

Supplement to “Against the Dimonds”



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 12/2005; Current Version 3/2007

Mary's Little Remnant

302 East Joffre St.

TorC, NM 87901-2878

Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us

(Send for a free catalog)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FALSE TEACHINGS OF BROTHER MICHAEL DIMOND (1/2000)	5
<i>Curiosity Killed the Cat!</i>	5
<i>Bro. Michael Blasphemes the Holy Catholic Church and the Papacy!</i>	6
<i>Bro. Michael uses Cabalistic Numerology!</i>	10
<i>Bro. Michael's schismatic interpretations!</i>	11
<i>He teaches that the False Prophet and the Antichrist are the Same Person!</i>	12
<i>Bro. Michael Attacks the Two Witnesses of the Book of the Apocalypse!</i>	13
<i>The Ram and the Goat of Daniel Chapter 8</i>	13
<i>The Continual Mass Has had been Taken Away!</i>	14
<i>Has The Continual Mass Has been Taken Away? Br. Michael's Hypocrisy</i>	15
<i>Why I Left Most Holy Family Monastery</i>	16
JOHN PAUL II AND THE DIMONDS ARE APOSTATES 3/05)	17
PRAYING IN COMMUNION WITH HERETICS AND SSPX PRIESTS (12/05)	18
DIMONDS' DENIAL OF THE SALVATION DOGMA (12/05)	23
DIMONDS IDOLIZE INFANTS AND DENY A DOGMA ON ORIGINAL SIN (11/06)	27
DIMONDS HANG THEMSELVES WITH LUGO QUOTE (2/07)	31
NOTORIETY OF FACT	34
<i>The two ways that a notorious-in-fact crime is public</i>	34
CMRI EXAMPLE	35
SSPV EXAMPLE	37
MICHAEL DIMOND'S LIE IN THIS MATTER	38
DIMONDS TEACH THAT THE APOSTATE ANTIPOPE ARE NOT NOTORIOUS HERETICS	39
DIMONDS' DONATION HYPOCRISY	39

False Teachings of Brother Michael Dimond (1/2000)

This article is taken from my *Exurge Michael* Journal: Issue 1, January 2000.

“For, professing themselves to be wise, they became fools. (Rom.1: 22) Ever learning, and never attaining to the knowledge of the truth... But they shall proceed no farther; for their folly shall be manifest to all men (2Ti. 3:7-9) The lips of a fool shall throw him down headlong. The beginning of his words is folly, and the end of his talk is a mischievous error. (Eccl. 10:12-13)

Brother Michael Dimond is a heretic and an apostate, and is outside the Catholic Church because he teaches Catholics that they can attend the Masses of manifest heretics. Therefore, he shares in all the sins against the faith of the heretics and apostates whom he prays in communion with. Satan does not care if you recognize him, the False Prophet, or the Antichrist, for what they are, all he wants from you is to remain in communion with them, so he can obsess and possess your soul, and keep you outside the Catholic Church. (See my booklet on “*Faith Before the Mass*” that addresses this topic).

Curiosity Killed the Cat!

This warning relates to Bro. Michael Dimond’s magazine he put out regarding the Book of the Apocalypse. One should be very careful not to place private revelations, apocalyptic interpretations, and secret society exposés over that of the faith - dogmas, morals, and the commandments of the Church. The learning of one’s faith must take priority over all, and if it does not, then all else is a distraction from the Devil, who will tempt you with inordinate curiosity, that is based upon pride—the fact that you can have a knowledge of secrets, of good and evil, that no other man has.

“Seek not the things that are too high for thee, and search not into things above thy ability: but the things that God hath commanded thee, think on them always, and in many of his works be not curious. For it is not necessary for thee to see with thy eyes those things that are hid. In unnecessary matters be not over curious, and in many of his works thou shalt not be inquisitive. For many things are shewn to thee above the understanding of men. And the suspicion of them hath deceived many, and hath detained their minds in vanity.” (Eccl. 3:22-26)

These types are easily detected. They have a disproportionate curiosity in secret societies and conspiracies over that of the faith, and it leaves their souls oblivious to the learning of dogma and doctrine. Our Lord said, “*Doctrine to a fool is as fetters on the feet and manacles on the right hand.*” (Eccl. 21:22) This inordinate curiosity is based on carnal lust and is charismatic (sensationalistic) in nature. These types will only attract curiosity seekers who are slothful in learning their faith, because they have no true interest in it, and no true love of God. They love themselves more than they love God. Quick are they to read the writings of the conspirators but slothful are they in reading books that teach them the Catholic faith. Catholics are to ever strive to increase their knowledge of the Catholic faith (See: Pamphlet Version, p. 12). What good is it to know all about the Book of the Apocalypse and secret societies but to suffer the loss of your soul because you did not learn your faith and died in heresy? There is a place for all this but it is secondary to learning your Catholic faith.

It is true that the Book of the Apocalypse is the most complicated book in the Bible. Many interpretations can have several meanings and some of the interpretations have been disputed over by the Fathers and Doctors of the Church. In these areas valid speculations are allowed. But there are other areas that are clear. When the Fathers and Doctors of the Church are unanimous in an interpretation of a particular scripture then this must be believed under pain of a mortal sin of schism. I believe John Paul II is the false prophet, but I cannot bind people to this. I cannot say they must believe he is the false prophet under pain of sin. I can put forward my opinion, and I must be prepared to admit I was wrong if it should prove he is not the false prophet. Those who believed Paul VI was the Antichrist should have quickly abandoned this belief when he died. Those that did not, due to pride (via- How can I be wrong?) have clung to their belief and have lost all credibility, and proceed to teach one stupidity after another when attempting to explain the Book of the Apocalypse and final day signs. The biggest danger, if they persist, is that God will allow Satan to send them a lying sign, as if it came from God, to confirm them in their lie. This is known as the operation of error that God allows as mentioned in the Bible. I have seen this time and time again with those who begin to obstinately deny the truth.

“Whose coming is according to the working of Satan, in all power and signs and lying wonders: And in all seduction of iniquity to them that perish: because they receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. Therefore God shall send them the operation of error, to believe lying: That all may be judged who have not believed the truth but have consented to iniquity.”
(2Thess. 2:9-11)

In Brother Michael’s article he has taught blasphemy and is guilty of schismatic interpretations of Holy Scripture that go against the unanimous consent of the Church fathers, and is guilty of using apostate Jewish, cabalistic numerology. He indicates that this information did not come from him, but came from an anonymous visitor. I dare say, the devil sneaked into the monastery and Brother Michael opened the door wide, allowing himself to be filled with this garbage. Any serious scripture scholar, as were all the Church Fathers, would condemn Brother Michael’s interpretations as foolish, rash, ridiculous, blasphemous, and show a lack of even common sense.

Bro. Michael Blasphemes the Holy Catholic Church and the Papacy!

Bro. Michael names three legitimate Roman Pontiffs, Benedict XV, Pius XI and Pius XII as heads of the beast, who are heads of evil, antichrist, infidel kingdoms, and this is a blasphemy against the divinely instituted papacy and the Holy Catholic Church. This false teaching totally discredits the true *sede-vacante* position by allowing men to think that the true *sede-vacante* position lends itself to blasphemy and attacks the papacy itself. Of course, this is far from the truth. What is the Catholic interpretation of the seven kingdoms (the seven heads of the beast), as mentioned in Apocalypse chapters 17 and 13?

Apocalypse 13:1. “And I saw a beast coming up out the sea, having seven heads and ten horns: and upon his horns, ten diadems: and upon his heads, names of blasphemy.”

Douay Commentary: “A beast... This first beast with seven heads and ten horns is probably the whole company of infidels, enemies and persecutors of the people of God, from the beginning to the end of the world. The seven heads are **seven kings**, that is, **seven principal kingdoms or empires**, which have exercised, or shall exercise, tyrannical power over the people of God; of

these, five were then fallen, viz.: the Egyptian, Assyrian, Chaldean, Persian, and Grecian monarchies: one was present, viz., the empire of Rome: and the seventh and chiefest was to come, viz., the great Antichrist and his empire. The ten horns may be understood as ten lesser persecutors.”

Note, there are seven kings. A king rules over an empire or kingdom. These kings and the kingdoms they rule are referred to as infidels, enemies of the people of God, and are antichrist kingdoms. In no way can a legitimate Roman Pontiff be referred to as an infidel or an enemy of the people of God. Although, a pope can be personally referred to as a “Satan” for sins of immorality and for gross lack of discipline and vigilance. Such a pope would still be inside the Catholic Church. Only sins of manifest heresy or schism place a pope outside the Catholic Church and automatically depose him from office (from being the head of the Church). But as long as he is a pope, he cannot be referred to as the head of an infidel empire.

Even if one might disagree with this interpretation, he can in no way equate the evil, infidel kingdoms, these heads of the beast, as legitimate Roman Pontiffs, without blaspheming the Holy Catholic Church and the divinely instituted papacy. The pope’s kingdom/empire is the Holy Catholic Church. If one refers to a legitimate pope as a head of the beast, as the head of an evil antichrist kingdom, then he is directly accusing the Holy Catholic Church of being an evil, infidel, and antichrist kingdom.

A pope may be personally referred to as evil, as a “Satan,” if he is extremely immoral or un-vigilant, but this would not reflect upon the Church or the papacy, but only upon himself.

Council of Constance: Condemned propositions: “20. If the pope is wicked and especially if he is foreknown, then as Judas, the Apostle, he is of the devil, a thief, and a son of perdition, and he is not the head of the holy militant Church, since he is not a member of it. - CONDEMNED!”

We see a personally evil (immoral or un-vigilant) pope, can even be referred to as a “the Devil” but he is still the pope and head of the Church. He is not a head of a beast. As long as he is the pope he is the head of the Church he cannot be referred to as a “head of the beast,” because he is the head of the Church and this would be calling the Church a beast, an evil kingdom. To personally refer to the pope as a “Satan” because of immoral or un-vigilant sins, only implicates the said pope personally, but to say that a pope is the head of the beast, is to drag the Holy Catholic Church into it, because this is what the term beast is referring to, evil kingdoms, ruled by evil rulers.

St. Peter was referred to as a “Satan” by our Lord, not because of heresy but because of a sin of presumption. This only reflected upon him personally. At that time St. Peter was not yet the head of the Church, as long as Christ was on earth. The Church was born on Pentecost Sunday.

Bro. Michael is playing into the hands of the Protestants when he refers to legitimate popes as heads of the beast and by direct connection says that the Catholic Church is an evil, antichrist, and infidel kingdom. That is why Bro. Michael had used a Protestant commentary to support this blasphemous teaching.

I will print an excerpt from my interpretation on the Book of the Apocalypse that will explain a true meaning of the seven, evil kingdoms and the 8th, which is of the 7th. I hope to make restitution for the Holy Catholic Church and the papacy that Bro. Michael has blasphemed by referring to three Roman Pontiffs as heads of the beast, and heads of an evil, infidel kingdom. Oh, how the apostate Jews and Protestants will reward Bro. Michael for his hatchet job on the Holy Catholic Church and the papacy.

Apocalypse Chapter XVII

Verses 7-8

“ And the angel said to me: Why dost thou wonder? I will tell thee the mystery of the woman and of the beast which carrieth her, which hath the seven heads and ten horns. The beast which thou sawest, was, and is not, and shall come up out of the bottomless pit and go into destruction. And the inhabitants on the earth (whose names are not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world) shall wonder, seeing the beast that was and is not.”

This beast that was, was pagan Rome, as well as the successive, evil kingdoms previous to this in the history of the world. Pagan Rome and the apostate Jewish forces were in power and conducted open warfare against Catholics for the first three hundred years of the Church. It was not until Constantine came to power in 312 A.D. that Catholics were freed and pagan Rome was destroyed. The beast, at the fall of pagan Roman, was not (was no longer a visible power), for 1000 years (Apoc. 20:1-7)¹ and was released from the bottomless pit around the in the year 1302, which prompted the promulgation of the Bull *Unam Sanctum*.

Pope Boniface VIII, who is commonly known as the first pope whom rough hands were laid upon him by Catholics—by Philip the Fair's henchmen. Catholic historians commonly acknowledge the pontificate of Boniface VIII as the beginning of the fall of the Holy Roman Empire, and the progressive rebellion of Catholic influence in the world. This is the beginning of the power that Antichrist was promised, to blaspheme God and His Church, and succeed at doing so (Apoc. 13:5-8), as exhibited in this attack against Pope Boniface VIII from which he died of shortly afterward. The Catholic monarchs started to rebel in a major and effective way against the Church and the papacy.

The ideologies of democracy begin to surface. “*Defensor Pacis*” written by Marsiglio of Padua and completed on June 24, 1324, was the first piece of work from a layman that Satan had inspired since his release from prison. It is this work that places the State over the Church, as the sole ruler, not only in secular affairs but also in religious affairs. Pope John XXII condemned this work in 1326 and twice in 1327. It also introduces the ideas of democracy that the will of the people is sovereign over that of the State and the Church. John of Jandun assisted Marsiglio. They fled in 1326, after a papal condemnation against “*Defensor Pacis*,” and were defended by Lewis of Bavaria. Marsiglio was also supported by the Franciscan William of Ockham, who introduced key heretical teachings into Catholic theology that put reason over faith, and denied any truth that man's senses could not verify, and even at that, he taught that truth, reality, is only an

¹ A Masonic ritual mentioned the demon of the bottomless pit as already being released. This fallen angel, Lucifer, is referred to as Abaddon in the Masonic ritual.

idea, and that there is no such thing as reality. He was the bastard father of the heresies of phenomenology, *sola scriptura* (the Bible only heresy - Protestants teach that the Bible is the sole source of revelation and that each man can interpret it for himself without the need of a Church as an infallible interpreter), and vital immanence. Ockham was Satan's first main weapon working inside the Church as a religious, while Marsiglio was Satan's first weapon working as a layman in regards to things of the State vs. the Church. It is Marsiglio's work, "*Defensor Pacis*," that directly inspired John Wycliff, John Hus, Martin Luther, and King Henry VIII after he rebelled against the Church.

So the beast, since 1302, is a force that will start to ascend to visible power, culminating with the 3 1/2 year, visible reign of the Antichrist, who was not (visible), but now is (visible).² The beast shall ultimately go to destruction. Note the term "beast" in the context of this verse does not refer to the personal Antichrist but to evil antichrist systems, so it cannot be used to prove there will be two Antichrists (two Beasts).

Douay Commentary on Apoc. 17:8: The beast which thou sawest... This beast which supports Babylon, may signify the power of the devil: which was and is not, being much limited by the coming of Christ, but shall again exert itself under Antichrist. The seven heads of this beast are seven mountains or empires, instruments of his tyranny; of which five were then fallen. (See chap. 13.1, and below, ver. 10.) The beast itself is said to be the eighth, and is of the seven; because they all act under the devil, and by his instigation, so that his power is in them all, yet so as to make up, as it were, an eighth empire, distinct from them all.

The use of the term Antichrist in the Bible does not always refer to the personal Antichrist who has been prophesied to come in the last days. This is evident when we consider the following verse and its commentary

1John 4:3: "Every spirit the dissolveth Jesus is not of God. And this is Antichrist, of whom you have heard that he cometh: and is now already in the world."

This verse refers to anyone that dissolves Christ, as do all the Protestants, as Antichrist. Does this mean all Protestants are "The personal Antichrist," so that there is not one, ultimate, personal Antichrist but a vast multitude? Let's read the commentary on the above verse.

Douay Commentary on 1Jn. 4:3: "That dissolveth Jesus... He is now already in the world... Not in his person, but in his spirit, and in his precursors."

Verse 9

"And here is the understanding that hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains, upon which the woman sitteth: and they are seven kings."

Douay Commentary: "The seven heads of the beast are seven mountains or empires, instruments of his (Antichrist) tyranny: of which five were then fallen. (See chap. 13.1)"

² Two other valid speculations as to this 1000-year reign are as follows. St. Augustine believes it refers to the whole New Covenant period of time. Another interpretation could place the chaining of the Satan in the year 517AD. This is the year in which St. Michael appeared on Mount Gargano in Italy and 1000 years later it was 1517AD the year Martin Luther placed his 95 point Theses on the door of the Church in Wittenburg, Germany. Condemned, as the heresy of Mellenarism, was the interpretation that the 1000 chaining of Satan takes place after the Second Coming of Jesus Christ upon earth, and after Christ is reigning for 1000 years on earth Satan is released again for a final battle.

This represents seven, successive, major, evil infidel kingdoms that are inspired by Satan and the spirit of the Antichrist, and are precursors to the personal reign of the Antichrist and his worldwide kingdom that will reign in the final days, as mentioned above in Apocalypse 13.1.

Verse 10

“Five are fallen, one is, and the other is not yet come: and when he is come, he must remain a short time.”

Five of these kingdoms had already passed away at the time of St. John’s revelation. (Egyptian, Syrian, Babylonian, Persian, Greece). “*One is*,” that is the 6th visible kingdom of pagan Rome at the time of St. John’s revelation, and the first to fight against the New Covenant religion of Catholicism. This 6th kingdom ended upon the reign of Constantine (312) in which pagan Rome fell. The hidden 7th kingdom then becomes a cold war against the Church directed by the apostate Jews (the Judeo and later Masonic conspirators), who for 1000 years from 302 to 1302 are greatly limited and cannot dominate the world because this time was given to the Holy Roman Empire to rule. But this 7th evil kingdom, nevertheless, exists underground and attacks the Catholic Church, and is said to, be not, because it is not visible and does not dominate the world, as did the past evil kingdoms.

Verse 11

“And the beast which was and is not: the same also is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into destruction.”

Around the year 1302 Satan is released from prison and given more power to begin to bring this 7th evil kingdom to visible power to the point of the One World Government in which Antichrist will visibly reign. This is the 8th kingdom, which is of the 7th—the Judeo/Masonic kingdom that had been secretly attacking the Church and was never destroyed as was the pagan Roman Empire, but rather has increased in power to the point where they will bring about the One World Government of Antichrist. This Antichrist kingdom “*is the eighth, and is of the seven.*”

The apostate Jews have been behind every group that has rebelled against the Catholic Church and have not ceased their cold war against the Catholic Church. After 1000 years of limited power, the 7th kingdom is given more power -Satan is released from his prison (he is given more power). This power is quickly felt by the falling away of the Gentile nations, which started with the Protestant rebellion, that actually started in the 14th Century. The 7th kingdom progresses in power, without diminishment, to the point that it brings Antichrist to visible power as the 8th kingdom of the One World Government, which is of the seventh.

Bro. Michael uses Cabalistic Numerology!

I will be putting a book out on the Apocalypse, and it will make sense. It will not be filled with Jewish Cabalistic Numerology, which Bro. Michael’s article is infected with. This technique of writing is filled with sensationalism and is “charismatic” in nature

because it appeals to the senses and seeks to dazzle. It is all right to prudently use numbers, dates and time spans, but not the way Bro. Michael has done. Numerology, the way Brother Michael has used it, has been condemned by the Church and anyone can make numbers fit however they want—to fit their false interpretations, especially with the assistance of the devil. That is why the Church condemns this type of numerology, because the devil is given power to make it work and fit the false interpretations of the willfully deceived. So, the use of numbers and dates should be prudently and rightly used. Bro. Michael uses “*gematria*” (the use of numbers in prophecy) the way numerologists, and cabalistic Jews use it.

The Encyclopedia of Witchcraft: “**gematria** A system for discovering truths and hidden meanings behind words, using numerical values... It was the Kabbilists, however, who delved deeply into gematria and raised it to an art form. The early Kabbalists of the 13th century believed the Old Testament to be written in code and inspired by God... Gematria was also used to search for and interpret the secret, holy names of God, which were believed to carry incredible power. Ceremonial magicians used these Kabbalistic writings to create new words of power used in conjuring and incantations. Opinions among Kabbalists were divided over the efficacy of gematria. Two schools of thought emerged, one that advocated it and one that cautioned against it, pointing out that gematria should not be used simply to reinforce one’s conclusions.”³

Bro. Michael’s schismatic interpretations!

He Schismatically Teaches that there are Two Antichrists

Bro. Michael teaches that there are two Antichrists. He says that Antipopes Paul VI and John Paul II are The Antichrist. Let’s use common sense,

Firstly, Paul VI is dead, and the mark of the beast has not yet been given, nor has Antichrist proclaimed himself as the sole world ruler and messiah to be adored by all nations.

Secondly, it is clear that he reigns for 3 1/2 years.

“And he shall speak words against the High One, and shall crush the saints of the most High: and he shall think himself able to change times and laws, and they shall be delivered into his hand until a time, and times, and half a time.” (Daniel 7:25)

Douay Commentary: “A time, and times, and half a time... That is, three years and a half; which is supposed to be the length of the duration of the persecution of Antichrist.”

See: (Apoc. 11:2) - The Holy City and Catholics are trampled under foot by Antichrist for two and forty months (42 months = 3 1/2/yrs);

See: (Apoc. 11:3) - The two witnesses’ prophecies for 1260 days (3 1/2/ yrs);

See: (Dan. 12:11) It says from the time the abomination of desolation is set up (the Antichrist) there will be 1260 days (3 1/2 yrs). John Paul II has been reigning from 1978 until the current year of 1999, which is 21 years.

³ Rosemary Ellen Guiley, *The Encyclopedia of Witchcraft*, Witches and Witchcraft, pp. 135-136, Facts of File, New York – Oxford.

Thirdly, the False Prophet must first be pointed out before any attempt can be made at pointing out the Antichrist because the False Prophet comes first and paves the road for the Antichrist. Bro. Michael had associated John Paul II as both the Antichrist and the False Prophet, and this is contrary to Holy Scripture. It is true that the False Prophet will share many traits of the Antichrist, just as John the Baptist did with Jesus Christ, many thinking John was the Messiah. The False Prophet must come before the Antichrist, and this description fits better with John Paul II as the False Prophet.

Fourthly, and most importantly, we refer to Church's teachings on the Antichrist. The Church Fathers are unanimous in this regard that there is only going to be one Antichrist, also referred to as the Beast. This is where Bro. Michael commits the sin of schism by going against the unanimous consent of the Church Fathers. Even if some may have taught that there may not be a personal Antichrist at the end of time; none taught that there would be two Antichrists. We read from the Bible:

“Let no man deceive you by any means: for unless there come a revolt first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition.” (2Thess. 2:3)

Douay Commentary: [2Thess. 2:3] “...The man of sin... Here must be meant some particular man, as is evident from the frequent repetition of the Greek article ὁ, the man of sin, the son of perdition, the adversary or opposer. It agrees to the wicked and great Antichrist, who will come before the end of the world.”

And we read:

Apocalypse 13:17-18 “And that no man might buy or sell, but he that hath the character, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name. Here is wisdom. He that hath understanding, let him count the number of the beast. For it is the number of a man: and the number of him is six hundred sixty-six.”

It is clear that the Beast (the Antichrist) shall be a man, a single man. Also, during the reign of Antichrist no one will buy or sell unless they have the mark of the Beast. This has not yet occurred and so we are not yet in the reign of Antichrist, although he is no doubt alive and working behind the scene. That being so, how could Antipope Paul VI have been the Antichrist, along with the fact that he is dead? Moreover, how can Antipope John Paul II be the Antichrist? He is reigning, and there has been no worldwide mark of the Beast yet.

He teaches that the False Prophet and the Antichrist are the Same Person!

Bro. Michael teaches that John Paul II is the Antichrist and the False Prophet. The Book of the Apocalypse is clear that the False Prophet and the Antichrist are two separate individuals who are thrown down into the pit alive.

Apocalypse 19:20: “And **the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet** who wrought signs before him, wherewith he seduced them who received the character of the beast and who adored his image. **These two** were cast alive into the pool of fire burning with brimstone.” (See: Apoc. 20:9-10)

“And I saw from the mouth of the dragon and from the mouth of the beast and from the mouth of the false prophet, three unclean spirits like frogs.” (Apoc. 16:13)

The dragon is Satan, the beast is the Antichrist, and the False Prophet is a pretender pope. It is clear the beast is not the same man as the false prophet.

Bro. Michael Attacks the Two Witnesses of the Book of the Apocalypse!

Bro. Michael then goes on to try and prove that the two witnesses of Apocalypse chapter 11 were Sts. Peter and Paul, and this is contrary to one's common sense. First, Sts. Peter and Paul did not devour their enemies with fire, or bring famine and plagues upon the earth.

“And if any man will hurt them, fire shall come out of their mouths and shall devour their enemies. And if any man will hurt them, in this manner must he be slain.” (Apoc. 11:5)

Two, it is clear these two witnesses will be around in the final days because the Antichrist murders them, and their bodies lay in the street for 3 1/2 days in the sight of many, and they are resurrected and taken up to heaven in the sight of many people, followed by an earthquake that kills many.

“And after three days and a half, the spirit of life from God entered into them. And they stood upon their feet: and great fear fell upon them that saw them. And they heard a great voice from heaven, saying to them: Come up hither. And they went up to heaven in a cloud: and their enemies saw them.” (Apoc. 11:11-12)

These events did not happen to Sts. Peter and Paul. Bro. Michael, like a seductive Protestant, ignores these key verses. If he could, Brother Michael would deny these witnesses the mission given them by God, to stand against the False Prophet and the Antichrist, and therefore he does the work of Satan, by trying to silence and discredit the witnesses before their mission has begun.

The Ram and the Goat of Daniel Chapter 8

In a future writing I will deal with this topic but I will give you a brief overview. The two horns of the Ram represent: **1)** the heathenish persecutors of the Catholic Church, that is the Masonic power, specifically the United States and the home base physical Babylon, New York City (Apoc. 18), and **2)** the spiritual persecutors of the Catholic Church, that being the Conciliar Church and the Masonic underling clerics who have turned Rome into the spiritual Babylon. These are the two horns of the beast mentioned in the Apocalypse 13:11. It is the USA that gives physical life to the apostate State of Israel, and the Conciliar Church who gives apostate Israel spiritual life.

It is clear from Daniel chapter 8 that the Antichrist is not of the kingdom of the Ram, but of the Goat. The Goat conquers the Ram and the Antichrist is of the kingdom of the Goat. He will burn the Ram with fire and eat her flesh (Rome and USA - specifically New York City (See: Apoc. 17:12-17)) The Masonic underlings of the Conciliar Church are of the Ram, but her false prophets (Antipopes John XXIII and Paul VI), and the False Prophet (Antipope John Paul II), along with many converso clerics are actually of the kingdom of the Goat, but pretend to be of the kingdom of the Ram. It is the kingdom of the Goat (Judeo power) who crushes the kingdom of the Ram (Masonic power). It is this Goat that is the real force behind Vatican II, and eliminates the continual sacrifice of the Mass, as mentioned by Daniel. Remember, the apostate Jews said in the *Protocols of the*

Elders of Zion that they control the Masons and will reduce the Masonic power to a mere nothing, to the point of eliminating it.

The Continual Mass Has had been Taken Away!

The holy prophet Daniel says that first the continual sacrifice of the Mass will be taken away, as has already occurred, and then the abomination of desolation shall be set up.

“And from the time when the continual sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination unto desolation shall be set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred ninety days... they shall defile the sanctuary of strength, and shall place there the abomination unto desolation.” (Dan. 12:11,31)

This is a two-fold prophecy that applies to Daniel’s day (the Old Covenant period of time) as well as the final days under the New Covenant. There are two separate events mentioned in this prophecy. In Daniel’s day the continual animal sacrifices was discontinued and the abomination of desolation was set up, the statue of the idol Jupiter Olympius was placed in the temple in Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes (a prefigurement of the Antichrist).

Catholic Bible Dictionary: “Abomination of Desolation, foretold by Daniel (XI:31), means according to the best commentators the idol of Jupiter Olympius placed in the temple of Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Mac. vi. 7; 2 Mac. vi. 2); that in Dan. ix. 27 refers to the profanation of the temple before the capture by Titus (see Matt. xxiv. 15); that in Dan. xii. 11, to the time of antichrist.”⁴

We see the abomination of desolation is referred to, not as a new form of false sacrifice, which is certainly also introduced, but specifically to an idol of a false god placed in the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes who is a prefigurement of Antichrist. When the Antichrist comes in these final days will set up his false prophet (Antipope John Paul II) as and idol, in the temple of God (Vatican City), in preparation for his reign in the temple at Jerusalem where he will sit showing himself as if he were God.

We see the fulfillment of this prophecy in Daniel’s day speaks of two events that take place in sequence.

Catholic commentary: [on Dan. 12:11] “The abomination continued three years and ten days, but the sacrifices had been discontinued six months and three days before.”

Clearly we see the continual prescribed animal sacrifices were first discontinued for some time, before the abomination was set up. Both of these events must take place in sequence. This also relates to the fulfillment of Daniel’s prophecy in these final days under the New Covenant. First, the taking away of the continual Mass, and then the visible reign of the Antichrist (the ultimate Abomination of Desolation) is set up, and then starts the 3 1/2 year reign of the Antichrist. The taking away of that, which withholds the Antichrist from coming to power, the pope, faith, and Mass, were necessary first steps in order to pave the road for the visible reign of the Antichrist.

⁴ Rev. Bernard O’Reilly, LD. (Laval.), “*An Illustrated and Comprehensive Catholic Bible Dictionary*,” Abomination of Desolation, p. 4.

“And now you know what withholdeth, that he may be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity already worketh: only that he who now holdeth do hold, until he be taken out of the way. And then that wicked one shall be revealed.” (2 Th. 2:6-8)

This specifically refers to the pope, because only when they first get rid of a reigning Pontiff and replace him with an antipope, an impostor, could the robber’s Second Vatican Council and the New Mass become a reality. A legitimate pope would have never allowed these abominations of desolation to take place. It is a pope who keeps Satan in check, by combating him from the Chair of Peter, with the whole army of Catholics at his command. All these things - the pope, faith, and the Mass—were preventing the Antichrist from coming to full power, and had to be taken out of the his way, and only an impostor “pope” can bring these events about. It was the faith that was lost first, even before the Second Vatican Council, and this is why God has allowed the pope to be taken out of the way with the subsequent reign of antipopes who abolished the faith at Vatican II and instituted the New Mass.

s physical persecution, this great tribulation that will take place during the reign of the Antichrist. It is clear that Daniel prophecy, as it applies to these final days, refers to the Abomination of Desolation as the setting up of Antichrist, although the New Mass is also an abomination of desolation and a harbinger of the advent of the Antichrist.

The Antichrist (the Abomination of Desolation) will visibly sit in the Temple of God, showing himself as if he were God. *“Who opposeth and is lifted up above all that is called God or that is worshipped, so that he sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself as if he were God.”* (2Thess. 2:4) The Church Fathers are split as to what the “Temple of God” means. Some believe it is the apostate Jewish Temple in Israel that will be rebuilt. Other Fathers believe the “Temple of God” refers to Vatican City, and both speculations are valid.

Douay Commentary: [2Thess. 2:4] “In the temple... Either that of Jerusalem which some think he will rebuild; or in some Christian church, which he will pervert to his own worship: as Mahomet has done by the churches of the east.”

I believe that both of these interpretations are true in that the false prophet will first sit in Vatican City, the one time temple of God for Catholics, and turn Rome into the see of the Antichrist, and Antichrist will then reign in the temple in Jerusalem, the one time temple of the faithful Israelites during the Old Covenant period of time. Whatever the case may be it is certain that the apostate Jews are bringing the Antichrist to power and will worship him as the Messiah.

“I am come in the name of the Father, and you receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him you will receive.” (John 5:43)

This tells us that apostate religious Jews, who believe in the coming of a personal messiah, are bringing Antichrist (their messiah) to power and him they will accept.

Has The Continual Mass Has been Taken Away? Br. Michael’s Hypocrisy

It is important to note that this prophecy regarding the Mass does not necessarily mean that there will be no Masses at all, although this may be the case. It says the continual sacrifice will be taken away, not that the sacrifice will be completely taken away. In other

words there will be very few Masses said, and very rarely will “Catholics” get to go to Mass, let alone every day, or every Sunday. In most cases Catholics will have no legal Mass to attend, depending on what time of the apostasy they are living through. At the height of the apostasy, and before the destruction of Rome, it can well be assumed that there may be no Masses at all to attend. But it is certain that daily Mass and Sunday Mass will not be available on a regular basis, and this is where Bro. Michael proves his hypocrisy.

Bro. Michael says this prophecy of Daniel - the taking away of the Continual Mass - has already occurred. Yet, he tells Catholics they can go to Mass every Sunday to non-Catholic churches and this would obviously include daily Mass, because these non-Catholic churches that are in communion with the Conciliar Church and Antipope John Paul II offer the daily (continual) Mass. So how can Bro. Michael say that Daniel’s prophecy has been fulfilled if he tells Catholics they have a continual Mass to attend? Bro. Michael cannot logically have both ways. His hypocrisy, or just plain foolishness, should be plain to see if one is of good will.

There is more that is wrong with his article, but that should suffice. Bro. Michael, as stated at the beginning of this section, is in heresy because he believes you can attend the church of manifest heretics or those who are praying in communion with manifest heretics, and this is a sin against the faith known as *communicatio in sacris*. The irony is that Bro. Michael says John Paul II is the Antichrist, a manifest heretic and apostate, an antipope, but nevertheless you can go into churches that are united with him and pray in communion with him. Does not the Book of the Apocalypse (13:7) say that all the world will adore the Beast? The devil loves Bro. Michael even more than the Conciliar “Catholics” who pray in communion with Antipope John Paul II, because they believe he is the pope and not the Antichrist. Bro. Michael admits he is a manifest heretic and not the pope, and even believes he is the Beast, but nevertheless, he enters the Church of the Antichrist and adores him - praying *una cum* (one with) the man whom he believes to be the Antichrist. Both the Conciliar “Catholic” and Bro. Michael will go to hell if they die unrepented, but Brother Michael to a deeper pit for acknowledging the crime and the criminal and staying in communion with him and not warning others to avoid John Paul II and the Conciliar Church at all costs. He is a fallen, fence-sitting angel who did not completely separate himself from Lucifer. Not only is Bro. Michael not warning others to avoid these churches, he encourages and tells Catholics they must go to these non-Catholic churches in order to fulfill their Sunday obligation, or they sin mortally.

Why I Left Most Holy Family Monastery

Many have asked why I left the Most Holy Family Monastery, in which Bro. Michael was my superior. I had held the *sedevacante* position a year before I was released from the Monastery and was silenced by Br. Michael from teaching this truth. He obstinately argued that he could not make a declaration that John Paul II is an antipope, and I kept hammering him with the clear words of the Bull *Cum Ex Apostolatus* and *Canon 188.4* on Tacit Resignation of Office, that states no declaration is necessary and that deposition takes place automatically *ipso facto*, without a declaration, and by the Church Law (*ab jure*). I vigorously resisted him and informed him that I would not obey him in his heresy

of denying these infallible teachings, and that he was impugning the known truth. Thus, I was released from the Monastery. A year or more after my departure Br. Michael now holds the *sedevacante* position, but he will never admit that this is the reason why he let me go from the Monastery. Simply put, he was wrong and I was right, as I am now, and as God will make evident for all to know. Bro. Michael has done his best to try and silence me then, and even now, but as all can see who are reading this, he has ultimately failed in his attempt.

“Woe to anyone who tries to silence me in any way, either by the use of secular courts, or by calumny, or detraction, or slander. You may temporally crush me, and win an occasional battle, but you will definitely lose the war, and God’s wrath will surely come down upon you and punish you in like manner and seven fold for all to see.”

January 2000

John Paul II and the Dimonds Are Apostates 3/05)

Statement:

I take issue with RJMI denouncing John Paul II as an apostate. John Paul II is indeed a notorious heretic, blasphemer, idolater, and sacrilegious wretch; but he is not an apostate.

I also take issue with RJMI denouncing non-Catholics like Michael and Peter Dimond as apostates. The Dimonds are indeed notorious heretics and sacrilegious wretches, but they are not apostates.

RJMI Comment:

1. In the strict sense, an apostate is a baptized man who entirely abandons the Christian faith. “If he abandons the Christian faith entirely, he is called an *apostate*.”⁵

2. In the non-strict sense, heretics who do not entirely abandon the Christian faith are also referred to as apostates. For instance, Abbot Guéranger, in his book *The Liturgical Year*, refers to Martin Luther as an apostate: “Luther would have the world believe Him to be the direct author of sin and damnation... Calvin followed; he took up the blasphemous doctrines of the German apostate...”⁶ There are many quotes from popes and saints that also refer to this type of a heretic as an apostate.

Therefore, I am justified for denouncing John Paul II and the Dimonds as apostates in the second sense, the non-strict sense, because they are notorious heretics.

But I also denounce them as apostates in the first sense, the strict sense. By teaching that Moslems and Talmudic Jews worship the true God, John Paul II denies the Most Holy Trinity, which is the very cornerstone dogma of the Christian faith; hence, he is an apostate for abandoning the Christian faith altogether by denying the very basis of the

⁵ A Practical Commentary, Woywod and Smith, Commentary on Canon 1324, vol. 2, p. 108.

⁶ Vol. 10, Feast of the Sacred Heart, p.428.

Christian faith, the Most Holy Trinity. It does not matter if he hypocritically and illogically professes belief in the Most Holy Trinity in one place and then denies the Most Holy Trinity in another place by saying that Moslems and Talmudic Jews worship the true God. One notorious denial of the Most Holy Trinity makes him an apostate.

The Dimonds are apostates because, in spite of the fact that they denounce John Paul II and his priests as apostates, they nevertheless pray in communion with them and thus share in the guilt of all of their notorious crimes by association, and thus are partners in their crimes:

Peter Dimond: “And it is precisely for this reason that God allowed the Catholic Buildings, Seminaries and Schools to be taken away and confiscated by a counterfeit non-Catholic sect (the Vatican II/Novus Ordo sect), with apostate priests, perverts, a phony ‘Mass’ (the New Mass) and an apostate Antipope (John Paul II).”⁷

The apostate Dimonds attend Mass at a non-Catholic Eastern Rite church, a “counterfeit non-Catholic sect,” that is under John Paul II, an “apostate Antipope.” During that Mass, the apostate Dimonds unite themselves in prayer and belief with the apostate priest and apostate John Paul II. For instance, they unite themselves in prayer with the priest in the *Orate Frates* Mass prayer: “Brethren, pray that my sacrifice and yours may be well pleasing to God the Father almighty.” Therefore, they share in the guilt of the priest’s notorious crimes against the faith—crimes of heresy and apostasy, which they themselves acknowledge. Every apostate is also a heretic, and the Dimonds have explicitly admitted that these priests at the church where the Dimonds attend Mass are also heretics:

“Peter Dimond, 1/25/02: ‘The churches that we say that Catholics can attend Mass at and receive the sacraments from (e.g., the SSPX, CMRI, SSPV, Eastern Rite churches, independent priests, etc.) are Catholic churches, even though the priests and certainly a number of the people who go there are heretics.’”⁸

They also unite themselves in prayer and belief with John Paul II in the following *Te Igitur* Mass prayer: “We pray... and offer up to Thee ...together with Thy servant John Paul II (N - the pope’s name).” Hence, the apostate Dimonds are “one with” John Paul II’s notorious crimes, which include his apostate belief that Moslems and Talmudic Jews worship the true God, which is a denial of the Most Holy Trinity. Therefore, the Dimonds are also apostates in the strict sense!

*March 5, 2005

Praying in Communion with Heretics and SSPX Priests (12/05)

The Dimonds heretically believe that during Mass the altar boys but not the laymen pray in communion with the priest. They also heretically believe that some SSPX priests in these latter days of the Great Apostasy may not be notorious heretics.

⁷ Peter Dimond, *Outside the Catholic Church There is Absolutely No Salvation*: Did Fr. Feeney predict the loss of the pope?

⁸ “ADB, What makes a church Catholic?”

The Apostate Dimonds' Website:

Questions and Answers: "Question 39 – Can one serve the altar at the SSPX? Dear Brothers Dimond, Since it is okay to attend an SSPX [Mass] to get sacraments as long as the priest is not a notorious heretic, what about altar serving or assisting in the choir?"

"MHFM [the Dimonds]: One definitely should not serve the altar at the SSPX. This is because in serving the altar one is directly assisting the priest who is praying in union with Antipope John Paul II and the apostate Novus Ordo Bishop."

RJMI Comment:

1) In their above statement, the Dimonds rightly imply that it is a mortal sin against the faith to knowingly pray in communion with heretics. They say, "One definitely should not serve the altar at the SSPX. ...in serving the altar one is directly assisting the priest who is praying in union with Antipope John Paul II and the apostate Novus Ordo Bishop." How, then, do the Dimonds escape the same guilt? They also knowingly attend Mass at a non-Catholic church and pray in communion with the heretical priest who in turn prays in communion with the Vatican II antipope and its local bishop. The Dimonds attempt to evade guilt by teaching that during the Mass the laymen do not pray in communion with the priest—only the altar boys do.

When and where does the Church teach that the altar boys and not the laymen pray in communion with the priest and the pope and the local bishop? One wonders if the Dimonds think the altar rail blocks the prayers of the laymen from reaching the priest so that the laymen are not praying in communion with the priest! What, then, becomes of the prayers of the priest offered for the laymen present at his Mass? Does the altar rail block the priest's prayers also? Again the apostate Dimonds have made up their own faith to accommodate their heresies and other errors. One falls deeper and deeper and becomes more illogical when, because of pride, he does not admit he is wrong. I challenge the Dimonds to produce a Church teaching which says that during Mass either the laymen do not pray in communion with the priest or only the altar boys pray in communion with the priest. If the Dimonds were to admit that the laymen do pray in communion with the priest during Mass, then the Dimonds would also have to admit that they themselves pray in communion with heretics because, by their own admission, they attend Mass at a non-Catholic Vatican II church (a meetinghouse of heretics) in which the priest is a heretic who prays in communion with the apostate antipope and local bishop. The Dimonds attend Mass at an Eastern Rite church: St. Josaphat's, in Rochester, New York.

2) The Dimonds also heretically believe that some SSPX priests in these latter days of the Great Apostasy may not be notorious heretics. All of the SSPX priests are notorious heretics on several counts. I will only list two counts:

a) The SSPX priests are notorious heretics because their sect denies the Salvation Dogma; hence all SSPX priests must be presumed to deny the dogma. Indeed, every SSPX priest I have spoken with denies the Salvation Dogma. If they did not deny this dogma, they would be kicked out of the SSPX. If they did not deny the dogma but kept their belief secret so as to remain in the SSPX, then this would also make them guilty of heresy because Catholics must not only believe a dogma in their heart but also profess it when the situation demands it. That is why the early Christians who denied the faith

when tortured fell outside the Catholic Church. Although they believed in Christ in their hearts, they outwardly denied Him under torture and thus became guilty of apostasy with the added mortal sins of hypocrisy and scandal. These apostates were known as “lapsed Christians” (*lapsi*) and had to abjure to re-enter the Catholic Church.

b) The SSPX sect does not condemn the manifest heresies and other crimes of the Vatican II Church and does not properly denounce its notorious heretical antipope, bishops, and priests. The SSPX has no excuse for not fulfilling these Catholic obligations because the crimes of the Vatican II Church and its members are manifest to all in these latter days of the Great Apostasy. Therefore by sins of omission and association, all the members of the SSPX and all those who willingly attend Mass at an SSPX church share in the guilt of the crimes of the SSPX sect and thus in the guilt of the crimes of the Vatican II Church and its antipopes and bishops. It is thus of the faith that in these latter days of the Great Apostasy not some, but all of the SSPX priests are notorious heretics on this count alone.

Also, anyone who contemplates attending Mass at an SSPX church obviously has access to the SSPX priest. Therefore before attending his Mass, all one has to do is ask the priest what he believes regarding the above two points. His answer will confirm that he is a notorious heretic. Thus the following statement, which the Dimonds condone, in Question 39 is illogical and heretical: “Since it is okay to attend an SSPX [Mass] to get sacraments as long as the priest is not a notorious heretic...” It is illogical because the person who asked the question has easy access to the priest and thus can easily find out what the priest believes. All he has to do is open the mouth God has given him and ask the priest what he believes, point by point. From the priest’s answer, he will receive confirmation that the priest is a notorious heretic. The statement is also heretical because by not asking the priest what he believes, this person sins by omission by omitting to perform the spiritual acts of mercy of instructing the ignorant and admonishing sinners and by omitting the Catholic obligation to profess the faith (which is an implicit denial of the Catholic faith):

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.”

Pope St. Felix III (483-492): “Not to oppose error, is to approve it, and indeed to neglect to confound evil men, when we can do it, is no less a sin than to encourage them.”

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: ...6. By concealment; 7. By being a partner in the sin; 8. By silence.

The Dimonds, indeed, are digging a deeper pit for themselves and for all those who follow them. They are the blind leading the blind into the pit (Mt. 15:14). One gets what he deserves. Fools deserve to be in religious communion with other fools. I am not being holier than thou, especially since I myself was a great fool at one time. By God’s grace and aid, it is my hope and prayer to wake up the fools from spiritual death who are in religious communion with the apostate Dimonds or who agree with any of their heretical and other mortally sinful errors. Of course, by God’s grace and aid, it is also my hope and

prayer to wake up the apostate Dimonds from spiritual death. They will have no hope of being saved until they wake up and thus abjure their errors and enter the Catholic Church.

12/12/2005: Date posted on St. John the Baptist Website

Dimonds' Denial of the Salvation Dogma (12/05)

The Dimonds heretically believe that certain baptized children who have the use of reason and who are self-professed Protestants (such as those who profess to be Calvinists) can be inside the Catholic Church without knowing it in spite of the fact that they willfully adhere to a heretical sect that opposes the Catholic religion and the Catholic Church:

Peter Dimond: "Those baptized persons among the Calvinists who believe in the Trinity and Incarnation (the essential mysteries of the Catholic Faith), but who have not obstinately embraced the Calvinists' heresies because they do not yet know or understand the distinction between them and Catholic teaching, are not necessarily heretics."⁹

It is clear that Peter heretically believes that certain persons with the use of reason who adhere to the Calvinist sect and believe the Calvinist heresies are nevertheless inside the Catholic Church; thus Peter denies the Salvation Dogma. Peter even refers to these persons as Catholics, while other salvation heretics refer to them as "Protestants in good faith."

Peter Dimond to Mr. X, 7/04: "The children of Protestant families do not become Protestants (i.e., heretics) until they reach an age where they comprehend the differences between Catholicism and Protestantism and then obstinately reject the Catholic position."¹⁰

Peter teaches the same heresy in regard to all Protestant and schismatic sects:

Peter Dimond: "It should be pointed out that those people who are above reason in notoriously heretical or schismatical church buildings, such as Protestant or Eastern Schismatic churches, must be presumed to be heretics in the external forum, even if a few of them aren't because they have not yet obstinately rejected a dogma or the Church. This is because malice is presumed in the external forum until the contrary is proven (canon 2200.2). We cannot say infallibly that all of them are, in fact, heretics because it's possible that a small number of the younger ones are not heretics, but Catholics, as I have shown."¹¹

To be consistent, the Dimonds must admit that this applies not only to "younger ones" but also to adults. If the Dimonds logically follow their erroneous theology that justifies their heresy regarding baptized children with the use of reason, they must also admit that the same applies to adults who adhere to Protestant sects but have not obstinately denied a dogma, which according to Peter they cannot do unless they first learn about the Catholic dogma from a Catholic source. Indeed, the Dimonds heretically believe that even adults who adhere to Protestant sects can actually be Catholics and inside the Catholic Church. One proof of this, among many, is that they did not yet answer the following questions that I and Mr. X presented to Peter:

Mr. X to Peter Dimond: "Sir, If you don't need pointers on how to communicate just simmer down... Now I am trying to take the points you raised about Mr. Ibranyi one at a time and see how things go. You state above that a Protestant does not become a heretic until he reaches the age of reason **and** then obstinately rejects the Catholic position. I can tell you from personal experience that I, when a Protestant, never was presented with the Catholic position until I was

⁹ Part 3: *R.I. Responds – a Mass of Contradictions and Illogical Nonsense* (hereafter RIR), by Peter Dimond, 3/2005; *The Dimonds Deny the Salvation Dogma* (hereafter DDD), Part Two: What about those who do not believe in a heresy?

¹⁰ DDD, Part One.

¹¹ *Our Challenge to Debate R.I. – Refused in Cowardly Fashion* (hereafter CRI), by Peter Dimond, 1/2005; DDD, Part 2: What about those who do not believe in heresy?

twenty-two years old. Now the questions, please just answer these two questions. Was I, or was I not, a heretic all of those years? Now I was not a formal dissenter as I had not personally repudiated something I had never been presented with, but I was not in the Church was I?”¹²

RJMI to Peter Dimond: “(2) Was Mr. X, the man addressed in my article ‘The Dimond Brothers Deny the Salvation Dogma,’ a Catholic until he was 22 years old? You never answered his question.”¹³

The Dimonds did not answer my question regarding Mr. X either. And they did not answer my following questions:

RJMI: “For instance, according to Peter Dimond’s definition of what it takes to become a heretic, the Amish, who are completely isolated from the world, are actually Catholic because from generation to generation they have never been presented with Catholic dogmas. In spite of all their heretical beliefs and practices, Peter would have to say these Amish are actually Catholics. That is, he would have to say this if he does not want to add hypocrisy to his heresy.”¹⁴

RJMI to Peter Dimond: “(1) Can a self-professed Protestant—assuming he is validly baptized—who never heard of Catholic dogmas ever be a heretic? If so, then explain how? If not, then [according to your erroneous theology] you would have to admit that all self-professed Protestants who never heard of Catholic dogmas are actually Catholics, inside the Church, and thus can be saved. Do you agree with this last statement?”¹⁵

Peter also did not answer my following three examples that I presented in my book *Baptized Non-Catholic Children*: 1) A child’s Protestant parents become Jehovah Witnesses, 2) A baptized child is raised as a Deist, and 3) An Anglican child. For instance, in my book *DDD*, Part Two, I asked Peter the following questions: “Peter, I ask you to address the following three examples (from my book *Baptized Non-Catholic Children*) that you evaded commenting on:

“Example 1: A child’s Protestant parents become Jehovah Witnesses

“What are the consequences if a baptized child’s parents become Jehovah Witnesses (who deny the Most Holy Trinity and Incarnation) before their child attains the use of reason? And, as soon as the child attains the use of reason, his parents teach him that Jesus is an angel and that God is not the Most Holy Trinity, without mentioning the Catholic Church or the Catholic religion. Therefore this child has neither heard of the Catholic Church or the Catholic religion nor had a chance to apply diligence in further learning about his own religion; nor can these dogmas be known by reason and the law upon the heart.”¹⁶

“Peter, is this baptized child with the use of reason who denies the Incarnation and the Most Holy Trinity inside the Catholic Church? If you answer that he is inside the Catholic Church, then you are a salvation heretic, even according to your own incomplete standards, because you have admitted that baptized children when they attain the use of reason must in the very least believe in the Incarnation and the Most Holy Trinity to be inside the Catholic Church and thus in the way of salvation:

Peter Dimond: “So what mysteries does everyone above reason have to *positively know*, without any exceptions for anyone, to be saved? The answer is very clear in the dogmatic teaching of the Church, as well as in Church Tradition. The answer is that the Catholic Faith, if defined by its

¹² *DDD*, Part One, by RJMI, 7/04.

¹³ RJMI’s email to Peter, 12/28/2004; *DDD*, Part Two.

¹⁴ *DDD*, Part One, by RJMI.

¹⁵ RJMI’s email to Peter, 12/28/2004; *DDD*, Part One.

¹⁶ In my book *Baptized Non-Catholic Children*, I have revised this example; and it is now titled “A child’s Catholic parents become Jehovah Witnesses.” The principle is the same.

simplest mysteries, is belief in the Trinity and the Incarnation. These are the essential mysteries of the Catholic Faith which all persons above reason must *positively know* to be saved without any exceptions for ignorance. Those above reason who are ignorant of these mysteries cannot be saved.” (CRI)

“If you rightly answer that he is not inside the Catholic Church, then give me the reason why he is not inside the Catholic Church. Is he a formal heretic or is he a material heretic or is he outside the Church while not being a heretic?” Peter said the following:

Peter Dimond: “The only way that baptized infants when reaching the age of reason can cease to be Catholic is through heresy, schism or apostasy.” (RIR and DDD, Part Two)

Hence if Peter does not believe that this child who denies the Incarnation and the Most Holy Trinity is a formal heretic, then, according to his above belief, he would have to believe this child is Catholic and inside the Catholic Church. Now even if one cannot theologically explain *how* this child mortally sinned and *why* he is not Catholic, a Catholic must still believe the dogma that this baptized child *has* mortally sinned and thus is outside the Catholic Church because this child has denied the Incarnation and the Most Holy Trinity. Hence even though this baptized child has not obstinately denied the dogmas of the Most Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, he is nevertheless a heretic because he *has* denied these dogmas which must be believed if one wants a hope to be saved. Therefore obstinacy, as stated in Canon 1325§2, is not always necessary to make a baptized man a heretic. This proves that Canon 1325§2 mentions only one way a Catholic becomes a heretic, but not the only way. Now if this child obstinately denied these dogmas by denying them after they had been taught to him by a Catholic source, he would be especially guilty; that is, he would be a worse heretic than when he had not obstinately denied them. Note carefully that in both cases he would be a heretic. (See my book *Baptized Non-Catholic Children*: “What, then, is their sin?” and “Are these baptized non-Catholic children also heretics?”)

Peter also takes the teachings of Orestes Brownson and Fr. Michael Muller out of context and leaves out main portions of their teachings to try to prove that they defended the very salvation heresy that they actually refuted. (See my book *DDD*, Part Two: Brownson and Muller denounce Peter.)

Like the 19th century salvation heretic Rev. Russo, Peter has invoked “countless authorities” out of context to defend his salvation heresy. Peter lies and deceives, as all heretics do, to defend his heresy. Peter attributes to Brownson, Muller, and other credible authorities the very salvation heresy they actually refuted and condemned, while Peter himself embraces the salvation heresy and sides with Brownson’s and Muller’s heretical opponents.

While Fr. Muller believed that Protestants who never heard of the Catholic religion are only material heretics, he also believed that these material heretics are nevertheless Protestants, outside the Catholic Church, and thus not in the way of salvation. Peter believes that Brownson and Muller’s self-professed Protestants who are material heretics are not only *not* guilty of formal heresy due to invincible ignorance but, unlike Brownson and Muller, Peter also heretically believes that these self-professed Protestants are *inside* the Catholic Church as Catholics.

Conclusive proof of Muller’s actual belief is found in *The Catholic Dogma* quotes that Peter deliberately omitted in his RIR article. While Fr. Muller believes these self-

professed Protestants are only material heretics, he does not believe they are inside the Catholic Church either as Catholics or “Protestants in good faith.” If he did, he would be a salvation heretic like Peter. Muller clearly teaches that these self-professed Protestants are outside the Catholic Church and thus on the road to hell. In spite of Fr. Muller’s belief in the erroneous theology which teaches that these Protestants are material heretics, he formulated an excellent theology proving that these Protestants cannot be inside the Catholic Church. Whereas Peter has denied the Salvation Dogma by believing that self-professed Protestants who have not learned about the true Catholic religion and who are only material heretics according to Brownson and Muller’s conditions are actually Catholics, inside the Catholic Church. That is what Peter wrongly thinks Brownson and Muller are teaching, and that is what Peter agrees with—his own misinterpretation of their teachings that he uses to defend his salvation heresy. To be consistent, Peter would then have to agree with the Baltimore Catechisms’ salvation heresy that first opened the door to salvation only for certain baptized men who lived and died as self-professed members of heretical sects:

The Original Baltimore Catechism No. 3: “**Q. 510. Is it ever possible for one to be saved who does not know the Catholic Church to be the true Church?** A. It is possible for one to be saved who does not know the Catholic Church to be the true Church, provided that person: (1) Has been validly baptized; (2) Firmly believes the religion he professes and practices to be the true religion, and (3) Dies without the guilt of mortal sin on his soul.

“**Q. 512. How are such persons said to belong to the Church?** A. Such persons are said to belong to the ‘soul of the church’; that is, they are really members of the Church without knowing it. Those who share in its Sacraments and worship are said to belong to the body or visible part of the Church.”

(For further explanation see my book *The Salvation Dogma: Salvation Heresy Enters Catechisms in U.S.A.*)

It needs to be mentioned that even saints can make mistakes by believing in an erroneous theology, but never can it be brought to a heretical conclusion. If it is, the offender becomes a heretic. If one wants to remain Catholic, the proper course he must take once an erroneous theology is brought to its heretical conclusion is to never concede to the heresy even if he cannot explain it using the erroneous theology. Dogmas must always be believed even if man cannot reasonably understand or explain them. For instance, this is what happened to Fr. Michael Muller who was fighting the Dimond Brother type heretics who were denying the Salvation Dogma in the late 19th century. Fr. Muller believed in the same erroneous theology as to what it takes to make a baptized person a heretic. Yet, when his opponents took the theology to its logical, heretical conclusion by teaching that all Protestants who never heard of the Catholic position are thus actually Catholic and inside the Catholic Church, Fr. Muller rejected this as heresy and said that they cannot be Catholic and inside the Catholic Church. Fr. Muller did not fall into heresy but lost the debate, whereas his opponents fell into heresy but won the debate because it was based upon an erroneous theology. Fr. Muller remained faithful to the Catholic Dogma even though he could not reasonably explain it based upon the erroneous theology, whereas his heretical opponents bowed to the erroneous theology instead of to the dogma.

To conclude, Peter did not address the above questions and evidence (along with many other questions and evidence presented in my book *The Dimonds Deny the Salvation*

Dogma) because it would further expose his heretical belief as to what it takes to make a baptized person with the use of reason fall outside the Catholic Church.

12/12/2005: Date posted on St. John the Baptist Website

Dimonds Idolize Infants and Deny a Dogma on Original Sin (11/06)

Among their other heresies, the apostate Dimonds deny a dogma on original sin. They believe that original sin does not make men impious sinners. Impious also means wicked. The Catholic Church has infallibly taught several times that inherited original sin makes men impious sinners. The Dimonds heretically teach that unbaptized infants are not impious sinners, which Peter Dimond stated in his book *Outside the Catholic Church There is Absolutely No Salvation* when referring to the Council of Trent's Session 6, Chapter 4:

Peter Dimond, *Outside the Catholic Church There is Absolutely No Salvation*: "But why does Trent define that the desire for Baptism, along with Baptism, is necessary for Justification? In the past we did not answer this question as well as we could have, because we thought that Sess. 6, Chap. 4 was distinguishing between adults and infants. But further study of the passage reveals that in this chapter Trent is defining what is necessary for the *iustificatio impiorum* – the justification of the impious (see quote above). The impii ('impious') does not refer to infants – who are incapable of committing actual sins (Trent, Sess. V, Denz. 791). The word 'impii' in Latin is actually a very strong word, according to a Latin scholar I consulted, and he agreed that it is too strong to describe an infant in original sin only. It is sometimes translated as 'wicked' or 'sinner.' Therefore, in this chapter, Trent is dealing with those above the age of reason who have committed actual sins..."¹⁷

Peter believes it is too strong to denounce unbaptized infants as impious sinners. Therefore he denies the dogma that unbaptized infants *are* impious sinners. If these unbaptized infants were not impious sinners, then God would be unjust for damning them to eternal hell when they die unbaptized.

No saint or theologian has ever taught that Trent's Session 6, Chapter 4, does not apply to those with the sole guilt of original sin, such as unbaptized infants. The chapter itself refers to those born with original sin as being impious—"Justification of the **impious** ... wherein man is **born** a child of the first Adam." Therefore this chapter does apply to unbaptized infants.

But that is not the worst of the Dimonds' error. Their error is also heretical. At the Council of Carthage in 418, the Catholic Church for the first time infallibly defined that those with the sole guilt of original sin are impious (wicked) sinners. And the Catholic Church again infallibly defined this same dogma at the Second Council of Lyons in 1274, at the Council of Florence in 1439, and at the Council of Trent in 1546. We will quote from the infallible Council of Trent which teaches this dogma, as this is the same Council that the Dimonds refer to when teaching their heresy that inherited original sin does not make men impious sinners:

¹⁷ Peter Dimond, *Outside the Catholic Church There is Absolutely No Salvation*: 16. Major Objections: SESS. 6, CHAP. 4 OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

Council of Trent, Decree on Original Sin, 1546: “2. If any one asserts that the prevarication of Adam injured himself alone and not his posterity, and that the holiness and justice, received of God, which he lost, he lost for himself alone and not for us also; or that he being defiled by the sin of disobedience has only transfused death ‘and pains of the body into the whole human race, but not sin also, which is the death of the soul,’ let him be anathema, whereas he contradicts the apostle who says: ‘By one man sin entered into the world, and by sin death, and so death passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned.’ (Rom. 5:12)”¹⁸

This infallible decree from the Council of Trent deals only with original sin, not actual sin, and teaches that all who inherit original sin, including infants, “have sinned” and hence are sinners. Therefore the Catholic Church infallibly teaches that St. Paul’s statement that “all have sinned” applies to unbaptized infants because from the moment of their creation they inherit Adam’s original sin. Unbaptized infants are sinners because they have sinned by way of Adam’s original sin: “*Therefore, as by the offence of one, unto all men to condemnation... For as by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners.*” (Rom. 5:18-19) Because of original sin, “all men...were made sinners.” And the guilt of this sin is “unto all men to condemnation,” which means it is a deadly sin that hence makes men impious sinners, children of Satan, and places them in a state of damnation. To say that such persons are not impious, are not wicked, is illogical and heresy.

Unlike venial sin, original sin and mortal sin are deadly sins. Deadly sin makes men not only sinners but also impious because it places them in a state of damnation and makes them children of Satan. No one who is in a state of damnation could be referred to as being pious or neutral. The very nature of their sin makes them impious (wicked). Whereas a man who is guilty only of venial sin is a sinner, he is not an impious sinner because he is in a state of grace and in the way of salvation. Venial sin does not make men impious because it is not a deadly sin.

Condemning the many heretics like the Dimonds who exempt unbaptized infants from being wicked sinners, the Council of Trent in another infallible decree even more specifically condemns as heresy the belief that unbaptized infants are not truly guilty of original sin and hence are not impious sinners and children of Satan:

Council of Trent, Decree on Original Sin, 1546: “4. If any one denies that infants newly born from their mothers’ wombs, even though they be sprung from baptized parents, are to be baptized; or says that they are baptized indeed for the remission of sins, but that they derive nothing of original sin from Adam, which has need of being expiated by the laver of regeneration for the obtaining of life everlasting,—whence it follows as a consequence, that in them the form of baptism, for the remission of sins, is understood to be not true, but false,—let him be anathema. For that which the apostle has said, By one man sin entered into the world, and by sin death, and so death passed upon all men in whom all have sinned, is not to be understood otherwise than as the Catholic Church spread everywhere hath always understood it. For, by reason of this rule of faith, from a tradition of the apostles, even infants, who could not as yet commit any sin of themselves, are for this cause truly baptized for the remission of sins, that in them that may be cleansed away by regeneration, which they have contracted by generation. For, unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.”¹⁹

“All have sinned...even infants.” Because infants need to be baptized to have original sin remitted, they are indeed guilty of sin and thus are sinners and also impious because

¹⁸ *Council of Trent*, 1546, sess. v; D. 789.

¹⁹ *Council of Trent*, 1546, sess. v; D. 791.

their sin is a deadly sin that makes them children of Satan and places them in a state of damnation. Therefore unbaptized infants “have sinned” because they are guilty of original sin. And anyone who interprets this “otherwise than as the Catholic Church spread everywhere hath always understood it” is a heretic.

Peter Dimond and other heretics like him idolize infants and children. They have a sick, sappy obsession with infants and children and do all they can to save them or to at least make their punishments less than the Catholic Church infallibly decrees. For instance, Peter Dimond heretically believes that certain baptized children with the use of reason who are raised as Protestants and thus adhere to Protestant sects and who never heard of Catholicism and the Catholic Church can actually be Catholics and thus inside the Catholic Church and in the way of salvation. Hence Peter denies the Salvation Dogma because of his obsessed idolization of children. (See my books *The Dimonds Deny the Salvation Dogma* and *Baptized Non-Catholic Children*.) And Peter also wrongly believes it is heresy to hold the opinion that dead unbaptized infants suffer the pain of hell fire—an opinion that is allowed by the Catholic Church and the most probable one when all things are considered. (For an in-depth presentation, see my book *Damned Infants*.)

Peter’s denouncing me as evil for teaching the truth that God punishes infants and children for their own sins and the sins of their parents is further proof that Peter idolizes infants and children. I quote from Peter Dimond’s book *Refuting R.I.*:

[Peter Dimond:] “R. I.’s rashness leads him to make statements such as the following diabolical one:

[Richard J. M. Ibranyi:] “R. I., *On the Crimes of Fr. Mario Blanco*: ‘**Your children deserve to be molested by these priests**, because the Catholic faith is not your primary concern, because you have put the Mass before the Faith, and thus you are not Catholic. God has forgotten you and your children, because you have forgotten Him.’

[Peter Dimond:] “While R. I. makes a valid point here, that most so-called ‘traditional Catholics’ today despicably deny the Faith and care only about the Latin Mass (i.e., the ‘Latin Mass alone’ heretical mentality) and are therefore not Catholic, this does not justify the egregious claim that because this is so the children of such persons who have been molested deserve to be molested. This is another example of R. I.’s invalid reasoning, whereby he states a truth and then proceeds to conclude something that is not warranted by that truth and which is even evil.”

By implication Peter also denounces God as diabolical. God speaking through the Prophet Osee says, “*My people have been silent, because they had no knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will reject thee... and thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I also will forget thy children.*” (Osee 4:6) Shall there be a child that was molested whom God has not allowed to be molested: “*Shall there be evil in a city, which the Lord hath not done?*” (Amos 3:6) During the Babylonian captivity, God punished the unfaithful Israelites by allowing the Babylonians to rape their virgins and male children:

“They oppressed the women in Sion, and the virgins in the cities of Juda. The princes were hanged up by their hand: they did not respect the persons of the ancients. They abused the young men indecently: and the children fell under the wood.” (Lam. 5:11-13)

Has not God allowed these virgins and children to be sexually molested, just as He does with the children of fallen-away Catholics! God could have prevented them from being sexually molested, just as He prevented His chaste saints from being sexually molested. God never allows this type of evil to happen to His faithful chosen people. This

type of evil is always a punishment from God and not an unjust persecution to be endured by those whom God favors.

In some cases God allows good infants and children, such as the Holy Innocents, to suffer unjust persecutions as a trial to be borne with patience and faith in order to gain much merit. This is not the case with evil infants and children whom God punishes because He sees the evil in their hearts and the hearts of their parents. God either punishes them directly or permits the devil or some other created thing to punish them. Sometimes God kills evil infants and children and then sends them to hell to be punished for all eternity, which is infinitely worse than being molested by perverted and faithless priests. To be consistent, then, the Dimonds must denounce God as being the most diabolical of all.

The Bible testifies that God punishes evil infants and children because of their sins and the sins of their parents and religious leaders:

- God killed the firstborn males of the Egyptians: *“And I will pass through the land of Egypt that night, and will kill every firstborn in the land of Egypt both man and beast: and against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgments: I am the Lord.”* (Exodus 12:12)
- God commanded Moses to kill infants and children: *“And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying: Revenge first the children of Israel on the Madianites... Kill all that are of the male sex, even of the children.”* (Num. 31:1-2, 17)
- God commanded Josue to kill infants and children: *“And when in the seventh going about the priests sounded with the trumpets, Josue said to all Israel: Shout: for the Lord hath delivered the city to you... So all the people making a shout, and the trumpets sounding, when the voice and the sound thundered in the ears of the multitude, the walls forthwith fell down: and every man went up by the place that was over against him: and they took the city, And killed all that were in it, man and woman, young and old. The oxen also, and the sheep, and the asses, they slew with the edge of the sword.”* (Josue 6:16, 20-21)
- God, speaking through the prophet Samuel, commanded King Saul to kill infants and children: *“And Samuel said to Saul: ...hearken thou unto the voice of the Lord: Thus saith the Lord of hosts: I have reckoned up all that Amalec hath done to Israel: how he opposed them in the way when they came up out of Egypt. Now therefore go, and smite Amalec, and utterly destroy all that he hath: spare him not, nor covet any thing that is his: but slay both man and woman, child and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass.”* (1 Kings 15:1-3)
- God allowed infants to be eaten by their wicked parents: *“And thou shalt eat the fruit of thy womb, and the flesh of thy sons and of thy daughters, which the Lord thy God shall give thee, in the distress and extremity wherewith thy enemy shall oppress thee ...And the filth of the afterbirths, that come forth from between her thighs, and the children that are born the same hour. For they shall eat them secretly for the want of all things, in the siege and distress, wherewith thy enemy shall oppress thee within thy gates.”* (Deut. 28:53, 57)

- God inspires the Prophet Osee to curse evil infants: *“Let Samaria perish, because she hath stirred up her God to bitterness: let them perish by the sword, let their little ones be dashed, and let the women with child be ripped up.”* (Osee 14:1)

If Peter Dimond seriously reads the Catholic Bible (that is, if he reads it at all) or pays attention when he prays his Divine Office (that is, if he prays it at all or at least the way he should), he would never have denounced me as diabolical for saying that God punishes these children by allowing them to be molested by apostate priests whom they and their parents put their trust in. Peter would have noticed the above Bible verses and the following Divine Office verse from the fourth psalm of Thursday’s Vespers, Psalm 136, in which God’s judgment of killing evil infants is invoked by King David: *“O daughter of Babylon, miserable: blessed shall he be who shall repay thee thy payment which thou hast paid us. Blessed be he that shall take and dash thy little ones against the rock.”* (Ps. 136: 8-9) (See my book *Damned Infants: Unbaptized Infants Are Impious Sinners.*)

A root of Peter’s blindness, as well as for others like him, is a misunderstanding of the true nature of God: *“And Jesus answering, saith to them: Do ye not therefore err, because you know not the scriptures, nor the power of God?”* (Mk. 12:24) They do not really believe that God is all powerful, all knowing, all just, and all merciful. Just because they do not comprehend God’s justice in these matters does not give them the right to deny dogmas. (See my book *Damned Infants: His belief endangers the dogmas on the nature of God.*) (For further proof that the Council of Trent’s Session 6, Chapter 4, applies to unbaptized infants, see my book *Baptism Controversy Supplement: The Council of Trent and Impious Infants.*)

November 15, 2006

Dimonds Hang Themselves with Lugo Quote (2/07)

The apostate Dimonds use a quote by Cardinal John de Lugo in an attempt to justify their Mass-before-the-Faith heresy; that is, to defend their heresy that Catholics are allowed to knowingly pray in communion with notorious heretics. The Dimonds will say that they do not teach this heresy; but I will, once again, prove they do believe in this heresy no matter how much they try to conceal it by twisting words and twisting the Church’s infallible definition of a notorious heretic. What follows is Question 30 from the Dimonds’ website (MHFM), followed by the quote from Cardinal Lugo and then by the pertinent part of Peter’s comment. I do not know who inserted the bracketed comments, and the underlining is Peter Dimond’s:

Peter Dimond, *Questions, Answers and Comments*: **“MHFM Card. Lugo - Question 30– How can one attend the Mass of a heretic? Another person says you cannot.** What about attending the traditional Masses of heretics? This person says that you can never attend the Mass of a heretic? **MHFM:** Cardinal de Lugo, who was a prominent theologian of the 17th century, who was often quoted by St. Alphonsus, addresses this very issue:

‘The second chief doubt is whether we may communicate with an undeclared heretic only in civil and human affairs or even in sacred and spiritual things. It is certain that we cannot communicate with heretics in the rites proper to a heretical sect, because this would be contrary to the precept of confessing the faith and would contain an implicit profession of

error. But the question relates to sacred matters containing no error, e.g. whether it is lawful to hear Mass with a heretic, or to celebrate in his presence, or to be present while he celebrates in the Catholic rite, etc.

“But the opposite view [i.e. that attendance at such a Mass is lawful] is general [communis] and true, unless it should be illicit for some other reason on account of scandal or implicit denial of the faith, or because charity obliges one to impede the sin of the heretical minister administering unworthily where necessity does not urge. This is the teaching of Navarro and Sanchez, Suarez, Hurtado and is what I have said in speaking of the sacrament of penance and of matrimony and the other sacraments. It is also certain by virtue of the said litterae extravagantes [i.e. Ad evitanda scandala] in which communication with excommunicati tolerati is conceded to the faithful in the reception and administration of the sacraments.

“So as these heretics are not declared excommunicates or notoriously guilty of striking a cleric, there is no reason why we should be prevented from receiving the sacraments from them because of their excommunication, although on other grounds this may often be illicit unless necessity excuse as I have explained in the said places.” (Cardinal John de Lugo S.J. (1583-1660), Tractatus de Virtute Fidei Divinae: Disputatio XXII, Sectio. According to The Catholic Encyclopedia, St. Alphonsus regarded Cardinal de Lugo as second only to St. Thomas as a theologian.)”

“...He [Lugo] teaches that attendance at such a Mass is lawful and that this is the ‘general and true’ position of Catholic theologians. Please note that Cardinal de Lugo also points out that if circumstances are such that scandal or a denial of the Faith would necessarily arise (e.g., if the priest made an announcement that everyone who attends must agree with him, such as the priests of the SSPV), then you necessarily couldn’t go; or if the priest is notorious about his heresy, then you definitely shouldn’t go. But that is not the case at all Masses celebrated by undeclared heretical priests in the Catholic rite; otherwise de Lugo would have stated that the teaching of all theologians is that all such Masses must always be avoided. Thus, the position that we have been advocating in this regard is the common teaching of Catholic theologians on this issue. A Catholic can never support such a priest and thereby assist him in the propagation of heresy, but he could attend his Mass in order to receive the Sacrament if the priest professes to be Catholic and is not notorious about his heresy.”

Cardinal Lugo’s quote actually exposes the Dimonds’ illogical hypocrisy and condemns them as heretics. Notice that Cardinal Lugo is only referring to heretical priests who are undeclared heretics and speaks of two different kinds of priests who are undeclared heretics: those whom Catholics are allowed to attend the Masses of and pray in communion with and receive the sacraments from and those with whom Catholics are forbidden to do these things. The question is, What kind of undeclared heretical priests are Catholics forbidden to attend the Masses of, pray in communion with, and receive the sacraments from? It is certain that this kind of undeclared heretical priest is a notorious heretic because there is no worse or more dangerous heretic than a notorious heretic. Hence Cardinal Lugo correctly teaches the dogma that Catholics are forbidden to knowingly attend the Masses of and pray in communion with and receive the sacraments from notorious heretics because to do so would be scandalous, an implicit denial of the faith, and to not fulfill one’s obligation to impede, if possible, the notorious heretic from saying Mass and administering the sacraments. Hence, according to Lugo, Catholics are allowed to attend the Masses of and pray in communion with and receive the sacraments from undeclared heretical priests who are less than notorious heretics, such as occult heretics or those suspect of heresy (meaning there is no certain evidence beyond all doubt that the offender is a heretic). For an in-depth analysis of Cardinal Lugo’s quote, see my book *Faith Before the Mass: Cardinal Lugo’s Quote Taken Out of Context by Heretics*.

Now for the Dimonds' hypocrisy: Unlike others who use this quote from Lugo, the Dimonds correctly believe that Cardinal Lugo does teach that Catholics are forbidden to knowingly attend the Masses of and pray in communion with and receive the sacraments from notorious heretics. The underlining is mine:

Peter Dimond, *Questions, Answers and Comments*, Answer to Question 30: "Please note that Cardinal de Lugo also points out that if circumstances are such that scandal or a denial of the Faith would necessarily arise (e.g., if the priest made an announcement that everyone who attends must agree with him, such as the priests of the SSPV), then you necessarily couldn't go; or if the priest is notorious about his heresy, then you definitely shouldn't go."²⁰

"A Catholic can never support such a priest and thereby assist him in the propagation of heresy, but he could attend his Mass in order to receive the Sacrament if the priest professes to be Catholic and is not notorious about his heresy."

But what does Peter do to get around the dogma that Catholics are forbidden to attend the Masses of and pray in communion with and receive the sacraments from notorious heretics, while not seeming to deny it? He denies the Church's definition of a notorious-in-fact heretic. Peter believes that a priest who is an undeclared heretic cannot also be a notorious heretic unless the priest publicly teaches his heresy to his parishioners and also imposes his heretical beliefs upon them as a condition for attending his Masses and receiving the sacraments from him. The underlining is Peter's:

Peter Dimond, *The Heretical Society of Pius V*, 2003: "When priests make public announcements that are heretical, which impose the heretical belief upon the people attending the Mass, then a Catholic must not attend the Mass or receive Holy Communion from such a priest. ... This is not the case with a heretical independent, C.M.R.I. or SSPX priest who has not made an announcement such as this; in fact, most of the C.M.R.I, independent, SSPX and Byzantine priests (who hold to the same heresy as the SSPV) are silent about their heresies (and therefore they are not *notorious* heretics), and they don't impose them upon anyone, so that receiving Communion from them (as long as one does not support or agree with them) is not a denial or a compromise of the Faith. But the SSPV has placed itself in another category - the category of notorious heretics who impose their heresy upon the people attending their Masses - which puts their Masses and their sacraments off limits."

According to Peter, a priest who is an undeclared heretic who does not publicly teach his heresy to his flock and also impose his heresy upon them as a condition for attending his Mass and praying in communion with him and receiving sacraments from him cannot be a notorious heretic. Peter teaches that priests who are undeclared heretics "are not notorious heretics" as long as they do not "make public announcements that are heretical, which impose the heretical belief upon the people attending the Mass." Therefore, according to Peter, even if this priest teaches his heresy to others in word and deed, in conversations, in speeches, in catechism classes, in books, articles, and letters, he is not a notorious heretic unless he imposes his heretical beliefs on others. This belief of the Dimonds is not only illogical but also heresy for denying the Church dogma regarding

²⁰ Notice Peter's weak and equivocal use of the words "you definitely shouldn't go" to the Masses of priests who are notorious heretics. He is implying that Catholics are allowed to attend their Masses if they want to, but they really shouldn't because it is not a very nice thing to do. Hence he implies they incur no penalty that is mortal to their souls if they should decide to go. If Peter really believes that it is a dogma that Catholics are forbidden to knowingly pray in communion with notorious heretics, he should have said, "You are forbidden to go under pain of mortal sin." Those are the correct words to use, not the weak and equivocal words "you definitely shouldn't go." That is like telling someone that he definitely should not do something, like drink poison, without telling him the reason why or the consequence if he does.

notorious-in-fact heretics. An undeclared heretic becomes a notorious heretic by notoriety of fact in two ways:

1. He becomes a notorious heretic when he makes his heresy known to others.
2. He becomes a notorious heretic the instant he places his heresy in the public domain even if no one has yet heard or read it.

You will find no good or bad theologian who teaches that an undeclared heretic must also impose his heresy on others to become a notorious heretic. I quote from my book *Heresy and Heretics*: Formal heretics are notorious or occult heretics:

Notoriety of fact

A formal heretic's sin of heresy is notorious by notoriety of fact if his heresy is in the public domain apart from a declaratory sentence from a competent judge or a confession from the offender:

1917 Code of Canon Law: "Canon 2197, §3. An offense is notorious by notoriety of fact, if it is publicly known and committed under such circumstances that it cannot be concealed by any subterfuge, nor excused by any excuse admitted in law (i.e., both the fact of the offense and the imputability or criminal liability must be publicly known)."

The offender's guilt is so certain that if he were brought to trial, he would have no excuse admitted by law; and because his heresy is in the public domain, he is a notorious heretic. Hence, when an offender's sin of heresy is notorious in fact, men can know that the offender is a formal heretic without the need of a declaratory sentence from a competent judge or a confession from the offender."

The two ways that a notorious-in-fact crime is public

There are two ways an offender's sin of heresy, as well as any other crime, is public without the need of a declaratory sentence from a competent judge or a confession from the offender: 1) When enough people know of the offender's crime; 2) When the offender's crime can easily be known to the public even if not one person knows of it:

1917 Code of Canon Law: "Canon 2197, §1. An offense is public, if it has already been divulged, or if it was committed under or attended by such circumstances that its divulcation may and must be prudently considered easily possible."

A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law, on Canon 2197: "The Code calls an offense public when knowledge of it has been spread among the people (*divulgatum*), or when it was committed under circumstances which make it practically impossible to keep the offense secret."²¹

End of excerpt

Hence the Catholic Church condemns the Dimonds and anyone who teaches that an undeclared heretic becomes an undeclared notorious heretic only if he imposes his heresy on others. By pretending that priests who are undeclared notorious heretics are not notorious heretics but only undeclared heretics whose heresy is less than notorious, the Dimonds deceive their readers who are inclined to put the Mass before the Faith. In this

²¹ *A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law*, Woywod and Smith, vol. II, c. 2197, p. 448-449.

way the Dimonds, speaking for the Devil, have deceived their readers who are worthy of being deceived into knowingly attending the Masses of and praying in communion with and receiving the sacraments from notorious heretics. Thus Dimonds assist the Devil in holding fast these souls in mortal sin upon mortal sin: *“Woe to you, apostate children, saith the Lord, that you would take counsel, and not of me: and would begin a web, and not by my spirit, that you might add sin upon sin.”* (Isa. 30:1)

CMRI example

What follows is more evidence of the Dimonds’ illogical and heretical teaching regarding who is a notorious-in-fact heretic. They present evidence which proves that Bishop Mark Pivarunus and the priests of his heretical CMRI sect are undeclared obstinate heretics for denying the Salvation Dogma; yet, Peter teaches that Catholics are allowed to attend Mass at CMRI churches and pray in communion with and receive the sacraments from CMRI priests. The underlining is mine:

Peter Dimond, *The Heretical CMRI*: “The priests of the CMRI are one of the only sedevacantist priestly societies in the world, and their Masses constitute the only legitimate option for valid sacraments for some people today... However, we have pointed out in our newsletters and magazines the unfortunate yet undeniable fact that the priests of the CMRI are heretics (as will be shown below). The priests of the CMRI are heretics first and foremost for their obstinate denial of the solemnly defined dogma that the Catholic Faith is necessary for salvation. The CMRI twice published in their Quarterly Magazine an article entitled, ‘The Salvation of Those Outside the Church.’ The article indicates that those who die as non-Catholics can be saved, which is a blatant rejection of Catholic teaching. In fact, the title of the article ‘The Salvation of Those Outside the Church’ is a word for word denial of the Catholic dogma ‘Outside the Church there is no salvation.’ It is equivalent to publishing an article entitled: ‘The Original Sin of Mary.’”

Every CMRI priest that Peter spoke to denied the Salvation Dogma:

Peter Dimond, *The Heretical CMRI*: “This heresy was so blatant that I called the headquarters of the CMRI in Washington and spoke to one of the priests about the article. He told me that he had ‘no problem with it.’ A priest from the CMRI’s seminary in Nebraska and a nun from the CMRI convent in Washington told me (when I questioned them over the telephone) that non-Catholics who die in their false religions can be saved without the Catholic faith. This has been the response of every priest of the CMRI that I have questioned about this issue.”

Notice that Peter clearly denounces the CMRI priests as obstinate (meaning formal) heretics but nevertheless teaches that “their Masses constitute the only legitimate option for valid sacraments for some people today.” Therefore, while Peter believes the CMRI priests are undeclared obstinate heretics, he also believes they are not undeclared notorious heretics because if they were he would not say Catholics are allowed to attend their Masses because he correctly believes Catholics are forbidden to attend the Masses of and pray in communion with notorious heretics. Hence Peter denies the very definition of an undeclared notorious heretic. An obstinate undeclared heretic whose heresy is in the public domain is a notorious heretic, by the very definition of a notorious-in-fact heretic.

According to the Dimonds, no matter how much and how certain the public evidence is against the CMRI priests for teaching heresy, these priests cannot be notorious heretics unless they also impose their heresy on others. That is why the Dimonds teach that Catholics are allowed to attend the Masses of CMRI priests in spite of the fact that the Dimonds have denounced them as obstinate heretics. Peter says that “The priests of the CMRI are one of the only sedevacantist priestly societies in the world, and their Masses constitute the only legitimate option for valid sacraments for some people today...”

However...the priests of the CMRI are heretics first and foremost for their obstinate denial of the solemnly defined dogma that the Catholic Faith is necessary for salvation.” Again, although Peter teaches that these priests are obstinate heretics, he does not believe they are notorious heretics. The bold type and underlining are mine:

Peter Dimond, *The Heretical Society of Pius V*, 2003: “When priests make public announcements that are heretical, which impose the heretical belief upon the people attending the Mass, then a Catholic must not attend the Mass or receive Holy Communion from such a priest. ...This is not the case with a heretical independent, C.M.R.I. or SSPX priest who has not made an announcement such as this; in fact, most of the C.M.R.I, independent, SSPX and Byzantine priests (who hold to the same heresy as the SSPV) are silent about their heresies (and therefore they are not notorious heretics), and they don't impose them upon anyone, so that receiving Communion from them (as long as one does not support or agree with them) is not a denial or a compromise of the Faith.”

Peter says the CMRI priests are silent about their heresies! If so, then how does he know they teach heresy so that he could denounce them as obstinate heretics? If they were truly silent about their heresies, then they would be occult heretics; and hence no mere man on earth, and that includes Peter, would know about their heresies.

The worst part of the Dimonds' hypocritical and heretical teaching regarding notorious heretics is that they are leading people into the jaws of the Devil and his heretical ministers to be devoured by them, one by one. According to the Dimonds, as long as the laymen freely accept the heresies taught to them by their heretical priest and the priest does not impose his heretical belief on them, Catholics can continue to attend the Masses of and pray in communion with and receive the sacraments from this priest. That is like saying that a pedophile priest should be allowed to have sexual relations with children as long as he does not impose his perversion on them, as long as the children freely consent to the priest's perversion. The Dimonds would say this priest is an obstinate pedophile but not a notorious pedophile and hence Catholics are allowed to continue to feed their children to him. According to the Dimonds, no matter how many souls are being taught, seduced, and devoured by a priest's heresy, you can continue to attend this priest's Masses and even bring your children so that you and your children may also be taught, seduced, and devoured by his heresy, as long as the people freely embrace the heresy without coercion from the priest. People are always inclined to believe those in positions of authority, such as a bishop over a priest and a priest over a layman. The longer laymen attend the Masses of a publicly heretical priest, the greater the odds are that he will teach his heresy to them in some forum or another and hence the greater the danger of their believing in his heresy. But the worst part is that when laymen attend the Masses of and pray in communion with and receive the sacraments from a priest whom they know is a notorious heretic, they commit mortal sins of omission and association, as well as other mortal sins, regardless if they embrace the priest's heresy or not. So the Dimonds are not really concerned if people fall prey to the priest's heresy but only if they are forced to believe in the priest's heresy in order to attend his Masses. The Dimonds do not really care if their gullible readers fall into one mortal sin of heresy after another, as long as they have a valid Mass to attend with valid priests. The apostate Dimonds “*are blind, and leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both fall into the pit.*” (Mt. 15:14) God is just!

SSPV example

We will now expose more of the Dimonds' illogical and heretical teaching about notorious-in-fact heretics. The Dimonds teach that, just like the CMRI priests, Bishop Kelley's Society of Pius V is a heretical sect and all its priests are obstinate heretics, which means formal heretics. Well, this is certainly true! Yet while knowing and teaching that the SSPV priests are obstinate heretics, Peter also taught that Catholics were allowed to attend the Masses of and pray in communion with and receive the sacraments from the SSPV priests, all of whom he acknowledges are obstinate heretics. The underlining is mine:

Peter Dimond, *Important Update on the Heretical Society of Pius V*: "In our magazines and newsletters we have emphasized that the priests of the Society of Pius V all believe that members of non-Catholic religions can be saved without the Catholic faith, which is totally heretical, as it rejects the defined dogma that without the Catholic Faith no one is saved (*de fide*). The priests of the SSPV, therefore, are not Catholic, but (unfortunately) they are obstinate heretics. ... In fact, Fr. Baumberger, a member of the SSPV, stated in the presence of the superior of our Monastery that Buddhists can be united to the Catholic Church without believing in Christ, which means that Buddhists can be saved without being Catholic or believing in Jesus Christ."

Yet two paragraphs later Peter goes on to teach that Catholics are allowed to attend the Masses of and pray in communion with and receive the sacraments from these obstinate heretics. The underlining is mine:

Peter Dimond, *Important Update on the Heretical Society of Pius V*: "...This is why we have taken pains to strenuously point out to those who attend the Masses of the SSPV (or the C.M.R.I., Society of St. Pius X, Byzantine churches, and almost all independent 'traditional' priests, etc. who believe the same way) that they cannot give them any financial support under pain of mortal sin, for this would actually constitute a denial of the faith by donating to a heretical organization."

Peter heretically believes that obstinate heretics are not notorious heretics as long as they do not impose their heresy on others. According to Peter, not until the SSPV priests, whom he correctly denounces as obstinate heretics, impose their heresy on others as a condition for attending their Masses and for receiving the sacraments do they become notorious heretics. The underlining is mine:

Peter Dimond, *Important Update on the Heretical Society of Pius V*: "However, this is no longer an option. I repeat (as this undoubtedly has relevance to many reading this notice) the SSPV Masses should not be attended even when one doesn't give them any support; for it has been brought to our attention from various sources that the priests of the Society of Pius V have recently and consistently been making announcements before their traditional Masses (and it seems to be occurring at all of their chapels almost every week!) that no one who holds to the "errors of Fr. Feeney" should receive Holy Communion."

Hence Peter is teaching that Catholics are allowed to attend the Masses of priests whom they know are formal heretics (obstinate heretics) as long as these priests do not impose their heresy on others as a condition for attending their Masses or receiving the sacraments from them. This, again, proves that Peter does not believe the Church dogma and law that undeclared obstinate heretics whose sin of heresy is in the public domain are notorious heretics.

Even what Peter does teach regarding obstinate heretics is heresy; that is, that Catholics are allowed to attend the Masses of and pray in communion with and receive the sacraments from obstinate heretics whose heretical guilt is hence *beyond doubt* and

therefore their churches are *beyond doubt* non-Catholic churches and thus are *beyond doubt* meeting houses of heretics:

III Council of Constantinople, 680-681: "If any ecclesiastic or layman shall go into the synagogue of the Jews or the meeting-houses of the heretics to join in prayer with them, let them be deposed and deprived of communion. If any bishop or priest or deacon shall join in prayer with heretics, let him be suspended from communion."

Michael Dimond's lie in this matter

Now to expose a lie in this matter by Michael Dimond and possibly by Peter. Before Peter even entered Michael's so-called monastery, Michael knew that the SSPV sect and its priests had banned Feeneyites from attending their Masses because Feeneyites believe in the Salvation Dogma and the absolute necessity of baptism by water for salvation. Whether Michael told Peter all the details about the confrontation with Fr. Baumberger that Peter speaks about above, I do not know. If Michael did, then Peter is lying in this matter also. Lying is nothing new with the Dimonds because obstinate heretics always lie when they are cornered instead of admitting they are wrong.

You may be wondering how I know about what went on during the confrontation between Michael and Fr. Baumberger. I have first-hand evidence. I was there! It was I and not Michael who confronted Fr. Baumberger. And it was I who did the talking, not Michael. I was a member of Michael's so-called monastery when Michael and I attended Fr. Baumberger's Mass at the SSPV church in Rochester, New York. After Mass Fr. Baumberger asked to speak with us. He first said we were heretics for not believing in the "Three Baptisms." I then presented our opinion that there are not three baptisms but only one, baptism by water. After arguing the baptism issue at length, Fr. Baumberger said that every catechumen he baptizes is already sanctified by baptism of desire; hence he heretically reduced the sacrament of baptism to a mere initiation rite for those with the use of reason. I then confronted Fr. Baumberger about the Salvation Dogma. I said to him, "The main reason people attack Fr. Feeney is because he believed in the Salvation Dogma. Consequently, I strongly suspect you are a salvation heretic."

He said, "No! I do not deny the dogma 'Outside the Catholic Church there is no salvation.'"

I then proceeded to firmly interrogate him. I asked him, "Do you believe that a Buddhist can implicitly believe in Jesus Christ, possess the Catholic faith, and be inside the Catholic Church while he worships his false god and practices his false religion and hence be in the way of salvation?"

He said without hesitation, "Absolutely! He can and would be in the way of salvation and when he dies can be saved as such, as a self-professed Buddhist."

I then said, "I knew it, I knew it! You are a salvation heretic just as I suspected, and you are an abomination!" He then told Michael and me that we and all Feeneyites are forbidden to attend the Masses of the SSPV priests and receive the sacraments because we are Feeneyites.

Now the point is that Michael knew that SSPV priests had banned Feeneyites from their Masses long before Peter Dimond (then Bob Dimond) entered the so-called monastery. Knowing this, Michael allowed Peter to teach that Catholics are allowed to attend the Masses of the SSPV priests as long as these priests do not impose their heresy on others as a condition for attending their Masses, even though Michael knew long ago that the SSPV priests *did* impose their heresies on others. Michael is guilty of lying,

sinning by omission, and impugning the known truth. And if Michael had told Peter all the details regarding this confrontation, then Peter is likewise guilty of lying, sinning by omission, and impugning the known truth. This is nothing new with the Dimonds, just one more lie and sin of omission among many.

Dimonds teach that the apostate antipopes are not notorious heretics

Because of the Dimonds' heretical belief as to who is a notorious heretic, the Dimonds believe that the apostate antipopes, bishops, and priests of the apostate Vatican II Church are not notorious heretics because these clerics do not impose their heresies on others as a condition for attending their Masses and praying in communion with them and receiving the sacraments from them. In fact, the apostate clerics of the Vatican II Church allow anyone—from Protestants and schismatics to Talmudic Jews and Moslems—to attend their Masses and pray in communion with them, and many of the Vatican II clerics even give the sacraments to Protestants and schismatics. Hence, according to the Dimonds, the Vatican II clerics are not notorious heretics and apostates. Indeed, that is why the Dimonds teach that Catholics are allowed to attend the Masses of and pray in communion with and receive the sacraments from heretical and apostate Vatican II clerics as long as the priests are valid and offer the Tridentine Mass. The Dimonds not only preach this heresy, but also practice it. They themselves attend Mass at an Eastern Rite Vatican II church, St. Josaphat's in Rochester, New York, and hence pray in communion with and receive the sacraments from the heretical and apostate priests of the Vatican II Church; and in so doing, the Dimonds also pray in communion with apostate Antipope Benedict XVI because these priests pray in communion with apostate Antipope Benedict XVI in the *una cum* prayer during the Mass. You should now be able to see how the Dimonds have deceived their gullible readers into attending the Masses of and praying in communion with and receiving the sacraments from notorious heretics by simply declaring these notorious heretics as not notorious heretics. Even more amazing is that the Dimonds "prophesied" almost as a dogma of faith that John Paul II was the Antichrist while they taught that he was not a notorious heretic and notorious apostate; and hence they prayed in communion with John Paul II during Mass at St. Josaphat's Church, and taught others that they can do the same. If anyone does not believe that the Dimonds attended or attend Mass at the church just mentioned, just call them up at (585) 567-4433 and ask them what church they attend Mass at now and what church they attended Mass at when John Paul II was the leader of the Vatican II Church. If they cowardly refuse to answer you, then that ought to be enough for you to know that not only are the Dimonds guilty of the crimes I have denounced them for, but that they also know they are guilty because they are ashamed to let others know. They are spiritual fornicators who are ashamed of their crimes and hence keep them secret in the same way a harlot who is ashamed of her physical fornications keeps her crimes secret. If the Dimonds have nothing to hide, if they have done no wrong, then why hide the facts from others?

Dimonds' donation hypocrisy

Once again I will expose the Dimonds' donation hypocrisy in which they place carnal things over spiritual things. The Dimonds teach that Catholics are not allowed to

financially support heretical churches and priests who are obstinate undeclared heretics, and that is certainly true:

Peter Dimond, *The Heresies of the Society of St. Pius X*: “Thus, no one can give any financial support to the Society of St. Pius X under pain of mortal sin. Those who continue to do so obstinately – while being aware of this information – will not save their souls. One could attend the SSPX’s Masses and receive sacraments from them, provided one does not agree with them or support them at all, and if the SSPX priest does not notoriously preach or impose the SSPX’s heresies at the chapel.”

This proves that the Dimonds do not believe that these churches are Catholic churches and that these priests are Catholic priests. If the Dimonds believed these churches are Catholic churches and these priests are Catholic priests, then the Dimonds would be committing a mortal sin for telling Catholics that they are not obliged to support the Catholic church where they attend Mass and the Catholic priest who offers them his ministrations. Hence, from this alone, the Dimonds are teaching that Catholics are allowed to knowingly attend Mass at non-Catholic churches (at meeting houses of heretics or schismatics) and hence knowingly pray in communion with non-Catholic priests (obstinate heretics), a practice which the Catholic Church has infallibly condemned:

III Council of Constantinople, 680-681: “If any ecclesiastic or layman shall go into the synagogue of the Jews or the meeting-houses of the heretics to join in prayer with them, let them be deposed and deprived of communion. If any bishop or priest or deacon shall join in prayer with heretics, let him be suspended from communion.”

In this we see how the Dimonds have placed carnal things over spiritual things. The Dimonds teach that while Catholics are forbidden to give non-Catholic priests and non-Catholic churches material (financial) support, they are allowed to give them spiritual support by attending the Masses of and praying in communion with and receiving the sacraments from these non-Catholic priests (obstinate heretics) in their non-Catholic churches (meeting houses of heretics).

To emphasize their correct teaching that Catholics are not allowed to give financial support to non-Catholic churches and non-Catholic priests, the Dimonds compare the SSPX sect to the Greek schismatic sect:

Peter Dimond, *Questions, Answers and Comments*, Question 2: “The bottom-line is that one cannot donate money to any organization that propagates heresies and leads souls to hell, as the SSPX does. It is true that they do some good things which can benefit people, but so do the Greek Orthodox. If one can donate to the SSPX, then one can donate to the Greek Orthodox or any schismatic group or the Indult priests which have valid sacraments...”

However, Peter did not say that “If one is forbidden to attend Mass at Greek schismatic churches and pray in communion with and receive the sacraments from Greek schismatic priests, then one is likewise forbidden to attend Mass at SSPX schismatic churches and pray in communion with SSPX schismatic priests.” Peter conveniently left out the Catholic Church’s dogmatic teachings that Catholics are also forbidden to knowingly give *spiritual* support to Greek schismatic churches by attending their Masses and praying in communion with Greek schismatics:

Council of Laodicea, 4th Century: “No one shall pray in common with heretics and schismatics.”

The Communication of Catholics with Schismatics, Rev. Ignatius J. Szal, A.B., J.C.L., 1948: “Article I—Active Participation (*Canon 1258, §1*): If the worship is Catholic in form but is

undertaken under the auspices of a non-Catholic body (as in the celebration of Mass by a schismatic priest), it expresses either faith in a false religious body or rebellion against the true Church. [Hence] active religious participation with schismatics is always intrinsically illicit. The reasons for this absolute prohibition of canon 1258, §1, have their origin in the natural and positive divine law. These reasons are: 1) The Church is the only *de jure* existing true religious society in which it is licit to render to God the worship that is due Him; 2) the giving of scandal through one's quasi-approval of a false sect must be avoided; and 3) the danger of perversion from the true faith must remain effectively neutralized." (pp. 42-48)

By comparing the SSPX sect to the Greek schismatic sect—which after Bishop Lefebvre's schismatic consecrations is a true comparison—the Dimonds teach by implication that Catholics are allowed to attend Mass at Greek schismatic churches and pray in communion with Greek schismatic priests (who are also obstinate heretics) because the Dimonds teach that Catholics are allowed to attend Mass at SSPX schismatic churches and pray in communion with SSPX schismatic priests (who are also obstinate heretics). In this we see that the Dimonds are more concerned about carnal things than spiritual things and therefore they attend Mass at churches that they know *beyond all doubt* are non-Catholic churches and pray in communion with priests whom they know *beyond all doubt* are obstinate heretics and hence notorious heretics—even though the Dimonds deny that public obstinate heretics are by that very fact notorious heretics.

I warn you readers, yet again, to denounce and avoid the Dimonds like the plague or you will surely share in their punishment from God and their utter destruction here on earth and in hell if they do not repent and convert in the time God has allotted for them to do so.

Date: February 2007