

It is a common error to refer to the human race as all “children of God.” It is correct to say that we are all “creatures of God.”

The picture is an insult to Our Lord Jesus Christ. The four religions are placed on an equal footing as four different ways of knowing God. It implies that they all worship the same God. Buddhism is a nontheistic “religion” that is, it is a religion which has no god. It would be best described as a philosophy — of sorts. For this reason, the Buddhist in the video does not say, “I believe in God,” but says “I have confidence in Buddha.” So even though there is no deity in Buddhism, it is presented to us by Bergoglio as “one of the ways of searching for God.” So the little statue of Buddha appears in the picture.

The Mohammedan says that he believes in “God — Allah.” It was correct for him to add “Allah” since Allah is not the true God, since He is not the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ. In the one, true God there are three Divine Persons, and Allah is not one of Them.

The Jew says that he believes in God. However, their god is not the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and is therefore not the true God. The Jews committed an *apostasy* from the true God when they rejected His only-begotten Son. By rejecting Christ and His revelation, they fashioned for themselves a false god, just as much as any idolater would fashion a god out of stone and worship it. A figment of your imagination is just as much an idol as a figment of stone.

That the Jews do not worship the true God is attested to by Sacred Scripture. In John VIII: 55 we read: *And you have not known Him, but I know Him. And if I shall say that I know Him not, I shall be like to you, a liar.* In the First Epistle of Saint John V:10, we read: *“He that believeth in the Son of God, hath the testimony of God in himself. He that believeth not the Son, maketh him a liar: because he believeth not in the testimony which God hath testified of his Son.”* In verse 12 of the same chapter we read: *“He that hath the Son, hath life. He that hath not the Son, hath not life.”* In John V: 22-23 we read: *“For neither doth the Father judge any man, but hath given all judgment to the Son, that all men may honor the Son, as they honor the Father. He who honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father, who hath sent Him.”* In the Acts of the Apostles III: 13-15, we read St. Peter’s words to the Jews of Jerusalem: *“The God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified His Son Jesus, whom you indeed delivered up and denied before the face of Pilate, when he judged He should be released. But you denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you. But the author of life you killed, whom God hath raised from the dead, of which we are witnesses.”*

Therefore not one of the four representatives of the four religions, if we take the Novus Ordite to represent Catholicism, worships the same god. The Buddhist has

no god; the Mohammedan and the Jew each have a false god whom they worship, and the Catholic worships the one, true God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Bergoglio, however, relegates all that I have said, and which I have supported by Sacred Scripture, to doubt.

Nor can anyone take refuge in the fact that three of the religions, Catholicism, Islam, and Judaism, all worship one God. It is true that they are all monotheistic religions. None believes in many gods. But because someone is a monotheist, it does not mean that he is worshipping the true God. It is possible, for example, to worship a single idol. Because your god is a single stone idol, it is not thereby the true god.

One worships the true God if he believes by supernatural faith all the dogmas, at least implicitly, which God has revealed concerning Himself. If one repudiates even a single dogma of revelation concerning God, he is not worshipping the true God.

It is true that the virtue of faith can tolerate the presence of errors, *provided that the erring person has invincible ignorance of the true dogma.* Invincible ignorance is ignorance which occurs through no fault of your own. Consequently a very poorly instructed baptized Catholic could be ignorant of many Catholic dogmas, through no fault of his own, and may even believe errors in their place, or even heresies. Provided his ignorance is invincible, however, he is not truly a heretic, since he is disposed by faith to believe the truth once he learns of it.

The Catholic Church, however, makes no judgments about who is ignorant and who is not when it comes to false religions. In the external forum, the Catholic Church considers adherents of false religions to be culpable of their ignorance. This judgement of the external forum, however, does not exclude the possibility that in the internal forum of the individual conscience the non-Catholic could have invincible and therefore inculpable ignorance.

This distinction is what the Feeneyites do not understand. The general condemnations of non-Catholics as persons destined to hell refer solely to the external forum. These condemnations do not in any way exclude the possibility of invincible ignorance, and therefore of supernatural faith and charity, in non-Catholics.

For example, the Council of Florence (1438-1445) declared the following: “It [the Church] firmly believes, professes, and proclaims that those not living within the Catholic Church, not only pagans, but also Jews and heretics and schismatics cannot become participants in eternal life, but will depart ‘into everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels’ [Matt. 25:41], unless before the end of life the same have been added to the flock; and that the unity of the ecclesiastical body is so strong that only to those remaining in it are the sacraments of the Church of benefit for salvation, and

do fastings, almsgiving, and other functions of piety and exercises of Christian service produce eternal reward, and that no one, whatever almsgiving he has practiced, even if he has shed blood for the name of Christ, can be saved, unless he has remained in the bosom and unity of the Catholic Church.” The Feeneyites often quote this text. It is of course true, even *de fide*. It refers, nevertheless, to those who are truly guilty of the sin of heresy, apostasy, or infidelity. It does not refer to those who are merely *materially* guilty of these things, i.e., who through no fault of their own, owing to invincible ignorance, espouse false doctrines. Likewise St. Paul says that fornicators shall not enter the kingdom of heaven. He is clearly referring to those who know that it is a sin. Many pagans in the ancient world, however, were ignorant of the gravity of fornication. The same may be said of many paganized young people today.

Let us return to the picture. What the three false religions have in common is that they all deny Jesus Christ. For this reason it is particularly offensive that they should be shown with the Christ child. The most offensive is the menorah, since it is precisely because of their rejection of Christ that the Jews called for His death. “*The Jews answered him [Pilate]: We have a law; and according to the law He ought to die, because He made Himself the Son of God.*” (John XIX: 7) Hence the menorah should be seen as a gun, symbolically, aimed straight for the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

There is a single point which separates Judaism from the Catholic Faith, and that is the rejection of Jesus Christ as the true Messiah. Consequently, the defining characteristic of Judaism is *anti-Christ*.

After Bergoglio tells us that the only certain thing about all these religions is that we are all children of God, we then hear the representatives of the four religions each saying, “I believe in love.”

This “love” that they believe in is none other than the love which Saint Pius X called a “monstrous error” in a speech to the Cardinals. He was referring to what he called a “charity without faith,” which is exactly what these four representatives believe in.

Faith, for the modernist, including Bergoglio, is not a supernatural assent to truths revealed by God and proposed by the Catholic Church for belief — the Catholic definition of faith — but a mere interior feeling about God. Dogma is an expression of this interior feeling. Hence dogma in the modernist system is inconsequential. Differences in dogma are not important. Bergoglio has repeated this theme time and time again, and has relentlessly attacked those who hold to dogmas.

Dogma, however, by its very nature, is *dogmatic*, that is, it is absolutely certain, never-changing, and obligatory for all. To strip it of these characteristics is to deny it.

The video is, therefore, an act of apostasy, for apostasy is to give up all Catholic dogma. It was Patrick Henry Omlor — may he rest in peace — who first pointed out that ecumenism was not a heresy but an *apostasy*, since there is not a single Catholic dogma which it does not infect with doubt and insignificance.

Remember: *There is nothing in Bergoglio which cannot be found first in Vatican II.*

A book against sedevacantism. The Society of Saint Pius X recently published a book of seven hundred pages against sedevacantism.

The appearance of the book is evidence of a rising tide of sedevacantism, which I attribute mostly to Bergoglio, but somewhat to our enhanced efforts to get the word out. *True Restoration* has done much good in enlightening a great many people regarding the nature of the problem in the Church.

Father Cekada has purchased the book and is analyzing it. He has already produced three YouTube videos against it. These are very well done, easy to understand, and very informative. Naturally Father Cekada adds a little wit and satire to it, but always within the limits of respect and fairness. They are short, not more than twenty minutes each. You can find them at www.fathercekada.com.

Although I have yet to order the book, I am not expecting any new arguments. Over the past fifty years a great deal of research has been done on the question. Our adversaries, as a rule, search for analogical situations in the Church’s history, and attempt to show that “heretical” popes in the past have indeed remained popes.

There is, however, no precedent to what we have today. At no time in the Church’s history has there been a heretical pope. What is even far more important is that at no time in the Church’s history has any pope tried to force upon the Church an entirely new religion, a substantial transformation of Catholicism.

I think that pro-sedevacantists and anti-sedevacantists ought to limit their discussion to these central questions: *Is the religion of Vatican II the same as that of pre-Vatican II? If no, then have the Vatican II “popes” promulgated this new religion with their supposed authority? If yes, then why are we resisting Vatican II and its changes? If no, then how can an indefectible Church, guided by the Holy Ghost, promulgate a false religion?*

The argument, however, that a pope who espouses heresy on the personal level is not a true pope, is a valid argument. For there is an intrinsic connection between the faith of the Roman Pontiff and the essence of the Catholic Church. Our Lord said to St. Peter: “*But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren.*” (Luke XXII: 32) This verse shows that in Our Lord’s divine mind, the faith of Peter

is absolutely necessary for the functioning of the Church, for he must confirm his brethren. In other words, it is essential to Peter's role that he confirm the whole Church in the faith. It is therefore essential to his role that he have the Catholic faith. For how can Peter confirm his brethren, unless he himself has the faith? How can a dead man strengthen anyone else, when he himself is totally drained of strength?

The reason why I shy away from the "personal heresy" argument, however is twofold: (1) it implies that the heretic was, at least at some point, a true pope, because all the arguments concern a heretical pope, i.e., someone already in the office, and enjoying jurisdiction; (2) the argument is open to too many objections which, although false, are nonetheless enticing to lay people.

Common sense is on the side of sedevacantism. It is common sense that a heretic cannot be a Catholic. It is common sense that someone who, through heresy, is not even a Catholic, cannot be the pope. It is common sense that someone who intends to promulgate a new religion which substantially transforms the Catholic Faith, cannot have the power of Christ to teach, rule, and sanctify the Church. It is common sense that a wolf with sheep's clothing on, or worse, shepherd's clothing, is not a member of the fold, and is not a true shepherd. It is common sense to say that the destruction wrought upon the Church since Vatican II is the work of enemies, and not of true Catholic popes.

The Recognize and Resist position is against common sense. It makes no sense to say that someone is the pope, but that we can ignore him, and act as though he does not exist. It makes no sense to say that we are submitted to the Roman Pontiff, but at the same time set up a parallel apostolate against his apostolate. It makes no sense to say that the Roman Catholic Church is infallible and indefectible, but at the same

time to reject everything that has come from Vatican II, because it is false and a defection from the true faith. It makes no sense to say that the pope is infallible except when he is wrong, or that the Church is indefectible except when it defects.



Jorge Bergoglio — our best argument for the vacancy of the Roman See

Evidence is on the side of sedevacantism. The evidence of heresy and defection on the part of the Vatican II "popes" is overpowering and hardly needs to be presented. The greatest evidence, however, is that all traditionalists, including the SSPX and R & R types, are resisting Vatican II and its reforms. If these changes are not false and evil, then why do they reject them?

Postponement of ordination. I sadly announce that it is necessary to postpone indefinitely the ordination of Rev. Mr. Eldracher,

originally scheduled for June 29th. The reason is that he has some ailment which, although not serious or life-threatening, is nonetheless affecting him in such a way that he cannot attend class. He lost the entire first trimester, and the problem seems to be continuing. He needs to finish three dogma courses and one Moral Theology course.

Please keep him in your prayers so that we can ordain him as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Most Rev. Donald J. Sanborn
Rector