

John Salza Responds to Another Sedevacantist

Anastasia: Dear Father Robinson,

March 23, 2015

J. Salza: Before I respond to Anastasia's assertions, let me preface my remarks by pointing out that Anastasia, like most sedevacantists, has failed to make the distinction between the speculative and practical order as regards a heretical Pope. She affirms the speculative (that a heretical Pope cannot be Pope), but fails to address the practical question, according to the greatest Doctors and theologians of the Church, of *how* a heretical Pope loses his office (which, by the way, is a probable theological opinion only, as this has never been defined by the Magisterium; Bellarmine didn't even believe a Pope could fall into heresy). Thus, her effort to commandeer snippets of papal quotes she takes off the internet (here, the English translations from the Dimond "brothers" website), only begs the practical question of how the Church determines a Pope is a manifest heretic. Thus, her argumentation is a classic case of *petitio principii*.

Nevertheless, even conceding the possibility that a Pope could fall into formal heresy (which I do, based on the teaching of Pope Innocent III and several historical examples), Anastasia has failed to address the position of the Church's greatest theologians, namely, that the Church, and not private judgment, must determine whether a Pope is a manifest heretic, by proving that he is guilty of the *crime* of heresy (not the *sin* of heresy). And it is only after the crime of heresy has been declared by the Church that the Pope automatically falls from his office (the *ipso facto* loss of office without further declaration also being only a common theological opinion, but one that I also hold).

In order for a person to be considered guilty of the *crime* of heresy, *both* the matter and form must be *proved* (not presumed) to be *public* (not occult). (Also, as we will see shortly, when the accused is a Pope, these elements must be proved by the legitimate trier of fact, the Church). In other words, the heresy must be "public and notorious." This is because the crime of heresy requires not only an external commission of the act (matter), but also internal *guilt* (the form), since internal guilt (pertinacity) is an essential part of the *corpus delicti* (the body of the crime). While the external presence of the material aspect alone (a heretical statement) may provide sufficient grounds for the *suspicion* of heresy, it does *not* permit even a juridical *presumption* of guilt, much less prove guilt, for the crime of heresy. It is only after the Church establishes the crime of heresy that the Pope would automatically fall from his office.

St. Robert Bellarmine affirms that the loss of office (consequence of the crime) is based upon the Church's establishment of pertinacity (the crime) by virtue of *ecclesiastical warnings*. He says: "For in the first place, it is proven by authority and reason that a manifest heretic is *ipso facto* deposed [*consequence* under Divine law]. The authority is that of Blessed Paul, who in his Epistle to Titus, chapter 3, orders that the heretic be avoided **after two warnings**, that is after he clearly appears pertinacious [*crime* under Church law], and he understands (by this) before any excommunication and judicial sentence; as Jerome writes regarding this passage, where he states that other sinners are excluded from the Church through a sentence of excommunication, but heretics depart from and are cut off from the Body of Christ through themselves" [*consequence* under Divine law].

Note that Bellarmine affirms with Suarez and others under Divine law that “a manifest heretic is *ipso facto* deposed” as we have already seen. But he then says this conclusion is based on the “*authority*” of Titus 3:10, which requires *warnings from ecclesiastical authority* before the heresy is established and the heretic avoided (specifically, the authority that Titus, as a Bishop, had in his diocese). Then, “*after two warnings*” (when pertinacity is proved and the crime is established), Bellarmine refers again to consequence under Divine law (the heretic is “cut off from the Body”). Bellarmine’s language is clear, although sedevacantists attempt to deny what he actually said.

Suarez teaches the same regarding the crime (determined by the Church) and the consequence (dictated by Divine law): “I affirm: if he were a heretic and incorrigible, the Pope would cease to be Pope just when a sentence was passed against him for his crime, by the legitimate jurisdiction of the Church. This is the common opinion among the doctors.” Suarez also says: “Therefore on deposing a heretical Pope, the Church would not act as superior to him, but juridically, and by the consent of Christ, she would declare him a heretic [crime] and therefore unworthy of Pontifical honors; he would be then ipso facto and immediately be deposed by Christ [consequence], and once deposed he would become inferior and would be able to be punished” [human punishment].”¹

John of St. Thomas, a contemporary of both Suarez and Bellarmine and one of the greatest Thomists the Church has ever known, confirmed Bellarmine and Suarez’s agreement by saying: “And for that reason Bellarmino and Suarez judge that the pope, by the very fact that he is a manifest heretic and has been declared incorrigible [the Church declared the crime], is deposed immediately by the Lord Christ [consequence of the declaration], not by some other authority of the Church.”² As I explained in my article “Bellarmine Against Suarez? Another Critical Error in the Sedevacantist Thesis” (*The Remnant*, November 2014), sedevacantists confuse the declaration of the crime under ecclesiastical law with the consequence of the declaration under Divine law. This is why sedevacantists erroneously conclude that Bellarmine (when talking about the consequence) and Suarez (when talking about the crime) held different opinions. They did not. They both held that a heretical Pope automatically falls from his office, “after two warnings, that is after he clearly appears pertinacious” (Bellarmine) and “just when a sentence was passed against him for his crime” (Suarez).

To put the final nail in the coffin, as it were, St. Bellarmine’s treatment of heretical bishops also proves that he rejected the sedevacantist thesis. This is another most critical insight from Bellarmine. He says, “...if the pastor is a bishop, they [the faithful] cannot depose him and put another in his place. For Our Lord and the Apostles only lay down that false prophets are not to be listened to by the people, and not that they depose them. And it is certain that the practice of the Church has always been that heretical bishops be deposed by bishop’s councils, or by the Sovereign Pontiff.”³

¹ *De Fide*, Disp. 10, Sect 6, n. 10, pg. 317.

² *Cursus Theologici* (Theological Courses), II-II, *De Auctoritate Summi Pontificis, Disputatio, Disp II, Art. III, De Depositione Papae*.

³ *De Membris Ecclesiae*, I, *De Clericis*, c. 7.

Bellarmino's affirmation of the "certain" treatment of "heretical bishops" as "always" practiced by the Church is consistent with his treatment of a "manifestly heretical Pope" – the basis for the *ipso facto* deposition (consequence of the crime) is the determination of the crime (offense) by ecclesiastical authority. Clearly, if bishops cannot be deposed by the faithful (but must be judged by bishops' councils or the Pope), *then it follows that the Pope, who has no judge on Earth, cannot be deposed by the faithful either.* This teaching expressly demonstrates once again that Bellarmine rejected the sedevacantist position of deposition by the faithful. This is the mind of St. Robert Bellarmine, lead prosecutor for the sedevacantists.

It is very important to note that Bellarmine in his treatment of heretical bishops was simply following the teaching of the Fourth Council of Constantinople (869-870). Using Scripture (i.e., Titus 3:10) as its authority, the council declared excommunicated anyone (whether cleric or lay) who adopted the sedevacantist position, that is, who separated themselves by private judgment from their patriarch for an alleged crime before ecclesiastical judgment. Hence, an official teaching of the Church also *condemns* the sedevacantist position. Canon 10 says:

"As divine scripture clearly proclaims, Do not find fault before you investigate, and understand first and then find fault, and does our law judge a person without first giving him a hearing and learning what he does? Consequently this holy and universal synod justly and fittingly declares and lays down that no lay person or monk or cleric should separate himself from communion with his own patriarch [the Pope is the patriarch of the West] before a careful enquiry and judgment in synod, even if he alleges that he knows of some crime perpetrated by his patriarch, and he must not refuse to include his patriarch's name during the divine mysteries or offices...If anyone shall be found defying this holy synod, he is to be debarred from all priestly functions and status if he is a bishop or cleric; if a monk or lay person, he must be excluded from all communion and meetings of the church [i.e. excommunicated] until he is converted by repentance and reconciled."

With the foregoing essential material as a background (none of which Anastasia addresses in her attempt to boot the Popes out of the Church), we will now more easily see the errors and omissions in the sedevacantist position.

Anastasia: The entire position of John Salza can be refuted without even getting into whether any of the conciliar post Vatican II popes are guilty of heresy or are manifest heretics.

J. Salza: Did you hear that? According to Anastasia, the Vatican II Popes can be declared anti-popes without being "guilty of heresy" or without being "manifest heretics"! When a sedevacantist begins with this kind of argumentation, I know I am dealing with an amateur. Perhaps Anastasia can tell us where a validly elected Pope loses his office without being guilty of either the sin or crime of heresy.

Anastasia: The Catholic Church teaches that only those who are baptized and profess the true faith can be considered members of the Catholic Church. Since these popes definitely do not profess the true faith, but a false faith, they cannot be considered members of the Catholic Church nor popes.

J. Salza: This argumentation is a classic example of how shallow the sedevacantist thesis truly is. As we've seen, in order for a Pope to lose his office for heresy, the Church (not individual Catholics with no authority) must determine both the objective and subjective elements of heresy. The objective element is established if the proposition directly contradicts an article of Faith. The subjective element is established, as Bellarmine says, after ecclesiastical warnings which establish pertinacity of the will. Note, again, that it is the CHURCH, the legitimate trier of fact, and not vigilante sedevacantists with no authority, who conduct the investigation and render the sentence. There is not a single Doctor of the Church (not one!) who says that individual Catholics can bypass ecclesiastical authority and depose a Pope by private judgment. Bellarmine says just the opposite, and this means sedevacantism is a false thesis (it is actually the reflexive "faith" of Protestantism).

Anastasia: Pope Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum* (#15), June 29, 1896: "... it is absurd to imagine that he who is outside the Church can command in the Church."

The Body of the Church refers to the supernatural entity known as Christ's Mystical Body, in which all truly have *one Lord, one faith and one baptism*. Those who deny Catholic teaching are automatically severed from the Body of the Church because **all in the Body of the Church have one faith**.

J. Salza: Again, Anastasia operates on the speculative level, but does not address the practical question of HOW a Pope is determined to be a public and notorious heretic who has lost his office. Nevertheless, Bellarmine, Suarez and John of St. Thomas have done that for us.

Anastasia: Pope Boniface VIII, *Unam Sanctam*, Nov. 18, 1302: "One is my dove, my perfect one... which represents **the one mystical body**... And in this, 'one Lord, **one faith**, one baptism' (Eph. 4:5)."

It's a dogma that all in the Body of the Church have *the same faith*. Therefore, a person who rejects the faith cannot remain in the supernatural Body of Christ with those who possess the faith. The teaching of the Magisterium is definitive and clear: those who deny the faith and fall into heresy are automatically severed from the Body of the Church.

J. Salza: Again, Anastasia fails to distinguish between the speculative and the practical, and does not address the distinctions between the material and formal elements of heresy, the internal versus external forum, or even the distinction between heretical propositions and those that are lesser categories of theological errors, as she acts as judge and jury over the conciliar Popes. Hers is a shallow treatment of a very complex topic, riddled with grave errors and unproven assumptions.

Anastasia: Pope Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum* (# 9), June 29, 1896: "The practice of the Church has always been the same, as is shown by the unanimous teaching of the Fathers, **WHO WERE WONT TO HOLD AS OUTSIDE CATHOLIC COMMUNION, AND ALIEN TO THE CHURCH, WHOEVER WOULD RECEDE IN THE LEAST DEGREE FROM ANY POINT OF DOCTRINE PROPOSED BY HER AUTHORITATIVE MAGISTERIUM.**"

Pope Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum* (# 13), June 29, 1896: “You are not to be looked upon as holding the true Catholic faith if you do not teach that the faith of Rome is to be held.”

Francis and the other post Conciliar popes do not teach that the faith of Rome (the Catholic faith) is to be held. They teach the opposite. Francis and the other Vatican II antipopes have publicly supported false ecumenism and rejected the necessity for non-Catholics to convert.

The Catholic Church publicly condemns false ecumenism (see *Mortalium Animos* of Pius XI) and declares that non-Catholics need to convert to Catholicism for unity and salvation (see The Council of Florence). Those who consider public supporters of false ecumenism, who reject the necessity for non-Catholics to convert, to be believers who profess the true faith, equate the profession of a false faith (support for false ecumenism) with the profession of the true faith (the Catholic Church’s condemnation of false ecumenism). By equating the profession of a false faith with the profession of the true faith, it denies the Church’s external unity of faith, one of the Church’s marks. The post Vatican II papal claimants have explicitly rejected converting atheists, Jews, schismatics and others many times. They therefore teach that non-Catholics do not need to hold the faith of Rome (the Roman Catholic faith). And in some cases, (see John Paul II *Ut Unum Sint* below) already have the same faith. According to Catholic teaching, they are not to be considered Catholic. It’s that simple.

J. Salza: If only it were that simple for Bellarmine, Suarez, John of St. Thomas, Francis de Sales, Laymann, Ballerini and the many other theologians who have addressed this most complex issue of a heretical Pope. Perhaps Anastasia is not aware that, under the 1917 Code of Canon Law, a Catholic could propagate heretical doctrines, participate in false worship with non-Catholics, baptize, raise and educate their children in non-Catholic sects, commit sacrilege against the Blessed Sacrament, take part in satanic “black magic,” and formally join anti-Catholic sects and secret societies, and only be *suspected* of heresy. Even though these activities are objective mortal sins against the Faith, under the Church’s law they are only *grounds for suspicion* that one is a heretic. Anastasia should also study the historical cases of Archbishop Darboy, Erasmus of Rotterdam and Michael de Bay and the public heresies they propagated, and how the Church dealt with them. In short, some of the Church’s greatest saints (e.g., Bellarmine and Liguori) acted completely *contrary* to the reaction of today’s sedevacantists (affirming their view that the Church, and not individual Catholics, makes the judgment of public and notorious heresy).

Anastasia: Antipope John Paul II, *Ut Unum Sint* (# 62), May 25, 1995, speaking about the non-Catholic and Schismatic Patriarch of Ethiopia: “When the Venerable Patriarch of the Ethiopian Church, Abuna Paulos, paid me a visit in Rome on June 11, 1993, together we emphasized **the deep communion existing between our two Churches: ‘We share the same faith handed down from the Apostles... moreover, we can affirm that we have the one faith in Christ...’**”

John Paul II, *General Audience*, May 5, 1999: “Today I would like to repeat what I said to young Muslims some years ago in Casablanca: **‘We believe in the same God...’**”

Antipope John Paul II, *New Catechism* (paragraph 841): "... Muslims; these profess to hold the faith of Abraham, and together with us they adore the one, merciful God, **mankind's judge on the last day.**"

Here we find John Paul II's Catechism teaching that the Muslims' god (who is not Jesus Christ) will judge mankind on the last day. This means Jesus Christ will not judge mankind on the last day, but rather the god whom the Muslims worship will. It is a denial of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ to judge the living and the dead.

J. Salza: As sedevacantist John Daly correctly noted, "Giving the name 'heresy' to an error which is opposed to a doctrine to be believed with divine and Catholic faith, where the opposition is not direct and manifest but depends on several steps of reasoning: in such cases the qualification 'heresy' is not applicable before a definitive judgment on the part of the Church." All sedevacantists should keep Mr. Daly's teaching in mind as they evaluate the modernist statements of the conciliar Popes (which intentionally *avoid* directly contradicting articles of Faith in order to sow confusion among the faithful).

Yes, the offensive and scandalous statement of John Paul II that Muslims and Catholics "together worship the same God" stinks of heresy and indifferentism. Yet is not explicitly heretical if understood to mean the Muslims' private worship "involves a virtue of natural religion" based on their "natural knowledge of God as the author of nature. See, for example, Fr. Matthias Gaudron, *The Catechism of the Crisis in the Church* (Kansas City, Missouri: Angelus Press, 2010), pp. 107-108. While John Paul II's statement is scandalous and approaches heresy, it does not deny the dogma of the Trinity or the Incarnation. Muslims do *profess* that they worship the God of Abraham, but they do so by an erroneous opinion. Also, John Paul II may have been referring to the Muslim's natural knowledge of God (e.g., through creation), Who will in fact judge them on the last day (by sending them to hell). The point is that it takes at least another step of reasoning to prove material heresy, and even that would not be sufficient to prove JP2 is an anti-Pope, because pertinacity must also be proven, and by the authority of the Church.

Anastasia: Pope St. Damasus I, *Council of Rome*, 382, Can. 15: "If anyone does not say that **He Jesus Christ... will come to judge the living and the dead, he is a heretic.**"

J. Salza: John Paul II did not say that Jesus Christ is not the judge of the living and the dead, so this quote is irrelevant.

Anastasia: Pope St. Leo the Great, *Sermon 129*: "Wherefore, since outside the Catholic Church there is nothing perfect, nothing undefiled... **we are in no way likened with those who are divided from the unity of the Body of Christ; we are joined in no communion.**"

J. Salza: Again, it takes another step of reasoning to determine what John Paul II meant by "communion," and he also in his statement did not deny the dogma No Salvation Outside the Church. Thus, his statement is a lesser degree of theological error, but it's not heresy (and, again, even if it were materially heretical, the Church – not Anastasia – would also have to

prove pertinacity of will to convict the Pope of the crime of heresy, and only then would he lose his office, according to the common opinion).

Anastasia: Pope Pius IX, Vatican Council I, Sess. 4, Chap. 3, ex cathedra: “Furthermore We teach and declare that the Roman Church, by the disposition of the Lord, holds the sovereignty of ordinary power over all others... **This is the doctrine of Catholic truth from which no one can deviate and keep his faith and salvation.**” (Denz. 1827)

When John Paul II asserts that he has the same faith and communion as non-Catholic sects, he is asserting that he is a non-Catholic.

J. Salza: He is deviating from the Catholic Faith, but that does not mean he loses his office, and THAT IS THE SOLE ISSUE of the debate. For a Pope to lose his office, the Church would have to establish both the objective and subjective elements of heresy through an ecclesiastical process, and certainly not by the private judgment of people like Anastasia who have no authority in the Church. The fact is, John Paul II claimed he was teaching the Catholic Faith, and even canon law gives the accused the right to rebut any presumption of guilt (and that is only after the subjective element of heresy has been proven, which is not the case with the conciliar Popes – and which means they cannot even be *presumed* guilty of heresy).

Anastasia: It should also be noted that in many cases just one act of participation in non-Catholic worship would render a person an actual heretic and/or an apostate in light of the divine law. And of course the repeated or persistent participation in non-Catholic worship, or support for such activity, would always require the conclusion that the person is a heretic and/or an apostate.

J. Salza: Unfortunately for Anastasia, she provides no historical examples where a Pope engaged in false worship and then was licitly deposed by the private judgment of lay Catholics such as herself. But even more unfortunately for her, history proves the Church takes precisely the opposite approach of the sedevacantists, in the case of Pope Marcellinus who was caught in an act of “non-Catholic worship” (he offered incense to idols). Did the early Church follow the sedevacantist thesis by allowing the Catholic faithful to depose Pope Marcellinus by private judgment? No. Rather, the Church convened a council to determine whether Marcellinus was (subjectively) guilty of the (objective) crime of apostasy (and this case has a happy ending, with Marcellinus’ repentance, which would have never happened if sedevacantists had anything to say about the matter). Thus, Anastasia’s claim that such activity “would always [always!] require the conclusion that the person is a heretic and/or an apostate” is proven false by historical precedent.

Anastasia: That’s clear, for example, from the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas:

St. Thomas Aquinas: “... if anyone were to... worship at the tomb of Mahomet, **he would be deemed an apostate.**” (*Summa Theologiae*, Pt. II, Q. 12, A. 1, Obj.

J. Salza: If Anastasia would know the 1917 Code of Canon Law, she would realize that presuming apostasy and proving apostasy are two different things, and that the presumption of apostasy does *not* cause a Pope to lose his office. Under canon 2220.2, the Church must *prove*

(not presume) the infraction of law (both the objective and subjective elements of heresy, which Anastasia of course has not done) in order for the presumption to take effect. Moreover, if the presumption is rebuttable for the average Catholic, then it is certainly rebuttable in the case of the Pope, who is above canon law and any canonical presumption of guilt. Anastasia's appeal to St. Thomas only highlights the fatal flaws in her position.

Anastasia: Archbishop Lefebvre, An Address to Seminarians, March 30 and April 18, 1986, The Angelus, July 1986.

"All gods of the pagans are devils," says Scripture (Ps.95,5). How can the Pope receive the sign of the devil? Whatever god is not Jesus Christ is not the one and only true God. And most recently, the Pope has been into the synagogue of the Jews in Rome. How can the Pope pray with the enemies of Jesus Christ? These Jews know and say and believe that they are the successors of the Jews that killed Jesus Christ, and they continue to fight against Jesus Christ everywhere in the world. At the end of the Pope's visit, the Jews sang a "hymn" that included the line "I believe with all my heart in the coming of the Messiah," meaning they refuse Jesus as the Messiah, and the Pope had given permission for this denial of Christ to be sung in his presence, and he listened, with head bowed! And the Holy See announces that in the near future he will visit Taize to pray with the Protestants, and he himself said in public at St. Paul Outside of the Walls that later this year he will hold a ceremony gathering all religions of the world together to pray for peace at Assisi in Italy, on the occasion of the Feast of Peace proclaimed by the United Nations due to take place on October 24.

Now all these facts are public, you have seen them in the newspapers and the media. What are we to think? What is the reaction of our Catholic Faith? That is what matters. It is not our personal feelings, a sort of impression or admission of some kind. It is a question of knowing what our Faith tells us, faced with these facts. Let me quote a few words - not my words - from Canon Naz's Dictionary of Canon Law, a wholly official and approved commentary on what has been the Catholic Church's body of law for nineteen centuries. On the subject of sharing in the worship of non-Catholics (after all, this is what we now see Pope and bishops doing), the Church says, in Canon 1258-1: "It is absolutely forbidden for Catholics to attend or take any active part in the worship of non-Catholics in any way whatsoever." On this Canon the quasi-official Naz Commentary says, and I quote, "A Catholic takes active part when he joins in heterodox; i.e., non-Catholic worship with the intention of honouring God by this means in the way non-Catholics do. It is forbidden to pray, to sing or to play the organ in a heretical or schismatic temple, in association with the people worshipping there, even if the words of the hymn or the song or the prayer are orthodox." The reason for this prohibition is that any participation in non-Catholic worship implies profession of a false religion and hence denial of the Catholic Faith. By such participation Catholics are presumed to be adhering to the beliefs of the non-Catholics, and that is why Canon 2316 declares them "suspect of heresy, and if they persevere, they are to be treated as being in reality heretics."

Now these recent acts of the Pope and bishops, with Protestants, animists and Jews, are they not an active participation in non-Catholic worship as explained by Canon Naz on Canon 1258-1? In which case, I cannot see how it is possible to say that the Pope is not suspect of heresy, and if he continues, he is a heretic, a public heretic. That is the teaching of the Church.

J. Salza: Unfortunately for Anastasia, Archbishop Lefebvre was not a sedevacantist, and hence his Excellency becomes a hostile witness for Anastasia. In fact, Lefebvre lived to see John Paul II's continued and ongoing participation in pagan worship AFTER Assisi (1986), which took place in Kyoto (1987), Rome (1988), Warsaw (1989), Bari (1990) and Malta (1990), and he *still refrained from declaring the Pope a manifest heretic!* Thus, Anastasia's reference to Archbishop Lefebvre only undermines her case, for the Archbishop properly recognized that this was a judgment for the Church, and not individual bishops or priests, much less lay people like Anastasia. Bishop Tissier recalls: "But the wisdom of Archbishop Lefebvre made him feel, to the contrary, that the premises of this reasoning [sedevacantism] were as shaky as the authority that formulated it, be it that of a theologian or even a bishop."

Anastasia: In 1984, in the wake of the promulgation of the heretical 1983 Code of canon Law, Archbishop Lefebvre had formed the judgement that John Paul II was in fact not a Catholic.

J. Salza: That is correct. And most of us traditionalists do not believe that Pope Francis is Catholic either. But our private judgment is not sufficient to cause a Pope to lose his office, as Archbishop Lefebvre always maintained, and this is the sole issue of this debate. The Church must prove the material element of heresy (that the Pope directly and unequivocally contradicted a dogma of the Faith) as well as the formal element of heresy (that he did so with pertinacity of the will). Anastasia, who has no authority to make this judgment, has nevertheless proved neither.

Anastasia: The words of Archbishop Lefebvre were given by his biographer, Bishop Tissier de Mallerai, in an interview published in the French magazine of the Society of Saint Pius X, marking the tenth anniversary of the episcopal consecrations of June 1988.

"The current state of the papacy renders insignificant the difficulties over jurisdiction, disobedience and apostolicity, because these notions suppose the reign of a Pope Catholic in his faith and government. Without entering into consideration of the consequences of an heretical, schismatic or non-existent Pope, which would lead to interminable theoretical discussions, in conscience could we not and ought we not, after the promulgation of the 1983 Code of Canon Law which clearly affirms the new Church, and after his scandalous declarations concerning Luther, now affirm that Pope John Paul II is not Catholic? We say no more, but we say no less. We had waited for the measure to become full, and it is so henceforth." *Fideliter*, n. 123, pp. 25-29. May-June 1998

J. Salza: Then, by all means, go ahead and say that Pope Francis is not Catholic. That is, Pope Francis does not speak like a Catholic or act like a Catholic. That is all true. However, our private judgment of Francis does not prove that Francis is guilty of the crime of heresy, which is required for Francis to lose his office.

Anastasia: Pope Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum* (#15), June 29, 1896: "... it is absurd to imagine that he who is outside the Church can command in the Church."

J. Salza: "Outside" according to whom? Anastasia and her like-minded colleagues who have no authority in the Church? Or "outside" according to the teachings of Bellarmine, Suarez and John of St. Thomas, who are among the Church's greatest theologians?

Anastasia: Archbishop Lefebvre, An Address to Seminarians, March 30 and April 18, 1986, The Angelus, July 1986. “.....So why worry about whether the Pope is a heretic or an impostor or whatever; it is of no importance to us. But I think that is not true. If any man is important in the Church, it is the Pope. He is the centre of the Church and has a great influence on all Catholics by his attitudes, his words and his acts. All men read in the newspapers the Pope's words and on television they see his travels. And so, slowly, slowly, many Catholics are losing the Catholic Faith by the scandal of the Pope's partaking in false religions. This ecumenism is a scandal in the true sense of the word, an encouragement to sin. Catholics are losing faith in the Catholic Church. They think all religions are good because the Pope in this way befriends men of all religions. When the scandal comes from so high in the Church, from the man in the chair of Peter and from almost all the bishops, then poor Catholics who are thrown back on their own resources and who do not know their Faith well enough to keep it despite all, or who do not have priests by their side to help them to keep the Faith.”

J. Salza: Any faithful Catholic would wholeheartedly agree with these remarks. In fact, the primary goal of the Freemasons was to attack the papacy by getting a liberal on the throne of St. Peter (and they exceeded their wildest expectations, by getting six liberals in a row to date). To have a liberal Pope would be the greatest act of subversion, as Archbishop Lefebvre also noted. But none of this proves that the conciliar Popes are guilty of the crime of heresy. That is a judgment that Church alone must make, according to the wisdom of the Doctors and theologians of the Church.

Anastasia: As far as John Salza's point about the sin of heresy: *“Their major error is the claim that the sin of heresy, and not the crime of heresy (because the Pope is above canon law) causes a loss of office. Not true. Sin is a matter of the internal forum and the Church does not judge internals. In fact, one can lose the supernatural virtue of faith (by internal, formal heresy) and still be a member of the Church (and such a person would retain ecclesiastical office).”*

The teaching of the Magisterium of the Church on the sin of heresy (i.e., denying Catholic teaching and losing the Catholic faith) is exactly the opposite.

J. Salza: Anastasia is grossly mistaken and reveals that this discussion is beyond her current learning. The “sin” of heresy does not necessarily equate to open or public heresy (it may remain occult), and even if the heresy is public, the heretical proposition by itself does not prove the subjective element of guilt, and which is a determination that must be made by the Church, as we have seen. Anastasia continues to confuse sin with crime, objective with subjective, external with internal.

Anastasia: It repeatedly teaches that the sin of heresy itself – i.e., the denial of Catholic truth, which results in the loss of faith – sends the person, by the very dissent itself, into “open heresy” (that is, into formal heresy). By its very own nature the sin automatically severs the person from the Body of the Church and indeed from the Catholic Church completely.

J. Salza: Anastasia has not done her theology homework. The sin of heresy alone does no such thing because one can lose the interior virtue of faith and *still remain a member of the Body of the Church*. This happens with occult heresy. But Anastasia not only fails to make the distinction between occult and public heresy, but she also confuses “formal heresy” with “open heresy.” Not all formal heresy is open heresy, and not all open heresy is formal heresy. Occult

heresy is formal heresy, but it's not "open" or "public." And an "openly" heretical statement does not mean it's formally heretical (it may only be materially heretical). Anastasia simply does not have a grasp of these technical concepts as she cuts and pastes from her favorite sedevacantist websites. That is a dangerous practice indeed.

Anastasia: Pope Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum* (# 9), June 29, 1896:

“So, with every reason for doubting removed, can it be lawful for anyone to reject any of those truths without thereby sending himself headlong into open heresy? without thereby separating himself from the Church and in one sweeping act repudiating the entirety of Christian doctrine?... he who dissents in even one point from divinely received truths has most truly cast off the faith completely, since he refuses to revere God as the supreme truth and proper motive of faith.”

J. Salza: Pope Leo XIII is obviously talking about heresy in the external forum because the Church does not judge the internal forum. Thus, he is talking about the CRIME of heresy, not the SIN of heresy. Anastasia repeats the classic sedevacantist error of confusing the sin of heresy with the crime of heresy (a common error of Fr. Cekada). The sin of heresy alone does NOT “sever the person from the Body of the Church” because sin is a matter of the internal forum. The sin of heresy severs one only from the Soul of the Church, using the analogical term of St. Bellarmine. As stated above, one can lose the interior virtue of faith through formal, internal heresy and *still remain a member of the Church*, united to her by the three external bonds of unity. Anastasia has followed her favorite sedevacantist apologists down the same road of error.

Anastasia: Pope Leo XIII teaches that anyone who dissents from a Catholic teaching ***sends or delivers himself*** (*se det* in the Latin) by that dissent itself (*hoc ipso*) into open heresy (*in apertam haeresim*). It is ***the individual's dissent from Catholic teaching*** (*not a churchman's declaration that one has dissented*) sends a person headlong into open heresy. It is thus undeniable that the offense of heresy (or what Pope Leo XIII calls “open heresy”) occurs *with the dissent itself on the part of the person*, prior to any declaration by a Church authority or any declaration by the individual of membership in a non-Catholic sect. ***The dissent itself*** separates the person completely from the Church in one sweeping act.

J. Salza: Again, Anastasia has demonstrated that she does not understand the difference between the sin of heresy and the crime of heresy. Pope Leo XIII is speaking of the crime of heresy. Further, in order to be guilty of the crime of heresy, the Church must prove the subjective element of the crime (pertinacity), in addition to the objective element. Pope Leo XIII is speaking on the speculative level, but Bellarmine, Suarez, John of St. Thomas, et. al. have told us how these principles are applied in practice in the context of a heretical Pope. Anastasia's argumentation is more question begging.

Anastasia: Pope Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum* (# 9), June 29, 1896: “”The practice of the Church has always been the same, and that with the consenting judgment [i.e. consensus] of the holy fathers who certainly were accustomed to hold as having no part of Catholic communion and as banished from the Church **whoever had departed in even the least way from the doctrine proposed by the authentic Magisterium.**”

J. Salza: But as St. Paul reveals in Titus 3:10, we are to have “no part of Catholic communion” with those who have proved to be “incorrigible” after “two warnings,” which Bellarmine says must come from the Church, as in the case of both the Pope and the bishops (and not from individual Catholics, which is a practice condemned by the Fourth Council of Constantinople and the unanimous consent of the Church’s Doctors and theologians).

Anastasia: Pope Eugene IV, Council of Florence, Bull “Cantate Domino,” 1441, ex cathedra: “It [the Holy Roman Church] condemns, rejects and anathematizes **all thinking opposed and contrary things, and declares them to be aliens from the Body of Christ**, which is the Church.”

Pope Eugene IV infallibly teaches that all *thinking opposed and contrary things* to the Church are expelled from **the Body of Christ**, which is the Church. It shows that thinking opposed and contrary to the Church expels one from the Body of the Church, even if there hasn’t been a declaration or a warning.

J. Salza: Again, Pope Eugene IV is speaking of the CRIME of heresy (not the sin of heresy), and the crime of heresy, especially as regards a Pope, must be determined by the legitimate trier of fact, the Church. Bellarmine and Suarez both say the crime is established after warnings have been given by ecclesiastical authority and the sentence is pronounced by the Church. This is yet another failure to distinguish the speculative from the practical.

Anastasia: Pope Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi* (# 23), June 29, 1943: “For not every **offense**, although it may be a grave evil, is such as by its very own nature [suapte natura] to sever a man from the Body of the Church [ab Ecclesiae Corpore], as does schism or heresy or apostasy.”

J. Salza: Again, Pope Pius XII is referring to the “offense” or CRIME (not SIN) of heresy, which severs one from the Body of the Church, after the formal and material elements have been proven by the Church. After the crime has been established, the heretic is automatically severed from the BODY (not SOUL) of the Church without further declaration (although most theologians maintain that the Church must *also* issue a declaration of deprivation).

Anastasia: The teaching of Pius XII in *Mystici Corporis* is that the offense of heresy, *by its very own nature* – in other words, before any declaration – severs a man from the **BODY** of the Church.

John Salza continuing “....., *St. Bellarmine said a Pope loses his office ipso facto for manifest heresy,, for the crime must be determined by the legitimate trier of fact, which is the Church, and not vigilante sedevacantists priests and laymen who have no authority in the Church.*”

Catholics distinguish the true Church from the members of countless sects, not by a specific declaration from Church authority about every single one of these people and their sects (which would be impossible for the Church to give), but rather by their *open rejection of Catholic teaching*, or by their open membership in a non-Catholic religious community, or by their open profession of a non-Catholic Faith. This has always been the way that the true

Church has distinguished itself from heretical sects and the members of the true Church from the members of heretical sects.

J. Salza: This is true in the case of “open membership in a non-Catholic religious community” which is called “public defection.” But this is not true in the case of public deviation from the Catholic Faith from those who still profess the Creed. If the Pope were to make a materially heretical statement (and modernist statements are crafted so as to *not* directly contradict the faith), the Church would have to prove he consciously dissented from Church teaching through the process of ecclesiastical warnings. If not, the Pope cannot even be *presumed* guilty of heresy, much less kicked out of the Church by fed-up Catholics like Anastasia who limit God to how much evil He is willing to allow in the Church.

Anastasia: St. Robert Bellarmine, *De Romano Pontifice*, II, 30: “... for men are not bound, or able to read hearts; **BUT WHEN THEY SEE THAT SOMEONE IS A HERETIC BY HIS EXTERNAL WORKS, THEY JUDGE HIM TO BE A HERETIC PURE AND SIMPLE, AND CONDEMN HIM AS A HERETIC.**”

J. Salza: Of course, we have seen how Bellarmine says this judgment is to be made when it comes to those holding ecclesiastical office; the Church must issue warnings to prove pertinacity, and then declare the sentence of the crime.

Anastasia: Pope Paul IV in his Bull . *Cum ex Apostolatus*, Feb. 15, 1559

In *Cum ex Apostolatus*, Pope Paul IV teaches that a heretic cannot be validly elected pope, even if he is elected by all the cardinals and accepted by the whole Church. He says that a heretical cleric cannot hold office in the Church. Concerning those invalidly elected as heretics, Pope Paul IV also declares that all Catholics, without any declaration by Church authority, “**shall be permitted at any time to withdraw with impunity from obedience and devotion to those thus promoted or elevated and to avoid them as warlocks, heathens, publicans, and heresiarchs**”. Paul IV makes it clear that all of this applies to the time period *before any declaration*. He explicitly states that it occurs and can be recognized “without the need for any further declaration.” Therefore, heretics lose their offices and are expelled from **the Body of the Church** – and can be recognized as heretics, warlocks and heathens **who don’t hold office in the Catholic Church or have membership in the Body** – before any declaration by Church authority.

J. Salza: Anastasia fails to make the proper distinction between the crime and the consequence, which we see in the writings of Bellarmine, Suarez and John of St. Thomas. Pope Paul IV is affirming the position of Bellarmine that a public and notorious heretic is outside the Church without any further declaration, *after* the Church has proved the crime (and both Bellarmine and Suarez held that the Church must issue a sentence establishing the crime). Hence, Anastasia’s misplaced reference to *Cum Ex Apostolatus* proves too much for her.

Anastasia: Being considered a heretic according to divine law/the Church’s dogmatic teaching is not the same thing as being considered a heretic in the Church’s ecclesiastical or canon law.

J. Salza: That's correct, and that is why the sedevacantists err when they say the "sin" of heresy causes the loss of office.

Anastasia: Canon 1325 #2: "**After the reception of baptism, if anyone, retaining the name Christian, pertinaciously denies or doubts something to be believed from the truth of divine and Catholic faith, [such a one is] a heretic;** if he completely turns away from the Christian faith, [such a one is] an apostate; if finally he refuses to be under the Supreme Pontiff or refuses communion with the members of the Church subject to him, he is a schismatic."

J. Salza: Correct. Note that the denial or doubt must be "pertinacious," which St. Paul says is established by ecclesiastical warnings, and not by private judgment, as also taught by Bellarmine and Suarez.

Anastasia: At various times in history the Church created and promulgated ecclesiastical laws to govern its members. One of those is **excommunication**. Even though it's sometimes a perfect reflection of the divine law, excommunication is actually an ecclesiastical law. Even the *ipso facto* excommunication for heresy, which has been in place in Church history, is an *ecclesiastical law*, not a divine law. In the case of the *ipso facto* excommunication for heresy, it's a perfect reflection of the divine law, but it's an ecclesiastical law.

J. Salza: None of this is relevant to establishing the crime of heresy. The Doctors and theologians of the Church make a distinction between proving the crime of heresy and issuing an excommunication for heresy. The Doctors are *unanimous* that the Church must declare the crime of heresy against a Pope. The common theological opinion is that the Church would also issue a declaration of excommunication to formally depose the Pope, but this is not necessary to establish the crime. Anastasia also fails to make or understand this distinction (and that is because it appears she has not studied these issues beyond her perusal of sedevacantist websites which don't reveal the critical material that refutes their case).

Anastasia: Canon 2314 #1, 1917 Code of Canon Law, "All apostates from the Christian faith and each and every heretic or schismatic: 1. **Incur by that fact excommunication.**"

If these canons (and similar ones promulgated in Church history) did not exist, **heretics would still be automatically expelled from the Catholic Church by the divine law**. The divine law automatically expels from the Church anyone who rejects a Church teaching.

J. Salza: Again, Anastasia confuses the sin of heresy with the crime of heresy. Heretics are not "automatically expelled from the Catholic Church by Divine law" if their heresy is occult only. Occult heretics remain members of the Body of the Church. It is only those who are guilty of public and notorious heresy that are severed from the Body of the Church (which, for a Pope, must be determined by the Church).

Anastasia: Pope Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum* (# 9), June 29, 1896: "So, with every reason for doubting removed, **can it be lawful for anyone to reject any of those truths without thereby sending himself headlong into open heresy? without thereby separating**

himself from the Church and in one sweeping act repudiating the entirety of Christian doctrine?... he who dissents in even one point from divinely received truths has most truly cast off the faith completely, since he refuses to revere God as the supreme truth and proper motive of faith.”

J. Salza: Already addressed above.

Anastasia: Since all who deny a Catholic teaching are automatically expelled from the Church by divine law,

J. Salza: Wrong again. The sin of heresy is an offense against Divine law, but the sin of heresy alone does not “automatically expel” one from the Body of the Church, nor does the Church judge the internal forum.

Anastasia: ...irrespective of any ecclesiastical law promulgated or not promulgated about heresy, for someone to be automatically removed from the Church it’s not necessary that he even incur an excommunication (whether automatic or any other kind) or be considered a heretic in canon law.

J. Salza: That is true, but it is necessary that the CRIME of heresy be established by the CHURCH as regards a heretical Pope. Whether the Church issues an excommunication for heresy is not the issue and is not necessary. Anastasia again confuses the crime of heresy with the ecclesiastical penalty that may be issued in connection with it. They are two different things.

Anastasia: A DISSENTER FROM CATHOLIC TEACHING IS AUTOMATICALLY EXPELLED FROM THE CHURCH, AND LOSES ANY OFFICE HE MIGHT HOLD, EVEN IF HE’S NOT A HERETIC IN CANON LAW

J. Salza: Wrong again. A dissenter is “automatically expelled from the Church and loses any office he might hold” if he is guilty of the CRIME of public and notorious heresy under canon law, not Divine law (which concerns the sin of heresy only). Again, Anastasia is quite confused on the distinctions between canon and Divine law, external and internal forum, open and occult, crime and consequence, and crime and ecclesiastical penalty.

Anastasia: Pope Innocent III, Fourth Lateran Council, 1215, Constitution 3, on Heretics: “We add further that each archbishop or bishop, either in person or through his archdeacon or through suitable honest persons, **should visit twice or at least once in the year a particular parish in which according to report heretics were living** and there he should compel **three or more men of good testimony**, or even the whole neighborhood if it seems expedient, to swear to it. That **if anyone should know of heretics there** or of any persons who hold secret conventicles or who differ in their life and habits from the normal way of living of the faithful, **then let him take care to point them out to the bishop**. The bishop himself should summon the accused to his presence, and they should be punished canonically if they are unable to clear themselves of the charge or if after compurgation they relapse into their former errors of faith. If however any of them with damnable obstinacy refuse to honour an oath and so will not take it, **let them by this very fact be regarded as heretics.**”

In this passage the Fourth Lateran Council says that each bishop or archbishop should visit parishes “in which according to report heretics were living”. The Council thus refers to these people as “heretics” before they have ever been declared heretics or officially warned about their heresies!

J. Salza: Pope Innocent’s teaching is clearly contrary to the sedevacantist thesis (that deposition is a matter of private judgment), and consistent with that of Bellarmine and Suarez (that deposition is a matter of the public judgment of the Church, here, the bishops who are responsible for determining “obstinacy”). Note that these dissenters are not treated as heretics until “obstinacy” has been established, which according to St. Paul (and St. Bellarmine) is established through canonical warnings (here, by the bishops). This teaching further undermines the sedevacantist thesis, and it is quite surprising that Anastasia would even cite it.

Anastasia: Moreover, it states that “if anyone should know of heretics there”, then he can point them out. Therefore, anyone – including a layperson – is able to recognize people as “heretics” before they have been declared heretics, officially warned or pointed out to the bishop!

J. Salza: Not quite. There is a presumption that the dissenters were heretics, but Pope Innocent requires them to be evaluated by ecclesiastical authority, here, the bishops, to determine whether BOTH the objective and subjective elements of heresy are present. If this were a decision solely for the laity, the Pope would not require the examination by the bishops (which is also the teaching of St. Bellarmine and the Fourth Council of Constantinople).

Anastasia: The Council is thereby recognizing the divine law principle mentioned earlier (and the dogmatic teaching of the Church) that anyone who clearly dissents from Catholic teaching can and must be recognized and rejected as a heretic, even if that person is not yet considered a “heretic” according to the procedures and requirements of the ecclesiastical law in place at the time.

J. Salza: More confusion from Anastasia. The only “divine law principle” that exists is the severance of a Pope from the Body of the Church after the CRIME (not the SIN) of heresy is established by the Church, according to the teaching of Bellarmine, Suarez, John of St. Thomas, Francis de Sales, etc.

Anastasia: Indeed, the Council refers to these people as “heretics” before they have been declared or warned according to the procedures of its own ecclesiastical law, **and in the very same context in which it explains how such people *can later be considered “heretics” in the Council’s ecclesiastical law.*** It says that if these people it already called “heretics” at some later point in time refuse an oath, they are to be reputed as “heretics”. In other words, if they refuse an oath after having been officially warned or censured, they are to be considered heretics *according to the strict letter of the Council’s canon law*; but it states that any of the faithful could already have recognized them as “heretics” before that even occurs (by virtue of the divine law).

J. Salza: Anastasia has once again undercut her sedevacantist thesis, for she says “if they refuse an oath after having been officially warned or censured, they are to be considered

heretics *according to the strict letter of the Council's canon law.*" That is correct, because it is the CRIME of heresy under the Church's ecclesiastical law, and not the SIN of heresy under Divine law, that severs one from the Body of the Church. This is because sin is a matter of the internal forum and crime is a matter of the external forum, where offices are held. Thus, as Anastasia says, it is only after a Pope has "been officially warned" that his pertinacity can be established in the external forum, which results in the loss of office.

Anastasia: Pope Innocent III, *Fourth Lateran Council*, 1215, Constitution 2, on the error of Abbot Joachim: "For between creator and creature there can be noted no similarity so great that a greater dissimilarity cannot be seen between them. **If anyone therefore shall have presumed to defend or approve the opinion or doctrine of the aforesaid Joachim in this matter, let him be confuted by all as a heretic.**"

J. Salza: But this statement already assumes both the material and formal elements of heresy are present, in which case the person who holds said proposition is deemed to be a heretic. But, on the practical level, it must be proved that both the material and formal element of heresy is present and, if the accused is the Pope, this determination must be done by the Church, as we have seen.

Anastasia: It also teaches that a cleric who publicly defects from the Catholic faith loses his office without any declaration (Canon 188.4). Therefore, according to canon law, someone who rejects Catholic teaching publicly cannot be considered a Catholic or one who holds office in the Church.

J. Salza: Anastasia confuses "public defection" with dissenting from Catholic teaching, which are two completely different things. Public defection means the Pope has publicly joined another religion and no longer declares himself Catholic. It is the formal repudiation of the Catholic Faith (e.g., the Pope leaves Rome to become a pastor in a Protestant sect). While the conciliar Popes have made statements which objectively deviate from the Catholic Faith, they have not publicly defected from the Church.

Anastasia: Canon 188.4, *1917 Code of Canon Law*: "There are certain causes which effect the tacit (silent) resignation of an office, **which resignation is accepted in advance by operation of the law, and hence is effective without any declaration.** These causes are... (4) if he has publicly fallen away from the faith."

Canon 2197.1, *1917 Code of Canon Law*: "A Crime is *public*: (1) if it is already commonly known or the circumstances are such as to lead to the conclusion that it can and will easily become so..."

J. Salza: The conciliar Popes have not publicly defected from the faith so canon 188.4 does not apply.

Anastasia: Francis taught his blatant heresy, that non-Christians are "justified by the grace of God", in #254 of *Evangelii Gaudium*. That document was addressed to the universal Church. Francis even identified it as a document of the "universal Magisterium." That

heresy **clearly denies the defined dogma** that only those with the Catholic faith can be justified, and that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church.

J. Salza: Francis' statement approaches heresy, smacks of heresy, is proximate to heresy, but still requires an extra step of reasoning to conclude that he is denying the Church's dogma on justification, because he says that this justification occurs "by God's gracious initiative" (the fragment Anastasia left out) which may suggest that he is repeating the teaching of Blessed Pius IX on those who labor in invincible ignorance but respond to God's grace (and thus may have the interior virtue of faith). Again, I am not defending this reckless statement, but showing that additional steps of reasoning are required to prove the objective element of heresy, which means the statement is not a direct denial of a dogma of the Faith, but constitutes a lesser category of theological error. But even if it were a materially heretical statement, it would only prove the material element of heresy, but not the formal element (pertinacity) which as Bellarmine teaches must come through ecclesiastical warnings.

Anastasia: Francis could not have taught that heresy more publicly, and there are many other examples of public heresies from the antipopes.

J. Salza: But the extent of the divulgation is only *one* of the elements of the crime (the "public" element). One would still have to prove the proposition directly contradicts a dogma of the Faith without any additional steps of reasoning (the "heresy" element); one would also have to prove that the Pope pertinaciously departed from Catholic teaching (the "notorious" element); finally, these determinations must be made by the Church, and not by private judgment. Anastasia's superficial treatment proves only her lack of genuine knowledge of these matters.

Anastasia: Therefore, the Vatican II antipopes are certainly heretics and public heretics, according to the letter of canon law.

J. Salza: Not at all. Canon law requires the heresy to be public and notorious, and the determination must be made by the Church. Thus, the sedevacantist case collapses.

Anastasia: But even if they weren't, it would not make any difference. A recognition that someone is a heretic in canon or ecclesiastical law is not necessary for a Catholic to reject that person as a heretic and outside the Catholic Church by virtue of the divine law and the dogmatic teaching of the Church.

J. Salza: Wrong again. The recognition that someone is a heretic to be "avoided" per Titus 3:10 rests precisely on the ecclesiastical authority which issues warnings to establish pertinacity, so that the Church can declare the crime of heresy and the heretic to be avoided (St. Thomas Aquinas specifically teaches that St. Paul's instruction in Titus 3:10 is addressing the need for *ecclesiastical authority*). The need to "avoid" heretics is based specifically upon the determination of ecclesiastical authority, which is why Bellarmine says the *ipso facto* loss of office is based in Titus 3:10 (ecclesiastical warnings).

Anastasia: The divine law enables and requires Catholics to reject such public dissenters from Catholic teaching **as heretics who are outside the Church and hold no authority in the Church**. That's the effect of the divine law sentence for heresy. The divine law and the

dogmatic teaching of the Church require Catholics to reject anyone who departs from the rule of Catholic faith, irrespective of any ecclesiastical law effects that have or have not occurred.

J. Salza: Anastasia once again confuses the Divine law with ecclesiastical law. It is true that the Divine law requires Catholics to separate from heretics. However, in regard to a Pope, this would happen only after the formal heresy has been established by the Church (through warnings proving pertinacity followed by the sentence for the crime). Once the crime of heresy has been established, the Pope falls automatically from his office under Divine law – but not before the judgment of the Church.

Anastasia: The divine law and the Church's dogmatic teaching enable and require people to reject clear dissenters from the rule of Catholic faith as heretics, irrespective of any ecclesiastical law or penalty.

J. Salza: Anastasia has simply followed the errors of Fr. Cekada, the Dimond "brothers" and others who erroneously maintain that a Pope loses his office for the sin of heresy under Divine law. This assertion is absolutely false.

Time has permitted me to provide only a cursory treatment of these complex issues. I go into these and many other details (along with many quotations from the Doctors and theologians of the Church) in an upcoming book on sedevacantism. This book refutes the most common sedevacantist arguments by quoting them verbatim. Most sedevacantists have not studied these issues in depth, and have been deceived by their false leaders.

Anastasia: A more detailed and complete presentation of these ideas are given in the Dimond brothers article and video <http://www.mostholyfamilymonastery.com/catholicchurch/remnant-robert-siscoe-refuted-sedevacantism/> and John Lane's article http://www.novusordowatch.org/sspx_dossier_sede.pdf.

In Christ,

Anastasia

J. Salza: In our upcoming book, a lot of time is spent exposing the errors of Fr. Cekada, the Dimond "brothers" and John Lane, among other sedevacantists. After reading this book, Anastasia, if she is in good faith, will no longer view their work as a "detailed and complete presentation of these ideas," but rather a completely erroneous and even dishonest presentation of the teachings of the Doctors and theologians of the Church. May God give her this wisdom. Stay tuned.

John Salza, 24 March A.D. 2015