Rejecters

May 11, 2011

My dear friend Paul Ellwanger,

Praised be Jesus, Mary, and Saint Joseph, now and forever. In my first response to your e-mail that you sent me a long time ago, I had mentioned I would send you another letter regarding this question of the three baptisms. As part of your e-mail, you wrote the following:

> "Fr. Feeney was persecuted then and is, to this day, being calumniated. Whereas, he was a martyr for the Faith. I believe he was a living saint.
>
> I suspect you and I are at odds on that Baptism issue. If so, I can only refer you to the book by Dimond wherein he provides Church documentation to support the Nicene Creed that there is only 'one Baptism for the remission of sins'. I do not agree with the Dimonds on everything they promulgate. But I am unable to find an error in their defense of Church teaching that there is only one Baptism.
>
> I have the book at my website . . ."

More recently, you also sent me, and I think a number of other people, your e-mail praising the latest publication by Bishop Neal Webster entitled, *The Magisterium and Baptism of Desire*:

> "Dear friend in the Faith,
>
> Bishop Neal Webster has granted permission to circulate attached 'letter'.
>
> I am grateful to Webster for his labors in enunciating infallible Church teaching on a fundamental Church dogma whose roots stem from the very words and teaching of Christ --- as it was He Who instituted the Sacrament of Baptism, without which eternal salvation is impossible.
>
> Disbelief in any dogma is heresy, which in turn incurs eternal damnation.
>
> You will note that the attached Webster letter provides specific Church infallible documentation to clarify what is probably the single most divisive issue since the Baptism heresy was first exposed by the late Fr. Leonard Feeney, S.J., S.T.D.
>
> Heresy is not a trifling matter. Eternal salvation is at stake.
>
> The hour is very late and Satan's undermining of the Church is in an advanced stage. Oremus.
>
> In Christ,
> Paul Ellwanger"

Yes, we are at odds on the baptism issue. You know that Robert and Frederick Dimond, Bishop Webster, and many others reject the teachings of the Catholic Church regarding baptism of desire and baptism of blood. Some of them do not like to be referred to as Feeneyites; nevertheless, they are all very adamant about rejecting baptism of desire and baptism of blood. Therefore, I will refer to them as the Rejecters simply because that is what they are. Rejecters receive this title as a compliment and glory in it because it succinctly, concisely, and crisply describes their belief, which rejects that anyone has ever been saved by what is known as baptism of desire and baptism of blood.

Since you requested my opinion concerning the articles written by Robert Dimond and Bishop Webster, I look for the truth by asking questions. When I finished answering my questions, I cannot conclude with you that Robert and Frederick Dimond and Bishop Webster are correct. Therefore, what I am asking you and all of the other Rejecters to do is to please *answer every question* I ask that is numbered between these types of brackets {}. My answers to *all* of my questions between these types of brackets {} are "yes." When I receive your

answers to my questions, we can each know what the other thinks. Please explain your reasons if you answer any of the questions with "no."

I intend to provide the reasons why I think that the Rejecters' conclusion is not correct. The Rejecters' conclusion being that: "*The Church teaches as a dogma that no one has ever entered heaven that did not receive the Sacrament of Baptism by water*."

(The emphasis here, as elsewhere throughout this letter, is usually added by Patrick Henry – except the emphasis in the quotes of Mr. Dimond is usually his own). Pope Pius IX reminded us that:

> "For any man to be able to prove his Catholic faith and affirm that he is truly a Catholic, he must be able to convince the Apostolic See of this."

When you have finished answering my questions, you will no longer believe the Rejecters' heresy, or else you will never be able to prove your Catholic faith and affirm that you are truly a Catholic and at the same time be able to convince the Apostolic See of this. I will also explain why the Rejecters' heresy teaches that the Catholic Church is responsible for spiritual abortions.

Later in this letter, you will again see these choices we all have to make regarding these issues of baptism:

FIRST CHOICE: Everyone *must* accept that Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Alphonsus Maria correctly understood and taught Catholic doctrine on this issue, and therefore, "it ***is*** de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire."

RESULT: If the first choice is correct, the Rejecters deny a dogma of the Church. Therefore, if they are pertinacious in that belief until death, they will be cast into hell forever.

SECOND CHOICE: The Church infallibly defined that no one has ever entered heaven who did not receive the Sacrament of Baptism by water, and therefore, "it ***is*** de fide that men are ***never*** saved by Baptism of desire."

FIRST RESULT: If the second choice is correct, Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Alphonsus Maria pertinaciously denied a dogma of the Church until their deaths, and were therefore cast into hell forever.

{1} Do you agree that anyone who believes Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Alphonsus Maria are now in the eternal fires of hell is a heretic on the sure road to damnation?

SECOND RESULT: Someone could erroneously believe that although Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Alphonsus Maria pertinaciously denied a dogma that they were not heretics.

{2} Do you agree that anyone who holds the belief that: "*they are not heretics who pertinaciously deny any dogma of the Church*," is himself a heretic?

THIRD RESULT: Others might hold a similar belief that although Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Alphonsus Maria pertinaciously denied a dogma, they were *not* heretics. Nevertheless, all those who *today* believe the exact same thing *are* now formal, pertinacious heretics because the late, excommunicated Father Leonard Feeney and other Rejecters have enlightened us. The Church once accepted the teachings of these Doctors of the Church as the truth when She canonized them. Now, however, everyone will be damned if they pertinaciously hold onto the *same* truths as explained by the Doctors of the Infallible Church.

{3} Do you agree that everyone who holds this belief denies what the Catholic Church teaches?

FOURTH RESULT: Others might choose to believe that at the time Saint Alphonsus Maria was canonized by Pope Gregory XVI, the Catholic Church did not know what the Rejecters would later figure out, namely, that it was heretical to teach *that men are also saved by baptism of desire*, as explained by Saint Alphonsus Maria in his *Moral Theology*. After all, it was through this same Pope Gregory XVI that Jesus Christ solemnly declared Saint Alphonsus Maria's *Moral Theology* error-free in areas of morals. Remember also that the Rejecters reminded us that no one figured out that Saint Alphonsus Maria was a heretic until the excommunicated Father Leonard Feeney *first* exposed it!

{4} Do you agree that this belief denies the dogma that the Church knows when She speaks infallibly, and that She cannot err?

I think all logical people who answer my questions will conclude with me that all Rejecters reject more than one dogma of the Church. Here are some things that will be presented again later in this letter. Because eternity in heaven or hell is at stake, the only logical thing to do is reject the Rejecters' heresy and believe: "*Now it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire*."

(a) Saint Alphonsus Maria was not separated from that Church, which clearly tells us in Her sacred liturgy that his soul was *never* soiled with the state of mortal sin, let alone him becoming a heretic or ever teaching contrary to any dogma of the Church. We are absolutely assured by the infallible Church that he preserved the true faith and the state of sanctifying grace, although he obstinately, tenaciously, determinedly, persistently, and pertinaciously defended his statement until death that: "*Now it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire*." That statement is either true or false, and therefore either correctly states a dogma or else Saint Alphonsus Maria was a formal heretic for denying an infallible pronouncement of the Church. Saint Alphonsus Maria either absolutely spoke the truth with the statement, "*Now it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire*," or else he absolutely totally rejected the Catholic faith. "*Either the Catholic faith is held in its entirety, or rejected totally*!"

(b) It is totally against reason that a heretic who obstinately and pertinaciously teaches contrary to a dogma of the Church should be found in the presence of all the people rapt in ecstasy, with remarkable gifts of prophecy, reading of hearts, bilocation, and miracles, as the liturgy of the Catholic Church teaches us about Saint Alphonsus Maria.

(c) If Saint Alphonsus Maria's statement is correct, then the Rejecters *reject a dogma* of the Church.

(d) If the Rejecters believe one can remain in the unity and bosom of the Church, who obstinately, tenaciously, determinedly, persistently, and pertinaciously believes, teaches, defends, supports, maintains, and insists until death that his statement is de fide – although it is in direct opposition to an infallible pronouncement, then the Rejecters *reject a dogma* of the Catholic Church.

(e) If the Rejecters believe Saint Alphonsus Maria's statement is heresy, then the Rejecters *reject the dogma* that the Catholic Church teaches the true faith through Her sacred liturgy.

(f) If the Rejecters believe Saint Alphonsus Maria's statement is heresy and yet he remained in the Catholic Church, then the Rejecters *reject the dogma* that heretics are not members of the Catholic Church.

(g) If the Rejecters believe Saint Alphonsus Maria's statement is heretical, then the Rejecters *reject the dogma* that there is no salvation for those who are heretics and outside of the Church.

(h) Rejecters therefore *reject the dogma* that there is no salvation outside of the Church.

(i) Rejecters also *reject the dogma* that the Church is infallible and cannot err.

(j) Rejecters also *reject the dogma* that the Catholic Church always knows when She speaks infallibly.

(k) All who reject any dogma of the Catholic Church will not be saved.

(l) Because eternity in heaven or hell is at stake, the only logical thing to do is reject the Rejecters' heresy and believe: "*Now it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire*."

{5} Do you believe that everyone must believe the dogmas of the Church to enter heaven?

{6} Do you agree that every Doctor of the Catholic Church and canonized saint believed each and every dogma of the Church at the time of their death?

Saint Francis De Sales reminds us of this truth:

> "To say the Church errs is to say no less that God errs, or else that He is willing and desirous for us to err; which would be a great blasphemy." (*The Catholic Controversy*, p. 70).

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 Saint 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 Saint 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..." Saint 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." Saint John of the Cross, *The Collected Works of Saint 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." Saint Thomas Aquinas, *On the Truth of the Catholic Faith, Q. #14, art. 12*.

{7} Do you agree that the Church cannot err and therefore, cannot teach today anything contrary to what She taught in the past?

{8} Do you agree that the Church does not define dogmas and then not know that they are binding on all Catholics to believe them?

{9} Do you agree that because the Catholic Church cannot err, She knows when She speaks infallibly?

The Catechism of the Council of Trent and Saint Alphonsus Maria

Let us review some things from the Introduction to the Catechism of the Council of Trent:

"All those who had part in the work of the Catechism were instructed to avoid in his composition the particular opinions of individuals and schools, and to express the ***doctrine*** of the universal Church, keeping especially in mind the decrees of the Council of Trent. On November 2, 1563 the Council of Trent enjoined on all bishops to see that the Catechism should be faithfully expounded to the people by all parish priests. January 17, 1566 Pope Saint Pius V succeeded Pope Pius IV. One of the first acts of the new Pontiff was to appoint a number of expert theological revisers to examine *every statement in the Catechism from the viewpoint of doctrine*.

This Catechism is unlike any other summary of Christian doctrine, it enjoys a unique authority among manuals. It was issued by the *express command* of the Ecumenical Council of Trent. It

subsequently received the *unqualified* approval of many Sovereign Pontiffs. In his Bull of June 14, 1761, Pope Clement XIII said that the Catechism contains a *clear* explanation of all that is necessary for salvation and useful for the faithful, that it was composed with great care and industry and has been highly praised by *all*, that by it in former times the faith was strengthened, and that no other catechism can be compared with it. He concluded, then, that the Roman Pontiffs offered this work to pastors as a norm of Catholic teaching and discipline so that there might be uniformity and harmony in the instructions of all.

Pope Leo XIII wrote that, 'This work is remarkable at once for the richness and *exactness* of its doctrine, and for the eloquence of its style; it is a precious summary of all theology, both dogmatic and moral. He who understands it well, will have always at his service those aids by which a priest is enabled to preach with fruit, to acquit himself worthily of the important ministry of the confessional and of the direction of souls, and *will be in a position to refute the objections of unbelievers*.' Pope Saint Pius X declared that pastors should give catechetical instructions, and for this purpose they should use the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*.

In addition to Popes and Councils, many Cardinals, Bishops, and other very distinguished and learned ecclesiastics, distinguished for their learning and sanctity, vied with one another in eulogizing the Catechism of Trent. Among other things they have said that not since the days of the Apostles has there been produced in a single volume so complete and practical a summary of Christian doctrine as this Catechism, and that, after the Sacred Scriptures, *there is no work* that can be read with *greater safety and profit*.

Cardinal Valerius, the friend of Saint Charles Borromeo, wrote of the Catechism: 'This work contains all that is needful for the instruction of the faithful; and it is written with such order, *clearness*, and majesty that through it we seem to hear *holy Mother the Church herself, taught by the Holy Ghost, speaking to us*. ... It was composed by order of the Fathers of Trent under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and ***was published by the authority of the Vicar of Christ***.'

Salmanticenses, the great Carmelite commentators on Saint Thomas, paid the following high tribute to the Catechism: 'The authority of this Catechism has always been of the *greatest* in the Church, because it was composed by the command of the Council of Trent, because its authors were men of highest learning, and because *it was approved only after the severest scrutiny* by Popes Pius V and Gregory the XIII, and has been recommended in nearly all the Councils that have been held since the Council of Trent.'

The preceptor of Saint Francis de Sales said: 'The Catechism of the Council of Trent was inspired by the Holy Ghost.' Dr. John Hagan, Rector of the Irish College in Rome, writes thus: 'The Roman Catechism is a work of exceptional authority. At the very least *it has the same authority as a dogmatic encyclical*, it is an authoritative exposition of Catholic doctrine given forth, and ***guaranteed to be orthodox by the Catholic Church*** *and her supreme head* on earth. The compilation of it was the work of various individuals; but the result of their combined labors *was accepted by the Church as a precious abridgment of dogmatic and moral theology*. All official documents have occasionally been issued by Popes to explain certain points of Catholic teaching to individuals, or to local Christian communities; whereas the *Roman Catechism* comprises practically the whole body of Christian doctrine, and is addressed to the whole Church. Its teaching is not infallible; but it holds a place between approved catechisms and what is *de fide.*' Translated into English with notes by Fr. John A. McHugh and Fr. Charles J. Callan. Imprimatur 1923.

Further comments by Patrick Henry: reflect seriously on how Pope Saint Pius V appointed expert theological revisers to examine ***every*** *statement in the catechism from the viewpoint of doctrine*. Consider that this catechism was: 1) *Approved only after the severest scrutiny* by Pope Saint Pius V and Pope Gregory XIII. 2) Approved and ***guaranteed to be orthodox by the Catholic Church*** *and her supreme head* on earth. 3) Absolutely guaranteed to be free from error by the **Apostolic See**. Let us recall that: "For any man to be able to prove his Catholic faith and affirm that he is truly a Catholic, he must be able to convince the Apostolic See of

this." How is it possible for a Catholic to convince himself that this *Catechism of the Council of Trent* contains heresy? There is no pope, Doctor of the Church, or canonized saint who made the statement that this catechism has heresy in it, for how could any logical man say such a thing? Nevertheless, more and more people are falling into the mistake of the Rejecters as they reject the orthodox teachings of this Catechism! On pages 179 and 180, this catechism states what the Rejecters claim is heresy:

"On adults, however, the Church has not been accustomed to confer the Sacrament of Baptism at once, but has ordained that it should be deferred for a certain time. The delay is not attended with the same danger as in the case of infants, which we have already mentioned; should any unforeseen accident make it impossible for adults to be washed in the salutary waters, their intention and determination to receive Baptism and their repentance for past sins, ***will avail them*** to grace and righteousness.

Nay, this delay seems to be attended with some advantages. And first, since the Church must take particular care that none approach this Sacrament through hypocrisy and dissimulation, the intentions of such as seek Baptism, are better examined and ascertained. Hence it is that we read in the decrees of ancient Councils that Jewish converts to the Catholic faith, before admission to Baptism, should spend *some* ***months*** in the ranks of the catechumens.

Furthermore, the candidate for Baptism is thus better instructed in the doctrine of the faith which he is to profess, and in the practices of the Christian life. Finally, when Baptism is administered to adults with solemn ceremonies on the *appointed days of Easter and Pentecost* ***only*** greater religious reverence is shown to the Sacrament."

At this time, I will quote Saint Alphonsus Maria in his commentary on the works of the Council of Trent. Therein, he clearly explains some of the things the Catholic Church teaches regarding baptism of desire:

"Who can deny *that the act of perfect love of God, which is sufficient for justification*, includes an implicit desire of Baptism, of Penance, and of the Eucharist? He who wishes the whole wishes the every part of that whole, and all the means necessary for its attainment. In order to be justified without Baptism, an infidel must love God above all things, and must have an universal will to observe all the divine precepts, among which the first is to receive Baptism: and *therefore in order to be justified it is necessary for him to have at least an implicit desire of that sacrament*." - *Saint Alphonsus Liguori on the Council of Trent*, 1846, Pg. 128 -129 (published by James Duffy, Dublin, 10 Wellington Quay).

Saint Alphonsus Maria was canonized by Pope Gregory XVI and declared a Doctor of the Church by Pope Pius IX. It was through Pope Gregory XVI that Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost solemnly declared Saint Alphonsus Maria's *Moral Theology* error-free in areas of morals. Now to review from St Alphonsus Maria's *Moral Theology*, Bk. 6, nn. 95-7:

"Baptism, therefore, coming from a Greek word that means ablution or immersion in water, is distinguished into Baptism of water, of desire, and of blood.

We shall speak below of Baptism of water, which was very probably instituted before the Passion of Christ the Lord, when Christ was baptized by John. But *Baptism of desire is* ***perfect*** *conversion to God by contrition or love of God above all things* accompanied by an explicit or implicit desire for true Baptism of water, the place of which it takes as to the remission of guilt, but not as to the impression of the character or as to the removal of all debt of punishment. It is called 'of wind' because it takes place by the impulse of the Holy Ghost who is called a wind. ***Now it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire***, by virtue of the Canon Apostolicam, 'de presbytero non baptizato' and of the Council of Trent, session 6, Chapter 4 where it is said that no one can be saved 'without the laver of regeneration, ***or*** **the desire for it**.'

Baptism of blood is the shedding of one's blood, i.e. death, suffered for the Faith or for some other Christian virtue. Now this baptism is comparable to true Baptism because, like true Baptism, it remits both guilt and punishment as it were ex opere operato. I say as it were because

martyrdom does not act by as strict a causality [“non ita stricte”] as the sacraments, but by a certain privilege on account of its resemblance to the passion of Christ. Hence martyrdom avails also for infants seeing that the Church venerates the Holy Innocents as true martyrs. That is why Suarez rightly teaches that the opposing view is at least temerarious. In adults, however, acceptance of martyrdom is required, at least habitually, from a supernatural motive.

It is clear that martyrdom is not a sacrament, because it is not an action instituted by Christ, and for the same reason neither was the Baptism of John a sacrament: it did not sanctify a man, but only prepared him for the coming of Christ.”

Sacred Scripture Says There Are Three Baptisms

The Rejecters say there are not three baptisms, but the Holy Ghost said there are three baptisms. Some people refuse to accept what the Holy Ghost teaches us. Saint Paul’s Letter to the Hebrews was inspired by the Holy Ghost. In chapter 6, verse 2, the Holy Ghost tells us there are three baptisms. Saint Thomas reminds us of this in the *Summa*, Pt. III, Q. 66 Art 11.

“On the contrary, on Heb. vi. 2, Of the doctrine of Baptisms, the gloss says: He uses the plural, because there is Baptism of Water, of Repentance, and of Blood.”

Saint Thomas explains, for those who will listen, how there are three baptisms, but only one of them is a sacrament. Under Objection 2 of this Q. 66, Art 11, Saint Thomas tells us:

“Further, Baptism is a sacrament, as we have made clear above. Now none but Baptism of Water is a sacrament. Therefore we should not reckon two other Baptisms.”

“*Reply Obj. 2*. As stated above (Q. 60, A. 1), a sacrament is a kind of sign. The other two, however, are like the Baptism of Water, not, indeed, in the nature of sign, but ***in the baptismal effect***. Consequently, they are not sacraments.”

To reword the sentence, one can say: “The other two (baptism of desire and baptism of blood) are like baptism of water in the baptismal effect.” Now do you understand why there are still only seven sacraments, although some have erred in saying that if baptism of desire and baptism of blood are like baptism of water, then there must be nine sacraments?

Saint Thomas agrees with the liturgy of the infallible Church when he writes of baptism of desire in the *Summa* Part III, Q. 68, Art. 2:

“Whether a man can be saved without Baptism?

Objection 1: It seems that no man can be saved without Baptism. For our Lord said (John iii. 5): *Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter the kingdom of God*. But those alone are saved who enter God’s kingdom. Therefore none can be saved without Baptism, by which a man is born again of water and the Holy Ghost.

Objection 2: Further, in the book De Eccl. Dogm. xli, it is written: We believe that no catechumen, though he die in his good works, will have eternal life, except he suffer martyrdom, which contains all the sacramental virtue of Baptism. But if it were possible for anyone to be saved without Baptism, this would be the case specially with catechumens who are credited with good works, for they seem to have the faith that worketh by charity (Gal. v. 6). Therefore it seems that none can be saved without Baptism.

Objection 3: Further, as stated above (A. 1; Q. 65, A. 4), the sacrament of Baptism is necessary for salvation. Now that is necessary *without which something cannot be* (*Metaph*. v). Therefore it seems that none can obtain salvation without Baptism.

On the contrary, Augustine says (Super Levit. lxxxiv) that some have received the invisible sanctification without visible sacraments, and to their profit; but though it is possible to have the visible sanctification, consisting in a visible sacrament, without the invisible sanctification, it will be

to no profit. Since, therefore, the sacrament of Baptism pertains to the visible sanctification, it seems that a man can obtain salvation without the sacrament of Baptism, by means of the invisible sanctification.

I answer that, The sacrament of Baptism may be wanting to someone in two ways. First, both in reality and in desire; as is the case with those who neither are baptized, nor wished to be baptized: which clearly indicates contempt of the sacrament, in regard to those who have the use of the free-will. Consequently those to whom Baptism is wanting thus, cannot obtain salvation: since neither sacramentally nor mentally are they incorporated in Christ, through Whom alone can salvation be obtained.

Secondly, the sacrament of Baptism may be wanting to anyone in reality but not in desire: for instance, when a man wishes to be baptized, but by some ill-chance he is forestalled by death before receiving Baptism. **And such a man can obtain salvation without being actually baptized, on account of his *desire* for Baptism**, which desire is the outcome of *faith that worketh by charity*, whereby God, Whose power is not tied to visible sacraments, sanctifies man inwardly. Hence Ambrose says of Valentinian, who died while yet a catechumen: *I lost him whom I was to regenerate: but he did not lose the grace he prayed for*.

Reply to Objection 1: As it is written (1 Kings xvi. 7), *man seeth those things that appear, but the Lord beholdeth the heart*. Now a man who desires to be *born again of water and the Holy Ghost* by Baptism, is regenerated in heart though not in body; thus the Apostle says (Rom. ii. 29) that *the circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, not in the letter; whose praise is not of men but of God*.

Reply to Objection 2: No man obtains eternal life unless he be free from all guilt and debt of punishment. Now this plenary absolution is given when a man receives Baptism, or suffers martyrdom: for which reason is it stated that martyrdom *contains all the sacramental virtue of Baptism*, i.e. as to the full deliverance from guilt and punishment. Suppose, therefore, a catechumen to have the desire for Baptism (else he could not be said to die in his good works, which cannot be without *faith that worketh by charity*), such a one, were he to die, would not forthwith come to eternal life, but would suffer punishment for his past sins, *but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire* as is stated 1 Cor. iii.15.

Reply to Objection 3: The sacrament of Baptism is said to be necessary for salvation in so far as man cannot be saved without, at least, Baptism of desire; *which, with God, counts for the deed* (Augustine, *Enarr. In* Ps. lvii)."

Saint Thomas Aquinas explains why the Church requires infants to be baptized very soon, although the liturgy has adults wait up to a year. Look in the *Summa* Part III, Q. 68, Art. 3:

"I answer that, in this matter we must make a distinction and see whether those who are to be baptized are children or adults. For if they are children, Baptism should not be deferred. First, because in them we do not look for better instruction or fuller conversion. Secondly, because of the danger of death, for *no other remedy is available* for them besides the sacrament of Baptism.

On the other hand, ***adults have a remedy in the mere desire for Baptism***, as stated above (Art. 2). And therefore Baptism should not be conferred on adults as soon as they are converted, but it should be deferred until some fixed time." (As seen in the Objections, Saint Thomas is speaking of the fixed time of Easter and Pentecost – P. H.)

{10} Do you agree that Saint Thomas just taught us the truth when he stated that: "*Adults have a remedy in the mere desire for Baptism*?"

{11} Do you agree that according to Robert and Frederick Dimond, Bishop Webster, and the other Rejecters, Saint Thomas did not teach the truth but rather heresy; and that their books, letters, and theology reject this statement of Saint Thomas as heretical?

{12} Do you agree that the Catholic Church, through her infallible liturgy, accepts this statement as true, "*Adults have a remedy in the mere desire for Baptism*?"

{13} Do you agree that if the statement of Saint Thomas is heretical, the liturgy of the Church would *not* have adults wait six months or longer for baptism?

{14} Do you agree that if the statement were heretical, the sacred liturgy of the infallible Church would not declare Saint Thomas to be a canonized saint and a Doctor of the Church?

Remember: "*In the sacred liturgy, we profess the Catholic faith explicitly and openly*," and saints are canonized during the sacred liturgy. The Divine Office and Holy Mass are certainly part of the Catholic sacred liturgy. The infallible Church prays the Divine Office and Holy Mass in honor of Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Alphonsus Maria Liguori.

{15} Do you agree that the Catholic liturgy teaches us that the infallible Church believes in baptism of desire because of the two different ways She treats children as opposed to adults concerning baptism?

Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, quotes a number of other popes who wrote about Saint Thomas. He concludes by saying:

> "While to these judgments of great Pontiffs on Thomas Aquinas comes the crowning testimony of Innocent VI: 'His teaching above that of others, the canonical writings alone excepted, enjoys such a precision of language, an order of matters, a truth of conclusions, that those who hold to it are never found swerving from the path of truth, and he who dare assail it will always be suspected of error.'"

{16} Do you agree that Popes Leo XIII and Innocent VI are teaching the truth in the above quote?

{17} Do you agree that Jesus Christ spoke the truth when He taught us to hear and obey His popes: *He who heareth you, heareth Me* (Luke 10: 16)?

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."

{18} Do you agree with Pope Pius VI that in hearing the voice of Popes Leo XIII and Innocent VI, we are actually hearing Jesus Christ teaching us?

Pope Leo XIII continues to teach us in his encyclical, *Aeterni Patris*:

> "The chief and special glory of Thomas, one which he has shared with none of the Catholic Doctors, is that the Fathers of Trent made it part of the order of conclave to lay upon the altar, together with Sacred Scripture and the decrees of the Supreme Pontiffs, the "*Summa*" of Thomas Aquinas, whence to seek counsel, reason, and inspiration."

{19} Do you agree that the Fathers of Trent found the *true* teaching of the Catholic Church concerning baptism of water, blood, and desire in the *Summa* of Saint Thomas Aquinas?

{20} Do you agree that if the Fathers of Trent did *not* find the *true* teaching of the Catholic Church concerning baptism of water, blood, and desire in the *Summa* of Saint Thomas Aquinas, that they would have condemned him as a heretic if this teaching were contrary to the infallible pronouncement of Pope Leo the Great in 451?

The Rejecters state that Saint Thomas taught heresy concerning baptism of blood and desire.

{21} Do you agree that the teachings of Saint Thomas Aquinas on this matter of baptism were not declared heretical or erroneous by the time the Council of Trent ended, nor at any time thereafter? If you answered no to this question, please provide proof that it was officially declared heretical by the time the Council of Trent ended. If you say it was only officially declared heretical after the Council of Trent ended, please provide the date and other relevant information. Thank you.

{22} Is it heretical to think the truths as explained by Saint Thomas concerning baptism have now become false because the excommunicated Father Leonard Feeney, Robert Dimond, and others suddenly claim they figured things out to be the opposite?

{23} Do you agree that Catholics should pray the Mass prayers codified by Pope Saint Pius V?

{24} Do you agree that this presents a serious contradiction for those who do not believe in baptism of blood and desire, since it was Pope Saint Pius V who declared Saint Thomas a Doctor of the Church?

{25} Do you agree that Pope Saint Pius V would not have declared Saint Thomas a Doctor of the Church if he did not also believe in baptism of blood and desire, as explained by Saint Thomas?

{26} Do you agree that Pope Saint Pius V, although he first gave the catechism the *severest scrutiny*, would not have issued the order for the publication and use by all priests of the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* if he did not also believe in baptism of desire as we have seen it explained in this catechism?

{27} If Pope Saint Pius V was a manifest heretic for believing in baptism of blood and desire, then would it be wrong to call him a saint, and pray his Mass prayers and the Divine Office he approved?

In addition to answering my questions, please do this for me: provide an infallible statement from the Catholic Church that Pope Saint Pius V, Saint Thomas Aquinas, and Saint Alphonsus Maria Liguori are now burning in hell for being pertinacious, manifest heretics because they believed in baptism of blood and desire! My research has never found such a document. However, you and I both know that the Church does have documents condemning your "Saint," Father Leonard Feeney, to be excommunicated by name. Furthermore, we both know Father Leonard Feeney died as a non-Catholic for being a member of the diabolical, non-Catholic, Novus Ordo religion. Where does the Church teach that those who died members of diabolical, non-Catholic religions are saints either in heaven or on earth?

AN INFALLIBLE DOGMA UNKNOWN FOR OVER 1600 YEARS

I do not know exactly when Robert Dimond, Bishop Webster, and all of the Rejecters claim the Church first taught infallibly that there is no such thing as baptism of blood and desire. Many of them claim it happened when Jesus Christ pronounced the words, "*Amen, amen, I say to thee, unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.*" Regardless, Robert Dimond claims it happened at least by the year 451 when he writes about how *Pope Saint Leo the Great Ends the Debate*:

> "Pope Saint Leo the Great, dogmatic letter to Flavian, Council of Chalcedon, 451: 'Let him heed what the blessed apostle Peter preaches, that sanctification by the Spirit is effected by the sprinkling of Christ's blood (1 Pet. 1:2); and let him not skip over the same apostle's words, knowing that you have been redeemed from the empty way of life you inherited from your fathers, not with corruptible gold and silver but by the precious blood of Jesus Christ, as of a lamb without stain or spot (1 Pet. 1:18). Nor should he withstand the testimony of blessed John the apostle: and the blood of Jesus, the Son of God, purifies us from every sin (1 Jn. 1:7); and again, this is the victory which conquers the world, our faith. Who is there who conquers the world save one who believes that Jesus is the Son of God? It is He, Jesus Christ, who has come through water and blood, not in water only, but in water and blood. And because the Spirit is truth, it is the Spirit who testifies. For there are three who give testimony – Spirit and water and blood. And the three are one. (1 Jn. 5:4-8) IN OTHER WORDS, THE SPIRIT OF SANCTIFICATION AND THE BLOOD OF REDEMPTION AND THE WATER OF BAPTISM. THESE THREE ARE ONE AND REMAIN INDIVISIBLE. NONE OF THEM IS SEPARABLE FROM ITS LINK WITH THE OTHERS.'"

Following the quote of Pope Saint Leo the Great, Robert Dimond gives his comments:

> "Before we get into the tremendous significance of this pronouncement, we will give a little background on this ***dogmatic*** letter. This is Pope Saint Leo the Great's famous **dogmatic** letter to Flavian, originally written in 449, and later accepted by the Council of Chalcedon – the fourth general Council of the Church – in 451 (quoted in Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils,

Georgetown Press, Vol. 1, p. 81). It is one of the most important documents in the history of the Church. This is the famous letter which, when read aloud at the dogmatic Council of Chalcedon, caused all of the fathers of the Council (more than 500) to rise to their feet and proclaim: 'This is the faith of the Fathers, the faith of the apostles; Peter has spoken through the mouth of Leo.' The very letter in itself embodies the term ex cathedra (speaking from the Chair of Peter), as proven by the reaction of the fathers at Chalcedon. This dogmatic letter of Pope Leo was accepted by the Council of Chalcedon in its definition of faith, which was approved authoritatively by Pope Leo himself. **It is unquestionably dogmatic and Magisterial**.

And if that were not sufficient to prove that Pope Leo's letter is without question **infallible**, consider the fact that it was also approved by Pope Vigilius at the Second Council of Constantinople (553) and by Pope Saint Agatho at the Third Council of Constantinople (680-681). It was also confirmed *infallibly* by a number of other Popes, including: Pope Saint Gelasius, Pope Pelagius II, 553 (Den. 246) and Pope Benedict XIV, 1743 (Denz. 1463). Because of the tremendous significance of Pope Leo's letter to the topic at hand, we will quote an extract from Pope Saint Gelasius which shows how no one can contradict, in the slightest way, this dogmatic epistle of Pope Leo to Flavian.

Pope Saint Gelasius, Decretal, 495: 'Also the epistle of blessed Leo the Pope to Flavian… if anyone argues concerning the text of this one even in regard to one iota, and does not receive it in all respects reverently, let him be anathema.' (Denz. 165)

Here we have Pope Saint Gelasius *speaking ex cathedra* to condemn anyone **[Including Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Alphonsus Maria, and Pope Saint Pius V, and the Fathers of the Council of Trent** = Comment of Patrick Henry**]** who would depart, even in regard to one iota, from the text of Pope Leo's dogmatic epistle to Flavian.

Now, in the section of Pope Leo's dogmatic letter quoted above, he is dealing with the sanctification by the Spirit. 'Sanctification by the Spirit' is the term for **Justification** from the state of sin (the state of grace). **No one can get to heaven without Sanctification by the Spirit**, as everyone professing to be Catholic admits. **Pope Saint Leo affirms, on the authority of the great apostles Sts. Peter and John, that this Sanctification by the Spirit is effected by the sprinkling of Christ's blood**. It is only by receiving the blood of Redemption, he proves, that one can be changed from the state of Adam (original sin) to the state of grace (justification/sanctification). It is only by this Blood that Sanctification by the Spirit works.

It is a divinely revealed truth that no one can be freed from the state of sin and sanctified without the application of the blood of Redemption to him. Of this no Catholic can doubt.

Baptism of desire/blood advocates – as well as the Saint Benedict Center, since they believe in justification by desire – explain that the blood of Redemption, which effects the Sanctification by the Spirit, is applied to the soul by the desire for baptism or by his martyrdom, *without water baptism*. They assert that the Spirit of Sanctification and the blood of Redemption are able to bring a soul to this Justification/Sanctification *without water baptism*. But this is *exactly* the opposite of what Pope Leo the Great defines dogmatically!

Pope Saint Leo defines that in Sanctification, the Spirit of Sanctification and the Blood of Redemption *cannot* be separated from the water of baptism! You must be baptized with water to receive the Spirit of Sanctification and the blood of Redemption, according to this *dogma*. There can be no Justification by *the Spirit* and *the Blood* without the water! This excludes the very concept of baptism of desire and baptism blood, which is that sanctification by *the Spirit* and *the Blood* without water is possible.

A sinner cannot be sanctified by the Spirit and the Blood, which he must in order to be saved, without the water of Baptism. In light of this dogmatic letter, baptism of desire and baptism of blood cannot be held, for these theories separate the Spirit and the Blood from the water in sanctification."

{28} Do you agree that, according to Robert Dimond, the Apostolic See has taught as a dogma since at least 451 that not one soul has ever been *saved by baptism of desire or baptism of blood*?

Saint Boniface I – 418 to 422 – wrote in *Retro maioribus tuis*, March 11, 422:

> "To the Synod [of Corinth] … we have directed such writings that all the brethren may know… that there must be no withdrawal from Our judgment. For it has never been allowed that that be discussed again, *which has once been decided by the Apostolic See*."

Review also the quotes given above on pages three and four, reminding us that the Catholic Church can never err, and "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.

{29} Do you agree that if Robert Dimond's conclusion is actually the truth, then since 451, no Doctor of the Church, saint, or any Catholic has ever been allowed to teach that *men are also saved by baptism of desire and baptism of blood*?

{30} Do you agree that according to Mr. Dimond, all who hold, believe, and teach that *men are also saved by baptism of desire and baptism of blood*; reject, deny, and declare not to be true what the Catholic Church positively knew She taught as a dogma since 451?

Mr. Robert Dimond continues to write:

> "Some may wonder why some early Church fathers, saints, and theologians taught baptism of desire and blood even after the time of Pope Leo's pronouncement. The answer is simple: They were unaware of Pope Leo's definitive pronouncement in this regard. They were erring in good faith. They were fallible human beings. They were not aware that their position was contrary to the infallible teaching of the Catholic Church."

Please stop and realize what Robert Dimond is teaching! Yes, stop and say a fervent prayer for the grace to understand the truth. Mr. Dimond says the Fathers, saints, and theologians were unaware of Pope Saint Leo's definitive pronouncement. He also strongly implies that *the Church, guided by the Holy Ghost, does not always know when She speaks infallibly*. Really!

{31} Do you agree that the Catholic Church never once condemned any of the Fathers, Doctors of the Church, saints, and theologians as heretics for denying, refuting, and believing the *exact opposite* of what every Rejecter claims to be an infallible dogma of the Church?

If the Rejecters' heresy was indeed the truth, then consider the great shame, embarrassment, scandal, discredit, and disgrace of which they accuse the Church.

{32} If the Rejecters' heresy was in fact the truth, then do you agree that *the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth* (1 Timothy 3:15) neglected to fulfill the duty imposed upon Her by Almighty God to correct the mistakes of the Fathers, Doctors of the Church, saints, and theologians by clearly reminding them of Pope Saint Leo's definitive pronouncement?

First: What proof do we have that Saint Bernard, Saint Thomas Aquinas, and Saint Alphonsus Maria never read what Pope Saint Leo the Great wrote? Only Robert Dimond's word, although he reminded us that: "*It is one of the most important documents in the history of the Church*!"

Second: Therefore, let us conclude that Saint Thomas and Saint Alphonsus Maria read and understood perfectly well what Pope Saint Leo the Great wrote!

{33} Do you agree that Mr. Robert Dimond is literally teaching the world that these two exceptionally well-learned Doctors of the Church were super stupid, hopelessly unintelligent, excessively dimwitted, extremely dull, completely brainless, and so utterly dense that they were totally unable to understand that the Church infallibly defined through Pope Saint Leo the Great that no one could ever be saved without baptism of water?

{34} Do you agree that if Robert Dimond and the other Rejecters hold the correct, precise, and exact Catholic faith they should not have the least difficulty in convincing the Apostolic See that Saint Alphonsus Maria was so super stupid, hopelessly unintelligent, excessively dimwitted, extremely dull, completely brainless, and so utterly dense that he was totally incapable of understanding what Pope Saint Leo the Great wrote, and what the ecumenical Council of Trent taught concerning baptism of water, blood, and desire?

Third: We have to consider just who was the brilliant super brain, who turned out to be more intelligent, bright, clever, smart, gifted, talented, knowledgeable, and brainy enough to figure out what all the saints and Doctors of the Church failed to understand?

{35} Do you agree that, of course, it is none other than Mr. Robert Dimond?

If you do not believe me, provide the proof of one other Church Father, saint, theologian, Doctor of the Church, or pope who understood, clarified, defended, expounded, comprehended, recognized, fathomed, empathized, and explained what Pope Saint Leo the Great wrote the same way that Robert Dimond did!

Fourth: Every single Church Father, saint, theologian, and Doctor of the Church that lived from Pope Saint Leo the Great until Robert Dimond came along were fallible human beings who taught the exact opposite of Robert Dimond. To quote Robert Dimond: "*They were not aware that their position was contrary to the infallible teaching of the Catholic Church*." Nevertheless, the Catholic Church never corrected even one of them and reminded them that Pope Saint Leo the Great infallibly pronounced their position as heretical!

Fifth: Wow!

{36} Do you agree that, according to Robert Dimond, since 451 there has not as yet lived one pope, Doctor of the Church, canonized saint, or theologian who knew when the Church spoke infallibly?

If you disagree, then please provide proof from that pope, Doctor of the Church, canonized saint, or theologian that explains, clarifies, and supports what Pope Saint Leo the Great wrote as just explained by Robert Dimond.

Sixth: Robert Dimond teaches this terrible blasphemy: The infallible Catholic Church Herself did not know that the position of these Church Fathers, saints, theologians, Doctors of the Church, and popes was contrary to Her infallible teaching!

Seventh: According to Robert Dimond and the other Rejecters, it should be obvious that the Church did not know when She spoke infallibly because the Church canonized saints who, until their death, pertinaciously, resolutely, and obstinately taught *exactly* the *opposite* of what Robert Dimond says Pope Saint Leo the Great defines *dogmatically*!

Eight: Therefore, according to the Rejecters, the Church canonized those who pertinaciously, resolutely, and obstinately denied Her infallible dogmas!

{37} Do you agree that according to the Rejecters, this Catholic Church never admonishes, censures, or condemns as heretics many of those who reject Her infallible dogmas, but rather She declares them to be Saints and Doctors of the Church?

Remember that Robert Dimond wrote:

> "In light of this dogmatic letter, baptism of desire and baptism of blood ***cannot be held***, for these theories separate the Spirit and the Blood from the water in sanctification."

Although Robert Dimond says they *cannot be held*, we know the Church has upheld the teaching of the Doctors of the Church and the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* as teaching the truth concerning baptism of desire and baptism of blood.

Why did the Catholic Church not condemn, denounce, and convict as heretics those who rejected Her infallible dogmas, unless, according to the Rejecters, no pope or Doctor of the Church knew what She taught infallibly in 451?

Mr. Ellwanger, I now draw your attention to what you wrote:

> "You will note that the attached Webster letter provides specific Church infallible documentation to clarify what is probably the single most divisive issue since the Baptism heresy was ***first*** exposed by the late Fr. Leonard Feeney, S..J., S.T.D."

Yes, you have revealed an important fact that can be taken two ways. First, that not even one council of the Church, pope, Doctor of the Church, saint, or theologian prior to Father Feeney knew of the *new heresy* started by Father Feeney. Second, it was indeed Father Feeney who *first* exposed and started the Boston heresy, commonly called the Feeneyite heresy, and more precisely, accurately, and truthfully defined as the Rejecter heresy. I have yet to read the writings of any Rejecter bringing forth the direct quote of even one council of the Church, pope, saint, bishop, priest, or lay person from the time after the Council of Trent up until Father Leonard Feeney that does not agree with Saint Alphonsus Maria when he taught: "*Now it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire*." Bishop Webster pretty much confirms the statement I just made.

On page two of Bishop Webster's letter, he writes:

> "All the traditional priests, including myself, have misunderstood exactly what Trent is saying here."

What a revealing statement! Do not all Catholics, especially "bishops", need to know and understand the infallible dogmas that the Church has taught for over 400 years? Now, if the Catholic Church always taught *infallibly* that which Bishop Webster claims was declared by the Council of Trent as an *infallible* pronouncement, then how can it be that nobody knew about it? Why was there nobody in the world who could understand the *infallible* teachings of the Catholic Church for 400 years before Father Leonard Feeney *first* exposed them? If the Rejecters now teach the truth, then it has *always* been the truth. Yet nobody knew of this *infallible* pronouncement of the Council of Trent before Father Leonard Feeney *first* exposed it about 400 years after the Council of Trent declared it – this according to Bishop Webster!

{38} Do you agree that this fact in itself should be enough to convince every Catholic that Father Feeney *first* displayed, presented, and revealed the **new Rejecter heresy**, which teaches contrary to the statement accepted by the Church that *it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire*?

{39} Do you agree that every pope – including Saint Pius V, Doctor of the Church – including Saint Alphonsus Maria, canonized saint and theologian who lived since Trent, understood the Council of Trent as teaching in agreement with the statement: *Now it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire*?

On page 1 of *The Magisterium and Baptism of Desire,* Bishop Webster states the following:

> "It is an act of heresy to try and prove an infallible pronouncement false!"

Bishop Webster repeats it again on page 5:

> "It is an act of heresy to try to prove an infallible pronouncement false! It is an act of heresy to say an infallible pronouncement does not mean what it says."

First: Bishop Webster goes on with his article to explain that Trent made the *infallible pronouncement* that one must receive baptism of water to enter heaven.

Second: If I understand Bishop Webster correctly, he is clearly stating that no one has ever been saved by means of baptism of desire, and one becomes a heretic to teach that *it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire*.

{40} Do you agree that Saint Alphonsus Maria pertinaciously, resolutely, and unyieldingly taught until his death that, "*Now it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire*?"

{41} Do you agree that, according to the statements of Bishop Webster, Saint Alphonsus Maria committed an act of heresy?

{42} Do you agree that Bishop Webster preaches hypocritically, untruthfully, and deceitfully if he now claims that Saint Alphonsus Maria was not a formal, pertinacious heretic at the time of his death?

Robert Dimond quotes Pope Gregory XVI, *Summo Iugiter Studio*, May 27, 1832, to remind us of what this unerring Church teaches on no salvation outside of the Church:

> "Finally some of these misguided people attempt to persuade themselves and others that men are not saved only in the Catholic religion, *but that even **heretics** may attain eternal life*… You know how zealously Our predecessors taught that article of faith which these dare to deny, namely the necessity of the Catholic faith and of unity for salvation… Omitting other appropriate passages

which are almost numberless in the writings of the Fathers, We shall praise Saint Gregory the Great who expressly testifies that THIS IS INDEED THE TEACHING OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. He says: '*The holy universal Church teaches that it is not possible to worship God truly except in her and asserts that all who are outside of her will not be saved*.' Official acts of the Church proclaim the same dogma. Thus, in the decree on faith which Innocent III published with the synod of Lateran IV, these things are written: '*There is one universal Church of all the faithful outside of which no one is saved*.' Finally the same dogma is also expressly mentioned in the profession of faith proposed by the Apostolic See, not only that which all Latin churches use, but also that which… other Eastern Catholics use. We did not mention these selected testimonies because We thought you were ignorant of that article of faith and in need of Our instruction. Far be it from Us to have such an absurd and insulting suspicion about you. But We are so concerned about this serious and well known dogma, which has been attacked with such remarkable audacity, that We could not restrain Our pen from reinforcing this truth with many testimonies."

{43} Is the Church infallible when She solemnly declares *during Her sacred liturgy* that someone is a canonized saint in heaven?

The Catholic Encyclopedia, Copyright 1907, Volume 2, page 366, quotes Saint Thomas:

"Since the honor we pay the saints is in a certain sense a profession of faith, i.e., a belief in the glory of the saints [quâ sanctorum gloriam credimus] we must piously believe that in this matter also the judgment of the Church is *not liable to error*."

These words of Saint Thomas, all favoring a positive infallibility, have been interpreted by his school in favor of papal infallibility in the matter of canonization.

Saint Thomas Aquinas teaches in the *Summa,* Pt. III Q. 27, Art. 1, when he writes, *On the Contrary*:

"Now the Church does not celebrate feasts except of those who are holy."

{44} Do you agree that the above quote from the *Summa* is true?

{45} Do you agree that those who died believing or teaching anything contrary to any infallible pronouncement are not holy, and that the Church will never celebrate their feast in the Mass and Divine Office?

Every Catholic should know the Church does celebrate the feasts of Saint Bernard, Saint Thomas Aquinas, Saint Alphonsus Maria Liguori, Saint Augustine, and Saint Jerome. The Church celebrates their feast with their own Mass and Divine Office in the sacred liturgy.

Remember, Pope Pius XII teaches us in *Mediator Dei* that:

"The entire liturgy, therefore, has the Catholic faith for its content, inasmuch as it bears public witness to the faith of the Church… Let the rule for prayer determine the rule of belief."

{46} Do you agree that legitimate, valid, Catholic popes have canonized Saint Bernard, Saint Thomas Aquinas, Saint Alphonsus Maria Liguori, Saint Augustine, and Saint Jerome?

{47} Do you agree that those popes declared infallibly that these saints and Doctors of the Church are in heaven?

{48} Do you agree that it follows in correct logic that the infallible, Catholic Church cannot possibly err and teach us heresy when She solemnly declares in the sacred liturgy that these five great Doctors of the Church are now canonized saints in heaven?

{49} Do you agree that all of these great Doctors of the Church teach us that there is baptism of water, blood, and desire?

{50} Do you agree that the Rejecters teach that they are ***heretics*** who believe that: "*It is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire*?"

{51} Do you agree that most of the Rejecters also believe that Saint Bernard, Saint Thomas Aquinas, Saint Alphonsus Maria Liguori, Saint Augustine, and Saint Jerome are now enjoying the Beatific Vision and eternal life in heaven?

{52} Do you agree that it follows with correct logic that the Rejecters must also believe "*that even **heretics** may attain eternal life*," although Pope Gregory XVI and Pope Eugene IV condemned that belief?

Pope Eugene IV, *Cantate Domino*:

> "It [the Church] firmly believes, professes, and proclaims that those not living within the Catholic Church, not only pagans, but also Jews and ***heretics*** and schismatics cannot become participants in eternal life, but will depart 'into everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels' [Matt. 25:41], unless before the end of life the same have been added to the flock; and that the unity of the ecclesiastical body is so strong that only to those remaining in it are the sacraments of the Church of benefit for salvation, and do fastings, almsgiving, and other functions of piety and exercises of Christian service produce eternal reward, and that no one, whatever almsgiving he has practiced, even if he has shed blood for the name of Christ, can be saved, unless he has remained in the bosom and unity of the Catholic Church."

I received the following information from a Rejecter:

> "The next thing I want to refute is the 'baptism of blood' myth. Are we not to believe in the 'de fide' teachings of Holy Mother Church? Are we not to believe in the solemn magisterium of the Church as is expressed in her councils and ratified by the Supreme Pontiff? Is this not what gives us, and all true Catholics, true and valid interpretations of the teachings of Our Lord and His Apostles? Are these not given Ex Cathedra, which is the certain knowledge that the faithful can have that it is guaranteed by the Holy Ghost? We have solid, incontestable proof against the notion of 'baptism of blood' in the Bull, 'Cantate Domino,' proclaimed at the Council of Florence and ratified by Pope Eugene IV in the year 1441. Listen to these clear and unambiguous words: 'No one, let his alms-giving be as great as it may, no one, even if he pour out his blood for the name of Christ, can be saved unless he abide within the bosom and unity of the Catholic Church.' Who, then, can make any kind of claim for the salvation of one who has shed his blood for Christ, but was not yet baptized! Baptism of water puts you in the bosom and unity of the Catholic Church; baptism of blood does not!
>
> There are so many arguments against this 'baptism of desire,' I could not begin to enunciate all of them here. For one argument, we have the above mentioned 'Cantate Domino,' which states, 'The most Holy Roman Catholic Church firmly believes, professes, and preaches that none of those existing outside the Catholic Church, not only pagans, but also Jews and **heretics** and schismatics, can have a share in life eternal, but that they will go into the eternal fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels, unless before death they are joined with Her…' This is an Ex Cathedra statement, an eternal truth which is to be believed by every Catholic with divine and Catholic faith (cum divina et Catholica fides) as it is guaranteed by the Holy Ghost! How can a person without baptism of water be joined with the Catholic Church? There is only ONE way to be joined with 'Her,' and that my friend, is by Baptism of Water!
>
> Another defense of Baptism of Water is stated very clearly in the Council of Trent. The second canon on baptism in the Council of Trent says: 'If anyone says that true and natural water is not necessary for baptism and thus twists into some metaphor the words of Our Lord Jesus Christ: unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, let him be anathema.'
>
> This canon (the Church speaking) says you cannot 'twist into some metaphor the words of our Lord.' That tells us that you cannot interpret these words according to your own meaning! These words of Our Lord must be taken literally! Cum divina et Catholica fides!"

Pope Eugene IV makes it apparent that the necessity of water baptism is *different* for children and adults, while at the same time making it obvious that he believed in baptism of desire. It should be obvious, apparent, and recognizable to everyone that he believed with Saint Thomas that, "*Adults have a remedy in the mere desire for Baptism*." Why else would he make such a clear, well-defined, and noticeable distinction between children and adults? Let us read again from *Cantate Domino*:

> "Regarding ***children***, indeed, because of danger of death, which can often take place, when no help can be brought to them by another remedy than through the sacrament of baptism, through which they are snatched from the domination of the Devil and adopted among the sons of God, it advises that holy baptism ought not to be deferred for forty or eighty days, or any time according to the observance of certain people, but it should be conferred as soon as it can be done conveniently, but so that, when danger of death is imminent, they be baptized in the form of the Church, early without delay, even by a layman or woman, if a priest should be lacking, just as is contained more fully in the decree of the Armenians.

I might say that another proof of baptism of desire is stated very clearly in the Council of Trent. Under Chapter 4 of session 6 it reads: "And this translation, since the promulgation of the Gospel, cannot be effected, without the laver of regeneration, *or the desire thereof*, as it is written; *unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God* (John 3:5)."

People have said these words of Our Lord Jesus Christ must be taken literally. However, we see that the Fathers of Trent taught that there is baptism of desire. The Fathers of Trent were certainly able to convince Saint Alphonsus Maria of this article of faith. According to the Rejecters, it would seem they thus twisted into some metaphor the words of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

{53} Do you agree that, therefore, if the Rejecters are always consistent in their teaching, each of them must absolutely believe that the Fathers of Trent and Saint Alphonsus Maria were manifest heretics who could never go to heaven unless they repented?

{54} Do you believe Saint Alphonsus Maria knew of the second canon on baptism in the Council of Trent? How about Saint Charles Borromeo, Pope Saint Pius V, and those who wrote and approved of the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*?

{55} Do you agree that Saint Alphonsus Maria, Saint Charles Borromeo, and Pope Saint Pius V all believed the dogmas of the Catholic Church after they read and *correctly understood* the second canon on baptism of the Council of Trent?

{56} Did you notice that the year Pope Eugene IV ratified the Bull, *Cantate Domino*, was 1441?

That was about 118 years after Saint Thomas Aquinas was declared a saint by the infallible Church. It was a little more than 100 years before the Council of Trent. Saint Alphonsus Maria wrote what he did about baptism desire approximately 300 years after Pope Eugene IV ratified *Cantate Domino*.

{57} Do you agree that it is very logical to believe that Pope Eugene IV knew what Saint Thomas Aquinas wrote concerning baptism of water, of desire, and of blood?

{58} Do you agree that if the writings of Saint Thomas were already condemned as heretical by the Church in 451, which is centuries before Saint Thomas lived, Pope Eugene IV had the obligation to condemn him by name?

{59} Do you agree that if Saint Thomas was a heretic for believing in baptism of desire and blood, might Pope Eugene have said something such as this: "Directly contrary to the heretical teachings of ("~~Saint~~") Thomas Aquinas, I hereby teach ex cathedra that no one has ever been saved by baptism of desire or blood?"

{60} Do you agree that Pope Saint Pius V, Saint Charles Borromeo, and the other Fathers of Trent knew what the Catholic Church taught within this Bull, *Cantate Domino*?

{61} Do you agree that although they knew about this Bull, *Cantate Domino*, they still believed and taught souls have been saved by means of baptism of desire and of blood?

{62} Do you agree that Saint Alphonsus Maria certainly must have known about this Bull, *Cantate Domino*?

{63} Do you agree that even though he knew about this Bull, *Cantate Domino*, Saint Alphonsus Maria taught that there are saints in heaven who never received baptism of water, but only baptism of blood?

{64} Do you agree that even though he knew about this Bull, *Cantate Domino*, Saint Alphonsus Maria Liguori taught: "It is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire?"

{65} Am I correct in understanding that the Rejecters who believe everyone must receive baptism of water to obtain salvation, also believe this Bull, *Cantate Domino*, infallibly teaches Catholics that no one can go to heaven by means of baptism of blood and desire?

{66} If the Rejecters' understanding of this Bull, *Cantate Domino*, is correct, then do you agree that Saint Alphonsus Maria, Pope Saint Pius V, Saint Charles Borromeo, and the other Fathers of Trent were heretics for denying an infallible dogma of the Church?

{67} When you pray an Act of Faith, do you say: "I believe these and all the truths which *the Holy Catholic Church believes and teaches*?"

{68} Have you ever seriously considered that those who believe there is no such thing as baptism of blood and baptism of desire ***must, of necessity,*** believe there **IS** salvation outside of the Catholic Church?

{69} Do you agree that because heretics are outside of the Church, the Rejecters either reject the infallible dogma that there is no salvation outside of the Catholic Church, or they reject the infallible dogma that pertinacious, formal heretics are *not* outside of the Catholic Church?

Let us summarize the choices we all have to make regarding these issues of baptism.

FIRST CHOICE: Everyone *must* accept that Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Alphonsus Maria correctly understood and taught Catholic doctrine on this issue, and therefore, "it ***is*** de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire."

RESULT: If the first choice is correct, the Rejecters deny a dogma of the Church. Therefore, if they are pertinacious in that belief until death, they will be cast into hell forever.

SECOND CHOICE: The Church infallibly defined that no one has ever entered heaven who did not receive the Sacrament of Baptism by water, and therefore, "it ***is*** de fide that men are ***never*** saved by Baptism of desire."

FIRST RESULT: If the second choice is correct, Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Alphonsus Maria pertinaciously denied a dogma of the Church until their deaths, and were therefore cast into hell forever.

{70} Do you agree that anyone who believes Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Alphonsus Maria are now in the eternal fires of hell is a heretic on the sure road to damnation?

SECOND RESULT: Someone could erroneously believe that although Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Alphonsus Maria pertinaciously denied a dogma that they were not heretics.

{71} Do you agree that anyone who holds the belief that: "*they are not heretics who pertinaciously deny any dogma of the Church*," is himself a heretic?

THIRD RESULT: Others might hold a similar belief that although Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Alphonsus Maria pertinaciously denied a dogma, they were *not* heretics. Nevertheless, all those who *today* believe the exact same thing *are* now formal, pertinacious heretics because the late, excommunicated Father Leonard Feeney and other Rejecters have enlightened us. The Church once accepted the teachings of these Doctors of the Church as the truth when She canonized them. Now, however, everyone will be damned if they pertinaciously hold onto the *same* truths as explained by the Doctors of the Infallible Church.

{72} Do you agree that everyone who holds this belief denies what the Catholic Church teaches?

FOURTH RESULT: Others might choose to believe that at the time Saint Alphonsus Maria was canonized by Pope Gregory XVI, the Catholic Church did not know what the Rejecters would later figure out, namely, that it was heretical to teach *that men are also saved by baptism of desire*, as explained by Saint Alphonsus Maria in his *Moral Theology*. After all, it was through this same Pope Gregory XVI that Jesus Christ solemnly declared Saint Alphonsus Maria's *Moral Theology* error-free in areas of morals. Remember also that the Rejecters reminded us that no one figured out that Saint Alphonsus Maria was a heretic until the excommunicated Father Leonard Feeney first exposed it!

{73} Do you agree that this belief denies the dogma that the Church knows when She speaks infallibly, and that She cannot err?

Do you think you can convince the Apostolic See you are a Catholic?

Pope Pius IX will now instruct us in *Quartus Supra*:

> "However it has never been possible to prove oneself a Catholic by affirming those statements of the faith which one accepts and keeping silence on those doctrines which one decides not to profess. But without exception, all doctrines which the Church proposes must be accepted, as the history of the Church at all times bears witness.
>
> For any man to be able to prove his Catholic faith and affirm that he is truly a Catholic, he must be able to convince the Apostolic See of this. For this See is predominant and with it the faithful of the whole Church should agree."

{74} Do you agree that whatever the Apostolic See taught in the past still holds true today?

{75} Do you agree with Saint Francis De Sales that: "To say the Church errs is to say no less that God errs, or else that He is willing and desirous for us to err; which would be a great blasphemy?"

{76} Do you agree that at the time of Pope Saint Pius V the Apostolic See believed the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* was free from all error and proclaimed only the true Catholic dogma when it taught, declared, avowed, and clarified that: "*Should any unforeseen accident make it impossible for adults to be washed in the salutary waters, their intention and determination to receive Baptism and their repentance for past sins, will avail them to grace and righteousness*?"

{77} Do you agree that you will never convince the Apostolic See that you are Catholic if you say the Church did err and teach heresy in the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* that was issued by the *express command* of the Apostolic See at the Ecumenical Council of Trent?

{78} Do you agree that you will never convince the Apostolic See that you are Catholic if you teach that everything written in the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* was not approved as orthodox, true, and free from **every error** and heresy by the Apostolic See?

{79} Do you agree that you will never convince the Apostolic See you are Catholic, if you say this most important catechism issued by the express command of the Apostolic See does not teach the true and correct doctrine when stating: "*Should any unforeseen accident make it impossible for adults to be washed in the salutary waters, their intention and determination to receive Baptism and their repentance for past sins, will avail them to grace and righteousness*?"

{80} Do you agree that the Church did not err in teaching: "Should any unforeseen accident make it impossible for adults to be washed in the salutary waters, their intention and determination to receive Baptism and their repentance for past sins, will avail them to grace and righteousness?"

{81} Do you agree that, therefore, the Rejecters profess a *great blasphemy* every time they write, tell others, or promote in any way that the **Church did err** in teaching the above quote from the catechism?

{82} Do you agree that you will never convince the Apostolic See that you are Catholic, if you say *The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Ecumenical Council of Trent* condemn and teach the exact opposite of the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* although the same Church Fathers composed both, which thereafter were promulgated by the Apostolic See during the reign of Pope Saint Pius V?

{83} Do you agree that you will never convince the Apostolic See that you are Catholic, if you teach that the Fathers of Trent believed and taught one thing during the council, but the *exact opposite* almost immediately afterwards in the catechism they composed to teach the Catholic faith?

{84} Do you agree that Saint Thomas did convince the Apostolic See he was a Catholic while being very pertinacious, headstrong, and persistent in teaching: "*Adults have a remedy in the mere desire for Baptism*?"

{85} Do you agree that the Apostolic See was absolutely convinced that Saint Thomas was always a member of the Church since the moment he was baptized, and that therefore he did not teach any error or heresy in stating, avowing, affirming, and maintaining that: "*Adults have a remedy in the mere desire for Baptism*?"

{86} Do you agree that the Apostolic See has never for a moment considered Saint Thomas as being heretical for teaching: "Secondly, the sacrament of Baptism may be wanting to anyone in reality but not in desire: for

instance, when a man wishes to be baptized, but by some ill-chance he is forestalled by death before receiving Baptism. And such a man can obtain salvation without being actually baptized, on account of his desire for Baptism?"

{87} Do you agree that you will never convince the Apostolic See that you are Catholic if you believe it is heretical to state: "Secondly, the sacrament of Baptism may be wanting to anyone in reality but not in desire: for instance, when a man wishes to be baptized, but by some ill-chance he is forestalled by death before receiving Baptism. And such a man can obtain salvation without being actually baptized, on account of his desire for Baptism?"

{88} Do you agree that the Church did not err in teaching that the *Moral Theology* of Saint Alphonsus Maria taught the truth wherein he stated, "*Now it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire*?"

{89} Do you agree that no one would ever convince the Apostolic See at the time of Popes Gregory XVI and Pius IX that it was heretical for Saint Alphonsus Maria to teach, "*Now it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire*?"

{90} Do you agree that you will never convince the Apostolic See, and Jesus Christ on Judgment Day, that you are Catholic if you say the Church has infallibly canonized someone although he pertinaciously rejects, denies, preaches contrary to, and declares not to be true any of Her dogmas?

ONE CANNOT BE SAVED WITHOUT THE TRUE FAITH

On page 316 of his book, *Outside the Catholic Church There is Absolutely No Salvation*, Mr. Robert Dimond correctly states the truth, wherein he writes:

> "On Judgment Day, God will separate those who have preserved the true faith and the state of grace from those who have not. Those who have defiled this faith will have to line up with the reprobate… **one cannot be saved without the true faith**."

Mr. Dimond also quotes Pope Pius XII in *Ad Apostolorum Principis*:

> "No one can depart from the teaching of Catholic truth without loss of faith and salvation."

{91} Do you agree that not one person who is canonized by the Church suffered the loss of faith and salvation?

{92} Do you agree that, therefore, Saint Alphonsus Maria did not at any moment of his life *depart from the teaching of the Catholic truth*, although he resolutely, purposefully, and definitely believed in baptism of desire and baptism of blood?

{93} Do you agree that everyone who resolutely teaches and obstinately professes his beliefs to be the exact opposite of infallible pronouncements has absolutely departed from the teaching of Catholic truth?

Elsewhere, Robert Dimond quotes Saint Alphonsus Maria:

> "We must believe that the Roman Catholic Church is the only true Church; hence, they who are out of our Church, *or they who are separated from it*, cannot be saved."

{94} Do you agree that the Church has condemned as heretics Nestorius, Arius, etcetera, because they taught the opposite of the dogmas of the faith?

{95} Do you agree that, according to Robert Dimond's explanation of Pope Saint Leo the Great's definitive pronouncement, Saint Alphonsus Maria taught the opposite of what has been a Catholic dogma since at least the year 451?

{96} However, do you agree that Saint Alphonsus Maria was *not* separated from the Catholic Church for teaching: "*Now it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire*?"

{97} Therefore, do you agree that no one is separated from the Catholic Church if they believe: "*Now it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire*?"

{98} Consequently, do you agree that they ***are*** out of the Catholic Church who resolutely, decisively, and pertinaciously reject the truth that *men are also saved by Baptism of desire*, and accordingly that they cannot be saved if they persevere in that belief until death?

Every idle word that a man shall speak, they shall render an account for it in the Day of Judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned. (Matthew 12:36, 37).

{99} Do you agree that the words of Saint Bernard, Saint Thomas Aquinas, and Saint Alphonsus Maria clearly teach that it is possible to be saved by baptism of desire and baptism of blood?

{100} Do you agree that Saint Bernard, Saint Thomas, and Saint Alphonsus Maria "*preserved the true faith and the state of grace*?"

{101} Do you agree that Robert Dimond wrote the truth when he stated: "On Judgment Day, God will separate those who have *preserved the true faith and the state of grace* from those who have not?"

{102} Do you agree that Robert Dimond writes the truth in stating: "*One cannot be saved without the true faith*?"

{103} Do you agree that Saint Bernard, Saint Thomas, and Saint Alphonsus Maria were saved?

{104} Do you agree that these saints and Doctors of the Church definitely, absolutely, and positively taught the Catholic world that men are saved by baptism of desire and baptism of blood?

{105} Do you agree that they most certainly did not change their belief before their deaths?

{106} Do you agree that they lived centuries after 451 when Robert Dimond claims the Church taught *infallibly* that everyone must receive baptism of water to be saved?

{107} Do you agree that they went to heaven believing that men are saved by baptism of desire and baptism of blood, despite the fact that they did not believe the Rejecters' *so-called* infallible dogma?

{108} Do you agree that the popes who canonized them and declared them to be Doctors of the Church also knew the dogmas of the Church and when She taught infallibly?

{109} Do you agree that the popes, who infallibly canonized these saints, certainly knew that these Doctors of the Church taught that men are saved by baptism of desire and baptism of blood?

{110} Do you agree that it follows as correct logic to believe the infallible Catholic Church, therefore, certainly knew that these Doctors of the Church taught that men are saved by baptism of desire and baptism of blood?

{111} Do you agree that the Catholic Church has never erred, blundered, and made the mistake of canonizing anyone who was pertinacious in teaching the exact opposite of Her dogmas?

{112} Therefore, do you agree that the true faith is that men are saved by baptism of desire and baptism of blood?

{113} Do you agree that Robert Dimond, Bishop Webster, and the other Rejecters are the true heretics if they teach that these Doctors of the Church, who have already been in heaven for centuries, will have to *line up with the reprobate on Judgment Day*?

Oh, so you say, these Doctors of the Church will not be with the reprobate on Judgment Day! And you are quite right! Therefore, so that I will be on the right side on Judgment Day, I am going to believe what they believed when they taught that men are saved by baptism of desire and baptism of blood!

{114} Do you agree that according to correct logic one could only conclude that Mr. Robert Dimond is either a double talking, dishonest, deceitful writer who preaches double standards; or else he *correctly teaches* that you will have to line up with the reprobate on Judgment Day if you do *not* believe that men are also saved by baptism of desire and baptism of blood?

{115} Are you willing to spend eternity where Saint Bernard, Saint Thomas, and Saint Alphonsus Maria will be sent by God for eternity after the final Judgment Day?

The Eternal Truth said, "*My judgment is just*" (John 5:30). God knows everything and does not play by double standards. Why will God condemn me to hell just because I believe what the liturgy of the infallible Church and the saints in heaven teach me?

Robert Dimond said the saints are not infallible.

{116} Do you agree that neither are Robert Dimond nor the Rejecters infallible?

{117} Are you now willing to admit that Robert and Frederick Dimond and the other Rejecters *could be wrong* in the way they explain that outside of the Church, there is no salvation?

{118} Do you agree that no canonized saint could have been outside of the Church when they died?

{119} Do you agree that at the time of their deaths, the saints believed that men are saved by baptism of desire and baptism of blood?

{120} Do you agree, therefore, that one is *not* outside of the Church if they believe that men are saved by baptism of desire and baptism of blood?

{121} Knowing the *Church cannot err,* do you agree that She could never proclaim that souls are now in heaven who were pertinacious until death in believing and teaching contrary to dogmas?

{122} Do you agree that all who died teaching contrary to any infallible pronouncement cannot be in heaven unless the infallible Church does err, which would be a great blasphemy?

Recollect that Saint Francis De Sales taught us: "To say the Church errs is to say no less than that God errs, or else that He is willing and desirous for us to err; which would be a great blasphemy?" Also, remember that the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* was published by *direct command* of the Church.

{123} Do you agree that to say the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* does teach error is the same as directly insisting that the Church does err, which is to say no less than that God errs?"

{124} Do you agree that Robert and Frederick Dimond, Bishop Webster, and the other Rejecters are living by double standards, hypocrisy, and two-facedness if they condemn as heretics those who believe what the saints in heaven believed?

Canon Laws and the Sacred Liturgy

{125} Do you believe it is true that the Catholic Church can never teach heresy in Her liturgy?

{126} Do you agree that Jesus Christ could never command us to hear the Church if She teaches heresy, or contradicts Her own *ex cathedra* teachings in Her binding, promulgated canon laws and liturgy?

{127} Therefore, will you accept everything in the canon laws and liturgy of the Church to be that which the Church truly teaches?

Catholics believe Pope Benedict XV, the Vicar of Jesus Christ, promulgated the *Code of Canon Law* in the Constitution, *Providentissima*. Let us examine its opening and closing paragraphs:

> "The most provident of mothers, the Church, enriched by Her Divine Founder with all the notes befitting a perfect society, from the very beginning of Her existence, when, obeying the mandate of the Lord, She commenced to teach and govern all nations, undertook to regulate and safeguard the discipline of the clergy and the Christian people by definite laws.
>
> In process of time, however, particularly when She achieved Her freedom and grew greater and more widespread from day to day, She never ceased to develop and unfold the right of making laws, which belongs to Her by Her very constitution. She did this by promulgating numerous and various decrees emanating from the Roman Pontiffs and Ecumenical Councils, as events and times suggested. By means of these laws and precepts, She made wise provision for the government of the clergy and Christian people, and, as history bears witness, wonderfully promoted the welfare of the State and civilization...
>
> Therefore, having invoked the aid of Divine grace, and relying upon the authority of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, of Our own accord and with certain knowledge, and in the fullness of the Apostolic power with which we are invested, by this Our Constitution, which we wish to be valid for all times, We promulgate, decree, and order that the present Code, just as it is compiled, shall have from this time forth the power of law for the Universal Church, and We confide it to your custody and vigilance.
>
> But in order that all concerned may be able to have a thorough knowledge of the regulations of the Code before they begin to be binding, We ordain that they shall not come into effect until Pentecost day next year, i.e., May 19, 1918.

Notwithstanding all contrary regulations, constitutions, privileges, even those worthy of special and individual mention, and notwithstanding contrary customs, even though they be immemorial, or whatever else may run counter to this Constitution.

For no one, therefore, is it lawful willingly to contradict or rashly to disobey in any way this Our constitution, ordination, limitation, suppression or derogation. If anyone should dare to do so, let him know that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.

Given at Rome, from Saint Peter's, on the Feast of Pentecost of the year one thousand nine hundred and seventeen, the third year of Our Pontificate."

When the *Code of Canon Law* was promulgated and made effective in 1918, every true, genuine, and sincere Catholic accepted these laws as the belief, teachings, compulsory, and binding laws of God's infallible Church. Protestants, on the contrary, believe: "Canon law is not for our times. The Laws of the Catholic Church do not apply to us. It is true that some of them we will accept and observe. *Nevertheless, when the laws of the Catholic Church are not in agreement with the beliefs of our Protestant sect*, we will simply dismiss God's Laws by saying the canon laws of the infallible Church teach the opposite of the dogmas of the same Church!"

{128} Do you agree that whenever anyone teaches, preaches, and accepts this above-stated Protestant belief as if it were the truth, that he is a Protestant?

{129} Do you agree that yes, he is protesting, as only a true Protestant would, regardless of what sect he belongs to or what name he gives his religion?

A commentary on canon law, by Father Augustine, provides the English translation for Canon 1204 as follows:

"Ecclesiastical burial consists in bringing the body to the church, holding the funeral service over the same in the church, and entombing it in a place destined for the burial of departed Catholics."

Canon law, a text and commentary by Fathers Bouscaren and Ellis, provides the following information:

"Persons who die without baptism are not to be admitted to ecclesiastical burial. (Canon 1239 § 1). ***Catechumens*** *who through no fault of their own die without baptism* ***are to be considered*** *(in this connection)* ***as baptized*** (Canon 1239 § 2). All baptized persons are to receive ecclesiastical burial unless they are expressly excluded from it by law (Canon 1239 § 3)."

"Ecclesiastical burial is to be taken as defined in Canon 1204. Infants who die without baptism are not entitled to the full rights of ecclesiastical burial; but they may be buried in an unblessed portion of a cemetery (Canon 1212)."

"***Catechumens are treated as if baptized, if they remain unbaptized through no fault of their own***. This does not include infants, but refers rather to would-be converts, persons under instructions or who had indicated a positive desire to begin instruction for reception into the Church."

{130} Do you agree that: "Persons who die without baptism are not to be admitted to ecclesiastical burial (Canon 1239 § 1)?"

{131} Do you agree that Canon 1239 has to teach either the truth or heresy?

{132} Do you accept that the Catholic Church is teaching the truth in Canon 1239 § 2?

{133} Do you agree that the burial service in the Catholic cemetery is part of the liturgy of the Church?

{134} Do you agree that the laws and liturgy of the Catholic Church authorize, sanction, and permit catechumens to receive ecclesiastical burial in consecrated ground although: "Persons who die without baptism are not to be admitted to ecclesiastical burial (Canon 1239 § 1)"?

{135} Do you agree that the prayers prayed during the burial of the faithful are part of the Catholic liturgy, and that the Catholic Church teaches the true faith through her liturgy? (See *Mediator Dei*).

{136} Do you agree that the Apostolic See, through Pope Benedict XV, solemnly promulgated canon law?

{137} Do you agree that you will never convince the Apostolic See that you are a Catholic if you say the Apostolic See promulgated heresy in Canon 1239?

It should be obvious that Pope Benedict XV believed the canon laws taught the truth, when he made them binding on all Catholics. If Canon 1239 is heretical, than Pope Benedict XV is also a heretic. If indeed, Pope Benedict XV was a heretic, then he had no authority to make any of the other laws binding.

{138} Do you agree that if Canon 1239 is heretical then none of the canon laws are binding?

{139} Do you agree that if Canon 1239 is heretical in teaching us there is baptism of desire, then the *infallible* Church could not accept these laws as Her own unless you are willing *to say the Church errs which is to say no less that God errs, or else that He is willing and desirous for us to err; which would be a great blasphemy*?

{140} However, do you agree that the Catholic Church has accepted these laws and considered them as binding on the faithful for over 90 years?

If you answered no to this question please tell me which laws of the Church Catholics are bound to believe.

{141} Do you agree that they are Protestants who pick and choose which laws they will believe and obey?

{142} Do you agree that those people might be considered as insane who claim the laws of the Church teach heresy, although all Catholics are bound to accept them as the truth unless you are willing *to say the Church errs which is to say no less that God errs, or else that He is willing and desirous for us to err; which would be a great blasphemy*?

{143} Do you agree that the Church teaches Catholics through Her binding, compulsory, and enforced canon laws that men are also saved by baptism of desire?

Let us review from the book, *A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law*, by Father Stanislaus Woywod and revised by Father Callistus Smith. Volume 1, Imprimatur and Copyright 1943, pages 353 and 354:

"OF THE TIME AND PLACE OF BAPTISM

668. Infants shall be baptized as soon as possible. Pastors and preachers shall often remind the faithful of this grave obligation (Canon 770)…

The meaning of "quamprimum" (as soon as possible) cannot be determined with absolute exactness. In fact, the law did not want to specify the exact number of days, as it could easily have done, for circumstances are so varied that a narrow law in this matter is not desirable, at least as a general law. The individual bishops who know the conditions of their dioceses, the facility or the difficulty of reaching the parish church, climate, roads, etc., can make particular regulations. It is considered to be within the power of the Bishop to *demand* that the Baptism be conferred ***within eight days*** after birth, making due allowance for circumstances where that regulation would impose undue hardship. In an Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, July 31, 1902, to the missionaries among the Nestorians, it states that Baptism shall be conferred on the infants at least within eight days after birth, and if necessary, Private Baptism should be given ***rather than wait longer*** for Solemn Baptism.

669. If there is no particular law limiting the time and no special danger of death from the condition of the child or other circumstances, one may hold with Noldin and Vermeersch Creusen that one cannot delay Baptism over a month *without sinning gravely* against the law. If circumstances are such – and they certainly exist in the scattered districts of the United States – that the priest cannot be had within a month, some layperson should be asked by the parents to baptize the child, rather than delay the Baptism. The Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda approved an Instruction given to the catechists and other well-instructed Catholics to baptize any of the infants of the Christians, ***though they are in good health***, if the priest is absent or it is difficult to go to him. We saw that the Instructions to the missionaries among the Nestorians insisted that Baptism should be conferred within eight days, and that, when necessary, the *infants should be baptized privately rather than delay Baptism* and expose the infants to the danger of dying without it.

670. Private Baptism may, in case of necessity, be given at any time and in any place (Canon 771). Solemn Baptism may be given on any day. However, in accordance to the most ancient rite of the Church, *it is a* ***becoming*** *practice to baptize adults on the vigils of Easter and Pentecost*, especially in metropolitan and cathedral churches, if it can be done conveniently (Canon 772). The

proper place for the administration of Solemn Baptism is the baptistery in a church or public oratory (Canon 773).

Up to about the ninth century, Solemn Baptism in churches of the Latin Rite was given ***only*** on the vigils of Easter and Pentecost. In the Oriental Rite and in the diocese of Northern Africa, the Epiphany was added to the baptismal days. In Spain, they began to baptize also on the feasts of the Apostles and martyrs, *but the Roman Pontiffs objected to that practice*. As the number of baptisms of adults got fewer, the practice of baptizing on the **two vigils only** ceased of itself. Pope Simplicius (d. 483) is said to have appointed several priests at Rome who had to be ready any day and at any hour of the day to baptize infants. Very likely baptism of infants in danger of death is meant. When there was even a slight danger, the infants were baptized immediately at the time when Solemn Baptism *was still limited to the two days*. A certain Bishop Fidus in Africa had, in 253, contended that it was not lawful to baptize infants before the eighth day because in the Old Testament circumcision was to be given only on the eighth day after birth. Saint Cyprian writes to him: 'Nobody in our council agreed with what you thought should be done; on the contrary, we all have held that to no human being born into this life should mercy and grace be denied.'"

Catholics should know that babies are to be baptized very soon after birth. If parents put off having their children baptized longer than 30 days, the catechism and canon law books tell us they are guilty of mortal sin. Moreover, Catholics know that the *sacred liturgy* of the Catholic Church has adults wait as much as six months before they are permitted to be baptized unless there is danger of death. For over 900 years the Church taught us as part of Her sacred liturgy and Tradition that adults had to wait as much as *one year*, just so that they could be baptized during the vigils of Easter and Pentecost.

{144} Do you agree that the Church teaches us only the truth through Sacred Scripture, Her sacred liturgy, and sacred Tradition?

{145} Do you agree that the Tradition of the Church, especially during the *first nine centuries*, has been to baptize adults *only* on the vigils of Easter and Pentecost, unless there was danger of death?

{146} Do you agree that the Roman Pontiffs all agreed with Catholic doctrine when they objected to baptizing adults on days except the vigils of Easter and Pentecost, unless they were in danger of death?

{147} Do you agree that the Roman Pontiffs also teach with Saint Cyprian when he wrote: "We all have held that to no human being born into this life should mercy and grace be denied?"

{148} Do you agree that Bishop Fidus in Africa was only requiring infants to wait until the eighth *day* before they could receive baptism?

{149} Do you agree that knowing parents commit mortal sin if their infant is not baptized within one month, the Catholic Church would never *require* adults to wait eight months, or longer, if She did not teach that *their intention and determination to receive Baptism and their repentance for past sins, will avail them to grace and righteousness*?

{150} Is it against reason to think the Catholic Church requires adults, who are perfectly ready for baptism, to wait eight months to one year if She did not think they could be saved with baptism of desire?

{151} Do you agree that the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, issued by order of Pope Saint Pius V, teaches there is baptism of desire when it states: "On adults, however, the Church has not been accustomed to confer the Sacrament of Baptism at once, but has ordained that it be deferred for a certain time. *The delay is not attended with the same danger as in the case of infants*, which we have already mentioned; *should any unforeseen accident make it impossible for adults to be washed in the salutary waters, their intention and determination to receive Baptism and their repentance for past sins, will avail them to grace and righteousness*?"

{152} Do you agree therefore, that through Her liturgy (which bears witness to the faith of the Church) the Catholic Church teaches that adults can be saved with baptism of desire?

{153} Do you agree that predestination is completely, obviously, and totally irrelevant since the Church mandates immediate baptism of children who are neither more nor less subject to predestination than adults?

Surely you have heard the following: "The highest law is the salvation of souls." Look in the obituary notice section of the newspapers and you will find therein many more adults than children. Do Rejecters actually

believe that adults are in less danger of dying than babies; or that once somebody becomes an adult there is no longer a danger of death? Yet we know our Holy Mother Church, directly guided by the all-wise God, makes adults wait much longer than 30 days before She recommends that they be baptized! Remember that: "Up to about the *ninth* century, Solemn Baptism in churches of the Latin Rite was given **only** on the vigils of Easter and Pentecost. In the Oriental Rite and in the diocese of Northern Africa, the Epiphany was added to the baptismal days. In Spain, they began to baptize also on the feasts of the Apostles and martyrs, *but the Roman Pontiffs objected to that practice*."

Predestination has been connected to the Baptism-by-water-only heresy. People say things such as: "God knows everything and God controls everything. There is no such thing as an unforeseen death. There is no such thing as an accident. God can keep alive *everyone* whom He wants to be in heaven until they receive baptism with water. If God wants a catechumen to enter heaven, He will keep him alive until he is correctly baptized with water. This is why in accordance with the most ancient rite and tradition of the Church, it is a becoming practice to make *adults* wait many, many months to be baptized ***only*** on the vigils of Easter and Pentecost."

My dear friend, please pray for the grace to understand the obvious truth. Because God knows everything, and God controls everything, why do the Rejecters usually agree with the Church in teaching that infants should be baptized with water as soon as possible after birth? Do the Rejecters think that God could not keep alive *everyone* (*infants* as well as adults) whom He wants to be in heaven until they receive baptism of water?

{154} Do you agree that the infallible Church, guided by the Holy Ghost, would never make such an obvious, clear, and unmistakable distinction between infants and adults if there is no such thing as baptism of desire?

Saint Thomas teaches in Pt. III, Q. 66 Art. 10.

> "The Church is ruled by the Holy Ghost, Who does nothing inordinate."

The Holy Ghost does nothing unreasonable, irrational, or inordinate. The Church that is ruled by the Holy Ghost requires babies to be baptized very soon after birth. Yet the Church that is ruled by the Holy Ghost has adults wait for up to a year. A Rejecter wrote in her article: "If infants cannot enter into heaven without Baptism, how in the world can an adult?" Saint Thomas explained it very clearly, and the answer is that adults do not enter heaven without baptism of water or blood or desire. That is one reason why you will never find anyone in heaven who was not a Catholic who died in the state of sanctifying grace.

Is the Catholic Church Responsible for Spiritual Abortions?

{155} Do you agree that if you do not believe in baptism of desire, you must believe the Catholic Church is culpable, guilty, and responsible for thousands if not millions of spiritual abortions?

Let me explain. What is the greatest evil of abortions? Babies are not baptized, and therefore they will not enjoy the Beatific Vision. Therefore, I can say that abortions deprive souls of eternal life. During the past 2,000 years, how many catechumens do you think died before they received baptism of water? Probably thousands or maybe even millions of them! The liturgy and Tradition of the Church ***required*** them to wait until the vigils of Easter and Pentecost, but in the meantime some of them died without receiving baptism of water. It is exactly ***and only*** because of what the Catholic Church teaches about baptism of desire that thousands of catechumens died without receiving baptism of water. According to Robert Dimond, and the other Rejecters, not a single one of them will ever enjoy the Beatific Vision.

{156} Do you agree that it was *not* the fault of the catechumens or the priests who completed the catechetical instructions with them months before, that these adults were deprived of baptism of water?

{157} Do you agree that if the Rejecters are correct, the *Catholic Church* is guilty of depriving catechumens of eternal life?

{158} Do you agree that if the teachings of the Rejecters are correct, the **Catholic Church** is guilty of many spiritual abortions?

{159} Do you agree that if there is no such thing as salvation by baptism of desire, then it was the **Catholic Church** that aborted them by depriving them of baptism of water and the eternal enjoyment of the Beatific Vision?

{160} Do you agree that **the Rejecters teach a very horrifying, diabolical, and blasphemous doctrine**? What answer will the Rejecters make to Jesus Christ on Judgment Day when asked, "Why did you accuse My Church of committing abortions?" "Why did you accuse Me of not having Mercy?" "Why did you accuse Me of teaching something that is unwise and not true?" "Why did you refuse to believe that I am the One who commanded that everyone must hear and obey My Church which *can never err*, because it is without spot or wrinkle and ruled by the Holy Ghost who does *nothing* unreasonable, irrational, or inordinate?" "How dare you accuse My Church of not doing everything in Her power to *save* souls?"

The Holy Gospel of Saint John 3:5; 6:54; and 6:52

At this time I will provide information from an article sent to me by a Rejecter entitled, *ONE BAPTISM*:

> "Our Lord spoke clearly and simply: 'Amen, amen I say to thee, unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' (John 3:5). And, He also said to the apostles: 'Going therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' He also said: 'Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.' (Matthew 28:20).
>
> Here He is *commanding* the apostles to baptize the faithful, simply because He tells them that a man cannot enter the kingdom of heaven without it (baptism of water). How much clearer can Our Lord get? He *always* speaks in SIMPLE terms to the faithful! No one should ever change, add to, dilute, extrapolate on what the God-Man says!
>
> If He said that man must be born of water and the Holy Ghost (to gain eternal life), how can anyone mince those definitive words and not take them literally? Again, this is the God-Man speaking! If a mere man comes along and changes the God-Man's words, who do you want to believe? This means any man, be he bishop, cardinal, theologian, or saint! I want to believe My Lord and Savior, who will not, cannot, and shall not deceive! … I want to believe the Holy Ghost, not mere man!"

I therefore reply to the Rejecter: "Wait, my friend, that is not what the Fathers of Trent teach us. That is not what Saint Thomas teaches in the *Summa*! That is not what Saint Alphonsus Maria teaches in his *Moral Theology*! That is not what I find in the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*! That is not what Saint Augustine and Saint Jerome teach. That is not what the Eternal Father told Saint Catherine of Siena. That is not what the liturgy of the Catholic Church teaches. That is not what I read in the Council of Trent. That is not how any of them explained and understood John 3:5."

Saint Thomas tells us in Q. 94 of the S*upplement* under the first article:

> "*I answer that*, now everything is known the more for being compared with its contrary, because when contraries are placed beside one another they become more conspicuous."

Let us place three Scripture verses (John 3:5, John 6:54, and John 6:52) one beside another and apply the same basic statements and questions to each one of them. The person who wrote the *ONE BAPTISM* article, inserted above, has already supplied some questions and statements for John 3:5. I will now provide my own interpretation of how the Rejecter explains John 6:54 and John 6:52:

> "'*Amen, amen, I say unto you: Except you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, you shall not have life in you*.' (John 6:54). Jesus Christ here spoke with a sort of oath by saying Amen, amen. If Jesus Christ was not speaking literally when He spoke this verse (John 6:54), then when did Jesus Christ speak literally? Patrick, don't you think that Jesus Christ actually said what He meant and meant what He said? How much clearer can Our Lord get? Are not His words very

clear: '*Except you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, you shall not have life in you*?' No one should ever change, add to, dilute, or extrapolate on what the God-Man says! If He said that men must eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood (to have life in them), how can anyone mince those definitive words and not take them literally? Again, this is the God-Man speaking! If a mere man comes along and changes the God-Man's words, who do you want to believe? This means any man, be he bishop, cardinal, theologian, or saint! I want to believe My Lord and Savior, who will not, cannot, and shall not deceive! I want to believe the Holy Ghost, not mere man! Jesus Christ is speaking, and He tells us in no uncertain terms that no one can possibly have sanctifying grace in them before they receive Holy Communion. A baby that was properly baptized the same day it was born cannot possibly have life in it before it eats the Flesh of the Son of Man and drinks His Blood, which will be another seven years or more!"

Then I say to the Rejecter: "Wait, my friend, that is not what the Fathers of Trent teach us. That is not what Saint Thomas teaches in the *Summa*! That is not what Saint Alphonsus Maria teaches in his *Moral Theology*! That is not what I find in the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*! That is not what Saint Augustine and Saint Jerome teach. That is not what the Eternal Father told Saint Catherine of Siena. That is not what the liturgy of the Catholic Church teaches. That is not what I read in the Council of Trent. They all teach me that babies do have life in them. That is, *both* natural life and the life of sanctifying grace as soon as they are baptized."

What reply do I receive from the Rejecter?

"Patrick, let me repeat: don't you think that Jesus Christ actually said what He meant and meant what He said? How much clearer can Our Lord get? Are His words not clear to you? If He said that men must eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood (to have life in them), how can anyone mince those definitive words and not take them literally? No one will convince me, (This means any man, be he bishop, cardinal, theologian, or saint) that you can have life in you, *Except you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood*. My belief is guaranteed by the Holy Ghost to be true. That tells us that you cannot interpret these words according to your own meaning! These words of Our Lord must be taken literally! Neither the Saints nor Doctors of the Church nor the liturgy of the infallible Church will convince me that the words of Jesus Christ should not be accepted literally. Therefore, we must all believe it to be a dogma of the Church that no one has ever gone to heaven who did not *eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood*! Our Lord said, '*Amen, amen, I say unto you: Except you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, you shall not have life in you.*' And that's good enough for me!"

The Rejecter continues expounding the meaning of Scripture while teaching:

"If any man eat of this Bread, he shall live forever: and the Bread that I will give, is My Flesh for the life of the world." (John 6:52).

Do the Rejecters actually think that if any man received Holy Communion just once, he shall live forever, although he committed a multitude of mortal sins after that time, never repented of them, and ended his life by means of suicide? Of course, they must believe that if they are consistent in their thinking and **teaching**! Have you already forgotten what Rejecters tell us?

"If Jesus Christ was not speaking literally when He spoke this verse (John 6:52), then when did Jesus Christ speak literally? Did Jesus Christ actually say what He meant and mean what He said? How much clearer can Our Lord get? Are not his words very clear: 'If any man eat of this Bread, he shall live forever.' If anyone receives Holy Communion just once, we know he will live forever. This is true even if he commits a multitude of mortal sins and never repents, and ends his life by committing suicide. Jesus Christ said it, so we know it is true, and that's good enough for me!"

Again, I say to the Rejecter: "Wait, my friend, that is not what the Fathers of Trent teach us. That is not what Saint Thomas teaches in the *Summa*! That is not what Saint Alphonsus Maria Liguori teaches in his *Moral Theology*! That is not what I find in the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*! That is not what Saint Augustine and Saint Jerome teach. That is not what the Eternal Father told Saint Catherine of Siena. That is not what the liturgy of the Catholic Church teaches. That is not what I read in the Council of Trent. These sources clearly teach me that those in the state of mortal sin do not live forever. Suicide is pretty much a sure ticket to hell. The liturgy of the Catholic Church does not permit those who commit suicide to have a Catholic burial."

What reply do I receive from the Rejecter?

> "Patrick, don't you think that Jesus Christ actually said what He meant and meant what He said? How much clearer can Our Lord get? Are His words not clear to you? If He said: '*If any man eat of this Bread, he shall live forever,*' how can anyone mince those definitive words and not take them literally? Nothing will convince me that anyone who receives Holy Communion will not be in heaven forever, even if they committed suicide to end their life. Neither the Saints nor Doctors of the Church nor the liturgy of the infallible Church will convince me that the words of Jesus Christ should not be accepted literally! Our Lord said, '*If any man eat of this Bread, he shall live forever* …' And that's good enough for me!"

Recall the words of Saint Thomas: "I answer that, now everything is known the more for being compared with its contrary, because when contraries are placed beside one another they become more conspicuous." I pray that the truth has now become more conspicuous. I simply placed three verses of Scripture, one beside another, and applied basically the same questions and statements. If you insist on applying your questions and statements to John 3:5, then I think you should accept the theological conclusions (which I have put into your mouth, so to speak) when they are applied to John 6:54 and John 6:52.

{161} Do you agree that it has become conspicuous that the Rejecters only want us to pick *one* verse out of the three to be interpreted literally?

Comment: The Holy Catholic Church ALONE has the authority to define officially what is meant by Christ's words. She does so in the course of infallible pronouncements, the pontifical teachings of Her General Councils, and decrees of the Holy Office and Sacred Congregations. If we wrest passages of Holy Scripture from this context and assign to them our own fallible meaning, we are no better than Protestants, for we resort to *private interpretation* while rejecting the Supreme Authority of the Church! This rejection of the Church's teaching authority is the very source of the heresy Father Leonard Feeney and the other Rejecters hold by denying baptism of blood and desire.

{162} Do the Rejecters think Saint Charles Borromeo, Pope Saint Pius V, and those who put together the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* did not know that Jesus said: "*Amen, amen, I say to thee, except a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*," or that they were unable to understand its meaning?

{163} Does not this catechism quote John 3:5 and then go on to teach that there is baptism of desire?

{164} Do the Rejecters think Saint Thomas Aquinas never read John 3:5, or presume that when he did read it, this exceptionally well-learned Doctor of the Church was so super stupid, hopelessly unintelligent, excessively dimwitted, extremely dull, completely brainless, and so utterly dense that he was totally unable to understand its meaning?

I suggest that it might do Rejecters much good to review the *Summa* Pt. III, Q. 68 Art. 1. Therein, Saint Thomas answers the question: "Whether All Are Bound to Receive Baptism?" After presenting the objections, he writes the section: *On the contrary*. He begins by quoting this verse of Scripture from John 3:5. He goes on to tell us what the Church teaches. He concludes by saying:

> "Consequently, it is manifest that all are bound to be baptized: and that without Baptism there is no salvation for men."

This conclusion of Saint Thomas is exactly what I believe concerning the necessity of baptism. Then Saint Thomas quotes John 3:5 again when he explains about baptism of desire (under article 2 – which I have inserted above). I also believe the rest of the things Saint Thomas wrote in the *Summa* concerning baptism.

The infallible Church, which is ruled by the Holy Ghost, has convinced me of the following facts:

FIRST FACT: The Catholic Church knew what Saint Thomas and Saint Alphonsus Maria taught concerning baptism *before* She canonized them through Her liturgy.

SECOND FACT: Therefore, each of their teachings concerning baptism is not contrary to any part of the liturgy or the faith of the Catholic Church because the Church does not allow the canonization of heretics.

THIRD FACT: Therefore, I should also believe in baptism of water, blood, and desire as taught by Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Alphonsus Maria if I also want to spend eternity in heaven.

The Dialogue of Saint Catherine of Siena clearly reminds us that the Rejecters' theology is the exact opposite of Almighty God's. Here God is talking and explains that souls can be saved by means of baptism of desire and of blood without having received baptism with water. But I realize that the Rejecters do not believe what God, the Eternal Truth, said because, according to them, it is contrary to their own interpretation of salvation.

{165} Do you agree that the Rejecters believe God teaches by the year 451, through Pope Saint Leo the Great's definitive pronouncement, that there is no such thing as baptism of blood and baptism of desire as was later explained by Saint Thomas, Saint Catherine of Siena, and Saint Alphonsus Maria?

Which side did the Catholic Church declare was correct: (1) the belief of the Rejecters or (2) what the Eternal Father told Saint Catherine?

{166} Do you agree that the infallible Church declared that this mystical saint with the stigmata, who lived for long intervals on practically no food save the Blessed Sacrament, told us the truth in her Dialogue and that therefore the Rejecters' belief is a lie?

{167} Do you agree that when two beliefs are contrary, only one can be true?

{168} Will you believe what the Catholic Church declared as opposed to what the Rejecters teach?

{169} Do you agree that the Rejecters' interpretation of John 3:5 is the *opposite* of what is found in the words and works of: 1) the Eternal Father teaching Saint Catherine of Siena, 2) Saint Thomas, 3) Saint Alphonsus Maria, 4) the liturgy of the Catholic Church, 5) the Fathers of Trent, 6) the Council of Trent, and 8) the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*?

{170} Do you agree that the Supreme Authority of the Church has given approval of what is written concerning baptism by: 1) the Eternal Father teaching Saint Catherine of Siena, 2) Saint Thomas, 3) Saint Alphonsus Maria, 4) the liturgy of the Catholic Church, 5) the Fathers of Trent, 6) the Council of Trent, and 8) the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*?

{171} Do you agree that, therefore, the Rejecters' interpretation of John 3:5 is the opposite of Holy Mother Church's *authoritative, faithful, and authentic* teaching?

You want me to read Robert Dimond's book to find out the truth about baptism. Now I would like to ask you to read some books to find out the truth about baptism. Only instead of recommending that you read a book authored by pseudo-religious people who are not recognized by the Church, I will ask you to read *The Catholic Dogma* by Father Michael Müller. You can find it at: http://www.jmjsite.com/r/catholicdogma.pdf. Father has the correct teaching and understanding of the important dogma *outside the Church; there is no salvation*. Father explains how this is in complete conformity with baptism of desire and baptism of blood.

The books by Father Michael Müller, The Dialogue of Saint Catherine of Siena, the Summa of Saint Thomas, the Moral Theology of Saint Alphonsus Maria Liguori, the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, the Catechism of the Council of Trent, The Liturgical Year by Abbot Gueranger, and the Roman Breviary have certainly been approved by the Catholic Church for every one of Her children to read. These books teach the opposite of Father Leonard Feeney, Robert and Frederick Dimond, and the other Rejecters whose books and articles have NEVER been approved by the Catholic Church.

I am going to believe what the books approved by the Church teach, and pray that you will do likewise. There is a great misunderstanding about baptism of desire and no salvation outside of the Church. Although the Rejecters do not agree with Pope Gregory XVI and Pope Eugene IV, I do agree with Pope Gregory XVI and Pope Eugene IV that absolutely no one goes to heaven outside of the Catholic Church. Although the Rejecters

do not believe it, I do believe that no one who persistently, obstinately, and constantly teaches contrary to the dogmas of the Church until death can be saved. Neither Protestants, Jews, Muslims, Rejecters, nor the man in the deepest jungle can be saved outside of the Catholic Church. Invincible ignorance will neither save one nor damn one. I believe what Saint Thomas and Saint Alphonsus Maria explained about baptism of desire and baptism of blood, although Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre and other Traditional Movement clerics do not agree with these two Doctors of the Church.

Let me ask you some more questions.

{172} Have you ever been somewhat amazed at the amount of knowledge that Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Alphonsus Maria Liguori had?

{173} Do you agree that there is not a single pope, Doctor of the Church, Council of the Church, saint, or verse from Sacred Scripture in Robert Dimond's book, which existed prior to Saint Thomas and Saint Alphonsus Maria, that these two Doctors of the Church failed to quote sometime or other in their own books?

{174} Do you agree that these two great Doctors of the Church had all the important facts that Robert and Frederick Dimond, Bishop Webster, and *all* of the other Rejecters have?

{175} Do you agree that if everything these two saints and Doctors wrote concerning baptism was good enough for the infallible Church that it is good enough for every Catholic?

{176} Will you therefore conclude that these two Doctors of the Church figured things out correctly concerning baptism of water, blood, and desire?

{177} Do you agree that it was the Apostolic See that declared the writings of Saint Alphonsus Maria to be *free from error*?

{178} Do you agree that everyone should believe the Apostolic See and not the Rejecters who teach the opposite of the Apostolic See?

Therefore, what answer would the Apostolic See and every child of the Church give to the question: Do the Rejecters hold the correct, precise, and exact Catholic faith, or did Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Alphonsus Maria hold the correct, precise, and exact Catholic faith? Jesus Christ told us through Pope Pius IX that: "For any man to be able to prove his Catholic faith and affirm that he is truly a Catholic, he must be able to convince the Apostolic See of this."

If you think the excommunicated Father Leonard Feeney and Robert Dimond are the kind of "saints" you want to follow, then our discussion about baptism might just as well come to an end. As for me, I pray that my beliefs will always be the same as the saints who are now enjoying the Beatific Vision.

Saint Thomas gives a warning to all who resist the truth. He writes in the *Summa*, Pt. II-II Q. 11 Art. 2:

> "On the contrary, Augustine says against the Manichees: In Christ's Church, those are heretics, who hold mischievous and erroneous opinions, and when rebuked that they may think soundly and rightly, offer a stubborn resistance, and, refusing to mend their pertinacious and deadly doctrines, persist in defending them. Now pertinacious and deadly doctrines are none but those which are contrary to the dogmas of faith, whereby the just man liveth (Rom. i. 17)."

I will now review and sum up part of what I have attempted to explain within this letter and leave you to ponder these closing reflections:

Mr. Robert Dimond correctly stated:

> "On Judgment Day, God will separate those who have preserved the true faith and the state of grace from those who have not. Those who have defiled this faith will have to line up with the reprobate… **one cannot be saved without the true faith**."

Mr. Dimond also quotes Pope Pius XII in *Ad Apostolorum Principis*:

> "No one can depart from the teaching of Catholic truth without loss of faith and salvation."

Elsewhere, Robert Dimond quotes Saint Alphonsus Maria as Doctor of the Church:

> "We must believe that the Roman Catholic Church is the only true Church; hence, they who are out of our Church, *or they who are separated from it*, cannot be saved."

We can be sure that what is in the Divine Office is true since it is part of the liturgy of the infallible Church. Here are *some* of the things the Divine Office tells us about Saint Alphonsus Maria Liguori:

> "He had the greatest devotion to the Mother of God, and published a book on Her glories, and while he was discoursing upon them with great earnestness in preaching, more than once there appeared a marvelous light, projected on him from the statue of the Virgin, and in the presence of all the people he was rapt in ecstasy, with his countenance all aglow…
>
> He joined a wonderful innocence of life, *which he had never soiled with the state of mortal sin*, with an equally wonderful spirit of penance, and chastised his body by fasting, by light chains of iron, hair shirts, and scourging even to blood. At the same time he was remarkable for the gifts of prophecy, reading of hearts, bilocation, and miracles…
>
> On August 1, in the year 1787 … he died in the greatest peace. Thereafter, as he was illustrious for his virtues and his *miracles*, the Supreme Pontiff Pius VII added him to the calendar of the Blessed in the year 1816; and as his memory shone with further signs and wonders, Gregory XVI, on the feast of the most holy Trinity, in the year 1839, with solemn rites, added him to the list of the Saints. And finally, the Supreme Pontiff Pius IX, after consulting the Congregation of Sacred Rites, declared him to be a Doctor of the Universal Church."

Recall the quote that was given toward the beginning of this letter:

> "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*.

It would be formal heresy for anyone to teach: "Now it is de fide that Jesus Christ was human but not God." No one who pertinaciously taught formal heresy until their death could ever be canonized.

{179} Do you agree that the Catholic Church *could **not*** have canonized Saint Alphonsus Maria if he actually and pertinaciously taught heresy?

(m) Saint Alphonsus Maria was not separated from that Church, which clearly tells us in Her sacred liturgy that his soul was *never* soiled with the state of mortal sin, let alone him becoming a heretic or ever teaching contrary to any dogma of the Church. We are absolutely assured by the infallible Church that he preserved the true faith and the state of sanctifying grace, although he obstinately, tenaciously, determinedly, persistently, and pertinaciously defended his statement until death that: "*Now it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire*." That statement is either true or false, and therefore either correctly states a dogma or else Saint Alphonsus Maria was a formal heretic for denying an infallible pronouncement of the Church. Saint Alphonsus Maria either absolutely spoke the truth with the statement, "*Now it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire*," or else he absolutely totally rejected the Catholic faith. "*Either the Catholic faith is held in its entirety, or rejected totally*!"

(n) It is totally against reason that a heretic who obstinately and pertinaciously teaches contrary to a dogma of the Church should be found in the presence of all the people rapt in ecstasy, with remarkable gifts of prophecy, reading of hearts, bilocation, and miracles.

(o) If Saint Alphonsus Maria's statement is correct, then the Rejecters *reject a dogma* of the Church.

(p) If the Rejecters believe one can remain in the unity and bosom of the Church, who obstinately, tenaciously, determinedly, persistently, and pertinaciously believes, teaches, maintains, defends, and insists until death that his statement is de fide – although it is in direct opposition to an infallible pronouncement – then the Rejecters *reject a dogma* of the Catholic Church.

(q) If the Rejecters believe Saint Alphonsus Maria's statement is heresy, then the Rejecters *reject a dogma* that the Catholic Church teaches the true faith through Her sacred liturgy.

(r) If the Rejecters believe Saint Alphonsus Maria's statement is heresy and yet he remained in the Catholic Church, then the Rejecters *reject the dogma* that heretics are not members of the Catholic Church.

(s) If the Rejecters believe Saint Alphonsus Maria's statement is heretical, then the Rejecters *reject the dogma* that there is no salvation for those who are heretics and outside of the Church.
(t) Rejecters therefore *reject the dogma* that there is no salvation outside of the Church.
(u) Rejecters also *reject the dogma* that the Church is infallible and cannot err.
(v) Rejecters also *reject the dogma* that the Catholic Church always knows when She speaks infallibly.
(w) All who reject any dogma of the Catholic Church will not be saved.
(x) Because eternity in heaven or hell is at stake, the only logical thing to do is reject the Rejecters' heresy and believe: "*Now it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire*."

Saint Thomas lists the six sins against the Holy Ghost in the *Summa*, Pt. II-II Q. 14 Art. 2 as: despair, presumption, impenitence, obstinacy, *resisting the known truth*, and envy of our brother's spiritual good. He continues in the Third Article to explain whether the sin against the Holy Ghost can be forgiven. In doing so he quotes (Matthew xii. 32): *He that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come*: and Augustine says that *so great is the downfall of this sin that it cannot submit to the humiliation of asking for pardon*.

{180} Do you agree that those people are headed toward eternal damnation who sin against the Holy Ghost in *resisting the known truth*, while pertinaciously believing that Father Leonard Feeney, Robert and Frederick Dimond, Bishop Webster, and the other Rejecters are correct and that the Catholic Church was wrong when She accepted the statements of Saint Alphonsus Maria and the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* as true and free from all error?

Mr. Ellwanger, your e-mail said that you have Robert Dimond's book on your Website. Are you willing to publish this letter with your answers to *all* of the questions between the brackets on the same Website?

Remember, my answers to every one of the questions between these types of brackets {} are: "y*es*." I ask everyone who reads this letter to please be kind enough to send me your answers to *every* one of my questions between the brackets. If any of your answers are "*no*," please be kind enough to explain why. Thank you.

How many of the Rejecters will imitate the members of the Traditional Movement when I asked them, and especially the clerics, to answer the questions in *My Petition for Spiritual Help*? A few priests wrote and said they would not answer the questions. Aside from that, not even one priest and only two bishops made any attempt at an answer. Neither of those bishops answered my questions. You can read *My Petition for Spiritual Help* and the letter from Bishop Giles, and my reply to him at www.JMJsite.com. Bishop Pivarunas has never contacted me or sent me a copy of his letter, although his comments were uploaded to the CMRI Website.

Did anyone conclude that the Traditional Movement clerics are so ashamed of their defense of the Traditional Movement that they did not want me or others to know their answers to the questions in *My Petition for Spiritual Help*? Now we will find out if the Rejecters are so ashamed of their beliefs in this heresy that they do not want others to know their answers to ***all*** of the questions in this letter.

A number of people have contacted me and asked me to express what I believe about the baptism issue. Rather than reply to everyone individually, please let this letter suffice as an answer to all.

There is much more that might be said, and someday I might share other thoughts with you. If you decide to share this correspondence with others, and they, in turn, want to correspond with me concerning what is in this letter, they also need to *first* send me their answers to my questions.

I now repeat what I said toward the beginning: "When you have finished answering my questions, you will no longer believe the Rejecters' heresy, or else you will never be able to affirm that you are truly a Catholic and at the same time *be able to convince the Apostolic See of this*." Therefore, if you think you are able to do *both* please show me how it can be done. Consequently, I will be waiting to see how many Rejecters have the charity, kindness, and courage to come forth with their answers to the 180 questions.

This letter is under my copyright laws. That is to say, copy it *right*. Send copies via e-mail or US mail to everyone you can. It can be found at www.JMJsite.com, and now please put a copy of it on other Blogs, Forums, and Websites. Be God's instrument in letting every Rejecter *come to the knowledge of the truth* (1 Timothy 2:4) and not sin against the Holy Ghost by *rejecting the known truth* of the Holy Catholic faith.

I pray that the Blessed Virgin Mary will intercede with the good God to grant all of us the crosses, contradictions, sufferings, joys, graces, and blessings we need in this life, so that we will live in such a way to be with Jesus, Mary, and Saint Joseph for eternity.

In Jesus, Mary, and Joseph,

Patrick Henry
JMJ@JMJsite.com
www.JMJsite.com