

# Against Patrick Henry



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: 10/2001; Current version: 10/2001

**Mary's Little Remnant**

302 East Joffre St.

TorC, NM 87901-2878

Website: [www.JohnTheBaptist.us](http://www.JohnTheBaptist.us)

(Send for a free catalog)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>CONDEMNATION OF PATRICK HENRY AND AMENDMENTS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>No Clear Response from Patrick Regarding Pont One:.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Patrick Admits to Improper Use of Words regarding Point Four:.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Patrick Admits his Error on Point Five: .....</i>	<i>9</i>
<b>COMMENTS: .....</b>	<b>10</b>
PATRICK HENRY LIES!.....	10
<i>Perfect Act of Contrition.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Epikeia and the Divine Laws.....</i>	<i>11</i>



## Condemnation of Patrick Henry and Amendments

As my duty to profess the faith and defend Catholics against schismatics and heretics I, Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi, reprove, rebuke, and condemn Patrick Henry. Just as our Lord Jesus Christ exposed the true Pharisees in His day, so also, as my duty as a Catholic, I also will expose the true Pharisees in these days. To remain silent when crimes are committed, when one must speak up, is to be guilty of the sins and sinner you do not condemn.

### One:

Patrick Henry is a rebellious schismatic and a heretic. His denial of the use, and need, to be exempted from the letter of the law in emergency situations is absolutely schismatic. He himself has violated the two canon laws regarding the public teaching of the Catholic Faith, Canons 1384 and 1385.

*1917 Code of Canon Law: “c. 1384. The Church has the right to demand that Catholics shall not publish any books without first submitting them for her judgment and approval, and to forbid for a good reason the reading of books published by anyone. Whatever is prescribed under this title regarding books, shall be applied also to newspapers, periodicals, and all other published writings, unless the contrary is certain.”*

*1917 Code of Canon Law: “c. 1385 1. Without previous ecclesiastical approval, even laymen are not allowed to publish: (1) the books of Sacred Scripture, or annotations and commentaries on the same: (2) books treating of Sacred Scripture, theology, church history, canon law, natural theology, ethics, or other religious or moral sciences... c. 1385 2. The permission to publish books... in this Canon may be given either by proper local Ordinary of the author, or by the local Ordinary of the place where the books... are published, or the local Ordinary of the place where they are printed... Religious authors must also obtain the permission of their major superior before publication.*

Being that Patrick does not believe he needs to be exempted from these laws, he has violated them, because these canons teach you need a Bishop with ordinary jurisdiction, a local Ordinary, to authorize public teachings, and if the public teachings are in writing you need an imprimatur. Patrick has violated the letter of these laws, and being that he does not believe he needs to be exempted from them, he is absolutely guilty of violating these laws and incurs the penalty of excommunication.

*Canon 2318.2: Authors and publishers who without the proper permission procure the printing of books of the Sacred Scriptures of annotations or commentaries on the same incur ipso facto non-reserved excommunication.”*

Without epikeia; without an exemption from the letter of these laws, Canons 1384 and 1385, no one can publicly teach the Catholic faith unless they have a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction. Patrick does not have a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction to approve of his works before he makes them available to the public. Patrick publicly teaches without the approval of a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction, while he says, a Catholic priest cannot function without access to a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction. The same applies to a Catholic bishop who does not have access to a pope. In this Patrick is a merciless hypocrite and a rebellious schismatic.

### No Clear Response from Patrick Regarding Pont One:

Patrick now admits that epikeia can be used. In his original debate with me he said,

Patrick Henry, Original Debate, year 2000: “Richard, you may not agree with me, but I do not think I need to evoke epikeia to keep God’s Commandments.”

In an email he sent me on October 16 he now says,

Patrick Henry, Oct. 16, 2001: “I have never denied the use, and need, to be exempted from the letter of the law in emergency situations.”

He then tries to escape guilt by an argument of semantics. He goes on to teach that one can be exempted from the letter of the law for many reasons, other than epikeia, which is a point of contention among the canonists and theologians, while all agree exemptions from the letter of certain laws do apply. Patrick then implies that is because of one of these reasons that he is exempted from the letter of the law regarding his public teaching of the faith, not epikeia, but he never directly says so.

The fact is that in our original debate he denied that he needed to be exempted from the letter of the law for any reason. He invoked Holy Scripture out of context (1Peter 3:15) to try and support his publicly teaching the faith. I quote Patrick Henry’s answer to a question I posed to him from our original debate.

Patrick Henry, Original Debate, year 2000: **What bishop has authorized you to teach the Catholic faith?** [Patrick Henry] I reply: St. Peter, the Apostle, first Pope and Bishop of Rome. “Be ready always to satisfy everyone that asketh you a reason of that hope which is in you.” (2Peter 3/15).

Patrick, obviously, since the debate, realized he was wrong, so he does not invoke this Scripture again to justify his publicly teaching the faith. Instead he implies he is exempted from the above laws, while giving no direct answer to the question.

In the whole 42 pages of mostly confused garbage filled with diversions, lies, half-truths, quotes taken out of context, he never directly said he was exempted from the above Canons regarding public teaching, and thus he never gave the reason he is exempted from them. He did not directly address this first point. He evaded a clear answer by willful ambiguity because he is not humble enough to plainly admit he was wrong, and thus he is faced with three dilemmas.

One: If he admits it is due to a legitimate exemption that is not what he said in our original debate when he invoked Holy Scripture to support his publicly teaching the faith, thus he would have to admit the defense of his position in our original debate was wrong.

Two: If he admits that he is exempted from the above Canon Laws, for whatever reason he gives, regarding the public teaching of the Catholic faith that requires authorization from a bishop with ordinary jurisdiction, then he has to admit a Catholic bishop or Catholic priest can be exempted from the laws that would normally prohibit him from functioning as a Catholic bishop and Catholic priest, for want of a Pope or Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction.

Three: Patrick falsely teaches there can be no exemptions from invalidating laws for any reason. If he admits he is granted an exemption from the letter of the Canon Law regarding the public teaching of the faith, then he has to admit that invalidating laws can be exempted from, because Canon 1385 is an invalidating law: No bishop with ordinary jurisdiction to authorize your teaching then your teaching is null-and-void (invalid), it is illegal. There are invalidating laws

that allow for exemptions by the principle of epikeia as proven in the practice of the Church, when her subjects have invoked it and were justified and doing so.

*The History, Nature, and Use of Epikeia*, Fr. Riley, p. 382: “*Ballerini*: ... Suffice it here to call attention to his insistence that the fact that a law is invalidating does not exclude the possibility of the subject’s resorting to the use of epikeia in regard to it.”

Therefore, I ask Patrick to clearly answer the question posed in point one. By what Catholic principle are you exempted from obeying the above Canon Laws regarding the public teaching of the Catholic faith? A simple straight forward answer, please, without 42 pages of diversion.

**Two:**

Patrick schismatically teaches that there can be no exemptions from the Divine Laws that do not deal with faith or morals, and negative laws (invalidating laws) that do not deal with faith or morals. The canonists are unanimous that exemptions to these laws are allowed, but they give different reasons, some say, because of epikeia, some say, because the law ceases to bind, some say, due to a prudent interpretation they may be exempted. All the canonists and theologians teach that you can be exempted from the letter of the law in these situations, but for different reasons. Patrick denies that there can ever be an exemption for any reason, and that is schismatic.

**Three:**

Patrick schismatically teaches there can be no exceptions to God’s divine laws because He foresees all things, and therefore, there can be no exceptions to these laws for any reason. This is contrary to the unanimous consent and contrary to historical (empirical) evidence. There is historical (empirical) proof from the past that Catholics have been exempted from these laws in emergency situations (See: *Exceptions to the Law*, Epikeia and the Sacrament of Matrimony). Even God, Himself, Jesus Christ, had exempted Himself from His own laws. Being that God foresees all things, the reason He does not include exceptions in His laws, is for the sake of brevity, so as not to make the law burdensome. The canonist and theologians are unanimous on this fact. When God decreed through Moses to the people, that no one must work on the Sabbath Day, He did not say, except the work of circumcision if it falls on the infant’s eight day, or except to pull an ox out of a pit, or to heal someone, etc. God said that King David and his men were justified for eating the loaves of proposition, that the letter of the law only says the Levitical priests could eat, with no exceptions included in the letter of the law. God certainly foresaw these exceptions. But he did not include them in the law for the sake of brevity. Therefore it is schismatic to say God’s divine laws cannot be exempted from because God did not include exceptions in His law. God relied upon the common sense of all good willed men, and as a test to weed out the true Pharisees, who did not understand the spirit of the law. A true Pharisee only follows the letter of the law, but with no real understanding of it, because of their pride. They do all their deeds out of a spirit of self-righteousness and self-justification, even appearing to be very humble. There is a false humility that covers sins and faults and is mortally sinful. True Pharisees do not have true wisdom, and only follow the letter of the law to appear outwardly to men righteous, while inwardly they are full of dead men bones and filthiness (Mt. 23:27-29).

#### **Four:**

Patrick also teaches the heresy that a Catholic can be inside and outside the Catholic Church. He teaches that his abjuration placed him internally in the Church, but not externally in the Church until he abjures before an authorized Catholic Bishop. Therefore, Patrick will tell you he is outside (external) and inside (internal) the Church. This is where he proves his eccentricity that all true Pharisee have. A simple child would detect the contradiction of such a foolish teaching. A Catholic is inside the Church, objectively (externally) and subjectively (internally). One cannot belong to the soul of the Church while not belonging to the body. Patrick confuses the external act of the lawgiver that confirms that a subject is indeed in the Church. This future act of the lawgiver does not externally place one who had already abjured in the Church; he was already externally in the Church. The external act of the lawgiver only confirms this.

#### **Patrick Admits to Improper Use of Words regarding Point Four:**

In the email sent to me on October 16, Patrick said that he used his word improperly to express what he meant.

Patrick Henry, Oct. 16, 2001: “Do you believe he is then in the state of Sanctifying Grace and belongs to both the soul and the body of the Church? However, he is NOT ABLE TO PROVE HIS RECEPTION INTO THE CHURCH. That is what I meant when I wrote, during earlier correspondence with Richard Ibranyi, that I am not a member of the Catholic Church in the EXTERNAL forum. I am NOT ABLE TO PROVE MY RECEPTION INTO THE CHURCH by providing the document signed by a Catholic bishop or priest who received me back into the Catholic Church.”

He does not clearly answer this question. I take it he does believe abjurations, or perfect acts of contrition for those who do not know they have to take an abjuration, place the subjects inside the Church both in the external and internal forum. I take it he believes they are in the Church body and soul. This is not what he taught in our original debate. I quote from our original debate.

Patrick Henry, Original Debate, year 2000: The way Divine Providence arranges things, it may be I will never find a Catholic Bishop, that has Ordinary Jurisdiction, who brings me back into the Catholic Church by the formal means of *The Form of Receiving a Convert* as found in the Catholic Liturgy

I quote from Patrick Henry’s, book that he published and made available to the public, *The True Church*:

Patrick Henry, *True Church*, p. 36: “The true fact of the matter is clerics in the Traditionalist Movement do NOT have an Office, Authority and Jurisdiction. Without Jurisdiction they cannot provide the necessary help to anyone who needs to make an Abjuration of Errors and Profession of Faith. An act of perfect contrition puts one back into the State of Sanctifying Grace. Only an Abjuration of Errors and Profession of Faith made to one who has Jurisdiction can put anyone back into the True Church in the EXTERNAL Forum.”

Clearly he is teaching that there is no way for a penitent fallen-away Catholic to come back into the Church in the external forum, until he has access to a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction. Thus Patrick is teaching Catholics can be outside the Church in the external forum, while being inside the Church in the internal forum, which is heresy. As he stated above, he no longer believes this, but he is not humble enough to admit his error. He tried to say he used his

words improperly. I take it he was confused, but he should of clearly admitted it. Even in his above amended position he does not give a clear straight forward answer. He still did not directly say these converted penitents are inside the Church, both in the external and internal forum—united to the Church’s Body and Soul. Clear answers, Patrick, please, clear straightforward answers will suffice. There is no need to confuse the lost sheep more than they already are.

**Five:**

Patrick heretically teaches there cannot be another pope, and thus the papacy has defected, the primary apostolic mark, and the gates of hell prevailed over the papacy. Being that he does not believe in exemptions from the law, there can be no way to elect the next pope, because the last letter of the law requires Cardinals to elect a pope.

**Patrick Admits his Error on Point Five:**

In an email sent to me on October 16, Patrick admitted that at one time he did believe the heresy that there is no way to elect a pope, which implies the gates of hell prevailed over the Church by destroying the primary apostolic mark, the papacy. He now believes *epikeia* may be evoked in order for the next pope to be elected.

Patrick Henry, Oct. 16, 2001: Richard Ibranyi’s statement above is not true, and he should know that it is not true. Sometime after I left the CMRI sect, I read some of the first letters written by Martin Gwynne and John Daly. They taught there could never be another Pope elected. For a while I thought their reasons sounded valid, and I was probably led to believe as they taught. I cannot recall that I ever recorded on any tape or taught in any public way their belief. Later, I prayed and studied more and realized their teaching was not correct. ...If Almighty God’s Divine Providence has another Pope elected, this may be one of those times when *Epikieia* is validly and licitly used.

How am I supposed to know Patrick no longer believes this if he never told me or made his position public? Patrick, in more of his infamous ambiguity, says he “was probably led to believe as they taught.” What does “probably” mean? Does he not know what he taught? Patrick, is your memory that bad that you do not know for sure what you believed in at one time? Patrick, you did believe it. I got it in a side-note you wrote in the book you sent me, “The History, Nature, and Use of Epikieia,” by Fr. Riley. One of Patrick’s followers was so confused on this topic that anyone who said there could be another pope, he accused of being a heretic, based on Patrick Henry’s old position.

Patrick’s amended position, that epikieia may be invoked to elect the next pope, is certainly true, and places Patrick in another dilemma. If an exemption applies to Pope Pius XII’s law regarding the election of a pope,<sup>1</sup> then an exemption can also apply to Pope Pius XII’s law of no consecrating of bishops without an explicit papal mandate, as taught in *Ad Principium*. The same would apply for Catholic priests hearing of confessions and preaching sermons without access to a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction.

**Six:**

<sup>1</sup> [3/02 Pius XII lost his office in 1951 for teaching the heresy of Natural Family Planning (See: Exurge Michael, Issue 8, but the law still requires Cardinals to elect a pope)]

Patrick does not require a specific public abjuration from those who have adhered to heresy and/or schism, or have been in communion with heretics and/or schismatics. Therefore he is in schism for going contrary to the Catholic Church's teaching that requires abjurations, and he is in heresy by way of association because he has no way of knowing if those whom he is in communion with are Catholic or not.

## Comments:

For an in depth teaching regarding *epikeia* read my Book Two. It clearly condemns Patrick Henry's schismatic and heretical teachings.

## ***Patrick Henry lies!***

### **Perfect Act of Contrition**

I will expose two of Patrick Henry's many lies in his recent refutation of me on October 2001. Patrick implied that I do not believe a perfect act of contrition, alone, can bring a penitent fallen-away Catholic back into the Church and place him in a state of grace.

Patrick Henry, Oct. 16, 2001: "I believe Father Michael Müller teaches a material heretic can obtain Sanctifying Grace without sacramental absolution by means of perfect contrition, if he will renounce heresy and believe the Catholic Church... {22} Do you believe after the material heretic renounces heresy and believes the Catholic Church he is able to make an act of perfect contrition **BEFORE** he takes an Abjuration?"

What I actually taught is an act of perfect contrition can bring a fallen-away penitent into the Church, if he did not know he must take a specific public abjuration as the Church demands. I also taught that once the subject learns the Church teaches he must take and abjuration, then he must take it.

Richard J.M. Ibranyi, Original debate, year 2000: "RJMI Comment 49.1 - No, Patrick, not everybody who embraced the heresies of the Conciliar Church is currently bound to take an abjuration if they have not leaned that they must take an abjuration. A confession of their sins against the faith followed by a perfect act of contrition would place them back inside the Church. That does not alleviate a subject who embraced the heresies of the Conciliar Church from his responsibility to take an abjuration once he learns the Church teaches he must. What follows will explain these facts... 68.1 - First of all, Patrick, it is the Protestant heresy to state that all that is necessary is a perfect act of contrition (love) without the desire and will to do what the Church demands as it becomes possible for the penitent. Such as going to a Catholic priest to confess your sins as soon as one becomes available, and if one does not the he re-incurs his sins and his original perfect act of contrition would then have been useless, because of his disobedience in not submitting to the Church to ratify his perfect act of contrition. A perfect act of contrition (love) must be accompanied with a promise to do as the Church demands when it can be done, and to amend your life and to publicly condemn the heresies you held and to totally separate from Conciliar non-Catholics once the deposition teaching are manifest to them. An act of contrition alone, without a promise to do as the Church demands the first available opportunity, is the Protestant heresy of Luther. A perfect act of contrition must be accompanied by a desire/vow to have a private confession or abjuration confirmed by whatever the Church demands. If a Catholic confesses his sins before God, he must also vow to go before a Catholic priest the first available opportunity. I am sure you would agree with this, although you conveniently left this teaching out in the above discourse."

Richard J.M. Ibranyi, "*Exceptions to the Law, Laymen can Accept Abjurations*": "A non-Catholic penitent, who does not have access to a Catholic bishop or priest, and does not know the teachings of the Church regarding abjurations, can be freed (absolved) from his censures by a private confession of his sins if he has perfect contrition. His private confession would serve as an abjuration, even though he does not technically know he abjured. Once the Church's law on abjuration has been presented to him he would

then be bound to take an abjuration either before a Catholic bishop, priest or laymen. (See: my book, “The Abjuration from the Great Apostasy” for further information)”

## **Epikeia and the Divine Laws**

Patrick also lied when he said that I teach *epikeia* can sometimes be used in matters of faith and morals. He also lies by saying Divine Laws only deal with faith and morals. Divine Laws also deal with disciplinary and governmental matters that can change. He does not want the reader to know that.

Patrick Henry, Oct. 16, 2001: “2nd Contradiction: Richard Ibranyi teaches sometimes you cannot use *Epikeia* in matters of Faith or Morals. Richard Ibranyi then hides the truth that Divine Law is a matter of Faith & Morals.”

What I taught was the opposite of what he wants the reader to believe. I had taught in my Book Two and in our original debate that *epikeia* can never apply, under any circumstances, to the Divine Laws that deal with faith and morals, but it does apply to the Divine Laws that do not deal with faith or morals.

Richard J.M. Ibranyi, *Exceptions to the Law*, p. 1: “*Epikeia* can never be used for laws that deal with faith and morals, but only laws that deal with discipline and government.”

Richard J.M. Ibranyi, Original debate with Patrick Henry, year 2000: “The divine positive laws deal with two basic types of laws: a) Those dealing with faith and morals that can never admit to the use of *epikeia*, because they can never be changed or abrogated, and individuals can never be exempted from them. These laws admit to no exceptions. b) Those dealing that do not deal with faith or morals in which *epikeia* can be used. These admit to exceptions, and can be changed, or abrogated.”

This debate took place over one year before Patrick Henry’s recent refutation. He cannot say he did not know what I taught. He clearly lied by making the reader think I taught that *epikeia* could sometimes be used for laws that deal with faith and morals. Patrick does this many times. A man such as this is not to be trusted.

Patrick also implies that Divine Laws, also referred to as the Divine Positive Laws, only deal with faith and morals, when he says, “Richard Ibranyi then hides the truth that Divine Law is a matter of Faith & Morals.” This is false. It is a half-truth. Divine Laws do deal with faith and morals, but they also deal with discipline and government. That Patrick denies. The Old Testament laws dealing with eating pork, circumcision, the eating of the loaves of proposition, the prescribed sacrifices of animals, etc, were Divine Laws that did not deal with faith or morals, but deal with discipline and government. These laws can and have changed, thus *epikeia* can be applied to these Divine Laws.

*The History, Nature, and Use of Epikeia*, Fr. Riley, p. 300: “*Salmanticenses*. According to the opinion of the *Salmanticenses*, *epikeia* may be used, with regard not only to human law, but also to divine positive law... In support of this position, the *Salmanticenses* allege the instances of David’s partaking of the loaves of proposition, and the Machabees’ interpretation that they were not obliged to observe the Sabbath by abstaining in all circumstances from the shedding of blood.”

Patrick, in his 42 pages of nonsense did not once address these issues. He did not address our Lord Jesus Christ’s use of *epikeia* regarding His own Divine Laws.