faith in general (a disdain toward the full deposit of the Catholic faith) and hence is an implicit denial of the full deposit of the Catholic faith:

1917 Code of Canon Law: "Canon 1325, §1: Obligation to Profess the Faith - The faithful are bound to profess their faith openly whenever under the circumstances silence, evasion, or their manner of acting would otherwise implicitly amount to a denial of the faith, or would involve contempt of religion, an offense to God, or scandal to their neighbor."

Therefore, a so-called Catholic knowingly prays in communion with a notorious heretic implicitly when he is culpably ignorant of that notorious heretic's notorious heresies. (See my book *Heresy and Heretics*: Conditions that require a Catholic to learn a deeper dogma.)

¹ *Malleus Maleficarum* (also known as the *Witches' Hammer*), by Professors of Theology Heinrich Kramer, O.P., and James Sprenger, O.P., authorized by a Bull from Pope Innocent VIII on December 9, 1484, pt. 1, q. 1.

² *Outlines of Moral Theology*, Very Rev. Francis J. Connell, S.S.R., S.T.D., LL.D., Professor of Moral Theology, Dean of the School of Sacred Theology, Catholic University of America, The Bruce Publishing Company (Milwaukee), General Moral Theology, p. 16.

The notorious heretic United States bishops before Vatican II

You are correct when you say that most, if not all, of the United States bishops before Vatican II—and, I believe, from the very creation of the United States—were notorious heretics for denying the Salvation Dogma, for believing in the heresy of Americanism, and for believing in other heresies. There is ample proof of this. Therefore most, if not all, of the United States bishops before Vatican II were automatically excommunicated from the Catholic Church, not Catholic, and automatically lost their offices if they ever held them in the first place. This did not affect unsuspecting Catholics who were still able to validly receive the sacraments from these notorious heretic clerics by virtue of Canon 209. (See my book *A Public Heretic Cannot Be Pope: Canon 209 supplies jurisdiction to validate invalid acts by sentenced officeholders and fake officeholders for the sake of unsuspecting Catholics.*)

A Catholic was not guilty for praying in communion with these pre-Vatican II notorious heretic bishops unless he was presented with the notorious evidence against these bishops or unless he had good reason to suspect that these bishops were notorious heretics and he did not apply due diligence in investigating the truth of the matter.

At first the United States bishops' notoriously heretical teachings were only contained in books that theologians and bishops read and then in books that priests read and only then in books that laymen read. And even when the heresy first entered books that laymen read, it was only presented in a few books that some but not all laymen read. The heretics tested the waters to see how a few laymen would react before imposing their heresy on a greater number of laymen. And if the laymen who were exposed to the heresy reacted against it, the heretics replaced the few catechisms that explicitly taught the heresy with catechisms that presented the heresy ambiguously so that it could be taken in either a true or a heretical sense. This somewhat appeased the vigilant laymen and threw them off guard. When enough time passed, the heretics re-introduced explicit heresies in books that taught a few laymen and tested the waters again. There is plenty of proof of this in the Baltimore Catechisms. (See my book *The Salvation Dogma: Salvation Heresy Enters Catechisms in U.S.A.*) This ploy of consistently moving heretical teachings two steps forward and one step backward eventually succeeded in seducing most and then almost all of the laymen because the laymen were worthy of being deceived because of their own lack of faith: "*The prophets [bishops] prophesied falsehood, and the priests clapped their hands: and my people [laymen] loved such things.*" (Jeremias 5:31)

Therefore, before the bishops' notorious heresies entered books that teach laymen, most laymen had no knowledge of these heresies and had no reason to be suspicious of these bishops because laymen are not required to read books that are only meant to teach theologians or bishops or priests. However, even before a bishop's notorious heresy enters books that teach laymen, a layman could know about the bishop's heresy if, for any reason, a layman has access to the bishop's notorious heresy by reading the bishop's heresy in books meant for theologians or bishops or priests or by hearing about his notorious heresy from a credible source. In this case, this layman is bound to denounce the bishop as a notorious heretic and not attend his Masses so as to pray in communion with him. This layman is also bound, if possible, to denounce this bishop to his superiors and to other Catholics, as many as possible. Anything short of that, this layman commits mortal sins of omission. And if he attends the Mass of this bishop who he knows is a notorious heretic, then he commits mortal sins by association for knowingly praying in

communion with a notorious heretic. Doubt it not! This is how God judges these laymen when they come before Him during their particular judgment. Then they will realize, but too late, just how very, very, very important the zealous profession and defense of the Catholic faith is to attain eternal salvation, even if no one around them is professing or defending the Catholic faith. After they die, men will realize that not only are all self-professed non-Catholics in hell but also the vast majority of professed Catholics. They will know that very, very, very few professed Catholics go to heaven—not just in these final days but also from the birth of the Catholic Church on Pentecost Sunday.

A Catholic church becomes a non-Catholic church when heresy is taught in it

As mentioned above, at first many of the notorious heretic so-called Catholic bishops and priests kept their heresies from the laymen and hence did not teach their heresies in their churches to their flocks. However, a different situation presented itself when these heretic bishops and priests began to teach their heresies in their churches to their flocks. Once this happened, then these Catholic churches became non-Catholic churches and all with the use of reason who attended Mass at these non-Catholic churches fell outside the Catholic Church by the mortal sin of schism for adhering to a non-Catholic church.

Laymen, then, incur mortal guilt not only for knowingly praying in communion with heretics but also for belonging to a non-Catholic church. For example, the CMRI and SSPX churches are not Catholic churches because the notorious heretic bishops and priests of the CMRI and SSPX teach one or more heresies in their churches to the flock. Hence, all with the use of reason who attend Mass at CMRI and SSPX churches are outside the Catholic Church by the mortal sin of schism for adhering to a non-Catholic church. And they are also guilty of mortal sin for knowingly praying in communion with heretics, for sins of omission, and for being religiously associated with heretics. This makes them gravely suspect of heresy and presumed heretics. And if it is known that they believe in any one of the heresies, then they are heretics without any doubt. (See my book *Baptized Non-Catholic Children*: “The determining factor is when Catholic churches become non-Catholic churches” and “How Catholic churches become non-Catholic churches.”)

Wicked popes needed for heretic bishops and priests to remain within the ranks of the Catholic Church

Pope Pius X teaches that during his pontificate there were many heretics within the ranks of the Catholic Church stealthily teaching their heresies to Catholics:

Pope Pius X, *Editae Saepe* (On St. Charles Borromeo), 1910: “18. All of you know their purpose, subterfuges, and methods. On Our part We have denounced and condemned their scheming. They are proposing a universal apostasy even worse than the one that threatened the age of Charles. It is worse, We say, because **it stealthily creeps into the very veins of the Church, hides there, and cunningly pushes erroneous principles to their ultimate conclusions.** 19. Both these heresies are fathered by the ‘enemy’ who ‘sowed weeds among the wheat’ in order to bring about the downfall of mankind. Both revolts go about in the hidden ways of darkness, develop along the same line, and come to an end in the same fatal way.”

There were so many bad books with imprimaturs in the days of Pope Pius X that he said it was impossible for him and even the Holy See to check them all:

Pope Pius X, *Pacendi Dominici Gregis*, 1907: “51. We bid you do everything in your power to drive out of your dioceses, even by solemn interdict, any pernicious books that may be in circulation there. The Holy See neglects no means to put down writings of this kind, but **the number of them has now grown to such an extent that it is impossible to censure them all.** Hence it happens that the medicine sometimes arrives too late, for the disease has taken root during the delay... Let no Bishop think that he fulfils this duty by denouncing to us one or two books, while a great many others of the same kind are being published and circulated. Nor are you to be deterred by the fact that a book has obtained the Imprimatur elsewhere, both because this may be merely simulated, and because it may have been granted through carelessness or easiness or excessive confidence in the author as may sometimes happen in religious Orders.”

Pope Pius X, then, correctly points out that there were many heretics and heretical books with imprimaturs within the ranks of the Catholic Church in the beginning of the 20th century. However, what he does *not* point out is that it was necessary to have one wicked pope like himself after another for the notorious heretic bishops and priests and their heretical acts to thrive within the ranks of the Catholic Church. While it is true that popes cannot know about every heretic and his heretical acts, it is also true that popes had to know about heretics and their heretical acts when they became rampant and part of the curriculum for the priesthood. A good pope would denounce the heretics, declare them to have been automatically excommunicated, condemn their heretical works and put them on the forbidden index, and ban all of the heretic’s works. However, wicked popes allow the heretics and their heretical acts to remain within the ranks of the Catholic Church either by doing nothing or by not taking effective action to remove them. What follows is a quote from my book *A Public Heretic Cannot Be Pope*: “A pope can commit any sin other men commit including heresy”:

“A pope can be as wicked as Judas Iscariot and the Devil - In the 14th century in a letter written to the wicked Pope Gregory XI, St. Catherine of Siena said, ‘Alas, Most Holy Father! At times, obedience to you leads to eternal damnation.’ This is one proof that a pope can make wicked laws and command wicked things and thus harm the souls of his subjects. Indeed, the Council of Constance infallibly defined that a pope can be as wicked as Judas Iscariot and the Devil and still be the pope:

‘*Council of Constance*: —Condemned proposition # 20. If the pope is wicked and especially if he is foreknown, then, as Judas the Apostle, he is of the devil, a thief, and a son of perdition, and he is not the head of the holy militant Church, since he is not a member of it! (Session 15, Errors of John Hus; D. 646.)’

“An honest study of the history of the Catholic Church proves that there were many wicked popes who were either immoral or unvigilant or deniers of ordinary magisterium doctrines or occult heretics or supporters of heretics and hence gravely suspect of heresy. And there were many wicked popes who made bad political laws or sinful disciplinary laws. All of these mortal sins do not cause a pope to lose his office. Thus a pope can commit an innumerable amount of these mortal sins and still be pope because a pope loses his office only by death, insanity, voluntary resignation, or public heresy. Consequently, a pope can be as wicked as Judas Iscariot and the Devil.”

A root cause of the Great Apostasy is bad popes

The apostate Second Vatican Council and its apostate rulers, clerics, and laymen are not the root or main cause of the Great Apostasy but only the end result of the apostasy that started long before the Second Vatican Council. Pope Pius X teaches that the apostasy was already in progress in the 16th century and steadily progressed to the Great Apostasy, to the point that he believed the Antichrist was alive during his day:

Pope Pius X, *Editae Saepe*, 1910: “9 ...in the century of Saint Charles Borromeo. In those days passions ran riot and knowledge of the truth was almost completely twisted and confused. A continual battle was being waged against errors. Human society, going from bad to worse, was rushing headlong into the abyss. Then those proud and rebellious men came on the scene who are ‘enemies of the cross of Christ... Their god is the belly...they mind the things of earth.’ These men were not concerned with correcting morals, but only with denying dogmas. Thus they increased the chaos. They dropped the reins of law, and unbridled licentiousness ran wild. They despised the authoritative guidance of the Church and pandered to the whims of the dissolute princes and people. They tried to destroy the Church’s doctrine, constitution and discipline. They were similar to those sinners who were warned long ago: ‘Woe to you that call evil good, and good evil.’ They called this rebellious riot and perversion of faith and morals a reformation, and themselves reformers. In reality, they were corrupters. In undermining the strength of Europe through wars and dissensions, they paved the way for those modern rebellions and apostasy.”

Pope Pius X, *E Supremi Apostolatus*, 1903: “...For who can fail to see that society is at the present time, more than in any past age, suffering from a terrible and deep-rooted malady which, developing every day and eating into its inmost being, is dragging it to destruction? You understand, Venerable Brethren, what this disease is—apostasy from God... When all this is considered there is good reason to fear lest this great perversity may be as it were a foretaste, and perhaps the beginning of those evils which are reserved for the last days; and that there may be already in the world the ‘Son of Perdition’ of whom the Apostle speaks (II Thess. 2:3).”

(See my book *Where Are the Catholic Bishops and Priests?: Falling-away of the Gentile Nations - The major apostasy begins.*) The root cause of the Great Apostasy is the many bad rulers, clerics, and laymen that existed within the ranks of the Catholic Church long before the apostate Second Vatican Council. And these bad rulers include many bad popes, especially from the 14th century onward. Yes, many popes were bad and unvigilant rulers! These bad popes made bad disciplinary laws; did not enact or enforce just penalties against violators of laws dealing with faith, morals, or discipline; and did not support and defend good Catholics who were fighting the good fight against the many bad bishops, clerics, and laymen. And these bad popes were not vigilant in weeding out the many heresies and heretics and their many bad books with imprimaturs. Without many bad popes, there would be no Great Apostasy, no apostate Vatican II Church and its apostate antipopes. (See my “Topic Index”: Great Apostasy)

Beware of those who think all was fine before the apostate Second Vatican Council

Therefore, in order to come out from under the Great Apostasy and restore the Catholic Church and faith, one must expose the many bad and unvigilant laws made by popes long before the Second Vatican Council and denounce and correct them or he will

find himself being a root cause of the same apostasy that led to the Great Apostasy—and this cycle of corruption will never end. That is why the main focus of the works God has given me is not to endlessly expose the many and notorious crimes and criminals of the Vatican II Church but to get to the root of the problem by exposing the many bad popes, bishops, theologians, priests, and laymen and their many heresies, bad laws, and other errors that existed within the Catholic Church long before the apostate Second Vatican Council. Any so-called Catholic who does not do this is not getting to the root of the problem but is himself a cause of the problem. Even worse are those Traditionalists who believe that before Vatican II there were no major problems caused by bad and unvigilant popes who made bad laws and did not properly enforce good laws and there were no major problems caused by a multitude of bad bishops, theologians, and priests who were nominal Catholics because they were notorious heretics. Even though these Traditionalists rightly denounce and reject the Vatican II Church and look Catholic by holding to the holy rituals, they are nevertheless notorious heretics for believing in pre-Vatican II heresies and other bad laws that led to the Vatican II Church. In fact, the Traditionalists are more dangerous than the liberals of the Vatican II Church because they look more Catholic while they are actually non-Catholic heretics.

Even though all of the Traditionalists are non-Catholic heretics, there are differences among them. They differ in the heresies they believe in; they differ in the bad disciplinary laws they abide by; and they differ in their deficient and sinful pastoral care by which they lead their flocks into sins and near occasions of sin and thus into the clutches of the Devil. All of the Traditionalists are deficient in one or more areas dealing with faith and morals.

One type of Traditionalist to beware of is the hypocrite and coward who does not properly profess the things that he does believe in. For instance, many Traditionalists who correctly believe that the Vatican II Church and its rulers are not Catholic do not properly profess this truth to their flock or others nor demand them to hold the same belief. They do this so that more people can attend their Masses, which means more donations and other kinds of support. They do not want to offend the members of their flocks that believe the Vatican II Church and its rulers are Catholic. Hence they love men more than God and His eternal dogmas. This type of Traditionalist is guilty of the heresy of non-judgmentalism, among his other heresies.

Beware of those who endlessly expose the Vatican II crimes and criminals but are notorious heretics themselves

One type of Traditionalist heretic to beware of is the one who distracts from his own pre-Vatican II heresies and deficient and sinful pastoral care by obsessively and endlessly exposing the crimes and criminals of the Vatican II Church while ignoring other important and necessary things that souls need to be saved. To obsessively and endlessly expose the crimes and criminals of the Vatican II Church is like endlessly scraping off great quantities of cancerous flesh that keep returning because you did not cut out the root cause of the cancer that goes deep to the bone. The apostate Vatican II Church is a great mass of cancerous flesh whose origin goes deep to the bone. This cancerous bone is the many bad popes, bishops, clerics, and laymen and their many heresies, bad laws, and other errors that existed within the ranks of the Catholic Church long before the Second Vatican Council. Consequently, all of the Traditionalist sects who think they are restoring

the Catholic Church and faith by scraping off the cancerous flesh of the Vatican II Church are actually the root cause of the Great Apostasy because they are the cancerous bone that lies at the very root of the problem that keeps re-corrupting the remaining flesh after they scrape away the cancer.

After enough evidence has been presented that exposes the Vatican II Church and its members as non-Catholic entities, a true Catholic must go on to the root of the problem by exposing the pre-Vatican II errors that led to the Great Apostasy and must teach Catholics how to be good Catholics and must evangelize non-Catholics. All the time one spends by endlessly exposing the crimes and criminals of the Vatican II Church takes away from these other good and necessary things. For instance, how many pictures of clown “Masses” does one need to see before he utterly rejects the Vatican II Church? How many pictures does one need to see of an apostate antipope of the Vatican II Church praying in communion with non-Catholics in order to denounce him as a heretic and apostate antipope? And how much time should one spend scouring the world for yet another picture of a clown “Mass” or another picture of an apostate antipope praying in communion with non-Catholics when more than sufficient evidence has already been presented? When does this all become an immense waste of time, idle curiosity, and a distraction from learning the full deposit of the Catholic faith and how to be a good Catholic in your everyday life? How many times does one need to hear about or see a harlot performing her dirty deed before he denounces her as a harlot? How many pictures and other evidence does one need to dig up showing the harlot doing her dirty deed after enough evidence has been presented? To endlessly dwell upon her many other dirty deeds is at best a waste of time and at worst a near occasion of sin and sinful curiosity. And it is a distraction and evasion from deeper problems that need to be addressed, from teaching Catholics the full deposit of the Catholic faith and how to live as good Catholics, and from evangelizing non-Catholics.

For instance, how much time does one need to spend exposing the heresies of the Anglican Church before it becomes an immense waste of time that should be spent teaching Catholics the full deposit of the faith and how to be good Catholics and evangelizing non-Catholics? Once a Catholic is armed and constantly edified with the Catholic faith and lives a good Catholic life, no one can deceive him, be it the Vatican II Church, the Anglican Church, the Greek Schismatic Church, the many Traditionalist sects, or any false religion under the sun. Once enough evidence has been presented that shows the Vatican II Church is not the Catholic Church, one must then treat the Vatican II Church the same as he treats the Anglican or the Greek Schismatic Church by not spending more time than is necessary in exposing its heresies and immoralities.

If you scrutinize all the beliefs and ways of these so-called Catholics who endlessly and obsessively expose the crimes and criminals of the Vatican II Church but who ignore other necessary Catholic things, you will discover that they are heretics themselves on one point or more. They are the pre-Vatican II heretics that caused the Great Apostasy to come about. For instance, the apostate Dimonds endlessly expose the crimes and criminals of the Vatican II Church while not exposing the root of the problem or doing other necessary Catholic things. If you scrutinize all their beliefs, you will discover that they are heretics themselves on several counts. The Dimonds are the same kind of pre-Vatican II heretics who first denied the Salvation Dogma because the Dimonds believe that certain baptised children with the use of reason who never heard of the Catholic

Church or faith and who are self-professed Protestants are actually Catholics and can be saved. And they even believe in heresies unique to the Vatican II Church. For instance, they believe in the heresy that Catholics are allowed to knowingly pray in communion with notorious heretics, which the Dimonds do by attending Mass at a Vatican II church and hence praying in communion with the Vatican II's apostate antipope and the apostate bishops. Yes, dear reader, the Dimonds are praying in communion with the very Vatican II criminals they obsessively and endlessly expose and denounce. In this we see that under all the good work the Dimonds do lie deception and hypocrisy calculated to keep those who follow them outside the Catholic Church by embracing their heretical teachings and actions. They are an opposition sect set up by the Devil to trap those who rightly reject the Vatican II Church and its members.

Do not misunderstand what I say. I am not saying that Catholics are not obliged to expose the enemies and their plots and crimes. They must, while leaving no stone unturned, no enemy unexposed and undenounced. What I am saying is that there must be a proper balance. One must not spend more time than necessary exposing one enemy while ignoring another or while not teaching and doing other good Catholic things that are necessary for salvation. (See my book *How to Be a Good Catholic*.)

Original version: 5/2007; Current version: 7/2010

Mary's Little Remnant

302 East Joffre St.

TorC, NM 87901-2878

Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us

(Send for a free catalog)