

Against Thomas More



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

*Júdica me, Deus, et discérne causam meam de gente non sancta:
ab hómine iníquo, et dolóso érue me*

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam

Thomas More (1477-1535)
Patron Satan of Non-Judgmentalists



A Satan for All Seasons

As Thomas More was indeed a heretic for all seasons,
so indeed must he be denounced as a heretic in all seasons:

*“Preach the word: be instant in season, out of season:
reprove, entreat, rebuke in all patience and doctrine.
For there shall be a time when they will not endure sound doctrine;
but according to their own desires,
they will heap to themselves teachers having itching ears:
And will indeed turn away their hearing from the truth but will be turned unto fables.”*
(2 Timothy 4:2-4)

Original version: 10/2009; Current version: 9/2014

Mary’s Little Remnant

302 East Joffre St.

TorC, NM 87901-2878

Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us

(Send for a free catalog)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

HIS HERETICAL SINS OF OMISSION AND COMMISSION	7
<i>Thomas More and the Anglican Heresy and Mr. X and the Arian Heresy.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>The Notoriously Heretical and Schismatic Anglican Oath.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>The Heretic Thomas More’s Deadly Silence</i>	<i>11</i>
More tries to save his life and soul by remaining silent but loses both	12
<i>The Heretic Thomas More’s Follow-Your-Conscience Heresy</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>The Evidence Against the Heretic Thomas More</i>	<i>18</i>
More’s mortal sins of omission and follow-your-conscience heresy	18
More left a friend in doubt and wished him luck when he denied the dogma	18
More’s wife tells him to take the Oath and his daughter took the Oath	19
More prays with his heretic family and says they are worthy of heaven.....	20
More’s sins of omission when in prison and under examination	20
More says his silence about the Oath means consent to the heresy in it	21
More professes the dogma only after he is condemned to death	21
More sinned by omission and remained in religious communion with the heretics to the day he died	22
HIS HERETICAL AND IDOLATROUS HUMANISM AND UTOPIA.....	24
<i>His Humanism</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>His Utopia</i>	<i>24</i>
Respects and promulgates false gods and false religions	25
Promotes women priests	26
Puts priests above the law	26
Legalizes suicide and euthanasia.....	27
Legalizes divorce	27
Forbids private property	27
He practiced what he preached	28

His Heretical Sins of Omission and Commission

Thomas More and the Anglican Heresy and Mr. X and the Arian Heresy

The Arian crisis that infected the whole Catholic world in the 4th century was similar to the Anglican crisis that infected all of England in 1534. Both heresies involved the denial of basic dogmas. The Arian heresy denied the basic dogmas of the Most Holy Trinity and the divinity of Jesus Christ. The Anglican heresy denied the basic dogma that the pope is the supreme head of the Catholic Church throughout the whole world. This same basic dogma of the supremacy of the pope over the Catholic Church was denied in 1054 by the Eastern schismatics about 500 years before the Anglican crisis. In any situation that involves heresy or apostasy or schism, Catholics are obliged to condemn the heresy or schism or apostasy, denounce the offenders as heretics or schismatics or apostates, avoid them in religious matters, and punish them if it is within their power to do so. So-called Catholics who do not sufficiently do these things when they are obliged to, share equally in the guilt of the offender and thus are either heretics or schismatics or apostates.¹ You will learn in this book that the heretic Thomas More did none of these necessary Catholic things in regard to the Anglican heresy and heretics. Whereas St. Athanasius and other good Catholics did all of these necessary Catholic things during the Arian crisis:

Letter of St. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, to his flock: “May God console you! What saddens you is the fact that others have occupied the churches [Catholic churches that became Arian churches] by violence, while during this time you are on the outside. It is a fact that they have the premises—but you have the Apostolic Faith. They can occupy our churches, but **they are outside the true Faith**. You remain outside the places of worship, but the Faith dwells within you. ... They are the ones who have broken away from it in the present crisis. ... They claim that they represent the Church; but in reality, they are the ones who are expelling themselves from it and going astray. Even if Catholics faithful to Tradition are reduced to a handful, then they are the ones who represent the true Church of Jesus Christ.”²

St. Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria, to the Solitaries, Second letter to Monks, Letter 53: “Athanasius to those who practise a solitary life, and are settled in faith in God, most beloved brethren, greeting in the Lord. I thank the Lord who hath given to you to believe in Him, that ye too may have with the saints eternal life. But because there are certain persons who hold with Arius and go about the monasteries with no other object save that under colour of visiting you, and returning from us they may deceive the simple; whereas there are certain who, while they affirm that they do not hold with Arius, yet compromise themselves and worship with his party; I have been compelled, at the instance of certain most sincere brethren, to write at once in order that keeping faithfully and without guile the pious faith which God’s grace works in you, you may not give occasion of scandal to the brethren. For when any sees you, the faithful in Christ, associate and communicate with such people, [or worshipping along with them], certainly they will think it a matter of indifference and will fall into the mire of irreligion. Lest, then, this should happen, be pleased, beloved, to shun those who hold the impiety of Arius, and moreover to avoid those who, while they pretend not to hold with Arius, yet worship with the impious. And we are specially bound to fly from the communion of men whose

¹ See RJMI book *Sins of Omission*.

² Coll. selecta SS. Eccl. Patrum, Caillau and Guillou, vol. 32, pp. 411-412.

opinions we hold in execration. If then any come to you, and, as blessed John says, brings with him right doctrine, say to him, All hail, and receive such an one as a brother. But if any pretend that he confesses the right faith, but appear to communicate with those others, exhort him to abstain from such communion, and if he promise to do so, treat him as a brother, but if he persist in a contentious spirit, him avoid. I might greatly lengthen my letter, adding from the divine Scriptures the outline of this teaching. But since, being wise men, you can anticipate those who write, and rather, being intent upon self-denial, are fit to instruct others also, I have dictated a short letter, as from one loving friend to others, in the confidence that living as you do you will preserve a pure and sincere faith, and that those persons, seeing that you do not join with them in worship, will derive benefit, fearing lest they be accounted as impious, and as those who hold with them.”

St. Hermenegild denounced his Arian heretic father, as well as all the Arian heretics, and refused to be in any kind of religious communion with them:

Pope St. Gregory the Great, *The Dialogues*: “It was the feast of Easter. At an early hour of the night when all was still, his wicked father sent an Arian bishop to him with this message, that if he [Hermenegild] would receive Communion from his hands (the Communion of a sacrilegious consecration!) he should be restored to favor. True to his Creator, the man of God gave a merited reproof to the Arian bishop, and, with holy indignation, rejected his sinful offer; for though his body lay prostrate in chains, his soul stood on ground beyond the reach of tyranny. The bishop therefore returned whence he had come. The Arian father raged, and straightaway sent his lictors, bidding them to repair to the prison of the unflinching confessor of the Lord, and murder him on the spot. They obeyed: they entered the prison; they cleft his skull with a sword; they took away the life of the body, and slew what he, the slain one, had sworn to count as vile. Miracles soon followed, which testified to the true glory of Hermenegild...”

You will see that the heretic Thomas More was no St. Athanasius and no St. Hermenegild nor was he even Catholic. Regarding the Anglican heresy, Thomas More did the exact opposite of what St. Athanasius and St. Hermenegild did regarding the Arian heresy. You will learn that the heretic Thomas More did not condemn the Anglican heresy as heresy nor denounce the Anglican heretics as heretics nor avoid them in religious matters. Instead, he confirmed and encouraged them in their heresy, prayed with them, blessed them, treated them as good Catholics who were worthy of heaven—even though he personally did not believe the heresy! So we add the mortal sin of hypocrisy to Thomas More.

I will compare the heretic Thomas More to Mr. X who lived in the 4th century during the Arian crisis when almost every Catholic lost the faith and fell outside the Catholic Church for embracing the Arian heresy that Jesus is not God. The Arian heresy is also apostasy because it denies the Most Holy Trinity and the divinity of Jesus Christ. But for the sake of comparing the Arian heresy to the Anglican heresy that the pope is not the supreme head of the Catholic Church on earth, I will refer to the Arian heresy and apostasy simply as heresy.

Arian heretics ruled the town in which Mr. X lived. The Mayor of the city commanded that all the citizens must take a Profession of Faith that contained the Arian heresy that Jesus is not God. Now almost everyone in the town took the Profession, including Mr. X’s wife, daughter, and all his friends. However, Mr. X refused to take the Profession but never told anyone why he refused to take it. Mr. X was asked time and time again the following question: “Do you refuse to take the Profession because you believe Jesus is

God?” And Mr. X gave the same answer time and time again: “I will not tell you.” At times he even said, “I did not say I believe Jesus is God.” And when asked if he believed Jesus is not God, he said, “I did not say that I believe Jesus is not God. I said nothing regarding this matter, so you cannot know what I believe.” Hence Mr. X sinned by omission and scandal and implicitly denied the dogma he secretly believed in and thus was a formal heretic. While thousands of souls were embracing this heresy and falling outside the Catholic Church, Mr. X did nothing to stop them from embracing the heresy. And even worse, Mr. X confirmed and encouraged them in their heresy. He said that he would never attempt to prevent or discourage anyone from taking the Profession nor denounce anyone who took it. Instead, he said he admired them for taking the Profession and wished one of his friends “good luck” when he took it. Previous to taking the Profession, this same friend asked Mr. X to help him because he was beginning to doubt the dogma that Jesus is God and hence was about to take the Profession. Mr. X said, “I will not tell you or anyone what I believe. I will remain silent. You must follow your own conscience and not worry if you do.” Hence Mr. X did not profess the dogma to his friend who doubted it and even encouraged him by letting him think there were no mortal consequences for taking the Profession and believing that Jesus is not God. A week later, his friend takes the Profession because he believes Jesus is not God and tells Mr. X. Instead of denouncing his friend as a heretic and instructing him with the dogma that Jesus is God, Mr. X wishes his friend good luck for taking the heretical Profession.

And when Mr. X was asked if he thought the Mayor sinned for composing the Profession, he answered, “No. I speak no harm or ill against any man, especially the Mayor.” Hence he did not denounce the Mayor as a heretic and the Profession as heretical. Instead, he blessed them both by not attributing any harm or error in either. Mr. X believed there was nothing mortally wrong with believing Jesus is not God even though he himself believed Jesus is God. Mr. X believed that both those who believe Jesus is God and those who believe Jesus is not God are one in Christ, inside the Catholic Church, and Catholic brothers.

Even though Mr. X did not personally agree with the Profession and knew it contained a heresy, he believed that those who took the Profession and believed the heresy that Jesus is not God were inside the Catholic Church and could be saved in their heresy because they followed their own conscience. Hence Mr. X was a follow-your-conscience heretic. Follow-your-conscience heretics believe that men are saved by following and obeying their own conscience and not by following and obeying all of God’s commandments. In this way, Mr. X looks at all the Arian heretics surrounding him, his wife and daughter among them, as good Catholics who are worthy of heaven because they followed their own conscience in embracing the Arian heresy that Jesus is not God. Hence he prays with them, blesses them, and says they are worthy of heaven.

All this time Mr. X never lets anyone know whether he believes Jesus is God or Jesus is not God. He remains silent about why he would not take the Profession. When Mr. X was eventually brought to trial, he was told that his silence would be taken to mean that he did not consent to the belief that Jesus is not God. Mr. X then answered, “If anything, my silence means that I *consent* to the belief that Jesus is not God.” Hence, he scandalized everyone who heard him by giving them the impression that he believes Jesus is not God. Not until he was sentenced to death for his silence did Mr. X finally say what he believed about the Profession. Only then did he say that the Profession had no

right to say Jesus is not God because Jesus is God. But even then he never said the Profession is heretical or that the belief that Jesus is not God is heresy or that anyone who believes in this heresy is a heretic. And even after his death sentence and up to the moment of his death, he never condemned the heresy as heresy nor denounced those who believed in it, such as his daughter, as heretics. Instead, he treated them as Catholics and remained in religious communion with the Arian heretics by praying with them and asking them to pray for him and by referring to them as worthy of heaven, such as his daughter.

How does the behavior of this heretic and coward Mr. X who did not condemn the Arian heresy as heresy nor denounce those who held the heresy as heretics nor avoid them in religious matters compare to the behavior of St. Athanasius who condemned the heresy that Jesus is not God as heresy and denounced those who held the heresy as heretics who are outside the Catholic Church and avoided them not only in religious matters but also in secular matters. Either Mr. X or Athanasius is Catholic but both cannot be Catholic! Either Mr. X or Athanasius is a true saint but both cannot be true saints. If Mr. X is Catholic and a true saint, then Athanasius is a schismatic for avoiding Catholics in religious matters and guilty of mortal sin for condemning as heresy the belief that Jesus is not God and for denouncing as heretics those who held it. If Athanasius is Catholic and a true saint, then Mr. X is a heretic and a coward for not condemning as heresy the belief that Jesus is not God and for not denouncing as heretics those who held it and for being in religious communion with the Arian heretics.

To understand the mortal guilt of the heretic Thomas More, just substitute in the above example the Arian heresy with the Anglican heresy and Mr. X with Thomas More. The heretic and coward Mr. X is the exact same as the heretic and coward Thomas More. The only difference is the basic dogma they denied.

The Notoriously Heretical and Schismatic Anglican Oath

Life and Writings of Sir Thomas More [hereafter LTM], by Rev. T. E. Bridgett: “[pp. 398-399] The parliament which More had opened in 1529 met for another session in November, 1534. It passed the following Acts... Chapter I. says: ‘Albeit the **king’s Majesty justly and rightfully is, and ought to be, supreme head of the Church of England**, and so is recognised by the clergy of this realm in their convocations; yet, nevertheless, for corroboration and confirmation thereof, and for increase of virtue in Christ’s religion within this realm of England, and to repress and extirpate all errors, heresies, and other enormities and abuses heretofore used in the same, be it enacted, by the authority of this present parliament, **that the king, our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted, and reputed, the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England**, called *Anglicana Ecclesia*, and shall have and enjoy, annexed and united to the imperial crown of this realm, as well the title and style thereof as all honours, dignities, immunities, profits, and commodities to the said dignity of supreme head of the said Church belonging and appertaining. **And that our said sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall have full power and authority, from time to time, to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities**, whatsoever they be, which by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction, ought to be or may lawfully be reformed, repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained, or amended, most to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue in Christ’s religion, or for the conservation of the peace, unity,

and tranquility of this realm, any usage, custom, foreign laws, foreign authority, prescription, or any other thing or things to the contrary hereof notwithstanding.’³

The Heretic Thomas More’s Deadly Silence

“If any one sin, and hear the voice of one swearing, and is a witness either because he himself hath seen, or is privy to it: if he do not utter it, he shall bear his iniquity.”
(Leviticus 5:1)

Even though Thomas More personally believed in the dogma that the pope is the head of the Catholic Church in England, his deadly silence in not professing this dogma when he was obliged to do so made him guilty of the mortal sin of heresy and schism for implicitly denying the Catholic faith by mortal sins of omission and for mortal sins of commission for remaining in religious communion with the Anglican heretics. And he committed the mortal sins of scandal and led innumerable souls to embrace or remain in the Anglican heresy and schism:

“If any one sin, and hear the voice of one swearing, and is a witness either because he himself hath seen, or is privy to it: if he do not utter it, he shall bear his iniquity.”
(Lev. 5:1)

“Son of man, I have made thee a watchman to the house of Israel: and thou shalt hear the word out of my mouth, and shalt tell it them from me. If, when I say to the wicked, Thou shalt surely die: thou declare it not to him, nor speak to him, that he may be converted from his wicked way, and live: the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but I will require his blood at thy hand.” (Ez. 3:17-18)

Catholic Commentary on Ez. 3:17: “**Require his blood:** Let none perish through thy neglect. ‘He kills the man whom he delivers up to death by silence.’ Pope St. Gregory I, hom. xi. 9.”

Catholic Commentary on Ez. 3:20: “**Iniquity:** For want of thy instruction or if thou neglect to reclaim him and he perish. Thy sin is great whatever become of him. But if he be damned, though he must blame himself chiefly, yet the blood of his soul shall cry for vengeance more than Abel’s. If thou neglect to attempt reclaiming him, thou shalt perish with him. (St. Gregory I)”

Catholic Commentary on Ez. 3:21: “**Warn:** It is the duty of a pastor to warn the just as well as sinners.”

“Now I beseech you, brethren, to mark them who make dissensions and offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learned and avoid them. For they that are such serve not Christ our Lord but their own belly: and by pleasing speeches and good words seduce the hearts of the innocent.” (Rom. 16:17-18)

Pope St. Leo the Great, *Letter 15*, to Turribius, Bishop of Asturia, 447: “XVII) ...When...they shrink from anathematizing by their written confession blasphemies which the whole world has already condemned, what do they wish men to understand except that they are not of the number of the brethren, but on the enemy’s side?”

³ *Life and Writings of Sir Thomas More* [hereafter LTM], by Rev. T. E. Bridgett. *Nihil Obstat:* Eduard O’Lavery, C.S.S.R., *Censor Deputatus.* Imprimatur: + Henricus Eduardus, Card. Archiep. Westmon., Feb. 6, 1891. Published by Burns and Oates, Ltd., and Benzinger Brothers, 1892. Chap. 22: Examination in Prison.

Pope St. Gregory the Great, Book 9, *Epistle 110*, To Theoderic and Theodebert, Kings of the Franks, 6th century: “Since he who neglects to amend what he is able to correct, undoubtedly has the guilt of the doer.”⁴

Pope St. Gregory the Great, Book 10, *Epistle 42*, to Eusebius, Archbishop of Thessalonica, 6th century: “...By consort with others [heretics] you...make the right faith which you hold, doubtful. For he who does not correct things that should be cut off commits them.”

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.”

Second Council of Constantinople, 553, confirmed by Pope St. Leo II in 683: “Sentence against the ‘Three Chapters’: ...It is clear to all believers that when a problem about the faith comes up it is not only the heretical person who is condemned but also the person who is in a position to correct the heresy of others and fails to do so.”

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

Invalid and Heretical *1917 Code of Canon Law*: “Canon 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 their neighbor.”

When almost all of England, More’s family included, took the heretical Oath and hence embraced the heresy that the King of England is the supreme head of the Catholic Church in England, Thomas More did not resist or oppose the heresy or those that took the heretical Oath but remained deadly silent and concealed the dogmatic truth that the pope is the supreme head of the Catholic Church in England and throughout the whole world. He said nothing about the Oath, one way or another, even though he refused to take it. Nor did he condemn the heresy nor denounce the heretics nor instruct them about the dogma. He took great pride in remaining silent about his belief that the pope is the head of the Catholic Church in England. He left everyone in suspense about what he believed in this extremely important dogmatic matter until after he was sentenced to death. Only after he was sentenced to death because of his silence did he then publicly profess the dogma, but even then he did not condemn the Oath as heretical nor denounce those who took it as heretics. Instead he referred to them as good Catholics and remained in religious communion with them.

More tries to save his life and soul by remaining silent but loses both

In several of his letters, Thomas More gives his reasons for remaining silent about the Oath—one reason was to do his best to save his physical life, and another was to not anger the king or give him undue trouble. He said,

⁴ “J. Joseph Ryan’s *Saint Peter Damiani and His Canonical Sources*, 58f, no. 104, cites John the Deacon, *Sancti Gregorii magni vita* 3.2 (PL 75.128C) and Gregory I, *Reg.* 9:215 (MG Epist. 2.202 [JE 1744]).”

LTM: “[p. 417] The Act of Parliament is like a two-edged sword, for if a man answer one way it will confound his soul, and if the other way it will confound his body.”

“[p. 421] Supposing a statute cut thus both ways like a two-edged sword, how could a man behave so as not to incur either damage. [Hence] I never did or said anything maliciously against the statute...”

“[p. 408] It was said unto me,... why did I not speak even plain out against the statute. It appeared well I was not content to die, though I said so. Whereto I answered, as the truth is, that I have not been a man of such holy living as I might be bold enough to offer myself to death...”

“[p. 402] At which time the Master Secretary said unto me... whether that I thought that the king’s Grace might not exact of me such things as are contained in the statutes, and upon like pains as he might upon other men. Whereunto I answered that I would not say the contrary... that I gave no man occasion to hold any point one or other, nor gave any man advice or counsel there in one way or other. ... **I do nobody harm, I say none harm, I think none harm, but wish everybody good.** And if this be not enough to keep a man alive...”

So More did not answer either way about his belief, hoping to save both his physical life and his soul and in so doing lost both. Yes, indeed the truth can cause your death, especially the truth of the gospel. To the heretic More apply the following words of Jesus:

“For whosoever will save his life, shall lose it: and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel, shall save it. For what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his soul?” (Mk. 8:35-36)

Well, the heretic and coward Thomas More saved his physical life for a few more days but ended up being sentenced to death anyway because of his silence. And as soon as he died, he then knew what those few extra days of life cost him—an eternity in hell! He mocks the blood of all the Catholic martyrs who were tortured and died rather than deny the Catholic faith by sins of omission or commission.

The Heretic Thomas More’s Follow-Your-Conscience Heresy

*“You have wearied the Lord with your words, and you said:
Wherein have we wearied him? In that you say:
Every one that doth evil is good in the sight of the Lord, and such please him.”*
(Malachias 2:17)

“Woe to you who call evil good.”
(Isaias 5:20)

Thomas More was also a follow-your-conscience heretic. He believed in the heresy that a man is saved by believing in and following his own conscience instead of by believing in and obeying all of God’s commandments as taught by the Holy Catholic Church. Even though he knew that the king and his wife, daughter, friends, and many others denied the dogma that the pope is the supreme head of the Church in England, he did not condemn their heresy nor denounce them as heretics. Instead, he encouraged them to follow their own conscience and keep their heretical beliefs and wished them luck for doing so and hoped they would all meet in heaven. This is what the heretic Thomas More

believed about these Anglican heretics and schismatics, a heretic people who committed no less a crime of heresy and schism than did the Greek Schismatics 500 years earlier! Well, if these Anglican heretics and schismatics were innocent and actually good Catholics, then so were the Greek Schismatics who also denied that the pope is the supreme head of the Catholic Church. Indeed, 431 years after the founding of the Anglican Church in 1534 and 30 years after apostate Antipope Pius XI canonized Thomas More in 1935 as a so-called saint, the apostate Antipope Paul VI declared the Greek Schismatics innocent and lifted the excommunication of the Greek Schismatics and their heretical and schismatic Church in 1965:

Apostate Antipope John Paul II, *Ut Unum Sint*, 1995: “17. My Predecessor, Pope John XXIII, understood this clearly: in calling the Council, he refused to separate renewal from ecumenical openness. At the conclusion of the Council, Pope Paul VI solemnly sealed the Council’s commitment to ecumenism, renewing the dialogue of charity with the Churches in communion with the Patriarch of Constantinople, and joining the Patriarch in the concrete and profoundly significant gesture which ‘condemned to oblivion’ and ‘removed from memory and from the midst of the Church’ the excommunications of the past.”

Apostate Antipope John Paul II, *Oriente Lumen*, 1995: “18. ...All this praiseworthy work was to converge in the reflections of the Second Vatican Council and to be symbolized in the abrogation of the reciprocal excommunications of 1054 by Pope Paul VI and the Ecumenical Patriarch Athrenagoras I.”

Here is what Thomas More said about the Anglican heresy and heretics and schismatics:

LTM: “[p. 402] I [Thomas More] gave no man occasion to hold any point one or other [regarding the heresy that the pope is not the supreme head of the Catholic Church in England], nor gave any man advice or counsel there in one way or other. ...**I do nobody harm, I say none harm, I think none harm, but wish everybody good.** ...**Your conscience will save you and my conscience will save me.** ...Pray to God for me, but trouble not yourselves [Anglican heretics]; as I shall full heartily pray for us all that we meet together once in heaven, where we shall make merry forever, and never have trouble after.”

It seems the heretical and diabolical *Pinocchio* got its inspiration from the heretic Thomas More when the fairy (witch) and Jiminy Cricket (an imp devil) teach mankind to “Always let your conscience be your guide.” Instead of obeying God’s commandments, the heretic Thomas More obeyed Satan’s commandment of “Do what thou wilt is the whole of the law.” A man who does what he wilt is a man who follows his own conscience. Hence according to More, as long as a man follows his conscience and thus does what he wilt, he will be saved. That is one reason the heretic Thomas More is exactly like the proverbial three monkeys who in the face of evil “hear no evil, see no evil, and speak no evil”:



The heretic Thomas More hears no evil, sees no evil, and speaks no evil regarding the Anglican heresy and schism that denied the dogma of the supremacy of the pope over the Catholic Church—the same dogma the Greek heretics and schismatics denied about 500 years earlier. When More says, “I do nobody harm,” he means “I do not resist or oppose the heretics but remain in religious communion with them and even bless them and tell them they are worthy of heaven.” When More says, “I say none harm,” he means “I do not condemn the heresy or schism, and I do not denounce the heretics for holding the Anglican heresy and schism.” And when More says, “I think none harm,” he means he truly believes in his heart that the heretics and schismatics are not worthy of any harm, are not guilty of any crime worthy of punishment, are not on the road to hell. This is certainly not the way a Catholic is supposed to talk about or treat heretics and schismatics, such as the Greek heretics and schismatics. Not only did Thomas More not condemn the heresy nor denounce the heretics, but he also prayed with them and hence remained in religious communion with them. The heretic Thomas More, then, had the same heretical and schismatic spirit as apostate antipopes Paul VI and John Paul II, who spoke the same way about and treated the Greek heretics and schismatics as Thomas More did the Anglican heretics and schismatics. None of them believed that the heretics and schismatics were guilty of heresy or schism or outside the Catholic Church. And all of them were in religious communion with the heretics and schismatics.

- According to the heretic More’s follow-your-conscience heresy, God’s following decree is false and erroneous: *“Thou wilt hear the voice of the Lord thy God, to do and keep all his commandments, which I command thee this day.”* (Deut. 28:1) The heretic Thomas More corrects this passage to read, “Thou wilt hear the voice of thy own conscience, to do and keep all that it tells you.”
- According to the heretic More’s follow-your-conscience heresy, Jesus Christ does not save you but your own conscience does. Hence Jesus Christ is not *“the way, the truth, and the life,”* (Jn. 14: 6) but your own conscience is.
- According to the heretic More’s follow-your-conscience heresy, Jesus’ following words are incorrect: *“If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.”* (Mt. 19:17) The heretic Thomas More corrects Jesus’ words by saying, “If thou wilt enter into life, follow your own conscience.”
- And the heretic Thomas More must also correct the following Biblical passages that condemn his follow-your-conscience heresy:

“For I am not conscious to myself of any thing, yet I am not hereby justified. (1 Cor. 4:4) There is a generation that are pure in their own eyes, and yet are not washed from their filthiness. (Prv. 30:12) The way of a fool is right in his own eyes. (Prv. 12:15) There is a way which seemeth just to a man: but the ends thereof lead to death. (Prv. 14:12)”

Catholic Commentary on Proverbs 14:12: “If any Turks, Jews, or heretics lead a moral good life, it seemeth both to themselves and to other ignorant people that they are in the right way to salvation; but their error in faith leadeth them to eternal damnation.”

- According to the heretic More's follow-your-conscience heresy, St. Paul was wrong for teaching that certain men have evil consciences: "*Let us draw near with a true heart in fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with clean water.*" (Heb. 10:22) Thomas More says an evil conscience saves men—as long as they follow it. The only thing evil, then, is when men do not follow their own conscience.
- According to the heretic More's follow-your-conscience heresy, the following Bible verse is incorrect: "*A perverse heart is abominable to the Lord.*" (Prv. 11:20) According to the heretic More, there is no such thing as a perverse heart because a man is justified and saved by following his own heart no matter how false or sinful it may be.
- According to the heretic More's follow-your-conscience heresy, the following Bible verse is incorrect: "*He that trusteth in his own heart is a fool.*" (Prv. 28:26) According to the heretic Thomas More, a man who trusteth his own heart is justified and saved and hence cannot be a fool.
- According to the heretic More's follow-your-conscience heresy, the following Bible verse is incorrect: "*Who can say: My heart is clean, I am pure from sin?*" (Prv. 20:9) According to the heretic Thomas More, a man who follows his own heart (his own conscience) can say that his heart is clean and pure from sin.
- According to the heretic More's follow-your-conscience heresy, More must deny infallible papal decrees that condemn his follow-your-conscience doctrine as heresy. The infallible Athanasian Creed teaches that no man can be saved unless he holds the Catholic faith whole and entire:

The Athanasian Creed (*Quicumque*), 4th century: "Whosoever willeth to be saved, needs above all to hold the Catholic faith... The Catholic faith is this, that we worship one God in Trinity and Trinity in unity... It is necessary for eternal salvation that he also believe faithfully the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ... that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man. ... This is the Catholic faith: everyone must believe it, firmly and steadfastly, otherwise he cannot be saved." (D. 39-40)

- According to the heretic Thomas More, men who follow their own conscience by believing in heresies or false religions or false gods can be saved and hence do not have to believe and profess the Catholic faith.
- And according to the heretic More's follow-your-conscience heresy, More must deny the Invalid Council of Trent's condemnation of the opinion that a man is justified before God as long as he believes he is justified. According to the heretic More, a man is saved by believing he is saved and thus a man is justified and saved by following his own conscience:

Invalid *Council of Trent*, Canons on Justification, 1547: "Canon 14. If any one saith that man is truly absolved from his sins and justified because that he assuredly

believed himself absolved and justified; or that no one is truly justified but he who believes himself justified; and that by this faith alone, absolution and justification are effected; let him be anathema.”

- According to the follow-your-conscience heretics, a man is justified and saved by following his own conscience—by doing what he believes is right in his own heart and conscience and not by believing in and obeying all of God’s commandments as taught by His Holy Catholic Church.

In his invalid encyclical *Apostolica Constitutio*, apostate Antipope Benedict XIV re-taught the dogma that men cannot be justified or saved by following their own conscience. Heretics in his day were using the follow-your-conscience heresy to deny other dogmas and escape punishments and penalties in order to forward their heresies in Catholic teaching instruments:

Apostate Antipope Benedict XIV, invalid *Apostolica Constitutio*, 1749: “21. ...For it is well known that among so many writings there are some whose opinions and assertions do not well agree with the simplicity of the Gospel and the teaching of the holy Fathers. ‘Many opinions advocate a relaxation of Christian discipline and bring ruin to souls, some being old opinions revived, others newly invented, and the great license of rank minds grows daily more extravagant. By this means, a way of thinking completely at variance with the simplicity of the Gospel and the teaching of the holy Fathers has crept in concerning matters of conscience. If the faithful should adopt it as correct, a mighty corruption of the Christian life would ensue,’ to quote Our predecessor Alexander VII (decree published September 7, 1665).”

And apostate Antipope Benedict XIV again re-taught this dogma in his following invalid encyclical because the follow-your-conscience heresy was making progress in Poland:

Apostate Antipope Benedict XIV, invalid *A Quo Primum*, 1751: “To the great glory of God **it prohibited the principle of freedom of conscience**; adherents of this principle were seeking to introduce and establish it in Poland.”

In his invalid encyclical *Mirari Vos*, apostate Antipope Gregory XVI re-taught this infallible dogma which condemns the opinion that a man can be saved by following false religions or false gods and by living a moral life:

Apostate Antipope Gregory XVI, invalid *Mirari Vos*, 1832: “13. Now We consider another abundant source of the evils with which the Church is afflicted at present: indifferentism. This perverse opinion is spread on all sides by **the fraud of the wicked who claim that it is possible to obtain the eternal salvation of the soul by the profession of any kind of religion, as long as morality is maintained.** Surely, in so clear a matter, you will drive this deadly error far from the people committed to your care. With the admonition of the apostle that ‘there is one God, one faith, one baptism,’ may those fear who contrive the notion that the safe harbor of salvation is open to persons of any religion whatever. They should consider the testimony of Christ Himself that ‘those who are not with Christ are against Him,’ and that they disperse unhappily who do not gather with Him. Therefore ‘without a doubt, they will perish forever, unless they hold the Catholic faith whole and inviolate.’ ”

According to the follow-your-conscience heretics like Thomas More, men who believe in false gods, false religions, and heresies can be saved because they followed their own conscience. And according to the follow-your-conscience heretics, a man who lives a

moral life can be saved without the Catholic faith as long as he thinks his false religion or false god or heresy is true.

The Evidence Against the Heretic Thomas More

More's mortal sins of omission and follow-your-conscience heresy

LTM: “[pp. 352-355] Sir Thomas will now himself tell us what happened to him at Lambeth. It was a great crisis in English history, the first overt and total renunciation of the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff and separation from the rest of Christendom... A letter to his daughter Margaret, written a few days later, has been preserved: ‘When I was before the lords at Lambeth...I desire the sight of the oath, which they showed me under the great seal. Then desired I the sight of the Act of Succession, which was delivered me in a printed roll. After which read secretly by myself, and the oath considered with the Act, I answered unto them that **my purpose was not to put any fault either in the Act or any man that made it, or in the oath or any man that swore it, not to condemn the conscience of any other man:** but as for myself, in good faith in conscience so moved me in the matter, that though I would not deny to swear the succession, yet unto that oath that there was offered me I could not swear without the jeopardizing of my soul to perpetual damnation. ...Now, as well before as then, they somewhat laid unto me for obstinacy, that whereas before, since I refuse to swear, **I would not declare any special part of the oath that grudged my conscience, and open the cause wherefore.** For thereunto I had said unto them, that I feared lest the king’s Highness would, as they said, take displeasure enough towards me for the only refusal of the oath. And that **I should not open and disclose the causes why,** I should therewith but further exasperate His Highness... [Hence] **I would neither swear the oath, nor yet declare the causes why...** [p. 357] Howbeit, as help me God, as touching the whole oath I never withdrew any man from it, nor never advised any to refuse it, nor never put nor will put any scruple in any man’s head, but leave every man to his own conscience. And methinketh in good faith that so were it good reason that every man should leave me to mine.’⁵

“[p. 408] [letter to his daughter] ‘I was very sure that mine own conscience, so informed as it is by such diligence as I have so long taken therein, may stand with mine own salvation. I meddle not with the conscience of them that think otherwise. Every man *suo damno stat aut cadit*. I am no man’s judge.’

“[p. 418] Richard Rich charitably moved Sir. T. More to be conformable to the before-mentioned laws, to which More replied: ‘Your conscience will save you and my conscience will save me.’

“[p. 421] ‘Be assured I never did or said anything maliciously against the statute...’”

More left a friend in doubt and wished him luck when he denied the dogma

LTM: “[pp. 381-382] Two other letters are addressed to **Dr. Nicolas Wilson**, one of the king’s chaplains, who had refused the oath on the same day as More and Fisher, and had been committed to the Tower. It would seem that his strength of soul was exhausted by a long solitary confinement. He found means to write to his old friend,

⁵ [Footnote] *English Works*, p. 1428.

Sir Thomas, **suggesting doubts that now occurred to him regarding the force of the conclusions that had made him refuse the oath. More replies that he is sorry to see him thus agitated, but that he cannot give him any relief.** When the king had bidden them both study the subject, they had done so together as thoroughly as possible, and had arrived at the same conclusions. ‘Now,’ he says, **‘I neither murmur, nor grudge, nor make assertions, nor keep disputation on the matter; and, as touching the oath and the causes for which I refused it, no man knoweth what they be.** For they be secret to my own conscience, some other, peradventure, than those that other men would ween, and such as I never disclosed to any man yet, nor never intend to do while I live.’ He meddles with no other man’s conscience... With some affectionate words and commendation to his prayers, he concludes, asking him to send the letter back, ‘for though its contents are harmless, the bearer might get into trouble by it.’⁶

“It seems, however, that Dr. Wilson kept it, and wrote him a second letter, to which Sir Thomas answered shortly: **‘I perceive that you have promised to swear the oath. I beseech Our Lord give you thereof good luck.** And whereas I perceive that you would gladly know what I intend to do, you wot well that I told you when we were both abroad, that I would therein neither know your mind nor no man’s else; nor you nor no man else should therein know mine. With God’s grace I will follow my own conscience. What my own shall be to-morrow, myself cannot be sure; and whether I shall have finally the grace to do according to mine own conscience or not hangeth in God’s goodness, not in mine, to whom I beseech you heartily to remember me in your devout prayers, and I shall and do daily remember you in mine, such as they be.’⁷

“Whether Dr. Wilson was moved to recall his promise to take the oath, I do not find recorded. From the bill of the governor’s expenses it appears that he remained prisoner for two years and two months;⁸ yet at a subsequent period he got promotions that he could not have enjoyed without acquiescing in the schism.”

More’s wife tells him to take the Oath and his daughter took the Oath

LTM: “[pp. 368-369] Lady More was allowed once or twice to visit her husband. He has told us of his amusement at her horror of suffocation under locks and bolts. Another interview is related by Roper, the details of which may have been witnessed by Margaret Roper or related by Sir Thomas to Margaret, or, perhaps, told by Lady More herself. ‘When Sir Thomas,’ writes Roper, ‘had continued a good while in the Tower, my lady, his wife, obtained licence to see him. Who, at her first coming, like a simple, ignorant woman and somewhat worldly too, with this manner of salutation homely saluted him: “What a good year! Mr. More,” **quoth she, “I marvel that you, that hitherto have been taken for a wise man, will now so play the fool, to lie here in this close, filthy prison, and be content thus to be shut up among mice and rats, when you might be abroad at your liberty, and with the favour and goodwill both of the king and his Council, if you would but do as all the bishops and best learned of this realm have done.** And seeing you have at Chelsea a right fair house, your library, your gallery, garden, orchard, and all other necessaries so handsome about you, where you might in the company of me, your wife, your children, and household, be merry, I muse what (a God’s name!) you mean here still thus fondly to tarry.”’ ...Lady More...probably thought that too much learning or too much religion had driven Sir Thomas mad. ...Her husband, therefore, loved and esteemed her, though he could

⁶ [Footnote] *English Works*, p. 1443.

⁷ [Footnote] *Ib.*

⁸ [Footnote] Cotton MS.; *Titus*, Bk. i.; also *Archæologia*, xviii. 294.

smile at her weaknesses, and did not expect from her a heroism of which she could not even frame a conception.

“Very different was his correspondence and conversation with **his daughter Margaret**. According to a marginal note in Rastell’s edition of More’s works, she **had taken the oath** with the clause ‘as far as it would stand with the law of God,’ a manner of swearing that the government would occasionally connive at. **She seems to have more than once by word or letter tried to persuade her father to conform his conscience to that of the men of learning and reputation who had yielded**. The following letters will tell their own tale.”

More prays with his heretic family and says they are worthy of heaven

LTM: “[p. 347] He [Thomas More] concluded by exhorting all his family to be resigned, to remain united, and to pray for him. ‘And if anything happen me that you would be loth, pray to God for me, but trouble not yourselves; as I shall full heartily pray for us all that we meet together once in heaven, where we shall make merry forever, and never have trouble after.’ ”

More’s sins of omission when in prison and under examination

LTM: “[pp. 400-403] More himself told the result in the following letter: ‘My Beloved Daughter, ... You have heard that I was brought also before the Council here myself. I have thought it necessary to advertise to you of the very truth... Wherefore, shortly ye shall understand, that on Friday, the last day of April, in the afternoon, Master Lieutenant came in here unto me, and showed me that Master Secretary would speak with me... [p. 402] At which time the Master Secretary said unto me... whether that I thought that the king’s Grace might not exact of me such things as are contained in the statutes, and upon like pains as he might upon other men. Whereunto I answered that I would not say the contrary... that I gave no man occasion to hold any point one or other, nor gave any man advice or counsel there in one way or other. And for conclusion I could no farther go, whatsoever pain should come thereof. “I am (quoth I) the king’s true, faithful subject and daily bedesman, and pray for His Highness, and all his, and all the realm. **I do nobody harm, I say none harm, I think none harm, but wish everybody good...**” After this the Master Secretary said: “Well, ye find no fault in that statute; find you any in any of the other statutes after?” Whereunto I answered: “Sir, whatsoever thing should seem to me other than good in any of the other statutes, or in that statute either, I would not declare what fault I found, nor speak thereof...” Your loving father, Thomas More, Knight.’

“[pp. 404-405] The following letter [by Thomas More] has no date... it is addressed to Margaret Roper: ‘...Here sat my Lord of Canterbury, my Lord Chancellor, my Lord of Suffolk, my Lord of Wiltshire, and Master Secretary. And after my coming Master Secretary...added thereunto that the king’s Highness was nothing content nor satisfied by my answer... And that I should either acknowledge and confess it lawful that His Highness should be the supreme head of the Church of England, or else utter plainly my malignity. Whereunto I answered that I had no malignity, and therefore, I could none utter...’ ”

More says his silence about the Oath means consent to the heresy in it

LTM: “[pp. 420-421] ‘For this reason I [Thomas More] will only reply to the principal charge against me, that I have incurred the penalty of the statute made in the last parliament since I was in prison, by refusing to the king, maliciously, falsely, and traitorously, his title of Supreme Head of the Church of England, in proof of which you allege my reply to the secretary and Council, that as I was dead to the world, I did not care to think of such things, but only of the Passion of Christ. **I reply that your statute cannot condemn me to death for such silence**, for neither your statute nor any laws in the world punish people except for words and deeds—surely not for keeping silence.’ To this the king’s proctor replied that such silence was a certain proof of malice intended against the statute, especially as every faithful subject, on being questioned about the statute, was obliged to answer categorically that the statute was good and wholesome. ‘Surely,’ replied More, ‘**if what the Common law⁹ says is true, that he who is silent seems to consent, my silence should rather be taken as approval than contempt of your statute.** You say that all good subjects are obliged to reply; but I say that the faithful subject is more bound to his conscience and his soul than to anything else in the world, provided his conscience, like mine, does not raise scandal or sedition, and **I assure you that I have never discovered what is in my conscience to any person living.** ...Be assured I never did or said anything maliciously against the statute, but it may be that this has been maliciously reported to the king.’ ”

More professes the dogma only after he is condemned to death

LTM: “[p. 422] These articles were given to them that they might judge whether More had maliciously contravened the statute. After a quarter of an hour’s absence, **they declared him guilty of death, and sentence was pronounced by the chancellor**, ‘according to the tenour of the new law.’ More then spoke as follows: ‘**Since I am condemned and God knows how, I wish to speak freely of your statute**, for the discharge of my conscience. For the seven years that I have studied the matter, I have not read in any approved doctor of the Church that a temporal lord could or ought to be head of the spirituality.’ The chancellor, interrupting him, said: ‘What, More, you wish to be considered wiser and of better conscience than all the bishops and nobles of the realm?’ To this More replied: ‘My lord, for one bishop of your opinion I have a hundred saints of mine; and for one parliament of yours, and God knows of what kind, I have all the General Councils for 1000 years; and for one kingdom I have France and all the kingdoms of Christendom.’ Norfolk told him that now his malice was clear. More replied: ‘What I say is necessary for discharge of my conscience and satisfaction of my soul, and to this I call God to witness, the sole Searcher of human hearts. I say further, that your statute is ill made, because you have sworn never to do anything against the Church, which, through all Christendom, is one and undivided, and you have no authority, without the common consent of all Christians, to make a law or Act of Parliament or Council against the union of Christendom. [RJMI: This is another heresy because the common consensus of Catholics cannot change the meaning of a dogma or make a dogma.] I know well that the reason why you have condemned me is because I have never been willing to consent to the king’s second marriage...’ ”

⁹ “Huit paires de lettres.” The Spanish says simply, “ocho letras.”

More sinned by omission and remained in religious communion with the heretics to the day he died

LTM: “[pp. 425-428] In what follows not a word may be changed or omitted from Roper’s narrative: ‘Now, after his arraignment departed he from the bar to the Tower again, led by **Sir William Kingston** [an Anglican heretic], a tall, strong, and comely knight, constable of the Tower, and his very dear friend. Who, when he had brought him from Westminster to the “Old Swan,” towards the Tower, there, with a heavy heart, the tears running down his cheeks, bade him farewell. **Sir Thomas More, seeing him so sorrowful, comforted him with as good words as he could, saying: “Good Mr. Kingston, trouble not yourself, but be of good cheer, for I will pray for you and my good lady your wife, that we may meet in heaven together, where we shall be merry for ever and ever...”**’

“ ‘When Sir Thomas,’ continues Roper, ‘came from Westminster to the Tower, **his daughter, my wife, desirous to see her father**, whom she thought she should never see in this world after, **and also to have his final blessing**, gave attendance about the Tower wharf; where she knew he should pass before he could enter into the Tower. There tarrying his coming, as soon as she saw him, **after his blessing upon her knees reverently received**, she hasting towards him, without consideration or care of herself, pressing in among the midst of the throng and company of the guard, that with halberds and bills went round about him, hastily ran to him, and there openly, in sight of them, embraced him, and took him about the neck and kissed him. Who, well liking her most natural and dear daughterly affection towards him, **gave her his fatherly blessing and many godly words of comfort besides**. From whom after she was departed, she, not satisfied with the former sight of him, and like one that had forgotten herself; being all ravished with the entire love of her father, having respect neither to herself nor to the press of people that were about him, suddenly turned back again, ran to him as before, took him about the neck, and divers times kissed him lovingly, and at last, with a full and heavy heart, was fain to depart from him; the beholding whereof was to many that were present so lamentable that it made them for very sorrow thereof to weep.’ ...

“The sentence passed on More was that he should die at Tyburn with all the infamous brutalities then inflicted on traitors... He was condemned on the 1st July, and executed on the 6th. ... On Monday, the 5th July, he wrote with a charred stick this his last letter to Margaret, at the same time sending to her his hair shirt: **‘Our Lord bless you, good daughter**, and your good husband, and your little boy, and all yours, and all my children, and all my god-children and all our friends. ... whom I beseech Our Lord to comfort... I comber you, good Margaret, ... **Farewell, my dear child, and pray for me**, and I shall pray for you and all your friends, that **we may merrily meet in heaven...**’¹⁰”

The Word of God condemns the heretic Thomas More who blessed his heretic daughter and was in religious communion with other Anglican heretics and schismatics:

*“The aged and honourable, he is the head: and the prophet that teacheth lies, he is the tail. And they that call this people **blessed**, shall cause them to err: and they that are called blessed, shall be thrown down headlong.”*
(Isaias 9:15-16)

¹⁰ [Footnote] *English Works*, p. 1457.

“Now I beseech you, brethren, to mark them who make dissensions and offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and avoid them.”
(Romans 16:17)

“If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house nor say to him, God speed you. For he that saith unto him, God speed you, communicateth with his wicked works.”
(2 John 1:10-11)

*Catholic Commentary on 2 Jn. 1:10: “**This doctrine:** The Apostles, and true Pastors in their lawful successors, and the Church of God in holy Council, use to set down the true doctrine in those points which heretics call into controversy. Which being once done and declared to the faithful, they need no other mark or description to know a heretic or false teacher by, but that he cometh with another doctrine than which is set down to them. Neither can the heretics shift themselves, as now a days they would do, saying, O let us first be proved heretics by the Scriptures, let them define a heretic. No, this is not the Apostle’s rule. Many a good honest shepherd knoweth a wolf that cannot define him. But the Apostle saith, If he bring not this doctrine, he is a seducer. So holy Church saith now, Christ is really in the Blessed Sacrament, under form of bread and wine, etc. **If therefore he bring not this doctrine, he is a seducer, and a heretic, and we must avoid him, whether in his own definitions and censures he seem to himself an heretic or no.** ...In matter of religion, in praying, reading their books, hearing their sermons, presence at their service, partaking of their Sacraments, and all other communicating with them in spiritual things, it is a great damnable sin to deal with them. **Nor say, God save you:** St. Irenaeus (li. 3 c. 3) reporteth a notable story of this holy Apostle touching this point, out of St. Polycarp, which is this. There be some (saith he) that have heard Polycarp say, that when John the disciple of our Lord was going to Ephesus, into bath, to wash himself, and saw Cerinthus the heretic within the same, he suddenly skipped out, saying that he fear lest the bath should fall, because Cerinthus the enemy of truth was within. So saith he of St. John, and addeth also a like worthy example of St. Polycarp himself: who on a time meeting Marcion the heretic, and the said Marcion calling upon him, and asking him whether he knew him not: Yes, quoth Polycarp. I know thee for Satan’s son and heir. So great fear (saith St. Irenaeus) had the Apostles and their disciples to communicate in word only, with such as were adulterers or corrupters of the truth. As St. Paul also warned, when he said, a man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition avoid. So far Irenaeus. If then, to speak with them or so speak with them to salute them, is so earnestly to be avoided according to this Apostle’s example and doctrine: what a sin is it to flatter them, to serve them, to marry with them, and so forth?”*

(See RJMI book *Canonizations Are Not Infallible.*)

His Heretical and Idolatrous Humanism and Utopia

His Humanism

The heretic Thomas More was a humanist and thus had humanist friends, such as the heretics Erasmus of Rotterdam, Ulrich von Hutten, and Pico della Mirandola:

Wikipedia, Thomas More: “Sir Thomas More (1478-1535)...was an English lawyer, social philosopher, author, statesman and noted Renaissance humanist.”

Heretical *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Thomas More, 1912: “Besides the classics, he studied French, history, and mathematics, and also learned to play the flute and the viol... He wrote poetry, both Latin and English, a considerable amount of which has been preserved and is of good quality, though not particularly striking, and he was especially devoted to the works of Pico della Mirandola, of whose life he published an English translation some years later. He cultivated the acquaintance of scholars and learned men... In 1497 More was introduced to Erasmus, probably at the house of Lord Mountjoy, the great scholar’s pupil and patron. The friendship at once became intimate, and later on Erasmus paid several long visits at More’s Chelsea house, and the two friends corresponded regularly until death separated them.”

Heretical *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Humanism, 1910: “The learned, refined, charitable, and courageous chancellor Thomas More (1478-1535) was in a way an intellectual counterpart of Erasmus, with whom he was on terms of closest intimacy.”

(See RJMI book *The Great Apostasy: Humanism and Humanists at the Papal Court*.)

His Utopia

The notorious heretic Thomas More attempted to compete with God’s paradise by trying to create a paradise all his own, which he called Utopia. The only true Utopia is God’s paradise which Christ brings after His second coming. Hence any Catholic who dares to think that he can bring about a Utopia, a paradise on earth, before the second coming of Christ in which Christ will be King of that Utopia, is a heretic. Secondly, if More meant to write about the best kind of kingdom that can exist on this sinful earth, and thus before the second coming of Christ, that kingdom has to be a good Catholic kingdom and thus cannot be a non-Catholic kingdom. But the kingdom in More’s Utopia is a non-Catholic kingdom that has heretical and immoral laws. On this point alone, Thomas More is a heretic for presenting a non-Catholic kingdom as a Utopia, the ideal society—one in which Christ the King and His Catholic Church do not rule supreme and which violates God’s commandments on faith and morals.

Far from God’s paradise or even a Catholic kingdom, More’s Utopia is a place where his god gives men the right to worship false gods and practice false religions (which is heresy, because the true God does not give men that right); a place where false gods and false religions must be respected and allowed to be publicly propagated (which is heresy); a place where false gods, false religions, and unbelievers cannot be condemned or punished (which is the heresy of non-judgmentalism or non-punishmentism); a place where suicide and euthanasia are legal (which is heresy); a place where divorce is legal (which is contrary to the disciplinary law of the Catholic Church that forbids divorce); a place where men are forbidden to own private property (which is the heretical version of

communism); a place where women are ordained as priests (which is heresy); a place where priests cannot be judged or punished by anyone and thus are granted immunity from any crimes or other sins they commit (which is the heresy of non-judgmentalism or non-punishmentalism):

Wikipedia, Thomas More: “Utopia contrasts the contentious social life of European States with the perfectly orderly, reasonable social arrangements of Utopia and its environs (Tallstoria, Nolandia, and Aircastle). In Utopia, ... communal ownership supplants private property, men and women are educated alike, and there is almost complete religious toleration (except for atheists, who are allowed but despised).”

Sir Thomas More and the Heretics, by J. A. Guy, 1980: “The fame of Sir Thomas More, who became Henry VIII’s Lord Chancellor in 1529, rests in great part upon his authorship of *Utopia*. This novel, written in Latin and published in Louvain in 1516, is generally regarded as the quintessence of [so-called] Christian humanism in its English context, a brilliant manifesto of social idealism within the tradition of the reforming ideas of Erasmus. More’s vision of human progress was modeled on Plato’s *Republic* and conceived in terms of imagining a perfect society as the best means of achieving at least its partial realisation in an imperfect, materialist world. Subtitled ‘The Best State of a Commonwealth,’ *Utopia* held out the promise of ... religious toleration and the ordination of women.”¹¹

Thomas More, Christian Humanism, Catholicism and Utopia, by J. P. Sommerville: “*Utopia* was written (in Latin, for educated people) at a time when Europeans were just beginning to sail across oceans to previously unknown lands. The book claimed to be a description of such a new land (though the fact that its title is Greek for ‘no place’ gave away that it was fiction—at least to people who knew Greek!). For much of the time, More writes as though the way the Utopians manage their lives is far superior to the European way. The Utopian way centered on communism; Utopians had no private property... They also practiced religious toleration, and permitted euthanasia, suicide, and divorce.”¹²

Respects and promulgates false gods and false religions

Utopia, by the heretic Thomas More, 1516: “There are different kinds of religion not only in some parts of the island but also in diverse places and each city. While some worship the sun, the moon, one of the planets, or a man conspicuous enough for either virtue or glory, not only as God but also as the chiefest and highest God. But the most and the wiser part (rejecting all this) believe that there is a certain Godly power unknown, everlasting, incomprehensible, inexplicable, far above the capacity and reach of man’s wits, dispersed throughout all the world...

“One of our company in my presence was sharply punished. He, as soon as he was baptized, began against our will, with more earnest affection than wisdom, to reason of Christ’s religion; and began to wax so hot in his matter, that he did not only prefer our religion before all other, but also did utterly despise and condemn all other, calling them profane, and the followers of them wicked and devilish, and the children of everlasting damnation. While he had thus long reasoned the matter, they laid hold of him, accused him, and condemned him to exile; not as a despiser of religion, but as a seditious person, and a raiser up of dissension among the people. For this is one of the ancientest laws among them: that no man shall be punished for his religion.... It should be lawful for every man to favor and follow what religion he would, and that he might to the best he could to bring others to his opinion... If

¹¹ Published in *History Today*, v. 30, i. 2, 1980.

¹² Internet reference: <http://faculty.history.wisc.edu/sommerville/283/283%20session02.HTM>

he could not by fair and gentle speech induce them into his opinion, yet he should use no kind of violence, and refrain from unpleasant and seditious words. To him that would vehemently and fervently in this cause strive and contend was decreed banishment or slavery... This decree should make for the furtherance of religion.” (b. 2, c. 9)

Jesus, the Apostles, St. Paul, and all true Catholics would be banished from More’s Utopia for preaching the true Catholic faith, which includes condemning all false gods and false religions and denouncing all who practice them as unbelievers and thus children of Satan who are on the road to hell. In fact, much sedition arose from the preaching of the gospel by St. John the Baptist, Jesus, the Apostles, St. Paul, and other Catholic evangelists. After all, Jesus told His true followers, true Catholics, to expect sedition and not peace: *“Do not think that I came to send peace upon earth: I came not to send peace, but the sword. For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law.”* (Mt. 10:34-35) Jesus told the unbelieving Jews that Satan was their father. He said, *“You are of your father the devil, and the desires of your father you will do.”* (Jn. 8:44) He also denounced them as a brood of vipers and serpents. And a great sedition arose when Jesus overturned the sellers’ tables and whipped them out of the Temple. Hence Jesus must be banished from More’s Utopia. The first martyr for Christ, St. Stephen, denounced the unbelieving Jews as evildoers; and as a result a sedition arose in which they murdered him:

“You stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, you always resist the Holy Spirit: as your fathers did, so do you also. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? And they have slain them who foretold of the coming of the Just One; of whom you have been now the betrayers and murderers: Who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it. Now hearing these things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed with their teeth at him.” (Acts 7:51-54)

Hence St. Stephen must also be banished from More’s Utopia. And sedition arose many times when St. Paul preached: *“We have found this to be a pestilent man [St. Paul], and raising seditions among all the Jews throughout the world, and author of the sedition of the sect of the Nazarenes.”* (Acts 24:5) Hence St. Paul would also be banished from More’s Utopia.

Promotes women priests

Utopia, by the heretic Thomas More, 1516: “Their priests, if they be not women (for that sex is not excluded from the office, though rarely chosen, and then not unless she be a widow and old), have for their wives the most excellent women in the country.” (b. 2, c. 9)

Puts priests above the law

Utopia, by the heretic Thomas More, 1516: “None of the magistrates have greater respect shewn them than the priests; and should they commit any crime they would not be questioned about it, their punishment being left to God and their consciences. For the Utopians deem it unlawful to lay hands on any man, how wicked soever, who hath been particularly dedicated to God. Nor find they any considerable inconvenience in this; for, having so few priests, and those chosen with much

caution, it must be very unusual to find one, who was raised to such a dignity merely from his virtue and goodness, degenerating into corruption and vice. Even should such a thing happen, for man is changeable, yet the smallness of their number; and their having no authority but what arises from the respect paid them, nothing of consequence can happen to the public from the indemnity they enjoy.” (b. 2, c. 9)

The heretic More either lies or is a complete idiot when he says nothing harmful can come from sinful priests. No one can cause more harm than a sinful priest! Sinful priests not only scandalize others and cause many to follow their sins, but they also harm others by the sins they commit, such as sexual molestation, murder, stealing, calumny, usury, simony—and worst of all heresy, which kills souls. If anyone ever wondered what kind of ungodly, satanic theology justifies priests who commit the sin of pedophilia from being sufficiently denounced and punished. Now you know! The heresy that popes, bishops, and priests are immune from being judged, denounced, or punished for crimes and other sins did not just start in the 16th century but in the 11th century. Thomas More also teaches heresy by saying that the only authority priests, and thus including Catholic priests, have over their flocks is one of respect and thus not of jurisdiction.

Legalizes suicide and euthanasia

Utopia, by the heretic Thomas More, 1516: “But if a disease is not only incurable but also distressing and agonizing without cessation, then the priests and the public officials exhort the man, since he is now unequal to all life’s duties, a burden to himself, and a trouble to others, and is living beyond the time of his death, to make up his mind not to foster the pest and plague any longer nor to hesitate to die now that life is torture to him but, relying on good hope, to free himself from this bitter life as from prison and the rack, or else voluntarily to permit others to free him. In this course he will act wisely, since by death he will put an end not to enjoyment but to torture. Because in doing so he will be obeying the counsels of the priests, who are God’s interpreters, it will be a pious and holy action. . . . If anyone commits suicide without having obtained the approval of priests and senate, they deem him unworthy of either fire or earth and cast his body ignominiously into a marsh without proper burial.” (b. 2, c. 7)

Legalizes divorce

Utopia, by the heretic Thomas More, 1516: “Matrimony is there never broken, but by death; except adultery break the bond, or also the intolerable wayward manners of either party. . . . But now and then it happens, where as the man and woman cannot well agree between themselves, both of them finding with whom they hope to live more quietly and merrily, that they, by the full consent of them both, be divorced asunder and married to others.” (b. 2, c. 70)

Forbids private property

Utopia, by the heretic Thomas More, 1516: “I am persuaded, that until property be destroyed, there can be no just distribution of things, nor can the world be happily governed; for while it is maintained, the greater and better part of mankind will be oppressed with care and anxiety. I confess, that without destroying it entirely, the

oppressions of many may be lightened, but they can never be quite removed. (b. 1)
... Thus have I described to you, as particularly as I could, the constitution of that
commonwealth [More's Utopia], which I think not only the best in the world, but
the only one truly deserving that name. In all other places, while men talk of a com-
monwealth, every one seeketh only his own wealth; but there, where no man hath
any property, all pursue with zeal the public good." (b. 2, c. 9)

He practiced what he preached

The heretic and humanist Thomas More practiced what he preached in his heretical
Utopia:

Utopia, by the heretic Thomas More, 1516: "One of our company in my presence
was sharply punished. He, as soon as he was baptized, began against our will, with
more earnest affection than wisdom, to reason of Christ's religion; and began to
wax so hot in his matter, that he did not only prefer our religion before all other, but
also did utterly despise and condemn all other, calling them profane, and the
followers of them wicked and devilish, and the children of everlasting damnation.
While he had thus long reasoned the matter, they laid hold of him, accused him, and
condemned him to exile; not as a despiser of religion, but as a seditious person, and
a raiser up of dissension among the people.

For this is one of the ancientest laws among them: that no man shall be punished
for his religion.... It should be lawful for every man to favor and follow what
religion he would, and that he might to the best he could to bring others to his
opinion... If he could not by fair and gentle speech induce them into his opinion, yet
he should use no kind of violence, and refrain from unpleasant and seditious words.
To him that would vehemently and fervently in this cause strive and contend was
decreed banishment or slavery... This decree should make for the furtherance of
religion." (b. 2, c. 9)

In order to not create sedition and to respect all religions, he did not condemn the
Anglican heresy and schism as heresy and schism, did not denounce the Anglicans as
heretics and schismatics, did not tell them they are outside the Catholic Church and on
the road to hell, remained in religious communion with them, and told them they are in
the way of salvation for following their own conscience. Hence his motto was:

"I do nobody harm, I say none harm, I think none harm, but wish everybody good.
... Your conscience will save you and my conscience will save me."