

**Introduction about the following text:** In the late 1980s and early 1990s David Bawden and Teresa Bennis wrote a book explaining reasons why they wanted people to come together and elect a pope. It did not bring many people to the “conclave”. However, the five or six that did show up and vote claimed at that time that David Bawden was elected; and he chose to be known as Pope Michael I. By 1998 a family I knew was having problems with David Bawden splitting up the children from the parents. The parents wanted to know if I would explain to the family why I did not think David Bawden was a pope of the Catholic Church. As a result I recorded the following message onto two cassette tapes. Copies of the tapes were sent out to the family and a few others, including David Bawden and Teresa Bennis. In February of 2008, Teresa Bennis told me she never listened to her copy of the tapes. I sent her a copy of the transcript of the tapes, and she asked me to upload the following transcript of the tapes. Teresa Bennis’ answers to the questions I asked toward the end of the tapes will be found at the end of the following transcript of the tapes. Please take notice that Teresa Bennis no longer supports David Bawden. By the Grace of God, Teresa Bennis now knows that David Bawden has never been a Catholic Pope.

## **WHAT DO DAVID BAWDEN and TERESA BENNIS TEACH?**

By: *Patrick Henry*

Bennis and Bawden wrote in their book about the necessity of observing the laws of God, and as they state on page 41,

“We are bound by Canon Law and the penalties prescribed by Canon Law.”

On Page 344, they wrote,

“if we observe His law we will not be able to receive the sacraments from traditionalist priests who lack jurisdiction since the Council of Trent has decreed that anyone who denies the necessity of jurisdiction is to be considered anathema.” [Denzinger 903.]

“If we observe His laws we must observe them all, and as we have seen in Parts 1 and 2, this a tall order indeed.”

Having made it plain that they (Bawden and Bennis) are bound to observe the laws of God and of His Holy Church, as are all Catholics, let us review **Canon 1258** which states:

**“It is unlawful for the Faithful to assist in any active manner or to take part in the sacred services of non-Catholics.”**

When you study their book, and know what they have done during their lives you will find that Bennis and Bawden have actively taken part in non-Catholic services, being a member of the Novus- Ordo-Montini-Schismatic-Church, and part of the Society of St. Pius X, and as they say in their back cover they joined practically all the traditionalist movements and non-Catholic sects over the years.

We should know Canon 2316:

“A person who of his own accord and knowingly helps in any manner to propagate heresy or who communicates in sacred rites with heretics in violation of the gravitation of Canon 1258 incurs suspicion of heresy.”

So now we see from the laws of the Church that Bennis and Bawden have incurred “suspicion of heresy” for being part of non-Catholic sects.

In Canon 2315 we read:

“A person who is suspected of heresy and who after admonition has not removed the cause for suspicion shall be forbidden to exercise legal ecclesiastical acts, if he is a cleric and after repeated admonition has not removed the cause for suspicion, he shall be suspended *a divines*. If a person suspected of heresy has been punished with the penalties herein stated and does not amend within six months after their imposition, he shall be considered as a heretic and be liable to the penalties for heresy.”

On Page 352, they remind us,

“it should be obvious to all that if heretics participate they could also be elected and as Leo here said, *‘A man who is not a Catholic could never be a pope.’*”

Beginning on page 345 Bennis and Bawden wrote a section entitled, “Countering Objections.” By the time we get to page 354 we read the **Tenth Objection:**

“(Q)--By the strictest reasoning set forth in Part II, one of you is not even a Catholic in the eyes of the Church, having been born and baptized after the “election” of John XXIII. How can we take the word of a non-Catholic?”

“(A)--Allow me to introduce myself. I, David Bawden, was born September 22, 1959 and baptized in Christ the King Church, Oklahoma City, in October of the same year. By the strictest interpretation, I am a baptized non-Catholic. The priest who baptized me apparently accepted John XXIII as Pope, and, therefore, according to Canon 2200, was a schismatic. However, his defection from the faith is not certain, as it was not apparent (especially in this country), that John XXIII was an anti-pope. Now, Catholicism consists mainly of the Profession of the Faith. If there was someone whom I could approach to be received with certainty into the Church, I would jump at the opportunity. I submit myself to the Pope for judgment. Concerning my profession of faith, you will find it in the pages of this book. The status of an author in the Church does not effect the truthfulness of his statements. Truth must be believed, regardless of the source.

“If the other electors wish to take the strictest view, (which is advisable) and this disqualifies me from voting, then so be it. However, under the laws governing the use of the system of probabalism, they must take the same strict view and consider all priests ordained after the election of John XXIII illicit, as well, and therefore, suspended from all exercise of Orders.”

So here from his own statements we find that David Bawden has doubts that he was a member of the True Church, or why did he write “if there was someone whom I could approach to receive with certainty into the Church I would jump at the opportunity.”

If Bennis and Bawden would have truly thought themselves to be Catholics in good standing, as well as all the other electors, then why did they insist upon everyone participating in the election to take the Profession of Faith, as we have already covered from page 445? Good Catholics in good standing are not in need of taking an Abjuration of Error and Profession of Faith. After having truthfully written that they are not Catholics in good standing, as we have just covered we wonder why they wrote on page 309,

“We are Catholics in good standing, not excommunicates.”

That is just a blanket cover statement. How can they be Catholics in good standing when they belonged to the Schismatic Church of Montini? as they describe on page 114? On page 362 they wrote, “In a day and age when so few remain Catholic, the only reasonable and necessary qualification must be the demonstrable Catholicity of all voters. We have not taken this responsibility on ourselves--rather we have had it thrust upon us. We are qualified electors, because God has not seen fit to leave us with those who are more qualified.”

We have already mentioned how they spoke practically the same thing on page 318,

“Papal election is ordinarily a jurisdictional act, but because there are none more qualified to perform this act, and for this reason only, we are allowed to proceed.”

On page 109 they wrote,

“A syllogism is proof of probability.”

Bennis and Bawden clearly state they’re not allowed to proceed with an election if there is anyone more qualified than themselves to elect a pope.

On page 419 Bennis and Bawden wrote,

“For as we have already seen, the promise of indefectibility to the Church would never allow for Holy Orders (hence bishops and priests) to cease to exist....”

On pages 138, 139, 356, 357, and elsewhere in their book, Bennis and Bawden also teach that “truly Catholic bishops will always exist, therefore it follows that true Catholic bishops have persevered in keeping the Faith are more qualified than a few non-Catholics who departed from the Faith to elect a pope.”

And, therefore, Bennis and Bawden, on their own testimony, may not proceed to a papal election. Although they have done this, they themselves beforehand stated it would not be proper to do in the eyes of the Church nor lawful and licit before God and His Holy Church.

Bennis and Bawden taught this on page 360:

“In a doubt, the safer course should be followed.”

The doubt that they were Catholics was manifested by David Bawden in that just recently quoted from page 354. He doubted that he was a Catholic in good standing, and Bennis and Bawden prove that all the electors, including David Bawden and Teresa Bennis were doubting that they were qualified electors, and therefore, they made it very plain to us they all needed to take the abjuration of error. They also taught us very plainly that there can be no doubt, it’s against the Catholic Faith to doubt, that there are truly Catholic bishops living in the world, as well as Catholic priests who have not defected from the Faith in any way. It simply follows that they (such priests and bishops) are more qualified than Bennis and Bawden and therefore Bennis and Bawden do not have the right to proceed with a papal election.

Maybe this is a time to cover more extensively their objections of countering **Objections** starting on page 345, first Question:

**Objection One:**

“(Q)—Your substitute inside the front cover for an imprimatur does not satisfy me. If you are indeed such great lovers of the law, how can you excuse your violation then of the Canon which prohibits anyone from publishing without ecclesiastical approval?”

Then we go to this inside the front cover and read their part about “Where is Your Imprimatur? Part of their statement reads:

“Heresy is now so widespread and all-persuasive that it would be impossible for most Catholics to learn the truth without assistance. These Catholics are in grave spiritual danger whether they realize it or not, and in the common opinion of moral theologians we must assist them even at the risk of our own lives. Should we fail to render such assistance, we would ourselves commit mortal sin. We are, therefore, *obligated* to present here the *truth*, that our light might shine before men, for the *supreme* law is the salvation of souls.”

It is true that they are obliged to present the truth, for the truth that Bennis and Bawden did show is the fact that true bishops existed elsewhere, but because there were true bishops they would not and could not give an imprimatur to this book because, although Bennis and Bawden presented part of the truth, they also presented many contrary errors. In this same book these bishops do not exist in some of the things I have already covered. Why did Bennis and Bawden totally excuse themselves for not doing the one truly important thing they should have done—go and seek out the true shepherds left in this world, work with them in electing a true pope? Toward the end of this first objection Bennis and Bawden wrote,

“In a conflict of law the higher law prevails. Hence we are allowed to *faithfully* relay the faith, to defend the faith, and to increase our faith among each other, by written and other means. Strict precautions must be taken to guard against errors, but as in all else, God will come to the aid of those who are pure of heart and keep His law.”

So Bennis and Bawden remind us they must “*faithfully*” and they emphasize that in their book, “*faithfully* relay the faith,”—that means not to put in contrary things or write something and then not observe it themselves. And they must be strict in taking care to guard against errors, which means there

should be no contradictions, not stating one thing and contradicting it later, "...but as in all else God will come to the aid of those who are pure of heart and keep His law (s)" they have shown in their book the laws of the necessity of an Abjuration of Error and Profession of Faith for those who have been members of non-Catholic sects before they are eligible to vote in a papal election. This never took place for Bennis and Bawden, nor their other electors, and therefore, let us question and find out why they do not keep the law after saying here in their book that they would do so.

**Objection 2:**

“(Q) What you have written is only your opinion. Why should we believe you when our priest, who spent eight years in the seminary, has far more training and knowledge than a layman?”

Bennis and Bawden’s answer:

“Unless your priest has somehow retained his jurisdiction, which is indeed a rarity, he is transgressing the laws of the Church and encouraging you to commit sacrilege and committing mortal sin himself, by violating the suspension he incurred when he heard that *first* confession without the proper jurisdiction. If he is so knowledgeable, why would he do such a thing? What we have written here is *not* merely our opinion. In fact, we have not so much written as we have presented what duly approved, pre-1958 authors have written, most of whom are theologians. In the main, we have *based* all our arguments on the teachings of the magisterium itself, and wherever interpretation was employed, we have endeavored to use the soundest and most irreproachable sources possible, including doctors and fathers of the Church, as well as eminent canonists. If you wish to argue, you must argue with the Church, not us.”

When you first read this answer to the objection it seems very good and sound and like a nice cover-up but when you study the book it simply is not true. If it was true why are there so many contradictions? If it was true why can they state “we are Catholics in good standing” after proving they have been to non-Catholic religions? If it was true how did they conclude that non-Catholic lay people, both men and women, would be more qualified to elect a pope than true Catholic bishops? Here we begin their answer,

“...unless your priest has somehow retained his jurisdiction which is indeed a rarity he is transgressing the laws of the Church and encouraging you to commit sacrilege and committing mortal sin himself...”

And so on. Yet on page 445 and in other places in this book, we find that Bennis and Bawden are absolutely relying on these same priests, these rarities, ones they have never found, to somehow have that jurisdiction to be able to bring all of these electors back into the Church, absolve them in the external forum first, and then hear their confessions. Well, Bennis and Bawden did not find these rare priests and therefore, they violated the laws of the Church they themselves brought out. They did not follow what they preached in so many places. As part of their answer to this **Objection 2**, remember Bennis and Bawden wrote,

“...what we have written here is not merely our opinion.” And yet, looking at what they have actually written we find there are many such statements with no quotes as they go on to say in fact, “...we have not so much written as we have presented what duly approved pre-1958 authors have written.” But they did not provide the proofs that they explain they should provide on page 14 of their book.

I have another booklet here in my hand titled “*St. Therese Returns a defense of fundamental Catholic Teaching.*” by Albert H. Dolan, Order of Carmel. Under Chapter 2, page 18, there is something that is important to understand:

“by way of preliminary let me formulate some principles which will serve as excellent guides whenever in your reading you encounter any objection against religion in any of its departments. First principle: The most important of these guides is this: It is one of the first principles of logic of correct thinking, that mere statement is not proof.”

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

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

And that’s what Benns and Bawden are obliged to do is prove what they have said is always the truth. Prove that they are Catholics in good standing, not excommunicated. Prove that they are the most qualified voters. Prove that non-Catholics laymen and women can elect a pope when there are true bishops living. **Prove it!** Protestants and non-Catholics, even these people you recognize as not popes, Paul 6, John Paul II, make statements, some of which are truly orthodox and Catholic. They have said, for example, “we should pray the rosary.” That’s a true statement. We should pray the most holy rosary. But you read the rest of what they state and it is contrary to the teachings of the Church—much of it. Another example, the man who is known as Bishop Francis Conrad Maria Schuckardt gave a talk trying to justify his receiving orders in the Old Catholic line. One statement he made strikes me very strongly, “The Old Catholics kept the most perfect records of any place in the world.” **Prove it!** Look in the book, *Bishops at Large*, by Peter Anson, and you’ll find they kept NO RECORDS. Very many secret ordinations and consecrations. Where do they get the proof? How does Francis Schuckardt prove that the abjuration of error before 30 lay people by the so-called “bishop” Daniel Q. Brown brought him back into the true Church? That was Schuckardt’s whole basic line that he was himself a Catholic because Brown abjured his errors. But it was only done before lay people, none of whom could absolve him and bring him back into the Church. The same sad fact happened with Benns and Bawden. They abjured, I suppose, but if they did do it at all, it was only before lay people who, themselves, were outside the Church. Let Benns and Bawden provide the real proof that they were brought back into the Catholic

Church before they attempted the papal election. Then maybe we can see whether we should follow Bawden as a pope. Prove the basic things, and then proceed.

**No. 3 of their Questions (and Objections) against them:**

“(Q)—But you’re positively anti-clerical. You teach that wicked ministers cannot confect valid sacraments. This is the Donatist Heresy.”

Their answer:

“On the contrary this is the teaching of St. Thomas, St. Pius XI as well as the Council of Trent.”

Here I’m not trying to be critical about them, but it must be a misprint in their book. I’ve never heard of him, but that’s what they wrote in their book. I’m not sure what Pope Pius they are speaking about. And I’m not sure as to how they came to this statement of this objection of Part 3.

“Do you teach that wicked ministers cannot confect valid sacraments? This is the Donatist Heresy.”

Well, I state that if Bennis and Bawden are truly teaching that wicked ministers cannot confect valid statements, then that is also their heresy. The answer Bennis and Bawden give are on the contrary,

“This is the teaching of St. Thomas, St. Pius XI as well as the Council of Trent.”

What is the teaching of St. Thomas, St. Pius XI and the Council of Trent? That wicked ministers cannot confect valid sacraments? Whoa, friend. Just the opposite! St. Thomas and the Council of Trent teach that wicked men DO CONFECT VALID SACRAMENTS.

Opening now the *Summa of St. Thomas Aquinas* we turn to *Question 19, Article 5 of the Supplement*. Under his fifth Article it is asked whether wicked priests have the use of the keys.

**Objection 1:** “It would seem that wicked priests have not the use of the keys. For in the passage where the use of the keys is bestowed on the Apostles, John 20:22-23, the gift of the Holy Ghost is promised. But wicked men have not the Holy Ghost. Therefore they have not the use of the keys.”

But in reply to this Objection, St. Thomas Aquinas gives the teachings of the Catholic Church when he says,

“**On the contrary,** No man can know whether another man is in the state of grace. If therefore no one could use the keys in giving absolution unless he were in a state of grace, no one would know that he had been absolved, which would be very unfitting. Further, the wickedness of the minister cannot void the liberality of his Lord, but the priest is no more than a minister, therefore, he cannot by his wickedness take away from us the gift which God has given through him.”

St. Thomas goes on when he says,

“**I answer that:** just as participation of a form to be induced into an effect does not make a thing to be an instrument, so neither does the loss of that form prevent that thing being used as an instrument. Consequently, since man is merely an instrument in the use of the keys, however much he may through sin be deprived of grace, whereby sins are forgiven, yet he is by no means deprived of the use of the keys.”

But there is more here that possibly Bennis and Bawden were referring to that made them form their opinion. It is very confusing what they said, but for the sake of those who are involved in the many false religions of the traditionalist movement today, let us go on here to cover what St. Thomas said in **Objection 3 in this Fifth Article**.

“Further Augustine says (De Bapt. v, 21) that God gives the sacrament of grace even through wicked men, the grace itself only by Himself or through His saints. Hence He forgives sin by Himself, or by those who are members of the Dove. But the remission of sins is the use of the keys. Therefore, sinners who are not ‘members of the Dove’ have not the use of the keys.”

So that is someone's objection and now St. Thomas gives the Church's teaching in reply:

“Augustine speaks of the remission of sins insofar as holy men cooperate therein, not by virtue of the keys but by mere congruity. Hence he says that God confers the sacraments even through evil men, and among the other sacraments, absolution, which is the use of the keys should be reckoned: but that through ‘members of the Dove,’ i.e., holy men, He grants forgiveness of sins, insofar as He remits sin on account of their intercession.

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

Now I, Patrick Henry, comment that I hope people understand what St. Thomas, the Prince of Theologians, just explained. If you receive sacraments from those who are cut off from the Church, which includes the priests in the traditionalist movement, because they never were called to the priesthood by any true ecclesiastical authority, they are cut off from the Church. When you go to the sacraments to those men you do not receive grace because you sin in so doing, except in the case of Baptism.

Now we continue with **(St. Thomas) Article 6, Question: 19:**

“Whether those who are schismatics, heretics, excommunicates, suspended or degraded, have the use of the keys.”

**Objection 1:** “It would seem that those who are schismatics, heretics, excommunicate, suspended or degraded have the use of the keys. For just as the power of the keys results from Orders, so does the power of consecration. But the above cannot lose the use of the power of consecration since if they do consecrate, it is valid, though they sin in doing so. Therefore, neither can they lose the use of the keys.”

That is the objection, and now St. Thomas writes the truth,

“**On the contrary,** Augustine says [Tract. cxxi in Joan.] ‘that the charity of the Church forgives sins.’ Now it is the charity of the Church which unites its members. Since, therefore, the above are disunited from the Church, it seems that they have not the use of the keys in remitting sins.”

“Further, **no man is absolved from sin by sinning. Now it is a sin for anyone to seek absolution of his sins from the above, for he disobeys the Church in so doing. Therefore, he cannot be absolved by them,** and so the same conclusion follows.”

St. Thomas continues:

“I answer that in all the above the power of the keys remains as to its essence, but its use is hindered on account of the lack of matter. For since the use of the keys requires in the user authority over the person on whom they are used, as stated above (Question [17], Article [2], ad 2), the proper matter on whom one can exercise the use of the keys is a man under one's authority. And since it is by appointment of the Church that one man has authority over another, so a man may be deprived of his authority over another by his ecclesiastical superiors. Consequently, since the Church deprives heretics, schismatics and the like, by withdrawing their subjects from them either altogether or in some respect, in so far as they are thus deprived, they cannot have the use of the keys.”

I will continue by reading the reply to this **Objection 1** as stated in the *Summa*:

“The matter of the sacrament of the Eucharist, on which the priest exercises his power, is not a man but wheaten bread, and in Baptism, the matter is simply a man. Wherefore, just as were a heretic to be without wheaten bread he could not consecrate, **so neither can a prelate absolve if he be deprived of his authority,** yet he can baptize and consecrate, albeit to his own damnation.”

So my dear friends, in Jesus, Mary and Joseph, we have just learned that the Novus Ordo clerics, even if they would happen to have valid orders and the traditionalist movement clerics, mainly those coming from Archbishop Thuc and Lefebvre, as well as the free-lance priests, if they join the non-Catholic Novus Ordo religion they were participating in non-Catholic services, they lost their office, authority and jurisdiction. Therefore, **they can no longer absolve you and those who participate with them in their sacraments, because they are cut off from the Church, do not receive grace.** Because the Summa is open to this section I will continue with explaining something under question 20. In the reply to **Objection 2** St. Thomas Aquinas teaches us:

“...in the case of excommunication, absolution from which should precede absolution from sin, for as long as a man is excommunicated, he cannot receive any sacrament of the Church.”

Do you comprehend what the Church is teaching us here through St. Thomas Aquinas? If people were once Catholic, then they left that true Faith or for any other reason joined a non-Catholic sect, they are excommunicated and the Church teaches they must first be absolved in the external forum before they can be absolved from their sins. That is the need for the Profession of Faith and the Abjuration of Error. The traditionalist movement clerics very, very seldom follow this teaching of the Church. They neglect it, and therefore, they do not follow the Catholic Faith. Many traditional movement clerics tell us: “confession alone suffices.” But we know now that it does not.

Now you know positively that St. Thomas Aquinas teaches the exact opposite of what Bennis and Bawden say they teach on page 346 where they teach that “wicked ministers cannot confect valid sacraments.” Then they told us that this is the teaching of St. Thomas. Well we found out from his *Summa* this is not the teaching of St. Thomas. He does teach that wicked ministers can confect valid sacraments.

In their book on page 289 Bennis and Bawden reminded us how important it is to listen to St. Thomas Aquinas when they wrote:

“(The testimony of this doctor alone proves our case, since Pius XII averred that you can believe everything St. Thomas said.)

Now we turn to the *Sources of Catholic Dogma* by Denzinger under No. 860 to prove that the Council of Trent is also contrary to what Bennis and Bawden teach. For the sacred and ecumenical Council of Trent teaches under the Canons on the Sacrament of Baptism, Canon No. 4:

“If anyone shall say that the Baptism which is also given by heretics in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, with the intention of doing what the Church does is not true Baptism, let him be anathema.”

So we see that Trent does teach heretics, wicked men, can confect valid sacraments. This subject is covered in quite a few places in Denzinger’s book. Under 169 it tells us very plainly that schismatic bishops can confer sacraments and it also goes on to explain in the same place,

“therefore, then this person has only injured himself by wickedly administering the good. For the inviolable sacrament, which was given through him, held the perfection of its virtue for others.” [Denz. 169]

The Sacred Council under the Canons on the Sacraments in General states under Canon 12 (p. 263, par. No. 854 Denz.):

“Can. 12. If anyone shall say that a minister who is in mortal sin, although he observes all the essentials which pertain to the performance or conferring of the sacrament, neither performs nor confers the sacrament: let him be anathema. [Denz. 854]

In Denzinger under No. 902 (p. 277) we find the Council of Trent teaching:

“...It also teaches that even priests who are bound by mortal sin exercise as ministers of Christ the office of forgiving sins by virtue of the Holy Spirit conferred in ordination, and that they are of an erroneous opinion who contend that this power does not exist in bad priests.” [Denz. 902]

So, in reviewing again what Bennis and Bawden wrote under this third part on page 346, they state,

“It is not because the ministers are wicked that we claim that they claim that they cannot administer valid sacraments, but because the Council *infallibly decreed* that the Sacrament of Penance cannot be validly administered by those who do not possess delegated jurisdiction.”

In that statement they are correct. The priest needs jurisdiction, but the way they worded the top part of this Question and Answer was heretical, and it may be that this needs to be clarified that they probably were correct in their own thinking, but just wrote it somewhat in this book in a way that was contrary to what the Church teaches. If you read the whole paragraph then they seem to have it correct, that wicked ministers can administer valid sacraments but not absolve someone because they lack jurisdiction.

But here again, we continue on with their next sentence and to the answer to part three,

“The pope is the originator of such jurisdiction, and unless we wish to deny that he has the *fullness* of said jurisdiction, which is also a *de fide* teaching (DZ 1823), we cannot pretend that these priests possess it in his absence.”

Here again Bennis and Bawden it seems should have been more specific what they meant by “these priests.” Because the truth of the matter is bishops and priests DO possess jurisdiction during a period of interregnum, if they had jurisdiction before the pope died. That is, of course, if they did not lose their jurisdiction. But as written here, Bennis and Bawden are trying to teach, it would seem that priests do not possess jurisdiction in the absence of a pope, which is wrong. There are true bishops and true priests in the world, as I speak right now, 1998, that do possess jurisdiction, although there has been the absence of a pope since 1958. Over 40 years from the time I speak right now.

Let us continue to review together these objections and answers that Teresa Bennis and David Bawden put together in their book. And we will pick up again on side B of this tape.

+++++

We have now come to the fourth objection put forth by Bennis and Bawden which deals with the question,

**Objection 4:**

“Q. While you cleverly disguise the fact one of the authors of this work is a woman, aren’t women forbidden to teach in the Church?

While Teresa Bennis did not teach in the Church, they only wrote this book, so I am going to pass on to **Objection Five:**

“(Q)—Let’s get down to brass tacks here. Aren’t you really a closet “fem” who wants to include women electors in the Conclave? Isn’t this the real reason you promoted this election from the beginning?

Benns and Bawden answer.

“(A)—Surely you jest. Would either of us have gone out of our way to adhere faithfully to all the articles of faith, law, and opinions in this work, and yet advocate unbridled liberty in something so exquisitely sensitive as the ordering of the Conclave? If you must know the truth in this matter, *others* have suggested that I be allowed to vote, and I personally wish it was possible.”

I comment, that although Mrs. Benns claims here that personally she wishes it was possible for her to take part in the election of a pope, on page 359 it is written,

“Or certain individuals may have doubts concerning their own qualifications as electors and on that account may wish to exempt themselves. This is perfectly understandable and even praiseworthy, providing that such individuals do not prevail on others to do likewise, or question the necessity of such an election.”

So, though it is “praiseworthy” according to Benns and Bawden for people not to want to take part, to have doubts concerning their own qualifications as electors, Mrs. Benns tells us she wants to take part in it if it’s possible.

But going on under this answer, **Objection 5**, on page 348,

“But I would NEVER consider such participation, even though we have found precedents in early elections and the opinions of medieval canonists to support the theory that women *could* be allowed to vote. But under Canon 21, even though an opinion in favor of liberty exists, probabilism cannot be used whenever there is a question of the means to eternal salvation. Since Pope Boniface VIII has declared that all must be subject to the Roman Pontiff in order to be saved, we must consider any election of a pope a means necessary to that end.”

Well, what is the real meaning that Benns and Bawden are trying to put forth in this statement, “Since Pope Boniface VIII has declared that all must be subject to the Roman Pontiff in order to be saved,” and that part of it is very true, but they go on,

“we must consider any election of a pope a means necessary to that end.”

Indirectly, that’s very true, but this certainly does not mean that babies and converts who were baptized and died during a period of interregnum could not be saved. Those babies and converts were never, strictly speaking, subject to the Roman Pontiff as an individual person. And even now since the period of interregnum, after the death of Pope Pius XII, newborn babies who are baptized and died, or converts who were baptized and died shortly thereafter without committing mortal sin, were saved, although they were not directly at that time subject to the Roman Pontiff as an individual person. It would seem here that Teresa Benns gives a very false conclusion to a teaching of the Church. Benns and Bawden go on:

“Therefore, the participation of woman cannot be countenanced. If women took part, those anxious to invalidate the election would claim that they could then be *elected* and resurrect Pope Joan. Furthermore, there is the danger of scandal whenever men and women are in close proximity of each other for an extended length of time. While there will surely be many women in the outer room, praying and anxiously awaiting the triumphant ‘Habemus papam,’ there will be none found in the Conclave. It will require a great deal more than a cheap shot like this to topple all the evidence amassed in this book.”

When David Bawden and Teresa Benns receive their copy of this tape, please be kind enough to tell me, and also all others who follow you who might receive this tape, the honest

truth if Teresa Bennis and/or any other women actually took part in the Conclave. Did they follow that which was written in this objection, “there will be no women found in the Conclave.”

When the entire truth is presented, I believe we will find that some of the women then present did vote. Can Teresa Bennis truthfully state that no women voted in the attempted election of David Bawden as a pope? Under **Objection 6** we come to the question,

“(Q)--Speaking of cheap shots, didn't you deal more than a few of these to the Jewish people when you accuse them of working throughout the centuries to destroy the Church? Are you trying to revive anti-semitism?”

I'm not going to record the entire answer on this tape just now but there is one sentence that might need a comment which states, (p. 349)

“No one man was at the same time more firmly opposed to the efforts of the Jews and yet solicitous for their spiritual welfare than the inestimable Reverend Denis Fahey.”

You might say that Patrick Henry is now being nit-picky, but that statement itself is not correct. It is a lie. What about Jesus Christ? Wasn't He more firmly opposed to the efforts of the Jews and more solicitous for their spiritual welfare than Reverend Fr. Denis Fahey?

We come now to **Objection 7:**

“(Q)–A few priests and layman cannot possibly restore the Church today! What precedent can you possibly quote in support of this?”

For their answer Bennis and Bawden give a rather lengthy explanation of how St. Bernard, a religious, called on lay rulers to assist him in vindicating the rights of a man who most considered as a pretender to the papal throne. Bennis and Bawden end this chapter to Objection 7 stating,

“St. Bernard's triumph speaks for itself. It gives us the courage and inspiration to continue our work which, after all, is not so different from that of this great saint who lived some 750 years ago.”

I comment: St. Bernard did nothing similar to what Bennis and Bawden did. St. Bernard fought with the true bishops on earth to uphold the rights of the True Bishop of Rome. But Bennis and Bawden had nothing to do with the true bishops, as they persist in claiming anti-pope Michael I is the true vicar of Jesus Christ.

We come to **Objection 8:**

“(Q)–In substituting the laws of canonical elections for Pius XII's constitution on papal elections, you overlook the fact that Pius XII actually *allowed* cardinals who had been excommunicated to vote in the Conclave. Doesn't this serve to topple your entire argument on this point?”

For an answer Bennis and Bawden give some good information but along toward the end of the first long paragraph they write,

“...a man who is not a Catholic could never be a pope.”

**That is a very true statement of the Church. To be the pope you have to be a Catholic and you have to be a male, but we already know that from the external forum David Bawden is a non-Catholic, therefore, according to their own teaching, David Bawden can never be a pope.** We know that David Bawden was a member of a non-Catholic sect. We find that out on the next several pages, 354 and 355. Secondly we know that the Church teaches that members of non-Catholic sects are not members of the Catholic Church. Heresy, schism, apostasy and formal excommunication put one outside the mystical body of Christ, according to Pope Pius XII in his Encyclical on the Mystical Body of Christ. And thirdly we know that David Bawden, according to Canon 2200 must absolutely prove he was always a Catholic and

never a heretic, or this very page we are on here now, page 352, from their own writings, David Bawden and Teresa Bennis prove that David Bawden can never be eligible for the papacy. Bennis and Bawden make the statement that they are Catholics in good standing, not excommunicated, however, they don't prove it. They do prove they had need for the Abjuration of Error and the Profession of Faith before a cleric who could absolve them. That never took place, and they were NOT brought back into the True Church, in the external forum, according to the laws of the Church. Therefore, the obvious conclusion follows, David Bawden is not a valid vicar of Jesus Christ.

Bennis and Bawden include this answer to **Objection 8** stating,

“Since heresy concerns the faith (or a lack thereof) and is punished specifically by deposition (Canon 188, No. 4), we *must* believe Pius XII wished to exclude heretics from the voting.”

As I have been pointing out, all, including David Bawden, were outside the Church in the external forum when the votes were cast that supposedly elected David Bawden as “pope Michael I.” Pope Pius XII, then, obviously wished to exclude such people from voting. If they did find a priest who brought them back into the Church and everything was good, let them bring forth the proof. Canon 2200 demands it. I personally was there the night before the election and talked to them at length. No mention was made of any priest, none was seen around that day, nor the next, the day of the election. It was very uncharitable for them if they had a true priest in the area not to mention it to those who were there to visit them trying to talk them out of their election the night before it all happened.

We come now to **Objection 9.**

“(Q)—You have no college degree, no official theological training; educationally speaking, you are paupers. How can we believe you when you have no credibility?”

Their answer:

“(A)—Educational paupers we are, in the modern-day sense of the word and proud of it. We have known a great many people who have trotted themselves off to secular (and even “Catholic”) colleges, only to return as flaming intellectual liberals. Colleges today disseminate poison, carefully tucked between the pages of their humanistic textbooks. Any university of “higher learning,” which does not teach *Catholic doctrine* and uphold high moral standards, is not an institution of “higher learning,” but a disseminator of anti-supernaturalism. Learning is fine, as long as all learning is trends to Christ and His Church. If non-Catholics wish to fill such halls, we cannot prevent them. But no Catholic can attend these schools without placing their faith in grave danger. As Catholics, they must heed the dictates of Canon 1372:

*‘The education of all Catholics from their childhood must be such that not only shall they be taught nothing contrary to the Catholic faith and good morals, but religious and moral training shall occupy the principal place in the curriculum...parents...have the right and most serious obligation of providing for the Christian education of children.’*”

I am going on to **Objection 10:**

“(Q)—By the strictest reasoning set forth in Part II, one of you is not even a Catholic in the eyes of the Church, having been born and baptized after the “election” of John XXIII. How can we take the word of a non-Catholic?”

I have already covered part of this objection in the answer that David Bawden explained that he is a non-Catholic. He wrote here,

“If there was someone whom I could approach to be received with certainty into the Church I would jump at the opportunity.”

Then immediately he wrote,

“I submit myself to the pope for judgment.”

What pope will he submit himself to? To himself? when he was not even elected at the time he wrote this book and did not know who would be elected? But since he supposedly was elected then we need to be reminded that a pope, as with every cleric, cannot absolve himself or bring himself back into the church, with the exception of the Holy Eucharist, not even a pope can give any sacrament to himself. If David Bawden was not received into the Church before his papal election, or attempted papal election, he still is out of the Church, unless he has met some true bishop or priest since that time who absolved him. That certainly has not been brought forth publicly. They talk in their book of having ordination and consecration of the new pope. Who’s going to do that? So as David Bawden wrote, “I am a baptized non-Catholic.” There is a doubt about his catholicity in his own mind.

Maybe this is the place to review a few things from a practical course of doctrinal instructions based on the teachings of the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, prepared and arranged by Fr. Charles Cullin and Fr. John McCue, imprimatur 1941, from pages 73 and what follows:

*“There are two rules or norms according to which a person must shape his conduct, namely the Commandments of God and his own conscience. Conscience is a judgment of the practical reason which decides that a particular action is in conformity with or opposition to God’s law. We are never permitted to act contrary to the dictates of our conscience, for as St. Paul says, ‘All that is not of Faith, that is, according to one’s conscience, is sinful.’ ” Romans 14:23. And again we must know, “But while one must always act according to the dictates of his conscience it does not follow that in doing so he may not, under certain conditions, be guilty of sin, for there is such a thing as a false conscience.”*

Going on we learn,

*“It is never lawful to act with a doubtful conscience, because that would be carelessly running the risk of doing the wrong thing, and so of sinning.”*

We might comment here that there are many people in the world today who act with a doubtful conscience, although it is never lawful. People have doubts that such and such a priest has jurisdiction, if they don’t actually know the truth, they doubt whether that priest could absolve them, they doubt whether that priest received valid orders, and if they know their faith they are almost certain he has not ability to function as a licit priest. Others may doubt that such and such a man is a pope, whether it be Paul VI, John Paul II, David Bawden, or many others in the world today. It is never lawful to act with a doubtful conscience, because that would be carelessly running the risk of doing wrong and so of sinning. These priests go on to tell us, “When one’s conscience is in error through his own fault, because he does not wish to know what is right or because he has neglected to use the ordinary diligence and interest to determine what is right, he has a false conscience, and IS in bad faith, and IS guilty of sin every time he acts according to such a conscience.

I will go on to **Objection 11** in Bennis and Bawden’s book, (p. 354):

“(Q)–It is obvious that you intend to discredit the clergy, because you have been unable to join their ranks. Isn’t this your purpose for writing about jurisdiction—to put all these priests out of business?”

“(A)–This calumny has been with me for some time. True; I have longed to pursue a priestly vocation, since the age of ten. Yes, I was dismissed without cause from the Society of St. Pius X and was never able to make connections with a Thuc-line Bishop to receive Holy Orders. But, even if I *had* been ordained, I would still be a layman in the eyes of the Church, owing to a Roman decision, as are my fellow classmates who have received Holy Orders. However, my only reason for working out the information on jurisdiction, was to find out God’s law and obey it; nothing more, nothing less.”

I only say that if you ever need to find out for the record or some other reason that David Bawden belonged to the Society of St. Pius X it’s here in black and white on page 355 and that he was to some degree maybe trying to find a Thuc-line bishop who would ordain him.

**Objection 12:**

“(Q)–Your motives for circulating the information concerning Lefebvre and Leinart and their ties to masonry are suspect, because you have reason to attack Lefebvre, owing to your dismissal from Armada.

“(A)–Simply not true. I first read this information within two months of resigning from the Society of St. Pius X, in St. Mary’s (1981).”

David Bawden gives some information and then he goes on,

“That argument runs as follows: ‘Masons are apostates; therefore, an apostate cannot have the proper intention to confect, receive, or confer the sacraments.’ Since I consider this opinion as at least probable and in harmony with the teachings of St. Thomas on apostasy and on what is required to validly confect the sacraments, I considered Leinart’s consecrations and therefore Lefebvre’s ordinations and consecrations as doubtful. I admit the possibility that he may be valid. However, the Church teaches us that we must be *certain* about the validity of a sacrament. In effect, a doubtful sacrament is no sacrament, as it must be conditionally reconferred.

“I have NEVER publicly promoted this theory, precisely because I consider it solidly probable, and I did not want to jeopardize its reception by those Catholics who harbored unjust prejudice against me. There are many other reasons to reject Lefebvre, such as his probably membership in a secret society and his blatant heresies. I resigned from the Society, thinking these men to be priests. This required me to look for not only validity in the sacraments, but liceity as well, which is required under pain of mortal sin and can, in some cases, result in excommunication or suspension.”

So here David Bawden is explaining that it is required under pain of mortal sin to only receive licit sacraments as well as valid sacraments. No excuse ever justifies committing even a willful venial sin. Yet on page 355 David Bawden confesses he desired to receive illicit ordinations from Lefebvre and Thuc-line bishops. We should conclude that that must have been before he knew they were illicit. And thanks be to God that he has found out the truth about these illicit bishops. But now that he knows to not go to any kind of an illicit bishop trying to get himself ordained or consecrated, after proclaiming to be a pope. This proves that David Bawden still must find the true bishops before he can do anything about carrying on the spiritual life of the Church, dispensing the sacraments or carrying on apostolicity. Without ordination, David Bawden does not carry on the fourth mark of the Church. They have proven in their book that true bishops exist. They should have found them before they went ahead with the papal election—it would have made things much better. They still have the obligation to do so before they can effect anything, that is in the mind of the Church-proper.

Now we come to **Objection 13:**

“(Q)—You deny the necessity of the Sacraments, by making them totally unavailable by your reasoning.

“(A)—We absolutely do not deny the necessity of the sacraments. In fact, a strong motivation for electing a Pope is to again be able to frequent the sacraments which we long for; especially Confession and Holy Communion.”

Do I need to comment that David Bawden, claiming to be a pope now, has certainly not helped this situation in the least? I have just explained he must find a true bishop for ordination and consecrations to help in the sacramental life of the Church. David Bawden proved that trying to obtain illicit sacraments from Thuc and Lefebvre or someone else is not the mind of the Church, it can be a mortal sin—in fact it’s required under pain of mortal sin—to find the true bishops. Election as a pope did nothing for this cause.

Benns and Bawden go on in this answer to **Objection 13:**

“What we point out is that the sacraments, being one of the supreme gifts of Our Lord, Jesus Christ, to his Holy Church, must not only be preserved in a manner which guarantees their validity, but they must also be treated reverently and devoutly in perfect conformity with Christ’s Law.”

So here Benns and Bawden truthfully told us that the sacraments must be preserved in a manner which guarantees their validity. And this rules out Lefebvre and the Thuc-line bishops, for many people in the world have presented a lot of evidence, including here, David Bawden, that their orders are doubtful, and what they are doing is obviously illicit. Benns and Bawden continue,

“Pope Benedict XV promulgated Canon 682, which reads: ‘The laity has the right to receive from the clergy the spiritual goods and especially the necessary means of salvation, according to the rules of ecclesiastical discipline.’ Pope Benedict XV has bound us, as Christ promised he could, and no power on earth, save another Pope, could ever loose what he has bound.”

Well I comment what has Pope Benedict XV bound us to do? Certainly not to receive illicit or invalid sacraments. He tells us we have the right to receive from the clergy spiritual goods. Well, it is certainly not a spiritual good to receive illicit sacraments or invalid sacraments. The attempted papal election will only complicate things if God wills for the true bishops to elect another pope. David Bawden thinks that these bishops must approve HIM as a pope. But as we view some other things from the Council of Trent, in Denzinger’s book under No. 960 we learn that the Council of Trent teaches,

“...those who by their own temerity take these offices upon themselves, are not ministers of the Church, but are to be regarded as “thieves and robbers, who have not entered by the door [cf. John 10:1; can. 8].” [Denz 960]

Then we soon come to the Canons of the Sacraments of Orders, and under number 966 we come to Canon 6:

“If anyone says that in the Catholic Church a hierarchy has not been instituted by divine ordinance, which consists of the bishops, priests, and ministers: let him be anathema [cf. n. Denz.960].”

So here we have the proof of the teaching that there will always be bishops, priests and ministers. Note the plural is used. That means at least two bishops, two priests and two deacons will always be on earth until the consummation of the world. That is of divine ordinance—that is part of the Church herself. Canon 7 “If anyone says that the bishops are not superior to priests; or that they do not have the power to confirm and to ordain, or, that the power which they have is common to them and to the priests; or that orders conferred by them

without the consent or call of the people or of the secular power are invalid, or, that those who have been neither rightly ordained nor sent by ecclesiastical and canonical authority, but come from a different source, are lawful ministers of the word and of the sacraments: let him be anathema [cf. n. 960].”

Out of those people who follow the Lefebvre-line bishops and the Thuc-line bishops, consider that, as the Council of Trent explained, the Catholic Church has not called them, that they are going to be anathema. The bishops they follow and the priests ordained by those bishops are not sent by ecclesiastical and canonical authority. They come from a different source. They're not lawful ministers of the word and of the sacraments. And if anyone says they are, including themselves, if they say they are lawful ministers, the infallible Church contradicts them and says, "let them be anathema." If those who have their own temerity take these offices upon themselves, they are not ministers of the Church but are to be regarded as thieves and robbers who have not entered by the door. **If David Bawden tries to force some bishop to consecrate him or ordain him, he is not called upon by the Church—it is his own temerity to take this office upon himself. He is not a minister of the Church, but a thief and a robber, according to the definition of Jesus Christ, the eternal Truth, and His infallible Church.**

I have already quoted this last section of the answer to **Objection 13**, but it is well to review it again: David Bawden and Teresa Bennis wrote:

“Since the Church will last to the end ‘as Christ constituted it, we shall affirm that there exist bishops, canonically appointed who, for their dioceses, can and do properly confer the sacraments.”

Again, as stated before, I will ask why could not Bennis and Bawden let these “true bishops who do exist” elect a true pope if it’s God’s Holy Will? These “truly Catholic bishops” are the ones God is using to carry on the sacramental life of the Church and the Apostolicity of the Church, whereas David Bawden does neither.

Now we come to **Objection 14**:

“(Q)—How can you quote from men who were later excommunicated for apostasy and heresy? Doesn’t this invalidate your statements?

“(A)—St. Thomas said, “Remember every good thing that you hear, and consider not who said it.”

That’s good advice. Consider everything that is good in this book and apply it to your life. But St. Thomas did not say “consider everything you hear and consider not who said it,” only consider “the good things,” and “only apply those to your life.” You might also consider the bad things people have said and the contrary teachings they point out as opposed to the truth of the Catholic Church. Remember that they said these things, and then you will not be so likely to fall into their trap and follow them on their way to perdition.

Bennis and Bawden go on to state,

“The works we quote from are duly approved, according to the laws of the Church. In our opinion, they are the best presentation of the subject, but by no means the only presentation. Our research shows that they are in harmony with the common and constant teaching of the Catholic Church.”

As pointed out before, not all these authors and what they teach are in conformity with the mind of the Church. The Old Catholic, Arnold Harris Matthew whom they quoted from, does not have his teachings in harmony with the common and constant teaching of the Catholic Church. Church history reminds us of a terrible persecution in Japan for about 200 years. Now let us consider something that could possibly have taken place during that time. After 30,

40, 50 or 100 years, let us say that three to ten of those people decided they needed to elect a pope to save God's True Church. They say, "the Catholic Church teaches there must be bishops living with an office, authority and jurisdiction, but we do not know where they are at. No one in our whole country has known of a valid, licit bishop with jurisdiction for over 30 years! We have six of us non-Catholics together, therefore, let us proceed to elect one from among us to be the pope of the Catholic Church." They then abjure their heresy and errors, one at a time before the others then present. Now, they claim they are all Catholics in good standing. Next they elect one from among this group, following the exact same steps and rules that were used later when a few people attempted to elect David Bawden and proclaimed him as a true pope. These Japanese people say, "now that we have a true pope again all he needs to do is find some bishops that will accept what we have done. Our pope can convince the bishop to ordain and consecrate him and we will have the great glory of being known as the wise and active Catholics who did what was necessary to save God's Church."

I ask, if some Japanese people had actually done such a thing during a time when there actually was a true period of interregnum in the Church, would you accept the man they elected as a true vicar of Jesus Christ? If you answer yes, please explain why. If the one the people in Japan attempted to elect is not accepted as a true pope—is it correct to accept David Bawden as a true pope? If you answer yes, please explain why.

Benns and Bawden wrote in their book on page 407,  
"a doubtful pope is no pope."

I, for one, have doubts that David Bawden is a true vicar of Jesus Christ. Therefore, I ask, especially David Bawden and Teresa Benns, when you receive your copy of these tapes, to answer these questions and send them back to myself, and if anyone asks me for your reply, I can just simply send what you send me:

Is the Novus Ordo sect Catholic or non-Catholic?

Is the Society of St. Pius X sect Catholic or Non-Catholic?

Are the bishops and their followers coming from the line of Archbishop Thuc, after he signed the documents of Vatican II and the consecrations in Spain, Catholic or non-Catholic?

Does a true Church teach that someone becomes a non-Catholic if they attend a non-Catholic sect?

Does David Bawden believe that everyone who has belonged to a non-Catholic sect must be received back into the True Catholic Church through the Abjuration of Error and the Profession of Faith administered by a true Catholic bishop or priest who has faculties to bring them back into the Church?

Were David Bawden and all those who attempted his election as a pope truly good Catholics in good standing at the time of their election?

Did any of them take an Abjuration and Profession of Faith before a Catholic priest or bishop who could and did absolve them and bring them back into the True Church?

Did David Bawden and Teresa Benns teach correctly in their book that this did not happen—the electors were not qualified to validly elect a pope?

Were those who attempted to elect a pope not qualified and Catholics in good standing?

Does the Catholic Church say they could still elect a true pope?

Do you agree that someone is in schism who denies a true vicar of Jesus Christ as being the head of the visible church?

Do you also agree that if someone claims a person who is not the pope to BE a pope he also goes into schism?

Do you believe that those who are formal heretics or formal schismatics are not members of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church Outside of Which There Is No Salvation? Did

Benns and Bawden write the truth on page 318 of their book when they said, ‘papal election is ordinarily a jurisdictional act, but because there are none more qualified to perform this act—and for this reason only—we are allowed to proceed?’

Do you believe that truly Catholic bishops are more qualified to elect a Catholic pope than a few people who join non-Catholic sects who were never brought back into the True Church?

Did Teresa Benns vote at the papal election for David Bawden?

Thank you for listening and I will await your reply to these questions. Please do not be ambiguous. Answer them straightforward. Send them in a written form so that they can be passed on and let David Bawden and Teresa Benns justify themselves if they think I have said anything against them on this tape. Please send your correspondence to Patrick Henry, 7067 South Tumbleweed Drive, Safford, Arizona, 85546.

May Jesus, Mary and St. Joseph grant to each and every one of us the grace to live our lives in perfect uniformity with God’s most Holy Will, accept the truth, live the truth, and die in the True Catholic Church in the state of sanctifying grace, to be with Him forever in eternity.

Ora pro nobis,

Patrick Henry

+++ That ended my tape: **WHAT DO DAVID BAWDEN and TERESA BENNS TEACH?**

**The following are the answers of Teresa Benns to the questions asked.**

Q 1. Is the Novus Ordo sect Catholic or non-Catholic? **A. Non-Catholic**

Q. 2 Is the Society of St. Pius X sect Catholic or non-Catholic? **A. Non-Catholic**

Q. 3 Are the bishops and their followers coming from the line of Archbishop Thuc, after he signed the documents of Vatican II and the consecrations in Spain, Catholic or non-Catholic? **A. Non-Catholic**

Q. 4 Does the true Church teach that someone becomes a non-Catholic if they attend a non-Catholic sect? **A. Yes**

Q. 5 Does David Bawden believe that everyone who has belonged to a non-Catholic sect must be received back into the True Catholic Church through the Abjuration of Error and the Profession of Faith administered by a true Catholic bishop or priest who has faculties to bring them back into the Church? **A. Teresa Benns believes this.**

Q. 6 Were David Bawden and all those who attempted his election as a pope truly good Catholics in good standing at the time of their election? **A. I, Teresa Benns, believed that I was a Catholic in good standing at the time of the election, but now realize that this was not the case.**

Q. 7 Did any of them take an Abjuration and Profession of Faith before a Catholic priest or bishop who could and did absolve them and bring them back into the True Church? **A. No**

Q. 8 Did David Bawden and Teresa Bennis teach correctly in their book that if this did not happen the electors were not qualified to validly elect a pope? **A. Yes**

Q. 9 Were those who attempted to elect a pope not qualified and Catholics in good standing? **A. In fact, we were not qualified to elect a pope nor were we Catholics in good standing.**

Q.10 Does the Catholic Church say they could still elect a true pope? **A. No**

Q. 11 Do you agree that someone is in schism who denies a true vicar of Jesus Christ as being the head of the visible church? **A. Yes**

Q. 12 Do you also agree that if someone claims a person who is not the pope to BE a pope he also goes into schism? **A. Yes, into material schism at the very least (if otherwise they can prove they are in good faith).**

Q. 13 Do you believe that those who are formal heretics or formal schismatics are not members of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church outside of which there is no salvation? **A. Yes**

Q. 14 Did Bennis and Bawden write the truth on page 318 of their book when they said, papal election is ordinarily a jurisdictional act, but because there are none more qualified to perform this act and for this reason only we are allowed to proceed? **A. No**

Q. 15 Do you believe that truly Catholic bishops are more qualified to elect a Catholic pope than a few people who joined non-Catholic sects and were never brought back into the True Church? **A. Yes, most definitely.**

Q. 16 Did Teresa Bennis vote at the papal election for David Bawden? **A. Yes, but in March, 2007, she unqualifiedly renounced that vote.**

**As God is my witness,  
Teresa Stanfill Bennis**