

Transcript: SSPX Podcast – Crisis in the Church Series Episode #34
sspypodcast.com

Andrew: “Welcome back to the SSPX Podcast, and our next episode in the Crisis In The Church Series. And happy to welcome back Don Tranquilo; “Hello, Father, how are you today?”

Father: “Hi. Nice to see you again. I’m fine, thank you.”

Andrew: “You as well, very good to have you back for this second time and [the] last episode that we had you on, about 5 episodes ago, we were speaking about collegiality. Today we are speaking about something that is related, in that it has to do with the Papacy. And you had said that some of the topics of the main points that we talked about in that episode will help us to inform this episode. So this episode is all about sedevacantism. So, can we start with just understanding what is sedevacantism and what is the sedevacantist position?”

Father: “Yes, as you know, after the Council, the problem of these Popes, the new Popes...holding.. actually radical statements, writing them in the documents in the council, that was a problem actually, because how can we relate ourselves to an authority that is apparently out of the Church in some way, that is what they would say. If these people become heretics, they are no longer Popes for example, or they lose their authority. That was a solution because they should be infallible. How can they say heresies, and even in some way apparently teach them. So they are heretics, they cannot be part of the Church and so either as Popes, and so they lose everything by the day they say heresy they no longer are Popes, for example, they lose their jurisdiction, that’s what we talked about in the episode of collegiality; the question of the origin of jurisdiction, for the bishops and the Popes and so on. And that’s the point; we are all in front of a problem, heretical people having authority, apparently having authority in the Church, how can we solve that? How can we save the dogma of infallibility, for example? And the primacy of the Holy See, and to put that together with these people having authority, apparent authority in the Church now saying heresies, spreading errors, spreading modernism and many other scandals about doctrine, the very essence of the papacy to translate doctrine seems to us, so they say they cannot be Popes, they are no longer Popes and they have authorities on their side apparently still, to say that many theologians seem to have foreseen this possibility and they quote a lot of theologians and past doctors having said that if a Pope falls into heresy he loses the papacy and is no longer a Pope so it’s ok, we are not to blame, they say you, the Society, you say that they are Popes but you disobeyed them, how is this possible, this is not Catholic, your position is not Catholic, they say. And so their opinion that comes from them is essential to remain Catholics in this moment, that’s why they are very strong in their position, is because they say if you do not hold our position well you lose the Faith, you will say that Popes are not infallible you say because they say heresies, [and] we agree with them about that, we agree that there are heresies in the council that go against the Faith in the council and after that. So they say to us, you say that... these people say heresies, and then you don’t want to obey them even if you say they have authority, so how is that possible? You are no longer Catholic, you say that they are not infallible so you are denying dogmas, they say to us. And so what is the answer, which was our question today, how is that right? It is so simple, they lose papacy and everything is fine, according to them, once we see that they are no longer

Popes, it's ok we have no problems, we have solved the crisis in the Church or the problem and they are no longer Catholics, refusing authority of Pope Francis or Benedict or John Paul II the first and so on up to John the XXIII, they are not altogether in this question. Then they have many schools, many positions slightly different but the main things of their problem is to say that since John XXIII or Paul the VI, the Popes have lost their authority so they are not Popes actually, not true Popes, [they are] false Popes, anti-Popes if you like better, but they are not Popes, so they do not have the power of governing and teaching the Church; that's the question, that's sedevacantism in it's essence. And we have seen they have some reasons, they seem to have some reasons in what they say obviously."

Andrew: "Right.. I'd like to read just a little bit of a piece from Bishop Sanborn, he's one of the largest figures, I think, in the sedevacantist movement, at least here in the United States.. He says: 'If one admits that the Novus Ordo changes, proceed from the Catholic Church, one must admit that the Catholic Church has defected, for these changes substantially contradict the Faith, the morals, worship and discipline of the Catholic Church. But it is impossible that the Catholic Church defects, therefore, it is impossible that these changes proceed from the Catholic Church.' So he seems to be saying... that since these changes are coming from Rome, we know that the Church cannot defect, then therefore, one cannot be enforced, there must be a sede vacante, an open seat."

Father: "This sentence taken as it is, we could maybe subscribe to that, in a sense, because we should agree that these changes do not come from the Catholic Church, because we say that the New Rite, for example, is not a Catholic Rite, it is not a rite of expressing the Faith, but we have to find a different solution to explain that; how this doesn't come from the Church and it is not necessary, as they think, to say that there is no hierarchy, otherwise we will see why it's better, or to say that it's not necessary, to explain what he says in another way; we have to explain that sentence, which could be taken as it is, could be, but it does have to be explained by another cause...we must find at least another explanation, because their explanation doesn't work. So we can start from that, in common with them, saying, ok, we can agree that there are heresies and they cannot come from the Catholic Church, but it is not a solution to say there is no hierarchy, [that the] hierarchy is not working. Maybe we...have not found a complete solution to the problem, but [theirs] is certainly wrong, and we will see why... We [don't] have to diminish the gravity of the crisis of heresies and so on, to go against them, this is not necessary, this is not to say that maybe they are not heresies, but maybe they're just mistakes or something, or they [don't] really come from the mind of the Pope, this is not necessary, not at all, it doesn't matter, we take the problem in the highest level, we don't need to diminish it. [14:45] We agree with them, but we can discuss [where] we start agreeing with them: they are heresies, it's ok, we are not to discuss that. If what we say works, it will work even if we [would say] they are not heresies or whatever, we go at the highest level so that everything is fine, [it] cannot be contradicted."

Andrew: "And also in the same token, Father, it's understandable for many people to have this position. You can definitely empathize with how they are feeling, all of these errors, all of these changes, all of this coming from the Vatican, it's understandable for many people to go 'they can't be the Pope'.

Father: “It is a reaction that somebody tried to build theologically, but they forgot something, in my opinion, they forgot something in their reasoning. They didn’t see the consequences of their opinions, that is a problem... We can try to see why: what they say [is that] many theologians in the past have said, many it is true, if the Pope falls into heresy, he is no longer Pope. So if he says heresies in public, for example, he stops to be the Pope. But what they forget is that these theologians [and] doctors...for them it was a kind of hypothesis...this never happened, so it was just a school-study, a schoolcase, they wanted to see all the possibilities. Some were accusations against some of the Popes in the past, for some of them it was also a question of solving problems of the time but maybe they were wrong on some occasions. Anyway, they say that. But what...the scenario or image was is that, yes, the Pope fell into heresy, but there was still.. The hierarchy, the bishops, the cardinals, having the faith, so [it was] right to elect a new Pope, simply. [But] this thesis was problematic because who is in charge of saying ‘ok, the Pope is saying heresy, so we have to elect a new one’ who is this man - he does not exist, there is no authority able to do that, the Pope cannot be judged. But they knew that this was a problem because it was a school-case. Sometimes they tried [some] solutions, but it’s very difficult in practice to do that. Some of these people...were conciliarists, so they say if the Pope is heretic the council can judge him, but this is not acceptable for a Catholic at all, some of them were Catholic so they couldn’t find a proper solution, [because] they didn’t know who was in charge to say ‘ok it’s the moment to elect a new Pope’, it doesn’t matter now, let’s say that this works. [18:45] What doesn’t work is that the case they thought is not our case. Why? Because according to every sedevacantist of today who were not just lacking missing the Pope, but all the hierarchy, because with the Pope, Paul the VI, I don’t know, all the bishops in the council and especially the residential bishops, the bishops with jurisdictions in their diocese, so the hierarchy technically speaking, having ordinary jurisdiction, from God, from the Pope for the bishops, as we have seen in the episode of collegiality, all of those people together...they accepted the new heresies of the council, of the new Mass and so on, altogether. So, all the hierarchy disappeared together because the Pope fell from his position but also all the residential bishops and the cardinals too, for them. In the moment, in a glance, all the hierarchy of the Church disappeared. I don’t talk about the hierarchy of the holy orders, as we’ve seen this is a very different question. We cannot [give] bishops [the ability to] ordain priests, or to give confirmation but this is not the hierarchy of God running, this is just of sanctifying, but the hierarchy of God and of the Church, the jurisdiction, the bishops in [their] diocese’ mainly, of the divine right, altogether disappeared, so this is a very different scenario, and a very problematic one, not just because you don’t know who is going to elect the next Pope, which is already a problem, they cannot really solve that, otherwise they would have elected a new Pope because if you don’t have a Pope why not elect a new one because they don’t know, the sedevacantists themselves, who is going to do that. But this doesn’t matter, we talk today, after 1965, of 1958 after death of the IV or the XXII, I don’t know, doesn’t matter when, but how is it possible that the Church continues to exist without a Pope and without hierarchy?.. They would say that there is no Pope, so what is the problem? Instead of a few days or a few years we have a 50-60 year vacancy, why not? There is a reason why not. The Pope, when he dies, of course, the supreme power disappears with him, but the effects of his power, the jurisdiction coming from Our Lord to him and just to him, the effects of that are still there, the effects are mainly for what we are talking about, they are that there are bishops in their diocese’ having of the jurisdiction received by him the Pope, so obviously this is not supreme power but it is an ordinary power of jurisdiction. So ordinary jurisdiction still exists within the Church, our government, not the

supreme one, yes, but the ordinary one, is still there, so if you have still bishops in their diocese' you can still go into a new election of a new Pope, after a few days, or a year or two or whatever. But you must have, if you don't have papacy, in the moment you must have effects of papacy, which are, for what concerns this conference, the presence of ordinary bishops having jurisdiction from the Pope, otherwise you destroy ordinary jurisdiction and there is no extraordinary jurisdiction without the ordinary one. Maybe we have to explain... these terms, I think. We have seen that jurisdiction is the power of God governing the Church, we have seen that in the episode on collegiality, it's a power coming from Our Lord which is necessary not only to do something, but for the Church to exist to Church as she is, and not to be another one maybe, it exists in Our Lord, the jurisdiction always, Our Lord gives it to the Pope and to the bishops and to other people sometimes, but by divine right the bishops in their diocese' not all bishops, otherwise we would be Lumen gentium of the council. In this way the Church exists firstly, as a society and as such a society, not another one. What defines a society is to be herself, itself, is...the relations of the members with the authority with the authority with the members, and..the kind of relations that exist, defines the society that says that it is that society and not another one. So we have as the formal cause of the Church, jurisdiction coming from Our Lord to the Pope and by the to the bishops and in their diocese' and to other people that he gave it. This is essential to the existence of the Church, when you clear all the jurisdictions as they do, the Church is no longer herself, simply, it's another thing, if it still exists it's another thing. Because you don't have the papacy, but the leaving Pope, obviously this is not always the case, the Pope dies, but you no longer have the Pope and the effects of the presence of the Pope so you destroy the papacy, totally. Which means the papacy becomes, as for the modernists, paradoxically, an accessory of the Church, because today we can have the Church, according to the, the Roman Church, without Pope, without bishops having received from him jurisdiction, which means that we have nothing, no papacy, the Church still works, and exists for them without the Pope. So papacy works always unless, not necessarily according to them, because they can go on, they do not say to you 'this situation must stop some way, because otherwise there is something wrong'. No, according to them you can go on forever, we've gone for 50-60 years, so why not forever? Everything works, so why not before? What was papacy for? Not for the existence of the Church but something more accidental we can have or not have and the Church is still there. This cannot work obviously, this is nonsense, simply, for a Catholic, because the sedevacantists are saying to us 'the Church without papacy, forever'. Is that possible? The comments we say in Italy...'When a Pope dies, you make another one.' You don't stay forever without, according to them you can stay forever without, we don't say that, we say you can have a moment without because there is still what the Pope gave to the Church is still there, in the bishops in their diocese'. That's why he can die and we have time to elect a new one, because what he did for the existence of the Church is still there. It's very simple, very simple."

Andrew: "So the sedevacantists by making this claim that the papacy...that because of these errors that he is no longer the Pope and no longer acting as the Pope, they're essentially making the papacy...superfluous to the Church. And we know from the doctrine of the Church that that is impossible because Our Lord has given papacy to the Church and said 'On this rock I will build my Church'. He has given us this papacy, so this is contradictory to the way that the Church is set up entirely."

Father: “To save the dogma of infallibility, according to them still, they destroy the primacy, the necessity of the papacy. And they don’t seem to worry about that, they don’t seem to notice that, they don’t seem to notice that they are saying that we can have a Church without a papacy potentially forever. I give you an example, the simplest example of the problem, which many people are sometimes shocked by this example because it touches everybody. It’s the example of confession. Confession, we know by the doctrine of the Church, it’s not an opinion, to confess somebody a priest, it must be a priest firstly, that’s the essence of the minister, so he received the power of confessing people in his ordination, there is no doubt, but there is a condition to confess people, it is to have jurisdiction upon them because confession is a kind of judgement, it’s a tribunal, the tribunal of confession, so the minister must have, as a condition to use his power of orders in that case, the possession of jurisdiction, this is not discussed this is a dogma of the Church, and the sedevacantist would deny that. Obviously, usually, the Pope gives to the bishops this power over sin and the bishops to the priest in many ways, and then you go to confess. If you...have a priest who doesn’t have this power, he can’t confess any way, for example in the case of necessity, of danger of death, to as we know, but even that case, he receives for the moment he needs to confess for example a dying man, he needs to receive, by the delegation of the authority, the power of jurisdiction, just for the moment, but he has it. Even for the Society, when we didn’t have the power of jurisdiction to confess people from the Pope, we say ‘ok, we are in the case of necessity’, so because heresy is everywhere, it’s like when someone is dying, it’s a common grave necessity, that allows every priest to confess, to have jurisdiction to confess in the moment it is required to do that. This is according to cardinal and divine law, and this is, even for sedevacantists, this is clear because they know they don’t have jurisdiction, the priests and the bishops, their bishops and priests. So they say in case of necessity everybody can confess, that’s fine, but the problem is by whom you receive this jurisdiction if nobody has it, according to them. By whom? If I am a sedevacantist priest, who is giving me, according to me, not according to reality, according to my opinion, who is giving me the power of confessing? There are no ordinary bishops, there is no Pope, so who is giving me, not the Church, it’s just not a kind of spirit, it doesn’t come from some [other] jurisdiction, it comes from people having it, in different ways, even in extraordinary ways when...there is a necessity as we have seen, but it comes from somebody having it ordinarily, usually, in himself. So, the bishop, in his diocese, or the Pope, nobody else.”

Andrew: “So I want to make sure I understand this, Father, sorry for interrupting. So, in the case of even a priest who is laicized, who has been disciplined, let’s say, and I’m dying on the side of the road, he can hear my confession, it is valid, I die, I’m ok. He gets that hopefully, but he gets that jurisdiction through the proper channels, even though he doesn’t normally have it. And what you’re saying is the sedevacantists, if there is a sedevacantist priest who is saying there is no jurisdiction, then logically, you’ve cut that thread of jurisdiction.”

Father: “Yes, they do not know how to answer that actually. I [gave] you some examples but they cannot explain where this jurisdiction is from for them. Of course we say that obviously if they are priests then they can confess in the case of necessity which is everywhere now because it’s general today, and they can confess receiving jurisdiction from Pope Francis, even if they don’t want to, but that’s the reality. But they cannot explain for themselves and for us because there is no authority, so what can they ask for? Some of them say Our Lord gives jurisdiction, they receive jurisdiction from Our Lord, but this is

crazy, why? Because [they] are saying the papacy is useless. They are saying the same thing as Lumen Gentium. You are saying that there is somebody, yourself for example, in some cases, it doesn't matter, that can receive jurisdiction directly from Our Lord and this person is not the Pope, so you are destroying the monarchy of the papacy. We do not believe that, absolutely. We believe that every jurisdiction on earth comes through the Pope. And there is no jurisdiction coming through the Pope. Jurisdiction of bishops in their diocese comes through the Pope to them, and then maybe to other people from the bishops, ok. But without the Pope there is no possible jurisdiction on earth, even not from hearing a confession of a dying man.

Father: Every man to be saved has to submit to the power of the Pope and to the power of the keys. This is not some kind of submission of — I don't know what kind— it means that you cannot confess without the Pope, the power of keys. You cannot confess without the Pope. So, they cannot answer to that. They cannot. One of their priests here in Italy, very clever man, he wanted to answer to that. And you know what he did? There is his conference in the Internet. He quoted the Manual of Moral Theology very important a German theologian talking about confession and explaining what I have said to you. You can read or I can send you the references. He explains that you need orders and jurisdiction, jurisdictions come from the Pope and so on. Everything. He quoted him, cutting a sentence because he said, this theologian said, that jurisdiction for confession comes by divine disposition. And he cut the sentence, but he says comes from divine disposition through the Pope as the minister of divinity. The sentence is that and he cut that in the middle of the very middle of the sentence. And he's not a stupid man. I think they know that something is not working in that. At least the main ones of them. I don't know. I think they know that there is something that's not working. I think. They cannot ignore that you cannot have Church, existence of the Church, and even confession, which is quite important, for example. For example, confession without the Papacy. You cannot.

Andrew: And just to be clear Father, can I say, and I'm assuming you're not saying that confessions done by priests who are sedevacantist are invalid. You're not saying that. You're saying that there is a logical flaw that they're missing when they make this argument.

Father: Confession is an example. As I said, jurisdiction is necessary for the Church to exist simply. And to exist as such, as the Roman Church. Which is Roman because there is only one Rock holding all the buildings. I'm saying that they cannot explain where their jurisdiction to confess comes from. It comes to every priest in the state of necessity, even heretical priests, sedevacantist priests, priests of the Society, every priest not having it usually, receives jurisdiction in the moment of the danger of death, for example. The question is by whom, and they have not an answer. Obviously, they can confess also, but we know where their jurisdiction is from, because we believe there is hierarchy. A modernist hierarchy, but it exists. They cannot say where they have jurisdiction from, unless they say that it comes from our Lord. You know a sedevacantist called me once to say that they have not the answers. Another sedevacantist, he told me that, oh you know, there is not a problem because bishops (they have sedevacantist bishops) bishops in their consecration, their ordination, they have jurisdiction they receive jurisdiction, which is the error of Lumen Gentium condemned by the Church. So, it's unlike something you've.... So, to justify their position, obviously some of them may be in good faith, I don't know. They have to recur to the errors of Lumen Gentium, so they say so bishops, ordained bishops, receive jurisdiction

from ordination so it's fine, so the priests from them. Which is false, simply unacceptable. But to say that they....

Andrew: So, they're utilizing the errors that they've been fighting against.

Father: Yes! Which is a paradox. I know that they are complete, not all of them, certainly some of them, I think, are aware of something wrong there. But you realize that there is a problem in their thesis that does not work. And all of them, all of the sedevacantists theorists have this problem. The priest that answers to me, so to speak is from the thesis of **cassiacum**, or the main one maybe today they say they are not Popes. They are not Popes, not at all, or bishops, according to jurisdiction. The power of jurisdiction. But if they become Catholic, they are the people who are receiving the power of jurisdiction. You don't need to do a conclave because there is a matter of succession. So, if Pope Francis tomorrow agrees with us (sedevacantists) he becomes the real Pope. For other sedevacantist you don't ever you have nothing. Pope Francis is nothing. Even if he becomes Catholic. But this is the ... doesn't ... This thesis of ??maybe tells you how things can change but not how they are working today. There is anyway not hierarchy today. For them.

Andrew: So, so, this is that middle position of sedevacantism. So, what we've been talking about is this, uh, the main sedevacantism. Where

Father: We are talking about all sedevacantism. All sedevacantism. All kinds of sedevacantism. Because what they hold in common to deny today, we have a hierarchy. So ... I think that they would not object....

Andrew: Okay, so, today even those who hold this sedeprivationist theory that the current occupant he was elected properly, Pope Francis, he was elected properly but he lacks the authority, he lacks the ability to teach, or to govern until he rejects the changes, until he recants his modernism, this is the same thing.

Father: It's the same thing because they are saying anyway that today we have not hierarchy; we haven't had the hierarchy for 60 years. So, the problem is exactly the same. It's not because you know who could become the Pope tomorrow that this changes. Then ?? a lot of other problems. For example, they say, I'm making an example, they say, if the bishop of Milan, tomorrow (it's not the real bishop actually for them obviously) but that man who is sitting on the chair of Milan becomes Catholic, he becomes the bishop really. But how, I wonder, if there is no Pope? There is no Pope having jurisdiction, who is giving to him jurisdiction to become the real bishop? And someone ... one of ...

Andrew: And who decides that?

Father: That's another problem.

Andrew: Is it you Father, is it me, I mean who decides when he actually becomes the bishop?

Father: That's another problem, who decides when Pope Francis becomes Catholic? Them, maybe. This is another problem I wanted to think that this is possible, as they say, but to

show that in any way this doesn't work. But this is another problem, actually, yes, who can tell us when is the moment that Pope Francis becomes a real Catholic, Bergoglio becomes a real Catholic and so becomes Pope Francis. Who? That's another problem. That's another problem.

Andrew: With all due respect Father, I hope it's not up to you, just an average priest. I mean that would be scary.

Father: The same problem is at the beginning, who has decided when Paul VI or John XXIII was no longer a Catholic? Yeah, they can say okay, but you can see that because they say heresies, heresies are So, in that moment, which is quite simple to say, but a bit less to demonstrate, but we have talked up to now as if everything they said was possible. They are heretics, certainly, without any doubt, and so on. We have seen that in that perspective. So, to have a complete answer that works in many scenarios, in any case, what we have said works, while what they say, doesn't work.

Andrew: Right. Well, that's very interesting. It reminds me of a conversation I was having with someone who said, "well I know that Christ said that the Church would never fail but look. Look at everything that's happened. It must have happened." And I said to them, "who are you to decide that the Church has failed?" Like, yes things are bad, things are really bad, but how do we say that the Church has failed? To make that definitive statement; that's big.

Father: Yes, but we can... we have to find an explanation to the problem. But if the explanation is that in any way the hierarchy has disappeared, the Church has disappeared. It has not just failed, it's even worse. The Church changed completely, it became a different society where the relations between the members and the authority are different than before, than they used to be. But it is as a heretic to say that it has disappeared, so you have to find something different. In this conference we will maybe say something about a different solution, but what we must focus on is that their solution cannot work. Before going to look for another solution, you have to see that this one is wrong. Simply, it's wrong. It doesn't work. Let me tell you another problem they sometimes talk about. They say, oh you say maybe, but how can you say that somebody who is a heretic like Pope Francis or John Paul II, I don't know, is not a member of the Church, so how can he be the head of the Church when he is not even a member of it? Because to be a member of Church you have to have Faith, not to be a heretic. Which is partially true. That is a problem. Part of the different solution to start to understand is that there are other possibilities. They say that, but you have to put that in not just juridical terms, but I say essential, metaphysical terms. If what they say is to be taken strictly, that would mean that profession of heresy, external profession of heresy, and possession of jurisdiction are not compatible, cannot stay together in their being, in their essence, metaphysically. Like, you cannot be white and not white, or tall and not tall, I don't know, in the same sense. It is impossible. Man, and not man. Now, if this was true, what we have said just before about heretical priests hearing confession of a man in danger of death would be impossible too, because we have a man, a priest, professing heresy, and receiving jurisdiction at least for a moment. But if this were metaphysically impossible, this would not be possible even to confess a dying man. Because essentially, they cannot stay together. So, if the Church admits that the heretic can have jurisdiction to confess a dying man, and nobody can discuss that, a Catholic. That means that the incompatibility is not metaphysical, of Divine right. There is certainly a law in the Church not allowing heretics to have jurisdiction, at least usually. But this is a law of the Church, an ecclesiastical law.

Strictly speaking, the two things can be together. Some of the ancient theologians, they sometimes forget to quote, because they know a lot of them, said that you could have a schismatic pope, so a pope who is not a member of the Church for schism, but a heretic would be the same thing. Somebody who is not a member of the Church can be the pope, according to Cajetan, for example, or **Torquemada**. They said, yeah, you can have a schismatic pope if he does some things, for example, change all the ceremonies of the Church, like starting a new church, so he doesn't want to be a member of the Church. And he governs the Church as a prince who is outside of it. Like, a secular prince, governing from the outside of a society. So, this is taught by the same theologians they sometimes like to quote. So, it's possible for somebody who is not a member of the Church to have jurisdiction and maybe also to be the head of it. Even heretics, they are not members of the Church, but have some, if they are baptized validly, a kind of relation to the Church. You know that the Church can make laws for them. They are subject to the Church. That means that they can receive jurisdiction to confess if they are priests. So that means that there is some kind, not of membership but relations of the heretics baptized with the Church. And so maybe they can hold jurisdiction within the Church. For some reasons, this is possible. So even the main argument of sedevacantism, which is, no, you're wrong because if he is heretic, he is not member of the Church so he cannot be the pope, at all. And I can destroy the Church, but this cannot be possible. The Church can disappear, but a heretic cannot be a member, and not the head of the Church. This is not so absolute as they would like to say to us. It is not so absolute. So, if the price of admitting that at every cost is to destroy the Church, it's clear that their solution is wrong, and you have to look elsewhere. So maybe, maybe, the problem is not what they are, popes, bishops, and so on; but what they do. To put the question, not about the possession of authority, which is necessary to make the Church exist. But to put the question a bit lower, what they do, their actions. Are their actions, all their actions, some of their actions, still the actions of the authority or can they do actions which come just from another qualities of them. Not just the jurisdiction or the power of teaching they have. If I am a priest, not every action I do is a priestly one. When I eat, I eat as a man. When I say Mass, the quality of the priesthood which is within me, goes into action, so to speak. To be simple. So, it is for papacy. The man being pope can do actions which are not coming from papal authority, are human actions simply. And even can talk, without using, and say things about Faith, without using papal authority, because teaching is a human act. It is an act of will. So, if you do not want to use the power when you talk, or you want to teach but not only infallibly, but even not as the magisterium of the Church, but just in another way, doesn't matter now how, this could be a way of finding the solution. So, they say heresies, but not using the authority. You don't need to deny the possession of authority, you deny, so to speak, the use of it. And this is simple, as a possible solution, and this doesn't destroy the existence of the Church. So, you can just move down, and say ok, they are popes, they have the being of the papacy, they have the first act of being, but not the second act. They do not pass into action. Because they do not want, not because they cannot. Because as the archbishop said, of their liberal mindset, because of many reasons. This is not the moment of explaining or trying to explain. They don't want to use their power, so they can also say heresies sometimes and even if they become heretics, they are still having the authority within the Church. Because we say in another way, the Church finishes her existence. So, you admit that they are still there, they hold possession of the authority, but they do not want to use it to teach, so they can be wrong and say wrong things. With sometimes good ones, maybe, but even wrong because they do not come from the authority they have. Because of their will simply, and not because they cannot, just because they don't want. Because they do not believe actually very much in papacy as we have seen in *Lumen Gentium* for example. So, this is just to say that there are other possible solutions. You do not

need to annihilate the entire structure of the Church as it was founded by our Lord, to change it substantially, to solve the problem of the errors and heresies of these people. You don't need that.

Andrew: Wow, that is fascinating and that helps quite a bit too, Father, because like I said towards the beginning, there are definitely some of these positions that do seem to, well not make sense, but you feel sorry for these positions that they're holding and you go well, I can see how you think that but as you said, lowering it from this idea of, well, he can never say anything wrong... Let me rephrase that: lowering the bar so to speak, is a much better solution like you said, without destroying the entire hierarchy of the Church.

Father: And without touching the dogma of infallibility. Because infallibility is connected, an action of God, of the Holy Spirit, of the Holy Ghost, connected with some kind of actions that the pope wants to do. And it's not even a question of... sometimes they say, you say that there is a kind of magisterium which is not infallible, and this is heresy. This is just rubbish, as the English would say, the British. It doesn't matter. Magisterium is an act of will of the pope and he can use this power at the degree he likes. From infallibility at the top, or other ones, if he likes, or not ones, or not using it, or using in a way that is full of heresies because he renounced to use it. The pope is not, and this is very important, is not a kind of puppet being moved Holy Ghost. This would be modernist or sedevacantist, in which sense, and I do not want to put them together just for the sake of being in the middle which I don't like, on the contrary. This is a kind of vision of infallibility as a providence, but this would make the Church prophetic, which is not Roman. The Church is an institution. When you do some actions, God grants you to be infallible, ok, and that's all. Many actions, few actions, doesn't matter, as you like, as the pope likes. But as you want to do juridically in the like terms and so on. It is not kind of inspirations that makes you always doing the right thing. Or as the modernists would say, a kind of general movement of the Holy Ghost allowing you to follow the spirit of times, which is the spirit of God so that you become a prophet and to say always the right thing in that moment even if you change the doctrine. This is infallibility according to the modernists... a kind of divine inspirations. Leading the Church and the pope maybe where God wants the Church to go. To the new horizons. Sedevacantists must not fall in something similar, not equal. Papacy is not prophecy; it is an institution. So, infallibility is for some actions, many actions, few actions, it doesn't matter. The actions the popes want to be infallible. You can call this magisterium extraordinary, I don't care, this is just talking rubbish. The important thing is that it is something coming from the will of the pope wanting to do this kind of teaching. It's not a kind of providence, so that whenever you say heresy certainly you are not the pope. This is even not the position of the old theologians. You know, there was a pope, and they quote him very often, Paul IV. Paul IV, Carrafa, was a very severe pope in the sixteenth century. He stopped the Council of Trent because the Council of Trent was too soft according to him. It reopened afterwards. And he was very much against heretics, which is good. And he wrote a bull, saying, they quote always this bull, saying, that if you are a heretic, you cannot hold any kind of authority within the Church, even papacy, obviously, and even within the kingdoms. Because the pope can make or unmake the kings, so if you were a heretical king you fell from your position immediately according to him, according to this bull. *Cum Ex Apostulatus*. They always quote that, and they say so you see, the popes have said that if you are a heretic, you cannot be a pope, and even if everybody recognizes you as the pope, it is written that you are not the pope anyway. It says that. But Carrafa, Paul IV, was very severe, it's true. And he wanted at the beginning, but they don't understand what it is written there, and I explain it to you. This is very important because this is one of their arguments, but it is related to our question. When he went to the

Cardinals in consistory because some of the Cardinals, he thought they were heretics and he hated them, so he wanted to make them out. And he said, ok, now I make a bull where it is written that everybody who is accused of being a heretic loses his position. And everybody said, Your Holiness, please revise that. If a Cardinal is my enemy, I accuse him and he cannot be a pope, he cannot be a Cardinal and so on. So, it is not good, you cannot do that. So, he changed, and he wrote a bull where it is said, the history is necessary to understand what is written, it is clear if you can read the juridical terms which are there, but the history helps you. So, he changed and he said in this bull, that everybody who during his life was condemned as a heretic cannot be pope, cardinal, bishop, and if he is, he loses his position. Which is ?? juridically working. So if a tribunal of the Church condemned you as a heretic once, you lose even the possibility, even if you convert, according to this law which is not longer but that doesn't matter. You lose the ability to be elected for example, pope or other things. But you see, it is written that if you were condemned as a heretic, not if you were a heretic, or are a heretic, it's different. It is something juridically visible, determined, there is a sentence that you have been a heretic, so you are out, even if you become a good guy afterwards, you are out of any position of authority. It is important because it makes you see that even their argument coming from this bull doesn't work, and the Church is a juridical society, not some kind of...you cannot accuse somebody of being a heretic and they become a heretic. It doesn't work like that. But it is important to be said because they talk a lot about this bull, and they have different positions about what it says. But they sometimes don't understand the text of the bull. The bull always talks about people being condemned for heresy because they were a cult or because they were a tribe, by the tribunal. Or for confession, one time it was a confession. There are always these three terms coming, there is not just an accusation. So, it's important to understand even for them sometimes. But it is clear that there is a juridical society and not just a kind of prophecy. And I think that sedevacantists who are so keen on defending the papacy, which is good, and I am on their side about that... they must be careful not to destroy, make it superfluous as we have seen, accessory, accidental to the existence of the Church because they say Church can exist forever without. And not to make it, because of what they say about infallibility, as a kind of puppet moved by God. This would be a bit, even protestant in some ways, this kind of inspiration, continued inspiration. This is a bit scary for us Italian being used to this situation very heavy and having this solid position very juridically. In a very juridical sense. Having this juridical weight on society.

Andrew: Well Father, that was very helpful to understand the position, but also to understand how there are flaws with it and how it is untenable for us as Catholics. So, thank you for taking the time to go through it with us. I think next time we speak with you we'll be talking about Pope Benedict and the topic of his resignation. So, I'm looking forward to that one as well. So, thank you so much for your time, Father, I appreciate it.

Father: Thank you, and God bless you, all our listeners.