

Serious Reflections Well Worth Considering - #3

{1} Do you agree that anti-Pope John Paul II belonged to a non-Catholic sect on May 7, 1981 – and consequently, he was no longer a member of the Catholic Church?

{2} Do you agree that Joseph Ratzinger (later known as Pope Benedict XVI) belonged to a non-Catholic sect on May 7, 1981, and consequently, he was no longer a member of the Catholic Church?

{3} Do you agree that Bishop Gilles-Henri-Alexis Barthe, the Novus Ordo Bishop of Toulon, France, in 1981, belonged to a non-Catholic sect on May 7, 1981, and consequently, he was no longer a member of the Catholic Church?

Most Rev. Sylvester William Treinen, D.D., was appointed Bishop of the diocese of Boise, Idaho, on May 19, 1962, and retired August 17, 1988. Bishop Sylvester William Treinen did the same thing as Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre; he signed the heretical decrees of Vatican II and was a member of the non-Catholic Novus Ordo sect in 1981.

{4} Do you agree that Bishop Sylvester William Treinen belonged to a non-Catholic sect on May 7, 1981, and consequently, he was no longer a member of the Catholic Church?

Bishop Lawrence Harold Welsh served as the Novus Ordo bishop of Spokane, Washington, from November 6, 1978, until he retired in April 1990. Bishop Lawrence Harold Welsh did the same thing as Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre; he was a member of the non-Catholic Novus Ordo sect in 1981.

{5} Do you agree that Bishop Lawrence Harold Welsh belonged to a non-Catholic sect on May 7, 1981, and consequently, he was no longer a member of the Catholic Church?

{6} Do you agree that Bishop Thuc belonged to a non-Catholic sect on April 15, 1981, (only 22 days *before* he consecrated Guérard des Lauriers on May 7, 1981) when he concelebrated a Novus Ordo “mass” on Holy Thursday with Bishop Gilles-Henri-Alexis Barthe, the Conciliar Novus Ordo Bishop of Toulon, France?

{7} Do you agree that Bishop Thuc belonged to a non-Catholic sect at the time he consecrated Guérard des Lauriers on May 7, 1981, and Bishop Carmona on October 17, 1981 – and consequently, he was no longer a member of the Catholic Church at the time those consecrations took place?

{8} Do you agree that the Vatican II, Novus Ordo sect, is a non-Catholic religion?

{9} Do you agree that no one can belong to a non-Catholic religion and to the Catholic religion at the same time?

{10} Do you agree that if any Catholic joins a non-Catholic religion, he must formally make an adjuration of error and profession of faith to someone who has authority and jurisdiction, before he can be formally received back into the Catholic Church?

Now, it is a fact of Church history that Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre signed the heretical decrees of Vatican Council II. They were just as much members of this Vatican II sect as were anti-Pope John Paul II, Joseph Ratzinger, Bishop Gilles-Henri-Alexis Barthe, Bishop Sylvester William Treinen, Bishop Lawrence Harold Welsh, and the hundreds of thousands of other Novus Ordo clerics and laity.

It is also a fact of Church history that Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre never again became members of the Catholic Church in the external forum any more than did anti-Pope John Paul II, Joseph Ratzinger, Bishop Gilles-Henri-Alexis Barthe, Bishop Sylvester William Treinen, Bishop Lawrence Harold Welsh, and the hundreds of thousands of other Novus Ordo clerics and laity!

{11} Do you agree that it is just super deceptive and a gigantic illusion for the Traditionalist Movement clerics and members to believe and teach that Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre always remained members of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Roman Church?

The traditionalist movement clerics present strong evidence that Bishop Thuc was NOT an ignorant man; nor was he senile at the time he signed the documents of Vatican II.

The traditionalist movement clerics also present strong evidence that the only thing that can excuse the Vatican II clerics who signed the heretical documents of Vatican II (including Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre) from being formal heretics is IGNORANCE!

I will now insert a section from the *Combined Response* article. You can read the entire article at: <https://jmjsite.com/f/cr.pdf>. The following section starts on page 98.

Let us continue with the transcript of what Bishop Sanborn said:

Now that said; what are some objections to Sedevacantism? The first is; we cannot judge the Pope! This is a classic case of what is known as begging the question. The question is: "Is this man the Pope or not?" So, you cannot come in with the argument; "well we can't judge the pope." Because that's what we're trying to ask; "whether he is the Pope or not." So that's known as begging the question, so then we just set that aside. Another objection is that the Pope is only a material heretic. First of all, I would respond that we're not really talking about his personal heresies here. We are talking about Vatican II and its reforms. The personal heresies of each of these men, and they exist, also argue to there being not popes. But that is not the principal argument of Sedevacantism; that he said this, he said that, or he did this. It all goes back to Vatican II. What is Vatican II? What are its reforms? That is the first thing I would answer. The second thing is that **the only way in which you can pronounce a heresy and not be guilty; that is, not be a formal heretic, IS BY IGNORANCE**. So, if a farmer who can't read or write says there are four persons in the Trinity. Anybody in his right mind would say: "Well he doesn't know, he has never been instructed, the poor man just doesn't know, he's a material heretic. That does not corrupt the virtue of faith, if through ignorance you do not know. Are we going to say for one moment that a person like Ratzinger is ignorant; that he doesn't know Catholic doctrine; that he was born in the 1920s; raised as a Catholic? Or Bergoglio, born in the 1930s, raised as a Catholic in a very pious Italian family, that he doesn't know Catholic doctrine? He said for example: I do not believe, (this is a quotation) "I do not believe in a Catholic God, there is no Catholic God!" That is a quotation from Bergoglio, in that interview with that atheist. A quotation: "There is no Catholic God!" Can you say that? Can anyone say that without destroying the virtue of faith in them? That means the object of the Creed of the Catholic Church that we recite, the Nicene Creed, the Apostles Creed, the Athanasian Creed, all of the Creeds of the Catholic Church. That what is described as the true God doesn't exist! **So, the argument that he is only a material heretic is, I would respond, absurd! Because it is absurd to say that someone like Ratzinger, or Wojtyla, or Bergoglio does not know the Catholic faith! That is absurd!**

{12} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn is explaining clearly enough that we are not talking ONLY about the personal heresies of the Vatican II popes, but rather, the main issue is: "We are talking about Vatican II and its reforms"?

{13} Do you agree that because it all goes back to Vatican II and whether Vatican II made substantial changes in the Faith of the Catholic Church; that we can make our judgments of whether or not the bishops were formal heretics who were responsible for composing, discussing, debating, and signing the documents and decrees of Vatican Council II in order to bring about the new religion?

{14} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn teaches: "that the only way in which you can pronounce a heresy and not be guilty; that is not be a formal heretic IS BY IGNORANCE"?

{15} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn is basically saying it is ABSURD to believe or to say for one moment that a person like Ratzinger is ignorant; that he doesn't know the Catholic doctrine?

Bishop Sanborn certainly wants everyone to believe with him that: "the argument that he (Bergoglio) is only a material heretic is, I would respond, absurd! Because it is absurd to say that someone like Ratzinger, or Wojtyla, or Bergoglio does not know the Catholic faith! That is absurd!"

Here <https://jmjsite.com/speechofbpmusey4-22-85.pdf>, you can read that April 22, 1985, Bishop George Musey reminded the CMRI Community how well educated and informed Bishop Thuc was:

"The fact was, though, that criticized him as they may, Archbishop Lefebvre asked Archbishop Thuc to head up the seminary for him; because the Archbishop, of course, had had

previous background in Vietnam of universities and seminary work ...Archbishop Ngo-diem-Thuc had three doctorates. He was a Doctor of Canon Law, a Doctor of Philosophy, and a Doctor of Theology.”

Bishop Pivarunas wrote the following when commenting on *My Petition for Spiritual Help*:

As for the false accusation that Archbishop Thuc was senile, there are many witnesses who have verified that before, at the time of, and after the 1981 consecrations the Archbishop was completely lucid, attentive, rational, offered public Masses, and met with numerous people, etc. A number of these witnesses were traditional priests who, under oath, with God as their witness, verified that the Archbishop was certainly rational.

{16} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn, Bishop Pivarunas, Rev. Anthony Cekada, and a number of other traditional clergy teach that Bergoglio has never been consecrated a bishop or even ordained to the priesthood?

{17} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn, Bishop Pivarunas, Rev. Anthony Cekada, and a number of other traditional clergy teach that the layman Bergoglio (who is oftentimes referred to as Pope Francis) with his cornucopia, excessive, and abundant statements contrary to Catholic doctrine cannot be accused of ignorance of the Catholic faith without absurdity?

{18} Do you agree that it follows therefore to be contrary to reason to think that a well-educated Bishop and seminary professor with three doctorates who was born October 6, 1897 could be accused of ignorance of the teachings of the Catholic Church; and therefore, not know that the documents of Vatican II are contrary to the doctrines of the Catholic Church?

{19} Do you agree with St. Thomas Aquinas that whatever is contrary to reason is a sin?

Remember that Bishop Sanborn spoke the truth when he said: “Because the Society of Saint Pius X's position is impossible, it cannot be pleasing to God! Something cannot be pleasing to God if it is against reason! Reason is our connection to morality! Whatever is moral is connected to God's will by reason. If it is unreasonable, it cannot possibly be in accordance with God's will! All moral theology is based on that; the connection of what you do to right reason based on the authority; on principles that are revealed by God, – the Ten Commandments.”

{20} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn, Bishop Pivarunas, Bishop George Musey, Rev. Anthony Cekada, and everyone else should agree that according to the Sedevacantist clergy; they should unreservedly and absolutely pronounce that it is absurd to say someone like Bishop Thuc did not know the Catholic faith and could be excused for being ignorant on matters concerning the Catholic faith?

{21} Do you agree that Bishop Pivarunas and traditional priests who, under oath, with God as their witness, verified that the Archbishop was certainly completely lucid, attentive, and rational can never reasonably conclude that Bishop Thuc was senile, or ignorant of what the Catholic Church teaches, and did not know there were heresies in the documents of Vatican II that he willfully, deliberately, and consciously promulgated to the Universal Church; and was therefore formally guilty of public heresy when he signed the heretical decrees of Vatican Council II?

{22} Do you agree that it follows with correct logic that it is unreasonable, and cannot possibly be in accordance with God's will to make excuses for Bishop Thuc to come up with the unreasonable conclusion that he is not guilty of formal and public heresy, with no pertinacity involved, for promulgating the documents of Vatican II?

{23} Do you agree that Bishop Sanborn, Bishop Pivarunas, Rev. Anthony Cekada, and the other Sedevacantist clergy teach, preach, and proclaim that the reason they have a worldwide apostolate going against the Novus Ordo hierarchy and the Vatican II Church is because the Vatican II documents clearly pronounce heresies; and therefore, that the Vatican II Church is intrinsically evil and that one cannot save his soul in it?

{24} Do you agree that according to the Sedevacantist clergy, everyone should express that it is absurd to deny, disagree, or contradict the truth that the Vatican II documents clearly state and declare heresies?

{25} Do you agree that the main issue is: “We are talking about Vatican II and its reforms.” “It all goes back to Vatican II and the Vatican II documents that clearly state and declare heresies; and whether Vatican II made substantial changes in the Faith of the Catholic Church”?

{26} Do you agree that if we can determine that Vatican II made substantial changes in the Faith of the Catholic Church, then we can make our judgments about whether or not those who signed the heretical documents of Vatican II were formal heretics?

{27} Do you agree that Vatican II did not just come from no place, and with nobody knowing anything about it until after it came into existence, and that somebody was responsible for bringing this new religion into existence?

{28} Do you agree that all the documents and decrees of Vatican II were well discussed, debated, considered, and reviewed before any bishop or cardinal signed them?

Read again from the article on the CMRI website talking about their position and beliefs:

V. MODERN HIERARCHY OF THE VATICAN II CHURCH: In the light of the above, it must be concluded that the modern hierarchy who have approved and implemented the errors of Vatican II no longer represent the Catholic Church and her lawful authority.

{29} Do you agree that the real people actually responsible for beginning this new religion that has brought about substantial changes in the Church were those who signed the documents and decrees of Vatican Council II?

{30} Do you agree that without the signatures of Paul VI, the Cardinals, the archbishops, and the bishops, the new religion would never have had its official beginning?

{31} Do you agree that therefore, the TOTAL responsibility for the existence of Vatican II goes exactly to those who signed the documents and decrees of Vatican II; as the CMRI website states, “It must be concluded that the modern hierarchy who have approved and implemented the errors of Vatican II no longer represent the Catholic Church and her lawful authority.?”

{32} Do you agree that those who signed these heretical decrees are the very ones who brought into existence this new religion that made substantial changes in the Church?

{33} Do you agree that the Vatican II documents clearly pronounce heresies?

{34} Do you agree that those who willfully signed the documents and decrees of Vatican II thereby acknowledged that they pronounced all the heresies the Vatican II documents contained?

{35} Do you agree that Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre are/were a very predominant, chief, principal, leading, and main part of the modern hierarchy who have approved and implemented the errors of Vatican II, and who after their part in bringing about the non-Catholic church with its substantial change, no longer represent the Catholic Church and her lawful authority?

{36} Do you agree that “the only way in which you can pronounce a heresy and not be guilty; that is not be a formal heretic IS BY IGNORANCE”?

An article on the CMRI website talking about their position and beliefs states the following:

IV. MODERN VATICAN II CHURCH: The Catholic Church is identified as the true Church of Christ by her four marks (Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, and Apostolicity). Since the heretical teachings of Vatican II, the Novus Ordo Missae, and the new rites of the sacraments have manifestly been a departure from the Catholic Church’s traditional teachings, it must be concluded that this modern so-called “Catholic” Church no longer possesses the first two marks of the true Church — namely, Unity and Holiness. Its obvious departure over the past twenty-five years from what the Catholic Church has always held can lead to only one conclusion: a new ecumenical Church has been established which stands in contradiction to the true Catholic Church.

{37} Do you agree the CMRI article clearly tells us that 1) the heretical teachings of Vatican II, 2) the Novus Ordo Missae, and 3) the new rites of the sacraments have *manifestly* been a departure from the Catholic Church’s traditional teachings?

CMRI continues with their article in the next paragraph:

V. MODERN HIERARCHY OF THE VATICAN II CHURCH: In the light of the above, it must be concluded that the modern hierarchy who have approved and implemented the errors of Vatican II no longer represent the Catholic Church and her lawful authority. This most certainly

includes the one who confirmed, approved, decreed, and implemented these heretical teachings, namely Paul VI (Montini). Likewise included are his successors, namely, John Paul II (Wojtyla) and Benedict XVI (Ratzinger), who have continued to implement these heretical teachings. Despite the lack of canonical warning and formal declaration of loss of office, their repeated acts of ecumenism and their enforcement of the heresies of Vatican II and the new code of Canon Law, which are injurious to faith and morals, are manifestations of their pertinacity in heresy.

THEREFORE, as the First Vatican Council infallibly teaches: “‘Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build My Church,’ these words are proven true by actual results, since in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has always been preserved untainted...the See of St. Peter always remains unimpaired by any error, according to the divine promise of Our Lord.” Further, since John Paul II has manifestly taught heresy, promoted ecumenism and fostered interfaith worship, he clearly cannot be recognized as a successor of St. Peter in the primacy.

Read again from the article on the CMRI website talking about their position and beliefs:

V. MODERN HIERARCHY OF THE VATICAN II CHURCH: In the light of the above, it must be concluded that the modern hierarchy who have approved and implemented the errors of Vatican II no longer represent the Catholic Church and her lawful authority.

CONCLUSION: Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre were the MODERN HIERARCHY OF THE VATICAN II CHURCH who signed the heretical document that brought the VATICAN II CHURCH into existence.

{38} Do you agree that on the testimony of the CMRI website talking about their position and beliefs, we have written proof that Bishop Thuc and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre were non-Catholics who no longer represented the Catholic Church and her lawful authority when they consecrated the non-Catholic bishops from whom the majority of Traditional Movement clerics come?

Please send me your answers to the questions between these kinds of brackets {}.

In Jesus, Mary, and Saint Joseph,

Patrick Henry

www.JMJsite.com