

Introduction

The incidence of those who attempting to seduce the faithful by posting erroneous and undocumented essays on sites appealing to those praying at home seems to be increasing. So the following is necessary to help those encountering such sites to see exactly how omissions, assumptions, lack of sufficient proofs and misinterpretations, whether unintentional or done from some hidden motive, can make it appear that such individuals are promoting the truth when this is not the case. Many who come across such sites find it difficult to determine exactly where they deviate from the faith, because those operating these sites are so adept at stating their premises in ambiguous and misleading terms. A brief, although incomplete summary of the errors of those presenting such material is listed below.

- Those who advise praying at home yet hold the Feenyite heresy that “baptism” of desire does not result in salvation, denying the authority of the Holy Office’s decision regarding Rev. Leonard Feeney’s teachings and the validity of his excommunication by Pope Pius XII.
- “Catholic” liberals who while endorsing praying at home minimize papal authority and dismiss papal decisions, espouse liberal charity regarding the status of Traditionalists and profess the heresy of Fideism, the “dumbing down “ of Catholics by insisting that no one today is required to learn truths of faith beyond those found in the basic catechisms.
- Sites that would have readers believe it is heresy to teach there that are no longer true bishops alive following the reported death of ALL bishops consecrated under Pope Pius XII. They maintain this because they pretend that such bishops must yet exist to fulfill Christ’s promise that the Church, as He constituted it, will last until the very end. (Ironically, they fail to acknowledge the fact that Christ constituted the Church with Peter as its indispensable foundation.) This is basically a denial of the Vatican Council decrees which clearly recognize the pope as HEAD bishop wielding supreme jurisdiction, with the bishops and cardinal bishops, priests and religious, as well as all Catholics on earth fully and individually subject to him.
- Still others advise praying at home, but only if no “priest” is available, claiming certain unspecified “elderly” priests can still possess jurisdiction.

All of the above advocate for a belief system at odds with what the Church actually teaches, so therefore they scatter not gather. Faith must be one and undivided, centered on the only source of faith and unity set at the head of the Church by Christ Himself — St. Peter and his successors. ***Denial of the necessity of the papacy and the Roman Pontiff as the sole source of ANY jurisdiction whatsoever should be the red flags that warn all away from these sites.*** The sappy and sinful sort of charity that would give Traditional pseudo-clergy a pass should also be a dead giveaway, when, in the words of Pope St. Pius X, “... "They want [to treat the Modernists] with oil, soap and caresses. But they should be beaten with fists. In a duel, you don't count or measure the blows, you strike as you can." As the errors of these “pray-at-home” sites continue to come to our attention, we will refute them. The most recent refute follows below.

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

The Calefactory.org site advertises itself as “the source for 100% traditional Catholic doctrine.” It has many lovely pictures and helpful resources, some of which also are available on this site. The authors of Calefactory are not listed anywhere discoverable in their site map and so remain anonymous. Citing many of the same sources already noted in articles and books published here since 2006, they have posted a summary of errors of Vatican 2, some of which are excerpted below with comments. All comments appear in blue.

Catechism on the Errors of Vatican II ... and its “popes”

1. Who was John XXIII?

His real name was Giuseppe Roncalli. He was sent as Nuncio to Turkey because the Holy Office's suspicion of his liberal views. During his term there, he joined the Rosicrucian Masonic Sect in 1935. By this very act of changing religions he “tacitly resigned” (Canon Law 188 # 4.) from all offices in the Church and was no longer a member of the Catholic Church. However, as with all things Masonic, this was still “secret” (occult) from the hierarchy of the Church and the Pope. He was then sent to France as Nuncio, and it was there that he received his red hat from the hands of the Masonic French President, an unparalleled event. He was then re-called and sent to Venice as its Patriarch and it was there that he set into motion the creation of this false Church.

COMMENT: The **FACT** that Roncalli defended Communism and Socialism pre-election was proven by citing comments from Roncalli himself prior to his election, taken from his own writings, and as quoted by his biographers. On July 1, 1949, Pope Pius XII issued a directive from the Holy Office, entered into the Acta Apostolica Sedis, condemning as **APOSTATES** those who “...defend and spread the materialistic and anti-Christian doctrine of the Communists...” These proofs appeared in my 1990 book, *Will the Catholic Church Survive...?* This not to mention Roncalli's practice of pan-Christianism condemned by Pope Pius XI. Especially given this directive from Pope Pius XII on Communism, **RONCALLI'S HERESIES COULD NOT HAVE BEEN OCCULT**, although they may have been unknown to Pope Pius XII. They were uttered publicly and gave rise to incredulity from Catholics even then, as his biographers record. It therefore was **notorious**, and those electing a future pope were obligated to inform themselves about the character of their candidate.

2. If John XXIII was the infidel he was, how did he get elected?

Roncalli was not the only Free Mason within the bowels of the Church. Many other Cardinals and Archbishops had already sold their souls to the devil. After all, **Christ did not guarantee that every member of the hierarchy would be a saint.** Everyone would have to work out his own salvation. In the end there were more infidels in the hierarchy than there were Catholics. **Roncalli was elected (invalidly) because it was the “permissive” will of God** to fulfill the prophecy of Scripture detailing the “Universal Apostasy,” the coming of the “Man of Sin,” **and the eventual return of Christ to judge all mankind.**

COMMENT: Roncalli was elected invalidly because those electing him failed to follow the laws **laid down by pontiffs throughout the centuries**, infallibly codified in Pope Pius XII's *Vacantis Apostolicae Sedis* (VAS). Failure to follow this election constitution invalidated the entire election (see also Can. 147) as well as any future elections. Can. 2391 §1 also nullifies and voids any election attempted by a college of electors that has elected an unworthy candidate, meaning that Paul 6 could never have been validly elected on two counts. Although Calefactory.org mentions Can. 188 no. 4 twice in their document, there is no other mention of Canon Law, God's **SIGNIFIED**, as a body, nor of its application to the current crisis. We never have supposed that the hierarchy, cardinals and bishops were saints. But the Church demands that saints or no, **they diligently follow Her laws**, which are negatively infallible.

3. If Roncalli was an Infidel and because of his prior defection and loss of Office how are we to judge?

Due to the Providence of God in the 3rd person of the Blessed Trinity, it fell on the responsibility of Pope Pius IX, who was the Pope that faced the Revolutionaries of Socialism, **Communism, Liberalism and Freemasonry**, who saw the face of Satan when he stripped bare these images of the 19th century revolution. It was this saintly pontiff who called the First Vatican Council and even in that Council, there were already forces that were arrayed against him.

COMMENT: Here they neglect to mention *the 1949 binding teaching of Pope Pius XII* on excommunications for defending Communism. This is the most definitive and most recent teaching available to us today.

4. How could the Doctrine of Papal Infallibility expose Roncalli for the traitor that he was?

“Pastor Aeternus,” the Encyclical that defined this dogma states that the pope, when speaking from the “Chair of Peter” on matters of the faith morals, cannot err. **When John XXIII spoke out from this very position in his encyclical “Pacem in Terris,” he taught error. It is incompatible that he could be the pope and yet teach error**, therefore by the Will of Almighty God, the protection promised by Christ to Peter was never with Roncalli. It was a sign of his defection from the faith.

COMMENT: This explanation could lead those accepting it to believe that **BEFORE** Roncalli issued *Pacem in Terris*, which was co-authored by G.B. Montini, **he may** have been a valid pope. If incontrovertible proofs are not offered for the invalidity of the **election** from Pope Pius XII’s VAS, (see comment under no. 2 above), then the door for validity to that point remains open and up for to debate, as indeed has been the case in certain Traditionalist circles. This would mean that up until April 11, 1963, when *Pacem in Terris* was released — **LESS THAN TWO MONTHS BEFORE RONCALLI’S FALSE PAPACY ENDED** — his acts could possibly be valid, meaning for the scope of almost his entire papacy. This would include the convening of the **first session** of the false Vatican 2 council and the institution of the John 23 Missal. But as stated above, his commission of heresy publicly **has** been proven and is a matter of record.

Therefore it is not just “incompatible” that Roncalli could be pope and teach error; it is dogmatically **IMPOSSIBLE**. The only documentation offered on the Calefactory site for Roncalli’s defection from the faith is his Masonic membership, which, since it is secret, cannot be proven publicly. Public defection must be provided and has been provided. This entire line of argument disingenuously sidesteps the **legal command** to invoke Pope Paul IV’s infallible bull *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio* as the old law (Can. 6 §4) governing heresy. This bull is listed repeatedly in the footnotes to nearly every canon of the 1917 Code of Canon Law treating heresy, apostasy and schism. In studying this bull conscientiously and **HONESTLY**, it can easily be seen that it excludes from the possibility of election anyone, most specifically cardinals, who at the time of election could be identified as an apostate, heretic or schismatic. More on this below.

Four hundred years before the Vatican Council convened, Pope Paul IV **DID** uphold the dogma of infallibility by issuing this bull. For if one believes that Roncalli’s heresy only became manifest during his false papacy, it allows for the debate to continue, as it indeed has, regarding whether a pope can become a public heretic in office. This question was later **settled** at the Vatican Council in 1869-70. So if we see that a man **HAS** uttered heresy in office, we **KNOW** that he must necessarily have been a heretic prior to his election, and the need arises to prove that this was the case. For it is Catholic dogma that no one is allowed to judge the pope, but in declaring one

who was never validly elected a usurper, one is not judging anyone by an individual **reduced to the lay state**, who never obtained the office in the first place.

7. Did not these clerics know the teachings of their faith, and that to deviate from it would be the loss of salvation. Or that “outside the Church there is No salvation?” Unfortunately, many priests were already by then no longer members of the faith in the spirit. They were brainwashed in the Seminaries with the apostasy of Modernism. It was too well protected by their local Ordinaries, if not explicitly, then implicitly. Pius XII, the last true Pope before John XXIII, was by then already surrounded by a Masonic Cabal. **Even his personal physician was a Mason, his confessor, who became Cardinal Bea in Vatican II was an unconverted Jew within the Jesuit order.**

COMMENT: Proofs, please. I have no doubt that this is true but proofs must be provided. Canon 2233 states that: “No penalty can be inflicted unless it is proved **with certainty** that the offence has been committed... If the delinquent remains obstinate the censure may be inflicted.” However **NO DECLARATION IS NECESSARY** in the case of a notorious offence *ipso facto* or automatically incurred, and that is according to Can. 2197. The censure for heresy, apostasy and schism is *ipso facto (latae sententiae)* under Can 2314.

9. If this was so, then what about all further hierarchical promotions, the calling of Vatican II, its decrees the changes to the liturgy and the laws of the Church, the new canon Law and John Paul II’s new catechism? They are ALL **null and void**, since they had **no** authority, to function as Catholic members of the hierarchy. This is because they all followed John XXIII into his new false religion of ecumenical Conciliarism, a deadly heresy previously condemned by the past Magisterium. **And by virtue of the Magisterium’s Canon 188 # 4, they too “tacitly resigned” from all offices in the Church, outside of which there is NO salvation. (Unam Sanctam. Pope Boniface VIII. 1302.)**

COMMENT: Here is the second mention of Can. 188 no. 4 in this document. The **parent law** of Can. 188 no. 4 is *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*. Pope Pius XII also footnotes another one of Pope Paul IV’s previous laws on papal election in his VAS. If *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio* is no longer applicable, why is it retained in the Code in so many places? Can 188 no. 4 is rightly attributed to the magisterium here, so if *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio* is defunct, why would Pope Pius XII cite it in his infallible election constitution? Also noteworthy in no. 9 above is the reference to “Outside the Church, no salvation.” Of course this is a Church dogma, but do the operators of this site favor the heretical teachings/ interpretation of Fr. Leonard Feeney on this teaching???

Second Vatican Council (1962-1965)

1. Is Vatican II a Valid Council?

NO. It is not a valid Council since it was called by a non-Pope, a non-Christian, who was NOT validly elected.

COMMENT: Once again I agree, but proofs, please. It seems fairly obvious that although such proofs are indeed available, and have been for over 30 years, many of these site operators will go to almost any lengths to avoid citing anything documented on betrayedcatholics in way of proof. This in itself should speak volumes.

Conclusion

We can only give at this time a short synopsis of the chief errors of this new false Sect now occupying Rome. It is a fact of the faith, a dogma of gigantic proportions, that "Outside the Catholic Church, there is NO salvation." Since Vatican II, John XXIII created a new man-made Church which is not the Catholic Church, then all those inside this false sect are outside the true Church Christ founded 2000 years ago. And since the clergy in this sect have been blinded and thus sin against the Holy Ghost, which sins are unforgivable, then it is up to the laity to flee this church of the Antichrist. It is also up to the Remnant members of the Church to help them. So what are we to do?

However, as has always been the case throughout the history of the Church, a Remnant persisted in retaining the fullness of the faith. The true Church is to be found among those who believe and continue to believe in the manner of their ancestors. It is they who bear witness to the truths of Christ's promise. It is they who provide the proof that "the gates of hell have not prevailed." Not all are profound theologians. Not all are sinless. But they can be recognized by their insistence on true priests and the true mass.

COMMENT: The remnant can **ONLY** be recognized by their firm belief that, as the Catholic Church infallibly teaches, the Church cannot exist juridically, hierarchically, **WITHOUT THE POPE**. Certainly, as they explain in their document, the **MYSTICAL BODY** headed by Christ can never cease to exist. For as Pope Pius XII infallibly taught in *Mystici Corporis*, this is indeed the Church. If they are preaching the end times here, the very end, as they appear to be doing, they cannot deny that "He who withholdeth," the Pope, has been taken out of the way and the Holy Sacrifice has ceased, as the Fathers unanimously agree will happen during the reign of Antichrist. They do not identify Paul 6 and his successors as Antichrist and his system. And yet if they expect the end, they are bound to identify **the** Antichrist and the fulfillment of the prophecies in Matt. 24 and 2 Thess. 2.

2. Are there then any Bishops left in the world to rescue the Church?

If there are, then they are, by their silence, traitors and defectors, certainly cowards. However, the understanding by the Remnant Church is that there are none, that is, those legitimately consecrated in the time of Pope Pius XII who died on October 9, 1958. The very few left do not have long to wait now to enter the "Promised Land."

COMMENT: Where are the proofs? The fact that no bishops consecrated by Pope Pius XII are alive today is readily available on the Internet. If we do not have long to wait now until the end, what happened to Antichrist? Where is/was he? Those who fail to provide proofs for what they present lack credibility. And this is especially true when such individuals do not even sign their names to the pieces they represent as "100% traditional Catholic doctrine." The catchword here is "traditional." **True** Catholicism has no need for adjectives, as Pope Benedict XV teaches.

4. Is there then No Apostolicity?

a) Yes, it resides with those very few priests still with jurisdiction. Time is running out as these men are old men now.

b) We, as the Remnant Members of the Church, must be very **explicit** in our terminology to distinguish between Members and non-members. It is **not** our prerogative at this time to label those clerics and even laity in the Vatican II church as heretics or otherwise, since no Papal declaration has been passed by the very fact there has been **no pope** since the death of Pius XII.

COMMENT: Regarding 4 (a) above, this is the **CLASSIC CASE** of a false (sophistic) argument as defined by those theologians teaching pre-1959 on the topic of scholastic philosophy/theology. The authors of this site do not bother even attempting to define jurisdiction before they tell others to seek out those who they claim possess it. This is called by these theologians *petition principi*: **“Assuming as true that which has yet to be proved”** (Joseph b. Walsh S.J., *Logic*, 1940). According to Can. 200, “He who claims to possess delegated jurisdiction has the burden of proving the delegation.” And Canon 201 states: “The power of jurisdiction may be exercised directly over subjects only. The judicial power, both ordinary and delegated, may not be exercised for one’s own convenience nor outside the proper territory.” Those advising people to resort to these few remaining elderly men **HAVE THE OBLIGATION TO POST ON THEIR WEBSITE** the documents *PROVING* these men ever received jurisdiction from a valid bishop who can be verified as such **AND THAT THEY YET POSSESS THIS JURISDICTION**. Canon law demands this and Pope Pius XII’s election constitution *VAS* forbids anyone to act outside the canons during an interregnum. If they do so act, these acts are null, void and invalid.

Clearly those responsible for this article at Calefactoy believe that apostolicity exists only in those who have received Holy Orders and delegated jurisdiction. And yet we read from the best theologians that apostolicity consists of three separate yet necessary components: *“Apostolicity of origin, [which] means that the legitimate, juridical succession of bishops can be traced back in an unbroken line to the Apostles... Apostolicity of doctrine, mean[ing] the full profession of those doctrines which Christ taught the Apostles and which they were to teach the world. Apostolicity of doctrine flows from apostolicity of origin. The latter is proof of the former, but not vice versa.”* *Evidence for Our Faith*, Rev. Joseph H. Cavanaugh, C.S.C., Asst. Professor of Religion, Notre Dame Univ., 1952). Apostolicity of mission is explained as follows by Revs. Devivier and Sasia, in their *Christian Apologetics*, Vol. II, (1924): **“JURISDICTION ITSELF DWELLS AT ALL TIMES IN THE HEADS OF THE CHURCH AND IS ALWAYS TRANSMITTED ACCORDING TO THE CANONICAL RULES IN FORCE AT THE TIME**. Whosoever, therefore, has not received jurisdiction according to those rules...remains without it...”

So what are the pre-1959 rules that govern the exercise of delegated jurisdiction? Revs. Woywod-Smith, *A Practical Commentary on Canon Law*, 1957, under Can. 804 write:

“699. A priest who desires to say Holy Mass in a church other than that to which he is attached must show authentic **and still valid letters of recommendation** (commonly called ‘Celebret’) to the priest in charge of the church. A secular priest must obtain these letters from his Ordinary... A priest who has a proper “Celebret” shall be admitted to say Mass, **unless it is known that in the meantime he has done something for reason of which he must be kept from saying Holy Mass...**

“700. The Council of Chalcedon (451) ruled that no strange cleric or lector should be permitted to minister outside his own town **without letters of recommendation from his own bishop**. Pope Innocent III issued the same prohibition but said that the priest who did not have his letters of recommendation might be admitted to say Mass if he desired to do so out of devotion: **he might not, however, say Mass before the people, but privately. The Council of Trent again made the rule absolute** — as the Council of Chalcedon had it — **that no priest should be permitted**

to celebrate Mass and administer the Sacraments without letters of recommendation from his own bishop.”

Why does the above canon forbid that validly ordained priests function today? Because jurisdiction is assigned priests for a limited amount of time and before it can be renewed, priests are required to take refresher courses to update them on the most recent dogmatic developments. Priests are always assigned only to a specific territory — for subjects only in that territory — for the length of the stay of any secular priest in a certain diocese, or any particular length of time. This varies from place to place. It is not unreasonable to assume that the average length of time granted by those possessing **episcopal** faculties (delegated jurisdiction from the bishop to the priest to hear confessions, say Mass, preach etc.) is five years, since this is the amount of time the Holy See granted general (**Apostolic**) faculties to bishops for various purposes. In many cases, such practices are modeled after the practice of the Holy See (see Catholic Encyclopedia article [here](#).) That being the case, how could those priests yet existing possibly possess jurisdiction when it long ago expired? And if they claim it was granted only verbally, or that it was perpetual, the burden of proof lies on them under Canon 200.

Meanwhile there is doubt, and grave doubt, since perpetual (universal) jurisdiction was granted only to the cardinals. In doubt we know that such men could never be asked to administer the Sacraments or celebrate Holy Mass. How are we to know whether or not they are under censure? Or perhaps might even have been dismissed by their diocese for sexual or other misconduct and therefore are not allowed to function even in normal times? The Council of Chalcedon and Pope Innocent III recognize the lack of jurisdiction of such priests by demanding letters of recommendation from the bishops and limiting their functions to mass in private, **NOT** before the people. Certainly and understandably there is no mention of Confessions. During an interregnum, all these functions are suspended. And if performed they are null, void and invalid as Pope Pius XII taught in VAS. We cannot accept statements made without proof. We must follow only what the popes infallible teach, obeying God, not man.

And now we must address the comments made under 4 (b). To **NOT** consider those among the laity and “clergy” of both the Novus Ordo and Traditionalist sects as heretics, when more than abundant proof has been advanced to demonstrate this, is a contradiction of papal teaching. Pope Alexander VII, condemning errors then proposed regarding various moral matters taught: “Although it is evidently established by you that Peter is a heretic **you are not bound to denounce [him]** if you cannot prove it” (DZ 1105). That there is no obligation to denounce is also contrary to Can. 1325 which **commands** us to profess our faith publicly, “...whenever, **silence**, subterfuge, or ...manner of acting would otherwise entail an implicit denial of faith, a contempt of religion, an insult to God or scandal to their neighbor.”

All of what the Novus Ordo stands for is a most grievous insult to God. Likewise the operations of Traditionalists, who commit sacrilege by their simulation of Mass and Sacraments. To remain silent on these base insults to God would be to dishonor Him and make it appear that we approved of them, scandalizing our neighbor and implicitly denying our faith. Canon 2200 states that the evil will to break the law is to be presumed in the **external forum** until the contrary is proven. We judge the **actions** we see and hear, not the conscience of those engaging in these actions, and we do so on the order of the Church. The common good, that the Church be preserved from all appearance of error, supersedes any consideration of individual cases. To place the interests of those erring, however much in good faith we might hope them to be, above the interests of truth is a false and liberal charity indeed. We leave the attribution of guilt for these actions to God, but as Rev. Felix Sarda-Salvany says in his *Liberalism is a Sin*:

“Modern Liberalism... imposes a false notion of charity; our neighbor first and, if at all, God afterwards. By its reiterated and trite accusations of intolerance, it has succeeded in disconcerting even some staunch Catholics. But our rule is too plain and too concrete to admit of misconception. It is: **sovereign Catholic inflexibility is sovereign Catholic charity. This charity is practiced in relation to our neighbor when in his own interests he is crossed, humiliated, and chastised. It is practiced in relation to a third party, when he is defended from the unjust aggression of another, as when he is protected from the contagion of error by unmasking its authors and abettors and showing them in their true light as iniquitous and pervert, by holding them up to the contempt, horror and execration of all.** It is practiced in relation to God when, for His glory and in His service, it becomes necessary to silence all human considerations, to trample underfoot all human respect, to sacrifice all human interests and even life itself to attain this highest of all ends... The saints are the type of this unswerving and sovereign fidelity to God, the heroes of charity and religion...”

And we have no choice today but to try our best to be those saints.

Summary

The comments above show that however well-intentioned this site may be, it is a danger to those who think they can read it and come away with a doctrinally correct idea of what happened at Vatican 2 and to the Church in general. If we are truly members of Christ's Mystical Body, the Church; if we accept Pope Pius XII as the last true pope, which those responsible for Calefactory claim, then we must obey what he infallibly taught in *Mystici Corporis Christi* regarding who are to be counted as members of the Mystical Body:

“Now since its Founder willed this social body of Christ to be visible, **the cooperation of all its members must also be externally manifest through their profession of the same faith** and their sharing the same sacred rites, through participation in the same Sacrifice, **and the practical observance of the same laws. Above all, it is absolutely necessary that the Supreme Head, that is, the Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth, be visible to the eyes of all**, since it is He who gives effective direction to the work which all do in common in a mutually helpful way towards the attainment of the proposed end. As the Divine Redeemer sent the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, who in His name should govern the Church in an invisible way, so, in the same manner, He commissioned Peter and his successors to be His personal representatives on earth and to assume the visible government of the Christian community.” Pope Pius XII would later teach in VAS that during an interregnum, the laws of the Church cannot be violated, and if they are transgressed, the acts resulting from that transgression are null and void.

The laws and teachings of the Roman Pontiffs must be our only guide today. Those sites which do not insist on this cannot be trusted and must be avoided. The Deposit of Faith as carefully guarded by the Roman Pontiffs is our only lifeline, the light on the mountaintop which still shines forth in all its splendor and glory from Holy Mother Church. Only the Holy Ghost shines with this light, and men who fail to avail themselves of His wisdom live in darkness.