

No Popes since Innocent II or Catholic Theologians since 1250

By Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

No Popes or Cardinals since Innocent II in 1130.....	1
No Catholic Theologians since 1250	2
Culpability of Bishops.....	2
When Catholics Must Believe There Were No Popes since Innocent II or Catholic Theologians since 1250	2
On Good Things Taught by the Apostates, and a Catholic Does Not Need Their Works in Order to Be Saved	4

No Popes or Cardinals since Innocent II in 1130

There have been no popes or cardinals since 1130 AD. All of the so-called popes and so-called cardinals from Innocent II (1130-1143) until today were and are apostate antipopes and apostate anticardinals for supporting or allowing the following crimes or criminals. Supporting the crimes or criminals means they favored or promoted the crimes or criminals. Allowing the crimes or criminals means they did not sufficiently condemn the crimes or they did not sufficiently denounce or punish the criminals or were in religious communion with them.

1. All of the apostate antipopes and anticardinals supported or allowed the desecration of Catholic places with images against the Catholic faith and morals. And most of the desecrations remain to this day. For this crime alone, all of them are idolaters and formal heretics and thus banned from holding offices even if they did not hold any other heresy or idolatry. From the information I have, twenty-one places were desecrated from the 11th to the 12th century. The first desecrated place in Rome was St. Paul Outside the Walls in 1170; and the first time St. Peter's Basilica was desecrated was on 6/26/1445, by its idolatrous and immoral doors, with many more desecrations following shortly after. (See RJMI book *The Desecration of Catholic Places*.)
2. Some of the apostate antipopes and anticardinals supported or allowed the heresy of scholasticism, which is the glorification of philosophy. It glorifies philosophy in any one of the three following ways: 1) by using philosophy or mythology to edify or enlighten oneself or others on faith or morals; 2) by using methods unique to philosophy; or 3) by using terminologies unique to philosophy (scholastic babble). The notorious heretic Thomas Aquinas' *Summa* uses all three of these scholastic methods. Scholasticism, which took root in the 11th century, corrupted not only theology but also canon law. (See RJMI book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics: The Ways That Philosophy or Mythology Are Glorified*.)
3. All of the apostate antipopes and anticardinals supported or allowed the glorification of the false gods and false religions of mythology at least by supporting or allowing Catholic places to be desecrated with the images of idols, false gods, false religions, and pagans. Many of them also glorified the false gods and false religions of mythology by their words and deeds.

4. All of the apostate antipopes and anticardinals glorified immorality at least by supporting or allowing Catholic places to be desecrated with immoral images. Many of them also supported or allowed the glorification of immorality by their words and deeds.
5. All of the apostate antipopes and anticardinals were guilty of the heresies of non-judgmentalism or non-punishmentalism. They either did not sufficiently condemn sin or did not sufficiently denounce or punish sinners and thus the crimes and criminals remained in so-called good standing and hence continued to corrupt Catholic teaching instruments, Catholic places, and Catholics. And thus they enabled the Great Apostasy to make steady progress and succeed.
6. Many of the apostate antipopes and anticardinals held other idolatries and heresies. (See RJMI book *The Great Apostasy* and RJMI book *Non-Catholics Cannot Hold Offices in the Catholic Church: ...All the so-called popes from Innocent II in 1130 onward were apostate antipopes.*)

The four main crimes of the Great Apostasy, which began in the 11th century and made steady progress, are 1) the glorification of philosophy (aka scholasticism); 2) the glorification of the false gods and false religions of mythology; 3) the glorification of immorality; and 4) non-judgmentalism and non-punishmentalism, which was necessary for the success of the Great Apostasy. And these crimes led to many other heresies and other crimes.

The primary blame falls upon the men who had the authority and power to punish the criminals and eradicate the crimes but did not because they were guilty of either the same crimes or sins of omission. “Unto whomsoever much is given, of him much shall be required: and to whom they have committed much, of him they will demand the more.” (Lk. 12:48) “If any one sin and hear the voice of one swearing and is a witness either because he himself hath seen or is privy to it: if he do not utter it, he shall bear his iniquity.” (Lev. 5:1) (See RJMI book *Sins of Omission.*)

No Catholic Theologians since 1250

All of the theologians and canon lawyers from 1250 onward were apostates for glorifying pagan philosophers or philosophies by supporting, allowing, or not sufficiently condemning scholasticism and the scholastics. Many theologians and canon lawyers before 1250 were also apostates, but each case must be studied individually.

Culpability of Bishops

All bishops in control of a diocese with notoriously desecrated places were apostates and thus held no office, as well as all bishops who were guilty of any of the crimes against the faith listed in the above six points.

When Catholics Must Believe There Were No Popes since Innocent II or Catholic Theologians since 1250

Under pain of heresy and idolatry, a Catholic must believe there were no popes since Innocent II in 1130 and no Catholic theologians since 1250 once he sees the evidence against

them and once he knows the deeper dogma that non-Catholics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church.

The reasons why a Catholic must believe there were no popes since Innocent II in 1130 and Catholic theologians since 1250 once he sees the evidence are based upon two basic dogmas and one deeper dogma (that non-Catholics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church). They are the same reasons why a Catholic must condemn the Vatican II antipopes, anti-cardinals, and bishops once he sees the evidence against them. Here are the reasons:

1. It is a basic dogma that a Catholic must condemn heresy as heresy and idolatry as idolatry or he is guilty of the heresy or idolatry he does not condemn and thus becomes a heretic or idolater and is no longer Catholic. And he is guilty of mortal sins of omission. Hence once he sees the evidence against the antipopes since Innocent II in 1130 and Catholic theologians since 1250, he must condemn their heresies and idolatries. If he does not, then he is a heretic and idolater for not condemning heresy as heresy and idolatry as idolatry. And he is guilty of mortal sins of omission. It is the same thing a Catholic must do regarding the Vatican II clerics and theologians.
2. It is a basic dogma that a Catholic must denounce heretics as heretics and idolaters as idolaters or he is guilty of the heresy or idolatry of the heretics or idolaters he does not denounce. And he is guilty of mortal sins of omission. Hence once a Catholic sees the evidence against the antipopes since Innocent II in 1130 and Catholic theologians since 1250, he must denounce them as heretics and idolaters. If he does not, then he is a heretic and idolater. And he is guilty of mortal sins of omission. It is the same thing a Catholic must do regarding the Vatican II clerics and theologians.
3. It is a deeper dogma that non-Catholics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church. Hence a Catholic who knows this deeper dogma must in the very least presume that all so-called officeholders who he knows are heretics or idolaters do not hold offices. If he knows that they are formal heretics, then it is certain they do not hold the offices. If there is a possibility that they may be material heretics, then the Catholic must still treat them as formal heretics and presume they do not hold the offices. There is no excuse for acts of idolatry and hence all idolaters are guilty of mortal sins against the faith with no excuse. It is the same thing a Catholic must do regarding the Vatican II clerics and theologians.

For example, when apostate Antipope Eugene IV put up the Filarete Doors on St. Peter's Basilica on 6/26/1445, he was guilty of idolatry for desecrating the Basilica with images against the faith (images of pagan gods, goddesses, and religions) and images against morals. He was also guilty of the heresy and idolatry of humanism and guilty of the conciliarist heresy. (See RJMI book *Non-Catholics Cannot Hold Offices in the Catholic Church: Apostate Antipope Eugene IV.*) And all of the successive apostate antipopes promoted and added to the desecration of Catholic places. (See RJMI book *The Desecration of Catholic Places.*) And many of the apostate antipopes, such as Sixtus IV, Julius II, Leo X, and Paul III, practiced astrology. (See RJMI book *The Great Apostasy: Astrology.*) Once a Catholic sees the evidence against these apostate antipopes, he must do the following:

1. Condemn their acts of idolatry or heresy as idolatry or heresy.
2. Denounce them as idolaters or heretics.

3. Denounce them as non-officeholders, as apostate antipopes.

If the so-called Catholic does not do either of the first two things, then he is a heretic or idolater himself and commits mortal sins of omission. And if he does not do the third thing and knows or should know the deeper dogma that non-Catholics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church, then he is a heretic and commits mortal sins of omission. (See RJMI book *Sins of Omission*.) Any so-called Catholic who avoids the evidence so that he does not have to make these condemnations and denunciations is guilty of affected ignorance and thus is a heretic or idolater himself and also guilty of mortal sins of omission. And he would also be a hypocrite and double-tongued, double-faced, and double-hearted if he denounces the Vatican II apostate antipopes but not all of the *pre*-Vatican II apostate antipopes once he sees the evidence. He would also undermine his own position regarding the Vatican II apostate antipopes. To be less dishonest, he would have to believe that all of them are apostate antipopes or that none of them are apostate antipopes and thus are popes.

“Woe to them that are of a double heart and to wicked lips, and to the hands that do evil, and to the sinner that goeth on the earth two ways. (Eccus. 2:14) A heart that goeth two ways shall not have success, and the perverse of heart shall be scandalized therein. (Eccus. 3:28) Be not incredulous to the fear of the Lord: and come not to him with a double heart. Be not a hypocrite in the sight of men, and let not thy lips be a stumbling block to thee. (Eccus. 1:36-37) Winnow not with every wind, and go not into every way: for so is every sinner proved by a double tongue. (Eccus. 5:11) No hypocrite shall come before his presence. (Job 13:16)”

As you should know, Catholics are forbidden under pain of heresy to be in any kind of religious communion with non-Catholics. Hence, neither I nor any other true Catholic will enter into religious communion with nominal Catholics until they acknowledge these above facts and repent, convert, and abjure. True Catholics do not put anything over God and thus above the Catholic faith—not business associates, friends, family members, or fear of persecution:

“Do not think that I came to send peace upon earth: I came not to send peace, but the sword. For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man’s enemies shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me, and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not up his cross and followeth me is not worthy of me.” (Mt. 10:34-38)

To be in religious communion with a person who a so-called Catholic knows is a heretic or idolater is to put that person over God and the Catholic faith. It is to love that person who is on the road to hell more than loving God, who is the only one who can put us on the road to heaven. Jesus, son of Sirach, says, “By respect of person he will destroy himself.” (Eccus. 20:24) And Jesus Christ, son of God and son of Mary, says that it is to “love the glory of men more than the glory of God.” (Jn. 12:43) And He says that they cannot believe because they “receive glory one from another, and the glory which is from God alone [they] do not seek.” (Jn. 5:44)

On Good Things Taught by the Apostates, and a Catholic Does Not Need Their Works in Order to Be Saved

Even though the apostate or heretical antipopes, anti-Church Fathers, anti-saints, and theologians said many good things, it only takes one heretical or idolatrous act to make them heretics or idolaters. The Eastern Schismatics also teach many good and sublime things but

are schismatics and hold several heresies. (See RJMI book *The Great Apostasy: Don't Be Fooled by Evil Men Who Do Good Things.*)

More good Catholics existed before the year 1000 than after, and they did not need the post-1000 AD works of the apostate or heretical antipopes, anti-saints, and theologians in order to be good Catholics. If we needed their works to promote and defend the Catholic faith, then the Catholic Church and faith did not exist until the year 1000. As a matter of fact, I believe that the greatest number of good Catholics existed in the first three hundred years of the Catholic Church and they did not need the works of the successive apostate antipopes, anti-Church Fathers, anti-saints, and theologians in order to know, defend, and promote the Catholic faith and be holy.

The councils that we *know* are valid and infallible (such as the first eight Ecumenical Councils and the local councils infallibly confirmed by popes, such as the Council of Rome in 382 and the Second Council of Orange in 529) are a bulwark of dogmas. We also have the infallible dogmas defined by the unanimous consensus of the apostles and following true Church Fathers. These dogmas served Catholics well in the past, and they will serve us equally well now. St. Paul says to “stand fast; and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistle.” (2 Thes. 2:14) And he commanded the churches “to keep the precepts of the apostles and the ancients.” (Acts 15:41)

Hence if we ignore, deny, or doubt the Traditions of God (the dogmas taught from AD 33 onward), then we will be heretics and schismatics for breaking with the unbroken Traditions of God from the time of Christ and the apostles. This is what happened from the time the Great Apostasy began in AD 1030, when nominal Catholics and apostate councils progressively broke with the Traditions of God handed down from the first 1000 years of the Catholic Church. (See RJMI book *The Great Apostasy: Believe and Do What Was Believed and Done for the First Thousand Years of the Catholic Church.*)

However, for historical, educational, or refutational purposes, a Catholic with a dispensation can read and use teachings from heretical or idolatrous councils, nominal Catholics, and invalid councils. For example, the invalid Council of Trent and some works of the apostate antipopes contain good teachings. At times I use these teachings but present them in this way:

“Even though the Council of Trent was invalid, it nevertheless teaches the truth or dogma regarding this topic.” Or “Even though Eugene IV was an apostate antipope and thus his works are invalid, he teaches the truth or dogma regarding this topic.”

In this way you can still use a particular good teaching from an invalid or heretical council or from an apostate or heretic while not condoning the council or author.

Original version: 1/2014; Current version: 11/2024

Mary's Little Remnant

302 East Joffre St.

Truth or Consequences, New Mexico 87901-2878, USA

Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us