

Catholic Candle

October 2025 catholiccandle.org catholiccandle@gmail.com

Words to Live by – from Catholic Tradition

Spiritual Blindness Characterizes Our Times – Let Us Beware!

The sin of impurity brings with it blindness and obstinacy. Every vice produces darkness of understanding; but impurity produces it in a greater degree than all other sins.

St. Alphonsus de Liguori Sermon 45 – 16th Sunday after Pentecost – On Impurity, Point 1, section 2.

✠✠✠

Christ is King!

Christ is King over all mankind. As we are now celebrating the feast of Christ the King, we enclose a link to a previously-published *Catholic Candle* article, refuting the error of Bishop Richard N. Williamson and the Freemasons.

<https://catholiccandle.org/2025/08/22/christ-is-king-over-all-men-with-no-exceptions/>

Viva Cristo Rey!

✠✠✠

Do Not Celebrate the Pagan “Holiday” of Halloween

Halloween is un-Catholic, which is why so many traditional Catholic priests have taught over the years, that Catholics should not observe this pagan holiday. For a further analysis of why Catholics should not celebrate Halloween, read this article:

<https://catholiccandle.org/2015/11/01/reasons-not-to-celebrate-halloween/>

✠✠✠

The Church Militant Must Pray for the Church Suffering

In the early years of *Catholic Candle*, we had access to faithful, uncompromising priests who agreed, for the greater glory of God, to keep on their altars during November a list of the names of the dearly departed loved ones of *Catholic Candle* readers. Readers sent those names and they were compiled on our list of thousands.

Later, we no longer had access to any faithful, uncompromising priests. When God wills, we will again have such good priests. Meanwhile, it is a glorious time to be Catholic and to live for Christ the King! <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/it-is-a-blessing-to-live-during-this-great-apostasy.html>

However, during the interim – when few (or no) *Catholic Candle* readers have access to a faithful, uncompromising priest – let us all pray for each other’s dearly departed loved ones. Soon, it will be November, the month of the Poor Souls. We suggest that you send us the names of your departed loved ones to be added to our list and let each of us pray for “*all of those whose names are on the Catholic Candle list*”. In this way, we perform a work of charity towards each other and a work of charity towards the Church Suffering.

In the future, when we again have access to faithful, uncompromising priests, we will do our best to renew our practice of having all those departed souls be remembered at the altar every year during the entire Month of the Poor Souls.



Catholic Candle’s 2026 Catholic Calendar

The *Catholic Candle’s* 2026 Traditional Catholic calendar is coming soon. It will be free to download and freely distributable.



***Catholic Candle* note:** The article immediately below is part thirteen of the study of the Choleric temperament. The first twelve 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-cholerics-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-cholerics-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-cholerics-spiritual-combat-part-viii/>
9. Mary's School of Sanctity – Lesson #44 About the Temperaments – Continuing Our Study of the Choleric Temperament – Their Spiritual Combat, Part IX: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/04/23/lesson-44-temperaments-choleric-temperament-a-cholerics-spiritual-combat-part-ix/>
10. Mary's School of Sanctity – Lesson #45 About the Temperaments – Continuing Our Study of the Choleric Temperament – The Choleric's Spiritual Combat Part X: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/05/20/lesson-45-temperaments-choleric->

[temperament-a-cholerics-spiritual-combat-part-x/](https://catholiccandle.org/2025/06/28/lesson-46-temperaments-choleric-temperament-a-cholerics-spiritual-combat-part-x/)

11. Mary's School of Sanctity – *Lesson #46 About the Temperaments – Continuing Our Study of the Choleric Temperament – The Cholerics' Spiritual Combat – Part XI*: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/06/28/lesson-46-temperaments-choleric-temperament-a-cholerics-spiritual-combat-part-xi/>
12. Mary's School of Sanctity – *Lesson #47 About the Temperaments - Continuing Our Study of the Choleric Temperament - The Choleric's Spiritual Combat - Part XII*: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/07/24/lesson-47-temperaments-choleric-temperament-a-cholerics-spiritual-combat-part-xii/>
13. Mary's School of Sanctity – *Lesson #48 About the Temperaments - Continuing Our Study of the Choleric Temperament - The Choleric's Spiritual Combat Part XIII*: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/08/29/lesson-48-temperaments-choleric-temperament-a-cholerics-spiritual-combat-part-xiii/>
14. Mary's School of Sanctity -- *Lesson #49 About the Temperaments – Continuing Our Study of the Choleric Temperament – The Choleric's Spiritual Combat Part XIV*: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/09/24/lesson-49-temperaments-choleric-temperament-the-cholerics-spiritual-combat-part-xiv/>

Mary's School of Sanctity

Lesson #50 About the Temperaments – Continuing Our Study of the Choleric Temperament – The Choleric's Spiritual Combat – Part XV

Note: In this article, when referring to a person with a choleric temperament we simply will call him a “choleric”.

In our last lesson, we considered how we are all affected by the wounds of Original Sin and, in addition to this, we have our own personal inclinations and disinclinations which arise from our genetic (material, bodily) dispositions. We saw that one could have a natural disinclination to think deeply and how, ultimately, this disinclination stems back to the passion of fear.

The Passions Influence Us

We know that the passions are part of our human nature. We know that we all have them. In general, the passions work in our souls in the same way. However, what is unique to each of us is the *strength* of those passions and the particular ones which influence us most. We might not notice how each person, with his own particular temperament, has his own propensities and, therefore, his own unique battle to fight in order to train and discipline his passions to conform to his reason.

As we consider the four temperaments, one crucial aspect of our investigation is to understand how the passions are involved in the way people behave. Because we want to better understand how the passion of fear, in particular, affects each temperament, we first consider, more generally, what a passion is. Then, with this foundation, we will be better able to understand the role of the passion of fear in our lives. Thus, in this lesson we will discuss what, in general, a passion is and then look at the two types of passions, namely the *concupiscible* and the *irascible*.

What a Passion Is

St. Thomas Aquinas, the greatest doctor of the Church, treats the passions thoroughly. He begins by explaining the meaning of the word “passion” itself. St. Thomas explains that a passion is a type of receiving or “suffering”. *One way* that the word “passion” is used is to receive something that is a perfection of the receiver and this perfection (which is received) does not replace anything that had previously been present in the receiver; *the second way* passion is used it to receive something better, which is an improvement – replacing something worse than what is received; and *the third and most proper way* “passion” is used is to receive something worse which is a “downgrade” compared to that better thing which is replaced. Here are St. Thomas’ words:

The word *passion* is used in three ways:

First, in a general way, according as whatever receives anything is passive, even though nothing is taken from the receiver. Thus, we may say that the air is passive when it [*viz.*, the air] is lit up. But this is to be perfected rather than to be passive.

Secondly, the word *passive* is employed in its proper sense, when something is received, while something else is taken away: and this happens in two ways.

- a. For sometimes that which is lost is unsuitable to the thing: thus, when an animal’s body is healed, the body is said to be passive because it receives health, and loses sickness.

- b. At other times the contrary occurs: thus, “to ail” is to be passive; because the ailment is received and health is lost. And here we have passion most properly. For a thing is said to be passive from its being drawn to the agent: and when a thing recedes from what is suitable to the receiver, then especially does it appear to be drawn to something else. Moreover, in *De Generatione, Bk 1, ch.3 318b2*, it is stated when a more excellent thing is generated from a less excellent thing, we have generation simply, and corruption in a particular respect: whereas the reverse is the case, when from a more excellent thing, a less excellent thing is generated. [That is, when a less excellent thing is generated, then this is corruption simply speaking and is generation in a particular respect.]

In these three ways it happens that passions are in the soul. For in the sense of mere reception [*viz.*, the first meaning St. Thomas gives above], we speak of “*feeling and understanding as being a kind of passion*” (*De Anima Bk1, ch.5 410a25*). But passion, accompanied by the loss of something, is only in respect of a bodily transmutation [*viz.*, a physical change occurring in the body]; wherefore passion properly so called cannot be in the soul, save accidentally, in so far as the *composite*¹ is passive. But here again we find a difference; because when this transmutation is for the worse, it [the transmutation] has more of the nature of a passion, than when it [the transmutation] is for the better: hence sorrow is more properly a passion than joy.²

Next, St. Thomas gives us St. John Damascene’s definition of passion.

*Passion is a movement of the sensitive appetite when we imagine good or evil; in other words, passion is a movement of the irrational [part of the] soul, when we think of good or evil.*³

¹ Here St. Thomas is referring to the composition of body and soul because the soul is the form of the body. In other words, the soul is what makes the body able to live and to be the type of living creature that it is.

² Taken from the *Summa*, Ia IIae, Q.22, a.1, *Whether Any Passion is in the Soul? Respondeo*. The works St. Thomas is citing are Aristotle’s work about the generation and corruption/dying of animals (*De Generatione et Corruptione*), and his work on the soul (*De Anima*) (bracketed words added for clarity).

³ This is taken from the *Summa*, Ia IIae, Q.22, a.3, *Sed Contra*, where St. Thomas quotes St. John Damascene’s work *De Fide Orthodox, that is Concerning the Orthodox Faith, Book 2, chapter 22* (bracketed words added to show the context).

Where Do We Find the Passions? Are They in Our Bodies (In Our Sensible Part)? Or in Our Souls (the Will)?

St. Thomas answers these questions in the following words:

[P]assion is properly to be found where there is corporeal transmutation [*viz.*, physical change]. This corporeal transmutation is found in the act of the sensitive appetite [desire], and is not only spiritual, as in the sensitive apprehension [understanding through our senses], but also natural.

Now there is no need for corporeal transmutation in the act of the intellectual appetite [*i.e.*, the will – N.B. “appetite” is another word for “desire”]: because this appetite is not exercised by means of a corporeal organ. It is therefore evident that passion is more properly in the act of the sensitive appetite, than in that of the intellectual appetite; and this is again evident from the definitions of Damascene quoted in the *sed contra* [above].⁴

Looking at the Two Classes of Passions that We Possess

St. Thomas explains that there are two groups of passions – the **concupiscible** and the **irascible**. Here are his words:

The acts of different powers differ in species [that is in *kind*]; for instance, to see, and to hear. But the irascible and the concupiscible are two powers, into which the sensitive appetite is divided, as was said [earlier in the *Summa*, in Ia, Q.81, a.2]. Therefore, since the passions are movements of the sensitive appetite, as stated in Q.22, a.3, the passions of the irascible faculty are specifically distinct from those of the concupiscible part.⁵ ...

[T]he passions of the irascible part differ in species from those of the concupiscible faculty. For since the different powers have different objects, the passions of different powers must, of necessity, be referred to different objects.

In order, therefore, to discern which passions are in the irascible, and which are in the concupiscible, we must take the object of each of these powers. As was stated

⁴ This is taken from the *Summa* Ia IIae, Q.22, a.3, *Whether Passion Is in the Sensitive Appetite Rather Than in the Intellectual Appetite, Which Is Called the Will?, Respondeo*, (bracketed words added to show context).

⁵ *Summa*, Ia IIae, Q.23, a.1, *Whether the Passions of the Concupiscible Part are Different from Those of the Irascible Part?, Sed Contra*. When St. Thomas mentions “specifically distinct,” he means that they differ in kind.

above [in Ia, Q.81, a.2], the object of the concupiscible power is sensible good or evil [simply apprehended as such], which causes pleasure or pain. But, since the soul must, of necessity, experience difficulty or struggle at times, in acquiring some such good, or in avoiding some such evil, in so far as such good or evil is more than our animal nature can *easily* acquire or avoid; therefore, this good or evil itself, inasmuch as it is of an *arduous or difficult nature*, is the object of the irascible faculty. Therefore, whatever passions consider **good or evil absolutely**, belong to the **concupiscible** power; for instance, joy, sorrow, love, hatred, and such like: whereas those passions which consider **good or bad, as arduous**, through being difficult to obtain or avoid, belong to the **irascible** faculty; such as daring, fear, hope and the like.⁶

A Short Summary Concerning the Passions and Their Respective Movements

What is good (or perceived as good) causes the soul to incline toward it and this inclination is the passion of *love*. Similarly, what is evil (or perceived as evil) causes the soul to incline *away* from it and this disinclination is the passion of *hatred*.

If the good be not yet possessed, then this good object causes the soul to seek to possess this good. This inclination of the soul is the passion of *desire* or *concupiscence*. If the evil can be avoided (or can be avoided in the future, even if it is possessed now) then the soul seeks to avoid it and this is the passion of *dislike* or *aversion*.

When the good is obtained, it causes the appetite to rest in that good which has been obtained. This rest in the good which has been obtained is the passion of *delight* or *joy*. Similarly, when an evil is present in the soul which is (at least for now) unavoidable, then that possession of the evil is the passion of *sorrow* or *sadness*.

Concerning the *irascible* passions, they pertain to obtaining a good which is difficult to obtain or to avoiding an evil which is difficult to avoid. For the good which is difficult to obtain, the soul's seeking of this good is *hope* and the soul's not seeking it because the difficulty is too great, is *despair*. With respect to an evil which is difficult to avoid, the soul's seeking to avoid this evil which is difficult to avoid is *daring* and the soul's anticipation of suffering the evil which is difficult to avoid, is *fear*. There is no irascible passion with respect to the good obtained because it is not a subject of difficulty. But concerning an evil already possessed, the soul's reaction is *anger*.

Therefore, we see that there are three pairs of passions in the **concupiscible appetites**: namely, *love* and *hatred*; *desire* and *aversion*; *joy* and *sorrow*. Likewise, there are three

⁶ *Summa*, Ia IIae Q.23, a.1, *Whether the Passions of the Concupiscible Part are Different from Those of the Irascible Part?*, *Respondeo*.

“pairs” in the **irascible**: namely, *hope* and *despair*; *fear* and *daring*; and *anger*, which passion has no opposite. Therefore, there are in all 11 different passions: six which are concupiscible, and five which are irascible; in which all the animal passions are contained.⁷

A Preview... Having now considered the passions more generally, in our next lesson we will begin looking at the passion of fear in particular. In this way, we will be able to see how fear influences all the temperaments and especially how the passion of fear can hinder the intellectual life of a soul.



Catholic Candle note: Below is part 5 of the article concerning the best type of education, which is a Catholic Liberal Education. Do not confuse this education with many university programs called “liberal arts” but which are full of fluff, falsehood, and aimless so-called “cultural enrichment” courses and “humanities”.

A liberal education also does not refer to liberalism, nor is a true liberal education an indoctrination into that error of liberalism or *political correctness*. In fact, a true Catholic Liberal Education is the best antidote to the errors of liberalism.

Previously, ***in part 1 of this article***,⁸ we examined the problems we see in modern education:

- Modern colleges do not improve the quality of their students’ minds and their thinking ability much or at all.
- Most “education” is merely job training, fluff courses, and/or leftist indoctrination.
- The students are taught to sound like someone in their field but they do more memorizing and little thinking.
- Grade “inflation” and degree “inflation” is rampant. Grades and academic degrees do not mean much anymore.

⁷ This summary is based on *Summa*, Ia IIae, Q.23, a.4, *Whether in the Same Power, There Are Any Passions, Specifically Different, but Not Contrary to One Another?*

⁸ Part 1 of this article can be found here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/06/28/the-blessings-of-a-true-catholic-liberal-education/>

In part 2 of this article,⁹ we examined, in general, what education is. We considered the human soul and the perfection of its highest faculty (power) – the intellect – which is immaterial. We saw that our intellects are perfected through knowing eternal, unchangeable truths and their causes.

In part 3 of this article,¹⁰ after having seen what true education is, we examined the question *who should perfect his intellect?*

In part 4 of this article,¹¹ having seen that modern universities do not provide a true education, we consider whether there is *ever* any reason for men or women to attend them.

However, even though women and girls should pursue a True Catholic Liberal Education – just as men and boys should, too – what is the best environment in which women and girls should do this? Below, in Part 5, we will consider this question.

The Blessing of a True, Catholic Liberal Education

Part 5

What Would Be the Best Environment in which Women Could Pursue a True Catholic Liberal Education?

We saw above that men and women should strive to obtain a formal Catholic Liberal Education, if possible, which would be a strong beginning of their duty and high calling to perfect their intellects throughout their lives. Ideally, this true education should be obtained at the beginning of adulthood as the beginning of a lifelong adult pursuit of the truth (especially the truths of our Faith).

Although women should obtain the treasure of this education, too, (as we saw above), it is better for them to do so at an all-women’s college when this is possible, instead of a mixed “co-educational” institution.

⁹ Part 2 of this article can be found here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/07/24/the-blessing-of-a-true-catholic-liberal-education-part-ii/>

¹⁰ Part 3 of this article can be found here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/08/28/the-blessing-of-a-true-catholic-liberal-education-part-iii/>

¹¹ Part 4 of this article can be found here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/09/24/the-blessing-of-a-true-catholic-liberal-education-part-iv/>

Here is how Pope Pius XI taught this truth:

False also and harmful to Christian education is the so-called method of “coeducation”.¹²

There are five reasons why it is better to separately educate the sexes. These five reasons (below) show that separate education (when possible) is advantageous for both sexes, although these advantages are even greater for women and girls, compared to men and boys. These reasons reflect Church teaching, the Natural Law, and Common Sense:

1. For a Man to Compete Against Ladies is Not Gentlemanly

God made men wiser, more aggressive, and clearer and more abstract in their thinking. A true gentleman would not want to compete with ladies in the classroom and it would not be a fair competition. This is similar to how it would not be fair or decent to have men and women compete against each other in a foot race.

Thus, it is only common sense and decency that women should have their own classrooms and schools. Women and girls should have their own feminine academic environment in which to develop their minds and pursue the truth.

2. Co-Education Sends the Wrong Message by Inherently Tending to Posture Women as Men’s Competitors

Further, it is better that women and men not be educated together because it sends the wrong message, *i.e.*, it symbolizes the wrong thing for them to be class competitors. God did not make women to be man’s competitor but to be man’s helpmate and companion in the great work of raising a family.¹³

¹² *Divini Illius Magistri*, (On Christian Education), Pope Pius XI, 1929, §68.

¹³ Here is one way St. Thomas Aquinas, greatest Doctor of the Catholic Church, explains this truth that woman is not man’s competitor but should be his helpmate in the great work of her life (raising a family):

It was necessary that woman be made, as Scripture says, as a helpmate to the male; not indeed as a helpmate in some other work, as some have said, since in any other work a male can be more conveniently helped by another male than by woman; but as a helper in generation.

Summa, Ia, Q.92, a.1, *Respondeo*.

3. Co-Education is a Distraction from Academic Pursuits

God made men and women to be naturally attracted toward one another. This attraction is ordered toward marriage and raising a family. This is good and appropriate but must be limited to the correct occasions for this because this attraction is an obstacle to a focus on the intellectual life.

Just as women must cover their heads in church not only as a sign of submission,¹⁴ but also to assist in avoiding their becoming a distraction during prayer which can result

God willed woman to be man's helpmate. Sacred Scripture infallibly explains why God created woman, in these words:

[T]he Lord God said: It is not good for man to be alone: let Us make him a help like unto himself.

Genesis, 2:18.

Sacred Scripture infallibly says the same thing in other ways too, e.g.: "[M]an was not created for the woman: but the woman for the man" (1 Corinthians, 11:9), namely, to help him raise a family.

The *Summa* touches upon these different roles as follows:

Although the father ranks above the mother, the mother has more to do with the offspring than the father has, or we may say that **woman was made chiefly in order to be man's helpmate in relation to the offspring**, whereas the man was not made for this purpose.

Summa Suppl., Q.44, a.2 ad 1 (emphasis added).

¹⁴ St. Paul teaches infallibly:

But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. ... But **every woman praying or prophesying with her head not covered, disgraceth her head**: for it is all one as if she were shaven. For if a woman be not covered, let her be shorn. But if it be a shame to a woman to be shorn or made bald, let her cover her head. The man indeed ought not to cover his head, because he is the image and glory of God; but **the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man. For the man was not created for the woman, but the woman for the man.** Therefore, ought the woman to have a power over her head

1 *Corinthians*, 11:3-10 (emphasis added).

from their beauty, because *her hair is a woman's glory*¹⁵ and women are the more beautiful sex.

Similarly, in an academic environment – which should be devoted to the truth and the life of the intellect – mixing the sexes is a distraction which impedes that intellectual life.

Here is one way that Pope Pius XI taught this important truth of the Catholic Faith and the Natural Law:

Co-education ... is founded upon [the heresy of] naturalism and the denial of original sin [as well as] upon a deplorable confusion of ideas that mistakes a leveling promiscuity and equality for the legitimate association of the sexes.¹⁶

¹⁵ “But if a woman nourish her hair, it is a glory to her; for her hair is given to her for a covering.” 1 *Corinthians*, 11:15.

¹⁶ *Divini Illius Magistri*, (*On Christian Education*), Pope Pius XI, §68.

Here is the full quote:

False also and harmful to Christian education is the so-called method of “co-education”. This, too, by many of its supporters, is founded upon [the heresy of] naturalism and the denial of original sin; but by all, upon a deplorable confusion of ideas that mistakes a leveling promiscuity and equality, for the legitimate association of the sexes. The Creator has ordained and disposed perfect union of the sexes only in matrimony, and, with varying degrees of contact, in the family and in society. **Besides there is not in nature itself, which fashions the two quite different in organism, in temperament, in abilities, anything to suggest that there can be or ought to be promiscuity, and *much less equality*, in the training of the two sexes. These, in keeping with the wonderful designs of the Creator, are destined to complement each other in the family and in society, precisely because of *their differences, which therefore ought to be maintained and encouraged during their years of formation, with the necessary distinction and corresponding separation, according to age and circumstances.*** These principles, with due regard to time and place, must, in accordance with Christian prudence, be applied to all schools, particularly in the most delicate and decisive period of formation, that, namely, of adolescence; and in gymnastic exercises and deportment, special care must be had of Christian modesty in young women and girls, which is so gravely impaired by any kind of exhibition in public.”

Divini Illius Magistri, (*On Christian Education*), Pope Pius XI, §68 (emphasis added; bracketed words added for clarity).

4. Men and Women Learn Somewhat Differently and so the Teaching Methods Should Be Somewhat Different

Both men and women are rational but, to some extent, do not think the same way. God made men wiser, more aggressive, clearer in their reasoning and more abstract in their thinking. Women are more emotional – they are more inclined to bring personality and feeling into their reasoning. Thus, teaching methods for men and women should be adapted to their differences in the way they learn, through educating men and women separately.

Here is one way that Pope Pius XI describes how these differences show the benefit of using differences in teaching methods for the two sexes:

[T]here is not in nature itself, which fashions the two quite different in organism [*viz.*, men and women], in temperament, in abilities, anything to suggest that there can be or ought to be promiscuity [*viz.*, inappropriate mingling], and *much less equality*, in the training of the two sexes.¹⁷

5. The Catholic Church Shows the Better Way of Providing College-Level Education for Women by Founding so many Women’s Colleges

The practice of the Holy Catholic Church shows that it is better for women (and men) to be educated in separate schools and universities, where possible.

There are countless examples of women’s colleges, showing not only the Catholic Church’s commitment to perfecting women’s minds, but also the commitment to do it the better way, in separate institutions of learning.

Here are two of countless examples:

- ❖ The Catholic Church founded St. Mary’s College in South Bend, Indiana. This Catholic women’s college was founded before 1920 by the Sisters of the Holy Cross, with the help of Fr. Edward Sorin (the founder of Notre Dame) and the priests of the Congregation of the Holy Cross. This college is near Notre Dame University which was founded as an all-men’s college.
- ❖ Alverno College, a Catholic college in Milwaukee, was founded in 1936 as an all-women’s college. It is near Marquette University which was founded as an all-men’s college.

¹⁷ *Divini Illius Magistri*, (On Christian Education), Pope Pius XI, §68 (bracketed comment added for clarity).

Notice in these examples that the wisdom of the Church not only caused Her to found countless women's colleges but also countless men's colleges, since it is better for men and boys – as well as for women and girls – to be educated in single sex educational institutions.

Conclusion

We see as a matter of Church teaching, of the Natural Law, and of Common Sense that, where possible, women and girls should receive their education in separate classrooms and institutions of learning.

But an Objection Arises to the Idea of Anyone Receiving this Type of Education!

From the considerations we have made so far in this series (on the Value of a True Catholic Liberal Education), *shouldn't we be afraid that this great blessing might make us proud?*

We are on earth to save our souls and we know that pride is one of the biggest obstacles to salvation. So, if we receive a True Catholic Liberal Education and this were to result in our damnation, then shouldn't we avoid this education in order to save our souls?

We will consider this issue in a future article.

To be continued ...



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

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

In the first article, we saw that we cannot know whether the pope (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.***¹⁸

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 1.4 billion¹⁹ people who profess to be Catholic. We must not judge they are not “real” Catholics if they tell us that they are Catholics. Instead, we should count them as Catholics who are very confused or are uninformed.²⁰

Thus, we must judge the conciliar popes to have been material heretics, not formal heretics (if we judge them at all), and that each was pope in his turn until his death (or abdication). Regarding any of the world’s 1.4 billion self-described Catholics who hold heresy, we must judge them to be material heretics only (if we judge them at all), unless they themselves tell us that they know they don’t qualify to be Catholics.²¹

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.²²

In the fourth article, we saw that it does not help us to protect ourselves better from a conciliar pope’s heresy, to declare that we know he is not the pope and is not a Catholic.²³

¹⁸ Read this article here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/09/26/cc-in-brief-sedevacantist-questions/>

¹⁹ The Vatican estimates that the number of Catholics worldwide is about 1.375 billion. <https://www.vaticannews.va/en/church/news/2023-10/fides-catholic-church-statistics-world-mission-sunday.html>

²⁰ Read this article here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/10/24/are-we-allowed-to-decide-that-pope-francis-knows-he-is-not-catholic/>

²¹ Read this article here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/10/24/are-we-allowed-to-decide-that-pope-francis-knows-he-is-not-catholic/>

²² Read this article here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/11/26/bishops-have-excommunicated-heretics-cant-we-judge-the-pope/>

²³ Read this article here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2024/12/30/protecting-ourselves-from-a-bad-pope-or-bad-superior/>

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.²⁴ We looked especially at the cases of Pope John XXII and Pope Nicholas I, who both taught explicit heresy while pope and nonetheless continued to be the pope. Pope John XXII also taught the same explicit heresy before he became the pope.

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*.²⁵ In this sixth article, we saw that we are not presently in an interregnum (even though the sedevacantists absurdly claim we are in a many-decades-long interregnum).

In the seventh article of this series, we saw that the Catholic Church is a visible Body and remains 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 the one who is pope is visible (known) to all as the pope.²⁶

In the eighth article, we saw that the necessary visibility of the Catholic Church and the pope, requires as a corollary that the one who virtually all Catholics see (believe) is the pope must *be* the pope, since the pope must be visible to all.

In the ninth article, we addressed the superficial “argument” of sedevacantists (addressed to Catholics) saying that “if you think we have a pope, then you have to obey him in whatever he tells you to do”. We examined the true Catholic virtue of obedience and saw that we must not obey the commands of even a real superior like our pope, if/when he commands us to do something evil.²⁷

²⁴ 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/>

²⁵ 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*: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/02/21/the-catholic-church-will-always-have-a-pope/>

²⁶ 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/>

²⁷ Read this article examining false obedience, entitled, *The False “Obedience” of Cowardly and Weak Catholics*, which can be found here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/05/20/the-false-obedience-of-cowardly-and-weak-catholics/>

In the tenth article, we saw more deeply what schism is and how sedevacantism is inherently schism.²⁸

In the eleventh article of this series, we saw more deeply how we should respond to a pope (or other superior) who does harm – *viz.*, we should recognize his authority as pope but resist the evil of his words or deeds.²⁹

In the twelfth article of this series, we saw how we ordinary Catholic laymen can know what the Catholic Truth is and how we can know when the pope (or anyone) is promoting error.³⁰

In the thirteenth article of this series, we saw the falsehood of a related sedevacantist error (or “half-truth”), claiming that we have no pope because the conciliar popes had doubtful consecrations and/or ordinations.³¹

Now, in the fourteenth article in this series, we consider another way to see that sedevacantism is wrong and sinful, *viz.*, because it is the sin of revolution.

Sedevacantism is Un-Catholic Because it is Revolutionary

Resistance is different from revolt. When someone in authority commands something evil, it is one thing to resist that command, but it is a further step to use that evil command as a basis for rejecting the ruler’s authority *as such*. This further step is to revolt.

For example, the American revolutionaries considered it evil that King George III imposed taxes on them without their consent, and that he did many other things to which they

²⁸ Read this article showing that *Sedevacantism is Inherently Schism*, which can be found here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/06/28/sedevacantism-is-inherently-schism/>

²⁹ *Our Catholic Duty: Resist the Harm Done by a Bad Pope But (Of Course) Recognize His Authority*: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/07/24/our-catholic-duty-resist-the-harm-done-by-a-bad-pope-but-of-course-recognize-his-authority/>

³⁰ *Judging the Pope’s Words & Deeds According to Catholic Tradition*: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/08/29/judging-the-popes-words-deeds-according-to-catholic-tradition/>

³¹ *A Man Need Not Be Consecrated a Bishop or Ordained a Priest to Be a Valid Pope -- An Explanation How the Catholic Church Continues to Possess A Full Hierarchy even in these Times of Great Apostasy*: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/09/24/a-man-need-not-be-consecrated-a-bishop-or-ordained-a-priest-to-be-a-valid-pope/>

objected. But the American revolutionaries not only resisted such commands of King George but also used the commands as a (purported) “justification” for their revolution.

In their *Declaration of Independence*, the revolutionaries objected to many things such as their king “quartering large bodies of armed troops among us”; “imposing taxes on us without our consent”; and “depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of trial by jury”.

After listing their grievances, the American revolutionaries then did what all revolutionaries do: they said that their ruler was to blame for their own revolution because his conduct caused him to lose his status as their king. The American revolutionaries declared that King George III “whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.”

The American revolutionaries did what revolutionaries always do: they declared that their ruler had lost all authority over them. Here are their words:

[T]hese United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved.

Finally, the American revolutionaries then did something else which revolutionaries always do: they declared that it was their right (or duty) to revolt:

[W]hen a long train of abuses and usurpations ... evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is [the colonies'] right, it is their duty, to throw off such government.

This is what it is to be a revolutionary: to reject and resist not just particular (perhaps evil) commands but to also reject the very authority of one’s ruler.

The American revolutionaries followed the same pattern as countless other revolutionaries, *e.g.*, in France, Russia, Latin America, and the Protestant revolutionaries. In all human history – civil as well as religious – there is ***not even one*** revolution³² which the Catholic Church recognizes to have been praiseworthy and not sinful.³³

³² Generally, political revolt is called by the name “sedition”, and revolt against the Church, by the name “schism”. But at the root of all such revolts, there is the same “*non serviam!*” which echoes that of Satan, the father of all revolutionaries.

³³ If there could ever have been a place and circumstances where revolution could have appeared justified, it would have been a civil revolution by Catholics in newly-apostate England,

(Footnote continued on the next page.)

In summary, revolutionaries (including the sedevacantists) follow a common pattern:

1. they assert that their ruler committed wrongs (whether actual wrongs or merely imagined); and then
2. they use such wrongs as a basis to declare that their ruler's own conduct has resulted in his losing his authority to rule them.

The Cristeros were Not Revolutionaries

On a superficial level, a person might have the false impression that the Mexican Cristeros were revolutionaries because they took up arms against their anti-Catholic ruler in the early 20th Century. But the Cristeros' goal was to defend their priests, their churches, and the Catholicism of their families. The Cristeros resisted the many wrongs committed by their anti-Catholic government. By successfully taking up arms, the

(Footnote continued from the previous page.)

where the English government inflicted horrors and injustices of every type upon the Catholics. The torture, imprisonment, extreme suffering, and martyrdom inflicted on Catholics and the outrageous confiscation of Catholic property seemed unbearable to many. See, e.g., Chapters 1-3 of *Narrative of the Gunpowder Plot*, by Fr. John Gerard, S.J., *Quanta Cura Press*. This book is a fascinating contemporaneous account of the Anglican and Puritan persecutions of Catholics during the reign of King James I, as the context of the Gunpowder Plot.

Because of the Anglicans' and Puritans' shocking treatment of Catholics, Guy Fawkes and a few other Catholics devised the Gunpowder Plot to blow-up the parliament building when King James I was there with the rest of England's leaders. However, the two consecutive popes of the time, as well as all of the Jesuit superiors and priests in England all strongly forbade Catholics to take part in such plots or otherwise to revolt against their rightful King, James I.

In his contemporaneous account of the Gunpowder Plot and the savage persecutions leading up to this plot, Fr. John Gerard explains:

All Catholics received strict commandment from the See Apostolic, that in no case they should stir or attempt anything against His Majesty [*viz.*, King James I of England] or the State [*viz.*, England], and this both from Pope Clement VIII, of pious memory, and from Paulus Vtus [*viz.*, Pope Paul V] that now sitteth in the Chair, who both before and since his assumption to that supreme dignity of governing the Church of Christ, hath showed [*sic*] himself most earnest to procure the quiet, safety, and security of our Sovereign [*viz.*, King James I], ... [and by ordering] that no Catholic people should go about to interrupt or trouble the same [*viz.*, King James I of England] by their impatient proceedings

Id., page 120 (bracketed words added to show the context).

Cristeros prevented the anti-Catholic government from unjustly harming them (arresting them, killing them, *etc.*).

But unlike persons who *are* revolutionaries, the Cristeros never used their government's wrongs as a basis to declare that their government had lost all authority over them.³⁴ Instead, by taking up arms, the Cristeros merely prevented their lawful (but anti-Catholic) government from doing the harm it intended.

Sedevacantists are Revolutionaries

Unlike the Cristeros, sedevacantists *are* revolutionaries. Sedevacantists correctly recognize that the pope has committed many wrongs. Instead of resisting only the pope's wrongs, the sedevacantists follow the pattern of other revolutionaries by using these wrongs as a basis for denying that the pope has his authority and office. Like other revolutionaries, they blame the pope for their own revolt, saying that his words and actions have caused him to lose his authority over them.

Some sedevacantists vainly attempt to avoid their status as revolutionaries, by saying they are not revolting against their ruler (the pope) because his conduct caused him to lose his status as their ruler (pope). But they fail to see how they *beg the question*. This would be like the American revolutionaries saying they are not revolting against their ruler (King George III) because his conduct makes him not their real ruler. Such circular "reasoning" merely assumes their conclusion as a premise for their "argument" that they are not revolutionaries. In other words, they would claim that they do not deny the authority of the ruler over them because they deny he has the authority of the ruler over them.

Of course, the Church has had several rulers (popes) in a row since the beginning of the sedevacantist revolution. Having revolted against Pope John XXIII, sedevacantists take as a "matter of course" the rejection of the subsequent popes' authority, just as the American Revolutionaries took as a "matter of course" that King George III's successors had no authority over them.

A person might wrongly believe that sedevacantists are not revolutionaries, based on the superficial supposition that revolution must involve physical fighting. But what is essential to revolution is for persons to declare that their ruler has lost his *authority* to rule them. A revolution need not involve physical fighting. For example, the Hawaiian Revolution of 1893 did not involve any physical fighting. Likewise, any physical fighting was not essential to the Protestant Revolution against the Catholic Church.

³⁴ To read more on the Cristeros, read *Latin America: A Sketch of its Glorious Catholic Roots and a Snapshot of its Present*, by the Editors of *Quanta Cura Press*, pp. 40-42, ©2016.

Also, a person might wrongly believe sedevacantism is not revolutionary, based on the superficial supposition that revolution must involve deposing a ruler from his throne or office. However, what is essential to revolution is the **rejection of a ruler's authority**, but this might pertain to only certain persons or places. For example, in the American Revolution, the colonists did not cause King George III to lose his throne entirely. They succeeded merely in revolting against his authority in the thirteen American colonies. Similarly, the Protestant Revolution did not depose the pope from his throne but the Protestant revolutionaries merely rejected his authority among certain persons or in certain places.

Revolution is Always Wrong

It is un-Catholic to be a revolutionary. All authority comes from God, regardless of the method by which a ruler is chosen to wield civil or religious power. Here is how St. Paul teaches this truth:

[T]here is no power [whether civil or religious] but from God: and those [powers] that are, are ordained of God. Therefore, he that resisteth the power [whether civil or religious], resisteth the ordinance of God. And they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation. ... For [the ruler] is God's minister. ... Wherefore, **be subject of necessity**, not only for [the ruler's] wrath, but also **for conscience's sake**.³⁵

Pope Pius IX faithfully echoed St. Paul:

[A]ll authority [whether civil or religious] comes from God. Whoever resists authority resists the ordering made by God Himself, consequently achieving his own condemnation; **disobeying authority** [whether civil or religious] **is always sinful except when an order is given which is opposed to the laws of God and the Church**.³⁶

Pope Pius IX taught this same doctrine in his infallible **condemnation** of the following **erroneous** proposition:

³⁵ Romans, ch.13, vv. 1-2 & 4-5 (bracketed words added; emphasis added).

Also, in another place in Sacred Scripture, God declares: “By Me kings reign, and lawgivers decree just things; by Me princes rule, and the mighty decree justice.” *Proverbs*, 8:15-16.

³⁶ *Qui Pluribus*, November 9, 1846, §22 (emphasis added; bracketed words added).

It is permissible to refuse obedience to legitimate rulers [whether civil or religious], and even **to revolt** against them.³⁷

Pope Leo XIII taught the same doctrine as St. Paul and Pope Pius IX. Here are Pope Leo XIII's words:

If, however, it should ever happen that public power [whether civil or religious] is exercised by rulers rashly and beyond measure, **the doctrine of the Catholic Church does not permit rising up against them** on one's own terms, lest quiet and order be more and more disturbed, or lest society receive greater harm therefrom.³⁸

Because it is sinful to even willfully desire to sin, Pope Leo XIII taught that even the "desire for revolution" is a "vice". *Auspicato Concessu*, §24.

St. Ambrose, Doctor of the Church, teaches this same truth, *viz.*, that Catholics are not revolutionaries and must obey their rulers in those matters that are not sinful. Here are his words:

It is a great and spiritual lesson, which teaches Christians submission to the sovereign power, so that no one will allow himself to break the edicts of a king of the earth.³⁹

³⁷ *Quanta Cura*, proposition #63 (emphasis added; bracketed words added).

Pope Pius IX used his *ex cathedra* (infallible) authority to condemn this error as part of a list of errors contained in the syllabus of *Quanta Cura*. Regarding these condemnations, the pope said:

We, truly mindful of Our Apostolic duty, and especially solicitous about our most holy religion, about sound doctrine and the salvation of souls divinely entrusted to Us, and about the good of human society itself, have decided to lift our voice again. And so all and each evil opinion and doctrine individually mentioned in this letter, by Our Apostolic authority We reject, proscribe and condemn; and We wish and command that they be considered as absolutely rejected, proscribed and condemned by all the sons of the Catholic Church.

Thus, Pope Pius IX's condemnation fulfills the conditions for infallibility set out in Vatican I's document, *Pastor Aeternus*, because the pope was: 1) carrying out his duty as pastor and teacher of all Christians; 2) in accordance with his supreme apostolic authority; 3) on a matter of faith or morals; 4) to be held by the universal Church.

³⁸ Encyclical, *Quod Apostolici muneris*, December 28, 1878, §7 (emphasis added; bracketed words added).

³⁹ St. Ambrose, Doctor of the Church, *Commentary on St. Luke*, 5:1-11.

Although, as we saw earlier,⁴⁰ we are not allowed to commit a sin regardless of who commands us to commit the sin, St. Ambrose here teaches us that we are bound in conscience to otherwise submit to the edicts of the ruler. Thus, even more so, we cannot revolt against him.

Because revolution is always wrong, that is why Pope St. Pius X taught that revolutionaries could not possibly be the true friends of the people. Here are his words:

The Church, which has never betrayed the happiness of the people by consenting to dubious alliances, does not have to free herself from the past; that all that is needed is to take up again, with the help of the true workers for a social restoration, the organisms which the Revolution shattered, and to adapt them, in the same Christian spirit that inspired them, to the new environment arising from the material development of today's society. ***Indeed, the true friends of the people are neither revolutionaries***, nor innovators: they are traditionalists.⁴¹

If We Cannot Revolt, Then What Should We Do When We Have Bad Rulers?

Although revolution is forbidden, Pope Leo XIII gave us the remedies of patience, prayer, and ***resistance to the particular evil commands*** of a bad ruler. Here are his words:

Whenever matters have come to such a pass that no other hope of a solution is evident, [the doctrine of the Catholic Church] teaches that a remedy is to be hastened through the merits of Christian patience, and by urgent prayers to God.

But if the decisions of legislators and rulers should sanction or order something that is contrary to divine and natural law, the dignity and duty of the Christian name and the opinion of the apostles urge that “we ought to obey God, rather than men” (Acts 5:29).⁴²

St. Thomas offers the same remedy to persons who suffer the evil of a bad ruler:

⁴⁰ Read this article examining false obedience, entitled, *The False “Obedience” of Cowardly and Weak Catholics*, which can be found here: <https://catholiccandle.org/2025/05/20/the-false-obedience-of-cowardly-and-weak-catholics/>

⁴¹ Pope St. Pius X, encyclical *Our Apostolic Mandate*, (1910).

⁴² *Quod Apostolici muneris*, December 28, 1878, §7 (bracketed words added to show context).

[S]ometimes God permits evil rulers [whether civil or religious] to afflict good men. This affliction is for the good of such good men, as St. Paul says above [ch.8, v.28]: “All things work for the good, for those who love God.”⁴³

St. Peter, the first pope, infallibly gives the same remedy (prayer and patience) – not revolution – when subjects have a bad ruler. Here are his words:

Be ye subject therefore to every human creature for God's sake: whether it be **to the king** as excelling; or to governors as sent by him ... **Honor the king.** ... For this is thankworthy, **if for conscience towards God, a man endure sorrows, suffering wrongfully.** ... [I]f doing well you **suffer patiently**; this is thankworthy before God.⁴⁴

Notice that the revolutionaries intend the **opposite** of what St. Peter instructs us to do. They intend not to honor the king but to dishonor him by revolting against him. This is the most extreme way possible to dishonor him in so far as he is their ruler.

Further, St. Peter instructs us to “endure sorrows”, and to “suffer patiently” when we have a bad ruler. By contrast, revolutionaries seek the opposite, *viz.*, to avoid enduring the sorrow of a bad ruler and avoid suffering patiently under him.

Plainly, revolutionaries seek the opposite of what St. Peter instructs us to seek.

⁴³ St. Thomas Aquinas, *Commentary on Romans*, ch.13, lect.1 (bracketed words added).

⁴⁴ Here is the full quote:

Be ye subject therefore to every human creature for God's sake: whether it be to the king as excelling; Or to governors as sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of the good: For so is the will of God, that by doing well you may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: As free, and not as making liberty a cloak for malice, but as the servants of God. Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. **Honor the king.** Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. **For this is thankworthy, if for conscience towards God, a man endure sorrows, suffering wrongfully.** For what glory is it, if committing sin, and being buffeted for it, you endure? But **if doing well you suffer patiently; this is thankworthy before God.** For unto this are you called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving you an example that you should follow his steps. Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. Who, when he was reviled, did not revile: when he suffered, he threatened not: but delivered himself to him that judged him unjustly. Who his own self bore our sins in his body upon the tree: that we, being dead to sins, should live to justice: by whose stripes you were healed. For you were as sheep going astray; but you are now converted to the shepherd and bishop of your souls.

¹ *Peter*, 2:13-25 (emphasis added).

The Examples of the Saints Show Revolution is Wrong

Look at the example of Catholics, including great saints like St. Sebastian, who served bravely and faithfully even in the army of the pagan emperors of Rome. They did not revolt, *even when their emperor openly sought to kill all Catholics* (although, of course, those soldier-saints did not aid in the persecution of Catholics).

Here is Pope Gregory XVI's praise for those Roman soldier-saints, who were faithful to God first but also to their emperor (whenever the emperor's commands were not themselves evil):

[T]he early Christians ... deserved well of the emperors and of the safety of the state even while persecution raged. This they proved splendidly by their fidelity in *performing perfectly and promptly whatever they were commanded which was **not opposed** to their religion*, and even more by their constancy and the shedding of their blood in battle. "Christian soldiers", says St. Augustine, "served an infidel emperor. When the issue of Christ was raised, they acknowledged no one but the One who is in heaven. They distinguished the eternal Lord from the temporal lord, but were *also subject to the temporal lord for the sake of the eternal Lord.*"

St. Mauritius, the unconquered martyr and leader of the Theban legion had this in mind when, as St. Eucharius reports, he answered the emperor in these words: "We are your soldiers, Emperor, but also servants of God, and this we confess freely . . . and now *this final necessity of life has **not driven us into rebellion.***" ...

Indeed, the faith of the early Christians shines more brightly, if we consider with Tertullian, that since the Christians were not lacking in numbers and in troops, they could have acted as foreign enemies. "We are but of yesterday", he says, "yet we have filled all your cities, islands, fortresses, municipalities, assembly places, the camps themselves, the tribes, the divisions, the palace, the senate, the forum. ... For what war should we not have been fit and ready even if unequal in forces – we who are so glad to be cut to pieces – were it not, of course, that *in our doctrine we would have been permitted more to be killed rather than to kill?* ... [Y]ou have fewer enemies because of the multitude of Christians."

*These beautiful examples of the unchanging subjection to the rulers necessarily proceeded from the most holy precepts of the Christian religion.*⁴⁵

⁴⁵ Encyclical *Mirari Vos*, August 15, 1832, §§ 18-19 (emphasis added), quoting and relying on the teaching of St. Augustine (Doctor and Father of the Church), as well as St. Mauritius, and Tertullian (a Father of the Church).

Summary of this Article so Far

As shown above, it is Catholic dogma that revolution is always wrong but that resisting the particular evil commands of our ruler *is* permitted and sometimes necessary. When resisting is just, such resistance might include taking up arms and fighting the government soldiers who seek to enforce the ruler's evil orders. The Cristeros did this in Mexico.

If the evil is great enough, the resisters may even place themselves beyond the reach of the harm which the ruler seeks to unjustly inflict on them. The Cristeros did this, succeeding in defending three quarters of Mexico from the anti-Catholic harm attempted by Mexico's government.⁴⁶

However, even when strong resistance is justified by the greatness of the evil attempted by the ruler, those persons resisting the evil are not permitted to revolt, *i.e.*, to declare that the ruler has ceased to be their ruler. The ruler does not lose his authority *in principle*, even when the resisters prevent him by force of arms from accomplishing *in practice* the evil he wishes to do. This is the meaning of Pope Pius IX's *infallible condemnation* of the assertion that "**It is permissible ... to revolt**". (See above.)

Regarding the early soldier-saints fighting in the Roman army (see above) even while the emperor martyred Catholics: those Catholic soldier-saints faithfully served their emperor in other activities which were honorable and never aided the Roman persecution of Catholics. Those soldier-saints of Rome did not choose to do what the Cristeros did, *viz.*, defend themselves (without revolting). As quoted above, St. Augustine, Pope Gregory XVI and the other authorities do not address the option of armed resistance, while they praise those soldier-saints for not revolting.

A Note About a Different but Related Issue: How Can We Determine Whether a Ruler is the *Legitimate* Ruler?

Above, we see that Catholics must never revolt against their *legitimate* ruler (although they may resist his evil commands). However, a person can ask: "How do we know when a ruler is *legitimate*?"

This article does not lay out principles from which we can know in *all* cases if a ruler is legitimate. There are many ways a ruler might not be the legitimate ruler. Here is an easy case of a ruler being illegitimate:

⁴⁶ *Latin America: A Sketch of its Glorious Catholic Roots and a Snapshot of its Present*, by the Editors of *Quanta Cura Press*, p.41, ©2016.

When the head of a foreign, attacking army first lands on a country's soil and immediately declares himself the legitimate ruler of the country simply because he is there and is strong, this seems like an easy case that he is a usurper and not a rightful, legitimate ruler of the country he is attacking. The people of that country can deny his authority over them and fight against him to try to expel him from the country.

In this article, we don't treat the various possible ways in which a ruler might be illegitimate since we don't *need* to do that because the sedevacantists began their revolution against a pope whom they recognize as having been elected at the conclave. The sedevacantists do not raise a doubt about Pope John XXIII's *becoming* pope. For example, the sedevacantists do not claim that the papal conclave did not conduct a proper vote. The sedevacantists reject the pope's authority because of what he did and said, not because he had never been their ruler (pope) in the first place.

This is like the American revolutionaries, who did not say that King George III was never their king, *e.g.*, because he was not the proper heir to the throne of England. Instead, sedevacantists and the American revolutionaries declare that their ruler lost his legitimacy (his authority) because of what he said and did. For this reason, the sedevacantists are revolutionaries.

Thus, although there are many circumstances in which it would not be revolution to deny that a particular ruler was legitimate and had authority because of how he (supposedly) received his office, that is not an issue either with the American revolutionaries or with the sedevacantists who claim their ruler (the king and the pope respectively) *lost* his authority by his actions.⁴⁷

Prohibition Against *All Revolution Especially Forbids Rebellion Against the Pope's Authority as Such.*

Since the Catholic Church's ruler, above all others, has authority from God, the prohibition against revolution *most of all* applies to revolt against the pope's authority, as such. Thus, St. Robert Bellarmine, Doctor of the Church, explains that:

[I]t is licit to resist the Pontiff who ... tries to destroy the Church. I say that it is licit to resist him by not doing what he orders and by impeding the execution of his will; it is *not licit*, however, to *judge him, to punish him, or depose him*, for

⁴⁷ Of course, as noted above, having revolted against Pope John XXIII, sedevacantists now take as a "matter of course" the rejection of all subsequent popes' authority, just as the American revolutionaries took as a "matter of course" that King George III's successors had no authority over them.

these are acts proper to a superior.⁴⁸

Sedevacantism is an Over-Simplification of the Truth.

A Catholic Dictionary characterizes the traits of revolution in this way:

The methods of the Gospel are ***not revolutionary***; they do not deal in those ***sweeping general assertions*** which fuller experience always shows to be but ***half-truths***.⁴⁹

A sedevacantist exhibits such revolutionary traits. He “leaps” from the truth that the pope has taught and done much evil, to the declaration that we have no pope. Thus, the sedevacantist over-simplifies the truth through ***sweeping general assertions*** and ***half-truths*** about his ruler (the pope).

Conclusion of This Article

Without judging sedevacantists’ interior culpability, it is nonetheless plain that sedevacantists follow the objectively sinful pattern of revolutionaries. They assert that the wrongs committed by the pope – who is their ruler – are (purported) justification both for declaring he has lost his authority to rule them and that he is not the pope. Thus, we see that, in addition to the other reasons why the sedevacantists are wrong, they are also wrong because they are revolutionaries.

But a Question Arises: If We Cannot Deny that Leo XIV is Pope, Does that Mean We Are in Communion with *Him*?

Sedevacantists attempt to show that their own Catholicism is “exalted and pure” by saying that ***they*** are not, and would never be, connected with ***that man*** (who is our pope) because his words and deeds are often so problematic, scandalous, and heterodox.

⁴⁸ *De Summo pontifice* Book II, Ch. 29 (emphasis added).

St. Robert Bellarmine is here pointing out that whereas the pope can depose the bishop of a diocese because the pope is that bishop’s superior, we cannot depose the pope because no one, including us, is his superior (besides God).

⁴⁹ *A Catholic Dictionary*, Addis & Arnold, Article: *Slavery*, The Catholic Publication Society, New York, 1884, pp.767-68 (emphasis added).

So these sedevacantists attempt to pressure Catholics into becoming schismatics by urging those Catholics: “Don’t be in communion with *that man* (the pope)!” , suggesting that somehow it is un-Catholic to be in communion with a bad pope.

So the question arises: Are we Catholics *really* in communion with the pope, even when he is a bad, scandalous pope or teaches heresy? We will examine that question in a future article.

To be continued ...



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.