

## Against Tera Davis

By Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

### RJMI

Tera Davis joined the St. John the Baptist chat site on 8/4/2022. She pretended to be sincerely in search of the truth but was instead set on finding dirt, of finding some flaw or heresy. This is to be expected for many who join themselves to the site and even many who become Catholic will be insincere and thus come with evil motives.

“And they that are learned among the people shall teach many... and many shall be joined to them deceitfully.” (Dan. 11:33-34)

When she left the site, she did not give any reason why. Shortly after, she posted a refutation of me on her The Catholic Cottage website. <https://thecatholiccottage.blogspot.com/2022/08/is-marys-little-remnant-catholic-church.html>

This is my refutation of her letter. As all good-willed men will learn, Tera Davis, is a liar, feminist, rebel, stoic, non-judgmentalist, and non-punishmentalist.

Here is what the Word of God say about Tera and those like her:

“It is like the sin of witchcraft, to rebel and like the crime of idolatry, to refuse to obey.” (1 Ki. 15:23)

### TERA

As I continue to rebuild my blog, I hope to provide helpful information concerning the faith and Catholic family life, as well as useful links to homeschooling materials. I have disabled direct comments because of internet trolls. If anyone would like to contact me directly, my e-mail is [davis.tera@yahoo.com](mailto:davis.tera@yahoo.com). God bless you!

Is "Mary's Little Remnant" the Catholic Church?

Since Richard Ibranyi, the leader of Mary's Little Remnant (MLR), has uncovered so much information about the extent of the Great Apostasy, and other theological issues, I decided to join the MLR chat site as an inquirer. I wanted to discern the nature of his assertions which are:

- That the Great Apostasy began with the unchaining of Satan in 1033, and we've had no true popes since 1130.
- That only Richard and his followers form the Catholic Church.
- That, since the Church is hierarchical, Richard, though a layman, is justified in calling himself “sole ruler of the Catholic Church”, until we have a pope (which he also believes will be himself, in addition to being one of the apocalyptic Two Witnesses.)

- That those who doubt or disagree with Richard are excluded from the Catholic Church.
- That today, abjurations of heresy, normally required by the Church to be submitted to a bishop so that excommunications may be lifted, must be submitted only to Richard.

For the time, I put aside my own understanding, particularly concerning the binding nature of his claim to the title "sole ruler", as well as what I learned about the "Cadaver Synod" against Pope Formosus, and Sergius III being an antipope. I figured that, if I was somehow mistaken, Richard would clear it up; or, if it was true, that he would be glad to get the additional information.

I first asked about epikeia, but it really didn't answer my concerns.

## **RJMI**

Here Tera lies. I did answer her questions about Epikeia, but she was too slothful to learn about it by reading my book *Exemptions from the Law*. I figured she was not reading it because she never responded. Hence I picked out a pertinent part of the book and sent it to her, as you will see in our below correspondence on the chat site regarding this.

**Tera — 08/05/2022**

Thank you. I think my main concern is in dispensing with the disciplinary law concerning abjuration, which normally requires a bishop. I don't know what can be said about it, since I realize we are in a state of emergency. I will study your writings on epikeia in greater detail. Perhaps I must just persevere in petitioning for the graces I need. And also, getting to know everyone is helpful. Should I contact William when I am ready to move forward?

**RJMI — 08/05/2022**

You can contact Will or me. Yes, you must read my book *Exemptions from the Law*, which deals with Epikeia. If it were not for this, I would not even be able to teach others as I would need the approval of my local Catholic bishop to do so. And that is a good and necessary law to prevent anyone to teach the faith. But when Catholics do not have access to Catholic bishops, that law become harmful because no one would be able to teach them the faith. The same applies to the sacrament of penance. Just because Catholics do not have access to Catholic priests, does not mean they no longer have to confess their sins; or worse, if they did confess to God he would not remit them. This is another example of Epikeia in which God would remit their sins in this emergency situation, as long as they worthily confess them to God. As soon as a Catholic priest becomes available, they would then have to confess to him. There have several times in the history of the Catholic Church in which Catholics did not have access to Catholic priests and times when they did not have access their whole life. But they were got baptized, confessed their sins, and abjured if they fell away.

**RJMI — 08/05/2022**

For other works on Epikeia See RJMI Topic Index: Exemptions from the Law

**RJMI — 08/05/2022**

The abjuration is in the form of a Profession of Faith. You can access it on the Sidebar menu and start to study it. There is no rush. You should take your time. I

and others on the site would be glad to answer your question. If you have any question you would like to keep private then just contact me.

**RJMI — 08/07/2022**

Tera, here is a quote from my book Exemptions from the Law, pages 34-35:

Taking abjurations is allowed by the law: Under normal circumstances abjurations must be taken before authorized Catholic bishops or their delegates. But the law allows converts to take abjurations before laymen when no Catholic bishops or priests are available, such as in missionary areas:

*The Reception of Converts*: “During the period between the Council of Trent (1545-1563) and the present Code (1918) the Sacred Congregation developed many aspects of the abjuration of heresy and the profession of faith through instructions and responses. Thus, on April 7, 1629, the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith declared that apostates in missionary countries were under no obligation of making a public abjuration before infidels, but **it was sufficient for them to make it before the faithful**, provided that they discontinued wearing any garb indicative of apostasy, and that they took care that the infidels learned of their abjuration in due time either from themselves or from others, even if this entailed danger to their lives. **Ordinarily the abjuration was to be made before the bishop; but the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith permitted a private abjuration with only a few of the faithful present as witnesses under certain conditions.** If there was question of scandal, the abjuration necessarily had to be public. The Congregation insisted on this, even at the risk of the loss of temporal goods necessary for the sustenance of the convert and his family, when the retention of these goods connoted an implicit profession of heresy. At the same time, the Congregation declared that no one could be received into the Church if he wished to keep his Catholicity secret by publicly posing as a heretic.”

**Tera — 08/10/2022**

Thank you for the information. I wasn't feeling well for a couple days, and haven't been able to read the entire book as I wanted, or log on to the chat site. The passage you've highlighted is particularly helpful. Epikeia in general does not trouble me, but it's just a matter of understanding which matters would and wouldn't apply. I think you've done a very thorough job at clearing it up.

So here she says I cleared up her doubts about the use of Epikeia, but on her refutation of me, as quoted above, she said:

Tera: “I first asked about epikeia, but it really didn't answer my concerns.”

## **TERA**

After several days of getting to know everyone on the site, finding them all extremely nice, and chatting with them about secular matters, I sent Richard another message addressing my concerns. I asked that, since his insight came gradually, and since he has realized he had even been denying basic dogmas as late as 2013, could there possibly be things yet to be uncovered. Specifically, I asked if he counted Sergius III among the antipopes, since he had previously been excommunicated and deposed by Pope John IX. I wanted to know that, since no public miracle confirmed his authority, why was there no room for those who may doubt.

My questions were not received well, and he basically asked if I was trying to sabotage his work!

## RJMI

Another lie from Tera! I answered her questions. Here is a copy of her question and my answer:

**Tera — 08/24/2022**

To be blunt, my main theological concern is whether I can agree that only those who submit their abjuration here, and accept you as sole ruler, can be Catholic. If there was a public miracle to confirm this, I think there would be no hesitation among inquirers. Some people may hesitate since God has chosen to reveal the extent of the Great Apostasy gradually and there may be more heresies, since you admit to having been mistaken in the past, and since you realized you had denied basic dogmas in 2013. On the other hand, the Church is hierarchical in nature, and establishing lay authority is good. So, that is what I'm grappling with. I am also curious as to how you are getting holy water. Is it just blessed water, or are you trusting God to exorcise the water since we have no priests? The last thing is, I was wondering if you include Sergius III among the antipopes, since he had been excommunicated and deposed by Pope John IX. Thank you.

**RJMI — 08/24/2022**

Tera,

There may very well be other Catholics in the world that I do not know about and do not know about me. And I hope so. However, those who do know about me and the other Catholics who are with me would have to be in religious communion with us or they would be schismatics. The only thing that would save them from being schismatics is if they can prove I am a heretic on this point or that; and after having shown me certain proof, I do not abjure but remain obstinate.

The duty, then, is upon you to let me know if you do not believe in one or more points in the Profession of Faith in the Days of the Great Apostasy and show me your evidence.

If your evidence is lacking for one reason or another, then it is certain you would be a formal heretic on the given point for not accepting the dogma, being the evidence has been presented to you.

If your evidence is certain, then I would have to abjure and correct my opinion. And if I do not, then it would be certain that I am a formal heretic and then you would be bound to condemn me as such and thus you must not be in religious communion with me until I abjure.

So until you come up with such certain evidence, you would be guilty of schism for not wanting to be in religious communion with me and the other members of the Church who are in communion with me.

So now you know the great importance of learning your faith. If you find yourself trying to get me or come up with a heresy to stick on me, then you would already be of bad-will and as such would be blinded from doing any real good.

I got holy water quite some time ago from priests who I thought were Catholic. And since then, I add to the holy water before it evaporates. This is a teaching of the Church which states that if no priest is available to bless holy water, the existing holy water can be added to.

Regarding John IX and Serious III, see my book *Non-Catholics Cannot Hold Offices in the Catholic Church: Popes and antipopes who were put on trial: Formosus (891-896)*.

Sincerely,

RJMI

PS: "He that refuseth to learn, shall fall into evils." (Prv. 17:16) (edited)

**Tera — 08/24/2022**

I don't it's a question of heresy, but rather of ordinary vs. extraordinary mission.  
Thank you , I will consider these things further.

I will add another comment here. If the faithful who were at one time formal heretics and thus have since abjured can never be trusted again, then God should have never allowed Abraham, Aaron and St. Paul to be rulers in his Church, as Abraham was a pagan, Aaron fell into idolatry, and St. Paul was an apostate Jew, a Christ-denying Jew. The faithful, then, would be bound to say, I do not have to obey them because, who knows, they can fall again into paganism, idolatry, or apostasy. And even if I became the pope, you can still say: "Well he was a formal heretic in the past and may become one in the future, so why obey him," as even true popes can fall into formal heresy.

Now for the big issue that this lying, feminist, rebel Tera is so hot over, so eager to address: the dispute over the validity of Formosus' election to the papacy. Yes, it is a very complicated matter. But step aside, superwoman will handle it! One reason I will not waste years and years of my time delving deeper into this is because it was not a matter of sins against the faith but of violating or not violating disciplinary laws. In many of these cases the schism is a material schism not formal because the dispute was over who was or was not validly elected to the papacy and both sides have plausible arguments.

In these cases, one man says he is the pope and the other an antipope, and the other says he is the pope and the other is an antipope, and both are Catholic because the schism is a material schism. For example, If the so-called popes during the Western Schism were true popes (and they were not), the dispute was not over heresy but over who was or was not validly elected and thus it was only a material schism. Take the example of Anacletus II and Innocent II:

*History of the Church*, by apostate Philip Hughes: "The simple fact that a man physically sits in the Chair of Peter in Rome does not necessarily mean he is the pope. History shows that antipopes had physically sat in Rome for several years. Anacletus II (1130-1138) was such an antipope who reigned in Rome for eight years, while the legitimate pope, Innocent II, was in exile. Neither claimant to the papal dignity was canonically elected according to the current laws in force from 1059 A.D. onwards. Innocent II was elected first, but by a minority of cardinals, while Anacletus II was elected second but by a majority of cardinals. According to the law in force, regarding the election of the pope, one had to be the first candidate elected and also needed the majority of the votes of the cardinals. Neither held claim to a legal canonical election." (vol. 1)

Even though Innocent II was an apostate antipope for other reasons, this dispute was over disciplinary laws on who was or was not validly elected. And just because it is the opinion of the apostate Rev. Philip Hughes that Innocent II was the validly elected and Anacletus II was not, does not mean his opinion is true. This is one of those things we may never know until the General Judgment. Hence Anacletus II or Innocent II was not in formal schism over this but only material schism. That is beside the fact the Innocent II was an apostate antipope for sins against the faith.

Another reason I will not address this topic, even if it did involve sins against the faith, is because I do not have time to spend years on studying every pre-1000 pope to see if they were Catholic or not. I have presented enough evidence to prove that the Great Apostasy began in 1033 and that all the so-called popes since Innocent II in 1130 were and are apostate antipopes. That does not mean there were no antipopes and even heretical antipopes before that, as I have produced enough evidence of that in my book *Non-Catholics Cannot Hold Offices in the Catholic Church*.

I am now concentrating on presenting the full deposit of the faith on my site, which I now have done, and the pastoral works to help Catholics become or remain good Catholics. If I studied the life and works of all the pre-1000 popes it would take up all my time, even to study just one takes a lot of research and time. As such, the public would not have the Catholic Prayer book, Bible, and Profession of Faith I composed or my book on Penance and other important books.

Can you just image if ten people at the same time asked me to look at the evidence and investigate ten so-called popes. Obviously that would be impossible for me to do, all at the same time. And would it be just and fair if they called me a heretic for not reading their evidence and investigating it?

So I do not take my marching orders from everybody who wants me to work on their pet project, good as it may be, in order to distract me from doing more important works. Is that understood! Or capice as the Italians say.

That being said, the only reason I list Tera's full rambling and confused letter regarding Formosus is so she cannot say I left out some compelling evidence. I apologize ahead of time for the confusion. If you want, you can simply skip over the whole thing or only read parts.

## **TERA**

Specifically, I asked if he counted Sergius III among the antipopes, since he had previously been excommunicated and deposed by Pope John IX. I wanted to know that, since no public miracle confirmed his authority, why was there no room for those who may doubt... He then said that I had not studied the faith (meaning his materials), and directed me to a section of his book *Non-Catholics Cannot Hold Offices in the Catholic Church*, pp. 123-124:

### **RJMI**

Formosus (891-896): Depending on which side was right, Formosus was either a pope or never the pope if his election was invalid. After Formosus' death, his successor Pope Stephen VI had Formosus' body taken from the grave and put on a throne. And Formosus was then tried, condemned, his election declared invalid, and all of his acts were declared invalid:

Nominal Catholic Encyclopedia, Pope Formosus: "After his death, Stephen VI lent himself to the revolting scene of sitting in judgment on his predecessor, Formosus. At the synod convened for that purpose, he occupied the chair; the corpse, clad in papal vestments, was withdrawn from the sarcophagus and seated on a throne; close by stood a deacon to answer in its name, all the old charges formulated against Formosus under John VIII being revived. The decision was that the deceased had been unworthy of the pontificate, which he could not have validly received since he was bishop of another see. All his measures and acts were annulled, and all the orders conferred by him were declared invalid. The papal vestments were torn from his body; the three fingers which the dead pope had used in consecrations were

severed from his right hand; the corpse was cast into a grave in the cemetery for strangers, to be removed after a few days and consigned to the Tiber. In 897 the second successor of Stephen had the body, which a monk had drawn from the Tiber, reinterred with full honours in St. Peter's. He furthermore annulled at a synod the decisions of the court of Stephen VI, and declared all orders conferred by Formosus valid. John IX confirmed these acts at two synods, of which the first was held at Rome and the other at Ravenna (898). On the other hand Sergius III (904-911) approved in a Roman synod the decisions of Stephen's synod against Formosus; all who had received orders from the latter were to be treated as lay persons, unless they sought re-ordination. Sergius and his party meted out severe treatment to the bishops consecrated by Formosus, who in turn had meanwhile conferred orders on many other clerics, a policy which gave rise to the greatest confusion. Against these decisions many books were written, which demonstrated the validity of the consecration of Formosus and of the orders conferred by him."

A History of the Church, by apostate Rev. Philip Hughes, 1934: "Sergius renewed all the censures against Formosus, and honoured the tomb of...Stephen VI with an epitaph that exalted the infamous trial in words that defy translation. Next, annulling all the ordinations made by Formosus and the 'Formosan' popes, John IX and Benedict IV..."

Whichever side was right, true popes and antipopes were put on trial, sentenced, punished, and their acts declared invalid. The argument was not whether a pope could be put on trial but only if the trial was just or unjust.

Tera: "Whichever side was right"? It's clear that Richard has done a lot of research in his writings, so why is it different in this case? My opinion is that he brushed past the Cadaver Synod and its aftermath, first because he did not view it as a direct matter of heresy which is what he was searching for, and because finding Sergius III to be an antipope might not fit with his theory that the Great Apostasy began in 1033. Another factor might be that Richard doesn't really see anything wrong with the violent actions taken by Stephen VI against the body of Pope Formosus, the Vicar of Christ.

But whatever the reason, it was obvious that Richard was not interested in new information. He seemed more intent on blind obedience than the truth. So, I decided to simply share the information I had, and leave the chat site. Here is my (inescapably long) message, followed by Richard's terse reply:

## **RJMI**

Another lie, I never got her following message and thus could not have answered it. The answer I did give her was in response to her leaving the chat site and giving no reason why. She pretends that this was the answer to her following letter which I never received.

## **TERA**

Here is my (inescapably long) message, followed by Richard's terse reply:

Dear RJMI,

1. On whether a public miracle is needed to confirm one as sole ruler, I agree with you (Faith before Signs and Wonders) that it simply would not work. Even if there was a miracle, one would still have to study everything the person taught to confirm that it is in line with Church teaching. Otherwise, it would just be a false miracle.

2. I read the entire book *Non-Catholics Cannot Hold Offices in the Catholic Church* last year, and after taking another look at your section on Pope Formosus and the Cadaver Synod, I see that it is inconclusive. I thought you might have written more about it somewhere else, but I guess not. It is true that there is a lot of confusion surrounding the affair, but after studying the matter over the past several months, the Church's position is clear, as shown below, and I must follow the just decree of Pope John IX, lest I deny the dogma of Papal Supremacy. I reject Sergius III as one deposed and excommunicated, and therefore ineligible for the papacy. His successor Anastasius III, who explicitly upheld Sergius' heretical decrees, was therefore also an antipope. From Landonius to John XII, Sergius' dictates were tacitly denied, even though he has never been denounced, and Pope Formosus has not yet been restored to honor.

I will be leaving the chat site, since it was never my intention to make waves. I see now that I should have asked about Sergius III before joining the site. Thanks again for letting me join and meet everyone.

Tera

#### Summary

Pope Formosus was "charged" with leaving his See of Porto to become Pope, contrary to the ancient canons and the 769 decree of Pope Stephen III, making his election and all his acts invalid. Pope Formosus' election was uncustomary, but it did not actually violate the canons:

Apostolic Canon 14. A bishop is not to be allowed to leave his own parish and pass over into another, although he may be pressed by many to do so, unless there be some proper cause to do so on the ground that he can confer some greater benefit upon the persons of that place in the word of godliness. And then, this must not be done of his own accord, but by the judgment of many bishops and at their earnest exhortation.

Concilium Lateranense Stephani III, 769, pp. 9-14

#### Second Action

- Let no one of the laity ever presume, nor of any other order, unless, ascending through distinct degrees, he has been made a [cardinal] deacon, or a cardinal-priest, to be promoted to the sacred honor of the Pontificate.

#### Fourth Action: Statutes against Power and Ambition

- If any one of the bishops, or priests, or monks, or of the laity, breaks away from the statute of the canons and Holy Fathers, dares to thrust himself into the major rank of the Holy Roman Church, that is, of cardinal priests and deacons; and attempts to invade this Apostolic See, and wishes to ascend to the highest Pontifical honor; let him and his backers be forever anathema.



- If anyone dares to resist the Priests, and Primates of the Church, or all the Clergy, according to this canonical tradition, let him be anathema.

[This Council was a judgment against antipope Constantine II, who tried to lie about receiving Holy Orders, and strong-arm his way into papal power. According to the witness of the notary Christopher Primicerius, given on pages 4-9 of the document, Constantine was a diabolical murderer who plotted to kill Pope Paul I. Note that this council does not say a bishop from another diocese would be invalidly consecrated Pope. Nor does it say that a layman's elevation to the papacy would be invalid, provided he was elected or appointed by proper authority, and first obtained Holy Orders before the papal consecration.]

It was not Pope Formosus (891-896) who first changed Sees to become Pope, but Pope Marinus (882-884) before him. Pointing this out did not suit the cause of Pope Stephen VI or Sergius, however, since Stephen VI was ordained by Pope Marinus, and Sergius was made deacon by him, and ordained by Stephen VI.

Pope Stephen VI was angry because Pope Formosus was elected instead of himself in 891.

Pope Formosus also enraged the young Emperor Lambert's regent mother Ageltruda, by appointing another emperor to come to the aid of the Church. She encouraged Stephen VI to hold the unjust, macabre trial against the Holy Vicar Formosus.

Condemning Pope Formosus, and nullifying his acts, justified the renunciation of both Stephen VI's and Sergius' bishop's Sees, appointed by Formosus.

Like Pope Stephen VI, Sergius also set his sights on gaining papal power. He was functioning as cardinal priest under Pope Stephen VI, and he was a ringleader in the unjust trial against Pope Formosus.

The Roman people saw the sudden collapse of the Lateran as a sign of God's wrath against the unjust desecration of the body and memory of His Vicar Pope Formosus.

Pope St. Gregory the Great, "On the Authority of the Hierarchy": If David, who was the most righteous of kings, presumed not to lay his hand on Saul, who was evidently already rejected by God, how much more should heed be taken that none lay the hand of detraction or vituperation or indiscretion or dishonor on the Lord's anointed... since vexation or detraction of them touches Christ, in whose stead they fill the office of legates in the Church! (Fathers of the Church, Aquilina, p. 218)

The false charges against Pope Formosus were nullified by Pope Theodore II, even before Sergius and Pope John IX vied for the Papal Chair.

In 898, Sergius and Pope John IX were simultaneously elected while Rome was in chaos; ironically, it was Emperor Lambert who refused to acknowledge Sergius, but rather Pope John IX, who was accepted by all as pope.

At the 898 Council of Rome, and later that year at the Council of Ravenna, in which 70 bishops attended (and approved), Pope John IX resolved the matter of Pope Formosus, and brought a relative peace to Rome; he confirmed and expounded upon Pope Theodore's decree; he declared

the the trial null, and burned its minutes; he exonerated Pope Formosus and validated all Holy Orders coming from him. These decrees were also confirmed by his successor Pope Benedict IV.

Histoire des Couniles d'apres les Documents Originaux, Hefele, "Decrees of 898 Council of Rome", pp. 716-717 <https://archive.org/details/histoiredesconci42hefele/page/716/mode/2up>

1. The council celebrated under our predecessor Stephen VI which caused the body of Formosa to be removed from the tomb to condemn the memory of this pope, is declared by us to be null; and so that nothing similar is seen henceforth, we forbid the summoning of the dead.

2. On the entreaties of this holy council, we pardon the bishops and clerics who took part in the council against Formosa, and who beg pardon, saying that they were forced to act as they did. We prohibit in the future any violence made to the bishops in the councils.

3. Formosa was, because of his merits, transferred from the bishopric of Porto to the Apostolic See; but such exceptions should only rarely be tolerated, and we should return to the ancient custom.

4. Clerics ordained by Formosa and deposed by others will recover their ordinations and grades.

5. If, according to canon law, a place is not vacant, no other person should be ordained to fill it.

6. We declare valid the coronation of the Emperor Lambert, and completely reject the barbaric coronation of Berenger, obtained by force.

7. The acts of the council held under Stephen will be burned.

8. The Roman priests Sergius, Benoit and Marin, as well as the deacons Leon, Pascal and Jean, are deposed and excommunicated; they must not be recognized by anyone under penalty of excommunication.

9. As for those who excavated the tomb of Formosa to remove a treasure from it, who profaned it and then threw his corpse into the Tiber, they will be excommunicated until they have done penance.

10. As there is great violence in the elections of the popes, if some imperial commissioners do not attend these elections, we order that in the future the pope be elected by the bishops (cardinals) and by the assembled (Roman) clergy, in the presence of the senate and the people; but he will only be crowned before the emperor's legates.

11. We forbid that in the future the house of a pope or a bishop be looted after their death. Whoever does so, notwithstanding this prohibition, will be punished by the pope and the emperor.

12. The abuse was introduced that the civil judges evoke in their court the causes come from carnal faults, and which would return by right to the court of the bishop, then, by means of a certain sum of money, they manage not to to punish; or else they mistreat the girls of bad life, which they have in their possession, until their parents or their masters pay the ransom of these people. These women then continue their sad profession with more boldness than before, because

they are convinced that they no longer have anything to do with the bishop and that they have been judged by public officials. Also, in the future, no one should encroach on the power of the bishop to judge the sins of lust.

After the death of Pope Benedict IV, the (excommunicated) want-to-be emperor Berengar brought in Leo V and placed him on the papal throne to suit his political faction. Leo was called “dead priest” because he was not a cardinal priest of Rome; such an elevation was contrary to the canons, and he was imprisoned. After his death, the priest Christopher was elected pope, and he was accepted as valid until modern times.

In 904 Sergius was ineligible for papal election because he had been deposed and excommunicated by Pope John IX for instigating the violent desecration of the body of Pope Formosus. Nevertheless, Sergius returned from exile with armed forces, and took the papal office (violating the canons).

Sergius’ own decrees showed he was an antipope. He tried to re-confirm the straw man trial against Pope Formosus and all its acts. He decreed that all Holy Orders coming from Formosus, John IX and Benedict IV were not just illicit, but also invalid, which, as you have pointed out, is contrary to Church teaching. This caused great chaos.

The usurpation of Sergius III began the subjugation of the papacy by “The Rule of Harlots”, until Otto I deposed John XII. Isaias 3:12 As for my people, their oppressors have stripped them, and women have ruled over them.

Dear Tera,

We will continue to pray for your conversion into the Catholic Church. As of now, my Catholic obligation is to tell you that you are on the broad road to hell. I hope that after flailing around among all the lost souls who call themselves Catholic, you will come back to the site.

Sincerely,

RJMI

PS: You now know the truth and cannot deny it on your judgment day.

**RJMI**

Now that above email I sent her was not in response to her above letter, which I never received, but to her message that she was leaving the chat site. Here is her message in which she gave no reason why she is leaving the site and then my response, which is the one above:

**Tera — 8/27/2022, 11:35 AM**

Hello everyone. I will be leaving the chat site. Thank you all for being so kind and welcoming. I'm glad I had the chance to meet you. Take care.

**RJMI email 8/27/2022, 11:40am**

Dear Tera,

We will continue to pray for your conversion into the Catholic Church. As of now, my Catholic obligation is to tell you that you are on the broad road to hell. I hope that after flailing around among all the lost souls who call themselves Catholic, you will come back to the site.

Sincerely

RJMI

PS: You now know the truth and cannot deny it on your judgment day

What follows is more of her ramblings about the Formosus thing and other topics.

## **TERA**

I forgot to include that, long before his elevation, Pope Formosus (who had not been excommunicated by Pope John VIII) had been exonerated and restored to his bishop's See of Porto by Pope Marinus, another important point (typically) omitted by The Catholic Encyclopedia. See:

"Antipope Sergius"

<https://thecatholiccottage.blogspot.com/2022/07/antipope-sergius-iii.html>

But I don't think it would have mattered. So, I was condemned by Richard for upholding the decrees of Pope John IX, and three other Popes, as well. But unless Catholics have a valid canonical reason to reject these papal decrees, they are bound to follow them, rather than the opinion of a self-validating man.

St. Vincent of Lerins, "Commonitory---For the Antiquity and Universality of the Catholic Faith against the Profane Novelties of All Heresies"

Ch. 10. Why Eminent Men are permitted by God to become Authors of Novelties in the Church. [27.] ...Let us listen, then, to Holy Moses, and let him teach us why learned men, and such as because of their knowledge are even called Prophets by the apostle, are sometimes permitted to put forth novel doctrines, which the Old Testament is wont, by way of allegory, to call strange gods, forasmuch as heretics pay the same sort of reverence to their notions that the Gentiles do to their gods. [28.] Blessed Moses, then, writes thus in Deuteronomy: If there arise among you a prophet or a dreamer of dreams, that is, one holding office as a Doctor in the Church, who is believed by his disciples or auditors to teach by revelation: well — what follows? and gives you a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass whereof he spoke,— he is pointing to some eminent doctor, whose learning is such that his followers believe him not only to know things human, but, moreover, to foreknow things superhuman, such as, their disciples commonly boast, were Valentinus, Donatus, Photinus, Apollinaris, and the rest of that sort! What next? And shall say to you, Let us go after other gods, whom you know not, and serve them. What are those other gods but strange errors which you know not, that is, new and such as were never heard of before? And let us serve them; that is, Let us believe them, follow them. What last? You shall not hearken to the words of that prophet or dreamer of dreams. And why, I pray you, does not God forbid to be taught what God forbids to be heard? For the Lord, your God, tries you, to know

whether you love Him with all your heart and with all your soul. The reason is clearer than day why Divine Providence sometimes permits certain doctors of the Churches to preach new doctrines — That the Lord your God may try you; he says. And assuredly it is a great trial when one whom you believe to be a prophet, a disciple of prophets, a doctor and defender of the truth, whom you have folded to your breast with the utmost veneration and love, when such a one of a sudden secretly and furtively brings in noxious errors, which you can neither quickly detect, being held by the prestige of former authority, nor lightly think it right to condemn, being prevented by affection for your old master.

As Richard points out in his article "History of the Solemn and Ordinary Magisterium":

Papal Supremacy:

I've concluded that:

- Since Richard did not correct me concerning Pope Formosus and Sergius III, as a Catholic is obliged to do, he simply can't refute the information because it's true.
- That MLR has therefore not necessarily uncovered the extent of the Great Apostasy, and its understanding is of natural origin. (Even if it was supernatural, that does not mean it is from God.)
- That, even if everything was true on the MLR site, Catholics are not bound to subject themselves to Richard without the confirmation of a public miracle, as shown by Bp. de Sales below. (But there are other doubtful issues on the site, as well, like using epikeia to disobey laws that are not difficult or harmful to keep, such as: moving/adding feast days such as the long-standing feast of the Purification on Feb. 2; changing the fasts; minor things, like permitting Catholics to put cream in their coffee during Lent, whereas a Bishop would only grant such a dispensation when food was scarce; going beyond what true Popes have done by declaring OT Saints, renaming days and months, and wanting to honor OT feasts, etc.) No matter how well-meaning he may be, no one can appoint himself "sole ruler of the Church" to the point of binding consciences, or to the exclusion of the Catholic Church.

## **RJMI**

Because Tera did not refer to Francis de Sales as an apostate, she is an apostate on this point alone because she knows the extent of the Great Apostasy.

I have already addressed the two reasons why I will not address what she says about Formosus and Sergius III.

While she says she believes in Epikeia, she does not. If these things I have done are not heretical but good, then why the argument. There is no good reason not to obey me considering all the other works I have done, not just dogmatic but pastoral. Tera, disagrees because she is a feminist rebel.

Here is one example of her stoic heresy when she says it is a sin to put cream in coffee during Lent.

And she may be guilty of racism against Jews as she does not like that I added Old Testament saints and festivals to the calendar.

Now here is where she quotes the apostate Bishop Francis de Sales, who was an apostate and stoic and whom she never condemns as such.

## TERA

Bp. Francis de Sales, *The Catholic Controversy*, Mission, Ch. III, pp. 18-32 The Pretended Reformers had no Immediate or Extraordinary Mission from God: ...First, I say then that no one should allege an extraordinary mission unless he prove it by miracles: for, I pray you, where should we be if this pretext of extraordinary mission was to be accepted without proof? ... Never was any one extraordinarily sent unless he brought this letter of credit from the divine Majesty. Moses was sent immediately by God to govern the people of Israel. He wished to know his name who sent him; when he had learnt the admirable name of God, he asked for signs and patents of his commission: God so far found this request good that he gave him the grace of three sorts of prodigies and marvels, which were, so to speak, three attestations in three different languages, of the charge which he gave him, in order that anyone who did not understand one might understand another. If then they allege extraordinary mission, let them show us some extraordinary works, otherwise we are not obliged to believe them. In truth Moses clearly shows the necessity of this proof for him who would speak extraordinarily: for having to beg from God the gift of eloquence, he only asks it after having the power of miracles; showing that it is more necessary to have authority to speak than to have readiness in speaking.

The mission of S. John Baptist, though it was not altogether extraordinary, — was it not authenticated by his conception, his nativity, and even by that miraculous life of his, to which our Lord gave such excellent testimony? But as to the Apostles, — who does not know the miracles they did and the great number of them? Their handkerchiefs, their shadow, served for the prompt healing of the sick and driving away of the devils: by the hands of the apostles many signs and wonders were done amongst the people (Acts xix. V.); and that this was in confirmation of their preaching St. Mark declares quite explicitly in the last words of his Gospel, and St. Paul to the Hebrews (ii. 4). How then shall those who in our age would allege an extraordinary mission excuse and relieve themselves of this proof of their mission? What privilege have they greater than an Apostolic, a Mosaic? What shall I say more? If our sovereign Master, consubstantial with the Father, having a mission so authentic that it comprises the communication of the same essence, if He Himself, I say, who is the living source of all Ecclesiastical mission, has not chosen to dispense Himself from this proof of miracles, what reason is there that these new ministers should be believed on their mere word? Our Lord very often alleges his mission to give credit to His words: — As My Father hath sent Me I also send you (John xx. 21); My doctrine is not Mine, hut of Him that sent Me (ibid. vii. 1 6); You doth know Me, and you know whence I am; and I am not come of Myself (ibid. 28). But also, to give authority to His mission, He brings forward His miracles, and attests that if he had not done among the Jews works which no other man had done, they would not have sinned in not believing Him. And elsewhere He says to them: Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father in Me? Otherwise, believe for the works themselves (ibid. xiv. 11, 12). He then, who would be so rash as to boast of

extraordinary mission without immediately producing miracles, deserves to be taken for an impostor.

...That we may not now be children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, in the wickedness of men and in their craftiness (Eph. iv.)...the word of Our Lord frees us from all these difficulties, who has built His Church on so good a foundation and in such wise proportions that the gates of hell shall never prevail against it...for God hateth nothing of those things which He has made (Wis. xi. 25). How then did they abolish the ordinary Church [with the Pope being the only "Sole Ruler"], to make an extraordinary one, since it is He who has built the ordinary one, and cemented it with His own blood?

#### Ch. IV, An Answer to the Two Objections which are Made by the Supporters of the Theory of Immediate Mission

...And as to the Prophets, I see many persons under a delusion. It is supposed that all the vocations of the Prophets were extraordinary and immediate. A false idea: for there were colleges and congregations of the Prophets approved by the Synagogue, as may be gathered from many passages of the Scriptures... How many miracles did the Prophets work in confirmation of the prophetic vocation? I should never end if I were to enter upon the computation of these: but at such times as they did a thing which had an appearance of extraordinary power, immediately miracles followed. Witness Elias, who, setting up an altar on Mount Carmel according to the instinct which the Holy Spirit had given him, and offering sacrifice, showed by miracle that he did it to the honor of God and of the Jewish religion.

... Your first ministers then, gentlemen, are of the prophets whom God forbade to be heard, in Jeremias (xxiii):

Hearken not to the words of the prophets that prophesy to you and deceive you: they speak a vision of their own heart and not out of the mouth of the Lord...I did not send prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied...I have heard what the prophets said, that prophecy lies in my name, and say, I have dreamed, I have dreamed.

## RJMI

Tera is a sign and wonder seeker.

I never rested my claim of being sole ruler of the Catholic Church on signs and wonders or even that I am one of the Two Witnesses mentioned in Apocalypse 11. I based my claim solely upon my works that teach, uphold, and defend the full deposit of the Catholic faith, which includes my pastoral works, which no one else in the world is doing.

Is not the faith enough for you? Jesus rebukes you and those like you:

“Jesus therefore said to him: Unless you see signs and wonders, you believe not.”  
(Jn. 4:48)

Are not the works that God has given me regarding the Catholic faith the greatest miracle of all!  
And you even said that you did not find any heresy in my works.

**Tera — 08/24/2022:** I don't it's a question of heresy, but rather of ordinary vs. extraordinary mission. Thank you , I will consider these things further.

And you admit that even if someone had all the signs and wonders that you are now seeking but does not hold the Catholic faith must not be listened to. I could never tell people to obey me as the sole ruler of the Catholic Church if it were not for the works God has given me. Let the faith be your guide, not signs and wonders.

That does not mean signs and wonders will not come. They will, but they are for the unbelievers, those who do not even profess to be Catholic.

“Wherefore tongues [and other signs and wonders] are for a sign, not to believers but to unbelievers; but prophecies [the Catholic faith] not to unbelievers but to believers.” (1 Cor. 14:22)

Catholics will be given signs and wonders not only to convert unbelievers but also to protect themselves from the attacks of the Antichrist.

## **TERA**

- That, as my friend David pointed out, since Richard admitted to having denied basic dogmas in 2013, before that time he was inadvertently compelling others to abjure themselves out of the Catholic Church and into a non-Catholic sect! Yet, he has not abjured from doing this, and is still, therefore, excommunicated, having no authority "on this point alone", as he likes to say. Why then, should he be followed?

RJMI's Doubt or Denial of Basic Dogmas: "I was not Catholic when I held this heresy. I abjured from it on July 3rd, 2013."

## **RJMI**

I have no idea of what she is talking about in the above statement as to why I have to abjure again after I abjured. That would only be so if I fell again into mortal sins against the Catholic faith.

## **TERA**

- That, Richard claims the special privilege of entering the Church by epikeia, yet insists that others are only able to enter through him. (Unless, perhaps they've never heard of him, have never denied a basic dogma or doubted any dogma according to his understanding, and have had a truly Catholic Baptism, which does not include having been baptized in the nominal Catholic Church!)

## **RJMI**

I have abjured before others and so must all who want to come into the Catholic Church. If one agrees that I am the only one teaching and living by the full deposit of the Catholic faith, then what is the problem of me accepting your abjuration? Or would you rather abjure before yourself



or before one of your non-Catholic family members, all of whom you told me are nominal Catholics and one who does not even believe in God and thus is an atheist.

Also I am not sure if you believe baptisms outside the Catholic Church are valid but illegal. They are valid but illegal. They only bestow the indelible mark. Only Catholic baptism (those who are baptized into the Catholic Church) is legal and valid.

## **TERA**

- That, since the true Church is apostolic, built on no other foundation than the rock of St. Peter, no one can claim the title “Sole Ruler of the Catholic Church” for themselves. What if a man in China also claimed to be top dog? Who, then, would be sole ruler?

## **RJMI**

God directly choose Abraham, the Judges, and Moses to rule his Church, and that was before any public miracles. If a man in China claims to be a top dog and he is teaching and living by the full deposit of the Catholic faith as I am, then I will concede to him authority in that part of the world. By the way, who do you have in mind that fits this bill other than me? And as you said, God is not the author of confusion and thus will have his authority vested in one man and in one place only.

## **TERA**

- That God is not the Author of confusion. What about simple people who can't understand all of Richard's writings? How are they to discern the truth? No, I must conclude that Catholics are bound to submit only to a true pope, and his bishops and priests. They are not obligated to submit to a self-validating layman.

## **RJMI**

Confusion is what my works are saving men from, and now from you who are trying to confuse them all the more. Here is where Tera's sloth in learning the faith shows. Most of my works, and all of the most important ones, are easy for simple people to understand. She just does not want to read them because of sloth or she is afraid to learn something she does not want to hear, like obeying me, stop being a feminist, stoic, rebel and that her non-Catholic family members are on the broad road to hell, along with herself.

Now her following evidence backfires and proves her to be a rebel, just like the Protestants. She sounds more like a Protestant and a holder of the democracy heresy. In her attempt to try to prove that I am a cult leader and those who follow me are cult members, she actually lays out the marks of the true Catholic Church and true Catholics.

And she also has more evidence of her stoicism and even of non-judgmentalism and non-punishmentalism.

## TERA

- That MLR is cultish, rather than Catholic. People haven't left this group, or refuse to join, only because they're "bad-willed"!

"4 Signs that Someone You Know has Joined a Cult"

1. The person is in an especially vulnerable state [all true Catholics today are isolated and ostracized for upholding the faith]
2. The person becomes close to a charismatic figure who begins to have influence over them [Catholics want to make sense of the Great Apostasy; they naturally want to be unified under a pope-like leader; those in the group want closure so badly, they are willing to overlook the excessively violent and profane talk, which no holy Catholic leader has ever used, such as: "You piece of s\_\_t!"; "Immodest women deserve to be raped...and have their breasts cut off."; "I'd cut off his private part and feed it to my dogs.". Richard wants to be judge, jury and executioner: "If five obstinate heretics came to my door, I'd go outside, cut their heads off, then go back in and finish my dinner."; "I'd warn those fighting soccer players once, and if they fought again I'd kill them.".

## RJMI

Here is another sign of her sloth! She obviously does not read the Bible or ignores all the passage in which God's chosen people vehemently condemn, punish, and even kill God's enemies. Her disgust of these good works of God is one proof that she is a non-judgmentalist and non-punishmentalist. And may I add, that she does not really love God not even in the least.

A simple and honest reading of the Bible would knock the mushiness out of her.

Do we all agree the dung is shit by another name? Here is what the following holy men say about dung, about shit:

Prophet Elias: "And the flesh of Jezabel shall be as dung [shit] upon the face of the earth in the field of Jezrahel, so that they who pass by shall say: Is this that same Jezabel?" (4 Ki. 9:37)

St. Jesus, son of Sirach: "Every woman that is a harlot, shall be trodden upon as dung [shit] in the way." (Eccus. 9:10) "The sluggard is pelted with the dung [shit] of oxen." (Eccus. 22:2)

God says: "Thus saith the Lord: Even the carcass of man shall fall as dung [shit] upon the face of the country." (Jer. 9:22)

God says, "Behold, I will cast the shoulder to you, and will scatter upon your face the dung [shit] of your solemnities, and it shall take you away with it." (Mala. 2:3)

Listen to what St. Paul says,

“If you be without chastisement, whereof all are made partakers, then are you **bastards** and not sons.” (Heb. 12:8)

Listen to what the Holy Prophet Isaias says about the killing infants, pillaging homes, and raping women:

“Every one that shall be found shall be slain; and every one that shall come to their aid, shall fall by the sword. Their infants shall be dashed in pieces before their eyes; their houses shall be pillaged; and their wives shall be ravished.” (Isa. 13:15-16)

As such, the way Tera is now, she may be one of those whose children will be killed before her eyes, her house pillage, and her raped after shit is spread on her face. You think that is bad. Hell is way, way, way worse.

Phinees was highly blessed and chosen by God because he cut out the private parts of a Jew who was fornicating with a pagan Gentile:

“And Israel at that time abode in Settim, and the people committed fornication with the daughters of Moab, Who called them to their sacrifices. And they ate of them, and adored their gods. And Israel was initiated to Beelphegor: upon which the Lord being angry, Said to Moses: Take all the princes of the people, and hang them up on gibbets against the sun: that my fury may be turned away from Israel. And Moses said to the judges of Israel: Let every man kill his neighbours, that have been initiated to Beelphegor. And behold one of the children of Israel went in before his brethren to a harlot of Madian, in the sight of Moses, and of all the children of Israel, who were weeping before the door of the tabernacle. And when Phinees the son of Eleazar the son of Aaron the priest saw it, he rose up from the midst; of the multitude, and taking a dagger, Went in after the Israelite into the brothel house, and thrust both of them through together, to wit, the man and the woman in the genital parts. And the scourge ceased from the children of Israel: And there were slain four and twenty thousand men. And the Lord said to Moses: Phinees the son of Eleazar the son of Aaron the priest, hath turned away my wrath from the children of Israel: because he was moved with my zeal against them, that I myself might not destroy the children of Israel in my zeal. Therefore say to him: Behold I give him the peace of my covenant, And the covenant of the priesthood for ever shall be both to him and his seed, because he hath been zealous for his God, and hath made atonement for the wickedness of the children of Israel. And the name of the Israelite, that was slain with the woman of Madian, was Zambri the son of Salu, a prince of the kindred and tribe of Simeon. And the Madianite woman, that was slain with him, was called Cozbi the daughter of Sur, a most noble prince among the Madianites. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying: Let the Madianites find you their enemies, and slay you them: Because they also have acted like enemies against you, and have guilefully deceived you by the idol Phogor, and Cozbi their sister, a daughter of a prince of Madian, who was slain in the day of the plague for the sacrilege of Phogor.” (Num. 25:1-18)

And the holy prophetess Judith cut off the head of Holofernes, and the holy Prophet Elias slit the throats of the pagan priests.

And I can go on and on and on and on. So, Tera, you better start reading the Bible, and that means the Old Testament also.

Tera, then continues on to what she perceives to be my cultish behavior.

## TERA

3. The person is involved in a group with religious principles that differ from the mainstream [Baptized Catholics are not permitted to pray the Our Father unless Richard accepts their abjuration and gives the OK; Catholics are to expect two witnesses simultaneously, not one]
4. The person is not able to step away from the community, even for a short period of time [people are pressured to believe they will go to hell if they leave Richard's group]

## RJMI

The Catholic Church and faith is the mainstream and thus there is no other way. Tera says it is OK to differ from that mainstream, again, her rebellious nature shows.

Only the faithful (members of the Catholic Church) are allowed to pray the "Our Father." Tera would have known that if she read my works or at least asked me and I would have directed her where to read. (See my article *Catechumens, Religious Communion, and RJMI's Former Heresies*.) Here is a quote from that book:

St. Augustine, *On the Creed to Catechumens*, 425: "16. ...The very sins which he remits first, he remits not but to the baptized. When? When they are baptized... For how can they say 'Our Father' who are not yet born sons? The catechumens, so long as they be such, have upon them all their sins."

The faithful are forbidden to willingly remove themselves from being in communion with the faithful. If they did, they would be formal schismatics. And they must attend Mass every Lord's Day. If you do not want to do that, then you are guilty of the age old law of attending Mass on the Lord's Day, or at least services if no Mass is available but services are. If any of the faithful find it repugnant to be in communion with good members of the Catholic Church, then they are either not Catholic or are bad Catholics.

Yes, anyone who is not in communion with the Catholic Church (inside the Catholic Church) is on the broad road to hell.

## TERA

"10 Signs You're Probably in a Cult"

1. The leader is the ultimate authority
2. The group suppresses skepticism
3. The group delegitimizes former members
4. The group is paranoid about the outside world
5. The group relies on shame cycles
6. The leader is above the law
7. The group uses "thought reform" methods

8. The group is elitist
9. There is no financial transparency
10. The group performs secret rites

Posted by Mrs. Davis at [11:31 AM](#)

## **RJMI**

1. Yes, the sole ruler of the Catholic Church on earth through Christ, which normally is the pope, is the ultimate authority. If that is the sign of a cult, then the Catholic Church is a cult for upholding the dogma of papal supremacy.
2. Yes, the Catholic Church suppresses any doubt or denial of a dogma or immorality, which you call skepticism. So I take it that you are a skeptic regarding the Catholic faith. And indeed, you are.
3. Yes, the Catholic Church delegitimizes those who have been excommunicated from her either by a minor or major excommunication. To not be aware of this is again proof of your sloth.
4. While the Catholic Church is not paranoid about the outside world, she does hate this evil world and avoids as much as possible the evil in it. So here Tera proves to be a lover of this evil world or does not think it is as evil as it is.
5. Yes, everyone who sins should be ashamed. And if the sin is bad and obstinate enough, then the sinner must be shamed.
6. The leader of the Catholic Church is not above the law. I have never said that and never said that regarding myself. If that were true, then how can I have condemned all these apostate antipopes and true popes who made bad disciplinary laws! This is more proof of your lying, as in many of my works I teach that no one, not even popes, are above law and thus must not be obeyed if they command or teach something sinful.
7. I have no idea what you mean when you say “thought reform” methods. You sound like a Buddhist or New Ager. But the Catholic Church’s main job is to reform the thoughts of unbelievers and bad Catholics, if that is what you meant. After all, God said, “For my thoughts are not your thoughts: nor your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are exalted above the earth, so are my ways exalted above your ways, and my thoughts above your thoughts.” (Isa. 55:8-9) How is that for “thought reform”? Either you reform your thoughts and ways to God’s thoughts and ways or you will end up on hell.
8. Yes, Catholics are elitists. When it comes to the one true God, Church, and Faith, only Catholics are elite. It is us (Catholics) against them (non-Catholics). Catholics do not exclude others or claim secret/gnostic knowledge, if that's what you mean. There is no evidence that I withhold Catholic information from anybody, and we welcome all men of all races, classes, etc. This shows you again as a liar or at least you do not understand that the Catholic Church is the only way of salvation and in that sense is elitist.
9. I guess Tera means that I am living in luxury and spending the tithe and donation money on sinful things. If she only knew, as those who know me, how rash and unfounded a judgment that is! So here she committed a mortal sin of calumny.

10. What secret rites is Tera referring to? Every rite we perform is a Catholic rite, and I do not hide them. They are on my website for all to see. For example, see my videos on the Catholic Exorcism Prayer. I strongly advise you look at it attentively, as you are in dire need of an exorcism.

Now you know why there is a need of one Profession of the Catholic Faith and one sole ruler, especially in these final days of the Great Apostasy, to weed out heretical, rebellious, feminist, stoics like yourself.

Lastly, one proof that you care nothing about the truth but only want to exalt yourself as a kind of popess is that you did not first send your objections to me privately so that you can get my responses and see where you are wrong. If you did that and accepted the truth that I would have presented to you, none of this would have to had been public. But you want it to be public to exalt your self-worth. But the end result is that you made a fool of yourself in the eyes of good willed men. The only thing worse than a man infected with pseudo-intellectual pride is a woman infected with pseudo-intellectual pride. That is why St. Paul said that women are forbidden to teach the Catholic faith publically, as you are:

“Let the woman learn in silence, with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach nor to use authority over the man, but to be in silence.” (1 Tim. 2:11-12)

You clearly violated this decree and thus are guilty of mortal sin on this point alone and have no way of it being remitted unless you enter the Catholic Church. Here is a quote from the Profession of Faith for the Days of the Great Apostasy:

“It is heresy to believe that women can receive holy orders, serve at the altar, teach men the faith in an official capacity, or publicly speak in church: “Let women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted them to speak, but to be subject, as also the law saith.” (1 Corinthians 14:34) However, women can teach children the faith in an official capacity such as by teaching them the catechism. And women can teach men and women the faith in a private capacity.”

I leave you will this:

“It is a just thing with God to repay tribulation to them that trouble you [good Catholics like myself]” (2 Thes. 1:6)

“Except you will be converted, he will brandish his sword; he hath bent his bow and made it ready.” (Ps. 7:13)

*For the glory of God; in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary, St. Michael, St. Joseph, Ss. Joachim and Anne, St. John the Baptist, the other angels and saints; and for the salvation of men*

Original version: 9/2022; Current version: 9/2022

**Mary’s Little Remnant**

302 East Joffre St.

Truth or Consequences, New Mexico 87901-2878, USA

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