



Definition

# Catholicism, Modernism, Incompatibility

---

Derek Ignatius Asirvadem  
James Alan Schröpfer

V0.1  
04 Aug 14



# Content

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Purpose.....	1
1.2	Context.....	1
1.3	Participation.....	1
1.4	Progression.....	1
1.5	Cited Material.....	1
<b>2</b>	<b>Catholicism.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	The Definition.....	3
2.2	What is a Catholic ?.....	3
a.	Pius XII Mystici Corporis Christi 23	
<b>3</b>	<b>Modernism.....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	The Definition.....	7
3.2	What is a Modernist ?.....	7
a.	St Pius X E Supremi	
b.	Lamentabili Sane	
c.	Pascendi Dominici Gregis	
d.	Præstantia Scripturæ	
e.	Oath Against Modernism	
f.	CatholicCulture Definitions re Modernism	
g.	Rorate Cæli Centenary of Lamentabili Sane	
<b>4</b>	<b>Incompatibility.....</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1	By Simple Logic.....	9
4.2	By Papal Decree.....	9
4.3	Determination.....	9
<b>A</b>	<b>Cited Material.....</b>	<b>11</b>
a.	Pius XII Mystici Corporis Christi 23	
b.	Author Book & page	





# 1 Introduction

fubar

## 1.1 Purpose

fubar

## 1.2 Context

fubar

## 1.3 Participation

fubar

## 1.4 Progression

fubar

## 1.5 Cited Material

fubar





## 2 Catholicism

### 2.1 The Definition

### 2.2 What is a Catholic ?

*Agreed*

We are not starting from scratch, the following sets up the point of progress that we have reached.

#### **James**

Let us avoid using the terms Laissez faire [Catholic] or traditional Catholics as they are not found in Theology.

Let us discuss Catholic and non-Catholics. Now who are Catholics, who are non-Catholics, and why?

Before we go any farther, I believe it is imperative we establish some common ground on membership in the Church. Otherwise this will become to scrambled.

There are three things necessary for membership:

1. Baptism,
2. Profession of Faith, and
3. Submission to the Ruling authority of the Church.

#### **Derek**

Accepted, as an entry point.

Consider:

- do they ever lose that membership, is it something precious to hold, or
- once you're in, you're in, you have an entry ticket to Heaven or Purgatory, you can do what you please ?

Therefore, I would add, to be a Catholic

2. — One must be committed to maintaining their membership. Two points.

2.a. — Executing all things that are required to remain Catholic.

~~Such as: fasting and abstinence on prescribed days; confession at least monthly; assisting at Mass at least weekly; submission to all legitimate authorities; etc; etc.~~

#### **James**

The only way to leave the Church after becoming a member is either through:

1. Heresy
2. Schism
3. Apostasy
4. Excommunication

The examples you listed such as proper fasting, regular confession, attending mass on Sundays, while the omission is certainly a sin, they are not the above four, and the person who commits them is still a Catholic and a member of the Church.

a. [Pius XII \*Mystici Corporis Christi\* 23](#)

#### **James**

One can, contrary to your assertion, commit these sins and remain Catholic. This is why a person who has committed heresy must make an abjuration of error before going to confession, for the abjuration is really a profession of faith which allows them to be regarded as a member again, while a Catholic who purposefully missed twenty years of Sunday masses just goes to confession.

#### **Derek**

Thank you, I submit to Magisterium, I stand corrected. (I was confusing a Good Catholic with a Catholic.)

#### **Derek**

2.b. — Maintaining a state of Grace. I would prefer to state that as, maintaining their membership in the Mystical Body.

~~They can lose that state by committing a mortal sin, and after genuine Contrition, Confession, and Penance, regain it, which is a temporary issue. People who are constantly back and forth, in and out of sin, are hardly Catholic, but for the purposes of this thread, we are not concerned about whether they are Good Catholics or Bad Catholics, the scope is limited to whether they are Catholic or not. This thread is not about what it takes to obtain salvation. Therefore we have to consider any sin that causes them to cease being Catholic more or less permanently, that they must do some serious work to rectify, and dismiss other sins that are easy to rectify, that return them to a state of Grace, meaning that their absence was temporary~~



**James**

Again I answer in the negative. Sanctifying Grace is not necessary to maintain membership in the Church. A mortal sin, which is the loss of Sanctifying grace, requires confession only, not an abjuration of error. The individual is still a Catholic no matter how guilty or maliciously he committed the act or how hardened a sinner he may be. He may very well be a dead member, but never-the-less he is still a member.

(*Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, pg 311) *Specific text not provided*

**Christopher Conlon**

Fathers Rumble and Carty provide a concise explanation of the loss of the state of grace through mortal sin and its affect on membership in the Church.

**Frs Rumble & Carty *Radio Replies, Vol II* (1940) p148**

606. Does a Catholic who commits mortal sin still belong to your Church?

Yes; but as a dead member. He receives no blood from the heart of the Church, which is Divine Love. He does not obey the directing inspiration of the Church, which is the spirit of Christ. He has no right to the Eucharist, which is the bread of life, and which should be nourishing the life he lacks. Though he still associates with living members, and kneels side by side with them in the Church he attends, he is like a paralyzed limb. He has cut himself off from communion with the Church from within. And it is his duty to recover the life of grace by Confession and repentance, and thus become a living member of the Church once more.

**Derek**

Thank you, I submit to Magisterium, I stand corrected.

**Derek**

~~I stress, the distinction here is not a mortal sin vs a venial one, but about permanence or not in that state of Grace.~~

**James**

There is no such thing as "hardly Catholic," one is or is not. [Re permanence of sin in regards to membership,] there is no distinction between mortal sin, or venial sin. All such sinners then remain Catholic except for the four sins listed above."

**Derek**

Ok.

Likewise, re being a Catholic or re losing membership, I suppose there is no distinction between *a Good Catholic; a Bad Catholic; a Lapsed Catholic*, they are all *Catholics*.





## Proposed

*(Unformatted!)*

I think the next point is ...

3. One can lose their membership in the Mystical Body, by any of the following, per your three-point definition, which deems them as non-Catholic more-or-less permanently:

profess or execute a heresy

maintain communion with heretics

refuse to submit to the Ruling authority of the Church

4. Consistent with my post in the other thread, I propose there are two acceptable types of Catholic, by definition:

(a) Sede Vacante Catholic

Capable of being seriously aware of their religion, the Magisterium; caring about it; resolving any contradictions that present themselves.

(b) Novus Ordo Catholic

Not so capable, and thus they rely on their priests and bishops. They faithfully observe all things that they know to be Catholic.

I was going to say, there are no other types, but actually, if you wish the sets to be technically complete, there is one more type, although I think it will not attract discussion:

(c) Heretic, non-catholic

Once-were-catholics (a) or (b), and who have fallen into heresy.

We must note, the measure against which Heresy is determined, is the Magisterium up to Vatican II.

And outside those sets, there are only pagans. Protestants are pagans. The distinction is, I think, (c) was or was trying to be (a) or (b), Protestants aren't, thus technically they are not heretic.

I believe we have closed that point in the previous discussion, at least (a) and (b), but I am not sure, and I have added (c). Over to you.





## 3 Modernism

### 3.1 The Definition

### 3.2 What is a Modernist ?

#### James

Please provide the definition of modernist you are using to make such a distinction. I cannot discern it from the context of the paragraph.

#### Proposed

#### Derek

That is a big one, and the size of the answer depends on how much or little you know about the subject. Two answers, the first is ecclesiastical; the second is lay.

In the first instance, I would direct you to Pope St Pius X's encyclicals on the subject, because he was our great pope who identified it; identified the danger it poses to the Church; catalogued it; defined it; and condemned it, in order to destroy its presence in the Church. He succeeded, and it lasted for at least fifty years, but now we have upon us, again, the Age of Modernism. There are five related papal documents which form a set (some would say three, I explain below), two encyclicals plus three decrees, all closely related. In chronological order:

a. *St Pius X E Supremi*

Encyclical on the Restoration of All Things in Christ. That sets out our beloved pope's agenda and commitment. The great achievements of His Holiness during his reign cannot be fully appreciated without this context.

b. *Lamentabili Sane*

Decree. The syllabus or catalogue of 65 errors, specific actions that people (intended for all Catholics, but especially within all Catholic institutions) were engaging in, that His Holiness identified as heretical; damaging to the Faith. It stands as a simple form of definition.

c. *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*

Encyclical on the Doctrine of the Modernists. The formal definition, much more elaborate.

d. *Præstantia Scripturæ*

Motu Proprio (decree, motion). Literally, the value of scripture. On the scriptural underpinning relating to [b] and [c], and the penalties for not observing them.

e. *Oath Against Modernism*

Decree. Required to be taken by all religious and teachers. Willingly taken by many faithful, more in those days than these.

For those who may find that difficult or too time-consuming, here is a set of shorter versions of the definition from a (I think, but I am open to correction) good source, in lay language.

f. *CatholicCulture Definitions re Modernism*

Leads to other links, you can read as much or little as you like

g. *Rorate Cæli Centenary of Lamentabili Sane*

A good, short article, it assists with understanding Modernism in today's context, measured against [b] from one hundred years ago.

Of course, there is a third category, the writings of various theologians, which expand the papal document category. I can provide that, if requested, but I think the two categories given should suffice.



**James**

I am not following how tv or films makes one a modernist.

**Derek**

Well, *all* forms of media, are owned and governed by the Jews. They use it to propagandise, to brainwash, humans. Just as they said they would in their declaration of war against us. That is one of their specific identified strategies: dominate and control the media in every country.

Those *two* forms of media in particular are high value, in the home, you are being hammered, 24 hours a day. When you are in a relaxed and open state.

If you spend any significant amount of time watching TV or films, you are being programmed, and programmed heavily. To be a modernist, a naturalist, an humanist, a slave, destroying your own church, life, family. Without realising it. Unless you understand that, and you are consciously avoiding all media, especially those two forms, you are being made into a modernist.

I hope I am not telling you something new here.



## 4 Incompatibility

### 4.1 By Simple Logic

### 4.2 By Papal Decree

### 4.3 Determination

How can we determine what a person or institution is ?





# A Cited Material

This appendix contains quoted text from Doctrinal sources that is **not** located in the body of the document.

a. **Pius XII *Mystici Corporis Christi* 23**

23. Nor must one imagine that the Body of the Church, just because it bears the name of Christ, is made up during the days of its earthly pilgrimage only of members conspicuous for their holiness, or that it consists only of those whom God has predestined to eternal happiness. It is owing to the Savior's infinite mercy that place is allowed in His Mystical Body here below for those whom, of old, He did not exclude from the banquet. [20] For not every sin, however grave it may be, is such as of its own nature to sever a man from the Body of the Church, as does schism or heresy or apostasy. Men may lose charity and divine grace through sin, thus becoming incapable of supernatural merit, and yet not be deprived of all life if they hold fast to faith and Christian hope, and if, illumined from above, they are spurred on by the interior promptings of the Holy Spirit to salutary fear and are moved to prayer and penance for their sins.

24. Let every one then abhor sin, which defiles the mystical members of our Redeemer; but if anyone unhappily falls and his obstinacy has not made him unworthy of communion with the faithful, let him be received with great love, and let eager charity see in him a weak member of Jesus Christ. For, as the Bishop of Hippo remarks, it is better "to be cured within the Church's community than to be cut off from its body as incurable members." [21] "As long as a member still forms part of the body there is no reason to despair of its cure; once it has been cut off, it can be neither cured nor healed." [22]

b. **Author *Book & page***

Blah blah blah.

