

Against John Lane



R. J. M. I.

By

The Precious Blood of Jesus Christ,
The Grace of the God of the Holy Catholic Church,
The Mediation of the Blessed Virgin Mary,
Our Lady of Good Counsel and Crusher of Heretics,
The Protection of Saint Joseph, Patriarch of the Holy Family,
The Intercession of Saint Michael the Archangel
and the cooperation of

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

To Jesus through Mary

*Judica me Deus, et discerne causam meam de gente non sancta
as homine iniquo et doloso erue me*

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam

Original version: 9/2001; Current version: 12/2009

Mary's Little Remnant

302 East Joffre St.

TorC, NM 87901-2878

Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us

(Send for a free catalog)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RJMI' CONDEMNATION LETTER	5
FALSE ECUMENISM	5
IN COMMUNION WITH NON-CATHOLICS: DOES NOT PROFESS THE FAITH	7
CONCLUSION: TAKE SIDES	9
REFUTATION OF LANE'S ACCUSATIONS.....	10
NOTHING TRUE IN IBRANYI'S WRITINGS 9/28.....	10
THE BAPTISM CONTROVERSY 9/28	11
Lane's Reply (9/29):	11
IMPLIES SAINTS ARE INFALLIBLE 9/28	12
LATAE SENTENTIAE EXCOMMUNICATIONS 9/29	13
Lane Reply (11/19).....	15
DOES LANE TEACH MANIFEST HERETICS CAN BE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH? (10/1)	15
RJMI Question 1 (10/1):	16
Lane's Reply:	16
MINOR AND MAJOR EXCOMMUNICATIONS (10/1)	16
Lane's Reply:	17
LANE SAYS CUM EX APOSTOLATUS IS NOT IN FORCE (10/1)	17
LANE TEACHES A POPE CANNOT TEACH HERESY IN FALLIBLE CAPACITY (10/1)	18
RJMI Questions 2 (10/1):	20
Lane's Reply (10/15):	21
PUBLIC DEFECTION FROM THE CATHOLIC FAITH AND PRELATES WHO BECOME INSANE (10/1)	24
SEMANTICS: MANIFEST VS. PUBLIC & PRESUME VS. ASSUME (10/2)	26
PUBLIC DEFECTION (10/3)	28
BAD THEOLOGY & PERTINACITY/OBSTINACY (10/3)	29
More Quotes on Presumption of Malice (11/19).....	32
RJMI Questions (10/3):	34
DOES LANE IMPLY THE CONCILIAR CHURCH IS THE CATHOLIC CHURCH? (10/15)	35
RJMI Questions (10/15):	37
OPEN LETTER TO JOHN LANE 11/12/2001.....	37
LANE EFFECTIVELY DENIES LATAE SENTENTIAE EXCOMMUNICATIONS (11/19).....	39
False Analogy	42
RJMI Question 1 (11/19):	43
Violent Hands on the Pope and Tolarati and Vitandi Heretics	43
RJMI Question 2 (11/19):	48
Classes of Heretics	48
Ad Evitanda Scandala	49
Public Defection and Automatic Excommunication	50
WARNING AGAINST SOURCES (11/19).....	51
NO ANSWERS FROM JOHN LANE (12/31)	51
RJMI QUESTION 1 (10/1):	52
RJMI QUESTIONS 2 (10/1):	52
RJMI QUESTIONS (10/3):	52
RJMI QUESTIONS (10/15):	53
RJMI QUESTION 1 (11/19):	53
RJMI QUESTION 2 (11/19):	53

RJMI' Condemnation Letter

J.M.J.

Mr. John Lane,

First things first before I refute your silly, foolish, dishonest, and deceptive refutation of the teachings of the Catholic Church as found on my website. My duty as a Catholic obliges me to profess the Catholic faith. That duty obliges me to condemn you as a non-Catholic heretic and schismatic. You, sir, are an abomination in the eyes of God and are under His severe wrath, along with anyone associated with you in religious matters in anyway. No, John, I am not a diplomat, or a politician, or a compromiser—traits that belong to the secular realm. I am a Catholic whose duty is to clearly speak the truth and admonish and condemn the sinner, when it applies, and if I do not, then woe to me.

“Son of man, I have made thee a watchman to the house of Israel: and thou shalt hear the word out of my mouth, and shalt tell it them from me. If, when I say to the wicked, Thou shalt surely die: thou declare it not to him, nor speak to him, that he may be converted from his wicked way, and live: the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but I will require his blood at thy hand. But if thou give warning to the wicked, and he be not converted from his wickedness, and from his evil way: he indeed shall die in his iniquity, but thou hast delivered thy soul.” (Ezechiel 3:17-19)

False Ecumenism

Mr. John Lane, you are not Catholic on many counts, the most obvious of which I will now mention, so that a simple child of good will can see. There is only one Catholic Church and one Catholic faith (Eph. 4:5). Catholics are not to associate with, or converse on an equal basis with non-Catholics in religious matters. Your website is a tangled web of contradictions the equals that of the Conciliar Church, of which you are still a member of by way of association. Your website is nothing more than a Vatican III false ecumenism for traditionalist heretics and schismatics of the pseudo-intellectual stripe, who are “ever learning and never attaining to the knowledge of the truth” (2Tim. 3:7). A room full of Protestants and Schismatics will profess many individual truths while contradicting one another in areas of dogmatic truth regarding the faith and unity of the Church. In no way can such a congregation, as is the World Council of Churches, represent, or be, the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. It only takes common sense; the common sense even pagans have, to know that a group that claims to be a part of the Catholic Church that opposes one another in key areas of dogma and government can never be the one Catholic Church. Your website is no different than the World Council of Churches, which helped invent the Conciliar Church that incorporated fallen-away Catholics into great apostasy. Your website can never be Catholic on this count alone, because it supports and patronizes many opposing views regarding dogmatic truths of the Catholic faith, and regarding the government of the Church that deal with Her unity. Your website presents a smorgasbord of pre and post Vatican II heretics, and schismatics of the SSPX stripe. All one has to do is read your own writings and all the other writings on your website to see the contradictions. All one has to do is follow those whom you recommend, by following the links on your website. Your links will take the

reader directly back into the Conciliar Church. One link you direct your readers to, in order to gain some enlightenment, is the non-Catholic Conciliarist heretic, Abbe De Nantes. The word “link” means relation, connection, association, or bond. Therefore, you are connected to Abbe De Nantes. Or, will you tell me, as does John Paul II, that you are connected to the Abbe in a certain though imperfect manner, and that you ignore your differences and concentrate on what you have in common. Like a seductive devil, you lead your readers into a wasteland of corruption, found in your own writings and the writings of others on your website, and the linked website you send your prey too, and each carries its own devils that enter the curious readers. You are like the pervert who offers candy to a child in order to more easily seduce them.

Satan uses your website to trap the souls of the prideful pseudo-intellec[t]s. God especially abhors these types, even more than prostitutes and tax collectors. Spiritual prostitution is much worse crime than physical prostitution, and harder to overcome. The greatest sin of all was committed by Lucifer, and was not a sin of the flesh, but the spiritual sin of pride, the root of all sin. The charismatics are the sign-and-wonder seekers, to whom the dogmas of the Church are a stumbling block, whereas the pseudo-intellec[t]s are like the Greeks constantly searching for wisdom, while remaining foolish (1Cor. 1:22-23). Your website presents the prideful pseudo-intellec[t]s with a tangled web of contradictions that leave them ever more confused and confounded, because they can find no clear teachings of the faith after they have read all you have to offer. *“They are all confounded and ashamed: the forgers of errors are gone together into confusion.”* (Isaias 45:16) It takes their minds in circles and entangles them in an inescapable web. *“The heart of a fool is as a wheel of a cart: and his thoughts are like a rolling axletree.”* (Eclcus. 33:5) But, strangely, the pseudo-intellec[t]s love this confusion, and are addicted to it, just like an addictive drug gives momentary pleasure while inflicting agony and profitless pain. Many times the afflicted cannot connect the symptom with the cause. *“A mischievous counsel shall be rolled back upon the author, and he shall not know from whence it cometh to him.”* (Eclcus. 27:30) They return to your website as dogs return to their vomit, and sows to their mire (2Pt. 2:22). Your website puffs up the pride of the pseudo-intellec[t] by feeding him with vast amounts of knowledge, while void of true wisdom. Knowledge without wisdom is the greatest evil. Satan traps the pseudo-intellec[t] because of their great pride. The more confused they get, by what seems to be a profound exposition of knowledge, the smarter they think the author is, while the opposite is the truth. They strain out gnats, spelling and grammar errors, innocent misstates, and/or resort to character assassinations that have nothing to do with the content at hand, while swallowing camels, heresies and schismatic teachings and practices (Mt. 23:24). They are in reality, plain old stupid, foolish, and eccentric. John’s following email, which is the first one he directed to me, proves he is eccentric.

John Lane, to Richard Ibranyi, 9/19/2001: “Richard, Go tell your mother that she wants you. I'm sure it is time you went inside for dinner. John Lane.

That is the entire content of his first message sent to me. What this has to do with the Catholic faith is anyone’s guess. What it is is a foolish attempt at character assassination, by way of satanic degradation, that widely misses the mark. Yes John, my Mother does want me, and Her name is Mary. I always go to dinner when She calls, as Her obedient child, and She infuses me with Heavenly graces that She obtains from Her Son, Jesus

Christ, my Lord, Savior, and Redeemer; a dinner that you have also been invited too, but refuse to go, due to your Luciferian pride. “*God resisteth the proud, but to the humble he giveth grace.*” (1Pt. 5:5)

In Communion with non-Catholics: Does not Profess the Faith

Mr. Lane, a second count that condemns you as a non-Catholic is your association with the non-Catholic heretical and schismatic Society of Saint Pius X. This association renders you guilty of all their heresies and schismatic teachings and practices. Correct me if I am wrong John. I have been told you attend Mass at a SSPX chapel, and tell others they can do the same in violation of Canon 1258 of the 1917 Code and the infallible Council of Basle of 1435 that teaches Catholics must not pray in communion with notorious heretics or schismatics, regardless of what you think the previous fallible *Ad Evitandi Scandala* by Pope Martin V in 1418, taught (See: my book, “Faith Before the Mass, The 1917 Code, Council of Basle, and Pope Martin V’s *Ad Evitandi Scandala*)

John, you share in all the sins the SSPX commits by way of omission and association. You are in direct communion with John Paul II because you pray in communion with those who are in communion with him, as mentioned in the “*Te Igitur*” prayer of the SSPX Masses that you attend. Have you no shame! St. Paul says, “*From all appearance of evil refrain yourselves*” (1Thess. 5:22). You also cowardly shirk your duty and obligation to profess the Catholic faith, by not admonishing the SSPX priests and flock, by presenting them with the truth and informing them that they are in heresy and schism.

1917 Code of Canon Law: “1325.1 Obligation to Profess the Faith - The faithful are bound to profess their faith openly whenever under the circumstances silence, evasion, or their manner of acting would otherwise implicitly amount to a denial of the faith, or would involve contempt of religion, an offense to God, or scandal to the neighbor.”

Of course if you were to do this, you would not be too welcome at the SSPX non-Catholic chapels. If you were so do this you would no longer be able to sacrilegiously receive the precious Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ at their non-Catholic chapels that are holding our Lord hostage, as do the Greek Schismatics. Instead of rebuking them and calling them to conversion, you go to their chapels and pray in communion with them. No pillar of fire and truth are you. No man of conviction are you. You are an effeminate coward. Can you picture St. Paul, or the Sons of Thunder, SS. John and James, attending Mass at a non-Catholic church week after week and being in friendly communion with these non-Catholics? Or would they rather not be condemning them from the rooftops, like a trumpet blast from God and calling them to repent and convert?

You have said there are many good SSPX priests, meaning they are innocent of any series public sin. This is an absurd and hypocritical statement in the face of overwhelming evidence. The same evidence you have regarding John Paul II, Lefebvre, and the Conciliar Church is also available to them. If you blindly and foolishly like to think it is not, then present it to them and see what they say. Like a false prophet that you are, you have placed cushions under the elbows and pillows under the heads of the SSPX priests and flock, just as you have done to all those who follow your perverted teachings.

“Son of man, prophesy thou against the prophets of Israel that prophesy: and thou shalt say to them that prophesy out of their own heart: Hear ye the word of the Lord: Thus saith the Lord God: Woe to the foolish prophets that follow their own spirit, and see nothing... Thus saith the Lord God: Woe to them that sew cushions under every elbow: and make pillows for the heads of persons of every age to catch souls: and when they caught the souls of my people, they gave life to their souls.” (Ezechiel 13:2, 3,18)

Douay Commentary: Sew cushions, etc... Viz., by making people easy in their sins, and promising them impunity. -Ibid. They gave life to their souls... That is, they flattered them with promises of life, peace, and security.

John, you say there are many good SSPX priests and laymen that are innocent because they are blissfully ignorant, which is another heresy in itself. Pope Pius X taught most men who call themselves Catholic go to hell because of ignorance of things they must know in order to save their souls.

Pope Pius X, *Acerbo Nimis*, 1905: “We are forced to agree with those who hold that the chief cause of the present indifference and, as it were, infirmity of soul, and the serious evils that result from it, is to be found above all in ignorance of things divine. And so, Our Predecessor Benedict XIV had just cause to write: “We declare that a great number of those who are condemned to eternal punishment suffer that everlasting calamity because of ignorance of those mysteries of faith which must be known and believed in order to be numbered among the elect.”“ (April 15, 1905)

It is true that all those who are members of, or attend the SSPX chapels are ignorant or else they would not be associated with the SSPX in anyway.¹ But that does not alleviate them of guilt, because in these latter days of the great apostasy, they are all culpably ignorant. John, you blindly and foolishly teach that many SSPX priests and laymen are innocent because they do not know of the crimes of the Conciliar Church and Lefebvre, even if that were true, which it is not, is it not a Catholic’s duty to speak up loud and clear and tell them of the crimes and tell them they must leave the SSPX? John, have you presented the crimes of the Conciliar Church and the SSPX to your SSPX priest along with the teachings that a manifest heretic cannot be pope? And if you have, what was his answer? Have you done the same to the laymen that attend the SSPX Masses side-by-side with yourself? If they do not listen, and refuse to accept the evidence that is before their very eyes then what possible excuse can they have? If you excuse them, you would also have to excuse John Paul II if you are to be consistent. The one who commits the crime, as well as the one who condones it by not condemning for what it is, is equally guilty. In these latter days of the great apostasy, the crimes of apostate antipope John Paul II and the Conciliar Church are manifest to all, which includes the crimes of the non-Catholic heretic and schismatic Archbishop Lefebvre, who signed all the Vatican II documents, and then went into schism, objectively and subjectively, when he consecrated bishops contrary to the will of a man he believed was the pope (See: my book *Against the Society of St. Pius X*). John, as you rightly point out, John Paul II is a manifest heretic, meaning his heresy is notorious and public, or else you would not be able to judge him as an apostate antipope. That means anyone with the use of reason who is privy to the same evidence, as all are at this time in the Great Apostasy, must come to the same conclusion that John Paul II is an apostate antipope. If they do not then they are guilty, fully culpable for not seeing the truth. Their unbelief is fully culpable. God’s grace is sufficient to move

¹ No heretic or schismatic ever thinks he is a heretic or schismatic.

men to see the truth, while men's will is deficient. If a man does not condemn a notorious crime when he is privy to it, then it is as if he himself had committed the same crime. *"If any one sin, and hear the voice of one swearing, and is a witness either because he himself hath seen, or is privy to it: if he do not utter it, he shall bear his iniquity."* (Lev. 1:5)

Catechism **Question:** In how many ways may we either cause or share in the guilt of another's sin? **Answer:** We may either cause or share the guilt of another's sin in nine ways: 1. By counsel; 2. By command; 3. By consent; 4. By provocation; 5. By praise or flattery; 6. By concealment; 7. By being a partner in the sin; 8. By silence; 9. By defending the ill done.

God certainly motivates all men to see the truth and when they do not, and remain in unbelief, it is man's fault not God's. And woe to you John, I say triple woe to you, who have justified the wicked and condemned the just. *"He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, both are abominable before God."* (Prv. 17:15) May the wrath of Almighty God break out upon your head and drive you ever deeper into insanity and eccentricity, and I pray that you will be humbled unto repentance and not hardened unto damnation. As surely as God is the God of the Holy Catholic Church, so also, God shall surely treat you exactly as He will treat apostate antipope John Paul II. God shall tear away the cushions and pillows you have placed to catch souls unawares.

"Therefore thus saith the Lord God: Behold I declare against your cushions, wherewith you catch flying souls: and I will tear them off from your arms: and I will let go the soul that you catch, the souls that should fly. And I will tear your pillows, and will deliver my people out of your hand, neither shall they be any more in your hands to be a prey: and you shall know that I am the Lord. Because with lies you have made the heart of the just to mourn, whom I have not made sorrowful: and have strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his evil way, and live. Therefore you shall not see vain things, nor divine divinations any more, and I will deliver my people out of your hand: and you shall know that I am the Lord." (Ezechiel 13:20)

Conclusion: Take Sides

The above two main points in this condemnation against you is all one needs to know in order to know that you, John Lane, are not Catholic, and to avoid you like the plague that you are, without having to go into detail regarding your other specific heresies. All of your other specific heresies that are condemned by the Catholic Church are found on my website. I will not spend much time with you, as our Lord said, "Do not cast your pearls to swine" (Mt. 7:6). Nor did our Lord run after those who did not believe in a vain attempt to justify what He had already clearly taught. I will spend just enough time to expose and condemn you, as I already have, and direct those who are of good will to my website in order to learn the Catholic faith. The sheep are going to have to read and take sides, and woe to those who remain in your camp. As the holy prophet Elias said to the fallen-away Israelites, so I repeat:

"And Elias coming to all the people, said: How long do you halt between two sides? If the Lord be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him. And the people did not answer him a word. And Elias said again to the people: I only remain a prophet of the Lord." (3 Kings 18:21-22)

Yes, John, this is a very one-sided affair. Elias did not say they could stay on the other side and save their souls. Far from participating in a false ecumenism with the false prophets (teachers of falsehoods) Elias killed them, by slitting their throats by the torrent

Cison, after the separation. There is only one side men can take if they want to save their souls. This sounds very intolerant to a world that has freed itself from the yoke of God and has promised itself liberty from any absolutes, and tolerates everything that Satan suggests and that man's mind can imagine, except for the absolute and whole truth as taught by God through His Holy Catholic Church. God's infallible truths, as taught by the Catholic Church, are absolutely intolerant. The Catholic Church, speaking through the mouths of Catholics, says, follow me or die. Just as Moses imposed a choice to a sinful and fallen-away people, by demanding they take sides, to separate the wheat from the chaff, in preparation for the chaff to be justly killed, and then to suffer eternal damnation. *"Then standing in the gate of the camp, he [Moses] said: If any man be on the Lord's side, let him join with me."* (Exodus 32:26) Those who are with God will come over to my side before it is too late. They will join themselves with me, Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi, who is teaching them the full deposit of the Catholic faith with conviction and without compromise, and not as a purely academic matter in which there is no real consequence if one does not obey the truth. Those who are of good will, God will bless and the cobwebs that are spun around their minds, hearts, and souls will quickly be cut away by the two-edged Sword of Truth.

Ending, I will cover two points of your refutation of my writings to prove to the reader that you are a liar, and the rest will follow when I have some spare time. I will avoid any undue contact with you Mr. Lane, taking the advice of St. Paul to St. Timothy.

"If any man teach otherwise and consent not to the sound words of our Lord Jesus Christ and to that doctrine which is according to godliness, He is proud, knowing nothing, but sick about questions and strifes of words; from which arise envies, contentions, blasphemies, evil suspicions, Conflicts of men corrupted in mind and who are destitute of the truth... Fight the good fight of faith. Lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art called and be it confessed a good confession before many witnesses... O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding the profane novelties of words and oppositions of knowledge falsely so called." (1Tim. 6:3-5, 12, 20)

This is not an evasion on my part. I have already spoken the truth. All one needs to do is read my writings that teach the Catholic faith and compare them to "John Lane and company's" confused nonsense. I have already covered all the main topics that thoroughly refute you and your like. I would be glad to direct any one who is interested to the appropriate teachings.

Refutation of Lane's Accusations

Nothing True in Ibranyi's Writings 9/28

Point one: John says that nothing in the bulk of my writings is true.

John Lane, to Mr. X, on 9/27/2001: "I'm afraid we differ on Mr. Ibranyi. I find it difficult to identify anything *true* in his writings."

Talk about exaggeration! I will make this simple. In my writings I have taught many times that Jesus Christ is God. Would John say this is not true? Well John said, "I find it difficult to identify **anything true** in his writings." John either does not know how to read

or he has lied, and I know he can read. John is ruled by carnal passions, due to his pride and vanity, and this causes him to overstate his case, contrary to all right reason, in order to try and sway the reader. The Judeo-Masonic press does this all the time. John and they, have the same father, Satan, the father of the lie.

The Baptism Controversy 9/28

Point Two: We will again see that Mr. Lane either does not know how to read, or he is a liar. He falsely accuses me of condemning as heresy the opinion that an unbaptized catechumen can be justified by the explicit desire to get baptized or by blood martyrdom.

John Lane, to Mr. X, on 9/28/2001: I see that he also denies baptism of blood and "desire" and teaches that one is not a Catholic if one believes in these dogmas. St. Alphonsus Liguori, who, unlike Richard Ibranyi, is a Doctor of the Church, teaches: "Now it is de fide that men are also saved by Baptism of desire, by virtue of the Canon Apostolicam, 'de presbytero non baptizato' and of the Council of Trent, session 6, Chapter 4 where it is said that no one can be saved 'without the laver of regeneration or the desire for it.'" (Moral Theology, Bk. 6, nn. 95-7.) Of course, in his gigantic PRIDE Ibranyi no doubt holds that St. Alphonsus was just mistaken. After all, he probably wasn't as smart as Ibranyi, and didn't know how to twist texts to suit a pre-determined agenda.

First, John had lied, because I do not teach that those who believe in justification by the explicit desire to be baptized or blood martyrdom are teaching heresy and are non-Catholic heretics. I quote from my writings.

Richard J. M. Ibranyi, Exurge Michael, Issue #2, April 2000, The Baptism Controversy Review: Regarding my opinion that a man must be baptized by water to be justified and be in the way of salvation, I may be right and I could be wrong. Regarding those who hold the opposing view that a man can be justified by the desire to be baptized or blood martyrdom, they may be right and they could be wrong. But one thing is certain, I am absolutely right in accusing anyone who levels forth accusations of heresy on either side as being guilty of the sin of schism. Anyone who says I am teaching heresy, and therefore am a heretic, is defiantly a schismatic. Why? Because, they have made a judgment no pope has ever made. The last pope who had a perfect opportunity to condemn us who believe in the absolute necessity of sacramental baptism by water was Pope Pius XII. He was the pope who reigned during the Fr. Feeney. ... This issue is not that simple, and that is precisely why Pope Pius XII did not condemn, nor excommunicate Fr. Feeney for teaching heresy, or label him a heretic. Therefore, let no man on either side of this issue be accused of teaching heresy until a future pope explains all these above contradictions so as not to deny any other defined dogmas. Let us limit the accusations to erroneous teachings. Anyone who levels forth accusations of heresy on either side of this debate is guilty of a sin of schism for making a decision only a pope can make... I, Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi, vow to submit to the future decision of a pope regarding this controversy on the sacrament of baptism.

Lane's Reply (9/29):

I'll take you at your word that you hold the position that you assert. I misread you, if that is the case.

RJMI Comment:

John, you do not have to just take me at my word, as if I have not already publicly established my position in writing. What I quoted to you was from my writings that are available to the public. Therefore, your term that I assert to believe in this is incorrect. I do believe in this.

Implies Saints are Infallible 9/28

Second, John seems to have invested the saints with the charism of infallibility, as if they can never be mistaken. If this were true, one can say, “Of course, in his gigantic PRIDE Ibranyi no doubt holds that St. Thomas Aquinas was just mistaken, regarding his teaching that Mary was not conceived Immaculate.” What does pride have to do with pointing out the mistakes in saints’ writings regarding undefined doctrines? Many saints have opposed the teachings of other saints. From my writings I point out one mistake that Alphonsus Liguori taught as quoted from “The Baptism Controversy Review.”

From Exurge Michael Issue #2, “The Baptism Controversy Review”

Erroneous Teachings of the Saints

I will just give one example in this short review. A teaching by Alphonsus on baptism contains one error in particular that I will point out, just to show that saints are not infallible. He speaks of the Holy Innocents as being baptized by blood martyrdom.

Alphonsus: “Baptism of blood is the shedding of one’s blood... Now this baptism is comparable to true baptism... Hence martyrdom avails also for infants seeing that the Church venerates the Holy Innocents as true martyrs.”²

The baptism of John the Baptist, which was a precursor to the baptism of Christ, did not exist until John’s public ministry. True baptism, which is the baptism of Christ, was not instituted until Christ commanded His apostles to baptize in His Name and was not mandatory until after Ascension Thursday. At the time of the martyrdom of the Holy Innocents the sacrament of baptism did not yet exist. The Holy Innocents were saved under the conditions of the old dispensation when baptism was not yet necessary. This fact is taught by Holy Mother Church.

St. Robert Bellarmine: “The law making Baptism necessary for salvation was promulgated on Ascension Day or, if you will, on Pentecost, simultaneously for the whole world, and at once became binding upon all nations.”³

Catechism of The Council of Trent, “Sacrament of Baptism”, Made Obligatory After Christ’s Resurrection: “The second period to be distinguished, that is, the time when the law of Baptism was made, also admits of no doubt. Holy writers are unanimous in saying that after the Resurrection of our Lord, when He gave to His Apostles the command to go and teach all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, the law of Baptism became obligatory on all who were to be saved.”⁴

A Catholic Dictionary: “PROMULGATION-The public announcement of a law, before which it is not binding.”⁵

Therefore Alphonsus has erred in using the Holy Innocents as an example of baptism by blood as conferring upon them true baptism. In this we clearly see that Alphonsus was

² St. Alphonsus Liguori, *Moral Theology*, Bk. 6, nn. 95-7.

³ St. Robert Bellarmine, “On Baptism,” cf. ch.5, TSS I: 243 (AD306)

⁴ Catechism of The Council of Trent, “Sacrament of Baptism”, Made Obligatory After Christ’s Resurrection, p. 171

⁵ *A Catholic Dictionary*, Attwater, 1942, p429

wrong, the Holy Innocents were not under obligation to be baptized. This is precisely why we cannot use the opinion of saints, fathers, or doctors to settle this issue. It is true that they are martyrs but is it not true to say this martyrdom conferred upon them baptismal grace. The Holy Innocents were saved, just as was the prophet Simeon, etc, under the parameters of the old dispensation. It is my opinion that even these were baptized by water, some time during the 40 days after our Lord rose from the dead and before He ascended into Heaven, taking them with Him.

Latae Sententiae Excommunications 9/29

Lane's Comment:

Heretics are excluded from the Church because "they have separated from her" as "deserters." Deserters are not outside the army because of some judicial act, but because they have departed of their own accord. Likewise Pope Pius XII, in *Mystici Corporis Christi*, teaches that heretics and schismatics depart from the Church "by their own unhappy act." Bellarmine likewise teaches that this is the doctrine of all the Fathers.

RJMI Comment:

This portion is true. The separation of the perpetrator from the Catholic Church takes place by an automatic (*latae sententiae*) excommunication, without the need of a warning and without the need of a declaration. But, if it is beneficial for the common good a juridical act from a competent Church authority can pronounce a declaratory sentence against the perpetrator that simply confirms that the perpetrator has incurred the automatic (*latae sententiae*) excommunication. A declaratory sentence is not an excommunication, but just a confirmation that excommunication has already been incurred (See: my, Book One, *A Future Declaration to Affirm a Latae Sententiae Excommunication*)

Canon Law: a Text and Commentary: "c. 2232.1. A penalty *latae sententiae*, whether corrective or vindictive, binds the delinquent *ipso facto* both in the external and in the internal forum... which leaves the issuance of a declaratory sentence to the discretion of the superior and demands it only when the parties insist or when public welfare is at stake. Thus a priest may be interested in the declaration of a sentence against another because of the title he has to a parish. *A declaratory sentence* does not constitute a penalty, but simply affirms that a penalty has been incurred, and hence throws the penalty back to the moment when the crime was committed."⁶

Lane's Comment:

(Cont.) By equating this with *ipso facto* excommunication ("*latae sententiae*"), Ibranyi ruins the basis upon which we can be sure that Wojtyla is not pope. For he CANNOT be outside the Church by excommunication *latae sententiae*, unless he has laid violent hands on the Roman Pontiff, which obviously he hasn't done. *Latae sententiae* excommunication does not make one a non-Catholic. It cuts one off from the prayers, sacraments etc. of the Church. Ibranyi's doctrine is that of the Conciliarists, who deny

⁶ Fr. Augustine, *A Commentary on Canon Law*, vol. 8, p. 102-4.

that any man can leave the Church by his own act, but indeed must be excommunicated by authority before he is to be regarded as a non-Catholic.

RJMI Comment:

John seems to be saying that a one time Catholic who left the Church on his own accord and joined a non-Catholic sect has not been excommunicated. It cannot be said that this one time Catholic, while no longer being Catholic, has never been excommunicated from the Church. A Catholic who leaves the Church and joins a non-Catholic sect is automatically (*latae sententiae*) excommunicated as a heretic due to his professed membership in a heretical sect. A declaration can be made that confirms this by the a competent judge if the common good requires it. Every one time Catholic who falls outside the Catholic Church does so by being excommunicated.

I do not teach that automatic (*latae sententiae*) excommunications for sins against the faith or charity (schism) do not make the perpetrators non-Catholics, anyone who read my writings would know this. There are those who fall into heresy and outside the Catholic Church by no longer professing themselves to be a part of the Catholic Church, or simply by joining non-Catholic sects. There are also those who fall into heresy and outside the Church by embracing heresy, while still professing themselves to be Catholic. I will quote from my writings.

From: RJMI: Book One, Apostates, Heretics, and Schismatics are not Catholic:

The Catechism of the Council of Trent clearly teaches the different classes of formal heretics.

Catechism of the Council of Trent: “Hence there are but three classes of persons excluded from the Church’s pale: infidels, heretics, and schismatics, and excommunicated persons. Infidels are outside the Church because they never belonged to, and never knew the Church, and were never made partakers of any of her sacraments. Heretics and schismatics are excluded from the Church, because they have separated from her and belong to her only as deserters belong to the army from which they have deserted... Finally, excommunicated persons are not members of the Church, because they have been cut off by her sentence, from the number of her children and belong not to her communion until they repent.”⁷

The reference to heretics being outside the Church is mentioned separately from those who have been excommunicated. The heretics refer to Protestants who were never Catholic and therefore cannot be excommunicated from what they never belonged to. The excommunicated persons refers to two classes of heretics who were once Catholic, those who are automatically excommunicated (*latae sententiae*) without the need of a warning or declaration, and those who have been excommunicated by name (*ferendae sententiae*) by a condemnatory sentence from Church authorities. All of these classes of heretics are outside the Catholic Church. They are non-Catholics.

⁷ *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, art. IX, “The Parts of the Church, Those who are not members of the Church,” (Tan Edition, p. 101).

Clearly I teach that automatic (*latae sententiae*) excommunications for sins against the faith place the perpetrator outside the Catholic Church. I teach this in many other places. A pope that becomes a manifest heretic can only be excommunicated and fall outside the Catholic Church by an automatic (*latae sententiae*) excommunication, and he would also automatically lose his office. The fact that I have pointed out and condemned John Lane as a non-Catholic heretic and schismatic also proves that I believe that *latae sententiae* excommunications for his sins against the faith and charity (schism) place the perpetrator outside the Catholic Church.

Just because a man professes to be Catholic does not mean he is Catholic. The most seductive heretics were those who still professed themselves to be Catholic.

Apostate Antipope Pius IX,⁸ *Quartus Supra*, January 6, 1873: “4. It has always been the custom of heretics and schismatics to call themselves Catholics and to proclaim their many excellences in order to lead peoples and princes into error.”

Lane Reply (11/19)

See: [Lane Effectively denies Latae Sententiae Excommunications \(11/19\)](#)

Does Lane teach manifest heretics can be members of the Church? (10/1)

Lane’s Comment:

[Lane is commenting on the above quote from the Catechism of Trent.] Lane: Ibranyi even notices the wording of the paragraph, in which the fact that heretics are outside the Church is mentioned separately from those who have been excommunicated, and yet he fails to draw the correct conclusion. And those referred to as having been excommunicated, are private heretics that have been excommunicated by a declaration; *ferendae sententiae*. Note carefully that both classes of heretics are outside the Catholic Church and are not Catholic.

RJMI Comment:

First of all John you have used improper terminology. A *ferendae sententiae* excommunication is executed by a condemnatory sentence, not a declaratory sentence. The word declaration, in its strict theological use, refers to the affirming of a *latae sententiae* excommunication, and does not inflict the penalty of excommunication. It only affirms it (See: above explanation). Don’t feel bad John. I had made the same mistake and have since corrected it. Which brings me to another point, you have criticized some of my earlier writings that have since been corrected and revised. I suggest you re-read my teachings as found in my book *Infallibility, Heresy, and Heretics* on my website and comment on them. I will answer your refutations that apply to my corrected works.

⁸ Pius IX lost the papal office in 1856. See RJMI article “Pius IX Denied the Salvation Dogma and Lost His Office.” (Add in October 2012)

Where you got your interpretation of this passage is anyone's guess. That words "and excommunicated persons" from the Catechism of Trent does not distinguish between heretics and schismatics who have been *latae* and *ferendae* *sententiae* excommunicated, and incorporates both. It seems you are teaching that this passage from Catechism of Trent does not refer to manifest heretics who have been *latae* *sententiae* excommunicated, and thus you imply they are still members of the Church, and that is heresy. So to clarify your position please answer the following question.

RJMI Question 1 (10/1):

John, do you believe a manifest heretic who has been *latae* *sententiae* excommunicated can still be a member of the Catholic Church?

Lane's Reply:

Richard, I can't tell whether you are questioning your own interpretation or mine, because of your jumbling my words with yours. But if I assume that you are correctly identifying my own words, then I fail to see what is not clear. Excommunicates are mentioned separately from heretics. It isn't hard to see. Both classes are outside the Church. (Qualifying it, of course, with the fact that "excommunicates" here means "major excommunicates.")

RJMI Comment:

John, interesting that you use the term "major excommunication" that you criticized me for using (See: Below). You do admit then, that the principle remains the same.

It is good to see that you agree Manifest heretics are outside the Catholic Church. But, you are wrong when you teach that a Catholic who becomes a heretic falls outside the Catholic Church without being excommunicated. The excommunication and falling outside the Catholic Church takes place simultaneously. The excommunication is a *latae sententiae* excommunication. And your other error, which is heresy, is that you deny *latae sententiae* excommunications for sins against the faith or charity places the perpetrators outside the Catholic Church. You heretically teach they are still inside, and thus members of the Catholic Church. I will deal with this heresy of yours in more detail (See: below, "Lane heretically teaches that a Catholic can fall outside the Church without being excommunicated" and "Lane Effectively denies *Latae Sententiae* Excommunications")

Minor and Major Excommunications (10/1)

Lane's Comment:

[From RJMI, Quick Reference Manual] "Major and Minor excommunications can be incurred either by *latae* or *ferendae sententiae* excommunication. A **major** excommunication places a Catholic outside the Catholic Church and he is no longer a member of the Catholic Church and is not Catholic. Major excommunications are incurred for sins against the faith: heresy and apostasy, and against charity: schism. A **minor** excommunication does not place a Catholic outside the Catholic Church, but deprives him from the reception of the sacraments. Minor excommunications apply to Catholics who have procured an abortion; who are living in an illegal

second “marriage”; etc. These are still members of the Catholic Church; they are Catholic; they are not outside the Catholic Church.”

Lane: The Code abolished the terms, "major" and "minor" excommunication. It is a pity, because they are useful terms, but that's the way it is. Of course, one could not expect Ibranyi to have noticed - he was too busy hunting for useful stuff to misapply and employ in his campaign of building the Church of Ibranyi.

RJMI Comment:

John, whereas these terms are not used anymore, the principle remains the same. There are some excommunications that separate the perpetrator from the Church, making him a non-Catholic, and there are other excommunications that do not separate the perpetrator from the Church, but deprive him of some spiritual benefits.

Lane's Reply:

The terms, however, are not applicable, Richard, and if you look the question up you will find out why

RJMI Comment:

The principle still remains the same. If it is an error to use these terms, you have made the same error in your last reply to me above. You used the term “major excommunication.” Canonist use different terms to express this principle. Some refer to an automatic (*latae sententiae*) excommunication for sins against the faith as a “simple excommunication” and others use different terminology.

Lane says Cum Ex Apostolatus is not in force (10/1)

Lane Comment:

Ibranyi writes:

RJMI, Book One: "The fact that in 1917, in the official commentary of the Code of Canon Law, the Bull Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio is mentioned as the source of canon 188.4 is proof that this Bull is still in force and indeed is infallible."

Lane: The conclusion doesn't follow. The Bull itself is not in force. The divine law which it expressed is (in CIC 188, 4). But it also expressed some ecclesiastical law, which is certainly no longer binding, having been abrogated by the Code. Once again, he shows that he utterly ignorant of the principles to be applied to such questions. Canon 6 is to be applied.

RJMI Comment:

Canon 6 only deals with disciplinary laws. The teaching in the Bull Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio, that a manifest heretic cannot be validly elected to the papacy, is an infallible teaching regarding the highest matter of the faith. It is not a matter of discipline, and thus

cannot be abrogated. Only the parts of the Bull that deal with disciplinary laws can be abrogated. There are many disciplinary laws in the Council of Trent that have been abrogated. Does that mean the Council of Trent is abrogated? When the Church teaches that an Ecumenical Council is infallible, She means all the decrees that were approved by the pope and that deal with faith and morals. It does not mean the disciplinary decrees in such a Council are infallible.

From RJMI, Quick Reference Manual

This infallible bull [Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio] is the inspiration for Canon 188.4 in the 1917 *Code of Canon Law*, as listed in the original Latin footnotes for sources. The overall principle is that a pope cannot be a manifest heretic. If a candidate were a manifest heretic before his election to the papacy, the election would be null and void, or if he became a manifest heretic while pope, he would automatically (*ipso facto*) lose his office without any declaration by the operation of Church Law (*ab jure*) 188.4. This bull does not concern itself with how a pope is elected, which is a disciplinary matter, nor does it deal with the validity of consecrations and ordinations—a bishop can still be a bishop without an office in the Catholic Church, or without even being Catholic as is the case with the Greek Schismatics. This bull deals with the faith of a candidate for an office in the Church before he is elected that affects his eligibility to hold the office, and is a matter of the faith (*Res Fidei*). It is an infallible truth that a pope cannot be a manifest heretic, in order to protect the dogma of the indefectibility of the Church. To say that this bull only applied to the 16th Century but not to the 20th Century, precisely when it is needed, is to say that the Holy Ghost has lied - in the 16th Century, the Holy Ghost condemns the notion that a manifest heretic can become pope, but in the 20th Century He allows a pope to be a manifest heretic and destroy the Church, precisely when Catholics need these infallible teachings. Any child with common sense can see the bad-will of those who deny the eternal force of this infallible bull yesterday (1500s), today (1900s) and forever. This bull sets true Catholics free from imposters and their reign of terror, and those who ignore it, or water it down to fallible status choose to stay in communion with the imposters because they are themselves apostates, heretics, and imposters.

Lane teaches a pope cannot teach heresy in fallible capacity (10/1)

Lane's Comment:

Further on, Ibranyi writes:

[RJMI, Quick Reference Manual, A Pope Can be Excommunicated] “A pope cannot teach heresy in his infallible capacity, God the Holy Ghost would not allow it. The question then is: If a pope can never teach heresy in his infallible capacity then how can a pope teach heresy, so as to incur this penalty of excommunication that he, himself, mentions in this oath? A pope can teach heresy in his fallible capacity, in fallible encyclicals, apostolic exhortations, apostolic letters, private interviews, books, sermons,

etc.; in this capacity the pope is said to be teaching in his private capacity by his every day exercise of his office in teaching and in enforcing laws and doctrine.”

Lane: This assertion of Ibranyi's is held by some theologians to be heretical, and by the remainder to be gravely erroneous. Just because a pope speaks non-infallibly does not mean he is capable of heresy in his official, non-infallible, teaching. He is not protected from all error in every sentence of an encyclical, for example, but he is safe from preaching heresy to the universal Church. Ibranyi in this place merely adopts the errors of the "Conservative Conciliarists" and others, without ensuring that he has the truth before inflicting it upon the world. All errors are not heresies, so that we must not leap from the fact of non-infallibility to the conclusion that heresy is possible.

RJMI Comment:

John, you speak in an unclear and confused manner. Even when one may grasp a thought you are conveying you confuse it by contradicting it later on, just as apostate Antipope John Paul II does. This is a sign of a man who does not really understand the topic he is speaking of, or is willfully deceiving the reader. It seems you are teaching that a pope cannot fall into heresy.

Eduardus F. Regatillo (1956) “The Roman Pontiff ceases his office... (4) Through notorious public heresy. Five answers have been given: 1. ‘The pope cannot be a heretic even as a private teacher.’ A pious thought, but essentially unfounded... 5. The pope loses office *ipso facto* because of public heresy.’ This is the more common teaching, because a pope would not be a member of the Church, and hence far less could he be its head.”⁹

There is a difference between an error regarding a non-infallibly defined doctrine that is not a part of the ordinary magisterium and a heresy. A heresy contradicts an infallibly defined dogma. A pope who teaches the former, an error as defined above, is still the pope, and popes have taught erroneous doctrines. A pope that teaches heresy, which can only be done in his non-infallible capacity, gets automatically excommunicated and loses his office, and thus is no longer pope. A pope teaching in his infallible capacity cannot teach heresy, or even an error, the Holy Ghost would not allow it. As I am sure you would agree John, not every teaching from the pope is infallible. If you say a pope cannot teach heresy, and thus become a public heretic you find yourself in a woeful minority.

J. Wilhelm (1913) “A similar exceptional situation might arise were a pope to become a public heretic, i.e., were he publicly and officially to teach some doctrine clearly opposed to what has been defined as *de fide catholicâ*. But in this case, many theologians hold that no formal sentence of deposition would be required, as, by becoming a public heretic, the pope would *ipso facto* cease to be pope. This, however, is a hypothetical case which has never actually occurred...”¹⁰

In the very Coronation Oath the pope takes he admits that he can teach heresy, and that if he does he will get automatically excommunicated. He would also lose his office by the authority of Canon 188.4.

⁹ *Institutiones Iuris Canonici*. 5th ed. Santander: Sal Terrae, 1956, 1:396.

¹⁰ *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1913, Infallibility, (C) Mutual Relations of Organs, by P. J. Toner

From Quick Reference Manual, Papal Coronation Oath

The Pope admits in his Papal Coronation oath, that he can be excommunicated if he goes contrary to infallible decrees handed down from past popes.

Papal Coronation Oath: "...Accordingly, without exclusion, We subject to severest excommunication anyone - be it Ourselves, or be it another - who would dare to undertake anything new in contradiction to this constituted evangelic tradition and the purity of the Orthodox Faith and the Christian Religion, or would seek to change anything by his opposing efforts, or would concur with those who undertake such blasphemous venture." (*Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*, P.L. 105, S. 54)

A pope cannot teach heresy in his infallible capacity, God the Holy Ghost would not allow it. The question then is: If a pope can never teach heresy in his infallible capacity then how can a pope teach heresy, so as to incur this penalty of excommunication that he, himself, mentions in this oath? A pope can teach heresy in his fallible capacity, in fallible encyclicals, apostolic exhortations, apostolic letters, private interviews, books, sermons, etc.; in this capacity the pope is said to be teaching in his private capacity¹¹ by his every day exercise of his office in teaching and in enforcing laws and doctrine. It is in this capacity that a pope can fall from grace and teach heresy and attempt to implement it upon Catholics, and if he should do so, he is *ipso facto* excommunicated and deposed without declaration. Now that we know a Pope can be excommunicated the question is: Who excommunicates the Pope? This excommunication cannot be incurred by a declaration from a prelate of higher authority, but a higher authority must excommunicate the Pope. The Pope does have a higher authority on earth that can judge, excommunicate and depose him from office. This authority is the spotless, pure, indefectable Holy Catholic Church Herself, the Mystical Body of Christ on earth. Her past infallible decrees are binding on all Catholics. Popes are in submission to the Keys of Peter and the infallible teachings of the Catholic Church. The pope is not above Divine Law (faith and morals)! He cannot go contrary to the Divine Law. It is the indefectable Church that excommunicates and deposes a pope. This is effected by the authority and power of the Church law (*ab jure*) bound by a past pope, and takes place without declaration (*ipso facto*). In a way it can be said the past popes excommunicate him by violating their infallible decrees. He is excommunicated *latae sententiae* and deposed by the operation of Church law (*ab jure*), without the need of a declaration. No bishop, priest, or layman can depose the Pope, but the Holy Catholic Church, the Mystical Body of Christ on earth, can depose a pope. If a layman can be *ipso facto* excommunicated, so can a priest, bishop or pope (Romans 2:11).

RJMI Questions 2 (10/1):

John, do you believe a pope cannot teach heresy? If you do believe he can teach heresy, then in what capacity?

¹¹ By private capacity we do not mean it is not a public teaching; it is, and it can be imposed upon Catholics if he should seek to implement it or persist in teaching heresy. Private teaching in this context means all the other teachings of a pope that are not protected by his charism of infallibility.

Lane's Reply (10/15):

I do not believe that a pope can teach heresy. ...I do happen to believe it, but it is an entirely distinct point from the one being made here. With all due respect, Richard, which is very little indeed, I think that the problem here is with the reader, not the writer. Not every error is a heresy. Only some errors are heresies. Find me a theologian who teaches that one can find heresy in, for example, a papal encyclical. You can't, I'll bet. The idea is *impious* in the extreme. It is the stuff of nightmares, the fruit of V2 and the Modernists. Cardinal Franzelin explains that in official declarations which are not solemn definitions, "though the doctrine is not infallibly *true*...it is nevertheless infallibly *safe*." (*De Divina Traditione et Scriptura*, 1875). Do I need to prove that something which is "infallibly safe" cannot possibly contain "heresy"?

RJMI Comment:

Of course every error is not heresy. I have made that clear. A pope can teach an error regarding an undefined doctrine that is not a part of the ordinary magisterium, and he would still be pope. I am speaking of a pope who falls into heresy, so lets stay with this topic.

You will never find a heresy in a papal encyclical. If a pope did teach heresy in a fallible encyclical he would lose his office and no longer be pope. Therefore, the encyclical he wrote that contained the heresy would not be a papal encyclical. Just as the Second Vatican Council is not Catholic Council because it contains heresy. However, fallible encyclicals can contain errors regarding undefined doctrines, as well as bad and unvigilant ecclesiastical laws.

This idea of a second level of papal infallibility, known as "infallibly safe" is ridiculous. It contradicts the Vatican Council of 1870 that teaches that charism of infallibility is promised to the pope only when he teaches *Ex Cathedra*, from the Chair of Peter; only when he makes a solemn pronouncement on faith or morals. There is no mention whatsoever of a second level of infallibility known as, "not from the Chair of Peter (*Ex Cathedra*), but infallibly safe." This idea is a total fabrication and leads to the idolization of the pope.

Lane's Reply:

(Regarding canonists and theologians who teach a pope can fall into heresy and thus lose their offices)

Really, Rich? What an extraordinary statement. You think that Regatillo teaches that popes can fall into heresy? Where does he say that? I do not see that – I see him merely asserting that it cannot be *proved* that a pope can't fall into heresy. He is making merely a negative statement on the matter. In any case, Bellarmine, who is obviously of infinitely greater weight than Regatillo, says "*It is probable, and can be piously believed, not only that the Supreme Pontiff cannot err as Pontiff, but also, as an individual person cannot be a heretic, by pertinaciously believing against the Faith anything false.* (*De Rom.*

Pont., lib. iv, cap vi.). I see no reason whatsoever to depart from Bellarmine's view on this.

Wilhelm doesn't assert that this is possible, either. He merely gives his opinion of what would happen *if* it came to pass. He even takes care to qualify the entire thing as an hypothesis.

RJMI Comment:

I must teach you some basics that even simple children know. Just because something can happen does not mean it has to happen. That should be obvious. One can say that John Lane can repent, convert, and abjure, and that is certainly true. But, John Lane may never repent, convert, and abjure. If something can happen, then it can happen, although it may never happen.

John, like the Protestant that you are, you have quoted St. Robert out of context and ignore his other writings on this topic. St. Robert is correct by teaching a pope cannot teach heresy, in the sense that if he did he would no longer be pope. He makes this clear in his other writings in which he addresses the possibility of a pope who becomes a manifest heretic.

St. Robert Bellarmine (1610 A.D.) Cardinal and Doctor of the Church: "... A pope who is a manifest heretic automatically ceases to be pope and head of the Church, just as he ceases automatically to be a Christian and a member of the Church. Wherefore, he can be judged and punished by the Church. All the early Fathers are unanimous in teaching that manifest heretics immediately lose all jurisdiction. St. Cyprian, in particular, laid great stress on this point."¹²

John, have you not deceived the reader by not presenting St. Robert's full teachings on this topic? This is the same tactic that those who believe John Paul II is the pope use when they quote St. Robert's following teaching out of context.

St. Robert Bellarmine: "Just as it is licit to resist the Pontiff who attacks the body, so also is it licit to resist him who attacks souls or destroys the civil order or above all, tries to destroy the Church. I say that it is licit to resist him by not doing what he orders and by impeding the execution of his will. It is not licit, however, to judge him, to punish him, or to depose him, for these are acts proper to a superior. (De Romano Pontifice. II.29.)

You see John, if you refer to this text alone, without reference to St. Robert's other teachings you could be led to think a pope can never be deposed. This text is referring to an immoral or unvigilant pope and his relationship with the heads of state. It does not deal with a pope who falls into heresy. As St. Robert had taught, a pope that becomes a manifest heretic automatically becomes excommunicated from the Church and loses his office.

Lane's Reply:

[From RJMI] In the very Coronation Oath the pope takes he admits that he can teach heresy.

¹² De Romano Pontifice. II. 30.

Lane's Comment: No, Richard, wrong again. The oath merely says "if" a pope disappeared into heresy he would be excommunicated. It in no way says that it is *possible* for a pope to fall into heresy, nor does any theologian I have seen teach that a pope may do so. Everybody seems to agree with Bellarmine, that the most probable opinion is that this can never happen. For example, Bishop Zinelli, Relator of the Faith at the Vatican Council (the first and only), spoke thus: "Confident in supernatural Providence, we judge it to be quite probable that that will never happen."

RJMI Comment:

John, how does a pope disappear into heresy? A pope falls into heresy. He does not disappear into heresy. You are implying the Papal Coronation Oath contains an erroneous teaching (See: above Papal Coronation Oath). John, I trust the pope who composed this oath, as well as the popes who took it, more than any man of lesser authority. This oath has more authority than a fallible encyclical. The pope clearly teaches he could fall into heresy by proposing what would happen if he did. John, you teach that this "what if" is erroneous because a pope cannot fall into heresy, and thus you have contradicted the Papal Coronation Oath, and have deified the pope. John, I leave you with a quote from a pope who teaches a pope can "wither away into heresy."

Pope Innocent III (1198 A.D.) Still the less, can the Roman Pontiff glory because he can be judged by men, or rather, can be shown to be already judged, if, for example, he should wither away into heresy. (Sermon 4)

Why would a pope teach such a thing if he believed the pope could never fall into heresy? Here are some saints who teach a pope can become a heretic.

St. Antoninus (1459) "In the case of the pope becoming a heretic, he would find himself, by that fact alone and without any other sentence, separated from the Church.... A pope who would be separated from the Church by heresy, therefore, would by that very fact itself cease to be head of the Church. He could not be a heretic and remain pope, because, since he is outside of the Church, he cannot possess the keys of the Church."¹³

St. Francis de Sales (1567-1622 A.D.) Bishop and Doctor of the Church: "Now when [the Pope] is explicitly a heretic, he falls *ipso facto* from his dignity and *out of the Church*..."¹⁴

To conclude, a pope can fall into heresy, but this may never happen. To say a pope cannot fall into heresy is to deny the Papal Coronation Oath. To this date there has been no pope who has taught heresy and thus fell from his office because John XXIII, Paul VI, John Paul I, and John Paul II were never popes.

Your other inescapable problem is that while believing a pope cannot fall into heresy, you also believe the Bull Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio is not in force. That means John XXIII and Paul VI would have been validly elected to the papacy, while immediately losing their office by Canon 188.4. Thus we have two popes who fell into heresy and lost their offices by Canon 188.4. Canon 188.4 only applies to those who already have an office. The fact is that the Bull Cum Ex is still in force and John XIII and Paul VI were

¹³ Summa Theologica, cited in Actes de Vatican I. V. Frond pub.

¹⁴ *The Catholic Controversy*, TAN Books, pg. 306.

notorious heretics before the attempted elections and thus the elections were null and void.

Public Defection from the Catholic Faith and Prelates who become Insane (10/1)

Lane Comment:

[RJMI, Quick Reference Manual, Tacit Resignation of Office] “A sane prelate who publicly defects from the Catholic faith is also a formal heretic.”

Lane: This is a redundancy. "Publicly defects" means "becomes a formal heretic publicly."

RJMI Comment:

The basis of Canon Law is for the common good of Catholics. Moral theology deals with the good of the individual. Even though there are canon laws that effect individuals it is in relation to the common good.

In the eyes of Catholics there is no difference between a sane pope who begins to publicly teach heresy and a pope who becomes insane and publicly teaches heresy. A public defection from the faith is what the Catholic sees in both cases. Church law presumes guilt, unless otherwise stated in the Canon law, when it is clear a law has been violated. In both cases there is a public defection from the faith. In the case of the insane pope he is not subjectively guilty, because he does not have the use of reason. A sane prelate who publicly defects from the Catholic faith is subjectively guilty, thus he is a formal heretic.

Lane Comment:

[RJMI, Quick Reference Manual, Tacit Resignation of Office] “An insane prelate who objectively defects from the Catholic faith is not subjectively guilty, but he is also assumed to be guilty (formal heretic) until his innocence (due to insanity) is proven, and in either case, he still loses his office c. 2229.3.”

Lane: Canon 2229 regards penalties. Canon 188 is not penal, and so this canon is irrelevant. Furthermore, 2229, 3 says nothing whatsoever about anybody losing their office. 2229 has to do with excusing causes relating to the application of penalties. And it says nothing whatsoever about insanity. 2229, 3 is about grave fear as an excusing cause. Where does he get this stuff?

RJMI Comment:

I get it from Canon Law. Canon Law 2229.3 is not just about grave fear. That is only one of the topics. So again, you either do not know how to read, or you are deceiving the

people who do not have a Canon Law book. Grave fear is dealt with in 2229.3 (3). Ignorance is dealt with in 2229.3 (1), and drunkenness, omission of due care, mental weakness, and heat of passion are dealt with in 2229.3 (2). So John, you spoke falsely when you said, 2229, 3 is only about grave fear as an excusing cause.

Just because you do not comprehend what you read does not mean it is not in the Law. The Fifth Book of Canon Law, Canons 2195-2414, deals specifically with penalties. That does not mean laws in the other books do not inflict penalties. The loss of office that is inflicted by those who violate Canon 188.4 is indeed a penalty. If you do not agree John, then what would you call it?

Many times one must refer to other canons in order to rightfully apply a law. Other laws describe terms and sets conditions that must be met, that an individual law does not extrapolate upon. That should be obvious to you John, and is one of the ABC's of Canon Law. So either you are an idiot, or you are again trying to willfully sway the reader into thinking that I do not know what I am talking about.

I will now proceed to teach you how Canon 2229.3 applies to an insane prelate who loses his office by publicly teaching heresy.

1. The penalty of Canon 188.4 of lose of office is a *latae sententiae* vindictive penalty.
2. The medicinal penalty for an internal defection from the Catholic faith, regarding heretics and apostates, is found in Canon 2314.1, which is excommunication from the Catholic Church.
3. Canon Law 2229.3 (1) modifies *latae sententiae* penalties, both medicinal and vindictive, depending on the extenuating circumstance of types of ignorance.
4. An insane person is as invincible ignorant as one can get.
5. Canon Law 2229.3 (1) implies that if a subject who violated a law is invincible ignorant, he does not incur the medicinal penalty, but does incur the vindictive penalty.

Canon 2229.3: “(1) Ignorance of the law or merely of the penalty, if crass or supine, does not exempt from any *latae sententiae* penalty; if it is not crass or supine [ed. if it is invincible or simple ignorance], it excuses from medicinal but not from vindictive *latae sententiae* penalties.^{15,16}

The incurring of the vindictive penalty, in the case here mentioned of an insane prelate, is for the common good, for the public welfare.

Canon 2218.2 “...no one should be punished who is without *dolus* (malice) or *culpa* (culpability), unless for a special reason which involves the public welfare.”¹⁷

I am sure you would agree John, that a pope who publicly teaches heresy to the flock is the greatest danger to the common good of the souls of the flock, and to non-Catholics by inhibiting the conversion of good willed souls. It involves the deposit of faith, the Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved. Whether the pope who publicly

¹⁵ PCC, vol. II, p. 500, Commentary on Canon 2287: “From vindictive penalties *latae sententiae* inflicted by either the common or the particular law there is no appeal or recourse, because they take effect immediately on the violation of the law to which such a penalty is attached.”

¹⁶ Bouscaren, *Canon Law a Text and Commentary*, pg. 814, c. 2229.1.

¹⁷ Fr. Augustine, *A Commentary on Canon Law*, Vol. VIII, p. 77

teaches heresy is sane or insane is irrelevant in relation to the common good, he loses his office in both cases and is no longer pope. That is good old common sense that even a child can understand.

Dominic Prummer (1927) "The power of the Roman Pontiff is lost... (c) By his perpetual insanity or by formal heresy."¹⁸

Semantics: Manifest vs. Public & Presume vs. Assume (10/2)

Lane Comment:

[RJMI, Quick Reference Manual, Tacit Resignation of Office] "Comment: A Catholic who teaches manifest heresy is assumed to have defected from the Catholic faith."

Lane: "manifest" modifies the CRIME of heresy, not "heretical doctrine" as Ibranyi implies by this sentence. See Canon 2197 for definition of "public" which is essentially equivalent to "manifest."

RJMI Comment:

John, if manifest means public as you suggest, then my use of the term "A Catholic who teaches manifest heresy" would also mean "A Catholic who teaches public heresy." Or, if you prefer "A Catholic who publicly (manifestly) teaches heresy." Canonists have used the term "manifest heresy," just as I have. Udalricus Beste, A. Vermeersch and I. Creusen disagree with you John, they use the terms, manifest heresy and notorious heresy.

Udalricus Beste (1946)"Not a few canonists teach that, outside of death and abdication, the pontifical dignity can also be lost by falling into certain insanity, which is legally equivalent to death, as well as through manifest and notorious heresy." ¹⁹

Udalricus Beste's use of the term "manifest and notorious heresy, " is redundant if by manifest he means public, because one of the traits of notorious heresy is that it is public.

Canon 2197: **Notorious in fact**, if it is publicly known and was committed under such circumstances that no maneuver can conceal nor any legal defense excuse it...²⁰;

A notorious crime must meet two conditions. It must be public and certain; certain so as to remove all doubts, being—"committed under such circumstances that no maneuver can conceal nor any legal defense excuse it." Beste could be using the terms "manifest heresy" and "notorious heresy" as meaning the same thing. But he is most probably being redundant to drive home the point that the heresy must be public.

A. Vermeersch - I. Creusen (1949)"The power of the Roman Pontiff ceases by death, free resignation (which is valid without need for any acceptance, c. 221), certain and unquestionably perpetual insanity, and notorious heresy. At least according to the more common teaching, the Roman Pontiff as a private teacher can fall into manifest heresy. Thus, without any declaratory

¹⁸ *Manuale Iuris Canonici*. Frieburt im Briesgau: Herder, 1927, 95.

¹⁹ *Introductio in Codicem*. 3rd ed. Collegeville: St. John's Abbey Press 1946. Canon 221.

²⁰ Bouscaren and Ellis, *Canon Law a Text and Commentary*, Canon 2197, p. 838.

sentence (for the supreme See is judged by no one), he would automatically (*ipso facto*) fall from a power which he, who is no longer a member of the Church, is unable to possess."²¹

So my use of the term manifest with heresy is not incorrect, as you have suggested. To be more precise the better term to use is “notorious heresy.” This is the more common one used by the canonists, and leaves no room for misinterpretation.

Matthaeus Conte a Coronata (1950) ""2. Loss of office of the Roman Pontiff. This can occur in various ways: "c. Notorious heresy." ²²

Due to the fact that the word manifest can be taken several ways, it was not the best term for me to use. A notorious crime is by its very nature public and certain. That is what Canon 2197 teaches.

Notorious in fact, if it is publicly known and was committed under such circumstances that no maneuver can conceal nor any legal defense excuse it..."²³;

Public, if it is already commonly known or the circumstances are such as to lead to the conclusion that it can and will easily become so;

Some canonists use the term “public heresy,” but in the context that it is notorious heresy.

F. X. Wernz - P. Vidal (1943): A pope who falls into public heresy would cease *ipso facto* to be a member of the Church: therefore, he would also cease to be head of the Church."²⁴

By “public heresy” they mean “notorious heresy,” as they make clear in the same article.

Ibid: "Through notorious and openly divulged heresy, the Roman Pontiff, should he fall into heresy, by that very fact (*ipso facto*) is deemed to be deprived of the power of jurisdiction even before any declaratory judgment by the Church.

Eduardus F. Regatillo (1956)"The Roman Pontiff ceases his office... "5. The pope loses office *ipso facto* because of public heresy.' This is the more common teaching, because a pope would not be a member of the Church, and hence far less could he be its head."²⁵

A person of good will would know that in this context the term “public heresy” means “notorious heresy.” But a man infected with pseudo-intellectual pride would attempt to strain out Gnats, but willfully misinterpreting what they mean, if he does not agree with their conclusions.

To conclude this section, my use of the term manifest heresy was meant that the person who taught it, did so publicly and meant what he said, because it “was committed under such circumstances that no maneuver can conceal nor any legal defense excuse it.” In other words, it fits the exact description of the definition of a notorious in fact crime as taught in Canon 2197. If you read my writings, that is what I clearly convey to the reader. Therefore, the more precise terminology would be:

²¹ *Epitome Iuris Canonici*. Rome: Dessain 1949. 340.

²² *Institutiones Iuris Canonici*. Rome: Marietti 1950. 1:312, 316

²³ Bouscaren and Ellis, *Canon Law a Text and Commentary*, Canon 2197, p. 838.

²⁴ *Ius Canonicum*. Rome: Gregorian 1943. 2:453.

²⁵ *Institutiones Iuris Canonici*. 5th ed. Santander: Sal Terrae, 1956. 1:396 His emphasis

“A Catholic who teaches notorious heresy is assumed to have defected from the Catholic faith.”

Lane Comment:

... "assumed" is a non-technical, incorrect, word. The term is "presumed"

RJMI Comment:

I have interchangeable used the words “presume” and “assume.” Some canonists use the word “assume” and some use the word “presume.” Fr. Augustine uses the word “assume.”

A Commentary on Canon Law, Commentary on Canon 1325.2: Obstinacy may be assumed when a revealed truth has been proposed with sufficient clearness and force to convince a reasonable man.²⁶

As I said John, you are a man that attempts to strain out Gnats, to discredit an author, while you swallow Camels.

Public Defection (10/3)

Lane Comment:

[From RJMI, Quick Reference Manual and Book One, Tacit Resignation of Office] “This canon is not concerned about the interior disposition of the soul of the perpetrator, but is concerned with the damage to the souls that are under his care. This is why the word "public defection" was used instead of "formal heresy." “

Lane: An ipse dixit. He has no canonist who says this, and hence he quotes none. The reason "defects from the faith" is modified by "public" is because occult heresy does not destroy the social bond of union of faith which unites a man to the visible unity of the Church. Occult (i.e. not external) heresy is a sin, but not a crime.

RJMI Comment:

I will quote from a canonist who does teach that the interior disposition of the soul is not considered when there is a real or apparent (in the case of insanity) public defection from the Catholic faith, meaning the perpetrator notoriously teaches heresy.

Rev. Joseph G. Goodwine, *The Reception of Converts*, Footnote 105, Pappafava dei Carraresi, “Quaestio Quaedam Circa Haeresim,”—Jus Pontificium, XI (1931), 52-53: “It is the purpose of canon 2314.1, to penalize each and every apostate, heretic, and schismatic. It has been argued that all heretics, formal and material,²⁷ are included under the excommunication. The contention is made that the good of the Church cannot be endangered because of the internal affections of the mind, such as are the good or bad faith of her subjects, which can only with the greatest

²⁶ Fr. Augustine, *A Commentary on Canon Law*, 1922, vol. 6, p. 335.

²⁷ RJMI Comment: The commentator is in error when he says there is such a thing as a material heretic. There is no such thing as a material heretic. (See: Formal and Material Heresy, p. 42)

difficulty be discovered and measured; that therefore, canon 2314.1, must regard not the *person* (in whom a determined act can be more or less culpable), but rather the external quality of the person (i.e. heresy) which directly affects the public good, and that in consequence of this it is of no import whether good or bad faith is present. The parallel is drawn with canon 731.2 in an effort to interpret the words *omnes et singuli haeretici*. The further allegation is made that canons 1323.1; 1325.2, and 2314.1, have the nature of disqualifying laws from which no ignorance excuses.²⁸

Upon a public defection the perpetrator must be accused of being a formal heretic. If the person were insane he would still incur the penalty of loss of office, for the public good, and when he proved his insanity in the external forum, then the accusation of him being a formal heretic would be dropped, but the loss of office remains.

Bad Theology & Pertinacity/Obstinacy (10/3)

Lane Comment:

Heresy is defined as PERTINACIOUS doubt or denial of a dogma, in canon 1325. If pertinacity were presumed, then the crime itself would be presumed, not just the *dolus* (malice). All of the canonists are clear on this, so I don't know why Ibranyi is so confused. ... Malice ("dolus") is presumed in the external forum, but not pertinacity. Pertinacity must be present in the external forum for there to be a crime of heresy or schism at all. When it is present, then malice is presumed.

RJMI Comment:

No John, all the canonists are not clear on this. Many contradict one another, and even contradict themselves regarding the teachings on heresy, heretics, culpability, and the incurring of penalties, etc. There are brief moments of clearness in their writings, engulfed in a fog of contradictions that leaves them, as well as the readers, in total confusion. This is one of the heretical theologies, an improper definition as to who is a heretic and culpability, which crept into the Church's teaching instruments long before the Conciliar Church. Or, would you have us believe the Vatican II monstrosity and the apostate antipopes came about overnight and just burst upon the scene. The fact is Rome did fall and lost the faith. Only a blinded fool, an idiot with no common sense, would pretend the V2 (Vatican II) apostasy came about overnight. Bad Cardinals and bishops, who went undetected by the popes, infiltrated Rome long before V2. Many were occult heretics who still functioned as Catholic Cardinals and bishops even though they were not.²⁹ Canon Law makes provisions for this. And, the ones who were not occult heretics, whose crimes were manifest in one local but not yet detected by the pope and most people—even though they were not Catholic, outside the Church, and with no office—the

²⁸ Rev. Joseph G. Goodwine, A.B., S.T.B., J.C.L., *The Reception of Converts*, A Dissertation, Imprimatur +Franciscus J. Spellman, D.D., May 31, 1944, The Catholic University of America Press. p. 137.

²⁹ All the canonists agree, and common sense dictates, that an occult heretic still functions legally. The dispute is whether an occult heretic, such as a bishop, is actually a Catholic bishop, or only functions as one, and does so legally by virtue of the Canon 209. In the same way a couple can live together in what is called a putative marriage, which is not a true marriage. They incur no sin and are looked upon as being married, until a diriment (invalidating) impediment is made public. (See: my Book One, Occult (Secret) Heretics)

sacraments they administered were legal by virtue of Canon 209 of the 1917 Code, by common error and probable doubt (See: my Book One, Occult (Secret Heretics)).

The pope is one man and it is impossible for him to check all the bad Cardinals and bishops, and writings of every theologian in the world not only before they publish their works but also afterwards. Just because the popes did not have the opportunity to investigate and condemn these heretics does not absolve them of guilt. The pope can even promote a priest to bishop or a Cardinal who is a heretic and not know it. How else does the infiltration at the highest ranks, that had been prophesied to occur, succeed? No pope, if he were truly the pope, meaning he would have to be Catholic, would ever promote a man he knows is teaching heresy and is a heretic. How many times in the temporal world of business does an owner of a company hire a manager, whom he trusts, thinks is very good, and enters into intimate counsel with him, and latter on he finds out he was bad after he wrought destruction by lying, cheating, stealing, or just plain bad management (lack of vigilance)? The pack of rats that signed and V2 documents were Cardinals and bishops under Pope Pius XII, and the U.S.A. bishops with their Peter's Penance had certainly helped expedite the corruption in Rome. The Judeo/Masonic U.S.A. are the direct enemies of the Church who sowed their corruption within the ranks of the hierarchy in Rome, and this took many years of work before V2 could succeed. (See: my books, Canon Law, Infallibility, and Vigilance, Popes Cannot Personally Examine Every Book in the World; Exurge Michael Issue #3, Where are the Catholic Bishops and Priests?; and Book Three, The Romans One Curse: The Denial of the Faith, Forbidden Books)

John, your problem is twofold. One, you have been trained by the very bad and heretical pre-Vatican II theology, that infested if not every, almost every pre-Vatican II theology book, etc. Two, your sin of pride and rebellion have blinded you, and thus caused you to lose common sense, so that you could not detect the contradictions in the bad theology that you were taught. Doubt not that God has inflicted this well deserved punishment upon his fallen-away chosen (See: Exurge Michael, Issue #3, Where are the Catholic Bishops and Priests?). In short this bad theology has tried to make black look white and white look black, and you end up with grey; the inability to make consistent and proper judgments, thus the virtue of justice is first suppressed and then destroyed. All this paved the road for apostate, Antipope John XXIII's and the Conciliar Church's, "no more anathemas." Is it not a cliché among you non-Catholic traditionalists that one must either not at all, or at least be very careful not to condemn anyone, via, no "ad homine" attacks, condemn the heresy not the person? Heresy is not some perverse idea that floats in space. No, heresy is attached to real people with names, who teach and propagate it. The heresy itself is no danger if no one teaches it and propagates it. The person who teaches it is the danger. I have been condemned most for condemning others, which is a Catholic's duty when it applies, while the charges (crimes) and those who commit them (criminals) are either totally ignored, or treated with kid gloves (softly). If you non-Catholic traditionalists ever get around to condemning anyone, you do so with a respect that is not worthy of a heretic or schismatic. You disqualify the condemnation by leaving manifest criminals a loophole, by teaching they may be subjectively innocent. What kind of condemnation is this? It is one that condemns the true messengers, and the God who sent them, and justifies the wicked (manifest criminals). Not to mention the crime that you are

a contributing cause to the damnation of the criminals for easing their conscience into thinking they can be justified and in a state of grace. **WAKE UP** John, from your deep sleep that has been induced by your pride, rebellion, and bad theology.

I will now criticize your above nonsense. John, your proposition at face value, is absurd. How else can one accuse a subject, whom he has no contact with, of being a formal heretic, as you have done with John Paul II, unless he presumes pertinacity/obstinacy once it is certain the perpetrator meant to teach heresy. John Paul II does not believe he is teaching contrary to Church dogma, at least it cannot be proven that he believes he is. JP2 not only verbally professes to be Catholic, he also verbally submits to the Catholic Church and the papacy. He believes he is the pope. Others have added this latter extra condition to be a formal heretic, that being, the perpetrator must also refuse to submit to the Church and the pope. Nowhere in Canon 1325.2 does it say the perpetrator must also refuse to submit to the Church or the pope. It only says he must pertinaciously doubt or deny one dogma to be a heretic, with no mention whatsoever of refusing to submit to the Church, or the papacy. To refuse to submit to the Church or the pope is the sin of schism, not heresy.

The truth is pertinacity/obstinacy is presumed as soon as heresy is notoriously taught; meaning it is public and certain beyond all doubt that the perpetrator meant to teach the heresy. Now for the evidence from a canonist, which you led the unwary reader into believing, does not exist.

A Commentary on Canon Law, Commentary on Canon 1325.2: Others have doubts, but make no effort to disperse them, and are not ready to accept the truth, even though convinced of it. Such are formal heretics. To this we may also reckon those so-called Catholics who interiorly reject or doubt any revealed truth, provided the rejection as well as the doubt be obstinate (*pertinax*), because this characteristic constitutes malice. *Obstinacy may be assumed when a revealed truth has been proposed with sufficient clearness and force to convince a reasonable man.*³⁰

Pertinax is the Latin term used in Canon 1325.2, which can mean either pertinacity, or as some interpret it to mean obstinacy. Read clearly John, obstinacy/pertinacity (*pertinax*) can be assumed in relation to Canon 1325.2, something you say cannot be done. John, you find yourself in an inescapable dilemma by saying you cannot presume pertinacity. A characteristic of pertinacity is malice, it does not presume malice, but is malice. I repeat your words. John Lane says, "Malice ('dolus') is presumed in the external forum, but not pertinacity. Pertinacity must be present in the external forum for there to be a crime of heresy or schism at all. When it is present, then malice is presumed." John, when pertinacity is present so is malice. They go hand and hand. As the above commentary teaches, "obstinate (*pertinax*) ...this characteristic constitutes malice." Open your eyes and ears John, it says pertinacity constitutes malice, not presumes malice. You cannot have it both ways, either pertinacity is presumed along with malice, or neither is presumed. The fact is as stated above, "**Obstinacy may be assumed** when a revealed truth has been proposed with sufficient clearness and force to convince a reasonable man." It only takes common sense to know this. I will present one more commentator, whom you said does not exist, who teaches the same.

³⁰ Fr. Augustine, *A Commentary on Canon Law*, 1922, vol. 6, p. 335.

Rev. Eric F. MacKenzie, *The Delict of Heresy*: “The external act must be (or at least must seem to be), the expression of a mind that is aware of, and a will that is freely committed to, a sinful act. The preservation of order, and the elimination of quibbling excuses, make necessary the provision that where the external delinquent act has been committed, the existence of sin be presumed... A person who ponders a question of faith and arrives at a decision, will regularly express his decision in speech or writing... he is guilty of the delict of heresy as soon as he completely expresses his erroneous judgment. ... Complete externalization of thought may exist in signs, acts, or omissions.” P. 98: “The commission of an external act of heresy is presumed by law to have all the necessary qualities of contumacity [footnote #1: Canon 2200.2], and hence is automatically punished by a state of excommunication, which the delinquent must recognize as binding him in both the internal and eternal *fora*.”³¹

There is another condition that renders a perpetrator, who teaches heresy, a formal heretic, and that is, omission of due diligence, which leaves him no excuse for ignorance. (See: for an in depth teaching on these topics see my, *Book One, Heretics and Heresy*; *Book One, Imputability: The Delict of Heresy: Formal Heresy and Heretics*; and *Book One, Ignorance: Invincible & Vincible*)

More Quotes on Presumption of Malice (11/19)

Rev. McKenzie, *The Delict of Heresy*, p. 35: The very commission of any act which signifies heresy, e.g., the statement of some doctrine contrary or contradictory to a revealed and defined dogma, gives sufficient ground for juridical presumption of heretical depravity [footnote #12: Canon 2200.2]. p. 41: By virtue of canon 2200.2, the fact that a delict has been committed establishes a presumption that the delinquent was fully responsible. A mere assertion of ignorance will not suffice.

Lane Comment:

[From RJMI, Quick Reference Manual and Book One, “Guilty until Proven Innocent - Malice Presumed!”] “If God knows he is innocent in the internal forum He will see to it that the said Catholic is absolved of guilt in due time, as God rose up the Prophet Daniel to defend Susanna (Dan. 13).”

Lane: Yes, Ibranyi no doubt would have condemned Susanna himself until Daniel appeared to absolve her in the external (or was that internal?) forum. Some forum or other. After all, that's where judgment was passed in those days, right? Richard Ibranyi, what a mess you have made of this entire subject. You speak of unjust judgment, as though it were unjust to think one innocent who had been presumed guilty in the "internal forum." Here is what Daniel the just man had to say to the unjust judge of Susanna: "In judging unjust judgments, oppressing the innocent, and letting the guilty go free, whereas the Lord saith: The innocent and the just thou shalt not kill." (Dan. 13, 53).

RJMI Comment:

In the days of the Old Testament there was no talk, or even a thought of external and internal, objective and subjective, formal and material, inside while being outside, outside while being inside, as we see among the modernists. It was all quite simple, just as it was

³¹ “The Delict of Heresy,” Rev. Eric F. MacKenzie, *A Dissertation*, Catholic University of America Canon Law Series, pp. 34. 98.

in the good days of the Catholic Church, when there were many simple faithful Catholics who were willing to fight and die for the faith. Our Lord speaks of the simplicity in which judgment is rendered. “What cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man... the things which proceed out of the mouth, come forth from the heart, and those things defile a man.”(Mt. 15:11, 18) Our Lord was not condoning rash judgments. It is not a hard thing to tell if a man meant what he said or did, if he has done it publicly and in a way so as to remove all doubt as to what he meant. God did not create people with the use of reason to be idiots. God does not make every man a genius, but he does make idiots of men who have the use of reason. If a man committed what clearly appeared to be a crime he was accused of it, without any attempt to water it down. If the accused, either sufficiently answers for himself, or was brought to trial and was found to be innocent, the charges were then dropped. If those who accused him were found malicious they were punished. If a man is innocent and did not mean what he said, it is a very simple thing for him to say so. Or if he was ignorant, it is a very simple thing for him to repent of his ignorance, and learn the truth.

John, you interpret Holy Scripture like a Protestant. You twist it to suit your heresy. Daniel was not opposing the judicial system that God had imposed upon Israel, in which guilt was presumed upon the testimony of two witnesses, until innocence was proven in a fair trial. Daniel was not opposing the accusation of guilt against Susanna being brought before the judges. Daniel was opposing the fact that Susanna was not given a fair trial, in order to prove her innocence. The judges showed partiality to the two men who accused her because of their wealth and position—they being among the ancients and judges also. During the trial of Susanna the judges did not privately question the accusers to see if their testimonies concurred. Therefore Daniel accused them of making an unjust judgment, for condemning Susanna to death without giving her a fair trial. “But he standing in the midst of them, said: Are ye so foolish, ye children of Israel, that without examination or knowledge of the truth, you have condemned a daughter of Israel?” (Daniel 13:48) The judges did not examine those who accused Susanna, to see if they were lying, so Daniel took them aside and questioned them and caught them lying. Their testimonies as to the facts conflicted with one another, so the accusations against Susanna were dropped, she was set free, and the two unjust witnesses were killed. Again, Daniel was not against Susanna being accused of the crime, or he would be opposing the very judicial system God had imposed upon Israel. Daniel was condemning the unfair trial. That is what he meant when he said to the prejudiced judges, "In judging unjust judgments, oppressing the innocent, and letting the guilty go free, whereas the Lord saith: The innocent and the just thou shalt not kill." (Dan. 13: 53)

John, the other fact you failed to notice in this crime Susanna was accused of, was that it was “committed” in secret. It was occult. It was not public. Therefore, the public would have no way of knowing if she was guilty or innocent for themselves, and had to trust in the judicial system to come to a fair judgment. That is why canon law teaches there must be a trial and declaration by a judge against occult heretics. That is not what we are speaking of when we point out the manifest crimes and the criminals who commit them. The evidence of their guilt is superabundant for all who have eyes to see and ears to hear. JP2 and the Conciliarists, you included, publicly commit spiritual fornication in full view, without the least bit of shame of guilt. That is not what the story of Susanna was about.

I will deal with malice as it relates to the internal and external forum later on.

John, the heretical and erroneous theology you are infected with leaves you prey to the likes the non-Catholic heretics Michael Davis and Abbe De Nantes, and the like. They will make minced meat of you in a debate because of your bad theology, which on face value is hypocritical. They too are infected with the same heretical theology but are being consistent to it by not condemning John Paul II as an apostate antipope. Both you and they are your own worst enemies. God is allowing Satan to use both of you to inflict punishments upon one another, in an endless barrage of contradictions, that confounds and confuses evermore, in which the truth can never be found. And, you all wallow in the mire of a false ecumenism that places you in quasi communion with one another that suits your intellectual pride and rebellion. You love the confusion. The more confused a man makes you, by a very subtle and seductive speech, the more profound you think he is. “But the learning of wickedness is not wisdom: and the device of sinners is not prudence. There is a subtle wickedness, and the same is detestable... There is an exquisite subtilty, and the same is unjust.” (Eclcus. 19:19, 22) You and your like, love the argument of the sake of the argument, and that is evil. To you John, the Catholic faith is a purely academic endeavor, as there are no real consequences if one does not listen and obey what you put forth as the Catholic faith. If you cannot say follow me or die in regard to the dogmatic teachings of the Catholic Church, then you better be silent and find a Catholic who is teaching the faith, as I am, and follow him. You and your followers, the Laneites, are nothing more than a mutual admiration society, who look to be patted on the back and flattered by one another, being justified in the eyes of men, instead of in the eyes of almighty God. “It is better to be rebuked by a wise man, than to be deceived by the flattery of fools.” (Ecltes. 7:6) The Church of Lane is a Church built upon the traditions of men and not the traditions of God.

RJMI Questions (10/3):

- 1) What do you base your judgment on, that JP2 is pertinacious, and thus is a formal heretic?
- 2) Why have you not made the same judgment regarding the SSPX bishops, priests, and laymen, who do not condemn the crimes of JP2 and the Conciliar Church that are manifest to all, nor do they personally condemn JP2 as a criminal (idolater, apostate, and heretic)?
- 3) Is it the sin of idolatry and apostasy to teach the Moslems worship the one true God?
- 4) Is this a denial of the very basics of the faith, that all Catholic must know, as found in their baptismal vows and creeds of the Church?
- 5) Can Catholics claim ignorance if they deny the very basics of the Catholic faith as stated in the baptismal vows and creeds of the Church?
- 6) Can Catholics claim to be innocent by omitting to condemn this crime and the criminals who commit it, when they are privy to the crime?
- 7) Have you asked your SSPX priest if the Moslems worship the one true God?
- 8) If he said, yes, or gave you no clear answer, have you condemned him on the spot as an apostate and heretic?

- 9) If he said, no, did you then proceed to show him that JP2 teaches the Moslems worship the one true God, and then demand he condemn the crime and the criminal that committed it?
- 10) If the SSPX priest did not condemn JP2 as being an apostate and heretic, based upon this evidence alone, did you inform him that he has denied his baptismal vow, by justifying a man who teaches the Moslems worship the one true God, and is an apostate and heretic by way of sins of omission? (You can also show him JP2 kissing the Koran and ask him if that is a sin of idolatry, and therefore is JP2 and idolater.)
- 11) Have you told the SSPX priest he is a schismatic, and present him with the evidence to prove it? Have you told him that is always, at all times, and in all places a schismatic act to consecrate bishops contrary to the will of a pope, or in their case, a man they think is the pope? Have you showed him the dogmatic teachings regarding this, and what was his answer? (See: my Book Two, Part Two, for the specific crimes of the SSPX and its members, and those who attend their chapels, and for more pertinent questions.)

Give me the address and name of the SSPX chapel you attend, and the names of the priests who say Mass there, so I can witness the faith to them by condemning them and calling them to repent, convert, and abjure. I have done this on many occasions and have never received an answer from any of them. When I had the opportunity to personally profess the faith to them they got tongue tied and excused themselves very quickly, at times by outright running away like cowards. Friends of mine, who are now Catholic, have witnessed to the SSPX priests and when the SSPX priests did not call a heresy a heresy and a heretic a heretic, they condemned the priests, called them to conversion, and left the church and never went back. They “hated the assembly of the malignant, and with the wicked they would not sit.” (Ps. 25:5) They refrained “from all appearance of evil,” and avoid scandalizing the little ones, fearing the fate of a millstone being tied around their neck and being cast into the sea of eternal hellfire (Mk. 9:41). They followed the teachings of the great St. Paul, “mark those who make dissensions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which you have learned and avoid them.” (Ro. 16:17-18) “Bear not the yoke with unbelievers, for what fellowship hath light with darkness” (2Cor. 6:14-17). “Have no fellowship with the works of darkness, rather reprove them.” (Eph. 5:6-12) Yes, the Lord says to those Catholics who have repented, converted, abjured, and stay away from non-Catholic bishops and priests, “Blessed is the man who hath not walked in the counsel of the ungodly, nor stood in the way of sinners, nor sat in the chair of pestilence.” (Ps. 1:1)

Does Lane imply the Conciliar Church is the Catholic Church? (10/15)

Lane Comment:

[From R.J.M.I., Quick Reference Manual, B) Joining or Adherence to a Non-Catholic Religion, Canon 2314/3] 1917 Code of Canon Law: "c. 2314. All apostates from the Christian faith, and all heretics and schismatics: (1) are ipso facto excommunicated... (3) if they have joined a non-Catholic sect or publicly adhered to it, they are ipso facto infamous, and clerics, in addition to being considered to have tacitly renounced any office they may hold, according to canon 188.4, are, if previous warning proves fruitless,

to be degraded." [RJMI Comment] It is possible for a prelate to publicly defect (fall away) from the Catholic faith and not join or adhere to a non-Catholic sect, and this would also depose a prelate from office, ipso facto, according to canon 188.4 alone. But, if a prelate should join or adhere to a non-Catholic sect, this would be a sure sign of defection from the Catholic faith and he would incur the penalty of canon 2314.3 and lose his office by the authority and force of canon 188.4. Read how the Conciliar Church (a non-Catholic sect) admits in her founding decrees—her new Pentecost of Vatican II - that she also is joined to other non-Catholic religions.

Lane's Comment: If Vatican II was the founding of a new "non-Catholic sect", in the sense of that term employed by the Code, then where was the Catholic Church in 1965? We need to know where the Catholics were. Who was there who not only rejected the heresies of V2, but CUT OFF COMMUNION WITH THE CHURCH WHICH WAS IDENTIFIED WITH THEM PUBLICLY? I submit that there were none that we know of. Therefore, according to Ibranyi's reasoning, there was no Catholic Church for a period, until the sedevacantists appeared shortly afterwards. But that's a heresy, so Ibranyi must be wrong.

RJMI Comment:

[12/22/09: The Catholic Church and all Her sacraments and offices and dogmas and other laws are still intact on earth even if there were not one Catholic in the whole world. (See my book *The Catholic Church Survives Without Catholics.*)]

Lane Comment:

[From RJMI, *A Notorious Heretic cannot be the Pope*, B) Joining or Adherence to a Non-Catholic Religion: Canon 2314/3] Vatican II, Lumen Gentium "15. The Church knows that she is joined in many ways to the baptized who are honored by the name of Christian, but who do not however profess the Catholic faith in its entirety or have not preserved unity or communion under the successor of Peter...these Christians are indeed in some real way joined to us in the Holy Spirit..." [RJMI Comment] Therefore, not only is the Conciliar Church a non-Catholic religion/sect but she, in her own founding decrees, teaches that she is joined to other non-Catholic religions/sects. This teaching is verified in word and carried out in deed by John Paul II. His adherence to this non-Catholic religion/sect before his election to the "Papacy" invalidates his election by the force of Bull Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio (See: p. 28). Therefore, John Paul II was never Pope but he is a non-Catholic Antipope.

Lane's Comment: JP2 is not pope because he is a public heretic, and was already one before his "election." But to make the case about the non-Catholic sect, Ibranyi needs to show that his judgment that Vatican II founded a new, identifiable, non-Catholic sect, is equivalent to a judgment issued by the Church herself. I think he is going to struggle...

RJMI Comment:

The Catholic Church does not have to condemn by name every false sect that raises its ugly head under the sun. That would be an almost impossible task and is not necessary. Many false sects have arisen since Vatican II that claim to be the true Church of Christ, and some claim to have a pope. The non-Catholic Antipope Gregory XVII (Fr. John Gregory) and his Order of the Magnificat of the Mother of God in St. Jovite, Canada claims to be the pope of the Catholic Church. Catholic Church authorities have not judged or condemned him and his sect. Does that mean he and his sect must be referred to, and treated as the Catholic Church until a declaratory or condemnatory sentence by a competent authority is rendered? The same can be said of the non-Catholic antipopes, Pius XIII (Fr. Lucian Pulvermacher) and his sect, and the Thucite bishop Gregory XVII (Clemente Dominguez Gomez) of Palmar de Troya Spain and his sect.

RJMI Questions (10/15):

- 1) Is the Conciliar Church a non-Catholic sect?
- 2) Is the Order of the Magnificat of the Mother of God in St. Jovite a non-Catholic sect?
- 3) Is the Church founded by Gregory XVII of Palmar de Troya a non-Catholic sect?
- 4) By what right and authority do you have to make judgments regarding these above Churches?

Open Letter to John Lane 11/12/2001

November 12, 2001
St. Martin I, pray for us!

Mr. Lane,

I emailed you every time I posted a response to you, with a copy going to Mr. Y. and Nicholas Wurth in every instance. So don't play dumb just because you cannot answer my questions posed to you without hanging yourself higher than you are already hanging. I sent an email to you notifying you of my last post on 10/5/01. I have not heard from you since, until now. I am preparing my last responses to you and then I will put you on the back burner where you belong, and only respond if appropriate. Meaning if you show a good will and answer my straightforward questions that you have not answered. You are committing four main crimes that are easy for a simple child to detect, among the many others I have listed:

1) You are praying in communion with notorious heretics and schismatics. In this you are guilty of all their crimes by way of association. Have you no shame!

“Canon 1258. It is unlawful for the faithful to assist in any active manner, or to take part in the sacred services of non-Catholics.” Commentary: “...One may not be present at non-Catholic prayers, services or sermons either in a church or elsewhere.”³²

³² PCC, vol. II, p. 65

2) You have shirked your duty and obligation to profess the faith to them and demand they submit to the dogmas of the Church, by repenting, converting, and abjuring. In this you are guilty of all their crimes by way of omission.

1917 Code of Canon Law: “1325.1 Obligation to Profess the Faith - The faithful are bound to profess their faith openly whenever under the circumstances silence, evasion, or their manner of acting would otherwise implicitly amount to a denial of the faith, or would involve contempt of religion, an offense to God, or scandal to the neighbor.”

Catechism **Question:** In how many ways may we either cause or share in the guilt of another’s sin? **Answer:** We may either cause or share the guilt of another’s sin in nine ways: 1. By counsel; 2. By command; 3. By consent; 4. By provocation; 5. By praise or flattery; 6. By concealment; 7. By being a partner in the sin; 8. By silence; 9. By defending the ill done.

3) You are participating in the crime of sacrilegious receptions of Holy Communion. Non-Catholics, except for the sacrament of baptism, are forbidden to receive the other sacraments. You, being a non-Catholic yourself, are receiving side-by-side with other non-Catholics. Thus you are a willing accomplice in this crime. Instead of condemning the priest and people on this point alone, you receive Holy Communion side-by-side with them.

Canon 1917 Code of Canon Law: “c. 731. It is forbidden to administer the Sacraments of the Church to heretics and schismatics, even though they are in good faith and request the sacraments unless they shall have previously renounced their errors and obtained reconciliation with the Church.”

“Canon 2260.1. “An excommunicated person may not receive the Sacraments; after a declaratory or condemnatory sentence; he may not receive even the sacramentals.”

4) You have said that there are many good Society of Saint Pius X priests. In spite of the fact that they do not condemn even the most basic heresies of the Conciliar Church and John Paul II, and condemn them for what they are. Nor do they call John Paul II a heretic, apostate, or idolater in the face of overwhelming evidence—via the Moslems worship the one true God and the kissing of the Koran. Neither do they condemn Bishop Lefebvre’s act of schism when he consecrated bishops contrary to the will of a man he believed was the pope. That is the crime of bold schism at all times and in all places with no exceptions. Nevertheless, John assures his readers that there are many good SSPX priests. John, you have not yet given me the name of your SSPX priest and the address of the SSPX church you attend. Have you asked him the questions I posed to you earlier in this debate? (See: [RJMI Questions 10/3](#))

John, Jesus Christ said, a tree is known by its fruit. These above fruits of yours are evil, are corrupted (Mt. 7:15). John, Catholics must avoid you like a plague, based upon these above crimes alone. Any theology you put forward is totally corrupted because it has led you to justify the mortal sins against the faith you are committing above. It does not matter if you say some good things. It is the bad things that corrupt the whole of your work. I am not praying in communion with non-Catholics. You are. I profess the faith to non-Catholics when the opportunity presents itself and firmly teach them the truth, condemn their crimes, and call them to repent, convert and abjure. This you do not do. Instead you pray in communion with them during Mass and remain silent. I do not, since my repentance, conversion and abjuration, receive Holy Communion with non-Catholics.

This you do. God and His Catholic Church are pure, holy, unspotted, and undefiled, and He would never support a non-Catholic heretic and schismatic, such as yourself, who sits in the assembly of the malignant week after week with no shame.

When I finish my last two responses to you I will restate my questions to you and then go on with the business of helping to save good willed souls. Once I post enough evidence against a non-Catholic heretic and schismatic, such as yourself and Hutton Gibson, I no longer waste my time with him.

I have posted enough of your nonsense for any person with an inkling of good will to see that you are a notorious heretic and schismatic. If they think I have been unfair for not posting all your garbage that is their problem. I am not about to confuse the lost sheep with your garbage. That is what your website is for—the ever more confusing of the lost sheep with your heretical theology that you learnt from bad books with imprimaturs. They are going to have to ask you if you do, or do not, believe in what I have posted on my website. They are going to have to ask you if you are committing the crimes I accused you of. As I said in the beginning of this debate, I am Catholic and you are not. A Catholic is never, no never, to allow a non-Catholic to dictate the terms of a debate. I do not partake in false ecumenism.

Lane Effectively denies Latae Sententiae Excommunications (11/19)

Lane's Comment:

Of course, all heretics are excommunicated latae sententiae, but that is subsequent from the departure of external heretics from membership in the Church. They are two different things.

RJMI Comment:

John, you contradict yourself. First you say, “**all** heretics are excommunicated latae sententiae.” Then you say there is a period of time in which an “external heretic” is not excommunicated. Is the “eternal heretic” included in your use of the term “all heretics”? What is an external heretic? Is the body of this external heretic outside (external to) the Church while his soul is (internal) inside the Church? Is his body a non-member while his soul is a member of the Catholic Church? Talk about confused heretical nonsense. John, you are a confounded fool!

I understand some authors use the term material heretic, a term I do not believe is appropriate. It leads to confusion if not understood the way the authors define it and their explanations of what it means differ. The term “heretic” should be used only for a true (formal) heretic. No one should be called a heretic of any sort, unless he is a true heretic (See my book *Infalibility, Heresy, and Heretics*, Formal and Material Heresy).

Those who use the label “material heretic” do not teach the material heretic who professes to be a member of the Catholic Church, or as you say, external heretic, is excluded from membership in the Catholic Church, even thou in cases that involve the

common good they would incur vindictive penalties such as loss of office—for example an insane prelate. Only Catholics who become formal heretics incur the internal censure of excommunication, which is the medicinal penalty.³³ It is this censure, because of their heresy, that places them outside the Church, and renders them non-members of the Catholic Church.

Lane's Comment:

A heretic leaves the Church by his own act, prior to and without the need of any excommunication. The excommunication certainly is applied, *ipso facto*, but it is applied to a non-Catholic, for the culprit has already departed the Church. . . . Manifest heretics leave the Church by their own act, prior to being excommunicated. . . . The separation from the Church of a manifest heretic, schismatic, or apostate occurs without and prior to any ecclesiastical penalty whatsoever. It is *by his own act*, NOT by any act of the Church, which all ecclesiastical penalties are. Excommunications are penalties, Richard. They are inflicted by the Church, either *ipso facto* or *ferendae sententiae*. But they have nothing whatsoever to do with the fact that a manifest heretic, schismatic, or apostate is out of the Church. *Nothing*. They are imposed automatically or by sentence, *after* the culprit has left the Church by his crime. Is this clear yet? Here is Bellarmine on the point. “And this is what St. Jerome writes, adding that the other sinners are excluded from the Church by sentence of excommunication, but the heretics exile themselves and separate themselves by their own act from the body of Christ.”

RJMI Comment:

John, like the Protestant that you are, you have taken SS. Robert Bellarmine and Jerome out of context. SS. Robert and Jerome are referring to a condemnatory sentence of excommunication, which takes place by a competent judge, as opposed to an automatic (*ipso facto*) excommunication that takes place immediately upon the perpetrator falling into heresy. Automatic (*latae sententiae*) excommunication is effected by the Church—by Her laws (*ab jure*)—without the need of a sentence from a competent judge. When St. Jerome teaches that “heretics exile themselves and separate themselves by their own act from the body of the Christ,” what he means is that as soon as they fall into heresy, and thus become heretics, by this act alone, they are automatically excommunicated, without the need of a “sentence of excommunication,” from a competent judge, also known as a condemnatory sentence. Thus it is said that heretics exile themselves from the Church by their own crime of heresy that automatically (*latae sententiae*) excommunicates them, without the need of a competent judge to exile them (*ferendae sententiae*). That is the proper context in which this sentence must be interpreted. A heretic is not excommunicated by a condemnatory sentence by a competent Church authority. This is the “sentence of excommunication” that St. Jerome is referring to. However, a heretic by his own act is automatically (*ipso facto*) excommunicated without a “sentence of excommunication,” from a competent judge.

³³ The Delict of Heresy, Rev. McKenzie, p. 44: “Excommunication is never anything except a medicinal penalty. (footnote 4: Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome*, III, n. 456,1.)”

The Church excommunicates a perpetrator in two ways, either by a competent judge or automatically. Both are acts of the Church. One, the condemnatory sentence (*ferendae sententiae*), requires a judicial sentence by a competent judge. The other, *ipso facto* excommunication (*latae sententiae*), is automatically inflicted by the Church Herself by the operation and force of Her law (*ab jure*), with no need of a warning, judicial trail, or condemnatory sentence.

Rev. McKenzie, *The Delict of Heresy, Judicial Process Against Heresy*, p. 98: The commission of an external act of heresy is presumed by law to have all the necessary qualities of contumacity [footnote #1: Canon 2200.2], and hence is automatically punished by a state of excommunication, which the delinquent must recognize as binding him in both the internal and eternal *fora*. In this no judicial process is involved. The person is excommunicated by virtue of the pre-existing law and the fact that he has committed the forbidden delict.

John, read carefully, “an external act of heresy... is automatically punished by a state of excommunication.” The automatic excommunication does not take place sometime after. An automatic (*latae sententiae*) excommunication is as much an act of the Church (an ecclesiastical penalty - c. 2314.1) as is the condemnatory (*ferendae sententiae*) sentence by a (man) competent judge.

A future declaratory sentence can be made against a heretic, who has already been automatically excommunicated, but this is not a judicial sentence of excommunication, rather it is an affirmation that excommunication had already occurred. A delcaratory sentence can be made against a heretic by a judge for the common good, but this is not an excommunication. A delcaratory sentence is an affirmation that excommunication had already been automatically inflicted upon the perpetrator. In cases of occult (secret) heretics a delcaratory sentence would be needed in order for the public to become aware that the occult heretic has been excommunicated.

Canon Law: a Text and Commentary: “c. 2232.1. A penalty *latae sententiae*, whether corrective or vindictive, binds the delinquent *ipso facto* both in the external and in the internal forum... which leaves the issuance of a declaratory sentence to the discretion of the superior and demands it only when the parties insist or when public welfare is at stake. Thus a priest may be interested in the declaration of a sentence against another because of the title he has to a parish. A declaratory sentence does not constitute a penalty, but simply affirms that a penalty has been incurred, and hence throws the penalty back to the moment when the crime was committed.”³⁴

PCC, *Commentary on Canon 36.2*, Vol. 1, p. 31: “In the condemnatory sentence the court itself inflicts the penalty of the law, and for that reason the penalties are called *ferendae sententiae* (penalties to be inflicted by sentence of the court. In the declaratory sentence, the law itself has already inflicted the penalty immediately on the breaking of the law, and the court in which the offender is arraigned merely declares that it has found the person guilty, and that therefore he has incurred a certain penalty of the law. These penalties are called *latae sententiae* (sentence already pronounced).

Read carefully John, the offender who breaks a law with an *ipso facto* (*latae sententiae*) penalty attached, in this case a Catholic who becomes a heretic, is inflicted with the penalty of automatic excommunication as stated in Canon 2314.1 immediately and not after he leaves the Church for a certain period of time.

1917 Code of Canon Law: “Canon 2314.1 All apostates from the Christian faith, and all heretics and schismatics: (1) are *ipso facto* excommunicated.”

³⁴ Fr. Augustine, *A Commentary on Canon Law*, vol. 8, p. 102-4.

John, you said that a manifest heretic could be outside the Catholic Church without having incurred the above automatic (*ipso facto*) excommunicated. I quote from you above comments.

John Lane: “The separation from the Church of a manifest heretic... occurs without and prior to any ecclesiastical penalty whatsoever. ...A heretic leaves the Church by his own act, prior to and without the need of any excommunication... Manifest heretics leave the Church by their own act, prior to being excommunicated.”

John, is the manifest heretic, indeed a heretic? If so then how does he escape the automatic excommunication of the above penal law (c. 2314.1)? By this teaching you have denied the authority and force of the *latae sententiae* excommunication that is attached to Canon 2314.1. An automatic excommunication of a Catholic who becomes a heretic is inflicted immediately (simultaneously) upon the Catholic falling into heresy.

Rev. Eric MacKenzie, *The Delict of Heresy*, Penalties Entailed by Heresy, p.43: Delicts of heresy and apostasy are dealt with most severely... delicts against faith are visited with her heaviest punishments. **The heretic immediately incurs excommunication**, and is liable to further vindictive punishments. The reason is plain. Heresy indicates such a destruction of the Christian character of the delinquent, and, being externalized, has such potentialities of hindering and preventing the teaching of revealed truth to others, that immediate and decisive action must be taken to prevent any spread of the contagions of error. ...P. 82 **As soon as a delict of heresy has been committed, the delinquent incurs excommunication.**

John, open you eyes and ears. Take careful note. It does not say the heretic first leaves the Church, being a heretic for certain period of time, and then later on incurs excommunication. No! It teaches, just as does Canon 2314.1, that, “The heretic **immediately** incurs excommunication. ...As soon as the delict of heresy has been committed.”

John, it is heresy to teach a man who leaves the Church by becoming a heretic is not also simultaneously excommunicated. It is the excommunication, because of his heresy, that places him outside the Church (separates him from the Church). You admit that a one time Catholic who becomes a manifest heretic is separated from the Church, outside the Church, while not admitting this took place by an automatic excommunication. Thus you have denied the authority and force of an automatic (*ipso facto*) excommunication (*latae sententiae*). You teach that a manifest heretic is indeed separated from the Church, which is true, but you heretically teach this took place without any excommunication.

False Analogy

Lane Comment:

For manifest heretics are already cut off from the Church, and so their excommunication *cannot* cut them off. ...what it doesn't do is cut off from the Church those who have already, by their own unhappy act, departed from her unity. The idea is ridiculous. A man who leaps out of the boat by himself cannot also be pushed overboard. He's already in the water, Richard.

RJMI Comment:

John, you have used another ploy that heretics use, deception by false analogy. I will give the true analogy to your above scenario. The Admiral of the ship passes a law that says anyone who jumps overboard (c. 1325.2) is automatically sentenced as a deserter (c. 2314.1). If the deserter wants to return to the ship, become a member of the ship, the Admiral or his representative, must absolve him of the charges (c. 731 – c. 2314.2). Thus, if a member of the ship jumps overboard, the instant he does he is also automatically sentenced as a deserter. The jumping (heresy – c. 1325.2) and the automatic sentence of deserter (*latae sententiae* excommunication – c. 2314.1) are simultaneous. That is the equivalent of a *latae sententiae* excommunication that is inflicted upon a Catholic the instant he falls into heresy.

A member of the ship can also commit certain other crimes that require the Admiral or his representative to personally sentence him and throw him overboard. That is the equivalent of a *ferendae sententiae* excommunication. The Admiral's sentence would be a condemnatory sentence.

In both cases the offender is outside the ship, no longer a member of the ship. In both cases an Admiral has excommunicated them. One, passively, due to the previous decree of the Admiral that inflicts automatic excommunication (status of deserter) for those who jump overboard, and the other, actively, that requires a condemnatory sentence from the Admiral or his representative in which he is thrown overboard. Both end up in the water (outside the Church), one by jumping the other by being thrown overboard.

RJMI Question 1 (11/19):

John, when does your supposed external or manifest heretic, who is already outside the Church, incur automatic (*latae sententiae*) excommunication? What additional condition must the heretic, who is outside the Church, meet in order for the automatic excommunication to take place as decreed in Canon 2314.1?

Violent Hands on the Pope and Tolarati and Vitandi Heretics

Lane Comment:

In addition, and this is really a very grave error on your part, you are ignorant of the fact that *ipso facto* excommunication does not make anybody a non-member of the Church, except in the case of one who has laid violent hands on the Roman Pontiff. That is the *only* case in which the recipient of a *latae sententiae* excommunication is thereby deprived of membership in the Church. This is commonly taught by the theologians, so there is no excuse for your ignorance, given that you have dared to write on the matter in public.

Some non-Catholics were kicked out of the Church by excommunication – those against which a declaration of *vitandus* is issued. Manifest heretics leave the Church by their own act, prior to being excommunicated.

Only those excommunicated and declared *vitandus* (or who laid violent hands on the pope) are considered non-Catholics. The rest are referred to as *tolerati*, and the common opinion is that they remain within the Church. But even if in your insuperable pride you choose the discredited minority opinion against the great theologians, your statement here is still false, because heretics have already, as explained, placed themselves outside the Church by their own act.

RJMI Comment:

John, there were very, very few great theologians after the Protestant revolt, and barely any in the 19th and 20th centuries; so few that when all is said and done, these “great” theologians will be condemned as heretics by a future pope, or Christ Himself. It is they who have introduced multitudes of bad books with heretical theology. When the majority at any given time period, such as the 19th and 20th centuries in particular, are teaching heretical theology then one could only find the truth among the minority of theologians in the same time period, if even that. One may have to go back before the corrupted time period to find good theologians. A future book I am now working on will thoroughly expose the heretical theologians and their bad and heretical books with imprimaturs. I have already exposed enough for a person of good will to see that this is the root of the poison that led to the Great Apostasy. (See: my books *Why we lost the Pope, not the Papacy, and the Mass*, *Forbidden Books*; *Where are the Catholic Bishops and Priests?*; and, *Bad Books With Imprimaturs*, *Popes Cannot Personally Examine Every Book in the World*)

The crime of laying violent hands on the Roman Pontiff has nothing to do with heresy or membership in the Church. The laying of violent hands on the Roman Pontiff automatically excommunicates the offender, with that added penalty of automatically making him a *vitandus*, without the need of a sentence from a competent judge.

“Canon 2343.1. Persons who lay violent hands on the person of the Roman Pontiff: (1) automatically incur excommunication reserved in a most special manner to the Apostolic See, and *ipso facto* become *excommunicati vitandi*.”

In every other case an offender can only become a *vitandus* by a sentence from a competent judge. The laying of violent hands on the Roman Pontiff is the only automatic (*ipso facto*) penalty that makes the offender a *vitandus*. This canon has nothing to do whatsoever about defining the membership status of *tolerati* and *vitandi* heretics. Both the *tolerati* and *vitandi* heretics are outside the Catholic Church. They are non-members. The difference being the way Catholics must treat them. Also, not all *vitandi* are outside the Catholic Church, non-members. Only those who have committed sins against the faith (apostasy or heresy), or charity (schism), and certain other crimes, are outside the Church.

John, you mix apples with oranges. You speak of one topic and mix it with another topic, which has nothing at all to do with the original topic, and then switch back and forth. One topic is the status of *vitandi* and *tolerati* heretics. *Vitandi* heretics must be avoided at almost all costs, while the *tolerati* heretics can be more tolerated under strict conditions. Another separate topic is that all heretics, both *tolerati* and the *vitandi* heretics, are

automatically excommunicated and fall outside the Church. Canon 2314.1 clearly teaches that all heretics are automatically excommunicated, with no distinction made for *tolarati* or *vitandi*.

1917 Code of Canon Law: “Canon 2314.1 All apostates from the Christian faith, and **all heretics** and schismatics: (1) **are ipso facto excommunicated.**”

Rev. McKenzie, *The Delict of Heresy*, p. 41: Canon 2314.1, which provides an *ipso facto* excommunication. This basic excommunication is the penalty incurred by all heretics, whether or not they are guilty of other aggravating delicts which are mentioned in the succeeding numbers of the same canon and section.”

All offenders of Canon 2314.1 are first *tolarati* heretics. *Tolarati* heretics could later on become *vitandi* heretics by a sentence from a competent judge. The difference between the two has nothing to do with their membership status in the Church, but with how they are to be treated by Catholics. They are both non-members of the Catholic Church. The difference being the *tolarati* heretics can be tolerated more than the *vitandi* heretics.

John, you teach heresy when you imply an excommunicated *tolaratus* heretic is not separated from communion with the faithful, while the excommunicated *vitandus* heretic is. The truth is they are both separated from communion with the faithful, outside the Church, non-members, who must abjure their heresies in order to enter the Church.

Canon 1917 Code of Canon Law: “c. 731. It is forbidden to administer the Sacraments of the Church to heretics and schismatics, even though they are in good faith and request the sacraments unless they shall have previously renounced their errors and obtained reconciliation with the Church.”

1917 Code of Canon Law: “c. 2314.3. When he has been thus absolved from the censure, the offender may then be absolved from the sin in the internal forum by any confessor. The abjuration is made in juridical form, when it takes place in the presence of the local Ordinary or his delegate and at least two witnesses.”

Note carefully, all heretics fall under the censure mentioned in Canon 2314.1 and fall outside the Church. If they want to reenter the Church they must abjure in order to be absolved of their censure as stated in Canons 2314.3 and 731. Only then can they be absolved of their sins in confession. By logical conclusion all heretics having incurred the ecclesiastical penalty of Canon 2314.1 are outside the Church until they abjure as stated in Canons 2314.3 and 731. If the crime of heresy was private the offenders can abjure privately. If the crime was public then they must abjure publicly. All heretics are either *tolarati* or *vitandi* heretics who have been automatically (*latae sententiae*) excommunicated by Canon 2314.1. Both *tolarati* and *vitandi* heretics are forbidden to receive the sacraments.

Canon 2260.1: “An excommunicated person may not receive the Sacraments: after a declaratory or condemnatory sentence he may no receive even the sacramentals.”

The excommunicated person referred to above, whom no sentence has been pronounced against, either declaratory or condemnatory by a competent authority, is a subject who has been automatically (*latae sententiae*) excommunicated. If his automatic excommunication is because of heresy or schism, then he is a heretic or schismatic, who has also cut himself off from the Church.

Rev. McKenzie, *The Delict of Heresy*, p. 61: “Canon 2260.1, states that heretics cannot receive the Sacraments... The reason is obvious. The Sacraments are the chief means of grace whereby the Church procures and supports the supernatural well-being of her subjects. The heretic who has cut himself off from the Church has not the slightest right to turn to here and expect from here hands these greatest spiritual favors. Historically, deprivation of the Sacraments has always been the penalty assessed against heretics, from the earliest canons and regulations up to and including the legislation of the Code.”

Thus, the *tolaratus* heretic, being *latae sententiae* excommunicated the instant he fell into heresy, because “basic excommunication is the penalty incurred by all heretics,” “has cut himself off from the Church.” Nowhere does it say he must also be a *vitandus* heretic in order to be cut off from the Church. You will read again that as soon as a Catholic becomes a heretic, he immediately incurs excommunication, and he is no longer Catholic, he does “not possess membership in the Church.”

Rev. McKenzie, *The Delict of Heresy*, p. 82, and 81: “As soon as a delict of heresy has been committed, the delinquent incurs excommunication, and in that instant is bound in conscience, under pain of sin, to avoid exercising jurisdiction either in the internal forum or the external... Obviously, it would be highly improper for anyone but a Catholic to exercise either ordinary or delegated authority, and thus to assume the role of directing the Catholic faithful in their religious life. Canon Law guided by this principle, has consistently declared that those who do not possess membership in the Church, --heretics and other excommunicates, --are thereby incapacitated for the exercise of jurisdiction over the faithful.”

This sentence implies the heretic is not Catholic, “Obviously, it would be highly improper for anyone but a Catholic to exercise either ordinary or delegated authority...” Thus a subject who is guilty of the delict of heresy, as stated in Canon 2314.1, is not Catholic. The last underlined sentence speaks for itself—they are also non-members of the Catholic Church.

Rev. McKenzie, *The Delict of Heresy*, p. 76: “In general, it may be said that a heretic is guilty of sin whenever he acts in an official capacity (in the sense of ‘official’ just given); it is manifestly improper for one who has been guilty of the gravest of sins against the Church as an authoritative society, and who has thereby incurred excommunication and loss of membership in the general communion of that society, to act hereafter as on the society’s officers, and to administer officially to the faithful members of that society.”

John, read the underlined portion. “A heretic... has thereby incurred excommunication and loss of membership.” The excommunication takes place immediately upon him falling into heresy and this is how he loses membership.³⁵ Therefore, John, you teach heresy when you say *latae sententiae* excommunications for sins against the faith do not make the offenders non-Catholic.

John Lane: “Latae sententiae excommunication does not make one a non-Catholic. ...*ipso facto* excommunication does not make anybody a non-member of the Church, except in the case of one who has laid violent hands on the Roman Pontiff.”

You make no distinction when you make this statement, except for the laying of violent hands on the Roman Pontiff. Thus, you heretical teach that the automatic (*ipso facto - latae sententiae*) excommunication leveled against heretics mentioned in Canon 2314.1 does not make them non-members. Or, you may try to weasel out of your dilemma, by saying as you had above, that heretics already left the Church and this

³⁵ Only the occult heretic can legally function until his heresy becomes notorious, or until a declaratory sentence is rendered against him.

excommunication takes place sometime afterward, which is also heresy. John, you have fallen into heresy whichever way you go. It is heresy to teach that Catholics are not automatically excommunicated the instant they become heretics, and it is heresy to teach that this automatic excommunication does not make them non-members. You are also condemned for willful ambiguity by Bull *Autorem Fidei*. It only takes common sense to see the dilemma you have created. You are no different than your brother, who you pray in communion with, apostate, Antipope John Paul II. Would you have us believe you can close your eyes and ears when the “*Te Igitur*” (one with John Paul II - *una cum*) is prayed by the non-Catholic heretic and schismatic Society of Saint Pius X priest at the Mass you attend, and in so doing escape guilt? Would you have us pretend that God does not see you?

Beware of all iniquity... Their ways are always before him, they are not hidden from his eyes. ...And all their works are as the sun in the sight of God: and his eyes are continually upon their ways. Their covenants were not hid by their iniquity, and all their iniquities are in the sight of God... Turn to the Lord, and forsake thy sins: Make thy prayer before the face of the Lord, and offend less. Return to the Lord, and turn away from thy injustice, and greatly hate abomination... Go to the side of the holy age, with them that live and give praise to God. Tarry not in the error of the ungodly, give glory before death. Praise perisheth from the dead as nothing. Give thanks whilst thou art living, whilst thou art alive and in health thou shalt give thanks, and shalt praise God, and shalt glory in his mercies. How great is the mercy of the Lord, and his forgiveness to them that turn to him! (Eclclus. 17:11, 13, 16-17, 21-23, 25-28)

More proof that an automatically excommunicated *tolaratus* heretic is outside the Church is the infallible teaching that a manifest heretic cannot be pope. If a pope was to become a manifest heretic (c. 1325.2) he would be automatically excommunicated (c. 2314.1), fall outside the Church, and lose his office by tacit resignation (c. 188.4). The pope mentions in the Papal Coronation Oath that he would be excommunicated if he contradicts dogma.

Papal Coronation Oath: “...Accordingly, without exclusion, We subject to severest excommunication anyone - be it Ourselves, or be it another - who would dare to undertake anything new in contradiction to this constituted evangelic tradition and the purity of the Orthodox Faith and the Christian Religion, or would seek to change anything by his opposing efforts, or would concur with those who undertake such blasphemous venture.” (*Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*, P.L. 105, S. 54)

John, what type of excommunication is the pope speaking of here? This excommunication is an automatic (*latae sententiae*) excommunication, the one mentioned in Canon 2314.1. At the same time the pope would fall outside the Church, become a non-member, and lose his office. The Oath does not say the pope first falls outside the Church and then incurs the excommunication. It is true that a pope who contradicts dogmas separates himself from the Church when he falls into heresy, but this separation takes place by a simultaneous automatic excommunication. John, you would have us believe that if the pope contradicts dogma he would indeed be separated from the Church while not incurring the above-mentioned excommunication. Therefore, you contradict the Papal Coronation Oath.

John, you also taught heresy when you said the Church does not punish a heretic.

John Lane: “Manifest heretics leave the Church by their own act, prior to being excommunicated... The separation from the Church of a manifest heretic, schismatic, or apostate occurs **without** and prior to **any ecclesiastical penalty** whatsoever. It is *by his own act*, **NOT by**

any act of the Church, which all ecclesiastical penalties are. Excommunications are penalties, Richard.”

John is Canon 2314.1, which automatically excommunicates a heretic, an ecclesiastical penalty? Of course it is. St. Robert Bellarmine clearly teaches that the Church, indeed, judges and punishes a pope that becomes a manifest heretic.

St. Robert Bellarmine: A pope who is a manifest heretic automatically ceases to be pope and head of the Church, just as he ceases automatically to be a Christian and a member of the Church. Wherefore, he can be judged and punished by the Church. All the early Fathers are unanimous in teaching that manifest heretics immediately lose all jurisdiction. St. Cyprian, in particular, laid great stress on this point.³⁶

St. Robert teaches that a manifest heretic is “judged and punished by the Church.” John, you have said the Church takes no action whatsoever against a manifest heretic, until some time after he becomes a manifest heretic. You teach they leave the Church on their own accord and tried to use another teaching of St. Robert out of context to prove your heretical teaching. Above, St. Robert clearly teaches that the Church judges and punishes a manifest heretic, in the case a Roman Pontiff who becomes a manifest heretic. This can only occur by an *ipso facto* excommunication, the one mentioned in Canon 2314.1. This excommunication, which is an ecclesiastical penalty, is indeed, an act of the Church, a judgment and punishment of the Church that occurs automatically by the operation of Church law (*ab jure*).

The Catholic Church judges offenders in both of these cases: One, by a condemnatory sentence by a competent judge (*ab homine*), Two, by an automatic excommunication that is effected by Church law (*ab jure*). Both are juridical acts of the Church, one by a man (a competent judge), and the other by the Church Herself, by the authority an existing law (*ab jure*). “The person is excommunicated by virtue of the pre-existing law and the fact that he has committed the forbidden delict.”

RJMI Question 2 (11/19):

John, is the automatic excommunication mentioned in Canon 2314.1 an ecclesiastical penalty? Is it a juridical act of the Church?

Classes of Heretics

Lane Comment:

You wrote that “The excommunicated persons refers to two classes of heretics who were once Catholic...” which is also *entirely wrong*, Richard. There are no such “classes of heretics” – you invented that.

³⁶ De Romano Pontifice. II. 30.

RJMI Comment:

No John I did not invent that there are classes (different types) of heretics. There are two basic types of heretics. One class is those who have been automatically excommunicated, without a declaratory sentence. Some canonists refer to this as “simple” or “basic” excommunication, and the offenders as simple or basic heretics.

Rev. McKenzie, *The Delict of Heresy*, p. 41: Canon 2314.1, which provides an *ipso facto* excommunication. This basic excommunication is the penalty incurred by all heretics, whether or not they are guilty of other aggravating delicts which are mentioned in the succeeding numbers of the same canon and section. It may therefore be called *simple heresy*, with the term “simple” used in the sense of the Latin “*simpliciter*.”

The other class is those who have been automatically excommunicated followed by a declaratory sentence. Some canonists refer this as excommunication by sentence, and the offenders as “sentenced” heretics.

There are also two more classifications of heretics, that being *tolarati* and *vitandi* heretics. The *tolarati* is in the first class mentioned above, those who have been automatically excommunicated, without a later declaratory sentence. An offender who has already been automatically excommunicated would become a *vitandus* heretic if he incurred a declaratory sentence, with the specific mention that he is a *vitandus*.

There are then two types of heretics in which a declaratory sentence has been made, those who are *tolarati*, because no specific mention was made that they are *vitandi*. And, those in which specific mention is made that they are *vitandi*. Before the 1917 Code all heretics who incurred a declaratory sentence were *vitandi*. Since the Code, there must be a specific mention that they are to be treated as *vitandi*.

“Canon 2258. Nobody is a *vitandus*, unless (1) he is excommunicated by name by the Apostolic See, (2) the excommunication is publicly proclaimed, and (3) in the decree or sentence it is expressly stated that he must be avoided. The only case in which one becomes an *excommunicatus vitandus* by the very fact of committing the crime is stated in Canon 2343.1, n. 1.” [RJMI: Canon 2343.1, n.1. is the crime of laying violent hands on the Roman Pontiff]

There are also three types of *tolarati* based upon the publicity of their crimes: One, occult (secret) *tolarati*: Two, notorious *tolarati*: Three, a public *tolarati* whose crime is less than notorious. [###]

Ad Evitanda Scandala

Lane Comment:

Richard, the law of the Church changed when *Ad evitanda* was issued in 1418. From that date it was no longer true that *all* excommunications placed one outside the Church. Only those excommunicated and declared *vitandus* (or who laid violent hands on the pope) are considered non-Catholics.

RJMI Comment:

John, either you do not know how to read, and I know you do, thus, you are deliberately deceiving your readers in order to defend your crime praying in communion with notorious heretics and schismatics. Pope Martin V *Ad evitandi* teaches nothing whatsoever about the membership status of heretics, be they *tolarati* or *vitandi*. Furthermore, it was not his intention to allow Catholics to pray in communion with **notorious** *tolarati* heretics, which the future infallible Council of Basle makes clear, as does the 1917 Code of Canon Law. (See: my book, "[Faith Before the Mass](#), The 1917 Code, Council of Basle, and Pope Martin V's *Ad Evitandi Scandala*)

Public Defection and Automatic Excommunication

1917 Code of Canon Law: "Canon 188. 4. There are certain causes which effect the tacit resignation of an office, which resignation is accepted in advance by operation of law, and hence is effective without any declaration. These causes are: ... (4) if he has publicly defected (fallen away) from the Catholic faith."

Lane Comment:

A heretic loses his office because he leaves the Church by his own act, and the excommunication is irrelevant. The Code doesn't say that "excommunicates lose their offices." It says that those who publicly defect from the Catholic faith do. Do you think that the authors of the Code were incapable of writing clear Latin?

RJMI Comment:

John, Canon 188.4 is very wisely worded as such, for a very good purpose. It mentions public defection, instead of formal heresy, because an insane prelate can also publicly defect from the Catholic faith, while not being a formal heretic, while the sane prelate who publicly defects would also be a formal heretic. In both cases the office is lost, because of the threat to the common good. The threat being the loss of faith that would occur if a prelate who publicly defects from the faith were allowed to keep his office. (See: above, [Public Defection from the Catholic Faith and Prelates who become Insane \(10/1\)](#); and for an in depth teaching, my book *A Notorious Heretic cannot be the Pope, Tacit Resignation (Deposition) of Office: Canon 188.4*)

Warning Against Sources (11/19)

The below warning is taken from my *Strange Voice*, Book One:

Warning: Do not trust the vast majority of books with imprimaturs written by theologians in the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries, even some before that time, because they contain error, ambiguity, and heresy. The books I have used from “The Catholic University Canon Law Series” are infected with ambiguity and heresy in that the authors within the same book present contradicting views that cannot be reconciled. I have quoted the truthful dissertations. It is impossible for a pope to check all these books. A pope must trust his bishops. Popes, especially from the 18th century on, have consistently warned their bishops to be vigilant because heresy was creeping into the teaching instruments of the Church in their dioceses and seminaries, and the bishops were disobedient to the popes, either because they were direct infiltrators, or liberals who disguised their liberalism from the popes. As time went on these bad bishops became more numerous. (See: *Exurge Michael* Issue #3 – “Where are the Catholic Bishops and Priest?” and “Canon Law, Infallibility, and Vigilance”) The teachings I have presented to you are what all the Popes, Fathers, Doctors, and saints have taught and how Catholics have detected heresy and condemned heretics, even before a warning or declaration from the time of the apostles. There has never been any such talk among laymen, and barely any among the apostles, popes, Fathers, Doctors, and sainted theologians about formal and material heresy, and subjective and objective guilt, as we hear today among modern theologians, because they have twisted the true meaning of formal and material heresy and subjective and objective guilt so as to absolve a man who commits the most heinous public crimes, time and time again, of being accused of being a formal heretic. It was all quite simple until the modern theologians redefined what it takes to make a man formally guilty of a crime, or for a man to accuse another man of being a formal heretic, and all this is based on modern psychology and philosophy (Col. 2:8) that is completely alien to the Church Fathers, Doctors, and saints. We see this new theology comes from the secular modern world that absolves the most heinous criminals of guilt by bringing forward one excuse after another, such as, it is not his fault because of the environment he was raised in, or because he parents unjustly beat him, or because others were prejudiced against him, or because he was never formally educated, or because he genetically inherited this weakness so it is beyond his control, etc. This is also proven by the fact that the people re-elect corrupted Politicians whose crimes are manifest.

No Answers from John Lane (12/31)

John Lane, who was so eager to engage me in a debate, has fallen deadly silent. He has not fully answered one of my questions I posed in the above debate. He partially answered the first two questions and did not answer the others at all. I have not heard from Mr. Lane since my open letter to him on November 12. His last response on November 11 was a sarcastic letter that did not address one doctrinal issue, as are most of his responses. I will re-list the questions I asked him in the course of this debate.

RJMI Question 1 (10/1):

John, do you believe a manifest heretic who has been latae sententiae excommunicated can still be a member of the Catholic Church?

RJMI Questions 2 (10/1):

John, do you believe a pope cannot teach heresy? If you do believe he can teach heresy, then in what capacity?

RJMI Questions (10/3):

- 1) What do you base your judgment on, that JP2 is pertinacious, and thus is a formal heretic?
- 2) Why have you not made the same judgment regarding the SSPX bishops, priests, and laymen, who do not condemn the crimes of JP2 and the Conciliar Church that are manifest to all, nor do they personally condemn JP2 as a criminal (idolater, apostate, and heretic)?
- 3) Is it the sin of idolatry and apostasy to teach the Moslems worship the one true God?
- 4) Is this a denial of the very basics of the faith, that all Catholic must know, as found in their baptismal vows and creeds of the Church?
- 5) Can Catholics claim ignorance if they deny the very basics of the Catholic faith as stated in the baptismal vows and creeds of the Church?
- 6) Can Catholics claim to be innocent by omitting to condemn this crime and the criminals who commit it, when they are privy to the crime?
- 7) Have you asked your SSPX priest if the Moslems worship the one true God?
- 8) If he said, yes, or gave you no clear answer, have you condemned him on the spot as an apostate and heretic?
- 9) If he said, no, did you then proceed to show him that JP2 teaches the Moslems worship the one true God, and then demand he condemn the crime and the criminal that committed it?
- 10) If the SSPX priest did not condemn JP2 as being an apostate and heretic, based upon this evidence alone, did you inform him that he has denied his baptismal vow, by justifying a man who teaches the Moslems worship the one true God, and is an apostate and heretic by way of sins of omission? (You can also show him JP2 kissing the Koran and ask him if that is a sin of idolatry, and therefore is JP2 and idolater.)
- 11) Have you told the SSPX priest he is a schismatic, and present him with the evidence to prove it? Have you told him that is always, at all times, and in all places a schismatic act to consecrate bishops contrary to the will of a pope, or in their case, a man they think is the pope? Have you showed him the dogmatic teachings regarding this, and what was his answer? (See: my Book Two, Part Two, for the specific crimes of the SSPX and its members, and those who attend their chapels, and for more pertinent questions.)

Give me the address and name of the SSPX chapel you attend, and the names of the priests who say Mass there, so I can witness the faith to them by condemning them and

calling them to repent, convert, and abjure.

RJMI Questions (10/15):

- 1) Is the Conciliar Church a non-Catholic sect?
- 2) Is the Order of the Magnificat of the Mother of God in St. Jovite a non-Catholic sect?
- 3) Is the Church founded by Gregory XVII of Palmar de Troya a non-Catholic sect?
- 4) By what right and authority do you have to make judgments regarding these above Churches?

RJMI Question 1 (11/19):

John, when does your supposed external or manifest heretic, who is already outside the Church, incur automatic (*latae sententiae*) excommunication? What additional condition must the heretic, who is outside the Church, meet in order for the automatic excommunication to take place as decreed in Canon 2314.1?

RJMI Question 2 (11/19):

John, is the automatic excommunication mentioned in Canon 2314.1 an ecclesiastical penalty? Is it a juridical act of the Church?

No, I did not forget to answer the question about malice and the external and internal forum. That will be answered in great detail in a book I am working on. I will not waste any more time with John Lane. It is up to the readers and those misled by him to ask him for the answers to the above questions. All that is left for me to do is pray and sacrifice for his repentance and conversion, as well as all the non-Catholics who are following him in his heresy and schism. I will only continue to debate a heretic or schismatic as far as needed to expose the heresies and schismatic teachings and practices. It is up to the reader to take sides. I do not engage in false ecumenism, or friendly conversation with notorious heretics that are blaspheming God and leading souls astray. I will only respond to those who have good will. I will continue to write on any necessary topic defending the Catholic faith. I will not bog down my website with endless refutations of heretics and schismatics. I will debate when appropriate and only long enough to expose the heretic and/or schismatic. Unlike Lane and company, I do not like the argument for the sake of argument, nor do I desire to engage in satanic character assignments that the buffoon Lane is infected with. That bad fruit alone will tell a good-willed soul all they need to know about John Lane. Lane's wise cracks and childish humor are straight out of hell. He is the type of heretic that Pope Pius X said, "should be beaten with fists." And I assure you, unless he repents and converts, much worse than that will happen to Mr. Lane and those who follow him. The utter destruction and eternal damnation of unrepentant sinners, and doubly so for fallen-away Catholics, are assured of by God.

There is more hope of repentance and conversion for pagan prostitutes, whores, thieves, street punks, and drug addicts than there are for the pseudo-intellectual Lane and his like. I have seen and dealt with both in my life and none is worse, more filled with pride, more dishonest, more deceitful, more vicious, and more dangerous than the pride-filled pseudo-

intellectual, whose ancestors are the pride filled Pharisees whom Jesus vigorously condemned for replacing the law of God with the traditions of men. The pride filled Pharisees who were scandalized because SS. Peter and John were not formally educated, *“Seeing the constancy of Peter and of John, understanding that they were illiterate and ignorant men, they wondered: and they knew them that they had been with Jesus.” (Acts 4:13)*

Yea, these bastard Pharisees thought themselves smarter and wiser than God Himself. *“Jesus went up into the temple and taught. And the Jews wondered, saying: How doth this man know letters, having never learned?” (Jn. 7:14-15)*

I am now working on several books, one titled, “Bad Books with Imprimaturs.” This book will expose the heretical theologies that crept into Catholic teaching instruments of the Church well before the non-Catholic Second Vatican Council. I have already briefly written on this topic (See: my books, “Canon Law, Infallibility, and Vigilance, Popes Cannot Personally Examine Every Book in the World”; Exurge Michael Issue #3, Where are the Catholic Bishops and Priests?; “Strange Voiced, Book Three, The Romans One Curse: The Denial of the Faith, Forbidden Books.”)

May Jesus Christ, by the merits of His passion, death, and Most Precious Blood, through the Sorrowful and Immaculate Heart of Mary, grant Mr. John Lane the grace to humble himself, repent, convert, and abjure, as well as all those who follow his heretical and schismatic teachings and practices