THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume XIV, No. 3 † April 15, 1993

The "Secret" Sedevacantist Priests

John Kenneth Weiskittel

The past quarter century has been an almost unbearably agonizing period for traditional Roman Catholics. The faithless Second Vatican Council and the equally non-Catholic religion it sired have combined to produce a crisis that is without precedent in all Church history. Although earlier generations of Catholics suffered through the most terrible schisms, heresies and bloody persecutions, it is safe to say that the current cross is the heaviest the Church has ever had to shoulder, consisting, as it does, not only of the abandonment of Christian social principles by the nations but also of the defection from Catholicism by bishops sworn to defend it (with their lives, if necessary). Most prominent and predominant among these perfidious prelates is the Bishop of Rome — "Pope" John Paul II.

Not only, then, are neighborhood "Catholic" churches in the hands of Modernists, but so, too, are dioceses, seminaries, monasteries, convents, etc.; in short, every level of the institutional Church has been infiltrated and subverted, up to and including the Holy See. All of this is agonizing enough in itself for those committed to tradition. Unfortunately, the circumstances are worsened by the continuing existence of self-styled "traditionalists" who, defying faith, right reason and a virtual mountain of evidence to the contrary, continue to act as though John Paul II is entitled to the homage due a Sovereign Pontiff, as well as by those who, while rejecting his claims to the Chair of Peter, prefer to remain quiet about their views.

The most notorious of those in the former category has to be *The Wanderer*, which for years has had an editorial policy that prints articles that cast John Paul II in a favorable (read *traditional*) light, but systematically ignores information that reveals his less-than-Catholic activities and utterances. (This mentality is also found in the Society of Saint Peter, Mother Angelica's Eternal Word Network and "Father" Gruner's *Fatima Crusader*, to name a few.) A particularly striking recent example of this reprehensible practice can be seen in *The Wanderer's* coverage of his ten-day tour of Africa in early February. Two related stories were carried: "Islamic Law Not For Catholics, Pope States On Way To Africa" (2-11-93), and "Pope Sees 'Mystery Of Calvary' In Suffering Of Sudan Christians" (2-18-93). What is conspicuous by its absence in these articles is any reference to his meeting in Benin *with thirty voodoo priests and their followers*, and of how he spoke to them of their "right" to believe as they choose and of the thanks they owe their ancestors for teaching them to worship the "true God." The semi-official Vatican newspaper, *L'Osservatore Romano*, covered the meeting (including a photo of the "Pope" with voodoo witch doctors), as did numerous secular dailies, such as *USA Today* and *The New York Times*. But ***not*** *The Wanderer*. Why? Perhaps it is best to leave the readers of that "traditional" publication to grapple with this mystery, since the answer is easily grasped by subscribers to *The Athanasian*.

Occupying a position more or less directly in between the "see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil" of *The Wanderer* and the "secret" sedevacantists' *different* sort of silence, there is the confused stand of the Society of Saint Pius X (SSPX), and like-minded "traditionalists" (such as those publishing *The Remnant*). Although far more honest in telling the whole truth about John Paul II's scandals, the SSPX continues to operate in a dense fog when the question of his validity is discussed. In January, after the Conciliar Vatican announced an interreligious meeting at Assisi (non-Christians, along with the usual assortment of heretics and schismatics, were invited) to pray and fast for war-torn Bosnia, Father Franz Schmidberger, the SSPX's Superior General, issued a statement that, while strongly worded, revealed the weakness of the Society's view. He rightly condemned the "Pope" for convoking a gathering that amounts to a "new blasphemy against Our Lord Jesus Christ," and which "is tantamount to an absolute denial of Truth, ...mak[ing] all Religion absurd and a matter of no importance." Father Schmidberger further indicts it as "a grave sin" against the First Commandment and the first article of the Creed. So far, so good. But then he undoes the effect he has created with the following appeal:

> May the Successor of St. Peter at the last minute turn evil into good by repeating to the Jews and Moslems

> gathered at Assisi the words of the first Pope: "Do penance, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins" (Acts II:38); and, using the words of Pope Pius IX, let him in all charity invite the other Christian bodies to return to the one and only sheepfold of Christ. Only in this way will he fulfill his apostolic ministry and the missionary task of the Church; only thus will he fortify his brothers in the Faith. (Luke XXII:32)

These are, of course, wonderful sentiments, *except* for the fact that they bear little or no relation to the reality of the situation. Father Schmidberger is as aware as anyone that Assisi is but the latest in a decade-and-a-half of such outrages featuring John Paul II, and, in light of such a proven record of sacrilege, it is unrealistic in the extreme to suppose that (short of a miracle of the first order) any change for the better is likely. In plain English, all these pious admonitions for the "Pope" to lead non-Catholics to the Faith are doomed to failure, quite simply because *John Paul II, in stark opposition to the revealed dogmas of Christ and His Church, believes and teaches that God uses the other religions as* ***means of salvation*** (see the reply to Objection No. 9 in "*Still* No Pope In Rome: Answering Our Critics" in the March 1, 1993 issue of *The Athanasian*).

However fanciful the SSPX's position, it certainly cannot place much stock in this plea from its head, for it well knows, as does he, that this much longed-for change is not apt to take place. If the Society's founder, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, could use equally strong language to condemn the first Assisi meeting in 1986 — and even refer to the "Antichrists in Rome," prior to the SSPX consecrations two years later — yet still maintain "loyalty" to John Paul II as "Holy Father," it is evident that the "Pope" can do *anything* (even "excommunicate," as he did, the group's leaders and followers) with full impunity. The latest incident is merely further confirmation that the SSPX mind-set cannot come to grips with the fact — or even consider the *possibility* — that John Paul II's claim to the papacy is *in name only*. Statements like that of Father Schmidberger, then, only serve to satisfy the group's "party line" and placate its followers. (For a well-researched article that demolishes the SSPX position, which is described there as "looking for the side altar in the modernist cathedral," see Father Donald Sanborn's "Una Cum" in the January-February 1993 issue of *Catholic Restoration*.)

The Silence Of The Shepherds

Still, deplorable as *The Wanderer's* blatant blackout of critical information concerning John Paul II is, regular readers of *The Athanasian* are not misled by such deceit. And the SSPX's comic attempts to maintain nominal links to Modernist Rome likewise fall on deaf ears (they claim to be "in union" with a "Pope" they refuse to obey, but who has, in the strongest terms possible, made it abundantly clear that he *in no way* regards himself as being in communion *with them*). It is to their credit that our readers are not taken in by such false solutions; in the midst of this profound predicament they have been able to maintain a candid and consistent view of events.

Despite this, many of them are confronted by another more immediate dilemma: priests they trust and whose Masses they regularly attend, who, though solidly orthodox and committed in their opposition to the Conciliar religion, are reluctant to express openly their sedevacantist position. This stance, however, is most assuredly to be preferred over the others mentioned above.

The purpose of the present study is not (God forbid) to put the laity at odds with their priests, but to help further incite a holy zeal in *all* traditional Catholics to expose the fraud in Rome and the un-Catholic religion over which he presides. But clearly it is *the priests* who need to be taking the lead in this area.

A couple of points of clarification need to be made. First, the term "'secret' sedevacantist" actually refers to two distinct positions that, while differing in specifics, nevertheless produce similar results. The first of these includes those priests who are most deserving of the title. They have no doubts about the *invalidity* of John Paul II, yet feel that there are strong *pastoral* grounds for keeping a low profile on the subject. Under a second heading fall priests who do not, strictly speaking, profess sedevacantism; at least not so in its fullest sense (some even going so far as to attack aspects of it). They do not believe John Paul II is a valid Pope, do not heed him in anything whatsoever and refuse to insert his name in the Canon of the Mass. But, although they are obviously sedevacantists *in practice*, they maintain that this is not out of any strong conviction on their part, but merely the exercise of a valid — and "probable" — theological opinion. These differing camps of "secret" sedevacantists are frequently at odds, sometimes heatedly, with each other over other matters. The relative importance of these controverted points varies, but, whatever their disagreements, the "secret" sedevacantists seem to be joined in a tacit alliance on the "Roman question." And this unity amounts to one simple tenet: *Avoid, whenever possible, any firm statements on the question of John Paul II's legitimacy*.

For example, a priest who advances the "theological opinion" argument as the only proper and truly consistent "Catholic position" on the question, has decried open discussion of the issue as, simultaneously, too much for the uninformed to handle, and merely "preaching to the choir" for those who are informed. (This, in the popular parlance, is known as "having it both ways.") Yet a priest who vigorously opposes him on other points has basically sided with him on this one, even suggesting *in print* that strong statements about the matter of John Paul II's legitimacy (or lack thereof) should be avoided, presumably for the sake of "unity" — he drolly calls for "sede-vacationism," meaning that Catholics should "take a vacation" from debating the issue.

Given that many of the clerics who adopt this position are former members of the SSPX, it should be pointed out that when they belonged to the Society they were obliged to follow a policy that, when asked about the "Pope question," they were to *first* give its position (namely, that John Paul II *is* Pope, albeit a bad one), and only *then* state their personal *opinion*, if it differed from the official stand. It is quite possible, then, that their present position is somehow a carryover from those earlier days. That said, however, it must also be noted that other ex-SSPX priests have been able to slough off this counterproductive mentality, opting for an open — and, hence, more *vital* — opposition to the pseudo-Pope.

In fairness, it must be noted that generally these priests are actually more *guarded* than *secret* in their proclamations, though the effect is substantially the same. They will, if asked (but, most frequently, *only* if asked), express their doubts about the papal claims of John Paul II. The problem is, if they *are not* asked, they will either avoid discussing the question or else couch it with expressions such as "I do not *think* that he is Pope," always leaving the door open for those who *do* think that he is Pope. From their responses can be discerned the most common justifications used to stifle open and frank dialogue concerning the present status of the Holy See; namely, that such discussion is: 1] a barrier to unity; 2] a stumbling block for those new to traditional chapels; 3] old hat for longtime traditional Catholics; and 4] mere theological speculation.

What follows, then, are refutations of these mistaken rationales, to enable the average Catholic in the pew to better encourage his priest *forward* toward a more hard-line stand on the subject. As emphasized a few sentences ago, the purpose here is *not* to cause dissension in traditional churches or to divide the shepherds from their flocks. Quite the contrary, in accord with the belief of a growing number of priests, the only aim is to *strengthen the resolve* of the Church Militant in its fight against the apostate Conciliar religion, by *openly attacking the beast at its head.*

John Paul II: *Is* He Pope Or *Isn't* He?

It is incredible that such a simple but profoundly important question as is asked in this section heading could elicit such studied evasiveness. Whatever the defects of the SSPX or *The Wanderer*, at least they are clear on where they stand: John Paul II *is* a legitimate Pope and must be treated as such. True, SSPX priests, aside from saying their Masses "in union with" (*una cum*) John Paul II, pay him little in the way of obedience, but they argue, from what they presumably believe is a consistent position, that they are opposing a bad Pope. At the other end of the spectrum are those who, like *The Athanasian*, openly reject him as a false Pontiff, and look upon *una cum* Masses as communion with the enemy, being at once a sacrilege against Christ and a scandalous insult to Saint Peter and his *legitimate* successors. (Given the widespread confusion since Vatican II, the culpability of *una cum* "traditional" priests is best left for God to judge, but *objectively* such Masses must be regarded as schismatic since they are *expressly* in union with the head of a non-Catholic Church.) The vital need for priests to make their allegiance a matter of public record is thus at the very heart of the issue; it is one which can be reduced to a pair of simple questions: *"Where do you stand? You know and I know where, but isn't it time that you let* ***others*** *know, too?"*

The "barrier to unity" claim is unique, given that some of its adherents have been known, among other things, to participate at gatherings with Conciliar "traditionalists," and promote the "Indult" Mass as permissible for those unable to attend one celebrated by truly Catholic priests. This mentality has been termed *pantraditionalist*, meaning that its proponents, throwing caution to the wind, are ready to embrace virtually anyone saying the Latin Mass as an ally. Although their motive no doubt springs from a good intention (to bring together those who are in any way traditional, in hopes of leading them to a more hard-line stand), the results have compromised resistance. Those attached to the Conciliar Church are apt to stay there, since there is no pressing reason given for them to leave — after all, they are *already* accepted. Pantraditionalists seem to falsely present the Mass as the primary bond of Catholic unity, while the overriding issues are passed over as divisive. Such "union," however, where *una cum*, or non-*una cum* is

held to be a minor difference in liturgies that are equally pleasing to God, must be regarded as exceedingly dangerous — and, ultimately, disastrous to the cause of Catholic restoration. For where does such thinking wind up? With the SSPX? With Indult Masses? With the Conciliar Fraternity of Saint Peter? Is *nothing* sacred?

Another claim of the "secret" sedevacantists, closely related to the one just mentioned, is that discussion of John Paul II must be subdued on account of newcomers to traditional churches. This is necessary, it is argued, because the topic is *too hot*. There is, to be sure, some truth here, for the impact of such a revelation is not always easy to accept. Saint Paul instructed (in I Cor. 3:2) that new Catholics be fed "milk" (easy doctrines to accept) before giving them "meat" (stickier teachings), so there is some justification for bringing them along slowly. Nevertheless, these same priests do not hesitate to impose another "hard saying" upon the same visitors — and that is that the Conciliar Church and its "new Mass" *must* be avoided at all costs. Yet, as will be demonstrated later in this article, this is an *artificial* distinction, since these same un-Catholic entities would *have no being* if their existence was not maintained and advanced by the false Pontiff, John Paul II. Most newcomers already sense that something is radically sinful in the Conciliar Church or they would not have sought out a traditional Mass. Hence, if these priests would only take the time to prepare for newcomers an adequate exposition of the problem, trusting in God and the faith of these lay people, they would surely find them receptive to the truth. It is a *sham* to conceal from them the fact that the traditional Mass they are attending is *not* in communion with the local Conciliar bishop, and *not* in communion with the impostor in Rome. And it is *doubly* so not to tell them *why* it is that way!

Another premise difficult to justify is that of "preaching to the choir," as if the sedevacantist position is so ingrained in the minds of the faithful that they have no need to be reminded of it. This argument is deficient in two ways. To begin with, the subject is not an abstract one, about which one may idly speculate when there is nothing better to do, but a concrete problem that causes harm to Catholics on a daily basis. The faithful, by and large, are obliged to live in a hostile environment, where even family and friends may take a pro-John Paul II stance, so the need is great for them to be able to intelligently demonstrate — according to Faith and reason — why such a point of view is false. And it is up to traditional priests to lead the way by laying out the proper counterarguments. Second, reminding the faithful of this unpleasant reality need not be an around-the-clock task for clerics, but neither should it be relegated to some dusty, forgotten closet. The evil of abortion, for example, is readily accepted by the faithful, and yet can any cleric reasonably argue that it should never be the topic of a sermon? Of course not, for it is from the pulpit that the Church Militant receives its strength, its encouragement, its marching orders. While it would be a mistake for the preacher to dwell obsessively on the subject, and so neglect the moral and doctrinal teachings essential to the spiritual well-being of the congregation, he would surely be equally amiss to make the status of John Paul II and his false religion a *taboo* subject, for it is *every bit as critical* an issue for Catholics as abortion (and even *more* so).

We come, then, to the final — and, perhaps, the most daunting — of the "secret" contentions, that it is permissible to advance the invalidity of John Paul II as a "theological opinion," (and likely the probable one), but that is as far as it is permissible to take the premise. End of discussion. This is so, they maintain, because only a future Council can give the official, definitive verdict that all Catholics must subsequently heed. Until then, the ecclesial identity of John Paul II must be regarded as a dark, unfathomable mystery: *Maybe the Church has a Pope; maybe it doesn't.* A major contention of this argument is that, because John Paul II's *personal* heresy is open to dispute (some holding it to be formal in nature, while others do not), the question of his legitimacy must also be considered as unresolved. Whatever the merits or flaws of the "personal heresy" view, it is not the primary one with which to show his lack of authority. As demonstrated in the last issue of *The Athanasian*, John Paul II has — *from the Chair of Peter* — advanced doctrines and established laws that are plainly contrary to the solemn teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. This he *could not do* were he a valid Pope, since the charism of the office preserves its occupant both from error and from promulgating laws harmful to souls.

But the "secret" sedevacantists of the "theological opinion" type have placed themselves in the contradictory position of *categorically* condemning the Conciliar "Catholic" Church as a false Church, and the *Novus Ordo Missae* (alias the "new Mass") as sacrilegious — to the point, even, of *forbidding* the Holy Eucharist to anyone who continues to attend it — yet allowing the "papacy" of John Paul II to remain a matter open to speculation. By so

doing, they set themselves up as judges on what Catholics *must* believe and what they *may* believe regarding the great Conciliar apostasy — precisely what they accuse the open sedevacantists of doing. The only difference is that the latter are utterly unfailing in acknowledging not only the absolute necessity for Catholics to remove themselves from the Protestant "new Church" and its "new Mass," but also from giving any adherence to its pseudo-Pope. The grave and urgent need for *consistency* on this question is admirably addressed by Father Donald Sanborn in his article, "Una Cum" (mentioned earlier in the present study). He writes:

> [I]f John Paul II's papal authority is "a matter of theological opinion," then the non-Catholicism of the New Religion and the New Church is also "a matter of theological opinion." For one cannot separate Pope and Church. *Where Peter is, there is the Church.* To make, therefore, the identity of *Peter* a matter of opinion is to make the identity of *the Church* a matter of opinion. *Where a true Peter is, there is the true Church; where there is a false Peter, there is a false Church. But not: where there is a false Peter, there is the true Church, nor where there is a true Peter, there is a false Church.* Impossible, for the Pope is the principle of unity of the Catholic Church...; the identity of the Catholic Church, therefore, is inseparable from the identity of the Roman Pontiff. You cannot separate Pope and Church.

John Paul II *cannot* be accepted as the Pope if his teaching authority, which is *essential* to the papal office, is rejected. It must be one or the other — *accept him or reject him* — and to suggest otherwise is to make a mockery of Catholic theology. And the very falseness of his reign is intimately connected to the falseness of the Conciliar Church.

The Time Is *Now* To Publicly Expose John Paul II

The Modernist captivity of the Catholic Church began in 1965 when Paul VI finalized the decrees of Vatican II, and solidified its bondage four years later with the promulgation of the "new Mass." This Protestant-approved worship service not only greatly helped to establish the Council's revolutionary errors at the parish level, but also served as a principal sign for faithful Catholics that something was drastically amiss with post-Conciliar theology — it was not Catholic, but only *pretended* to be so. The exodus to traditional chapels was then begun in earnest, although there was always the hope that the Church would shortly be restored. Until his death in 1978, Paul VI demonstrated an absolute commitment to these changes and an equal hostility toward traditional Catholicism.

Yet no relief came for the faithful with Paul VI's passing, for his successors, the two John Pauls, made clear their intentions to further the false reforms he had done so much to advance. John Paul II, in particular, has proven, in nearly a decade-and-a-half, to be a very able continuer, adding his own contaminated encyclicals, a "reform"of the Code of Canon Law, and scandalous trips around the world that vie with one another as being the most shocking and infamous. In anguish, traditional Catholics in every nation cry out to Heaven, as with a single voice: *When, pray God, will it end?*

Ultimately, this lament will be answered in God's good time. What is also quite certain, though, is that His timetable very much depends on the response of the faithful in defending His Church. For a Catholic can no more sit idly by during this continuing attack on the Spotless Bride of Christ, than could a husband impassively watch the rape of his wife. To do so, in either case, clearly shows a lack of love. Or, to borrow a military phrase, such behavior amounts to *dereliction of duty*.

If this responsibility extends to the laity, as it surely does, how much greater the obligation of priests? One of the chief reasons that so little progress has been made toward Catholic restoration is, for whatever reason, the unwillingness of the "secret" sedevacantists to hammer home the falseness of John Paul II's reign. The objection will be raised that exposure of John Paul II is not the only issue that separates Catholics or interferes with this longed-for restoration. This is true, of course, but it fails to take in the most *crucial* consideration: There will be *no* restoration of the Church and *no* final resolution of these other issues until the entire Conciliar abomination — including its pseudo-Pope — is overcome.

The "secret" sedevacantist priests have very current evidence of John Paul II's defection from the Faith in his outrage with the voodooists, for it is impossible to conceive of a true Pope not only praising their worship of "God," but also failing to tell them the *necessity* of accepting Christ. For some, this may not be as directly compelling a proof as his officially promulgated heresies but, when taken with the many other similar incidents, it weaves a pattern of apostasy that is difficult to refute. It provides such priests with an excellent opportunity to speak out on the matter. But *will they*?

Regrettably, the answer to this question could well be *no*. The case against John Paul II has grown steadily with the passing years, yet their policy of silence has continued as though there were but scant evidence of his non-papacy. So their change to a more hard-line, more visibly militant position requires a prod. Because there is no clear hierarchy to lead, this prod necessarily must come, first from fellow priests, and then from the laity.

There is nothing wrong with lay people approaching their "secret" sedevacantist clerics on the matter; indeed, there is much that is *right* about it. But before going into this, let me offer a personal experience that may shed some light for any of the laity who are inclined to pursue such a venue. Almost a year ago I wrote a letter of *better than eight pages small print* to one such priest. Before sending it I had another priest proofread it, not only to catch grammatical or theological flaws, but to assure that its tone was properly reverential. Only after it met with these stringent tests did I dare mail it. Month after month passed, but with *no reply*. Meanwhile, the letter circulated to a few other priests, all of whom agreed with the first who read it: The points contained there are well thought out, and the manner of expression reverent. When the leaves began falling from northern trees, I took it upon myself to reproduce the letter, sending it on the faint assumption that the original was never received. Again, *no reply*. During the Christmas season a card was mailed to the same priest with an inscription gently chiding him for his failure to even acknowledge receipt of either copy. Again… well, you know the rest. I bring this up not to discourage contacts with these priests, but only to show what the laity are up against.

It is understood that such lay communications must always be prayerful, reverent and respectful. While one should not harp about the issue, he should make it quite clear to the priest in question that he is firmly committed to sedevacantism, and hopes the priest will "stand up and be counted" on the issue as well. Priests truly have a higher status in the Church than the laity, but they are, as is taught by the Church, given their orders by Christ for one reason, and one reason only: *To serve His flock and lead them to salvation*. This cannot be forgotten by anyone, whether in the clerical or lay state. While the laity should be familiar enough with the arguments outlined above to raise them in discussion, the strongest one is, quite simply, that the sooner the false Conciliar religion and its head are sufficiently denounced — when enough voices are raised to *openly* condemn their lies — the sooner restoration will advance to the next level. And *only* when this stage of heightened Catholic militancy is reached, will Roman Catholics, priests and laity alike, have any *serious hopes* of emerging out of the modern Babylonian Captivity. *This* is the bottom line for these priests to address. They must be shown that their continuing efforts to "stonewall" the question only serves to delay that blessed day of liberation. Surely if, after careful deliberation, they place — as we believe they will — the well-being of the Church above *all* other considerations, they will seriously reconsider their stance. We must trust in Christ that at least some of them will see the need to make this change, and have the courage to forcefully express it. *Let us storm Heaven with prayers for this intention.*

Each priest is, through the Sacrament of Holy Orders, an *alter Christus*, one who acts in the person of Christ. Let us pray that the "secret" sedevacantists *fully* measure up to this sacred duty. May they all take to heart, pondering deeply and devoutly, the words of Our Lord before His persecutors: "I have spoken openly to the world. I have always taught in the synagogue and the temple, wither all the Jews resort: and in secret I have spoken nothing." (Saint John 18:20) †

The enclosed white envelope is for the convenience of those who may wish to send a donation to the TCA. If a blue envelope is also enclosed, that is to be used for subscription renewal.

SUBSCRIPTION RENEWALS

The date on the envelope address label indicates the month and year in which the recipient's subscription is due for renewal. At the proper time, a subscription envelope will be enclosed with the newsletter. One may enter a new subscription at any time, of course, and will then receive the eight following newsletter issues.

Questions And Answers

Fr. Oswald Baker (England)

Question:

If you have something extremely confidential to confide to a priest, can you put him under the seal of confession to keep quiet about this?

Answer:

No. The seal of confession applies only to what is submitted for absolution in the act of confession. But do rest assured that, if your communication is confidential, it will be an odd sort of priest who will not realize this without having to be told so. Avoid odd priests. In the new-style face-to-face chat confession in the Conciliar Church one danger is possible: failure to discern precisely how much chat comes under the seal. In the traditional Catholic form of confession no such doubt is possible. Avoid Conciliar priests.

Question:

Is it permissible for a Catholic to state in his will that an artery in his wrist is to be cut before he is buried? May the priest promise him that this will be done?

Answer:

What is morally lawful in such a request depends on the person's intention. Whether or not he is a Catholic is irrelevant. If he is haunted by fear of being buried alive and is demanding that, in case death is only apparent, it be made real by direct intervention, he is provisionally requesting homicide, and the request is morally unlawful. But what he more probably wants is, not a future act of provisional killing, but relief from a present obsession about being buried alive, and he can be granted this relief if he rewords his request. An artery is to be cut, not "before my burial," but "after my death." Death having been established, an artery may be cut.

It is hardly appropriate that the promise be made by the priest. The priest will ensure that the testator's intention is correctly limited, and can promise that he will make no objection to its fulfillment.

Question:

In response to the priest's prayer, "Dominus vobiscum," what is the meaning of "and with thy spirit"?

Answer:

It means: and with the spirit which is in you by reason of your ordination. May your priesthood be fruitful. May the Lord strengthen you in your work for Him. May you succeed in spreading knowledge and love of Our Lord.

Question:

For what sort of reasons does the Church grant annulments of marriage?

Answer:

Never use the term "annulment." It is ambiguous. It is used to mean a judgement that a union was invalid from the beginning by reason of some legal obstacle. It is also used to mean the *dissolution* of a marriage bond. When the first meaning is intended we ought always to use the term "decree of nullity." The Church judges that, in particular cases and in spite of appearances to the contrary, there was no true marriage in the first place because there was some legal defect or impediment in the contract rendering it invalid. For example, it may be ascertained after a wedding that one of the parties went through the ceremony under duress, or that one suffers from permanent impotence. Such an impediment invalidates the contract, and a "decree of nullity" is simply a judicial declaration to this effect. There are a round dozen such impediments which nullify a marriage contract.

An Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Fisher), who some few years ago declared that he "preferred" the Anglican attitude to divorce to the Roman device of "multiplying impediments" in order to facilitate decrees of nullity, was gravely mistaken. The nullifying, or "diriment," impediments to marriage have remained unchanged down through the centuries. The Church's teaching on divorce is, and has always been, that a marriage sacramentally valid, and consummated, can never be dissolved except by the death of one of the parties.

CAPSULE COMMENTS

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

According to Article III, Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States, treason against this country consists, in part, in adhering to its enemies, giving them aid and comfort. Can any intelligent, well-informed, honorable person fail to see that this definition of treason applies to a T to the man who is now the President of the United States? The ultimate objective of Mr. Clinton (I have not the slightest doubt) is the destruction of the USA and its incorporation into the inhuman, amoral, satanic New World Order. In a word, then, Mr. Clinton is a traitor — and treason is the order of the day in his administration. But it is never identified as such. How come? The oft-quoted words of Sir John Harrington (1561-1612) provide the answer: "Treason doth never prosper. What's the reason? For if it prosper, none dare call it treason." And what has been said here of President Clinton is, I contend, every bit as applicable to "co-president" Hillary as well. Neither the moral law of God nor the U.S. Constitution amounts to a hill of beans with either of them.

† †

More and more Roman Catholics are becoming convinced that John Paul II is a bogus Pope, that is to say, they are becoming sedevacantists. Since that has been my absolute conviction for some eight years now, it is gratifying to know that the sedevacantist position is being accepted by a steadily increasing number. One confirmation of this appeared in an article in the February 15, 1993 issue of *The Remnant* in which it was stated that the ranks of sedevacantism are "fast expanding." *The Remnant* being another conservative publication aligned with the Conciliar Church — and, consequently, recognizing John Paul II as a valid Pope — the author of the article was very unhappy about the fast expansion in the sedevacantist ranks. The point, however, is that the fact that such an admission was made by such a publication as *The Remnant* is, I submit, a good indication that sedevacantism is coming into its own and can no longer be ignored by the conservative branch of the Conciliar Church. May our ranks grow speedily!

† †

Preliminary steps, the last I heard, are in progress in the Conciliar Church to determine the qualifications for "canonization" of Paul VI. Incredible, you say — but it's true. Yes, the day may not be far distant when non-Pope Paul VI will be "canonized" a "saint" in the non-Catholic Conciliar Church by non-Pope John Paul II. What a consummate farce! What a brazen insult to Almighty God and to the multitude of His glorious saints throughout the Christian centuries!

† †

For many months now the national news media have included reports almost daily on the hostilities in what was formerly Yugoslavia. Among those hostilities are the Serbian assaults on Slovenia and Croatia. But not even once have I heard on these news broadcasts that the forces waging the assaults are Serbian *Communists* and that the population of Slovenia and Croatia is predominantly Catholic. According to the Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation, however, such is the case. And so we have yet another example of the enemy controlled press here in America. The Serbian forces are Communist and their victims are primarly Catholic — and that kind of information *must* be kept from the American people by the mass media.

† †

Pray the Rosary Daily

THE ATHANASIAN

Published by Traditional Catholics of America

Eight issues a year: (Jan. 15, Mar. 1, Apr. 15, June 1, July 15, Sept. 1, Oct. 15, Dec. 1)

Subscriptions: $12 per year (via First Class Mail) for the USA, Canada and Mexico; $16 per year (via Air Mail) for all other countries.

Additional Copies: Single copy - $1.50; 10 copies - $12.00; 40 or more to same address - $1.00 each

Mailing Address: P. O. Box 38335, Colorado Springs, CO 80937 **Telephone:** (719) 636-1575

Articles appearing in this newsletter may be reproduced providing no changes of any kind are made in those articles and adequate credit is given to *The Athanasian* for them. The adequate credit preferred would be the inclusion with the articles reproduced of the information contained in this box.