

Dimonds Deny the Salvation Dogma



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

“Some reduce to a meaningless formula the necessity of belonging to the True Church in order to gain eternal salvation.”

Pope Pius XII, *Humani Generis*, 1950

Original version: 12/2004; Current version: 11/2011

Mary's Little Remnant

302 East Joffre St.

TorC, NM 87901-2878

Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us

(Send for a free catalog)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NOTES ON OCTOBER 2011 CORRECTION.....	7
<i>Infants baptized outside the Catholic Church do not get their sins remitted.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Warning against the salvation heretic Fr. Michael Muller</i>	<i>7</i>
PART ONE.....	8
PART TWO	11
<i>Introduction</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Peter has not answered my main questions</i>	<i>11</i>
Peter changes beliefs like the wind	15
<i>Brownson and Muller denounce Peter.....</i>	<i>18</i>
Orestes Brownson	18
Fr. Michael Muller	21
What about those who do not believe in a heresy	28
Conditional Abjuration and Peter's deception	32
Dogma takes precedence over theology	35
<i>St. Josaphat was a convert</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Peter denies automatic excommunications.....</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Summary.....</i>	<i>39</i>

Notes on October 2011 Correction

Instead of revising the original text of this refutation, I will keep it as it was written and list the corrections in this chapter.

Infants baptized outside the Catholic Church do not get their sins remitted

My previous position was that infants baptized outside the Catholic Church, such as into the Anglican Church, get all the gifts of baptism and thus are Catholic and inside the Catholic Church. I always doubted this opinion and waited for the time when I could thoroughly study this topic. Well, I finally had some time to deeply study the topic. The conclusion is as follows. Although the solemn magisterium teaches that infant baptisms outside the Catholic Church are valid and thus confer the indelible mark, it does not teach if these infant baptisms are legal and thus confer the other gifts of baptism. However, the unanimous consensus of the Church Fathers and thus the ordinary magisterium does teach that all who are baptized outside the Catholic Church (infants included) do not get the remission of sins. And this ordinary magisterium dogma is upheld by the Catholic Church's law and practice that receives infants baptized in non-Catholic Churches into the Catholic Church. If these baptized infants were already inside the Catholic Church, there would be no need for this law and practice that receives these baptized infants into the Catholic Church.

But regarding those with the use of reason (both children and adults) who get baptized outside the Catholic Church, it is not only an ordinary magisterium dogma but also a solemn magisterium dogma that they get only the indelible mark and thus do not get the other gifts of baptism. And it is an ordinary magisterium dogma and a solemn magisterium dogma that all children with the use of reason who adhere to non-Catholic sects, churches, religions, or no religion are outside the Catholic Church and on the broad road to hell, which is the main point I defend in this refutation and the dogma the Dimonds deny. (See RJMI book *Baptized Non-Catholic Infants and Children*.)

I warn the readers again, do not trust or even consider the scholastic theologians whose job from Satan was to undermine infallible papal decrees (the solemn magisterium), the infallible teachings of the unanimous consensus of the Church Fathers (the ordinary magisterium), and the infallible natural law (the natural magisterium).

Warning against the salvation heretic Fr. Michael Muller

Warning: Beware of Fr. Michael Muller and his book *The Catholic Dogma*. He is a salvation heretic and his book contains the salvation heresy. In his book he supports the salvation heretic Alphonsus de Liguori's heresy. Alphonsus denied the Salvation Dogma by teaching that it is an allowable opinion to believe that men can be saved during the New Covenant era without explicit belief in the Most Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, even though Alphonsus did not personally hold this belief. (See RJMI book *Bad Books on Salvation: Alphonsus de Liguori*.) Below is the heretical quote from Fr. Michael Muller's book *The Catholic Dogma*:

The Catholic Dogma, the heretic Fr. Michael Muller, Chapter II. The Infallible and Only True Guide to Heaven: “ ‘Some theologians,’ says St. Alphonsus, ‘hold that

the belief of the two other articles—the Incarnation of the Son of God, and the Trinity of Persons—is strictly commanded but not necessary, as a means without which salvation is impossible; so that a person inculpably ignorant of them may be saved. But according to the **more common and truer opinion**, the explicit belief of these articles is necessary as a means without which no adult can be saved.’ (First Command. No. 8.)”

His book *The Catholic Dogma* also contains erroneous and very possibly heretical teachings on conscience and other points. For lack of other sources, I quote from his book to present truthful points he defends. Or I quote his works to refute his heresy or some other error. In his book *The Catholic Dogma*, Fr. Muller correctly teaches that these baptized children are outside the Catholic Church for schism for not being in communion with the true Catholic Church and the true Catholic religion and hence are not in communion with true Catholics. And he shows that St. Augustine and Orestes Brownson teach the same thing. It must be noted that Fr. Michael Muller and Orestes Brownson believed that infants baptized in non-Catholic sects get all the gifts of baptism and hence are Catholic. And thus they denied the ordinary magisterium dogma that these infants get only the indelible mark and are not Catholic.

Part One

When I use the word heretic in this letter, I am referring to what modern theology calls a formal (guilty) heretic. The reason the Dimond Brothers had condemned Points 28 and 31 contained in the specific abjuration I composed led them into denying the Salvation Dogma. See my FAQ, “Deeper Dogmas and the Two Ways to Incur Guilt.” It was they who posed questions one and two.

They believe the only way a baptized man can become a heretic is if a Catholic dogma is presented to him and he then denies it. Consequently, they would likewise have to believe that all Protestants with the use of reason who were never presented with the dogmatic teachings of the Catholic Church are not heretics; thus, they are actually Catholics. Indeed, this is what Peter Dimond said to Mr. X, a Catholic who abjured from the Great Apostasy, in an email exchange regarding points 28 and 29.

Peter Dimond to Mr. X (7/1/04):

Sir, I will answer your question. A heretic, by definition, is one who obstinately or stubbornly with pertinacity rejects an article of divine and Catholic Faith. The children of Protestant families do not become Protestants (i.e., heretics) until they reach an age where they comprehend the differences between Catholicism and Protestantism and then obstinately reject the Catholic position.

Mr. X to Peter Dimond (7/1/04):

Sir, If you don't need pointers on how to communicate just simmer down... Now I am trying to take the points you raised about Mr. Ibranyi one at a time and see how things go. You state above that a Protestant does not become a heretic until he reaches the age of reason **and** then obstinately rejects the Catholic position. I can tell you from personal experience that I, when a Protestant, never was presented

with the Catholic position until I was twenty-two years old. Now the questions, please just answer these two questions. Was I, or was I not, a heretic all of those years. Now I was not a formal dissenter as I had not personally repudiated something I had never been presented with, but I was not in the Church was I?

RJMI Comment:

Mr. X never got an answer to his good question. Typical of heretics, Peter Dimond kept changing topics by asking other questions. This is the reason I stopped all communication with Peter Dimond, because he had done the same thing to me, time-and-time again, after I had answered all his questions, even the stupid ones, he would never answer my questions when he got cornered. At that point I was wasting my time. You know the Biblical saying, “Continue to argue with a fool and you become a fool.”

Mr. X to Peter Dimond (7/1/2004):

Sir, If you expect to communicate intelligently, and I believe you are intelligent, we must communicate by exchanging ideas. I ask you a question based upon an example I gave. You did not answer my question and came back with two of your own. I believe this is what happened in a previous exchange we had. You will not answer my questions, but come back with your own. To me it seems fair that you first answer my question and then, once you do, that I answer yours.

RJMI Comment:

Peter Dimond took his erroneous theology to its heretical conclusion by believing that all Protestants who never heard of Catholic dogmas are actually Catholics by default, because, according to Peter, they can never become heretics unless Catholic dogmas are first presented to them, until they first know the Catholic position. He said, “The children of Protestant families do not become Protestants (i.e., heretics) until they reach an age where they comprehend the differences between Catholicism and Protestantism and then obstinately reject the Catholic position.” He pretends his conditions only apply to children, but, if he is to be consistent, his erroneous theology logically applies to all Protestants with the use of reason no matter what age they are. Therefore, according to Peter, it is not a matter of age but of learning the Catholic position and then denying it. That is why he did not answer Mr. X’s question.

For instance, according to Peter Dimond’s definition of what it takes to become a heretic, the Amish, who are completely isolated from the world, are actually Catholic because from generation to generation they have never been presented with Catholic dogmas. In spite of all their heretical beliefs and practices, Peter would have to say these Amish are actually Catholics. That is, he would have to say this if he does not want to add hypocrisy to his heresy.

Now, if Peter agrees that these Amish are heretics and thus non-Catholics, he would then have to agree that there are certain circumstances in which a baptized person with the use of reason can become a heretic even if not presented with Catholic dogmas. That is precisely what I address in the second way a Catholic becomes a heretic for denying a deeper dogma that has not been taught to him. The same applies to basic dogmas that all Catholics must know and believe in order to be Catholic regardless if they ever heard of them.

Peter's heresy is the root of the denial of the Salvation Dogma. It was very first one the Salvation heretics introduced to laymen in the 19th century. They first opened the door for salvation for certain baptized non-Catholics who never heard of the Catholic position, for certain men who died in their Protestant and Schismatic religions, as Peter has done. They justified their heresy by using the same erroneous theology that Peter uses.

It needs to be mentioned that even saints can make mistakes by believing in an erroneous theology, but never can it be brought to a heretical conclusion. If it is, the offender becomes a heretic. If one wants to remain Catholic, the proper course he must take once an erroneous theology is brought to its heretical conclusion is to never concede to the heresy even if he cannot explain the dogma using the erroneous theology. Dogmas must always be believed even if man cannot reasonably understand or explain them.

For instance, this is what happened to Fr. Michael Muller who was fighting the Dimond Brother type heretics who were denying the Salvation Dogma in the late 19th century. Fr. Muller believed in the same erroneous theology as to what it takes to make a baptized person a heretic. Yet, when his opponents took the theology to its logical, heretical conclusion by teaching that all Protestants who never heard of the Catholic position are thus actually Catholic and inside the Catholic Church, Fr. Muller rejected this as heresy and said that they cannot be Catholic and inside the Catholic Church. Fr. Muller did not fall into heresy but lost the debate, whereas his opponents fell into heresy but won the debate because it was based upon an erroneous theology. Fr. Muller remained faithful to the Catholic Dogma even though he could not reasonably explain it based upon the erroneous theology, whereas his heretical opponents bowed to the erroneous theology instead of to the dogma. This will be explained in detail in a chapter in my book *Bad Books with Imprimaturs*.

Therefore, it is not Peter's erroneous theology that led him into heresy. It is his pride. He could have caught his mistake if he was of good will when confronted with the dilemma during his exchange with Mr. X. Instead, he denied the Salvation Dogma by taking the erroneous theology to its heretical conclusion and thus fell into heresy regarding this point.

The Dimond Brothers are also heretics for teaching Catholics can knowingly attend Mass at non-Catholic churches and thus pray in communion with non-Catholics (in which five mortal sins are committed), and for denying the Church teaching that fallen-away Catholics must take a specific abjuration of their errors and the errors of the sect they belonged to in order to enter the Church.

Lastly, the only valid question regarding children born into non-Catholic families is when they acquire the use of reason sufficient to seek and know the truth and to detect and reject basic falsehoods. This is based upon I.Q. (Intelligence Quotient) and not age. Although an age is assigned to the average case, it is based upon I.Q. Therefore this age varies for particular children. This does not just apply to children, for even adults who are mentally retarded may not have the use of reason. I will go into detail regarding this in the future. God willing.

December 12, 2004

[Addition, 2/05: See my book *Baptized Non-Catholic Children*.]

Part Two

Introduction

Abbreviations: The list is in chronological order.

- **TCD** – *The Catholic Dogma*, by Fr. Michael Muller, C.S.S.R., 1888, Benzinger Brothers.
- **DDD1** – *The Dimond Brothers Deny the Salvation Dogma: Part One*, by RJMI, 12/12/2004.
- Peter's email response to DDD1 is contained in his article CRI.
- **RTP** – RJMI's email to Peter, 12/28/2004.
- **CRI** - *Our Challenge to Debate R.I. – Refused in Cowardly Fashion*, by Peter Dimond, 1/2005.
- **BNCC** – *Baptized Non-Catholic Children*, by RJMI, 2/25/2005.
- **RIR** - Part3: *R.I. Responds – a Mass of Contradictions and Illogical Nonsense*, by Peter Dimond, 3/2005.

I thank the Lord God for recreating this confrontation that took place between those who believed in the Salvation Dogma in its true and thus only sense (namely, Orestes Brownson and Fr. Michael Muller) and the original salvation heretics (namely, Reverends Sir Oracle, Cronin, and Alfred Young). These salvation heretics first denied the Salvation Dogma by placing certain validly baptized persons with the use of reason and who profess false religions (such as Lutheranism) or adhere to heretical sects (such as the Lutheran Church) inside the Catholic Church. In this recreated confrontation I take the position of those who defended the Salvation Dogma in its true and thus only sense, and Peter takes the position of the original salvation heretics.

Peter has not answered my main questions

In his article *Our Challenge to Debate R.I. – Refused in Cowardly Fashion* (hereafter CRI), Peter attempted to refute my book *The Dimonds Deny the Salvation Dogma: Part One* (hereafter DDD1). Once again, he did not give my name or website address or email address so that only his position would be presented. Peter omitted important parts of my teachings and responses and took others out of context. These are acts of a heretic and a coward. He should have nothing to fear from my refutation if he really believes he is right.

For instance, his challenge omitted my full reply to his first email response to my book DDD1. Below is my full reply in an email (hereafter RTP) I sent to Peter. I asked him the following fourteen questions and demanded that he answer them all, or the confrontation would end immediately:

From: RJMI
To: Peter Dimond
Date: 12/28/2004

First, I do not refute heretics on their terms. Therefore, I will pose the first questions and if every one of them is not answered properly, meaning if you evade clearly answering any of them, the exchange ends immediately. I will not go in circles with you again while you refuse to answer my questions and go off on tangents. I am too busy attempting by God's grace to edify Catholics and convert good-willed souls who hate and easily see your evasion and other heresies. Good-willed people need no further explanations regarding your heresies of putting the Mass before the Faith and of denying the Church teaching that fallen-away Catholics are required to make a specific abjuration of their errors and the errors of the sect they belong to.

1) Can a self-professed Protestant—assuming he is validly baptized—who never heard of Catholic dogmas ever be a heretic? If so, then explain how? If not, then you would have to admit that all self-professed Protestants who have never heard of Catholic dogmas are actually Catholics, inside the Church, and thus can be saved. Do you agree with this last statement?

2) Was Mr. X, the man addressed in my article “The Dimond Brothers Deny the Salvation Dogma,” a Catholic until he was 22 years old? You never answered his question. You had better answer mine, all of them, clearly and without evading, or the exchange ends here.

3) Do you teach Catholics can knowingly attend Mass at non-Catholic churches, meeting houses of heretics, and thus knowingly pray in communion with non-Catholic heretics?

4) Is the Mass a public prayer?

5) Are you praying in communion with the priest who offers Mass and with the others who are attending the Mass?

6) Where do you attend Mass?

7) Do you give that church financial support? - If not, then, why not?

8) Is that church a Catholic church?

9) Is the priest a non-Catholic heretic?

10) Are the members of the church non-Catholic heretics?

11) Is the Catholic obligation to profess the faith as stated in Canon 1325, the spiritual acts of mercy of admonishing and converting the sinner, and the ways in which one shares in the guilt of a sinner, such as by silence and by being a partner in the crime, part of the Holy Catholic Church's teachings?

12) Do you profess the faith to the members of the church that you attend Mass at and denounce the heretics and call them to conversion?

13) Is it a mortal sin of sacrilege for non-Catholics to receive Holy Communion?

14) Do the non-Catholic heretics in the church you attend Mass at commit sins of sacrilege for receiving Holy Communion? If you answer correctly by saying “yes,” then, are you a partner in this crime for receiving alongside with them and for remaining silent (for not denouncing them and the priest for these sins of sacrilege)?

Lastly, I have an answer as to when children of Protestants become non-Catholic heretics based upon what the Church teaches, which I will not answer until you answer properly all the above questions.

That will be enough for now.

Soli Deo Gloria

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi
To Jesus through Mary

CC: William Norris...

Peter refused to answer all of my questions; therefore, per my terms, the confrontation ended immediately. He only answered the first question, although incompletely and ambiguously. His response leaves one wondering what he actually believes because of his contradictory teachings. I asked him twelve other questions not related to the Salvation Dogma because I had asked him these same questions in our previous confrontations, as recorded in my book *Against the Dimond Brothers*. For example, in these previous confrontations Peter did not answer some of the questions and improperly answered others:

- 1) Peter ignored my evidence that proves it is contrary to the infallible teaching of the Church to knowingly pray in communion with notorious heretics. (See my books *Faith Before the Mass* and *Against the Dimond Brothers*.)
- 2) Peter did not address my denunciation of him for putting physical things over spiritual things, and worse, for condoning spiritual crimes (sins against the faith). For instance, he rightly teaches that Catholics cannot give physical (financial) support to a non-Catholic church; but he heretically teaches that Catholics can give a non-Catholic church spiritual support by attending Mass there and praying in communion with its notoriously heretical members. Which is the greater mortal sin: to give physical support or spiritual support to notorious heretics and their heretical churches?
- 3) Peter completely ignored the Church's infallible teachings regarding a Catholic's obligation to profess the faith and to perform the spiritual acts of mercy of admonishing and converting sinners and how these obligations especially apply to those with whom one prays in communion and is thus spiritually united. Consequently, he also ignored the Church's infallible teachings on how one shares in the guilt of another's sin by not properly fulfilling these obligations; such as, by sins of omission (by silence) and by sins of association (by being a partner in the crime).
- 4) Peter ignored my denunciation of him for participating in sacrilegious receptions of Holy Communion. He rightly denounces Vatican II priests for committing sacrilege by giving Communion to John Kerry who publicly supports abortion, which is a sin of immorality. Yet, Peter himself participates in sacrilegious receptions of Holy Communion every Sunday because heretics are forbidden to receive Holy Communion under pain of the mortal sin of sacrilege; and by his own admission, the priest and most of the people at the non-Catholic church where he attends Mass are heretics:

1917 Code of Canon Law: "Canon 731. It is forbidden to administer the Sacraments of the Church to heretics and schismatics, even though they are in good faith and request the sacraments unless they shall have previously renounced their errors and obtained reconciliation with the Church."

Once again, Peter believes, in practice, that sins of immorality are worse than sins against the faith; and even worse, he condones sins against the faith. Has Peter denounced Vatican II's heretical priests for the sin of sacrilege for receiving Holy Communion and giving it to their heretical flock? If Peter had denounced the heretical priest and the heretical flock (with whom he receives Communion and prays) for sins of sacrilege, Peter would rightly condemn himself for being a partner in crimes of sacrilege every time he receives Holy Communion with heretics. And Peter would also rightly condemn himself for sins of omission for remaining silent since he does not personally denounce the priest and the heretical flock for sacrilegious receptions of Holy Communion. He is also guilty of sins of omission for not personally denouncing them as heretics.

5) Peter never clearly answered if the Eastern Rite (Vatican II) church where he attends Mass but which he does not financially support is a non-Catholic or a Catholic church. In one place he claims they are Catholic churches, yet in another place he claims they are non-Catholic churches and thus meetinghouses of heretics, and yet in another place he claims that he does not attend Mass at a meetinghouse of heretics or pray in communion with heretics.

Every time I presented Peter with good evidence or good questions, he either ignored them or did not address or answered them properly. At that point we were just going in circles and I was arguing with a fool. When a wise man knows that he has presented enough evidence for good-willed people to see and that the evidence has not been honestly addressed by the heretic, a wise man ends the confrontation. And that is when I ended the confrontation.

To avoid going in circles during this current confrontation over the Salvation Dogma and to see if Peter had some good will, I tested him to see if he would properly address the good evidence and questions that I had previously posed to him in our other confrontations; if he did not do this, then there would be no good reason to expect he would do otherwise in our Salvation Dogma confrontation. Indeed, Peter exhibited bad will by continuing to resort to the same dishonest tactics, as all heretics do, when attempting to further defend his denial of the Salvation Dogma.

By God's grace and aid I have answered all meritorious challenges in due time—in God's time and way and not in Satan's time and way. The Catholic way to deal with a religious topic is not according to the terms and conditions of heretics, but according to the terms and conditions of Catholics. Instead of clarity, there is only confusion and discord if heretics are allowed free reign and control over a debate because they lie, evade, deceive by mixing truths with half-truths and lies, rant and rave incoherently, and change topics continually without having sufficiently addressed them. This disorderly and dishonest forum only confuses people and prevents them from seeing the truth that the Catholic presents. Because heretics' motives and methods are never just, they cannot be trusted to honestly address a topic.¹

¹ That is why the Catholic Church does not allow heretics to testify against a Catholic in court even if the heretic is correct on the point in question.

Peter changes beliefs like the wind

Once again, I will expose Peter's bad will and more of his heresies and contradictions for the sake of the people whom he is leading astray; but I will do so on my terms and in my forum, not his. In response to RTP, not only did Peter not answer my twelve questions that do not relate to the Salvation Dogma but he also did not answer my second question that does relate to the Salvation Dogma; and he ambiguously answered the first question. The second question I asked Peter related to the question Mr. X asked him as recorded in my article *The Dimond Brothers Deny the Salvation Dogma*:

DDD1, RJMI: "Mr. X: 'Sir, If you don't need pointers on how to communicate just simmer down... Now I am trying to take the points you raised about Mr. Ibranyi one at a time and see how things go. You state above that a Protestant does not become a heretic until he reaches the age of reason **and** then obstinately rejects the Catholic position. I can tell you from personal experience that I, when a Protestant, never was presented with the Catholic position until I was twenty-two years old. Now the questions, please just answer these two questions. Was I, or was I not, a heretic all of those years. Now I was not a formal dissenter as I had not personally repudiated something I had never been presented with, but I was not in the Church was I?'"

RTP, RJMI: "2) Was Mr. X, the man addressed in my article 'The Dimond Brothers Deny the Salvation Dogma,' a Catholic until he was 22 years old? You never answered his question. You had better answer mine, all of them, clearly and without evading, or the exchange ends here."

Although Peter briefly referred to this question, he never actually answered it. One is left wondering if Peter believes that Mr. X was actually a Catholic or could have been a Catholic for the first 21 years of his life during which he professed belief in a false religion (Protestantism) and membership in a non-Catholic sect (a Protestant Church). Mr. X has not yet received a straightforward answer from Peter, nor has Peter addressed other related evidence. I refuted Peter's challenge (CRI) in my book *Baptized Non-Catholic Children* (hereafter BNCC), which Peter attempted to refute in his article "Part3: R.I. Responds – a Mass of Contradictions and Illogical Nonsense" (hereafter RIR). In my book I presented the following four examples: 1) A child's Protestant parents become Jehovah Witnesses,² 2) A baptized child is raised as a Deist, 3) An Anglican child, and 4) A pagan child. Again, proving his bad will, Peter completely ignored these examples and other evidence because it exposes his heretical belief regarding what it takes to make a baptized person with the use of reason fall outside the Catholic Church.

We will now observe Peter's willful ambiguity when he changes his positions back and forth and even within his same article! Peter's original heretical position was that baptized self-professed Protestants could not become heretics unless they first hear of the true Catholic faith so that they can "comprehend the differences between Catholicism and Protestantism" and then obstinately reject a Catholic dogma:

DDD1, RJMI: "Peter Dimond: 'A heretic, by definition, is one who obstinately or stubbornly with pertinacity rejects an article of divine and Catholic Faith. The children of Protestant families do not become Protestants (i.e., heretics) until they

² In my book *Baptized Non-Catholic Children*, I have revised this example; and it is now titled "A child's Catholic parents become Jehovah Witnesses." The principle is the same.

reach an age where they comprehend the differences between Catholicism and Protestantism and then obstinately reject the Catholic position.”

According to Peter, then, as long as self-professed Protestants do not learn the teachings of true Catholicism (the Catholic faith) so that they can “comprehend the differences between Catholicism and Protestantism,” they are inside the Catholic Church as Catholics, no matter what their age. According to Peter, they would be Catholic in spite of the fact that they profess belief in false religions (faiths) or membership in false sects (Protestant Churches). I pointed out the horrible consequences of Peter’s heretical belief by using the following examples:

DDD1, RJMI: “For instance, according to Peter Dimond’s definition of what it takes to become a heretic, the Amish, who are completely isolated from the world, are actually Catholic because from generation to generation they have never been presented with Catholic dogmas. In spite of all their heretical beliefs and practices, Peter would have to say these Amish are actually Catholics. That is, he would have to say this if he does not want to add hypocrisy to his heresy.”

RTP, RJMI: “1) Can a self-professed Protestant—assuming he is validly baptized—who never heard of Catholic dogmas ever be a heretic? If so, then explain how? If not, then you would have to admit that all self-professed Protestants who never heard of Catholic dogmas are actually Catholics, inside the Church, and thus can be saved. Do you agree with this last statement?”

After I presented these examples to Peter, he knew he was wrong and could not defend his heretical belief that the only way a baptized man can become a heretic and a non-Catholic is if he learns of the Catholic faith from a Catholic source in order to “comprehend the differences between Catholicism and Protestantism” and then denies a Catholic dogma. So, Peter merely changed his position in his response (CRI) while never admitting he was wrong. In his response he rightly adds other conditions, although incomplete, that make these baptized men heretics:

CRI, Peter Dimond: “So, when do the baptized children born to heretics or schismatics become heretics and schismatics like their parents? ...If they are baptized and they don’t obstinately reject any dogma of the Catholic Faith or the authority of the Catholic Church because they don’t know about any *other* Catholic dogmas (other than the Trinity and Incarnation) then they are not heretics but Catholics [Christians], unless they hold a position that is incompatible with Faith in the Trinity and the Incarnation or deny a truth that all know about God and the natural law or deny something that they know to be clearly taught in Scripture. In each of these cases, however, they are still rejecting a dogma by rejecting a truth they know to be taught by God.”

So, it seems that Peter no longer believes that the only way baptized men can become heretics is by learning of Catholicism (the Catholic faith) so that they can “comprehend the differences between Catholicism and Protestantism,” which is what he told Mr. X. Peter now rightly includes other conditions that he lists after “unless.” He did not include the “unless” followed by other conditions in his answer to Mr. X. As a matter of fact, he did not yet answer Mr. X’s question that I put before him again in my second question (RTP). Why? Because Peter is not even sure of the other conditions he now mentions that make baptized men heretics. Within Peter’s same article (CRI) and the recent one (RIR), he changes his position back and forth. The other conditions that he rightly mentions he later condemns in his same article. He does this by taking Thomas and others out of context:

CRI, Peter Dimond: “In order to be a heretic one must obstinately reject a Catholic teaching. If one is not aware of the Catholic teaching or is not familiar with the issue involved, he is not necessarily a heretic.

“Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Pt. II-II, Q. 5., A. 3: ‘Now it is manifest that he who adheres to the teaching of the Church, as to an infallible rule, assents to whatever the Church teaches; otherwise, if, of the things taught by the Church, he holds what he chooses to hold, and rejects what he chooses to reject, he no longer adheres to the teaching of the Church as to an infallible rule, but to his own will. **Hence it is evident that a heretic who obstinately disbelieves one article of faith, is not prepared to follow the teaching of the Church in all things; but if he is not obstinate, he is no longer in heresy but only in error.**”

What does Peter think Thomas means in relation to the topic at hand? Thomas says that this type of heretic becomes a heretic by learning of the Catholic Church and Her teachings and then by denying a dogma and also rejecting the teaching authority of the Catholic Church. If Peter believes that this is the only way a baptized man can become a heretic and a non-Catholic, then he condemns his other conditions and *does* believe that Mr. X was Catholic for the first 21 years of his life when he was a self-professed Protestant and invincibly ignorant of the teachings of the Catholic Church. Peter must also believe that the self-professed Amish mentioned above are Catholics and that the baptized children in my Examples 1, 2, and 3 (in my book *Baptized Non-Catholic Children*) are also Catholics. He then takes St. Augustine’s teachings out of context to prove the same thing:

CRI, Peter Dimond: “St. Augustine, *Against the Manichees*: ‘In Christ’s Church, those are heretics, who hold mischievous and erroneous opinions, and when rebuked that they may think soundly and rightly, offer a stubborn resistance, and, refusing to mend their pernicious and deadly doctrines, persist in defending them.’ (quoted by Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Pt. II-II, Q. 11. A. 2.)”

If all baptized men who believe in heresy must be rebuked before they can become heretics, then Peter’s other conditions are again false. Peter would also have to consider John Paul II a Catholic (in spite of all his notorious crimes) until Peter or someone else had justly rebuked John Paul II, and John Paul II then had obstinately rejected the rebuke along with the teaching authority of the Catholic Church.

Thomas and St. Augustine are teaching only one way in which baptized men become heretics, but not the only way. They are specifically referring to baptized men who profess membership in the Roman Catholic Church, profess submission to the Roman Pontiff, attend Mass at Catholic churches, and culpably deny a deeper dogma. (See my article *Deeper Dogmas; the Two Ways to Incur Guilt*.) Certainly Thomas and St. Augustine do not mean what Peter wants the reader to believe they mean; that is, baptized men who have never heard of the Catholic faith or Catholic Church or have never been rebuked could never be heretics and thus are Catholics no matter what false religion they profess or heretical sect they embrace.

Peter has never admitted he was wrong because, in the greater part of his teachings on this topic, he still heretically teaches that the only way a baptized man can become a heretic is by learning of the true Catholic faith from a true Catholic source so that he “can comprehend the differences between Catholicism and Protestantism” and then obstinately rejecting a Catholic dogma. He even teaches in one place that the baptized man must also deny the teaching authority of the Catholic Church to become a heretic, which implies

this man must first know about the Catholic Church. Therefore Peter has changed his position again by refuting the other conditions that he rightly mentioned in CRI, those conditions being that a baptized man can become a heretic without having heard of the Catholic faith or Catholic Church:

CRI, Peter Dimond: “If they are baptized and they don’t obstinately reject any dogma of the Catholic Faith or the authority of the Catholic Church because they don’t know about any *other* Catholic dogmas (other than the Trinity and Incarnation) then they are not heretics but Catholics [Christians], unless they hold a position that is incompatible with Faith in the Trinity and the Incarnation or deny a truth that all know about God and the natural law or deny something that they know to be clearly taught in Scripture. In each of these cases, however, they are still rejecting a dogma by rejecting a truth they know to be taught by God.”

Peter also condemns his other conditions in another place by taking selected teachings of Orestes Brownson and Fr. Michael Muller out of context.

Brownson and Muller denounce Peter

Orestes Brownson

After having taken Orestes Brownson’s and Fr. Michael Muller’s teachings out of context, Peter says the following:

RIR, Peter Dimond: “So, let me summarize: Fr. Muller and Brownson prove exactly what I said, and what R.I. called heretical; they prove that what I said *is the consistent teaching of countless authorities*; yet R.I. says that they are great and that we are heretical.”

In an attempt to sway his readers to embrace his salvation heresy, Peter invokes the teachings of Brownson, Muller, and countless credible authorities—all of which he takes out of context. This is the same ploy used by another salvation heretic, the Rev. Nicholas Russo, whom Fr. Muller refutes:

The Catholic Dogma, p. 213: “To give an example, the Rev. Nicholas Russo, S. J., professor of philosophy in Boston College, says in his book, *The true Religion and its dogmas*:—‘This good faith being supposed, we say that such a Christian (he means a baptized Protestant) is in a way a member of the Catholic Church. Ignorance alone is the cause of his not acknowledging the authority of his true mother. The Catholic Church does not look upon him as wholly a stranger; she calls him her child; she presses him to her maternal heart; through other hands she prepares him to shine in the kingdom of heaven. Yes, the profession of a creed different from the true one will not, of itself, bar the gates of heaven before this Christian; invincible ignorance will, before the tribunal of the just God, ensure the pardon of his errors against faith; and, *if nothing else be wanting*, heaven will be his home for eternity.’ [Fr. Muller] We have already sufficiently refuted these false assertions, and we have quoted them, not for the purpose of refuting them, but for the purpose of denying emphatically what follows after these false assertions...”

The heretic Peter believes that Brownson and Muller’s self-professed Protestants who are material heretics are not only *not* guilty of formal heresy due to invincible ignorance but, unlike Brownson and Muller, Peter also heretically believes that these self-professed Protestants are *inside* the Catholic Church as Catholics. Even though Brownson and

Muller believe that these self-professed Protestants are not guilty of the sin of heresy, they do not believe they are inside the Catholic Church.

Peter, like Rev. Russo, has invoked “countless authorities” out of context to defend his salvation heresy. Peter lies and deceives, as all heretics do, to defend his heresy. Peter attributes to Brownson, Muller, and other credible authorities the very salvation heresy they actually refuted and condemned, while Peter himself embraces the salvation heresy and sides with Brownson’s and Muller’s heretical opponents.

Peter uses the following quote from Brownson, taken from Fr. Muller’s book *The Catholic Dogma*, to try to prove that Brownson believes material heretics who belong to heretical or schismatic sects are actually inside the Catholic Church as Catholics or “Protestants in good faith”:

RIR, Peter Dimond: “Fr. Muller quoting Orestes Brownson, in *The Catholic Dogma*, p. 204: ‘Unquestionably, authorities in any number may be cited to prove – what nobody [EXCEPT R.I.] disputes – that pertinacity in rejecting the authority of the Church is essential to formal or culpable heresy, that persons may be in heretical societies without being culpable heretics, and therefore, that we cannot say that all who live and die in such societies are damned precisely for the sin of heresy.’”

Brownson does not say that these Protestants whom he believes are non-culpable (material) heretics are inside the Catholic Church and thus in the way of salvation. He teaches the opposite, that they are outside the Catholic Church and in damnation even though not precisely for the sin of heresy. Even though Brownson, in my opinion, wrongly teaches that they may not be guilty of the “sin of heresy,” he, as well as Muller, does not deny the Salvation Dogma because he rightly believes, as I do, that these Protestants are outside the Catholic Church and thus on the road to hell.

In his article RIR, Peter deliberately omitted Brownson’s following quote, taken from Fr. Muller’s book *The Catholic Dogma*. I say with all certainty that Peter deliberately omitted it because I included this quote in my book *Baptized Non-Catholic Children* that Peter has attempted to refute. Why did he omit it? - Because it proves that he took Orestes Brownson’s above quote out of context, and it actually condemns Peter’s position as heretical and supports my position as orthodox:

The Catholic Dogma, Fr. Muller: “[pp., 204-205] [O. A. Brownson says,] ‘A man may, indeed, not be damned for his erroneous faith, and yet be damned for sins not remissible without the true faith, and for the want of virtues impracticable out of the communion of the Church. ...[p. 269] How many of our Catholics, though holding Protestantism to be an error against Faith and antagonistic to the Church, hold that the mass of Protestants are out of the way of salvation, and can never see God in the beatific vision, unless before they die they become Catholics, united to Christ in the Church, which is His Body? If we assert the contrary, are we not met with theological distinction, logical refinements, subtle explanations and qualification, which place us altogether in the wrong?’

“...[pp. 181-182] ‘The Church,’ says Dr. O. A. Brownson, ‘teaches that the infant validly baptized, by whomsoever the baptism be administered, receives in the sacrament the infused habit of faith and sanctity, and that this habit (*habitus*) suffices for salvation till the child comes to the use of reason. Hence all baptized infants dying in infancy are saved.

“‘But when arrived at the use of reason, the child needs something beyond this infused habit, and it is bound to elicit the act of faith. The habit is not actual faith, and is only a supernatural facility infused by grace, of eliciting the actual virtue of faith. The habit of sanctity is lost by mortal sin, but the habit of faith, we are told, is

lost by a positive act of infidelity or heresy. This is not strictly true; for the habit may be lost by the omission to elicit the act of faith, which neither is nor can be elicited out of the Catholic Church; for out of her the credible object, which is *Deus revelans et Ecclesia proponens*, (God revealing and the Church proposing for our belief) is wanting. Consequently, outside of the Church there can be no salvation for any one, even though baptized, who has come to the use of reason. The habit given in Baptism then ceases to suffice, and the obligation to elicit the act begins.

“We may be told that it may not be through one's own fault that he omits to elicit the act, especially when born and brought up in a community hostile, or alien to the Church. Who denies it? But from that it does not follow either that the habit is not lost by the omission, or that the elicitation of the act is not necessary, in the case of every adult, to salvation. Invincible ignorance excuses from sin, we admit, in that whereof one is invincibly ignorant, but it confers no virtue, and is purely negative. It excuses from sin, if you will, the omission to elicit the act, but it cannot supply the defect caused by the omission. Something more than to be excused from the sin of infidelity or heresy is necessary to salvation.”

As you have just read, Brownson teaches the opposite of what Peter would have his readers believe. Peter dishonestly attributed to Brownson the very heresy Brownson was refuting. After knowing that Brownson believes all baptized men, material heretics included, with the use of reason who profess a false faith or belong to a heretical sect are outside the Catholic Church, we can see that Peter also took Brownson's following quote out of context to defend Peter's own salvation heresy:

RIR, Peter Dimond: “Orestes Brownson, as quoted in *The Catholic Dogma* by Fr. Muller, p. 61: ‘There are, we like to believe, **among Protestants**, many individuals who are far superior to their Protestantism...It is not these, as men, as individuals, that we denounce, **for many of them we honor and esteem**, but the Protestantism with which they are associated.’”

Brownson does not denounce this class of self-professed Protestants as he does the more culpable class of self-professed Protestants; however, he nevertheless denounces both classes as being outside the Catholic Church as non-Catholics. The more culpable class he refers to as genuine or orthodox Protestants because they believe the truth is only a matter of opinion. The less culpable class he refers to as not genuine Protestants because they believe the truth is not a matter of opinion; thus he also refers to them as “laggards,” lagging behind the genuine Protestants:

The Catholic Dogma, pp. 61-62: “[O. A. Brownson says,] ‘There are, we like to believe, among Protestants, many individuals who are far superior to their Protestantism, who have not yet learned to distrust reason, who hold that truth is obligatory, that religion is the law of conscience, who are honest, upright, kind-hearted, and benevolent according to their light, and who mean to be true Christian believers. These can be reasoned with and be more or less affected by argument; but they are not genuine Protestants. They may not very well understand the doctrines retained from the Church by the early reformers, but they believe them to be revealed truths, which it would be sinful in them to deny, not mere opinions which one is free to hold or not, hold according to his pleasure. These serve to keep up a show of religion in the several Protestant sects, but they are not governed by the Protestant spirit, and if carried away, by the Protestant movement, they are not its leaders. They are the laggards in the onward march of Protestantism. You find some of them in Geneva, who in earnest condemn the measures adopted by the Council against Bishop Mermillod and the Catholic clergy; some, like Herr von Gerlach, in Prussia, who resist with all the means in their power the legislation demanded by the government against the Church and her faithful pastors; and a small number

even in this country who openly oppose the iniquity of taxing Catholics for the support of schools to which their consciences forbid them to send their children. It is not these, as men, as individuals, that we denounce, for many of them we honor and esteem, but the Protestantism with which they are associated. ... A few of the laggards may be occasionally captured, but most of them will quicken their pace and close up with the main body. Individual conversions, indeed, are made, which in the aggregate are considerable, but which are little more than the dust in the balance compared with the whole number of Protestants, and are by far outnumbered by the Catholics who lapse, here and elsewhere, into Protestantism or infidelity.”

While Brownson does not denounce these laggards as true Protestants, he does not teach they are inside the Catholic Church, that they are Catholics. He teaches that they are outside the Catholic Church and must convert into the Catholic Church. “A few of the laggards may be occasionally captured... Individual conversions, indeed, are made...” If he believed the laggards were inside the Catholic Church, then they would not need to convert. And most of all, Brownson’s other teachings as presented in *The Catholic Dogma* as I quoted above prove that he does not believe these laggards are inside the Catholic Church. Therefore Peter has indeed taken Brownson’s teachings out of context, and it is Peter who holds the very salvation heresy that Brownson refutes.

Fr. Michael Muller

While Fr. Muller believed that Protestants who never heard of the Catholic religion are only material heretics, he also believed that these material heretics are nevertheless Protestants, outside the Catholic Church, and thus not in the way of salvation. While deliberately omitting this last part of Muller’s teachings, Peter only presented the first part. Both parts of Fr. Muller’s teachings are found in his book *The Catholic Dogma*, and both parts are necessary to read in order to understand Muller’s actual belief. Taking Muller out of context, Peter only presented the one part of Muller’s teaching that seems to defend Peter’s own heresy:

RIR, Peter Dimond: “In his blind pride and ignorance he is oblivious to the fact that they [Brownson and Muller] teach many times the very thing he [RJMI] condemns as heretical.

“Fr. Michael Muller, *The Catholic Dogma*, p. 166: ‘**Not guilty of the sin of heresy are all those who, without any fault of theirs, were brought up in a sect of Protestantism,** and who never had an opportunity of knowing better. This class of Protestants are called invincibly or inculpably ignorant of the true religion, or material heretics.’

“The only way that baptized infants when reaching the age of reason can cease to be Catholic is through heresy, schism or apostasy. But Fr. Muller is saying that many of these people among the Protestants (!) are not guilty of heresy.”

Peter attributes to Muller heretical beliefs that clearly do not exist in Muller’s above quote. Muller did not say these material heretics did not “cease to be Catholic.” Instead, Muller teaches that they have ceased to be Catholic because he refers to them as Protestants when he says, “This class of Protestants.” Changing Muller’s words, Peter says that Muller refers to these material heretics as “people among the Protestants,” meaning that they are not Protestants. Not only did Muller *not* say this, but he also

condemns Peter's interpretation. Muller clearly refers to them as Protestants when he says, "This class of Protestants." Muller did not say, "This class of people among Protestants," as Peter would have his readers believe.

At this point we stop to take note of Peter's heretical belief. He has again denied the Salvation Dogma by believing that self-professed Protestants who have not learned about the true Catholic religion and who are only material heretics according to Brownson and Muller's conditions are actually Catholics, inside the Catholic Church. That is what Peter wrongly thinks Brownson and Muller are teaching, and that is what Peter agrees with—his own misinterpretation of their teachings that he uses to defend his salvation heresy. To be consistent, Peter would then have to agree with the Baltimore Catechisms' salvation heresy that first opened the door to salvation only for certain baptized men who lived and died as self-professed members of heretical sects:

The Original Baltimore Catechism No. 3: "**Q. 510. Is it ever possible for one to be saved who does not know the Catholic Church to be the true Church?** A. It is possible for one to be saved who does not know the Catholic Church to be the true Church, provided that person: (1) Has been validly baptized; (2) Firmly believes the religion he professes and practices to be the true religion, and (3) Dies without the guilt of mortal sin on his soul.

“Q. 512. How are such persons said to belong to the Church? A. Such persons are said to belong to the ‘soul of the church’; that is, they are really members of the Church without knowing it. Those who share in its Sacraments and worship are said to belong to the body or visible part of the Church.”

(For further explanation see my book *The Salvation Dogma: Salvation Heresy Enters Catechisms in U.S.A.*) I will now let Fr. Muller refute this heresy that is contained in the Baltimore Catechism and Peter's heretical belief that he attributed to Muller. Conclusive proof of Muller's actual belief is found in *The Catholic Dogma* quotes that Peter deliberately omitted in RIR. While Fr. Muller believes these self-professed Protestants are only material heretics, he does not believe they are inside the Catholic Church either as Catholics or "Protestants in good faith." If he did, he would be a salvation heretic like Peter. Muller clearly teaches that these self-professed Protestants are outside the Catholic Church and thus on the road to hell. In spite of Fr. Muller's belief in the erroneous theology which teaches that these Protestants are material heretics, he formulated an excellent theology proving that these Protestants cannot be inside the Catholic Church.

It is important to note that Muller's and Brownson's reference to material heretics applies only to baptized men who profess false religions or belong to heretical sects. Muller and Brownson do not label as material heretics Catholics who err in good faith; that is, baptized men who profess membership in the Roman Catholic Church, profess submission to the Roman Pontiff, attend Mass at Catholic churches, and non-culpably deny a deeper dogma:

The Catholic Dogma, Fr. Michael Muller: "[p. 186] An ignorant Catholic is not a material heretic; he is a member of the Body of Christ ... [p. 187] Nothing of the kind is true of a material heretic, because he is out of the Church and therefore no member of Christ's body. ... [p. 204] 'The Catholic,' says Dr. O. A. Brownson, 'who holds implicitly the Catholic faith, but errs through invincible ignorance with regard to some of its *consectaria* and even dogmas, may be saved; but how can a man be said to hold implicitly the Catholic faith, who holds nothing or rejects every

principle that implies it? It is not safe to apply to Protestants, who really deny everything Catholic, a rule that is very just when applied to sincere but ignorant Catholics, or Catholics that err through inculpable ignorance. Protestantism does not stand on the footing of ordinary heterodoxy; it is no more Christian than was Greek and Roman paganism.”

According to Muller and Brownson, only those who belong to Protestant sects can be material heretics. They also teach that these baptized men who profess false faiths or belong to heretical sects can never be excused even if they are only material heretics because they do not belong to the Roman Catholic Church:

The Catholic Dogma, Fr. Michael Muller, pp. 178-181: “All heretics, formal as well as material, are separated from this divine authority, and therefore even the acts of faith made by material heretics are by no means acts of divine faith, in spite of their inculpable ignorance of the divine authority of the Church. Suppose such a Protestant has counterfeit money in his possession, which he innocently believes to be quite genuine, is his money, from being counterfeit, changed into genuine money by his inculpable ignorance in the matter. In like manner, the acts of faith made by a material heretic are counterfeit acts of faith, because they are not based upon the authority of God, speaking through the authority of his true Church. These acts are without a divine foundation.

“In inculpable ignorance of this fundamental truth for true acts of faith there is no power whatever to change counterfeit acts of faith into divine acts of faith. All that can be said in favor of this kind of heretics is that they may have the disposition for believing what is right, and this disposition comes from God and prepares such Protestants for receiving the gift of the true faith when they come to know it.

“...As long, then, as a material heretic, though through inculpable ignorance, adheres to an heretical sect, he is separated from Christ, because he is separated from his Body—the Catholic Church. In that state he cannot make any supernatural acts of divine faith, hope, and charity, which are necessary to obtain life everlasting, and therefore, if he dies in that state, he is pronounced infallibly lost by St. Augustine.

“...One of the effects of Baptism is that, when children are validly baptized, they receive, together with the indelible character of a Christian, the habit of faith, —or a capacity, a power or faculty which enables them, when they come to the use of reason, and are instructed by the Catholic Church in revealed truths, to make acts of divine faith, this habit of faith enabling them to see clearly and believe firmly the truths of the Catholic religion. A baptized child is a child of God, and God lives in the soul of that child and is its Father. So, when God speaks through his Church to that child, it easily recognizes the voice that speaks to him as the voice of God, and firmly believes whatever that voice teaches him to believe. But this habitual divine faith is lost by the profession of heresy, material heresy not excepted. To a child that is brought up in heresy, God does not speak when it hears the voice of a heretical teacher; if it believes that teacher, it believes not God, but man, and its faith is human, which cannot lead it to God. (See Thomas, *De Fide*, Q. V., art. iii.; *Cursus Compl. Theologiae*, vol. 21, Q. III., art. iii., *de Suscipientibus Baptismum*. Instruction in Christ, Doct. chapt. ii.)

“This may be more clear from the following: If a person who has come to the use of reason and professes heresy at the time of his baptism, he is indeed indelibly marked as a Christian, but he is not sanctified—the other supernatural effects of baptism being suspended for want of the proper dispositions or preparations which are required to receive not only the sacrament, but also its supernatural effects. One of the most essential requisites to receive these effects is to have the true faith, *i.e.*, to believe God, speaking through the Catholic Church. Now heresy, material heresy not excepted, is a want of this faith, on account of which the supernatural effects of baptism are suspended. God cannot unite himself with a soul that lives in heresy,

even though it be only material heresy. As the supernatural sanctifying effects in this case are suspended, so they are for the same reason, destroyed in him who was baptized in his infancy and became a heretic, though only a material heretic, when he came to the use of reason. This person, to be again reconciled with God, must renounce heresy, believe the Catholic Church, and receive worthily the sacrament of penance; or if this cannot be had, he must have perfect contrition or charity with the desire (at least implicit) to receive the sacrament of penance. The other person, however, will be reconciled with God and truly sanctified, as soon as he renounces heresy, believes the Catholic Church, and has at least attrition (imperfect supernatural sorrow) for his sins, because it is then that the supernatural sanctifying effects of baptism take place. It is therefore evident that, if these persons and others like them were to die in heresy, they would be lost forever. (See Theolog. Curs. Compl. De Confirmatione, Part II., Q. II., art. vi.)”

Why, then, did Peter ignore these important quotes that put Muller’s teaching into context? - Because they expose Peter’s lies and deceptions and condemn Peter as a salvation heretic. They also vindicate his slandering of Fr. Muller. They prove that Peter attributes to Muller the heretical doctrine that Muller was opposing. Peter, then, agrees with some of the heretical positions of Fr. Muller’s heretical opponents; namely, the Reverends Sir Oracle, Cronin, and Young. For example, Peter’s heretical belief coincides with Rev. Young’s following heretical belief that Muller refutes:

The Catholic Dogma, Fr. Michael Muller: “[p. 184-185] ‘As a Protestant,’ continues the Rev. A. Young, ‘I was always taught that the Christian religion was divinely true, because it was the religion of Christ, who was God incarnate. I was taught and firmly assented to all the doctrines of the Christian religion as formulated in the Apostles’ and the Nicene Creed, in precisely the same words, and, to all intents and purposes, in *precisely the same sense that I now recite them as a Catholic*. Whatever the Apostles meant and whatever the Council of Nice meant to convey, whether I perfectly understood it or not, I meant to believe, and did believe; and therefore, whensoever I recited those Creeds, I made distinct acts of divine faith, most unquestionably. And it is also beyond a doubt that I implicitly included in my acts of divine faith *all* divine truth that God has ever revealed to mankind.

“...[p. 184] ‘I was brought up to believe that the Roman Catholic Church was the Church of Antichrist; that she was the scarlet woman of Babylon, and the Pope the man of sin; that she taught false doctrines; that she was the great enemy of all the Christian truth, morality, and love of God. I read the wandering Jew, I also read many other horrible, lying, immoral books written to defame the Roman Catholic Church; and as there was no opportunity for me to learn better I believed them to be true.

“...[p. 186] ‘Being unfortunately brought up a Protestant,’ continues the Rev. A. Young, ‘I *was like* an ignorant Catholic in good faith who failed to learn all that the Catholic Church, the visible, authorized teacher of all divine truth, does teach.

“...[p. 190] ‘I, moreover,’ continues the Rev. A. Young, ‘naturally (providentially, I must say, since it was not my fault) mistook my own Episcopalian Church to be what the Roman Catholic Church is. Therefore it cannot be questioned that, when I recited the Creed, and said, “I believe in the Holy Catholic Church,” and believed at the same time that the Episcopal Church was that Catholic Church, I certainly made acts of divine faith.’”

Young had not heard of the true Catholic faith, but instead was taught falsely about the Catholic faith so that in no way could it be said he had ever learned of the true Catholic faith so as to “comprehend the differences between [true] Catholicism and Protestantism,” which according to Peter is a necessary condition to be a formal heretic and to fall outside the Catholic Church. And Young even believed he was a true Catholic

and professed belief in all the articles of the Nicene Creed, which according to Peter is more than enough to be Catholic if one has not been taught about the other dogmas of the Catholic Church from a true Catholic source.

Even though I believe Muller is wrong for referring to Young as a material heretic (I can easily prove Young was a formal heretic), Muller never denied the Salvation Dogma by teaching that Young was inside the Catholic Church either as a Catholic or a “Protestant in good faith.” Whereas, if Peter concedes that Young was only a material heretic, he would also have to believe Young was Catholic because Peter takes the erroneous theology regarding material heretics to its heretical conclusion. Remember, Peter took Muller’s following teachings out of context (as I have already proven):

RIR, Peter Dimond: “In his blind pride and ignorance he is oblivious to the fact that they [Brownson and Muller] teach many times the very thing he [RJMI] condemns as heretical.

“Fr. Michael Muller, *The Catholic Dogma*, p. 166: ‘**Not guilty of the sin of heresy are all those who, without any fault of theirs, were brought up in a sect of Protestantism**, and who never had an opportunity of knowing better. This class of Protestants are called invincibly or inculpably ignorant of the true religion, or material heretics.’

“The only way that baptized infants when reaching the age of reason can cease to be Catholic is through heresy, schism or apostasy. But Fr. Muller is saying that many of these people among the Protestants (!) are not guilty of heresy.”

Therefore, Peter clearly teaches that baptized men who profess false faiths or belong to heretical sects and who are not formal (obstinate) heretics are actually Catholics because they can only fall outside the Church by formal heresy (obstinately denying a dogma). Hence, if Peter concedes that Young was only a material heretic, he would also have to concede that Young was inside the Catholic Church and was Catholic. Other salvation heretics would refer to Young as a “Protestant in good faith” who is inside the Catholic Church. As Muller refutes Young’s above statements, he also refutes Peter:

The Catholic Dogma, Fr. Michael Muller: “[p. 185-186] ‘Insane people,’ said one day a certain gentleman to me, ‘are also called men, but they are not the right sort of men.’ In like manner material heretics may call themselves Christians, and their sects Christian Churches; but they are not the right sort of Christians and their sects are not the true Church of Christ. They are not Catholic Christians, and therefore they are not the Church of Christ.

“...[pp. 185-186] So the Rev. A. Young believed in a Christian religion, but not in the right sort of Christian religion, because it was not the Catholic Christian religion. He believed in the Christian Church, but not in the Catholic Christian Church, ‘which,’ as he candidly avows, ‘he, in his ignorance, hated, detested and feared, believing her to be the Church of Antichrist, etc.’ That he recited the Apostles’ and Nicene Creed does not change the matter. For ‘it may happen,’ says St. Augustine, ‘that a heretic holds all the words of the Creed, and yet does not believe rightly, because he does not believe the divine truths of the Creed, as explained by the Church; under these words heretics generally hide their venomous doctrines.’ (De Fide et. Symb. c. 1.)

“St. Cyprian says the same (Epist. 76 ad Magn.): ‘Should any one say that a Novatian holds the same law that the Catholic Church holds, that he baptizes in the symbol (Creed) as we do, etc., let him know first that the law of our symbol is not one and the same with that of the schismatics, nor are our questions the same with theirs: for if any one is asked, dost thou believe the remission of sins and life everlasting through the Holy Church? their answer to this question is a lie, since

they have not the Church.’

“...[pp. 190-192] In answer to this, we say with Dr. A. O. Brownson, who asks: ‘But may not those who are baptized in heretical societies through ignorance, believing them to be the Church of Christ, be regarded as in the way of salvation? Not they who are born and educated in Protestant Churches who have separated themselves from the unity of the Catholic Church, but their ancestors, Calvin, Luther, Henry VIII., etc. Let St. Augustine reply: “But those who *through ignorance* are baptized there (with heretics), judging the sect to be the Church of Christ, sin less than these (who know it to be heretical); *nevertheless they are wounded by the sacrilege of schism*, and therefore sin not lightly, because others sin more gravely. For when it is said to certain persons, it shall be more tolerable for Sodom in the day of judgment than for you, it is not therefore said because the Sodomites will not be punished, but because the others will be more grievously punished.”’

““And again, St. Augustine says: “It is true, Donatists who baptize heathens heal them of the wound of idolatry or infidelity; but they inflict on them *a more serious wound instead, the wound of schism*. Those of the people of God in the Old Law, who fell into idolatry, were destroyed by the sword, but under the feet of the authors of schism the earth opened and swallowed them up (Ps. cv. 17.), and the rest of their followers were consumed by a flame of fire from heaven. (Ecclus. xlv. 24.) Who, therefore, can doubt that those who were more severely punished had also sinned more grievously?” (De Bapt. contr. Donatist., lib. i, c. 8.) Those idolaters who were baptized by the Donatists, and believed in Christ, were healed of their wound of infidelity; they never lived in the unity of the Catholic Church. They never wilfully left her in their ancestors, as Rev. A. Young and other heretics did; and yet St. Augustine tells us that the wound of schism which they received by adhering to the sect of the Donatists was more fatal for them than that which they had received before by the crime of idolatry. Now the wound inflicted by heresy, though material, is still more fatal than that of schism. Hence those who are separated from the Church cannot be innocent. (St. Augustine, lib. i. contr. Epist. Parm., c. 3.) “Where there is no unity in faith, there can be no divine charity. Therefore divine charity can be kept *only in the unity of the Church*.” (St. Augustine, contr. lit. Petil. lib. ii. C. 77.)

““As a person who has, in his ignorance, taken very poisonous food, becomes very sick from it and may even die, if the effects of it cannot be controlled in due time by medicine, so, in like manner, he who has taken, though ignorantly, the very poisonous food of heretical doctrines, becomes most fatally wounded by it in his soul, and unless this poison is expelled from the soul before death, by a sincere renunciation of heresy and by profession of the true faith in the Church, the soul will be lost for ever.

““Our Blessed Saviour, in one short sentence, clearly shows the miserable fate of all those who follow false teachers, when he says, “They are blind teachers of the blind; and if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the pit.” (Matt. xv. 14.) This evidently shows that the lot of both shall be the same, and that all the dreadful curses pronounced in Holy Scripture upon the teachers of false religions will also fall upon those who follow them blindly.””

The salvation heretic Sir Oracle, whom Muller refutes in the following quote, professes the very heresy that Peter does with one exception: Peter refers to these baptized men with the use of reason who profess a false faith or belong to a heretical sect as Catholics, while Sir Oracle refers to them as “Protestants in good faith,” and both believe these baptized men are inside the Catholic Church:

The Catholic Dogma, Fr. Michael Muller, pp. 202-203: “[Sir Oracle says], ‘Catholics do not believe that Protestants who are baptized, who lead a good life, love God and their neighbor, and are *blamelessly* ignorant of the just claims of the

Catholic religion to be the only one true Religion (which is called being in *good faith*), are excluded from Heaven, provided they believe that there is one God in three Divine Persons; that God will duly reward the good and punish the wicked; that Jesus Christ is the son of God made man, who redeemed us, and in whom we must trust for our salvation; and provided they thoroughly repent of having ever, by their sins, offended God.

“Catholics hold that Protestants who have these dispositions, and who have no suspicion of their religion being false, and no means to discover, or fail in their honest endeavors to discover, the true religion, and who are so disposed in their heart that they would *at any cost* embrace the Roman Catholic Religion if they knew it to be the true one, *are Catholics in spirit* and in some sense within the Catholic Church, without themselves knowing it. She holds that these Christians belong to... the Catholic Church, although they are not united to the visible *body* of the Church by external communion with her, and by the outward profession of her faith.”

Again, I will let Fr. Muller and Orestes Brownson denounce Sir Oracle and Peter as salvation heretics:

The Catholic Dogma, Fr. Michael Muller: “[pp. 203-204] [Fr. Michael Muller says,] It is a well-known fact that many Protestants are baptized only when they are grown up. If validly baptized, they were, it is true, indelibly marked with the character of the sacrament of Baptism, but they did not receive the supernatural effects of Baptism—they were not justified—for want of the proper dispositions. The Council of Trent teaches that the very first condition to receive the grace of justification in Baptism is true Catholic faith. When this faith is wanting in a person, the supernatural effects of Baptism remain, suspended until such a baptized person becomes a true member of the Catholic Church. If such baptized Protestants die in that state they will be lost forever.

“Those Protestants who were baptized in their infancy, and were brought up in heresy after they had come to the use of reason, became separated from the Church, and could not preserve, as St. Augustine says, divine charity out of the unity of the Church, and without such charity it is impossible to be saved.

“Besides, those four great truths of salvation must be believed, as Cornelius a Lapide remarks, with divine faith, to be of any avail towards salvation. But how could those persons have this divine faith and true repentance for sins without the special mercy of God, who grants these gifts only to true converts to the Church. ‘Remission of sin’ says St. Fulgentius, ‘cannot be obtained anywhere except in the Church.’

“And how could such persons even think of joining the Church, unless they are made to understand that they can find their salvation only in the Church. And then they would need a special grace to come up to their duty. And how could they be Catholics in spirit without having the true faith and divine charity? And how could they belong to the Soul of the Church, since that soul is not in them—that is, true faith and divine charity, which, we repeat, can be had only in the unity of the Church?

“...[pp. 63-64] [O. A. Brownson says,] ‘We know nothing more reprehensible than the mambypambyism babbled by sentimental Catholics about the good faith of “our separated brethren.” There may be persons in good faith amongst Protestants, but, if so, they do not lack opportunities of showing it, and of coming out from the Babylon in which they have been reared. Men cannot be saved without Christ, for there is no other name given under heaven whereby they can be saved. Without faith it is impossible to please God, and he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and is the remunerator of them that seek him; and how can those be saved by Christ who adhere to the party that rejects him and makes war on him. And how can they have faith or believe in God who commune with those who resolve all faith, all

belief, all truth, indeed, into a mere opinion, or an inward sentiment, varying with each individual? If Catholicity is Christian, if reason is authoritative in its own province, nothing is more certain than that Protestantism is in no sense Christian, and that persons living and dying Protestants cannot be saved. It is a stultification of common sense to maintain the contrary, and besides, it practically neutralizes all our efforts to convert Protestants, and to bring them to a living and saving faith in Christ.

“‘We know what theologians say of invincible ignorance and we do not contradict them: Invincible ignorance excuses from sin in that whereof one is invincibly ignorant; but it gives no faith, no virtue; and without faith, without positive virtue, no man can be saved.’”

Peter also slanders St. Francis de Sales by taking his following teaching out of context, just as he did with Brownson and Muller, to try to prove that St. Francis believed in the salvation heresy which Peter has embraced:

RIR, Peter Dimond: “St. Francis De Sales, *The Catholic Controversy*, p. 334, **to the Calvinists**: ‘For, by supposition, let us say that there was never Church, nor Council, nor pastor, nor doctor, since the Apostles, and that the Holy Scripture contains only those books which it pleases Calvin, Beza, and Martyr to acknowledge; that there is no infallible rule for understanding it rightly, but that it is at the mercy of the notions of everybody who likes to maintain that he is interpreting Scripture by Scripture, and by the analogy of the faith – as one might say he would get to understand Aristotle by Aristotle and by the analogy of philosophy. Only let us acknowledge that this Scripture is divine. **And I maintain before all equitable judges that if not all, at least those amongst you who had some knowledge and ability, are inexcusable, and cannot defend their choice of religion from lightness and rashness.**’”

St. Francis does not say or even imply that those who are excused from a greater sin, such as those who know of the Catholic faith and reject it, are not guilty of any sin at all and that they are inside the Catholic Church. (See my book *Baptized Non-Catholic Children*: What, then, is their sin?)

What about those who do not believe in a heresy

Not only do Brownson and Muller teach that all material heretics who belong to heretical sects are outside the Catholic Church, but, upholding the Salvation Dogma, they also teach that even baptized persons with the use of reason who belong to heretical sects but have not yet professed belief in a heresy are outside the Catholic Church. They teach that these baptized persons mortally sin and thus fall outside the Catholic Church for adhering to a false sect and that even their professed beliefs in the Most Holy Trinity and the other articles of the Creed are not sufficient for salvation because they believe them with a human faith and not a divine faith; that is, even though they do believe in certain dogmas, they do not believe them because the Catholic Church infallibly teaches them but because they agree with a human opinion:

The Catholic Dogma, Fr. Muller, pp. 199-201: “[Dr. O. A. Brownson says], ‘...Infants, validly baptized, by whomsoever baptized, are made members of the Body of our Lord, and, if dying before coming to the age of reason go immediately to heaven. But persons having come to the age of reason, baptized in an heretical society, or persons baptized in such society in infancy, and adhering to it after having come to the years of understanding—for there can be no difference between

the two classes—whether through ignorance or not, are, as we have seen, out of unity, and therefore out of charity, without which they are nothing. Their faith, if they have any, does not avail them; their sacraments are sacrilegious. The wound of sacrilege is mortal, and the only possible way of being healed is through the sacrament of Reconciliation or Penance. But for these to stand in the same relation to this sacrament that catechumens do to the sacrament of Faith, they must cease to adhere to their heretical societies, must come out from among them, seek and find the Church, recognize her as the Church, believe what she teaches, voluntarily subject themselves to her laws, knock at the door, will to enter, standing waiting to enter as soon as she opens and says, Come in. If they do all this, they are substantially in the same category with catechumens; and if, prevented by death from receiving the visible sacrament in reality, they may be saved, yet not as simply joined to the soul of the Church, but as in effect joined or restored to her external Communion. By their voluntary renunciation of their heretical or schismatic society, by their explicit recognition of the Church, by their actual return to her door, by their dispositions and will to enter, they are effectually, if not in form, members of the body as well as the soul. Persons excommunicated stand on the same footing as these. They are excluded from the Church, unless they repent. If they repent and receive the visible sacrament of Reconciliation, either in reality or in desire, they may be saved because the Church, in excommunicating them, has willed their amendment, not their exclusion from the people of God; but we have no authority to affirm their salvation on any other condition.

“‘The apparent exception alleged turns out, therefore, to be no real exception at all; for the persons excepted are still members of the Body of the Church in effect, as the authorities referred to labor to prove. They are persons who renounced their infidel and heretical societies, and have found and explicitly recognized the Church. Their approach to the Church is *explicit*, not *constructive*, to be inferred only from a certain vague and indefinite longing for the truth and unity in general, predicable in fact, we should suppose, of nearly all men; for no man ever clings to falsehood and division, believing them to be such. Their desire for truth and unity is explicit. Their faith is the Catholic faith; the unity they will is Catholic unity; the Church at whose door they knock is the Catholic Church; the sacrament they solicit, they solicit from the hands of her legitimate priest. They are in effect Catholics, and though not actually and properly in the Church, nobody ever dreams of so understanding the article, “out of the Church no one can be saved,” as to exclude them from salvation.’”

The Catholic Dogma, Fr. Muller, p. 175-178: “[Fr. Muller says,] Those who have not the true faith cannot make an act of faith as it ought to be made, that is, in the manner determined by the true faith. And what Thomas means by ‘*Ipsum credere, to believe God*,’ he tells us in II-II, q. v., art. 3, in which he says: ‘The formal object of faith is the First Truth (that is, God himself) such as he is known from Holy Scripture and from the *doctrine of the Church*, which (doctrine) proceeds from the First Truth. Hence any one who does not adhere to the infallible and divine rule of faith—to the doctrine of the Church, which proceeds from the First Truth as made known in the Holy Scripture, cannot have the habit of faith; but if he holds certain truths of faith, he holds them not by faith, but by some other reasons. But it is clear that he who adheres to the doctrine of the Church as to the infallible rule of belief, assents to all that the Church teaches; he, however, who chooses to believe some of those truths which the Church teaches, and to reject others, instead of adhering to the doctrine of the Church as the infallible rule of faith, adheres only to his own private will or judgment.

“‘Those articles of faith in which a heretic does not err, he does not believe in the same manner as a Catholic believes them; for a Catholic believes them by unhesitatingly adhering to the First Truth (as made known in Holy Scripture and in the doctrine of the Church), to do which he needs the help of the habit of faith; but a

heretic does not hold certain articles of faith by this infallible rule, but only by his own choice and private judgment. He whose faith is not based upon the infallible and divine rule of faith, has no true faith at all; for he who does not believe God in the way determined by the true faith, does not believe God.

““We cannot believe absolutely a divine truth proposed for our belief unless we know that such a truth is proposed for our belief by an infallible and divine authority; it is only then that both the intellect and the will are infallibly directed to believe, and to adhere to the object of faith—God and his revealed truths—as the principle end of man, on account of which he assents to divine truths. As this infallible and divine authority is found only in the Catholic Church, it is evident that true acts of faith can be made only by him who adheres to this authority.” (Sum. 22 q. ii. art. ii., ad 3; 3, 22, q. iv., art. 5...)

“...Faith, therefore, to be truly divine and saving, must be based upon the divine Authority of God as invested in the Roman Catholic Church.

“Without a visible, infallible Head of the Church it would be impossible to have an infallible rule of faith, whereby to know with certainty what to believe and what to do. Hence he who is separated from the Church and is not obedient to her has no infallible rule of faith; he has no longer any criterion whereby he can know what he has to believe and to do. Without this divine authority of the Church, neither the principles of divine revelation nor even those of human reason have any support, because the utterances of the one as well as those of the other will then be interpreted by every one as he pleases...

“So, without the divine authority of the Roman Catholic Church, we can hold no revealed truth on divine authority; if we hold any Catholic truths, we believe them only on human authority; and such belief is no divine faith. Acts of divine faith, therefore, consist in believing firmly what God tells us through the divine authority of his Church.”

Peter heretically teaches below that certain baptized children who have the use of reason and who are self-professed Protestants (such as those who profess to be Calvinists) can be inside the Catholic Church without knowing it in spite of the fact that they willfully adhere to a heretical sect that opposes the Catholic religion and the Catholic Church:

RIR, Peter Dimond: “Those baptized persons among the Calvinists who believe in the Trinity and Incarnation (the essential mysteries of the Catholic Faith), but who have not obstinately embraced the Calvinists’ heresies because they do not yet know or understand the distinction between them and Catholic teaching, are not necessarily heretics.”

CRI, Peter Dimond: “It should be pointed out that those people who are above reason in notoriously heretical or schismatical church buildings, such as Protestant or Eastern Schismatic churches, must be presumed to be heretics in the external forum, even if a few of them aren’t because they have not yet obstinately rejected a dogma or the Church. This is because malice is presumed in the external forum until the contrary is proven (canon 2200.2). We cannot say infallibly that all of them are, in fact, heretics because it’s possible that a small number of the younger ones are not heretics, but Catholics, as I have shown.”

Peter, I ask you to address the following three examples (from my book *Baptized Non-Catholic Children*) that you evaded commenting on:

Example 1: A child’s Protestant parents become Jehovah Witnesses

“What are the consequences if a baptized child’s parents become Jehovah Witnesses (who deny the Most Holy Trinity and Incarnation) before their child attains the use of reason? And, as soon as the child attains the use of reason, his parents teach him

that Jesus is only a man and that God is not the Most Holy Trinity, without mentioning the Catholic Church or the Catholic religion. Therefore this child has neither heard of the Catholic Church or the Catholic religion nor had a chance to apply diligence in further learning about his own religion; nor can these dogmas be known by reason and the law upon the heart.”

Peter, is this baptized child with the use of reason who denies the Most Holy Trinity inside the Catholic Church? If you answer that he is inside the Catholic Church, then you are a salvation heretic, even according to your own incomplete standards, because you have admitted that baptized children when they attain the use of reason must in the very least believe in the Most Holy Trinity to be inside the Catholic Church and thus in the way of salvation:

CRI, Peter Dimond: “So what mysteries does everyone above reason have to *positively know*, without any exceptions for anyone, to be saved? The answer is very clear in the dogmatic teaching of the Church, as well as in Church Tradition. The answer is that the Catholic Faith, if defined by its simplest mysteries, is belief in the Trinity and the Incarnation. These are the essential mysteries of the Catholic Faith which all persons above reason must *positively know* to be saved without any exceptions for ignorance. Those above reason who are ignorant of these mysteries cannot be saved.”

If you rightly answer that he is not inside the Catholic Church, then give me the reason why he is not inside the Catholic Church. Is he a formal heretic or is he a material heretic or is he outside the Church while not being a heretic?

Example 2: A baptized child is raised as a Deist

“A Deist, one who believes that God exists but is unknowable, adopts a baptized child before the child attains the use of reason. When the child attains the use of reason, he is only taught that God exists and is a rewarder and punisher but otherwise is unknowable. The child believes these things. Consequently, he loses the habit of the Catholic faith ‘by omission to elicit the act of faith’ in the most necessary dogmas of the Most Holy Trinity and the Incarnation; hence, he is no longer Catholic. His invincible ignorance of the Most Holy Trinity and the Incarnation ‘cannot supply the defect caused by the omission.’ A Catholic must believe under pain of heresy that this child is not Catholic, even though this child had not obstinately denied a dogma that has been made known to him nor had an opportunity to apply diligence in learning further about his false religion or the true religion (Catholicism).”

Peter, is this baptized child with the use of reason inside the Catholic Church? If you answer that he is inside the Catholic Church, then you are a salvation heretic, even according to your own incomplete standards, because you have admitted that baptized children when they attain the use of reason must in the very least believe in the Most Holy Trinity to be inside the Catholic Church and thus in the way of salvation. If you rightly answer that he is not inside the Catholic Church, then give me the reason why he is not inside the Catholic Church. Is he a formal heretic or is he a material heretic or is he outside the Church while not being a heretic?

Example 3: An Anglican child

“A baptized child who attains the use of reason and is raised in seclusion as an Anglican by his Anglican parents would be Catholic if this erroneous theology were taken to its logical and heretical conclusion. As soon as he attained the use of reason, his parents and religious leaders taught him that the King of England is the

head of the Catholic Church in England; and the child believed and professed this. Then, until reaching the age of 21, he had not been allowed to read the Bible and had been guarded from hearing or learning about the Catholic Church and Catholic religion. Now from the time he attained the use of reason until his 21st year, he could not have come to the knowledge of the truth that the Roman Pontiff is the head of the Church because he had never heard of the Catholic Church and religion; and the law upon his heart and reason could not teach him this. Yet we know that he is not Catholic and thus in the way of salvation because he is not subject to the Roman Pontiff. Pope Boniface VIII, in his Bull *Unam Sanctum*, in 1302, infallibly teaches: ‘Furthermore, we declare, we proclaim, we define that it is absolutely necessary for salvation that every human creature be subject to the Roman Pontiff.’”

Peter, was this baptized person with the use of reason inside the Catholic Church until he reached his 21st year of age? If you answer that he was inside the Catholic Church, then you are a salvation heretic, even according to your own incomplete standards, because you admit that all baptized persons must be subject to the Roman Pontiff, and this person clearly was not. If you rightly answer that he was not inside the Catholic Church, then give me the reason why. Was he a formal heretic or was he a material heretic or was he outside the Church while not being a heretic?

Lastly, Peter, answer my second question from RTP that you did not yet answer:

2) Was Mr. X, the man addressed in my article “The Dimond Brothers Deny the Salvation Dogma,” a Catholic until he was 22 years old?

In other words, do you believe it is possible that Mr. X could have been inside the Catholic Church for the first 21 years of his life when he was a self-professed Protestant and invincibly ignorant of the teachings of the Catholic religion? Please, no evasion. In this matter, a simple “yes” or “no” will do. If you answer, “Yes, he was or could have been Catholic (inside the Catholic Church),” you are a salvation heretic no matter what reasons you give to try to justify your heresy because Mr. X admitted that he was a self-professed Protestant who adhered to a Protestant sect. If you do not give a straight-forward answer, then that means you *do* believe he could have been Catholic for the first 21 years of his life. Again, I do not care what reasons you try to put forward to defend your heresy. In other words, those who truly believe in the Salvation Dogma can only give one answer: “**NO!** Mr. X could not have been inside the Catholic Church while he was a self-professed Protestant who adhered to a Protestant sect, no matter what his age.”

From past experience I now expect Peter either to ignore this challenge or to address it incompletely while explaining away the dogma that he verbally professes, as do all the salvation heretics. I expect him to explain it away with “theological distinctions, logical refinements, subtle explanations and qualifications, which place us [who do truly hold the Salvation Dogma] altogether in the wrong” and his heresy in the right.

Conditional Abjuration and Peter's deception

To defend their salvation heresy, both Peter and Rev. Young falsely present the Church teaching on conditional abjuration. Peter says the following:

CRI, Peter Dimond: “They become heretics when they obstinately reject a Catholic teaching. You [RJMI] would have to say that such a declaration of the Holy Office

is completely heretical, as you have said that I am heretical and that every person above reason at every chapel is heretical. The formula prescribed for absolution from heresy also illustrates the truth of my position and refutes yours. The formula of absolution prescribed by the Church for converts from heresy: ‘By apostolic authority, which I exercise in this matter, I absolve you from the bond of excommunication which you have perhaps incurred, and I restore you to the holy sacraments of the Church, and to communion and unity with the faithful, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.’ It incorporates the word ‘perhaps’ because some of these people, even if the number is extremely small, may not have incurred excommunication for heresy because they were not obstinately against a dogma.”

Rev. Alfred Young says the same thing:

The Catholic Dogma, p. 187: “‘So long,’ continues the Rev. A. Young, ‘as one’s faith is a willing oblation, or spiritual sacrifice of self authority, by referring his *reason* for believing to what he thinks (according to his lights and opportunities) to be a divinely authorized source of instruction by which he is directly taught, or through which he honestly believes God wills him to learn divine truth, that man is a Catholic in the sight of God, and he is a Catholic in the sight of the Church, no matter what he calls himself, and though such a one dies piously as an Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, or what not, St. Peter will let him into heaven as a Catholic. And many a one rejoices to find himself so recognized after death, in spite of his earthly name and ignorance. That such a baptized Protestant is a Catholic in the sight of the Church is proved by the fact that he is treated as one when he becomes a convert and applies to be received into the Church, for he is absolved as one who has been, or, as the ritual wisely adds, “if perchance he has been” an excommunicated Catholic, on account of professed heresy.’”

Peter and Young have taken the Church teaching on conditional abjuration out of context to defend their salvation heresy. Conditional abjurations apply to converts from Protestant sects whose baptisms are doubtfully valid. If the baptism of a Protestant convert was doubtfully valid, he must be conditionally baptized using the following form (words): *“If thou art not baptized, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”* He must also conditionally abjure his errors and be conditionally absolved by the following form (words): *“By apostolic authority, which I exercise in this matter, I absolve you from the bond of excommunication which you have perhaps incurred, and I restore you to the holy sacraments of the Church, and to communion and unity with the faithful, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.”* At this point he is assured of being inside the Catholic Church, and he must then conditionally confess his sins. If this Protestant convert were not validly baptized, he would not have incurred any censures of excommunication; and his conditional baptism would have effected the forgiveness of all his sins, original and actual. If he were truly baptized, the conditional abjuration would have lifted his censure of excommunication that he had indeed incurred thereby placing him inside the Catholic Church; and his conditional confession would have effected the remission of his sins.

Also, conditional abjurations apply to Protestants who are guilty only of material heresy but not formal heresy, which does not, however, imply they could have been inside the Catholic Church. Instead, it implies the opposite because they, too, must be received into the Church just like baptized converts who are under 14 years of age. Fr. Muller refutes Peter and Young’s heretical interpretation of the Church teaching on conditional abjuration that they use to defend their salvation heresy:

The Catholic Dogma, Fr. Michael Muller, pp. 187-190: “Continues the Rev. A. Young... ‘That such a baptized Protestant is a Catholic in the sight of the Church is proved by the fact that he is treated as one when he becomes a convert and applies to be received into the Church, for he is absolved as one who has been, or, as the ritual wisely adds, “if perchance he has been” an excommunicated Catholic, on account of professed heresy.’ Was the Rev. A. Young quite honest in believing what he has just said?

“...As the Rev. A. Young was unfortunate in explaining the doctrine of Thomas on faith, so, in like manner, he is again unfortunate in the explanation of the formula of absolution from heresy, which the Church has prescribed for the priest to use in absolving heretics from heresy when they are about to be received into the Church.

“Before giving the true, genuine explanation of that formula of absolution, we must remark that this formula of absolution is never used by the Church when an excommunicated Catholic is to be absolved from the censure of excommunication, nor does the Church look upon an excommunicated heretic as an excommunicated Catholic. By what right, therefore, does the Rev. A. Young call an excommunicated heretic *an excommunicated Catholic*?

“Now what is the true explanation of the formula of absolution prescribed by the Church for absolving an excommunicated heretic?

“‘It may be assumed,’ says the Rev. J. O’ Kane, ‘that amongst the Protestants there are many whose heresy is only material; and it may be added that this is most likely to be the case with those who are converted to the faith, the very fact of their conversion being, generally speaking, an evidence of the sincerity with which they previously adhered to their errors.

“‘Now it is *formal* heresy alone (that is, heresy to which one pertinaciously adheres, though the true doctrine and the motives of its credibility are clearly proposed to him) *which is reserved to the Pope*, and not material heresy, even when the person is guilty of grievous sin by his neglect to inquire when doubts occurred, or by his culpable ignorance; for this, though it may be a grievous sin against faith, is not, after all, the sin of formal heresy. Hence, it may easily happen that *no special faculty* is required for the absolution of these converts. (LACROIX, lib. vi., p., ii., n. 1613.)

“‘Again, since there is a doubt, as we suppose, whether they have been *really* baptized, there must be a doubt whether they could incur the censures of the Church. De Lugo discusses the question, and gives it as his opinion that, when, after diligent inquiry, there remains a doubt as to the validity of the baptism of one who is guilty of heresy, he is not to be regarded as having incurred the censures of the Church attached to heresy. (De Fide, Disp. xx., n. 143.)

“We look on it, then, as very probable, that the converts of whom there is question have not incurred the excommunication annexed to heresy; and since the case is reserved to the Pope, dependently on the excommunication annexed to it, and since an ordinary confessor can absolve from reserved cases when there is a doubt either as to law or fact, it would seem to follow that no special faculty is required to absolve in the cases we are discussing, so far, at least as the papal reservation is concerned.

“‘The practice is, however, to deal with all converts from heretical sects, as if they had incurred the reserved excommunication. Kenrick observes (De Bapt., n. 243) that the Church does not acknowledge, *in foro externo*, the distinction between “*material*” and “*formal*,” which would except from the *reserved* censure any one living in a heretical communion, and cites a decree of the Holy Office, reprehending one who, relying on that distinction, had absolved a Calvinist: “Eo quod ignarus haeresum et errorum Calvinii non posset dici haeticus formalis, sed tantum materialis.” The doubt whether a convert has incurred a *reserved* censure, may be expressed in the form of absolution, as is directed in the ritual for the use of the American clergy, by inserting the word *forsan*: “...a vinculo excommunicationis quam *forsan* incurristi,” etc.

“Although bishops cannot, by their ordinary power, absolve from heresy, they can do so in virtue of special faculties, which they usually have from the Holy See, and they can delegate a priest to absolve from the excommunication.’ (Rev. J. O’ Kane on Rubrics, n. 467, 468.)

“The word ‘forsan’ (perchance), then, instead of proving that material heretics belong to the Catholic Church and are considered by her as belonging to her, proves clearly the very reverse. The Church considers all Protestants (*formal* as well as *material*) as separated Christians, but material and doubtful heretics are not excommunicated with that kind of excommunication the absolution from which is reserved to the Pope. Hence heretics though baptized, are separated from the Church. The fact that the Church receives converts into her communion clearly proves that she considers them as persons who did not belong to it. And be it also remembered that the Catholic Church would never bury a deceased material heretic, nor allow a priest to announce to his congregation that the holy sacrifice of the Mass will be offered up for him, for the simple reason that she considers him as separated from her Communion or Christ’s Body.

“Alas! how could the Church look upon a material heretic as one of her members, so long as he adheres to doctrines quite opposite to hers; so long as he has not renounced the errors of his sect, has not made profession of her faith, and is not received into her communion. To become a citizen of the United States, you have to renounce allegiance to all foreign potentates, etc.; in like manner, to become a member of the Church, a citizen of the Kingdom of God on earth, you have to renounce all allegiance to every doctrine contrary to that of the Church.”

Peter and Young, then, heretically believe that conditional abjuration for Protestants implies that some of these self-professed Protestants, no matter what their age, are inside the Catholic Church. Peter refers to them as Catholics; Young refers to them as “Protestants in good faith.” The true interpretation of the Church law regarding conditional abjuration, upholding the Salvation Dogma, “proves clearly the very reverse,” that all self-professed Protestants with the use of reason are outside the Catholic Church but for different reasons.

RJMI note: A study needs to be made on the history of conditional abjurations for baptized converts from heretical or schismatic sects. It seems that conditional abjurations were only necessary for such persons whose baptisms were doubtfully valid. Recently and only in the United States were conditional abjurations used for all such persons, possibly because of the new theology that took root in the 18th century regarding material heretics. Preying upon this new theology and the conditional abjuration used to accommodate it, the salvation heretics took both out of context to deny the Salvation Dogma, as you have seen in this section.

Dogma takes precedence over theology

Orestes Brownson and Fr. Muller, then, believed that these Protestants whom they refer to as material heretics (Peter believes they are Catholics!) are outside the Catholic Church (Peter believes they are inside the Catholic Church!). Although Brownson and Muller presented an excellent theology that absolutely proves these men whom they call material heretics cannot be Catholic, their defense of the erroneous theology regarding material heretics weakened their defense of the dogma.

For instance, it is easy to prove that the Protestants whom Brownson and Muller refer to as material heretics are actually formal heretics either because they have learned about knowable, heretical falsehoods in their false religions and have not rejected them or because they have not applied due diligence in learning about the false religions they profess and thus are guilty of criminal negligence.

Yet, in principle, Brownson and Muller's theology on material heretics (who in their opinion are free from the sin of heresy) can actually be applied to baptized persons who have the use of reason, who adhere to heretical sects, and who have not had a chance to learn about the Catholic religion from a Catholic source or to apply due diligence in learning about the false religion they profess (a situation which is most common among children who just attain the use of reason and profess belief in a false religion or adhere to a heretical sect). And this is where Brownson and Muller's theology absolutely excels by proving that even these baptized persons are not inside the Church even though free from the sin of heresy. The true nature of the mortal sin that places these baptized persons outside the Catholic Church is open to debate; however, a Catholic, under pain of heresy, must believe that these baptized persons are outside the Catholic Church. For instance, these baptized persons may or may not be guilty of the sin of (formal) heresy or the sin of (formal) schism for adhering to a heretical sect; but the Salvation Dogma decrees that they are, nevertheless, outside the Catholic Church (as Brownson and Muller's theology proves) and thus have committed a mortal sin that placed them outside the Catholic Church. (See my book *Baptized Non-Catholic Children: What, then, is their sin?*) It is understandable that the reader may be confused as to what type of mortal sin places these baptized persons outside the Catholic Church; however, it is not confusing, but easy to understand and to believe in the Salvation Dogma as Holy Mother Church teaches it: All baptized persons who have the use of reason and who profess false religions (such as Anglicanism) or adhere to heretical or schismatic sects (such as the Anglican Church or the schismatic Greek Orthodox Church) are outside the Catholic Church, no matter what their age.

I will end this chapter with Peter's own words, substituting myself (the innocent party) for Peter (the guilty party):

So, let me summarize: Fr. Muller and Brownson prove exactly what I, RJMI, said and what Peter called heretical; they prove that what I, RJMI, said *is the consistent teaching of countless [credible] authorities*.

St. Josaphat was a convert

Peter took out of context my comments regarding St. Josaphat. He tells his readers that I believe St. Josaphat was a Catholic while adhering to his parents' schismatic sect:

RIR, Peter Dimond: "Here is R.I.'s response to my evidence from St. Josaphat:

"R.I. writes [BNCC]: 'St. Josaphat -A baptized child with the use of reason who professes belief in his parents' false religion or joins their heretical or schismatic sect falls outside the Catholic Church and becomes a Protestant child.

Subsequently, to enter the Catholic Church, **he must reject the false religion he professes and/or reject the false sect he joined**, and he must also embrace and profess the Catholic religion in order to enter the Catholic Church. **This was the**

case with St. Josaphat whose parents were schismatics:...Therefore, baptized children who profess their parents' false religion or join their heretical or schismatic sect must do what St. Josaphat did if they want to become Catholic.'

"R.I. writes that the children of schismatics '**must do what St. Josaphat did if they want to become Catholic.**' First of all, these baptized persons were already made Catholics by their baptism. Secondly, what did St. Josaphat do? St. Josaphat attended the schismatic church building [the Eastern Slavic Liturgy] with his parents! St. Josaphat rejected the Eastern Schism when he became cognizant of it, and converted many eastern Schismatics; but he was still a Catholic those years that he attended the Eastern Schismatic building because he had not embraced the Eastern Schism, was baptized and held the essential mysteries of the Catholic Faith. **Thus, R.I. is changing his position by admitting that people [such as St. Josaphat] can be attending a non-Catholic church building with their parents and still be Catholic!**"

I said no such thing. Peter misinterpreted my clear words and left out other portions that prove I teach the opposite. In the first part of my quote that he misinterpreted, I clearly teach that St. Josaphat was outside the Catholic Church when he willfully adhered to his parents' schismatic sect; and only after he turned toward the Roman Catholic Church at an early age, did he enter Her:

BNCC, RJMI: "A baptized child with the use of reason who professes belief in his parents' false religion or joins their heretical or schismatic sect falls outside the Catholic Church and becomes a Protestant child. Subsequently, to enter the Catholic Church, he must reject the false religion he professes and/or reject the false sect he joined; and he must also embrace and profess the Catholic religion in order to enter the Catholic Church. This was the case with St. Josaphat whose parents were schismatics."

Clearly I teach that St. Josaphat was a schismatic who converted into the Catholic Church at an early age. Here is the portion of my quote (the underlined sentences) that Peter did not include:

BNCC, RJMI: "St. Josaphat, as a child, turned away from his parents' heresy and schism and toward the Catholic religion and Catholic Church: 'He turned towards communion with the ...Catholic Church.' This proves that children with the use of reason have the ability to detect and reject falsehoods in false religions and find and embrace the Catholic faith and Catholic Church, even if their parents are heretics or schismatics. Therefore, baptized children who profess their parents' false religion or join their heretical or schismatic sect must do what St. Josaphat did if they want to become Catholic."

The underlined portion clearly confirms what I teach; that is, St. Josaphat fell outside the Catholic Church when he attained the use of reason and willfully adhered to his parents' schismatic sect. St. Josaphat would not have had to "turn towards communion with the... Catholic Church" if he had already been in communion with (inside) the Catholic Church. Hence, when I said, "Therefore, baptized children who profess their parents' false religion or join their heretical or schismatic sect must do what St. Josaphat did if they want to become Catholic," I meant that St. Josaphat indeed fell outside the Catholic Church but converted at an early age and entered the Catholic Church; and this is what all baptized non-Catholic children can and must do if they want to enter the Catholic Church and have a hope to be saved.

We will now read that St. Josaphat entered the Catholic Church when he was 15 years of age when the schismatic sect he adhered to renounced its schism and reunited with Rome:

Life of St. Josaphat (1580 – 1623), by the Very Rev. Anselm Romb, OFM Conv., former Rector of the Basilica of St. Josaphat: “He [St. Josaphat] was born John Kuncevic about 1580 in Vladimir, a village of the Lithuanian Province of Volhynia (then a part of the Polish Kingdom begun under the Jagellonian Dynasty). His parents belonged to the Eastern Rite Church of Kiev, Russia, which was then separated from Rome.

“...The Union of Brest: The bishops of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Churches who lived within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth held a Ruthenian Synod in 1595 and voted to unite with Rome under Pope Clement VIII. John Kuncevic was fifteen years old. In 1598 seven bishops signed the Union of Brest, which allowed them to retain their Eastern Rites while in full communion with the Pope. Although most of Vilno refused union, John made his profession of faith, then entered the Basilian Monastery of the Holy Trinity in Vilno, and took the name of Josaphat.” [The Basilica of St. Josaphat Website, www.thebasilica.org]

Again, Peter has taken teachings out of context by leaving out important quotes and misinterpreting others, as do all heretics. In a similar way salvation heretics take St. Gregory Nazianzus’ following teaching out of context to try to prove that his father was actually a Catholic while being a self-professed non-Catholic:

St. Gregory Nazianzus, Oration XVIII, On the Death of his Father: “Even before he [St. Gregory’s father] was of our fold, he was ours. His character made him one of us. For, as many of our own are not with us, whose life alienates them from the common body, so, many of those without are on our side, whose character anticipates their faith, and need only the name of that which indeed they possess. My father was one of these, an alien shoot, but inclined by his life towards us...”

(For a detailed explanation see my book *The Salvation Dogma: Salvation in Context: Other sheep not yet in the fold: St. Gregory Nazianzus.*)

Peter denies automatic excommunications

RIR, Peter Dimond: “The schismatic R.I.’s position on when people become heretics will always be contradictory, as we have proven again and again, because it is false. He fails to realize the truth that people don’t become heretics corporately, but individually. He fails to realize what we proved in the article, that the children of heretics become heretics, not at the age of reason – nor in a coruscating flash that instantly knocks everyone going to a particular priest for Mass outside the Church – but **as soon as they obstinately reject a Catholic dogma or the authority of the Catholic Church.**”

First, I must admit my stupidity in a minor matter. I had no idea what the word “coruscating” meant. I had to look it up in the dictionary. It means to “move quickly.” I am sure most, if not all, of Peter’s readers did not know what it meant either. I do believe Peter is attempting to enter the ranks of the prideful and faithless pseudo-intellectuals. He is already prideful and faithless.

It seems that Peter does not agree that baptized persons fall outside the Catholic Church in an instant, as Lucifer did when he fell from Heaven like a lightning bolt—“*I saw Satan like lightning falling from heaven.*” (Lk. 10:18) For example, a baptized child

who just attains the use of reason and adheres to the Lutheran religion or Lutheran Church instantly—not a moment before or after, but at the very moment he adheres to the Lutheran religion and Church—falls outside the Catholic Church, even before he has a chance to apply diligence in learning about the Catholic religion or the knowable falsehoods in the Lutheran religion. Peter heretically believes that these self-professed Lutheran children, without knowing it, are inside the Catholic Church and are Catholics in spite of their willful adherence to a heretical sect that opposes the Catholic religion and the Catholic Church.

The same applies to baptized men who have the use of reason, are raised as Roman Catholics, attend Mass at Catholic churches, and are subject to the Roman Pontiff: the instant they doubt or deny a basic dogma or a deeper dogma under certain circumstances they, too, *ipso facto* fall outside the Catholic Church, in a blinding instant, in a flash that instantly knocks them outside the Catholic Church. Peter, therefore, denies automatic (*ipso facto*) excommunications that instantly place offenders outside the Catholic Church—instantly, and not a moment after or before the offender commits an excommunicable crime:³

1917 Code of Canon Law: “Canon 2217: A penalty is called: (2) *latae sententiae*, if a specific penalty is attached to a law or a precept in such a manner that it is incurred *ipso facto* [ed. automatically] by the commission of the offense.”

Summary

1. Peter did not answer my questions 3 through 14 (in RTP).
2. Peter ambiguously answered my first question (in RTP) that deals with the Salvation Dogma by changing his position back and forth so that one is not sure of what Peter believes.
3. Peter did not answer my second question regarding Mr. X (in RTP) that deals with the Salvation Dogma.
4. Peter did not address my following four examples that I presented in my book *Baptized Non-Catholic Children*: 1) A child’s Protestant parents become Jehovah Witnesses, 2) A baptized child is raised as a Deist, 3) An Anglican child, and 4) A pagan child. He did not address this evidence because it exposes his heretical belief as to what it takes to make a baptized person with the use of reason fall outside the Catholic Church.
5. Peter ignored the Church’s teaching regarding the reception of converts which upholds the Salvation Dogma by proving that baptized children who have the use of reason, who are under the age of fourteen, and who profess belief in a false religion or join a heretical sect (such as Lutheranism or the Lutheran Church) are outside the Catholic Church until they convert into Her, even though they do not need to take an abjuration to enter the

³ The heretic John Lane, in a similar way to Peter, denies automatic excommunications that take place the instant an offender commits a crime that places him outside the Catholic Church. Lane heretically believes that a heretic first leaves the Church; and later, after a period of time, he becomes automatically excommunicated. (See my book *Against John Lane*: Lane effectively denies *latae sententiae* excommunications.)

Catholic Church. I presented these teachings in my book *Baptized Non-Catholic Children* in the section titled “Converts (baptized non-Catholics) who do not need to take an abjuration”:

Catholic Encyclopedia, Abjuration: “The abjuration demanded of converts in the present discipline of the Church is essentially the same as the above. ...A convert, whose baptism is considered valid, or who, at most, on his reception into the Church is rebaptized conditionally, is required to make a profession of faith, which contains an abjuration of heresy. A salutary penance also is imposed (S. Cong. S. Off., Nov., 1875. See Appendix Conc. Plen. Balt., II, 277, 278; American edit. Roman Ritual, 1, 2, 3). No abjuration is required from converts under the age of fourteen (S. Cong. S. Off., Mar. 8, 1882, in Collectanea S. Cong. de Propag. Fid., n. 1680, ed. 1903).”

These baptized children under the age of fourteen and with the use of reason are outside the Catholic Church until they convert and enter Her. If they were already inside the Catholic Church, the Holy Office would not have referred to them as converts. Instead of taking an abjuration, these non-Catholic children must make a profession of the Catholic faith in order to enter the Catholic Church.

6. Peter takes the Council of Elvira out of context to defend his salvation heresy. After I presented the true and only context, Peter still insists on his heretical interpretation. He pretends that these baptized persons who profess false faiths or belong to heretical sects are not being received into the Catholic Church and thus are actually inside the Catholic Church. If they are not being received into the Catholic Church then, according to Peter, into what are they being received?

Council of Elvira, 300 A.D.: “Canon 22 - If someone leaves the Catholic Church and goes over to a heresy, and then returns again, it is determined that penance is not to be denied to such a one, since he has acknowledged his sin. Let him do penance, then, for ten years, and after ten years he may come forward to communion. If, indeed, there were children who were led astray, since they have not sinned of their own fault, they may be received without delay.”

The Council of Elvira clearly teaches that these children who were led astray by their parents must be received into the Catholic Church if they want to be Catholic. If they were already inside the Catholic Church, then there would be no need to receive them into Her.

7. Peter did not include my quote from the Council of Carthage that confirms the clear words of the Council of Elvira:

Council of Carthage, A.D. 419: “Canon LVII. (Greek lxi.) - SINCE in the former council it was decreed, as your unanimity remembers as well as I do, that those who as children were baptized by the Donatists, and not yet being able to know the pernicious character of their error, and afterward when they had come to the use of reason, had received the knowledge of the truth, abhorred their former error, and were received, (in accordance with the ancient order) by the imposition of the hand, into the Catholic Church of God spread throughout the world, that to such the remembrance of the error ought to be no impediment to the reception of the clerical office.”

These baptized children who attained the use of reason and professed themselves as Donatists were in error and outside the Catholic Church. To enter the Catholic Church, they needed to come to “the knowledge of the truth”; abhor “their former error”; and then be “received, by the imposition of the hand, into the Catholic Church.” If they were already inside the Catholic Church, then they would not need to be “received into the Catholic Church.”

(See my book *Baptized Non-Catholic Children: Councils of Elvira and Carthage*.)

8. Peter took my teaching on St. Josaphat (in my book *Baptized Non-Catholic Children*) out of context. I clearly teach that while St. Josaphat adhered to his parent’s schismatic sect, he was not Catholic; and he converted at an early age. (See: [St. Josaphat was a convert](#), p. 36.)

9. Peter took the teachings of Orestes Brownson and Fr. Michael Muller out of context and left out main portions of their teachings to try to prove that they defended the very salvation heresy that they actually refuted. (See: [Brownson and Muller denounce Peter](#), p. 18.)

10. Peter takes the Church law on conditional abjurations out of context to defend his salvation heresy. (See: [Conditional Abjuration and Peter’s deception](#), p. 32)

After exposing Peter’s dishonesty and evasion, we can see how wise Holy Mother Church is in decreeing that Catholics must never deal with a religious topic according to the terms and conditions of heretics, but according to the terms and conditions of Catholics. Instead of clarity, there is only confusion and discord if heretics are allowed free reign and control over a debate because they lie, evade, deceive by mixing truths with half-truths and lies, rant and rave incoherently, and change topics continually without having sufficiently addressed them. This disorderly and dishonest forum only confuses people and prevents them from seeing the truth that the Catholic presents. Because heretics’ motives and methods are never just, they cannot be trusted to honestly address a topic.

*April 26, 2005