

# Against Hutton Gibson

Collected from Exurge Michael Journals



R. J. M. I.

By

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

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

To Jesus through Mary

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

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam

Original version: 4/2000; Current version: 10/2012

**Mary's Little Remnant**

302 East Joffre St.

TorC, NM 87901-2878

Website: [www.JohnTheBaptist.us](http://www.JohnTheBaptist.us)

(Send for a free catalog)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>NOTES ON OCTOBER 2012 CORRECTION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>ISSUE 2, APRIL 2000 .....</b>	<b>5</b>
HUTTON GIBSON; THE IMPLICIT FAITH HERESY, AND THE BAPTISM SCHISM .....	5
<i>Does Grace Exist Outside the Church?</i> .....	6
<i>Fr Feeney Unjustly Excommunicated for Disobedience not for Heresy!</i> .....	7
<i>The "Holy Office" Letter Against Fr. Feeney</i> .....	8
<i>The Denial of the dogma "No Salvation Outside the Catholic Church."</i> .....	11
<i>Does Hutton Deny the Dogma "No salvation outside the Catholic Church?"</i> .....	14
<i>Hutton's Schismatic Interpretation of Holy Scripture</i> .....	14
The Holy Office of 18th Century .....	15
<i>Hutton's Erroneous Interpretation of Holy Scripture – The Good Thief</i> .....	16
<i>Hutton implies God is Stupid and Powerless!</i> .....	16
Quick Summary on Predestination: .....	17
<i>Hutton is the Root Cause of the Great Apostasy!</i> .....	19
<i>Hutton Prophesied!</i> .....	20
<i>Hutton Gibson attends Mass at a non-Catholic chapel</i> .....	21
<b>ISSUE 3, APRIL 2001 .....</b>	<b>23</b>
WESTERN SCHISM WAS NOT A MATTER OF HERESY AS TODAY .....	23
<b>ISSUE 5, JULY 2001 .....</b>	<b>24</b>
HUTTON GIBSON: .....	24
<i>Unguarded Sanctuaries</i> .....	24
<b>ISSUE 6, SEPTEMBER 2001 .....</b>	<b>25</b>
FOLLOW UP: ON HUTTON GIBSON .....	25



## Notes on October 2012 Correction

Hutton Gibson correctly pointed out to me that I granted Pius IX a fool's pardon for teaching the salvation heresy because I tried to excuse Pius IX from teaching the heresy. I can no longer make excuses since I have obtained an old copy of Pius IX's allocution *Singulari Quidem*. The allocution was in 1856 and the copy is from 1863, seven years later. It is contained in the following book:

Sanctissimi D. N. PII PP. IX., Epistola Encyclica, Die VIII. Decembris MDCCCLXIV (1864), p. 92.  
Publisher: Ratisbonae, MDCCCLXV.

Pius IX taught the salvation heresy in 1856 in his allocution *Singulari Quidem* and in 1863 in his encyclical *Quanto Conficiamur Moerore*. Hence Pius IX automatically lost his office in 1856 and thus became an apostate antipope. (See RJMI article "Pius IX Denied the Salvation Dogma and Lost His Office.") Therefore, I deleted parts of this refutation in which I said that Pius IX did not deny the Salvation Dogma. Even though Hutton was right on this point, he is still a notorious heretic for denying the Salvation Dogma and for teaching that Catholics are allowed to be in religious communion with heretics. He is also guilty of non-judgmentalism and non-punishmentism. Hutton knows that a pope can automatically lose his office for publicly defecting from the Catholic faith. I pray that he will now see that Pius IX did publicly defect from the faith by denying the Salvation Dogma and thus automatically lost his office and hence Hutton will no longer follow Pius IX in his heresy and in his damnation.

## Issue 2, April 2000

### ***Hutton Gibson; the Implicit Faith Heresy, and the Baptism Schism***

By Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

#### **Abbreviations:**

Hutton Gibson	Newsletter <i>The War Is Now!</i>	TWIN
Richard J.M. Ibranyi	<i>Outside The Church There is No Salvation</i>	OCNS
Richard J.M. Ibranyi	<i>Why we lost the Pope, not the Papacy, and the Mass</i>	SV3

When you are done reading this refutation of Hutton Gibson, you will realize that he and Antipope John Paul II have much in common. He uses the same techniques of Antipope John Paul II. He uses lies, half-truths, deception, and ambiguity when he writes, as anybody of good will who has read his material can attest to. His reading is really quite tortuous to anybody who has tried to decipher his disconnected and very uncharitable way of writing. Instead of enlightening his readers he confuses them and leaves them confounded, precisely because he is confounded. And why is he confounded?

Because he holds the same lynch pin heresy that led to the Great Apostasy. He believes in the heresy that men can be saved without explicit faith in the Incarnation and the Most Holy Trinity. He says they can be saved by an implicit faith if they are invincibly ignorant, meaning, apostate Jews, Moslems, pagans, and Protestants who live and die in their false religions can be saved and enter heaven.

He also holds the schismatic position that it is heresy to say one must absolutely be baptized by water to have a hope to be saved. He accuses those who believe that one must be baptized by water in order to be saved, or in order to be justified and saved, as is my opinion, of teaching heresy. (See: The Baptism Controversy Review)

I will be referring to Hutton's recent attack against me in his February 2000 newsletter "The War Is Now!" Issue No. 49. I will also be referring to some of his previous newsletters as will be indicated.

### **Does Grace Exist Outside the Church?**

Yes! We will start out by exposing a first class piece of deception. Hutton infers that I have taught that no grace is given outside the Catholic Church. When in reality what I had taught was that sanctifying grace—the grace that places a soul in a state of grace—is not given outside the Catholic Church but actual grace is given outside the Church to effect the conversion of non-Catholics. This you would not know by reading Hutton's attack against me.

Hutton Gibson, TWIN, No. 49, p. 4: "In 1713 Clement XI condemned in his dogmatic Bull '*Unigenitus*' the proposition of the Jansenist Quesnel... 'no grace is given outside the Church' (Denzinger # 1379), just as Alexander VIII had already condemned in 1690 the Jansenistic proposition of Arnaul... (Pagans, Jews, heretics and others of the sort, receive no influx [of grace] whatsoever from Jesus Christ) (Denzinger #1295) Moreover, Ibranyi was sent this information in April 1998..."

The reader would come to no other conclusion from reading the above 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph and the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph that I had taught that absolutely no grace is given outside the Catholic Church, and that is a bold face lie. Hutton should know I don't teach this because I sent him my books and if he did not read them then that is his fault and his sin of calumny would be even greater in the eyes of God. "*Before thou inquire, blame no man: and when thou hast inquired, reprove justly.*" (Eclcus. 11:7)

Note in the first paragraph Hutton did not actually say I taught this heresy he just inserted this paragraph during his attack upon me. It is the very next paragraph that infers I taught the heresy when he says, "Moreover, Ibranyi..." It is clear he is inferring I taught the preceding condemned propositions. I will now present the evidence from my own writings that show what I really teach, which is what the Church teaches.

Richard Ibranyi, OCNS, ch. 13: "p. 265: This is why, when the Holy Roman Empire, Church and State, entered a pagan country with her army, the first thing She did was build monasteries to make available the graces necessary for the pagans to accept the word of God, when preached to them. P. 276-7: Sufficient grace is supplied to all souls... There is a standard meter of grace in which God judges as sufficient to convert a soul, this standard is the same for all men, but if the soul is bad willed and predominately obstinate at the moment the grace is supplied, then it can only be attributed to his own fault, for the grace which God made available to him was sufficient for him to convert."

There are many instances where I speak of actual grace given to non-Catholics in chapter 14 of OCNS and in SV3. So there you have seen what I actually taught as opposed to what Hutton would deceptively have you believe I taught. Is this not the worst type of lying that uses deception?

The other truth is that sanctifying grace—that is conferred by the sacrament of baptism and confession—is only given to those inside the Catholic Church. The Bull *Unam Sanctum* teaches, “*Outside the Church there is no remission of sins.*” Sanctifying grace is not given, nor does it exist, outside the Catholic Church.

### **Fr Feeney Unjustly Excommunicated for Disobedience not for Heresy!**

I will now expose more evidence of Hutton’s deception and willful ambiguity. In this following quote from his newsletter he seems to clearly say that Fr. Feeney was excommunicated for heresy. This is what the unsuspecting reader would believe.

Hutton Gibson, TWIN, No. 49, p. 4: “Father Leonard Feeney... was excommunicated by the Congregation of the Holy Office, which dealt exclusively with doctrine and condemned only for heresy. Not even he doubted that he could surely have avoided this penalty by dropping his innovation.”

Now I ask you dear reader, does this not seem to say that Fr. Feeney was condemned only for heresy. I will now present to you the excommunication decree against Fr. Feeney.

*Decree from The Holy Office:* “Since the priest Leonard Feeney, who for a long time has been suspended from his priestly duties on account of grave disobedience of the Church authority, being unmoved by repeated warnings and threats of incurring excommunication *ipso facto*, has not submitted; the Most Eminent and Reverend Fathers, charged with safeguarding matters of faith and morals, in a Plenary Session held on Wednesday 4 February 1953, declared him excommunicated with all the effects of law.”<sup>1</sup>

Fr. Feeney was excommunicated for disobedience because he did not go to Rome to meet with the Holy Office when he was ordered to do so. Fr. Feeney defended himself against his supposed act of disobedience by the proper use of Canon Law. When Fr. Feeney was ordered to Rome he was not given the reason.

*Letter to appear from The Holy Office, October 15, 1952:* “Pope Pius XII... has decreed that, before any other measure be carried into effect, you be summoned to Rome for a hearing. Therefore, in accordance with the express bidding and by the special authority of the Supreme Pontiff, you are hereby ordered to proceed to Rome forthwith and there to appear before the Authorities of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office as soon as possible.”

Fr. Feeney was not informed of the charges against him so he could prepare his case. He wrote letters to this effect to the proper superiors and they refused to let him know what the charges against him were. According to Canon Law, the accused must be informed of the charges and the nature of the proceedings against him or the order to appear is null and void. (See: SV3, p. 53)

Hutton had also said, regarding Fr Feeney, that “*Not even he doubted that he could surely have avoided this penalty by dropping his innovation.*” If Fr. Feeney was called to appear before the Holy Office because of his “innovation” then why is there no mention of his “innovation” in the decree for him to appear? Not only was he not told of what he was being accused of, there was no mention of any charges whatsoever. And Hutton would have us believe that this was supposed to have been a fair and just doctrinal inquiry. Quite strange that there was no mention of any doctrinal issue what so ever. Quite strange that no mention was made of Fr. Feeney’s “innovation (heresy).” Quite strange, and illegal, that no mention of any charges were contained in Fr. Feeney’s decree to appear in Rome before the Holy Office.

Hutton knows the truth, he knows Fr. Feeney was excommunicated for disobedience and not heresy, but he wants the reader to think he was excommunicated for heresy. He can cover

---

<sup>1</sup> *Acts Apostolicae Sedis*, V.XXXXV, p.. 100

himself because this sentence was craftily written. He can say that he was just making a statement that the holy office only deals with doctrine, but he did not directly say Fr. Feeney was excommunicated for heresy. However, for those who do not know the facts Hutton's paragraph would absolutely be interpreted as to mean that Fr. Feeney was excommunicated for heresy. This is deception and calumny of the worse sort. This is willful ambiguity—he can deny to one person what he can confess to another. Pope Pius VI, 1794, in the Bull *Auctorem Fidei* condemned those who use this technique and said that this is a trait of the worse sort of heretics. It would not have been hard for Hutton to come right out and say, “Fr. Feeney was not excommunicated for heresy but for disobedience.”

### **The “Holy Office” Letter Against Fr. Feeney**

Hutton insists that the letter, *Suprema haec sacra*, against Fr. Feeney's teaching came from the “Holy Office” and this is simply not true. This letter is a shame and is not authentic. It is willfully ambiguous and implies the implicit faith/desire heresy. I quote Hutton's use of this bogus letter to support his heretical position.

Hutton Gibson, TWIN, No. 48, p. 3: “Where does such a heresy acquire all those lay adherents? It is not only an impossibly illogical innovation confined to a small area; it was condemned early by the Holy Office headed at the time by Pius XII.”

The “Holy Office” letter against Fr. Feeney is from an unofficial source! The origin of this heretical letter is found in the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, of October 1952, an unofficial American Catholic review. This may indicate the origin of this letter, the bishops in the United States of America acting in compliance with their Judeo/Masonic friends. For a Church document to be official it must be registered in the *Acts of the Apostolic See*. From 1865 to 1908 this was known as the *Acta Sanctae Sedis* (ASS). The name was changed in 1908 and is now known as the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (AAS).

The “Holy Office” letter against Fr. Feeney is recorded in *Denzinger* 3869-72. A search of the source from *Denzinger* shows no link with the AAS, rather an unofficial source: *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. Once in *Denzinger* it has a pseudo-official status in which it tries to justify the implied heresy by deception.

This letter from the “Holy Office,” has the signature of Cardinal Ottaviani. Many think this proves the orthodoxy of the letter. Cardinal Ottaviani had also signed all of the Vatican II documents, so much for his orthodoxy. He was a notorious heretic, who lost his office and title when he signed the Vatican II documents. See my *Book Three*, for a more detailed explanation of this nefarious affair. (See: SV3, for further explanation)

Fr. Anthony Cekada insists that this is an authentic Holy Office letter in spite of the fact that I sent him the above information in my *Book Three* and asked him to comment. He never answered my questions and in his short response he said that he rather trust this “Holy Office” letter than trust Fr. Feeney. He responded as if he never read my book and insisted that this “Holy Office” letter was authentic. Therefore, Fr. Cekada was presented with the truth and he either did not read it, which makes him guilty of affected ignorance, or he read and denies the truth and is guilty of lying and calumny against Fr. Feeney regarding this topic.

I will reprint the questions regarding the implicit faith heresy that I sent Fr. Cekada and Hutton Gibson that neither of them answered.

1. **Questions:** Name one Council, or papal teaching, fallible or infallible, before the Pontificate of Pius IX that taught a man could be saved without explicit faith in the Incarnation and the Most Holy Trinity by an implicit faith if they are invincibly ignorant?



2. **Questions:** Give a list of recognized Fathers, Doctors, and Saints of the Church that teach the same?

The purpose of these questions is to prove that this heretical teaching has never been taught from any recognized Catholic from the time of Peter the first Pope to Pius IX. It has never been a part of tradition (what was taught everywhere, by everyone, and at all times) in any way. As a matter of fact the Solemn Magisterium, the popes, have condemned this heresy time and time again. The following is only a partial list.

**Implicit Faith Heresy; No Link with Tradition!  
Evidence Chart**

**The Truth: No  
Exceptions for  
Invincible Ignorance!**

**Popes/Councils Until  
Pope Pius IX**

1. Pope Clement I, (90-100)
2. Athanasian Creed
3. Pope St. Leo the Great, (440-461)
4. Pope St. Hormisdas, (514-523)
5. Pope Pelagius II, (579-590)
6. Pope St. Gregory the Great, (590-604)
7. Pope Adrain II, (867-872)
8. Pope Innocent III, Fourth Lateran Council, (1215)
9. Pope Boniface VIII, (1294-1303)
10. Pope Clement VI, (1342-1352)
11. Pope Eugene IV, Council of Florence, (1445)
12. Council of Trent, (1563)
13. Pope Gregory XIII, (1572-1585)
14. Pope Benedict XIV, (1740-1758)
15. Pope Leo XII, (1823-1829)
16. Pope Pius VIII, (1829-1830)
17. Pope Gregory XVI, (1831-1846)
18. Pope Pius IX, (1846-1878)

**Popes/Councils After  
Pope Pius IX**

1. Pope Leo XIII, (1878-1903)
2. Pope St. Pius X, (1903-1914)
3. Pope Benedict XV, (1914-1922)
4. Pope Pius XI, (1922-1939)
5. Pope Pius XII, (1939-1958)

**Teaches the  
Heresy**

**The Pontificate of Pius IX**

- A. Pope Pius IX, "Singulari Quidem," (1856)

How is that for credible evidence? I'll match these popes and councils against any 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup> or 20<sup>th</sup> century heretical theologian or canonist. Every recognized Father, Doctor, and saint of the Church has taught this dogma. I will list a few, Saint Irenaeus (died A.D. 202), Origen (died A.D. 254), Saint Cyprian (died A.D. 258), Bishop Firmilean (died A.D. 269), Lactantius (died

A.D. 310), Saint Cyril of Jerusalem (died A.D. 386), Saint Ambrose (died A.D. 397), Bishop Niceta of Remesiana (died A.D. 415), Saint Jerome (died A.D. 420), Saint Augustine (died A.D. 430), Saint Fulgentius (died A.D. 533), St. Bede the Venerable (died A.D. 735), Saint Peter Canisius (died A.D. 1597), Saint Robert Bellarmine (died A.D. 1621).

Useless is the testimony of modern day (18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup>, and 20<sup>th</sup> century) theologians, compared to the above evidence. But most importantly, useless is their heretical opinions when compared to the Solemn Magisterial pronouncements of the popes in and out of councils, that have infallibly condemned them. Fr. Michael Muller in 1888 was already very busy detecting and exposing these heretical theologians and canonists that Fr. Cekada and his like so often bring to their defense.

Anyone who deeply studies this issue, if they have a drop of good will, can come to no other conclusion that salvation by an implicit faith for the invincible ignorant under the New Covenant is a heretical exception that has never been even seemingly taught by any pope prior to the pontificate of Pius IX, and not by any pope since. He who studies, will quickly discover that in no way could this teaching be considered part of the ordinary magisterium, because it has not been taught *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* (always, by everyone, and at all times). The truth is that the above popes and councils have infallibly defined this dogma, and not one had ever taught that there was an exception for the invincible ignorant to be saved by an implicit faith. Instead they specifically condemned anyone who would even infer such a monstrous heresy

Interesting to note, many who hold this heresy, call us who believe in the absolute necessity of sacramental baptism by water, heretics, because they quote many past saints that held this opinion and try to bind us to this teaching as if, by this fact alone, it is part of the ordinary magisterium. But, when they try to use the same reasoning regarding the implicit faith heresy they cannot bring one papal teaching (fallible or infallible) or one council before the pontificate of Pius IX to link this heresy with the magisterium, nor can they produce a list of Fathers, Doctors, and saints from the time of Peter until the Pontificate of Pius IX that taught this heresy. Yet, dishonestly they would have us believe this heresy is part of the ordinary magisterium because taught in one fallible encyclical of Pius IX in 1856 in which he lost his office for doing so. (See RJMI article “Pius IX Denied the Salvation Dogma and Lost His Office.”)

### **The Denial of the dogma “No Salvation Outside the Catholic Church.”**

The implicit faith/desire heresy teaches that certain men, under the New Covenant, can be saved without explicit faith in the Incarnation and Most Holy Trinity if they are invincibly ignorant. Any priest or laymen who teaches the implicit faith heresy or calls us heretics for putting forth the opinion that one must absolutely be baptized by water in order to have a hope for salvation must be avoided and cannot be supported by Catholics in any way. They are committing the same crimes that led to the Great Apostasy as explained in detail in my book *Why we lost the Pope, not the Papacy, and the Mass*. They must know by now that the implicit faith heresy is the lynch pin heresy that has led to the Great Apostasy and was the deathblow to evangelization. Evangelization first had to be eliminated before the heresies of religious liberty and false ecumenism could take root in the Conciliar Church. Hutton does not agree, he says:

Hutton Gibson, TWIN, No. 45, p. 2: “This entire matter should concern us not in the least. None of it applies to us, or even to the Church. It may safely be left to God. It never stopped the missionary effort. That was accomplished by Vatican II’s Ecumenism and Religious Freedom.”

No, the denial of the dogma “No salvation outside the Catholic Church” had stopped the missionary effort and only then were the heresies of religious liberty and false ecumenism implemented in the Conciliar Church after Vatican II. What does Pope Gregory XVI teach?

Pope Gregory XVI, *Mirari Vos*, 1832: “13. Now We consider another abundant source of the evils with which the Church is afflicted at present: indifferentism. This perverse opinion is spread on all sides by the fraud of the wicked who claim that it is possible to obtain the eternal salvation of the soul by the profession of any kind of religion, as long as morality is maintained. Surely, in so clear a matter, you will drive this deadly error far from the people committed to your care. With the admonition of the apostle that “there is one God, one faith, one baptism” may those fear who contrive the notion that the safe harbor of salvation is open to persons of any religion whatever. They should consider the testimony of Christ Himself that “those who are not with Christ are against Him,” and that they disperse unhappily who do not gather with Him.<sup>2</sup> Therefore “without a doubt, they will perish forever, unless they hold the Catholic faith whole and inviolate.... 14. This shameful font of indifferentism gives rise to that absurd and erroneous proposition which claims that liberty of conscience must be maintained for everyone.”

Clearly, Pope Gregory teaches that before the heresy of religious liberty (liberty of conscience), came the heresy of justification and salvation for men in false religions provided they live a moral life (follow the natural law upon their heart). He clearly teaches, that first the sin of indifferentism is committed by denying the dogma of “No salvation outside the Catholic Church” by saying, *“it is possible to obtain the eternal salvation of the soul by the profession of any kind of religion, as long as morality is maintained.”* It is the propagation of this heresy, *“this shameful font of indifferentism,”* in the fallible teaching instruments of the Church that *“gives rise to that absurd and erroneous proposition which claims that liberty of conscience must be maintained for everyone.”* After the Religious Liberty heresy follows the justification of the False Ecumenical movement. So we see, Hutton Gibson is dead wrong. It is the crafty denial of the dogma “No salvation outside the Catholic Church,” that Hutton is guilty of, that leads to the heresies of religious liberty and false ecumenism. The denial of the dogma “No Salvation Outside the Church” is the key dogma that had to be denied first. If this dogma were not first denied then the heresies of religious liberty and false ecumenism would have no chance of implementation. We will present a testimony from the enemy, a Protestant that attests to these facts:

A Protestant Author, *The Oxford Illustrated History of Christianity*: “Nevertheless the ecumenical mood had consequences in the European churches. They were far readier to share their altars with each other, and even their church buildings, and to co-operate in common social ventures. This difference was most marked in the Roman Catholic Church. Since the Counter-Reformation Rome taught that it alone was the church; no-Roman Christians could only be part of it if their baptism was Catholic... In the nineteenth century, when Catholicism was centralizing itself ever more in Rome, Pope Pius IX admitted that men might be saved outside the church by reason of ‘invincible ignorance’ of the true faith. This was a large concession of charity in the tradition of thought.<sup>3</sup> When the ecumenical movement grew strong, Pope Pius XI formally refused to take part (1928), lest participation imply a recognition that the Roman Catholic Church was but one of a number of denominations. The same encyclical forbade Roman Catholics to take part in conferences with non-Roman Catholics. All this began to change after the Second

---

<sup>2</sup> Note carefully that Pope Gregory condemns those who have never been Catholic as well as Catholics who leave the Church.

<sup>3</sup> The enemy was quick to pick up on the breach. They admit it is a novelty, a new revelation that has never been taught by the Catholic Church. They also admit the contrary, the orthodox position, was taught previous to Pope Pius IX Pontificate, because they say he had made a “concession.” He conceded to a new novelty that directly denies a dogma..

World War.<sup>4</sup> But it was the accession of Pope John XXIII in 1958 which began to transform the atmosphere. Part of his object in summoning the Second Vatican Council was to heal the separations in the East and West, and he continued to recognize the Protestants of the West as brothers. An encyclical of 1959 greeted non-Catholics as 'separated brethren and sons'. In 1960 the pope set up a Secretariat for Christian Unity. In the same year he received Archbishop Fisher of Canterbury. In 1961 he allowed Roman Catholic observers to attend the meeting of the World Council at Delhi. His successor Paul VI carried this new and far more charitable attitude much further. In 1965 he and the Patriarch of Constantinople Athenagoras agreed a joint declaration deploring the mutual excommunications of 1054 which had stained their past histories as churches. In 1967 he met the Patriarch again, the year after he had met Archbishop Ramsey of Canterbury. The doctrine that Roman Catholics cannot share in worship with other Christians was finally killed by the Polish Pope John Paul II when in 1982 he went to Canterbury Cathedral with the Anglican Archbishop Runcie of Canterbury... All this was part of the coming out of the papacy towards the world.<sup>5</sup>

This Protestant clearly links Apostate Antipope Pius IX's denial of the Salvation Dogma—salvation for those who practice false religions—as the lynch pin, the necessary concession that lead to the religious liberty heresy and the false ecumenical movement. It was this concession, as admitted by the enemy, which opened the door to the false ecumenical movement.

The 19<sup>th</sup> century is when those who believed you had to be baptized by water were beginning to be treated as heretics, and the 20<sup>th</sup> century saw the birth of the heresy of salvation by an implicit faith/desire for the invincibly ignorant.

*Our Lady of Good Fortune, Quito, Ecuador, 1634:* "...At the end of the 19th century and for a large part of the 20th, various heresies will flourish on this earth, which will have become a free republic. The precious light of the Faith will go out in souls... "

If one does not look for heresies in the fallible teaching instruments of the Church especially in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries they will not understand the reason why God has allowed Catholics to be punished by the Great Apostasy .

It is true to say that any priest who holds this heresy is not known to militantly evangelize, by condemning false religions and calling non-Catholics to conversion without compromise, or without loopholes that promises them and their heretical or pagan ancestors salvation while living and dying in their non-Catholic religions. Many go out of their way and take up all their precious time by speaking and writing volumes and volumes, defending the right of non-Catholics to enter heaven, instead of going out on the street corner and preaching conversion or at least authorizing competent laymen to do so and set up a real evangelizing campaign in their chapels by mailings, door to door contacts, or brochures placed in homes and public areas. This, most of the Protestant heretics do, and they don't have the true faith. That is why Protestant religions are snatching Catholic souls left and right, while these so-called traditional "Catholics" stand idly by, and not only stand idly by, but interfere with us who are trying to convert non-Catholics, by telling them they can't be saved while practicing their false religion and that they will be surely damned unless they convert and enter the Catholic Church.

If priests and laymen cannot see this by now, since it is now 43 years since Fr. Feeney has brought this to their attention then they are as non-Catholic as the Protestants and schismatics that they are trying to justify and even worse, because the schismatics and most of the Protestant

---

<sup>4</sup> Under the very liberal and unvigilant Pope Pius XII, who was the legitimate pope who paved the road for the Great Apostasy and was just as evil as the antipopes of the Conciliar Church, because he was much more deceptive and careful in not falling into manifest heresy.

<sup>5</sup> *The Oxford Illustrated History of Christianity*, by John McManners, cap. 10, "The Ecumenical Movement," p. 373, Oxford University Press, Oxford, NY. 1990

religions don't teach a man can be saved without explicit faith in Jesus Christ, the Incarnation and the Most Holy Trinity.

### **Does Hutton Deny the Dogma "No salvation outside the Catholic Church?"**

Those who do not know of Hutton Gibson may be thinking, does Hutton believe invincibly ignorant non-Catholics can be saved by an implicit faith/desire? The answer is yes. He teaches this heresy that has been condemned by Pope Gregory and many other popes

Hutton Gibson, TWIN, No. 49, p. 3: "If the invincibly ignorant are saved it is not through ignorance but from co-operation with grace and conformity to God's will. It is far harder for them so to conform in ignorance than for Catholics who know their obligations. We don't know who or how many these people are."

You have just read Hutton say that an invincibly ignorant non-Catholic can conform to God's will, meaning he can live a moral life, according to the law that is written upon his heart. Pope Gregory, condemning Hutton, says, "*This perverse opinion is spread on all sides by the fraud of the wicked who claim that it is possible to obtain the eternal salvation of the soul by the profession of any kind of religion, as long as morality is maintained. Surely, in so clear a matter, you will drive this deadly error far from the people committed to your care. With the admonition of the apostle that "there is one God, one faith, one baptism" may those fear who contrive the notion that the safe harbor of salvation is open to persons of any religion whatever.*"

All men have the natural law (moral laws), and laws against idolatry (Wisdom chaps. 14,15,16) and false religions upon their hearts. A non-Catholic cannot keep all of the laws that are in his heart. He may keep some of the laws written upon his heart but he can never keep them all. He is bound to commit actual sins as St. John teaches, "*If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us.*" (1John 1:8,10) The laws that a non-Catholic keeps defend him and grant him the reward of actual grace toward his conversion. However, the laws upon his heart that he breaks accuse him before God and render him fully guilty. "*For when the Gentiles, who have not the law, do by nature those things that are of the law; these having not the law are a law to themselves: Who shew the word of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness to them, and their thoughts between themselves accusing, or defending one another." (Romans 2:14-15) Even if a non-Catholic could keep all of the laws that are upon his heart, which you have just learnt is impossible, this will still not save him because he does not have supernatural faith, the root of which is explicit faith in the Incarnation and the Most Holy Trinity. His ignorance does not give him what he needs to be saved...*

### **Hutton's Schismatic Interpretation of Holy Scripture**

Hutton, using Holy Scripture out of context like a Protestant, goes on to say,

Hutton Gibson, TWIN, No. 48, p. 3: If the invincibly ignorant are saved it is not through ignorance but from co-operation with grace and conformity to God's will. It is far harder for them so to conform in ignorance than for Catholics who know their obligations. We don't know who or how many these people there are. But we can find the proper attitude in: 'When therefore they were come that came about the eleventh hour, they received every man a penny. But when the first also came, they thought that they should receive more: And they also received every man a penny. And receiving it they murmured against the master of the house, saying: These last have worked but one hour, and thou hast made them equal to us, that have borne the burden of the day and the heats. But he answering said to one of them: friend, I do thee no wrong: didst thou not agree with me for a penny? Take what is thine, and go thy way: I will also give to this last even as to thee. Or, is it not lawful for me to do what I will? Is thy eye evil, because I am good?' – Matt. xx,9-15"

Explicit faith and a repentant heart save these 11<sup>th</sup> hour converts. The 11<sup>th</sup> hour converts made an explicit contract to work for “one penny.” Does Hutton actually think they can make an implicit contract for “one penny” and not knowing this how would they even know what work was to be done. Hutton would have us believe, contrary to the unanimous consent of the Church Fathers, and contrary to common sense, that some of these 11<sup>th</sup> hour converts are saved by an implicit faith in the Incarnation and the Most Holy Trinity, that they are saved by Christ and don’t even know it or acknowledge it. Not one Catholic commentary teaches this nonsense. It is clear that our Lord is referring to those who are converted late in life and to deathbed conversions.

Douay Bible, Catholic commentary: “Ver. 14. Some are called to the service of their God... from infancy, whilst others, by a powerful call from above, are converted late in life... those, who even in the 11<sup>th</sup> hour, enter upon the path of rectitude; and that all may learn that there is time sufficient, however short, left them to repair by their diligence and fervor their past losses.”

Read clearly that those who are “*converted late in life*” must “*enter upon the path of rectitude*” and “*repair (make reparation) by their diligence and fervor their past losses.*” Now, I demand to know from Hutton, how is it possible for a man to be penitent by implicit faith? How is it possible for a man to make reparation by diligence if he is not even aware that he needs to make reparation? Oh, what a fool is Hutton, and all those like him. They are pirates on a ship of fools. Our Lord surely has shown that the wise of the world, due to their pride, are nothing more than fools. A pagan with natural common sense would be able to detect that these fallen away Catholics are the stupidest of all God’s creatures upon earth.

Regarding those who never believed in Christ they would have to explicitly believe in the Incarnation and the Most Holy Trinity and get baptized before they die, and regarding fallen away Catholics and Protestants, they must enter the Catholic Church by an explicit abjuration of their errors and by a profession of the Catholic faith. This has always been the practice of the Church, to demand some explicit sign of conversion before the death of a man, if he is to be considered among the faithfully departed.

### The Holy Office of 18th Century

**Question:** " Whether a minister is bound, before baptism is conferred on an adult, to explain to him all the mysteries of our faith, especially if he is at the point of death, because this might disturb his mind. Or, whether it is sufficient, if the one at the point of death will promise that when he recovers from the illness, he will take care to be instructed, so that he may practice what has been commanded him.

**Response:** A promise is not sufficient, but a missionary is bound to explain to an adult, even a dying one who is not entirely incapacitated, the mysteries of faith which are necessary by a necessity of means, as are especially the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation.<sup>6</sup>

**Response.** A missionary should not baptize one who does not believe **explicitly** in the Lord Jesus Christ, but is bound to instruct him about all those matters which are necessary, by necessity of means, in accordance with the capacity of the one to be baptized."<sup>7</sup>

Thus the Church teaches a 11<sup>th</sup> hour convert must have explicit faith. No room for implicit faith in the Incarnation and the Most Holy Trinity in these above decrees from the Holy Office. Hutton would tell us these Holy Office teachings, which is what the Church has always and everywhere practiced, had been wrong. Hutton does not really believe God has given the keys to Peter to bind and loose, because if he did he would not have said the following.

---

<sup>6</sup> Response of the Sacred Office to the Bishop of Quebec, Jan. 25, 1703, Pope Clement XI; D. 1349.

<sup>7</sup> Response of the Sacred Office, May 10, 1703; D. 1349

Hutton Gibson, TWIN, No. 45, p. 2: “This entire matter should concern us not in the least. None of it applies to us, or even to the Church.”

Hutton Gibson, TWIN, No. 49, p. 4: “The Church has never claimed jurisdiction in particular judgments. Such matter are safely left in God’s hands.

If this were true then how is it that the Church, the pope and the bishops, make decisions that label men as unfaithfully departed and ban them from burial in the Church and from prayers for the faithfully departed, if they have no real jurisdiction in these matters, as if there is a judgment regarding the fate of souls that God would allow to stand in His Church that He does not concur with. God’s Church, the Holy Catholic Church is His Mystical Body on earth, and Hutton tells us She cannot pass judgments upon those who died without the least explicit sign of conversion or repentance.

Now, if a bishop, or even a pope, had been mistaken about the facts surrounding the life and death of one who was unjustly condemned, such as St. Joan of Ark, who was unjustly condemned by the English bishops, then God in due time will see to it that evidence is brought forward to vindicate the unjustly accused. God would see to it that this vindication would take place through His Church that he appointed to bind and loose. The Church would then retroactively nullify the unjust judgment and officially set the record straight.

God always requires all judgments to come through His Church, because His Church is His own Body on earth, and His Body on earth does not contradict His Body in Heaven. If a prelate who rules in the Church should make a mistake regarding the fate of a soul God will see to it that another prelate who rules in the Church will rectify it before the end of time. When all is said and done, immediately prior to the second coming of Christ, the Church’s final decision regarding the fate of a soul as unfaithfully departed will stand, it will be binding in heaven just as it is binding on earth. If a mistake was made regarding a soul unjustly judged by Church officials God will see to it that restitution will be made so that the Church, at some time before the end of time, would pronounce the just sentence. Read in Daniel chapter 13 how God had the prophet Daniel defend Susanna at the very last moment when she was already condemned and ready to be stoned to death

### **Hutton’s Erroneous Interpretation of Holy Scripture – The Good Thief**

Many who believe in the opinion of baptism of desire and blood erroneously use the example of the Holy Innocents and the Good Thief, Dismas. Many, even after we present them with the facts, still continue to use this example to try and justify baptism of desire and these are the bad-willed. I quote from Hutton.

Hutton Gibson, TWIN, No. 49, p. 4: “All Catholics can quickly cite the surest, best documented canonization in history—of an un-baptized criminal to whom Jesus Christ on the Cross said: ‘This day thou shalt be with Me in paradise.’ No Catholic in nineteen centuries was fool enough to cast serious doubt on this original ingredient of the Deposit of Faith.”

The Sacrament of Baptism was not yet instituted as a necessity of means until after Jesus Christ ascended into Heaven. The Good Thief, St. Joseph, Simeon the Prophet, and the Holy Innocents were saved under the parameters of the Old Covenant, because the New Covenant did not take effect until Jesus died on the Holy Cross and the veil in the Temple was rent in two signifying the end of the Old Covenant and the beginning of the New. (See: This Journal, “The Baptism Controversy Review”)

### **Hutton implies God is Stupid and Powerless!**

He does not understand the Catholic Doctrine on Predestination



Hutton Gibson, TWIN, No. 45, p. 1: “Those who insist on literal Catholic Baptism with water lack understanding of God’s revealed plan. God wishes all men saved. So He makes it impossible for most?”

Just because God wants all men to be saved does not mean all men will be saved. As a matter of fact only few will be saved, very few. Does this mean God is unjust? It is of the faith that un-baptized infants who die go to hell. According to Hutton, if just one un-baptized infant who died is in hell then God is unjust.

It is impossible for an un-baptized infant to be preached to, they do not even have a chance to hear the word. So how is it that God sends these souls to hell when they did not even have a chance to hear the word and make a choice? Why has God damned these souls when it was impossible for them to hear the word? The answer lies in the proper understanding of predestination, of God’s all-knowing attribute of omniscience and His all-powerful attribute of omnipotence.

Hutton cannot properly answer this because he does not have supernatural faith. He thinks God is dust and dirt like he is, and therefore with his limited intelligence, which is what all humans have, he brings God down to his level because he does not accept by faith these attributes of God and His just judgments when he damns an un-baptized infant, or ignorant pagan to hell. Hutton and his like infer that God is stupid and powerless.

**First:** They infer that God is stupid. They presume that God infused a good-willed soul into the womb of a woman on a pagan island without the possibility of being baptized by a missionary before his death. God seeing this would then have to say: how thoughtless could I have been to abandon this poor good-willed soul on this island in which no missionary will reach him in its lifetime. So, we see, God is portrayed as stupid, denying His foreknowledge. God did not know that this soul was good-willed before his conception, and allowed him to be born on this remote island, with no hope of him being preached to nor baptized in his lifetime.

**Second:** They infer that God is powerless, denying His Omnipotence; He could not physically get a missionary to this soul to baptize him within his one lifetime. If faith can move mountains, God can see to it that water Baptism reaches every good-willed man. God knows ahead of time the disposition of souls; He places them where he pleases, and has the power to see to it that they get baptized if they are of good will. It is those who deny the necessity of the Sacrament of Baptism who are limiting God’s knowledge and power, and question His justice and abuse His mercy. The potter has power over the vessel, to do as He pleases, one created to glory and another to destruction; the vessels of glory due to their good will and the vessels of destruction due to their bad will (Rom. 9). What is man but dust and dirt, that he judges a man worthy of heaven who lived and died explicitly in unbelief. If God allowed a man to die in manifest unbelief, who is man to judge him worthy of heaven.

Therefore Hutton and his like accuse almighty God of being stupid and powerless. This is precisely the sin Hutton commits in the eyes of God when he dare questions God’s judgments by saying un-baptized men who do not explicitly believe in the Incarnation and the Most Holy Trinity can be worthy of heaven.

#### Quick Summary on Predestination:

- God’s passive will is that all men be saved.

“For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, Who will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth.” (1Tim. 2:3-4)

- God says only a few will be saved.

“Enter ye in at the narrow gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there are who go in thereat. How narrow is the gate, and strait is the way that leadeth to life: and few there are that find it! (Mt. 7:13-14) ...many are called but few chosen.” (Mt. 20:16)

- God knows all things before they come to pass.

“For all things were known to the Lord God, before they were created.” (Eclcus. 23:29)

- God knows who is among the damned and the elect before the creation of the world.

“And the inhabitants on the earth (whose names are not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world) shall wonder, seeing the beast that was and is not.” (Apocalypse 17:8) Who shew from the beginning the things that shall be at last, and from ancient times the things that as yet are not done, saying: My counsel shall stand, and all my will shall be done.” (Isa. 46:10)

- God knows the disposition and fate of a soul before it is conceived in the womb of a woman.

“Before I formed thee in the bowels of thy mother, I knew thee...” (Jeremias 1:5) “For whom he foreknew, he also predestinated to be made conformable to the image of his Son.” (Romans 8:29)

- God knows if a soul is evil before its existence and judges it in the womb of its mother to be evil. It is damned either because of the choice God knows it will make with its freewill or the choice it would have made with the use of its freewill if given a chance, but died before the evil act God knew it would commit.

“The wicked are alienated from the womb; they have gone astray from the womb: they have spoken false things.” (Psalm 57:4) “But as for the wicked, even to the end there came upon them wrath without mercy. For he know before also what they would do.” (Wisdom 19:1)

- God can place a soul upon earth, when and where He pleases, as His justice sees fit.

“The works of God are done in judgment from the beginning, and from the making of them he distinguished their parts, and their beginnings in their generations.” (Ecclesiasticus 16:26)

- God has the power to bring a good-willed man the Sacrament of Baptism and bring a good-willed Protestant into the Catholic Church before he dies.

“The Lord knoweth who are His; (2Timothy 2:19) ...as many as were ordained to life everlasting, believed. (Acts 13:48) The sheep hear His voice and follow him. And other sheep I have that are not of this fold: them also I must bring. And they shall hear my voice: And there shall be one fold and one shepherd.” (John. 10:4-5, 16)

A point to deeply ponder: If just one man who heard the word of God is in hell then it is certain that every man who died without hearing the word of God is hell. The man who heard the word of God that is now in hell either did not believe or believed and fell away, and is known by God to be a bad willed (impious) soul before he was conceived in his mother's womb. Now, if there was a pagan on an island who is of good will, known by God to be among the elect before he was conceived in the womb of his mother, could not God switch these two souls, so as to have the bad willed soul to be born on the pagan island and the good willed soul to be born in a location so that before he died he would hear the word of God, or be born into a Catholic family.

Another example: On the one hand we have a man who is born to a Catholic family and raised as a Catholic, but falls away in his adult life and is damned to hell upon his judgment day. Now, on the other hand we have a pagan on an island that never gets the opportunity to hear the

Gospel word, and he dies and is damned to hell on his judgment day. Remember now, God knows all of this before these souls existed, before they were placed on earth (conceived in the womb of their mothers). It is concluded, then, that the pagan had to be of bad will just as the bad Catholic. Why? We answer first with a question. If the pagan was of good-will, and God knew this before he was conceived, then why did God not switch the soul of the good-willed pagan with that of the bad Catholic? If God did this, then the good-willed pagan, would instead be a good-willed baptized Catholic from his birth and die faithful and enter heaven, whereas the bad-willed Catholic would instead be a bad-willed pagan who never had the opportunity to have the Gospel word preached to him. He would end up in hell, the same fate that would have been his if he was born to the Catholic family and fell away, being that his soul is bad-willed. This was known to God ahead of time, because **God is All-Knowing!**<sup>8</sup>

Ah, the ways and justice of God are un-searchable. Blessed is the man who simply believes that there is absolutely no salvation outside the Catholic Church, no salvation by implicit desire and faith, no salvation for the unbaptized invincibly ignorant. Blessed is the man who simply believes without the need of all these explanations to refute the heretics of our day who have confused and led astray God's sheep with twisted, convoluted, and perverted theologies in an attempt to defend their most pompous and presumptuous heresy of salvation by implicit desire and faith—judging men worthy of heaven who have not exhibited the least manifestation of worthiness in their one lifetime, as if dust and dirt is all-knowing and God is stupid. How nice of these heretics, who presume to be much more merciful than God, by covering up for God's weakness by allowing these misplaced souls a back door and wide gate entry into heaven to clean up this messy piece of God's work. St. Paul says to these heretics, *"O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it: Why hast thou made me thus? Or hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump, to make one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour?"* (Rom. 9:20-21)

But the faithful shall say, *"Thou art just, O Lord, and all thy judgments are just, and all thy ways mercy, and truth, and judgment. (Tobias 3:2) For thou hast done things of old, and hast devised one thing after another: and what thou hast designed hath been done. For all thy ways are prepared, and in thy providence thou hast placed thy judgments. (Judith 9:4-5) O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been his counselor?"* (Rom. 11:33-34) All love, all praise and all glory to our just and merciful God, all-knowing, all-powerful God, we beg of thee to make us into a vessel of honor and not of dishonor and destruction. Please, oh, please, all-powerful God, make us, in spite of our unworthiness into vessels of glory. Take my will, take my life and please may I not be found out to be a vessel of destruction upon my judgment day.

### **Hutton is the Root Cause of the Great Apostasy!**

It is because of men who believed as Hutton Gibson does before Vatican II that has led to the Great Apostasy. Hutton and his like act as if the Church hierarchy, priests, laymen, and fallible teaching instruments were just fine on the eve before the robber's Second Vatican Council. They act as if the Great Apostasy just came out of no-where and burst upon the scene upon the takeover by Antipope John XXIII. If Hutton really read his Bible with a true heart he would know that when evil comes upon God's chosen it is because they have done evil well before the righteous punishment God inflicts upon them.

---

<sup>8</sup> My book, *"No Salvation Outside the Catholic Church,"* goes into detail on the Catholic doctrine of predestination.

Hutton can be compared to a single cancer cell in the body of a human. At first it is only one cell, and can only be detected with a thorough examination. But, from this one cancer cell the whole body becomes infected to the point of total corruption of all the members of the body and inevitable death. Hutton Gibson, and those like him, is the one cancer cell that led to the total corruption of the Conciliar Church. Hutton, looking at the last stage of the disease in Antipope John Paul II is appalled at what he sees, but he, and his like are the root cause. In short, Hutton deserves Antipope John Paul II. It is akin to the disobedient Israelites who cry out to God when they are punished with bad leaders and conquered by pagan nations and taken into exile, they cry out, “Why oh Lord, why hast thou allowed this to happened to us?”

Hutton would rail against anybody who dare suggest that God has authorized this takeover as a punishment for the sins of so-called Catholics who lost the faith long before the apostate Council of Vatican II. He has stated in a letter to a friend of mine that God did not take the Mass away, Antipope Paul VI did. As I had written him, yes, Antipope Paul VI had taken away the Mass, but God had allowed it! He could have prevented it. He allowed it as a punishment for bad “Catholics” who had put the Mass before the Faith and who have ignored the teachings of the past popes.

Hutton Gibson does not deserve a pope anymore than the other so-called Catholic traditionalists he rightly condemns. Oh, in his great pride I am sure he thinks he deserves a pope. The proof of his own perversity is that his search for a pope has him insanely looking at the most unlikely non-Catholic candidates, via Cardinal Siri and Archbishop Pintonello, both Conciliar Church, non-Catholic heretics.

### **Hutton Prophesied!**

Yes you heard it right, Hutton had uttered a prophecy, just as had Caiphas regarding our Lord Jesus Christ’s death, and Hutton does not even realize it. Hutton explains, unaware, that the reason there is no unity in the “traditionalist” movement is precisely because they have denied the dogma “No salvation outside the Catholic Church.” I quote:

Hutton Gibson, TWIN, No. 48, p. 3: “Crying in the Wilderness #3 has erupted from Fillmore N.Y. ...These Criers are lost, disoriented followers of a heresy only half a century old... Indeed the Criers themselves clearly demonstrate its impossibility in their complaint that not one traditional priest in the entire country agrees with their heresy. It would be hard to surpass such a clear, unanimous condemnation. Can anyone cite another issue on which all traditional priests agree?”

Now we start out with some facts that I am sure Hutton would agree with. These traditionalists he refers to are all divided, one group from the other, and disagree on dogmatic issues. Now a fruit of the Holy Ghost that always exists within the Catholic Church is unity in faith. Where there is no unity in faith among groups two things are certain either, none of the groups are Catholic, or, only one of the groups is Catholic and the rest are not.

The divisions (lack of unity) among the traditionalist so-called Catholics, involve disagreements regarding dogmatic teachings—infalible teachings of the Catholic faith. The divisions during the Western Schism (lack of unity) were not due to disagreements over dogmatic teachings of the Church. The lack of unity among Catholics during the Western Schism was only apparent, because it involved misunderstandings as to who was the legitimately elected pope. The various groups of traditional so-called Catholics today, who are in reality non-Catholic heretics, are divided, one from the other, over dogmatic teachings of the Catholic Church—they are not united in the Catholic faith. Catholics during the Western Schism were united in the Catholic faith.

That being said, Hutton admits these groups don't agree on many other key dogmatic issues, that is why Hutton does not refer to these groups as Catholic. Nevertheless Hutton is using these groups as authoritative sources when it comes to Catholic dogma. He is actually calling these non-Catholic groups to defend him and that is because he himself is among them, a non-Catholic. There is no honor, nor shame, nor fear of the Lord, among thieves, liars, and heretics.

Now the fact is that the reason these groups have been confounded with dissensions, discord, and disunity is precisely because they all deny the dogma "No salvation outside the Catholic Church," and because they refer to us as heretics for believing a man must absolutely be baptized by water in order to have a hope to be saved. Does not Hutton prophesize this very fact, but it is a prophecy against his will, against what he intended it to mean, just as Caiphas' prophecy regarding the death of Christ. God many times will use the enemy's own words to speak a truth they did not intend to while condemning themselves. Our Lord had even used the mouth of a dumb jackass to speak a warning to Balaam (Num. 22:28).

This condemnation Hutton has leveled against us who hold the Salvation Dogma will turn back upon his own head. Instead of condemning us on this issue, he has condemned himself. By his own words he shall be judged by Almighty God, the God of the One, Holy, Catholic Church, not the god of the pagans, apostate Jews, Moslems, Protestants, and schismatics. Unless he repents before he dies and those who believe like him, they will surely go down to the fires of everlasting hell. Let God be my judge and discern my cause from a people who are not holy, Hutton and those who believe as he does.

Who are these men who believe as Hutton does? Who are these groups that have been confounded that Hutton mentions, these traditionalists that are not united and don't agree with one another? I will only mention a few of the most prominent traditionalists: Bishop Dolan, Fr. Cekada, Fr. Sanborn, Bishop Pivarunas, Bishop Kelly, the Society of St. Pius X, Bishop Robert McKenna.<sup>9</sup> Our Lord condemns these men as thieves and robbers, "*Amen, amen I say to you: He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up another way, the same is a thief and a robber.*" (Jn. 10:1-1)

### **Hutton Gibson attends Mass at a non-Catholic chapel**

In my Journal, Issue #1, I pointed out that Hutton is a heretic and is *ipso facto* excommunicated on several points, one of which is his attending a chapel that does not require abjurations, and therefore he is witnessing sacrilegious receptions of Holy Communion and is also guilty of the crime against the faith of *communicatio in sacris* (CIS)—publicly praying in communion with non-Catholics.

Hutton, looking wherever he may to try and trap me in my own words, had pointed out a minor error in the condemnation against him. I only mentioned the Catholic Church's condemnation as applying to clerics. I meant to include laymen but forgot to mention it. Hutton refers to this in his newsletter.

Hutton Gibson, TWIN, No. 49, p. 4: "(3) Because 'these clerics' [me?!] 'do not require an abjuration from those who have adhered to heresy or schism, or have been part of the non-Catholic Conciliar Church or any independent chapel that is in communion with the Conciliar Church, or any non-Catholic Church. They give sacraments to heretics in violation of c. 731, and therefore share in the heresies and/or schism of those with whom they give the sacraments to, and pray in communion with them.' "

---

<sup>9</sup> Bishop McKenna has these words to look forward to from the Lord during his particular judgment if he does not convert and repent before he dies, "*Not every one that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven... Many will say to me in that day: Lord, Lord, have not we... cast out devils in thy name... And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, you that work iniquity.*" (Mt. 7:21-23)

Hutton was the only layman that I pointed out as being *ipso facto* condemned, all the rest were clerics, and I should have also said “*these clerics, that do not require an abjuration... and laymen who attend their Masses.*” Hutton knows this is what I meant. He is playing stupid, and is trying to discredit me by pointing out this minor error. How typical is this behavior of a true Pharisees. He criticizes the mote in my eye, but does not cast out the beam (heresies) in his own. (Mt. 7:3-5)

Now, to get back to the main point that Hutton has evaded in his newsletter by this side issue: Does Hutton attend the Mass of a non-Catholic priest at a non-Catholic chapel? We will let Hutton tell us, as he so amply provides in the very newsletter that he attacked me in. How great is God, He traps the enemy by the words from his own mouth.

Hutton Gibson, TWIN, No. 49, p. 1: “Query—You wrote (last issue) that you assist at Mass regularly. Where? Reply—I assist regularly at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass as standardized by Pope Pius V... It is celebrated at St. Jude’s Shrine in Stafford, Texas... usually by a priest ordained in 1955, who omits the names of all heretics from the first prayer of the Canon, *Te igitur*... He himself retains the jurisdiction conferred on him in 1955 by a Catholic diocesan ordinary, if only because there is now no authority to restrict or remove his jurisdiction—or his priestly faculties and functions.”

I will now produce the evidence that proves Hutton is attending the Mass of a non-Catholic priest at a non-Catholic chapel. For the record the priest he is speaking of is Fr. DaSilva, a priest from India, who right after Hutton had written this newsletter had a falling out with the owner of the Chapel, Gary Guiffrey, and is no longer the priest at that chapel. In that chapel no abjurations are required from those who have either publicly believed in heresy and/or schism, or have been in communion with those who are in public heresy and/or schism. Abjurations are required from these non-Catholic newcomers in order for them to have their censures lifted in the external forum. Only then can they go to confession, and then, after they have done their penance, approach the altar rail.

The chapel Hutton attends Mass at not only does not require abjurations as needed, but also allows newcomers to approach the altar rail without even being examined to see if they are Catholic or not. Thus the crime of public sacrilegious receptions of the Holy Eucharist is taking place during that Mass and at that chapel. Because of these crimes Hutton and all who attend that chapel are also guilty of the crime of *communicatio in sacris*, publicly praying in communion with non-Catholics, and they are therefore non-Catholics on this point alone.

A person I know had attended Mass at Gary’s chapel in Texas. He had attended Gary’s chapel on a Sunday when a visiting priest, a Fr. John, was saying Mass. During the sermon Fr. John had said that all traditionalists should work together, the Society of St. Pius X and the Fraternity of St. Peter were mentioned as groups that should work along with those who hold the sede-vacante position. He did not receive the Holy Eucharist because of that sermon, because his instincts were telling him that this would be wrong. After the Mass he questioned Fr. John about his sermon and discovered that he is a Conciliar priest who is under the obedience of his Conciliar bishop and only agreed to leave out John Paul II’s name from the canon of the Mass when he was at Gary’s chapel. He had also questioned him about the dogma “No salvation outside the Catholic Church,” and Fr. John said that Jews, Moslems, Protestants, and pagans could get to heaven by an implicit faith/desire. He also said that the Jews worship the same God as Catholics. Even when Fr. DaSilva says Mass there are no abjurations required from those who need to take one, and there is no examination of the faith of newcomers before they approach the altar rail.

Now dear reader, this is the chapel and Mass that Hutton Gibson attends. He is a hypocrite and these things have happened to him because of his own sins of heresy that have left him in

darkness, thinking he is in the light. See my booklet “The Abjuration” for a detailed explanation of these crimes Hutton and Gary are guilty of.

I end by saying God chastises those whom he loves in order for a hope to save their souls. If there were no hope for Hutton and his like I would not have singled them out. So, I hope and pray they take this rebuke and reproving to heart and convert. It truly was not done out of hatred for them but first for the glory of God, second for the sake of the souls misled by them, and then for their own souls.

## **Issue 3, April 2001**

### ***Western Schism was not a Matter of Heresy as Today***

This is a clarification of a point I made in my article “Hutton Gibson: The Implicit Faith Heresy and the Baptism Schism” in “Exurge Michael Issue #2.” The divisions (lack of unity) among the traditionalist so-called Catholics, involve disagreements regarding dogmatic teachings—infalible teachings of the Catholic faith. The divisions during the Western Schism (lack of unity) were not due to disagreements over dogmatic teaching of the Church. The lack of unity among Catholics during the Western Schism was only apparent, because it involved misunderstandings as to who was the legitimately elected pope. The various groups of traditional so-called Catholics, who are in reality non-Catholic heretics, are divided, one from the other, over dogmatic teachings of the Catholic Church—they are not united in the Catholic faith. Catholics during the Western Schism were united in the Catholic faith. The words I should have added in the article are in brackets to clarify what I meant

“Hutton Prophesied! - ...Now we start out with some facts that I am sure Hutton would agree with. These traditionalists he refers to are all divided, one group from the other, and disagree on dogmatic issues. Now a fruit of the Holy Ghost that always exists within the Catholic Church is unity [in faith]. Where there is no unity [in faith] among groups two things are certain either, none of the groups are Catholic, or, only one of the groups is Catholic and the rest are not. That being said, Hutton admits these groups don’t agree on many other key dogmatic issues, that is why Hutton does not refer to these groups as Catholic.”

The point was that Hutton, a non-Catholic heretic himself, was using other non-Catholic heretics to defend his implicit faith heresy, because that is the root heresy they all hold. That is the primary heresy that cries out to God for vengeance upon all those that hold and teach it, that has lead to the Great Apostasy. God has punished them by confounding them, one punishing the other with their own perverse thoughts, teachings and practices opposing the others perverse thoughts, teachings and practices which cannot be reconciled in their minds, thus entangling them in a web of contradictions. God shall never, no never allow them to be united, and if they die in such a state they will be damned to hell for all eternity. These heretics, cursed with irreconcilable teachings that have encased their minds in a web of contradictions, were already manifest by so-called Catholic theologians in the 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup>, and 20<sup>th</sup> century as is evident in their laboriously long, confused, and heretical teachings that in no way can be reconciled in the mind of a Catholic who holds and embraces that Catholic faith, because, although the Catholic faith cannot always be reasoned out by man, it never, no never contradicts reason, and can be embraced by a simple man. Popes have warned their bishops to weed out these heretics in the 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup>, and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, and the bishops disobeyed the popes. That is the key heresy, the

implicit faith heresy, that the enemy wanted to infiltrate into the hearts, minds, and souls of Catholics so as to excommunicate them, place them outside the Catholic Church, and to destroy in the mind of the all men, the very necessity of Jesus Christ and His Holy Roman Catholic Church—the very purpose of Their mission to save men. That crime of crimes, that heresy, is what directly led to the Great Apostasy—God cursing apostate Catholics with the loss of the pope (not the papacy) and the Holy Mass. Also, God has confounded and divided all those who schismatically accuse us of teaching heresy, who hold the opinion that all men must receive the Sacrament of Baptism in which water must be used in order to be justified, and have a hope to be saved.

## Issue 5, July 2001

### *Hutton Gibson:*

#### **Unguarded Sanctuaries**

I do not have Hutton's newsletter in which he mentioned that I said there should be bodyguards in the back of the Catholic churches so as to make me look foolish, but the fact is that there has always been men appointed in the Catholic churches to check who comes into the church and to keep order in the church. Hutton used the term bodyguard to muster up images of men in full battle gear checking people in the back of the churches before they enter. This is a ploy the enemies of the Catholic Church use. They overstate a case to make the opponent look foolish, as they always refer to true Catholics as fanatics. Well the fact is that Catholic churches have never been left unguarded, unattended if you will, so as to allow any one to enter and do as they please. Call them what you like, but the Catholic churches have never left been left unguarded. The Catholic Church called them by several names, ostiaries, porters, doorkeepers, deacons, or ushers.

Catholic Encyclopedia, Doorkeepers: "According to the "Apostolic Constitutions" belonging to the end of the fourth century the guarding of the door of the church during the service was the duty of the deacons and subdeacons. Thus the doorkeepers exercised their office only when service was not being held."

Catholic Encyclopedia, Deacons, Duties of Deacons: 2. Again, as the Apostolic Constitutions further explain in some detail, the deacons were the guardians of order in the church. They saw that the faithful occupied their proper places, that none gossiped or slept. They were to welcome the poor and aged and to take care that they were not at a disadvantage as to their position in church. They were to stand at the men's gate as janitors to see that during the Liturgy none came in or went out, and as St. Chrysostom says in general terms: "if anyone misbehave let the deacon be summoned" (Hom. xxiv, in Act. Apost.)... Most especially were they conspicuous by their marshaling and directing the congregation during the service. Even to the present day, as will be remembered, such announcements as *Ite, missa est, Flectamus genua, Procedamus in pace*, are always made by the deacon; though this function was more pronounced in the early ages. The following from the newly discovered "Testament of Our Lord", a document of the end of the fourth century, may be quoted as an interesting example of a proclamation such as was made by the deacon just before the Anaphora:

"Let us arise; let each know his own place. Let the catechumens depart. See that no unclean, no careless person is here. Lift up the eyes of your hearts. Angels look upon us. See, let him who is without faith depart. Let no adulterer, no angry man be here. If anyone be a slave of sin let him depart. See, let us supplicate as children of the light. Let us supplicate our Lord and God and Savior, Jesus Christ."



In the non-Catholic church that Hutton attends, Satan could walk up to the altar rail and no one would stop him. And in fact, Satan does approach the altar rail every week, through the bodies of Hutton and all the rest of the non-Catholics who make unworthy receptions, week after week. I have heard that the new priest at Gary Guiffrey's St. Jude's Shrine in Stafford, Texas, that Hutton attends, is a member of the Conciliar Church. Hutton and Gary, have you no shame! Repent and convert! (Proverbs 3:12)...

## Issue 6, September 2001

### ***Follow Up: On Hutton Gibson***

Hutton Gibson is living evidence of our Lord's teaching that once a heretic is exposed to the light he falls very quickly into one foolish and strange teaching after another. In a letter Hutton had just sent me he has supplied the last nail in his coffin, where is already dead soul lies. He referred to an article I printed in my last Journal regarding the duties of doorkeepers who make sure only Catholics approach the altar rail. He said that this only applied to times when there was overt persecution.

Hutton Gibson, Letter to Richard J. M. Ibranyi, 6/26/01: "And you send me citations from The Catholic Encyclopedia which record the duties of deacons and doorkeepers during the times of overt persecution."

Has there ever been a more overt persecution that has succeeded worldwide as the Great Apostasy? Hutton admits it is overt by condemning the Conciliar Church and John Paul II. These are the days when men are least to be trusted, and yet the doors in the church Hutton attends are open to all, without the least concern as to whom the person is or where he came from. Fertile ground for sacrilegious receptions of the Most Holy Eucharist is what is cultivated in his church. Before Vatican II, when I attended a church outside of my parish I was stopped by the usher who had asked me what parish I belonged to and said I must go back there and attend Mass, and forbid me to enter. Not only does Hutton not care about the faith of those that attend his church, he does not care about the faith of the priest either. He admits that he attends the Masses of priests he is educating and may not yet be Catholic.

Ibid: "I try to convert, among others, former Catholics, even priests. If we can interest a priest in returning to the true Mass we do so... [Edited 10/2009] After years in the postconciliar "Church" he may need education, but we are willing to take the trouble, for his sake as well as for our own. Sometimes we fail."

Hutton has put the cart before the horse, the Mass before the Faith. Hutton has it backwards. First the priest must convert and become Catholic before a Catholic can attend his Mass and pray in communion with him. Hutton readily admits that the priests at his church are excommunicated heretics... [Edited 10/2009] Hutton's church is inhabited with, non-Catholics. I wonder if Hutton would go to a doctor for surgery, who had previously butchered people, while he has not yet learned how to operate properly? Ah, Hutton would be more concerned about his physical life than his spiritual life, because a heretic does not truly understand the spiritual things of God (Mk. 8:35-36). Hutton also said that those who never heard of the gospel, such as practicing Protestants, Jews, and Moslems, can be in a state of grace and be saved if they die as such.

Ibid: "According to you, if anyone has never heard of Christ and His Gospel he will not be condemned for that but he will be condemned anyway, whether or not he is in a state of grace. You insist that all Protestants, Jews, Moslems, etc, are corrupt, steeped in mortal sin, predestined for hell. This is utterly absurd."

This is pure heresy, apostasy and blasphemy! Our Lord and His Church at all times condemns all those who commit acts of idolatry by worshipping false gods and practicing false religions, as being corrupted and steeped in sin, and calls them to conversion as their only hope for salvation. Whereas, Hutton has placed them in a state of grace and ready for Heaven, without hearing the Word of God, without faith in Jesus Christ, without the cleaning waters of baptism, and without entering the Catholic Church, and he has the nerve to say that I am absurd for saying they need these things to be saved. The world is upside down when men like Hutton are looked upon as Catholics. In the days of the Inquisition Hutton would be burnt at the stake as the vilest of all heretics, as an apostate, for teaching such abominable things that are odious to pious ears. Hutton has blasphemed the Holy Ghost by relegating the Third Person of the Most Holy Trinity to some inner part of the heart of a man who worships a false god, and thus being dominated and defiled by the false god! Hutton wrongly says that I teach these souls are predestined to hell. God predestines no one to hell. However, God does know the eternal destiny of all men before they are created. Hutton proves that he does not understand the Catholic doctrine of predestination that I have dealt with at length. He also proved another point I made regarding men like him, and that is they imply that God is stupid and powerless, by teaching that God could not get a good-willed man the things he needs to be saved before he dies. Referring to my comment that there are no unforeseen accidents with God, Hutton disagrees.

Ibid: "Every man dies, in the manner which God has foreseen and permits. **Unless** he kills himself, or was hit by a truck from the path of which he pushed another person."

No man dies without permission from God. Hutton believes there are some things that God is stupid about, that He does not know, and that Satan can kill men without God's permission. Hutton says God does not foresee suicides, and the other example he gives does not even make sense. I would not even attempt to figure out his reasons for teaching such heretical nonsense that denies God's Omniscience. Descending ever deeper into more blasphemy Hutton says that God gives the power of miracles to non-Catholics because of their strong faith.

Ibid: "...You will probably counter: *Without faith it is impossible to please God*. But I have known Protestants with faith enough to move mountains."

So Hutton knows Protestants that have faith enough to move mountains. Protestants who do not believe in the papacy; who do not believe in the real presence of Jesus Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist, Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity; who do not believe in the Ever Virginity of Mary; who do not believe in Her Immaculate Conception, etc. Yet, this spiritual bastard, Hutton Gibson, says they have faith to move mountains, implying that God is so pleased with them that He grants them the miracle of moving mountains. Let him tell that to God on his judgment day. I say woe to him. I say triple woe to him, abomination upon abomination. Dear reader, if after you have read this, you still believe Hutton is Catholic then you are an abomination also. I warn anyone who supports Hutton in any way, by promoting any of his materials that you share in the full guilt of every one of his sins and will surely go down into the fires of hell, unless you repent and condemn him.