

# Catholic Candle

☪ April 2025 ☪ catholiccandle.org ☪ catholiccandle@gmail.com

---

## *Words to Live by – from Catholic Tradition*

### *We Must Never, Ever Tell a Lie*

To tell a lie is always evil and sinful. ***No end ever justifies a sinful means.*** Even if we were to suppose that a person had the very highest of all motives – which is to promote the glory of God – that would still never justify a lie.

Here is the very striking way in which St. Thomas Aquinas, greatest Doctor of the Catholic Church, teaches this truth:

A lie must be shunned to such an extent that, even if it seemed that the lie would increase the glory of God, we should still not tell a lie.<sup>1</sup>

Let us consider an example: Suppose a pagan were on his deathbed with only minutes to live. Suppose also that we happen to know that he would convert to the Catholic Faith and agree to baptism if we were to tell him a small (so-called) “harmless” lie, such as that the dog he loved would go to heaven. We can never justify even such a (so-called) “white” lie even to save his soul.



---

<sup>1</sup> Here is St. Thomas’ teaching in the Latin original:

Adeo enim vitanda sunt mendacia, ut etiam si cedere videantur ad laudem Dei, non sunt dicenda.

St. Thomas Aquinas’ *Lectures on St. John’s Gospel*, ch.13, lecture #3, section #1776.

# The “New” SSPX Promotes the Evil of Going into Conciliar Churches to Pray during the “Holy Year”

Pope Francis declared that, in the 2025 “holy year”<sup>2</sup>, people can gain a plenary indulgence by praying in one of many churches throughout the world, *viz.*, the cathedral in any diocese, plus many other churches. He did this in 2015 too.

The “new” liberal SSPX promotes participation in this “holy year” and encourages its followers to pray in conciliar churches. One of the “new” SSPX priests, Fr. Peter Scott, who had previously been uncompromising, promotes this evil in these words:

Of course, most of us cannot go in person to Rome, but in this case, we can gain the plenary indulgence **by visiting and praying a Rosary in the cathedral of our town**, and fulfilling all the other conditions required.<sup>3</sup>

The now-liberal Fr. Peter Scott is simply following his now-liberal group. When Pope Francis declared a “holy year” about ten years ago and declared that people can gain a plenary indulgence by praying in one of many churches throughout the world, *viz.*, the cathedral in any diocese, plus many other churches, Bishop Fellay strongly urged his followers to participate in the so-called “holy year” by going to conciliar churches to pray. He wrote:

Must we then deprive ourselves of the graces of a Holy Year? Quite the contrary. When the floodgates of grace are opened wide, we must receive abundantly!<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The conciliar church is a new and false religion. Read this analysis here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/02/05/the-conciliar-church-is-anti-god-and-anti-catholic/>

There has been nothing holy whatsoever about the new conciliar religion itself, arising out of the 16 documents of Vatican II, and perpetuated and strengthened through the gravely anti-Catholic words, actions, and omissions of the leaders of that false religion, such as the conciliar popes and the conciliar clergy.

But that does not mean that the leaders of this new religion might not (subjectively) **believe** that they can both be members of this new false religion while also being members of the Catholic Church, just as men could suppose that it is possible to be members of the freemasons at the same time as being Catholic. Such dual membership, while possible, would show their great confusion of mind but it would not make it impossible for them to be (confused) members of the Catholic Church.

<sup>3</sup> Fr. Peter Scott, 2- 20-25 *Defende Nos*, #123, p.3 (emphasis added).

<sup>4</sup> Quoted from Bishop Fellay letter #84, May 24, 2015.

The “new” SSPX has been weakening for a long time and has long blurred the difference between the conciliar church – which is a new religion<sup>5</sup> – and the true Catholic Church of all time. This causes the “new” SSPX to increasingly promote praying in conciliar churches, which are occupied by the modernists and which for almost 60 years have been used to further Revolution.

For example, the “new” SSPX was thrilled that one of its priests said Mass in St. Peter’s Basilica in Rome. <http://rorate-caeli.blogspot.com/2014/08/sspx-priest-celebrates-mass-in-saint.html> (Fittingly, this new-SSPX video showing the Mass in this basilica is posted by a person whose user name is *New Catholic*.)

## **Reminder: We Should Stay Out of Conciliar Churches and Other Compromise Chapels**

There are three reasons we should not go into conciliar churches to pray:

1. Places of sacrilege are most *unfitting* places to pray;
2. We should *abhor* and shun places of sacrilege; and
3. We must avoid giving *scandal*.

Below, we discuss each of these points.

### **1. Sacrilege Makes a Conciliar Church Unfitting for Prayer**

Places of evil are inherently very unfitting places for spiritual actions such as prayer. Prayer is among the very best and most sacred “Things”. To mix prayer with the worst (*viz.*, an evil place) is most unfitting and offensive to God. It is like choosing the filthiest, most disgusting vessel as the container for the most precious liquid – it is wholly unfitting.

---

<sup>5</sup> Read the analysis in these articles:

- <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/02/05/the-conciliar-church-is-anti-god-and-anti-catholic/>
- and
- <https://catholiccandle.org/2020/11/01/the-conciliar-church-is-anti-god-and-is-a-cult-of-man/>

The *Summa* explains this truth admirably:

Now although, properly speaking, a corporeal thing cannot be the subject of the stain of sin, nevertheless, on ***account of sin corporeal*** [*i.e.*, physical] ***things contract a certain unfitness for being appointed to spiritual purposes; and for this reason, we find that places where crimes have been committed are reckoned unfit for the performance of sacred actions therein, unless they be cleansed beforehand.***<sup>6</sup>

But sins directed against God are the gravest sins – much worse, for example, than the crime of murder, because murder is a sin directed against man, not God. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.13, a.3, ad 1.

The new mass is inherently protestantized and man-centered and so is always “an irreverent treatment of the Sacred” (the definition of a sacrilege). *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.99, a.1.<sup>7</sup> Thus, the new mass is objectively worse than murder, since the new mass is objectively a grave offense directed against God Himself.

If a new mass is valid, that makes it objectively worse – by being a valid (rather than invalid) sacrilege. A valid sacrilege even more strongly calls down the wrath of God because a valid sacrilege compels God Himself (Sacramentally present) to take part in the sacrilege.

Thus, conciliar churches are inherent ***dens of sacrilege*** because the new mass is said there (and for many other reasons). As a *den of sacrilege*, it is a very unfitting place to pray. *Summa Supp.* Q.74, a.1, *respondeo*.

In conciliar churches also we find other evils such as scandalous conciliar sermons, “communion” in the hand and “eucharistic” ministers, gross immodesty, banal un-Catholic music, bookshelves full of poisonous materials, ugly conciliar “art”, “priests” walking around in street clothes, and so on. All of these things tend to weaken the Faith of good Traditional Catholics, as well as weaken the horror for sin and compromise that we must maintain.

## 2. Faithful and Informed Catholics Instinctively Abhor Conciliar Churches

In the proportion in which we love Our Lord, we should abhor conciliar churches. This is like a widow who loved her deceased husband. In proportion to her love for him, she would not wish to use as a place of amusement, rest, and comfort the location in which

---

<sup>6</sup> *Summa Supp.* Q.74, a.1, *respondeo* (emphasis added; bracketed word added for clarity).

<sup>7</sup> Read this article about why the new mass never gives grace:  
<https://catholiccandle.org/2020/03/01/the-new-mass-does-not-give-grace/>

her husband had previously been tortured and brutally murdered. Her love would not permit it.

Similarly, those who love Our Lord and realize that the new mass is objectively a sacrilege, would never wish to be in a place which continues to be used for the new mass and other conciliar evils. And the more an informed Catholic loves Our Lord, the more he finds conciliar churches intolerably odious – more because of the sacrileges that continue to occur there than because of the buildings’ conciliar ugliness! This is a second reason informed Catholics do not enter conciliar churches.

### **3. Entering Conciliar Churches Causes Scandal**

Scandal is giving the appearance of evil which makes another person more likely to sin. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.43, a.1, ad 2.

To the extent others see us entering a conciliar church, it gives scandal because this would tend to give credence (in their minds) to what goes on there. Most people would not make the distinction *when* we entered a conciliar church, *e.g.*, to pray the rosary but not when the new mass is said there. Each person’s presence adds a little to the appearance that the conciliar church is more visited/attended and that what goes on there is more accepted.

Without thinking deeply about the matter, many people would tend to think that those entering a conciliar church approve what is happening there. Therefore, in the eyes of many people, we would indicate our approval generally for what goes on there, regardless of our real opinion. Because people are social creatures, they would tend to accept the conciliar church because they see other people accepting it. This is a third reason that informed Catholics do not enter conciliar churches.

### **Conclusion**

For the three reasons given above, Catholics should never go into a conciliar church to pray. It is among the most unfitting places to pray and is among the places that a faithful and informed Catholic would least desire to be, because it is a place of sacrilege and grave offense to Our Lord.

What a contrast this Catholic position is to that of the “new” SSPX leaders, who urge us to pray in conciliar churches for the “holy year”! They see no reason why the new mass

should make conciliar churches unfitting for prayer because they already say kind things about the new mass and are moving toward accepting it.<sup>8</sup>

Would the “new” SSPX tell the faithful to stay away from conciliar churches if, in those churches, people regularly and openly spit on the SSPX logo or on a picture of Bishop Fellay there? If so, that means the **“new” SSPX is more offended at insults to their bishop and their own institution, than at the infinite offenses given to Our Lord God** in the sacrileges of the new mass.

### **Postscript:**

Because of the liberalism and other compromises of groups such as the “new” SSPX,<sup>9</sup> their Masses and other activities in their own chapels also offend God.<sup>10</sup> Thus, as outlined above, the “new” SSPX chapels are also unfitting places to pray, are places that faithful and informed Catholics should abhor, and are places where scandal would arise from persons entering there. Let us stay out of their liberal and compromise chapels as we should stay away from the mainstream conciliar churches!



**Catholic Candle note:** Below is a corrected version of an article.

## **Correction**

This correction regards our April 2025 article -- *Warning about Lifesitenews.com: It Promotes Heresy!*: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/04/23/warning-about-lifesitenews-com-it-promotes-heresy/>

*Catholic Candle* is embarrassed to have written an article in our April 2025 edition where we wrongly identified the name of the website at fault. We thought it was Lifesitenews.com and it was really Lifenews.com.

---

<sup>8</sup> See, e.g., example #6 in the list of 21 examples of “new” SSPX liberalism. This list is found here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/03/27/21-examples-of-liberalism-in-the-new-sspx/>

<sup>9</sup> See, e.g., the examples of 21 examples of “new” SSPX liberalism, found here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/03/27/21-examples-of-liberalism-in-the-new-sspx/>

<sup>10</sup> <https://catholiccandle.org/2020/04/02/a-compromise-groups-masses-and-sacraments-do-not-give-grace-because-the-end-does-not-justify-the-means/>

We are sorry and apologize to Lifesitenews.com and to *Catholic Candle* readers. It was our mistake completely.

## Warning about Lifenews.com: It Promotes Heresy

Lifenews.com publishes a mix of articles, good and bad.

Among other examples is its recent article which concludes falsely, that all unbaptized babies go to heaven. For example, here are two ways that this heresy is stated in the article:

***Do Aborted and Miscarried Babies Go to Heaven?*** ... I conclude that babies are among the “loved by God, that he [sic] has chosen” (1 Thessalonians 1: 4) and ***are with him*** now. ...

Trust that ***your babies are with the Lord*** and with perfect understanding, enjoying him [sic], as you will come to see.<sup>11</sup>

The article in Lifenews.com promotes the protestants’ denial of the importance (or existence) of Original Sin. They do not consider prompt infant Baptism to be necessary or important.

The protestant author purports to be “biblical”. But he is not. He quickly segues into his squishy protestant heresy, namely, that Baptism is not crucial for salvation because the Father is so loving.

This protestant author’s supposed “biblical” analysis is so shallow that he neither mentioned nor showed how his protestant heresy fits with Our Lord’s words:

Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

*St. John’s Gospel*, 3:5.

---

<sup>11</sup> Both of the above statements are quoted from: *Do Aborted and Miscarried Babies Go to Heaven? Here’s What the Bible Says* found here: <https://www.lifenews.com/2025/03/04/do-aborted-and-miscarried-babies-go-to-heaven-heres-what-the-bible-says/?cmid=d5fc2db8-b428-4858-b3aa-6b8ade0ecdb7> (emphasis added).

Let us close this present article with a quick summary of the truths that Lifeneews.com denies, at least implicitly, by publishing that heretical article.<sup>12</sup>

- ❖ **Original Sin makes us enemies of God.** As the psalmist teaches: “I was conceived in iniquities; and in sins did my mother conceive me.” *Psalm* 50:7. St. Paul teaches that, because of Original Sin, we are all “by nature children of wrath”. *Ephesians*, 2:3.

- ❖ **No One Can Go to Heaven Without Grace.**

Here is one way that St. Thomas shows the connection between sanctifying grace and salvation:

[M]an is not justified from sin<sup>13</sup> [including Original Sin] except by grace ... [and] the very least grace is sufficient to ... merit eternal life.<sup>14</sup>

St. Thomas teaches the same truth in these words:

The holy Fathers [of the Old Testament] were delivered from hell by being admitted to the glory of the vision of God, to which no one can come except through grace; according to Rom. 6:23: “The grace of God is life everlasting.”<sup>15</sup>

- ❖ But babies (and retarded persons who have never had the use of reason) can only receive grace through Baptism (because they cannot use their reason and so cannot have Baptism of Desire<sup>16</sup>). As the *Summa* explains:

---

<sup>12</sup> *Do Aborted and Miscarried Babies Go to Heaven? Here’s What the Bible Says* found here: <https://www.lifeneews.com/2025/03/04/do-aborted-and-miscarried-babies-go-to-heaven-heres-what-the-bible-says/?cmid=d5fc2db8-b428-4858-b3aa-6b8ade0ecdb7>.

<sup>13</sup> *i.e.*, so that his sins are forgiven.

<sup>14</sup> *Summa*, III, Q.62, a.6, ad 3 (bracketed words added).

<sup>15</sup> *Summa*, III, Q. 52, a.7, respondeo; the quote from St. Paul is in the original, bracketed words in the original.

<sup>16</sup> Contrary to the Feeneyite errors, the Catholic Church teaches the possibility of Baptism of Desire and Baptism of Blood. Read the explanation here: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/the-catholic-teaching-of-baptism-of-desire-and-baptism-of-blood.html>

[S]ometimes Baptism cannot be omitted without loss of eternal salvation, as in the case of children who have not come to the use of reason.<sup>17</sup>

In other words, because there is no way for a baby to receive grace except through Baptism, if a baby is not baptized, he cannot go to heaven.

Here is another way to state this same explanation that an unbaptized baby does not go to heaven:

1. No one goes to heaven unless he is a friend of God.
2. No one is a friend of God without the (supernatural) Theological Virtue of Charity.
3. There is no way for a baby to obtain this (supernatural) Theological Virtue of Charity except through Baptism.
4. Therefore, a baby does not go to heaven unless he is baptized.

- ❖ Because a baby cannot go to heaven without grace and cannot obtain grace without Baptism, the Church insists on prompt Baptism. As St. Thomas explains:

We must make a distinction and see whether those who are to be baptized are children or adults. For ***if they be children***, Baptism ***should not be deferred***. First, because in them we do not look for better instruction or fuller conversion. Secondly, because of the danger of death, for ***no other remedy is available*** for them besides the sacrament of Baptism.<sup>18</sup>

This phrase “no other remedy is available for them” refers to a baby’s inability to be purged of Original Sin and to receive Grace, in any way besides Baptism. By contrast, a person who has the use of reason could possibly receive Baptism of Desire, if he were unable to be Baptized.

- ❖ In the book, *The Teaching Of The Catholic Church*, Canon Smith explains the reality for parents of a baby who died without baptism:

---

<sup>17</sup> *Summa Supp.*, Q.8, a.1, ad 2.

<sup>18</sup> *Summa*, III, Q.68, a.3, *respondeo* (emphasis added).

[U]nbaptised children, not having received the sacrament of faith [*i.e.*, Baptism], have not the supernatural knowledge, without which they cannot know what they have lost. Hence their loss causes them no anguish of soul. Although these considerations may bring some little consolation to the Catholic mother grieving over the fate of her child who has died unbaptised, they will not relieve the weight upon her conscience, should hers have been the fault, or free parents from the obligation to have their children baptised as soon as possible, since ***there is no measure or proportion between the natural happiness that will be their lot*** [*i.e.*, the lot of the babies] ***in limbo, and the inconceivable felicity of heaven***, of which man's carelessness [*viz.*, by delaying Baptism] may so easily deprive them.<sup>19</sup>

- ❖ In his Constitution, *Auctorem Fidei*, on August 28, 1794, Pope Pius VI condemned the claim that the existence of the *Limbo of the Children* is a fable. Here is his condemnation:

**Condemned:**

The doctrine which **rejects as a Pelagian fable**, that **place of the lower regions (which the faithful generally designate by the name of the limbo of children)** in which the souls of those departing with the sole guilt of original sin are punished with the punishment of the condemned, exclusive of the punishment of fire, just as if, by this very fact, that these who remove the punishment of fire introduced that middle place and state free of guilt and of punishment between the kingdom of God and eternal damnation, such as that about which the Pelagians idly talk,--false, rash, injurious to Catholic schools.<sup>20</sup>

Thus, the article<sup>21</sup> published by Lifenews.com promotes one or more heretical doctrines:

- That all unbaptized babies have grace;
- That grace is not necessary to get to heaven; and

---

<sup>19</sup> *The Teaching Of The Catholic Church, A Summary of Catholic Doctrine*, By Canon George D. Smith, D.D., Rh.D, Volume I, p.358, New York, MacMillan, ©1949 (emphasis and bracketed words added).

<sup>20</sup> 2626 Dz 1526 26 (emphasis added).

<sup>21</sup> *Do Aborted and Miscarried Babies Go to Heaven? Here's What the Bible Says*, found here: <https://www.lifenews.com/2025/03/04/do-aborted-and-miscarried-babies-go-to-heaven-heres-what-the-bible-says/?cmid=d5fc2db8-b428-4858-b3aa-6b8ade0ecdb7>

- That the *Limbo of the Children* is a fable, incurring the condemnation of Pope Pius VI.

Abortion is the murder of innocent babies. It is very human for us to sympathize with the innocent and the weak. We would be inclined to “wish ourselves into” the error that unbaptized babies (including all those murdered in abortion), somehow go to heaven.

But we should love the truth more than the comfort of an appealing heresy! It is heresy to say those unbaptized babies can go to heaven. So that heresy is a false comfort.

Also, this demonic heresy deemphasizes the urgent need to baptize babies. When heretics deemphasize the necessity of infant Baptism, they promote the devil’s strategy of seeking to delay the Baptism of babies, even though it is the only way they can get to heaven.

## Conclusion

Beware of the recklessness of Lifenews.com. Watch out for the heresies that it publishes under the guise of “pro-life”!



**Catholic Candle note:** The article immediately below is part nine of the study of the Choleric temperament. The first eight parts can be found here:

1. Mary’s School of Sanctity – Lesson #36: About the Temperaments – Beginning our Study of the Choleric Temperament – Part I:  
<https://catholiccandle.org/2024/08/27/lesson-35-about-the-temperaments-the-choleric-temperament/>
2. Mary’s School of Sanctity – Lesson #37: About the Temperaments – Continuing Our Study of the Choleric Temperament– Part II:  
<https://catholiccandle.org/2024/09/26/lesson-37-about-the-temperaments-continuation-of-the-choleric-temperament/>
3. Mary’s School of Sanctity – Lesson #38 -- About the Temperaments – Continuing our Study of the Choleric Temperament – Their Spiritual Combat – Part III:: <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/10/24/lesson-38-temperaments-choleric-temperament-their-spiritual-combat/>
4. Mary’s School of Sanctity – Lesson #39 About the Temperaments – Continuing Our Study of the Choleric Temperament – That Temperament’s Spiritual Combat – Part IV: <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/11/26/lesson-39->

[temperaments-choleric-temperament-their-spiritual-combat-part-iv/](#)

5. Mary's School of Sanctity – Lesson #40: Temperaments – Choleric Temperament – Their Spiritual Combat – Part V:  
<https://catholiccandle.org/2024/12/30/lesson-40-temperaments-choleric-temperament-their-spiritual-combat-part-v/>
6. Mary's School of Sanctity – Lesson #41 - About the Temperaments - Continuing Our Study of the Choleric Temperament: a Choleric's Spiritual Combat -- Part VI: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/01/27/lesson-41-temperaments-choleric-temperament-a-choleric-spiritual-combat-part-vi/>
7. Mary's School of Sanctity – Lesson #42: About the Temperaments – Continuing Our Study of the Choleric Temperament – a Choleric's Spiritual Combat – Part VII: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/02/21/lesson-42-temperaments-choleric-temperament-a-choleric-spiritual-combat-part-vii/>
8. Mary's School of Sanctity -- Lesson #43 About the Temperaments --Continuing Our Study of the Choleric Temperament -- Their Spiritual Combat Part VIII: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/03/27/lesson-42-temperaments-choleric-temperament-a-choleric-spiritual-combat-part-viii/>

## Mary's School of Sanctity

### ***Lesson #44 About the Temperaments – Continuing Our Study of the Choleric Temperament – Their Spiritual Combat, Part IX***

**Note: When referring to a person with a choleric temperament in this article we simply will label him as a choleric.**

In our last lesson we saw how anger is inherently caused by some slight that someone has felt. We had a list of questions that a choleric, in particular, can ask himself about feeling slighted and some means to take to prevent himself from getting angry.

Because anger becomes sinful when it is unreasonable, the choleric must learn to watch his feelings very closely. As we mentioned, St. Thomas reminds us that the person with a

choleric temperament is prone to become “angry too quickly or for any slight [meaning small/trivial] cause.”<sup>22</sup>

In addition to these two ways for anger to become sinful, we discussed what St. Thomas said about anger being “too long in a man’s memory, the result being that it gives rise to **a lasting displeasure**, wherefore he is *grievous* and *sullen* to himself.”<sup>23</sup>

This brings us to the important topic of the choleric tendency to hold grudges. Let us take a brief look at two definitions of the word “grudge”:

**1. Grudge = sullen malice, cherished ill will.**<sup>24</sup>

**2. Grudge = a feeling of deep-seated resentment of ill will.**<sup>25</sup>

These meanings given for the word grudge plainly tell us that a grudge is something bad for the soul because these meanings refer to the ‘lasting displeasure’ that St. Thomas is talking about.

## **Recognizing and Squelching Anger/Not Allowing Anger to Linger**

St. Paul warns us not to keep lasting anger in our hearts, “*Be angry: and sin not. Let not the sun go down upon your anger.*” [Ephesians 4:26].

Rightly does St. Paul warn us because he knows that anger can quickly become unreasonable and therefore sinful. This tendency of anger to be unreasonable is because anger has a close connection to pride. We know that pride blinds the soul. So pride makes it very difficult to discover that one’s anger is unfounded, hence, unreasonable. St. Paul says, “*Be angry.*” Be tough on yourself. Further, he says, “*Sin not.*” Don’t be unjustly angry with your neighbor. And again, St. Paul says, “*Let not the sun go down upon your anger.*” Do not let your anger linger.

Thus, it is crucial that a person must judge himself strictly when he feels anger flaring up in his soul. He must keep a close guard on himself. He must find the source or cause of his feeling of anger. This requires much self-knowledge. By studying himself and his tendencies closely, he can discover what types of things spark his anger into action. He

---

<sup>22</sup> *Summa Theologica* IIa IIae, Q. 158, a. 6, *Respondeo* [bracketed words added for clarity]

<sup>23</sup> *Summa Theologica* IIa IIae, Q. 158, a. 6, *Respondeo* [Bold emphasis added.]

<sup>24</sup> *Merriam-Webster New Collegiate Dictionary*, ©1949.

<sup>25</sup> *Webster’s Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary*, ©1987.

must “nip-in-the-bud” his unjust anger. In other words, he must quench the fire of anger at its beginning.

We discussed in our last lesson how a choleric’s anger is usually attached to pride. This pride makes the choleric frequently view everything as an insult. We gave some typical things that a choleric feels slighted about. We showed how each of these was linked to pride. We gave some suggestions on how the choleric could counteract his pride and his anger for each case. We list here again some common links to pride.

### **A person feels slighted because:**

- 1) He feels that he is not getting attention from others.
- 2) He feels that someone insulted him.
- 3) He thinks someone is making fun of him.
- 4) He feels that someone is getting in the way of his plans and his getting what he wants.
- 5) He thinks someone is insulting his (God-given) talents.
- 6) He does not like someone pointing out his defects or anything that he has done wrong.

### **A Strategy to Counteract His Tendency to Feel Slighted**

A choleric must ask himself some hard-hitting questions and give himself some tough rebukes. He cannot be gentle with himself. He must be strict with himself. So here is a sample of the toughness the choleric has to have on himself and tell himself the following:

- 1) What do you want attention for? Who do you think you are? You act as if you are God’s gift to mankind!! You are not the center of the universe! Stop being so self-centered! And how many times have you failed to give others the attention they deserved?
- 2) So, you think you have been insulted? What makes you think that? Do you really think that everyone must treat you as a king? Treat you with kid-gloves? Why are you so sensitive? Most likely you deserve to be insulted. Think of all your past sins and how you yourself have insulted God and then you will not be so prone to think that you deserve anything better than you have. In fact, you have gotten far better than you have ever deserved! And how many times have you insulted others?
- 3) Likewise, you feel that you have been mocked/made fun of? Haven’t your past sins truly mocked Our Lord? And here you allow yourself to take offense at the tiniest word

spoken about you or to you. Further, how many times have you mocked/made fun of others?

4) Now you are upset because your plans are disrupted in any way whatsoever? What makes you think that God is pleased with your plans? Did you pray to God about them and think deeply whether your plans would help you save your soul or help you to become a straight-to-heaven saint?

5) You are so upset because you think your (God-given) talents are being insulted? If they are truly God-given talents, then you are not acting grateful for them by getting upset. God did not have to give you anything and you should not act as if you were not given these talents from God and as if they were simply automatically yours. God could, if He wanted to, take these away from you in an instant.

6) So now you are upset because someone pointed out a defect in you/or something that you have done wrong? Do you *really* think you are perfect and there is absolutely no room for improvement in you? Do you think you are without sin? Shouldn't you be grateful that someone is trying to help you improve? Do you not feel ashamed for your ingratitude toward the person trying to help you become holy?

## **Grudges Come When One Does Not Humble Himself and Is Not Willing to Forgive**

Grudges, because they are unreasonable, are always sinful. One must see himself in the true light, and thereby see that he deserves slights, insults, chastisements, admonishments, and punishments. These are needed not only for the strengthening of the soul in virtue, but also to make reparation for one's past sins.

Grudges may not necessarily be because one is seeking to get revenge, but is rather the case of a person not being willing to forgive his neighbor. Our Lord speaks many times in the Gospel about forgiving one's neighbor. He says we should always forgive from our hearts even if we were treated unjustly. The following (from St. Matthew's Gospel) is a good example:

Then came Peter unto Him and said: Lord, how often shall my brother offend against me, and I forgive him? till seven times? Jesus saith to him: I say not to thee, till seven times; but till seventy times seven times.

*St. Matthew's Gospel, 18:21-22.*

Our Lord here means to forgive always.

Again, in St. Matthew's Gospel [18:23-35] we find the parable about the man being forgiven a huge debt and then he went out and throttled his fellow servant and demanded prompt payment of a very small debt.

[Our Lord says:] Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened to a king, who would take an account of his servants.

And when he had begun to take the account, one was brought to him, that owed him ten thousand talents. And as he had not wherewith to pay it, his lord commanded that he should be sold, and his wife and children, and all that he had, and payment to be made. But that servant falling down, besought him, saying: Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. And the lord of that servant being moved with pity, let him go and forgave him the debt. But when that servant was gone out, he found one of his fellow-servants that owed him a hundred denarii: and laying hold of him, he throttled him, saying: Pay what thou owest. And his fellow-servant falling down, besought him, saying: Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. And he would not: but went and cast him into prison, till he paid the debt. Now his fellow servants seeing what was done, were very much grieved, and they came, and told their lord all that was done. Then his lord called him: and said to him: Thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all the debt, because thou besoughtest me. Shouldst not thou then have had compassion also on thy fellow servant, even as I had compassion on thee? And his lord being angry, delivered him to the torturers until he paid all the debt. **So also shall my heavenly Father do to you, if you forgive not everyone his brother from your hearts.** [bold emphasis added]

And if these quotes are not enough to convince a choleric to keep a close eye on his pride and beware of the beginning of his anger, then simply looking at the ***Our Father*** that Our Lord taught us shows us plainly enough that we must forgive our neighbor if we are going to expect forgiveness from God.

Let's face it. We have all known someone who has held a grudge. We can see that the grudge is very ugly and ridiculous. Holding a grudge truly shows the pride and foolishness of the one holding it. The grudge shows a gross lack of compassion and patience. Most importantly, grudges show a grave lack of charity in the person holding the grudge. It is as we have seen from what we have studied in St. Thomas, anger and pride married together and kept for a long time, engender hatred. How can someone willing to hold a grudge really think he will be able to meet His Judge Who has been so forgiving and meek to him, when the reality remains that he was not willing to show any mercy and meekness to his neighbor?

Let the choleric remind himself of Our Lord's words:

Amen I say to you, unless you be converted, and become as little children, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, he is the greater in the kingdom of heaven. [St. Matthew 18:3-4]

And let us all – especially choleric – often pray: “Jesus, meek and humble of Heart, make our hearts like unto Thine.”

## A Preview...

In our next lesson we will study another character flaw of the choleric which is directly linked to his pride—his tendency to criticize and misjudge others. Again, our goal will be to investigate this bad trait and strategize on the means to amend it.



***Catholic Candle* note:** Sedevacantism is wrong and is (material or formal) schism. *Catholic Candle* is not sedevacantist.

Below is the eighth article in a series which covers specific aspects of the error of sedevacantism. As context for this eighth article, let us recall what we saw in the earlier seven articles:

**In the first article**, we saw that we cannot know whether Pope Francis (or anyone else) is a formal heretic (rather than a material heretic only) – and thus whether he is outside the true Catholic Church – ***based simply on his persistent, public teaching of a heretical opinion.***<sup>26</sup>

**Then in the second article**, we saw that we must not judge a man to be a formal heretic if he professes to be Catholic and says he believes what a Catholic must believe now, in order to be Catholic now. When a person professes a heretical opinion, we must judge him in the most favorable light (if we judge him at all). So, we must avoid the sin of rash judgment and we must not judge negatively the interior culpability of the pope and the 1.3 billion<sup>27</sup> people who profess that they are Catholic. We must not judge they are not “real”

---

<sup>26</sup> Read this article here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/09/26/cc-in-brief-sedevacantist-questions/>

<sup>27</sup> <https://www.vaticannews.va/en/church/news/2023-10/fides-catholic-church-statistics-world-mission-sunday.html>

Catholics if they tell us that they are Catholics. Instead, we should count them as Catholics who are very confused.<sup>28</sup>

Thus, we must judge Pope Francis to be a material heretic, not a formal heretic, and that he *was* the pope (until his death on April 21, 2025). Regarding any of the world's 1.3 billion self-described Catholics who hold heresy, we must judge them (if we judge them at all) to be material heretics only, unless they themselves tell us that they know they don't qualify to be Catholics.<sup>29</sup>

**In the third article**, we examined briefly the important difference between persons in authority who fulfill their duty to judge those under their charge in the *external forum*, as contrasted to a sedevacantist or *anyone else except God* who judges the *interior* culpability of other persons and (rashly) judges them to be formal heretics.<sup>30</sup>

**In the fourth article**, we saw that it does not help us to protect ourselves better from Pope Francis' heresy (or the heresy taught by any pope) by declaring that he is not the pope.<sup>31</sup>

**In the fifth article**, we saw that it is possible for a pope to teach (or believe) heresy and, in fact, popes have taught and believed heresy at various times during Church history.<sup>32</sup>

**In the sixth article**, we saw that the Church infallibly assures us that we will have a pope at all times until the end of the world, except during very short interregnums between papal reigns, *during which the Church is in the process of electing a new pope and during which the Church's unified government continues to function*.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Read this article here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/10/24/are-we-allowed-to-decide-that-pope-francis-knows-he-is-not-catholic/>

<sup>29</sup> Read this article here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/10/24/are-we-allowed-to-decide-that-pope-francis-knows-he-is-not-catholic/>

<sup>30</sup> Read this article here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/11/26/bishops-have-excommunicated-heretics-cant-we-judge-the-pope/>

<sup>31</sup> Read this article here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/12/30/protecting-ourselves-from-a-bad-pope-or-bad-superior/>

<sup>32</sup> Read this article here: *It is Possible for a Pope to Teach Heresy and Remain the Pope?:* <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/01/27/it-is-possible-for-a-pope-to-teach-heresy-and-remain-the-pope/>

<sup>33</sup> Read this article here that the Catholic Church's unified government always continues, even during an interregnum: *The Catholic Church Will Always Have a Pope:*

**In the seventh article** of this series, we saw that the Catholic Church is a visible Body and will be visible to all. The Catholic Church has a visible monarchical government and the pope is visible to all. Thus, we know we have a pope and that he is visible to all.<sup>34</sup>

Below, **in the eighth article of this series**, we see that the necessary visibility of the Catholic Church and the pope, requires as a corollary that whoever all Catholics see (believe) is pope must **be** the pope, since the pope must be visible to all.

## **The Man Whom the *Whole Church* Accepts as Pope, *Is* the Pope**

Because the pope must be visible, a necessary corollary of this truth is that whoever is accepted as the pope by nearly all Catholics, we know must **be** the pope by that very fact, since the pope must be visible to the Church *as the pope*. This is true because, if almost all Catholics accepted the legitimacy of an anti-pope, then the true pope would be “invisible”, *i.e.*, unknown to the Church. Thus, because the pope must be visible to all, whoever is accepted as pope by virtually all Catholics, we know must **be** the pope.

St. Alphonsus de Liguori, Doctor of the Church, explained this truth as follows:

It is of no importance that in past centuries some Pontiff was illegitimately elected or took possession of the Pontificate by fraud. **It is enough that he was accepted afterwards by the whole Church as Pope, since by such an acceptance he would become the True Pontiff.**<sup>35</sup>

---

<https://catholiccandle.org/2025/02/21/the-catholic-church-will-always-have-a-pope/>

<sup>34</sup> Read this article showing that *The Catholic Church Will Always be Visible, and Will Always Have a Pope Who is Visible to All*, which can be found here:  
<https://catholiccandle.org/2025/03/27/the-catholic-church-will-always-be-visible-with-a-pope/>

<sup>35</sup> *Verità della Fede*, Part 3, Ch.8, §9, emphasis added.

This entire work of St. Alphonsus is available in an online library, for free, in Italian:  
[http://www.intratext.com/IXT/ITASA0000/\\_P3BD.HTM](http://www.intratext.com/IXT/ITASA0000/_P3BD.HTM)

Here is the original Italian version, of the sentences quoted above:

Niente ancora importa che ne' secoli passati alcun pontefice sia stato illegittimamente eletto, o fraudolentemente siasi intruso nel pontificato; basta che poi sia stato accettato da tutta la chiesa come papa, attesoché per tale accettazione già si è renduto legittimo e vero pontefice.

When teaching this same truth, Louis Cardinal Billot identified the cause of this truth, *viz.*, the indefectibility of the Church:

Beyond all doubt, it ought to be firmly held, that the adhesion of the universal Church would, in itself, always be an *infallible* sign of the legitimacy of a particular pope, and even for the existence of all conditions which are required for his legitimacy as pope. Nor does it take long to identify the reason for this fact. For the reason is taken directly from the infallible promise of Christ and from Providence: “The gates of hell shall not prevail against Her [the Church]”. And again: “Behold, I am with you all days”, which is equivalent.<sup>36</sup>

In his book *The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated*, Bishop Francis Kenrick discusses whether bribes (simony) can invalidate the election of a pope. He teaches that the Church’s acceptance of a pope cures any defect in his election but that the pope nonetheless has a moral duty to resign:

Should the contemplated case unfortunately occur, the guilty individual must know that he cannot conscientiously exercise the papal power. ... [T]he acquiescence of the Church heals the defect as far as the faithful are concerned, although it does not relieve the delinquent from the necessity of abdicating the high office which he sacrilegiously assumed.<sup>37</sup>

Similarly, *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology* declares this same principle:

[W]hensoever the Church at large recognizes any man whatever as being Pope, that man *is* Pope, whatever many have been the circumstances that led to his being recognized. ... [A]cceptance by the Church is a proof that such or such a person is lawful Pope.<sup>38</sup>

But a person could ask:

---

This work is also contained in *Opera de S. Alfonso Maria de Liguori*, vol. VIII, p.720, n.9, Marietti, Turin, 1887.

<sup>36</sup> Cardinal Billot, *Tractus De Ecclesia Christi*, Book 1, Q.14, *De Romano Pontifice*, Thesis 29, §3, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed., Prati, 1909; emphasis added.

<sup>37</sup> Bishop Francis Kenrick, *The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed., 1848, Dunigan & Bro., New York, pp. 287-8.

<sup>38</sup> *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology*, Sylvester J. Hunter, S.J., 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., vol. 1, pp. 394 & 395, Benziger Brothers, N.Y. 1894 (emphasis added).

How does this fit with the historical fact of the occurrence of the Great Western Schism?

The answer is that this Western Schism in the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries shows nothing to the contrary. In that schism, lasting over 40 years, there was no single man recognized by virtually all Catholics living then, as the true pope. Instead, there was a very large faction which supported each of the two main claimants to the papacy (one of which was the true pope). Here is how the Catholic Encyclopedia explains this great division:

The greater number of the Italian and German states, England, and Flanders supported the pope of Rome. On the other hand, France, Spain, Scotland, and all the nations in the orbit of France were for the pope of Avignon.<sup>39</sup>

Thus, we see that the Great Western Schism was *not* a situation where almost all Catholics accepted an anti-pope as the real pope. Similarly, it would be impossible at any time for almost all Catholics to accept an anti-pope as the real pope.

**There are Five Consequences of the Fact that Whomever the Whole Church Accepts as Pope, *is* the Pope.**

**1. Pope Francis was the pope until his death on April 21, 2025.**

More than 1.3 billion people worldwide, profess to be Catholic.<sup>40</sup>

Virtually all 1.3 billion Catholics accepted Pope Francis as pope (until his death). Thus, we know that Pope Francis *was* the pope, *i.e.*, until his death on April 21, 2025.

**2. Pope Benedict XVI was not pope after his resignation in 2013.**

The fact that Catholics universally accepted Pope Francis as pope, is one of many reasons why it is wrong to suppose that Pope Benedict XVI did not “really” resign, and continued to be the pope (instead of Pope Francis). Virtually the whole Church accepted Pope Francis as pope (until his death), and the whole Church could never accept an anti-pope (as shown above).

**3. Each of the other post-conciliar popes was the pope in his turn.**

---

<sup>39</sup> 1917 Catholic Encyclopedia, Article: *Western Schism*.

<sup>40</sup> <https://www.vaticannews.va/en/church/news/2023-10/fides-catholic-church-statistics-world-mission-sunday.html>

Over the last 67 years (as of 2025), virtually the whole Church accepted each of the other post-conciliar popes, as pope in his turn. Thus, we know each *was* the pope.

**4. This is a further reason we know Cardinal Siri was not pope.**

It is clear that Cardinal Siri was not pope (as a tiny group supposed). Not only was his supposed “pontificate” invisible, but it would have opposed the pontificate of the pope universally accepted by Catholics.

**5. This further shows the impossibility of the Church being now in a papal interregnum.**

The Church accepted Pope Francis as pope and accepted each of his post-conciliar predecessors. This is one of many compelling reasons why we know the Church is not in a decades-long papal interregnum because, when the Church accepted each post-conciliar pope in his turn, each one ***became the true pope*** (even if we were to suppose that, somehow, his election was irregular and that he wasn’t pope already).<sup>41</sup>

**Further Objection:** “I understand the above reasoning showing that if virtually the entire Church accepts a man as a pope, that shows infallibly that he *is* the pope. But that reasoning does not hold if the man was already a heretic upon his acceptance of that office, as surely all the post-conciliar popes have been, including Jorge Bergoglio.”

**Further Response:** This objection is answered by the arguments contained in the first and second articles of this series. This objection fails to make the crucial distinction between **formal** and **material** heresy. Material heresy (alone) does not prevent a man from becoming or from being accepted universally as pope, no matter how publicly he insists on teaching his heretical opinion.

In those first two articles, we saw that we have no evidence that Pope Francis or any of the post Vatican II popes are/were **formal** heretics (rather than a material heretics only). Thus, we cannot conclude that they are/were outside the true Catholic Church, based simply on their persistent, public teaching of heretical opinions.<sup>42</sup> All of the post-Vatican

---

<sup>41</sup> St. Alphonsus de Liguori, *Verità della Fede*, Part 3, Ch.8, §9.

<sup>42</sup> Read these articles here:

➤ <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/09/26/cc-in-brief-sedevacantist-questions/>

&

II popes professed to be Catholic before and after their election. Thus, we cannot judge them to be formal heretics.



*Catholic Candle's* purpose is to promote and defend the Traditional Catholic Faith. Many of our Readers assist us in this task by spreading the word about *Catholic Candle* and by sharing email copies (or paper copies) of our monthly magazine. To those readers: thank you for your help promoting Traditional Catholic Faith and Practice! We encourage the rest of our readers to share *Catholic Candle* with whoever would be interested. Anyone can subscribe to our free monthly magazine by emailing us this request or by subscribing on our website.

- 
- <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/10/24/are-we-allowed-to-decide-that-pope-francis-knows-he-is-not-catholic/>