

Introduction

Please read at least this short introduction to the two enclosed letters. The first letter is a reply to *My Petition for Spiritual Help* that was emailed to me on July 5, 2010, and uploaded to the World Wide Web by Bishop Giles Butler, O.F.M. The second letter is my reply to Bishop Giles, and both letters can be read at: www.JMJsite.com.

Bishop Giles explains why he and Bishop Louis Vezelis, O.F.M. teach that Jesus Christ is the Supreme Pontiff, and why these two bishops claim that they received ordinary jurisdiction, mission, and authority directly from Jesus Christ when they were consecrated.

Bishop Giles explains paragraph 42 of Pope Pius XII's Encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi* sentence by sentence in an attempt to justify his two claims: 1) That Pope Pius XII states Jesus Christ is the Supreme Pontiff, and 2) That Pope Pius XII consequently teaches that all bishops receive ordinary jurisdiction, mission, and authority directly from Jesus Christ, and *not* from the pope, when they are consecrated.

However, you will soon see that the bishops have failed to provide even *one* reference source from the Catholic Church that actually supports their *mere statements*. In my reply to the bishop's letter you will read a section that explains why *mere statements are not proof* (see page 14). In refutation to the *mere statements* of Bishop Giles, you will see that I provide plenty of reference sources directly from Pope Pius XII and other popes that positively state and prove the exact opposite of his two claims. Pope Pius XII provides us with an overwhelming amount of proof that Bishop Giles and Bishop Vezelis are absolutely not telling the truth. Consequently, you will understand why I believe this causes a threat to your eternal salvation.

In addition to quoting several popes, my letter provides additional proofs from the *infallible* liturgy of the Catholic Church that the two titles: *Supreme Pontiff* and *Sovereign Pontiff* unmistakably always refer to the *pope* and *not* to Jesus Christ as both bishops falsely claim (see page 6). A number of quotations from other authors, highly revered in the Church, are also provided which proves beyond doubt that the conclusions of the two bishops contradict the truth. In further refutation of the *mere statements* of Bishops Giles and Vezelis, I provide proofs from popes and other authors that when bishops are consecrated without the necessary papal mandate, the Church refers to them as intruder, schismatic bishops (see page 17).

My letter also answers Bishop Giles' statement that the Franciscans are not Traditionalists or Modernists, and helps identify what makes someone belong to these groups (see page 19). Please read that section, and then let me know if you agree with Bishop Giles that they are not Traditionalists. You are also especially encouraged to read the section explaining the Franciscan Foundation (see page 33); the one on mind control (see page 31); and the segment on Apostolic Succession (see page 42). My letter also provides a somewhat long section explaining why I wrote *My Petition for Spiritual Help*, and why I had a right and a duty before Almighty God to upload it to the Web (see page 28).

I now insert Bishop Giles' letter as found on his website, followed by my letter in reply (see page 5). May Almighty God grant you all of the crosses, contradictions, sufferings, joys, graces, and blessings you need in this life to enable you to be with Jesus, Mary, and Saint Joseph in eternity.

Letter to Patrick Henry

Mr. Patrick Henry,

It is with great sorrow that I write to you, and perhaps against my better judgment. I have every desire of helping those who are truly searching for the truth, but your "letter" indicates to me a very different spirit. Your two-hundred plus baited questions show forth a pride and arrogance that seems beyond help. You seem to have even surpassed Martin Luther who limited his "theses" to only ninety-five. Instead of attacking indulgences your attack is against jurisdiction.

I detect that you have read and studied very much, but what seems to be lacking is grace. I am reminded of how St. Augustine speaks of his studies of the Scripture before his conversion. Without grace the meaning was hidden from him. The words were clear enough but the deeper and true meaning escaped his trained and astute mind. It was not until after the grace of God touched his soul that the true meaning began to unfold itself before him. Hence it appears to me that you have a great gift of intelligence but that it is being misdirected and misguided due to a lack of grace. You have become the blind leading the blind. Your studies without grace will only prepare a deeper and deeper residence for you in the depths of Hell.

As you have cut yourself off from the Catholic Church I have little obligation or duty towards you. Yet, as I consider the woman's reply to our Lord: "but even the dogs eat the crumbs that fall from their master's table." I am moved by compassion and charity to perhaps give you the opportunity to cooperate with God's grace.

Your monetary bribes and demands for me to publish and promote your insulting and erroneous observations only confirms and reinforces my observation of your megalomaniacal pride and arrogance and hence your greater need of God's grace.

You have never met me nor Bishop Louis and I dare say that you have not met a great many of the people in your "letter" that you insult and denigrate. And yet you attempt to label me as a "traditionalist". We are not "traditionalists" nor are we modernists or of the Novus Ordo. We are Roman Catholics.

Your attack is against my having jurisdiction. And you demand proof of my having it. And I am fully aware that any proof will be insufficient to one who is blinded with his own self-righteousness and his arrogantly preconceived ideas. Therefore, I would rather first draw your attention to the fact that you deny jurisdiction to true bishops but you yourself act as if you have universal jurisdiction. You deny to bishops what you yourself act as if you have. You are therefore higher than the successors of the apostles, then you must be yourself a pope practicing universal jurisdiction. The Church law is clear that one needs jurisdiction to teach, publish, etc. You act as if you have universal jurisdiction and answer to no one. You do this in promoting your teachings online in print, audio, etc. for the whole world. If this is your wish that people see in you a pope then why do you not come out and say it? If this is not your desire, why do you act this way?

Your principle argument against Bishop Louis and therefore myself is our understanding of Pope Pious XII. You yourself without any mission or jurisdiction claim to have a truer and clearer interpretation of this pope, therefore let me use your translation to point out what is obvious to those who are not blinded as you are. Here follows the quote copied and pasted directly from your "letter". Any typos are yours.

"What we have thus far said of the Universal Church must be understood also of the individual Christian communities, whether Oriental or Latin, which go to make up the one Catholic Church. For they, too, are ruled by Jesus Christ through the voice of their respective Bishops. Consequently, Bishops must be considered as the more illustrious members of the Universal Church, for they are united by a very special bond to the divine Head of the whole Body and so are rightly called 'principal parts of the members of the Lord;' moreover, as far as his own diocese is concerned, each one as a true Shepherd feeds the flock entrusted to him and rules it in the name of Christ. Yet in exercising this

office they are not altogether independent, but are subordinate to the lawful authority of the Roman Pontiff, although enjoying the ordinary power of jurisdiction which they receive directly from the same Supreme Pontiff. Therefore, Bishops should be revered by the faithful as divinely appointed successors of the Apostles, and to them, even more than to the highest civil authorities should be applied the words: 'Touch not my anointed one!' For Bishops have been anointed with the chrism of the Holy Spirit."

Now consider the first sentence of the above quote. "What we have thus far said of the Universal Church must be understood also of the individual Christian communities, whether Oriental or Latin, which go to make up the one Catholic Church." Everything that the Pope has just said of the Universal Church must be understood also of the individual Christian communities which go to make up the one Catholic Church. What he said of the whole must also be said of the part as the part is one with the whole. Obviously and logically not everything of a whole belongs to a part, but the Pope is clearly stating that everything he has previously stated concerning the whole does apply to the individual parts.

Now in the second sentence, "For they, too, are ruled by Jesus Christ through the voice of their respective Bishops." he tells us that they (the individual Christian communities) are ruled by Jesus Christ through the voice of their respective Bishops. According to the Pope the bishops speak in the name of Jesus Christ. Bishops govern in the name of Jesus Christ. He is very clear here. There is no indication that bishops rule or govern in the name of the Pope. On the contrary their power to rule and govern come from the same source as does the pope – Jesus Christ. Remember the first sentence? What he said of the Universal Church applies to the parts. Here he is clarifying this further. Just as the pope universally rules in the name of Jesus Christ, so does the Bishop in his part rule in the name of Jesus Christ. Just as the universal power of the pope came from Jesus Christ so does the individual power of the bishops.

Now the third sentence: "Consequently, Bishops must be considered as the more illustrious members of the Universal Church, for they are united by a very special bond to the divine Head of the whole Body and so are rightly called 'principal parts of the members of the Lord;' moreover, as far as his own diocese is concerned, each one as a true Shepherd feeds the flock entrusted to him and rules it in the name of Christ." This seems very clear to me, but apparently you do not read and understand the same way that I do. Bishops are the more illustrious members of the Universal Church. They are united by a very special bond to the divine Head of the whole Body. They are united to Christ (the divine Head). This "Head" is not a pope and can in no way be attributed to a pope. The bishops are united to the divine Head, the Head of the whole Body. Notice Head is capitalized as referring to Christ (God) not as in pope vicar of the Head. And notice the word "divine" so that there will be no doubt. And to clarify more he continues: "each one as a true Shepherd feeds the flock entrusted to him and rules it in the name of Christ." Each bishop is a true Shepherd – not a hireling. Each bishop rules in the name of Christ – not in the name of a pope. The pope does not need a bishop to rule in his name because he is physically present and can rule in his own name because he has universal jurisdiction. Christ has chosen popes to rule in His name universally and bishops to rule in His name in dioceses. Though subject to the universal jurisdiction of the pope, bishops have ordinary jurisdiction in their own right from Christ.

Now the fourth sentence to which you take exception. "Yet in exercising this office they are not altogether independent, but are subordinate to the lawful authority of the Roman Pontiff, although enjoying the ordinary power of jurisdiction which they receive directly from the same

Supreme Pontiff.” Bishops are not independent of the vicar of Christ but are subordinate to “the lawful authority of the Roman Pontiff”. Therefore they are not subordinate to impostors (anti-popes) which are unlawful and therefore have no authority. And yes, even here the Pope reiterates that bishops have “ordinary power of jurisdiction”. Notice that it is “ordinary” not delegated. Which they receive from the same Supreme Pontiff or Sovereign Pontiff. (I care not which one you use. They refer to the same Person – Jesus Christ.)

If you need a reference where “Supreme” is used to refer to Jesus Christ rather than a pope just look further in your letter to the quote from Pope Pius VI bottom of page 6. Pope Pius VI wrote in the decree Super soliditate, November 28, 1786: “The Church is certainly the one flock of Jesus Christ, Who is reigning in heaven, its one Supreme Pastor. He has left it a visible Pastor here on earth, a man who alone is his supreme Vicar, so that in hearing him, the sheep hear in his voice the voice of Jesus Christ Himself, lest seduced by the voice of strangers they be led astray into noxious and deadly pastures.” Supreme as here used obviously refers to Jesus Christ.

And the word “same” only helps my position; it in no way takes any thing away from it. The “same” refers to the same Jesus Christ that is mentioned in preceding two sentences: sentence two of this paragraph “Jesus Christ”, and to the “divine Head” mentioned in sentence three. Your rendering of this sentence has to be forced even to conceive of what you mean. You would have to change the word “ordinary” to “delegated” for your rendering to be consistent. “Ordinary” means not delegated. And the “ordinary” power comes from Jesus Christ. It is the same ordinary power that the pope has received universally that the bishops receive for their dioceses. Again the pope is reinforcing the first sentence of the paragraph: what he has said of the universal is true of the individual.

Now sentence five: “Therefore, Bishops should be revered by the faithful as divinely appointed successors of the Apostles, and to them, even more than to the highest civil authorities should be applied the words: ‘Touch not my anointed one!’” Bishops are revered as “divinely appointed successors of the Apostles”. Note: not appointed by a pope but by someone divine i.e. God. This is how the pope would have everyone revere the Bishops. Are you accusing the pope of desiring that the whole world live a lie? If the pope intended to have just taught us that bishops have authority only through and from a pope why would he have us then revere them as “divinely appointed”? Are you suggesting that the pope would have us believe that he (the pope) is divine?

And last but not least the final sentence of your quote: “For Bishops have been anointed with the chrism of the Holy Spirit.” It is the chrism of God the Holy Spirit not the chrism of a pope that has anointed the bishops.

Please note that when you called me on the phone I had no idea of who you were, nor was I expecting such pride, arrogance and haughtiness in your “letter”. This was not conveyed in your phone conversation as it is so blatant in your writing. Your email was filtered out of my inbox because I receive too many of your unsolicited emails that I chose long ago not to have them delivered to my inbox. So it was many days before I discovered your “letter”. Your approach on the phone was vastly different than your tone in your “letter”. This I attribute to a pharisaical attempt to deceive and entrap me. I am not bitter or angry but have great pity for your troubled soul, and am grateful to you as I have been found worthy to suffer such attacks from you as Our Lord suffered from the Pharisees of His day.

If ever the grace of God touches your soul and you are ready to abjure your heresies and profess your faith in the Roman Catholic Church please call upon me, as I would be most pleased to take one of the devils' agents and turn them to God.

+Bishop Giles OFM

Letter to Bishop Giles

Dear Bishop Giles Butler, O.F.M.,

Praised be Jesus, Mary, and Saint Joseph, now and forever!

Thank you for your time, thoughts, and consideration to respond to me via email. You expressed various thoughts, but let us go directly to the crux of the truly important issue. You stated the reason and foundation of why we do not agree as to how bishops receive ordinary jurisdiction when you wrote:

“Now the fourth sentence to which you take exception. ‘Yet in exercising this office they are not altogether independent, but are subordinate to the lawful authority of the Roman Pontiff, although enjoying the ordinary power of jurisdiction which they receive directly from the same Supreme Pontiff.’ Bishops are not independent of the vicar of Christ but are subordinate to ‘the lawful authority of the Roman Pontiff’. Therefore they are not subordinate to impostors (anti-popes) which are unlawful and therefore have no authority. And yes, even here the Pope reiterates that bishops have ‘ordinary power of jurisdiction’. Notice that it is ‘ordinary’ not delegated. Which they receive from the same Supreme Pontiff or Sovereign Pontiff. (I care not which one you use. They refer to the same Person – Jesus Christ.)”

Your last three sentences express the primary, major, and crucial point on which we disagree as to how bishops receive ordinary jurisdiction: “Which they receive from the same Supreme Pontiff or Sovereign Pontiff. (I care not which one you use. ***They refer to the same Person – Jesus Christ.***)” I emphasize your last sentence because it is not the truth. It is in direct contradiction to the teaching of every pope and the liturgy of the Catholic Church, as I will show throughout this letter.

If I have understood correctly, both you and Bishop Vezelis believe that Pope Pius XII claims that the Sovereign Pontiff is another name for Jesus Christ but not another name for the pope. Bishop Vezelis wrote in the January 2008, issue of *The Seraph*: “The Sovereign Pontiff is Jesus Christ.” In his sermon on July 4, 2010, Bishop Vezelis continued to be persistent, pertinacious, and determined to teach that Jesus Christ is the Supreme Pontiff:

“The Church is the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ. Jesus, the Son of God, in His Divinity is the Head of the Church. He is the Supreme Pontiff.”

Contrary to what you and Bishop Vezelis teach, I will prove that Pope Pius XII and the Catholic Church teach that the Sovereign Pontiff is only the pope and not Jesus Christ. I will use the encyclicals found at: <http://www.papalencyclicals.net>. You can thereby see where I have added **bold**, underline, and *italics*. Most emphases seen throughout this letter are those of Patrick Henry.

I will begin with the encyclical of Pope Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi*. We have both studied paragraph 42, so let us now study from paragraph 44:

“Yet this, also, must be held, marvelous though it may seem: Christ has need of His members. First, because the person of Jesus Christ is represented by the Supreme Pontiff, who in turn must call on others to share much of his solicitude lest he be overwhelmed by the burden of his pastoral office, and must be helped daily by the prayers of the Church.”

Here in paragraph 44 Pope Pius XII makes it absolutely, completely, and unmistakably clear that the person of Jesus Christ is *represented by* the Supreme Pontiff. Remember that Bishop Vezelis said:

“Jesus, the Son of God... is the Supreme Pontiff.” If you two bishops speak the truth, then please explain why “Jesus, the Supreme Pontiff, in turn must call on others to share much of his solicitude lest he be overwhelmed by the burden of his pastoral office?” Consequently, how in the name of truth and honesty can you and Bishop Vezelis teach that the Supreme Pontiff is actually Jesus Christ? Remember, it is in misunderstanding paragraph 42 that you bishops teach the Supreme Pontiff is actually Jesus Christ. However, do you see that Pope Pius XII himself clearly corrects your mistake and teaches beyond any doubt that the Supreme Pontiff is not Jesus Christ but *only His representative*?

Proof from the Sacred Liturgy

Now we will study from paragraphs 47 and 48 of *Mediator Dei* – encyclical of Pope Pius XII:

“In the sacred liturgy we profess the Catholic faith explicitly and openly, not only by the celebration of the mysteries, and by offering the holy sacrifice and administering the sacraments, but also by saying or singing the credo or Symbol of the faith -- it is indeed the sign and badge, as it were, of the Christian -- along with other texts, and likewise by the reading of holy scripture, written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. The entire liturgy, therefore, has the Catholic faith for its content, inasmuch as it bears public witness to the faith of the Church.”

48. For this reason, whenever there was question of defining a truth revealed by God, the Sovereign Pontiff and the Councils in their recourse to the ‘theological sources,’ as they are called, have not seldom drawn many an argument from this sacred science of the liturgy. For an example in point, Our predecessor of immortal memory, Pius IX, so argued when he proclaimed the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary. Similarly during the discussion of a doubtful or controversial truth, the Church and the Holy Fathers have not failed to look to the age-old and age-honored sacred rites for enlightenment. Hence the well-known and venerable maxim, ‘Legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi’ -- let the rule for prayer determine the rule of belief. The sacred liturgy, consequently, does not decide or determine independently and of itself what is of Catholic faith. More properly, since the liturgy is also a profession of eternal truths, and subject, as such, to the supreme teaching authority of the Church, it can supply proofs and testimony, quite clearly, of no little value, towards the determination of a particular point of Christian doctrine. But if one desires to differentiate and describe the relationship between faith and the sacred liturgy in absolute and general terms, it is perfectly correct to say, ‘Lex credendi legem statuat supplicandi’ -- let the rule of belief determine the rule of prayer.”

The information in the above two paragraphs proves beyond all doubt what the Catholic Church teaches. Do you agree that all Catholics believe *every* truth the Catholic Church teaches in Her liturgy? Therefore let us turn to the liturgy for Pope Saint Pius I, Pope Saint Pius V, and Pope Saint Pius X. The Collect for Pope Saint Pius I is taken from the Mass: “*Si Diligis Me.*” This is the Mass in honor of *one or more* Supreme Pontiffs:

“Eternal Shepherd, regard graciously Thy flock, and keep it with an everlasting protection, by the intercession of blessed Pius thy Martyr and Sovereign Pontiff, whom Thou hast constituted Shepherd of the whole Church. Through our Lord Jesus Christ...”

Here is the Collect for Pope Saint Pius V:

“O God, Who for the overthrow of the enemies of Thy Church and for the restoration of divine worship, didst vouchsafe to choose blessed Pius as Supreme Pontiff: grant that we may be defended by his patronage and so cleave unto Thy service, that overcoming all the wiles of our enemies, we may rejoice in perpetual peace. Through our Lord Jesus Christ...”

Next we will read the Collect for Pope Saint Pius X:

“O God, who for the defense of the Catholic Faith and the restoration of all things in Christ didst fill Saint Pius, Supreme Pontiff, with heavenly wisdom and apostolic courage; grant in Thy loving kindness that by following his teachings and examples we may attain eternal rewards. Through Our Lord...”

Do you agree that these Collects provide the absolute, irrefutable, and indisputable proof that the titles Sovereign Pontiff and Supreme Pontiff are other names for the popes and *not* Jesus Christ? Three points which we must never forget are: 1) “In the sacred liturgy we profess the Catholic faith explicitly and openly.” 2) “The entire liturgy, therefore, has the Catholic faith for its content, inasmuch as it bears public witness to the faith of the Church.” 3) “The liturgy is also a profession of eternal truths.”

No Catholic will deny that the Collects prayed during Mass and in the Divine Office are part of the Catholic liturgy. Therefore, will you accept that the prayers prayed therein are a profession of the Catholic faith and a profession of the *eternal truth* that bears witness to the faith of the Church? Do you agree that when Catholics pray the Collect for the Mass: “*Si Diligis Me*” they absolutely, definitely, and unquestionably profess the *eternal truth* and faith of the infallible Church that the pope is the Sovereign Pontiff?

1) In the Act of Faith Catholics pray: “O my God I firmly believe... these and *all* the truths which the Holy Catholic Church believes and teaches because Thou hast revealed them...”

2) The Catholic Church has proclaimed to Her children that She teaches them what God has revealed concerning the true faith through the sacred liturgy.

3) The sacred liturgy clearly teaches that it is the pope, and not Jesus Christ, who is the Sovereign Pontiff.

4) Therefore, do you agree that in order for Catholics to believe *all* the truths that the Holy Catholic Church believes and teaches, they must necessarily believe that it is the pope who is the Sovereign Pontiff?

We recently read from the Mass: “*Si Diligis Me.*” Now we will read from the first paragraph of *Si Diligis* – the allocution delivered by Pope Pius XII for the canonization of Pope Saint Pius X:

“‘If you love ...feed.’ These words which are a command of our Divine Redeemer to the Apostle Peter are the commencement of the Mass in honor of one or more Supreme Pontiffs.”

Here is the proof from the teaching of the very same pope who wrote paragraph 42 of *Mystici Corporis Christi*. The Holy Father is quoting directly from the sacred liturgy of the Catholic Church, thus proving that the popes are the Supreme Pontiffs. If the Supreme Pontiffs are actually Jesus Christ, well might we ask: “Does the Catholic Church now teach there are two Jesus Christs and four Persons in the Blessed Trinity?” After having the evidence of these facts pointed out to them, what Catholic would not exclaim: “What a horrifying, blasphemous, and heretical statement it is to teach that the Supreme Pontiff is the same Person as Jesus Christ!” How could the Supreme Pontiff be the same Person as Jesus Christ when the Church infallibly teaches *there is more than one Supreme Pontiff*?

To absolutely prove the point that the Catholic Church infallibly teaches that there is more than one Supreme Pontiff, we need only to look in the Missale Romanum Catholic priests read from when they offer Mass. I now open to the Mass, which Pope Pius XII made reference to in the above quoted Allocution: *Si Diligis*. *Si Diligis Me* are the first three words of the Introit. However, this Mass is also known as: Commune Unius Aut Plurium Summorum Pontificum. When a Catholic opens his daily missal to this Mass of the Common of One or More Supreme Pontiffs he knows immediately that the Supreme Pontiff is the pope, *not* Jesus Christ. The truth is immediately before him that *there is more than one Supreme Pontiff*! This Mass gives several different Collects that the priest or bishop would pray

depending upon if the Mass was in honor of one pope *or several popes*. I will now provide the *Eadem Oratio in plurali*:

“Gregem tuum, Pastor aeternae, placatus intende: et per beatos N. et N. (Martyres tuos atque) Summos Pontifices, perpetua protectione custodi; quos totius Ecclesiae praestitisti esse pastores. Per Dominum.”

Do you agree that it is totally, completely, and entirely contrary to the truth taught by the infallible Catholic Church for anyone to teach that Jesus Christ is the Supreme Pontiff?

How in the name of truth, honesty, and love of the Catholic liturgy can anyone continually, perversely, and obstinately be pertinacious in accusing Pope Pius XII of teaching that the Sovereign Pontiff is actually Jesus Christ? Bishop Giles, can you not see that if Pope Pius XII actually taught what you and Bishop Vezelis claim he teaches, then Pope Pius XII would have taught the exact opposite of the faith of the Catholic Church as taught in Her liturgy? Do you agree that it is impossible for the Vicar of Jesus Christ to teach heresy in his dogmatic Encyclical, *Mystici Corporis Christi*? Therefore, how could Pope Pius XII ever teach that Jesus Christ is the Sovereign Pontiff? Cannot everyone see that the infallible Church absolutely, and without the least doubt, teaches that the pope is the Sovereign Pontiff?

Do you agree that in paragraph 48, of *Mediator Dei*, Pope Pius XII used the words Sovereign Pontiff to mean the pope? Continuing on in paragraph 55 of *Mediator Dei* we read:

“55. Other manifestations of piety have also played their circumstantial part in this same liturgical development. Among them may be cited the public pilgrimages to the tombs of the martyrs prompted by motives of devotion, the special periods of fasting instituted for the same reason, and lastly, in this gracious city of Rome, the penitential recitation of the litanies during the ‘station’ processions, in which even the Sovereign Pontiff frequently joined.”

If the Sovereign Pontiff is actually Jesus Christ, then please explain how and why He does not *always* join the processions, but only *frequently*. Do you agree that every Catholic who reads paragraph 55 will know the truth that the Sovereign Pontiff is only another name for the pope?

Next we read in paragraph 58 of *Mediator Dei*:

“58. It follows from this that the Sovereign Pontiff alone enjoys the right to recognize and establish any practice touching the worship of God, to introduce and approve new rites, as also to modify those he judges to require modification.”

If Jesus Christ is the Sovereign Pontiff rather than the pope, then please explain how Jesus Christ goes about: 1) Establishing any practice touching the worship of God. 2) Introducing and approving new rites. 3) Modifying those that require modification.

Notice how Pope Pius XII does not put the letter “h” in uppercase (He), as he would have done had he actually meant to teach that it is not the pope, but Jesus Christ Who is the Sovereign Pontiff. Again, do you believe every Catholic who reads paragraph 58 will know that the title Sovereign Pontiff is only another name for the pope?

In paragraph 65 we see that Pope Pius XII leaves no doubt whatsoever that it is not Jesus Christ, but the Sovereign Pontiff who is the successor of Saint Peter. We see that it is Jesus Christ Who charges the Sovereign Pontiff with the task of feeding the flock:

“65. In every measure taken, then, let proper contact with the ecclesiastical hierarchy be maintained. Let no one arrogate to himself the right to make regulations and impose them on others at will. Only the Sovereign Pontiff, as the successor of Saint Peter, charged by the divine Redeemer with the feeding of His entire flock, and with him, in obedience to the Apostolic See, the bishops ‘whom the Holy Ghost has placed . . . to rule the Church of God,’ have the right and the duty to govern the Christian people. Consequently, Venerable Brethren, whenever you assert your authority -- even on occasion with wholesome severity --

you are not merely acquitting yourselves of your duty; you are defending the very will of the Founder of the Church.”

Next we will read from: *Ad Caeli Reginam* – encyclical of Pope Pius XII:

“15. Moreover Epiphanius, the bishop of Constantinople, writing to the Sovereign Pontiff Hormisdas, says that we should pray that the unity of the Church may be preserved ‘by the grace of the holy and consubstantial Trinity and by the prayers of Mary, Our Lady, the holy and glorious Virgin and Mother of God.’”

Please explain how Jesus Christ could be the Sovereign Pontiff Hormisdas? How did Epiphanius write to Jesus Christ, and deliver his letter to Him in heaven? Bishop Giles, are you still unconvinced that in this Encyclical, *Ad Caeli Reginam*, Pope Pius XII is referring to a letter Epiphanius wrote to the pope living at that time? If your right reason, common sense, and intellect clearly show you that Epiphanius wrote to the pope living at that time then please explain how the Sovereign Pontiff is the Person of Jesus Christ rather than the pope!

You will find more proof of the truth in: *Ad Sinarum Gentem* - encyclical of Pope Pius XII:

“11. In fact, even then, as you well know, it will be entirely necessary for your Christian community, if it wishes to be part of the society divinely founded by our Redeemer, to be completely subject to the Supreme Pontiff, Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth, and be strictly united with him in regard to religious faith and morals. With these words -- and it is well to note them -- is embraced the whole life and work of the Church, and also its constitution, its government, its discipline. All of these things depend certainly on the will of Jesus Christ, Founder of the Church.”

After reading the above paragraph, who will not believe the Supreme Pontiff is the Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth? If the Supreme Pontiff is actually Jesus Christ as you and Bishop Vezelis teach, then who on earth can and will explain how Jesus Christ is also the Vicar of Jesus Christ? Now Bishop Giles, are you going to spin this teaching by saying the Vicar of Jesus Christ is Jesus Christ just as a Catholic priest is another Christ – completely contrary to what Pope Pius XII is teaching in this paragraph number 11?

The next paragraph in *Ad Sinarum Gentem* reads:

“12. By virtue of God’s Will, the faithful are divided into two classes: the clergy and the laity. By virtue of the same Will is established the twofold sacred hierarchy, namely, of orders and jurisdiction. Besides -- as has also been divinely established -- the power of orders (through which the ecclesiastical hierarchy is composed of Bishops, priests, and ministers) comes from receiving the Sacrament of Holy Orders. But the power of jurisdiction, which is conferred upon the Supreme Pontiff directly by divine rights, flows to the Bishops by the same right, but only through the Successor of St. Peter, to whom not only the simple faithful, but even all the Bishops must be constantly subject, and to whom they must be bound by obedience and with the bond of unity.”

Bishop Giles, please read again how clearly His Holiness explains the distinction as to how the bishops receive the twofold sacred hierarchy. 1) “*The power of orders... comes from receiving the Sacrament of Holy Orders.*” 2) But the power of jurisdiction does not come from receiving the Sacrament of Holy Orders! 3) Because, “*Jurisdiction... flows to the bishops... only through the Successor of Saint Peter.*”

Do you agree that the same Pope Pius XII who wrote paragraph 42 of *Mystici Corporis Christi*, cannot be teaching therein that jurisdiction is conferred directly on bishops by Jesus Christ Himself when they are consecrated? What Catholic will not acknowledge that Pope Pius XII, in the above paragraph, proves that the *power of jurisdiction flows to the bishops only through the Successor of Saint Peter*?

Bishop Giles, I read on your website where you quoted Pope Leo XIII from *Satis Cognitum*, attempting to support your claim that bishops receive ordinary jurisdiction directly from Jesus Christ:

“But if the authority of Peter and his successors is plenary and supreme, it is not to be regarded as the sole authority. For He who made Peter the foundation of the Church also ‘chose twelve, whom He called apostles’ (Luke 6:13); and just as it is necessary that the authority of Peter should be perpetuated in the Roman Pontiff, so, by the fact that the bishops succeed the apostles, they inherit their ordinary power, and thus the episcopal order necessarily belongs to the essential constitution of the Church. Although they do not receive plenary, or universal, or supreme authority, they are not to be looked upon as vicars of the Roman Pontiffs; because they exercise a power really their own, and are most truly called the ordinary pastors of the peoples over whom they rule.”

Is there a reason why you did not also quote and explain how the same Pope Leo XIII made it extremely, exceptionally, and extraordinarily clear that the Apostles, and their successors *the bishops*, *certainly did not receive the power of jurisdiction from Jesus Christ*?

Let us hear Jesus Christ speak to us again in *Satis Cognitum*:

“Indeed, Holy Writ attests that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were given to Peter alone, and that the power of binding and loosening was granted to the Apostles and to Peter; but there is nothing to show that the Apostles received supreme power without Peter, and against Peter. Such power they certainly did not receive from Jesus Christ.”

Do you agree that the popes continually teach that bishops do not receive jurisdiction directly from Jesus Christ? Jurisdiction is given to bishops only through the pope. If bishops do not receive jurisdiction from a pope, then no jurisdiction is given! Therefore, they have no authority, jurisdiction, or mission!

Bishop Giles, as explained above, am I correct in thinking that you and Bishop Vezelis believe, or at least teach, that bishops receive ordinary jurisdiction directly from Jesus Christ at the time they are consecrated? You and Bishop Vezelis teach that this ordinary jurisdiction is given only because Jesus Christ is actually the Sovereign Pontiff, thereby falsely claiming that the popes are never the same person as the Sovereign Pontiff. Are not your *entire claims to ordinary jurisdiction* based on your way of understanding paragraph 42 of *Mystici Corporis Christi*? Do you agree that your claim to have ordinary jurisdiction directly from Jesus Christ totally vanishes when it is proved that the popes are the Sovereign Pontiffs? I have shown that the infallible Catholic Church does in fact teach this through Her popes and liturgy. I believe the information already presented proves that truth. Those who pray, study, and research will realize how very often Pope Pius XII actually taught the opposite of what you and Bishop Vezelis claim he taught in paragraph 42 of *Mystici Corporis Christi*.

Here are a few more references from Pope Pius XII.

Ecclesiae Fastos teaches Catholics that: “Saint Boniface was consecrated by the Supreme Pontiff himself.” Bishop Giles, you teach that Jesus Christ is the Supreme Pontiff. Therefore, according to your statement that Jesus Christ is the Supreme Pontiff, it is Jesus Christ who consecrated Saint Boniface. Is it your theology that Jesus Christ as the Supreme Pontiff goes about consecrating bishops? The infallible Catholic Church teaches us that Catholic bishops are consecrated by other human bishops, and not Jesus Christ in His Person. Bishop Giles, when will you acknowledge that Jesus Christ is not the Supreme Pontiff who goes about consecrating bishops, such as Saint Boniface, and Who gives ordinary jurisdiction directly to bishops? If you and Bishop Vezelis were actually teaching the truth, then the infallible Holy Catholic Church has erred in Her liturgy; and the infallible popes have taught us errors. That would be a denial of Christ and the indefectibility and infallibility of the Church, which He had promised when He established Her. To say the least your teachings cause very serious problems and contradictions. You

have established a church based on a lie, following the footsteps of all other false churches, which can neither sanctify nor save their members.

Another serious problem arises if every bishop receives his jurisdiction, authority, and mission in the Church directly from Jesus Christ. If everything comes directly from Jesus Christ, no bishop in the world today is a successor of any Apostle. A successor is one who follows another. Some synonyms for successor are: recipient, beneficiary, descendant, follower, heritor, inheritor, next in line, and replacement. If you teach the truth, then do you agree that Jesus Christ personally and directly gave Saint Boniface the power of orders, the power of jurisdiction, and his authority and mission in the Church? Consequently, if you teach the truth, Saint Boniface might be a successor of Jesus Christ but he was not a *recipient* of anything from any Apostle! What did you receive from any Apostle? You two bishops teach that you received nothing from any Apostle since you did not receive orders, jurisdiction, authority, or mission from any Apostle. Since you therefore teach a *new doctrine unheard of before*, do you agree that you are not successors of the Apostles?

Ecclesiae Fastos also continues on to inform us: “34. And in the last years of his life, when he was already an old man and broken by his labors, he humbly wrote the following to Stephen II, recently elected Supreme Pontiff...” Bishop Giles, please explain why Pope Stephen II was the recently elected Supreme Pontiff if Jesus Christ is and always was the Supreme Pontiff.

Fidei Donum states: “First of all, because in so far as the Person of Christ is represented by the Sovereign Pontiff...” Please do not misunderstand what Pope Pius XII teaches. The Person of Christ is only *represented by* the Sovereign Pontiff. Do you agree that he does not teach that the Sovereign Pontiff is the same Person as Jesus Christ?

Haurietis Aquas states how Pope Pius XII teaches that he is himself the Supreme Pontiff: “When We took up Our office of Supreme Pontiff...” Was Pope Pius XII Jesus Christ?

Through the Sovereign Pontiff – Saints and Others

Bishop Giles, in the 13th paragraph of your reply you wrote:

“Ordinary’ means not delegated. And the ‘ordinary’ power comes from Jesus Christ.”

However, what you did not add was the very important phrase: “Through the Sovereign Pontiff.” And that is the important reason why you and Bishop Vezelis have never received ordinary or delegated jurisdiction.

I have already provided quotes from popes, which prove that *all jurisdiction flows to bishops only through the successor of St. Peter*. As a summary let us review other evidence that proves this truth.

In his *Summa Contra Gentiles*, Lib. IV, cap. 76, Saint Thomas Aquinas provides the doctrine of the Catholic Church:

“To conserve the Unity of the Church, the power of the keys must be passed on through Peter to the other pastors of the Church.”

Supplement, Q. 22, Art. 1, Reply Obj. 1:

“It is in this sense that some distinguish between the key of Orders, which all priests have, and the key of Jurisdiction in the tribunal of judgment, which none have but the judges of the external tribunal. Nevertheless, God bestowed both on Peter (Matt. XVI 19), from whom they are derived by others, whichever of them they have.”

Father Clarence McAuliffe teaches in his *Sacramental Theology* (Imprimatur, April 25, 1958, page 303):

“From this declaration it is evident that delegated jurisdiction to absolve is not conferred by priestly ordination or episcopal consecration. That ordinary jurisdiction is not granted follows

from the fact that no man receives a parish or diocese by his ordination [or consecration – P.H.]”

Father Michael Muller, C.S.S.R. teaches Catholic doctrine in a book titled: *The Beautiful Story of the Catholic Faith*, with an imprimatur of January 16, 1902:

“The choice of a bishop has to be made, or at least to be confirmed, by the pope; from him each bishop holds his jurisdiction over the territory assigned to him by the pope. Episcopal jurisdiction has been instituted by Christ in such a manner that each bishop should receive his jurisdiction from the pope, who makes the bishops sharers in the power of the keys which Christ gave to Peter alone, and, in his person, to his successors...”

From *A Manual of Pastoral Theology* by Rev. Fr. Frederick Schulze, (Imprimatur + Joannes J. Glennon, 1923), page 295, we learn bishops do not obtain jurisdiction through episcopal consecration. We also learn that a priest by his ordination has no jurisdiction:

“Jurisdiction rests with the hierarchy, - the Pope, as the head of the Church, and the bishops in their respective dioceses. This Jurisdiction the bishop does not obtain through Episcopal consecration; it is conveyed to him by the authority of the Holy See in the Apostolic brief appointing him and setting him as a ruler over a portion of Christ's vineyard. No temporal sovereign or State can give this jurisdiction. It is not earthly, but of heavenly creation. It is emphatically a power from God. The channel of its derivation is through the apostolate... A priest by his ordination has no jurisdiction.”

Let us review the Catholic faith from *The Liturgical Year*, by Dom Guéranger, Imprimatur, 1924, Vol. IV, pages 282-287:

“To-day, let us consider the Apostolic See as the sole source of the legitimate power, whereby mankind is ruled and governed in all that concerns eternal salvation.”

Do you agree that since the Apostolic See is the sole source of legitimate power, and that unless a bishop received a papal mandate and jurisdiction through a Vicar of Jesus Christ, he does not have legitimate power?

Dom Guéranger continues to teach us by providing these quotes from some saints and other learned men:

“She (the Catholic Church) says to us, by Tertullian: ‘Christ gave the keys to Peter, and through him to the Church.’”

“By St. Optatus of Milevis: ‘For the sake of Unity, Peter was made the first among all the apostles, and he alone received the keys, that he might give them to the rest.’”

“By St. Gregory of Nyssa: ‘It is through Peter that Christ gave to bishops the keys of their heavenly prerogative.’”

“By St. Leo the Great: ‘If Our Lord willed that there should be something common to Peter and the rest of the princes of His Church, it was only on this condition, that whatsoever He gave to the rest, He gave it to them through Peter.’”

Dom Guéranger here provides the unanimous teaching of Catholic tradition:

“Yes, the episcopate is most sacred, for it comes from the hands of Jesus Christ through Peter and his successors. Such is the unanimous teaching of Catholic tradition, which is in keeping with the language used by the Roman pontiffs, from the earliest ages.”

Remember that the deposit of Catholic faith is that which is contained in Sacred Scripture and in the *Universal Tradition*. We continue to learn from Dom Guéranger that the Universal Tradition of the Church teaches that the episcopate, with all its authority, emanates from the Apostolic See:

“This fundamental principle, which St. Leo the Great has so ably and eloquently developed (as we have seen on the feast of the chair at Rome, January 18), this principle, which is taught us by universal tradition, is laid down with all possible precision on the magnificent letters, still extant, of Pope St. Innocent I, who preceded St. Leo by several years, ‘the episcopate, with all its Authority, emanates from the Apostolic See.’”

Dom Guéranger sums up what he has been teaching us:

“All spiritual authority comes from Peter; all comes from the bishop of Rome, in whom Peter will continue to govern the Church to the end of time. Jesus Christ is the founder of the episcopate; it is the Holy Ghost who established bishops to rule the Church; but the mission and the institution, which assign the pastor his flock, and the flock its pastor, these are given by Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost through the ministry of Peter and his successors.”

I now bring Dom Guéranger’s statements and quotes to a close with his own pertinent conclusion:

“We, then, both priests and people, have a right to know whence our pastors have received their power. From whose hand have they received the keys? If their mission comes from the apostolic see, let us honor and obey them, for they are sent to us by Jesus Christ, who has invested them, through Peter, with His own authority. If they claim our obedience without having been sent by the bishop of Rome, we must refuse to receive them for they are not acknowledged by Christ as His ministers. The holy anointing may have conferred on them the sacred character of the episcopate: it matters not; they must be as aliens to us, for they have not been sent, they are not pastors.”

Always remember what Father Cox correctly teaches in *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* (Imprimatur and Copyright, 1900), pages 155, 156, and 173. He clearly explains that no sect can be the true Church if its clerics do not receive their *jurisdiction, which flows to the bishops only through the Successor of Saint Peter*:

“It is not enough for it to teach all the doctrines of the Apostles, if it lacks either their orders or their jurisdiction... Those who invent doctrines unheard of before are not the successors of the Apostles. Novelty and error are children of the same father - the father of lies. Those who have lost the line of valid ministers leading back to apostolic times cannot plead the possession of Apostolicity. Where there is no ordination, no priesthood, no authority, no power, Apostolicity is out of the question. Even if valid orders exist, where jurisdiction is lacking there is no real Apostolicity. Schism, as well as heresy, destroys apostolic succession.”

Proof has been given that you two bishops have *invented doctrines unheard of before*. Consequently, how is it possible that you are the successors of the Apostles? Do you agree that even if your orders are valid, neither you nor any other Traditionalist bishop received jurisdiction, because bishops can *only* receive jurisdiction and authority from a pope? Do you agree that the truth remains true even if no Traditionalist believes it? Do you accept the obvious truth that no bishop or priest in the Traditional Movement has jurisdiction? Do you agree that even if they did teach all the doctrines of the Apostles, and even if every cleric’s orders were valid, that still would not provide them with the power of jurisdiction? Do you agree that as a result the Church teaches that you do *not* carry on real Apostolicity? Do you also agree that without the Fourth Mark of the Church, everyone should acknowledge that you and all other Traditionalists belong to non-Catholic sects?

Jesus Is the Supreme Pontiff = Mere Statement

Bishop Giles, in your 7th paragraph you wrote:

“Your principle argument against Bishop Louis and therefore myself is our understanding of Pope Pious XII. You yourself without any mission or jurisdiction claim to have a truer and clearer interpretation of this pope, therefore let me use your translation to point out what is obvious to those who are not blinded as you are.”

Yes, the claim of you two bishops that Pope Pius XII teaches that Jesus Christ is the Sovereign Pontiff is one of the main things on which we do not agree. It is true that I do not have any mission or ordinary jurisdiction in the Catholic Church, but I also do not pretend to have them and then tell others that I have them. Your *entire* claim to ordinary jurisdiction depends on *one* thing, and that is your ability to absolutely prove that Jesus Christ *always* was, *always* is, and *always* will be the Supreme Pontiff! I certainly think that you bishops believe that God the Father is God; God the Son is God; and God the Holy Ghost is God. Undoubtedly you believe Jesus Christ, the Son of God, always was and always will be. But do you bishops teach that the Supreme Pontiff always was, is, and always will be? Do you agree that it was not the Supreme Pontiff who created Adam and formed Eve out of his rib? It is an article of faith that Jesus Christ rose from the dead and dieth now no more. Do you bishops believe the Supreme Pontiff rose from the dead on Easter Sunday and dieth now no more? Do you bishops believe Pope Pius XII never died? After all, he claimed to be the Supreme Pontiff when he wrote: “When We took up Our office of Supreme Pontiff.”

I believe he was the Supreme Pontiff, and therefore may I ask if you bishops believe Jesus, the Son of God is Pope Pius XII?

Let us review again what Bishop Louis Vezelis preached during his sermon on July 4, 2010:

“Jesus, the Son of God... is the Supreme Pontiff.”

Therefore, if the Son of God is the Supreme Pontiff, then there can *never* be two Supreme Pontiffs! Must I also force the truth upon you bishops that if the Son of God is the Supreme Pontiff then never at any time could any pope be the Supreme Pontiff? Why do you two bishops absolutely, perseveringly, and pretentiously persist in teaching the opposite of the popes and the sacred liturgy of God’s infallible Church?

Furthermore, what do mission and jurisdiction have to do with anyone, Catholic or non-Catholic, understanding the hundreds of times the popes throughout the centuries have shown that the Supreme Pontiff is the pope? I have provided plenty of evidence from many sources that *jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the pope*, including several quotes directly from Pope Pius XII. I have provided even more sources to prove that the titles of Sovereign Pontiff and Supreme Pontiff *always* refer to the pope. If you need more of the same kind of examples, you can find over 100 others in the writings of the popes, in the councils of the Church, and in the commentaries on canon law. The evidence supporting the truth that *bishops can only receive ordinary jurisdiction from the lawful successor of Saint Peter* is overwhelming! Therefore, if I am the blinded one as you say, in understanding this subject of jurisdiction coming from a pope and not directly from Jesus Christ, I am in excellent company. Every pope, saint, and spiritual author that has written about this matter is in agreement with me and opposed to you and Bishop Vezelis.

You bishops only make mere statements as your proof that Jesus Christ is the Sovereign Pontiff when you give your personal interpretation of what Pope Pius XII meant. However, *a mere statement is not proof*.

I have a book titled: *St. Therese Returns, a defense of fundamental Catholic Teaching* by Albert H. Dolan, Order of Carmel. Under Chapter 2, page 18, there is something that is important to understand:

“By way of preliminary let me formulate some principles which will serve as excellent guides whenever in your reading you encounter any objection against religion in any of its

departments. First principle: The most important of these guides is this: It is one of the first principles of logic of correct thinking, that mere statement is not proof.

I wish that all my auditors who read a great deal would try to engrave that principle upon their memories. 'Mere statement is not proof.' Modern journalism and current literature abound in statements for which no proof is offered, and if that principle is kept in mind it will guide you safely over nine-tenths of the irreligious material you meet in your reading.

I shall not apologize for repeating that principle often during this series of talks. Just what do I mean by 'Mere statement is not proof'? Well, let me illustrate. In my talk last week I proposed some twenty objections to Christianity in the form of statements taken from the New York Press, and they offered no proof for any except one of those statements. To say, 'the days of dogma are over' proves nothing. It is a mere statement without proof. I could encounter the statement with another contradicting it, 'the days of dogma are not over.' Again, the following statement, 'the idea of God is an antique—the notion of God originally developed from a primitive fear of the unknown. Psychoanalysis and behaviorism have demonstrated that man is not responsible for his actions.' All these are statements and merely statements proving exactly nothing. But there is one type of smart statement which recurs continually against which permit me particularly to warn you. And that is a statement beginning with the words, 'no intelligent man nowadays believes.' Modern unbelievers are very fond of this phrase. If they wish to indicate their own private disbelief they say not, 'I do not believe in creation or in Hell or immortality.' No, they say, 'no intelligent man nowadays believes in creation.' Or they vary it a bit by saying, 'every intelligent man knows that man's responsibilities for his actions has been long since disproved.' Or they say, 'the modern trained mind cannot accept the miracles of Christ.' Do not be disturbed by such statements, my dear friends. They are all violations of the first principle of logic. Violations of the first rule of the art of thinking, namely, that mere statement is not proof. The answer to all such objections is the same, namely, prove your statement. When a man says, 'no intelligent man nowadays believes this or that.' The answer is, 'you mean YOUR mind cannot believe. For it is simply not true that every trained mind disbelieves. On the contrary, I can give you a formidable list of highly intelligent men of giant intellect who DO believe what you deny.' So much for the very important principle to be remembered in all our reading, 'mere statement is not proof.' So when people make mere statements, either verbally or at least mentally, say 'prove it, prove your statement.'"

Therefore, please prove your statement that Jesus Christ is the Sovereign Pontiff. Please show me at least one quote from any pope, the Bible, council of the Church, catechism, canon law book, saint, or Doctor of the Church that says: "*Jesus Christ is the Supreme Pontiff*." Or give the quote from any of the above that says: "The Supreme Pontiff (or Sovereign Pontiff) is the same Person as Jesus Christ."

Bishop Giles, in your letter you have misconstrued and perverted Pope Pius VI's teaching that Jesus Christ is the Supreme *Pastor*, and by so doing have attempted to establish and defeat a new argument that I never presented. I am not denying that the adjective "Supreme" is also used to refer to Jesus Christ or Almighty God. Most Catholics learn that truth at a very young age, the day they begin to study the catechism. The second question in the catechism asks: "Who is God?" The answer says: "God is the *Supreme* Being, infinitely perfect, who made all things and keeps them in existence." I am not asking you bishops to prove that God is the Supreme Being, or that Jesus Christ is the Supreme *Pastor*. I am asking you for the quote from any pope, the Bible, council of the Church, catechism, canon law book, saint, or Doctor of the Church that says: "Jesus Christ is the Supreme *Pontiff*." Do you agree that if you do not provide this quote, then everyone will know that your statement: "Jesus Christ is the Supreme *Pontiff*," is a mere statement without proof?

Let us again review a summary from the popes and some other sources already quoted. Every Roman Catholic believes each one of the following truths that I have extracted, although Traditionalists and Modernists do not believe all of these truths:

“Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff.’ ‘The power of jurisdiction flows to the Bishops only through the Successor of St. Peter.’ ‘Such power they certainly did not receive from Jesus Christ.’ ‘To conserve the Unity of the Church, the power of the keys must be passed on through Peter.’ ‘Jurisdiction to absolve is not conferred by priestly ordination or episcopal consecration.’ ‘Episcopal jurisdiction has been instituted by Christ in such a manner that each bishop should receive his jurisdiction from the pope.’ ‘This Jurisdiction the bishop does not obtain through Episcopal consecration.’ ‘The episcopate comes from the hands of Jesus Christ through Peter and his successors.’ ‘All authority emanates from the Apostolic See.’ ‘All spiritual authority comes from Peter.’ ‘We, then, both priests and people, have a right to know whence our pastors have received their power. If they claim our obedience without having been sent by the bishop of Rome, we must refuse to receive them for they are not acknowledged by Christ as His ministers. They must be as aliens to us, for they have not been sent, they are not pastors.’”

From the statements of you two bishops as expressed in writing, preached in sermons, and told to me on the phone, you must believe that the quotes in the above paragraph cannot be the truth. How can you believe that those popes and spiritual writers wrote the truth, and still claim, assert, and argue that all bishops receive jurisdiction and authority directly from Jesus Christ and not through a pope?

I do not think that you can prove your *mere statements*, because they are the exact opposite of the doctrine of the Catholic Church. Therefore, do you agree that everyone can correctly conclude that you two bishops did *not* receive jurisdiction or authority when you were consecrated? It is very important that you provide the quotes that prove your *mere statements*. Do you agree that **if you do not find the quotes and proof that you actually teach the truth, your entire claims to be Roman Catholic bishops automatically collapses, crumples, and subsides?**

Father Joseph Noonan, O.F.M. told me in person that the Sovereign Pontiff is sometimes Jesus Christ and at other times the pope. He also said each one must determine if Jesus Christ is the Sovereign Pontiff by the way it is used in the document. Therefore, is everyone now to do the Protestant thing while they *pick and choose* when the Sovereign Pontiff is Jesus Christ or the pope? You two bishops say that Jesus Christ is the Sovereign Pontiff, and I have yet to hear or read any statement from you bishops that the pope is sometimes the Sovereign Pontiff. Do you teach the same way as Father Joseph, that everyone must *pick and choose* when the Sovereign Pontiff refers to the pope and when it refers to Jesus Christ? Is paragraph 42 of *Mystici Corporis Christi* the *only* time that Jesus Christ is the Sovereign Pontiff? That is indeed very slim pickings, so can you please tell me where else you believe the words Sovereign Pontiff are used for Jesus Christ?

I have never heard of or read from anyone else besides your followers, who at any time teach that the Sovereign Pontiff is the same Person as Jesus Christ. Am I correct in stating that you are the ones who *invented a new doctrine that has never been heard of before* Bishop Vezelis was consecrated? It is true that you Franciscans might continue to *pick and choose* when the Supreme Pontiff refers to the pope and when it refers to Jesus Christ. Neither can others stop you from explaining and interpreting paragraph 42 of *Mystici Corporis Christi* favorable to your claim of ordinary jurisdiction. Nevertheless, Pope Pius XII clearly teaches that you are wrong. In the encyclical letter, *Ad Sinarum gentem*, His Holiness teaches very plainly, unmistakably, and definitely that, “*The power of jurisdiction...flows to the bishops...only through the Successor of St. Peter.*” The Encyclical, *Ad Apostolorum Principis* teaches: “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff as We admonished in the encyclical letter, *Mystici Corporis...*” Here we have three encyclical letters teaching the Catholic doctrine that the power of jurisdiction passes

to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff, the successor of Peter. Jesus Christ said: “He who heareth you (in this case, Pope Pius XII) heareth Me.” Jesus Christ tells us through the encyclical letter *Humani Generis* that what is expounded in encyclical letters demands consent. Pope Pius XII officially, formally, and authoritatively expounded this matter in encyclical letters. The Holy Father thereby passed judgment and taught Catholics forever after that they must believe that *the power of jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff, the successor of Peter.*

Living a Lie – Divinely Appointed – Intruder, Schismatic

Bishop Giles, you wrote the following in your reply to me when explaining the fifth sentence:

“Are you accusing the pope of desiring that the whole world live a lie? If the pope intended to have just taught us that bishops have authority only through and from a pope why would he have us then revere them as ‘divinely appointed’? Are you suggesting that the pope would have us believe that he (the pope) is divine?”

Do you agree that the calling to the Catholic Priesthood is a divine calling? Do you agree that priests must be called by those bishops who are licit successors of the Apostles? Do you agree that the licit successors of the Apostles are only those bishops who are divinely called through the Supreme Pontiff, who is the pope? Do you agree that the Supreme Pontiff receives universal jurisdiction and authority to appoint bishops from the Divine Head, Jesus Christ, at the time that he accepts the Papacy? “You have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you.” – John 15: 16.

Do you agree that schismatic bishops sometimes have valid orders? Do you agree that not all bishops who have valid orders are divinely appointed successors of the Apostles? You wrote: “**Note: not appointed by a pope but by someone divine i.e. God.**” If Jesus Christ appointed every bishop who received valid orders, then would every schismatic and heretical bishop with valid orders also be a successor of the Apostles? If not, then how are you a successor of the Apostles? What did you receive from an Apostle that every schismatic bishop would not receive and why did you receive it whereas they would not? Do you teach that every validly consecrated bishop receives directly from Jesus Christ their jurisdiction, authority, and mission? If you answer yes and that was actually the truth, then many schismatic and heretical bishops would in fact have jurisdiction, authority, and mission in the Church! Do you agree that schismatic bishops who receive their orders outside the Church are not the successors of the Apostles because they did not receive them through the pope?

It is erroneous, if not heresy to say that bishops are not appointed by a pope to their diocese. Do you agree that the papal mandate comes from a pope? Do you agree that it is the pope who requires the mandate before a licit consecration can take place? Do you agree that without the papal mandate, no bishop has a diocese or mission in the Catholic Church? To what are Catholic bishops divinely appointed if not to rule over a portion of the flock, and who determines which portion or diocese he will rule if not the pope? Are you actually teaching that it is not the pope who appoints each bishop to his diocese, but rather Jesus Christ in His Person? Let us imagine that we could go back less than 100 years to the time when Pope Pius XI was the Sovereign Pontiff ruling the Catholic Church and review the records of every diocese throughout the world. Will you not expect to find that every Catholic bishop in each one of those dioceses was appointed with the consent of Pope Pius XI or one of his predecessors? Are you actually teaching that Jesus Christ Personally appointed each of those bishops to his diocese; and that the popes had absolutely nothing to do with them? That might be your belief, but every Catholic who reads the encyclicals of the popes, studies the catechisms, and who understands what the Catholic Church teaches has no doubt whatever that your doctrine is erroneous.

Consider what is written in the *Exposition of Christian Doctrine* by a seminary professor. Imprimatur: Patritius Joannes. Copyright, 1898-1925:

“170. From whom do bishops hold their jurisdiction?

From the Pope.

171. From whom does the Pope hold his jurisdiction?

From Jesus Christ, the Son of God made man.

172. What sort of bishop would he be who did not hold spiritual powers from the Pope?

He would be an intruded or schismatical bishop.

173. What sort of pastor would he be who did not hold his powers from a lawful bishop?

He would be an intruded or schismatical pastor.”

Do you agree that this seminary professor correctly told us in 1898 how Catholics should identify schismatic, intruder bishops and priests? Do you agree that the Catholic Church does not change Her teachings? Therefore, do you agree that Bishop Vezelis, all of the other Traditional Movement bishops and priests, and those who come from the Novus Ordo sect, are schismatic bishops and priests by the definition just given? Since they do not hold their powers from a *lawful* pope or bishop how can anyone justify receiving sacraments from these schismatic, intruder clerics day after day and week after week?

Now read from *Charitas* where Pope Pius VI tells us what to do about intruders:

“Carefully beware of lending your ears to the treacherous speech of the philosophy of this age which leads to death. Keep away from all intruders, whether called archbishops, bishops, or parish priests; do not hold communion with them especially in divine worship.”

Stop and think! The Catholic Church teaches that all bishops who did not receive a papal mandate for their spiritual jurisdiction, mission, and authority from a legitimate pope are schismatic, intruder bishops and that they are *cut off from the Church*. Thus, we review what the Catholic Church teaches through Saint Thomas Aquinas.

Supplement, Q. 19, Art. 5, Reply Obj. 3:

“We might also reply that by members of the Dove he means all who are not cut off from the Church, for those who receive the sacraments from them, receive grace, whereas those who receive the sacraments from those who are cut off from the Church, do not receive grace, because they sin in so doing, except in case of Baptism, which, in cases of necessity, may be received even from one who is excommunicated.”

Bishop Giles, you quoted Pope Pius VI reminding us that Catholics hear the voice of Jesus Christ speaking in encyclical letters. Is it clear why Jesus Christ told us through this same Pope Pius VI, in *Charitas*, to keep away from *all* bishops who are consecrated without a papal mandate? Of course, when Jesus Christ commands us to keep away from all intruders, His order includes *every* priest associated with any bishop consecrated without a papal mandate. Do you agree that Catholics must not hold communion with them in divine worship *because they sin in so doing*?

Why do you and the other Traditionalist bishops act as though you have universal jurisdiction when none of you have even been assigned to a diocese by a pope? Do you agree that you cannot name the exact boundaries of your diocese? Do you agree that Bishop Vezelis cannot show the exact boundaries of his diocese? Do both dioceses overlap and extend into other countries? Do you claim to have jurisdiction in any place you might want to go on this earth? Would not that imply that your claim of jurisdiction is actually universal jurisdiction?

You and Bishop Vezelis claim that each and every bishop receives ordinary jurisdiction and mission to function the moment he is consecrated. Just how did Jesus Christ communicate to you the specific boundaries of your diocese? Will you ever agree that for all Catholic bishops it is only a pope who is able to give them their *mission* and jurisdiction to work within a diocese? You imply in your letter that you have both a mission and jurisdiction in the Catholic Church, while you informed all of those who read your letter on the World Wide Web that I have neither a mission nor jurisdiction. Do you agree that if your intention was to make people think you have a divinely appointed mission and jurisdiction then you have acted very deceitfully? Do you agree that only the ignorant Catholics will be deceived into

accepting that you or any other Traditionalist bishops have been sent, have a divine mission, and were appointed to a diocese?

Pope Pius VI teaches that none of the schismatic, intruder bishops should be revered by the faithful as divinely appointed successors of the Apostles. Do you agree that the reason Catholic bishops should be revered by the faithful is because they are divinely appointed to their diocese *by the pope*? Do you agree that those bishops who did not receive a divine calling and appointment to a diocese *from a pope* are not Catholic bishops, but schismatic, intruder bishops who should be shunned by the faithful? Do you agree that such bishops are schismatic, intruder bishops by the very fact that they do not carry on Apostolicity?

When Pope Pius XII speaks of those who are “divinely appointed,” my understanding is that a divine appointment takes place only when the right order is obeyed and carried out in the Church. Right order means that Christ’s authority is transferred to the pope, from the pope to the bishops, and from the bishops to the priests. Thus the Divine Head, Jesus Christ, is understood to be at work in every appointment.

This could be analogous to why an obedient religious recognizes in his superior the voice and authority of Jesus Christ even though religious superiors are not Jesus Christ. However, do you agree that not one of those superiors has any jurisdiction over others unless those superiors themselves received their jurisdiction through the divinely instituted chain of command?

I assume that we agree that jurisdiction is of divine origin, and that no Catholic priest has ordinary or delegated jurisdiction unless he received it from a Catholic bishop who actually possessed ordinary jurisdiction himself. But you and Bishop Vezelis do not agree with me that no bishop has jurisdiction unless he received it from the pope. Do you agree that no pope has universal jurisdiction from the Divine Head, Jesus Christ, unless he accepts the office of the Papacy to rule the Catholic Church as its Supreme Pontiff? Is not that how and why jurisdiction is of divine origin, because it comes from the Divine Head of the Catholic Church through this *unbroken* chain of command? Although valid orders might be present in some of the intruder clerics, do you agree that not one of them has ordinary or delegated jurisdiction because they did not receive it from the Divine Head of the Church through His Vicar?

Do you agree that no bishop is divine just because it is through him that priests receive ordinary or delegated jurisdiction, and that no pope is divine just because it is through him that bishops receive ordinary or delegated jurisdiction? Do you agree that the Church teaches that all jurisdiction begins with the divine Head, Jesus Christ? Although elected by humans, the pope is given his divinely appointed office when he accepts the Papacy. Do you agree that it is through this divinely appointed office that this newly chosen Sovereign Pontiff has his mission, authority, and jurisdiction to divinely appoint bishops to various dioceses throughout the world? Do you agree with my understanding of “divinely appointed?”

We Are Not Traditionalists or Modernists

Bishop Giles, in your 5th paragraph you wrote:

“We are not ‘traditionalists’ nor are we modernists or of the Novus Ordo. We are Roman Catholics.”

Why is it that you say you are not Traditionalists? As far as I can see, the main thing that you think separates you from the rest of the Traditionalists is that you believe you have ordinary jurisdiction and authority, whereas the other Traditionalists do not. But as this letter demonstrates, you do not have ordinary jurisdiction and authority in the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore how are you different from any other Traditionalist sect?

In your mind, what are the characteristics found in Traditionalists that put them into this group of people that you wish to disassociate yourselves from so adamantly, determinedly, and resolutely? For me, some of those characteristics would be:

* Most of the Traditionalist clerics trace their lineage of holy orders back to 1) the Old Catholics, or 2) Archbishop Thuc, or 3) Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre.

* Many Traditionalist Clerics do not like to include some of the sects stemming from the Old Catholics, Archbishop Thuc, and Archbishop Lefebvre branches as part of the Traditionalist Movement. Nevertheless, these hundreds of Traditionalist clerics and sects are all connected because they all come from one of the above three trunks of the separated churches.

* None of the Traditionalist bishops received a papal mandate.

* None of the Traditionalist clerics have ordinary or delegated jurisdiction. Nor have they received authority or a mission from the Church.

* Most of the Traditionalist clerics offer their Mass services in Latin.

* Traditionalists follow the rules of their sect leader rather than the rules of the Church or a particular religious order. These rules may pertain to style of governance, Church doctrine, various disciplines, interpretation and application of canon law, the choice of liturgy, and rules of religious bodies. Consequently there is no unity among the various sects. For example, some Traditionalists use the Mass prayers of Pope Saint Pius V, some groups such as the Society of St. Pius X sect use the “liturgy” of John XXIII, while still others use the prayers of some other Vatican II “pope.”

* Traditionalist’s are notorious for justifying their disparity with the Church and each other by making statements to the effect that, “Canon law is not for our times; canon law is only a norm for our guidance; epikeia saves our day and takes God’s unwanted laws away; epikeia allows us to do everything we do.”

* Many Traditionalist clerics have been accused of and are suspected of being involved in homosexuality or other acts of immorality.

* Many Traditionalists were former members of the Novus Ordo or traditional Protestant sects. However, most of them were not required to officially profess the faith and abjure their non-Catholic errors.

* Traditionalist clerics are confused on who is in the Church and who is not. Therefore, they are not consistent on the Church’s requirement for the formal observance of the abjuration of error and profession of faith prior to administering the sacraments to the faithful. Some require it, others do not, and others pick and choose when it is required.

* Many Traditionalist clerics show a special favoritism or preferential treatment to certain members of their parish. Especially has this been known to be the case if those members are wealthy!

* Traditionalist clerics often do whatever it takes to persuade, influence, and convince parishioners to fix their Last Wills so that the cleric or organization will receive an inheritance upon their deaths.

* Parishioner’s problems brought to the attention of certain Traditionalist clerics are frequently ignored. Many conscientious and caring parishioners who speak up against wrongs also risk being severely rebuked, dismissed from employment, denounced from the pulpit, expelled from the community, or threatened with eternal damnation!

* All Traditionalist groups demonstrate cult-like characteristics. A number of Traditionalist clerics are secretly – and some very openly – involved in mind control, hypnotism, superstition, Satanism, Freemasonry, Trento, and other occult things.

* *All of the Traditionalist clerics that I know belong to a separated church.* The Old Catholic branches of the Traditionalist clerics separated from the Catholic Church to start their own church. The CMRI sect claims it separated from the Old Catholics to start another separated church. CMRI Traditionalist clerics separated from each other to start various churches. A few stayed with Bishop Schuckardt when his community separated in a *big way* in 1984. From these few clerics, Bishop Schuckardt consecrated two more bishops who can carry on making more separated churches.

Most of the CMRI Traditionalist clerics who separated from Bishop Schuckardt in 1984 chose to continue on their separated work in various, different branches of the Thuc-line. Some remained members of CMRI, while others went independent from the rest to start their own new churches.

After the Novus Ordo sect separated from the Catholic Church to start its own church, Archbishop Thuc, *to some extent*, separated from the Novus Ordo sect to start his own churches with their many diverse, numerous, and contradicting beliefs. I write that Archbishop Thuc, *to some extent*, separated

from the Novus Ordo church because he never did abjure his errors, nor was he ever received back into the Catholic Church by anyone with jurisdiction. The Archbishop signed the heretical decrees of Vatican II, acknowledged the Novus Ordo “popes” as the valid Vicars of Jesus Christ (before and after he started various branches of his churches), and remained an Archbishop in the Novus Ordo church until his death.

As an aside, I would like to clarify that “Archbishop” Thuc was never actually an *Archbishop* in the Church. Antipope John XXIII did not have authority to name *Bishop* Thuc, Archbishop of Hué on November 24, 1960. I use the title *Archbishop* because that is how Bishop Thuc is known throughout the world. That being clarified I now proceed.

The Thuc-line sects separated into quite a variety of separated branches of the Traditionalists. These include the Palmar de Troya branch, which claimed Marian apparitions and proceeded to follow their own self-appointed pope. The Palmar de Troya church then separated into many branches. Later Archbishop Thuc started the Cassiacum branches, which espouse the papa materialiter, non-formaliter ideology. Other Thuc-line branches include both Sedevacantists and non-Sedevacantists. A number of these have ties and connections to the Old Catholics and Russian Orthodox churches. There is, of course, the Mexican branch of the Traditionalist clerics, which again separated itself into several more branches in Mexico. Part of this branch spread to the USA, and from there it separated again into the “West of the Mississippi” for Bishop George Musey’s sect and “East of the Mississippi” for the Bishop Vezelis’ sect. Both of these two branches split again to make more separated branches. Part of the “West of the Mississippi” branch has spread back over to the Old Catholic church. Whilst on the East side of the Mississippi, the Franciscan branch had one of its priests break off from the ordaining bishop to continue yet another separated branch. Another separated branch from the divided Mexican branches grew into some of the CMRI branches.

The SSPX sect *to some extent* separated from the Novus Ordo sect to start their own church, although they have the same “popes.” As might be expected, there is more division, disunity, and separation going on in that separated branch. The SSPV sect separated from the SSPX sect to start other churches. Traditionalist clerics in the SSPV sect separated from each other to start various churches. There is the Bishop Dolan branch, the Bishop Kelly branch, the Bishop Sanborn branch, and a number of other branches. Among those separated branches, we again have priests separating from their ordaining bishop to form more and more separated branches.

As you can see by all of the above, who can even keep track of the many *recently* founded and separated churches that did not exist before 1960? Do you agree that every sect and new branch that has started after the first Pentecost Sunday is a non-Catholic sect? Now do you understand why I said that *all of the Traditionalists that I know belong to a separated church*? They all have ties and connections to each other as they separate and reunite. But no matter how often they separate, divide, and make more churches with contrary beliefs, all of the Traditionalist clerics strongly claim that they carry on the first mark of the Catholic Church – Unity! Do you agree that the only unity there is among all of these separated churches is the fact that each and every one of them is separated from the Catholic Church?

* The catechism tells us that all Catholics profess the *same* faith, have the *same* Sacrifice of the Mass, and have the *same* sacraments. Who can convince himself that all of these separated Traditionalists have the *same* faith and teach the truth? Saint Pacian tells us: “Error is always new and various in form, while truth is unchangeable and equally held by all persons, at all times, and in all places.” Do you agree that there are as many different non-Catholic churches and beliefs as there are separated branches? I have *not* even listed *all* of the branches! Let us call to mind the conversion of Cardinal John Henry Newman. According to *The Straight Path* by Father Phelan, what made the greatest impression on Cardinal Newman, and so largely contributed towards his conversion was the fact that unlike the sectaries, the Catholic Church was no branch wrenched from a parent trunk, She was the parent trunk itself.

The Traditionalist Religion certainly cannot be the parent trunk itself, for its many branches are all of recent foundation, and they form a monster with many different heads. Moreover, this Traditionalist monster is continually banging and butting its heads together.

Consider how this monster with many heads functions: One of the heads, which I will refer to as the **First Head**, spits out the declaration, “*He is the pope.*” The **Second Head** screams out in opposition, “*NO he is NOT the pope!*”

The **Third Head** of the monster yells: “*You’re both wrong! He is the pope materially but not the pope formally.*” Michael, the **Fourth Head**, chimes in and admonishes the first three heads of the monster, “*All you heads stop your bickering, wrangling, and power struggling! I am your pope!*” Although the fourth head of the monster is not even a cleric with minor orders, he insists that he has been their head pope for the past 20 years. He then proceeds to pontificate to the other heads of the monster, “*I was elected Supreme Pontiff by six lay people, including my parents, three women, and last but not least... myself!*”

Of course there is the **Fifth Head** of the monster that is not very fond of any of the other heads, especially the fourth head since he also claims to be the pope. This fifth head, who calls himself Pope Lucious Turtlemocker, provides some examples of what a slick, efficient, and resourceful tool epikeia is for the Traditionalist monster. First off, epikeia saves his day and takes God’s unwanted laws away, enough to allow him to be *elected pope by lay people who voted for him via the telephone and Internet from all around the world.* Following Pope Lucious Turtlemocker’s election by the laity, he provided yet another good example of what epikeia can do for the Traditionalists. His next step was to use epikeia to allow him to consecrate one of those who elected him. Why would epikeia be necessary for this consecration you ask? Because Pope Lucious Turtlemocker was still only a priest, without the episcopal powers necessary to consecrate a bishop. Next, someone will surely ask if they again used epikeia when this newly elected bishop returned the ‘*episcopal powers*’ to Pope Lucious Turtlemocker by consecrating him.

As was expected, all of the other heads of the monster are screaming and yelling at the new pope, “*We will not accept you as our pope!*” Pope Lucious Turtlemocker asks, “*Why not?*” “*Can you show us your line of Apostolic Succession back to Saint Peter?*” But Pope Lucious Turtlemocker’s apostolic succession only started and ended immediately with the bishop he just consecrated! Pope Lucious Turtlemocker retorts, “*Shut up, and just accept me as your pope! Why do you ask such an embarrassing question? Don’t you know we live in extraordinary times, and therefore epikeia saves the day and takes all unwanted laws away?*”

This Traditionalist monster has so many heads that yet another one, the **Sixth Head** speaks out to make his own case for authority, “*I solemnly condemn everyone else who claims to be the pope! None of you could have been validly elected because I already proclaimed myself Supreme Pontiff the very day that Paul VI died.*” But the head of the first Traditional Movement sect in America, that is to say the **Seventh Head** of the monster, yells back at him, “*Heretic head number six, I’ve got you beat! I was crowned pope by the Holy Mother of God Herself when She appeared to me.*” Next the Priestly Fraternity of Saint Peter head, the **Eighth Head** of the monster, butts heads with all of the other self-proclaimed and newly elected Supreme Heads. The FSSP head broadcasts loud and clear, “*The NO popes – John Paul II and Benedict XVI – are the true popes who gave approbation and approved of our Fraternity! We are the Latin branch under those heads.*”

Another haughty head of the Traditionalist monster, the **Ninth Head**, bangs his head against all the others and pronounces, “*There are only three Catholic bishops left in the whole world, and two of them came from ME! Two of us live in New York, and the other one resides in Mexico. You must all swear immediate obedience to me or else be damned!*” But the other heads snap back, “*Does that make you the First See, since you are the oldest and claim all the other bishops in the whole world come from you? If you are the one and only, what happened to the head that made you a bishop?*” The ninth head angrily

replies with annoyance: *“He and all of those associated with him left the Church because they associated with my Feeneyite Vicar General. How dare you question my authority you disobedient devils!”*

Yet other heads of the monster, the **Tenth** and **Eleventh**, speak out to the Ninth Head in response: *“When you three Catholic bishops decide to elect a new pope, put our names in the hat. Your line of succession comes from Archbishop Thuc, the same as ours. We are from the lines that went over to the Old Catholic sect. We’re not the first women bishops found in the Old Catholic sect, but we are part of them now thanks to Archbishop Thuc. Just because we are females doesn’t mean we shouldn’t qualify to be the next pope. After all, we qualified to be Thuc-line bishops. If you don’t like the idea of women priests, bishops, and pope you better realize you’re living in the age of Woman’s Rights!”*

Rev. Anthony Cekada predicted in his article, *“Two Bishops in Every Garage,”* that the multitude of heads connected to the monster from the many Thuc-line branches would eventually unite to elect their own pope. But his prediction made 27 years ago has not yet come true. Many of the Traditionalists have been asking, *“Why has such an important election not taken place?”* After all, Rev. Cekada did one of those 180-degree flip-flops that often take place in the monster church. As he flipped, he changed positions, together with the **Twelfth Head** of the monster. As with many other Traditionalist clerics, they are now frequently seen biting and fighting with their former head who ordained them. The laity continues to ask, *“Why haven’t these Thuc-line bishops elected a pope, since Rev. Anthony Cekada says they are all valid?”* Yes, even Rev. Cekada now defends the validity of these rogue and rascal bishops that can be found *“in every garage.”*

But each one of the many heads of the monster unanimously answers: *“Who needs a pope, I am the authority! I function as the pope with universal jurisdiction and go wherever I choose to go on earth. I am the one who makes the laws!”* Yes, each head of the monster makes their own laws even while they break, disregard, and ignore many of the canon laws of the Church.

There are *many* other heads that make up this monster, and year after year more appear. Everyone who has observed this monster sees these numerous heads butting together and biting at each other as they carry on in disunity, chaos, and madness. However, the only time these heads do unite and work together is when they gang up against another head that finally sees the scary monster for what it is, and who has the sincerity to say the following: *“We all know that if the Church ever has another truly elected pope, he will take away our universal ‘jurisdiction’, liberties, and freedoms that we all enjoy so much. The scary truth of why we are not united in the faith, and why we make little effort to elect a true pope is because the many heads of this non-Catholic monster are not even qualified, capable, or eligible to elect a pope. The second scary reason we would not elect a pope even if we could, is because he would have to side with the true popes of the Church. Any real Vicar of Jesus Christ would be like Pope Pius VI, and proclaim and declare all of us heads who make up this scary monster sect to be intruder, non-Catholic priests, bishops, and pontiffs.”*

What do you think the answers would be if you asked all of the members of the Traditionalists who make up this scary monster: *“To what church does your family belong?”* If you asked John and Jane Doe Traditionalist, you could expect an answer such as: *“We belong to the Society of St. Pius X. Our oldest son goes to the SSPV, and our oldest daughter became a Sister in the CMRI. One of Jane’s brothers goes to Bishop Dolan, while the other one goes to Father Ramolla after he separated from Bishop Dolan to start his own church. Her younger sister receives the sacraments from Bishop Kelly. We used to attend Mass at our neighbor’s home when the circuit priests, Fathers Town and Lucian came through our area. But when Father Town died and Father Lucian claimed to be a pope, we started with the Society. Jane’s parents go to Father Kevin, and my parents just stay home now because they got fed up, depressed, and down in the dumps with all the fighting and disunity going on in the Traditional Movement. My sister still goes to Father Joseph, O.F.M. when he comes into town the last Sunday of each month. However, she still goes to confession each week via the telephone.”*

Ask the members of the Traditionalist monster who founded the Traditional Movement? Did this monster start with one, two, or three heads? Was it Archbishop Thuc or Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre or

both of them or neither of them? If you choose one or both of these Archbishops, can you tell me the year they started the Traditional Movement? If it was either of them then why did Bishop Schuckardt claim he started the *first* Traditionalists in America, since he was not connected to either Archbishop Thuc or Archbishop Lefebvre? Take note that Bishop Schuckardt's CMRI was the *first*, and it only started in the late 1960s!

Who belonged to the Mormon sect before 1830? Nobody, because it did not exist! I think it has millions of members now, and a number of them were former Catholics. But do you agree that not one member of the Mormon sect is a member of the true Church Jesus Christ founded?

Can you name even one person who belonged to the non-Catholic Lutheran church before 1500? Do you agree that there were many baptized Catholics who became members of the new religion Luther started a few years later? Do you agree that some of those Catholics in Father Martin Luther's parish just stayed with him when he broke away from the Church? Do you agree that they all left the Catholic Church by being members of a *new*, recently founded sect? How long did they remain members of the Catholic Church? Did you know they still called themselves Catholics and *not* Lutherans for about 100 years? Can you count the number of new heads of the Protestant monster that was started by Luther?

Who belonged to the Traditional Movement before 1960? Do you see history repeating itself?

There are millions of martyrs and canonized saints in the Catholic Church. Can you name even one of them that belonged to the Traditional Movement?

Do I believe Jesus Christ founded the Traditional Movement? No! Jesus Christ founded the Catholic Church about 2,000 years ago. I have not heard of anyone who was a member of the Traditional Movement monster before 1960, because it did not exist 50 years ago. Do you agree that it is impossible for any one of the separated branches of this multi-headed Traditionalists monster to be the Catholic Church?

How can any Catholic convince himself that such a monster is the Bride of Jesus Christ reflecting His Oneness, Goodness, Truth, and Beauty? The Traditionalists do not even have the same Mass, sacraments, and liturgy! Nor are they in communion with one another. Not one of them by itself, or all of them together, possesses the Four Marks of the Church.

* Traditionalist clerics function as if they have spiritual authority in the Church. For that reason *they reject the truth* that: "All spiritual authority comes from Peter."

* Traditionalists *reject the truth* that, "The Apostolic See is the sole source of legitimate power," and that unless a bishop received a papal mandate and jurisdiction through a Vicar of Jesus Christ, he does not have legitimate power.

* No Traditionalist *accepts the truth* explained by Dom Guéranger: "We, then, both priests and people, have a right to know whence our pastors have received their power. If they claim our obedience without having been sent by the bishop of Rome, we must refuse to receive them for they are not acknowledged by Christ as His ministers. They must be as aliens to us, for they have not been sent, they are not pastors."

* Traditionalists are a conglomerate, rolled together concoction of chaotic, disorganized, incompetent, uncontrollable, unmanageable, unruly, and disobedient groups of separated non-Catholic sects, divisions, and factions who continue to manifest their quarrelsome, argumentative, competitive, jealous, and challenging attitudes toward each other.

Not every Traditionalist cleric is known by each and every characteristic that I have outlined. However, you know which of the characteristics listed above describe you and Bishop Vezelis. Furthermore, do you agree that you Franciscans know that you qualify as having the majority of the characteristics found in Traditionalists that place you into this group of people that you wish to disassociate yourselves from so adamantly? How can you two bishops thus deny that you are Traditionalist clerics?

If you still insist that you are not Traditionalists like some of the others mentioned above, then do you agree that Archbishop Thuc was the man to whom the majority of the Traditionalist clerics trace their lineage for Holy Orders?

Was Archbishop Thuc a Traditionalist cleric at the time Bishop Carmona received his consecration?

Was Bishop Carmona a Traditionalist cleric when he consecrated Bishop George Musey?

Did Bishop Vezelis believe Bishop Musey was a Traditionalist at the time he was consecrated by him? If Bishop Musey was not a Traditionalist the day he consecrated Bishop Vezelis, August 24, 1982, then was he a Traditionalist when he conditionally ordained the CMRI priests April 23, 1985? Do you consider the CMRI bishop and priests to be Traditionalists? Did Bishop Vezelis believe himself to be a Traditionalist cleric the day he was consecrated? If you answer no to the last question then you have a serious thing to explain: if Bishop Vezelis was not a Traditionalist cleric the day he was consecrated, then is he a super sneaky, crafty, cunning, underhanded, devious, and deceptive man? If he is not, then how did he manage to sneak a consecration from the Traditionalists without being a part of them? If Bishop Louis Vezelis was never a Traditionalist cleric, then has he always remained a member of the Novus Ordo church? Was *Father* Louis Vezelis always a member of the Roman Catholic Church during the many years he was a member of the Novus Ordo church that separated itself from the Catholic Church? If Father Vezelis was a Roman Catholic priest while being a member of the non-Catholic Novus Ordo sect; then is every other member of the non-Catholic Novus Ordo sect also somehow a member of the Catholic Church?

How did Father Vezelis receive a consecration in the non-Catholic Traditionalist religion and somehow end up a Catholic bishop? If Father Vezelis was not a Traditionalist before he was consecrated, then why did he receive consecration in the Traditionalist religion, and then soon afterwards condemn all other Traditionalists as non-Catholic?

If Bishop Vezelis was a Traditionalist at the beginning of the day on which he was consecrated in the Traditional Movement, then was he a Catholic by the end of that day? How many bishops in the world did Bishop Vezelis think were Catholic the day he was consecrated in the Traditionalist religion? Did Bishop Vezelis leave the Traditionalists because they are all non-Catholic? Then was Bishop Vezelis a non-Catholic while he was a Traditionalist? Did Bishop Vezelis still claim he had ordinary jurisdiction while he was one of the non-Catholic Traditionalist clerics, or just after he somehow managed to become the only Catholic bishop remaining in the Catholic Church? Who was the non-Traditionalist cleric who had ordinary jurisdiction to whom Bishop Vezelis abjured his errors? After all of this, do you agree that you two bishops cannot truthfully deny that you are also Traditionalist clerics?

Rev. Anthony Cekada, writing under the pseudonym “Peregrinus,” provided an in-depth analysis and critique of the Thuc-line branch of the Traditionalists in his 1983 article, *Two Bishops in Every Garage*, printed in *The Roman Catholic*.

In *Two Bishops in Every Garage*, Rev. Anthony Cekada had this to say about the consecration of Bishop Musey by Bishop Carmona:

“The photos of the event reveal some departures from what is prescribed in the Roman Pontifical.”

After stating that Archbishop Thuc started a schismatic sect, Rev. Anthony Cekada continued on to explain more about Archbishop Thuc:

“Nor were Mgr. Ngô’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. The author explains:

‘He said it was because on that day he could not celebrate alone... It happens that it was a false concelebration, because he said he didn’t receive communion. For, when a priest does not communicate, there is not a Mass. (17)’

Mgr. Ngô's justification for his action by maintaining that he only simulated the celebration of Mass – simulation of a sacrament, incidentally, is a grave sin – does not increase our confidence in his grasp of sacramental theology.

Mgr. Ngô seems to have some rather unusual ideas on liturgical and disciplinary matters.

A section of his autobiography appeared in a recent issue of *The Seraph*, (57) and the index page notes it is 'from the French by Bishop Vezelis.' Mgr. Ngô says that:

'...among the intellectuals, we admit unity of dogma in matters of Faith, but with diversity in the spheres which do not touch dogma.'

Speaking of the situation in the Church before Vatican II, he continues:

'This explains to some extent my disaffection for the invasive enterprises of the Vatican to impose points of liturgy and canon law – in a word – reducing the particularity of every civilization to a common denominator... Diversity is the ornament of the universe. Why impose only one manner of celebrating the Holy Mass, which consists uniquely of the consecration? And to impose it under the penalty of suspension and even excommunication – is this not an abuse of power?'

Mgr. Ngô seems to have forgotten that the reason the Church insisted on liturgical uniformity was because she viewed it as a reflection of doctrinal unity, in any case, he continues:

'The Vatican invents regulations in order to choke any peculiarity, be it liturgical, or be it canonical, of the local Churches. It wishes uniformity everywhere without thinking that the liturgical peculiarities of the oriental Churches date back to the apostolic age, and without considering that each people has its characteristics just as respectable as those of Rome.'

The oriental customs he enumerates are the social customs of pagan Asian cultures, and not those of the eastern Uniate churches. The reason the Church 'invented' regulations, by the way, was to preserve the faith and to 'choke' error.

He observes that Our Lord celebrated the Last Supper according to the Jewish Passover customs, and continues:

'Presently the priest consecrates while standing and receives Holy Communion in an inclined position. Why should he do that, since one eats while sitting? The Japanese eat while sitting on their heels; Hindus eat while sitting on the ground and the food spread out on a banana leaf. The Chinese and Vietnamese eat with chopsticks.'

He goes on to make the curious argument that, in light of this, Paul VI was illogical in condemning those who celebrate the traditional Mass because he condemned 'those who celebrate in a different manner.'

Thus, Mgr. Ngô, the head of this 'hierarchy' views the uniformity which existed in the Church prior to Vatican II in matters of canon law and liturgical practice as 'invasive' and undesirable. It was an 'abuse of power.' Mgr. Ngô, on the other hand, views diversity in these areas as 'an ornament of the universe.' It all sounds a bit like the documents of Vatican II.

(As an aside, it is interesting to note that in the same article Mgr. Ngô uses the words 'good Pope John XXIII,' which would no doubt come as a surprise to his Mexican 'bishops,' who seem to believe that the Apostolic See has been vacant since the death of Pius XII. Perhaps the phrase is simply a manifestation of the 'diversity' which ornaments the particular universe under discussion.)

To take these self-styled bishops to task on the basis of either theological opinion or canon law would only dignify what they have done – and discussions based upon mere opinion tend to draw our attention away from the facts.

Consider the history of the affair as a whole: private revelations, the Palmar affair, reconciliation with the Vatican, involvements with French 'Old Catholics,' concelebrating the New Mass, together

with a sudden involvement with someone who believes it's invalid, 'secret consecrations,' a sudden 'Declaration' about the Holy See, high-sounding 'Oaths of Unity,' a Latin teacher who has problems with Latin, a disappearing priest who ends up a 'bishop,' 'Father' DeKazel, Franciscans 'whose Bishop is the Pope in Rome,' a one-priest monastery-seminary-convent-retreat house, sudden hairpin turns on ideology, mysterious 'offers of the episcopacy,' claims of 'tacit consent,' self-proclamations of universal ordinary jurisdiction, and so on. Can we really take all this seriously and suppose that the 'bishops' involved in such goings-on are the future of the Church? Impossible. Even to refer to them as 'traditional Catholic bishops' lends too much respectability to the whole business, which is, in this writer's opinion, very disrespectable indeed.

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.'

What is far more serious, however, is that these men claim that they are the 'only legitimate authority' of the Catholic Church and that Catholics are 'bound' to obey them. Further, they pretend to exclude from the Catholic Church those traditional priests and laymen who refuse to recognize their 'authority' – something no traditional organization we know of presumes to do. By making such claims, these 'bishops' have set up their own religion, with its own 'magisterium,' its own 'episcopal hierarchy,' and its own beliefs. It is a new religion, in spite of its trappings – and all its 'episcopal consecrations,' self-important proclamations and inflated claims of 'canonical authority' cannot make it into the Catholic religion. It is at the very least in the process of creating what will surely become a schismatic sect.

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.'

It is not impossible that one day these men will decide that their 'authority' allows them to elect a 'pope' from among their number. Perhaps we will see them trudge along the path already taken by Palmar de Troya, following some man who wears a tiara that looks like a lampshade and who cranks out 'encyclicals' by the dozen. If such a day comes, we will then see the ultimate consequences of the movement which, for the moment, seems to promise 'a prelate in every pot, and two bishops in every garage.'"

Later, Rev. Anthony Cekada did a 180-degree, spiritual gymnastic flip-flop and totally took up the opposite position of his 1983 article. Why did he do that? You can ask him, but it seems that it was because his long time friend and associate Father Daniel Dolan, was getting lined up to be consecrated by Bishop Pivarunas, who had been consecrated by Bishop Carmona, both from the Thuc-line.

Although Rev. Anthony Cekada apparently did his best to defend the Thuc-line bishops in his flip-flop article, *The Validity of the Thuc Consecrations*, he cannot easily do away with his original observations and statements in his article, *Two Bishops in Every Garage*. Even if every consecration in the Archbishop Thuc lineage was valid, Rev. Anthony Cekada's closing statements regarding *all* consecrations coming from Archbishop Thuc succinctly and concisely describes the Traditional Movement:

"Can we really take all this seriously and suppose that the 'bishops' involved in such goings-on are the future of the Church? Impossible.

By making such claims, these 'bishops' have set up their own religion, with its own 'magisterium,' its own 'episcopal hierarchy,' and its own beliefs. It is a new religion, in spite of its trappings – and all its 'episcopal consecrations,' self-important proclamations and inflated claims of 'canonical

authority' cannot make it into the Catholic religion. It is at the very least in the process of creating what will surely become a schismatic sect.”

Do you agree that Rev. Anthony Cekada was absolutely correct in stating that it is *impossible* that the Thuc-line bishops are the future of the Church? Do you agree that he was extremely, exceptionally, and remarkably accurate in telling us the truth regarding the Thuc-line consecrations? Do you agree that not even he can deny that the Thuc-line bishops make up *a new religion*? Do you agree that all of the Thuc and Lefebvre-line Traditionalist clerics make up a schismatic, non-Catholic, *new religion* collectively known as the Traditional Movement?

Bishop Giles, in your 5th paragraph you wrote:

“We are not ‘traditionalists’ nor are we modernists or of the Novus Ordo. We are Roman Catholics.”

It is now time to read from the Encyclical, *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, on the doctrine of the Modernists by Pope Saint Pius X, September 8, 1907:

“43. And here we have already some of the artifices employed by Modernists to exploit their wares. What efforts do they not make to win new recruits! They seize upon professorships in the seminaries and universities, and gradually make of them chairs of pestilence. In sermons from the pulpit they disseminate their doctrines, although possibly in utterances which are veiled.”

You can write that you are not Modernists, but Pope Saint Pope Pius X clearly teaches the world that you are acting as Modernists whenever you and Bishop Vezelis disseminate your own doctrines *in sermons from the pulpit!* Acting as Modernists do, in a sermon from the pulpit Bishop Vezelis heretically preached, taught, and proclaimed that: “Jesus, the Son of God... is the Supreme Pontiff.” What you teach is not only an error but could be taken for blasphemous, mocking, and profane heresy! Do you agree that this makes a mockery of the infallible Church teaching us in Her liturgy that there is more than one Supreme Pontiff? Do you agree that since there is more than one Supreme Pontiff, it follows that you also preach the blasphemy that there is more than one Jesus Christ? Do you agree that what you teach denies what the infallible popes have told us hundreds of times: specifically, that the Supreme Pontiff is not Jesus Christ, but the pope himself?

Should Patrick Henry Write Letters?

Bishop Giles, in the 6th paragraph of your letter you took issue with the fact that I wrote *My Petition for Spiritual Help* and have it uploaded to www.JMJsit.com. You stated:

“The Church law is clear that one needs jurisdiction to teach, publish, etc. You act as if you have universal jurisdiction and answer to no one. You do this in promoting your teachings online in print, audio, etc. for the whole world. If this is your wish that people see in you a pope then why do you not come out and say it? If this is not your desire, why do you act this way?”

Canon Law a Text and Commentary by Fathers Bouscaren and Ellis informs us that Church law is also clear that:

“The faithful are bound to profess their faith openly whenever under the circumstances silence, evasion, or their manner of acting would otherwise implicitly amount to a denial of the faith, or would involve contempt of religion, an offense to God, or scandal to their neighbor (c. 1325.2).”

My conscience tells me that I am bound to profess my faith openly for everyone involved in this situation to see and hear, as well as for the other circumstances about which I write. Now who is involved with these circumstances concerning Traditionalist bishops and whether or not they have jurisdiction? Many, thinking they were living as Catholics have become very directly involved. Every man, woman, and child in the world is affected by the facts of whether or not the bishops and priests coming from Archbishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre have jurisdiction. As explained in this letter and in *My Petition for Spiritual Help*, my Catholic faith clearly tells me that bishops receive jurisdiction only through the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Do you agree that when schismatic, intruder bishops heretically teach that they have ordinary jurisdiction and act accordingly, then God is offended and many are scandalized? My Catholic faith also tells me that we are guilty of scandal whenever we offer others the occasion to sin. Even if we wish them not to sin, and even if they do not sin, we are guilty of the sin of scandal just because we offered them that occasion. Do you agree that when you claim that you have jurisdiction, although the Catholic Church teaches that you do not have jurisdiction, that you scandalize others and offer the occasion of sin?

Therefore, in my opinion, the Catholic Church does not want me to keep silent. She tells me to profess my faith openly to the world.

Do you agree that otherwise my silence would amount to an implicit denial of my faith, evasion of duty, and the contempt of my religion? Do you agree that my silence would offend God, cause scandal to my neighbor, and render me complicit in the sins of those who take part in the non-Catholic services of schismatic, intruder bishops and priests?

Do you agree that the truth follows that I have not only the right, but also the obligation to profess my Catholic faith to the world regarding these circumstances concerning jurisdiction?

Am I not permitted to carry on correspondence? Is it not the law in both civil and Church cases that both sides should be heard? Does not everyone have the right to defend himself? Your letter has been on the World Wide Web (WWW) for the world to read. Why am I not permitted by Traditionalist clergymen to show my response via the same WWW?

Father Joseph Noonan, O.F.M., first asked me to visit with him in December 2007. During our visit I asked him how he has jurisdiction to function as a priest. In my opinion, Fr. Joseph's answer to my question, and the circumstances that followed that visit obliged me to upload *My Petition for Spiritual Help* to the World Wide Web, where you and the Friars had already published your erroneous claims. Remember, Catholics are "bound to profess their faith openly whenever under the circumstances silence, evasion, or their manner of acting would otherwise implicitly amount to a denial of the faith, contempt of religion, offense to God, or scandal to their neighbor."

If you want to know why I wrote *My Petition for Spiritual Help* and why I was justified in posting it on my website, then simply go there and read it. I explained therein, on the last pages, why it was written and uploaded to: www.JMJsites.com.

Furthermore, God tells me to speak out in opposition to those who teach that Jesus Christ is the Supreme Pontiff; and also to speak out in opposition to all schismatic, intruder clerics who still claim that they belong to the Catholic Church. "Reprove a friend, lest he may not have understood, and say: I did it not: or if he did it, that he may do it no more. Reprove thy neighbor, for it may be he hath not said it: and if he hath said it, that he may not say it again." – Ecc. 19: 13, 14.

Another reason I write letters and articles for others to read is because we will all be judged when we die. Do you agree that our judgment will have a lot to do with how we lived the Spiritual and Corporal Works of Mercy? Among other things, God will judge me on how I admonished sinners, instructed the ignorant, and counseled the doubtful. It is a sin to deceive others, and in my opinion you and Bishop Vezelis deceive others when you teach that you received ordinary jurisdiction the moment you were consecrated outside of the Catholic Church. If I do not warn you, and the members of your congregation about your deception, then who will?

Do you agree that the Church tells Her children that bishops receive ordinary jurisdiction and their mission from the pope when he assigns them to a diocese or other location? Do you agree that you have never received jurisdiction, a diocese, or mission from any pope and are therefore, an intruder, schismatic bishop?

Furthermore, I was ignorant and deceived, and also took part in the services of intruder clerics in the CMRI non-Catholic sect. I was led into being among those who were directly involved in deceiving other ignorant people. But by the grace of God, I parted company with those intruder clerics, and continued to pray and study to dispel my ignorance. God and His Catholic Church oblige me to continuously instruct myself, and then in turn help others whenever I can.

Bishop Giles, are you not being hypocritical, insincere, and deceitful when you imply that I do not have the right and duty to love my neighbor as myself? Are you teaching, preaching, and proclaiming that Almighty God does not want me to do unto others, as I would want them to do unto me? Oh! If only someone had been there for me, and allowed me to read what is in *My Petition for Spiritual Help* before I got involved in the non-Catholic sects! Should I not do everything that I can to enlighten everyone who belongs to a non-Catholic sect?

Are the things written in *My Petition for Spiritual Help* erroneous and contrary to what the Catholic Church teaches? If yes, then why don't you specifically and clearly state which doctrine(s) of the Catholic Church I deny? You only make a *mere statement* that they are: "insulting and erroneous observations."

Do you agree that the bishops and priests coming from Archbishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre are habitually making conflicting, opposite, and contradictory statements from each other? Why should I believe you are necessarily teaching the truth just because you bishops make many statements without proof?

When anyone's statements and conclusions are not the same as those of the popes, Saint Thomas Aquinas, and spiritual writers such as Dom Guéranger, I am not going to believe them just because they draw conclusions to suit their needs. Do you agree that you and they are the ones who must prove that the popes, Saint Thomas Aquinas, and the others are teaching falsehood when they teach the opposite of you?

Bishop Giles are you sure the Catholic Church does not want me to let others know what She teaches? Although the Catholic Church wants everyone to know what She teaches, you Franciscans, the CMRI sect, and the other intruder clerics do not. Do you agree that you do not want everyone to know that the Catholic Church teaches that all jurisdiction comes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff? Do you agree that you do not want everyone to know that the Catholic Church teaches that you do not have ordinary jurisdiction? Do you agree that you do not want everyone to know that the Catholic Church teaches that without jurisdiction there is no real apostolicity, and that therefore you belong to a non-Catholic sect? Do you agree that you do not want everyone to stop, reflect seriously, and apply the truth that the Catholic Church teaches? As an example, you and the other Traditionalists do not want your followers to stop, reflect, and seriously apply the following truths explained by Dom Guéranger: "We, then, both priests and people, have a right to know whence our pastors have received their power. If they claim our obedience without having been sent by the bishop of Rome, we must refuse to receive them for they are not acknowledged by Christ as His ministers. They must be as aliens to us, for they have not been sent, they are not pastors."

I believe you do not want me to let the world know many things that the popes have written or some things that the Catholic Church teaches!

Do you agree that Bishop Vezelis and the Franciscans copy and imitate Bishop Schuckardt and the CMRI sect in many things? One of your weapons to silence me is the same as that used by Bishop Pivarunas. You both allege that because only bishops have divine authority to teach in the Church, no one else (except maybe another bishop) has any right and duty from God to point out and correct your errors. You want everyone to believe that no layperson ever has a right to publicly correct errors, and, if necessary, admonish the sinner. Especially is this true when you are the ones who need to be corrected

and admonished, for the reasons that your public statements and way of living are contrary to what the Church teaches.

How long has it been since you reviewed the nine ways we participate in the sins of others? One of them is by silence. If my Catholic faith instructs me that intruder clerics are sinning in what they do, why should I remain silent and thereby participate in their sins?

Two other ways people participate in the sins of others are: 1) by defense of the ill done, and 2) by concealment. Do you agree that there is very much evil going on among the intruder clerics, which includes homosexuality; double talk; deceitfulness; mind control; hypnotism; superstition; occultism; and connections to Freemasonry, Trento, and other non-Catholic sects? Should I participate in those sins by defending them, or by concealing them, or by keeping silent as many of the Traditionalist and Novus Ordo clerics do?

Mind Control

On July 26, 2010, Father Joseph basically told me to just believe that you and Bishop Vezelis have ordinary jurisdiction simply because you say it is true, even though it is not. Is Fr. Joseph telling me I should be in a state of blind obedience and *unholy*, “holy obedience?” Bishop Francis Schuckardt exercised mind control by means of *unholy* “holy obedience.” Do you agree that it is mind control when superiors use this *unholy* “holy obedience” to have subjects believe doctrines and obey commands that are contrary to the commandments of God or Holy Mother Church?

You two bishops are doing the very same thing Bishop Schuckardt did as he deceived me and his other followers. He taught that he had jurisdiction and we, the ignorant people, just believed him mostly because he was the bishop and said it was true. Did the followers of Bishop Schuckardt do wrong in believing him just because he said it without providing the proof? Why should any Catholic actually believe everything every roman collared politician says? “If it be just in the sight of God to hear you rather than God, judge ye: For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard.” – Acts 4: 19, 20. “We ought to obey God rather than man.” – Acts 5: 9.

Of course, I do not really need to remind you or Bishop Vezelis how often you warned your followers about the mind control and cult tactics used in the CMRI sect. You also know that I had been a victim of more than a fair share of the mind control and cult tactics used by Bishop Francis Schuckardt. Having been permitted by Divine Providence to get involved with a mind control cult leader, I will ask some important questions and share a few words of warning.

Do you agree that cult leaders recruit members of any age group, but typically have the most success when they target people of younger ages and/or during times of vulnerability? Do you agree that many victims of cult recruitment and mind control are often intelligent, idealistic, and zealous in their desire to work for the salvation of souls? I know that it is usually not easy for the victims of those who use mind control to realize how evil it is until they can get away from it. Do you agree that while you are under the influence of one who uses mind control and cult tactics, it is not always easy to understand what goes on, although you actually see things happen that you know are strange and wrong? Do you agree that loyalty to the cult leader is retained by concealing the truth about the origins and questionable activities of the cult; employing various means of psychological, emotional, physical, sexual, and financial abuses and exploitations; and lastly, by using fear and guilt to manipulate the members? Catholics, of course, greatly desire the true Mass and sacraments. Do you agree that cult leaders often use this natural Catholic mentality to draw them into their sect by providing what at first looks like they have found the Church the same way it was before Vatican II?

Do you agree that naivety, inexperience, and vulnerability on the part of Catholics make them very susceptible to the seductive ploys of the charismatic cult leader who is also highly skilled in understanding and manipulating human behavior? Do you agree that mind control in all forms and applications is immoral, unethical, and incongruous with the philosophy of the Church? Do you agree that the high prevalence of mind control among Traditionalists, Modernists, and their communities, is

another proof that they are all sects, which should never be mistaken for the true Catholic Church? “By their fruits you shall know them.” – Matthew 7: 16.

Have you ever asked yourself, “Am I a victim of mind control?” Have you ever *seriously* pondered on that question and told yourself the most truthful answer to that question? Have you considered that mind control *must be involved* when any Catholic cannot see and accept every obvious truth taught by any pope? Please *seriously* ponder, consider, and think over two important truths stated by Pope Pius XII. 1) “The power of jurisdiction... flows to the bishops... only through the Successor of St. Peter.” [*Ad Sinarum Gentem* – October 7, 1954]. 2) “Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff.” [*Ad Apostolorum Principis* – June 29, 1958].

What do those two truths tell you? Read them again and ask yourself, “What did Jesus Christ teach me as He spoke through Pope Pius XII?” Next, ask yourself, “If I am *not* a victim of mind control, why do I believe the *exact opposite* of these two clear and definite statements of Jesus Christ speaking to me through the infallible pope?” Who controls my mind to make me think: “The power of jurisdiction *does NOT* flow to the bishops through the Successor of St. Peter?” Also ask yourself who controls my mind if I think that: “Jurisdiction *does NOT* pass to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff.”

Please take note of the dates those two encyclicals were given from Rome. They were both given after *Mystici Corporis Christi* – June 29, 1943. Do you agree that it is *impossible* for the pope who is inspired by the Holy Ghost, and who speaks to us for Jesus Christ, to ever teach the *exact opposite* of what he previously wrote in his dogmatic encyclical? Therefore, will you please overcome the mind control and accept the truth? Do you understand the truth that it is *impossible* for Pope Pius XII to be teaching in *Mystici Corporis Christi* that bishops receive ordinary jurisdiction directly from Jesus Christ and not from the Roman Pontiff? Do you agree that the two truths quoted from *Ad Sinarum Gentem* and *Ad Apostolorum Principis* cannot possibly be different from what the Church has once understood and now understands? The First Vatican Council infallibly told us:

“If anyone shall have said that there may ever be attributed to the doctrines proposed by the Church a sense which is different from the sense which the Church has once understood and now understands: let him be anathema.” First Vatican Council, *Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith, ch. 4*, DNZ: 1800.

Bishop Giles, you correctly wrote in your letter, “You have never met me nor Bishop Louis.” Although I have never visited your communities, I have heard an audio file made some years ago, and now going around via the Internet, explaining Bishop Vezelis’ involvement with mind control and use of hypnotism on his subjects. Yes, others caught up with Bishop Vezelis years ago, and still others in more recent years, put out information concerning his involvement in hypnotism and mind control. Do you agree that it is the will of God that mind control be stopped, and that you are in a key position to do something about it? Hence, it is in the immediate interests of the general public, as well as your disciples, for you to stop participating in the sins of others 1) by defense of the ill done, 2) by concealment, and 3) by silence.

Bishop Giles, I think that you would agree that what goes on concerning the sacraments among you Franciscan clerics should all be in conformity with what the Catholic Church teaches. Therefore, do you agree that you should have nothing to hide in this regard, and be pleased if the whole world knows what you Franciscans are doing? It is known that you bishops and your priests attempt to give the sacrament of confession over the telephone to one another and to the faithful. Please let me know how this is approved in the Catholic Church. Where did you find it explained by any pope, catechism, or sacramental theology book that the Church approves of confession via the telephone? I found information on the WWW where some of the other Modernists and some new-breed “priests” practice telephone confessions. However, everywhere else that I have looked thus far in Catholic books, all condemn confession via the telephone. The absolution is invalid and the seal of confession is open to everyone who taps into and records phone conversations. In the Catholic Church, bishops and priests only have faculties to hear confessions in a

specific diocese, or a part of a specific diocese. Is it not true that you bishops and priests act as if you have universal jurisdiction, as if you were the pope? I have been told that you clerics attempt telephone absolutions for others who are thousands of miles away! Just how do you justify having a worldwide diocese so that you assume to have jurisdiction no matter where you go that still provides telephone service? Every other Traditionalist bishop that I know is just like you and Bishop Vezelis in this regard, acting as though you have worldwide dioceses and universal jurisdiction. Therefore, why do you Franciscans claim that you are not Traditionalists? Even if you had jurisdiction to hear confessions, this newly invented practice of telephone confessions invalidates those absolutions. Bishop Giles, is the novel practice of telephone confessions really just another mind control technique? Do you bishops use it for the purpose of discouraging your distant priests and disciples from thinking confessions could be received outside of your sect? Having now had this pointed out to you Bishop Giles, will you make contact with those who received “absolution” over the telephone or just allow them to continue to believe they were absolved from their sins? Will you continue to participate in the sins of others 1) by defense of the ill done, 2) by concealment, and 3) by silence?

I pray to God that the kind readers of this letter will be put on guard concerning the many dangers that abound in the Traditionalist Movement.

The Franciscan Foundation

Do you agree that there is much controversial history among the Franciscans under Father/Bishop Vezelis? For example: how as a priest professing loyalty to an antipope and the Modernist Franciscan Superior in Rome, could Bishop Vezelis start a Franciscan Foundation in New York, major and minor seminaries, and a publication called *The Seraph*? In his article, *Two Bishops in Every Garage*, Rev. Anthony Cekada provides information about what happened. In the February 14, 1982, bulletin of Father Vezelis’ Sacred Heart Mission in Buffalo we read:

“For those who may not understand Catholic teaching and practice: Sacred Heart Mission has become a Franciscan Foundation according to the laws of the Roman Catholic Church. We are Franciscans whose bishop is the Pope in Rome... Nor are we an illegal Religious organization without papal approval such as the Pius X people... This mission is the only legitimate place where true Catholics in union with the Pope can attend the Latin Tridentine Mass.”

Did Father Vezelis speak the entire truth or did he speak as a roman collared politician when explaining his Franciscan Foundation in 1982? Do you agree that Father Vezelis also claimed that he enjoyed tacit approval from his superiors in Rome to start his Franciscan Foundation? However in the same article, *Two Bishops in Every Garage*, Rev. Anthony Cekada provides the following segment from the letter of Archbishop Augustine Mayer, Secretary of the Vatican Congregation for Religious, written on May 25, 1982 that states otherwise:

“Please forgive the delay in answering your query concerning Rev. Louis Vezelis, O.F.M. but we have had to make enquiries to ascertain his status.

We can now tell you that Fr. Vezelis belonged to the Lithuanian Franciscan Vicariate of St. Casimir, but was expelled from the Franciscan Order on April 17, 1978. He does not recognize the jurisdiction of the local Ordinary, but presents himself as a genuine Franciscan Father.

Obviously, the organization operated by Fr. Vezelis is not recognized by the Holy See or the American hierarchy, and therefore, there is no basis for calling it a ‘Franciscan foundation whose bishop is the Pope of Rome.’”

Another letter quoted by Rev. Anthony Cekada is that of Father Louis Brennan, writing on March 9, 1982, from Rome on behalf of the Franciscan Minister General, in which he states:

“Fr. Louis Vezelis was a member of our Franciscan Order, in particular, a member of our Lithuanian Vicariate which has its center in Kennebunkport, Maine. By letter of April 19, 1978, the then Superior of the Lithuanian Vicariate, informed us that Fr. Vezelis had been declared automatically dismissed from the Order, by decree of April 18, 1978, on grounds of removing himself from Franciscan jurisdiction.

He is, then, no longer a member of our Franciscan Order, nor are we in a position to answer for him.”

Bishop Giles, do you agree that it is impossible to receive tacit approval from his Franciscan superiors if Father Vezelis had been expelled from the order several years prior? Do you agree that it was deceitful and dishonest to publicly claim such approval when it was never given at that time, and that it is *still* deceitful and dishonest to claim approval today? Bishop Vezelis has written in *The Seraph* that he was sent to Korea by order of the Franciscan Superior General of Rome and that this order has never been retracted. Here is what he wrote in *The Seraph*, October 1998, Volume XIX No 2:

“As a Religious, I received my mission from the highest authority in the Franciscan Order. And, I continue in that mission because it has not been retracted by a legitimate higher authority. This mission is from God although proceeding through the channel established by the Church guided by the Holy Ghost.”

Did Father Vezelis disobey his Franciscan Superiors when he returned from Korea and began his own association of individuals for the dissemination of a new separated part of the Novus Ordo religion in Rochester, NY? Should he still be in Korea where he had been given his mission and jurisdiction? After all he wrote: “I continue in that mission because it has not been retracted by a legitimate higher authority.”

They Are but They Are Not

Bishop Giles, during our phone conversation we discussed the validity of various Traditionalist bishops and whether or not they have jurisdiction. During that phone conversation you stated: “**The Supreme Pontiff is Jesus Christ.**” You then explained that you received ordinary jurisdiction the same way as a pope, that is to say – directly from Jesus Christ.

I then asked your opinion concerning other bishops in the world and whether they have jurisdiction the same way that you and Bishop Vezelis claim to have it?

You told me that, yes they did have jurisdiction in the same way if they were properly ordained and consecrated. You also explained that because Cardinal Lienart was a Freemason, there are doubts about Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre’s ordination and consecration.

I then asked if Bishops Altenbach and Siebert were valid bishops with jurisdiction since they received their consecrations from Bishop George Musey, as did Bishop Vezelis. You answered no, and then explained that Bishop Altenbach was a Feeneyite because he denied Baptism of Desire and Baptism of Blood, and was therefore a heretic prior to his consecration. You then concluded that Bishop Musey placed himself outside of the Church for consecrating Bishop Altenbach.

I also asked about Bishop Carmona and the other bishops he consecrated such as Bishop Pivarunas? You explained that Bishop Carmona sided with Bishop Musey, and that put him outside of the Church since Bishop Musey consecrated Bishop Altenbach. Your conclusion was that Bishop Carmona became a heretic by association just because he worked with Bishop Musey, who himself became a heretic by association because he worked with Bishop Altenbach. Did Bishop Pivarunas become a heretic by association just because he was consecrated by and worked with Bishop Carmona?

Now the serious question I hope you will explain is something that was not discussed via the phone. Is everyone who associates with a Feeneyite outside of the Church? Bishop Giles, I now remind you that Bishop Vezelis first appointed this same Feeneyite, Father Altenbach, as his own Vicar General before

Bishop Musey consecrated him. In light of the fact that you believe Bishops Musey and Carmona were outside of the Church because they associated with Father Altenbach, why was Bishop Vezelis not outside of the Church for associating with and appointing Father Altenbach as his Vicar General? Furthermore, why are you not outside of the Church since Bishop Vezelis consecrated you after he appointed a Feeneyite as his Vicar General? After all, your situation is very similar to that of Bishops Musey and Carmona, because you are also linked with one who became a heretic by your own law of association. Isn't it true that you continue to work and associate with Bishop Vezelis who appointed the Feeneyite as his Vicar General, Father Altenbach? Will you please explain why others are outside of the Church for associating with a Feeneyite, but you two bishops are not?

Seven Truths

Bishop Giles, it is not for lack of desire that I do not attend Mass and receive the sacraments, but rather because Jesus Christ commands me to stay away from all clerics that do not hold their spiritual jurisdiction from a pope. What do you and the other thousands of Traditionalists know that I do not know? Let us review some of the main truths of what I understand:

First truth: The Catholic Church can never change Her dogmas because they are immutable. She is guided by God the Holy Ghost and therefore, *never* makes a mistake!

"The faith shall never vary in any age, for one is the faith which justifies the Just of all ages. It is unlawful to differ even by a single word from apostolic doctrine." Pope St. Leo the Great, *Magno Munere*.

"The Catholic Faith is such that nothing can be added to it, nothing taken away. Either it is held in its entirety, or rejected totally. This is the Catholic faith, which, unless a man believes faithfully and firmly, he cannot be saved." Pope Benedict XV, *Ad Beatissimi*.

"Nothing can ever pass away from the words of Jesus Christ, nor can anything be changed which the Catholic Church received from Christ to guard, protect, and preach." Pope Pius IX, *Ubi Primum*.

"Nothing new is to be allowed, for nothing can be added to the old. Look for the faith of the elders, and do not let our faith be disturbed by a mixture of new doctrines." Pope St. Sixtus III, *De Jejun*.

"Let nothing of the truths that have been defined be lessened, nothing altered, nothing added; but let them be preserved intact in word and in meaning." Pope Gregory XVI, *Mirari Vos*.

"The faith which God has revealed has not been proposed like a theory of philosophy, to be elaborated upon by human understanding, but as a divine deposit to be faithfully guarded and infallibly declared. Therefore, that sense of sacred dogmas is to be kept forever which Holy Mother Church has once declared, and it must never be deviated from on the specious pretext of a more profound understanding. Let intelligence, and science, and wisdom increase, but only according to the same dogma, the same sense, the same meaning. If anyone shall have said that there may ever be attributed to the doctrines proposed by the Church a sense which is different from the sense which the Church has once understood and now understands: let him be anathema." First Vatican Council, *Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith, ch. 4*, DNZ: 1800.

"For it is not allowable for anyone to change even one word nor allow one syllable to be passed over..." St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistle 55*.

"Wherefore, if there be revealed to us anything new or different, we must in no way give consent to it, not even though it were spoken by an angel." St. John of the Cross, *The Collected Works of St. John of the Cross*.

"Our faith is identical with that of the ancients. Deny this, and you dissolve the unity of the Church. We must hold this for certain: that the faith of the people at the present day is one with the faith of the people of past centuries. Were this not true, then we would be in a different church than they and, literally, the Church would not be One." St. Thomas Aquinas, *On the Truth of the Catholic Faith, Q. #14, art. 12*.

Second truth: The Catholic Church teaches that all jurisdiction emanates from the pope. Let us review the *unchangeable* belief of every *Catholic* from four sources which proves this second truth:

1st source: As explained above by Pope Leo XIII in *Satis Cognitum*, Holy Writ attests that jurisdiction was given to Peter alone, and that all bishops receive their ordinary jurisdiction directly from the pope, not from Jesus Christ. Hence, every Catholic must believe and accept the obvious unchangeable *truth* that not *one* bishop consecrated since October 9, 1958 has received ordinary jurisdiction, unless they received a special papal mandate before that date.

2nd source: Dom Guéranger: “All authority emanates from the Apostolic See. All spiritual authority comes from Peter. We, then, both priests and people, have a right to know whence our pastors have received their power. If they claim our obedience without having been sent by the bishop of Rome, we must refuse to receive them for they are not acknowledged by Christ as His ministers. They must be as aliens to us, for they have not been sent, they are not pastors.”

Dom Guéranger either lied to us or else he *absolutely wrote the truth* while explaining above what the Holy Catholic Church believes and teaches! I believe he *absolutely wrote the truth*! Consequently, every Catholic who believes *all* the truths, which the Holy Catholic Church believes and teaches, has no choice but to refuse to receive all Traditionalist clerics, for they are not acknowledged by Christ as His ministers. All Traditionalist clerics must be as aliens to us. Jesus Christ did *not* send you to be our pastors, and you have no mission, authority, or jurisdiction to function in the Church founded by Jesus Christ!

3rd source: *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* by Father Cox: “It is not enough for it to teach all the doctrines of the Apostles, if it lacks either their orders or their jurisdiction... Even if valid orders exist, where jurisdiction is lacking there is no real Apostolicity.”

This 3rd source forces three additional truths into our intellect: 1) Traditionalist sects do not have all Four Marks of the Church founded by Jesus Christ. 2) Without ordinary or delegated jurisdiction no Traditionalist cleric can found a religious body or receive religious vows in the name of the Catholic Church. 3) As a result all “religious vows” professed in the Traditionalist sects are null and void.

Read from the book, *Catechism on the Religious State*, with an Imprimatur given in 1955:

“Q. 124. When are vows said to be public and when are they private?

A. Vows are said to be public when they are accepted by the lawful superior in the name of the Church. Vows are private, or of devotion, when they lack this official acceptance on the part of the Church.

Each of the faithful, if it so pleases him, can oblige himself before God to do something more in his Christian life than is absolutely required. He can, out of his particular devotion and fervor of spirit, make vows. However, the vows are considered private if the authority of the Church is not called upon to confirm them. In order that vows be considered public, the Church empowers superiors, [*that have authority and jurisdiction – P.H.*], to accept them, in Her name, in the form of a quasi-contract.

Q. 125. Are the vows of religion made in a religious institute considered private or public?

A. Religious vows, to be truly those of religious, must always be public. Indeed, they are religious vows precisely because they are public, that is, accepted by the Church.”

4th source: *The Exposition of Christian Doctrine* written in 1898, explained how the infallible Church taught Her children that: 1) Bishops hold their jurisdiction from the *pope*. 2) Bishops who do not receive their spiritual jurisdiction from the *pope* are *unlawful* intruders, schismatic, and *cut off from the Church*. 3) Priests who do not hold their jurisdiction from a Catholic bishop are unlawful intruders, schismatic, and *cut off from the Church*.

Third truth: Pope Pius VI told us to keep away from all intruders and not to hold communion with them. (See the Encyclical, *Charitas*).

Fourth truth: Pope Leo XIII stated that Saint Thomas Aquinas was the holiest of wise men and the wisest of holy men. (See his Encyclical, *Aeterni Patris*).

Fifth truth: Saint Thomas Aquinas told us we *sin* and do *not receive grace* when we receive sacraments (except Baptism) from all who are *cut off from the Church*. (Supplement, Q. 19, Art. 5). This includes all intruder clerics and sects who cannot prove their jurisdiction and authority emanates from a pope.

Sixth truth: Bishops and priests are obliged to *prove* that their jurisdiction is derived *from a pope*.

Seventh truth: Traditionalists often resort to epikeia in their *attempt* to justify and make lawful the *many changes* and new doctrines they implement.

Epikeia Does Not Save the Day

Let us review some truths about epikeia as explained by Father Lawrence Joseph Riley in his book, *The History, Nature, and Use of Epikeia in Moral Theology*, Copyright 1948:

“In short, it may be concluded that in regard to matters which touch the essence of the Sacraments, the use of epikeia is always excluded.” Page 344.

“In regard to the essence of these Sacraments, what has been explained above of all the Sacraments is applicable to them – viz., that epikeia is never licit.” Page 347.

“Epikeia is not an act of jurisdiction.” Pages 231-232.

Do you agree that Epikeia is excluded in *every attempt* to obtain jurisdiction? Do you agree that without jurisdiction being obtained by some means, bishops and priests cannot absolve sins in confession?

“At most, epikeia can excuse the individual from the precept, but it can never confer the capacity to act. Epikeia cannot bestow upon him the power which he does not now possess, nor can epikeia restore the power which the law has withdrawn. For such bestowal or restoration of power a positive act is required.” Page 387.

Do you agree that epikeia can never confer to a bishop the capacity to perform the act of consecrating another bishop without a papal mandate? Do you agree that epikeia can never bestow upon anyone authority, jurisdiction, or mission in the Catholic Church? Do you agree that epikeia does not bestow upon Traditionalist clerics the power they need to found religious bodies, or the power to receive religious vows in the name of the Church? Do you agree that epikeia cannot restore the power of jurisdiction which bishops and priests lost when they joined the non-Catholic Novus Ordo sect? Do you agree that jurisdiction can only be restored by a positive act of someone who has jurisdiction himself? Do you agree therefore, that the bishops who lost their jurisdiction by joining a non-Catholic sect can only receive it again by a positive act from a pope?

“D’Angelo endeavors to show that practically all modern canonists consider *epikeia* to be a purely moral or ethical institute, having validity only in the internal forum.” Page 6.

“Intimately connected with this problem is the question of whether or not epikeia has any standing in the external forum. It would appear to be the rather general consensus of authorities today that it has not.

Writing in *Apollinaris*, D’ Angelo points out that St. Thomas considers epikeia to be a merely moral element, and that modern writers believe it to have reference only to moral, and not to juridic matters... Van Hove contends that, since epikeia is not an act of jurisdiction, it has value only in the internal forum... Hilling seems almost unwilling to give any standing to epikeia at all. Believing that it practically amounts to self-dispensation, which is in contradiction to law as a binding norm, he concludes at the most that it may be recognized in the internal forum.” Pages 232-233.

“But the point here is that, in spite of the existence and necessity of this objective element, the effects of epikeia are confined to the internal forum. The lack of immutability and lack of guilt for transgressing the letter of the law have standing only in that forum.” Page 235.

Do you agree that the *internal* forum pertains to confession, whereas consecrating bishops, preaching sermons, founding religious bodies, and accepting religious vows in the name of the Church; all pertain to the *external* forum? Father Riley has quoted Saint Thomas and these other authors to teach us that epikeia is not an act of jurisdiction, and the theologians have told us that epikeia has value only in the *internal* forum. Does not the consecration of bishops pertain to juridic matters? But remember that epikeia does not pertain to juridic matters.

“There can be no doubt that the majority of theologians reject entirely and explicitly any possibility of the licit use of epikeia in matters involving the natural law.”

“Vasquez states definitely that epikeia has no place in reference to the natural law. That there is no place for epikeia in reference to the natural law, is the firm opinion of Suarez.” Page 266.

“The essential function of epikeia is to emend or correct laws which are deficient. But the natural law can never be deficient, maintains Malderus, and hence epikeia can never be allowed in regard to it.” Page 272.

“ARTICLE 3. Thesis: Epikeia May Not Be Applied to Precepts of the Natural Law.

A careful study of the problem at hand seems clearly to lead to the conclusion that epikeia, understood as a correction of law where it is deficient due to the universality of its expression, may never be applied to the natural law.” Page 276.

Father W. Humphrey in his book, *Elements of Religious Life*, reminds us on page 42:

“Pope Innocent III decreed that no religious order should in future be erected without the approbation of the Sovereign Pontiff (i.e. the pope – P. H.). Approbation in some fashion was always, from the beginning of the Church of Christ, necessary in order to the introduction into the Church of a new religious body. This approbation is, as it were, a canonization, by which the Institute is publicly and authoritatively set forth as holy. The necessity for approbation does not arise from Canon Law alone. It is founded in the law of nature.”

Approbation from a pope is necessary for a new religious *order*. Do you agree that approbation from a valid, licit, Catholic bishop who has ordinary jurisdiction was *always necessary* to introduce a new religious body into the Church? 1) Do you agree that approbation to found a new religious body is founded in the *law of nature*? 2) Do you agree that epikeia may *not* be called upon to permit one to violate, disobey, or contravene any *law of nature*? 3) Do you agree that a bishop must possess authority and jurisdiction in the Catholic Church to be qualified, capable, and competent to give approbation, approval, and sanction to a religious body? 4) Do you agree that none of the Traditionalist clerics possess authority and jurisdiction in the Catholic Church? 5) Do you agree that not even *one* of these new religious bodies received their *necessary* approbation from a bishop with jurisdiction and authority? 6) Do you agree that the members of these new religious bodies are no more a religious priest, brother, or sister in the Catholic Church than is anyone else – such as your local dog catcher or mail carrier? 7) Do you agree that epikeia does not save the day? Epikeia does not take God’s unwanted laws away!

Study more from Father Riley’s book, *The History, Nature, and Use of Epikeia in Moral Theology*:

“The licit use of epikeia in any and every case is conditioned upon the existence of the fact that the law is deficient.

Now, any law concerning which there can be no defect on the part of the legislator, or on the part of the promulgator, or on the part of the materia, excludes all possibility of correction

and hence of epikeia. For a defect in the law could be traced to no source other than to one or more of the three named.” Page 280.

Pope Pius XII teaches very plainly concerning those who are involved in the consecration of bishops without the approval of the pope:

“48. Consequently, if consecration of this kind is being done contrary to all right and law, and by this crime the unity of the Church is being seriously attacked, an excommunication reserved specialissimo modo to the Apostolic See has been established which is automatically incurred by the consecrator and by anyone who has received consecration irresponsibly conferred.” *Ad Apostolorum Principis*.

Do you agree that epikeia cannot be used to get around the need for a papal mandate? Not one of the three necessary conditions is present to use epikeia!

There is *no* defect on the part of: 1) The legislator – Pope Pius XII. 2) The promulgator – Pope Pius XII definitely promulgated this law with the approval of God and His Catholic Church. 3) The materia, – is a matter of utmost importance.

Study more from the book, *The History, Nature, and Use of Epikeia in Moral Theology*:

“No human authority has the power to change what Christ Himself has established for the attaining of salvation.” Page 333.

Do you agree that Jesus Christ established that the bishops in His Church receive their jurisdiction and mission through the pope to work for the salvation of souls? Do you agree that Jesus Christ established that unless the bishops receive their jurisdiction and mission through the pope that they are not sent, and that they are non-Catholic clerics? The Traditionalist clerics *attempt* to change what Christ Himself established; but of course they have failed and remain non-Catholics.

“It is clear, of course, that if the Church makes an infallible statement of divine law on some point there can be no epikeia, though the statement is embodied in a human formula.” Page 357.

The Catholic Church has made an infallible statement that the Church will last until the end of time and remain just as it was at the time of the Apostles, i.e. as Jesus Christ founded Her. (See *Mortalium Animos* by Pope Pius XI). 1) Do you agree that the Apostles had a mission, authority, and jurisdiction? 2) Do you agree that therefore, there will always be bishops living who have a mission, authority, and jurisdiction? 3) Do you agree that every bishop receives his mission, authority, and jurisdiction directly from a true pope? 4) Do you agree that only those bishops who received authority and jurisdiction from a pope carry on the Apostolicity of the Church? 5) Do you agree that no bishop in the Traditionalist Movement sects has a mission, authority, or jurisdiction? Do you agree that they can *never* invoke epikeia to obtain a mission, authority, or jurisdiction? Do you agree that it follows that their sects do *not* have *Apostolicity*; and therefore the members of the Traditionalist Movement sects belong to non-Catholic religions?

“The purpose of an invalidating law is to protect and to promote the common good by warding off from society fraud, deception, and other possible evils.

Like all law, invalidating law is established for the common good, but there is special connection between this law and the common good, which is not found in other laws. There are certain public juridical institutions such as elections, vows, benefices, and contracts which can contribute greatly to the good or harm of the community and which are essentially related to public order. The common good demands that there be uniformity and certainty about these institutions. Hence they must be regulated by law. Laws which merely prescribe or prohibit are not sufficient to safeguard these institutions against such dangers as fraud,

coercion, secrecy or lack of proper decency and respect for their public and religious nature. The law, therefore, establishes certain conditions for their validity, certain formalities by which their validity is publicly demonstrable.” Page 374.

The law of the infallible Church establishes certain conditions for the *validity* of religious vows. Do you agree that epikeia can *never* supply them when the conditions required by the law are not fulfilled? Two necessary conditions for *valid* religious vows are: 1) A properly made year of novitiate in a religious institute approved by the Catholic Church. 2) *Legitimate* superiors with ordinary or delegated jurisdiction to accept the vows in the name of the Church.

Do you agree that not one person in the CMRI community, the Franciscan Community, or the other Traditionalist sects has ever professed *valid* religious vows while in the Traditional Movement? Do you agree that they have never made a proper year of novitiate in a religious institute approved by the Catholic Church and that not even one of the Traditional Movement sects has legitimate superiors with ordinary jurisdiction?

“The need of invalidating laws is constant. Such laws, it is said again, are based on the danger of fraud, on public order and public decency.” Page 374.

Do you now see how evil, wrong, and contrary to truth, right order, and God’s Church it is to say, “Canon law does not apply in these times?”

“There is scarcely any point of greater consequence in connection with an invalidating law than the fact that it voids the act in question even though the subject is invincibly ignorant of the law or its application. Thus Canon 16, sec.1 states: ‘Ignorance of irritant or incapacitating laws does not excuse from them, unless it is expressly stated otherwise.’ The primary concern of an invalidating law is the common good – not simply an obligation in conscience. And the common good demands that the effect of an invalidating law persevere.” Page 381.

“Leroux terms as common the opinion that laws which are ipso facto invalidating very rarely admit of the use of epikeia. For the common good demands that these laws retain their effect.” Page 383.

“We say that an act which is invalidated simply and absolutely by law, can never by epikeia alone be validly performed contrary to the words of the law.” Page 386.

Here we have the Catholic Church teaching us *epikeia does not supply* the need for: 1) A *valid* year of novitiate. 2) A superior with ordinary jurisdiction. 3) The necessary approbation for a new religious body.

We should also apply this teaching of the Catholic Church about epikeia to the laws concerning the papal mandate, the need for jurisdiction to absolve from sins, the need for jurisdiction to receive converts into the Church, and to carry on the Apostolicity of the Church.

“If there is in question a contract already made, then epikeia used subsequently will not render valid what is already invalid.” Page 387.

Do you agree that religious vows, marriages, consecrations, ordinations, and confessions that are invalid by the laws of the Catholic Church cannot subsequently be made valid by epikeia?

“Finally, insofar as a marriage without the formalities prescribed by the Council of Trent is concerned, Suarez is most insistent that it is not valid. The words of the Council are explicit and precise; to allow deviation from them in one case would open the door to other exceptions, to the consequent detriment both to the force and to the intention of the law.” Page 388.

The words of the same Council of Trent are also explicit and precise when it says that without jurisdiction a priest cannot absolve sins! The same Council also teaches that without a proper year of novitiate, you cannot make a *valid* religious profession. The law is also very explicit and precise which states the need for a papal mandate. Do you agree that to allow deviation from them in one case would open the door to other exceptions, as well as the consequent detriment of both the force and intention of the law?

“It is the view of Herincx that ordinarily, according to the accepted opinion of authors, epikeia is not applicable to invalidating laws. This belief is based upon a twofold reason. First, no act without its substantial form can be valid; and secondly, the incapacity of an individual to perform a specified act cannot be removed by epikeia.” Page 388.

There is an incapacity now for bishops to perform the specified act of obtaining a papal mandate. Do you agree that such a problem *cannot* be removed by epikeia?

“Catalanus contends that if ignorance, which is entirely invincible and inculpable, cannot render an act valid, surely no cause, just and urgent though it may be, can make valid an act which is otherwise null.

Van den Berghe is quite definite in his opinion that in reference to laws which ipso facto invalidate acts, epikeia may not be used.” Page 390.

The following three laws invalidate the act of professing religious vows ipso facto whenever they are not *all* fulfilled. 1) There *must* be a complete year of a *properly* made novitiate. 2) The Church only accepts vows through someone who *has* ordinary or delegated jurisdiction. 3) The religious body must receive an actual, definite, and specific *valid* approbation in the Church through one who had ordinary or delegated jurisdiction.

“Practically all authors who treat of epikeia insist that it may be used only with the greatest discretion and prudence. Arbitrary resort to it would be dangerous, and would open the door to all manner of abuses.” Page 189.

Summary and Conclusion

I have provided many references and comments that explain and support why I understand the Catholic Church teaches that all bishops receive their jurisdiction, mission, and authority from the pope. Do you agree that bishops who do not receive their jurisdiction, mission, and authority from the pope are non-Catholics? Do you agree that epikeia does not help to make valid any religious vows professed in the Traditional Movement? Do you agree that epikeia cannot justify, excuse, or provide the defense for those episcopal consecrations that took place without a papal mandate? Do you agree that epikeia can be used *very seldom* and *only* with the greatest discretion? Do you agree that the *attempted* use of epikeia by the Traditionalists is very seldom warranted, defensible, and valid?

We have recently reviewed some facts about epikeia. However, jurisdiction and especially Canon 209 are also misunderstood and abused by Traditionalists. Are the truths about the nature and use of epikeia and Canon 209 in the Catholic Church another reason why you two bishops sarcastically, mockingly, and disdainfully refer to all of the other Traditionalists as the “209ers” in *The Seraph*? Now that this letter has proved that you two bishops do not have ordinary or delegated jurisdiction, will you do one of those spiritual gymnastic flip-flops on the “209ers” while *claiming* jurisdiction the way they do?

From what I understand, I do not believe Bishop Giles, Bishop Vezelis, or the other Traditionalist clerics will ever prove that they hold jurisdiction from a pope. Let them thus explain how and why they are not schismatics, and as a result cut off from the Church. Yes, how do they do it without having the infallible Church do the *impossible* and change what She taught in the past? Please think with great reflection and recollection on everything you know about Traditionalists. With those reflections fresh in mind, pray and meditate on what the popes and saints taught as quoted above under the First truth.

Bishop Giles, in your last paragraph you wrote:

“If ever the grace of God touches your soul and you are ready to abjure your heresies and profess your faith in the Roman Catholic Church please call upon me, as I would be most pleased to take one of the devils’ agents and turn them to God.”

Very importantly, it has been clearly demonstrated that the position of you two bishops regarding ordinary jurisdiction is heretical. However, you also claim to be the only authority in the Catholic Church. Who then with authority is left to absolve you from your heresies and receive you back into the Church?

In *The Validity of the Thuc Consecrations*, page 3, Rev. Anthony Cekada wrote:

“We want to determine whether or not the six Thuc bishops in the U.S. are validly-consecrated bishops – that is, whether or not they possess the sacramental power possessed by all Catholic bishops to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation, to ordain priests who are real priests, and to consecrate other bishops who are real bishops.

This sacramental power, called the Apostolic Succession, passes from one Catholic bishop to all the bishops he consecrates. They in turn pass this sacramental power on to all the bishops they consecrate, and so on.”

It is very important to point out that Rev. Cekada’s second paragraph is deceptive, misleading, and does *not* teach the truth! He fails to distinguish how three things are received and passed on: the power of orders, the power of jurisdiction, and Apostolic Succession. He gives the false impression that Apostolic Succession is received at the same time *sacramental power* is received with the *power of orders*. Yes, the *sacramental power* he writes about is automatically received through *the power of orders*, and that *sacramental power* does pass on from bishop to bishop as long as the correct matter, form, and intention are used. But on the other hand, the *power of jurisdiction* does not pass on from bishop to bishop. *This power of jurisdiction flows to the bishops only through the Successor of Saint Peter*, and without it Apostolic Succession does not pass from one Catholic bishop to all the bishops he consecrates.

Listen to Pope Leo XIII as we again read from *Satis Cognitum*:

“14. It is necessary, therefore, to bear this in mind, viz., that nothing was conferred on the Apostles apart from Peter, but that several things were conferred upon Peter apart from the Apostles... whatever He did not deny to the others he gave only through him. So that whereas Peter alone received many things, He conferred nothing on any of the rest without Peter participating in it.”

Do you agree that Apostolic Succession does *not* pass on without Peter, because: “nothing was conferred on the Apostles apart from Peter.” Think about what Pope Leo XIII taught us: “He conferred nothing on any of the rest without Peter participating in it.” Do you agree that Jesus Christ does not confer jurisdiction on any bishop (i.e. not on Bishop Vezelis, Bishop Giles, any Old Catholic bishop, or any Traditionalist bishop) without Peter participating in it? Do you agree that the capability, ability, and qualifications necessary for Catholic bishops to pass on Apostolic Succession cannot take place without a pope participating in it, because *Jesus confers nothing on any of the rest without Peter participating in it*?

Do you understand why the Unity of the Church would be destroyed if all of the intruder, schismatic, and heretical bishops who received their consecration without Peter participating in it actually passed on Apostolic Succession? Would there be as many non-Catholic branches still claiming to be Catholics as there have been bishops who were separated from the Catholic Church these past 2,000 years?

We are taught in the catechism that God is Almighty and that God can do all things. Nevertheless, there are some things God *cannot* do. He cannot cease to exist, commit sin, or create a rock bigger than He could lift. God cannot un-baptize someone who has received the indelible mark of the sacrament, no matter how evil, heretical, or schismatic that man might become. God cannot take away the *sacramental*

power received when another indelible mark is put on the soul via the *power of orders*. Therefore, once a bishop receives a valid consecration either inside or outside of the Church, he has the *sacramental power* to consecrate other bishops. However, do you agree that all such consecrations are illicit and received *outside* of the Catholic Church unless Peter participates in them? Do you agree that it is only if Peter participates in their consecration that bishops will receive jurisdiction and have what is necessary to pass on Apostolic Succession? Do you agree that none of the Traditionalist bishops coming from the Old Catholic-line, the Thuc-line, or the Lefebvre-line had Peter participate in their consecration?

Apostolic Succession is totally different from the *sacramental power* Rev. Cekada is referring to when one is ordained or consecrated! Read again what Pope Pius XII explained in *Ad Sinarum Gentem*, as quoted above on page 9. To pass on Apostolic Succession, bishops must receive the *twofold sacred hierarchy*, namely, of orders and jurisdiction. Always remember an important truth Pope Pius XII wrote in this encyclical: “*The power of jurisdiction... flows to the bishops... only through the Successor of Saint Peter.*” This is why Rev. Anthony Cekada correctly wrote on page 5 that: “No one in the traditional movement possesses ordinary jurisdiction.” If all validly consecrated bishops automatically carry on Apostolic Succession, then they would pass on real Apostolicity. But *never forget*, that because all Traditionalist clerics lack ordinary jurisdiction it is impossible for their bishops to pass on Apostolic Succession! Not one Traditionalist bishop that I know of has received the *twofold sacred hierarchy*; they only received half of it – the *power of orders*. Consequently, without any of them having received the *power of jurisdiction*, their sects do *not* have the Fourth Mark of the Church – Apostolicity! Although Rev. Anthony Cekada incorrectly taught on page 3 that Apostolic Succession has been passed on through the Thuc-line, he correctly told us on page 5 that none of them have jurisdiction. But do *not forget* what the Church teaches, as explained by Father Cox: “Even if valid orders exist, where jurisdiction is lacking there is no real Apostolicity.” (See above on page 13).

Although many of those who started the schisms and heresies condemned by the Catholic Church were first Catholic bishops, their newly formed schismatic sects were without jurisdiction, and therefore they did not have the ability to pass on Apostolic Succession. Nevertheless, according to Rev. Cekada and the information presented in *The Validity of the Thuc Consecrations*, we should conclude that the consecrations of those schismatic and heretical bishops were valid. Do you agree that even after bishops separate from the Church through schism and heresy they still retain the *sacramental power of orders* and could validly consecrate other bishops? But do you agree that they could not pass on to any newly consecrated bishop the *power of jurisdiction*? Did any of these schismatic, heretical bishops pass on Apostolic Succession? No! Those who are the successors of the Apostles have what the Apostles had, that is to say *both* parts of the *twofold sacred hierarchy* – orders and jurisdiction.

Do you agree that a validly consecrated bishop could validly consecrate another bishop even if neither of them are Catholic? Do you agree that bishops in schismatic and heretical sects do not pass on Apostolic Succession even though they might pass on valid orders?

Always remember these important facts:

1st fact: Bishops who do not hold spiritual powers from the pope are intruded or *schismatic* bishops. (See *Exposition of Christian Doctrine*, as quoted above on page 17).

2nd fact: Not one of the Traditionalist clerics holds his spiritual powers from the pope, and therefore they are in *schism* according to the unchangeable teaching of the Catholic Church.

3rd fact: Pope Pius XII wrote in *Mystici Corporis Christi*: “For not every sin, however grave it may be, is such as of its own nature to sever a man from the Body of the Church, as does *schism* or heresy or apostasy.”

4th fact: Bishops in *schism*, heresy, or apostasy cannot pass on Apostolic Succession, although it is possible for some of them to pass on valid orders.

5th fact: Not one cleric in the Traditional Movement has ordinary jurisdiction because: “*This power of jurisdiction flows to the bishops only through the Successor of Saint Peter.*” Epikeia is not an act of jurisdiction, and epikeia cannot be used to obtain jurisdiction. “Even if valid orders exist, where

jurisdiction is lacking there is no real Apostolicity (Apostolic Succession).” Therefore, the Traditional Movement is a non-Catholic sect!

I am willing to abjure my errors and material heresies for belonging to the non-Catholic Novus Ordo and CMRI sects. But to whom can I abjure that is in the Ark of Salvation? Remember that the bishop or priest must himself be a member of the Catholic Church in the external forum, and no Traditionalist cleric that I am aware of qualifies. Furthermore, the Church *requires* him to have *ordinary* or *delegated* jurisdiction to receive my abjuration and profession of faith in order to bring me back into the Church. Since no one in the Traditional Movement has ordinary or delegated jurisdiction, and the conditions necessary for Canon 209 are deficient, whom do you know that could help us? Is it justified, warranted, and reasonable for you and others to blame me for failing to find the bishops who never took part in non-Catholic services? Do you agree that all of us should be looking for them, since you obviously have as much need for them as I do? Do you know the name and address of a bishop who was never a member of the Novus Ordo, Traditional Movement, Old Catholics, or some other non-Catholic sect? Do you agree that not one of you intruder Novus Ordo and Traditionalist clerics has remained in the Catholic Church in the external forum? Do you agree that unless you can get yourselves back into the Catholic Church in the external forum, you are unable to put me into the Church in the external forum because you are not members thereof yourselves? The Church teaches that *epikeia* can *never* be used for the *external* forum.

After reading this letter will you truthfully acknowledge that the Sovereign Pontiff is only the pope and not Jesus Christ, and that therefore you and Bishop Vezelis did not in fact receive the ordinary jurisdiction that you both claim to possess? Your actions after reading this letter will clearly reveal how you have answered this last question. I am praying that you will answer it with a yes and live your lives accordingly.

Do you agree that if you two bishops are honest, just, and upright men you will add my response to your letter already published on the World Wide Web? Does not Saint Thomas Aquinas teach us that the other side must be heard? That is why in fairness I will upload your letter with my response to the WWW so that everyone can read both sides in their search for the truth. If you are afraid or ashamed to add my response to your website, then how will your followers and the world decide who is right and who is wrong? Do you agree that if people read this letter without finding it on your website, they should only conclude that you bishops are afraid and ashamed to have your errors exposed? Do you think that they will conclude that you are just hirelings and not Catholic bishops?

Furthermore, do you agree that some of the people who have attended your Mass will also read this letter? Do you agree that if you and Bishop Vezelis actually have the true faith and are teaching correctly when you state that Jesus Christ is the Sovereign Pontiff, then you would be anxious for all of your parishioners to read this letter and prove to them my error? Do you agree that if you do not want your followers to read what I have written, it is an absolute, silent proof that your own consciences have made it perfectly clear to you that the Sovereign Pontiff is the pope and not Jesus Christ? Do you agree that this will also prove that you are of ill will, and wish to continue in your prideful ambition to run a false church?

Let us review together why everyone must follow his conscience. The following is found in: *A Parochial Course of Doctrinal Instructions Based on the Teachings of the Catechism of the Council of Trent*, prepared and arranged by, Very Rev. Charles J. Callan and Very Rev. John A. McHugh, Imprimatur, 1941, MORAL SERIES, Part III, page 73 ff:

“We are never permitted to act contrary to the dictates of our conscience, for, as St. Paul says, all that is not of faith, i.e., according to one's conscience, is sinful (Rom. xiv. 23)... One must always act according to the dictates of his conscience... It is never lawful to act with a doubtful conscience, because that would be carelessly running the risk of doing the wrong thing, and so of sinning... When one's conscience is in error through his own fault, because he does not wish to know what is right, or because he has neglected to use the ordinary

diligence and interest to determine what is right, he has a false conscience and is in bad faith, and is guilty of sin every time he acts according to such a conscience.”

In conclusion, it seems to me that anyone who is pertinacious in teaching that Jesus Christ is the Sovereign Pontiff, Who automatically gives ordinary jurisdiction to bishops when they are consecrated, will end by becoming a formal heretic.

It is now time for all of us to pray much more fervently to understand the truth, to love the truth, and to live and die in the state of sanctifying grace.

In closing, I will ask you and Bishop Louis Vezelis to send me your answers to the questions asked in this letter. Also, please answer the questions asked in *My Petition for Spiritual Help*, which can be found at: <http://www.jmjsite.com/mypetitionforspiritualhelp.pdf>.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I will be waiting for you to answer those questions.

In Jesus, Mary, and Saint Joseph,

Patrick Henry
7645 S. Chuckwagon Loop Road
Safford, AZ 85546
928-468-3295
JM1208@cableone.net
[Www.JMJsite.com](http://www.JMJsite.com)

Ad Apostolorum Principis, 16, 32, 39
Ad Caeli Reginam, 9
Ad Sinarum Gentem, 9, 32, 43
All of the Traditionalist clerics that I know
belong to a separated church, 20
Apostolic See is the sole source of
legitimate power, 12, 24
Apostolic Succession, 1, 22, 27, 42, 43, 44
Approbation, 22, 38, 40, 41
Authority, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17,
18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31, 34, 36,
37, 39, 41, 42
Canon Law a Text and Commentary, 29
Carmona, 25, 27, 35
Catechism on the Religious State, 36
Cekada, 23, 25, 27, 28, 33, 34, 42, 43
Charitas, 18, 37
CMRI, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31, 40, 44
Dolan, 14, 21, 23, 27
Ecclesiae Fastos, 10, 11
Elements of Religious Life, 38
Epikeia, 20, 22, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44
Epikeia Does Not Save the Day, 37
Epiphanius, 9
Episcopal, 10, 11, 16, 22, 27, 28, 42
Exposition of Christian Doctrine, 17, 37, 44
Father Cox, 13, 36, 43
Father Joseph, 16, 23, 29, 31

Father Lawrence Joseph Riley, 37, 38, 39
Feeneyite, 34, 35
Fidei Donum, 11
First Vatican Council, 32
Franciscan Foundation, 1, 33
Freemasonry, 20, 31
Guéranger, Dom, 12, 13, 24, 30, 36
Haurietis Aquas, 11
Humani Generis, 17
Hypnotism, 20, 31, 32
Intruder, 1, 18, 19, 23, 29, 30, 31, 37, 43, 44
Jesus Is the Supreme Pontiff = Mere
Statement, 14
Jurisdiction, 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16,
17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30,
31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42,
43, 44, 45
Kelly, 21, 23
Lefebvre, 19, 20, 23, 28, 29, 30, 34, 43
Letter to Bishop Giles, 5
Liturgical Year, The, 12
Liturgy, 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 20, 24, 26, 28
Living a Lie – Divinely Appointed – Intruder,
Schismatic, 17
Magno Munere, 35
Mediator Dei, 6, 8
Mere statements, 1, **14**, 15, 16, 30
Mind control, 1, 20, **31**, 32, 33

Mission, 1, 2, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 30, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 41
 Modernists, 1, 16, **28**, 32, 33
 Monster, The, 22, 23, 24
Mortalium Animos, 39
 Musey, 21, 25, 34, 35
Mystici Corporis Christi, 1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 32, 44
 Old Catholic, 20, 21, 23, 43
 Papal mandate, 1, 12, 17, 18, 20, 24, 36, 37, 39, 41, 42
Pascendi Dominici Gregis, 28
 Peter, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 22, 24, 32, 36, 42, 43, 44
Pillar and Ground of the Truth, 13, 36
 Pivarunas, 27, 31, 35
 Pontiff, 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 22, 28, 29, 30, 32, 34, 38, 44, 45
 Pope Leo XIII, 10, 36, 37, 42, 43
 Pope Pius VI, 4, 15, 18, 19, 23, 37
 Pope Pius XII, 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 19, 32, 39, 43, 44
 Pope Saint Pius V, 6, 20
 Pope Saint Pius X, 6, 7, 28
 Power of jurisdiction, 4, 5, 9, 11, 13, 16, 37, 42, 43, 44
 Power of orders, 9, 11, 42, 43
 Proof from the Sacred Liturgy, 6
 Saint Boniface, 10, 11
 Saint Thomas, 11, 18, 30, 37, 38, 44
Satis Cognitum, 10, 36, 42
 Schuckardt, 20, 24, 31
Seraph, The, 5, 26, 33, 34, 42
 Seven Truths, 35
 Should Patrick Henry Write Letters, 28
Si Diligis Me, 6, 7
 Sovereign Pontiff, 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 45
 SSPV, 21, 23
 SSPX, 21
 Summary and Conclusion, 41
 Supreme Pontiff, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 28
The History, Nature, and Use of Epikeia in Moral Theology, 37, 39
 They Are but They Are Not, 34
 Through the Sovereign Pontiff – Saints and Others, 11
 Thuc, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 42, 43
 Truth, 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45
Two Bishops in Every Garage, 23, 25, 27, 33
 Twofold Sacred Hierarchy, 9, 43
 Vatican II, 20, 21, 26, 32
 Vezelis, 1, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 42, 43, 44, 45
 Vicar of Jesus Christ, 8, 9, 12, 23, 24, 29
 We Are Not Traditionalists or Modernists, 19