



# Adsum

*Adsum* is published by the seminarians of **Mater Dei Seminary** for the enjoyment of our families, friends, and benefactors.

## LETTER FROM THE RECTOR

Dear Friends and Benefactors,

As we enter into Passiontide, it is well for us to ponder the similarity between the Passion of Christ and the spiritual passion which the Mystical Body of Christ, the Catholic Church, endures today.

Our Lord warned His Apostles, “strike the shepherd and the sheep will scatter.” His words were verified when He allowed Himself to be betrayed by Judas and to be apprehended in the Garden of Gethsemane. In our own times, the Mystical Body of Christ has been betrayed by Judases from within the Church over the past 50 years.

And this should be no surprise for us. Pope Leo XIII in his *Motu Proprio* of September, 1888, had forewarned us in his Prayer to St. Michael:

*...These most crafty enemies have filled and inebriated with gall and bitterness the Church, the spouse of the immaculate Lamb, and have laid impious hands on her most sacred possessions. In the Holy Place itself, where has been set up the See of the most holy Peter and the Chair of Truth for the light of the world, they have raised the throne of their abominable impiety, with the iniquitous design that when the Pastor has been struck, the sheep may be scattered...*

Without a Supreme Shepherd, the sheep have been scattered! There can be no doubt that with the multiple heresies uttered by Francis I (Gorge Bergoglio) we face today not a sinful pope but a public and manifest

heretic who is in nowise pope.

How unfortunate that there are many Catholics today who recognize Francis I's heresies and yet do not draw the proper conclusion. His heresies are not just limited to the areas of religious indifferentism and false ecumenism, as can be seen in his recent joint declaration with the Grand Imam Ahmed el-Tayeb that God wills pluralism and the diverse religions in the world, but it also extends to his approval of adulterers' reception of the Eucharist (his “Apostolic Exhortation” *Amoris Laetitia*) and his recognition of homosexual unions (a transgender “man” with her female partner welcomed to the Vatican by Francis I and his public

photo with them; his approval of the declaration of the Synod of the Family that homosexuals have a positive element to give the Christian community; and finally his “who am I to judge?” statement about homosexuals). The man that is supposed to be the head of the Church does not believe in the Sixth and Ninth Commandments of God?!?

Francis I is not the case of a sinful pope whom Catholics are obliged to disobey. He is a public heretic who never was elected pope and as a public heretic could never be a true pope. It is a matter of divine law. By divine law, public, manifest heretics

are barred from the papal office.

Pope Paul IV in his Bull *Cum Ex Apostolatus* declared:

*Further, if ever it should appear that any bishop (even one acting as an archbishop, patriarch or primate), or a cardinal of the Roman Church, or a legate (as mentioned above), or even the Roman Pontiff (whether prior to his promotion to cardinal, or prior to*



*his election as Roman Pontiff), **has beforehand deviated from the Catholic faith or fallen into any heresy, We enact, decree, determine and define:***

***Such promotion or election in and of itself, even with the agreement and unanimous consent of all the cardinals, shall be null, legally invalid and void.***

*It shall not be possible for such a promotion or election to be deemed valid or to be valid, **neither through reception of office, consecration, subsequent administration, or possession, nor even through the putative enthronement of a Roman Pontiff himself, together with the veneration and obedience accorded him by all.***

*Such promotion or election, shall not through any lapse of time in the foregoing situation, be considered even partially legitimate in any way. . . .*

*Each and all of the words, as acts, laws, appointments of those so promoted or elected — and indeed, whatsoever flows therefrom — shall be lacking in force, and shall grant no stability and legal power to anyone whatsoever.*

*Those so promoted or elected, by that very fact and without the need to make any further declaration, shall be deprived of any dignity, position, honor, title, authority, office and power.*

Pope Pius XII in his encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, 1943, taught:

*For not every sin, even though it be serious, is such as to sever a man automatically from the body of the Church, as does schism or heresy or apostasy.*

Pope Innocent III declared in his decree *Si Papa* (1198):

*The Pope should not flatter himself about his power nor should he rashly glory in his honour and high estate, because the less he is judged by man, the more he is judged by God. **Still the less can the Roman Pontiff glory because he can be judged by men, or rather, can be shown to be already judged, if for example he should wither away into heresy.***

Multiple Doctors of the Church and Canonists reiterate this over and over again. To name a few: St. Robert Bellarmine [1610]

***A Pope who is a manifest heretic automatically ceases to be a Pope and head, just as he ceases automatically to be a Christian and a member of the Church.***

St. Antoninus [1459]

***In the case in which the Pope would become a heretic, he would find himself, by that very fact alone and without any other sentence, separated from the Church. A head separated from a body cannot, as long as it remains separated, be head of the same body from which it was cut off.***

St. Francis de Sales [1622]

***Now when the Pope is explicitly a heretic, he falls ipso facto from his dignity and out of the Church. . . .***

*Institutiones Iuris Canonici [1950] - Coronata*

*Appointment to the Office of the Primacy - **What is required by Divine Law for this appointment . . . Also required for validity is that the one elected be a member of the Church; hence, heretics and apostates (at least public ones) are excluded...***

*Institutiones Iuris Canonici, [1921] - Marato*

***Heretics and schismatics are barred from the Supreme Pontificate by the Divine Law itself.***

*Institutiones Iuris Canonici [1921] - C. Baldii*

*The law now in force for the election of the Roman Pontiff is reduced to these points:*

. . .

***Barred as incapable of being validly elected are the following:** women, children who have not reached the age of reason, those suffering from habitual insanity, the unbaptized, **heretics and schismatics.** . . .*

We need to heed Christ's words to watch and pray lest we enter temptation and His admonition to beware of wolves in sheep's clothing and that by their fruits you shall know them.

May all of you have a grace-filled Holy Week and a most Blessed Easter!

With my prayers and blessing,

Most Rev. Mark A. Pivarunas, CMRI





*Rev. Mr. Michael Sellner (Minnesota) checks one of our maple trees for sap and Mark Vincent (Idaho) boils sap to make maple syrup.*



*Mater Dei Academy High School Archery Team wins First Place in 2019 for the State of Nebraska.*

*Over the past ten years Mater Dei Academy has won the following Nebraska State Archery awards: 2010—1st Place; 2011—1st Place; 2012—1st Place; 2013—1st Place; 2014—1st Place; 2015—2nd Place; 2016—2nd Place; 2017— 1st Place; 2018—2nd Place*

# Father Connell Answers Moral Questions

by Very Rev. Francis J. Connell, C.S.S.R., S.T.D., LL.D., L.H.D.

---

## PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITY IN RESTITUTION

---

**Question:** A small boy, playing baseball, breaks a window in the rectory. May the priest in justice demand that the boy's father pay the bill for the repair of the damage?

**Answer:** Several distinctions are necessary for the solution of this problem. If the boy has not reached the age of reason and his father, through neglect of supervision, was responsible for the destructive activity of his son, the father is bound in conscience to make good the damage. Such would be the case if the father knew that the boy was playing too close to the rectory and did nothing about it. If, however, the damage was done without any culpable neglect on the part of the father, there is no obligation on this latter (at least prior to a court sentence) to pay for the window. In that event, the occurrence is to be considered a mere accident, like the breaking of a window by a hail-storm.

If the son has attained the use of reason, he himself is a responsible person, and hence, if the damage was due to his own deliberate carelessness, he is bound to make up for it. If he has no funds at present, he is bound to earn some money for this purpose. Even if the father was guilty of the failure to admonish his son about his indifference to the rights and property of others, the father would not *per se* be bound to make restitution. As Merkelbach state: "Parents are not bound to make restitution for the damage done by their children who have sufficient use of reason, because they are not bound by a duty of justice to safeguard the property of others, unless their silence would be equivalent to approval or protection" (*Summa theologiae moralis* [Paris, 1941], II, n. 316).

However, if the civil law obliges a careless parent to make reparation for the damage done by his son, the father is bound in conscience to pay the debt. Hence, a person who is the victim of the destructive actions of a small boy is perfectly within his rights if he brings suit against the child's father.

---

## RESTITUTION TO AN INSURANCE COMPANY

---

**Question:** Many years ago Martha defrauded an insurance company to the extent of \$2000. Since that time the company has gone out of existence, but its assets and liabilities have been taken over by another company. She now wishes to make restitution, but realizes that it would be almost impossible to find all the owners of the first company. Should she make restitution to the second company or to the poor?

**Answer:** The owners of the second company would seem to have no right to the restitution money, since they purchased the assets of the first company according to their value at the time of the purchase, and that did not include the money which Martha unjustly retained. Hence, the owners of the first company are the persons who have the right to the restitution. But, since they cannot be found—at least without grave difficulty—Martha should give the amount of her unjust transaction to the poor.

---

*Adsum*, a publication by the seminarians of **MATER DEI SEMINARY** for the reading enjoyment of friends and benefactors, is sent free of charge to all who request it. If you are interested, please provide your name and mailing address to:

**MATER DEI SEMINARY**  
7745 Military Avenue  
Omaha NE 68134-3356  
[www.materdeiseminary.org](http://www.materdeiseminary.org)