

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

OF THE

RESPONSES TO SOME QUESTIONS REGARDING CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE DOCTRINE ON THE CHURCH,

A DOCUMENT PUBLISHED BY THE SO-CALLED “CONGREGATION FOR THE
DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH” ON JULY 10TH, 2007

by Most Reverend Donald J. Sanborn

Foreword

On July 10th, 2007, only three days after the publication of the long-awaited *Motu Proprio* which liberalized the use of the John XXIII Mass, the “Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith” (CDF), the Vatican II replacement for the Holy Office, issued a document in question and answer form purporting to “clarify” the Vatican II doctrine concerning the nature of the Church of Christ.

The nature of the questions make clear the import of the document: it is to answer critics not from the left but from the right, who are saying that the ecclesiology — the doctrine concerning the Church — of Vatican II contradicts the teaching of the Catholic Church.

To my knowledge, the only quarters from which this criticism has come is from our own camp, namely that of the sedevacantists. I have never read in any of the literature of the Society of Saint Pius X any objection at all to this novelty (as the CDF itself, surprisingly, refers to it in this document). I know of no objection to it even from the most conservative regions of the *Novus Ordo*.

The appearance of this document is, therefore, rather curious. After more than forty years of Vatican II, is it now necessary to defend this Council from the accusation of heresy? For the first question in this list of five questions is really asking the question if Vatican II is heretical or not.

As we shall see, this document is nothing more than the parade of Ratzinger in heretical nakedness, while the crowds of *Novus Ordo* conservatives and now many traditionalists hail him for his new suit of orthodox clothes.

The CDF document is a mere repetition of the *Frankenchurch* heresy, which holds that the Church of Christ and the Catholic Church are not absolutely the same thing, excluding any other entity outside of itself. Instead the heresy perceives the Church of Christ to be an entity composed of many elements, many “particular churches” and “ecclesial communities” which are *partially* the Church of Christ, and of the Catholic Church, which is *fully* the Church of Christ. So this heresy has been correctly called the *Frankenchurch* heresy, since it makes one think of the horrid creature which was manufactured by Dr. Frankenstein, in which body parts from many and varied cadavers were sewn together to produce what looked like a man. Life came into this monster by lifting it to the sky in the midst of a thunderstorm, where the lightning bolts repeatedly hit the electrodes which

were inserted into the monster's neck. The monster then got loose and terrified the peasants. The analogy, while humorous, is very demonstrative of what Ratzinger and fellow Modernists have done to the doctrine concerning the nature of the Church of Christ.

The text of the CDF document is in bold. My commentary follows.

CDF TEXT

The Second Vatican Council, with its Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen Gentium*, and its Decrees on ecumenism (*Unitatis redintegratio*) and the Oriental Churches (*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*), has contributed in a decisive way to the renewal of Catholic ecclesiology.

Commentary: "Renewal" is the classic word which Modernists have used for over one hundred years in order to indicate their *destruction* of the traditional dogma under the guise of ambiguous and high-sounding language. All of the documents which he refers to fit into this very category.

CDF TEXT

The Supreme Pontiffs have also contributed to this renewal by offering their own insights and orientations for praxis: Paul VI in his Encyclical Letter *Ecclesiam Suam* (1964) and John Paul II in his Encyclical Letter *Ut unum sint* (1995).

Commentary: Paul VI's *Ecclesiam suam* encyclical was essentially a blueprint for the destruction of the Catholic Church through the practice of ecumenism and "dialogue" with non-Catholics. Its message to Catholics, still living at that time in relative peace and stability, was that major changes were about to come down the path, and that all had to be obedient to them. John Paul II's *Ut unum sint* is an overtly heretical document which denies the unity of the Catholic Church, repeats the Vatican II *Frankenchurch* heresy, and gives instructions and rules as to how to destroy further the Catholic Church through the poison of ecumenism.

CDF TEXT

The consequent duty of theologians to expound with greater clarity the diverse aspects of ecclesiology has resulted in a flowering of writing in this field. In fact it has become

evident that this theme is a most fruitful one which, however, has also at times required clarification by way of precise definition and correction, for instance, in the declaration *Mysterium Ecclesiae* (1973), the Letter addressed to the Bishops of the Catholic Church *Communio innotuit* (1992), and the declaration *Dominus Iesus* (2000), all published by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

Commentary: "Theologians" — read heretics — have taken the heretical principles of Vatican II to their logical conclusions. But because such conclusions go far beyond the limits to the heresy desired by the Modernists in charge, "clarifications" were issued. These "clarifications" merely presented again the same, tired Vatican II *Frankenchurch* heresy, but forbade the logical conclusions which flow therefrom. The three documents referred to in this paragraph all propose and explain the *Frankenchurch* heresy, especially the 1992 *Communio innotuit*, which was Ratzinger's brainchild. In other words, these documents were a call for "unity in one heresy."

CDF TEXT

The vastness of the subject matter and the novelty of many of the themes involved continue to provoke theological reflection. Among the many new contributions to the field, some are not immune from erroneous interpretation which in turn give rise to confusion and doubt. A number of these interpretations have been referred to the attention of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. Given the universality of Catholic doctrine on the Church, the Congregation wishes to respond to these questions by clarifying the authentic meaning of some ecclesiological expressions used by the Magisterium which are open to misunderstanding in the theological debate.

Commentary: “Novelty of the themes involved” is a euphemism for heresy. Nowhere in the history of the Church has any Pope, council, or theologian spoken about the Church of Christ as “subsisting in” the Catholic Church, or of “elements of the Church of Christ” being present in non-Catholic sects. It appears that the term “new interpretations” refers to criticism from the traditionalists that Vatican II substantially altered the teaching of the Catholic Church concerning the Church. For the questions which follow are clearly for the purpose of responding to this accusation — they are not addressed to the left, but to the right, to those who are saying that Vatican II has departed from the traditional teaching.

CDF TEXT

First Question: Did the Second Vatican Council change the Catholic doctrine on the Church?

Commentary: The question is enormous. Since the doctrine concerning the Church is dogmatic, and not merely a matter of theological opinion, the question really is: “*Is Vatican II a heretical council?*” Never before in the history of the Church has such a question been officially proposed or answered. Vatican II closed in 1965. So forty-two years later, nearly half a century, the Vatican is defending the orthodoxy of Vatican II. The lapse of time is very significant, for it attests to the fact that, far from being quietly accepted, Vatican II is coming under greater scrutiny, and is apparently comparing unfavorably with what went before it. One would have expected this reaction immediately during or after the Council, but its appearance after a near half-century is indicative of the souring of a once fresh and fragrant exuberance about the Council in the 1960’s. The thought that a general Council would have contradicted the teaching of the Church was unthinkable in the 1960’s. But as time wore on, and the devastating effects of the Council can be seen by all, it becomes now necessary to defend its orthodoxy.

CDF TEXT

Response: The Second Vatican Council neither changed nor intended to change this doctrine, rather it developed, deepened and more fully explained it. This was exactly what John XXIII said at the beginning of the Council. Paul VI affirmed it and commented in the act of

promulgating the Constitution *Lumen gentium*: “There is no better comment to make than to say that this promulgation really changes nothing of the traditional doctrine. What Christ willed, we also will. What was, still is. What the Church has taught down through the centuries, we also teach. In simple terms that which was assumed, is now explicit; that which was uncertain, is now clarified; that which was meditated upon, discussed and sometimes argued over, is now put together in one clear formulation.” The Bishops repeatedly expressed and fulfilled this intention.”

Commentary: This is very nice, but it does not answer the question. A true answer to the question would be to compare what was taught before the Council to what was taught during and after the Council. Every heretic makes the claim that Paul VI made: that his doctrine is in conformity with the true teaching. The central question is the *objective* conformity of what was to what is. Paul VI is hardly one to reassure us that nothing has changed, when he is the one who promulgated the New Mass, the new episcopal consecration, the new rite of ordination, and personally enacted the changes and oversaw their execution, which amounted to the total destruction of the Catholic Faith in all the institutions of the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church is in the deplorable condition in which we find it today primarily because of the changes wrought by Paul VI.

Furthermore, the very fact that this commentary had to be made about *Lumen Gentium* is indicative that at face value its teaching is contradictory to the teaching of the Catholic Church. When did any pope make such a statement in the past about a Council document?

It was this very “papal” seal of approval upon heresy which was the grease upon which the whole Council slid into place. It silenced whatever critics there were, branding them as being “anti-papal,” and cleared the way for the doubtful to give their wholehearted assent to these heretical acts. It gave birth to the whole conservative *Novus Ordo* movement, whose motto is “*Nothing has changed.*” These people, for example the editorial staff of the *The Wanderer*, have lived in a dream world for these forty-two years, believing that nothing has changed since the Council, but that everything bad must be assigned to mere incorrect interpretation. It’s the emperor’s new clothes.

Paul VI did a similar thing with regard to the document on religious liberty, to quell accusations that it departed from the teaching of the Church. (The most vocal of these accusers was Archbishop Lefebvre). I remember Archbishop Lefebvre's telling us that as soon as Paul VI made this intervention, nearly all opposition to the document collapsed. So the CDF has warmed it up and served the intervention again, hoping that it will have the same effect. I do not believe, however, that this approach will produce the same results. The nakedness of the emperor may be more apparent to some.

CDF TEXT

Response: Christ “established here on earth” only one Church and instituted it as a “visible and spiritual community”, that from its beginning and throughout the centuries has always existed and will always exist, and in which alone are found all the elements that Christ himself instituted. “This one Church of Christ, which we confess in the Creed as one, holy, catholic and apostolic. ... This Church, constituted and organized in this world as a society, subsists in the Catholic Church, governed by the successor of Peter and the Bishops in communion with him”.

Commentary: This statement has been copied and pasted from the documents of Vatican II. It is meant to be a reassurance of orthodoxy. In fact, it is the very heart of the heresy of Vatican II. The heresy is evident in two places: (1) in the qualification, “constituted and organized in this world as a society;” and (2) “subsists in.” The first qualification constitutes the basis of distinguishing the Roman Catholic Church from the Church of Christ. They are not exactly and exclusively the same. The Church of Christ is, as we shall see from what follows, a much broader entity, but is not, as such, constituted as a society except in the Catholic Church. The Catholic doctrine, by opposition, is that the Catholic Church is the Church of Christ, is the Mystical Body of Christ, is constituted by Christ as a visible society, and that therefore anyone who remains outside of this visible society is outside of the Catholic Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, the Church of Christ. If, through his own fault, he dies outside of this divinely constituted visible society, he goes to hell.

The second qualification, *subsists in*, is also heretical. For it opens the door to the heresy that the Church of Christ is present in schismatic and heretical sects, although it does not “subsist” in them. It means that the Church of Christ does not achieve its perfection and fullness in them, but is nonetheless present in them. This doctrine is explicitly stated by Ratzinger in *Communio* of 1992 and *Dominus Jesus* of 2000.¹

So we see that this CDF document is very far from affirming the traditional teaching of the Church, but instead in a monotonous and boring fashion merely repeats the heresies of Vatican II. As Fr. Cekada pointed out, it is curious that a document which purports to clarify the teaching of Vatican II, and prove that it did not contradict traditional teaching, does not once make a quotation from a pre-Vatican II document.

CDF TEXT

In number 8 of the Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen Gentium*, “subsistence” means this perduring, historical continuity and the permanence of all the elements instituted by Christ in the Catholic Church, in which the Church of Christ is concretely found on this earth.

It is possible, according to Catholic doctrine, to affirm correctly that the Church of Christ is present and operative in the churches and ecclesial Communities not yet fully in communion with the Catholic Church, on account of the elements of sanctification and truth that are present in them. Nevertheless, the word “subsists” can only be attributed to the Catholic Church alone precisely because it refers to the mark of unity that we profess in the symbols of the faith (I believe... in the “one” Church); and this “one” Church subsists in the Catholic Church.

Commentary: We see yet one more warmed-up presentation of the “elements” theory: where you have all the elements of Church together, there you have subsistence. But where the elements are found partially or imperfectly, there the Church of Christ is “present and operative” since these “Churches and ecclesial Communities” — read non-Catholic sects — have some “elements of sanctification.”

¹ I have commented both of these documents at length. These commentaries are available at traditionalmass.org.

This heresy passes easily, since everyone knows that non-Catholic sects do have certain truths, and do have certain valid sacraments. Right? Wrong.

We must first of all remember that there is only *one* Church, and that Church is the Roman Catholic Church. Everything outside of her is a sect of some form, an organized *group* of schismatics, heretics, or infidels of some type or other. Their organizations are not churches in the eyes of God or of the Roman Catholic Church. It is true that they are commonly referred to as churches, even before Vatican II (e.g., the Anglican Church), but this term was used only in a popular meaning, and in no way implied any worth or reality in this group of heretics. In other words, they have no “charter” from God to exist as churches. An analogy would be an attempt to establish a public corporation without any approval of the State. Sure, citizens can band together and form an organization with a common goal, but it has no legal existence in the eyes of the State, unless they should receive an approval of the State.

Therefore, since these groups of heretics and schismatics have no legal existence in the eyes of God, they cannot “have” anything. They can hold no title to anything supernatural. What does happen is that individuals in these sects occasionally use Catholic sacraments, sacrilegiously, since they have no right to, and these are at times valid. Because they are valid sacraments, they work by themselves, despite the sacrilegious use, and therefore give grace when received worthily. Worthy reception of these sacraments in non-Catholic sects is impossible, however, unless the members of the sect are laboring under invincible ignorance of their schism or heresy, and are free of the guilt of any other mortal sin. Such a state of soul in non-Catholics is relatively rare, in my opinion. So the general rule is that no sanctification is taking place in these sects, but instead the opposite: sacrilegious use and sacrilegious reception. In an exceptional case, particularly in the baptism of babies, grace is given.

Nor do they “have” any truth. They are not organizations which have any legitimate title to possess revealed doctrine, or to teach it. Sacred Scripture and Tradition, the truth given to us by God, belongs to the Roman Catholic Church exclusively, since it alone is the true Church established by Christ. In the second place, these sects have no determined rule of faith, and no

unity of faith. So the non-Catholic sect does not “possess” truths; at best their leaders might suggest certain doctrines which may be in conformity with supernatural truths, but since they neither have nor claim any authority to teach, the false “church” or “ecclesial community” as such does not “have” these truths. What is fair to say is that some members of the non-Catholic sects do happen to hold and profess *some* supernatural truths, which are spoils taken from the Catholic Church when their schismatic or heretical ancestors made their exit.

But these truths cannot sanctify, since they are mixed with adherence to error. Only the *whole* truth sanctifies, that is, the entire deposit of faith of the Roman Catholic Church *believed* on the authority of God revealing and the Roman Catholic Church proposing. This supernatural faith, furthermore, in order to sanctify, must be coupled with *perfect contrition for sin* and *supernatural love of God*. Only in such a case can the soul which is in sin be justified. Implicit in the supernatural love of God is the willingness to *comply with everything that God wills*, namely submission to the Roman Pontiff, the abjuration of schism or heresy, the reception of valid baptism. Only in such a case can the *whole* and *supernatural* truth sanctify.

While it is true that a non-Catholic can achieve the supernatural virtue of faith by knowing only a few of the truths of the Faith, and believing them for a supernatural motive, nevertheless he must be *disposed* to believe the rest of the truths of the Faith as soon as they are proposed to him sufficiently. Otherwise he lacks the true virtue of faith.

So any sanctification which happens in non-Catholic sects happens on a purely individual basis, because God has graced those individuals with the supernatural virtue of faith, perfect contrition, and supernatural love of God. The sanctification of these individuals has nothing to do with their non-Catholic sect, except that they might *happen* to hear about some supernatural truths from the sect members. But they could just as easily hear these truths on the television, the internet, or the radio, or from a talking bird, and these instruments of communication could be said to “have” these “elements of truth and sanctification” to the same extent that a non-Catholic sect does.

Third Question: Why was the expression “subsists in” adopted instead of the simple word “is”?

Response: The use of this expression, which indicates the full identity of the Church of Christ with the Catholic Church, does not change the doctrine on the Church. Rather, it comes from and brings out more clearly the fact that there are “numerous elements of sanctification and of truth” which are found outside her structure, but which “as gifts properly belonging to the Church of Christ, impel towards Catholic Unity.”

Commentary: So “subsists in” does not change the doctrine on the Church? Let us compare the notion of “subsistence” of the Church of Christ in the Catholic Church, and “elements of sanctification and truth” in the non-Catholic sects with a few statements from the Popes. Pope Pius XI said: “No one is in the Church of Christ, and no one remains in it, unless he acknowledges and accepts with obedience the authority and power of Peter and his legitimate successors.” Pope Pius XII: “Now, to define and to describe this true Church of Christ — which is [n.b. not *subsists in*] the holy, Catholic, apostolic, Roman Church — there is nothing nobler, nothing more excellent, finally no more divine expression can be found than that which designates her “the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ.” Pope Pius XII also said: “Some say they are not bound by the doctrine, explained in Our Encyclical Letter of a few years ago, and based on the sources of revelation, which teaches that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing. Some reduce to a meaningless formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain eternal salvation.”

CDF TEXT

“It follows that these separated churches and Communities, though we believe they suffer from defects, are deprived neither of significance nor importance in the mystery of salvation. In fact the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them as instruments of salvation, whose value derives from that fullness of grace and of truth which has been entrusted to the Catholic Church.”

Commentary: This section contains the most blatant heresy of Vatican II, namely that non-

Catholic sects are “means of salvation.” The CDC document goes a step further: they are *instruments* of salvation. Pope Pius XII: “A Christian community which would act in this way [i.e., cut off from the Apostolic See] would wither like the branch cut off from the vine and could not produce the fruits of salvation.” Pope Pius IX: “The true Church is one, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman; unique: the Chair founded on Peter by the Lord’s words; outside her fold is to be found neither the true faith nor eternal salvation, for it is impossible to have God for Father if one has not the Church for Mother, and it is in vain that one flatters oneself on belonging to the Church, if one is separated from the Chair of Peter on which the Church is founded.” Pope Leo XIII: “This is our last lesson to you: receive it, engrave it in your minds, all of you: by God’s commandment salvation is to be found nowhere but in the Church; the strong and effective instrument of salvation is none other than the Roman Pontificate.” There are many other similar texts which may be cited.

But notice the sly logic — or illogic — of the Modernists: because members of these sects happen to parrot truths which they have stolen from the Catholic Church, or happen to use sacrilegiously sacraments which they have likewise stolen, their sect-organizations are now elevated to “instruments of salvation.” This means that these sects, *as organizations*, have all the aptness and capacity to be used by the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity in order to effect someone’s *salvation*. Notice also that we have jumped from *sanctification* to *salvation*. For it may be possible that someone receive a valid baptism in a non-Catholic sect, and be *sanctified*. But, objectively speaking, unless he should abandon the false sect, abjure his schism or heresy, and join the Roman Catholic Church, he will go to hell. So obviously these false sects, despite whatever sanctification they may communicate through the sacrilegious use of baptism and other sacraments, become the *instruments of damnation* for these souls who are baptized validly or in some other way sanctified. For they place insurmountable obstacles to salvation by the preaching of insubordination to the Roman Pontiff, and blasphemous heresies concerning Our Lord, the Blessed Sacrament, Our Lady, the saints of God, and holy Church. The only way in which these mortiferous elements would not have their deadly effect is if the non-Catholic is

invincibly ignorant of his schism or heresy. But even in this case, he must fulfill many other difficult conditions in order to obtain eternal salvation. Pope Pius IX taught: "The Church declares openly that all man's hope, all his salvation, is in Christian faith, in that faith which teaches the truth, dissipates by its divine light the darkness of human ignorance, works through charity; that it is at the same time in the Catholic Church, who, because she keeps the true worship, is the inviolable sanctuary of faith itself and the temple of God, outside of which, except with the excuse of invincible ignorance, there is no hope of life or of salvation."

An instrument, furthermore, is something which must conform to the end for which it is used. Imagine, for example, a screwdriver made of foam rubber. Imagine a washing machine which made the clothes dirty instead of clean. Imagine a computer which typed your thoughts in Chinese characters. Imagine a pen which squirted ink in your face, instead of on the paper, as you moved it across the page. These would not be instruments since they are intrinsically unsuited to the end to be accomplished. So a non-Catholic sect, which has no true existence as a church, cannot possibly be used as an instrument of salvation. It injects *poison* into its adherents, a poison which kills! Even if there are certain "elements of sanctification and truth" in use among them, these elements do not in any way overcome the evil of the sect. A few drops of poison is enough to make a glass of water lethal, even though most of the molecules in the glass are healthful H₂O.

CDF TEXT

Fourth Question: Why does the Second Vatican Council use the term "Church" in reference to the oriental Churches separated from full communion with the Catholic Church?

Response: The Council wanted to adopt the traditional use of the term. "Because these Churches, although separated, have true sacraments and above all - because of the apostolic succession - the priesthood and the Eucharist, by means of which they remain linked to us by very close bonds," they merit the title of "particular or local Churches," and are called sister Churches of the particular Catholic Churches.

"It is through the celebration of the Eucharist of the Lord in each of these

Churches that the Church of God is built up and grows in stature." However, since communion with the Catholic Church, the visible head of which is the Bishop of Rome and the Successor of Peter, is not some external complement to a particular Church but rather one of its internal constitutive principles, these venerable Christian communities lack something in their condition as particular churches.

On the other hand, because of the division between Christians, the fullness of universality, which is proper to the Church governed by the Successor of Peter and the Bishops in communion with him, is not fully realized in history.

Commentary. In the first paragraph, the CDC is referring to the sects of the Photian schism, i.e., Greek Orthodox and similar sects.² The Modernists give them the name of "particular churches" because they have preserved valid sacraments, even those of the Eucharist and Holy Orders. A "particular church" in the truly traditional and Catholic terminology, however, refers to a Catholic diocese, of which the head is the Catholic bishop in communion with the Roman Pontiff. *Never* in the history of the Church have schismatic sects been referred to as "particular churches." They have at times been called *dissident* churches, since they are in schism, but retain in their structure a certain resemblance to what they once were, a true, Catholic particular church. They are often compared to dead branches which fall off the vine; they are dead, but nevertheless retain a certain likeness to what they once were in life. An Egyptian mummy would be another good example.

In the second paragraph there is blasphemy against the Blessed Sacrament. Supposedly by the *sacrilege* of using the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist in a schismatic act of worship, the "Church of God is built up and grows in stature." It is the equivalent of saying, "By trampling upon the Blessed Sacrament, the Church of God is built up and grows in stature."

Pope St. Leo the Great said: "Elsewhere [i.e., outside the Church] there is neither a legitimate priesthood nor true sacrifices."

² They take their name of *Photian* from the ringleader of the sect, the ninth century Patriarch of Constantinople by the name of Photius.

St. Jerome said: “God hates the sacrifices of these [i.e., heretics] and pushes them away from Himself, and whenever they come together in the name of the Lord, He abhors their stench, and holds his nose...”

St. Thomas Aquinas said: “The priest, in reciting the prayers of the Mass, speaks in the person of the Church, in whose unity he remains; but in consecrating the sacrament he speaks in the person of Christ, whose place he holds by the power of his Orders. Consequently, a priest severed from the unity of the Church celebrates Mass, not having lost the power of Order, he consecrates Christ’s true body and blood; but because he is severed from the unity of the Church, his prayers have no efficacy.”

From this insult they move to a contradiction. On the one hand they say that communion with the Catholic Church is an “internal constitutive principle,” these “venerable Christian communities lack something in their condition as particular churches.”

What they lack is a head. Think of a headless corpse lying on the guillotine, its head in the basket, and blood pouring out from the neck. Then someone says: “This person is lacking something in his condition as a human being.” Any person who would make such a remark would be considered crazy, since the condition of the man on the guillotine is so bad that he is no longer a man, but a headless, rotting mass of dead flesh. But the Modernists are contradicting themselves, for they say that they are in communion — partial communion — with these dead sects. So which is it? If, as they say, communion with the Catholic Church is an “internal constitutive principle” of being a particular Church, then what are these churches lacking? Are they not particular churches? Are they in communion or not? Are they particular churches or not? The whole thing is foggy and undefined, and understandably so, since their heresy involves inherent contradictions.

The last paragraph also contains a heresy. It is saying that because the schismatic sects are divided from the Catholic Church — even though they are particular churches of the Church of Christ — the catholicity of the Catholic Church cannot be fully realized. In other words, the Catholic Church is not *completely* Catholic. This is a heresy, since it is contrary to our holy creed, which calls the Church *catholic*. The fact that heretics and schismatics leave the Catholic Church *has nothing to do with the*

catholicity of the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church is perfect in her catholicity — it always has been and always will be, just as she is perfect in her unity, sanctity, and apostolicity. Nowhere in Sacred Scripture and Tradition is there any thing which says that the Catholic Church is going to bring all humanity into itself. Indeed the opposite is stated. St. Paul says that heresies must come in order to test the faithful (I Cor. XI: 19). He also predicts a great apostasy from the Faith (II Thess. II: 3).

CDF TEXT

Fifth Question: Why do the texts of the Council and those of the Magisterium since the Council not use the title of “Church” with regard to those Christian Communities born out of the Reformation of the sixteenth century?

Response: According to Catholic doctrine, these Communities do not enjoy apostolic succession in the sacrament of Orders, and are, therefore, deprived of a constitutive element of the Church. These ecclesial Communities which, specifically because of the absence of the sacramental priesthood, have not preserved the genuine and integral substance of the Eucharistic Mystery cannot, according to Catholic doctrine, be called “Churches” in the proper sense.

Commentary: The response to this question contains more of the same nonsense. They are saying that the Protestant sects should not be called “churches” but “ecclesial communities” since they lack validly consecrated bishops, validly ordained priests, and a valid sacrament of the Eucharist. The fact that the Greek Orthodox and similar Photian sects have preserved these things, on the other hand, has “merited” for them the title of “churches.”

The truth is that the Greek Orthodox and similar Photian sects are just as much sects as the Protestant sects. They are both organized groups of heretics and schismatics. The fact that the Photian sects have retained a valid episcopacy, priesthood, and Holy Eucharist — which is true in *most* cases — does not ennoble them in any way. The fact that thieves have been prudent enough to hold onto the jewels and money that they stole from your house does not ennoble them. It does not make them “venerable,” to use the term which this document gives to the Photian sects. They are still thieves, and have no

right to possess or use what they have taken. Imagine if you saw a car thief go by in your brand new Cadillac. Would you say: "There goes that venerable thief. What a beautiful car he has!" Would you sign over to him the title of your car? Of course not. But this is exactly what Ratzinger is doing in his *Frankenchurch* heresy, repeated for the umpteenth time in this recent document. It is to say to these thieving organizations of schismatics: "You have the title of Church, because you have retained possession of the things you stole from the Catholic Church. The Protestants do not have the title of Church, because they lost the things that they stole from the Catholic Church." Is this not the ravings of a lunatic?

It should be pointed out that Catholic theologians have always recognized in the Photian sects something they called *material* apostolic succession. This simply means that these sectarians have not interrupted the succession of persons to occupy the place of a bishop in these once Catholic dioceses. In other words, they did not snuff out the succession of bishops, in a purely natural and human way, in these once Catholic sees. These bishops are completely devoid of the power to rule the Church, however, and are not Catholic bishops in any sense of the term. They have been cut off from the true Church; they have no power either from Christ or from the Pope. Their "church" has been a mere sham, a dead body of the once Catholic Church which existed in that region. Because of their material succession, however, when some of these schismatic groups wanted to reconcile with Rome, it was the custom of the Catholic Church to treat them as a body, that is, to receive them with their bishop, their clergy, and their people. It was like raising a corpse from the dead. But this *material* succession does not in any way elevate these schismatic sects to having *any* connection with the true Church of Christ. We used to say when I was growing up in New York: "That (i.e. material succession) and 15 cents will get you on the subway."³

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

³ The total fare in those days was 15 cents for everyone, including the dinosaurs.

The CDF document, approved by Ratzinger (Benedict XVI), is a rehash of Vatican II and many other documents which have gone before it. It adds nothing new to the already expounded heresy of *Frankenchurch* in these documents. We are still being fed the tired, hackneyed bilge that our sacred Church, founded by Christ, is a hodge-podge of "particular churches" and "ecclesial communities" consisting of Roman Catholic dioceses, Photian schismatic and heretical sects, as well as Protestant heretical sects, which sliced themselves off from Christ and His Vicar on earth in their prideful revolt against the Pope. We are still being fed the monotonous and humdrum hokum that the Church of Christ is present and operative in such things as the Anglican and Episcopalian sect, which ordains women and public sodomites to an invalid priesthood and episcopacy, and whose Thirty-Nine Articles, printed in their *Book of Common Prayer*, contain insults to the Real Presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament.

Our intellects are furthermore subject to the insult of the blatant contradictions in this *Frankenchurch* doctrine: That although the Photian sects are "particular churches," they nevertheless lack an "internal constitutive element" of the Church of Christ, because they are not in communion with the Catholic Church. What? I thought they were in communion with the Catholic Church. Are we not in partial communion with them, according to Ratzinger? Which is it? Is it communion or not? If it is communion, then the papacy becomes accidental to the Church of Christ. But if, on the other hand, the papacy is *essential* to the Church of Christ, then how could these sects be particular churches, and part of the Church of Christ? Ratzinger, in other words, places himself in a dilemma in this document. If he is saying that the submission to the papacy is an essential element of the Church of Christ, then obviously these papacy-haters cannot be in the Church of Christ. On the other hand, if the submission to the Roman Pontiff is merely accidental to the Church of Christ, then Ratzinger ends up as a heretic. You can see between the lines of the document that Ratzinger is aware of the dilemma. He tries to use language, as all Modernists do, which declares for neither one nor the other. The whole pot is intellectually bankrupt.

Nowhere does it say in this document that the Catholic Church is the one, true Church of Christ. In fact, this very statement is implicitly repudiated, since it insists on “*subsists in*” as the proper way to describe the relationship of the Catholic Church to the Church of Christ. Notice in question 3 the phrase, referring to *subsists in*: that “indicates the **FULL** identity [emphasis added] of the Church of Christ with the Catholic Church.” It means that *subsists in* brings us back to the same drivel: that there is a **PARTIAL** identity of the Church of Christ with the Photian and Protestant sects.

Who ever heard of a *partial* identity? Does not the very term *identity* indicate an absolute sameness? Can a man be identified at a police line-up because he looks *partially* like the perpetrator of the crime? Because he has the same eyebrows? Does DNA testing hold up in court because there is *partial* identity with the DNA of the accused? Do fingerprints admit of *partial* identity? When the police ask you to identify yourself, do you say that you are *partly* you and *partly* someone else, for example, your neighbor’s dog? Such a response would cause you to take a breathalyzer test.

But Ratzinger’s heresy is just as insane, asking us to believe that the Photian and Protestant sects **both are and are not, at the same time, the Church of Christ**. He is asking us to believe that the Church of Christ is merely a collection of elements, a type of jig-saw puzzle which, when finished, is said to *subsist*.

Ratzinger has succeeded in presenting himself as a conservative. **Ratzinger is not a conservative, but a radical Modernist, a heretic.** This document, however, coupled with the *Motu Proprio* liberalizing the use of the John XXIII Mass, is deceiving a great many war-weary traditionalists into believing that he is effecting the restoration of Catholicism. Many are laying down their arms and joining his ranks in the hope of this restoration.

St. Paul said: “*Therefore, brethren, stand fast; and hold the traditions which you have learned...*”⁴ and, “*But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.*”⁵

⁴ II Thess. II: 14

⁵ Gal I: 8