

Reviewed by Robert Sungenis:

“Father Chad Ripperger versus the Little Gray Men” by Mike Lewis, 03-09-2025

In his present hit piece, “Father Chad Ripperger Versus the Little Gray Men,” Lewis writes about the efforts of the Kolbe Center for the Study of Creation to have a conference in Wisconsin in March 2025. (<https://wherepeteris.com/father-chad-ripperger-versus-the-little-gray-men/>). Lewis gloats over the fact that the diocese of Milwaukee disinvented the Kolbe Center from having the conference at one of the diocesan facilities, a decision the diocese made based on the fact that the conference speakers were going to promote six-day creationism, geocentrism, the Noachic flood, and the non-existence of aliens. Whereas all of these were once official and popular Catholic beliefs, the modern world has done its best to castigate them as nothing more than primitive notions of bygone days, and most Catholics have lapped it up. Mike Lewis is one of those who detests these traditional teachings. But one added idiosyncrasy about Lewis’s opinion is that he engages in full-throttle *ad hominem* attacks against such persons who cross his path.

Here is a recent comment Mike Lewis made about Fr. Chad Ripperger who was one of the four speakers at the Wisconsin conference: “@mlewis. Quote from Fr. Chad Ripperger on a recent podcast. What a profoundly stupid and twisted man,” which Lewis said merely because Fr. Ripperger stated that “grays” claim neither to be angelic nor human but some intermediate being. Whatever they are, Fr. Ripperger has been teaching that all the fascination about aliens today is nothing but a massive deception.

Mike Lewis, as you can probably guess, is of the opposite persuasion – that aliens are real and may come to visit and save us. As he puts it...

Ripperger, Sungenis, and their associates at the Kolbe Center seem to reject the possibility of extraterrestrial life altogether, as it does not fit within their rigid, literalist interpretation of Genesis. There is no room for this in a 6,000-year-old universe with a fixed Earth at the center, where everything — including every galaxy, star, and living species — was created directly by God in six 24-hour days.

Mike Lewis is not the only Catholic to be deceived. Except for a few faithful, almost the whole Catholic apologetics field has succumbed to the deception. On August 23, 2023, EWTN Radio featured Paul Thigpen and his new book, *Extraterrestrial Intelligence and the Catholic Church: Are We Alone in the Universe with God and the Angels?* (Tan Books 2022). EWTN TV, in February 2025, featured Dr. Diana Pasulka, an international speaker on alien life who was also featured on *The Joe Rogan Show*. The *National Catholic Register* and *Crisis Magazine* have also promoted Thigpen’s book. *Crisis*’ chief editor, Eric Sammons, who had Paul

Thigpen on to discuss the title: “Would Aliens Disprove Catholicism?” is of special interest since he also wrote a hit piece on the March 2025 Wisconsin conference telling Catholics not to attend. His article was titled: “A Truly Traditionalist Approach to Science Isn’t What You’ve Been Told.”

Others promoting that aliens exist or may exist are: Bishop Robert Barron of “The Word on Fire”; the show “Capturing Christianity,” who had Thigpen on to discuss the title: “No, Aliens Wouldn’t Disprove Christianity”; Fr. Mike Schmidt of *Ascension Presents* who responded to the question: “Did God Create Aliens” with “Maybe”; the *Connor Gallagher Show* in which the title: “Would Aliens Undermine the Authority of the Catholic Church?” is discussed in favor of a negative answer; *Relevant Radio* featured a show titled: “Catholic Thought on Extraterrestrial Intelligence,” while one of its major hosts, Patrick Madrid, who is a close friend of Thigpen’s, highly recommended Thigpen’s book. *NewsNation* featured Thigpen along with US Representative Burchett under the title: “Believing UFO’s are in the Bible is not anti-Christian.”

As for Mike Lewis, I’ve had my own experience with him and it was not good. He is not an honest man and I sincerely wonder if he is even a Christian. He is your typical liberal ideologue who is out to destroy anybody he doesn’t like, and that includes a lot of Catholics to the right of him. Watch out for your reputation because Mike Lewis, who appears from his picture to have a little too much time on his hands, will make sure he does his part to destroy it with a juicy assortment of half-truths and innuendos, even after he is corrected.

Case in point: In his article, Lewis makes a caricature of the efforts of my movie company, Stellar Motion Pictures, LLC, to produce the theatrical release, *The Principle*. Lewis, as could be expected, gives no appreciation to the movie’s thesis, a thesis which provided clear scientific evidence for the possible overturning of the long-held Copernican Principle. Most of our critics give a knee jerk reaction to such ideas, filled with all kinds of derogatory insults, Mike Lewis being no exception. As Lewis puts it in his present article:

In 2014 he and his production team successfully hoodwinked *Star Trek Voyager* actress Kate Mulgrew and a series of world-renowned scientists to appear in a documentary promoting this view. Mulgrew and many of the scientists renounced the documentary once they realized what it was about. For example, physicist Lawrence Krauss responded by writing an article for Slate entitled, “I Have No Idea How I Ended Up in That Stupid Geocentrism Documentary.”

Prior to the quote above from his 2025 article, Lewis did a similar hit piece against me in 2023. Long story short: Lewis twisted every fact he got his hands on. The best one was how he dealt with what happened with our narrator, Kate Mulgrew, the Captain Janeway of 1990s

Star Trek fame. In the 2023 article, Lewis likewise claimed that Mulgrew repudiated the movie and was tricked into participating. I politely responded to him by email and told him his claim was wrong, and I sent him proof that Ms. Mulgrew was not tricked, which included Ms. Mulgrew's request to do an interview with Stellar Motion Pictures after her narration so that she could tell the world how good the script was that she had narrated. Her request was totally unexpected since the contract said she could not do any interviews. So she broke her own contract to tell us how good our movie was! Here is just some of what she said in the interview:

It's great! First of all the material to me is fascinating...It's a pleasure. We discussed a lot of what this science could mean and all that is titillating, fascinating and intriguing to me, because the "what ifs" of the world is what makes it so fascinating....A lot of this stuff is difficult. I have to fully understand it and organize it in my mind. I have to separate it out. It has to make perfect sense to me, so that I can endow it with all the emotion it deserves.

To prove my point to Lewis, I sent him the actual recording of Ms. Mulgrew's interview so that he could hear it for himself. It contained all the words Ms. Mulgrew said above. Lewis never responded to me, even after I prodded him with another email asking if he had received the first email. What this experience told me is that Mike Lewis is not a man seeking the truth. He is not interested in listening to both sides of the story; rather, he is an ideologue who will pick and choose what information he wants his audience to know so that they will have a negative opinion of the person he has decided to attack.

As for Lewis's attempt to further denigrate me by using Lawrence Krauss's feeble attempt to play dumb, e.g., "I Have No Idea How I Ended Up in That Stupid Geocentrism Documentary," I told Lewis that Krauss was baldfaced lying. I told Lewis about the contract Krauss signed that stipulated *The Principle* would be covering all cosmological views; I told him of the fifteen-hundred dollar check Krauss cashed; and that I could provide excerpts of the four-hour video interview Krauss did with the producer of Stellar Motion Pictures in 2011. I also told Lewis that the reason for Krauss's sudden denial when the Press came calling was that Krauss was thoroughly embarrassed that *The Principle* had featured a quote from Krauss in he said that the Earth may be in the center of the universe, a statement he made to *The Edge* magazine in 2005. Lewis, true to form, never apologized or retracted any of his statements. So, we are dealing with a Pharisee, not an honest Christian.

As for Lewis's comments on me dealings with the Jews, they were obviously designed to make me look like some kind of skin head. He writes:

Sungenis was perhaps best known for promoting antisemitic views, earning him a rebuke from his bishop in 2007. In 2011, he was scheduled to speak at a conference in Westminster, but it was canceled due to his history of statements on Jews and Judaism. In subsequent years, Sungenis removed the antisemitic material from the internet (even having it scrubbed from the Internet Archive), but he has also reportedly stated that while he has not changed his views on Jews, he has chosen not to voice them publicly.

Oh yes, charges of antisemitism were flying everywhere, as they have been for anyone who speaks a negative word against Jewish religion or politics. What Lewis doesn't tell you is that the charge of "antisemitism" stems from my refusal to go along with the majority of Catholic apologists and teachers today who have promoted the "dual covenant" heresy, which teaches that the Jewish people today still have their covenant with God from the Old Testament; and can even be saved by that covenant; and have no obligation to join the Catholic Church. My bishop at that time (2007), Kevin C. Rhoades, was himself promoting the heresy in the Harrisburg, PA diocese, as was his mentor and the previous bishop, Cardinal William Keeler, who wrote the infamous 1992 paper saying that we should no longer preach the Gospel to the Jews because their salvation is dependent on their own covenant with God. Both Keeler and Rhoades tried to silence me, but both failed. I was about to sue Rhoades for his heavy-handedness until the Vatican moved him to South Bend, Indiana, where he now resides. As for whether I still teach the same, contrary to Lewis's summation, I recently published a 500-page book on the Jewish covenant, showing that it is an utter heresy. The book's title is *Supersessionism is Irrevocable* and is available at www.robertsungenis.org and on Amazon. In the meantime, in 2008 the USCCB was forced, after my public exposure of their error, to remove a sentence from its 2006 *United States Catholic Catechism for Adults* that promoted the dual covenant heresy, thus vindicating my alleged "anti-semitic" teachings. The sentence removed was: "Thus the covenant that God made with the Jewish people through Moses remains eternally valid for them" (p. 131). The Vatican approved the removal in 2009, but the USCCB dragged its feet and didn't make the change until 2019.

Besides Mike Lewis's obvious lack of character that was displayed by his non-response to my email, it made me wonder what else was lying beneath the surface of Lewis's exterior that led him to such superiority over his ideological opponents. So I spent some time reading his website. I discovered that the one thing that controls Mike Lewis's thoughts and how he evaluates his friends and foes is that he is an ultra-montanist, that is, one who thinks that Pope Francis can do no wrong. In one article Lewis says:

It is clear to me that this movement's most damaging and sinister "moment of decision" was when four cardinals published their dubia on *Amoris Laetitia* through the mass media. This document — along with a letter insinuating that an official magisterial document promulgated by the pope to the entire Church contained doctrinal errors — was a public declaration of non serviam by four "princes of the Church." By the act of publishing, these cardinals signaled to Catholics that open, public defiance against the pope on matters of doctrine was not only licit, but a solemn duty. And then all hell broke loose. The declaration of non serviam — "I will not serve" — has become the defining spirit of an increasingly radicalized segment of the Church.

Only a liberal ideologue like Mike Lewis would frame the objections to Francis' recent doctrinal aberrations as a case of "non serviam." Notice that not a modicum of respect is given to the cardinals for their courage in confronting Francis about his doctrinal aberrations. That's because Lewis doesn't really care what *Amoris Laetitia* says; rather, he has decided to worship the papal personality cult and condemn anyone who even questions the pope, even though *Amoris Laetitia* is full of doctrinal aberrations and is not a non-infallible or ex cathedra teaching of the pope.

Apparently Mr. Lewis has never ever considered Canon 212:2-3 of the 1983 Code of Canon Law. It says the following:

"The Christian faithful are free to make known to the pastors of the Church their needs, especially spiritual ones, and their desires. According to the knowledge, competence, and prestige which they possess, they have the right and even at times the duty to manifest to the sacred pastors their opinion on matters which pertain to the good of the Church and to make their opinion known to the rest of the Christian faithful..."

Notice that Canon 212 says that these Christian faithful can "make their opinion known to the rest of the Christian faithful," which is what the four cardinals did. But did they tell the pope "I will not serve"? No. That accusation is just another of Mike Lewis's innuendos. They told the pope that his doctrine was off-kilter and that it should be fixed in line with Catholic traditional teaching. They received no response from the pope.

Mike Lewis apparently doesn't know the difference. That's because he's a bleeding heart liberal who thinks it's perfectly acceptable to destroy the reputation of his opponents who go against his ideological beliefs.

Case in Point: While Mike Lewis is destroying reputations, at the same time he destroys the laws of our country by condemning its efforts to adhere to its immigration laws. Here are Lewis's own words:

In the United States, many Catholics have pushed aside our social doctrine on immigrants or twisted it. The way they dismiss the rights and dignity of our fellow humans is heartbreaking. I've spent the past week trying to find the words to express my shock and extreme sorrow at the callous and cavalier attitudes of my fellow Catholics who have expressed support for mass deportation — especially those who have tried to twist Catholic teaching to promote this brutally evil agenda against our brothers and sisters in need. The truth is that we are all foreigners because none of us has arrived at our true home. When we reject other people who are simply looking for work and an opportunity for a dignified life, we reject Christ.

Notice there is not one word from Lewis acknowledging US immigration laws that require seekers of citizenship to go through the proper channels of immigration and not flood the borders with masses of people so that they can enter illegally. To Lewis it is perfectly fine to break laws in order to act like you're obeying a higher law. And never mind that these masses of migrants contain violent criminals, cartel drug mules, and trafficked children for sexual exploitation. Those horrendous atrocities aren't even on Lewis's radar screen, for he mentions none of them. That's because Lewis sees what he wants to see and ignores anything else that gets in the way of his ideology.

He then has the gall to caricature law-abiding immigration authorities as those who "reject Christ." Truth be told, the only one rejecting Christ here is Mike Lewis. As most liberals do, they make Christ into their own image by cherry-picking from his life those things that agree with their ideology. Mike Lewis wants Christ to be some sort of vigilante who succeeds by rejecting established laws. But wasn't it Christ who told us to pay taxes to Caesar because it was the rightful law of the land? Wasn't it Christ who subjected himself to Pilate, and told Pilate he was doing so because God had put Pilate in charge? Wasn't it St. Paul who told us to obey rightful governmental laws because God put the government in place? Where in Scripture does it tell us the opposite, unless the law is immoral (e.g., abortion)?

If Lewis argues that it is immoral to refuse to take in migrants, he would be correct. But that's why the US established immigration laws so that migrants can be taken in—properly. If there is any place on Earth that willingly accepts migrants it is the United States. The whole country was built on migrants. But those migrants obeyed the immigration laws of the US and they were happy to do so. But the Soros-backed migrants at the US southern border have no intentions of obeying US immigration laws. The Soros-backed Democrats wanted mass illegal migration because they want to flood the US with Democratic voters. But Mike Lewis

can't see any of this because he lives in a liberal dream world of his own making where rules don't matter as much as virtue signaling does.

Mike Lewis's liberal ideology is seen no better than in his treatment of the death penalty. In two rather long articles, Lewis castigates any Catholic who disagrees with Pope Francis's recent addition to the *Catechism* that outlaws capital punishment. Although the pope certainly has the authority to do so, the question remains as to whether this action was justified in consideration of the fact that most of Catholicism before him allowed the death penalty.

We had the same problem with Francis when he recently allowed two homosexuals to receive a blessing from the Church based on the idea that the "person" was being blessed, not the homosexuality; or when he said that he does not have the right to say that a homosexual relationship is wrong because, "who am I to judge?" The answer to that question, of course, is: "You're the pope. The very person in the world who should be teaching that homosexuality is wrong and will lead one to hell." The problem is that, for whatever reason, Francis favors and protects homosexuals. Some estimate that the Vatican itself is 50% homosexual.

Since Mike Lewis ignores the Church's teaching in Canon 212 that allows faithful Catholics to question the pope's judgment in these non-infallible matters, Lewis simply regards dissenters as renegades, not sincere seekers of truth. In addition to the four dubia cardinals, his article denigrates the efforts of Scott Hahn, Edward Fessler, Athanasius Schneider, and others, who have tried to correct Francis's ideas on the death penalty.

The fact remains that Pope Francis's teaching against the death penalty – because it is not taught infallibly – can be changed in the future by another pope. Obviously, if the present pope can change a previous pope's teaching on a non-infallible subject, then the present pope's teaching can be changed by a future pope, which is an option that Mike Lewis probably never considered in his concept of the "development of doctrine."

The possibility that any of Francis's novel teachings can be overturned by a more conservative pope already had its precedent set in the matter of Pope Honorius in the seventh century whose non-infallible teaching that Christ had "one will" (which can be found as a doctrinal teaching of Pope Honorius in Denzinger ¶251: "Hence, we confess one will of our Lord Jesus Christ also..."), was summarily condemned and changed by two subsequent popes and three councils, and who added Honorius' name, as a heretic, in the *Liber Diurnas* until the 14th century.

The argument that Mike Lewis gives for the banning of capital punishment is stated in his second article as:

To reject the Church's teaching that the death penalty is inadmissible is to reject not only the papal Magisterium but also the witness of a Church united in cherishing and proclaiming human dignity. The doctrine's development is not a break from tradition; it is a faithful continuation of the Gospel's call to uphold life and reject vengeance.

I don't think I've ever seen such lame argumentation. It's the same kind of virtue signaling that Lewis uses in other issues. Since he appeals to "the Gospel's call to uphold life and reject vengeance," Lewis fails as he usually fails. He fails to make proper distinctions—the root of most heresies. The Gospel never teaches that it is right and moral to uphold the life of a criminal deserving of death. In fact, the Gospel teaches it is *immoral* to uphold the life of such a criminal. Moreover, when the Gospel says not to engage in vengeance, it is talking about personal vengeance (Rom 12:19), never about the right of the government to wield justice by the sword (Rom 13:1-4). Even Jesus told the apostles that after his resurrection they should carry two swords for their own protection (Luke 22:36-38).

On the one hand, as Catholics we accept Francis's authority to repeal capital punishment at the same time we hold our nose when we read his lame argumentation to defend it. On the other hand, as Catholics of conscience who have been molded by Catholic tradition, we can hope to God that this is not the end of the story and that a future pope will also see the present pope's lame argumentation and set things right again. That's what I would call a supreme example of the "development of doctrine," just as happened with Pope Honorius.

To claim that to allow capital punishment is to deny both human dignity and the upholding of life is the height of irrationality. The only reason Francis got away with it is that he was the pope. As even former ultra-Montanist, Scott Hahn, has argued against Pope Francis:

"St. Thomas Aquinas uses the Latin term vindication — it's the vindication of the objective moral order. And in Genesis 9:6, you actually have this. It doesn't in any way demean the dignity of man. Man was made in the image and likeness of God, so if you take the life of a man who bears that image and likeness, you forfeit that right to life. Likewise, it can be enforced because the authorities are not simply exerting their own private power, but they are exercising authority in the name of God, whose image and likeness they bear."

If we don't make these essential distinctions, then the next thing Mike Lewis is going to tell us is that Just War doctrine is wrong because we are never allowed to kill enemy soldiers. Or he will tell us that policemen never have the right to shoot a bank robber who raids a bank with a machine gun; or that we have no right to kill a violent intruder who invades our home.

I can envision bleeding heart liberals like Mike Lewis arguing that none of the above are allowable because each assailant has “dignity” as a human being; and that to kill them would be an example of “not upholding life” and taking “vengeance.” I would go so far as to say that this is exactly how Satan might deceive us into thinking that God wants us to refrain from any such killing.

Mike Lewis’ closing words are no better:

The fierce opposition to Pope Francis’s teaching on the death penalty reveals a troubling reality: for some, orthodoxy has become a litmus test based on personal interpretations rather than faithful assent to the Magisterium. This is not merely a disagreement over doctrine; it is a refusal to engage with the Church’s living tradition. (<https://wherepeteris.com/pro-death-penalty-catholics-part-2-fear-of-rupture/>)

Of course, this just follows Mike Lewis’ mantra that anyone who disagrees with Pope Francis, for any reason, is just a bad person full of ill will. First, let’s clear the air by saying that the death penalty is not a “personal interpretation.” It is a long held belief of the Catholic Church – its living tradition – since its inception, and it is only the liberals and modernists that have come in the last century or so who have changed that living tradition.

Francis opted for no capital punishment for the same reason he opted to bless homosexuals. Apparently homosexuals have a human dignity that trumps any effort to condemn their sin for the disgusting act that it is. Instead of telling homosexuals they are blatant sinners about to be consumed by God’s wrath, Francis and Lewis are exonerating them. It is the same reason Francis told Catholics living in adultery that they could receive Holy Communion. The reason is that Francis is a liberal who, like most liberals, think that the competition between justice and mercy somehow always has to end up on the mercy side; and only those who go to the mercy side can call themselves Christian. That’s why they are called “bleeding heart liberals.”

It is because their mercy is often based on an over scrupulous, guilty, or immature conscience that forms a heart that they like to wear on their sleeves so that everyone can see how good they are. That’s why a liberal can, on one side of his mouth, plead for mercy for illegal migrants and appear so “Christian,” yet, on the other side, not say one word of concern or remorse to the thousands of illegal migrants that have raped and pillaged US citizens. None of that would happen if the migrants were vetted at the border before they were let in.

Lewis continues:

Catholicism is not a faith of rigidity; it is a faith of fidelity — fidelity to the Gospel, to the Church, and to the ongoing work of the Holy Spirit. This is what Pope Francis

means when he speaks about the “God of Surprises” — this is what his critics reject when they mock and scorn the idea. The death penalty debate is a reminder that fidelity sometimes requires the faith to let go of secure certainties to embrace deeper truths.

This is what liberals love to do. They love to categorize their theological aberrations as “deeper truths,” since that language implies there is something wrong with you if you can’t see the “deeper truth.” It’s like the Emperor’s Clothes in reverse.

In reality, the death penalty debate is a reminder that even the pope can make mistakes. The only time he is protected from making mistakes is when he declares his teaching is infallible, which Francis didn’t do for the death penalty, or any of his teachings. Granted, we are to give assent even to the non-infallible teachings, but our assent doesn’t make the non-infallible teachings right. As I said earlier, if the pope is wrong, we leave it to a future pope to declare a former pope’s teaching null and void. That’s why God allowed the incident of Pope Honorius to occur – for popes exactly like Pope Francis.

Lewis then says:

The change to the Catechism in 2018 is not a rupture; it is a fulfillment of the Church’s call to uphold human dignity. The resistance to this teaching is not about defending orthodoxy; it is about defending a narrow vision of faith that cannot accommodate growth.

Instead of categorizing his view as a “deeper truth,” Lewis now calls it “growth.” In other words, it doesn’t matter whether the growth is good or bad. Just as long as the liberal sees “growth” then it must be ok. It doesn’t matter what direction it grows, it’s growing. This is a total farce. Just as when Jesus taught that a bad tree cannot bear good fruit, growth is not the criterion by which we judge whether something is good or bad.

Robert Sungenis

April 2025