

PHILOSOPHICAL CRITICISM OF THE CASSICIACUM THESIS

Following Gerard de Lauriers, Bishop Sanborn expounds the Cassiciacum doctrine or thesis: "They do not understand what the material, non-formal, Apostolic succession is. They do not distinguish matter from form in authority. The Apostolic Succession is classic, it comes from the Thomist philosophy and from many theologians; it exists among the schismatics and, according to some, also among the Anglicans: Material Apostolic Succession is what the See without authority possesses; formal is the possession of the See with authority. If possession of the See without authority were not possible, the distinction would not be possible. Therefore the thesis proves itself, it is not a spurious invention". For the followers of this false doctrine, completely strange to Saint Thomas Aquinas' philosophy, a Pope cannot be elected because a materially valid usurper is already occupying the See of Saint Peter.

The Thomistic Ontology marks out a difference between potency and act; between matter and form. And St. Thomas concludes that matter and form only happen together. Anyone who makes use of reason understands it: i.e. no one has seen or can even imagine the raw material "wood"; what he has seen or can imagine is a wooden chair, a wooden table, a wooden door, etc.; matter can only be conceived as already endowed with a form: chair, table, door, etc. Having discovered the deviation from Saint Thomas Aquinas' philosophy, the two prelates insist: "They do not see the accidental whole. They make confusion regarding both raw and processed material. In entities by themselves, matter cannot exist without form. But entities by accidents are born

from the union of the substance with the accidental form. The substance becomes matter in relation to the accident. They can exist apart, without the corruption of either one or the other, that is, matter and form. This is the relationship between a man and being white, or a musician. Such a doctrine is heretical in Theology and foolish in Ontology. 1. It is heretical in Theology because man, in terms of his substantial human form, does not have the natural capacity to receive the form of the visible Body of Christ's main member, without first being a member of the Church by Baptism and by the profession of the true faith (S.D. 3802). Whoever is not a member of the Church cannot be the Head. Only in Ecumenism any pagan or heretic can be a member and visible head of the false church. Therefore, the prelates do not distinguish between natural and supernatural order. A servant of Lucifer could be the visible Head of the Church, according to this thesis. The Council of Trent describes man, as man, according to divine Revelation: "he is unclean, son of wrath by nature, servant of sin, is under the power of the Devil and of death" (D.S.1521). For this reason, the servant of Lucifer cannot be the Head of the mystical Body of Christ. 2. In Ontology such a doctrine is an aberration. No one ever saw an accident of a material body as "existing" in the world outside the mind: extension, color, time, quantity, shape. If the accident exists "in alio", in the matter, it does not exist "in se" as a substance. No one saw a "Catholic" human being, separate from his human person. The accidental form of "son of God" does not exist apart from the human person, nor [neither does the accidental form] of the "son of perdition" exists apart from Mr. So-and-so. 3. In Logics the essence of a being is defined as: "id quod est". But in Ontology, the "ens quod est" only exists when it is composed of matter and form, of potency and act. And

when the term "pope" is used and it is stated that a person "is pope", it means that that human being is made up of the form of the papacy, defined by divine Law. It means the compound. – Father Paolo Dezza teaches: “The causality of matter and form consists in the union. From two realities the compound entity comes to be. One depends on the other to exist. They cannot exist apart from each other.” The possible being, in subjective power, is nothing else but the act. It's not real. They are intelligible principles, not sensible; not representable by the imagination. It refers to an ontological whole and not to a logical one. The way of existing in reality and in the mind is different. They are actually two different parts; in the logical whole the mind applies a form to an individual subject to signify an identity between this form and this subject” (Metaphysica Generalis, p. 201). -Father Gardeil teaches: “Matter and form are not represented as two things that, by composition, cause a third. Without union, there is no matter and form, essence and existence. They are two entities incapable of having separate existence from each other. They are two correlative principles that have (existential) reality only when completed. (Introd. to Philosophy, Metaphysics, p. 121). Therefore, the "separation" of the "material pope" is foolishness. -Saint Thomas Aquinas teaches: • "The compound entity does not exist as soon as its parts are divided, but only after they constitute the compound." “The existence of a being consists in its indivisibility. Just as each being preserves its existence, it also preserves its unity ”. (S.T. 1, 11, 1). • “In entities composed of matter and form: without either one or another, what it is cannot be told. They are two principles by which the entity exists. The compound substance is what actually is. (S. C. G. 2, 54) • “Since accidents have their own existence and essence; and since its existence is not its

essence; in them one thing is its existence and another thing is what it actually is. That's how they're made up." (In IV Sent. 12, 1, 3 ad 5). "The being is not a genus. Therefore, its existence cannot be the essence nor the substance nor the accident. Hence, the essence of an accident needs to exist in a subject. But, because of this, the accident does not stop being an accident and it is not up to the accident to define the substance" (S.T. 3. 77. 1, ad 2). "White belongs to the person of Socrates, not insofar as he is Socrates; but insofar as Socrates is white" (S.T. 3, 17, 2). That is: Not insofar as Socrates is substantially a man; but insofar as he has the accidental form of whiteness. "The forms begin to exist once the compounds are made" (S.T. 1, 45, 8). In a proper and true way only substances are beings. Accidents have their existence only through beings. Therefore, whiteness is said of beings because, through it, a being is white. Thus, in its own way, no form [is] subsistent without being complete. But they truly exist when they are compounded" (S.T. 1.90.2).

"He who preaches something does not accidentally preach; he preaches how much or what or in what way" (S.T 3, 2,6). From these lessons of the Ontology masters, the stupidity of the "existence" of a "pope" is clearly perceived, separating the matter from the form of him. Two principles of being, ontological, are not two substances that exist separately. The substantial human essence is not the accidental essence of being a member of the Church; nor of its visibility among those members. The natural human essence is not the essence of the accidental supernatural form of membership in the Church of Christ. Men exist in Hell and in Heaven, inside and outside the kingdom of Christ. The pure subjective power to be a member of the kingdom of Christ or to be pope, common to all human beings, in the existential

order is a "nihil actuale". And, if he wanted to act as if he were Pope: "nihil actum est", since "acting follows being". Therefore, the "Thesis" of the two prelates is either ignorance or fraud, or both. But, in addition, Catholic Theology distinguishes the power of Order from the power of jurisdiction, and teaches that the power of Order remains in heretics and schismatics, but not the power of jurisdiction. Therefore, the "material Apostolic Succession" through the transmission of the power of the Order, from the Apostles to the bishop, without interruption, does not occur in the fact of "owning the See" in terms of the ordinary jurisdiction power, such as that of the Apostolic See of Saint Peter, with the primacy of jurisdiction. Therefore, by actually and "materially" possessing a See, by a schismatic or heretic, it does not possess the divine power of Jurisdiction, it does not confer a "right" to the papacy nor to the episcopal see.

Only the materialist and atheist Positivism judges that material acts generate rights. The papal or episcopal "See" by divine Right is a position of the divine Constitution of the Church; it can only be occupied by a faithful member of the Church; it is not just a material piece of furniture, a chair. Therefore, wanting to "apply to the papacy" what belongs to the power of Order and not to the power of Jurisdiction is a conception of atheistic Positivism, it is a perversion. It is wanting to introduce this perverse heresy into the Church. It is to pretend that the two powers come from positive material acts, from the will of the people and not from divine Law. Such a distinction does not belong to the Catholic Philosophy and Theology, but rather to the sense of positivist and atheist philosophers and of heretical and schismatic theologians.

Therefore, it is a Luciferian doctrine to claim that in the Church a false "material pope" in terms of the power of jurisdiction is a "true pope." It would be as to claim that the Catholic Church is atheist, positivist, agnostic, Masonic. 2°.- Such sentence comes from the heresy of the Lutheran religious freedom, against the divine power of jurisdiction given by Christ "only to Peter". -Thus Pius VI condemned the heresiarch bishop J. N. von Hontheim, nicknamed Febronius, for wanting equality of jurisdictional power between the pope and all the bishops. The Church would be governed as a human "republic." The pope would only have the power to "watch for the preservation of unity", to make up for negligence, to exhort and give examples. "He would have no power in the other dioceses. He would receive his strength and power from the Church" (ab Ecclesia) (D.S. 2596). He would not receive it from God, directly and immediately, as Christ gave it to St. Peter. Therein lies the heretical root of not differentiating between the power of Order and that of jurisdiction by Bishop Guerard and Bishop Sanborn's doctrine. And they are followed by [the] headless sedevacantists, linked to the Lefebvrists in the ecumenical "union" of men "with each other", without hierarchical subordination of jurisdiction, by divine Right, and to the Magisterium of the Catholic Church. This is highly heretical. Pius IX condemned atheistic Positivism in the Syllabus: "The Law consists in the material fact; All human acts have the force of Law". "Authority comes from the sum of material forces" (D.S. 2959-2960). Thus, it denies the divine origin of authority, in addition to not differentiating the powers of Order and Jurisdiction. Heresy is mixed with Atheism.

And these autocephalous "guerardists" and sedevacantists make these same mixtures and remove the visible Head of the Church. Archbishop Lefébvre said he had a "practical attitude" in relation to the pope,

moving away from the “theoretical and theological order”, “from the absolute Logic of principles”. This is Agnosticism, without neither reason nor dogmatic divine faith, condemned in the Lamentabili Decree (D.S. 3426). From his heretical conception, Bishop Sanborn persistently insists: The conclave was legally convened. The one designated to be pope (Bergoglio) is valid. He can receive papal power. Until his death he is a material pope or until he resigns or until an authority verifies the vacancy”. A conclave of members of the Catholic Church is not a conclave of Lutherans, Buddhists, Muslims, nor Oriental schismatics. The Catholic Church is not a temporary society whose Constitution is changed by the will of the members of this society. The electoral laws of the Catholic Church are subordinated to divine Law, to the unity of faith and government, to the monarchical form of government. Only one who is a faithful member subordinated to the unity of faith and government is an elector or eligible member. The unity of the Church does not tolerate division in creed and in government. One being does not tolerate division into what belongs to its essence, which does not exist separately in matter and form. However, *matter is essentially potential and indeterminate; not even by a miracle can it ever exist apart from the form; such a hypothesis would be a true contradiction, since everything that exists endowed with a concrete essence, necessarily is placed in a specific degree, precisely derived from the substantial form.* (The XXIV Thomist Theses, P. Hügón). Let's see what Aristotle says: *Materia prima non est quid*, that is, a specific substance called *quidditas*, since matter is a potent and indeterminate element, *nec quale*, that is, it is not the subject adorned with qualities, since it previously needs a real substance to be modified, *nec quantum*, that is, a subject endowed with quantity, since quantity is already an accident

that supposes matter or material substance; Quantity supervenes on matter and quality on form, but neither of these two accidents exist outside the compound; nor is the matter any of the things that determine the being, none of those categories of accident that, modifying the constituted substance, put it in communication with other things, such as relationship, action, or passion.

It is not allowed to separate the being composed of both human and divine nature, of spirit and matter. 2. – Paul IV defined the nullity of the election if the elected one was not a faithful member of the Church. The Law of the Catholic Church comes from Faith and Morality defined by divine authority, not by the "number of material forces" or "by material acts" or by "votes" or by arbitrary, independent "consensus", without any subservience to divine authority. The Catholic faith "is universal, common to all, clergy and laymen; it belongs to all Christians" (D.S. 639); the election of a pope is "subordinated to divine Law" (D.S. 3114). Therefore, any "choice" based on material acts will be [something proper] to the heresy of the atheist positivist Law (D.S. 2959-2960) or Ecumenism, which comes from the free "consensus" of men among themselves (D.S. 3074). The one carried out with Lutherans, with Freemasons, with Jews, with agnostics will not be a "choice" of the Catholic Church. It will be null, it will be from a non-Catholic sect. 3.- Paul IV established: "If a Cardinal or Roman Pontiff shows up who, before his promotion to Cardinal or his assumption as Roman Pontiff, deviated from the faith or fell into heresy, his promotion or assumption will be null, invalid and void, even if it was made with the unanimous agreement of all the Cardinals" (Cum ex Apostolatus, 71, 72). [The foregoing is based on] the nature of the crime against faith, which, ipso facto, separates it from the unity of the

Church. Power does not come from the "consensus" of men (DS 3074) but from divine Law. 4. – This was the condemnation to the Jansenists who wanted the validity of the election coming from the “churches” (D.S. 2603) without subordination to divine Law (D.S. 3060), without which no one is saved (D.S. 875). "Therefore, it must be considered heretical" (Can. 2315) and "subject to the penalties to heretics" (Can. 2314,1) whoever judges such a "valid election", with "legal convocation", with "legal and valid designation" for the papacy. Whoever judges such a “pope” as “valid”, like Archbishop Lefebvre and Dom Mayer’s henchmen, like Archbishop Guerard and Archbishop Sanborn’s goons, is outside the unity of faith; this person makes his “own judgment” proper of the heretic (Tit III, 10-11). 5.- Therefore, such "election" is null, such "appointment" to the papacy is null and such elected person cannot "receive papal power" and has no "right to the papacy" "until his death". A conclave of heretics is not a conclave of faithful Catholics. 6.- There is no "material Apostolic Succession" because here it is about the power of jurisdiction that does not remain in the heretics; which proceeds "directly and immediately" from God and not, like the power of Order, by transmission through the Succession of the power from the Order of the Apostles. 7. Paul IV teaches the nullity of the power of that "Roman Pontiff" outside the unity of faith and government: "without the need for any other additional declaration that he should make, in fact or in law" (72-7475). Such persons are deprived of “all authority, office and power”, “penitus et in totum”, without any “jus aliquod”. He has already “tacitly resigned” from office, “sine ulla declaratione” (C.I.C. Canon 188, 4). 8.-

Let us observe the perverted doctrine of these persons: they distance themselves from the unity of faith and government by wishing to give

"validity" in the Church to the acts of the heretics; by wishing the servants of Lucifer to be the "valid" Head of the faithful who are the "connected and compact body" (Eph. IV, 15) of the Church against Divine Law (1 Cor VI, 1). Such prelates and their followers are emissaries from Lucifer, the Beast, the Dragon, the Antichrist. They "acknowledge" Lucifer and not Christ. Whoever is not Pope, does not have the exercise of a power that he does not possess. The act comes after the being. Therefore, the prelates accept the action of a void "authority" as if it were valid. Whoever usurps a divine power that he does not possess is a "thief and robber, who did not enter the door" (Jn 10,1) who came: "tantummodo a populo" (D.S. 1769) as the heretics want. 1.-Whoever is not "Authority" in the Church of Christ, but rather a heretic, does not work for the common good, but for the common evil. He does not teach the truth, but heresy, falsehood; he does not lead the way of heaven, but the way of eternal perdition. 2.- He does not lead to the sanctification of the Sacraments because the Sacrament of Holy Orders, coming from the people, from the "celebrating assembly", from the "president of the community" is entirely null. If Monsignor Sanborn has a seminary and ordained priests with this spurious doctrine, equal to that of the "new church", all his ordinations are probably null, says Homer Hoas, just like those of Vatican II, due to defects in form and intention or even minister and efficient cause. The validity of the Sacraments requires the four causes defined by divine Law and by the Council of Florence (D.S. 1313). 3.- Therefore, the "authority" of the power of jurisdiction does not come from the good or bad "intention" on behalf of someone elected by a null election, independent of faith and government unity. It is not the electors' human will nor the elect one that confers the form, but the divine

power that "directly and immediately" proceeds from God to the member of the Church, ready to receive it by the condition of a valid election and acceptance as a current member of the Mystical Body of Christ. Hence, the existing "impediment" to receive the power of jurisdiction results from the fact that the person is not a member of the Church, since he is not in unity to the divine and Catholic faith; he does not have "communion" with the other terrestrial and visible members of the "connected and compact body" (Eph. IV, 15) of all the visible members of this Body, subordinated to the Magisterium of the See of Peter. 4.-

Therefore, there is no "union" between the matter and the form of the papacy in a person if he is separated from the unity of faith and government of the Catholic Church. The "condition" of the valid election by human Law does not remove the condition of valid election by divine Law which the prelate has disregarded. "Whoever does not believe is already condemned" (Jn 3, 18). "Without faith it is impossible to please God" (Hb. 6, 6). 5.- That's how the agnostics and modernists' "practical norm" is followed: "The dogmas of faith must be preserved only according to a practical sense, as prescriptive norms of acting and not as norms of believing" (D.S. 3426). The norm of believing, as a "rational gift" and universal, common to all (D.S. 639) comes from the "reduction of intelligence as a gift to Christ" (2 Cor X, 15). The rule of action departs from "Theoretical Reason" and universal faith is placed under Practical Reason, where individual free will blindly govern actions for good or evil.

CONCLUSION

1.- Bishop Guerard des Lauriers, Bishop Sanborn and the Mater Boni Consilii Institute's specific doctrines are serious deviations in Thomistic Philosophy and are apostasy in Dogmatic Theology, because they prevent the election of the Vicar of Christ, which must always exist . They are founded on man without God. The power of the Orders conferred by them to the presbyterate and the episcopate is, according to Homero Hoas and many others, probably null, as in the Vatican II Ecumenism, the author (Homero H.) concludes, which the current author does not share in its total, thus: Those who received it in good faith received a null power, without the validity [that has] the power of Orders of the schismatics who have the "material apostolic Succession". Here, Godless Humanism destroys both the power of Orders and Jurisdiction.

2.- As for the other prelates who "validate" such a heretical pope of the "new Church", they admit the absurdity that agnostics and atheists can be rulers of the faithful and teachers of the unity of the Catholic faith. And those who reject the visible and faithful Head of the Church with false arguments reject "ipso facto" the same Church of Christ, perfect, holy, one; and they sow individual religious freedom, the dispersion of the flock of Christ, against the unity wanted by Christ.

3.- The Cassiciacum thesis cannot be sustained by Saint Thomas' philosophy, whose ontology is completely removed, the most serious consequence being that it prevents the Church from

reconstituting itself hierarchically, with its head, the Pope, whose existence gives visibility to The Church, then, the Church is where the Pope is.

Fr. José Vicente Ramón

November, 26th 2022

The original text (in Spanish) is found on *Sacrificium* Magazine number 5.