

Against the Thucites

Bishop Ngô Thuc's Heretical and Illegal Linage



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

“My people have been silent, because they had no knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will reject thee, that thou shalt not do the office of priesthood to me [such as Bishop Thuc]: and thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I also will forget thy children [such as the Thucites].”

- Osee 4:6 -

“No Armenian Catholic bishops were available for ordaining priests who were needed in Ispahan, and so it was asked whether sacred Orders could be received from schismatical or heretical bishops [Bishop Thuc was a heretic and schismatic]. The Holy Office replied that in **no way** could that be allowed, and that those who had been ordained by such bishops were irregular and suspended from the exercise of their Orders.”

- The Holy Office, 1709 –

“Depart from the tents of these wicked men [such as the Thucites], and touch nothing of theirs, lest you be involved in their sins.”

- Numbers 16:26 –

Original version: 8/2000; Current version: 10/2009

Mary's Little Remnant

302 East Joffre St.

TorC, NM 87901-2878

Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us

(Send for a free catalog)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RELEVANT FACTS.....	7
1) BISHOP THUC WAS NOT CATHOLIC. HE SIGNED THE VATICAN II DOCUMENTS.	7
<i>Thuc's Idolatrous and False Ecumenism.....</i>	7
<i>Thuc's Heretical Feminism and Woman Priests</i>	7
2) CATHOLICS CANNOT LEGALLY RECEIVE ORDERS FROM NOTORIOUS APOSTATE, HERETIC, OR SCHISMATIC BISHOPS	8
<i>On the Illegality of Ordinations by non-Catholic Bishops.....</i>	8
<i>Thucites must abjure in order to enter the Church and be forgiven</i>	11
3) BISHOP THUC DID NOT ABJURE HIS APOSTATE AND HERETICAL ERRORS.....	11
MUNICH DECLARATION	11
<i>Bishop Thuc's pre-1982-Declaration consecrations and ordinations.....</i>	12
4) EPIKEIA DOES NOT JUSTIFY CONSECRATIONS AND ORDINATIONS BY NON-CATHOLIC BISHOPS	14
5) NO EXCUSE FOR THOSE WHO RECEIVED HOLY ORDERS FROM BISHOP THUC.....	14
<i>Canon 2372 forbids holy orders from notorious apostate, heretic, or schismatic bishops</i>	15
<i>Canon 2261, §2, does not apply heretics and schismatics</i>	16
6) BISHOP THUC WAS NOT STABLE AND WAS RELIGIOUSLY INDIFFERENT.....	17
IRRELEVANT FACTS	19
BISHOP THUC WAS AN ANTICOMMUNIST	19
BISHOP THUC SAID AND DID SOME NICE CATHOLIC THINGS.....	20
BISHOP THUC HAD A MANDATE FROM PIUS XI TO SECRETLY CONSECRATE BISHOPS	20
THE THUC LINE IS VALID	21
SOME OF THE THUC LINAGE.....	22
SOME SEDEVACANTISTS' CONSECRATIONS.....	22

Relevant Facts

Bishop Peter Martin Ngô-Dinh-Thuc: (October 6, 1897 – December 13, 1984) - In 1938, at the age of 41, Father Thuc was chosen by Rome to direct the Apostolic Vicariate at Vinhlong in Vietnam. He was consecrated bishop on May 4, 1938, being the third Vietnamese priest raised to the rank of bishop. On November 24, 1960, apostate, Antipope Pope John XXIII named Bishop Thuc “Archbishop” of Hué. He attended the robber’s Second Vatican Council (1964) and signed its documents.

Thucites: The bishops and priests who trace their line back to Bishop Thuc and have not abjured from their schismatic consecrations and ordinations; and, the laymen who are in religious communion with them, such as those who belong to their sects or attend their Masses. They are all guilty of the mortal sin of schism, and thus are not Catholic on this point alone.

The Thucites appeal to sentiments and other irrelevant facts to defend Bishop Thuc, while they ignore, change, or misinterpret the relevant facts. The relevant facts are as follows:

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

Bishop Thuc signed the heretical Vatican II documents, at which point he was known to be a notorious heretic with no office in the Church. He was one of the most liberal, rebellious, and heretical bishops at Vatican II. From his own writings during the robber’s Second Vatican II Council, Thuc supported the false ecumenical movement, feminism, and women in sacred functions, such as deacons and priests:

Thuc’s Idolatrous and False Ecumenism

Bishop Peter Martin Ngo-Dinh-Thuc: “‘Concerning the attraction of non-Christians to the Church.’ With great consolation I see present in these assemblies the delegates of the non-Christian Churches, to be witnesses of our fraternity, sincerity and liberty. But where are the delegates or observers of the non-Christians? ...The scandal coming to the whole world from the absence of any invitations sent to the chiefs of the non-Christian religions I expounded in the central commission—but in vain. I earnestly begged the council to make good the omission, so that this most loathsome discrimination between some religions and religions may not longer be found. This absence of an invitation to the heads of the Christian religions confirms in a certain manner that prejudice creeping through the Asiatic and African world: ‘The Catholic Church is a church for men of white colour and not for coloured men.’” (*Acta Synodalia Vaticani II*, vol. 2, part 1, pp. 358-359)

Thuc’s Heretical Feminism and Woman Priests

Bishop Peter Martin Ngo-Dinh-Thuc: “...it seems to me an extraordinary thing that in the schema concerning the people of God, express mention is nowhere made of women, so that the Church appears totally masculine, whereas the reality is quite different. Do not women constitute the greater part of the laity—even of ecclesiastical prescriptions? Of course I well know the Church had to behave like this in order not to offend the prejudices of those ages. Thus, St. Paul imposed the veil on women in Church, lest they displease the angels. So why must men proudly

enter the church bareheaded which is contrary to the custom of clerics today both in the West and the East? In the same way, silence was imposed on women whereas in this Basilica the walls recently resounded to the voices of the Fathers. So to, nuns must obtain the permission of churches to wash the sacred linens. And likewise this unjust discrimination appears here and now in this conciliar hall... Why is it that in our atomic age, when almost everywhere in the world women have obtained juridical equality with men, it is only in the Church of Christ that they still suffer these injurious discriminations... I eagerly seek... these discriminations against the most valiant sex be eradicated. Last of all I shall be grateful to him who can present me with a plain apodictic text of the Gospel which excludes the sisters of the Blessed Virgin Mary from the sacred functions [i.e. the priesthood].” (*Acta Synodalia Vaticani II*, vol. 2, part 3, pp. 513)

This is the man, the monster, and his bastard children that the Thucites would have us believe will save the Holy Catholic Church. If this damning evidence from Thuc’s own writings did not exist, it would not matter, because Thuc signed the heretical Vatican II documents, and by that fact alone, he was known to be a notorious heretic who is not Catholic and holds no office in the Church.

Making fools of themselves and proving their extreme bad will, there are some Thucites, such as Fr. Terrance Fulham, who desperately and deplorably try to give Thuc’s clearly heretical statements an orthodox interpretation. They do the same thing Fr. Brian Harrison does when he makes the most ridiculous excuses for the obvious heresies in the Vatican II documents and John Paul II’s crimes. But these Thucites have an added sin of hypocrisy, because they admit the Vatican II documents contain heresy; that is the bases in which they reject all the Vatican II bishops who signed any one of the documents and the Vatican II antipopes. Yet, they exempt Bishop Thuc who signed the Vatican II documents, arguing that he was Catholic. If that were so, then they have no right to denounce any bishop for signing the Vatican II documents, and they have no right to denounce the Vatican II antipopes.

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

It is of the faith—therefore, *epikeia* cannot justify it—that a notorious apostate, heretic, or schismatic bishop cannot be a legal successor to the apostles, nor can he propagate a legal line. The sin of entering into active religious communion with non-Catholics is committed when a so-called Catholic knowingly gets consecrated or ordained by a notoriously non-Catholic bishop. It is of the faith that a Catholic cannot arrive at a good by an evil means. The Church has already dealt with a similar situation in which there were no Catholic bishops in Armenia. An appeal was made to the Holy See to allow schismatical or heretical bishops to ordain Catholic priests. The Holy See rejected the appeal:

On the Illegality of Ordinations by non-Catholic Bishops

The Communication of Catholics with Schismatics, Holy Orders: “[p. 103] Clement VIII in his Instruction *Sanctissimus* of August 31, 1595,¹ stated that those who had received ordination at the hands of schismatic bishops who apart from their

¹ [169] *Fontes*, n. 179.

schismatic status were properly consecrated—the necessary form having been observed—did indeed receive orders, but not the right to exercise them. In this he repeated the doctrine of the glossators.²

“Benedict XIV in the Constitution *Etsi pastoralis* of May 26, 1742,³ confirmed this doctrine of Clement VIII. ...Not only was the recognized validity of schismatic orders established, but further points were clarified. Schismatic bishops were not to be admitted for the conferring of orders or for the administration of any of the other sacraments. Persons ordained by schismatic bishops were, upon a proper rectification or amendment in their status, to be reconciled and absolved. An appropriate penance was to be imposed on them. If they had embraced any errors, they had previously to abjure them; if they had not embraced any errors, they had nevertheless to renounce the schism of their ordaining prelate. The abjuration was to be made either publicly or secretly, as the facts in the case directed. Before the ordained persons could exercise their Orders, it was necessary for them to receive from the Holy See a dispensation from the irregularity which they had incurred.⁴ ...[p. 105] On this same matter there was still another response of the Holy Office on November 21, 1709.⁵ No Armenian Catholic bishops were available for ordaining priests who were needed in Ispahan, and so it was asked whether sacred Orders could be received from schismatical or heretical bishops. The Holy Office replied that in no way could that be allowed, and that those who had been ordained by such bishops were irregular and suspended from the exercise of their Orders. ...The prohibition to receive holy Orders at the hands of a schismatic bishop is contained in the general prohibition against active religious communication as expressed in canon 1258.1. There is also an implicit prohibition contained in canon 2372, wherein it is stated that those who presume to receive Orders from a notorious schismatic automatically incur a suspension *a divinis* reserve to the Apostolic See.”⁶

By decreeing “in no way could that be allowed,” the Holy Office confirmed that it is a matter of faith that a Catholic may never knowingly be ordained a priest or consecrated a bishop by a heretic or schismatic. The Holy Office condemns the same excuse that some Thucytes use for going to the notorious apostate and heretic Bishop Thuc to be consecrated bishops or ordained priests—they say, there are no Catholic bishops; therefore, we can go before a non-Catholic bishop to be consecrated or ordained. The 1917 Code of Canon Law, Canon 2372, also condemns them by reaffirming the Holy Office’s 1709 decree.

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

Even if a heretic or schismatic bishop lied to a candidate by hiding his notorious crimes of heresy or schism, and produced a forged papal mandate, that candidate, even though of good faith, upon discovering the fraud, cannot exercise his orders. That is not

² [170] Ad c. 1, X, *de schismaticis et ordinates ab eis*, V, 8.

³ [171] §VII, n. XIII—*Fontes*, n. 328.

⁴ [172] *Ibid.*, nn. XI, XIV, XV—*Fontes* n. 328.

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

⁶ *The Communication of Catholics with Schismatics* (hereafter CCS), Rev. Ignatius J. Szal, A.B., J.C.L., Imprimatur +D Cardinal Dougherty, Phil., April 2, 1948, Catholic University of America Canon Law Series #264, The Catholic University of America Press, pp. 103-105.

even the case with the Thucites, because Bishop Thuc's notorious crimes could have been easily known upon a basic inquiry, and thus, all who received orders from him were of bad faith. Either way, good faith or bad faith, their orders cannot be legally exercised. Those of good faith incur no mortal guilt; whereas, those of bad faith do, they become schismatics. Those of good faith would incur guilt if they continued to exercise their orders after discovering the bishop they received orders from was not eligible to legally confer orders.

These Thucites imply a good can come from an evil means: They violate the infallible Church law that forbids them to knowingly go before a notorious apostate, heretic, or schismatic bishop to be consecrated or ordained (Holy Office Decree, 1709 and c. 2372); they violate the infallible Church law that forbids active religious communication with non-Catholics (*communicatio in sacris*) (c. 1258, §1); they violate the natural law by scandal; and, they violate the divine positive law by endangering the Catholic faith of perversion.

As a result of their schismatic crime, they also share in the guilt of the public crimes against the faith (heresy) or charity (schism) of the non-Catholic bishop they went before, in a way that a son inherits his father's ways and dispositions. "*By what things a man sinneth, by the same also he is tormented.*" (Wis. 11:17) God abhors them and places them under the Romans' One Curse. This is evidenced in the schismatic and heretical Old Catholic line, which is infested with homosexuals; the same applies to the Thucites and others like them, they are afflicted by one or more of the immoral sins listed by St. Paul in Romans chapter one, because of their schism and heresy. They are more immoral than most non-Catholics who were never Catholic:

"For if, flying from the pollutions of the world, through the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they be again entangled in them and overcome: their latter state is become unto them worse than the former. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of justice than, after they have known it, to turn back from that holy commandment which was delivered to them." (2 Pt. 2:20-21)

Do not be fooled because their immoral crimes are not manifest to you, for they are very good at hiding these crimes so as to appear pious and holy, like the Pharisees that outwardly appeared beautiful to men, but inwardly were full of hypocrisy and iniquity (Mt. 23: 27-28). Yet, in due time, God will expose their immoral crimes, "*For there is nothing hid, which shall not be made manifest: neither was it made secret, but that it may come abroad.*" (Mk. 4:22) However, sins of immorality are not the main issue. Your main concern must be their sins of apostasy and heresy, because they deny the Catholic faith; and, their sins of schism because they revolt from the unity of the Church. These sins are manifest among the Thucites and others like them. Therefore, if you later find out your child was molested by one of these perverted priests, you only got what you deserved for not caring about the Catholic faith, because you yourself are a heretic or schismatic. "*And as they liked not to have God in their knowledge, God delivered them up to a reprobate sense.*" (Rom. 1:28) You pay a high price, indeed, for putting the Mass and sacraments before the Faith, and that price is punishment here on earth and eternal damnation hereafter.

Thucites must abjure in order to enter the Church and be forgiven

If illegal bishops and priests, such as the Thucites, want to enter the Catholic Church and have their sins forgiven, they must abjure by renouncing their schismatic crime and any heresies they believe in, along with the public crimes of schism and heresy of the non-Catholic bishop who consecrated or ordained them.

The Communication of Catholics with Schismatics, Holy Orders: “[p. 103] If they had embraced any errors, they had previously to abjure them; if they had not embraced any errors, they had nevertheless to renounce the schism of their ordaining prelate. The abjuration was to be made either publicly or secretly, as the facts in the case directed.”

If the crimes were public, the specific abjuration must also be public. *Epikeia* would apply for the penitent bishops or priests to abjure if proper Church authorities are impossible to access for a perpetual duration. Perpetual duration means that proper Church authorities cannot be foreseeable accessed for five years. *Epikeia* also allows abjured Catholic bishops and Catholic priests to legally function when access to competent Church authorities with ordinary jurisdiction is not possible. (See my books, *The Abjuration from the Great Apostasy* and *Exceptions to the Law*)

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

There is no public record that Bishop Thuc abjured from signing the Vatican II documents, or from his association with the Conciliar Church and its apostate, antipopes. He made a deficient declaration in 1982, but it was not an abjuration of his errors. An abjuration is an admission of guilt on the part of the penitent who takes it. In it, he must admit his personal guilt, he must reject and condemn all the errors he held and committed, along with all the errors of the sect he belonged to, along with denouncing its leaders. With this in mind, when you read Thuc’s declaration against the Conciliar Church, take special note that he is not admitting any personal guilt on his part. Instead, he refers to himself as being a faithful Catholic:

Munich Declaration

The Archbishop reading the declaration March 21, 1982: How does the Catholic Church appear today as we look at it? In Rome, John Paul II as “Pope” surrounded by the body of Cardinals and of many bishops and prelates. Outside of Rome, the Catholic Church seems to be flourishing, along with its bishops and priests. The number of Catholics is great. Daily the Mass is celebrated in so many churches, and on Sundays the churches are full of many faithful who come to hear the Mass and receive Holy Communion. But in the sight of God, how does today’s Church appear? Are the Masses—both the daily ones and those at which people assist on Sundays—pleasing to God? By no means, because that Mass is the same for Catholics as for Protestants—therefore it is displeasing to God and invalid. The only Mass that pleases God is the Mass of Pius V, which is offered by few priests and bishops, among whom I count myself.

Therefore, to the extent that I can, I will open seminaries for educating candidates for that priesthood which is pleasing to God.

Besides this “Mass” which does not please God, there are many other things that God rejects: for example, changes in the ordination of priests, the consecration of bishops, and in the sacraments of Confirmation and Extreme Unction.

“Moreover, the “priests” now hold to: 1) modernism; 2) false ecumenism; 3) the adoration [or cult] of man; 4) the freedom to embrace any religion whatsoever; 5) the unwillingness to condemn heresies and to expel the heretics.

Therefore, in so far as I am a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, I judge that the Chair of the Roman Catholic Church is vacant; and it behooves me, as bishop, to do all that is needed so that the Roman Catholic Church will endure in its mission for the salvation of souls.

Here I add the principal documents:

1. The Bull “Quo primum” of Pius V.
2. Council of Trent, sess. XXII.
3. Letter “Adorabile exaristiae” Pu. VII., at Council of Florence: Decree pro Armenis (Dz. 698; Decree pro Jacobitis (Dz. 715).
4. Missale Romanum Pius V.: De defectibus in celebratione Missarum: “De defectibus forae”.
5. Constitution “Auctorem fidei” Pu. VI.; Decree “Lamentabili” Pu. X.; Encyclical “Pacendi dominici gregis” Pius X.
6. Council of Florence: Decretum pro Jacobitis; Encyclical “Quanta Cura” Pu. IX.; “Unam sanctum” Boniface VIII..
7. Codex Juris Canonici, can. 1322.
8. Bull “Cum ex apostolatus officio” Paul IV.; Codex Juris Canonici, can. 188, n. 4.
- 9 Pontificale Romanum: De consecratione electi in episcopum” “Forma juramenti” et “Examen”.

February 25, 1982 Munich +Peter Martin Ngo-dinh-Thuc Archbishop

Where is Thuc’s admission of guilt for signing the Vatican II documents and for his association with the Vatican II Church and its apostate leaders? He does not even mention Vatican II. Where does he indicate that he is outside the Catholic Church and now desires to enter? Instead of admitting personal guilt, Bishop Thuc refers to himself as already being Catholic, among the faithful, and as being a “Roman Catholic bishop” who is “pleasing to God.” If this were an abjuration, he would not be Catholic until after he took the abjuration, which brings us to the next point.

Bishop Thuc’s pre-1982-Declaration consecrations and ordinations

The Thucites admit there is no public record of Thuc abjuring or making any kind of public declaration before February 25, 1982. Therefore, even if Bishop Thuc did abjure in 1982, which he did not, it is of no consequence to those who were consecrated or ordained by him before his 1982 Declaration; those who were, and appeal to Thuc’s future 1982 Declaration to justify their crime, admit, by implication, that they knowingly went before a non-Catholic bishop to be consecrated as bishops or ordained as priests.

The Thucites face an inescapable dilemma in trying to justify their schismatic crime. “*A snare shall entangle the wicked man when he sinneth.*” (Prv. 29:6) Those who tried to make Thuc Catholic at the time he consecrated or ordained them could not produce any evidence that Thuc had abjured before they went to him. But, at the very least, they

needed something to prove that Thuc was Catholic and rejected the Vatican II Church and its apostate, antipopes. They approached Bishop Thuc with the proposition that he make a Declaration, but not an abjuration. If they told Thuc to take an abjuration, they would be admitting he did not take one previously, and thus they would be admitting their own guilt for being consecrated or ordained by Thuc before he abjured. So they went with a Declaration instead of an abjuration. But the 1982 Declaration did not solve their problem or excuse them either, because they still did not have any proof that Thuc abjured, nor did they even have a declaration from him before February 25, 1982. No matter which way they turn to try and escape their snare, they only become more entangled. The fact is that those who were consecrated or ordained by Thuc before his 1982 Declaration had no proof of an abjuration or declaration from Thuc. Even those who were consecrated or ordained by Thuc after his 1982 Declaration committed the mortal sin of schism, because Thuc needed to take a specific abjuration of his crimes, not a declaration, in order to enter the Catholic Church—this is aside from the fact that his 1982 Declaration was deficient.

Practical Commentary on the Code: “Canon. 2314 ... The Holy See insists that converts from heretical or schismatic sects be not received into the Church until they have first abjured the heresy or schism and been absolved from the censure.”⁷

A comprehensive declaration (position paper) from a Catholic would be edifying and necessary to know what he believes in these days when there are no competent authorities. But, Thuc was not Catholic, and thus he needed to take a specific abjuration in order to enter the Church, not a declaration.

If one examines Thuc’s declaration closely one can easily come to the conclusion that he still supported the Second Vatican Council, as he did not condemn it and the heresies in its documents, all of which he signed. There is no reason why the Thucites would not demand that Thuc also include a condemnation of the Second Vatican Council and its documents, other than Thuc himself would not take it if this were included in the declaration, proving that Thuc still supported the Second Vatican Council and its heretical documents.

One Thucite bishop, Louis Vezelis, realizing the dilemma and admitting to its consequences, in desperation, lies by telling others that Thuc did not sign the Vatican II documents. But, Bishop Vezelis is still faced with the fact that Thuc adhered to the Vatican II Church, and for that alone he is guilty of apostasy and heresy, for that alone he needed to abjure, even if he did not sign the Vatican II documents.

There is public evidence that Thuc was still in communion with the Conciliar Church in 1981. Less than a month before Thuc consecrated Michel Louis Guérard des Lauriers a bishop on 7 May 1981, and less than six months before he consecrated Moisés Carmona-Rivera and Adolfo Zamora Hernandez bishops on 17 October 1981, Thuc concelebrated the Novus Ordo Mass of Holy Thursday on 15 April 1981, with the Conciliar Bishop Barthe of Frejus-Toulon, and received “faculties” from him to hear confessions. Therefore, these Thucite bishops needed to have public, documented proof that Thuc

⁷ *Practical Commentary on Canon Law* (hereafter PCC), Woywod and Smith, By Rev. Stanislaus Woywod, O.F.M., LL.B., revised by Rev. Callistus Smith, O.F.M., J.C.L., Nihil Obstat: Fr. Felician Berkery, O.F.M., Imprimi Potest: Fr. Thomas Plassmann, O.F.M., Minister Provincialis, Nihil Obstat: John Goodwine, J.C.D., *Censor Librorum*, Imprimatur + Francis Cardinal Spellman, D.D. Archbishop of New York, Nov. 14, 1957, vol. II, p.511.

abjured sometime after he concelebrated the Novus Ordo Mass in 1981 and before he consecrated them. No such proof exists. There is no proof that Thuc ever abjured his errors before he died on 13 December 1984; therefore, Thuc is not among the faithfully departed.

Most, if not all, of the Thucites that believe the Holy See is vacant trace their line through the Thucite Bishops des Lauriers and Carmona. (See: [Some Consecrations for the Sedevacantists](#), p.22)

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

The principle of *epikeia* allows for an exemption from Church laws that do not deal with faith or morals in certain emergency situations. Only Catholics and catechumens can be justified by the principle of *epikeia* in these emergency situations. Non-Catholics who are not preparing to enter the Catholic Church by baptism or abjuration cannot be justified by *epikeia*. Therefore, the Thucites, being non-Catholics and not catechumens, cannot justify any of their actions by *epikeia*. They cannot justify, make legal, their consecrations and ordinations by non-Catholic bishops (notorious heretics or notorious schismatics) anymore than the Greek Schismatics can. It would be of no effect if a Greek Schismatic attempted to make his consecrations and ordinations legal by appealing to *epikeia*, which is an exemption from a Catholic Church law, because he is not inside the Catholic Church. The same applies to the Thucites.

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

Those who used Bishop Thuc to be made bishops or priests are guilty of schism by this act alone, and share in the guilt of Thuc's notorious crimes that they easily could have known upon a basic inquiry—the Thucites that I know of are guilty of professing several heresies and are under the Romans' One Curse. They cannot be excused for any type of ignorance, because it was their duty and responsibility, especially in these days of the Great Apostasy, to thoroughly examine Bishop Thuc before they were consecrated or ordained by him. Upon a very basic inquiry they would have learned that Thuc signed the Vatican II documents, and that there was no public record of an abjuration by Thuc. Before they were consecrated or ordained by Thuc, their duty was to demand that Bishop Thuc prove, by public documentation, that he took a specific abjuration from his signing of the Vatican II documents that rejects and condemns all the Conciliar Church heresies and other crimes, and its leaders as apostate, antipopes. This would have prevented them from committing the mortal sins of schism, of being in religious communion with non-Catholics (c. 1258), of scandal, and of endangering the Catholic faith of perversion.

In the secular realm, most men do not buy a house without first seeing and then receiving the Title, and without examining the condition of the house. If they were not diligent in doing this, and later discovered there was no Title or the house falls apart because it was in bad condition, the fault is theirs for not examining these basic things ahead of time. The same is true in the spiritual realm, the things of God. No man would buy a car or house without a Title and no true Catholic would go before a bishop to be

consecrated or ordained without that bishop having thoroughly proved he is Catholic, and that he can legally consecrate and ordain.

Whose fault is it if a layman or a priest did not thoroughly check the faith of Bishop Thuc, who was about to ordain or consecrate him, and demand from Thuc, in writing, a specific abjuration or confirmation that he took one that rejects and condemns the prevalent heresies and prominent heretics of the Vatican II Church? Whose fault is it if the layman or priest did not check if Thuc signed the heretical Vatican II documents? Surely, this is a very easy thing to do. Is not the making of priests and bishops one of the most serious things that men do in the eyes of God? What kind of man, especially in these days of the great apostasy when false shepherds abound, approaches any bishop for ordination or consecration without first thoroughly examining him, checking into his past, and demanding that the bishop put his beliefs in writing, and if he was associated with the non-Catholic Conciliar Church, or any non-Catholic sect, that he abjured from these non-Catholic entities? Are we bold enough to say before God that these men are entitled to be ignorant of things they must know in order to be a priest or bishop, whereas a pagan is not entitled to be ignorant of the things he must know before he buys a car or home. Anyone who is so foolish as to be ordained or consecrated without thoroughly examining the bishop and demanding that he prove he is Catholic is not a true candidate for the priesthood or episcopacy. He is a fraud and a hireling.

I am sure that these same men (Thucites) are very diligent and meticulous with temporal things, such as when they buy a home, a chapel, or a car. They would make sure they had all the proper papers, and that the home, the chapel, or the car is in proper working order before they purchased it. They should have done the same before they were ordained or consecrated by Thuc! They should have been very diligent and meticulous in examining Thuc, by making sure they had signed papers from Thuc that prove he abjured, and all the evidence necessary to prove he is currently Catholic in word and deed, before they were ordained or consecrated by Thuc.

Oh, how we have taken away the guilt from sinful, evil men and placed all the blame on God by making a mockery of the effectiveness of His grace and powerful assistance that he gives to all the good-willed in order for them to see the truth and do the right thing. It is my hope that the Thucites, and all those others who have been illegally consecrated or ordained, are of good will when they read this and repent and abjure. The only insurmountable obstacle is man's own pride.

Canon 2372 forbids holy orders from notorious apostate, heretic, or schismatic bishops

Canon 2372 teaches the dogmatic law that Catholics cannot legally receive holy orders from bishops who are notorious apostates, heretics, or schismatics.

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

Bishop Thuc was a notorious apostate, heretic, and schismatic. Therefore, he could not have legally administered the sacrament of orders, ordain, or consecrate. Those who were ordained or consecrated by him incur automatic suspension and cannot legally exercise their orders.

Canon 2261, §2, does not apply heretics and schismatics

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

The Practical Commentary: “c. 2261, §2. Except as provided in 2261.3, the faithful can for any just cause ask for sacraments or sacramentals of one who is excommunicated, especially if there is no one else to give them; and in such cases the excommunicated person so asked may administer them and is not obliged to ask the reason for the request.”⁸

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

Canon 2261, §2, does not include the sacrament of holy orders

Even regarding excommunicate bishops who are Catholic, Canon 2261, §2, does not allow them to administer the sacrament of holy orders, the ordination of priests and consecration of bishops. Canon Law is written with the assumption that there is a visible hierarchy intact, even if the Holy See or a local see may be vacant. When a see falls vacant, in normal times, a vicar capitular or general is appointed to run the see until a new pope or bishop is elected. For a layman to legally receive the sacrament of holy orders (become a priest), he must first have dimissorial letters from his bishop, and he must be either incardinated into a diocese or belong (be ascribed) to a regular religious order, thus have a domicile, a place to legally function (c. 111-117). For a priest to become a legal bishop, he must be certain the consecrating bishop has a papal mandate from the pope (c. 953), at least tacitly, before he can legally be consecrated, and he must be assigned to a place in which he can legally function. Therefore, it is not just a matter of receiving the sacrament of holy orders, but also a matter of these other requirements that must be met in order to become a legal bishop or legal priest. Canon 2261, §2, cannot abolish the requirements in Canons 111-117, 953; therefore, Canon 2261, §2 does not include the sacrament of holy orders.

The lawgiver was well aware of these facts when he wrote Canon 2261, §2, and thus, never envisioned this canon to include the sacrament of holy orders, because of these other necessities—dismissorial letters, papal mandates, and domiciles. Canon 2261, §2 does not make provision these necessities, and therefore, it cannot apply to the sacrament of holy orders. If it did, there would be chaos in the Church by the making of priests or bishops without the approval of proper Church authorities. There would be no place where they can go and legally function, often conflicting with those who were given a

⁸ PCC, vol. 2, p. 487.

mission and a place to legally function by proper Church authorities. If Canon 2261, §2, includes the sacrament of holy orders, it would undermine and destroy the hierarchic order and structure of the Church. For instance, if Canon 2261, §2, includes the sacrament of holy orders, then bishops with ordinary jurisdiction, those who rule dioceses, would fall prey to excommunicated bishops in their dioceses who would be allowed to ordain priests and consecrate bishops by the mere request of the candidate, and thus without the approval of the ruling bishop, the result in those dioceses would be instant chaos, rebellion, and the undermining and destruction of the hierarchic order and structure of the Church.

Also, there would be no way to stop any Catholic from receiving holy orders, from being ordained or consecrated. All a Catholic layman or priest would have to do is ask an excommunicated bishop to ordain or consecrate him, and the bishop is not obliged to ask him the reason for the request—“in such cases the excommunicated person so asked may administer them and is not obliged to ask the reason for the request.” Thus, instead of Catholics being called to be priests or bishops, they, any Catholic man whatsoever, can demand it from an excommunicate bishop whether called or not, that is, if Canon 2261, §2 included the sacrament of holy orders.

Epikeia, not Canon 2261, §2, justifies a Catholic bishop’s consecrations

The fact that there is no hierarchy in the Church in these latter days of the Great Apostasy is a separate topic altogether that has nothing to do with the letter and the spirit of Canon Law 2261, §2, which was written with the assumption that there is a ruling hierarchy when this canon is utilized. One would have to appeal to the principle of *epikeia* in these days to justify a Catholic bishop’s ordinations and consecrations. In these cases, there is no conflict with proper Church authorities, such as the pope and bishops with ordinary jurisdiction, because there are none. The next pope would approve these consecrations and ordinations, as long as the bishop in question is Catholic. The principle of *epikeia* allows for this, not Canon 2261, §2. *Epikeia* exempts the Catholic bishop from the letter of Canon 953 that requires an explicit papal mandate before he consecrates a bishop. (See RJMI book *Exemptions From the Law*: The sacrament of holy orders is allowed by *epikeia*.)

No pope could approve, either currently or retroactively or tacitly, of a subject who knowingly went before an excommunicated bishop to be ordained or consecrated, let alone a non-Catholic one. Anyone who did is a schismatic, is outside the Catholic Church, and is on the broad road to hell.

6) Bishop Thuc was not stable and was religiously indifferent

Thuc’s religious indifferentism and instability is just more proof of the unreliable character of those who used Thuc to further their prideful ambitions. Not only is there no proof that Thuc became Catholic by abjuring from his signing of the Vatican II documents and from his association with the Vatican II Church, but there is ample proof that he was religiously indifferent and was not stable. He was religiously indifferent because he had no true regard for the Catholic faith. Religious indifferentism is a mortal sin against the faith.

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

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

Therefore, Thuc’s actions of knowingly ordaining and consecrating non-Catholics prove he believed in the heresy of religious indifferentism, and thus was a notorious heretic on this point alone.

Thuc was a bishop for hire, a fool’s fool, that any ambitious man could go to become a bishop or priest, be he an “Old Catholic” heretic and schismatic, or even a man who wanted to start his own Church. Fr. Anthony Cekada, now a Thucite priest, at one time wrote truthfully about Bishop Thuc in his article, *Two Bishops in every Garage*:

“THE PALMAR FIASCO - The three-day journey by car took Mgr. Ngo to Palmar de Troya, a Spanish village 25 miles south of Seville. ...In 1968, tales of apparitions there began to circulate. Among the early enthusiasts was a young man named Clemente Dominguez Gomez who organized devotions and set up a shrine in the little town. ...When Mgr. Ngo appeared in Palmar, Mr. Dominguez asked the prelate to ordain himself and several other laymen to the priesthood, and then to consecrate him and a few others bishops. If Mgr. Ngô had any doubts, they were dispelled after Dominguez gave him the news that Paul VI had appeared to him by means of ‘bilocation’ to give his approval to the project.

“Pause for a moment to consider what Mr. Dominguez was saying: both the Blessed Virgin and Paul VI (by ‘bilocation’) were telling a Catholic bishop that he should ordain laymen to the priesthood (whom he had just met, and who had done no ecclesiastical studies) and then consecrate them bishops-all in three weeks time. Where anyone else would have laughed the proposal off as absurd, Mgr. Ngô showed a truly colossal lack of common sense and agreed...

““OLD CATHOLIC’ CONNECTIONS - Mgr. Ngo ...moved to Toulon, France. There, in 1979, he raised to the episcopate (for the “umpteenth time”) Jean Laborie, leader of a schismatic ‘Old Catholic’ sect, the ‘Latin Church of Toulouse.’ He also ordained another ‘Old Catholic’ from Marseilles named Garcia, and a certain ex-convict named Arbinet who went on later to become a Palmar ‘bishop.’

“Nor were Mgr. Ngo’s activities limited to the consecration and ordination of schismatics. A French newsletter which supports him states that on Holy Thursday, April 15, 1981, he concelebrated the New Mass with Mgr. Barthe, the bishop of Toulon...

“Mgr. Ngô’s actions from 1975 onward do not inspire a great deal of confidence in his judgment or in his prudence: the Palmar affair, the promises made and promises broken to the Vatican, the involvement with ‘Old Catholics,’ concelebrating the New Mass while claiming he really wasn’t, then consecrating someone [Guérard des Lauriers] who believes the New Mass is invalid. While everyone is entitled to a few mistakes, one is forced to say that those made by Mgr. Ngô were very grave indeed... given Mgr. Ngo’s track record. The prelate seems to be rather quick to make bishops-the Palmar affair comes to mind-and not particularly fussy. In light of this, one suspects that any priest to show up on Mgr. Ngo’s doorstep could get himself consecrated with very little difficulty and few questions asked. in an age of instant coffee, there are now ‘instant bishops’...

“One theme which dominates the affair from beginning to end is a gross and dangerous lack of prudence regarding the transmission of Apostolic Succession-a

matter in which the slightest lack of prudence is inadmissible. St. Paul reminds us: 'Lay not hands lightly on any man' -he does not say: 'Lay hands quickly on anyone.'

"...The story will not end here-it is probable that 'instant bishops' will continue to multiply exponentially, as among the 'Old Catholics.' Our missionary friend in Mexico offers us his opinion on this rather gloomy prospect: 'We should have within a few years hundreds or thousands of bishops... without true vocations, the one more ignorant than the other, and an unavoidable cause of more division among traditionalists.'" (Fr. Anthony Cekada, *Two Bishops in every Garage*)

Fr. Cekada now finds himself in the same company he once condemned, with bishops and priests who have no true vocation, who are frauds, schismatics, and heretics, like a freak show in a multiple ring circus. That is because Fr. Cekada was and is a heretic himself, of the pre-Vatican II type that led to the Great Apostasy, raised and imbibed with poison from an erroneous and heretical theology that is found in bad books with imprimaturs many years before the robber's Second Vatican Council. Fr. Cekada is proof that a heretic—and he believes in several heresies⁹—if he does not repent and abjure, only falls deeper and deeper and gets blinder and blinder. He eventually joined the Thucites and now is one their ardent defenders. He deceives his readers by only talking of the validity of Thuc's consecration, while ignoring the main issue, the legality. (See: [The Thuc line is valid](#), p.21) In so doing, he puts the validity of the sacraments before the Catholic faith, and in effect, has implicitly denied the whole deposit of the Catholic faith.

Irrelevant Facts

Some Thucites defend their spiritual, bastard father and heresiarch, Bishop Thuc, by appealing to sentiments that have no bearing on the above relevant facts. Some of the irrelevant facts about Bishop Thuc are as follows:

Bishop Thuc was an anticommunist

Some elaborate at length that Bishop Thuc was anticommunist.

Wikipedia, Peter Martin Ngo-Dinh-Thuc: "Thuc's brother, Ngo Dinh Khoi was buried alive because of his refusal to become a minister in the first communist government. Thuc's three other brothers, Ngo Dinh Diem, president of South Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Nhu and Ngo Dinh Can, his close collaborators were all assassinated. President Diem was assassinated on November 1, 1963. Of all his siblings, only Thuc and Luyen escaped assassination. Luyen was serving as ambassador in London and Thuc had been summoned to Rome for the Second

⁹ Fr. Cekada's is a notorious heretic on several counts. He denies the Salvation Dogma. He heretically believes that certain men who live and die worshipping false gods and practicing false religions can be in the way of salvation and be saved. He is also a notorious heretic for teaching Catholics can knowingly attend mass at non-Catholic churches and pray in communion with notorious heretics or schismatics. He is also a schismatic for denying the Church teaching that requires specific abjurations from fallen-away Catholics in order for them to enter the Church and have their sins forgiven; thus, even if he was Catholic—which he is not—he does not bring fallen-away Catholics into the Church. He is also a notorious heretic for teaching the contraception heresy of Natural Family Planning, also known as the Rhythm Method.

Vatican Council. After the Council, for political reasons, Archbishop Thuc was not allowed to return to his duties at home thus beginning his life in exile.”

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

This is one of the reasons that some say Thuc was not allowed to return to his duties in South Vietnam, because it would antagonize the Communists whom the Vatican II Church was trying to reconcile with. This was not religious persecution, but merely political. The communists also persecute Buddhists; that does not mean Buddhists are Catholic, or that they can claim the status of true martyrs. The only true martyr is a Catholic who dies for the Catholic faith, all other so-called martyrs go to hell, no matter how noble their cause seemed or was. “No one... even if he pour out his blood for the name of Christ, can be saved, unless he remain within the bosom and the unity of the Catholic Church.” (Pope Eugene IV, Council of Florence, Bull *Cantate Domino*, 1441)

Therefore, the fact that communists persecuted Thuc has no bearing on the fact that Thuc was a notorious apostate and heretic, as proved when he signed the apostate and heretical Vatican II documents.

Bishop Thuc said and did some nice Catholic things

In spite of Thuc’s notorious crimes, some try to sway others into Thuc’s camp by presenting some nice Catholic things that Thuc said or did. That is like ignoring the guilt of a notorious rapist and murderer because he is known to help little old ladies cross the street. So, Thuc said and did some nice Catholic things. A Talmudic Jew can say and do some nice Catholic things, so can a Protestant, and so can apostate, Antipope John Paul II. A Southern Baptist minister can say many Catholic things, and even seem Catholic if he does not mention any of the heresies he believes in. Does that mean he is Catholic? Therefore, to say and do some nice Catholic things does not a Catholic make. To be Catholic, a man must say and do all the necessary Catholic things regarding dogmas and unity with the Holy See.

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

Some believe Bishop Thuc received a mandate from Pope Pius XI (1922-1939) to secretly consecrate bishops without an explicit papal mandate. Below is the evidence:

Pius XI, Pope,

In virtue of the fullness of powers of the Holy Apostolic See, we institute in our legate Pierre Martin Ngô-Dinh-Thuc, Titular Bishop of Saïgon, for purposes known to us, with all the powere required. Given in Rome, near St. Peter, on March 15, 1938, in the seventeenth year of our Pontificate.

Pope Pius XI

Based on the above evidence alone, no one can know what power was given to Thuc and for what purpose. If it did mean Thuc could secretly consecrate bishops without an explicit papal mandate, it could only have applied to a certain territory and possible for a certain time period. Therefore, Thuc could not secretly consecrate bishops outside that territory in Vietnam. If he did, he would commit the sin of schism and the bishops he consecrated would be illegal and also schismatics.

However, whether Bishop Thuc was given this mandate by Pope Pius XI or not is irrelevant, because after the Second Vatican Council it was certain the Bishop Thuc was automatically excommunicated, was not Catholic, lost his office, and thus any previous privileges he had were also lost.

1917 Code of Canon Law: “Canon 188, §4. There are certain causes which effect the tacit resignation of an office, which resignation is accepted in advance by operation of law, and hence is effective without any declaration. These causes are: ... (4) if he has publicly defected (fallen away) from the Catholic faith.”

1917 Code of Canon Law: “Canon 2263. An excommunicated person is forbidden to exercise legal ecclesiastical acts within the limits defined in law. Canon 2264: Acts of jurisdiction of both the internal and external forum by an excommunicated person are illicit [illegal]....”

The Thuc line is valid

Validity and Legality are separate issues. A valid bishop or priest can be either Catholic or not Catholic. Greek Schismatic bishops and priests are valid, but they are not legal, they are not Catholic. Likewise, the Thucite bishops and priests are valid, but they are not legal, they are not Catholic. Another term used for legal is licit and illegal is illicit.

Validity means a bishop or priest is truly a bishop or priest—once a bishop or priest always a bishop or priest—but it does not mean he is a Catholic bishop or Catholic priest. It does not mean he is a legal bishop or legal priest. To be legal he must be inside the Catholic Church and be obedient to Her decrees.

A valid, non-Catholic bishop or priest, such as the Thucite bishops and priests, can validly administer the sacraments, except for penance, but he cannot do so legally. The below decrees from the Holy Office demonstrate the difference between validity and legality:

The Communication of Catholics with Schismatics, Holy Orders: “[p. 103] Clement VIII in his Instruction *Sanctissimus* of August 31, 1595,¹⁰ stated that those who had received ordination at the hands of schismatic bishops who apart from their schismatic status were properly consecrated—the necessary form having been observed—did indeed receive orders [valid], but not the right to exercise them [but illegal]. In this he repeated the doctrine of the glossators.¹¹

“Benedict XIV in the Constitution *Etsi pastoralis* of May 26, 1742,¹² confirmed this doctrine of Clement VIII. ...Not only was the recognized validity of schismatic orders established, but further points were clarified. Schismatic bishops were not to be admitted for the conferring of orders or for the administration of any of the other sacraments. Persons ordained by schismatic bishops were, upon a proper

¹⁰ [169] *Fontes*, n. 179.

¹¹ [170] Ad c. 1, X, *de schismaticis et ordinates ab eis*, V, 8.

¹² [171] §VII, n. XIII—*Fontes*, n. 328.

rectification or amendment in their status, to be reconciled and absolved. An appropriate penance was to be imposed on them. If they had embraced any errors, they had previously to abjure them; if they had not embraced any errors, they had nevertheless to renounce the schism of their ordaining prelate. The abjuration was to be made either publicly or secretly, as the facts in the case directed. Before the ordained persons could exercise their Orders, it was necessary for them to receive from the Holy See a dispensation from the irregularity which they had incurred.^{13,14}

Therefore, the Thucite bishops and priests are valid, but they are not Catholic, they are illegal and are schismatics. They can validly confect the sacraments, except for penance, but they cannot legally administer the sacraments—“schismatic bishops... did indeed receive orders, but not the right to exercise them.” Every time they confect or administer the sacraments, they commit the mortal sin of sacrilege. That is the primary issue that must be dealt with, and those who ignore it do not truly care about the Catholic faith and have put the sacraments before the faith. Beware of the Thucite defenders who only speak of the validity issue while ignoring the legality issue. The questions you should ask the Thucites are as follows: Was Bishop Thuc known to be a non-Catholic bishop, a notorious heretic, when he signed the Vatican II documents? Do you have irrefutable proof that Bishop Thuc abjured his errors, and thus became Catholic, before you or those in your line were ordained or consecrated by him?

There is no public record of an abjuration by Bishop Thuc. His 1982 Declaration was not an abjuration and was even deficient as a declaration. Therefore, Thuc was a notorious apostate, heretics, and schismatic who could not legally ordain or consecrate, as decreed by the Holy Office in 1709 and Canon 2372. (See: [Bishop Thuc’s pre-1982-Declaration consecrations and ordinations](#), p.12)

Some of the Thuc Linage

Some Sedevacantists’ Consecrations

- **Michel Louis Guérard des Lauriers** (1898-1988) was consecrated a bishop on 5/7/1981, at Toulon, France, by [Bishop Ngo Dinh Thuc Pierre Martin](#).
 - **Gunther Storck** (19xx-1993) was consecrated a bishop on 4/30/1984, at Etioles, France, by Michel Louis Guérard des Lauriers.
 - **Robert Fidelis McKenna** (1927; still living) was consecrated a bishop on 8/22/1986, at Raveau, France, by Michel Louis Guérard des Lauriers.
 - **J. Elmer Vida** (1912-1993) was consecrated a bishop on 7/2/1987, in the USA by Robert Fidelis McKenna.
 - **Richard F. Bedingfeld** (1930; still living) was consecrated a bishop on 12/17/1987, in South Africa, by Robert Fidelis McKenna.

¹³ [172] *Ibid.*, nn. XI, XIV, XV—*Fontes* n. 328.

¹⁴ CCS, p. 103.

- **Edward Peterson** (19xx; still living) was consecrated a bishop on 7/29/1994, in South Africa, by Richard F. Bedingfeld.
 - **Oliver Oravec** (1941; still living) was consecrated a bishop on 10/21/1988, at Monroe, Connecticut, by Robert Fidelis McKenna.
 - **John E. Hesson** (1937; still living) was consecrated a bishop on 6/12/1991, at Monroe, Connecticut, by Oliver Oravec.
 - **Raphaël Cloquell** (1956; still living) was consecrated bishop on 10/24/1996, at Karlsruhe, Germany, by Oliver Oravec.
 - **Francis Slupski** (19xx; still living) was consecrated a bishop on 10/12/1999, at Monroe, Connecticut, by Robert Fidelis McKenna.
 - **Donald J. Sanborn** (194x; still living) was consecrated a bishop on 6/20/2002, at Detroit, Michigan, by Robert Fidelis McKenna.
 - **Franco Munari** (19xx; still living) was consecrated a bishop on 11/25/1987, at Ravaux, France, by Michel Louis Guérard des Lauriers.
- **Moisés Carmona-Rivera** (1912-1991) was consecrated a bishop on 10/17/1981, at Toulon, France, by Bishop Ngo Dinh Thuc Pierre Martin.
 - **George J. Musey** (1928-1992) was consecrated a bishop on 4/1/1982, at Acapulco, Mexico, by Moisés Carmona-Rivera.
 - **Louis Vezelis** (1930; still living) was consecrated a bishop on 8/24/1982, at Buffalo, New York, by George J. Musey.
 - **Conrad Altenbach** (1910-1986) was consecrated a bishop on 5/24/1984, in the USA by George J. Musey.
 - **José de Jesus Roberto Martínez y Gutiérrez** (b. in 1917; still living) was consecrated a bishop on 6/18/1982, in Mexico, by Moisés Carmona-Rivera.
 - **Mark Anthony Pivarunas** (1958; still living) was consecrated a bishop on 9/24/1991, at Spokane, Washington, by Moisés Carmona-Rivera.
 - **Daniel Lytle Dolan** (1951; still living) was consecrated a bishop on 11/30/1993, at Cincinnati, Ohio, by Mark Anthony Pivarunas.
 - **Martin Davila Gandara** (1965; still living) was consecrated a bishop on 5/11/1999, at Acapulco, Guerrero, Mexico, by Mark Anthony Pivarunas.
- **Jean Gérard de la Passion Antoine Laurent Charles Roux** (1951; still living) was consecrated bishop on 4/18/1982, at Loano, Italy, by Bishop Ngo Dinh Thuc Pierre Martin.
 - **Tomas Maria Fouhy** (19xx; still living) was consecrated a bishop on 10/27/1993, at Chaillac, France, by Jean Gérard de la Passion Antoine Laurent Charles Roux.
 - **José Ramon Lopez-Gaston** (19xx; still living) was consecrated a bishop on 06/29/1992 at Miami, Florida, by Guy Jean Tau Johannes de Mamistra Oliveres. Later he was consecrated *sub conditione* a bishop on 11/20/1993

at Miami, Florida, by Jean Gérard de la Passion Antoine Laurent Charles Roux.