

Brief against the Thucites

by RJMI

Relevant Facts:

1) Bishop Thuc was not Catholic. He signed the Vatican II Documents.

Bishop Thuc signed the heretical Vatican II documents, at which point he was known to be a notorious heretic with no office in the Church.

2) Catholics cannot legally receive Orders from notorious apostate, heretic, or schismatic bishops

It is of the faith—therefore, *epikeia* cannot justify it—that a notorious apostate, heretic, or schismatic bishop cannot be a legal successor to the apostles, nor can he propagate a legal line. The Church has already dealt with a similar situation in which there were no Catholic bishops in Armenia. An appeal was made to the Holy See to allow schismatic or heretical bishops to ordain Catholic priests. The Holy See rejected the appeal:

The Communication of Catholics with Schismatics, Holy Orders: "...[p. 105] On this same matter there was still another response of the Holy Office on November 21, 1709.¹ No Armenian Catholic bishops were available for ordaining priests who were needed in Ispahan, and so it was asked whether sacred Orders could be received from schismatical or heretical bishops. The Holy Office replied that in no way could that be allowed, and that those who had been ordained by such bishops were irregular and suspended from the exercise of their Orders. ...The prohibition to receive holy Orders at the hands of a schismatic bishop is contained in the general prohibition against active religious communication as expressed in canon 1258.1. There is also an implicit prohibition contained in canon 2372, wherein it is stated that those who presume to receive Orders from a notorious schismatic automatically incur a suspension *a divinis* reserve to the Apostolic See."²

1917 Code of Canon Law: "Canon 2372. Reception of Orders from Unworthy Prelates: All persons who presume to receive orders from a prelate who has been excommunicated, suspended, or interdicted by a declaratory or condemnatory sentence, or from a notorious apostate, heretic, or schismatic, automatically incur suspension *a divinis* reserved to the Apostolic See. Any person who has been ordained in good faith by such a man, forfeits the right to exercise the order thus received until he obtains a dispensation from the prohibition."

¹ [175] *Fontes*, n. 774; *Fonti*, II, 115.

² *The Communication of Catholics with Schismatics* (hereafter CCS), Rev. Ignatius J. Szal, A.B., J.C.L., Imprimatur +D Cardinal Dougherty, Phil., April 2, 1948, Catholic University of America Canon Law Series #264, The Catholic University of America Press, pp. 103-105.

The Thucites violate the infallible Church law that forbids them to knowingly go before a non-Catholic Bishop to be consecrated or ordained (c. 2372); they violate the infallible Church law that forbids active religious communication with non-Catholics (*communicatio in sacris*) (c. 1258, §1); they violate the natural law by scandal; and, they violate the divine positive law by endangering the Catholic faith of perversion.

3) Bishop Thuc did not abjure his apostate and heretical errors.

There is no proof that Bishop Thuc ever abjured from signing the heretical Vatican II documents, or from his association with the Conciliar Church and its apostate, antipopes. Therefore, Thuc, who died on 12/13/1984, is not among the faithfully departed. He made a deficient declaration in 1982, but it was not an abjuration of his errors.

4) Epikeia does not justify consecrations and ordinations by non-Catholic bishops.

The principle of *epikeia* allows for an exemption from Church laws that do not deal with faith or morals in certain emergency situations. Only Catholics and catechumens can be justified by the principle of *epikeia* in these emergency situations. Non-Catholics who are not preparing to enter the Catholic Church by baptism or abjuration cannot be justified by *epikeia*. Therefore, the Thucites, being non-Catholics and not catechumens, cannot justify any of their actions by *epikeia*. They cannot justify, make legal, their consecrations and ordinations by non-Catholic bishops (notorious heretics or notorious schismatics) anymore than the Greek Schismatics can.

5) No excuse for those who received Holy Orders from Bishop Thuc.

Those who used Bishop Thuc to be made bishops or priests are guilty of schism by this act alone, and share in the guilt of Thuc's notorious crimes that they easily could have known upon a basic inquiry—the Thucites that I know of are guilty of professing several heresies and are under the Romans' One Curse. They cannot be excused for any type of ignorance, because it was their duty and responsibility, especially in these days of the Great Apostasy, to thoroughly examine Bishop Thuc before they were consecrated or ordained by him.

Canon 2261, §2, does not apply heretics nor to Consecrations and Ordinations

Some Thucites—of those who admit Bishop Thuc was an excommunicated, non-Catholic heretic when he ordained or consecrated them—appeal to the Canon 2261, §2 to justify, make legal, their ordinations or consecrations.

The Practical Commentary: "c. 2261, §2. Except as provided in 2261.3, the faithful can for any just cause ask for sacraments or sacramentals of one who is excommunicated, especially if there is no one else to

give them; and in such cases the excommunicated person so asked may administer them and is not obliged to ask the reason for the request.”³

First: Canon 2261, §2, applies only to excommunicate bishops and priests who are still Catholic and hence not to heretics and schismatics. (See: my book, *Faith Before the Mass and Sacraments*: Canons 882, 938, 2252, and 2261, §2, §3, do not apply to excommunicated heretics.)

Second: Canon 2372, quoted above, teaches the dogmatic law that bishops who are notorious apostates, heretics, or schismatics cannot legally administer the sacrament of holy orders.

Third: Even in regard to Catholic excommunicate bishops, Canon 2261, §2, does not include the sacrament of holy orders, the ordination of priests and consecration of bishops. For a layman to legally receive the sacrament of Holy Orders (become a priest), he must first have dimissorial letters from his bishop, and he must be either incardinated into a diocese or belong (be ascribed) to a regular religious order, thus have a domicile, a place to legally function (c. 111-117). For a priest to become a legal bishop, he must be certain the consecrating bishop has a papal mandate from the pope (c. 953), at least tacitly, before he can legally be consecrated, and he must be assigned to a place in which he can legally function. Canon 2261, §2 makes no provisions for these necessities and thus cannot apply to the sacrament of holy orders.

6) Bishop Thuc was not stable and was religiously indifferent.

Not only is there no proof that Thuc abjured and became Catholic, but there is ample proof that he was not stable and was religiously indifferent—he had no true regard for the Catholic faith. Religious indifferentism is a mortal sin against the faith.

Those who Bishop Thuc consecrated and ordained were “free to embrace and profess that religion which he, led by the light of reason, thinks to be the true religion.” Thuc did not care what they believed in, or what religion they belonged to, he treated them all as equals, as Catholics, and proved it by ordaining or consecrating them. Pope Gregory XVI equates this type of behavior with “insanity.”

Pope Gregory XVI, *Mirari Vos* “...And so from this most rotten source of indifferentism flows that absurd and erroneous opinion, or rather insanity, that liberty of conscience must be claimed and defended for anyone.”

Therefore, Thuc’s actions of knowingly ordaining and consecrating non-Catholics prove he believed in the

heresy of religious indifferentism and was a notorious heretic on this point alone.

Thuc was a bishop for hire, a fool’s fool, that any ambitious man could go to become a bishop or priest, be he an “Old Catholic” heretic and schismatic, or even a man who wanted to start his own Church.

Irrelevant Facts

Bishop Thuc was an anticommunist.

So, Bishop Thuc was an anticommunist. Does that mean he was also Catholic? Are all anticommunists Catholic? Buddhists and many Protestants are anticommunist, even apostate Antipope John Paul II claims to be anticommunist.

Bishop Thuc said and did some nice Catholic things.

Thuc said and did some nice Catholic things. How nice! A Talmudic Jew can say and do some nice Catholic things, so can a Protestant, and so can apostate, Antipope John Paul II. A Southern Baptist minister can say many Catholic things, and even seem Catholic if he does not mention any of the heresies he believes in. Does that mean he is Catholic? Therefore, to say and do some nice Catholic things does not a Catholic make.

Bishop Thuc had a mandate from Pope Pius XI to secretly consecrate bishops.

Whether or not Bishop Thuc was given a mandate from Pope Pius XI to secretly consecrate bishops is irrelevant, because after the Second Vatican Council it was certain that Bishop Thuc was automatically excommunicated, was not Catholic, lost his office; thus, any previous privileges he had were also lost.

The Thuc line is valid.

Validity and Legality are separate issues. A valid bishop or priest can be either Catholic or not Catholic. The Greek Schismatic bishops and priests are valid, but they are not legal, they are not Catholic. Likewise, the Thucite bishops and priests are valid, but they are not legal, they are not Catholic.

For further study see my book *Against the Thucites*

Original version: 8/2000; Current version: 8/2000

Mary’s Little Remnant
302 East Joffe St.
TorC, NM 87901-2878
Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us

³ Woywod & Smith, *A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law*, vol. 2, p. 487. Here after referred to a PCC.