

Saint Thomas Aquinas vs Pope Francis

Over the weekend the Pope's newspaper, L'Osservatore Romano, published some new guidelines for the reception of Holy Communion by divorced and remarried Catholics thereby verifying his position as the False Prophet of the End Times because, as Daniel says in chapter 10, verse number 3: ***'I ate no desirable bread and neither flesh nor wine entered into my mouth, neither was I anointed with oil until the days of three weeks were accomplished'***. The 'desirable bread' and 'flesh and wine' refers to the Eucharist; 'not anointed with oil' refers to an illegally ordained pope, Pope Francis, and the 'three weeks' means that for three years we will have to suffer as the Vatican and the city of Rome are trampled under by the Gentiles for 42 months (Revelation 11:2).

I want to read a few articles for you and this was published over the weekend, I believe on Friday, and the headline is: ***'Malta church goes beyond Pope in remarriage guidelines'***. This is unbelievable! I mean, we've already had quite a few bishops say that anyone can receive Communion in their churches, for example, Cardinal Cupich of Chicago: he said that anyone and everyone can receive Holy Communion and of course, that invalidates the Eucharist, as I am going to show later on in this program when I reference St. Thomas Aquinas, perhaps the greatest theologian in the Catholic Church.

The article is by Nicole Winfield of the Associated Press; thus even the secular newspapers are interested in this development and that's because Satan is behind it and the media loves to report anything that Satan is behind:

<https://sg.news.yahoo.com/malta-church-goes-beyond-pope-remarriage-guidelines-180027763.html>

'The Vatican is making clear Pope Francis supports letting divorced and civilly remarried Catholics receive Communion under certain conditions by publishing a set of new guidelines in the Pope's own newspaper that go beyond even what he has said (and of course, his newspaper is L'Osservatore Romano). The Catholic Church in Malta issued the guidelines Friday (that's this past Friday) on applying the divisive Chapter VIII of Francis' document on family life that concerns ministering to Catholics in irregular family situations ('irregular' is the Church's new code word for a couple shacking up together) the Vatican newspaper

L'Osservatore Romano published the guidelines in full. The newspaper would not do that if Pope Francis did not totally agree with this proposal by the Malta bishops which, in fact, negates 2,000 years of Church teaching and which negates what Jesus taught and which negates what St Paul taught. For example, Jesus said ***'do not give that which is holy to the dogs'***.

<http://www.catholicnews.com/services/englishnews/2017/bishops-of-malta-issue-norms-for-ministry-to-divorced-civilly-remarried.cfm>

Here is another article from Catholic News Service by Cindy Wooden and the headline is: ***'Bishops of Malta issue norms for ministry to divorced, civilly remarried under certain circumstances and after long prayer*** (well, the Apostles Creed is a long prayer, is that what they mean? Where did Jesus say 'do not give that which is holy to the dogs except after long prayer?') ***and a profound examination of conscience, some divorced and civilly remarried Catholics may return to the sacraments said the bishops of Malta***'. Thus the bishops of Malta have just delegitimized the Holy Eucharist on their Island. They've taken away the validity of the sacrament. Jesus is no longer present in your communions unless your priests or bishops disavow what Pope Francis is allowing. It's as simple as that, as I will explain in a minute.

'With an informed and enlightened conscience a separated or divorced person living in a new relationship (notice that marriage is not even mentioned here. In other words, they can be shacking up together. How many different times can they shack up together and still receive Communion? Henry the Eighth had six wives. It didn't bother his conscience; he felt it was his duty. If Pope Francis had been Pope then, we may not have had a Protestant Reformation. Anybody could receive Communion including people who get married half a dozen times, or are in 'relationships', as the bishops of Malta say) ***who is able to acknowledge and believe that he or she is at peace with God*** (that's all it takes; there are no rules anymore!) ***the bishops said cannot be precluded from participating in the sacraments of reconciliation and the Eucharist.***' Of course, this also violates what St. Paul said: ***'Anyone who eats and drinks the body and the blood of our Lord unworthily is guilty of the body and the blood of our Lord'***. Nowhere does St Paul add: 'unless they are able to acknowledge and believe that he or she is at peace with God! But what if the Church is 'guilty of the body and the blood of our Lord?' What if the Church decides that you CAN give that which is holy to the dogs?

The Church cannot go to hell; but Jesus can remove himself from those Eucharists and people are going to find out that is exactly what is happening; they will know in their souls they are no longer receiving our Lord in Unholy Communion.

Next, I thought I would see what Thomas Aquinas wrote about the validity of the Eucharist as far as the intention of the priest goes. If his intention is faulty does that ruin the validity of the sacrament? Thomas Aquinas says no it does not because the Church's intention is pure. But I ask: what if the Church's intention is no longer pure? This is from Summa Theologica, part 3, question 64, article 9, and you can look up the entire Summa Theologica on the internet if you would like to.

http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/03d/1225-1274,_Thomas_Aquinas,_Summa_Theologiae_%5B1%5D,_EN.pdf

And here is what he calls objection 1: this is an erroneous proposition from someone who disagrees with Thomas Aquinas and the Saint is going to shoot him down, so to speak: ***'It seems that the validity of a sacrament requires a good intention in the minister*** (Thomas Aquinas is going to disagree) ***for the minister's intention should be in conformity with the Church's intention. But the intention of the Church is always good.*** However, Thomas Aquinas never had to deal with the question of the Church's intention becoming evil. ***'Therefore the validity of the sacrament requires of necessity a good intention in the minister.'*** And Thomas Aquinas disagrees with that because he claims that the Church's intention overrides the priest's intention and he is correct. But what happens if the Church's intention is, as I say, faulty?

Here is Thomas Aquinas' answer to the first proposition: ***'On the contrary, a perverse intention belongs to the wickedness of the minister. But the wickedness of the minister does not annul the sacrament: neither does his perverse intention.'*** In other words, Thomas Aquinas is saying the Church's intention overrides the priest's intention and that's because you can never know what the priest is intending. There are three requirements for a valid Eucharist: the priest must use the same matter that Jesus did; he cannot consecrate strawberry shortcake, for example. He must use the same words Jesus did; he cannot say, for instance, 'this might be my body'. And he must have the same intention Jesus did and that intention includes who you are going to give the Eucharist to because Jesus specifically sent

Judas away from the Last Supper as I prove on my website, in case you're interested; I won't go into that right now.

Saint Thomas continues with a second erroneous proposition which he is going to disprove: ***'I answer that the minister's intention may be perverted as to something that follows the sacrament: for instance, a priest may intend to baptize a woman's so as to be able to abuse her or to consecrate the body of Christ so to use it for sorcery'*** and Thomas Aquinas answers neither of these matters because it's the Church's intention which overrides the priest's. But what if the Church has the intention to consecrate the Body of Christ so as to use it for sorcery? The priest condemns himself to hell but the Church can't go to hell. Of course, the False Prophet can go to hell and the bishops of Malta can go to hell but the unintended consequence is that the Body and Blood of our Lord will not go into new Eucharist because at the consecration, the intention of the priest is made faulty, no matter what he may personally intend, since the intention of the Church overrides that of the priest. It's the same as if Pope Francis suddenly ruled that a priest COULD use strawberry shortcake instead of bread or that he COULD use any words of consecration he chooses. Those innovative rules would also invalidate the Eucharist, as any theologian will tell you, it doesn't matter who made the new rules. It seems to be taking quite a long time for theologians to understand that Francis' new rules allowing the divorced and civilly remarried to receive the Eucharist will, in the same way, also make the priests' consecrations invalid. Saint Thomas continues: ***'And because that which comes first does not depend on that which follows, consequently such a perverse intention does not annul the sacrament.'*** Except, as I am claiming, if the Church's new intention is to consecrate the body of Christ so as to give that which is holy to the dogs; going precisely against what Jesus taught.

And the last erroneous proposition, this is objection three in the section (there are other parts that I'm not including): ***'A perverse intention perverts the action of the one who has such an intention, not the action of another. Consequently, the perverse intention of the minister perverts the sacrament in so far as it is his action: not insofar as it is the action of the Church (Christ) whose minister he is'***. And he gives an example: ***'It is just as if the servant of some man were to carry alms to the poor with a wicked intention whereas his master has commanded him with a good intention to do so.'*** Saint Thomas is right but my question is, what if the 'master' has the bad intention. In every example Aquinas gives, he assumes a

good intention on the part of the Church. This End Times situation is unique in that the Church of Pope Francis now has a bad intention. I'm sure Satan has read Saint Thomas and concluded that since the Church's intention overrides the priest's intention, all he had to do was get an evil pope to change the Church's intention in order to invalidate the Eucharists of all priests.

A lot of my subscribers have asked me about their own particular parishes. In other words, their priest says that he will give communion to the divorced and remarried since he is adhering to the new One World Religion which Pope Francis is establishing in the Catholic Church, and they say **'I can't get to any other mass, I live hundreds of miles away from another Catholic Church'**. This is admittedly a difficult question. Jesus said: **'When you see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet then those who are in the field must flee and not go back to take their cloaks'**. It's difficult for me to tell you not to attend such a mass because you could get some good out of it. You could make a spiritual communion. But it is also very dangerous. Those who flee the field, flee on the two wings of a great Eagle as we find out in the book of Revelation. Those two wings symbolize Mary's Rosary and Scapular. Will that be enough to save you when there are false Eucharists available through the taken over Catholic Church? The answer to that question I'm not sure of yet, and since I'm not sure, I don't like to give you a definite answer. I would rather have you ask the Holy Spirit because we still do have at this time a true Pope and that is, Pope Benedict. So it's possible that when your priest prays for the Pope you can assume that he's praying for Pope Benedict and he considers himself under his authority. And, in fact, in my prayer group we pray for both Pope Francis and Pope Benedict.

And that is my message for today. I hope this clears up some of the questions because I get a lot of questions on this problem; it is, of course, a very serious problem: it is the first 'Abomination of Desolation' of these End Times and it has already occurred. The next 'Abomination of Desolation' refers to Israel and Natan has already described that. The third 'Abomination of Desolation' after that of these End Times is brought about by the Antichrist when he starts martyring Christians. So, I can't give you a lot of good words for today but I can alert you to the disaster that is going to occur in the very near future.