

Against Fr. Brian Harrison



R. J. M. I.

By

The Precious Blood of Jesus Christ,
The Grace of the God of the Holy Catholic Church,
The Mediation of the Blessed Virgin Mary,
Our Lady of Good Counsel and Crusher of Heretics,
The Protection of Saint Joseph, Patriarch of the Holy Family,
The Intercession of Saint Michael the Archangel
and the cooperation of

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

To Jesus through Mary

*Judica me Deus, et discerne causam meam de gente non sancta
as homine iniquo et doloso erue me*

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam

Original version: 5/2004; Current version 11/2006

Mary's Little Remnant

302 East Joffre St.

TorC, NM 87901-2878

Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us

(Send for a free catalog)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	5
FR. BRIAN HARRISON SAYS, “MOSLEMS WORSHIP GOD” (MARCH 2002).....	5
FR. HARRISON’S INVISIBLE GOD (APRIL 2002)	9
FR. HARRISON TO RJMI (5/1/2002)	11
FR. HARRISON TO RJMI (2003)	11
FR. HARRISON TO RJMI (12/15/2003)	12
RJMI TO FR. HARRISON (1/7/2004)	13
<i>The Supposed Letter of Pope St. Gregory VII to the Moslem King</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Challenge:</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Question:.....</i>	<i>14</i>
ON THE OLD COVENANT AND TALMUDIC JUDAISM.....	14
<i>Questions:</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Apostasy and heresy: John Paul II teaches the Old Covenant is still in force.</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Apostasy and heresy: John Paul II implies that Talmudic Judaism is a true religion and teaches that unbelieving Jews are children of God, spiritual children of Abraham, and thus elder brothers to Catholics.</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Heresy: Vatican II & John Paul II teach unbelieving Jews are not under a curse.</i>	<i>17</i>
DID YOU EXPOSE JOHN PAUL II’S SCANDAL?	17
<i>On your article, “Moslems and the One True God,” in This Rock Magazine, January 2003</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Conclusion</i>	<i>19</i>
FR. HARRISON TO RJMI (3/4/2004)	20
RJMI TO FR. HARRISON (4/19/2004)	21
ON PRIVATE LETTERS AND CONVERSATIONS	21
<i>The real reason you did not answer my questions</i>	<i>23</i>
ON POPE GREGORY’S SUPPOSED TEACHING ON MOSLEMS.....	23
SO, DO YOU BELIEVE NON-CATHOLICS CAN BE SAVED?	24
YOUR WATERED DOWN DENUNCIATION OF JOHN PAUL II’S CRIMES.....	24
<i>Black is White</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Black is Grey</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>On John Paul II’s key appointments and your complicity.....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Black is White</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>You lifted up your voice like a mouse and weasel</i>	<i>29</i>
FR. BRIAN HARRISON TO RJMI (4/22/2004)	30
RJMI TO FR. HARRISON (OPEN LETTER, 5/25/2004)	32
<i>On Silencing Just Denunciations.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>On Doug Bersaw.....</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>On the Salvation Dogma</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>I have not rashly judged you</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Questions</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>On Pope Gregory, the Moslems, and Talmudic Jews</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>The Catholic God is visible, not just invisible</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>On your contradiction in This Rock</i>	<i>42</i>
JOHN CHAPTER 8.....	42
<i>Evil Jews lack of belief in Jesus, the true God, had been prophesied.....</i>	<i>43</i>
ROMANS 10:2	44

THE GOD OF NOAH, ABRAHAM, AND MOSES.....	47
You and your apostate professor are birds of the same feather	47
<i>You replaced Christ with the Apostate Jews</i>	48
<i>On the Numbers Game and your Hypocrisy</i>	48
<i>On your Black Magic</i>	49
FR. HARRISON TO RJMI (6/10/2004)	50
RJMI TO FR. HARRISON (7/26/2004)	55
WHO IS AN APOSTATE?	55
1) ON RASH JUDGMENTS	55
2) ON OMITTING THINGS, MY QUOTE FROM THOMAS, AND YOUR REPLY	55
3-4) ON NOT ANSWERING MY QUESTIONS ON THE APOSTATE JEWS	60
4A) ON THE GOD OF THE KORAN	61
<i>Some believe Lucifer/Satan is God</i>	62
<i>Antichrist worshipped as the one true God</i>	63
4B) ON THE SALVATION DOGMA	63
<i>Finally, by your own admission, you imply John Paul II and others teach heresy</i>	65
Pre-Vatican II	66
Post Vatican II	67
FR. HARRISON TO RJMI (8/15/2004)	68
RJMI UPDATE (12/6/2004)	68
RJMI UPDATE (12/31/2004)	69
WILL NORRIS TO FR. HARRISON (12/13/04)	69
FR. HARRISON TO WILL NORRIS (12/14/2004)	69
WILL NORRIS TO FR. HARRISON (12/15/2004)	70
FR. HARRISON TO WILL NORRIS (12/15/2004)	70
SOLI DEO GLORIA	71
RJMI UPDATE (6/17/2005)	71
STILL NO ANSWERS FROM FR. HARRISON TO QUESTIONS ABOUT BASIC DOGMAS.....	71
<i>On the Old Covenant and Talmudic Judaism</i>	71
<i>On the Salvation Dogma</i>	72
RJMI UPDATE (11/2006).....	72
STILL NO ANSWERS FROM FR. HARRISON TO QUESTIONS ABOUT BASIC DOGMAS.....	72

Introduction

This is an update of my on going denunciation of Fr. Brain Harrison as an apostate and heretic. I cannot print all of Fr. Harrison's defenses of his positions. I only print the pertinent parts. If you want to see a full defense of his positions, you can contact him at the below address:

Rev. Brian W. Harrison, O.S., M.A., S.T.D.
Pontifical Catholic University of P.R.
22250 Las Americas Ave. Suite 601
Ponce, Puerto Rico 00717-0777

I will continue to print the pertinent parts of Fr. Harrison's future responses. For my past correspondences and denunciations of Fr. Harrison see,

- 1) Exurge Michael Journal, Issue 6, September 2001, "Refutation of Fr. Brian Harrison and the St. Benedict Center." (This article is contain in "Against the Saint Benedict Center")
- 2) Exurge Michael Journal, Issue 10, March 2002, "Fr. Brian Harrison says, 'Moslems Worship God.'" (This article is contained in this book.)
- 3) Exurge Michael, Issue 11, April 2002, "Fr. Brian Harrison's Invisible god." (This article is contained in this book.)
- 4) RJMI "Refutation of Thomas Sparks' 'Against Sedevacantism' and Fr. Brian Harrison," July 2003. (This article is in a book with the same name.)

Fr. Brian Harrison says, "Moslems Worship God" (March 2002)

Taken from Exurge Michael Journal, Issue 10, 2002

Fr. Brian Harrison has responded to my condemnation against him in Issue #6. Per his request I had sent him a copy along with my "Strange Voices" book and video series. The result is very sad indeed. I must say, I did not expect it to be as bad as it was, but then again, I did say that whoever tries to defend apostate Antipope John Paul II could only do so if they profess his same apostasies and heresies, either implicitly or explicitly. Fr. Harrison knows a pope can lose his office if he publicly defects from the faith, so the thrust of his defense of John Paul II is to try and prove he has not publicly defected from the faith. Fr. Harrison's mission, given to him by Satan, is to defend the False Prophet John Paul II from those who see him for what he is, an apostate antipope. This is one of top priorities of Satan, and thus he needs an intelligent man who is accomplished in the craft of seduction and deception. I will first quote from my Issues #6 and #4.

Exurge Michael, Issue #6: "Just ask the St. Benedict Center and Fr. Harrison, is it a minor sin and just scandal, or is it a major scandal and a mortal sin of apostasy from the Catholic faith to teach that Moslems worship the one true God? Ask them, is it a minor sin and just scandal, or is it a major scandal and a mortal sin of idolatry and apostasy to kiss the Koran? Then ask, if John Paul II and the Conciliar Church are guilty of these crimes and see what answer they give you."

Exurge Michael Issue #4: "...If anyone who calls himself a Catholic does not condemn the Conciliar Church and Antipope John Paul II and separate from them, on this evidence alone, is

also an apostate, an idolater, who has denied the very basics of the Catholic faith as professed in his baptismal vow that proclaims the divinity of Jesus Christ and the Most Blessed Trinity. There is no need to go any further or discuss any other issue with such an apostate until he first repents of his sin against the first commandment. What use would it be to talk of the other heresies... if a fallen-away Catholic has directly violated the very first commandment of God? The end of the road of a fallen-away Catholic is apostasy, the violation of the first commandment. No sin is worse, and to reach this stage of unbelief such a man had to already be denying many other dogmas.”

Well, I praise God and thank Him that he has not delayed in giving me more than sufficient evidence to confirm this truth. Fr. Harrison has boldly, and for the record answered this question. Below is his answer.

Rev. Brain W. Harrison, O.S., M.A., S.T.D.
Assistant Professor of Theology
Pontifical Catholic University of P. R.
2250 Las Americas Ave. Suite 601
Ponce PR 00717-0777

13 February 2002
Ash Wednesday

Dear Mr. Ibranyi,

...As regards the piece of mine you have criticized, I recognized months ago, well before reading your comments, that my original article against sedevacantism in *This Rock* has certain defects and stands in need of correction or clarification on some points... I won't attempt to argue with you point by point on all the innumerable issues raised in your literature. Since I "fail" your very first "test" and have therefore, in your view, "reached the end of the road, apostasy"... For the record: (a) I agree with Pope John Paul II that it can truly be said that the Muslims "worship the one true God", even though they deny His trinitarian character; **(b)** at the same time, I believe firmly, unequivocally and absolutely in the revealed mystery of the Most Blessed Trinity (as does John Paul II along with all his predecessors), and hence I reject categorically your presumptuous accusation that I have lapsed into "apostasy" and "denial of Jesus Christ" simply because I have professed **(a)**. The fact that you evidently see a necessary incoherence or contradiction between **(a)** and **(b)** while I, the Pope, and millions of other Catholics do not, gives me very little confidence in your competence to distinguish accurately between heresy and non-heresy—and much less to present yourself before the world as virtually (absolutely?) the only reliable teacher of Catholic doctrine and canon law left on the face of the earth.”

A simple child can see the gross and blasphemous contradiction. First he denies the Most Holy Trinity by saying the Moslems worship the true God, implying that Allah is God, and then, in order to try and soften his apostasy, he says he believes the Most Holy Trinity is God. His hypocrisy, whose intent is to confuse and confound the reader, worsens his crime. Only a perverted theologian could say such a thing and then proceed to defend it. He is like a math professor who teaches $2+2=4$ and 5, and then sets out to prove it. In his first defense above he believes the truth is a numbers game, which is determined by what the majority of the people think. He is confident he is right because John Paul II and millions of other "Catholics" believe the same. This is proof positive of the Great Apostasy that Fr. Harrison denies we are in. He cannot see the Great Apostasy because he, John Paul II, and millions of fallen-away Catholics are part of it. How can a man who believes the Moslems worship the true God ever see the Great Apostasy, when he cannot see this greatest sin he has committed? It is his second defense of his apostasy, which follows, that is truly amazing and more confirmation of what I said in Issue #6.

Exurge Michael, Issue #6: Dear reader, if you are under the spell of Fr. Harrison or the St. Benedict Center, or men like them, I leave you with this warning and admonition. These men have bewitched you so that you would not obey the truth (Gal. 3:1). They are master magicians of the illusion. They put the best Hollywood or Black magician to shame. They will have you believe you did not really see what you saw, or hear what you heard, a crime is not really a crime and a criminal is not really a criminal. They will have you believe a dung heap is a rose bush and rose bush is a dung heap. God has allowed this operation of error to come upon you, because you would not obey the truth (2Thess. 2:9-11). You will actually believe the illusion, because you are under a veil of darkness and are in a very deep, deep sleep. So I say to you, **WAKE UP NOW**, before it is too late. **REPENT, CONVERT, AND ABJURE!!! GOD WILL NOT BE MOCKED!**

Now dear reader, you will be tested to see if you believe the illusion. Fr. Harrison using black magic exploits the craft of illusion. He tries to imprint a lie on the mind of the reader by using a false analogy. He wants you to believe every false god mentioned in the Bible and by the saints is actually the true God who is not clearly seen. In other words, there is no such thing as a false god. A false god is actually a blurred and confused image of the true God.

Fr. Harrison, Ibid: As in your "litmus test" concerning the Muslims, you err in footnote 62 on p. 37 of *Strange Voices*, Book 1, by asserting that "Protestants do not worship the same Jesus as Catholics." In both cases you are confusing two distinct questions: *whether one person or two separate persons* are under discussion in a given situation; and *what the qualities or attributes* of a given person are.

Let me explain. Imagine two people with their television sets in two adjacent houses, tuned in to the same channel at the same time, watching the same news bulletin. One TV set is in excellent condition and the image of the news broadcaster comes out perfectly on the screen. The set (or antenna) in the next house is in poor condition, and the image comes out on the screen in a blurry, confused, and partly unrecognizable form. Are the two viewers *seeing the same man*? Of course they are! There are not *two different men* in the TV studio producing the two respective images! However, because of his defective receiving mechanism, the second viewer does not see the true attributes and qualities of the broadcaster's face. In the same way, there is only one and the same Jesus who is the object of worship by Catholics and Protestants alike. But because the Protestants' 'receiving mechanism' is defective (they reject Tradition and the Catholic Magisterium), they do not see the *full* truth about Our Lord and Saviour. Likewise, there is only one Supreme and Eternal Creator of the universe, who is recognized as such by both Muslims and Christians. But because of their defective 'receiving apparatus' (they do not accept Christian revelation), the Muslims err grievously by not recognizing His Trinitarian character. This is the way we must understand John Paul II's statements which needlessly scandalize you.

Ah, a dung heap (Allah) is actually a rose bush (God) but not clearly seen. Scandal is not scandal at all; instead those who are scandalized are the cause of scandal. Scratching your head in bewilderment! If you are there is hope for you. Using this false analogy, Fr. Harrison has referred to the Devil as God, just as he does directly when he said Moslems worship the true God. According to Fr. Harrison King David lied when He said, "*The gods of the Gentiles are devils.*" (Ps. 95:5) The new version according to Fr. Harrison reads, "The gods of the Gentiles is the true God not clearly seen." St. Paul says, "*The things which the heathens sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils and not to God.*" (1Cor. 10:20) Fr. Harrison teaches, "The things which the heathens sacrifice, they sacrifice to God not clearly seen." The First Commandment is, "*I Am the Lord Thy God, thou shalt not have strange gods before Me.*" (Ex. 20:2-3) Fr. Harrison version is, "I am the Lord Thy God, thou shalt not have Me before thee in a confused, blurred, or unclear manner." "What strange god," says Fr. Harrison, "a strange god is nothing more than the true God not clearly seen." Thomas teaches that unbelievers do not have the true God as their object of worship.

Thomas Aquinas, Summa, II-II, Q. 10, Art. 3: Now man is more than ever separated from God by unbelief, because he has not even true knowledge of God: and by false knowledge of God, man does not approach Him, but is severed from Him. Nor is it possible for one who has a false opinion of God, to know Him in any way at all, because **the object of his opinion is not God.** Therefore it is clear that the sin of unbelief is greater than any sin that occurs in the perversion of morals.”

The Catholic interpretation of the following verse clearly teaches that unbelievers do not worship the true God in any way.

“Paul, standing in the midst of the Areopagus said; Ye men of Athens, I perceive that ye are in all things too superstitious. For passing by, and seeing your idols, I found an altar also, on which was written: to The Unknown God. What, therefore, you worship without knowing it, that I preach to you.” (Acts 17:22-23)

St. Paul is not saying that they worship the one God. He is saying that this Unknown God you worship I will make known to you as the One True God so that your worship may be genuine, and you may save your souls.

Catholic commentary, on Acts 17:23: "It may be asked, why they had not implicit faith, worshipping the true, though unknown, God? 1st. because **the worship of the true God can never exist with the worship of idols**; 2d. because and explicit faith in God is required of all; 3d. because it is repugnant to implicit faith, to admit anything contrary to it, as comparing this unknown God with the pagan idols; for God to be at all, must be one. Lucan towards the end of his 2d book, hath these words: "What, therefore, you improperly worship, that I preach to you, and instruct you in the true worship, far different from what you pay to your strange gods.""

By the grace of God, I will now proceed to untwist Fr. Harrison’s false analogy with a true one. Before we begin let us invoke the Holy Name of Jesus Christ and the Most Holy Trinity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost in order to exorcise the spell that Fr. Harrison has tried to cast upon us by his black magic. Oh, do not make light of this, his piece of work is surely cursed and with it goes a legion of demons to throw your mind off balance so that it would accept his apostate teaching that Moslems worship the true God. A conclusion of his false analogy is that if a man believes in one God, but that god is the Sun, then when that man looks at the Sun to worship it, he is actually looking at God not the Sun, thus the Sun is God.

The trick of his analogy lies in this statement, “Imagine two people with their television sets in two adjacent houses, tuned in to the same channel at the same time, watching the same news bulletin,” both viewing the “same newscaster.” The truth is that those who worship a false god are not even on the same channel (station) as those who worship the true God. The true God, the God of the Catholic Church, is only on one channel. All the other channels are real images of either a false god, if the non-Catholics believe in one god (newscaster), or multiple gods (newscasters) if the non-Catholics believe in more than one god.

There is no possibility of defective TV sets [receptive equipment: eyes, ears, and a mind] for those with the use of reason, because God gives these to men to clearly see all things. It is men’s wills and hearts that are defective not their eyes, ears, and minds (TV sets). A Hindu is tuned into a channel in which there are many newscasters (gods) in the same studio, and views many gods on his TV set. A Moslem’s channel is tuned into Allah, he really sees Allah in the clear image invented by Mohamed. He truly sees a god that is not Jesus Christ and the Most Holy Trinity. Now a Moslem, by the grace of God and his good willed cooperation, can detect a defect in the image he clearly sees on TV,

in what it teaches or practices, and this will cause him to change the channel in search of the true God. He may end up on another channel with another false god and by God's grace detect the falsehood in that god and change channels again in search of the true God. He may even turn on the channel and see the true God, the God of the Catholic Church—the Word of God is preached or sent to him teaching him of the Catholic God. If he does not like what he sees he will change the channel in search of another god. If he has some good will he may go back to the channel with the true God and observe. It's not that he does not see a clear picture of the God of the Catholic Church, he does, it's that he does not yet like or believe in the true God because his heart is not yet right. God's grace is certainly motivating him to believe in Him. The defect is not in his capacity to see, his eyes, ears, and mind (TV set). Nor is it in God's grace that is motivating Him to believe. The defect is in his heart and will. Be gone Fr. Harrison with your black magic, for the deepest pit of hell awaits you unless you repent, convert, and abjure.

“And the delusions of their magic art were put down, and their boasting of wisdom was reproachfully rebuked. For they who promised to drive away fears and troubles from a sick soul, were sick themselves.” (Wis. 17:7-8)

Fr. Harrison's Invisible god (April 2002)

Taken From Exurge Michael Journal, Issue 11, April 2002

This is a follow up on my article that rebuked and condemned Fr. Brian Harrison in my previous Journal Issue #10. Fr. Brian Harrison replied by letter on March 30, 2002 to my charges against him. Instead of repenting and converting from his sin against the first commandment for teaching Moslems worship the true God, he adds more fuel to the fire, by qualifying his statement and formulating a heretical theology to try and defend his crime of blasphemy and idolatry. As the saying goes, when one lies and does not repent when caught, he just tells another lie and when caught tells more lies and makes more excuses. In his trying to defend apostate Antipope John Paul II he falls further and further away from God, and is on the verge, if he hasn't already, of committing the unforgivable sin against the Holy Ghost. The truth I have publicly presented to him is the very basic truth that all Catholics are demanded to know even the simplest child—Jesus Christ and the Most Holy Trinity is God and those who do not believe this do not believe in or worship the true God. Simple is it not!

I will expose Fr. Harrison's crime against the first commandment that he tries to weasel out of. He admits pagans who worship a finite god that is visible are idolaters and worship false gods. He believes only those who worship a limited finite and visible god or gods are guilty of violating the first commandment.

Fr. Harrison, 3/30/02: “I agree that all the false gods mentioned in the Bible are false gods, who are rightly styled as ‘devils’... I was talking only about Islam... I am not talking about the polytheistic and idolatrous cults which the Biblical writers had in mind when they spoke of “the gods of the Gentiles. ... The essence of idolatry is to worship some limited finite being (real or imaginary), either visible in itself (e.g., the Sun or Moon) or else represented by visible images, instead of the of the one, visible Supreme, Eternal and Infinite Being. And it is obvious that in polytheistic worship all the supposed gods are limited and finite: none of them is thought to be omnipotent and eternal. ...”

According to Fr. Harrison, as long as a man worships an invisible, infinite and almighty god he worships the true God.

“Recognizing the invisibility of God is an essential part of any worship (correct or incorrect), that can legitimately be described as worship of the “one true God. And of course the Moslems do recognize God’s invisibility. The corresponding analogy between true worship and Sun-worship would not be one and the same man in the TV studio, being seen clearly and confusedly by different viewers; but rather, two different images on two different channels, one transmitting the image of a single man, and the other transmitting the image of a single sub-human object... Your logic requires you to assert that the Jews do not worship the one true God any more than the Muslims do... the object of Jewish and Muslim worship is the one true God, and not some finite, creature, or idol.”

First of all the Word, Jesus Christ, was made flesh, visible, and dwelt among us. Two of the minimum requirements for belief in and worship of the true God since the coming of Christ, under the New Covenant, are belief that Christ is God and man, and belief in the Most Holy Trinity. According to Fr. Harrison, it does not matter what a man believes regarding his invisible, infinite, and almighty god or what his religion teaches about his god. For instance, a man who believes in an invisible, infinite, and almighty god that condemns Jesus Christ as an impostor and condemns the Most Holy Trinity would be worshipping the one true God. This mere thought would make any true Catholic cringe and fill them with utter outrage against such a blasphemer. Or, a man that believes his invisible, infinite, and almighty god promotes and condones adultery, rape, and homosexuality would be worshipping the true God. Fr. Harrison has lowered the minimum requirement under the New Covenant for belief in and worship of the one true God. Man is bound to believe what God has revealed of Himself and only then can he believe in and worship the true God. Pope Leo XIII, *Immortale Dei*, 1885: “We are bound absolutely to worship God in that way which He has shown to be His will.” The Catholic Church infallibly teaches two of the minimum requirements for belief in and worship of the true God under the New Covenant are belief in the Incarnation (Jesus is God and man), and the Most Holy Trinity (Three Persons in one God).

“After the Incarnation,” Thomas says, “all men if they wish to be saved... are bound to explicit faith in the mysteries of Christ as regards those which are observed throughout the Church and publicly proclaimed, such as the articles that refer to the Incarnation.” “After the Incarnation...all men in order to be saved...are bound to explicit faith in the mystery of the Trinity.”

A so-called Catholic that teaches a man who does not believe in these basic dogmas can believe in and worship the true God, has himself denied them and would commit the sin of apostasy and become a non-Catholic apostate. There are no excuses for ignorance regarding the basic dogmas of the Church as professed in the baptismal vow and creeds of the Church. All men who do not believe in Jesus Christ as God and man and the Most Holy Trinity do not worship the true God in any way, shape, or form.

Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, II-II, Q. 10, Art. 3: Nor is it possible for one who has a false opinion of God, to know Him in any way at all, because the object of his opinion is not God.”

The gospel according to Fr. Harrison teaches that under the New Covenant the minimum requirement is belief in an invisible, infinite, and almighty god and that qualifies for belief in and worship of the true God. It does not matter what else you believe about this god. Therefore, he blasphemously teaches that Moslems and unbelieving Jews believe in and worship the one true God, while they directly deny that

Christ is God and the Most Holy Trinity is God. Not only do Moslems and unbelieving Jews worship a false god, as do pagan idolaters, they are worse because their religions directly deny Jesus Christ and the Most Holy Trinity is God. The Moslems also believe that Christ was not crucified; He did not rise from the dead; and those who believe in the Holy Trinity are idolaters and infidels. The Jews teach that Christ was a rebel, liar, black magician, fanatic, madman, and is in hell in boiling hot excrement. That is what modern day perverted Judaism teaches in their Talmud, Kabala, and Zohar. They are not confused in the least in what they believe. It is in their blasphemous religious books for all to see. But Fr. Harrison waves his magic wand and that all disappears in a wink. He is proud to tell the world that in spite of all this, the Moslems and unbelieving Jews believe in and worship the true God. I say triple woe to you Fr. Harrison, one woe for each of the Divine Persons of the Most Holy and Blessed Trinity, whom you blaspheme. I assure you this true God shall make an example of you for all to see, when the time of your visitation shall come, when you have filled your cup of abominations to the brim. (See: This Journal, “Who is the God of Abraham?”)

Act of Reparation

“The more Thy mysteries are blasphemed, the more firmly we shall believe them, O Sacred Heart of Jesus! The more unbelief attacks Thy Divinity, the more humble and profoundly we shall adore it, O Divine Heart of Jesus!

Fr. Harrison to RJMI (5/1/2002)

Dear Mr. Ibranyi,

I have duly received the April issue of “Exurge Michael.” As I anticipated, you are either unwilling to or incapable of, reasoning by arguments fairly, and resort to the mere bluster of calumniating me as a “liar”, instead of courteous and rational discourse

Particularly obvious is your failure to draw your readers’ attention to Romans 10:2, wherein the Apostle clearly teaches what I teach, and what you deny—namely, that the unbelieving Jews have “zeal” for (i.e. worship) the true God, even though they worship Him falsely. I will probably be publishing a more complete rebuttal of your fanaticism in our Oblates of Wisdom publication shortly.

Sincerely,

Fr. Brian Harrison

Fr. Harrison to RJMI (2003)

I misplaced this letter and will summarize its contents. Fr. Harrison sent me a note and a Latin copy of Pope Gregory VII’s supposed letter to the Moslem King Anzir of Mauretania. This is the letter the Vatican II document *Nostrae Aetate* uses to defend its apostate teaching that Moslems worship the one true God. In the note, Fr. Harrison told me that I must also, then, condemn Pope St. Gregory VII for teaching the same thing.

Vatican II, Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions (*Nostrae Aetate*), 28 October 1965, p. 739: “3. The Church has also a high regard for the Muslims. They worship God, who is one, living and subsistent, merciful and almighty, the Creator of heaven and earth. [Footnote 1: Cf. St. Gregory VII, Letter 21 to Anzir (Nacir), King of Mauretania (*PL*. 148, col. 450 ff.).]”¹

Below is Fr. Harrison’s English translation of the pertinent part of Pope Gregory VII’s supposed letter:

St. Gregory VII, Letter 21 to Anzir (Nacir), King of Mauretania: “You and I are obliged to show this charity to each other in particular, more than to other nations. Since we believe and confess the one God—although in different ways. We daily praise and honor him as Creator of the universe and ruler of the world.”

Fr. Harrison to RJMI (12/15/2003)

Dear Mr. Ibranyi,

I am enclosing for your interest last January’s issue of *This Rock* magazine, where, as you will see (pp. 26-30), I have taken issue with you again as regards the supposed “blasphemy” and “apostasy” of saying that Muslims worship the true God.

I presume you received earlier this year the documentation I sent you proving that no less than Pope Saint Gregory VII (cited by Vatican II in *Nostra Aetate*) affirmed exactly the same thing in his epistle to the Muslim King Al Nasir of Mauretania. I remind you once again that if you are an honest man and a true Catholic, you will make this fact known to your readers, and either retract your error and calumnies against the Pope, myself, and others, or else at least be consistent with your own folly and publicly accuse this canonized Pontiff of being another “apostate” and “anti-Pope” for teaching that Muslims worship the true God.

I see in one of your bulletins that you are offering for \$1.50 copies of your rebuttal of my “Remnant” articles against sedevacantism. I enclose my check for \$3.00 for one copy of the said rebuttal, including approximate costs for first-class mailing.

With my prayers for your repentance and conversion in this holy Christmas season,

Yours sincerely,

Fr. Brian Harrison, O. S.

¹ The Vatican Collection, Vatican Council II, Volume I, The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents, New Revised Edition; General Editor: Austin Flannery, O.P., *Nihil Obstat*: Reverend Francis X. Gimm, S.T.L., Censor Librorum, July 25, 1975; *Imprimatur*: Walter P. Kellenberg, D.D., Bishop of Rockville Centre, August 12, 1975; Costello Publishing Company, Inc., P.O. Box 9, Northport, New York, 117658; Dominican Publications, 42 Parnell Square, Dublin 1, Ireland; Fourth printing, 1998.

RJMI to Fr. Harrison (1/7/2004)

Fr. Harrison,

Firstly, I must let you know that I do not hate you. I do love you. But, I also abhor you because of your grievous, mortal sins against God and the many souls you are leading to hell. You are training a legion of perverted priests to spread your apostate and heretical beliefs. That is how the apostasy eventually became the Great Apostasy, by perverted seminary teachers who teach gullible seminary students, who themselves have no faith or they would never remain in the seminary. If they were of good will, they would have left when they heard the voice of a stranger. I shudder to think of a seminary student who answers that Muslims and Talmudic Jews do not believe in and worship the one true God whom you flunk unless he adjusts his true belief to your false, idolatrous, and blasphemous one. The same applies to your other heretical beliefs that I will not go into here, such as teaching that certain men who live and die worshipping false gods and practicing false religions can be in the way of salvation and be saved—faith in Jesus Christ under the New Covenant is no longer necessary for salvation, according to you. Not even the arch-heretic Martin Luther taught such an abominable thing.

This may be your last chance to make reparation before God, the one true God, the God of the Catholic Church besides whom there is no other God. *“See ye that I alone am, and there is no other God besides me: I will kill and I will make to live: I will strike, and I will heal, and there is none that can deliver out of my hand.”* (Deut. 32:39) *“I am the Lord thy God... Thou shalt not have strange gods before me.”* (Ex. 20:20-3) If you do not straighten out your beliefs, repent, convert, and abjure, you will surely go down to one of the deepest pits of hell. For the love of the one true God, who is not the god of the Muslims or Talmudic Jews, profess the truth before it is too late. If you deny Jesus Christ and the Most Holy Trinity again in your response to this letter, God may very well deem that you have committed the unforgivable sin against the Holy Ghost and take all His grace away from you. Pray and think very carefully before you answer as if the eternal fate your soul depends on your answers.

The Supposed Letter of Pope St. Gregory VII to the Moslem King

No one with any credibility would base the blasphemous and apostate belief that Moslems believe in and worship the one true God, which goes against the teaching of the solemn and ordinary magisterium (the unanimous consent of the Church fathers) of the Church, based upon one piece of unofficial evidence, a private letter, that is attributed to a pope. I do not accept as true for one second that Pope St. Gregory VII believed Moslems believe in and worship the one true God. The apostates must have dug real deep to pull that one out of the hat. Either the letter that is attributed to Pope St. Gregory VII is fraudulent, tampered with, taken out of context, or someone else wrote it and sent it without the pope's knowledge of its contents.² If you and the Vatican II Church were honest you would have investigated to see if you had other proof, especially of a more official nature, before teaching such an outrageous and rash thing that is most offensive to pious ears.

² See my book *Infallibility, Heresy, and Heretics*, Saints' Teachings.

Pope Clement XIII, *In Dominico Agro*, 1761: “1. ...Evil and deceitful men would exist in the Church of God. The insidious tempters would use their work to try to infect unwary minds with errors which are hostile to evangelical truth. 2. It often happens that certain unworthy ideas come forth in the Church of God which, although they directly contradict each other, plot together to undermine the purity of the Catholic faith in some way. ...Meanwhile the matter is such that diabolical error, when it has artfully colored its lies, easily clothes itself in the likeness of truth while very brief additions or changes corrupt the meaning of expressions; and confession, which usually works salvation, sometimes, with a slight change, inches toward death. 3. The faithful—especially those who are simple or uncultivated—should be kept away from dangerous and narrow paths upon which they can hardly set foot without faltering. The sheep should not be led to pasture through trackless places. Nor should peculiar ideas—even those of Catholic scholars—be proposed to them. Rather, only those ideas should be communicated which are definitely marked as Catholic truth by their universality, antiquity, and harmony.”

Challenge:

- 1) Produce other evidence from Pope St. Gregory VII, preferably those with the more weight than private letters, such as encyclicals and apostolic exhortations, in which he teaches Moslems worship and believe in the one true God. I do not believe you will find one other piece of evidence.
- 2) Produce teachings from other popes, not the Vatican II apostate Antipopes, which teach Moslems believe in and worship the true God.
- 3) Produce teachings from saints, and not Vatican II “saints”, which teach Moslems believe in and worship the one true God.

After your fruitless effort, you must admit that you and the Vatican II Church are rash and blasphemously presumptuous for using this one piece of unofficial evidence that is attributed to Pope Gregory VII to teach such an outrageous and apostate thing that Moslems believe in and worship the one true God, which has no link with Tradition.

Question:

- 1) Is the god depicted in the Koran a description of the true God?

On the Old Covenant and Talmudic Judaism

I present you with these following questions and would like to see what type of black magic you may use to evade more dogmatic truths and the denial of them by apostate Antipope John Paul II. Of course, I hope you do not use any, but simply, for once in your life, tell the truth regarding notorious crimes and criminals as you are obliged to under pain of sharing in the guilt of the sin and sinner you do not properly condemn and denounce.

1917 Code of Canon Law: “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 the neighbor.”

Catechism **Question:** In how many ways may we either cause or share in the guilt of another’s sin? **Answer:** We may either cause or share the guilt of another’s sin in nine ways: 1. By counsel; 2. By command; 3. By consent; 4. By provocation; 5. By praise or flattery; 6. By concealment; 7. By being a partner in the sin; 8. By silence; 9. By defending the ill done.

Pope St. Felix III (483-492): “Not to oppose error, is to approve it, and indeed to neglect to confound evil men, when we can do it, is no less a sin than to encourage them.”

IV Lateran Council: “We decree that those who give credence to the teachings of heretics, as well as those who receive, defend, or patronize them, are excommunicated.”

Pope Leo XIII, *Inimica Vis*: “An error which is not resisted is approved; a truth which is not defended is suppressed... He who does not oppose an evident crime is open to the suspicion of secret complicity.”

St. John Chrysostom: “What an evil! Covering up the rottenness of another! For the Lord says that you make yourself a sharer of the retribution that will come to them, and rightly too!”³

Questions:

First: I want to know what you believe. Please answer the following questions:

- 1) Is the Old Covenant still in force or did it end when Christ died on the Cross? Is it apostasy and heresy to teach that the Old Covenant is still in force, that it did not end?
- 2) Are two religious Covenants with God in force under the New Covenant era?
- 3) During the New Covenant era, are Jews who do not believe in Christ and His New Covenant under a religious Covenant with God? Is it apostasy and heresy to say they are?
- 4) Is Talmudic Judaism, a religion created to accommodate the denial of Jesus Christ as God and Messiah, a true religion? Is it apostasy and heresy to teach either explicitly or by implication that it is a true religion?
- 5) Is the Catholic religion the one and only true religion and all others, then, are false?
- 6) Is Talmudic Judaism (a Christ-denying Jewish religion) intrinsic to the Catholicism (the Catholic religion)? Is it apostasy and heresy to teach it is?
- 7) Are Christ-denying Jews elder brothers to Catholics? Is it apostasy and heresy to teach they are? Note: The clear reference is to spiritual brothers who share the same faith and not racial brothers. *“Not they that are the children of the flesh are the children of God: but they that are the children of the promise are accounted for the seed.”* (Rom. 9:8) *“Know ye, therefore, that they who are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. ...For you are all the children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus.”* (Gal. 3:7, 26)
- 8) Are Jews who do not believe in Jesus Christ under a double curse? The one that all men are under being born in original sin, and the other for Deicide, the murder of Christ—the inherited Blood Guilt that their Christ-denying ancestors called down upon them: *“And the whole people answering, said: His blood be upon us and upon our children.”* (Mt. 27:25) *“For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse.”* (Gal. 3:10)
- 9) Is a man cursed who is under the wrath of God?

Second: I want to see if you condemn John Paul II’s below sins against the faith and denounce him for what he is, an apostate and heretic. Do you concur that the below teachings of apostate Antipope John Paul II are apostate and heretical:

³ “On Respect due the Church and Sacred Mysteries, *Patrologiae Cursus Competus*, 63: 623; “Sunday Sermons of the Great Fathers,” 1955, II: 189.

Apostasy and heresy: John Paul II teaches the Old Covenant is still in force.

Apostate Antipope John Paul II, “Address to the Jewish Community in Mainz, West Germany” (Nov. 17, 1980): “The first dimension of this dialogue, that is, the meeting between the people of the Old Covenant, never revoked by God, and that of the New Covenant, is at the same time within our Church...”

Apostate Antipope John Paul II, A prayer he placed in the Western Wall, one of Talmudic Jew’s holiest sites, March 26, 2000: “God of our fathers, you chose Abraham and his descendants to bring your Name to the Nations: we are deeply saddened by the behavior of those who in the course of history have caused these children of Yours to suffer and, asking Your forgiveness, we wish to commit ourselves to genuine brotherhood with the people of the Covenant. – Jerusalem, 26 March 2000 – John Paul II” (Jerusalem Post, “Pope places note in cracks of Wall,” March 26, 2000.)

Apostate Antipope John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, 1994, p. 99: “The Old and the New Covenants are drawing closer together.”

Apostate Antipope John Paul II, GENERAL AUDIENCE, Wednesday, 28 April 1999: “2. This dialogical attitude between Christians and Jews not only expresses the general value of interreligious dialogue, but also the long journey they share leading from the Old to the New Testament. There is a long period of salvation history which Christians and Jews can view together. ‘The Jewish faith’, in fact, ‘unlike other non-Christian religions, is already a response to God’s revelation in the Old Covenant’ (CCC, n. 839).”

Apostasy and heresy: John Paul II implies that Talmudic Judaism is a true religion and teaches that unbelieving Jews are children of God, spiritual children of Abraham, and thus elder brothers to Catholics.

John Paul II implies Talmudic Judaism is a true religion and teaches that it is pleasing to God, intrinsic and even superior to the Catholic religion.

Apostate Antipope John Paul II, April 13, 1986, In The Synagogue in Rome: “The first is that the Church of Christ, in examining its own mystery, discovered its bond with Judaism. The Jewish religion is not extrinsic to us, but in a certain way it is intrinsic to our religion...You are our favorite brothers and in some ways, one could say, our elder brothers.” (D C of May 4, 1986, p. 438)

Take note that John Paul II is addressing current day Jews who do not believe in Christ and His New Covenant; thus, he is referring to their Christ-denying religion of Talmudic Judaism and not true Judaism that was practiced before the Christ came and died on the Cross.⁴ Therefore, the “Jewish religion” that he says is intrinsic to the Catholic religion is Christ-denying Talmudic Judaism. Being there is only one true religion, it is apostasy and heresy to teach that any other religion, all of them being false, can be intrinsic to that one true religion. What is even worse is that Talmudic Judaism explicitly denies Christ, His Catholic religion, and His New Covenant. How could a religion that explicitly denies what the Catholic religion professes be intrinsic to the Catholic religion? A pagan with common sense can know that this is a blatant, boldfaced lie.

Apostate Antipope John Paul II, Vatican City, Allocution to the B’nai B’rith, Jewish Freemasons, March 22, 1984: “...the Lord has done great things for us. We are invited to unite in a sincere act of thanksgiving towards God. The opening verse of Ps. 132 is apt here: ‘Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.’ The encounter between Catholics and

⁴ See my article *The Jews*, “Jews: Then and Now.”

Jews is not one between two ancient religions that each go their own way...It is a meeting between “brothers ...It is certain that the great task of promoting justice and peace is a sign of the messianic age in both Jewish and Christian tradition, rooted as it is in the great heritage of the prophets. This ‘spiritual bond’ allows us to face up to the great challenge...” (D C No. 1874, p. 509-510)

Apostate Antipope John Paul II, GENERAL AUDIENCE, Wednesday, 28 April 1999: “3. ... Christians also explore the mystery of their own roots. In the biblical sources they share with their Jewish brothers and sisters, they find the indispensable elements for living and deepening their own faith...”

Apostate Antipope John Paul II, Rome, Episcopal Conference on Relations with Judaism, March 6, 1982: “Our common spiritual heritage ...aids in understanding certain aspects of life in the Church... that God grant Christians and Jews to meet more often, before insisting that in the instruction of children the Jews and Judaism be presented, not only in an honest and objective way without any prejudice, and without offending anyone, but still more, with a vivid consciousness of our common heritage.”

Heresy: Vatican II & John Paul II teach unbelieving Jews are not under a curse.

Robber’s Second Vatican Council, *Nostra Aetate*: [Referring to the Jews who do not believe in Jesus Christ and His New Covenant.] “4. ...It is true that the Church is the new people of God, yet the Jews should not be spoken of as rejected or accursed as if this followed from holy Scripture

Did you expose John Paul II’s scandal?

All true Catholics are obliged to obey God’s command as spoken through the Prophet Isaias: “*Cry, cease not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and shew my people their wicked doings, and the house of Jacob their sins.*” (Isa. 58:1) You told me that you did not agree with John Paul II’s kissing of the Koran and his gathering of false religions at Assisi in which many crimes took place. You admitted these acts were scandalous and that you would strongly oppose them in a public forum.

Fr. Brian Harrison, O.S., Letter to Richard Ibranyi, March 30, 2002: “I should add that I am by no means an unqualified defender of all Pope John Paul II’s positions. ...I have been appalled by the scandal (a lesser offence, however, than “idolatry” or “apostasy”) of the Pope’s kissing the Koran, and by his summoning of the followers of false religions, not only Muslims and Jews, but even polytheists, pantheists and idolaters, to worship in Catholic churches and convents in Assisi. I am expressing publicly (in another forum) my strong objections to the Pope’s actions in this regard.”

Have you done so? If so, please let me know where I can read it or send me a copy. Whether you did or not, you have watered down John Paul II’s scandalous crimes by saying they were not idolatry or apostasy. The kissing of the Koran by John Paul II, and worse, his doing so joyfully and with respect and honor, is objectively and subjectively an act of idolatry, blasphemy, apostasy, and heresy. The same applies to his crimes at Assisi and similar ones elsewhere.

Many who denied the faith under torture and the *libellatici* who pretended to deny it, subjectively believed in Christ while objectively denying Him. Nevertheless, they were automatically excommunicated and fell outside the Catholic Church and had to abjure to re-enter Her. Although they subjectively believed in Christ, they had no real faith in Him, because they denied Him. This denial proves they did not truly love Him, trust Him, and have true faith in Him to strengthen and deliver them, as God did for the faithful martyrs. Professed belief alone is not enough. Belief is tested by works, which prove if one’s faith is genuine. In this case subjective belief in Jesus Christ is not denied in the hearts of the

perpetrators, but the faith as a whole is subjectively denied because of lack of true faith in the object of all faith, God. To deny God for any reason proves a lack of true love and faith in God. This amounts to a denial of the whole deposit of faith by not having the conviction to profess Christ when persecuted, and worse by denying Him, the very object of faith, of dogmas.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, 1907, Lapsi: The regular designation in the third century for Christians who *relapsed* into heathenism, especially for those who during the persecutions displayed weakness in the face of torture, and denied the Faith by sacrificing to the heathen gods **or by any other acts**. Many of the lapsi, indeed the majority of the very numerous cases in the great persecutions after the middle of the third century, certainly did not return to paganism out of conviction: they simply had not the courage to confess the Faith steadfastly when threatened with temporal losses and severe punishments (banishments, forced labor, death), and their sole desire was to preserve themselves from persecution by an external act of apostasy, and to save their property, freedom, and life. The obligation of confessing the Christian Faith under all circumstances and avoiding every act of denial was firmly established in the Church from Apostolic times. The First Epistle of St. Peter exhorts the believers to remain steadfast under the visitations of affliction (i, 6, 7; iv, 16, 17).

1917 Code of Canon Law: “Canon 2205.3. Physical force which takes away all power to act completely excludes crime (c. 2205.1). Also, fear which is even relatively grave, necessity, and even grave inconvenience usually excuse entirely from crime, if there is question of merely ecclesiastical laws (c. 2205.2). But if the act done is intrinsically wrong, or tends toward contempt of the faith or of ecclesiastical authority, or toward harm to souls, the causes mentioned in 2205.2 diminish but do not entirely remove the imputability of the crime.”

Grave fear diminishes, but does not remove, imputability. Grave fear does not exempt from automatic (*latae sententiae*) penalties. Denying the faith under torture was still a sin against the faith that placed one in a state of damnation.

1917 Code of Canon Law: “Canon 2229.3. (3) Grave fear does not exempt from penalties *latae sententiae*, if the offense entails contempt of the faith or of ecclesiastical authority, or public injure of souls.

Not only does John Paul II commit idolatrous, blasphemous crimes against the faith without grave fear, he does so with exuberant joy, and plans the events and praises them after he commits the crimes. How, then, does he escape not being automatically excommunicated and thus cast outside the Church for these crimes alone, not to mention his many other ones he committed against the faith? Apostate Antipope is worse than a harlot who sells herself for money. He is an adultress harlot who pays others to defile himself and others like yourself and churches that were at one time Catholic. See Ezechiel 16: 28-41.

On your article, “Moslems and the One True God,” in *This Rock Magazine*, January 2003

When and if I get your response to this letter, I will print in my Journal this letter and the pertinent parts of your response. I will also be commenting further on your article, “Moslems and the One True God,” in *This Rock* magazine. I will include Pope St. Gregory VII’s supposed letter that you sent me with the Latin and your English interpretation along with my above response regarding it.

Conclusion

Not only shirked your obligation to profess the Catholic faith and disobeyed God's command to the prophet Isaias to cry out against the sins and crimes of fallen-away Catholics, you tenaciously and obstinately defended them. Therefore, I cry out against you, Fr. Harrison! You are guilty of all the notorious crimes of John Paul II and the Vatican II Church that you either do not condemn at all or improperly condemn by watering down the crime or explicitly believe yourself. You are also guilty for not condemning the criminals that commit them.

You are either a useful idiot or an infiltrator whose mission is to subvert the sedevacantist position and keep the lost sheep under the yoke of the Vatican II Church and apostate Antipope John Paul II, thus under the yoke of Satan. I hope you are not an infiltrator, but even infiltrators can repent, convert, and abjure.

Lastly, if you do repent, convert, and abjure, you will lose your position, job, room and board, and friends. Are you prepared for that? That is what carrying the cross is all about (Mk. 8:34). Do not let the love of the world and its comforts cause you to lose your soul. *"Adulterers, know you not that the friendship of this world is the enemy of God? Whosoever therefore will be a friend of this world becometh an enemy of God."* (Ja. 4:4) *"And he said to all: If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: for he that shall lose his life for my sake shall save it. For what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world and lose himself and cast away himself? For he that shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him the Son of man shall be ashamed, when he shall come in his majesty and that of his Father and of the holy angels."* (Lk. 9:23-26)

For the love of the one true God, the God of the Catholic Church, and not the god of the Moslems and unbelieving Jews, repent, convert, and abjure, so we could fight the battle of the one true God side-by-side. You would then convert from being very evil to very good, a final day saint. Only by embracing, professing, and living the truth will you be set free (Jn. 8:32), and you will find yourself living like I do, in simplicity and poverty in the Southwest desert town of Truth or Consequences, New Mexico. God provides all my needs and fills me with a great peace and joy. You must separate from the evildoers, while praying, sacrificing, and calling for their repentance and conversion. *"I hated the assembly of the malignant and with the wicked I will not sit."* (Ps. 25:5) I suggest you read my completed, first two chapters of my book, "Bad Books with Imprimaturs."

May the Infant Jesus, through the Immaculate Heart of Mary, grant you all the graces you need to repent, convert, abjure in order that you may enter the Catholic Church and have a hope to save your soul.

Soli Deo Gloria
Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi
To Jesus through Mary

Fr. Harrison to RJMI (3/4/2004)

Dear Mr. Ibranyi,

I am sorry to be so long replying to your letter of nearly two months ago. I have been out of the country for a while, and also suffered an extended bout of bronchitis and influenza in February, so am only now picking up my correspondence again.

Even now, I am not yet going to answer in detail your letter of January 7, with all its usual accusations of blasphemy, apostasy, etc., etc. This is because of reservations I have with regard to your statement on p. 7, "When and if I get your response to this letter, I will print in my Journal this letter and the pertinent parts of your response."

I confess that I am not satisfied with that. In the first place, you as an editor should know that according to accepted journalistic ethics, *private* letters, such as this, (as distinct from "letters to the editor", which in any case do not appear in your journal) should not be published fully or in part without permission of the writer. You have never asked my permission to publish anything from my private letters. Moreover, I see from your December 30, 2003 catalogue, p. 2, that you have already violated the confidentiality of Doug Bershaw. You say openly there that he told you "to turn off the camera" during the event of June 6, 1998, because he wanted to make off-the-record statements about John Paul II. That is, statements which he explicitly told you he "did not want [made] public". But then, you went and published those remarks anyway!

Now, before I am willing to answer the questions in your letter, I would like to receive from you not only a written request for my *permission* for you to publish my reply (fully or in part), but also a written guarantee that you will not decide *unilaterally* what *are* in fact the "pertinent parts" of my reply. I am afraid I see no reason to have a great deal of confidence in your impartiality in deciding what those "pertinent parts" are. Therefore, I would want a prior guarantee from you that you won't publish any of my reply without the two of us coming to a *prior agreement* as to which parts should be published.

I see from your pamphlet against Thomas Sparks and myself that nearly all the attention is devoted to the former. I don't consider that the small amount you say here about my own articles in *The Remnant* constitutes a very serious attempt at rebuttal. I may say more about that at a later moment.

Apart from that, all I want to say at present are three things:

First, as regards your "challenge" about Pope St. Gregory VII and Islam (p. 2 of your letter), I would reply with another challenge to you: Since it is you who claims it is heretical to say that Muslims worship the one true God, the burden of proof lies on you to establish that fact. So I now challenge you to show me even one authentic papal or conciliar magisterial statement which teaches clearly that Muslims do NOT worship the one true God (in the sense, of course, in which my published article in *This Rock* claims they DO worship Him).

Second, in regard to your question on pp. 5-6 as to whether I have in fact "expose[d] John Paul II's scandal", I enclose here for your information: (a) a copy of my letter to the editor published in the April 2002 issue of *Inside The Vatican*, protesting at the recently held Assisi gathering and the Pope's kissing of the Koran; and (b) a complete copy of the October 2003 issue of *This Rock*, with my cover story on pp. 16-19, criticizing aspects of

the present pontificate. As you probably know, both these journals are more or less “establishment” or “conservative” (as distinct from “traditionalist”) magazines.*

Thirdly and finally, you have publicly denounced me in your pamphlet against me and Thomas Sparks, saying at the bottom of p. 3 that Fr. Harrison “heretical[ly] believes that certain men who live and die worshipping false gods and practicing false religions can be in the way of salvation and be saved.” Please tell me when and where I have said that I believe those propositions, either orally or in print. If you cannot do so, then I ask you to retract publicly this accusation in your journal.

Looking forward to your further reply,

Yours sincerely,

Fr Brian Harrison, OS.

P.S. Please send me the following two items from your catalog. *The Salvation Dogma* (\$9.00) and *Natural Family Planning is Contraception* (\$3.20. I enclose a check for \$15 which should be enough to cover first-class mailing costs.

* I would have said a lot more in “This Rock” in criticism of the Pope, but the editor gave me only limited space. – B.H.

RJMI to Fr. Harrison (4/19/2004)

Fr. Harrison,

On private letters and conversations

I agree that a private letter or conversation should be kept confidential, especially if requested. However, if the contents reveal a sin and that sin is a danger to the public, then the contents must not be kept confidential. For instance, if a man writes you a letter or in a private conversation tells you he is robbing banks, “Are you bound keep this information secret?” If you do not report the man, make public his crimes so as to bring him to justice and warn others, you commit a sin of omission by concealing and thus becoming a partner in his crimes. I am not talking of confession in which you must keep a penitent’s sins secret. The same applies to sins against the faith, and more so. If I know someone believes in heresy and he has not made it public, I must first privately admonish him and hope he repents. If not, I must make the information public to warn others that the man is a danger to souls. If the man’s heresy is public, then, I do not have to privately admonish him before I publicly denounce him.

Of the letters you sent me, I made public the parts that contain heresy that you are unwilling to repent of: for instance, your apostate belief that Moslems worship the one true God. You have made no secret of this and your other public defenses that excuse John Paul II’s many notorious crimes. You are one of the main apologists of John Paul II among the so-called conservative elements. You greatly influence them to remain ignorant or silent regarding the true nature of John Paul II’s crimes and to remain in

communion with him. Because of your high position and influence, you are very, very, very dangerous. You are responsible for leading those who hear you into apostasy and heresy and thus assuring them a place on the broad road to hell. As such, a true Catholic can never remain silent in the face of this great danger; not even a vow would bind in such matters, for such a vow would be sinful, null-and-void, akin to the vows Satanists make to Satan and to keep their crimes secret.

Pope Leo XIII, *Sapientiae Christianae*: "14. When necessity compels... as Thomas maintains: 'Each one is under obligation to show forth his faith, either to instruct and encourage others of the faithful, or to repel the attacks of unbelievers.' To recoil before an enemy, or to keep silence when from all sides such clamors are raised against truth, is the part of a man either devoid of character or who entertains doubt as to the truth of what he professes to believe. In both cases such mode of behaving is base and is insulting to God, and both are incompatible with the salvation of mankind. This kind of conduct is profitable only to the enemies of the faith, for nothing emboldens the wicked so greatly as the lack of courage on the part of the good. Moreover, want of vigor on the part of Christians is so much the more blameworthy, as not seldom little would be needed on their part to bring to naught false charges and refute erroneous opinions, and by always exerting themselves more strenuously they might reckon upon being successful. After all, no one can be prevented from putting forth that strength of soul which is the characteristic of true Christians, and very frequently by such display of courage our enemies lose heart and their designs are thwarted. Christians are, moreover, born for combat, whereof the greater the vehemence, the more assured, God aiding, the triumph: 'Have confidence; I have overcome the world.' ... 15. The chief elements of this duty consist in professing openly and unflinchingly the Catholic doctrine, and in propagating it to the utmost of our power..."

Father, you are training priests to be apostates and heretics who will in turn will corrupt others. Who, with an ounce of good will, can deny that so-called Catholic priests are corrupt to the core?

A true Catholic is to be Catholic first, not a politician. He must not concern himself with a worldly etiquette that covers or diminishes sins or treats the faith as a merely academic endeavor. The Catholic faith is a deadly serious matter. So deadly are our sins that Christ had to suffer greatly and die for them to offer us a hope to be saved. How, then, can one sit back comfortably over coffee and cake and flatter men that believe in apostasy, heresy, and idolatry, or commit other public mortal sins and treat them as if these differences have no real consequences? The consequence is eternal hell fire and cry out to heaven for vengeance, especially sins against the faith, because they are first person sins against the one true God, the God of the Catholic Church. A true Catholic is obliged not to remain in friendly religious communion with any heretic, apostate, idolater, scandalizer, or other public mortal sinner.

"Bear not the yoke with unbelievers: For what participation hath justice with injustice? Or what fellowship hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath the faithful with the unbeliever? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? ... Wherefore, Go out from among them; and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing;" (2 Cor. 6:14-17) "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them." (Eph. 5:12)

"I have hated the assembly of the malignant; and with the wicked I will not sit." (Ps. 25:5) "Now I beseech you, brethren, to mark them who make dissensions and offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learned and avoid them." (Rom. 16:17) "But now I have written to you, not to keep company, if any man that is named a brother be a fornicator or covetous or a server of idols or a railer or a drunkard or an extortioner: with such a one, not so much as to eat." (1Cor. 5:11)

The real reason you did not answer my questions

Father, what is the real reason you did not answer my questions in my last letter I sent you on January 7, 2004? You did not answer them because you fear the apostate Jews and love the world more than God or you would not have hesitated to answer them. He who hesitates in matters of the faith, especially regarding basic dogmas, is lost, is not Catholic. If you were truly Catholic, you would glory in any opportunity to profess the faith. Instead, you made excuses not to profess it. You made excuses not to answer my simple, basic questions regarding the Catholic faith. Let this be your prayer: *“Incline not my heart to evil words; to make excuses in sins. With men that work iniquity: and I will not communicate with the choicest of them.”* (Ps. 140:4) If you answer my questions honestly, and I make them public, you know that the apostate Jews and your apostate companions in the Vatican II Church will persecute you. You would lose your position and be an outcast. That is if you stand by your honest answers and do not deny or retract them. Well, that is what carrying the cross is all about. Jesus said, *“Whosoever doth not carry his cross and come after me cannot be my disciple.”* (Lk. 14:27) You have a choice. Either you truly carry the cross and thus have a hope to be saved or you do not and will be damned to hell for all eternity. All glory in this life is fleeting. Those who are in hell know this truth very well. Your professorship and position will not save nor comfort you in hell. God is the respecter of no person: *“For God will not except any man's person, neither will he stand in awe of any man's greatness: for he made the little and the great, and he hath equally care of all. But a greater punishment is ready for the more mighty.”* (Wis. 6:8-9) *“For there is no respect of persons with God.”* (Rom. 2:11)

On Pope Gregory's supposed teaching on Moslems

Father, it is a dogmatic fact that Moslems do not worship the true God; thus, it is part of the solemn magisterium. This dogmatic fact is related to the dogma of the Most Holy Trinity, which is expressed in the infallible creeds and many other infallible papal teachings. Thus, any description of God that does not admit the Holy Trinity during the New Covenant era is infallibly condemned as a description of a false god. Anyone who does not believe in the Most Holy Trinity during the New Covenant era does not believe in the true God. To say they do is to deny the dogma of the Most Holy Trinity. Therefore, to teach Moslems worship the true God while they do not believe in the Most Holy Trinity is to deny the dogma of the Most Holy Trinity. Therefore, it is not necessary for a pope to specifically, infallibly condemn the belief that Moslems worship the true God, because they have already done so by infallibly professing the dogma of the Most Holy Trinity. Also, there was no need to do so because no Catholic ever dared to utter it, that is, until fallen-Catholics have done so since the apostate Second Vatican Council. No pope or saint ever even imagined that so-called Catholics would utter such an abominable, idolatrous teaching, no more than they would imagine a so-called Catholic would teach Noah built the Ark after the flood or Isaac was not the son of Abraham. The saints taught that the crimes in these last days would be so evil that they could not even imagine how bad they would be, and they were right.

For the sake of argument, even if you did not believe it is part of the solemn magisterium, it would then belong to the ordinary magisterium, and as such, it must also be believed that Moslems do not worship the true God. By your own admission, you have not been able to produce one saint or pope that taught Moslems worship the true God, other than Pope Gregory VII's private letter to a Moslem king, which is either fraudulent,

tampered with, taken out of context, or someone else wrote it and sent it would the pope's knowledge of its contents: hardly does this a dogma make or a doctrine that belongs to the ordinary magisterium, and you know it!

So, do you believe non-Catholics can be saved?

You evaded answering clearly my denunciation against you that you heretically believe certain men who died and went to their particular judgment worshipping false gods or practicing false religions can be saved. Your below response to me implies you believe they cannot be saved, which means you hold the Salvation Dogma "No Salvation Outside the Catholic Church" in the true and only sense. But, you did not explicitly say so:

Fr. Harrison to RJMI, 3/2/04: Thirdly and finally, you have publicly denounced me in your pamphlet against me and Thomas Sparks, saying at the bottom of p. 3 that Fr. Harrison "heretical[ly] believes that certain men who live and die worshipping false gods and practicing false religions can be in the way of salvation and be saved." Please tell me when and where I have said that I believe those propositions, either orally or in print. If you cannot do so, then I ask you to retract publicly this accusation in your journal.

For the record, then, answer the following questions, and I will print your responses:

- 1) Do you believe certain men who die and go to their particular judgment worshipping false gods or practicing false religions can be saved?
- 2) Do you believe that only Catholics who die and go to their particular judgment have a hope to be saved?

Your watered down denunciation of John Paul II's crimes

Your exposing of John Paul II's crimes in *This Rock* and *Inside the Vatican*, which you sent me, fall very short of the full truth and lie about John Paul II.

In your article, "Will Pope John Paul II be styled 'the Great'?" in *This Rock* magazine, October 2003, you started out by saying black is white, then you said it is grey, and you ended up by saying it is white. But you never called it what it is, black!

Black is White

You opened your article by saying black is white by placing John Paul II, a very evil man, in a good light, as a good man:

Fr. Harrison, *This Rock*: "Every faithful Catholic will be able to think of many highlights of this unusually long pontificate: the Holy Father's staunch championing of marriage, purity, and human life against an increasingly globalized and politicized "culture of death" and its effete fellow-traveler, the pursuit of sterilized pleasure; his major contribution to the downfall of totalitarianism in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe; his personal example of integrity, goodness, piety, and Marian devotion; and his promulgation of a universal *Catechism* that is helping to counteract the tide of rampant dissent that rose after Vatican II.

"John Paul II's personal charisma and globetrotting style of leadership have been inspirational to millions of Catholics, especially to young people, and above all in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Eastern Europe. In these regions, vocations to the priesthood and consecrated life have shot up during his pontificate, even as they have continued to decline overall in the West. Among world leaders of recent decades, no individual on this troubled earth comes close to Christ's present Vicar in being a powerful influence for goodness and truth."

All men, no matter how evil they are, say and do some good things and some more than others. It is the evil things they do, not the good things, which make them evil. The most evil man that ever lived to this date is apostate Antipope John Paul II, not because of the good things he says and does—which are only ploys to deceive—but because of the many evil things he says and does.

As you should know, it only takes one heresy to make a Catholic a non-Catholic heretic.

Pope Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum*: He said the Church has always "regarded as rebels and expelled from the ranks of her children all who held beliefs on any point of doctrine different from her own." The Arians, the Montanists, the Novatians, the Quartodecimans, the Eutychians "did not certainly reject all Catholic doctrine: they abandoned only a certain portion of it. Still, who does not know that they were declared heretics and banished from the bosom of the Church? There can be nothing more dangerous, and yet by one word, as a drop of poison, infect the real and simple faith taught by our Lord and handed down by Apostolic tradition... The Church has always "regarded as rebels and expelled from the ranks of her children all who held beliefs on any point of doctrine different from her own... St. Augustine notes that other heresies may spring up, to a single one of which, should any one give his assent, he is by the very fact cut off from Catholic unity... "if any one holds to one single one of these [heresies] he is not a Catholic" (S. Augustinus, *De Haeresibus*, n. 88).

John Paul II notoriously professes, both in his words and deeds, many heresies, many of which are also idolatry and apostasy. It is a deception to point out the dogmas a heretic does believe in with the purpose of justifying him as a good man and worse as a Catholic. This is what the heretical ecumenical movement does. It points out the dogmas the Protestants heretics believe in thus casting them in a good light, as good religious men, while ignoring their heresies. It does the same regarding apostate Jews, Moslems, and pagans.

For instance, a man who rapes and murders women cannot be considered a good man because he helps little old ladies cross the street or feeds the poor or condemns abortion, etc. His good beliefs and deeds do not make him a good man. No! On the whole, as a man, he is very evil. The same is true with John Paul II. You present his good deeds with the purpose of justifying him as a good man, even though, as you later admit in the article, he is not a great man. And worse, you present the good things he says and does with the purpose of justifying him as a Catholic, in spite of his many notorious crimes against the faith, of which one is sufficient to cause him to automatically become a non-Catholic heretic. Your opening statement, indeed, says black is white (an evil man is a good man). Even a Catholic who commits one mortal sin becomes evil as a whole person and enters a state of damnation.

Also, you called black white by implying the universal *Catechism*, the so-called *Catechism of the Catholic Church* promulgated by apostate Antipope John Paul II, is orthodox, when, in fact, it is rife with notorious apostasy and heresy. For that alone you are a heretic and apostate, guilty of all the notorious apostasy and heresy that is in it. I will only list the heresies that pertain to the questions I asked you in my last letter:

The so-called *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, promulgated by apostate Antipope John Paul II: "The Old Covenant has never been revoked" (§ 121). "The relation of the Church with the Jewish people, the People of God in the New Covenant, discovers, in scrutinizing its own mystery, its bond with the Jewish People, 'to whom God has first spoken.' Unlike the other non-Christian religions, the Jewish faith has already responded to the revelation of God in the Old Covenant. It is to the Jewish People that 'belong the adoption of sons, the glory, the covenants, the law, the

cult, the promises and the patriarchs, and he who was born according to the flesh, the Christ' (Rom. 9:4-5), for the 'gifts and the call of God are without repentance'" (§ 839). "God's People of the Old Covenant and the new People of God tend towards similar goals." (§ 840) "The Moslems... together with us they adore the one merciful God, mankind's judge of the last days." (§ 841)

Black is Grey

After the introduction of your article, in which you praised John Paul II, you then exposed some of his crimes. But, you watered them down. Thus, you said black is grey:

Fr. Harrison, *This Rock*: "The Holy Father's own Masses frequently seen by millions on television have sometimes led the way in novelty, introducing (usually in the name of 'inculturation') practices of a secularizing or even paganizing nature. Bare-breasted women in grass skirts have read the epistle at papal Masses in New Guinea. Liturgical dancers have undulated with some regularity at the Pope's liturgies for World Youth Day (among others)..."

"The 1995 papal Mass in Sydney for Australia's first-ever beatification included liturgical dance, female altar servers, and an aboriginal 'smoke and fire' purification rite that replaced the official penitential rite. An ad hoc 'creative' dialogue replaced the Creed, while nuns in secular dresses accompanied the bishops and Pontiff in the sanctuary. Large numbers of lay eucharistic ministers held ciboria filled with altar breads, raising them for the consecration almost as if they were concelebrating the Mass.

"Someone might maintain that such abuses at papal Masses might have been sprung on the Holy Father without his prior knowledge. While this may have happened on occasion, the pattern has continued too long for this excuse to be plausible. Most of these unfortunate novelties have been orchestrated by the master of pontifical ceremonies, Msgr. Piero Marini, who was appointed in 1988. His Holiness has rewarded him with a bishop's miter and has kept him in office as papal emcee.

"Pope John Paul has taken bolder initiatives than any of his predecessors in regard to relations with non-Catholics and non-Christians. But some of these initiatives appear to run the risk of neglecting, at least at the practical level, Pope Pius XII's warning against 'reduc[ing] to a meaningless formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain eternal salvation.' (*Humani Generis* 27)

"...Some of us are deeply concerned about the effect on public opinion that certain recent actions by the Holy Father have had, especially as reported and interpreted by the secular media. These actions have blurred important theological distinctions, leaving the impression that the Catholic Church is now admitting what it condemned in the aforesaid encyclical namely [*Mortalium Animos*, Pope Pius XI], the idea that all religions are more or less good and praiseworthy.

"Isn't that the impression likely to have been given by the Assisi gatherings of October 1986 and January 2002? There the Holy Father invited not only separated Christians and other monotheists but leaders of pagan, pantheistic, and polytheistic religions to carry out their own respective cultic practices on Church property. (He did not invite them all simply to 'pray' in some generic sense, as was claimed by the *Wanderer's* editorial of May 8 this year.)

"A similarly unfortunate impression was left by the Holy Father on May 14, 1999. Presented a copy of the Qu'ran by some Muslim visitors from Iraq, he publicly accorded it the same gesture of honor bestowed on the Holy Gospels at Mass: He inclined his head and kissed it—kissed this book that condemns to hell believers in the Trinity and the Incarnation, that insults and oppresses women, and that, with its repeated injunctions to slaughter infidels, has inspired Christendom's longest-standing and most dangerous enemies for nearly fourteen centuries.

"Less than a year later, on March 21, 2000, while visiting Syria, John Paul II offered a prayer that included the aspiration 'May St John the Baptist protect Islam.'"

Father, you did not denounce these sins for what they are: idolatry, blasphemy, apostasy, heresy, and sacrilege. Nowhere do I see these words in your article that describe the true nature of these crimes. Thus, you are also guilty of these crimes for not condemning them and the criminal who committed them for what they are. You do not

even refer to them as crimes or sins. You previously denounced some of John Paul II's crimes as scandalous—although not in this article, possibly because the editor, the apostate Karl Keating, would not print your article if you did—but, even that is not enough. For instance, if I catch a friend committing adultery and only accuse him of scandal, but not adultery, I would share in the guilt of his sin because I watered it down, covered (concealed) it, and thus remained silent regarding the full nature of its evilness.

Catechism **Question:** In how many ways may we either cause or share in the guilt of another's sin? **Answer:** We may either cause or share the guilt of another's sin in nine ways: ...6. By concealment ...8. By silence.

In God's eyes, I, too, would commit the adultery for not condemning the crime as adultery and denouncing the offender as an adulterer. To just say it is scandal falls far short of the full nature of the crime and the guilt incurred by the criminal.

On John Paul II's key appointments and your complicity

Fr. Harrison, *This Rock*: "Some key appointments in which the Pope certainly had personal knowledge of the men in question are mystifying. For instance, as a theologian, Walter Kasper has 'demythologized' many miraculous elements in the Gospels. He and Karl Lehmann were leaders in the German bishops' campaigns of the 1990s to get divorced and remarried Catholics admitted to Communion and to resist John Paul II's clear instructions regarding controversial abortion counseling procedures. How can the bestowal of red hats on such clerics be reconciled with the canon law that the Pope himself promulgated? Canon 351 §1 stipulates that those made cardinals must be (among other things) 'truly outstanding in doctrine.'

"Let me conclude with a personal testimony. One of my professors in the seminary in Sydney, Australia, taught year after year in the classroom and in published articles that the Resurrection of Jesus was a spiritual, non-miraculous event that left his mortal remains somewhere to decay. This meant that the Gospel accounts of his subsequent physical appearances were mere mythologized descriptions of internal, intangible 'experiences of grace' in the hearts and minds of the disciples. Archbishop Edward B. Clancy of Sydney, who had been a Scripture professor in the same seminary, was aware that this was being taught to his future priests, but showed no outward signs of concern.

"The Vatican's doctrinal congregation *was* concerned. When its prefect, Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, learned of this scandal in 1986 and instructed Archbishop Clancy to correct the false doctrine being taught in Australia's major seminary, the latter demonstrated his confidence in this priest's orthodoxy by naming him a diocesan censor of books for the archdiocese of Sydney a judge of other people's orthodoxy!

"The standoff between Rome and Sydney dragged on into a second year without resolution. By that time I had been ordained and was doing postgraduate studies in Rome. Assisting at a papal Mass in the spring of 1988, I heard the Pope read out, among the names of those he planned to elevate to the College of Cardinals, that of the archbishop of Sydney.

"After prayerful consideration, I became convinced that I had a duty in conscience to make known to the Holy Father the evidence I possessed that this appointment would violate canon law. After all, how could any Catholic as confused as the archbishop evidently was about a foundational article of Christian faith be described as 'truly outstanding in doctrine'?

"At that time, I had access through a priest friend to a high-up Polish contact in the Vatican who was able to get messages personally and promptly to the Pope. I prepared a short, respectful letter, with appropriate documentary proof. My Polish contact accepted this material and undertook to place it personally in the Pope's hands.

"The comment from this man so close to Peter's successor was sadly significant. Agreeing that the matter was a serious one, he added that he doubted whether John Paul II would take appropriate action. 'We must pray very much for the Holy Father,' he said gravely, 'that he himself be strengthened. *He needs to be firmer than he is in matters of this sort.*'

"Archbishop Clancy received the cardinal's red hat at the consistory of June 1988 and retains

it to this day. The Australian priest at the center of the Resurrection controversy eventually received a wrist slap, but he was not ousted from the Sydney seminary, and within a few more years was publishing scathing criticisms of the ‘outdated 1950s theology’...”

Father, a man shares in another’s sin by defending the ill done, by not properly denouncing the sin and the sinner, or by not inflicting a proper punishment if it is within his means to do so. And worse, a man would further participate in another’s sin if he flattered the sinner instead of truly punishing him, and worse still, if he commands him to be promoted thus allowing the sinner to more efficiently corrupt more men. By rewarding a known sinner, one also shares in his guilt by provocation, by quelling his conscience and thus provoking (encouraging) him to sin more mightily.

Catechism **Question:** In how many ways may we either cause or share in the guilt of another’s sin? **Answer:** We may either cause or share the guilt of another’s sin in nine ways: 2. By command; 4. By provocation; 5. By praise or flattery; 9. By defending the ill done.

Apostate John Paul II, then, shares in the guilt of these known sinners he promoted. In God’s eyes, and thus in the eyes of the Catholic Church, it is as if John Paul II had denied the Resurrection. His promotion of men like these are wilful acts of war against the Catholic Church in an attempt to destroy Her and subvert Her children, as well as non-Catholics by leaving them in darkness, and worse, fostering it. Any one with common sense and even a basic knowledge of warfare would know John Paul II is a spy, a willful infiltrator, who is attempting to destroy the Catholic Church. His notorious crimes in these latter days of the Great Apostasy are not hidden. A spy whose mission is to infiltrate and subvert must, sooner or later, show his hand if he is to fulfill his mission.

Father, again, you have not denounced John Paul II for these crimes. You did not mention any sin on his part. You leave his actions in the realm of just bad judgments or non-sinful errors, when, in fact, they are sins against the faith. One who promotes known heretics is a heretic. If he did it many times, he is beyond suspicion. He would also be guilty if he did it once, it was brought to his attention, and he did nothing.

Your remaining in such a Seminary speaks loudly of your priorities. No lover of God and truth (the faith) are you to remain in such an abominable Seminary or any like it. For that crime alone, you fell under the immense wrath of God. Where is your concern for the Catholic faith? It was a far second to your desire to become a Catholic priest. Where was and is the law upon your heart, which is capable of detesting lies and hypocrisy? If nothing was immediately done to amend such a momentous crime—the denial of the Resurrection, which is the very cornerstone dogma of the Catholic Faith that proved Jesus is God and Messiah—I would have left that seminary, denounced it and the criminals publicly, and not look back, and also denounce John Paul II from the roof-tops as an apostate for knowing of the crime and doing nothing to stop it and actually promoting those who took part in it. We are not talking about a pope who unknowingly promotes a heretic, which can and has happened. You admitted John Paul II knew of the crime and still promoted the apostate bishop to a Cardinal and left the apostate priest to continue teaching his heresies.

Black is White

You then ended your article by saying again that black is white, not even the grey you just said it was:

Fr. Harrison, *This Rock*: “John Paul II’s achievements and successes under difficult circumstances certainly deserve praise. I admire much of what he has done, and I revere him as a holy and prayerful leader of the Church. But I do not expect that he will end up as one of the few popes to be styled ‘the Great.’”

Not only have you not denounced John Paul II as an apostate, you praised, admired, and revered him as a holy leader! Triple woe to you Fr. Harrison, you abominable hypocrite! Tell that to Jesus Christ on your judgment day!

If you did not put in a good word about John Paul II as your final verdict, your article would not have been printed in *This Rock*. Stop pandering to these bastards and their effeminate, modernist, non-judgmentalist publications. I will again put before your eyes your hypocritical contradiction followed by God’s judgment against you regarding it:

Fr. Harrison, *This Rock*: “The Holy Father’s own Masses... led the way in novelty, introducing... practices of a secularizing or even paganizing nature. ...Pope John Paul’ [s] ...actions have blurred important theological distinctions, leaving the impression that the Catholic Church is now admitting what it condemned in the aforesaid encyclical namely [Mortalium Animos, Pope Pius XI], the idea that all religions are more or less good and praiseworthy. ...The Holy Father invited not only separated Christians and other monotheists but leaders of pagan, pantheistic, and polytheistic religions to carry out their own respective cultic practices on Church property. ...Presented a copy of the Qu’ran... he publicly accorded it the same gesture of honor bestowed on the Holy Gospels at Mass: He inclined his head and kissed it—kissed this book that condemns to hell believers in the Trinity and the Incarnation... while visiting Syria, John Paul II offered a prayer that included the aspiration ‘May St John the Baptist protect Islam.’ ...John Paul II’s achievements and successes under difficult circumstances certainly deserve praise. I admire much of what he has done, and I revere him as a holy and prayerful leader of the Church.”

The Word of God: “The fear of the Lord hateth evil: I hate arrogance, and pride, and every wicked way, and a mouth with a double tongue. ...The words of the double tongued are as if they were harmless: and they reach even to the inner parts of the bowels.” (Prv. 8:13; 18:8) “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 stumblingblock to thee. ...Woe to them that are of double heart... and to the sinner that goeth on the earth two ways. ...Winnow not with every wind, and go not into every way: for so is every sinner proved by a double tongue. ...An evil mark of disgrace upon the double tongued. ...The double tongue is accursed: for he hath troubled many that were at peace.” (Eclcus. 1: 36-37; 2: 14; 5:11, 17; 28:15)

You lifted up your voice like a mouse and weasel

So, that is the extent of your obedience to God’s command to “*Cry, cease not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and shew my people their wicked doings, and the house of Jacob their sins.*” (Isa. 58:1) Well, that is a pipsqueak of a cry if I ever heard one. What you did was “Whimper, condemn not, lift up your voice like a mouse and weasel, and show my people their scandalous doings, but do not say they are wicked, and the house of Jacob her mistakes or errors, but not say they are sins. Yea, praise, admire, and revere them for it.”

Father, as bad as your sins are, and they are the worst anyone can commit, there is still hope for you to repent, convert, and abjure while you yet live. Do not be like Judas, a lover of the world, who ended in despair, or like Caiphas who was proud, envious, and jealous. Be like St. Peter who repented and converted. And lastly, do not tempt God. This is the day of salvation: repent, convert, and abjure now before it is too late, before you commit the unforgivable sin against the Holy Ghost!

May the risen Lord Jesus Christ, through the Immaculate Heart of Mary, grant you all the graces and aid you need to repent, convert, and abjure from the Great Apostasy so that you may enter the Catholic Church and have a hope to save your immortal soul.

Soli Deo Gloria

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi
To Jesus through Mary

PS: I await you answers to my questions.

Fr. Brian Harrison to RJMI (4/22/2004)

Dear Mr. Ibranyi,

I have just received your long letter of April 19, and will offer some observations.

1. “On Private Letters and Conversations”. My first comment on this point in my letter of March 4, was that you, discourteously, “have never asked my permission to publish anything from my private letters”. Now, it so happens that nothing from my private letters which you HAVE so far published in your newsletter was anything that I actually wished to keep private. But if you thought, as you say, that what I said was heretical and so needed to be made public in order to warn others against me, then the courteous and charitable thing to do would have been to first write back privately, citing those parts of my letters which you found “heretical”, asking my permission to publish those parts, while warning me that, even if I should *refuse* permission, you would in any case feel in conscience bound to publish them. This you did not do.

My second comment was a more serious complaint, namely, that you had already clearly violated the confidence of Mr. Doug Bershaw in 1998, in that case, making public certain statements which he had expressly wished NOT to be made public. I would now point out that your apologia for publishing privately expressed opinions simply does not apply. For, according to your own disclosure of what Bershaw said, what he wanted to keep private was not heresy, but (in your view) truth and orthodoxy, namely, his *denunciations* of John Paul II. Since there is certainly no danger to the common good in a private expression of *orthodoxy*, then by the logic of your own argument you should have respected his desire for confidentiality (his desire to speak “off the record”).

I then said that, in the light of your track record so far, I didn’t feel much confidence in your own impartiality or fairness in deciding *unilaterally* what parts of my replies are in fact “pertinent” to the issues under discussion. I note that your latest letter contains not the slightest sign of acquiescence in my request for “a prior guarantee from you that you won’t publish any of my reply without the two of us coming to a *prior agreement* as to which parts should be published”. Will it help if I assure you in advance that, in seeking such prior agreement, I will never refuse permission for you to publish any statement of mine which you consider heretical, blasphemous, apostate, etc.? I can assure you I am not

ashamed of my doctrinal beliefs, and have no desire to conceal them! But until you manifest your willingness to come to such prior agreement, I continue to decline to enter into any substantial attempt to answer the specific questions set out in your letter of last January. If you wish to fantasize to yourself with the presumptuous and nonsensical claim that “the real reason [I] did not answer (your) questions” is because “I fear the apostate Jews and love the world more than God”, then that is your problem, not mine.

2. **“So, do you believe non-Catholics can be saved?”** You here accuse me of “evading” your denunciation of my presumed heresy on this question. I say that it is you who are being evasive. You are evading my own request: “Please tell me when and where I have said that I believe those propositions, either orally or in print. If you cannot do so, then I ask you to retract publicly this accusation in your journal.”

The present situation is this: *you* took the initiative in denouncing me for certain alleged heresies. Now, I have to be presumed innocent of such heresies until my guilt is proven. Naturally, justly and logically, therefore, I asked you to show *evidence* from my writings to substantiate your accusation. It is now obvious, by your failure to cite even one word from my writings, that you have no evidence whatsoever to back up your public accusation. But instead of offering me any sign of an apology for your presumptuous and unsubstantiated accusation, and offering to publish a similar apology in your bulletin, you evade taking responsibility of your sin of rash judgment by simply firing back the same questions at me, as to what I actually believe on those points.

The point is, that, ***whether or not I do actually hold the views you publicly ascribed to me***, you committed a public sin of rash judgment by denouncing me for holding them, without having the necessary evidence to back up your denunciation. However you may reply to me in your next letter, please don’t come at me again with more accusations of “evasion”, or of refusing to profess the faith, or of fearing the Jews, or whatever. I can assure you here and now that I will happily answer your questions on this issue, and will happily grant you permission to publish my answers. But *first*, I want to see in your bulletin a public apology for your sin of rash judgment in denouncing me for holding certain heretical views, without having any concrete evidence to back up your denunciation.

Until I see that public apology in your bulletin, you won’t get any answer to your two questions as to what I actually believe on those issues.

3. **“On Pope Gregory’s supposed teaching on Moslems”.**

Here again, it is obvious that you have been unable to answer my challenge to find even a single papal teaching to the effect that Muslims do not worship the true God. Instead, you take refuge in a gigantic begging of the vital question. You claim that simply by proclaiming the dogma of the Most Holy Trinity, the infallible papal magisterium has taught what you claim is true about the Muslims. But that is precisely what you need to prove, and have NOT proved! All one can reasonably deduce from the mere proclamation of the dogma of the Trinity is that anyone who, like the Muslims and unbelieving Jews, denies the Trinity, but professes belief in One, Eternal, Invisible, Omnipotent Creator,

has a false *understanding* of God and worships Him falsely; not that the object of their false worship is a *false god* (like those worshipped by the pagans, i.e., polytheists, pantheists and idolaters).

4. “Your watered down denunciation of John Paul II’s crimes”

I won’t comment in any detail on your accusations here, because in general it all boils down to one simple point. I did not denounce him as severely as you think I should have, because *I honestly don’t believe* he merits that degree of severity. To me, your own level of severity in denouncing JP II is another instance of rash judgment on your part. On just one specific point I will comment. You denounce me on p. 8 for “remaining in such a Seminary” (i.e., a seminary where the true Resurrection of Our Lord was being denied). Once again, this is rash judgment on your part! Why do you presume I *did* remain in that seminary? (It was St. Patrick’s, Sydney, Australia’s leading seminary.) The fact is, I did not remain there! For the record, while I was a seminarian, taking classes with the heretical priest/professor, I argued with him, warned my classmates about his false doctrine, and denounced him (in vain) to the Cardinal Archbishop of Sydney. The result was that I was promptly called up by the rector of that seminary and was expelled (on November 27, 1981) for being too “rigid”, and for being a troublemaker who was “obsessed with doctrine” and who saw “everything in black and white”. He claimed I would “make life a misery for any bishop”. These were the precise words the rector used, after having discussed my case with the Cardinal, to inform me of my unsuitability for the modern priesthood. The very reason I am in Puerto Rico now is that no other bishop in Australia would accept me once I was expelled from the Sydney seminary. I had to come to the other side of the world to find a path to the priesthood.

I have received your paper “Woe to Your Who Call Evil Good”, and am frankly appalled by what I can only describe as your fanaticism. You go as far as to call down “thousands of curses” on anyone who watches “Schindler’s List” or who even “dares to shed a tear for the so-called victims of the so-called Jewish holocaust”! Your comparison of the Nazi atrocities against Jews with God’s slaying of the Egyptian first-born is outrageous. We know that the latter was just only because Holy Scripture assures us explicitly that God, the Lord of life and death, ordained it. But what Word of God can you point to that assures us that the Jews in Europe in Hitler’s time “deserved” to be massacred in millions, and that God had ordained this death-sentence upon them?

Sincerely,

Brian Harrison, O.S.

RJMI to Fr. Harrison (Open Letter, 5/25/2004)

Fr. Brian Harrison,

On Silencing Just Denunciations

Oh how the Devil desperately tries to silence those who would profess the truth. I thought God had shown me every way that the Devil, working through men, attempts

this, from the “false obedience to superiors” ploy; to the “Priests are the ministers of God, and thus they must never be denounced by laymen” ploy; to the “You are just a laymen, and thus you have no authority to judge and denounce anyone” ploy; to the “You have no theological degrees, and thus you have no right to religiously judge anyone” ploy; to the “Judge not lest you be judged” ploy; to the one used by the false devotees of Mary, “Just pray for sinners but do not denounce them or their sins and do nothing to stop them. Just let Mary take care of it all” ploy, as if Mary would help those who are not willing to cooperate with God’s grace and perform the spiritual acts of mercy of admonishing and converting the sinner and do all that is within their power to stop them and warn others; to the “False devotion to the Infant of Prague” ploy, in which a priest tried to silence me by taking out of context Christ’s words, “Become like little children,” by saying I must literally be like an infant who can neither talk nor make judgments. If I fell for any of these ploys, I would not have exposed the crimes and criminals that everyone either does not denounce or waters down the crimes and the guilt of the criminals. In short, my many writings would not exist. I would just be another silenced or muffled voice, mortally guilty of many sins of omission, and not a voice crying for God in the wilderness.

Yes, I thought I knew and conquered, by God grace and aid, all the silence ploys. But, God has just shown me another. The worldly, diplomatic etiquette that teaches private conversions and plots must remain private, even if they involve sins that are harming others. That means Talmud Jews and Masons, who take vows to lie with promises to keep their sinful secret doings secret, are justified in keeping these sins secret and cannot be exposed, according to worldly diplomacy.

Your outrageous claim that I need the permission from an apostate like yourself before I make public your sins that are injuring souls and sending them to hell is like asking me to take satanic vow of silence. The day I need permission from an apostate to make his apostate sins public is the day I no longer work for the one true God! Father, your heretical diplomacy does away with the obligation to profess the faith and justifies and perpetuates sins of omission. Every one wants to keep things secret, silent, hidden under a bushel. They hide the full deposit of the Catholic faith and crimes against that faith and the criminals who commit them. This satanic silence has gone as far as protecting child-molesting priests and thus allowing them to continue to perpetrate their horrible crimes. Fr. Harrison, you are doing the same thing, and even worse, because you are attempting to silence my just denunciations against you that deal with the faith, sins that you infect others with. Sins against the faith are the root cause of sins of immorality. The Lord only knows how many of these immoral crimes you have witnessed or heard of and said and did nothing of any worth to stop them. The Lord only knows how many of your Seminary students, whom you train as apostates, are committing some type of mortal sin of immorality. In these latter days of the Great Apostasy, the Vatican II Church only accepts liberal, effeminate non-judgmentalists as Seminary students, and the same applies to professors like you.

Also, I have been fair in my presentation of your position, even if you think I have not. It is dishonest to denounce a man and his position without giving the readers the name of the person denounced or a way to contact him so they can hear his position. That is a sign of a man who knows he cannot defend his position. All those whom I denounced, I give the readers a way to contact them directly to get the full defense of their position. I have done this with you by making public your name and address. This is only fair, especially

in these days when we have no ecclesiastical authority to settle disputes, denounce heretics, and forbid Catholics to read their books. Even heretics were giving a hearing before Catholic authorities.

On Doug Bersaw

How do you know what took place between Doug Bersaw and me since the speech I gave in Massachusetts in 1998? You committed the same “sin” you accused me of. You accused me of violating Doug’s confidence. You said, “My second comment was a more serious complaint, namely, that you had already clearly violated the confidence of Mr. Doug Bershaw in 1998, in that case, making public certain statements which he had expressly wished NOT to be made public.” How do you know Doug did not give me permission to make public his comments? Whether he gave me permission or not is not the point, according to you, but the point is that you do not know if he did or did not give me permission; yet, you accused me of violating his confidence.

However, none of this applies when dealing with public sinners whose sins are endangering the souls of others. In this case, the sin and sinner must be exposed no matter how one comes by the evidence. *“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) Your appeal to confidence in these matters does away with this obligation and leaves souls deceived, seduced, and in a state of damnation.

For the record, Doug did not give me permission to make known his off the camera comments. I do not need his permission to make manifest his mortal sins of omission that are harming many souls, leading them to hell. However, he was warned before I made them public. Friends of mine who attended that speech, which converted many of them to the sedevacantist position, spoke to Doug some time after that speech in an attempt to convert him. Instead of converting, he became more obstinate and denied he ever said John Paul II teaches heresy and is a heretic. Now, approximately 30 witnesses heard him say it. It was then, when he remained obstinate, that I made his off the camera comments public.

Father, you either ignore or deny sins of omission, which is one of the sins Doug commits. In his heart he believes John Paul II teaches heresy and is a heretic, but, in practice, he publicly teaches others that John Paul II does not teach heresy and is not a heretic. Instead of exposing, he defends heresy and heretics, which is criminal. He does not denounce sin and the sinner for what they are and thus mortally sins by omission and leads others into committing the same sins, thus keeping them on the road to hell. Only a man who does not truly love God, the Catholic faith, or souls would say that a man must remain silent in the face a public sinner whose sins are endangering souls.

“Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. For there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed: nor hidden that shall not be known. For whatsoever things you have spoken in darkness shall be published in the light: and that which you have spoken in the ear in the chambers shall be preached on the housetops.” (Lk. 12:1-3)

On the Salvation Dogma

I have not rashly judged you

Father, you presume I do not have evidence that you deny the salvation dogma. How else could I have denounced you? I have first hand evidence against you:

A few years ago, by emails, you debated a Robert (Bob) More regarding the salvation dogma. He forwarded me those emails. You used your secretary's email address (materdei@pucpr.edu) that had her name attached (Raquel). Your responses were signed with your initials (BH). I did not have time to get involved in the debate. Your position was that certain men could be saved who died worshipping false gods or practicing false religions, such as Protestants. Robert held the dogma in its true sense. He brought to your attention Fr. Michael Mueller's imprimatured book "The Catholic Dogma," 1888, which defends the proper interpretation of the dogma and refuted those who were denying it in the late 19th century. You then said that does not matter because Pope Pius XII has since spoken in *Mystici Corporis*, in 1943, in which you believe he taught certain non-Catholics, such as Protestants, are related to the Church and thus can be saved even though they do not know they are related to the Catholic Church, even though they are self-professed non-Catholics. You misinterpreted Pope Pius XII's encyclical and attempted to give more authority to the fraudulent Holy Office letter against Fr. Feeney, which was actually an unofficial letter published in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, which is not an organ of the Holy See. You then leaned upon a heretical Cardinal who, in the late 19th century, introduced salvation for certain men who die as Protestants, which is a new revelation, an exception that was never taught or even hinted at by the saints and most important by past infallible papal decrees, or any papal teachings. The Immaculate Conception was always believed by most saints and popes and explicitly allowed by popes as a possible exception. You will find no such exceptions that support the liberal (heretical) interpretation of the salvation dogma that was introduced for the first time in the 19th century. Therefore, it has no link with tradition, as does the Immaculate Conception. And most importantly, it has no link with popes' teachings who never mentioned possible exceptions [Added on October 2012 - until Apostate Antipope Pius IX denied the Salvation Dogma in 1856. See RJMI article "Pius IX Denied the Salvation Dogma and Lost His Office."] Below are excerpts from your debate with Robert:

From: Raquel [mailto: materdei@pucpr.edu]
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2002 11:54 AM
To: Bob More
Subject: book by Muller

Dear RJM [Robert More], Thank you for the book by Muller, but it really doesn't change the situation. Nobody has ever denied that many Fathers and older theologians took the rigorist, Augustinian interpretation of "No salvation outside the Church". Muller is obviously one of those... as were Fr. Feeney and Orestes Brownson. The important point is that the Magisterium itself never defined or explained the words "outside the Church" in this rigorist sense, as totally excluding all except professing Catholics. That is a formerly admissible opinion which has now, however, been ruled out as incorrect by *Mystici Corporis* and by an Ecumenical Council (Vatican II, which loyal Catholics should accept). It was never more than a theological opinion. By the time Muller wrote, in 1888, approved theologians such as the learned Roman Cardinal Mazzella were teaching the opposite opinion (i.e., that Protestants etc. ARE capable of acts of faith, hope and charity if they're in invincible ignorance of the true Church)... This is the view

eventually taught explicitly in the 1949 Holy Office, in a papally-approved comment and explanation of what Pius XII had already said in *Mystici Corporis*. Muller's view was never magisterial teaching, only the common theological opinion of earlier doctors and theologians. Although the encyclical doesn't explicitly state that those with an implicit desire for the Church can be in the state of grace, the Pope clearly implies that, for the context shows that what he means is that such persons are not necessarily excluded from salvation. And to attain salvation you have to be in the state of grace. To try and reconcile Muller's rigorist view with *Mystici Corporis* makes nonsense of the Encyclical, and the 1949 letter clears up any possible doubt that this is what the Pope meant in MC. So to be consistent you ought to consider him an "Antipope" as well.

BH

From: Raquel [<mailto:materdei@pucpr.edu>]

Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2002 10:19 AM

To: Bob More

Subject: Re: book by Muller

"It is beyond all dispute that Pius XII privately supervised the 1949 Holy Office letter, and its translation into English, including, of course, the part where he says the view of Fr. Feeney and the St. Benedict Center (same as that of Muller, St. Augustine, etc., is no longer compatible with the 20th-century magisterium. In 1952 Pius XII, (who himself was the Prefect of the Holy Office!) via the Secretary of same, ordered Cardinal Cushing of Boston to PUBLISH that English translation which he (the Pope) personally had revised for three hours with Cardinal (then Bishop) John Wright; and Cardinal Cushing did so in the "American Ecclesiastical Review". The fact that the 1949 letter never appeared in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* does not make it "non-official", as you Feeneyites claim, since according to canon law, it is only legislation, not magisterial teaching (i.e., discipline, not doctrine), which has to be published in AAS in order to be binding.

"Pius XII clearly held personally and firmly, and ordered to be published, the doctrine that an IMPLICIT desire for the Church can be sufficient to possess faith, hope and charity, and so gain salvation. That is precisely the doctrine which Feeney, Muller, Brownson, etc., regard as heretical. Of course, Pius XII was under no obligation to declare St. Augustine unorthodox for having taught the contrary and erroneous opinion 1500 years ago, any more than Pius IX was obliged to "condemn" Aquinas for having doubted or denied the Immaculate Conception long before it was taught definitively. If you give me your postal address (I'm not up to scanning), I can send published testimony from Cardinal J. Wright that he spent an entire morning with Pius XII making sure the English translation of the 1949 HO letter was exactly right, in his (the Pope's) clear, firm and final judgement. That letter, of course, among other things, explicitly states that the correct, papally-intended meaning of *Mystici Corporis* is that of the Holy Office letter, i.e., that even implicit desire is enough for salvation...In short, if you and... RJMI are right, Pius XII was a heretic from "Mystici Corporis" onward (post-1943) and so no true Pope..."

BH

Father, here is just one soul you tried to corrupt with your heresy. Lord only knows how many more, all your Seminary student, for sure! And do not say Robert had no right to send me the private debate between you and him. That is no different than saying that a priest can privately rape a young boy and tell him he must not tell anyone because the crime was private. Yes, it is no different, for you tried to rape Robert's soul by corrupting him with heresy, which is even worse than sins of immorality.

You say Pope Pius XII approved the 1949 heretical Letter, *Suprema haec sacra*, against Fr. Feeney based upon third party evidence. That does not suffice. Infiltrators and obstinate heretics are notoriously known to be liars and resort to fraud. Pope Pius XII did not sign the letter, and that ends the discussion! He even condemned those who would dare teach such a thing as contained in that letter:

Pope Pius XII, *Humani Generis*, 1950: 14. Some want to reduce to a minimum the meaning of dogmas; and to free dogma itself from terminology long established in the Church... 27. ... Some reduce to a meaningless formula the necessity of belonging to the True Church in order to gain eternal salvation... 28. These and like errors, it is clear, have crept in among certain of Our sons who are deceived by imprudent zeal for souls or by false science.

Pius XII's other teachings on the salvation dogma in *Mystici Corporis* also disprove your misinterpretation of his words in that same encyclical.

Pope Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi*, 1943: 22. Actually only those are to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith, and who have not been so unfortunate as to separate themselves from the unity of the Body, or been excluded by legitimate authority for grave faults committed... It follows that those who are divided in faith or government cannot be living in the unity of such a Body, nor can they be living the life of its one Divine Spirit.

Only those who signed the 1949 Letter against Fr. Feeney are directly responsible for it, no matter what evidence you may try and produce that Pope Pius XII knew of its contents. If he did, then he, too, would be a salvation heretic, but not a notorious one, because he never signed his name to such a teaching, and thus, he would not lose his office on this point. Only notorious heresy causes a pope to lose his office. You even admit that his encyclical, *Mystici Corporis*, does not explicitly teach that a good willed man who had not yet explicitly desired to enter the Catholic Church could be in a state of grace. You said, "Although the encyclical doesn't explicitly state that those with an implicit desire for the Church can be in the state of grace..." But, as stated above, Pope Pius XII actually condemned the salvation heretics.

Also, your priorities are backward. Even genuine Holy Office decrees do not carry the same weight as papal decrees. Papal decrees, especially infallible ones, make clear misunderstandings or errors found in Holy Office decrees, not visa-versa. A papal decree can never be subjugated to a Holy Office decree. If there is a contradiction between the two, then the papal decree takes precedence. In short, popes' teachings overrule Holy Office decrees.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, 1913, Infallibility: "Proof of Papal Infallibility - The pope, of course, can convert doctrinal decisions of the Holy Office, which are not in themselves infallible, into ex cathedra papal pronouncements..."

For the record, I assume Cardinal Mazzella taught the salvation heresy based upon your say so. If he did, it is no surprise to me. His teaching the salvation heresy in the late 19th century only proves what popes had already known and warned against, time and

time again, long before the 19th century: bad prelates who taught heresy or allowed it to enter books they imprimatured. That is the only way the Catholic faith can become corrupted, which led to the Great Apostasy. Pope Pius XII, in the very encyclical that he condemned the salvation heretics, speaks of prelates introducing this and other heresies into Church teaching instruments, “These and like errors, it is clear, have crept in among certain of Our sons.”⁵ (*Mystici Corporis*)

In the late 19th century, Mazzella and many American bishops first, publicly taught that certain men who die as Protestants and Schismatics (baptized non-Catholics) could be saved. But since then others have even denied this heretical interpretation of the salvation dogma and gave it a new twist. They introduced salvation also for certain men who die as pagans, apostate Jews, and Moslems: men who do not believe in the Most Holy Trinity and do not desire to be baptized. So, we have heretical bishops opposing other heretical bishops and they all oppose the true meaning of the salvation dogma.⁶

Also, you say Pope Pius XII infallibly settled this dispute over the salvation dogma, which is a heresy in itself, because there can be no dispute regarding a dogma. The purpose of an infallible dogma is to end all disputes.

Pope Pius XII, *Humani Generis*: “19. ...It is true that Popes generally leave theologians free in those matters which are disputed in various ways by men of very high authority in this field; but history teaches that many matters that formerly were open to discussion, no longer now admit of discussion.”

To allow exceptions to a dogma that never existed from the time it was infallibly defined, is like saying exceptions can be added to the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. That an exception can be added to teach that the Blessed Virgin Mary was stained with original sin, such as not for an instant, but outside of time.

Father, you even lose the argument based upon your heretical premise that dogmas can be clarified by adding exceptions that never existed. If, as you say, Pope Pius XII and Vatican II infallibly settled the dispute over the salvation dogma, your Church, the Vatican II Church, has not admitted the same. It allowed Fr. Feeney and allows the current day St. Benedict Center in Massachusetts to believe in the strict interpretation of the dogma—which is another heresy in itself, because a dogma can only be interpreted in one way, strictly.

A letter from the Judicial Vicar of the Diocese of Worcester, dated May 4, 1988: “It would seem that the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith holds the doctrine ‘no salvation outside the Church’ to have been defined and consequently definitive. It is the theological interpretation and speculation which they see as problematical. In our discussions with the Congregation it seemed rather clear that proponents of a strict interpretation of the doctrine should be given the same latitude for teaching and discussion as those with a more liberal view.”

There is no such thing as a liberal interpretation of a dogma. But this is not the point I wish to make here. The point is that you believe Pope Pius XII and Vatican II infallibly settled this dispute, yet, your Church, the Vatican II Church, still allows the strict interpretation of the salvation dogma, as St. Augustine, all the Church Fathers, all the past popes, and Fr. Feeney held it. Thus, your Church admits that Pope Pius XII words in *Mystici Corporis* and the Vatican II documents are not as clear as you would have us believe. Your Church admits it can be wrong and Fr. Feeney’s interpretation of the

⁵ See my book, *Bad Books with Imprimatures*, Bad Books and Bad Teachers.

⁶ See my book “*The Salvation Dogma*, Salvation Heresy Enters Catechisms in USA.”

dogma could be right. Of course, this is just more insanity, because your Church teaches the salvation dogma allows for certain men who die as non-Catholics to be saved, and we who hold the dogma in the true and only sense, deny this. If this is indeed a dogma, there can be only one meaning not two. There can be no exceptions that popes have never addressed and allowed for over 1800 years. Therefore, if your Church is to be consistent regarding dogmas, it should denounce us as heretics and we must denounce it as heretical on this point. A dogma is not an opinion. It cannot have two different meanings.

Now, back to your evasion and calumny. You said that I rashly denounced you for denying the salvation dogma, for denouncing you as a heretic for believing certain men who die worshipping false gods or practicing false religions could be saved, without any evidence. Well, I have produced the evidence. So, it is you who rashly judged me when you said in your last letter to me, “The point is, that, ***whether or not I do actually hold the views you publicly ascribed to me***, you committed a public sin of rash judgment by denouncing me for holding them, without having the necessary evidence to back up your denunciation.” So, it is you who presumed I did not have the evidence, and are thus condemned by your own false standard, because I had the evidence. Accordingly, you should have said, “If you do not have evidence against me, then, you have rashly judged me.” Instead, you said that I definitely did not have the evidence, “without having the necessary evidence to back up your denunciation.”

I know this all sounds quite silly to a man of good will, and it is. It only proves your foolish evasion of not answering my simple questions and your desperate attempt at trying to silence me from publicly denouncing you.

Even if I did not have the above first hand evidence against you, I still would have denounced you as a salvation heretic until you proved otherwise. Because I have another piece of first hand evidence, the so-called “Catechism of the Catholic Church” promulgated by John Paul II, a man you believe is the pope. It was not just promulgated by a local bishop, but by a man you believe is pope and is to be used by the Universal Church as the universal guide for Catholic doctrine. That catechism contains many heresies; one is the denial of the salvation dogma:

The so-called “Catechism of the Catholic Church”: “**1260** "Since Christ died for all, and since all men are in fact called to one and the same destiny, which is divine, we must hold that the Holy Spirit offers to all the possibility of being made partakers, in a way known to God, of the Paschal mystery." Every man who is ignorant of the Gospel of Christ and of his Church, but seeks the truth and does the will of God in accordance with his understanding of it, can be saved. It may be supposed that such persons would have *desired Baptism explicitly* if they had known its necessity.”

Therefore, anyone who is a member of the Vatican II Church is presumed to hold this same heresy, because this is the most official book they use to learn and teach from. The presumption, then, is guilty until proven innocent. For instance, Gerry Matatics is not guilty of this heresy. I know this because he has made public his position on the salvation dogma many times and defends it in the true and only sense. His problem is that he believed, when I debated him, that catechisms promulgated by popes are infallible. If that is so—and it is not—, then he must accept all the heretical teachings in the so-called Catechism of the Catholic Church, because a man he believes is the pope, John Paul II, promulgated it.

Questions

Father, I ask you again and hope you have changed your previous heretical belief: “Do you believe certain men who die worshipping false gods or practicing false religions can be saved?” And, I will add one more: “Do you believe certain men who died not believing in Jesus Christ and the Most Holy Trinity, such as Talmudic Jews and Moslems, can be saved?”

On Pope Gregory, the Moslems, and Talmudic Jews

Father, you stand condemned as an apostate blasphemer when you teach that Moslems believe in the true God. I have the infallible Creeds of the Church and the unanimous consent of the saints who teach only those who believe in the Most Holy Trinity during the New Covenant era believe in the true God, excepting those good willed Jews in the first century who were worshipping the true God of Israel and only needed to hear of the Most Holy Trinity in order to believe. Current day Talmudic Jews never believed in the true God at any time. They do not believe in the true God of Israel. If they did, they would be Catholics (See: my book “*The Jews, The Jews: Then and Now.*”). Thomas Aquinas sums up the unanimous teaching of the Fathers and saints as follows:

Thomas Aquinas, Summa, II-II, Q. 10, Art. 3: Now man is more than ever separated from God by unbelief, because he has not even true knowledge of God: and by false knowledge of God, man does not approach Him, but is severed from Him. Nor is it possible for one who has a false opinion of God, to know Him in any way at all, because **the object of his opinion is not God.** Therefore it is clear that the sin of unbelief is greater than any sin that occurs in the perversion of morals.”

There is no need for a pope to infallibly teach a doctrine that is held by the unanimous consent and has never been challenged. Thus, popes had no reason to condemn those who oppose it, because no one, yet, had opposed it. As I said in my last letter, popes did not have to specifically condemn the doctrine that Moslems believe in the true God, because they never dreamed any so-called Catholic would ever teach or even think such an impious thing. Not even a Moslem, who is true to his religion, will say he believes in the Catholic God.

In the first half of the 20th century, the apostate Frs. Rumble and Carty taught that Moslems believe in the true God and natives who practice idolatry and never heard of Christ are no longer to be called pagans. It is not to be presumed the popes were aware of this, as it is impossible for a pope to examine every imprimatured book in the world.⁷

I have come across a papal encyclical that reinforces the dogma that all men who do not believe in the Most Holy Trinity during the New Covenant era do not believe in the true God. Evidently, some so-called Catholics in Germany, in the 1930's, were explicitly or by implication teaching that certain men who did not believe in the Most Holy Trinity believed in the true God, which led to Pope Pius XI's below condemnation.

Pope Pius XI, *Mit Brennender Sorge*, 1937: 9. Beware, Venerable Brethren, of that growing abuse, in speech as in writing, of the name of God as though it were a meaningless label, to be affixed to any creation, more or less arbitrary, of human speculation. Use your influence on the Faithful, that they refuse to yield to this aberration. Our God is the Personal God, supernatural, omnipotent, infinitely perfect, one in the Trinity of Persons, tri-personal in the unity of divine essence, the Creator of all existence. Lord, King and ultimate Consummator of the history of the

⁷ See my book *Bad Books with Imprimatures*, Popes Cannot Examine Every Book.

world, who will not, and cannot, tolerate a rival God by His side. ... 14. No faith in God can for long survive pure and unalloyed without the support of faith in Christ. "No one knoweth who the Son is, but the Father: and who the Father is, but the Son and to whom the Son will reveal Him" (Luke x. 22). "Now this is eternal life: That they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent" (John xvii. 3). Nobody, therefore, can say: "I believe in God, and that is enough religion for me," for the Savior's words brook no evasion: "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father. He that confesseth the Son hath the Father also" (1 John ii. 23). ... 21. If the oppressor offers one the Judas bargain of apostasy he can only, at the cost of every worldly sacrifice, answer with Our Lord: "Begone, Satan! For it is written: The Lord thy God shalt thou adore, and Him only shalt thou serve" (Matt. iv. 10). And turning to the Church, he shall say: "Thou, my mother since my infancy, the solace of my life and advocate at my death, may my tongue cleave to my palate if, yielding to worldly promises or threats, I betray the vows of my baptism." As to those who imagine that they can reconcile exterior infidelity to one and the same Church, let them hear Our Lord's warning:--"He that shall deny me before men shall be denied before the angels of God" (Luke xii. 9).

Father, can you not feel, in the very core of your being, Pope Pius XI's anathema against you: Begone Satan! Begone Judas!

Many Satanists, and especially Luciferians, believe the Devil is God. They believe he is the One, Invisible, and Omnipotent Creator. According to you, they also believe in the true God. No pope ever condemned a so-called Catholic who would dare teach Satan is the true God not clearly seen, that Satanists or Luciferians believe in the true God. Does that mean Satanists and Luciferians believe in the true God?

The Catholic God is visible, not just invisible

Father, you teach that to believe in the true God, even during the New Covenant era, a man only needs to believe God is one, invisible, omnipotent, and creator. Your definition denies the visible God, Jesus Christ. During the New Covenant era, God is no longer just invisible to men. The Catholic God is invisible and visible. He became visible upon the Incarnation and birth of Jesus Christ. "*And the word was made flesh and dwelt among us.*" (Jn. 1: 14) Jesus said, "*He that seeth me, seeth him that sent me.*" (Jn. 12:45) When Thomas doubted that Jesus rose from the dead, Jesus appeared to him and let Thomas see and touch Him. And Thomas, while touching the wounds of the visible God, said, "*My Lord and my God.*" (Jn. 20:28) Men can even look upon the Holy Face of God that He left us on the Holy Shroud of Turin. That is one of the main differences between the Catholic God and those who believe in one god who did not become man (visible). The Catholic God, the one true God, became man, died for our sins, and rose from the dead. The apostate Jews and Moslems not only do not believe in this visible God, but they also explicitly deny Him and even the possibility that God could ever become man or exist in a Trinity of Persons.

Rabi, *Anatomie du Judaïsme français*, p. 188: "The conversion of the Jews to Christianity is treason and idolatry since it involves the supreme blasphemy, the belief in the divinity of a man."

Rabbi Joshua Jehouda, *l'Antisémitisme Miroir du Monde*, pp. 135-6: "Spinoza, who was further than any other thinker from the historic messianism of Israel, wrote: 'As for what certain churches say, that God assumed human nature, I must confess that this seems to me as absurd as saying that a circle assumed the shape of a square.'"

The Talmudic Jews, as do the Moslems, believe Catholics are not true monotheists, are idolaters:

Rabbi Joshua Jehouda, Ibid, pp. 155, 260, 349: “Your monotheism is a false monotheism; it is a bastard imitation and a falsified version of the only true monotheism which is Hebrew monotheism, and if Christianity does not return to Jewish sources it will be finally condemned.”

Rabbi Joshua Jehouda, Ibid. pp. 135-6: “*The current expression ‘Judaeo-Christian’ is an error which has altered the course of universal history by the confusion it has sown in men’s minds... by abolishing the fundamental distinctions between Jewish and Christian messianism, it seeks to bring together two ideas that are radically in opposition. By laying the accent exclusively on the ‘Christian’ idea to the detriment of the ‘Judean’ it conjures away monotheistic messianism... the term ‘Judaeo-Christian’... is based on a ‘contradictio in adjecto’ which has set the path of history on the wrong track. It links in one breath two ideas which are completely irreconcilable, it seeks to demonstrate that there is no difference between day and night or hot and cold or black and white...*”

Father, the apostate Jews can use your incomplete definition of God’s attributes against you to prove Jesus Christ is not God. You admitted He is invisible while deliberately leaving out the fact that He also became visible.

Not only do Talmudic Jews admit that the Catholic God is not the Talmudic Jewish god, they blasphemously condemn the Catholic God, the Most Holy Trinity, as a Devil:

A. Memmi, *Portrait of a Jew*, pp. 188-9) “Your religion [Catholicism] is a blasphemy and a subversion in the eyes of the Jews. Your God [the Most Holy Trinity] to us is the Devil, that is to say, the symbol and essence of all evil on earth.”

How dare you blasphemously teach these monsters believe in the one true God, especially after reading what they actually believe! Even if you did not read this, you are still guilty, because you know they do not believe in Jesus Christ and the Most Holy Trinity, and that is the crux of the matter. This evidence is meant to shock and shame you, and hopefully wake you up and convert you, and if not, then those who are reading this.

These are the people, Talmudic Jews, whom your demonic master, John Paul II, tell us worship the true God, are elder brothers to Catholics, are under a religious covenant with God, and whose religion of Talmudic Judaism is intrinsic to Catholicism. Father, the Talmudic Jews are laughing all the way to the bank at your monstrous stupidity and cowardness. John Paul II and men like you are their main weapons in subverting Catholicism and bringing their Antichrist to power.

On your contradiction in *This Rock*

Father, you still think and act like a Protestant by twisting Bible verses and dogmas. You also contradicted your own apostate teaching in your article, “Muslims Worship the One True God,” that you sent me, that was printed in *This Rock*, January 2003. In that article, you attempt to refute my denunciation of you as an apostate for teaching Moslems believe in the true God, as published in my *Exúrge Michaël* Journal, Issue #10, March 2002.

John Chapter 8

In that article, you rightly implied that the Jews in John chapter 8, who did not believe in Jesus, did not have God as their Father and thus did not believe in or worship the one true God:

Fr. Brian Harrison, *This Rock*, January 2003, “Moslems Worship the One True God”: “Your [Richard J. M. Ibranyi] logic requires you to assert that the Jews do not worship the one true

God any more than Muslims do. Paul, however, does not suggest for a moment that the Jews are idolaters or that the God they worship is *not* the one true God. On the contrary, he says (speaking of the Jews in general, not those bad-willed leaders who conversed with our Lord in John 8), ‘I testify with regard to them that *they have zeal for God*, but it is not discerning’ (Rom. 10:2)

“Paul obviously means by the word *God* here the one true God, not some idol or false deity. Under the heading of that ‘zeal’ which he ascribes to the Jews, their acts of worship would certainly have to be included. Hence, the apostle’s divinely inspired ‘testimony’ supports what I am telling you: The *object* of Jewish and Muslim worship is indeed the one true God and not some finite spirit, creature, or idol, but the *way* they worship the true God is wrong (‘not discerning’).

“Indeed, it seems to me that your position logically implies the absurd idea that not even the ancient patriarchs—Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Moses, et cetera—worshipped the one true God. They too were idolaters if the Muslims are idolaters, for, as regards their explicit belief, those holy patriarchs (like the Jews and Muslims today) had no knowledge of the Trinity. And they had no idea that God himself would take on human nature. As Paul says, ‘The mystery of Christ...was *not made known to human beings in other generations*, as it has not been revealed to his holy apostles and prophets’ (Eph. 3:5).”

Before I explain Romans 10:2 and address your other comments, I will focus on John Chapter 8, in which you rightly admit these bad-willed Jews who did not believe in Jesus did not believe in or worship the true God.

“I know that you are the children of Abraham: but you seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you... They answered and said to him: Abraham is our father. Jesus saith them: If you be the children of Abraham, do the works of Abraham. But now you seek to kill me, a man who have spoken the truth to you, which I have heard of God. This Abraham did not. You do the works of your father. They said therefore to him: We are not born of fornication: we have one Father, even God. Jesus therefore said to them: If God were your Father, you would indeed love me. For from God I proceeded and came. For I came not of myself: but he sent me. Why do you not know my speech? Because you cannot hear my word. You are of your father the devil” (Jn. 8: 42-44)

This text disproves your heretical and apostate belief. You teach that for a man to believe in the true God, he must at least believe “God is One, Eternal, Invisible, Omnipotent Creator.” These Jews in John Chapter 8 believed this, although they did not believe in Jesus Christ, and Jesus said their father is not God but Satan. Therefore, they did not actually believe in the true God, for if they did, they would have believed in Jesus. Jesus’ words in this passage are so clear that you dared not oppose them. Yet, this is where you contradict yourself and your whole apostate doctrine falls by your own admission. According to you, there are certain men, such as these Jews who denied Christ in John Chapter 8, who do not believe in the true God even though they do believe in a god who is One, Eternal, Invisible, Omnipotent, and Creator. Therefore, even according to you, not every man who believes in these attributes of God believes in the one true God. Your hypocrisy stinks to the high heavens!

Evil Jews lack of belief in Jesus, the true God, had been prophesied

The Bible teaches that the Jews, because of their faithlessness, were to be punished for an extended period of time by not having the true God, by not worshipping or believing in the true God, along with the loss of the priesthood, a true teacher, and the law.

“Many days shall pass in Israel, without the true God, and without a priest a teacher, and without the law.” (2 Para. 15:3)

This prophecy was fulfilled twice. First, after the destruction of the First Temple and the Babylonian Exile, when, for a period of time, the Jews lost the active priesthood and even knowledge of the true God and His laws.

Second, this prophecy was completely fulfilled after the Jews murdered Jesus Christ. Christ's death established the New Covenant, its new sacraments and disciplinary laws, and its new priesthood, all of which replaced the old.

Catholic commentary on above Bible verse, 2 Para. 15:3: "Its full completion includes the latter ages, particularly after the murder of the Messias. (T.) and seems of the same nature as the prophecy of Osee, (iii. 4) as our Saviour himself insinuates. Mat. xxiv. 6. 9. 13. C."

The Jews, then, that rejected Christ (the true God) and His New Covenant formed a new, false religion called Talmudic Judaism, from which point forward they no longer believed in the true God. They were no longer under the true law, which is the New Law, and they no longer had a valid and legal priesthood, which now exists only in the Catholic Church as the order of Melchisedech and not the Levitical order of Aaron. They, also, no longer have valid and legal teachers, for they, too, exist only in the Catholic Church. The Talmudic Jews at least admit they have had no active priesthood since the destruction of the Second Temple. What they do not admit is that they have sat for many days, near 2000 years, without the true God, a teacher, and the law. *"Many days shall pass in Israel, without the true God, and without a priest a teacher, and without the law."* (2 Para. 15:3) Therefore, Talmudic Jews, as well as all current day Jews who do not believe in the Most Holy Trinity, do not believe in the true God.

Romans 10:2

"Brethren, the will of my heart, indeed and my prayer to God is for them [Jews who denied Christ] unto salvation. For I bear them witness that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they, not knowing the justice of God and seeking to establish their own, have not submitted themselves to the justice of God. For the end of the law is Christ: unto justice to everyone that believeth." (Rom. 10:1-4)

It is a dogma of the Catholic Church that Talmudic Jews, as well as all current day Jews who do not believe in Jesus Christ and the Most Holy Trinity, do not believe in the true God. Therefore, all Biblical interpretations must conform to this dogma.

Father, you imply that the Jews St. Paul speaks about in Romans 10:2 are not like the Jews in John chapter 8 who denied Christ. That is your first error. They did deny Christ just like the Jews in John 8. St. Paul, in Romans 10, teaches these Jews have heard of Christ and not submitted to Him. Therefore, he is speaking about Jews like those in John Chapter 8 who did not discern that Jesus was the Messiah, because good willed Jews discerned that Jesus was the Messiah and believed in Him, which was a sign of their election. Therefore, St. Paul cannot mean the Jews in Roman 10:2 believed in the true God, because Jesus said that the Jews in John Chapter 8, who also did not discern he was the Messiah, did not believe in the true God, the true Father, even though they professed belief in the God of Israel. He clearly said that their god, their father, is Satan.

What, then, does St. Paul mean? Firstly, he is referring to Jews who were practicing the true religion of Judaism, not to the current day Talmudic Jews who practice the false religion of Talmudic Judaism, which was invented to accommodate their denial of Christ. The current day apostate Jews never believed, at any time, in the true God and never practiced a true religion, unlike the Jews St. Paul is referring to in Romans 10:2. Yet, St.

Paul is not saying that even these Jews continued to believe in the true God. No! He is saying that their zeal for the true God was tainted with bad motives; thus, they lost knowledge of the true God and thereby did not truly believe in Him, even though they professed that they did, just like the Jews in John Chapter 8. They felt they could be justified by the mere exterior works of the law without true knowledge of or true faith in the God of Israel. They, like robots, performed the prescribed rituals but knew not the God whom they professed. Their unbelief in the true God, the God of Israel, was made manifest when they denied Christ was the Messiah.

Catholic commentary, on Romans 9: 30-32: "Behold, what was wanting to the justice of the Jews! Scrupulous observers of the ceremonial law: esteeming too much their power, and pretended justice, they regarded the gospel and faith in Christ as of no advantage. Running in the path of the commandments with zeal, but without circumspection, they struck against Jesus Christ, who became to them a stumbling-block. They rejected him: they refuse to believe. Thus did their works become dead works, without any fruit for eternity. Calmet.

Douay Commentary on Romans 10:3: The justice of God... That is, the justice which God giveth us through Christ; as on the other hand, the Jews' own justice is, that which they pretended to by their own strength, or by the observance of the law, without faith in Christ.

If these Jews believed in the true God whom they professed, they surely would have believed in Christ, as Simeon the Prophet and the apostles did. In the last verse of Romans chapter 10, Jesus says that the Jews St. Paul referred to in verse 2 do not believe in God, just like the Jews during the days of the Prophet Isaias: "*But to Israel he saith: All the day long have I spread my hands to a people that believeth not and contradicteth me.*" (Rom. 10:21) They believeth not in and contradicteth the true God!⁸

Jesus also teaches, in John 16, that not all who profess belief in the true God actually believe in the true God, and that they will actually persecute those who do. "*They will put you out of the synagogues: yea, the hour cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doth a service to God. And these things will they do to you; because they have not known the Father nor me.*" (Jn. 16:2-3) They profess belief in the true God, the God of Israel, thinking they are serving Him, but nevertheless, Jesus says they know not the Father. A man cannot believe in what he does not know. Here again we have Jews who can be said to have "zeal for God," but because of bad motives they lost sight of and belief in the true God.

The same can be said of Catholics who fall away from the faith. Before their falling away is made manifest, there is a period of time in which they are performing the exterior rituals of the Catholic Church and professing belief in the Catholic God, while in their hearts, in reality, they do not believe in the Catholic God. St. Paul teaches that these so-called Catholics actually deny God: "*They profess that they know God: but in their works they deny him: being abominable and incredulous and to every good work reprobate.*" (Titus 1:16)

The beloved St. John teaches that when a Catholic's loss of faith is manifest, such as if he joins a false religion or becomes a heretic, it is then known that there was a period of time when he professed himself to be Catholic, was among Catholics, but was not truly Catholic:

"They went out from us but they were not of us. For if they had been of us, they would no doubt have remained with us: but that they may be manifest, that they are not all of us." (1 Jn. 2:19)

⁸ See my book "*The Jews, The Jews: Then and Now*".

Catholic commentary: “Ver. 19. *They were not of us*, true and profitable members; though it can scarce be doubted but that some of them at least for some time, truly believed: and by their going off, God was pleased to make it manifest that they were not of his faithful members... Wi. ... That is, they were not solid, steadfast, genuine Christians, otherwise they would have remained in the Church.”

Likewise, there were many Jews during Jesus’ first coming who professed belief in the true God, the God of Israel, and practiced the true religion of Judaism, but did not really believe in the God they professed. These are the type of Jews St. Paul is referring to in Romans 10:2 and Jesus condemned in John Chapter 8. After they denied Christ, their unbelief in the true God was made manifest.

The above commentary rightly teaches that all the baptized who are not Catholics, such as Protestants and Schismatics, are not Christians, in the strict sense. They are not “genuine Christians.” In the strict sense, Protestants, also, do not believe in the true God. They do not believe in the same Jesus as Catholics do. The Catholic Jesus is present in the Holy Eucharist; was born of a mother who is ever virgin; instituted the papacy, hierarchy, and sacrificial priesthood, which has the power to forgive sins, etc. The Protestant Jesus did not do all these things and condemns the Catholic Jesus who did. Protestants dissolve the true Jesus and thus are not of God, but are of the antichrist. *“Every spirit that dissolveth Jesus is not of God. And this is Antichrist, of whom you have heard that he cometh: and he is now already in the world.”* (1 Jn. 4:3)

St. Robert Bellarmine: “A manifest heretic is not a Christian, as is clearly taught by St. Cyprian, St. Athanasius, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and others.” (“On the Church Militant”)

St. Augustine: “Heretics worship a God who is a liar, and a Christ who is a liar.” (Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graca, Fr. J. P. Migne, Paris: 1866, 42:207)

Tertullian: “Heretics do not have the same God, the same Christ as Catholics.” (Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graca, Fr. J. P. Migne, Paris: 1866, 1:1216)

St. Cyprian: “He is no Christian who is not in Christ’s Church.” (Epistle to Antonianus,” 52)

St. Cyprian: “He who has not the Church for his Mother cannot have God as his Father.” (Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graca, Fr. J. P. Migne, Paris: 1866, 4:502)

St. Peter Canisius: “Who is to be called a Christian? He who confesses the doctrine of Christ and His Church. Hence, he is truly a Christian who thoroughly condemns and detests... the Jewish, Mohammedan, and the heretical cults and sects.” (St. Canisius Catholic Catechism, Dillingen, 1560, Question no. 1)

St. Bridget of Sweden: There is only one Christian faith, that is: Catholic. (Book of Revelations, St. Bridget of Sweden, ed. Cardinal John Torquemada, Rome: 1488)

Fr. Michael Müller, C.S.S.R., “The Catholic Dogma,” 1888: “What Protestant Belief In Christ is - ... (Protestants) never had any divine faith in Christ. ‘He who does not believe all that Christ has taught,’ says St. Ambrose, ‘denies Christ himself.’ (In Luc. c. 9.) ‘It is absurd for a heretic,’ says Thomas Aquinas, ‘to assert that he believes in Jesus Christ. To believe in a man is to give our full assent to his word and to all he teaches. True faith, therefore, is absolute belief in Jesus Christ and in all he has taught. Hence he who does not adhere to all that Jesus Christ has prescribed for our salvation has no more the doctrine of Jesus Christ and of his Church, than the Pagans, Jews and Turk’s have.’ ‘He is’ says Jesus Christ, ‘a heathen and publican.’”

However, Protestants can still be called Christians in the non-strict sense because of their professed belief in the Incarnation and the Most Holy Trinity. Being Protestants do not really believe in the true God, how dare you blasphemously say that Moslems and

Talmudic Jews, who do not even profess belief in the Most Holy Trinity, believe in the true God?

Also, even a pagan who zealously seeks God but has not yet found Him can be said to have a zeal for God, even though he does not believe in the true God. For instance, a pagan who goes from one pagan religion to another in search of God can be said to have a zeal for God, but that does not mean he believes in the true God. He can only believe in the true God when he finds Him and professes belief in Him. Seek and you shall find if you are of good will (Mt. 7:7).

The God of Noah, Abraham, and Moses

You try to win your argument by saying Noah, Abraham, and Moses believed in the true God, yet they did not believe in the Most Holy Trinity; therefore, Talmudic Jews who do not believe in the Most Holy Trinity also believe in the true God. Here is where your dishonesty and deception is even more blatant. Using more of your black magic, you have craftily changed topics. You transport your readers mind to a different time period than the one we are actually discussing in an attempt to merge the two. I am not speaking of the Old Testament era, but the New Testament era in which God, through Jesus Christ, has revealed Himself to men as the Most Holy Trinity. This should be obvious to you, as you, yourself, have quoted from gospel passages that did not exist during the Old Testament era.

Of course Noah, Abraham, and Moses did not have to believe in the Most Holy Trinity, because God did not reveal Himself as such to men during the Old Testament era. Nor did Noah have to believe in the God of Abraham, because Noah lived before Abraham. Nor did Abraham have to believe in the God of Moses, because Abraham lived before Moses. Yet, these are all descriptions of the true God. To worship the true God, then, a man cannot reject any description (attribute) of the true God that has already been revealed to men by God. Therefore, during the New Covenant era all men that do not believe in the Most Holy Trinity do not believe in the true God, excepting the good-willed Jews of the first century who did believe in the true God of Israel as proven by their belief in Christ once He was preached to them.

Adam, Noah, Abraham, and Moses believed in the true God as God revealed Himself to them in the days they lived. As believers, they did not have a false concept of God, as do Moslems and Talmudic Jews. God did not, and could not, without lying, reveal Himself to men as the god of the Talmudic Jews or the god of the Moslems, because the attributes of their gods, taken as a whole, are not a description of the true God from any time period, and actually denies revealed attributes of God. No, Satan is the author of their false gods and false religions.⁹

You and your apostate professor are birds of the same feather

Father, you are no different than your professor who denied the physical resurrection of Jesus. The Moslem god is explicitly described as not being Jesus Christ who rose from the dead. They explicitly deny the resurrection. Being that you teach they believe in the true God, you must also believe the true God did not rise from the dead. If He did rise from the dead, then He cannot be the god of the Moslems who did not rise from the dead.

⁹ See my book "*The Jews, Who is the God of Abraham?*"

You cannot have it both ways. Can you not see that all you apostates are spiritual brothers to one degree or another? You are no different, in the eyes of God, than your professor who explicitly denied the physical resurrection of Christ.

Father, as anyone with a little common sense and good will can see, it is you who are absurd, not me. And worse, you are a liar, deceiver, and blasphemer, whose mission is to recruit souls for Satan.

You replaced Christ with the Apostate Jews

"For where thy treasure is, there is thy heart also." (Mt. 6:21) Father, after reading my book "Woe to you who call Evil Good!" your only comment was to come to the defense of the apostate Jews. You did not say a word about their blasphemous atrocities against Christ, the gospels, and the Catholic Church and faith. The only thing that bothered you enough to speak about was my discrediting the so-called Jewish Holocaust. In your last letter to me, in the last paragraph, you have, indeed, bowed and worshipped at the idolatrous altar of the so-called Jewish Holocaust and replaced the Passion of Christ with the "Passion" of the Apostate Jews. You said nothing of the apostate Jews' attack against Mel Gibson's excellent, truthful movie, "The Passion of the Christ," in which they also attacked the gospels and Church Fathers. Instead, you only came to the defense of the lying, apostate Jewish movie, "Schindler's List," which portrays the "Passion" of the Apostate Jews during the so-called Jewish Holocaust. If you had even a bit of true love for Jesus Christ, you would have come to His defense: *"Where thy treasure is, there is thy heart also."*

You also did not address the fact that dead apostate Jews are in the eternal holocaust of hell that God created and sustains. To be consistent, you must denounce God as an outrageous fanatic also.

It amazes me, I cannot get you to answer simple questions about the Old and New Covenant, Talmudic Judaism, and the curses the apostate Jews are under, but you are more than willing to speak in defense of the apostate Jews. I did not ask you what you thought about Schindler's List, but you were more than willing to comment on it: *"Where thy treasure is, there is thy heart also."* Whether you admit it or not, you are a Judaizer! I can just imagine how many pieces of silver you were paid to deny the one true God, the God of the Catholic Church, and defend apostates and infidels, which is your main mission from Satan. For an estimate, just add up your salary and free room and board that you receive from the apostate Vatican II Church, which serves the Judaizers.

On the Numbers Game and your Hypocrisy

Your hypocrisy shows it ugly head again. In a previous letter to me, you tried to justify your crimes by appealing to the numbers game: the truth is what the majority believes. Because all the Vatican II bishops and laymen are one with John Paul II and his apostate and heretical teachings, you assume they must be right and us few that oppose them are wrong. In other words, how can they all be wrong and we few are right.

RJMI, Exurge Michael, Issue 10, *Fr. Harrison says, Moslems worship God*: "[Fr. Harrison] The fact that you evidently see a necessary incoherence or contradiction between (a) and (b) while I, the Pope, and millions of other Catholics do not, gives me very little confidence in your competence to distinguish accurately between heresy and non-heresy—and much less to present yourself before the world as virtually (absolutely?) the only reliable teacher of Catholic doctrine and canon law left on the face of the earth."

“...[RJMI] In his first defense above he believes the truth is a numbers game, which is determined by what the majority of the people think. He is confident he is right because John Paul II and millions of other “Catholics” believe the same. This is proof positive of the Great Apostasy that Fr. Harrison denies we are in. He cannot see the Great Apostasy because he, John Paul II, and millions of fallen-away Catholics are part of it.”

Fr. Anthony Cekada vs. Fr. Brian Harrison, *Sedevacantism: A Debate in “The Remnant”*: “[Fr. Harrison] But since ‘notorious’ means, by definition, **generally** or **commonly** known, it is clear that none of the conciliar and post-conciliar Popes could have lost their office through heresy. For only a tiny minority of Catholics — indeed, not even one of the thousands of Successors of the Apostles now in communion with Rome! — have believed any one of those Popes to be heretics.”

This is an illogical argument, because most people can go bad, even Catholics, just as in the days of Noah. Now for your hypocrisy, in your last letter, you admitted that you had to search the world to find a bishop who would make you a priest after you were dismissed from “St. Patrick’s, Sydney, Australia’s leading seminary.”

Fr. Brian Harrison, Letter to RJMI, 4/22/2004: “The very reason I am in Puerto Rico now is that no other bishop in Australia would accept me once I was expelled from the Sydney seminary. I had to come to the other side of the world to find a path to the priesthood.”

So, you had to search worldwide to find a bishop who would accept you. Therefore, you also lose the numbers game. To be consistent, you must be the one who is wrong if we are to judge by numbers. Most of the Vatican II bishops would not accept you. Therefore, I can say to you, “Father, you think you are right, whereas, the man you believe is the pope, John Paul II, and almost all the bishops and laymen in your Church disagree with you.” You see it is not about numbers. How could the Great Revolt (2 Thess. 2:2-3) be a Great Revolt if most of the bishops, priests, and laymen are faithful? In fact, it is so great that there is not one Catholic bishop or Catholic priest worldwide that I know of. “*Yet the Son of man, when he cometh, shall he find, think you, faith on earth?*” (Lk. 18:8) Just like their spiritual brothers, the apostate Jews, apostate Catholics are now sitting “*many days... without the true God, and without a priest a teacher, and without the law.*” (2 Para. 15:3)¹⁰

On your Black Magic

In your article against me, in *This Rock*, you resorted to character assassination. You tried to prove my “fanaticism” by mocking, by implication, my zeal in accusing you of using Black Magic to seduce and corrupt men with heresy and apostasy.

Fr. Brian Harrison, *This Rock*, January 2003, “Moslems Worship the One True God”: “Richard J. M. Ibranyi, and active and zealous sedevacantist, took issue with me... To give you a taste of his rhetoric, I quote at length from his critique, which appeared in his own publication, *Exurge Michaël* (March 2002)... Be gone, Fr. Harrison, with your black magic, for the deepest pit of hell awaits you unless you repent, convert, and abjure.”

I have not exaggerated in accusing you of using black magic. All rebellion against God is like the sin of witchcraft. “*It is like the sin of witchcraft, to rebel: and like the crime of idolatry, to refuse to obey.*” (1 Kings 15:23) Father, you rebel against and disobey God. I will give the saintly Fr. Michael Mueller the last word on this topic:

¹⁰ See my book “*Where are the Catholic Bishops and Priests?*”

The Catholic Dogma, Fr. Michael Mueller, Chapter IV, Bishop Coxe's Dishonesty: "Satan is called, in Holy Scripture, the father of lies. From the beginning of the world he has tried to misrepresent every religious truth. He practised this black art in paradise; and so unhappily successful was he in it, that ever since he has practised it, in order to propagate error and vice among men. When our Saviour began to preach his holy religion, Satan practised his black art, even in the presence of Christ himself. By malicious men, the ministers of Satan, Christ was contradicted and misrepresented in his doctrine; for, instead of being believed, he was held up to the people as a blasphemer, for teaching that he was the Son of God, as the impious Caiphas declared him to be, saying, "He hath blasphemed, he is guilty of death." (Matt. xxvi. 65.) He was misrepresented in his reputation; for he was noble, of royal lineage, and yet was despised: "Is not this the carpenter's son?" (Matt. xiii. 55.) He is wisdom itself, and was represented as an ignorant man: "How doth this man know letters, having never learned?" (John vii. 17.) He was represented as a false prophet: "And they blindfolded him, and smote his face . . . saying: Prophecy who is this that struck thee?" (Luke, xxii. 64.) He was represented as a madman: "He is mad, why hear you him?" (John, x. 20.) He was represented as a winebibber, a glutton, and a friend of sinners: "Behold a man that is a glutton and a drinker of wine, a friend of publicans and sinners." (Luke, vii. 34.) He was represented as a sorcerer: "By the prince of the devils he casteth out devils." (Matt. ix. 34.) He was represented as a heretic and possessed person: "Do we not say well of thee, that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil?" (John, viii. 48.) In a word, Jesus was represented to the people as so bad and notorious a man, that no trial was deemed necessary to condemn him, as the Jews said to Pilate: "If he were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered him up to thee." (John, xviii. 30.) If ever infamous calumny was carried to excess, it was undoubtedly in the case of our Saviour, "who knew not sin," who had never uttered a deceitful Word, who "did all things well," and who "passed his life in doing good, and healing all kinds of infirmities." Christ's holy doctrine and his holy Church, the teacher of his divine doctrines, are still misrepresented by Lucifer's agents, now that he is on his throne, gloriously reigning in heaven. Our divine Saviour and his holy Apostles spoke of these agents and warned the Christians to be on their guard against them."

I await your answer to my simple questions. (See: [Question](#) p. 14, [Questions](#) p. 15, and [Questions](#) p. 40.)

Fr. Harrison to RJMI (6/10/2004)

Dear Mr. Ibranyi,

I am responding here briefly — not completely — to your latest missive, dated May 25, 2004, the very title of which displays surprising ignorance as well as committing the sin against charity and justice of flagrant, public calumny. Even if the doctrinal positions I espouse were indeed unorthodox, you would have no right to call me anything worse than a 'heretic'. For "apostasy" is defined theologically and canonically (1917, C. 1325 #2, 1983, c. 751) as "total repudiation of the Christian faith" (*fidei christianae ex toto repudiatio*). As all reputable commentaries make clear, that means a baptized person who openly repudiates *all* of the truths of Christian revelation (as distinct from a heretic, who ceases to profess just one, or a limited number, of such truths). That is, to qualify for "apostasy", a baptized person needs to have lapsed openly into either a non-Christian religion (Judaism, Hinduism, Islam, etc.) or into outright unbelief (atheism, pantheism, agnosticism, indifferentism, etc.). Since I openly profess my faith in the Most Blessed Trinity, the Incarnation and the entire Nicene Creed, you would not find any traditional theologian or canonist who would agree with your description of someone like me as an "apostate". You only do more damage to your credibility by such absurdities.

1. First (and least important), as regards my so-called “presumption”, in allegedly doing the same thing which I accused you of (rash judgment). There is no true parallel, (a) first, because what I said to you was in a private letter, while what you said was in your published bulletins. (b) Second, as regards Doug Bershaw (p.27) it was reasonable for me to presume (correctly, as you yourself now admit) that he never gave you permission to publish his “off-the-record” criticisms of John Paul II. That is because you yourself revealed that initially he explicitly *forbade* publication, asking for the video recorder to be switched off. If, in the unlikely event that he had subsequently changed his mind and given you permission to publish those comments, you would naturally have informed your readers of that fact, in order to forestall the kind of charge of unethical behavior that eventually came from me. (C) My most serious charge (which you reproduce on pp. 24-25 and which I now *repeat* with regard to the first part of your accusation, regarding “men who live and die worshipping false gods”) was that you publicly committed the sin of rash judgment by accusing me of certain heresies without evidence. It was perfectly reasonable for me to make this charge, in its entirety, because in your initial response to my request for you to tell me when and where I had uttered those heresies, you said nothing whatsoever (see p. 17) to indicate that you had received those e-mails from Robert More. The correct moment to inform me you had those e-mails in your possession was in that letter of April 19. Since you did not then divulge that information, I naturally, and without any rashness, accused you of rash judgment in my reply of April 22.

2. Since I see that you have published my recent letters in full in the May 25 dossier, I am willing to withdraw my insistence that you guarantee prior agreement with me as to what is to be published, as a condition for my answering your questions. I was never at any stage worried (as Mr. Bershaw was) that you might print things I wanted to keep secret. Nothing I say to you is confidential or secret. Rather, I was worried that you might *omit* things from my responses that exposed your weaknesses. After all, that is what you did with my letter of March 30, 2002, concealing from your readers my rebuttal of your argument based on the quote from Aquinas (ST, Ila Ilae, 0. 10, a.3). I see you are still, on p. 34, appealing to that text of Thomas, not letting your readers know of my reply, and indeed, that of the great commentator on Aquinas, Cardinal Cajetan, who plainly agrees with me. Anyway, since you show some signs of being more open, I am willing to appeal to your sense of fair play. I am also willing to withdraw my insistence that you apologize for your rash judgement as a condition for answering your questions, though of course I still hope you will be Christian enough to do so.

3. This letter makes no attempt to be a complete answer to your document of May 25, 2004. Frankly, I have other study and writing priorities at present (especially that of replying to a published attack on my book defending the continuity of doctrine between Vatican II’s *Dignitatis Humanae* and the traditional encyclicals on Church, State and religious tolerance). So the fact that I do not address in this letter all the points you raise in your latest screed should not be taken as any kind of concession on my part that I find your arguments valid and convincing.

4. I will limit myself for the moment to answering the most directly relevant questions which you put to me — those on p. 7 and p. 33. Those on p. 8 I will answer later on when

I have more time. They need more time, largely because of the tendentious and ambiguous way you have worded some of them.

4a. First, on p. 7, you ask: “Is the god depicted in the Koran a description of the true God?”

Answer: The Koran gives a false description of the true God. The Koran’s description is false, insofar as it denies the Trinity and the Incarnation, as well as other errors. In the same way, the following statement, ever since 9/11/01, would be a false description of the true city of New York: “The skyline of the great city centered on Manhattan Island is dominated by the twin towers of the World Trade Center.” Surely you can see, Mr. Ibranyi, that it would be ridiculous to claim that this (now) false statement concerns *some other* city that is *not* New York? But according to your confused and faulty logic regarding Allah, that is what you would have to say about the city mentioned in the above false description — i.e., that the city which the author of this erroneous statement has in mind is simply not New York, just because the WTC is no longer there!

By the way, I certainly don’t accept your argument that, according to my logic, Satanists or Luciferians also worship the “true God”. Those wretched persons do not really believe Lucifer is the One, Eternal, Infinite Creator of the universe. In everything I have ever read about the abominable practices of Satanists, they rejoice in the *rebellious* character of their idol, recognizing him as a *challenger* to the true God, whom they hate. If they ascribe such uniquely divine characteristics to Lucifer (e.g., One, Eternal, Infinite Creator), then that is only done because they are habitual liars, who say such things in blasphemous mockery and irony, not because they really believe Lucifer possesses such characteristics.

4b. On pp. 33-34 you ask again, “Do you believe certain men who die worshipping false gods or practicing false religions can be saved?” Then you add a new one: “Do you believe certain men who died not believing in Jesus Christ and the Most Holy Trinity, such as Talmudic Jews and Moslems, can be saved?”

Let me answer this last question first: No.

Now let me return to the first question, dividing it into separate questions:

Question: “Do you believe certain men who die worshipping false gods can be saved?”

Answer: No.

As you can see from my answer, my original complaint that you have judged me rashly is still justified in regard to the above. Nothing I said in those e-mails to Bob More, and nothing I have ever said anywhere, justifies the accusation that I believe certain men who die worshipping false gods can be saved.

You are therefore morally bound now to publish a retraction of the above charge in your bulletin, with an apology for your publicly declared rash judgment. However, you strike

me, from your writings, as such a very proud, self-righteous and stubborn man that I am afraid I do not have much confidence that you will fulfil that duty.

Next:

Question: “Do you believe certain men who die practicing false religions can be saved?”

Here your question is not, as far as I am concerned, sufficiently clear or specific. So I have to distinguish again. If by the expression “men who die practicing false religions”, one is referring to those who (like Jews and Muslims) worship the true God, rather than false gods, but who die without any explicit belief in the Trinity and Incarnation, my answer is No (as I already made clear above in answering your new question). The definitions of Lateran IV and the Council of Florence about the fate of Jews and pagans are quite clear in this regard. And of course, we cannot “re-interpret” dogmas, giving them a different sense from that which was intended by the Popes and Bishops who originally formulated them. As you know, that lying hermeneutic was condemned infallibly by Vatican Council I.

On the other hand, if by the expression “men who die practicing false religions”, one is referring to persons who believe at least in the Trinity and the Incarnation, but who hold other erroneous beliefs, then it is necessary to distinguish between those who have *culpably* committed the sins of heresy and/or schism, and those who have not. My answer to your question is No for the former and **Yes** for the latter.

I wish and intend to understand the terms “heretics” and “schismatics”, used in the infallible teaching of Eugene IV and the Council of Florence, in the same sense in which their authors intended those words. I believe that by the words “heretics” and “schismatics” (numbered along with Jews and pagans as those who are outside the Church), the Fathers meant what, for instance, the most approved theologians, such as Thomas Aquinas and St. Augustine, meant by those words. As regards heretics, we find in the *Summa*, Ila Ilae, 0. 11, a.1 that they are understood to be those who through “pride or covetousness”, or some other sinful motive, corrupt the faith, preferring their own opinions and ‘wisdom’ to the teaching of Christ proposed by the Church. Moreover, in 0. 11, a.2, *sed contra*, Thomas quotes and confirms St. Augustine as noting that not all who hold erroneous opinions about the faith are heretics, but rather, only those who “when rebuked, offer stubborn resistance”, and refuse to accept correction. As regards schism, Thomas teaches in Ila Ilae 0. 39, a. 1, that schismatics commit a grave sin against charity. Augustine is again quoted in the *sed contra* as defining a schismatic as one who “takes pleasure in the mere disunion of the community”, and Aquinas understands schismatics to be those who “wilfully and intentionally separate themselves from the unity of the Church”. Understanding “heretics” and “schismatics” in the above sense, as I believe was intended by Pope Eugene IV and the Council of Florence, I believe that those who die without repenting these grave sins cannot be saved, not even if “they shed their blood for the name of Christ”, as the Fathers of the said Council put it. (After all, St. Paul in I Cor. 13 says that even if a man gives his body to be burned, but has not charity, it profits him

nothing.) Such sinners are what more recent theological terminology calls formal, as distinct from merely material, heretics.

However, I by no means agree with you that we are entitled to affirm that all Protestants with the use of reason *are in fact* formal heretics. Your argumentation on that point seems to me lamentably weak, as I hope to show in more detail at a later date. I deny that your view has ever been the *doctrine* of the Church. It was only a traditional, centuries-long *presumption* regarding a matter of *contingent fact*. The subjective degree of guilt of given individuals or groups who *externally* (materially) commit a given sin cannot in principle be a matter of infallible Catholic doctrine, because only God can judge that. Church authorities can only make practical *presumptions* on such matters, but that presumption will be a non-infallible judgment regarding a matter of *fact*, not a matter of doctrine properly so called. And that presumption can change with the course of time, in the light of accumulated human experience regarding pedagogy, psychology, sociology and other such sciences. I agree with Pope Pius XII and the 1949 Holy Office Letter which he personally and officially confirmed on Thursday, July 28, 1949, namely, that it is possible for some non-Catholics who have (explicit) faith (i.e., in the Trinity and Incarnation) to be only *materially* heretical or schismatic, and thus, implicitly linked by desire to the true Church in a way that is sufficient for their salvation. Such persons are neither “outside the Church” nor “inside” her (as members), but (using the symbolism of a physical church building) in her portico or atrium. They’re ‘on the border’, as it were.

Note well that I am not affirming the value, or even the reality, of any “implicit *faith*” in Christ — that alleged disposition which you are always attacking. An implicit *desire* (Latin *votum*), which is what Pius XII and the Holy Office teach, is not the same thing as an implicit *faith*. Also, you are mistaken in saying that, according to me, this 1949 Holy Office teaching is infallible. I never said or thought that. I regard the real possibility of that salvific *votum implicitum* on the part of Protestants and Eastern Orthodox as authentic, non-infallible doctrine which requires on our part a religious assent of mind and will, but not the irrevocable assent due to dogmas and other doctrines which are ‘to be held definitively’. I have never said or thought that Fr. Feeney’s rigorist understanding of the salvation dogma was heretical, only erroneous.

I hope all of the above answers the questions under discussion sufficiently for you to understand what my position is.

Yours sincerely,

Fr Brian Harrison, O.S.

RJMI to Fr. Harrison (7/26/2004)

Who is an apostate?

Father, the word apostate is used in two senses:

- 1) In the strict sense, it means a baptized man who entirely abandons the Christian faith. "If he abandons the Christian faith entirely, he is called an *apostate*."¹¹
- 2) In the non-strict sense, heretics who do not entirely abandon the Christian faith are also referred to as apostates. For instance, Abbot Guéranger, in his book *The Liturgical Year*, refers to Martin Luther as an apostate: "Luther would have the world believe Him to be the direct author of sin and damnation... Calvin followed; he took up the blasphemous doctrines of the German apostate..."¹²
There are many quotes from popes and saints that refer to these type of heretics also as apostates.

Therefore, I would be justified for denouncing you as an apostate in the second sense even if you were just a heretic and not an apostate in the strict sense. But, I denounce you as an apostate in the first sense, the strict sense, also. Why? - Because the denial of the Most Holy Trinity, which is the very cornerstone dogma of the Christian faith, is a denial of the Christian faith altogether. Your belief that Moslems who do not believe in the Most Holy Trinity believe in and worship the true God is an implied denial of the Most Holy Trinity and thus a repudiation of the very basis in which the Christian faith stands. Therefore, you are also an apostate in the strict sense and a double-tongued hypocrite also. That is how God sees it no matter what you think.

1) On Rash Judgments

I repeat: My exposing another's sins that are blaspheming God and harming others is not unethical, anymore than it would be unethical to expose a child molester who is raping children. Enough has been said regarding this topic and rash judgments. This is only a diversion on your part. Let us get on to the most important matters. Your mortal sins against the faith, which, first and foremost, blaspheme the true God, and then endanger souls, both those under your care and those who hear you or read your material.

2) On omitting things, my quote from Thomas, and your reply

In refutations and debates, it is not possible to include all the teachings of an opponent. One concentrates on the key points. If one deliberately omits a key piece of evidence, then that would be dishonest. In practice, I have honestly addressed all your points and what I believed to be your key evidence. You have not done the same in your public and private refutations of me. You even resort to character assignation that has nothing to do with the faith and other pertinent topics.

For instance, in your last letter to me, you omitted commenting on several pieces of evidence, such as my comments on John 8 as they relate to John 10 and your hypocrisy. You admitted the Jews in John 8 did not believe in the true God even though they did

¹¹ A Practical Commentary , Woywod and Smith, Commentary on Canon 1324, vol. 2, p. 108.

¹² Vol. 10, Feast of the Sacred Heart, p.428.

believe in one God who is invisible, almighty, and creator, which, according to you, should have been enough for them to believe in the true God; therefore, you contradicted and condemned your own heretical and apostate opinion. That is just one example. There are many others.

In your last letter, you implied that I dishonestly left out your comments explaining what Thomas meant when he said:

Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, II-II, Q. 10, Art. 3: Now man is more than ever separated from God by unbelief, because he has not even true knowledge of God: and by false knowledge of God, man does not approach Him, but is severed from Him. Nor is it possible for one who has a false opinion of God, to know Him in any way at all, because **the object of his opinion is not God.** Therefore it is clear that the sin of unbelief is greater than any sin that occurs in the perversion of morals.”

Yet, you did not even include this quote, a key piece of my evidence, in your public refutation of me in *This Rock*.

For the record, you did not send me quotes from Cajetan regarding this topic. I did not reply to your comments on what you thought Thomas meant, because it was so erroneous as to not be worthy of comment. For more proof of your bad will and my good will, I will now address your comments:

Fr. Brian Harrison to RJMI, 3/30/2002: **3.** As regards your quote from Aquinas (ST, IIa IIae, Q. 10, a. 3) Even if you were interpreting Thomas correctly, the authority of the Roman Pontiff is still greater than his. If Pope John Paul II teaches that Muslims worship the one true God, that has greater authority than the opinion of even the greatest Doctor.

However, in any case, I do not think you are duly taking account of the context in which Thomas is teaching here. He is talking in this article about the *sin* of unbelief, i.e., what happens when a person knowingly rejects a truth about God because of pride, hatred of truth, or some other base human motive, thus *closing his eyes to the truth*. It is understandable that under those conditions one can say that his wilful rejection of the truth so vitiates his mind that he no longer knows God at all. Thus does Our Lord say to the bad-willed Jewish leaders who know of His miracles and still refuse to believe in Him, that they “do not know God” (Jn. 8: 54-55)...

Within his question (II-II, Q. 10), Thomas speaks of two classes of unbelievers. He does not refer to either of them as believers in the true God. The part of his answer I quoted from in article 3 includes both classes of unbelievers. In article 1, Thomas defines both classes of unbelievers: One type of unbeliever is the man who hears of the true God and rejects Him and is thus guilty of the sin of unbelief, also known as infidelity. The other unbeliever is the man who has not heard of the true God and is thus not guilty of the sin of unbelief, but his ignorance of the true God is a punishment for the guilt of his other sins:

Thomas, *Summa*, II-II, Q. 10, a1: **I answer that**, Unbelief may be taken in two ways: first, by way of pure negation, so that a man be called an unbeliever, merely because he has not the faith. Secondly, unbelief may be taken by way of opposition to the faith; in which sense a man refuses to hear the faith, or despises it, according to Is. 53:1: "Who hath believed our report?" It is this that completes the notion of unbelief, and it is in this sense that unbelief is a sin. If, however, we take it by way of pure negation, as we find it in those who have heard nothing about the faith, it bears the character, not of sin, but of punishment, because such like ignorance of Divine things is a result of the sin of our first parent. If such like unbelievers are damned, it is on account of other sins, which cannot be taken away without faith, but not on account of their sin of unbelief. Hence Our Lord said (Jn. 15:22) "If I had not come, and spoken to them, they would not have sin";

which Augustine expounds (Tract. lxxxix in Joan.) as "referring to the sin whereby they believed not in Christ."

In both cases, neither unbeliever believes in the true God, both the one who heard of Him and rejected Him and the one who never heard of Him. Nowhere does Thomas even imply that the invincibly ignorant unbeliever actually believes in the true God or else he would have referred to him as a believer and not an unbeliever. Father, you imply that Thomas was actually teaching the invincibly ignorant unbeliever is actually a believer in the true God, and this is just one more proof of your extreme bad will (deception) or plain stupidity, and I know you are not stupid. Someone cannot believe in someone of something that he is invincible ignorant of.

Also, again, in an attempt to explain what Thomas meant, you at least agree that the unbeliever who hears the truth and rejects it is guilty of the sin of unbelief and thus does not believe in the true God, like the bad-willed Jews in John 8. You rightly said, "Thus does Our Lord say to the bad-willed Jewish leaders who know of His miracles and still refuse to believe in Him, that they 'do not know God' (Jn. 8: 54-55)" Yet, these Jews, while rejecting Christ, still believed in one God who is invisible, almighty, and creator, just like the Talmudic Jews and Moslems of today, which according to you should have been enough for them to know and believe in the true God. So, again, you contradict and condemn yourself.

Even if there were such a thing as Moslems and Talmudic Jews who are invincibly ignorant of the Most Holy Trinity—which is not a true statement, because their religions explicitly deny the Most Holy Trinity—they, too, as the word implies, would be ignorant of the true God, and thus they do not believe in Him. Invincible ignorance is a negation of something not an affirmation. It does not give man knowledge. It is the absence and not the presence of knowledge. This is why Thomas rightly and logically refers to invincible ignorant unbelievers as unbelievers.

From the above quote, you went on to say:

Fr. Brian Harrison to RJMI, 3/30/2002: Thus does Our Lord say to the bad-willed Jewish leaders who know of His miracles and still refuse to believe in Him, that they "do not know God" (Jn. 8: 54-55) But Thomas also recognizes elsewhere that unbelief (which clearly includes 'false opinions about God') is not a sin when it is involuntary, for then it involves no hatred of truth nor of God (see. IIa IIae, Q. 34, a.3). And he does not say in that context that such a person "does not know God in any way at all".

Your reference to Thomas' *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q. 34, a. 3 deals with hating sin and loving the sinner. It does not even relate to the topic.

I did not say, nor did Thomas say, that every false opinion of God is sinful. The invincibly ignorant unbeliever does not commit a sin of unbelief in the true God, because he never heard of the true God. Yet, this ignorance of the true God does not make him a believer in the true God, as you would have us believe. Thomas refers to him as an unbeliever, who, thus, "does not know [the true] God in any way at all," or else Thomas would have called him a believer. There is no such thing as a man who half way believes in the true God and half way does not believe in the true God. Also, even the man who is invincibly ignorant of the true God can have sinful opinions about God: For instance, if he worships idols, or the sun, or the moon (See: Wisdom 13, 14, 15), or if he believes in one, almighty, creator god who approves of homosexuality or adultery or rape, etc. You then said,

Fr. Brian Harrison to RJMI, 3/30/2002: "...And he does not say in that context that such a person "does not know God in any way at all". To insist on this even when the false opinion is involuntary and inculpable would lead to extreme and quite unacceptable conclusions. For instance, vast numbers of young children still learning Catechism and many simple uneducated Catholics would then have to be considered as "not knowing God in any way at all", and hence excluded from salvation, just because they unwittingly held some false opinion about God. As a Theology teacher, I am constantly correcting the innocent mistakes of many of my Catholic students, and when (as usual) they have good will, they humbly accept my red pencilled corrections in their exams and term papers. It would be ridiculous to say that as long as they hold some mistaken ideas they "do not know God in any way at all", even though they are often devout, attend Mass regularly, pray every day, and so on.

In the case of the Muslims, the Pope is clearly presuming that the majority of them, too, are not rejecting Christian revelation on the Trinity and Incarnation out of malice, like the Pharisees, but out of ignorance. And I think he's right. After all, only a tiny, minuscule proportion of Muslims would ever have been presented with the motives of credibility that morally oblige us, when recognized, to accept Christian revelation. In short, I don't think your quote from Thomas carries much weight against the Pope's teaching that Muslims "worship the one true God".

Thomas never said that men must know everything about God in order to believe in Him. God never demanded that men must know everything about Him in order to believe in and worship Him. That is impossible. Even the angels and saints in heaven do not know all there is to know about God. However, at different times in history, there are basic things that God demands that men must know in order to believe in Him. Obviously Thomas' unbelievers that he speaks of in question 10 do not meet these basic demands. Even though these unbelievers may know certain truths about God—for instance, that God exists and He rewards those who seek Him (Heb. 11:6), which all men can now by interior revelation, by the law upon their hearts—they cannot be said to know the true God in any way until they believe all that God demands of them to qualify for belief in Him, which can only come by exterior revelation. During the New Covenant era, the very first and necessary things men must know and believe in order to qualify for belief in the true God are Jesus Christ's Incarnation, death, and resurrection, and that God exists in a Trinity of Persons.¹³ A man cannot even become a catechumen until he professes belief these articles of faith, and He cannot be baptized until he professes the same.

With this in mind, I am not concerned about your students' innocent mistakes. If they are truly innocent mistakes, then they incur no sin. But not all so-called Catholics' religious falsehoods and ignorances are innocent mistakes as Pope Pius X clearly teaches:

Pope Pius X, *Acerbo Nimis*, 1905: "We are forced to agree with those who hold that the chief cause of the present indifference and, as it were, infirmity of soul, and the serious evils that result from it, is to be found above all in ignorance of things divine. And so, Our Predecessor Benedict XIV had just cause to write: "We declare that a great number of those who are condemned to

¹³ Excepting certain Jews during the first century who were worshipping the true God and did not yet hear of Jesus Christ. Once they did, they believed in Him, which was proof they believed in the true God, and even they needed to believe in Jesus Christ and the Most Holy Trinity before they died to have hope to be saved. If they rejected Christ, then this was proof they did not believe in the true God, like the Jews in John 8. After Christ was preached to all the Jews, sometime before the end of the first century, and as some teach before the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70, there were then no more Jews who believed in the true God while not also believing in the Jesus Christ and the Most Holy Trinity. The apostate Jews, the Jews who denied Christ, then went on to invent a false religion, Talmudic Judaism, which accommodated their denial of Jesus Christ. The followers of this false religion never did and do not believe in or worship the true God, unlike the Jews in the first century who did practice the true religion of Judaism but did not yet hear of Christ. (See my book "*The Jews: The Jews: Then and Now.*")

eternal punishment suffer that everlasting calamity because of ignorance of those mysteries of faith which must be known and believed in order to be numbered among the elect.”

If one of your students either denied or did not know even one of these necessary for salvation dogmas, then he did not make an innocent mistake but a deadly one that confirms he is on the road to damnation. There are basic dogmas that all Catholics must know and believe without any excuse for ignorance. They must also know deeper dogmas when they have a compelling reason to learn them and a means to do so. To not do so, in this case, would be affected ignorance, which is culpable. And, of course, they must believe deeper dogmas when they are taught to them. In these cases, if they do not know or deny any of these dogmas, they have not made an innocent mistake but are mortally guilty.¹⁴

There are also basic dogmas during the New Covenant era that all men must believe to qualify for belief in the true God, such as belief in Jesus’ Incarnation, death, and resurrection, and the Most Holy Trinity. I hope you would agree that if one of your seminary students denied the Most Holy Trinity or that Christ rose from the dead, which are the very basic and root dogmas of the Catholic faith, he would be an apostate who renounced his baptismal vow and the creeds of the Church. Far different is this than if he made an innocent mistake by denying a deeper dogma that was not yet taught to him and that he had no compelling reason to learn.

A Catholic who innocently denies a deeper dogma still believes in the Most Holy Trinity, the one true God, the God of the Catholic Church. A Moslem, or anyone who does not believe in the Most Holy Trinity during the New Covenant era, does not even qualify for belief in the true God. Therefore, it does not matter for what reason a Moslem does not believe in the Most Holy Trinity. The fact that he does not makes him an unbeliever in the true God.

Again, your own teachings contradict and condemn your above out-of-context example. You have taught that certain false opinions about God do disqualify a man from belief in the true God. For instance, the Jews in John 8 had some true beliefs about God, that He is one, almighty, invisible, and creator, yet, you admit that their false opinion of Christ, that He was not the Messiah, disqualified them from knowing the true God in any way. You said, “Thus does Our Lord say to the bad-willed Jewish leaders who know of His miracles and still refuse to believe in Him, that they ‘do not know God’ (Jn. 8: 54-55).” So, even you believe there are certain false opinions about God—even among those who believe that God is one, almighty, invisible, and creator—that would disqualify one from belief in the true God. In your statement above, you give the impression that your students would be innocent no matter what false opinions about God and the Catholic faith they held.

Lastly, your students are not Catholic. Like you, they are apostates. “*If the blind lead the blind, both fall into the pit.*” (Mt. 15:14) Protestants and Greek Schismatics also pray and the latter attend Mass, receive Holy Communion, and go to confession, and seem very devout and pious. Yet, they are in the way of damnation. In the days he lived, Pope Pius X, in *Acerbo Nimis*, said that so-called Catholics that prayed and attended the Holy Mass were on the road to hell because of ignorance of things divine that they must know to

¹⁴ See my book “*Infallibility, Heresy, and Heretics*, Basic and Deeper Dogmas.”

have a hope to save their souls. They were Catholic in name only. Prayer and the Holy Mass alone will not save souls.¹⁵ One must also perform good works, the chief of which is the profession and defense of the Catholic faith. The faith comes before the Mass and sacraments.

Pope Pius X, *Editae Saepe*: “When the true son of the Church sets out to reform himself and others, he fixes his eyes and heart on matters of faith and morals. He yielded no ground on any matter that would endanger faith and morals”

For want of a Catholic priest, one can be saved if he has the Catholic faith. But one cannot be saved without the Catholic faith even if he has a valid Mass and sacraments.

Saint Augustine, *Sermo ad Caesariensis Ecclesiae plebem*: “No man can find salvation except in the Catholic Church. Outside the Catholic Church one can have everything except salvation. One can have honor, one can have the sacraments, one can sing alleluia, one can answer amen, one can have faith in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and preach it too, but never can one find salvation except in the Catholic Church.”

If the Catholic faith is not your primary consideration, then your prayers, attendance of Mass, and reception of the sacraments are tainted with bad motives, just like the Jews during the Old Covenant who offered up the prescribed sacrifices and prayers but did not obey God.

“For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice: and the knowledge of God more than holocausts.” (Osee 6:6) “The offering [Mass] of him [priest] that sacrificeth of a thing wrongfully gotten, is stained, and the mockeries of the unjust are not acceptable. The Lord is only for them that wait upon him in the way of truth and justice [believe in and practice the full deposit of the Catholic faith]. The most High approveth not the gifts of the wicked: neither hath he respect to the oblations of the unjust, nor will he be pacified for sins by the multitude of their sacrifices.” (Eclcus. 34:21-24)

Father, you and your students are outside the Catholic Church, you do not have the Catholic faith. Therefore, God does not even hear you and your students’ prayers. They are an abomination to Him: “*He that turneth away his ears from hearing the law, his prayer shall be an abomination.*” (Prv. 28:9) That is not to say God does not give you actual grace for your conversion. He does, that is, if you have not committed the unforgivable sin against the Holy Ghost. (See my FAQ, *Does God hear all prayers?*)

3-4) On not answering my questions on the apostate Jews

My questions about the apostate Jews, their false religion of Talmudic Judaism, and the Old Covenant are not ambiguous. They are simple and straightforward. Ambiguous will be the answers you are conjuring up to explain away, again, John Paul II’s apostate teachings. To attempt to explain away the notorious crimes of Vatican II and John Paul II, you would have to be a master of ambiguity, deceit, and evasion, in short, a black magician, which is what you are.

By not answering my simple, unambiguous questions, you prove, again, what I already know: You are afraid of the apostate Jews. You are a coward who does not want to lose his position, friends, and comforts in this world. If you speak out against the apostate Jews and firmly call them to conversion, you will lose all of that.

Your other motive is to defend apostate Antipope John Paul II’s notorious crimes, which include his apostate teachings on the unbelieving Jews and their false religion of

¹⁵ See my book *Faith Before the Mass*.

Talmudic Judaism. All this is proof that you do not truly love the one true God and His Catholic Church and faith. Just keep defending John Paul II and you will eventually commit the unforgivable sin against the Holy Ghost, that is, if you have not already committed it, which is very possible.

The readers and I await your answers so I can print them for all who have eyes to see and ears to hear.

4a) On the god of the Koran

So, you are not ashamed to blaspheme, again, the true God, the Most Holy Trinity, by teaching the god mentioned in the Koran is the true God; thus, Moslems believe in and worship the true God.

Father, spare us your infamously irrelevant comparisons in an attempt to justify blasphemy and idolatry. Not all false descriptions of a person or thing are fatal to his or its identity whereas certain ones are. Take the following examples that attempt to describe George Bush, the one who is the President of the United States:

- 1) George Bush is a man. He is the President of the United States. His father was also a President of the United States. He has a ranch in New Jersey. He is six feet four inches tall.
- 2) George Bush is not the President of the United States. He was born in the United States. He is Italian and is the head of a New York Mafia family. His father was also the head of the same Mafia family. He is now in prison.
- 3) I never heard of George Bush.
- 4) George Bush is not a man. He does not even exist.

The first person describes the true George Bush even though he believes two non-fatal falsehoods: that Bush has a ranch in New Jersey and is six feet four inches tall. His ranch is in Texas, and he is less than six feet tall. There are enough truths in this description and the falsehoods are not fatal to know that this man knows the true George Bush.

The second person does not know the true George Bush, the one who is the President. His description contains fatal errors. He does not describe the true George Bush even though he professes two truths about him: that he is a man, and he was born in the United States. Even though he professes these truths about George Bush, he cannot be said to know the true George Bush in any way because of the fatal errors. It cannot be said that he has falsely described the true George Bush. Rather, he accurately describes a false George Bush.

The third person cannot know the true George Bush, because, by his own admission, he never heard of him.

The fourth person, regardless of whether he heard of the true George Bush or not, believes he is not a man, that he does not even exist.

The second, third, and fourth persons' descriptions are fatal; thus, they do not know or believe in the true George Bush, the one who is the President, in any way. The fourth example applies to Moslems, because they do not even believe the Most Holy Trinity

exists, that the Most Holy Trinity is God, and they explicitly say so in the Koran. A man cannot believe in what he does not know or what he explicitly denies. Moslems explicitly deny that the Most Holy Trinity is God: therefore, the god described in the Koran is an accurate description of a false god, not a false description of the true God, as you blasphemously and idolatrously believe. The Koran very accurately describes a false god and very accurately denies the Most Holy Trinity.

How would you like it if I said that you, the Brian Harrison that I am now denouncing, is a devout Moslem who explicitly denies the Most Holy Trinity and that Christ rose from the dead? Can such a person be said to know you in any way just because they said you are a man? Well, you have said that the god mentioned in the Koran, the Moslem god, is the true God, while that god explicitly condemns the Most Holy Trinity and the resurrection? How do you think the Most Holy Trinity feels about that description? Yet, I am sure you would be offended if someone said you were a Moslem who thus explicitly denies the Most Holy Trinity and the resurrection. Oh, how you would want your honor vindicated, but the true God's honor, which is blasphemed by the Moslems, you do not consider, and even have the audacity to say Moslems do believe in and worship Him.

Therefore, your analogy that compares New York City to the Most Holy Trinity does not apply to the Moslems, because they deny the Most Holy Trinity exists. It would be akin to a man who does not even believe New York City exists, either because he never heard of it, or he heard of it and, nevertheless, denies it exists. Your analogy only applies to my first example above in which a Catholic knows enough about God to qualify for belief in Him, such as belief in the Most Holy Trinity, while holding non-fatal errors regarding Him. Even though this Catholic does not know all there is to know about God, for that is impossible, and even though he may believe in some non-fatal errors regarding God, such as if he innocently denies a deeper dogma, he still knows and believes in the true God.

Even if you applied the Moslems to my second example above because they profess some truths about God, such as He is one, invisible, almighty, and creator, they still do not know or believe in the true God, because their description contains fatal errors: that God does not exist in a Trinity of Person; that God did not become man and thus visible in the Person of Jesus Christ; and, Jesus did not die for men's sins and rise from the dead. All these errors are fatal to the identity of the true God during the New Covenant era.

Short and simple for those who have a child like faith and a deep, deep, deep love of the Most Blessed and Holy Trinity, a man cannot know or believe in or worship what he does not know or explicitly denies. Even those who do not believe in the Most Holy Trinity, such as Moslems, pagans, and apostate Jews, but have some common sense, would agree with this. Just ask an apostate Jew or Moslem if he believes in and worships the Catholic God, the Most Holy Trinity, and see what he says.

Some believe Lucifer/Satan is God

Contrary to what you believe, there are some Luciferians who believe the Devil is the true God and even some Satanists. Several of them whom I tried to convert have told me: "How do you know that Satan is not God and God is not Satan? How do you know the hell is not heaven and heaven is not hell?" Some Satanists have told me that Satan is the true God, as did some Luciferians. You rightly called them "wretched persons" who perform "abominable practices." Therefore, I think you would agree, that those who do believe the Devil is God would nevertheless not worship and believe in the true God,

because their god condones these “abominable practices,” even though they believe he is one, invisible, almighty, and creator.

Speaking of wretched persons and abominable practices, Talmudic and Cabalistic Jews are actually warlocks. Their god—who they believe is one, invisible, almighty, and creator—condones immorality, racism, perversion, divination, and occultic practices. But, even if this were not true, they still do not believe in the true God, because they do not believe in the Most Holy Trinity and even explicitly deny Him.

Antichrist worshipped as the one true God

Father, you would also have to believe that all who will worship the Antichrist, especially those who are invincibly ignorant of the true Christ, believe in and worship the true God, because the Antichrist shows himself as if he were God, the one true God, above all other gods, and even as the Messiah who becomes visible to men as a man, which is an added attribute of the true God. *“Let no man deceive you by any means: for unless there come a revolt first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition [the Antichrist] who opposeth and is lifted up above all that is called God or that is worshipped, so that he sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself as if he were God.”* (2 Thess. 2:3-4) Therefore, according to your apostate and blasphemous standards, all those who believe that the Antichrist is the one true God, especially those who are invincibly ignorant of the true Christ, believe in and worship the true God, because they believe the Antichrist is one, almighty, and the creator, and that he was invisible but now visible as man, as the Messiah, which is another attribute of the true God. You would have to say that their Antichrist is actually the true God falsely described, just as you have said about the Moslem god, the god of the Koran.

4b) On the Salvation Dogma

So, you rightly believe apostate Jews, Moslems, and pagans who die in their false religions cannot be saved. I owe you no apology for saying you believed some of them could be saved, because that is the presumed belief of all the members of the Vatican II Church, as this is one of its official teachings as found in the so-called *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Also, you told Robert that certain men who die as non-Catholics can be saved without qualifying your statement; thereby leaving the impression this also includes non-Catholics who do not believe in the Most Holy Trinity. Your obsessive desire for me to apologize for exposing your grievous sins against God is unjust, is a diversion, and is rooted in vanity and sinful pride.

Father, you are still a salvation heretic, because you believe certain Protestants who die in their false religions can be saved. This topic is of primary importance, because this was the first heresy that denied the Salvation Dogma and opened the door for apostate Jews, Moslems, and pagans. See my book *“The Salvation Dogma: Salvation Heresy enters Catechisms in U.S.A.”*

The heretics mentioned in Pope Eugene IV’s Bull *Cantate Domino* encompasses all heretics: all Protestants as well as Catholics who became heretics and are thus no longer Catholic even though they may still refer to themselves as Catholics. All those who adhere to Protestant religions are (formal) heretics, even those who never heard of the Catholic Church or faith. I have written on this topic. See my book *Infallibility, Heresy, and Heretics*, Protestants are (Formal) Heretics. My most important work on this topic

will be in my book *Bad Books with Imprimaturs*, Chapter 4. Below is a rough draft from the not yet completed chapter:

Even Protestants who never heard of the Catholic faith—such as the Amish or similar Protestants who are isolated from the rest of the world or at least from the Catholic Church and Her teachings—are (formal) heretics for not rejecting the basic falsehoods in their religions that can easily be known without ever having heard of the Catholic faith. It is akin to a man with the use of reason who puts a round peg into a square hole and says it fits perfectly. This man is fully guilty for his obstinate (pertinacious) denial of the truth that the round peg does not perfectly fit into the square hole, which anyone with the use of reason and by God's grace can easily know. Even if this man does not have access to either a round hole to fit the round peg or square hole to fit the square hole (the teachings of the Catholic faith that fit with one another), he still can and must know that the round peg does not fit in the square hole (the basic falsehoods in his false religion that do not fit). God's grace is certainly motivating Protestants to detect and reject the basic falsehoods in their false religions, for God wills that all men come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved and thus enlightens every man that comes into the world (1 Tim. 2:3-4; Jn. 1:9). If a Protestant detects the basic falsehoods in his false religion (if he admits round pegs do not fit into square holes and visa-versa), then God will eventually see that he hears of the Catholic faith (that he gets round pegs and round holes and square pegs and square holes that fit into one another) so that he may believe and enter the Catholic Church sometime before he dies. God says, in the Book of Wisdom, chapters 13, 14, 15, the same in relation to idolaters who have not yet heard of Him. He says that even though they have not yet heard of or known Him, they should have known better than to worship idols and other falsehoods. In other words, they should have been able to reject the basic falsehoods in their false religions even if they have not yet heard of the true God and His true religion. Modern heretical theology would refer to pagans who never heard of the true God as material idolaters, not true idolaters, and some even teach the same of the pagans who do hear of the true God but do not believe; whereas, God condemns all idolaters, both those who heard of the true God and those who have not.

Therefore, all Protestants are (formal) heretics. The law upon man's heart enables him to detect the basic falsehoods in all false religions, regardless if the true religion, Catholicism, has been presented to him, as Abram rejected the idols of his father before he learned of the true God. This merited Abram further enlightenment to the point that God eventually revealed Himself to Abram. All Protestants, even those who never heard of the Catholic Church or faith, are (formal) heretics for embracing instead of rejecting the basic falsehoods in their false religions, such as salvation by faith alone without the need of good works. The teachings in their own Protestant Bible prove men need faith and good works to be saved (Mt. 7:21-24; Phil. 2:12; Rom. 2:13; Ja. 2:26; Apoc. 22:12, etc.). Even if there were no contradiction on this point in the Protestant Bible, salvation by faith alone without good works contradicts reason. Although some articles of faith cannot be known by reason, they never contradict reason. Another basic falsehood is that no Protestant leader claims infallibility; thus, by their own admission, all their teachings could be false, which contradicts Christ's Word that His Church is the pillar and ground of truth (1 Tim. 3:15), and He would not leave us orphans (Mt. 14:18) with no way to infallibly know the truth in all generations. Another basic contradiction is that even the Protestant Bible teaches the Church is one in faith and unity. Yet, there are thousands of Protestant Churches (religions) that do not share the same faith and are disunited. How, then, can there ever be one Church with one faith if each Protestants determines for himself what the truth is. Only willfully obstinate, blind Protestants, who spurn God's grace that attempts to enlighten them, would ignore the obvious contradictions found in their false religions, which include those who never heard of the Catholic Church or faith.

Therefore, all those who adhere to Protestant religions (self-professed Protestants) are (formal) heretics, even those who never heard the teachings of the Catholic faith. If this were not true, then all the generations of the Amish who never heard of the Catholic Church, while holding many heresies and attending their Protestant services would have to be Catholics while not knowing it. Most heretical theologians recognized this is too much for the sheep to swallow so they refer to

them as Protestants of “good faith” who belong to the soul of the Church,¹⁶ which, in essence, implies the same thing, that they are actually Catholics while not knowing it. A Protestant cannot be said to have good faith until abjures his false faith (religion) and enters the Catholic Church by professing the Catholic faith, which is the only good faith. Good faith and good will are not the same thing and do not always exist together. A Protestant can be said to have good will, which would eventually lead him to reject his false faith and embrace the Catholic faith, the only good faith. He would be one of our Lord’s other sheep that will hear His voice, will learn of the Catholic faith, and enter the one fold by abjuring his false religion and embracing the Catholic faith before he dies (Jn. 10:16).

Father, being you are a supposed converted Anglican—I say supposed because you are still a Protestant at heart—, could it be that you want your dead Anglican ancestors in heaven? Ah, this is many times the cause for denying dogmas, the love of family members over the love of God, which makes you unworthy of heaven (Mt. 10:34-37). Father, God infallibly teaches through His Catholic Church that all of your ancestors who died as Anglicans are in hell. Does that get you angry? If so, then it is God you are angry with, for it is He who sent them to hell on their judgment day. And, it is He who will send you to hell on your judgment day if you do not repent, convert, and abjure. You can then spend an eternity in hell with your Anglican ancestors being angry at, hating, and cursing the true God, who, as you will then surely know, is not the god of the Moslems or the Talmudic Jews.

Finally, by your own admission, you imply John Paul II and others teach heresy

Father, you have covered up or tried to explain away John Paul II’s notorious crimes; thus, you share in his guilt by not admitting they are crimes or watering down the true nature of the crimes. Other of John Paul II’s crimes against the faith you have explicitly embraced, such as your apostate belief that Moslems believe in and worship the true God. However, in your last letter to me, you acknowledge that it has been infallibly taught that men who die as apostate Jews, Moslems, and pagans cannot be saved:

Fr. Brian Harrison: If by the expression “men who die practicing false religions”, one is referring to those who (like Jews and Muslims) worship the true God, rather than false gods, but who die without any explicit belief in the Trinity and Incarnation, my answer is No (as I already made clear above in answering your new question). The definitions of Lateran IV and the Council of Florence about the fate of Jews and pagans are quite clear in this regard. And of course, we cannot “re-interpret” dogmas, giving them a different sense from that which was intended by the Popes and Bishops who originally formulated them.

Therefore, to be consistent, you must then condemn as heresy and denounce as heretics all those who teach certain men who die as unbelieving Jews, Moslems, and pagans can be saved. This includes apostate Antipope John Paul II and all the pre and post Vatican II heretics who taught this heresy in bad books with imprimaturs along with the bishops and the censors who approved their books. I will present you will a few pieces of evidence and ask you two questions: Are these men teaching heresy and are they heretics?

¹⁶ This is another heresy, because a man cannot belong to the soul of the Church while not also belonging to Her body.

Pre-Vatican II

Joseph Pohl

Title: *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1913, vol. 14, "Toleration, Religious"

Author: Joseph Pohle

N. O.: Remy Lafort S.T.D., July 1, 1912, C.L.

Imp. : + John Cardinal Farley, Archbishop of New York

The Catholic Encyclopedia, 1913, Vol. 14, "Toleration, Religious," J. Pohle: "II. THE INADMISSIBILITY OF THEORETICAL DOGMATIC TOLERATION - ...But does the proposition that outside the Church there is no salvation involve the doctrine so often attributed to Catholicism, that the Catholic Church, in virtue of the principle, "condemns and must condemn all non-Catholics"? This is by no means the case. The foolish unchristian maxim that those who are outside the Church must for that very reason be eternally lost is no legitimate conclusion from Catholic dogma. ...Otherwise the gentle breathing of grace is not confined within the walls of the Catholic Church, but reaches the hearts of many who stand afar, working in them the marvel of justification and thus ensuring the eternal salvation of numberless men who either, like upright Jews and pagans, do not know the true Church, or, like so many Protestants educated in gross prejudice, cannot appreciate her true nature. To all such, the Church does not close the gate of Heaven..."

Title: *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1913, "Predestination"

Author: Joseph Pohle

N. O.: Remy Lafort S.T.D., June 1, 1911, C.L.

Imp. : + John Cardinal Farley, Archbishop of New York

The Catholic Encyclopedia, 1913, J. Pohle, "Predestination": "Since in reality only those reach heaven who die in the state of justification or sanctifying grace, all these and only these are numbered among the predestined, strictly so called. From this it follows that we must reckon among them also all children who die in baptismal grace, as well as those adults who, after a life stained with sin, are converted on their death-beds. The same is true of the numerous predestined who, though outside the pale of the true Church of Christ, yet depart from this life in the state of grace as catechumens, Protestants in good faith, schismatics, Jews, Mohammedans, and pagans..."

Revs. Rumble and Carty

Title: *Radio Replies*, 1940

Authors: Rev. Leslie Rumble, M.S.C. and Rev. Charles Mortimer Carty

Publisher: Radio Replies Press, St. Paul, Minn., U.S.A.

N. O.:

Imp. : +Joannes Gregorius Murray, Archiepiscopus Sancti Pauli, Die 10a Julii, 1940

Radio Replies, vol. 2, Rumble and Carty, 1940: "722. Does Catholic doctrine allow that the soul of an unbaptized heathen can enter heaven? Not in the case of unbaptized infants who die before coming to the use of reason and the stage of personal responsibility. The heathens who do come to the age of personal responsibility can attain to the supernatural order of grace and inherit that very heaven for which baptism is normally required on certain conditions. For example, a pagan may never have heard of the Gospel, or having heard of it, may have quite failed to grasp its significance. He remains a heathen, knowing no better, and dies without receiving the actual Sacrament of Baptism. In such a case God will not blame him for that for which he is really not responsible. At the same time, God wills all men to be saved, and will certainly give that heathen sufficient grace for his salvation according to the condition in which he is. If that heathen, under the influence of interior promptings of conscience and the actual inspirations of grace given by God, repents sincerely before death of such moral lapses as he has committed during life, he will secure forgiveness, and save his soul in view of the Baptism he would have been willing to receive had he known it to be necessary, and could he have done so. We Catholics say that such a heathen has been saved by Baptism of Desire. The desire, of course, is implicit only."

Bishop LaRavoire

Title: My Catholic Faith, 1949

Author: Most Reverend Louis LaRavoire Morrow, S.T.D.

Imp. : Most Reverend Louis LaRavoire Morrow, S.T.D., Bishop of Krishnagar, 1949, 1952, 1954,

“[p. 141] 70. Salvation and the Church - 2. It is possible for one that has never even heard of Jesus Christ to be saved, for God ‘wishes all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth’ (1Tim 2:4) and ‘Christ died for all’ (2 Cor. 5:15). In order that such a one may be saved it is required that he observe the *natural law*; with the help of God, everyone having the use of the reason can do that.”

Rev. Denis Fahey

Title: *The Kingship of Christ and the Conversion of the Jewish Nation*, 1953

Authors: Rev. Denis Fahey C.S.Sp., D.D., D. Ph., B.A.

Publisher:

Imp. Potest: P. O’Carroll, C.S.Sp.

N. O.: Jacobus Browne, C.D.

Imp. : +Jacobus, Episcopus Fernesis, die 26 Januarii 1953

The Kingship of Christ and the Conversion of the Jewish Nation, Rev. Denis Fahey, Chap. 4, Jewish Naturalism, p. 52 “The Jews, as a nation, are objectively aiming at giving society a direction which is in complete opposition to the order God wants. It is possible that a member of the Jewish Nation, who rejects Our Lord, may have the supernatural life which God wishes to see in every soul, and so be good with the goodness God wants, but objectively, the direction he is seeking to give to the world is opposed to God and to that life, and therefore is not good. If a Jew who rejects our Lord is good in the way God demands, it is in spite of the movement in which he and his nation is engaged.”

For more evidence see my book *Bad Books on Salvation*.

Post Vatican II

John Paul II

“Cardinal” Wojtyla [now apostate Antipope John Paul II]: “The new conception of the idea of the people of God has replaced the old truth on the possibility of redemption outside the visible bounds of the Church. This premise shows the attitude of the Church towards the other religions, which is the basis for recognizing values which are spiritual, human and Christian at once, extending to religions such as Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism...”¹⁷ (Taken from Fr. Malinski’s book, *Mon Ami, Karol Wojtyla*, is an interview with “Cardinal” Wojtyla in Rome, in 1963)

Redemptoris Missio: “I:10 The universality of salvation means that it is not granted only to those who explicitly believe in Christ and have entered the Church. Since salvation is offered to everyone, it must be made concretely available to everyone. However, it is clear that today, as in the past, many people do not have an opportunity to come to know or to accept the revelation of the Gospel or to enter the Church ... and frequently they have been brought up in other religious traditions. For such people, salvation in Christ is accessible by virtue of a grace which, while having a mysterious relationship to the Church, does not make them part of the Church formally, but enlightens them in a way which is accommodated to their spiritual and material situation ... This grace enables each person to attain salvation through his or her free cooperation.”

Veritatis Splendor: “I.3. The Church knows that the issue of morality is one which deeply touches every person; it involves all people, even those who do not know Christ and his Gospel

¹⁷ Malinski: “*Mon Ami, Karol Wojtyla*,” Le Centurion 1980, p. 189.

or God himself. She knows that it is precisely *on the path of the moral life that the way of salvation is open to all*. The Second Vatican Council clearly recalled this when it stated that “those who without any fault do not know anything about Christ or his Church, yet who search for God with a sincere heart and under the influence of grace, try to put into effect the will of God as known to them through the dictate of conscience... can obtain eternal salvation.”

The so-called “Catechism of the Catholic Church”: “1260. Since Christ died for all, and since all men are in fact called to one and the same destiny, which is divine, we must hold that the Holy Spirit offers to all the possibility of being made partakers, in a way known to God, of the Paschal mystery.” Every man who is ignorant of the Gospel of Christ and of his Church, but seeks the truth and does the will of God in accordance with his understanding of it, can be saved. It may be supposed that such persons would have *desired Baptism explicitly* if they had known its necessity.

I can stack up a library full of bad books with imprimaturs dated from the late 18th century onward that teach this heresy and others.

Fr. Harrison to RJMI (8/15/2004)

Dear Mr. Ibranyi,

I shall answer your latest attacks when I have more time. (Frankly, they aren't very high on my list of priorities.) ...

Sincerely, Fr. Brian Harrison, O.S.

[RJMI Comment: Still no answers from Fr. Harrison. He does not believe that blasphemy against God and the fate of his immortal soul are priorities.]

RJMI Update (12/6/2004)

I have still not received answers from Fr. Harrison to my basic questions regarding the Catholic faith. And he has the audacity to say that I am of bad will for not answering his questions. I have answered all his questions; even the stupid ones. Dear reader, review the questions he has not yet answered, and I ask you, “Are these questions too difficult to answer, especially for a professor at a Pontifical University. Even a good willed Catholic child with the use of reason and by God’s grace could answer them.

One of Fr. Harrison’s main points was that I had no right, for any reason, to publicly denounce Doug Bersaw or anyone else whose sins are secret or for their off-the-record heretical statements. I proved this to be false. In certain cases, if the secret sins of others are a danger to others, then public denunciations are necessary. This is the Church teaching as perfectly expressed by Thomas.

Thomas Aquinas teaches the Catholic obligation to denounce sinners. He says, “I answer that, With regard to the public denunciation of sins it is necessary to make a distinction: because sins may be either public or secret. On the case of public sins, a remedy is required not only for the sinner, that he may become better, but also for others, who know of his sin, lest they be scandalized. Wherefore such like sins should be denounced in public, according to the saying of the Apostle (1 Tim. 5:20): ‘Them that sin reprove before all, that the rest also may have fear,’

which is to be understood as referring to public sins, as Augustine states (De Verb. Dom. xvi, 7). On the other hand, in the case of secret sins, the words of Our Lord seem to apply (Mt. 18:15): ‘If thy brother shall offend against thee,’ etc. For if he offend thee publicly in the presence of others, he no longer sins against thee alone, but also against others whom he disturbs. Since, however, a man’s neighbor may take offense even at his secret sins, it seems that we must make yet a further distinction. For certain secret sins are hurtful to our neighbor either in his body or in his soul, as, for instance, when a man plots secretly to betray his country to its enemies, or when a heretic secretly turns other men away from the faith. And since he that sins thus in secret, sins not only against you in particular, but also against others, it is necessary to take steps to denounce him at once, in order to prevent him doing such harm, unless by chance you were firmly persuaded that this evil result would be prevented by admonishing him secretly. On the other hand there are other sins which injure none but the sinner, and the person sinned against, either because he alone is hurt by the sinner, or at least because he alone knows about his sin, and then our one purpose should be to succor our sinning brother: and just as the physician of the body restores the sick man to health, if possible, without cutting off a limb, but, if this be unavoidable, cuts off a limb which is least indispensable, in order to preserve the life of the whole body, so too he who desires his brother’s amendment should, if possible, so amend him as regards his conscience, that he keep his good name.” (Summa, II-II, q. 33, art. 7.)

RJMI Update (12/31/2004)

One of Mary’s Little Remnant, William George Norris, a Catholic who abjured from the Great Apostasy, contacted Fr. Brian Harrison by email. Below is a record of the very brief and informative correspondence.

Will Norris to Fr. Harrison (12/13/04)

12/13/04

St. Lucy, Pray for us!

Fr. Harrison,

My name is William G. Norris and I am a Catholic Evangelist. I have a simple question that I know that you can easily answer. Is the Old Covenant still in effect? I hope I will get a swift response to this question.

To Jesus Through Mary,

William G. Norris

Fr. Harrison to Will Norris (12/14/2004)

12/14/04

Dear Mr. Norris,

The question is not so “simple”. It all depends what you mean by “the Old Covenant”.

Sincerely,

Fr. Brian Harrison, O.S.

Will Norris to Fr. Harrison (12/15/2004)

12/15/04

Octave Day of the Immaculate Conception

Fr.,

What do you mean what I mean by the Old Covenant?

Fr., Don't you believe that we are living under the New Covenant era established by Christ when he did away with the animal sacrifices and the Old Mosaic laws and supplanted them with the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

The Old Covenant says that the Jews are the chosen people of God. Do you believe that this still applies to today's Jews?

I eagerly await your response.

To Jesus Through Mary,

William G. Norris

Fr. Harrison to Will Norris (12/15/2004)

12/15/04

Dear Mr. Norris,

Since you clearly think you already have all the answers on this matter, you are clearly not asking me for information to help you in a difficulty. Rather, it seems, you are acting as a self-appointed inquisitor, testing out my orthodoxy. I'm afraid I don't feel inclined to participate. (If I am not mistaken, you are a disciple of Mr. Richard Ibranyi. Correct?)

Sincerely wishing you every blessing at Christmas,

Fr. Brian Harrison, O.S.

RJMI Comment:

Yes, Will Norris is an inquisitor, just as all good Catholics are. I at least got some kind of answer from Fr. Harrison regarding the Old Covenant—an answer that is more proof that he is an apostate. Fr. Harrison either believes the Old Covenant is still in force or is partially in force or does not know for certain what the Old Covenant was or is. Either way he is an apostate because he does not believe Jesus completely ended the Old Covenant and replaced it with the New Covenant. He makes Jesus a liar. Fr. Harrison is

just as evil as the stiff-necked, blind, obstinate Jews who denied Christ during His first coming. He sleeps in the same bed with them and commits spiritual fornication.

Soli Deo Gloria

RJMI Update (6/17/2005)

Still no answers from Fr. Harrison to questions about basic dogmas

To this date, the apostate Fr. Brian Harrison has not answered the below questions that deal with basic dogmas of the Catholic faith. Fr. Harrison is a typical Vatican II priest and professor—an apostate, hypocrite, deceiver, evader, and seducer.

On the Old Covenant and Talmudic Judaism

RJMI to Fr. Harrison (1/7/2004): On the Old Covenant and Talmudic Judaism:

- 1) Is the Old Covenant still in force or did it end when Christ died on the Cross? Is it apostasy and heresy to teach that the Old Covenant is still in force, that it did not end?
- 2) Are two religious Covenants with God in force under the New Covenant era?
- 3) During the New Covenant era, are Jews who do not believe in Christ and His New Covenant under a religious Covenant with God? Is it apostasy and heresy to say they are?
- 4) Is Talmudic Judaism, a religion created to accommodate the denial of Jesus Christ as God and Messiah, a true religion? Is it apostasy and heresy to teach either explicitly or by implication that it is a true religion?
- 5) Is the Catholic religion the one and only true religion and all others, then, are false?
- 6) Is Talmudic Judaism (a Christ-denying Jewish religion) intrinsic to Catholicism (the Catholic religion)? Is it apostasy and heresy to teach it is?
- 7) Are Christ-denying Jews elder brothers to Catholics? Is it apostasy and heresy to teach they are? Note: The clear reference is to spiritual brothers who share the same faith and not to racial brothers. *“Not they that are the children of the flesh are the children of God: but they that are the children of the promise are accounted for the seed.”* (Rom. 9:8) *“Know ye, therefore, that they who are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. ...For you are all the children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus.”* (Gal. 3:7, 26)
- 8) Are Jews who do not believe in Jesus Christ under a double curse? The one that all men are under being born in original sin, and the other for Deicide, the murder of Christ—the inherited Blood Guilt that their Christ-denying ancestors called down upon them: *“And the whole people answering, said: His blood be upon us and upon our children.”* (Mt. 27:25) *“For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse.”* (Gal. 3:10)

9) Is a man cursed who is under the wrath of God?

On the Salvation Dogma

RJMI to Fr. Harrison (7/26/2004): 4b) On the Salvation Dogma: Finally, by your own admission, you imply John Paul II and others teach heresy:

In your last letter to me, you acknowledge that it has been infallibly taught that men who die as apostate Jews, Moslems, and pagans cannot be saved... Therefore, to be consistent, you must then condemn as heresy and denounce as heretics all those who teach that certain men who die as unbelieving Jews, Moslems, and pagans can be saved. This includes apostate Antipope John Paul II and all the pre and post Vatican II heretics who taught this heresy in bad books with imprimaturs along with the bishops and the censors who approved their books. I will present you with a few pieces of evidence and ask you two questions: Are these men teaching heresy, and are they heretics? (See the evidence in this book [Finally, by your own admission, you imply John Paul II and others teach heresy](#), p. 65.)

RJMI Update (11/2006)

Still no answers from Fr. Harrison to questions about basic dogmas

To this date, November 2006, the apostate Fr. Brian Harrison has not answered my questions from January and July 2004 that deal with basic dogmas of the Catholic faith. Fr. Harrison is a typical Vatican II priest and professor—an apostate, hypocrite, deceiver, evader, and seducer. In this book, see [Still no answers from Fr. Harrison to questions about basic dogmas](#), p. 71.