

Scholastics and Others Who Denied the Salvation Dogma

By Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

Table of Contents

<i>History</i>	2
<i>16th and 17th century theologians who denied the Salvation Dogma</i>	2
<i>Apostate Albert Pigghe (1490-1542)</i>	3
<i>Apostates Juan Martínez de Ripalda, S.J. (1594-1648) and Gutberlet (1837-1928)</i>	4
<i>Apostate John de Lugo, S.J. (1583-1660)</i>	5
<i>Salvation heresy not allowed as universities' official position from the 16th to 18th centuries</i>	6
<i>Apostate Fr. Joseph Clifford Fenton (1906-1969)</i>	7
<i>Apostate Mark Massa, S.J. (b. 1950)</i>	8
<i>Apostate Fr. Francis A. Sullivan, S.J. (1922-2019)</i>	12
<i>Protestants admit the salvation heresy is a new revelation</i>	15
The Oxford Illustrated History of Christianity.....	15
<i>Hollywood admits the salvation heresy is a new revelation</i>	16
The Cardinal.....	16
<i>Apostate Jews admit the salvation heresy is a new revelation</i>	17
Gary Rosenblatt.....	17
<i>Apostate Antipopes admit the salvation heresy is a new revelation</i>	18
Apostate Antipope John Paul II	18
<i>Nominal Catholics admit the salvation heresy is a new revelation</i>	18
Apostate Bishop George Hay (1729-1811)	18
Apostate Fr. Michael Müller, C.S.S.R. (1825-1899).....	18
Apostate Orestes A. Brownson (1803-1876)	19

History

The denial of the Salvation Dogma was resurrected in the 16th century. To justify their denial of a dogma, heretics either misinterpret a dogma or believe that a dogma is not a dogma or believe that a dogma can change its meaning according to time, place, or other circumstances. The heretics who believe that a dogma can change its meaning are guilty of yet another heresy—the heresy that a dogma can change its meaning. I call this heresy “the dogma-changer heresy” and these heretics “dogma changers.”¹

Most of the salvation heretics admit that their heresy is a novel teaching that contradicts the Salvation Dogma as infallibly defined by the ordinary magisterium (the unanimous consensus of the Church Fathers) and the solemn magisterium (infallible papal decrees). These salvation heretics justify their denial of the dogma by their heretical belief that a dogma can change its meaning according to time, place, and other circumstances. They believe that progress made in human psychology and other discoveries in the 16th century have caused the Salvation Dogma to change its meaning from what was once held to another meaning that must now be held according to these new circumstances. Let us listen to these heretics as they acknowledge that their novel and heretical teaching is contradicted by the ordinary magisterium and the solemn magisterium and thus by all the Catholics that came before them.

16th and 17th century theologians who denied the Salvation Dogma

Apostate Fr. Francis A. Sullivan, *Salvation Outside the Church?*, 2002: “What we find in these Catholic theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is an openness to truth from whatever source it came to them, and a readiness to re-examine traditional ideas and assumptions in the light of newly acquired human knowledge. One has to admire not only their honesty in facing the problems which the discoveries of their age presented to them, but also their courage in proposing solutions that not only ran counter to the previous theological tradition, but seemed also to contradict the teaching of medieval councils and popes that there was no salvation outside the church. Their attitude was perhaps best expressed by Suarez, when he said, referring to those decrees, that *in some sense* it must be true that there is no salvation outside the church. They saw it as their task to determine *in what sense* this could still be true, when one examined it in the light of knowledge which medieval Christians had not possessed.”²

The apostate Fr. Sullivan blasphemously refers to rebelling against God as an act of courage. If one can call that courage, then this courage is certainly the greatest of all evils. By admiring the boldness and so-called courage of the salvation heretic theologians for going against infallible papal decrees and all the past Church Fathers and other Catholic theologians regarding the true and only meaning of the Salvation Dogma, the heretic Fr. Sullivan also admires Satan’s boldness and so-called courage for going against God and his good angels and his dogmas. These foolish and rebellious theologians rush in where good angels dare not go! Indeed, it is bold and daring to go against God and his Catholic Church. And might I add it is also stupid, foolish, unjust, arrogant, egotistical, rebellious, and the greatest of evils that Lucifer fell into when in his boldness and daring he rebelled against God. Need I tell you what happened to Lucifer and his fallen angels? I will let St. Peter tell you about these heretical theologians, these false prophets, and how they are the same as Lucifer and his fallen angels and hence share the same fate of everlasting hell:

¹ For an example of a dogma-changer regarding the Salvation Dogma, see in this book, “Apostate Fr. Francis A. Sullivan, S.J. (1922-2019),” p. 12.

Some Nominal Catholics Who Denied the Salvation Dogma: Fr. Francis A. Sullivan.

² *Salvation Outside the Church?* [hereafter SOC], by Francis A. Sullivan, S.J. Originally published by the Paulist Press, 1922. Currently published by Wipf and Stock Publications, Eugene, Oregon, 2002. Chap. 6, p. 98.

“But there were also false prophets among the people even as there shall be among you lying teachers who shall bring in sects of perdition and deny the Lord who bought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their riotousness through whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you, whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not and their perdition slumbereth not. For...God spared not the angels that sinned, but delivered them, drawn down by infernal ropes to the lower hell, unto torments, to be reserved unto judgment.” (2 Pt. 2:1-4)

As Lucifer said to God “I will not serve,” these rebellious theologians say the same thing to God when they seek religious truth from sources other than the Catholic Church’s infallible teachings. Instead of serving God and his dogmas as infallibly defined by His Catholic Church, they serve Satan and the evil world by seeking a perverse knowledge to defend their perverse and heretical opinions that deny God’s dogmas. These salvation heretic theologians seek the perverse knowledge of human psychology, which is a false religion based on humanism and Pelagianism. Both psychology and psychiatry were invented to replace and hence deny God and the true knowledge of his dogmas that tell men about the true nature and condition of hearts and souls and offer the only solution to heal the spiritual ills of the heart and soul.

Apostate Albert Pigghe (1490-1542)

In 1542 Albert Pigghe or Pigge or Pighius was the first nominal Catholic theologian to deny the Salvation Dogma and remain in good standing with Catholics. He admits that his belief is a novel and new revelation that was never held by any Catholic before him. Hence he was not only a salvation heretic but also a dogma-changer heretic:

Apostate Fr. Francis A. Sullivan, *Salvation Outside the Church?*, 2002: “What is most interesting in Pigge’s treatment of this question is that his reflection on the possibility that people who were invincibly ignorant of the Christian message could be justified by their faith in God, without faith in Christ, led him to reflect on the possibility of salvation for Moslems who were inculpably ignorant about the truth of the Christian religion. In entering on this question, he says that he realizes he is setting out on an uncharted sea, full of great problems and obscurities. He does not refer to anyone who had explored this territory before him. As far as I have been able to ascertain, he was the first Christian thinker to suggest that a Moslem’s lack of Christian faith might actually be inculpable, and that he could be saved by his faith in God. ... As far as I know, no Christian had drawn before him: that Moslems, too, could be inculpably ignorant of the truth of the Christian religion, and could find salvation through their sincere faith in God. It is a striking coincidence that this work of the Catholic theologian, Albert Pigge, was published exactly one hundred years after the Council of Florence had declared that Catholics must believe that anyone who died outside the Catholic Church would inevitably be damned to the eternal fires of hell. In our next chapter, we shall see how the Jesuits of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries continued the rethinking of traditional Catholic theology about the salvation of people who lived and died ‘outside the church.’”³

(See in this book, Some Nominal Catholics Who Denied the Salvation Dogma: Albert Pigghe or Pighius, 1490-1542.)

³ SOC, Chap. 5, pp. 78-80.

Apostates Juan Martínez de Ripalda, S.J. (1594-1648) and Gutberlet (1837-1928)

Two salvation heretics, Juan Ripalda and Gutberlet, knew that their opinion that denied the Salvation Dogma was a new revelation because they admitted that it contradicted all of the Church Fathers and other Catholic theologians that came before them and all of the infallible papal definitions. Yet they did not believe their opinion was heretical:

The Salvation of the Unbeliever, by apostate Fr. Riccardo Lombardi, S.J.: “[p. 55] Ripalda...held...the doctrine of broad faith (faith based upon reason that there is one God who rewards and punishes)... [p. 61] According to Ripalda’s doctrine of desire, men can be saved without [supernatural] faith... [p. 59] The ‘desire’ of Ripalda and Gutberlet in practice reduces itself to this: That an unbeliever’s soul may be so disposed that, if the truth were revealed to him, he would certainly accept it; thus it is a case, at most, of interpretative faith... [pp. 59-60] Let us begin with Ripalda’s account. First of all we must see what the authors to whom the doctrine is historically attributed thought about it in their own hearts; we see indeed signs of most interesting and instructive personal hesitations, which may help us to formulate our judgment. ‘One thing is very obvious’, says Father Harent, ‘and that is that they feel honest scruples about it’⁴—so much so that they end by recommending to their readers the usual thesis requiring the explicit act of strict faith, and have not the courage to press their own personal opinion. Ripalda’s position is well known. After having expounded and defended the opinion that bears his name he concludes: ‘There may be some who will dare freely to subscribe to the doctrine I have developed. For my own part, in such a grave matter, I have not the courage to do so, since the common consent of theologians appears to read into the texts of St. Paul and the Tridentine documents the absolute necessity of strict faith, to be exercised *in re* as the means of justification. Consequently, all that we have said has been set forth tentatively and without any certainty, to the end that the learned may either confirm it with their approval or correct it with their verdict.’⁵ And finally he confesses: ‘Meanwhile I hold absolutely that strict faith is necessary for justification, since neither of the two theories is proved with evident arguments. When there are probabilities and doubts in matters of grave importance—such as this—we must prefer the safer part.’⁶

“We find some hesitations in Gutberlet also. He too recognizes that the broad theory is not certain, although he judges it to be very probable; therefore in practice he wishes the common theory to be held. It is a question of man’s ultimate end, of his eternal salvation; therefore the surest means must be adopted. In fact, in his theoretical defence of the doctrine, it may be said that Gutberlet’s purpose was more negative than positive: a polemic defence against the adversaries of the Church rather than the maintenance of a position of obvious dogmatic significance. ‘When her enemies rebuke the Church for assigning to hell all who are ignorant of revelation’, he writes, ‘I wish to point out to them that the rebuke does not in reality concern a definition laid down by the Church, but only a thesis now commonly held in theology.’⁷ If the inventors of this first theory were themselves hesitant, no wonder it was coldly received by theologians.”⁸

The apostate Ripalda denied the Salvation Dogma by misinterpreting the infallible definitions of past popes. He says that the “common consent of theologians *appears* to read into the texts of St. Paul and the Tridentine documents the absolute necessity of strict faith.” By using the word *appears*, Ripalda leaves open the possibility that St. Paul and the Council of Trent did not teach

⁴ *Dict. de théol. cath.*, Vol. VII, col. 1771.

⁵ *De ente supernaturali*, disputatio 20, sect. 23, n. 123.

⁶ *De fide*, disputatio 17, sect. 13.

⁷ Gutberlet’s continuation of Heinrich’s *Dogmatische Théologie*, Vol. VIII, Magonza, 1897, p. 502.

⁸ *The Salvation of the Unbeliever*, by Riccardo Lombardi, S.J. Translation from the Italian original *La Salvezza di chi non ha fede* (Edizione “*La Civiltà Cattolica*”, Rome) by Dorothy M. White. Nihil Obstat: Daniel Dvivesteijn, S.T.D., Censor Depvtatvs. Imprimatur: E. Morrogh Bernard, Vicarivs Generalis, Westmonasterii, die XIX Decembris MCMLV. The Newman Press. First published 1956 in Great Britain. Disputatio. 20, sect. 23, n. 122.

that a strict faith (which is explicit belief in Jesus Christ and the Holy Trinity) is necessary for salvation. Hence he denied the Salvation Dogma by misinterpreting St. Paul and the Council of Trent—and, by his own admission, without one theologian to confirm his heretical opinion.⁹ Hence he admits that his opinion is a novel and new revelation, and that is why he is afraid to publicly teach it.

The apostate Gutberlet denied the Salvation Dogma by denying the very infallible charism of the Catholic Church. He refers to a dogma as the “common theory” and his heresy as the “broad theory” and says that his theory, his heresy, is “very probable.” Hence he refers to dogmas not as dogmas but only as theories that can thus be erroneous. That is why he refers to the Salvation Dogma as infallibly defined by past popes as a “thesis” and not as a dogma. He says,

“I wish to point out to them that the rebuke does not in reality concern a definition laid down by the Church, but only a *thesis* now commonly held in theology.”

If the Salvation Dogma were not a dogma as defined by the unanimous consensus of the Church Fathers (the ordinary magisterium) and infallible papal decrees (the solemn magisterium), then nothing can be a dogma. One wonders if Gutberlet would say that belief that Jesus is God is only a thesis and not a dogma. And if he admits this is a dogma, then why does he not admit the same with other dogmas. Obviously he is picking and choosing the dogmas he personally agrees with while rejecting the ones he does not personally agree with.

Apostate John de Lugo, S.J. (1583-1660)

The apostate Fr. Sullivan refers to Lugo’s denial of the Salvation Dogma as daring and revolutionary because it contradicted all of the medieval theologians and the Council of Florence’s¹⁰ infallible Bull *Cantata Domino*, which implies that Lugo’s opinion was a new and heretical revelation:

Apostate Fr. Francis A. Sullivan, *Salvation Outside the Church?*, 2002: “Juan De Lugo taught at the Roman College from 1621 to 1643, and subsequently was named a cardinal, as Robert Bellarmine had been before him. On the question of the possibility of salvation for people who had never had a chance to hear the message of the gospel, he gave the same response that Suarez had given: that they would receive the grace with which they could observe the natural law; and if they kept this, they would be enlightened so that they could arrive at faith in God, and with this they could have the implicit desire for Christian faith, baptism and membership in the church that would suffice for their salvation. However, De Lugo went beyond Suarez...in applying this solution not only to those who had never heard the gospel preached, but also to people who knew about Christ, but either did not believe in him, or had a faith that was not orthodox. De Lugo dared to suggest that heretics, Jews, and Moslems might not be damned, as the Council of Florence had said they would, but, on the contrary, might be saved through their sincere faith in God. ...De Lugo went further toward the modern Catholic position on the salvation of those ‘outside the church’ than any of his predecessors had done. Obviously, his position depends on his recognition that heretics, Jews, and Moslems might not be guilty of sinful unbelief, as St. Thomas and the medieval theologians had judged them to be. As medieval Christians saw it, it was only those who had heard nothing about Christ whose lack of Christian faith could be guiltless. It seemed obvious to them that the Jews were guilty of rejecting Christ, that the Moslems were the enemies of the Christian faith, and that heretics were guilty of sinning against the true faith. ...It is important for us to try to realize how revolutionary these ideas of De Lugo must have seemed to his contemporaries. After all, the Council of Florence had declared it to be a matter of faith to hold that all pagans, Jews, heretics, and schismatics who died outside the Catholic Church would inevitably be damned to hell. St. Thomas

⁹ Even though the Council of Trent was invalid and heretical, it teaches the truth in regard to the Salvation Dogma.

¹⁰ Even though the Council of Florence was invalid and heretical, it teaches the dogma in this regard.

and the whole medieval tradition had taught that there was no salvation for anyone in the Christian era without explicit faith in Christ. They were convinced that anyone who had heard about Christ and did not believe in him must be guilty of the sin of unbelief, for which he would be justly damned. Medieval popes and councils had declared again and again that there was no salvation outside the church. And yet here we have a Catholic theologian, teaching in Rome, who dared to suggest not only that people who had never heard of Christ might be saved, but that some Jews, Moslems, and heretics might not be guilty of the sin of unbelief, and in that case might find salvation through their sincere faith in God and contrition for their sins. The medieval presumption had been that everyone who sincerely sought the truth would inevitably be led to embrace the orthodox Christian faith. De Lugo dared to suggest that some who sincerely sought the truth might not recognize it in the Christian religion, and might still be saved by the faith in God which they found in their own religion.”¹¹

Indeed, Lugo’s opinion was revolutionary! But whom and what was Lugo revolting against? He was revolting against God and his Catholic Church! By the apostate Fr. Sullivan’s own admission and to his own satisfaction, Lugo revolted against the Catholic Church by revolting against the Salvation Dogma that was taught by infallible papal decrees, the unanimous consensus of the Church Fathers other Catholic theologians, and even by some nominal Catholic theologians and councils. In the 16th century the salvation heresy was indeed a revolutionary idea and hence a new and heretical revelation that heretical theologians introduced into imprimated books. And there the salvation heresy remained uncondemned while the automatically excommunicated heretic theologians remained undenounced as automatically excommunicated heretics and hence were looked upon as Catholics in good standing.

(See in this book *Some Nominal Catholics Who Denies the Salvation Dogma*: John de Lugo, S.J., 1583-1660.)

Salvation heresy not allowed as universities’ official position from the 16th to 18th centuries

No university allowed the heretical theologians to officially teach their salvation heresy in its name until after the 18th century. When presenting a university’s position on the Salvation Dogma, the heretical theologians were not allowed to mention their heresy and had to teach the true and only meaning of the Salvation Dogma as infallibly defined by the Church. The apostate Fr. Sullivan points out this fact:

Apostate Fr. Francis A. Sullivan, *Salvation Outside the Church?*, 2002: “Needless to say, Rousseau’s attack on the Christian religion did not go unanswered. In fact it received an almost immediate censure from the most prestigious Catholic theological faculty of the day, the Sorbonne of Paris.¹² M. Legrand, a Sulpician, was commissioned to write the official response to Rousseau’s *Émile* in the name of the faculty. It is instructive to see that he did not invoke the idea that for those who were inculpably ignorant of the Christian religion, an implicit faith in Christ could suffice for their salvation. As Louis Capéran remarks: ‘In France, in the 18th century, in an official document engaging the responsibility of the Sorbonne, it was not possible to speak of implicit faith in Jesus Christ.’¹³ In other words, at that period it was thought necessary, at all costs, to maintain the doctrine that no one could be saved without explicit faith in Christ. How then did the spokesman of the Sorbonne answer Rousseau’s argument that the God of Christian revelation must be unjust? He went back to St. Thomas for his answer. First of all, unbelief on the part of those who have heard nothing about the faith is not a sin. As St. Thomas put it, such unbelievers are damned on account of their other sins, which cannot be taken

¹¹ SOC, Chap. 6, pp. 94-99.

¹² *Censure de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris contre le livre intitulé Émile ou de l’Éducation*, in Migne, *Theologiae Cursus Completus*, vol. 2 (Paris 1838) 1111-1248.

¹³ Louis Capéran, *Le Problème du Salut des Infidèles, Essai Historique*, Toulouse, 1934, p. 400.

away without faith, but not on account of the sin of unbelief.¹⁴ Furthermore, if people who had heard nothing about Christ were ‘doing what lay in their power’ to keep the natural law, God would take even exceptional measures to enlighten them about the Christian faith. On the other hand, if some people were not so enlightened, it must be on account of their sinful lives, for which God could justly deprive them of salvation. Hence, their failure to achieve eternal salvation was their own fault, and God could not be charged with any injustice in depriving them of it.¹⁵ This was indeed the solution offered by the medieval theologians. But the theologian of the Sorbonne did not seem concerned about the difference between St. Thomas’ knowledge of the non-Christian world and his own.”¹⁶

The fact that the superiors of the universities did not allow the salvation heresy to be taught as the official position of the university proves that the superiors knew the salvation heresy was a new and heretical revelation that changed the meaning of the Salvation Dogma as infallibly defined by many popes and held by the unanimous consensus of the Fathers and all of the theologians up to and including the Middle Ages. Hence the superiors were guilty of heresy by sins of omission and association for not denouncing the heretics who were denying the Salvation Dogma and for not condemning their books. Instead, the superiors gave imprimaturs to books that denied the Salvation dogma and referred to the salvation heretics as Catholics in good standing. Hence, according to these superiors, the Salvation Dogma was not really a dogma but only an allowable opinion (a thesis) that can hence be erroneous. Or they held the heresy that dogmas can change their meaning and thus were dogma-changer heretics.

Apostate Fr. Joseph Clifford Fenton (1906-1969)

In 1951 in his article “The Meaning of the Church’s Necessity for Salvation, Part II,” from the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, Volume 124, the apostate Fr. Joseph Clifford Fenton, a salvation heretic himself, teaches that the salvation heresy first entered into books with imprimaturs in the 16th century and progressed from that point forward. Note also how he refers to the Salvation Dogma not as a dogma but as a thesis:

Apostate Fr. Joseph Clifford Fenton, *The Meaning of the Church’s Necessity for Salvation*, 1951: “[p. 207] The many faulty presentations of the teaching on the Church’s necessity for salvation have a definite background in theological history. First of all, this thesis is so bound up with the fundamental teaching of the nature of the Church itself that any misunderstanding about one of these doctrines inevitably brings about an erroneous grasp of the other. Moreover, as it stands now in the body of scholastic ecclesiology, the thesis of the necessity of the Church is not the development of the doctrine on this subject in the works of the older theologians, but rather the continuation of what was basically only a group of answers to certain objections inserted into the treatises of the great controversialists of the late sixteenth century. Finally there have been many transmutations in the meanings attached to the terms ‘body’ and ‘soul’ of the Church from the time of St. Robert [Bellarmine] until the early part of the nineteenth century. These are factors which definitely must be taken into consideration if we are to gain anything like an adequate understanding of the thesis as it has hitherto appeared in Catholic literature.

“[p. 209] A greater enlargement of this thesis came about in the post-Reformation period [16th century], it came as the development of a group of answers to objections, and not as progress along the line of the pre-Reformation treatment of the thesis. Ultimately this enlargement or progress considered the question from the point of view of the minimum in the way of attachment to the Church that could be considered as sufficient for salvation, rather than in line with a study of the

¹⁴ *Summa theologiae* II-II, q. 10, a. 1.

¹⁵ Migne, *Theologiae cursus completus*, vol. 2 (Paris 1838), 1179-1182.

¹⁶ SOC, Chap. 7, The Nineteenth Century, pp. 106-107.

conditions divine revelation ascribes to salvation itself, conditions which indicate the living and visible Church of Jesus Christ as involved in the necessary *terminus ad quem* of the process of supernatural revelation.

“[pp. 210-211] Turrecremata’s masterpiece had a distinctly polemical orientation. Written in mid-fifteenth century and printed for the first time in Cologne in 1480, the *Summa de ecclesia* was directed against *pestilentes quidam homines, spiritu ambitionis inflati*,¹⁷ the members of the anti-papal faction at the Council of Basle. Despite its controversial orientation, however, the book contained a relatively complete and quite objective statement of the basic characteristics of the Catholic Church. *The Summa de ecclesia* gives an early and careful consideration to what Turrecremata calls ‘the pernicious error of those men who, animated by evil sentiments towards the dignity of the holy, Catholic, and apostolic Church and the sacrament of its inseparable unity, presume to declare that anyone can be saved in his own sect outside this holy Church.’¹⁸ He declares this teaching to be ‘not only false or erroneous, but also heretical.’¹⁹ He expressly teaches that the contradictory of this heretical doctrine can be demonstrated in many ways, but he professes himself as content, in this instance, to base his own arguments on what the Scriptures teach about the virtue of faith, ‘since the unity of the holy Catholic and apostolic Church springs primarily from the unity of faith.’²⁰ The chapter containing this material contains no less than seven distinct proofs or demonstrations of the Church’s necessity based on the divine teaching about that faith which is a basic bond of unity within the Church. In following this procedure, John de Turrecremata was contributing to and developing a theological tradition accepted by St. Thomas Aquinas himself. Commenting on the Fourth Lateran Council’s words, ‘There is one universal Church of the faithful, outside of which no one at all is saved,’ the Angelic Doctor writes that ‘the Church’s unity exists primarily for the unity of the faith, for the Church is nothing but the congregation of the faithful. And, because without faith it is impossible to please God, it follows that there is no opportunity for salvation outside the Church.’²¹ Had the tragedy of the Reformation never come to pass, it seems entirely probable that subsequent theologians would have gone on to cultivate this tradition which St. Thomas had accepted and which John de Turrecremata had so magnificently enriched. Pressing practical considerations, however, brought the great Catholic writers of the sixteenth and the early seventeenth centuries to adopt an entirely different course. These men were primarily controversialists.”

Notice how the salvation heretic Fr. Fenton refers to the 16th century salvation heretics as “great Catholic writers.” To be dogmatically honest, Fr. Fenton needed to replace the word “Catholic” with the word “heretic”—“the great heretic writers.”

(For Fr. Fenton’s hypocrisy and denial of the Salvation Dogma, see in this book, *The Apostate Fr. Fenton’s hypocrisy and denial of the Salvation Dogma*.)

Apostate Mark Massa, S.J. (b. 1950).

The apostate Mark Massa is a member of the apostate Vatican II Church. He is also a salvation heretic. Nevertheless, in his book *Catholics and American Culture*, he shows that it took less than 100 years for the salvation heresy to corrupt most of the laymen from the time it first entered catechisms in the late 19th century to the middle of the 20th century when most laymen believed in the salvation heresy. He admits that the salvation heresy is a new revelation that was not believed by most Catholics until the mid-twentieth century. But he does not believe that the

¹⁷ *Summa de ecclesia* (Venice, 1561), p. 1^r.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 23^v.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *In decretalem I expositio ad Archidiaconum Tridentinum*. This work is numbered 23 in the old Roman edition and 31 in the edition of Mandonnet. The passage is found in the Mandonnet edition (Paris: Lethielleux, 1927), IV, 338.

salvation heresy is heresy because he also believes in the heresy that a dogma can change its meaning according to time, place, or circumstance.²² Hence he believes that the Salvation Dogma has changed its meaning due to the circumstances of the modern world. This enables him to give an impartial historical account of the original (and I must add *only*) meaning of the dogma and of the facts surrounding the Boston Heresy Case. Salvation heretics who do not believe a dogma can change its meaning are faced with the impossible task of trying to reconcile their heresy with past infallible teachings that oppose their heretical interpretation. And as a result they resort to every trick and underhanded method in order to make heresy reconcile with dogmatic truth. Mostly they just ignore and hide the dogmatic teachings and hope their victims do not read them. But Mark Massa is not faced with this dilemma because he believes a dogma can change its meaning. He readily admits that the new interpretation of the Salvation Dogma contradicts the meaning (sense) of past infallible definitions. This enables him to speak many truths in his chapter on the apostate Fr. Feeney and the Boston Heresy Case while not realizing the full import of his words. He rightly teaches that the Salvation Dogma's changed meaning is not based on theology but is an accommodation influenced by non-Catholic culture, which leads him to doubt his own heretical belief that dogmas can change:

Apostate Mark S. Massa, S.J., *Catholics and American Culture*: Chapter 1, Boundary Maintenance: Leonard Feeney, the Boston Heresy Case, and the Postwar Culture:

“[p. 21] ‘The first sign of your approaching damnation is that Notre Dame has Protestants on its football team.’ - A Feeneyite at a Notre Dame Football game, 1953 -

“On the afternoon of September 4, 1952, the readers of the *Boston Pilot*—the voice of the Roman Catholic archdiocese—found on the front page of their usually staid weekly the text of the trenchant letter from the Holy Office in Rome. The text, dated August 8, addressed a group of Boston Catholics who had kicked up quite a fuss over the ancient theological dictum *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* (‘outside the church there is no salvation’)—a phrase going back to St. Cyprian in the third century and one of the pillars of orthodoxy for Christian believers.

“The letter itself was actually an ambivalent affair... it allowed that a person might be ‘in the church’ by a more than ‘implicit desire’—**an interpretation that had achieved almost normative status among Catholic theologians by the mid-twentieth century, although it has never been officially interpreted as such by Rome.**

“[p. 23] What has tended to be overlooked in these interpretations of the Feeney episode, however, is the irony of the ‘boundary redefinition’ between Catholicism and American culture that the Feeney case marked with such dramatic clarity: far from representing an authoritarian threat to the democratic institutions of American society, American Catholicism seemed to fall over itself in the years after World War II to become part of what sociologist Will Herberg termed the ‘Triple Melting Pot,’ indistinguishable from Protestantism and Judaism in terms of its political, social, and moral positions. It was precisely *this* seemingly uncritical embrace of all things American that first alarmed Feeney and his followers, and their adamant refusal to acquiesce in this cultural embrace...

“[p. 27] Feeney’s message—that the Catholic tradition stood over and against a bankrupt post-Protestant culture teetering on the brink of intellectual anarchy and physical annihilation—reached ready ears. By the late 1940’s the center boasted two hundred converts...

“[pp. 28-29] Applying Cyprian’s doctrine of salvation with a ferocity and literalness that appeared to beg for confrontation, Feeney (and many of the center students who soon became known as ‘Feenyites’) broadcast teaching that rejected the ecumenism

²² See in this book, *The Meaning of a Dogma Cannot Change*.

and movement into the mainstream that defined the postwar religious revival: Harvard was a ‘pesthole of atheism and Marxism’; its president, James Conant, was a ‘thirty-third degree Mason brute’; Boston College, run by Feeney’s own Jesuit province, had lapsed into heresy for teaching that non-Roman Catholics might actually be saved.

“The Catholic ‘liberals’ (such as they were in the 1940’s) likewise increasingly became the targets of his contempt. Feeney enjoyed explaining (with both irony and contempt in his voice) that Catholic liberals didn’t like talk about the doctrine of salvation because it was not ‘nice’: niceness had replaced orthodoxy as the test of a doctrine’s viability. Catherine Clarke would later capture this same contempt in explaining Feeney’s position during the gathering storm:

‘[The] Catholic liberal is one who, having taken all his cultural standards from a non-Catholic society, tries to make his Catholic dogmas square with those standards... The situation [has] induced Catholics to attempt to reconcile beliefs they had brought over from Europe with the humanitarian, utilitarian, pragmatic, and political ideals of the new world. It ended up by leaving Catholics with a set of relative standards as regards religion... A liberal Catholic always knows how God *should* behave, for God’s behavior is invariably made to conform with the liberal’s own fine feelings.’

“The previous archbishop of Boston, William O’ Connell, would have easily resonated with these words. As something of a prototypical American ultramontanist, O’Connell had forbidden absolutism to Catholic mothers who placed the education of their children in the hands of ‘infidels, heretics, and atheists’; he had frowned on Catholic students attending secular schools like Harvard and loved to show up at civic occasions in full regalia, demanding his due as prince of the church from discomfited Yankees. His successor, however, was different. Richard Cushing had little time for abetting the outsider image of the church, possessing the shrewdness as well as the warmth of a politician from South Boston, where he was born and raised. Furthermore, he seems to have been deeply influenced by his sister’s happy marriage to a Jewish man. The loudly proclaimed ‘Romanism’ of his predecessor was not for him.

“[pp. 32-33] On strictly theological grounds, Feeney’s teaching was not as outrageous or pathological as might appear from the vantage of post-Vatican II Catholic reality. Catholic propagandists in Counter-Reformation Europe had certainly believed their Protestant opponents, no less than Moslem infidels, to be beyond the reach of grace [sanctifying grace], and a rigorist interpretation of Cyprian’s phrase clearly uncovers the motives undergirding much of the missionary activity between the sixteenth and twentieth centuries. The urgency of ‘snatching souls’ from the jaws of hell inspired Jesuit Francis Xavier in India...to go out and preach the good news to the ‘people that walked in darkness’ (Isa. 9:2)...

“Long before 1965, however—certainly by the end of the decade following the Second World War—most North American Catholics had ceased to believe that their good Protestant and Jewish neighbors were going to eternal ruin at death, invincibly ignorant or not. Leonard Feeney had recognized as early as 1945 this quiet but quite important revolution in Catholic thinking about boundaries between Catholics and North American culture. Indeed, Feeney’s insight saves the Boston Heresy Case from comic opera and makes it an important episode in the North American experience.

“[pp. 34-35] Feeney’s rigorist interpretation of *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* [outside the Church there is no salvation] arguably stood closer to its meaning held by Pope Innocent III in the thirteenth and St. Francis Xavier in the sixteenth centuries than did that of his ‘liberal’ Catholic opponents who found his teaching abhorrent. Indeed, in the era **between the Reformation and Vatican II, ‘the church’ in official dogmatic statements had meant precisely what Feeney said it did**... The church found itself in a no win situation, trying to hold on to its claims to

unequivocal truth even while censuring one who had proclaimed that truth a little too literally...

“The boundary line marking those saved from those condemned had moved (or perhaps been moved) to include others (that is, most Americans) who had no desire, implicit or otherwise, to join the Roman communion...

“Doctrinal positions that had been considered rigorous but nonetheless orthodox at an earlier moment in North American Catholic history were now perceived to be beyond the pale—beliefs that the collective now declared to be deviant and even dangerous to the community. The collective conscience had changed, the boundary between what constituted ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ had moved or been scaled down, and the official interpretation of what it meant to be ‘outside the church’ had changed with it. ...An older, hardline interpretation of the church’s relationship to those ‘outside’ of its body—an interpretation almost sectarian in its rigorous denunciation of the belief that one might ‘with impunity consort constantly with heretics and atheists’—was now declared to be deviant, damnably so...

“[p. 36] Indeed, the later, *ex post facto* theological justification for this boundary redefinition, offered at Vatican II, raises quite legitimate questions about the role of cultural (as opposed to theological) impulses redefining the relationship of ‘Christ’ to ‘culture’...

“Feeney’s opponents blithely abandoned the fortress of the immigrant Catholic subculture for the fair and broad plans of mainstream American culture with an optimism and enthusiasm that, in retrospect, appears at best equally uncritical. Catholics, no less than mainstream Protestants, stood in danger of embracing a ‘culture religion’ that Gibson Winter at the time termed ‘the suburban captivity of the churches.’

“If America was, indeed, ‘the land too easily loved,’ then many postwar Catholics appeared to stand among the front ranks of its admirers. At least part of the *irony* of the story, therefore, is that the ‘accommodationist,’ winning side of the Boston Heresy Case announced and celebrated the removal of the old boundary between Holy Mother Church and the Redeemer Nation without adumbrating a new one that elucidated a clearly defined boundary between the claims of the church and the claims of the culture. The social, economic, and political rewards of ‘letting down the drawbridge’ from the Catholic fortress were so great that few ‘mainstream Catholics’—a new term that would emerge in the next few decades—saw much danger at the time. American Catholicism, quite suddenly, was no longer exactly a ‘church’ in the older, dogmatic sense of Cyprian’s phrase—the sole locus of truth and fidelity on the darkening plains of history. But it was not exactly a ‘denomination’ in the American Protestant sense either, as it continued to make claims to unqualified authority vis-à-vis other Christian believers.

“The Boston Heresy Case foreshadowed a Catholic future that would take the route charted by those whom Feeney termed ‘accommodationist liberals.’ This may seem like a penetrating glimpse of the obvious today, now safely on the other side of Vatican II, but it was not always so obvious. There was a time, before Knute Rockne’s day, when one expected everyone on Notre Dame football team to be a good Catholic.”²³

By changing the meaning of the Salvation Dogma, Massa admits that the salvation heretics have passed beyond the boundaries set by the Fathers: “*Pass not beyond the ancient bounds which thy fathers have set.*” (Prv. 22:28) What Mr. Massa needs to know in order to rid himself of one of his heresies is that a dogma can never change its meaning. This dogma will set him free from his chaotic belief in which the truth constantly changes with every wind that blows hard enough against it.

²³ *Catholics and American Culture*, Mark S. Massa, S. J., Associate Professor of Church History and Director of the American Studies Program at Fordham University, The Crossroad Publishing Company, New York, 1999.

Apostate Fr. Francis A. Sullivan, S.J. (1922-2019)

Just like the apostate Mark Massa, the apostate Fr. Francis A. Sullivan is a salvation heretic and a dogma-changer heretic. Hence just like Massa, Sullivan readily admits that he and other dogma changers have changed the original meaning of the Salvation Dogma due to the changing circumstances of so-called advancements in human psychology and the discovery of the American Indians in the 16th century.²⁴ This leads him to blasphemously refer to the Council of Florence's²⁵ teaching and other teachings on the Salvation Dogma as "atrocious":

Fr. Francis A. Sullivan, *Salvation Outside the Church?*, 2002: "As we come to the end of our history of Christian thought about salvation for those outside the church, it seems appropriate to reflect on what we have learned about the way in which the teaching of the church can develop and change in the course of the centuries. We begin our reflections by recalling the key statement made by Pope John XXIII in his opening address to the bishops at the Second Vatican Council: 'The substance of the ancient doctrine of the deposit of the faith is one thing, and the way in which it is presented is another.'²⁶ About ten years later, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in its declaration *Mysterium Ecclesiae* spelled out some of the reasons why, in the course of the centuries, there have been changes in the way the church's teaching has been presented. For the first time an official document of the Catholic Church explicitly recognized the 'historical conditioning' which inevitably affects the way in which her faith has been expressed. It acknowledged the fact that at an earlier period a dogmatic truth might be expressed incompletely or imperfectly, and only later, when considered in a broader context of faith or human knowledge, receive a fuller and more perfect expression.²⁷ ...However, during most of the church's history, this truth has been expressed in a negative way by the formula: 'No salvation outside the church.' This formulation of the doctrine frequently led to the naming of categories of people who, being 'outside the church,' were thought to be excluded from salvation and destined for eternal damnation. ...Now, not only Christian heretics and schismatics, but pagans and Jews as well, were judged guilty of grave sin for refusing to join the Christian community. And so, in the sixth century, we find Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe, formulating the doctrine of the necessity of belonging to the church in terms of the belief that all pagans, Jews, heretics and schismatics would be condemned to hell. That this remained the standard expression of the doctrine for almost a thousand years is shown by the fact that the Council of Florence, in 1442, incorporated Fulgentius' formula into its Decree for the Jacobites. ...The limits of their grasp of human psychology led them to the conviction that all those who had heard the message of the gospel and did not accept it must be guilty of sinning against the truth which surely was evident to them. The medieval Christian does not seem to have been capable of understanding how Jews, for instance, living in the midst of Christendom, could fail to recognize the truth of the Christian religion, or how their persistence in their own religion could be anything else than a sin of obduracy. These limits of the geographical and psychological horizons of medieval Christians are historical factors which profoundly conditioned their expression of the doctrine of the necessity of the church for salvation. The atrocious formulation of this doctrine, which the Council of Florence incorporated into its Decree for the Jacobites, can be understood only if one takes into consideration the cultural factors which conditioned medieval Christians to think that all those outside the church must be guilty of grave sin, and hence that God would justly condemn them all to hell. The limits of this geographical horizon were to be drastically expanded just fifty years after the Council of Florence, when Columbus discovered America. Awareness that there were whole continents inhabited by people who had never before had the opportu-

²⁴ See in this book, The Meaning of a Dogma Cannot Change.

²⁵ Even though the Council of Florence was invalid and heretical, it teaches the Salvation Dogma.

²⁶ AAS 54 (1962) 792.

²⁷ AAS 65 (402-03).

nity to believe in Christ led Catholic theologians to express the doctrine of the necessity of the church for salvation in terms consistent with belief in God's salvific will in regard to all those generations prior to the arrival of the missionaries. Interestingly enough, the necessity of rethinking the medieval solution to this question stimulated some of those theologians to question the assumption that all who had heard the gospel but had not accepted it must be guilty of sin in rejecting the salvation that was offered to them. It would take several centuries more for the limits of the psychological horizon to expand sufficiently so that the presumption of guilt, which was characteristic of the medieval judgment concerning all those outside the church, would gradually change, first into a recognition that some of them might be in good faith, and then into the general presumption of innocence which is now the official attitude of the Catholic Church. ... Besides this theological development, other factors have also played an important part in bringing about the positive attitude of the modern Catholic Church concerning the salvation of those 'outside.' Perhaps the best way to describe these factors is to speak of a 'broadening of horizons.' In place of a 'ghetto mentality' that was rather typical of Catholicism in the past, Catholics are now open to the values present in the world 'outside the church.' In the first place, through the impact of the ecumenical movement, which came to them at first from the Protestant and Anglican churches, Catholics have come to recognize other Christians as brothers and sisters in Christ. Then, more gradually, there has been the opening of the minds of Catholics to the people who do not share Christian faith, and to the values to be found in their religions. It is obvious that when people are no longer seen as strangers and adversaries, but are accepted as partners in dialogue, they are much less likely to be judged guilty of sin for remaining faithful to their own religious traditions. The conclusion we come to is that cultural factors have had a decisive influence on the way that the dogmatic truth about the necessity of the church for salvation has been expressed by the Catholic Church in the past, and on the way that it is being expressed now. The limited horizons of the medieval Christian mentality, on the one hand, and the expansion of those horizons that began with the discovery of the new world just five hundred years ago, are elements of the 'historical conditioning' which the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith has told us we must take into account in interpreting church teaching. Indeed, without taking this into account, it would be hardly possible to explain the difference between what the Catholic Church said in 1442 and what it is saying today about the possibility of salvation for all those people who are 'outside the church.'"²⁸

Hence this dogma-changer heretic not only presents the Church Fathers and popes who upheld the Salvation Dogma as stupid or at least not as enlightened as modern men, but he also presents the Holy Spirit as having been stupid or at least not having been as enlightened as modern men because it is God the Holy Spirit who makes infallible definitions through the unanimous consensus of the Church Fathers and popes.

But if they truly believe dogma that the Holy Spirit knows all things, past, present, and future, then he presents the Holy Spirit as a liar because the Holy Spirit lied about the Salvation Dogma in the earlier days of the Church because he now teaches the opposite by denying the original meaning of the Salvation Dogma. Well, the Holy Spirit is all powerful and all knowing and does not lie because he is God, the Third Person of the Most Holy and Blessed Trinity. The Holy Spirit is the one who makes infallible definitions through the unanimous consensus of the Church Fathers and through the popes. Hence it is blasphemy and heresy to say or even imply that the Holy Spirit lacks any kind of knowledge or is unaware of any future circumstances when he infallibly defines dogmas through the unanimous consensus of the Church Fathers and the popes.

During the time period of the Catholic Church when the Holy Spirit infallibly defined the true meaning of the Salvation Dogma from Pentecost Days and was upheld for 1400 years, the apostate Fr. Sullivan has the Holy Spirit being ignorant of existence of the Indians on the American continent and ignorant of and being swayed by the so-called advances in human

²⁸ SOC, Conclusion, pp. 199-204.

psychology. All the dogma changer heretics have this blasphemous heresy in common, that the Holy Spirit is ignorant of certain things and does not foresee all things or he is a liar.

And what are we to make of the apostate Fr. Sullivan's claim that advances in psychology by rebellious, sinful human beings take precedence over what God has told mankind about the deepest thoughts and ways of men. Through God's holy Church during the Old Testament period and now through his holy Catholic Church during the New Covenant era, God has already told mankind everything it needs to know about spiritual things regarding humans. So what good can come from a human psychology that was specifically invented by rebellious and sinful men in order to deny what God has already told us about the spiritual nature of men! Only a rebellious man who hates the one true God and his commandments would dare pretend to have a better understanding about the spiritual nature of men than God does! Any source other than God that tells mankind about the spiritual things of men is not to be trusted and is bound to contain blasphemies, heresies, and other falsehoods because Satan is at the root of that source—be it psychology or psychiatry or philosophy, all of which St. Paul condemns:

“As, therefore, you have received Jesus Christ the Lord, walk ye in him, rooted and built up in him and confirmed in the faith, as also you have learned, abounding in him in thanksgiving. Beware lest any man cheat you by philosophy and vain deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the elements of the world, and not according to Christ.” (Col. 2:6-8)

And what are we to make of the apostate Fr. Sullivan's illogical, foolish, dishonest, and ludicrous claim that the American Indians were the only group of people during the New Covenant era who never had a chance to have the gospel preached to them within their lifetime and hence that this shocking discovery changes the meaning of the Salvation Dogma as previously defined by the Holy Spirit speaking through unanimous consensus of the Church Fathers and the popes? Did the Catholic Church convert the whole world within the lifetime of the original apostles? No! For instance, the gospel was not preached in Britain until the 2nd century and France until the 5th century and Hungary until the 10th century. Certainly, the apostles, Church Fathers, theologians of the Middle Ages, and all the popes were aware of the fact that the gospel had not been preached to everyone in the world; yet, they held to the dogma given to them by Christ, as infallibly defined by the Holy Spirit, that no one can be saved without in the very least an explicit faith in the Catholic Church and her basic dogmas; such as belief in Jesus Christ, the Incarnation, the Holy Trinity, and the necessity of being a member of the Catholic Church to be saved (after all, that is main reason men want to become members of the Catholic Church, to be saved):

“They are cut off, and are gone down to hell, and others are risen up in their place. Young men have seen the light, and dwelt upon the earth: but the way of knowledge they have not known, Nor have they understood the paths thereof, neither have their children received it, it is far from their face. It hath not been heard of in the land of Chanaan, neither hath it been seen in Theman.” (Bar. 3:19-22)

St. Fulgentius, *Synodal Letter of Fulgentius and Other African Bishops, to John and Venerius*, 6th century: “Grace [of justification] is not properly esteemed by any one who supposes that it is given to all men, when not only does the faith not pertain to all, but even at the present time some nations may yet be found to whom the preaching of the faith has not yet come. But the Blessed Apostle says: ‘How then are they to call upon Him in whom they have not believed? or how shall they believe in him whom they have not heard? But how are they to hear, without preaching?’ Grace, then, is not given to all; for certainly they cannot be participants in that grace who are not believers, nor can they believe if it is found that the preaching of the faith has never come to them at all.”²⁹

²⁹ 15, 10; Contained in apostate Rev. William A. Jurgens, *The Faith of the Early Fathers*, vol. 3, 2277.

And some countries in which the gospel was preached fell away and banned the gospel. Does that mean that the people in that country no longer have to believe in the Catholic Church and faith to be saved, as was the case with the previous generation of inhabitants! If God allowed such a curse to befall a country, who is mere man to counteract it and turn it into a blessing and even an easier way to be saved because these people no longer have to believe in and obey all that the Catholic God commands through his Catholic Church. Just because a Catholic cannot understand God's justice and mercy regarding the Salvation Dogma, he is not allowed to deny or even doubt that dogma or any dogma for any reason. If he does, he becomes an automatically excommunicated heretic and is no longer Catholic.

Protestants admit the salvation heresy is a new revelation

The Oxford Illustrated History of Christianity

To my knowledge, apostate Antipope Pius IX, in 1856, was the first so-called pope to deny the Salvation Dogma.³⁰ Pius IX's denial of the Salvation Dogma was a focal point that other salvation heretics used for the salvation heresy to enter imprimatured books that teach laymen, such as catechisms, and hence to breach the faith of most Catholics.

The following quote from a Protestant version of the history of Christianity glories in the fact that the Salvation Dogma has changed from its original meaning in order to open the door of salvation to those who die worshipping false gods or practicing false religions. It also admits this is a new revelation that goes contrary to the original meaning of the Salvation Dogma as infallibly defined by unanimous consensus of the Church fathers and by popes and even as taught by some apostate antipopes who came before apostate Antipope Pius IX. The author, John McManners, speaks of the efforts of Protestants and schismatics to get Catholics to acknowledge them as equals, to sit down together in ecumenical gatherings to mutually determine how to work toward unity. This Protestant author links the ultimate success of this venture by the Vatican II Church (aka the Conciliar Church) with apostate Antipope Pius IX changed meaning of the Salvation Dogma and thus with his denial of the true meaning of the Salvation Dogma. He then exalts the apostate antipopes John XXIII and Paul VI who furthered these plans. But the ultimate praise goes to apostate Antipope John Paul II, the finisher of the work of the apostate Second Vatican Council, who promulgated and implemented all its poison:

The Oxford Illustrated History of Christianity, John McManners: "Nevertheless the ecumenical mood had consequences in the European churches. They were far readier to share their altars with each other, and even their church buildings, and to co-operate in common social ventures. This difference was most marked in the Roman Catholic Church. Since the Counter-Reformation Rome taught that it alone was the church... In the nineteenth century, when Catholicism was centralizing itself ever more in Rome, Pope Pius IX admitted that men might be saved outside the church by reason of 'invincible ignorance' of the true faith. This was a large concession of charity in the tradition of thought.³¹ When the ecumenical movement grew strong, Pope Pius XI formally refused to take part (1928), lest participation imply a recognition that the Roman Catholic Church was but one of a number of denominations. The same encyclical forbade Roman Catholics to take part in conferences with non-Roman Catholics. All this began to change after the Second World War. But it was the accession of Pope John XXIII in 1958 which began to transform the atmosphere. Part of his object in summoning the Second Vatican Council was to heal the separations in the East and West, and he continued

³⁰ See in this book, Some Nominal Catholics Who Denied the Salvation Dogma: Pius IX, 1792-1878

³¹ The enemy was quick to pick up on the supposed breach. They admit it is a novelty, a new revelation that has never been taught by the Catholic Church. In so doing they also admit the contrary, that the orthodox position was taught previous to Pius IX's pontificate because they say he had made a "concession" relating to the dogma.

to recognize the Protestants of the West as brothers. An encyclical of 1959 greeted non-Catholics as ‘separated brethren and sons’. In 1960 the pope set up a Secretariat for Christian Unity. In the same year he received Archbishop Fisher of Canterbury. In 1961 he allowed Roman Catholic observers to attend the meeting of the World Council at Delhi. His successor Paul VI carried this new and far more charitable attitude much further. In 1965 he and the Patriarch of Constantinople Athenagoras agreed to a joint declaration deploring the mutual excommunications of 1054 which had stained their past histories as churches. In 1967 he met the Patriarch again, the year after he had met Archbishop Ramsey of Canterbury. The doctrine that Roman Catholics cannot share in worship with other Christians was finally killed by the Polish Pope John Paul II when in 1982 he went to Canterbury Cathedral with the Anglican Archbishop Runcie of Canterbury... All this was part of the coming out of the papacy towards the world.³²

This Protestant admits that the Salvation Dogma as infallibly defined before apostate Antipope Pius IX has changed its meaning and hence is a new revelation. So here we have an impartial testimony from a non-Catholic who admits the Salvation Dogma has changed its meaning to allow for the salvation of men who die worshipping false gods or practicing false religions. The Protestants, as you have just read, were enthralled that the Salvation Dogma has changed its meaning so that they are no longer damned forever to hell for living and dying in their Protestant religions. In the eyes of these Protestants, the Roman Catholic Church ceded her original infallible teaching regarding the Salvation Dogma by admitting she was wrong and much too tyrannical, strict, and harsh in her treatment, judgment, and condemnation of the non-Catholic world. Hence in the eyes of the non-Catholic world, recognition was given to false religions as not being as bad as the Catholic Church had said they were before the denial of the Salvation Dogma, as the new (heretical) meaning of the Salvation Dogma teaches that men can now be saved by living and dying in a Protestant, schismatic, or other false religion. As a result, past infallible anathemas by the Catholic Church were eventually lifted against non-Catholic religions and their founders and followers. Honor and respect were given to false religions and condemned heretics to the point that so-called Catholics were taught that they can pray with non-Catholics and were encouraged to respect and learn the teachings of false religions and to take part in their religious rites and customs.

Hollywood admits the salvation heresy is a new revelation

The Cardinal

Apostate Jewish and Masonic controlled Hollywood is one of Satan’s main weapons in attacking the Catholic Church by distorting and lying about Catholic history and by introducing heretical and immoral doctrines to the world. A 1963 Hollywood movie, *The Cardinal*, directed by Otto Preminger, was a major weapon used to indoctrinate the public with the salvation heresy while proving that this heresy is a new revelation. The time frame of the movie was the World War II era, the 1920’s to the 1940’s. The movie shows that during that time period most so-called Catholic priests denied the Salvation Dogma while some Catholic laymen did not. These laymen believed the dogma in the true and only sense as the Catholic Church infallibly defined it. The evidence from this movie also proves what Mark Massa said—that the salvation heresy was not believed by most laymen until the mid-twentieth century, until after World War II. Here is the dialogue from the movie. The scene is set with a group of young Catholics in a church with their priest, the star of the movie, who is teaching them catechism:

Youth 1: Father, I’ve got a bet.

³² *The Oxford Illustrated History of Christianity*, by John McManners, cap. 10, “The Ecumenical Movement.” Oxford University Press, Oxford, NY. 1990. P. 373.

Priest: What about?

Youth 1: Well, Chick here, he says that only Catholics can get into heaven.

Youth 2: Everyone knows Protestants can't go to heaven.

Youth 1: Why can't Protestants go to heaven?

Priest: Anyone have an answer for that?

Youth 3: Because they ain't Catholics.

Priest: Now, how does that strike the rest of you? You're all wrong. The Catholic Church teaches that it is possible for anyone, Protestant, Mohammedan, Jew, anyone who does God's will according to his conscience, to go to heaven.

Youth 4: Well, then what's the use of going to all this trouble to be Catholic?

Youth 5: Yes, Father, what's the use?

Priest: Well, we'll take that up next Sunday. I think we've all had enough for today.

Jew catechumen: The kid had a point there, don't you think?

Before World War II, then, these children believed in the Salvation Dogma in its original and only meaning as infallibly defined. They obviously had not been infected by one of the heretical catechisms that contained the salvation heresy, which is one proof that some churches did not use heretical catechisms. One of the good questions from a youth who believed in the Salvation Dogma proves that the salvation heresy contradicts not only the faith but also reason, when the youth said, "Well, then what's the use of going to all this trouble to be Catholic?" In other words, why not be a Protestant because it would be a lot easier to be saved as a Protestant than as a Catholic because the Catholic Church has so many more commandments that must be obeyed in order to be saved. And the Jew catechumen who defended this youth's question had more common sense and knew more about the dogma than the heretic priest. This heretic priest, who is a wolf in sheep's clothing, was the first one to introduce this new, heretical revelation to these children with the hope that they would believe it. And this priest's evasion from honestly addressing good questions and evidence is a trademark of heretics. One can only imagine how many people who watched this movie became infected with the salvation heresy or confirmed in it because according to the public whatever Hollywood puts out is dogma. Not only is this movie a cause of Catholics losing the faith but also of non-Catholics remaining confidently on the road to hell by promising them salvation while they worship false gods or practice false religions. Instead of edifying and evangelizing, this movie corrupted Catholics and un-evangelized non-Catholics and gave the Catholic Church a bad name by making the public think that she teaches this heresy, the salvation heresy.

Apostate Jews admit the salvation heresy is a new revelation

Gary Rosenblatt

The Jewish Week, "Three Faiths and a Glimmer of Hope," Gary Rosenblatt, Editor and Publisher, 8/29/2003: "During the interactive discussions I came to realize how painful and difficult it has been for the Catholic Church, starting with Vatican II in the early 1960s, to face up to its shameful treatment of the Jews and, as a result, reverse a centuries-old position that salvation for mankind can only come through Jesus. ... In a lesser-known case, Richard Cardinal Cushing excommunicated a Boston priest, Leonard Feeney, in 1953, for preaching that all non-Catholics would go to Hell. Even though Father Feeney's words were based on the Gospel, Cardinal Cushing found them offensive, in large part because his sister had married a Jew,

said Carroll, and the Cardinal had grown close to the family, sensitizing him to the Jewish perspective toward proselytization.”

Apostate Antipopes admit the salvation heresy is a new revelation

Apostate Antipope John Paul II

“Cardinal” Wojtyla: “The new conception of the idea of the people of God has replaced the old truth on the possibility of redemption outside the visible bounds of the Church. This premise shows the attitude of the Church towards the other religions, which is the basis for recognizing values which are spiritual, human and Christian at once, extending to religions such as Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism...”³³

Nominal Catholics admit the salvation heresy is a new revelation

Apostate Bishop George Hay (1729-1811)

Sincere Christian: “**Q. 36.** You said above that it is only of late that this loose way of thinking [about the] necessity of true faith, and of being in communion with the Church of Christ [the Catholic Church], which we have been examining, has appeared among the members of the Church: was not the same language held by Christians in all former ages?

“**A.** Far from it; and this is one of the greatest grounds of its condemnation. It is a novelty, it is a new doctrine; it was unheard of from the beginning; nay, it is directly opposite to the uniform doctrine of all the great lights of the Church in all former ages. These great and holy men, the most unexceptionable witnesses of the Christian Faith in their days, knew no other language on this subject but what they saw spoken before them by Christ and His Apostles; they knew their Divine Master had declared, ‘He that believeth not shall be condemned;’ they heard His Apostle proclaiming a dreadful anathema against any one, though an angel from heaven, who should dare to alter the Gospel he had preached, [Gal. 1:8]; they heard him affirming in express terms, that ‘without Faith it is impossible to please God;’ and they constantly held the same language. And as they saw not the smallest ground in Scripture for thinking that those who were out of the Church could be saved by invincible ignorance, that deceptive evasion is not so much as once to be met with in all their writings.”

Apostate Fr. Michael Müller, C.S.S.R. (1825-1899)

Apostate Fr. Michael Müller, C.S.S.R., *The Catholic Dogma*, 1888: “Introduction: ... The Right Reverend George Hay, Bishop of Edinburgh, Scotland...wrote a treatise entitled ‘*An Inquiry whether Salvation can be had without true faith and out of the Communion of the Church of Christ.*’ In this treatise, the pious and very learned Prelate of the Church proves most clearly that ‘out of the true Church no one can be saved,’ and adds ‘that it is *only of late* that that loose way of thinking and speaking about the necessity of true faith, and of being in communion with the Church of Christ, has appeared among the members of the Church, and that this is one of the strongest grounds of its condemnation. It is a novelty, it is a new doctrine; it was unheard of from the beginning; nay, it is directly opposed to the

³³ Taken from Fr. Malinski’s book *Mon Ami, Karol Wojtyla* in an interview with “Cardinal” Wojtyla in Rome in 1963, *Le Centurion* 1980, p. 189.

uniform doctrine of all the great lights of the Church in all former ages.’ ...It is indeed of faith that no one can be saved outside of the Apostolic, Roman Church; that this Church is the one ark of salvation; that he who has not entered it, will perish in the deluge... We must mention and condemn again that most pernicious error, which has been imbibed by certain Catholics, who are of the opinion that those people who live in error and have not the true faith, and are separated from Catholic unity, may obtain life everlasting. Now this opinion is most contrary to Catholic faith, as is evident from the plain words of our Lord (Matt. xviii. 17; Mark xvi. 16; Luke x. 16; John iii. 18) as also from the words of St. Paul (II. Tim. iii. 11) and of St. Peter (II. Peter. ii. 1). To entertain opinions contrary to this Catholic faith is to be an impious wretch. We therefore again reprobate, proscribe, and condemn all and every one of these perverse opinions and doctrines, and it is our absolute will and command that all sons of the Catholic Church shall hold them as reprobated, proscribed, and condemned. It belongs to our Apostolic office to rouse your Episcopal zeal and watchfulness to do all in your power to banish from the minds of the people such impious and pernicious opinions, which lead to indifference of religion, which we behold spreading more and more, to the ruin of souls. Oppose all your energy and zeal to these errors and employ zealous priests to impugn and annihilate them, and to impress very deeply upon the minds and hearts of the faithful the great dogma of our most holy religion, *that salvation can be had only in the Catholic faith*. Often exhort the clergy and the faithful to give thanks to God for the great gift of the Catholic faith.’ Now is it not something very shocking to see such condemned errors and perverse opinions proclaimed as Catholic doctrine in a Catholic newspaper, and in books written and recently published by Catholics?”³⁴

Apostate Orestes A. Brownson (1803-1876)

Apostate Orestes A. Brownson: “It is worthy of special notice that those recent theologians who seem unwilling to assent to this doctrine [the Salvation Dogma] cite no authority from a single Father or Mediaeval doctor of the Church, not strictly compatible with it. ...Father Perrone cites passages in abundance to this effect, which as Suarez says, is the uniform doctrine [the salvation heresy] of all the theologians of the Church; but he and others cite not a single authority of an earlier date than the seventeenth century, which ever hints anything more than this.”^{35,36}

For the glory of God; in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary, St. Michael, St. Joseph, Ss. Joachim and Anne, St. John the Baptist, the other angels and saints; and for the salvation of men

Original version: 12/2022; Current version: 12/2022

Mary’s Little Remnant
 302 East Joffre St.
 Truth or Consequences, New Mexico 87901-2878, USA
 Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us

³⁴ *The Catholic Dogma*, by apostate Fr. Michael Müller, C.S.S.R. Permissu Superiorum copyright, 1888, by Elias Frederick Schauer. Benzinger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago.

³⁵ Actually the Salvation Dogma began to be denied by nominal Catholic theologians in the 16th century. (See in this book “16th and 17th century theologians who denied the Salvation Dogma,” [165](#).)

³⁶ *De Loc. Theologica.*, p. 1, cap. 4, art. 1.