Anathema sit Bergoglio

*Miles Christi*

Francis has finally found the pontifical tiara that suits him¹

«That We make no delay in this matter is rendered necessary especially by the fact that the partisans of error are to be sought not only among the Church’s open enemies; they lie hid, a thing to be deeply deplored and feared, in her very bosom and heart, and are the more mischievous, the less conspicuously they appear. We allude, Venerable Brethren, to many who belong to the Catholic laity, nay, and this is far more lamentable, to the ranks of the priesthood itself, who, feigning a love for the Church, lacking the firm protection of philosophy and theology, nay more, thoroughly imbued with the poisonous doctrines taught by the enemies of the Church, and lost to all sense of modesty, vaunt themselves as reformers of the Church; [...] Nor indeed will he err in accounting them the most pernicious of all the adversaries of the Church. For as We have said, they put their designs for her ruin into operation not from without but from within; hence, the danger is present almost in the very veins and heart of the Church, whose

¹ [http://traditioninaction.org/RevolutionPhotos/A665-Tiara.htm](http://traditioninaction.org/RevolutionPhotos/A665-Tiara.htm)
injury is the more certain, the more intimate is their knowledge of her. Moreover they lay the axe not to the branches and shoots, but to the very root, that is, to the faith and its deepest fibres.»

(Saint Pius X, Encyclical Pascendi, 1907)²
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Introduction

To speak of Francis could be not only a most disagreeable exercise but above all dangerous, for a twofold reason in that it deals with both the past and the future. Regarding the past, one risks focusing too much attention on the person of Bergoglio and thus forgetting the source of the present crisis, which essentially was not the work of Francis; he only exacerbated it and brought it to its ultimate consequences. Regarding the future, one risks losing sight of the significance of this horrendous crisis, living as kind of prisoners of the present nightmare, and forgetting that, if God permits this, it is to better show forth the resplendent glory of Our Lord when He deigns to intervene and punish the evildoers, reward the just, and restore all things. The first risk consists then of losing sight of the big picture and overemphasizing one person to the detriment of the entire establishment of which he is only an interchangeable part. The second and even greater risk lies in the weakening of the theological virtue of hope, forgetting that Our Lord has already conquered evil and that we will take part in His victory, by the grace of God if we remain faithful to Him.

This is why I will strive primarily to show, concerning the past, that the root of the Bergoglian errors lies in Vatican II. Secondly, concerning the future and to avoid discouragement, I will try to show the eschatological aspect of the present crisis, recalling, as Saint Paul says, that « all things work together unto the good of those who love God » (Rm 8:28) and that the spreading of the mystery of iniquity, even « in the holy place » (Mt 24:15), is permitted by God to better shine forth his triumph at the Judgment of Nations, the Dies Irae when the empire of evil will be annihilated.

Corruptio optimi pessima, the worst thing is the corruption of the best. The greatest moral authority on earth placed in the service of evil and falsehood necessarily becomes the principle revolutionary factor in the world. As I have said before, this work of iniquity is not due only to Francis, in that he has drunk at the poisonous fountain of Vatican II, of which he is the latest propagator, although certainly with him the revolution in the Church has incontestably reached a new level, it has accomplished a qualitative leap: error and lying, blasphemy and sacrilege have become omnipresent and are manifested with shameless effrontery and frenetic recurrence, rendering the spiritual atmosphere suffocating.

Nearly three and a half years into his pontificate and the work of devastation perpetrated by Francis is beyond imagination: the need for an “ecological conversion”; the call to pardon “gays” for having been “discriminated against” by the Church; the building of a “new humanity” through a “culture of encounter”; the Church and Synagogue have “equal dignity”; Mary and the Church have “defects”; Luther was not mistaken on the doctrine of justification; Catholic States are incompatible with the sense of “History”; the Muslims are “children of God”; the death penalty for criminals is “inadmissible”; one day the human species will be extinguished; there is

---

3 This article was written in August 2016.
no Catholic God; the multiplication of loaves did not happen; God used evolution and he is not a “magician”; Christian marriage is only an “ideal”; the language of the Lutherans and the language of the Catholics concerning the Eucharist are “the same thing”; the Church in the past has had “inhumane behavior” but since Vatican II she has learned “respect” for other religions... The list is endless.

This study does not intend to be exhaustive (but how could it be without being the size of an encyclopedia?). It has only the modest objective of reviewing in summary the main aberrations and ravages achieved by this man who is idolized by the media and adulated by all the enemies of the Church. The iniquities of this pontificate are of such magnitude and indecency that one can not refrain from saying with the psalmist: «Lift up thyself, thou that judgest the earth: render a reward to the proud. How long shall sinners, O Lord: how long shall sinners glory? Shall they utter, and speak iniquity: shall all speak who work injustice?» (Ps. 94, 2-4)

Beware, Francis, because enough is enough...

« These most crafty enemies have filled and inebriated with gall and bitterness the Church, the spouse of the Immaculate Lamb »

---

4 For more information about the countless heresies and blasphemies of Francis, one can read the books Three years with Francis: the Bergoglian deceit, and Four years with Francis: enough is enough, published by Editions Saint-Remi in four languages (English, French, Italian and Spanish):

http://saint-remi.fr/fr/anti-liberalisme/1499-four-years-with-francis-enough-is-enough.html
http://saint-remi.fr/fr/35-livres/#filtre_auteur-miles_christi

5 Leo XIII Prayer to St. Michael the Archangel: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prayer_to_Saint_Michael
1. Homosexuality is no longer condemned but « integrated »

At a time when the tyrannical homosexual lobby rampages unrestricted over the whole planet, Francis has made statements and gestures clearly reinforcing the homosexual ideology. Here are some specifics. Everyone remembers his bombshell statement during his in-flight press conference when returning from World Youth Day in Rio de Janeiro in July of 2013, speaking of homosexuals: “Who am I to judge?” This little sentence immediately circled the globe and won for Francis the 2013 Man of the Year award in the American LGBT magazine The Advocate. Following this, on December 8, 2013, was the telephone call to Diego Neria, a transsexual Spanish woman turned “man”, inviting her/him to a private audience in Rome with his “fiancée”, at the Vatican’s expense. This audience took place January 24, 2014, and Francis had himself photographed in the Vatican with the lesbian couple, and the picture went around the world. According to “Diego”, at the time of his call Francis said:

«God loves all His children, whatever their situation, and you are a child of God, and that is why the Church loves you and accepts you as you are.»

On March 21, 2014 Italian television cameras videotaped Francis walking hand in hand with the homosexual Italian priest Luigi Ciotti. On May 6, 2014 he concelebrated in the Vatican with another homosexual priest, Michele de Paolis, with whom he shook hands after the Mass before journalists there to immortalize the scene. On Holy Thursday of 2015, he washed the feet of a transsexual in a prison, who afterwards received Holy Communion. All these pictures went around the world.

During an interview in August 2013 with Father Antonio Spadaro, director of the Jesuit magazine La Civiltà Cattolica, he said the following:

«One day someone asked me in a provoking manner if I approved of homosexuality. I replied to him with another question: “Tell me: when God looks at a homosexual person, does He approve his existence with affection or does He repel and condemn him?”

Thus Francis refuses to say that he condemns homosexuality, and full of bad faith he tries to make us believe that God’s love for homosexuals signifies approval of their sin.

During his trip to the United States in September 2015 Francis granted only one private audience, and that was to a homosexual couple, one of whom was an old acquaintance in

---

6 http://www.elmundo.es/espana/2015/01/28/54c7e217268e3e6e518b4572.html
7 http://www.traditioninaction.org/RevolutionPhotos/A579-Ciotti.htm
8 https://intuajustitia.blogspot.com.ar/2014/05/vatican-two-days-ago-salesians-of-don.html
9 http://chiesa.espresso.repubblica.it/articolo/1351258?eng=y
Argentina. The scene, and I remind you that it was a so-called “private” audience, was filmed and circulated immediately by the press, showing Francis embracing and kissing the two sodomites.¹²

When Francis addressed the U.S. Congress he did not say a word about the so-called “gay marriage” that had just been imposed on the whole country by judicial decree. Nor did he say a word about the crime of abortion, claiming innumerable victims yearly in this country, even when a short time before the scandal of selling organs from aborted babies was exposed, the work of America’s Planned Parenthood on the pretense of “medical research”. Instead, Francis took the opportunity to plead for abolishing the death penalty, condemning it as intrinsically unjust and contrary to the “inalienable dignity of the human person,” which is false and contrary to divine revelation and the magisterium of the Church. So Francis stands for preserving the life of murderers but doesn’t breathe a word about the life of innocents slaughtered in their mother’s womb.

Here are some figures that perfectly illustrate the bad faith of Francis: in 2015 there were 1,200,000 abortions in the United States and only 28 capital punishment executions. But he speaks to Congress against the death penalty and not against the genocide of unborn babies, nor of the abominable crimes perpetrated by Planned Parenthood. And here is an interesting fact: in his address to the U.S. Congress, not one single word out of the 3,500 he spoke referred to Our Lord Jesus Christ, while the names of leftists such as Dorothy Day or Martin Luther King had a place of honor.

To conclude this section, here is what Francis said on June 26, 2016 in his press conference on the flight returning from Armenia. A journalist asked what he thought of the proposal of Cardinal Marx, according to which the Catholic Church should ask pardon from “gays” for having “discriminated” against them. Here is his response:

«I think that the Church should apologize -as that “Marxist” Cardinal said [Cardinal Reinhold Marx] -not only to this person who is gay and has been offended, but also to the poor, to women and to children exploited in the workplace, and for having blessed so many weapons […] Christians should apologize for not having helped with so many decisions, helped so many families […] I remember from my childhood the culture of Buenos Aires, the insular Catholic

---

¹¹ «The Vatican has confirmed that the only “real audience” Pope Francis had while he was in Washington last month was with a gay former student and his longtime partner -a day before the pontiff met Kim Davis, the Kentucky clerk who was jailed for refusing to grant same sex couples marriage licenses for religious reasons. On Friday, the Vatican sought to distance itself from Davis, saying in a statement that her encounter with the pope did not represent an endorsement of her opinions or actions. » https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/oct/02/pope-francis-kim-davis-audience-gay-student

culture which I come from. You could not enter the home of a divorced couple! I am talking about eighty years ago. The culture has changed, thank God.»

Thus Francis publicly makes himself the mouthpiece of the enemies of the Church who spend their time attacking and defaming her, and his complicity with them is shown in broad daylight without restraint.

2. Secularism follows the sense of History

On July 27 2013 in an address to the managerial class of Brazil Francis praised State secularism and religious pluralism in these terms:

«I consider fundamental for this dialogue the contribution made by the great religious traditions, which play a fruitful role as a leaven of society and a life-giving force for democracy. Peaceful coexistence between different religions is favoured by the laicity of the State, which, without appropriating any one confessional stance, respects and esteems the presence of the religious dimension in society, while fostering its more concrete expressions.»

Now this is religious indifferentism pure and simple. Francis praises the purported social provision of all the “great religious traditions” and even the false “neutrality” of the State vis-à-vis divine revelation and Church teaching. To refute such godlessness it is enough to read any magisterial document issued between the Revolution and Vatican II, especially *Immortale Dei* of Leo XIII and *Quas Primas* of Pius XI. Here is a brief passage from the Leonine encyclical of 1885:

«As a consequence, the State, constituted as it is, is clearly bound to act up to the manifold and weighty duties linking it to God, by the public profession of religion. Nature and reason, which command every individual devoutly to worship God in holiness, because we belong to Him and must return to Him, since from Him we came, bind also the civil community by a like law. […] All who rule, therefore, would hold in honour the holy name of God, and one of their chief duties must be to favour religion, to protect it, to shield it under the credit and sanction of the laws, and neither to organize nor enact any measure that may compromise its safety.»

And here is another citation, from the 1925 encyclical of Pius XI in which he instituted the solemnity of Christ the King:

«Nations will be reminded by the annual celebration of this feast that not only private individuals but also rulers and princes are bound to give public honor and obedience to Christ. It will call to their minds the thought of the last judgment, wherein Christ, who has been cast out

---

15 http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_01111885_immortale-dei.html
of public life, despised, neglected and ignored, will most severely avenge these insults; for his kingly dignity demands that the State should take account of the commandments of God and of Christian principles, both in making laws and in administering justice, and also in providing for the young a sound intellectual and moral education.»\(^{16}\)

These two brief extracts are sufficient to amply prove for all intellectually honest readers not only the Bergoglian deception concerning his position on secularism but above all, that of the conciliar document *Dignitatis humanae* which totally contradicts Catholic doctrine on this matter. And when one considers that for the purpose of applying the novel doctrine of *Dignitatis humanae* the Vatican has asked for new concordats with States that once were Catholic, such as Italy and Spain, which is neither more nor less than a formal request of apostasy from the Catholic religion, then one realizes the extent of the gravity of the present crisis, of which Francis is only the heir and latest craftsman.

On Tuesday March 1, 2016 Francis received the *Poissons Roses*, the so-called “Christian inspired” French Socialists. Here is what he told them:

«Your secularism is incomplete... France should become a more secularized country. A healthy secularism is needed [...] A healthy secularism includes an openness to all forms of transcendence, according to different religious and philosophical traditions. Besides, even an atheist can have an interiority.»\(^{17}\)

Here again Francis vindicates all forms of “spirituality” whatever they be, even that of atheists, with the State limiting itself to the role of guaranteeing this false “religious liberty”, which supposedly would be a source of richness for society. He further acclaimed this in May 2015 during an interview with *La Croix*:

«The State must be secular, those which are confessional end badly. It goes against history.»\(^{18}\)

One must face the evidence, this man lies as he breathes: three short sentences, three gross lies. With him one could say that the greater the lie the better it is. First of all, organized political society, which is the State, must profess the true religion and conform to its laws. Divine revelation and the magisterium of the Church teach us this, as we have seen before. And then, if Catholic States have “ended badly,” in the sense that they have disappeared, this is not because of their being Catholic, but because of the incessant attacks of their external and internal enemies. Finally, in saying that “it goes against history” Francis professes a historical determinism, philosophically and theologically erroneous because it denies human freedom and, above all, Divine Providence, sinking into a pantheistic and evolutionary gnosis like that of George Hegel and Pierre Teilhard de Chardin.

\(^{16}\) http://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-xxvi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xxvi_enc_11121925_quas-primas.html
\(^{17}\) http://www.news.va/it/news/incontro-con-un-gruppo-del-cristianesimo-sociale-f
Here is a final citation, taken from his address on January 28, 2016 to the Italian National Committee of Bioethics:

“Everyone knows that the Church is sensitive to ethical issues; but perhaps not all realise that the Church does not claim a privileged place in this field; rather she is happy when civil conscience at various levels is able to reflect, to discern and to act on the basis of a free and open rationality and the values inherent in the person and society.”

Regarding the question of secularism, the four cited declarations prove the Bergoglian position, which is none other than that taught by Vatican II and by all his conciliar predecessors, is radically incompatible with Catholicism.

3. Church and Synagogue: equal dignity

Judaism, since the Crucifixion of Our Lord, has become the enemy of the Gospel, and the chosen people has been transformed into the Synagogue of Satan. It is not I who say this but two Jews, two Apostles of Jesus Christ: Saint Paul, who affirms it in the epistle to the Romans and Saint John, who affirms it in the Apocalypse. And it will be thus until the final conversion of Israel, which will take place one day as Saint Paul announced in the same epistle. While awaiting this happy event, the conflict between Church and Synagogue is total, in that the first is entirely consecrated to spreading Jesus Christ among souls and making Him reign in society, while the second opposes this with all its might, seeking only one objective: the coming of the Antichrist.

And yet, Our Lord had warned them: “I am come in the name of my Father, and you receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him you will receive” (Jn. 5:43). Saint Jerome comments thus on these words of Jesus: “The Jews, after having scorned truth in person, will welcome falsehood by receiving the Antichrist” (Epist. 151, ad Algasiam, quest. II). And Saint Ambrose said: “This shows that the Jews, who did not want to believe in Jesus Christ, will believe in the Antichrist” (In Psalm 43).

Secular globalism and the rights-of-man, the installation of the technocratic and impersonal New World Order, lacking soul and lacking history, are the result of their secular efforts of methodical subversion of the natural and Christian political order. The Universal Republic, abstract and disembodied, designed by spirits enlightened in the cabalistic lodges, “democratic, multicultural, and pluralistic”, but excluding Christ, is the diabolic counterpart of Christianity, a monstrous counterfeit of Catholic unity, and the indispensable condition for the manifestation of the Man of Sin. And it is clear that since John XXIII all the “conciliar popes” have joined their camp, becoming the most ardent partisans of the United Nations and the Rights of Man, obsequious agents of anti-Christian globalism and servile minions of the Synagogue.

19 https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/it/speeches/2016/january/documents/papa-francesco_20160128_comitato-nazionale-bioetica.html
There are two key dates to keep in mind, because they reveal to attentive minds the presence of the enemy in the holy place. First, the modification of the prayer for the Jews on Good Friday, which John XXIII hastened to put into effect in March 1959, barely four months after his election, suppressing the words *perfidious* and *perfidy* that applied to the Jews. Second, the promulgation of the conciliar declaration on the relationship of the Church with non-Christian religions, *Nostra Aetate*, on October 28, 1965, declaring that Talmudic Judaism should not be considered as being “rejected by God” and condemning “anti-Semitism” –this word being falsely used because it actually refers to the theological anti-Judaism based on the teaching of the New Testament, and because it proscribes the true Catholic doctrine regarding the Synagogue, which conforms to Divine revelation and the two thousand year magisterium of the Church.

The attitude of Francis toward Judaism is in perfect continuity with the new conciliar theology. We will limit ourselves to citing just one example totally sufficient to illustrate the situation. On September 27, 2015 during his visit to the United States, at the University of Saint Joseph in Philadelphia, Francis blessed a statue called *Synagogue and Church in our time*, which shows two women seated next to each other like two sisters. One holds a book, the other a scroll, as each looks with great respect at the text of the other. On the pedestal is inscribed a citation of Francis, taken from *Evangelii Gaudium* § 249:

« [...] there exists as well a rich complementarity which allows us to read the texts of the Hebrew Scriptures together and to help one another to mine the riches of God’s word. »\(^{20}\)

The previous day, on the campus of the same university, there was a Judeo-Christian colloquy to commemorate the 50\(^{th}\) anniversary of *Nostra Aetate*, entitled *Fifty Years of a Voyage of Friendship*. Here is a brief passage of the intervention of the Argentine rabbi Abraham Skorka, a good friend of Francis, with whom he wrote the book *On Heaven and Earth*, in 2010:

«The ultimate aim of Nostra Aetate was to create a new reality for Jews and Catholics, a new world. A world in which they are not opposed but can actively study and learn together, and so enrich each other and assist each other in walking their covenantal lives with God. We are no longer “foreigners” to each other. This idea is represented by the very significant sculpture we are about to dedicate, which will remind all who will see and contemplate it in the future about the achievements of the past and the challenges for the future. »\(^{21}\)

For his part, the sculptor, Joshua Koffman, stated that: “the declaration of 1965 rejected as obsolete centuries of Christian allegations claiming that the Jews were the enemies of God, and it called for dialogue and friendship between Catholics and Jews.” In turn, Vatican spokesman Father Federico Lombardi, shortly before Francis’ arrival before the statue, explained to

\(^{20}\) [http://hola-akermariano.blogspot.fr/2015_09_01_archive.html](http://hola-akermariano.blogspot.fr/2015_09_01_archive.html)

journalists that the statue “is a perfect manifestation of the same dignity of two sisters, the Church and Synagogue.”

As a historical reminder, here are the words spoken by rabbi Abraham Skorka on November 11, 2012, four months before the election of Francis to the pontificate, on the occasion of his receiving a doctorate honoris causa conferred by the Catholic University of Argentina from the hands of Jorge Bergoglio, at that time archbishop of Buenos Aires and cardinal primate of Argentina, who listened attentively to the rabbi’s speech and warmly applauded it:

«I ask God to multiply those who fight for the truth, beyond explanations and theological points of view, beyond theological differences. We must create a human reality, a different human reality. We await the Messiah, but for him to arrive we must prepare the earth, we must make way for him. I believe he will come when God wills, God will reveal himself to humanity when he judges it opportune. But I believe that God awaits us also. Thank you very much.»

To conclude this section, here is a short passage from Evangelii Gaudium in which Francis explains that the Church must enrich herself with the “values” of Talmudic Judaism that rejects Our Lord Jesus Christ:

«God continues to work among the people of the Old Covenant and to bring forth treasures of wisdom which flow from their encounter with his word. For this reason, the Church also is enriched when she receives the values of Judaism. » § 249

One is stupefied before such words. What are these “values of Judaism” capable of enriching the Church? Is it their obstinate rejection of their only Messiah and Savior, Jesus Christ? Or perhaps their subversive and anti-Christian internationalism, prelude to the world reign of the Antichrist? I ask myself: what more is needed to convince oneself that Francis has betrayed the Church and has placed himself entirely at the service of the Synagogue?

4. Some blatant heresies

A clarification: indeed, heresies are found in all the topics addressed in this presentation. Here I will only reiterate a few that are particularly egregious, because they show the radical incompatibility between what Francis says and divine revelation.

For example, he proclaims “live and let live is the first step to peace and happiness.” So, for him, it is not faith in Our Lord Jesus Christ that constitutes the first step toward peace and happiness, but the fact of living one’s life as one wishes, leaving others to do likewise. Thus he is telling us that true peace and true happiness are not gifts of God but the fruit of human endeavor.

---

22 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/pope-francis-jewish-community-statue_us_56081281e4b0af3706dca278
24 Replying to the Argentinean journalist Pablo Calvo on July 7, 2014 for the magazine Viva: http://www.novusordowatch.org/wire/interview-no-11-francis.htm
Note that this phrase is part of the *Ten Commandments of Happiness*, which he enumerated during an interview with an Argentine magazine in July 2014, during which Francis did not deign even once to name God or Our Lord Jesus Christ.

Here is a sentence from his first Apostolic Exhortation, *Evangelii Gaudium*:

«We should not think, however, that the Gospel message must always be communicated by fixed formulations learned by heart or by specific words which express an absolutely invariable content.» §129

You have read that right: no precise words and no invariable content. This is the quintessential modernist heresy condemned by Saint Pius X. To convince oneself, one need only read the encyclical *Pascendi*.

Here is another citation, taken from his interview with Father Antonio Spadaro:

«Yes, in this quest to seek and find God in all things there is still an area of uncertainty. There must be. If a person says that he met God with total certainty and is not touched by a margin of uncertainty, then this is not good.» 25

Must one be reminded that the theological virtue of faith demands certainty and the unwavering acquiescence to God’s revealed truth, and to entertain a voluntary doubt in this regard constitutes a grave sin? Here is what the Catechism of Saint Pius X says:

Q: Are we certain of the truths the Church teaches us?
A: We are most certain of the truths the Church teaches, because Jesus Christ pledged His word that the Church should never be led into error.
Q: By what sin is the Faith lost?
A: Faith is lost by denying or voluntarily doubting even a single article proposed for our belief. 26

Francis insisted on this point in a talk with Italian youth at *Villa Nazareth* in Rome on June 18, 2016. To a young man who asked: “Have you ever found yourself in a crisis of faith?” Francis replied:

«So many times I find myself in crisis with faith and sometimes even I had the nerve to reproach Jesus: But why do You allow this? and even when in doubt: But this will be the truth, or will it be a dream? And that as a young man, as a seminarian, a priest, a religious, Bishop and Pope. A Christian who has not felt this, ever, that has not gone through a crisis of faith, is missing something: a Christian who is satisfied with a little worldliness.» 27

26 Catechism of Saint Pius X, Section on Theological Virtues - On Faith
27 http://www.romereports.com/2016/06/20/pope-francis-he-who-has-not-had-a-crisis-of-faith-is-missing-something
What Francis is saying to the youth is that doubting the truths of the Catholic faith is a good thing and those who do not do this are mediocre and worldly Christians. Imagine a catechist who would say to his students that he is constantly doubting what he is teaching them and that this seems to him not only beneficial, but also necessary, in order to become a good Christian. Well, here we have a so-called pope, supreme doctor of the Catholic faith, who says to the faithful something like this:

“Dear brothers and sisters, in order to become authentic Christians I encourage you to not hesitate to question your faith, taking example from me, as I have never ceased to do so through each of the many stages of my long life, and I continue to do so even now that I have become the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Moreover, I wish to point out that if you refuse to do so you will be among the weak and worldly Christians incapable of advancing toward the “existential peripheries” and of practicing the “culture of encounter.”

The conclusion is obvious, and it is distressing to see how practically no one is aware of it: Francis does not have the Catholic faith, because he teaches that faith and certainty are incompatible and that in matters of religion one must leave a place for doubt. But here is another counter-truth:

«To dialogue means to believe that the other has something worthwhile to say, and to entertain his or her point of view and perspective. Engaging in dialogue does not mean renouncing our own ideas and traditions, but the claim that they alone are valid or absolute.»

Which is to say that, for Francis, Catholicism is only one “tradition” among others, and by no means the truth revealed by God Himself. Thus, Catholic dogma would be reduced to “one’s own ideas and traditions.” In other words, it is only a matter of opinions. It follows that religious truth would not be conceived as absolute, certain, invariable. He teaches afterwards, perfectly consistent with himself, that:

«Religion has the right to express its opinion in the service of the people, but God in creation has set us free: it is not possible to interfere spiritually in the life of a person.»

It is always the same thing: religious truth, “unique and absolute” does not exist; one cannot attain truth with certainty; there are only “opinions” and these are all worthy of respect, to the extent that they respect the “inalienable dignity of the human person.” For Francis, the Christian who would seek doctrinal clarity and certainty would be taking the wrong path, and he who would remain attached to the past would miss the train of progress, enclosing himself in a static view of things. While this may seem surreal, it is exactly what Francis said to Father Antonio Spadaro in August of 2013, in his interview for the Jesuit magazine La Civiltà Cattolica:

28 http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/messages/communications/documents/papa-francesco_20140124_messaggio-comunicazioni-sociali.html
«If the Christian is a restorationist, a legalist, if he wants everything clear and safe, then he will find nothing. Tradition and memory of the past must help us to have the courage to open up new areas to God. Those who today always look for disciplinarian solutions, those who long for an exaggerated doctrinal ‘security’, those who stubbornly try to recover a past that no longer exists -they have a static and inward-directed view of things.»

Here is another falsehood, whose essence undermines the very existence of Christianity:

«Proselytism is a pompous absurdity with no sense. It is necessary to know one another, to hear one another, and to expand the knowledge of the world that surrounds us. It happens to me that after an encounter I want to have another because new ideas emerge and new needs are discovered. This is what is important: to know one another, to listen to one another, to expand the circle of thoughts. The world is crossed by roads that draw close and move apart, but the important thing is that they lead towards the Good.»

Obviously, if there are only “opinions” in religious matters, what is the point of “proselytizing?” The important thing is to dialogue, to open oneself to the thinking of others, whatever it be, because this will help us to “expand the range of our thoughts.” Can you imagine for a moment what fruits the preaching of the Apostles would have had if they had spoken like this to the Greeks and Romans? To ask the question is equivalent to giving the answer.

According to Francis, the Church should not preserve the dogma of the faith unchanged and proclaim it to the world in order to convert it to Christ, but She must change her faith to adapt to a society that is no longer Christian:

«The world has changed and the Church cannot close herself in presumed interpretations of dogma. We must deal with social conflicts, old and new, and seek to give a hand to reassure, not stigmatize nor simply reprove.»

And here Francis explains the same thing in other words: to have “credibility” today, the Church must sense the “aroma” of the men of our times and let himself be immersed in it. This is what is called being consistent with his own ideas.

«To find what the Lord asks of his Church today, we must lend an ear to the debates of our time and perceive the “fragrance” of the men of this age, so as to be permeated with their joys and

---
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hopes, with their griefs and anxieties (cf. Gaudium et Spes, n. 1). At that moment we will know how to propose the good news on the family with credibility.»

The contempt and hatred shown by Francis regarding the Church’s dogma and moral teaching are displayed in a special way in the following declaration:

«We cannot insist only on issues related to abortion, gay marriage and the use of contraceptive methods. This is not possible. [...] The dogmatic and moral teachings of the church are not all equivalent. The church’s pastoral ministry cannot be obsessed with the transmission of a disjointed multitude of doctrines to be imposed insistently.

Here are two other citations which prove the radical religious indifferentism of Francis. In the first, he maintains that “the Spirit” (sic) acts in all religions, and in the second, he affirms that the religion of children has no importance, so long as they have enough to eat:

«Anyone who wants to bring into this world a family which teaches children to be excited by every gesture aimed at overcoming evil -a family which shows that the Spirit is alive and at work -will encounter our gratitude and our appreciation. Whatever the family, people, religion or region to which they belong!»

«If there is a child that is hungry and has no education, what should matter to us is that he gets food and education. I don’t care if this education is given by Catholics, Protestants, Orthodox or Jews. What matters is that this child receives an education and ceases to be hungry.»

You heard it right: the matter does not interest him. It could not be more clear. I ask myself: what more is needed to convince oneself that this man does not profess the Catholic faith at all, but a naturalistic humanism in perfect accord with that of Freemasonry? Once again, let us try to imagine for a moment Saint Peter or Saint Paul explaining to their contemporaries that the religion they profess has absolutely no importance, and that the only thing that matters is that poverty be eradicated and everyone can satisfy his hunger. The actual situation is so absurd that one can hardly conceive that after more than three years of uttering such rubbish, the great majority of Catholics continue to consider this man as the legitimate Supreme Pontiff of the Church.

33 Address at the vigil of the opening of the Extraordinary Synod of Bishops on October 4, 2014
34 Interview with Father Antonio Spadaro
36 Interview with Gerson Camarotti of Brazilian television in July 2013
I can’t help but think of the story of Little Red Riding Hood with the little girl continuing to call “Grandmother” the one who is clearly a voracious wolf that wants only her death. And I also think of the incredible naïveté of those “conservatives” addressing numerous petitions to Francis, asking him to “get back in line” or “clarify his ambiguities” or “renounce” his pontificate. It is like imagining Little Red Riding Hood begging the wolf to be kind enough not to devour her, and imploring him to leave her grandmother’s house immediately…

5. The destruction of marriage and the abolition of sin through false mercy

With his second Apostolic Exhortation, entitled Amoris Laetitia (the joy of love), Francis has reached a new level of iniquity. In fact, he has culminated the long process of subversion resulting in the publication of this document, a process encompassing the two Synods of Bishops of 2014 and 2015 and an incredible quantity of documents and indigestible reports, filled with all kinds of omissions, ambiguities, manipulations and deceits.

In view of the unprecedented length of this document (58,000 words), cleverly conceived with a view to disseminating all sorts of errors and time bombs in multiple spheres of faith and morality, and not only as regards the admission of the « remarried » to the sacraments, as is often mistaken, I shall content myself with presenting some particularly harmful extracts.

As soon as Francis begins, he sets the tone of the document, literally abolishing the role of the magisterium, in favor of doctrinal relativism erected as the only rule:

«Since “time is greater than space”, I would make it clear that not all discussions of doctrinal, moral or pastoral issues need to be settled by interventions of the magisterium. Unity of teaching and practice is certainly necessary in the Church, but this does not preclude various ways of interpreting some aspects of that teaching or drawing certain consequences from it. [....] Each country or region, moreover, can seek solutions better suited to its culture and sensitive to its traditions and local needs.»  § 3

Here Francis not only sets forth his continual gnostic fantasy according to which “time is superior to space,” but he has the incredible audacity to show us with a condescending tone that he intends to “remind” us of it, shamelessly, as if nothing happened, as if it were an article of faith when instead it is a complete novelty that he is the first and only one to present in 2000 years of Christianity, when it is only a philosophical aberration completely devoid of sense, except in the perspective of evolution.

Francis had set forth this idea for the first time in Evangelii Gaudium; I will repeat the entire passage because it shows us his gnostic thinking and also because, if one takes it with a sense of humor, I am convinced that it will provide a moment of relaxation from laughing at such...
A constant tension exists between fullness and limitation. Fullness evokes the desire for complete possession, while limitation is a wall set before us. Broadly speaking, “time” has to do with fullness as an expression of the horizon which constantly opens before us, while each individual moment has to do with limitation as an expression of enclosure. People live poised between each individual moment and the greater, brighter horizon of the utopian future as the final cause which draws us to itself. Here we see a first principle for progress in building a people: time is greater than space. » § 222

It’s not clear? Come now, a little effort, please! For greater clarity, here is a paraphrase of this “pontifical” text:

«There is a fullness between the bipolar tension and the boundary. The will of fullness brings about the possession of the boundary which is like a wall before us. The fullness, in a broad sense, refers to the horizon which is expressed, and the moment is the expression of a space which is out there. People tend toward the experience unfolding in the light of time in the precise moment in which the appearance of a greater horizon carries us toward the utopia that attracts us as a final cause. It is here that a people arise to construct the principle that permits us to advance: space opens toward the time that enlightens. »

Still not there? No matter! A little exercise in German idealism and everything will be clear as crystal. Be careful, because one is assumed to be before a magisterial text that should expound truths of faith contained in revelation. In reality, with this hermetic babbling worthy of a Hegelian philosopher, Francis alludes to the evolutionary process of human consciousness that unfolds with time, tending infallibly toward the goal that draws it as a final cause, which is non other than the famous Omega Point or Cosmic Christ of his pantheistic master Teilhard de Chardin. This Omega Point represents the ultimate point in the development of consciousness that rises from matter and toward which the universe is moving, the point at which the total union of man, of the world, and of God will consummate.

In the next paragraph Francis explains the meaning of his false principle: it is a necessary and inevitable evolutionary process unfolding in the events of human history. This notion is the ideological foundation of Marxist “progressivism” and it implies a monist vision of reality, with no place for freedom or divine transcendence. We will speak again about it later. Here is the text:

«Time governs spaces, illumines them and makes them links in a constantly expanding chain, with no possibility of return. What we need, then, is to give priority to actions which generate new processes in society and engage other persons and groups who can develop them to the point where they bear fruit in significant historical events. » § 223
But let us return to § 3 of Amoris Laetitia. After reminding us of the absurd principle according to which “time is superior to space”, and which you undoubtedly will not soon forget, Francis explains that in the Church one needs to guard “the unity of doctrine,” but “that should not hinder the subsisting of different interpretations of certain aspects of doctrine.”

To understand how one can blithely hold these contradictory propositions in the same sentence, one should not lose sight that the principle of non-contradiction has absolutely no sense for someone who adheres to the principle of evolution, in which the conflicts, the crises and, precisely, the contradictions, constitute the true engine of progress, the dialectic dynamism that makes possible the progressive ascent of the human spirit toward absolute awareness, that is to say, toward divinization.

Once pluralism and doctrinal relativism are introduced, no one will be surprised if Francis expresses words so stupefying as these:

« [...] we can appreciate the teachings of some Eastern masters who urge us to expand our consciousness, lest we be imprisoned by one limited experience that can blinker us. This expansion of consciousness is not the denial or destruction of desire so much as its broadening and perfection. » § 149

I ask myself: is that a pope who is speaking, or some guru of the new age? Note that Francis says this in speaking of pleasure and sexuality, so one cannot help but think of the Tantra, the esoteric shamanic tradition found in the major oriental religions, notably Hinduism and Buddhism, and which uses sexuality to “expand consciousness”, to attain “illumination”, the “awakening”, that is, the passage from individual consciousness, limited and dualistic, to the state of “superconsciousness” proper to the divinity. No need to explain that this is total pantheism.

Afterwards, as a good apostle of feminism and egalitarianism, Francis took the opportunity to undermine the authority of the head of family, explaining that the teaching of Saint Paul is none other than a “cultural matrix” (!!!):

«Every form of sexual submission must be clearly rejected. This includes all improper interpretations of the passage in the Letter to the Ephesians where Paul tells women to “be subject to your husbands” (Eph 5:22). This passage mirrors the cultural categories of the time, but our concern is not with its cultural matrix but with the revealed message that it conveys. » § 156

In another passage Francis claims that consecrated virginity is not a more excellent state of life than marriage.

«Reflecting on this, Saint John Paul II noted that the biblical texts “give no reason to assert the ‘inferiority’ of marriage, nor the ‘superiority’ of virginity or celibacy” based on sexual abstinence. Rather than speak absolutely of the superiority of virginity, it should be enough to
point out that the different states of life complement one another, and consequently that some can be more perfect in one way and others in another.» § 159

This is really bad news for both Francis and John Paul II, because they fall hard under the anathema of the Council of Trent:

«If any one saith, that the marriage state is to be placed above the state of virginity, or of celibacy, and that it is not better and more blessed to remain in virginity, or in celibacy, than to be united in matrimony; let him be anathema. » (Mt 19:11; 1 Co 7:25; 1 Co 7:38-40) - [Session XXIV, 10th Canon on the sacrament of marriage]

John Paul II and Francis are thus anathematized by the Church since they explicitly deny that which the Church clearly affirms. They both pretend to be Catholic, but they are absolutely not, because they do not profess the faith of the Church.

Pius XII repeated this dogmatic truth in his 1954 encyclical Sacra Virginitas:

«It is first and foremost for the foregoing reasons that, according to the teaching of the Church, holy virginity surpasses marriage in excellence. Our Divine Redeemer had already given it to His disciples as a counsel for a more perfect life. St. Paul, after having said that the father who gives his daughter in marriage “does well,” adds immediately “and he that gives her not, does better.” [...] Virginity is preferable to marriage then, as We have said, above all else because it has a higher aim: that is to say, it is a very efficacious means for devoting oneself wholly to the service of God, while the heart of married persons will remain more or less “divided.” (§ 24) [...] This doctrine of the excellence of virginity and of celibacy and of their superiority over the married state was, as We have already said, revealed by our Divine Redeemer and by the Apostle of the Gentiles; so too, it was solemnly defined as a dogma of divine faith by the holy council of Trent, and explained in the same way by all the holy Fathers and Doctors of the Church.» (§ 32)

Then Francis pleads for reintegration into the life of the Church of all those who are in an “irregular” situation:

«It is a matter of reaching out to everyone, of needing to help each person find his or her proper way of participating in the ecclesial community and thus to experience being touched by an unmerited, unconditional and gratuitous mercy. No one can be condemned for ever, because that is not the logic of the Gospel! Here I am not speaking only of the divorced and remarried, but of everyone, in whatever situation they find themselves.» § 297

“Everyone” means “everyone”, right? Which is to say, concubines, the divorced-“remarried”, homosexuals, supporters of abortion and gay “marriage”, etc. And yet Francis should know that nobody is excluded from the Church “forever”, but on condition that they decide to change their

38 http://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-xii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_25031954_sacra-virginitas.html
life! The problem is that, for him, one must integrate everybody, whatever their situation may be, which is to say including those who have no intention of ending their scandalous life. And then considers words such as these:

«Then he shall say to them also that shall be on his left hand: Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels. » (Mt 25:41)

It is in fact Our Savior who said this. But for a gnostic, these propositions are inadmissible, because thanks to the evolutionary process, everyone reaches his end, and that is divinization. Recall here these words of Francis to Eugenio Scalfari:

« Our species, like others, will be extinguished, but the light of God, that will not be extinguished, which in the end will invade all souls and then everything will be in all. »

Here Francis proclaims universal salvation by assimilation into the divine essence. In this view of things, it goes without saying that the idea that someone could be “condemned” has absolutely no sense. It is pure pantheism, and we will come back to this because it is the foundational error of the discourses and praxis of Bergoglio.

Then he explains that if one lives in adultery with “proven fidelity” and a “generous giving of self” (we are not making this up!), even though it is not an “ideal” situation (!!!), one can still be reintegrated, by means of “discernment” and “adequate distinction” of pastors, which, obviously, changes everything!

«The divorced who have entered a new union, for example, can find themselves in a variety of situations, which should not be pigeonholed or fit into overly rigid classifications leaving no room for a suitable personal and pastoral discernment. One thing is a second union consolidated over time, with new children, proven fidelity, generous self giving, Christian commitment, a consciousness of its irregularity and of the great difficulty of going back without feeling in conscience that one would fall into new sins. [....] It must remain clear that this is not the ideal which the Gospel proposes for marriage and the family. The Synod Fathers stated that the discernment of pastors must always take place ‘by adequately distinguishing’, with an approach which ‘carefully discerns situations’. We know that no ‘easy recipes’ exist. » § 298

This relates to situational ethics, which reduces morality to subjective relativism: it is enough to consider the circumstances, there are no longer objectively evil acts, pure and simple, whatever the situation. Christian marriage with its implied indissolubility is no longer normative but becomes an “ideal” which is not attainable for everyone. Thus we are forced to bring to light the “positive values” found in “irregular” situations (concubinage, adultery, homosexual relations, etc.): “proven fidelity, generous gift of self, Christian duty” etc. Is there need to state that such propositions are nothing but atrocious lies and can only come from the father of lies?

39 Interview with Eugenio Scalfari on September 24, 2013, published on October 1 in La Repubblica
Here is what Pius XII said about situational ethics during an address in 1952 at the International Congress of the World Federation of Young Catholic Women:

“This new ethic is so outside the Faith and Catholic principles that even a child if he knows his catechism will realize and understand this. It is not difficult to recognize how the new moral system derives from existentialism, which whether it makes an abstraction of God, or simply denies Him, in any case turns man on himself.”

This is exactly the opposite of what Francis said. Here to illustrate are four extracts from Amoris Laetitia:

“What is possible is simply a renewed encouragement to undertake a responsible personal and pastoral discernment of particular cases, one which would recognize that, since ‘the degree of responsibility is not equal in all cases’, the consequences or effects of a rule need not necessarily always be the same.” § 300

“[....] It is true that at times we act as arbiters of grace rather than its facilitators. But the Church is not a tollhouse; it is the house of the Father, where there is a place for everyone, with all their problems.” § 310

“It is petty simply to consider whether or not an individual’s actions correspond to a general law or rule, because that is not enough to discern and ensure full fidelity to God in the concrete life of a human being.” § 304

“This offers us a framework and a setting which help us avoid a cold bureaucratic morality in dealing with more sensitive issues. Instead, it sets us in the context of a pastoral discernment filled with merciful love, which is ever ready to understand, forgive, accompany, hope, and above all integrate. That is the mindset which should prevail in the Church and lead us to open our hearts to those living on the outermost fringes of society.” § 312

And here, finally, is a fifth and last citation, taken from his homily at the Casa Santa Marta on June 16, 2016 in which Francis qualifies the traditional Catholic doctrine as simply heretical. The situation is grotesque: this man displays an unheard of effrontery, he believes himself permitted to do anything, he stops at nothing, he lies and blasphemes as he breathes, and no one dares stand up to him. But what is most deplorable is that apparently almost no one seems concerned by this inconceivable situation. Here is the citation:

“This [is] the healthy realism of Catholicism. It is not Catholic [to say] ‘either this or nothing:’ This is not Catholic, this is heretical. Jesus always knows how to accompany us, he gives us the ideal, he accompanies us towards the ideal, he frees us from the chains of the law’s rigidity and

---
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But let us return to the allocution of Pius XII to better grasp the opposition between Catholic doctrine and the fantasies held by Francis:

«From essential relations between man and God, between man and man, between spouses, between parents and children, on essential relations in the community of the family, in the Church, in the State, the following results among other things, [here follows a long list of sinful behaviors, including adultery and fornication] all of which is gravely forbidden by Divine Law. There is nothing to question. Whatever the individual situation, there is no choice but to obey.»

This is really not good news for Francis and his “personal and pastoral appropriate discernment”. Pius XII proclaimed that in face of certain objectively disordered actions, “regardless of the individual situation, there is no other choice but to obey.” Francis, on the other hand, declares: “We know there are not simple solutions” and pleads for a “discerning pastoral approach.” Who is in error? I will even go further and say: Who is the true pope? Is it not the one whose teaching conforms to Church doctrine? One must ask: how is it possible for two legitimate pastors to give speeches that are diametrically opposed in matters of faith and morals? Could a contradiction in logic be part of the deposit of faith? Since I am not prepared to embrace Hegelian dialectic, I can only respond in the negative.

Taking as an example the fall of Adam and Eve, one could say that while Pius XII would say “Do not eat and do not touch, or you will die,” Francis would retort: “Not at all, you will not die! Come, dear children, approach the Holy Table with confidence, you will be welcomed with my mercy, your eyes will be opened and you will be as gods, and at last you will discover the joy of love.” Here is another extract from the document:

«Their participation [that of the divorced-‘remarried’] can be expressed in different ecclesial services, which necessarily requires discerning which of the various forms of exclusion currently practiced in the liturgical, pastoral, educational and institutional framework, can be surmounted. Such persons need to feel not as excommunicated members of the Church, but instead as living members, able to live and grow in the Church [...]» § 299

Here is the true goal of Francis: the pure and simple abolition of sin. According to him one can live in the state of adultery and at the same time be “a living member of the Church.” That’s it. And nobody is bothered. The fact that a billion Catholics can continue to call this diabolic person “Holy Father” is totally beyond my comprehension...
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Here are two other bits of literature from *Fornicationis Laetitia*, the final Bergoglian *Eschatological Expectoration*:

«For this reason, a pastor cannot feel that it is enough simply to apply moral laws to those living in “irregular” situations, as if they were stones to throw at people’s lives. This would bespeak the closed heart of one used to hiding behind the Church’s teachings, “sitting on the chair of Moses and judging at times with superiority and superficiality difficult cases and wounded families”. [...] Because of forms of conditioning and mitigating factors, it is possible that in an objective situation of sin -which may not be subjectively culpable, or fully such -a person can be living in God’s grace, can love and can also grow in the life of grace and charity, while receiving the Church’s help to this end. Discernment must help to find possible ways of responding to God and growing in the midst of limits. By thinking that everything is black and white, we sometimes close off the way of grace and of growth, and discourage paths of sanctification which give glory to God. » § 305

«At the same time, from our awareness of the weight of mitigating circumstances –psychological, historical and even biological– it follows that “without detracting from the evangelical ideal, there is a need to accompany with mercy and patience the eventual stages of personal growth as these progressively appear”, making room for “the Lord’s mercy, which spurs us on to do our best”. I understand those who prefer a more rigorous pastoral care which leaves no room for confusion. But I sincerely believe that Jesus wants a Church attentive to the goodness which the Holy Spirit sows in the midst of human weakness, a Mother who, while clearly expressing her objective teaching, “always does what good she can, even if in the process, her shoes get soiled by the mud of the street. » [Phrases in quotes are from *Evangelii Gaudium*] § 308

That is the “church” propounded by Francis, under cover of a false notion of mercy: a “church” in which confusion reigns and which does not hesitate to “roll in the mud”. One must declare that this “Bergoglian church” in no way resembles the Catholic Church, the immaculate Spouse of the Lamb, but rather an infernal counter-church ready to sell out to the Antichrist...

On June 16, 2016 in the opening speech of the *Pastoral Congress of the Diocese of Rome*, held in St. Peter’s Basilica, Francis returned to the subject, pushing ungodliness to unimaginable limits. Here are three brief extracts.44

43 Following is a footnote numbered 351 in *Amoris Laetitia*: « In certain cases, this can include the help of the sacraments. Hence, “I want to remind priests that the confessional must not be a torture chamber, but rather an encounter with the Lord’s mercy” (Apostolic Exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium* [24 November 2013], 44: AAS 105 [2013], 1038). I would also point out that the Eucharist “is not a prize for the perfect, but a powerful medicine and nourishment for the weak” (ibid., 47: 1039). »

1. « They prefer to live together, and this is a challenge, it calls for work. Not to say straight away: “Why don’t you get married in Church?” No. Accompany them: wait and cultivate. And cultivate fidelity. »

2. « Yet really, I say that I have seen a great deal of fidelity in these cohabiting couples, a great deal of fidelity; and I am certain that this is a true marriage, they have the grace of matrimony, precisely because of the fidelity that they have. »

3. « It is the culture of the provisional. This happens everywhere, even in priestly life, in religious life. The provisional. This is why a part of our sacramental marriages are null, because they [the spouses] say: “Yes, for a lifetime”, but they do not know what they are saying, because they have another culture. »

But then, why get married if the majority of marriages are invalid and concubines living in “fidelity” have the grace of marriage? Imagine the deleterious effects that Francis’ words can have on couples going through difficult moments and who try their best to remain faithful to their duties. Why continue to struggle? Isn’t it more sensible to request an annulment, given that the majority of marriages are invalid, and “start a new life”?

In reality, what Francis is saying to concubines is that they need not get married, and to married couples that their marriage has no value. So I can’t help asking: is it possible to conceive a more devastating message with regard to marriage and the family? Can one reasonably believe that such a message could come from the lips of the Vicar of Christ? And the third and final question: does a true disciple of Jesus Christ have the right to remain silent before these diabolical and incessant attacks against the faith and morals of the Church made by the one who in the eyes of the world passes for the Sovereign Pontiff?

6. Globalism and the « eco-encyclical » Laudato Si’

At a time when humanity has totally abandoned God and evil has become the universal morality (abortion, euthanasia, pornography, “gay marriage”, etc.) Francis has decided that the priority of our times must be given to saving the environment and the battle against the so-called global warming.

Here is a brief review of his statements on the subject, beginning with his declaration on June 1, 2016 to representatives of the Institute of Jainology:

“We all love mother Earth, because she is the one who has given us life and safeguards us; I would also call her sister Earth, who accompanies us during the journey of our existence. Our
duty is to take care of her just as we would take care of a mother or of a sister, with responsibility, with tenderness and with peace.”

Francis then thanked the Jains for what they do to protect and care for the earth and said “we remain united within this ideal [...] in the awareness that healing and caring for the Earth is healing and caring for the whole of humanity”.

Here are some facts on this “religion.” For Jainists, the purpose of life is the same as for Hinduism, Buddhism and Sikhism: the believer must arrive at the illumination that ends reincarnations: nirvana. A person must escape from the perpetual flux of reincarnations, samsara, by choices of life, of which the primary that guides all others is that of universal nonviolence. This citation is from the Encyclopedia of Philosophy:

“Cult, internal and external, has only suggestive value and serves to focus the spirit of the faithful on the example of perfect beings that can be imitated, but that cannot be prayed to for intervention in the destiny of man. Man, alone with himself in the end, in the company only of his own effort, can arrive at the asceticism that will bring him to peace beyond all human experience.”

It is then a naturalistic religion, promethean and pantheistic, with the goal of man being to assimilate himself into the cosmos by his own efforts, achieving a state of expanded consciousness or illuminative “superconsciousness”, allowing him to go beyond the state of division or dualism proper to the individual consciousness. But for Francis, these people “protect all of humanity” and are worthy of praise. And in his proverbial mercy, he leaves them prey to their diabolical superstitions, without proposing to them the salvation that comes only from the Cross of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

The following citation will help us to better understand the attitude of Francis; it is taken from his discourse of April 24, 2016 on the occasion of the gathering of the Village of the Earth, organized in Rome by the Focolari to celebrate Earth Day:

“Here, these are the things that come to my mind. How is this done? Simply with the awareness that we all have something in common, we are all human. And in this humanity let us come closer in order to work together. ‘But I am of this religion, of that one...’ It doesn’t matter! Everyone, forward in order to work together. Respect each other, respect! And this is how we will see this miracle: the miracle of a desert that becomes forest.”
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Now all is clear, given that according to Francis it matters little what religion each one professes and the only thing that matters is our “common humanity,” it follows that to preach the Gospel to Jainists has little sense… And he repeats this false “humanist” principle that religious differences do not matter, in his *tweet* of June 9, 2016:

“We need to recognize the values of our common humanity, in the name of which one can and should collaborate and build up.”

And here is the disturbing message that Francis gave to the Brazilian pilgrims at the general audience of August 3, 2016 on the occasion of the *Olympic Games* in Rio de Janeiro, where he explained that “the good fight” consists in achieving a “society of solidarity” for the entire human family, whatever the religious differences:

“In a world which thirsts for peace, tolerance and reconciliation, I hope that the spirit of the Olympic Games may inspire all, participants and spectators, to fight “the good fight” and to finish the race together (cf. 2 Tim 4:7-8), hoping to obtain as a prize not a medal but something far more precious: the achievement of a civilization in which solidarity reigns, based on the recognition that we are all members of a single human family, independent of differences in culture, skin colour or religion.”

Let us have a look now at the encyclical *Laudato Si’*, the Bergoglian ecological manifesto, in which Francis endorses a dual scientific hoax: that of global warming and that of its alleged human causality. The document is founded on very contestable and in fact much disputed scientific data, which nullifies its entire basis. If we add to this the fact that the scientific debates do not concern the magisterium, the absurdity of this text is obvious.

Below, I quote two paragraphs which illustrate very well the Bergoglian absurdity which consists in making, out of the ecology, an essential element of Christianism and, almost, the quintessence of the Gospel:

«I urgently appeal, then, for a new dialogue about how we are shaping the future of our planet. We need a conversation which includes everyone, since the environmental challenge we are undergoing, and its human roots, concern and affect us all... We need a conversation which includes everyone, since the environmental challenge we are undergoing, and its human roots, concern and affect us all. [...] We require a new and universal solidarity. » § 14

«The external deserts in the world are growing, because the internal deserts have become so vast. For this reason, the ecological crisis is also a summons to profound interior conversion. It must be said that some committed and prayerful Christians, [...] tend to ridicule expressions of concern for the environment. Others are passive; they choose not to change their habits and
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thus become inconsistent. So what they all need is an ‘ecological conversion’ [...] Living our vocation to be protectors of God’s handiwork is essential to a life of virtue; it is not an optional or a secondary aspect of our Christian experience.» § 217

So according to Francis, we are called to an “ecological conversion”.51 And thus we will succeed in building “the future of the planet,” working together with all who are part of our “common humanity,” to establish a “new universal solidarity.” And this grotesque parody of Christian conversion he dares to present as an essential element of the Gospel. I confess that when I am able to put aside the tragic aspect of the situation, I can’t help finding this discourse quite comical, imbued with a tinge of a surrealistic humor.

Since all of this is absurd, why not quote the authority of a schismatic “patriarch” of Constantinople, in this case Bartholomew, the first of the series as his Argentinian counterpart, zealous apostle of ecumenism and interreligious dialogue, ardent partisan of the entry of Turkey in the European Union, and who considers the defense of the environment as part of his religious mission. Here are Francis’ words:

«Patriarch Bartholomew has spoken in particular of the need for each of us to repent of the ways we have harmed the planet, for ‘inasmuch as we all generate small ecological damage’, we are called to acknowledge ‘our contribution, smaller or greater, to the disfigurement and destruction of creation’. He has repeatedly stated this firmly and persuasively, challenging us to acknowledge our sins against creation: ‘For human beings to destroy the biological diversity of God’s creation; for human beings to degrade the integrity of the earth by causing changes in its climate, by stripping the earth of its natural forests or destroying its wetlands; for human beings to contaminate the earth’s waters, its land, its air, and its life -these are sins’. For ‘to commit a crime against the natural world is a sin against ourselves and a sin against God’.» § 8

Truly hilarious. Thank you, “Pope” Francis, thank you “Patriarch” Bartholomew, for this great moment of amusement. It’s good to relax a bit thanks to your ecological extravagances. I confess that I laughed long and often while reading those many paragraphs of this improbable “ecoen cyclical.”

51 In his Message for the Celebration of the World Day of Prayer for the Care on September 1, 2016, Francis gave some examples concerning this “ecological conversion”:
«Examining our consciences, repentance and confession to our Father who is rich in mercy lead to a firm purpose of amendment [!!!]. This in turn must translate into concrete ways of thinking and acting that are more respectful of creation. For example: “avoiding the use of plastic and paper, reducing water consumption, separating refuse, cooking only what can reasonably be consumed, showing care for other living beings, using public transport or carpooling, planting trees, turning off unnecessary lights, or any number of other practices” (Laudato Si’, 211). We must not think that these efforts are too small to improve our world. They “call forth a goodness which, albeit unseen, inevitably tends to spread” and encourage “a prophetic and contemplative lifestyle, one capable of deep enjoyment free of the obsession with consumption” (ibid, 212, 222).
I hope the readers will not reproach me if, to prolong this moment of fun, I try their patience by reading the beginning of Bartholomew’s discourse at the *Summit of Consciences for the Climate* (I’m not making this up!) at Paris in July of 2015, in the presence of more than forty political and religious personalities of the entire world, gathered to answer the question: *Why be concerned about the climate?* And to launch together a *Call to conscience for the climate*, a meeting that took place four months before the COP21 (climate conference) organized at Paris by the United Nations.

« [...] Dear Nicolas Hulot, special envoy of the president of the Republic for the protection of the planet, Eminences, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen representatives of cults, Ladies and Gentlemen: In a forceful call from Manilla, jointly by the French and Philippine authorities, in February 2015, we were all called, individually and collectively, to act on behalf of the climate. Today more than ever we recall the urgency of global justice, of a world solidarity both financial and technological. The call ended saying: “We call [...] all actors, States [...] and citizens to fully play their role in the battle against climate change and in particular against its effects, and the reduction of risks of natural catastrophes linked to the climate, through individual efforts or cooperative initiatives.»

And, toward the end is a choice bit worth its weight in gold. Be careful, cardiac patients, to laugh with moderation…

«To convert, one must understand interior conversion as the point of departure for exterior conversion. Scientists unceasingly put in first place the necessity of a radical change in our ways of life so as to limit the polluting actions that affect climate changes. It is a question of a reality that Christianity calls metanoia, a total turnaround of life. This, in the patristic tradition of the Fathers of the desert -these spiritual persons who through centuries of ascetic experience forged a true view of humanity- encourages us to constantly question the necessity of our needs, in order to disassociate that which comes from cravings from that which comes from the good. Ethics and morality are not far from each other and must permit the emergence of the rights of the earth itself.»

We are assured, in all seriousness, that there is only a step from Christian *metanoia* to ecological conversion, with the support of the Desert Fathers and passing through the emergence of the “rights of the earth”. Are we not in the presence of two identical false prophets: Francis and Bartholomew? As the proverb says: “Birds of a feather flock together”. It seems that “protecting the planet” and fighting “against climate change” have become the new recipe for salvation. If I were in the place of Francis and Bartholomew, I would be worried, all the same…

---
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Elsewhere in the encyclical *Laudato Si’* Francis makes himself the champion of the *Charter of the Earth*, the eco-global UN initiative launched in 2000, and to this day an internationally juridical reference morally binding for all governments, until such time that it becomes politically binding. It is a product of the illuminist lodges, a mixture of socialism, pantheism, laicism, and feminism… an entirely destructive instrument, in line with the various declarations on the *Rights of Man*. Here is what Francis says:

«The Earth Charter* asked us to leave behind a period of self-destruction and make a new start, but we have not as yet developed a universal awareness needed to achieve this. Here, I would echo that courageous challenge: “As never before in history, common destiny beckons us to seek a new beginning [...] Let ours be a time remembered for the awakening of a new reverence for life, the firm resolve to achieve sustainability, the quickening of the struggle for justice and peace, and the joyful celebration of life’. » § 207

Here is a new starting point for humanity without God and for the celebration of life without Jesus Christ. Now we have a sort of new “gospel” of the illuminists aimed at establishing the New World Order that will guarantee “justice” and “peace” for a humanity that has turned its back on its adorable Redeemer and that has fallen completely in the snares of Satan, to whom Francis is incontestably a devoted servant and distinguished representative.

Here are three brief passages of this globalist document having Francis as its champion in his encyclical:

«*Humanity is part of a vast evolving universe. Earth, our home, is alive with a unique community of life. The forces of nature make existence a demanding and uncertain adventure, but Earth has provided the conditions essential to life’s evolution.»*  

«*Eliminate discrimination in all its forms, such as that based on race, color, sex, sexual orientation, religion, language, and national, ethnic or social origin. Affirm the right of indigenous peoples to their spirituality, knowledge, lands and resources and to their related practice of sustainable livelihoods.»*  

«*In order to build a sustainable global community, the nations of the world must renew their commitment to the United Nations, fulfill their obligations under existing international agreements, and support the implementation of Earth Charter principles with an international legally binding instrument on environment and development.»*

Here then are the objectives of the *Earth Charter*, as well as the “eco-encyclical” *Laudato Si’*: above all the establishment of a world government charged with enforcing on a global scale the

---
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requisite measures to “save the planet” from “climate change”, and secondly the pursuit of destruction of Christianity from within, so as to finally integrate it with the other “noble religious traditions”, and thus establish a universal religion, a monstrous parody of Catholicism, whose role would be to endorse the anti-Christian New World Order. So what Francis wants, working hand in hand with the United Nations, is none other than the realization of a political and religious globalism that prepares the way for the Man of Sin.

Francis returns to this subject in his video of prayer intentions for February 2016, in which he said:

«The relationship between poverty and the fragility of the planet requires another way of managing the economy and measuring progress conceiving a new way of living. Because we need a change that unites us all. Free from the slavery of consumerism. This month I make a special request: that we may take good care of creation -a gift freely given- cultivating it and protecting it for future generations. Caring for our common home.»

And to this he adds a piece in his tweet of June 8, 2016, in which he says:

«Let us protect the oceans, which are common global goods, essential for water and the variety of living beings!»

If all this were not tragic, it would make us die laughing at such absurd declarations: contemporary society rejects God and the Church en masse, abandoning itself to every type of aberration that cries to heaven for vengeance (abortion, pornography, “gay marriage”, euthanasia, etc.), and here we have Francis pleading for the protection of the oceans. What’s wrong with this picture?

7. Shocking blasphemies

What was said in the chapter on heresies must be repeated in regard to blasphemies, because when speaking of the words and gestures of Francis one finds them everywhere, whatever the subject. Nevertheless, I have decided to dedicate a section to blasphemies in order to highlight some that are particularly detestable. And it seems important to add another clarification: if there is one distinctive trait in the pontificate of Francis, one trademark of his style, one common denominator that gives coherence to his words and actions, one stance found permanently in everything this man says and does, it is precisely blasphemy. Francis blasphemes with each breath, spouts his insults against all that is sacred with a prodigious flair, a diabolic enthusiasm and an extraordinary insolence. Here are a few items chosen from the multiple and incessant Bergoglian outbursts:

«And I believe in God, not in a Catholic God, there is no Catholic God, there is God. »
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This sentence alone, said six months after his election and naturally repeated by the world press, would be enough to arouse condemnation without appeal for the prodigious Argentinian maligner. But since this did not happen, it proves, if there were any need, the incredible state of spiritual, intellectual and moral delinquency of Catholics. And if anyone thinks this sentence of Francis can permit an interpretation that is benign, orthodox, in conformity with the magisterium, and does not see in it a colossal sacrilege, a paroxysmal hatred of God and the Church with all the malice of the demon who speaks through the mouth of this mindless man, I am sorry to say it, he has a very serious problem…

According to Francis, Jesus had to ask pardon of his parents for his “escapade” in the Temple of Jerusalem. And his parents would have expressed their “reprimand.” Certainly, Francis has a sense of timing, seeing that he wanted to express this sick compliment to Jesus, Joseph and Mary during his homily for the festivities of the Holy Family on December 27, 2015 in the Basilica of Saint Peter. Please excuse the length of this citation, but it’s needed to fully expose the gravity of his words:

«At the end of that pilgrimage, Jesus returned to Nazareth and was obedient to his parents (cf. Lk 2:51). This image also contains a beautiful teaching about our families. A pilgrimage does not end when we arrive at our destination, but when we return home and resume our everyday lives, putting into practice the spiritual fruits of our experience. We know what Jesus did on that occasion. Instead of returning home with his family, he stayed in Jerusalem, in the Temple, causing great distress to Mary and Joseph who were unable to find him. For this little ‘escapade’, Jesus probably had to beg forgiveness of his parents. The Gospel doesn’t say this, but I believe that we can presume it. Mary’s question, moreover, contains a certain reproach, revealing the concern and anguish which she and Joseph felt. Returning home, Jesus surely remained close to them, as a sign of his complete affection and obedience. Moments like these become part of the pilgrimage of each family; the Lord transforms the moments into opportunities to grow, to ask for and to receive forgiveness, to show love and obedience.»

On August 15, 2013 Francis visited the contemplative Poor Clare community in the monastery of Albano. He explained to the religious in a pretended humorous tone that Mary perhaps rebelled against Saint Peter and disobeyed him, and secretly during the night, hidden from sight, she succeeded in arranging that everyone would be saved:

«Vatican Radio interviewed two of the sisters who attended the 45 minute meeting with Francis: the Mother Vicar, Sister Maria Concetta, said that: “the Pope was calm, relaxed as if he had nothing to do or was thinking of nothing. He spoke to us about Mary in a way that was very touching, on this Solemnity of the Assumption. The consecrated woman is a little like Mary. He
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told a sweet story that made us all smile, including himself: Mary is standing at the gates of heaven; Saint Peter doesn’t always open the doors when sinners arrive and so Mary suffers a bit, but does nothing. But at night when the gates of heaven are closed, when no one can see or hear anything, Mary opens the gates of heaven and lets everyone enter.»62

Francis obviously takes a malicious pleasure in offending the Mother of Jesus. According to him, Our Lady at the foot of the Cross would have revolted against God, treating him as a liar. Here are his words during a homily on December 20, 2013 at the Casa Santa Marta:

«She was silent, but how many things did she say in her heart to the Lord! ‘You one day told me that he would be great; that you would give him the throne of David, his father, that he would reign forever, and now I see him here.’ The Virgin was human! And perhaps she wanted to say: Lies! I was deceived!’ »63

Francis repeats this hideous blasphemy several times: here is what he said on May 29, 2015, again in a homily at Casa Santa Marta:

«So often I think of the Virgin Mary, when they gave her the dead body of her Son, all wounded, spit upon, bloody, filthy. And what did the Virgin Mary do? Did she say ‘Carry him away’? No, she embraced him, caressed him. Even the Virgin Mary did not understand. Because in that moment she recalled what the Angel had said to her: ‘He will be King, great, a prophet...’; and with that wounded body in her arms, having suffered so much before dying, surely within herself she would have wanted to say to the Angel: ‘Liar! I was deceived.’ Even she had no answer.»64

Let us try to decipher the lesson Francis gives us regarding the Mother of God and Queen of Angels. According to him, Mary did not understand what happened to Jesus, she did not understand the meaning of His suffering. Mary at the foot of the Cross rebelled against God in her heart. Mary felt herself deceived by the Angel Gabriel at the Annunciation. Mary did not freely and clearly consent to the redemptive sacrifice of her Son. Mary then is not Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows nor the Queen of Martyrs. Mary did not understand the prophecy of Simeon at the presentation of the Child Jesus in the Temple. Mary did not know what she was doing there and she misunderstood the meaning of her mission. Mary did not know what role she was given in the plan of salvation. That is the Bergoglian version of the role played by Our Lady on Good Friday at the foot of the Cross on Golgotha, when the Redemption of the human race took place. Such a version is absolutely Luciferian, and not to acknowledge this is due purely and simply to spiritual blindness.
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But the blasphematory obsession of Francis does not end there. And why should it, given that no one contradicts him and he himself is devoid of any fear of God? According to Francis, it is not only the Most Holy Virgin Mary who blasphemes God but also her Divine Son, Our Lord Jesus Christ. Here are Francis’ words during the homily of September 3, 2015 at the Casa Santa Marta:

«When Jesus lamented: ‘Father, why have you abandoned me?’ was He blaspheming? The mystery is there. So often I have heard people who are living in difficult situations, who have lost much or who feel alone and abandoned, ask: ‘Why? Why?’ They are rebelling against God. And I tell them: ‘Continue to pray like that, because that is also a prayer.’ For it was indeed a prayer when Jesus said to his Father: ‘Why have you abandoned me?’»

And so, according to Francis, Jesus and Mary rebelled against God, and in their distress they blasphemed. But of course it was still a true prayer on their part. And so he encourages those who are suffering to follow this example, rebelling in their turn against God and blaspheming this cruel and evil being who cares nothing about gratuitous and incomprehensible human suffering…

Thus Francis explains that at the very moment when Our Divine Savior accomplished the Redemption of the human race by His voluntary sacrifice of Himself on the altar of the Cross, He would have blasphemed against His Father, rebelling against His salvific plan. And at the same time he explains that Our Lady, at the foot of the Cross, instead of lucidly and freely uniting herself to the redemptive sacrifice of her divine Son, would have blasphemed against the will of God, feeling herself deceived at the Annunciation by the Angel’s promise concerning the mission of Jesus.

According to the incredible reconstruction of Francis, the central moment in the history of Salvation becomes an act of rebellion and blasphemy against God. So the new Adam and the new Eve at Calvary would have done no better than our first parents who acted under the instigation of the Demon and committed the first sin. Salvation then would not be substantially different from the Fall, since their common denominator would be rebellion against the will of God, with Satan at the origin of these two decisive moments in human history.

Here then we have the teaching of Francis to Catholics: pure Luciferianism. Here we have the true face of this false prophet whom the masses of Catholics continue to naively call “Holy Father”, considering him to be the Vicar of Our Lord Jesus Christ. We rub our eyes in disbelief. I will say it again: to not recognize the diabolical character of this man is proof of spiritual blindness. But is it really surprising? Our Lord himself, did not warn us, in his eschatological discourse (Mark 13:22, Matthew 24:24), that the cunning power of false prophets that will precede His second coming will be such as to deceive even the elect, if possible?

---

At the general audience of September 11, 2013 Francis said that Mary and the Church “have defects” but one must know how to “excuse” them and love them “as they are.” Here are his words:

«The Church and the Virgin Mary are mothers, both of them; what is said of the Church can be said also of Our Lady and what is said of Our Lady can also be said of the Church! [...] Do we love the Church as we love our mothers, also taking into account her defects? All mothers have defects, we all have defects, but when we speak of our mother’s defects we gloss over them, we love her as she is. And the Church also has her defects: but we love her just as a mother. Do we help her to be more beautiful, more authentic, more in harmony with the Lord?»

At his press conference during the flight to Manila on January 15, 2015 Francis explained unperturbedly that, thanks to the conciliar “pentecost”, the Church has succeeded in going beyond her old obscurantism and has become respectful of other religions:

«But I believe that the Church has become much more respectful -as I said during the interreligious meeting in Colombo- and appreciative. When we read what the Second Vatican Council said about the values to be found in other religions, the Church has grown greatly in this regard. And yes, there are dark periods in the history of the Church, we must admit, without being ashamed...»

On October 10, 2014 Francis addressed members of the Evangelical Communion of Episcopal Churches at their visit to the Vatican. He began his message with a heinous outrageous joke about the Church, revealing his monstrous hatred toward her:

«Above all, I congratulate you on your courage. Yesterday at the entrance to the synod hall I ran into a Lutheran bishop and I said: ‘Are you here? What courage! Because in another age the Lutherans were burned alive’... [laughter]»

One must note that the purpose of the visit of the evangelicals was to honor Tony Palmer, an Episcopal “bishop” who died a short time before in an automobile accident. He was a good friend of Francis and had seriously thought of converting to Catholicism but was persuaded not to do so by him when he was still Cardinal Bergoglio, because, he explained, it would be more useful for ecumenical dialogue if he remained in Anglicanism. But at the death of his friend, Francis arranged that he be buried with the Catholic Episcopal funeral rite, despite his not being officially converted to Catholicism and he was therefore only a simple layman. It was Leo XIII who, in his encyclical Apostolicae Curae of September 13, 1896, replied negatively to a question about the validity of Anglican orders.
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On July 9, 2015 Francis renewed his insults against the Church during his speech to the Popular Movements of Bolivia, composed of the worst kind of leftist and anticlerical organizations. Here are his words:

«Here I wish to bring up an important issue. Some may rightly say, ‘When the Pope speaks of colonialism, he overlooks certain actions of the Church’. I say this to you with regret: many grave sins were committed against the native peoples of America in the name of God. My predecessors acknowledged this, [...] and I too wish to say it. Like Saint John Paul II, I ask that the Church -I repeat what he said- ‘kneel before God and implore forgiveness for the past and present sins of her sons and daughters’. I would also say, and here I wish to be quite clear [...] I humbly ask forgiveness, not only for the offenses of the Church herself, but also for crimes committed against the native peoples during the so-called conquest of America.»

One must note that beyond the unacceptable blasphemies against the Church for the so-called “many and grave sins” that she allegedly committed against the native people of America “in the name of God”, Francis again becomes the mouthpiece of the enemies of the Church, endorsing the anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish black legend fabricated by the protestants, the “philosophers” and the freemasons, the sworn enemies of Catholicism and Catholic Spain.

The last example of blasphemy that I have chosen is that of denying the miracle of the multiplication of loaves of bread. One should note that this is commonplace in the Bergoglian “magisterium”, because to my knowledge, he has publicly sustained it many times since the day of his election. Here are three citations: the first on May 16, 2013 in his address to the Executive Committee of Caritas International concerning the bread and fishes:

«They were not multiplied. No, it’s not true: they simply were not finished, as the widow’s flour and oil were not finished. They were not finished. To speak of multiplication can lead to error, making one think that it’s magic. No, the grandeur and love of God that He has placed in our hearts is such that, if we want it, that which we have will not finish. Have great trust in that.»

And here is a second citation from his Angelus address of June 2, 2013:

«Jesus then takes those loaves and fish, looks up to heaven, recites the blessing -the reference to the Eucharist is clear- and breaks them and gives them to the disciples who distribute them... and the loaves and fish do not run out, they do not run out! This is the miracle: rather than a multiplication it is a sharing, inspired by faith and prayer. Everyone eats and some is left over: it is the sign of Jesus, the Bread of God for humanity.»

---

69 http://es.radiovaticana.va/storico/2013/05/16/hoy_d%C3%ADa_est%C3%A1_en_peligro_el_hombre%2C_la_personona_humana%2C_la_carne_d/spa-692879
70 http://it.radiovaticana.va/storico/2013/05/16/il_papa_alla_caritas_internationalis_aiutare_i_poveri,_%C3%A8_in_pericol/it1-692785
71 http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/angelus/2013/documents/papa-francesco_angelus_20130602.html
Finally, here is the third example, taken from his homily at Santa Cruz de la Sierra in Bolivia on July 15, 2015:

«Those words of Jesus have a particular resonance for us today: No one needs to be excluded, no one has to be discarded; you yourselves, give them something to eat. Jesus speaks these words to us, here in this square. Yes, no one has to be discarded; you, give them something to eat. Jesus’ way of seeing things leaves no room for the mentality which would cut bait on the weak and those most in need. Taking the lead, he gives us his own example, he shows us the way forward. What he does can be summed up in three words. He takes a little bread and some fish, he blesses them and then gives them to his disciples to share with the crowd. And this is how the miracle takes place. It is not magic or sorcery. With these three gestures, Jesus is able to turn a mentality which discards others into a mindset of communion, a mindset of community.»

So Francis explicitly denies the miraculous character of the multiplication of loaves, which he blasphemously calls “magic”, and he also denies implicitly the divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ, implying that such belief would be equivalent to pure and simple “idolatry”…

In conclusion, here is a passage from the homily of Francis at Casa Santa Marta on June 15, 2013, scarcely three months after his election:

«And when we go to confession, for example, it is not that we tell our sins and God forgives us. We find Jesus Christ and we say to him: this is yours, and I have made you sin once again. And it pleases him, because that was his mission: to make himself sin for us, in order to free us. [...] Christ has made himself sin for me! And my sins are there, in his body, in his soul. This is crazy, but beautiful: it is the truth.»

Such words absolutely would not enter the mind of any pious Christian. No, such atrocious words about Our Lord could only come from an infernal spirit spewing his irrevocable hatred of our adorable Redeemer. Given the unending outrageous blasphemies of Francis, I can only conclude that we are faced with a severe state of diabolical possession, as there seems to be no other possibility to explain this extraordinary phenomenon of ceaselessly outraging every sacred reality for three and a half years, with the circumstance particularly aggravating because it is done by one who is the Vicar of Our Lord Jesus Christ, at least in the eyes of the majority of Catholics.

In my opinion it is high time to raise one’s voice and dare to call things by their name. Please permit me to use this occasion to publicly and solemnly declare, with full awareness of the extreme seriousness of my words, but with the most absolute moral certainty, that Jorge Mario Bergoglio, alias “pope Francis” (although the title Sovereign Blasphemer of the Vatican suits him

---
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better) is possessed by evil spirits who inspire in him all these abominable blasphemies against God, against Our Lord, against Our Lady and against Holy Church.

Saint John in the Apocalypse speaks of a beast with “two horns like those of a lamb but who speaks like a dragon”, whom he also calls the false prophet, that is, he who will place spiritual power in the service of a world government of the Antichrist, in order to make him legitimate in the eyes of the world. Do these prophetic words of the seer of Patmos apply literally to the ignominious person who calls himself Francis? I do not know, but I confess that I consider this possibility more and more seriously…

8. Support for Islam and Muslim immigration in Europe

Here are a few citations for a first look at the position of Francis vis-à-vis Islam. The first is from a speech to clandestine immigrants, the majority Muslims, on January 19, 2014 at the rectory of the Sacred Heart of Jesus church in Rome, where they had been staying, during the World Day for Migrants:

«Sharing our experience in carrying that cross, to expel the illness within our hearts, which embitters our life: it is important that you do this in your meetings. Those that are Christian, with the Bible, and those that are Muslim, with the Quran. The faith that your parents instilled in you will always help you move on.»74

The second is an extract from his homily at Lampedusa on July 8, 2013 where there were clandestine Muslim migrants:

«I also think with affection of those Muslim immigrants who this evening begin the fast of Ramadan, which I trust will bear abundant spiritual fruit.»75

The third is part of the Apostolic Exhortation Evangelii Gaudium:

« [...] and it is admirable to see how Muslims both young and old, men and women, make time for daily prayer and faithfully take part in religious services.» § 25276

For Francis, then, the Koran helps people go forward in the difficulties of life, the Ramadan is a source of spiritual fruit, and participating in Islamic religious rites is an admirable thing. By such proclamations, Francis does nothing but confirm this poor people in the shadows of Mohammedan error. Is this a charitable act on his part for people who unfortunately are not on the path to salvation? And, is this the mission of the Vicar of Christ to praise false religions that turn away from Our Lord Jesus Christ? Is there any need to say that these words to Muslims are
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deceitful and do not conform to the Gospel? Everything in Holy Scripture and the Magisterium contradicts the Bergoglian assertions. It suffices to read Saint Paul to know this.

But nowadays, sadly, one must recall this, because Vatican II, with its declaration *Nostra Aetate*, wanted to change that which was always evident for Catholics but is no longer so today. It suffices to think of the many interreligious assemblies organized at Assisi by John Paul II and by Benedict XVI, to realize the spiritual upheaval produced by the Vatican II revolution.

But one must be very clear: Francis invented nothing. He just faithfully carried on the devastating work initiated by John XXIII and Paul VI fifty years ago and continued since then by all their successors with a diabolical relentlessness on this matter as well as those related to false ecumenism, religious liberty, State secularism, the *Rights of Man*, and the UN globalization project. And he himself told us this, first in his interview with Father Spadaro in August 2013:

«“Vatican II was a re-reading of the Gospel in light of contemporary culture,” says the pope. “Vatican II produced a renewal movement that simply comes from the same Gospel. Its fruits are enormous. Just recall the liturgy. The work of liturgical reform has been a service to the people as a re-reading of the Gospel from a concrete historical situation. Yes, there are hermeneutics of continuity and discontinuity, but one thing is clear: the dynamic of reading the Gospel, actualizing its message for today -which was typical of Vatican II- is absolutely irreversible.”»

And then in his interview with Eugenio Scalfari in September of the same year:

«Vatican II, inspired by Pope Paul VI and John, decided to look to the future with a modern spirit and to be open to modern culture. The Council Fathers knew that being open to modern culture meant religious ecumenism and dialogue with non-believers. But afterwards very little was done in that direction. I have the humility and ambition to want to do something.»

But let us return to the question of Islam and Muslim immigration. Francis, like his conciliar predecessors, highlights the spiritual value of the religion of Mohammed, but he goes further than them: he openly favors the Islamization of Europe by advocating the massive arrival of Muslim immigrants. He glorifies immigrationism by his words and acts. First, by his acts: On his return to the Vatican after his trip to the Greek island of Lesbos, he decided to bring along in his private plane twelve Muslim immigrants. By his words: we cite his speech of April 19, 2016 in the *Centro Astalli* for refugees, at Rome:

---

78 http://www.repubblica.it/cultura/2013/10/01/news/pope_s_conversation_with_scalfari_english-67643118/
«Too many times you have not been welcomed: forgive the closure and indifference of our society that fears the change in lifestyle and mentality that your presence asks for. Treated as a burden, a problem, a cost, instead you are a gift.»

According to Bergoglio, the massive immigration of Muslims is a gift for Europe, and their arrival demands a “change of life and mentality” on the part of the Europeans. In addition, since some refuse to disappear under the Islamic tidal wave, Francis stigmatizes them and asks pardon from the so-called “refugees” for the “closed mind” and the “indifference” of the bad recalcitrants to the Islamic invasion. With such words Francis publicly demonizes the Europeans who fight for their survival and stir hatred and contempt of the Muslim invaders in the white Christian population, “racists and xenophobes”, who show them such a bad welcome.

His action has an extremely powerful symbolism. The Bergoglian gesture at Lesbos is the antithesis of that by Pope Saint Pius V at Lepanto, which prevented the conquest of Christianity by Islam. Saint Pius V, pope of Trent, protected Europe from the Muslim invaders. Francis, Pope of Vatican II, brings them himself to Rome in his private airplane before the eyes of the entire world, showing everyone the example to follow…

But there is nothing surprising about that. Francis exposed his subversive plot in his Apostolic Exhortation Evangelii Gaudium, published some months after his election:

«Migrants present a particular challenge for me, since I am the pastor of a Church without frontiers, a Church which considers herself mother to all. For this reason, I exhort all countries to a generous openness which, rather than fearing the loss of local identity, will prove capable of creating new forms of cultural synthesis.» § 210

On his return flight from World Youth Day in Krakow, Francis was asked about the recent Islamic attacks, and he replied by minimizing them and falsely stating that one must also speak of “Catholic violence” (!!!) and there exist also groups of “Catholic fundamentalists”:

«I don’t like to speak of Islamic violence because every day when I open the newspapers I see acts of violence, […] someone kills his girlfriend, someone else his mother-in-law... And these violent people are baptized Catholics! They are violent Catholics... If I spoke about Islamic violence, I would also have to speak about Catholic violence. [...] I believe that in almost all religions there is always a small fundamentalist group. Fundamentalist. We have some ourselves. [...] one can kill with the tongue (these are words of the Apostle James, not mine) as well as with a knife.»
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And in his homily of July 31, 2016 at World Youth Day in Krakow he spoke of his project to establish a global and multicultural “new humanity”:

«People may judge you to be dreamers, because you believe in a new humanity, one that rejects hatred between peoples, one that refuses to see borders as barriers and can cherish its own traditions without being self-centred or small-minded.»

It’s always the same humanistic utopia, here taken from his message of April 19, 2016 to the Centro Astalli for refugees, in Rome:

«You are the testimony of how Our God [!!!!], kind and merciful, knows how to transform the evil and injustice that you suffer into a good for all. Because each of you can be a bridge that unites distant peoples, that makes possible an encounter between diverse cultures and religions, a way to rediscover our common humanity.»

Here Francis not only uses the “basmala”, Islamic ritual formula that begins the suras of the Koran: “In the name of the kind and merciful God”, but he dares to speak of “our God”, implying that Muslims and Christians believe in the same God. And it is well to note that he even implies that the only thing that matters is the discovery of our “common humanity”, with “diverse religions” that would be their random manifestations in diverse epochs and diverse cultural contexts. This is pure modernism: all emerging from the vital immanence and religious experience of the “believer”, regardless of the dogmatic formulation used to explain it on a conceptual level.

Is there need to recall that the foundation of religious immanence is none other than monism, pantheism, expressed for example by Teilhard de Chardin, Francis’ gnostic Jesuit “guru” according to whom the soul emerges from matter through the evolutionary process?

On the return flight from Lesvos, a journalist asked Francis a good question about the twelve immigrants that he was bringing along to Rome: why had he chosen exclusively Muslim families. Here is his reply:

«These three families had their papers in order, the necessary documents, and so it was possible. There were, for example, two Christian families on the first list who did not have their papers in order. It is not a privilege. All twelve of them are children of God. The “privilege” is being children of God: this is true.»
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Francis, as is his custom, deceives people with an extraordinary shamelessness. In fact, one is not a child of God by birth but by divine adoption, through the reception of Baptism and faith in Our Lord Jesus Christ. And this is well known. Or, at least, it was until Vatican II…

I stress that Francis expressed this heresy from the beginning of his pontificate, before the eyes of everyone, at the “silent” blessing he gave to the media representatives in the Paul VI hall of the Vatican for the meeting of journalists on March 16, 2013, three days after his election. Here are his words, which he said in Spanish:

«Since many of you are not members of the Catholic Church, and others are not believers, I cordially give this blessing silently, to each of you, respecting the conscience of each, but in the knowledge that each of you is a child of God. May God bless you!»

These words alone should have been more than enough to arouse a general outcry in the Catholic world, they are so heretical and blasphemous: we are in the presence of religious indifference together with the cult of the human conscience, in which name those of the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity are passed in silence, and the sign of the Cross is omitted under the pretense of not disturbing the “conscience” of non-Catholics. Is there any need to state that the false respect of the conscience, endorsed by Francis, has roots in the “philosophers”, the “Enlightened”, and is an integral part of the illuminist teaching of Freemasonry?

In his encyclical Mirari vos (1832) Gregory XVI says:

«This shameful font of indifferentism gives rise to that absurd and erroneous proposition which claims that liberty of conscience must be maintained for everyone. It spreads ruin in sacred and civil affairs, though some repeat over and over again with the greatest impudence that some advantage accrues to religion from it.»  

Now, let us be clear, this cult of man and his conscience is not a Bergoglian invention: it was proudly proclaimed by Paul VI in his speech at the closing of Vatican II. Here are his words:

«Secular humanism, revealing itself in its horrible anti-clerical reality has, in a certain sense, defied the council. The religion of the God who became man has met the religion (for such it is) of man who makes himself God. And what happened? Was there a clash, a battle, a condemnation? There could have been, but there was none. The old story of the Samaritan has been the model of the spirituality of the council. A feeling of boundless sympathy has permeated the whole of it. […] But we call upon those who term themselves modern humanists, and who have renounced the transcendent value of the highest realities, to give the council credit at least

---
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for one quality and to recognize our own new type of humanism: we, too, in fact, we more than any others, honor mankind.»

This sentence of Paul VI provides a good transition to the following chapter.

9. Francis, Teilhard de Chardin and pantheism

The cult of man, regarded as a god-in-the-making through evolution, is of Luciferian gnosis. Here is a little known text of Cardinal Montini, taken from the conference Religion and Work, held on March 27, 1960, which one can read in the Documentation Catholique of 1960 on page 764. I am giving the precise reference for those who might find it difficult to believe their eyes, understandably, at such outrageous words of Cardinal Montini. These are the words of the man who would become pope three years later and who would promulgate the documents of Vatican II in 1965:

«Will it not happen one day that modern man, as his scientific studies progress and discoveries are made of laws and realities buried in the silent vault of matter, will hear the marvelous voice of the spirit pulsating within? Will this not be the religion of tomorrow? Einstein himself envisioned the spontaneity of a religion of the universe.»

The spirit “pulsating” in matter, the “religion of tomorrow”, which would be a “cosmic religion”, a “religion of the universe”: these are the fundamentals of the Teilhardian evolutionist gnosis, with the cult of man on the path of divinization. And if that were not enough, it was a cardinal of the Church who, in religious matters, invoked the authority of a Jewish socialist proclaiming a “cosmic religiosity” based on contemplating the structure of the universe, consistent with positivistic science and rejecting all dogma or belief… it leaves one in a state of shock!

In effect, in 1929 when Rabbi Herbert S. Goldstein asked Einstein: “Do you believe in God?”, he replied:

«I believe in Spinoza's God who reveals himself in the orderly harmony of what exists, not in a God who concerns himself with fates and actions of human beings.»

And in a letter addressed to the Jewish philosopher Eric Gutkind in 1954, Einstein wrote:

«The word God is for me nothing more than the expression and product of human weakness, the Bible a collection of honorable, but still purely primitive, legends which are nevertheless pretty childish. No interpretation, no matter how subtle, can change this for me.»

This means that the god of Einstein is none other than the Deus sive natura of the Jewish philosopher Baruch Spinoza, who, in his pantheistic doctrine, identified God with nature. Such is
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the “religion of the universe” that Einstein professed and that Cardinal Montini evoked with admiration in his conference, and on which he was inspired to preach a “religion of the future” destined one day to take the place of Christianity. When one thinks that this man later became pope, and that he afterwards promulgated the novel documents of Vatican II, abolished the Catholic Mass, invented a “new mass” in collaboration with “protestant experts”, and modified the rituals of all the sacraments, it leaves one shuddering...

Here is another statement of Paul VI along the same line, given at the Angelus on February 7, 1971 at the time of a voyage to the moon, which is a veritable hymn to man on the road to divinization:

«Honor to man! Honor to thinking! Honor to science! Honor to technology! Honor to work! Honor to human boldness! Honor to the synthesis of the scientific and organizational activity of man, who unlike every other animal knows how to give his mind and hand instruments of conquest. Honor to man, king of the earth and now also prince of heaven.»

This cult of humanity and of progress has been condemned many times by the magisterium. Here is a passage from the encyclical Qui Pluribus of Pius IX in 1846, followed by a condemned proposition in his Syllabus of 1864:

«7. It is with no less deceit, venerable brothers, that other enemies of divine revelation, with reckless and sacrilegious effrontery, want to import the doctrine of human progress into the Catholic religion. They extol it with the highest praise, as if religion itself were not of God but the work of men, or a philosophical discovery which can be perfected by human means.»

«5. Divine revelation is imperfect, and therefore subject to a continual and indefinite progress, corresponding with the advancement of human reason.»

Pius IX is very clear regarding “progressives”: he uses the expression “enemies of divine revelation.” What better qualification could one find for a cardinal and archbishop of the Church who uses his eminent ecclesiastical dignity to diffuse the blasphemous and heretical idea that a so-called “religion of the future” will one day replace Catholicism? And that person is Giovanni Battista Montini. He is responsible for Vatican II, the destruction of the Roman liturgy and the terrible crisis that has afflicted the Church for more than half a century. I ask myself: given what we have exposed here, is there really any place for wonder?

But let us return to Francis and his claims that all men are “children of God.” It’s not the first time he proposes such a lie. For example, here are his words in The Pope Video of January 2016, in which there were Catholic, Jewish, Muslim and Buddhist symbols, as Francis explains that:
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“Many think differently, feel differently, seeking God or meeting God in different ways. In this crowd, in this range of religions, there is only one certainty we have for all: We are all children of God.”

These words are so grotesque that one can hardly believe that such a video had not aroused a spontaneous and vehement outcry worldwide, including among conciliar “conservatives”. But the reason is quite evident: the systematic brainwashing, whether by the “magisterium” or by the post-conciliar “praxis” for more than a half century (for example, at Assisi I to IV) has neutralized the last hope of one day seeing a public uprising in defense of the Catholic faith by members of the clergy of all types.

Let us be clear: if all men are children of God by nature, if divine life is in all men simply by the fact of their existence, if one is not elevated to the life of grace by a gift of God added to our condition as creatures, then the difference between the natural and supernatural orders disappears, the distinction between the Creator and creature vanishes and one falls into pantheism. I have already referred to this several times, and now I declare formally: Francis is none other than a pantheistic gnostic in the type of a Teilhard de Chardin. This is certain. And even if he avoids stating it in black and white, he certainly does not hide it.

Here is another sentence whose beginning I previously quoted, in which Francis displays his creed:

“And I believe in God, not in a Catholic God, there is no Catholic God, there is God and I believe in Jesus Christ, his incarnation. Jesus is my teacher and my pastor, but God, the Father, Abba, is the light and the Creator. This is my Being.”

One must decipher what Francis meant to say with this short sentence, which is truly inconceivable. It goes so far in falsehood and impiety that it makes one shudder. And with an understandable but illusory self-defense, the great majority of Catholics either looked away or tried to give it an “orthodox” interpretation. On the other hand, to look such a terrible reality in the face is not easy, and most people prefer to find peace by turning their head away.

In the first place, Francis denied the existence of the Holy Trinity by rejecting the existence of a Catholic God. It’s obvious that in saying this he also denied the supernatural character and divine mission of the Church. And then he denied the divinity of Our Lord by stating that Jesus is his master and pastor “but” that God is the light and his Creator. Finally, he professes a pantheistic faith by declaring that his being is that of God: “this is my being” are his words.

Francis is an evolutionist gnostic disguised as a Catholic precisely to deceive, no more nor less, and to use the structure of the Church to carry out his Luciferian project of global unification of the human race outside of Christ and His Church. In other words: Francis is there to achieve
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revolutionary globalization and place it under the auspices of the Antichrist and the counter-church of Satan. That is what is called being a false prophet in the service of the New World Order.

The tactic of the modernists is well known: remain in the bosom of the Church to transform her from within, surreptitiously, imperceptibly, in order to make her a suitable instrument and powerful influence for their subversive cause. I am inventing nothing -it is Saint Pius X who said this in his encyclical Pascendi:

«And so they go their way, reprimands and condemnations notwithstanding, masking an incredible audacity under a mock semblance of humility. While they make a show of bowing their heads, their hands and minds are more intent than ever on carrying out their purposes. And this policy they follow willingly and wittingly, both because it is part of their system that authority is to be stimulated but not dethroned, and because it is necessary for them to remain within the ranks of the Church in order that they may gradually transform the collective conscience - thus unconsciously avowing that the common conscience is not with them, and that they have no right to claim to be its interpreters.»\textsuperscript{95}

In his speech at the World Meeting of Popular Movements on October 28, 2014 Francis used one of his fetish expressions to express his holistic or totalistic vision of human reality: the metaphor of the polyhedron, a figure which harmoniously integrates the “diversity” of its components:

«I know that you are persons of different religions, trades, ideas, cultures, countries, continents. Here and now you are practicing the culture of encounter, so different from the xenophobia, discrimination and intolerance which we witness so often. Among the excluded, one finds an encounter of cultures where the aggregate does not wipe out the particularities. That is why I like the image of the polyhedron, a geometric figure with many different facets. The polyhedron reflects the confluence of all the partialities that in it keep their originality. Nothing is dissolved, nothing is destroyed, nothing is dominated, everything is integrated.»\textsuperscript{96}

In a video message on November 21, 2013 to the Third Festival of the Social Doctrine of the Church, held in Verona and entitled “Fewer inequalities, more differences”, Francis developed this notion that is completely foreign to the magisterium of the Church:

«The sphere can represent homogenization, like a type of globalization: it is smooth, without facets, equal in all its parts. The polyhedron has a form similar to the sphere, but is composed of many facets. [...] I like to imagine humanity as a polyhedron, in which the many forms, expressing themselves, constitute the elements that comprise in plurality the one human family.
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And this is a true globalization. The other globalization -that of the sphere- is a homogenization.»

And here is a third and final quotation on this key idea in Bergoglian thought, taken from his speech to the Council of Europe on November 25, 2014:

«To speak of European multipolarity is to speak of peoples which are born, grow and look to the future. The task of globalizing Europe’s multipolarity cannot be conceived by appealing to the image of a sphere -in which all is equal and ordered, but proves reductive inasmuch as every point is equidistant from the centre- but rather, by the image of a polyhedron, in which the harmonic unity of the whole preserves the particularity of each of the parts. [...] In light of all this, I am gratified by the desire of the Council of Europe to invest in intercultural dialogue, including its religious dimension, through the Exchange on the Religious Dimension of Intercultural Dialogue. Here is a valuable opportunity for open, respectful and enriching exchange between persons and groups of different origins and ethnic, linguistic and religious traditions, in a spirit of understanding and mutual respect.»

For Francis, the different religious “traditions” are all worthy of respect, because they simply manifest the common ground of humanity, which resides in its vital immanence, in its religious experience, which unites us to “life”, more important than “explanations” and “interpretations”, and which allow us to integrate in a healthy pluralism the diverse particular expressions, equidistant from the center that unifies them, like the trunk of a tree unites its multiple branches.

Here is another statement of Francis from his meeting with Eugenio Scalfari, in which he directly expresses his pantheistic belief:

«From my point of view, God is the light that illuminates the darkness, even if it does not dissolve it, and a spark of divine light is within each of us. In the letter I wrote to you, you will remember I said that our species will end [!!!] but the light of God will not end and at that point it will invade all souls and it will all be in everyone.»

Never mind the truly inconceivable heresy, stupefying and monstrous, according to which one day our species “will end” like the others, which defies imagination and good sense, at least if one knows the Scriptures. And forgive my repeating it, but let us also pass by the fact that here again there have not been mass protests against these unprecedented statements.

Let us return to the question of pantheism: Francis clearly states it, and there is no need to resort to some convoluted hermeneutics to understand what he means by: “a spark of divine light is within each of us” and one day that light “will invade all souls and it will all be in everyone.”

---
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From which we also understand that salvation is universal, that no one will be damned, that no one risks going to hell. And actually it’s all logical: Francis may not be Catholic, but at least his ideas are coherent, because how could one conceive of eternal damnation, which implies an irreversible separation from God and the elect, in a pantheistic logic that by definition allows nothing to escape the unique divine substance and which excludes all duality: Creator-creature, grace-nature, good-evil, heaven-hell?

But if neither evil nor the possibility of damnation exist, then there is neither sin nor the need of Redemption, which necessarily would consist only in “being conscious” of our true nature and ignoring duality and division, the only sources of evil in man. So one understands better that sort of conciliar mantra with the same meaning: “the inalienable dignity of the human person.” An understanding that obviously does not mean that all those who use it are conscious of it.

It is strict logic: if the dignity of the human person is inalienable, then eternal punishment is inconceivable, and if no one can ever be separated from God, it can be explained only by a necessity of metaphysical order, namely by monism. The modernist religion, the conciliar religion, is none other than a Luciferian gnosis dissimulated under the appearances of Christianity, which is to say the deification of man through an ineluctable evolution, a necessary progress of consciousness in man and through man which leads to absolute spirit. Let us remember the words of Satan to Eve in Genesis: “you will be like gods”… This pantheistic vision of the universe, clothed in a Christian garment by the enlightened Teilhard de Chardin, and which results in the cult of divinized man, was a major influence in Vatican II and the post-conciliar “magisterium”.

I now propose an anthology of short quotations from the encyclical *Laudato Si’* which are in line with Teilhardian pantheism:

« [...] we are also called “to accept the world as a sacrament of communion, as a way of sharing with God and our neighbours on a global scale.” § 9

«Although change is part of the working of complex systems, the speed with which human activity has developed contrasts with the naturally slow pace of biological evolution.» § 18

«Human beings, even if we postulate a process of evolution, also possess a uniqueness which cannot be fully explained by the evolution of other open systems.» § 81

« [...] God in some way sought to limit himself in such a way that many of the things we think of as evils, dangers or sources of suffering, are in reality part of the pains of childbirth which he uses to draw us into the act of cooperation with the Creator.»  § 80

«The ultimate destiny of the universe is in the fullness of God, which has already been attained by the risen Christ, the measure of the maturity of all things.» § 83
"We can say that “alongside revelation properly so-called, contained in sacred Scripture, there is a divine manifestation in the blaze of the sun and the fall of night”. Paying attention to this manifestation, we learn to see ourselves in relation to all other creatures: “I express myself in expressing the world; in my effort to decipher the sacredness of the world, I explore my own.” § 85

« [...] we are also called “to accept the world as a sacrament of communion, [...] It is our humble conviction that the divine and the human meet in the slightest detail in the seamless garment of God’s creation, in the last speck of dust of our planet.” § 9

«Admittedly, Christians have not always appropriated and developed the spiritual treasures bestowed by God upon the Church, where the life of the spirit is not dissociated from the body or from nature or from worldly realities, but lived in and with them, in communion with all that surrounds us.” § 216

«Rather, all creatures are moving forward with us and through us towards a common point of arrival, which is God, in that transcendent fullness where the risen Christ embraces and illumines all things.” § 83

« [...] all of us are linked by unseen bonds and together form a kind of universal family, a sublime communion which fills us with a sacred, affectionate and humble respect». § 89

«A sense of deep communion with the rest of nature cannot be real if our hearts lack tenderness, compassion and concern for our fellow human beings. [...] Everything is connected. Concern for the environment thus needs to be joined to a sincere love for our fellow human beings and an unwavering commitment to resolving the problems of society.” § 91

We have already seen some statements of Paul VI, and now let us see two very revealing ones of John Paul II. The first is from the 1986 encyclical Dominum et Vivificantem:

«The Incarnation of God the Son signifies the taking up into unity with God not only of human nature, but in this human nature, in a sense, of everything that is “flesh”: the whole of humanity, the entire visible and material world. The Incarnation, then, also has a cosmic significance, a cosmic dimension. The “first-born of all creation,” becoming incarnate in the individual humanity of Christ, unites himself in some way with the entire reality of man, which is also “flesh” and in this reality with all “flesh,” with the whole of creation. § 50

The second is from the first encyclical of the pontificate of John Paul II, Redemptor Hominis. I apologize for the length of this quotation, but it shows the magnitude of the anthropocentric turn taken by the post-conciliar magisterium:
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«Accordingly, what is in question here is man in all his truth, in his full magnitude. We are not dealing with the “abstract” man, but the real, “concrete”, “historical” man. We are dealing with “each” man, for each one is included in the mystery of the Redemption and with each one Christ has united himself for ever through this mystery. Every man comes into the world through being conceived in his mother’s womb and being born of his mother, and precisely on account of the mystery of the Redemption is entrusted to the solicitude of the Church. Her solicitude is about the whole man and is focused on him in an altogether special manner. The object of her care is man in his unique unrepeatable human reality, which keeps intact the image and likeness of God himself. The Council points out this very fact when, speaking of that likeness, it recalls that “man is the only creature on earth that God willed for itself”. Man as “willed” by God, as “chosen” by him from eternity and called, destined for grace and glory—this is “each” man, “the most concrete” man, “the most real”; this is man in all the fullness of the mystery in which he has become a sharer in Jesus Christ, the mystery in which each one of the four thousand million human beings living on our planet has become a sharer from the moment he is conceived beneath the heart of his mother.» § 13

And here are three quotations of Benedict XVI showing the extent of Teilhard’s influence. The first is taken from his work Light of the World, page 220:

« [God] was able to create by means of the resurrection, a new dimension of existence beyond that of the biosphere and noosphere, as Teilhard de Chardin says, he was able to create even a new sphere in which man and the world are one with God.»

The second is from his homily for Vespers on July 24, 2009 in the cathedral of Aosta, in which Ratzinger, speaking of the Eucharist, explicitly cites Teilhard de Chardin, making himself the echo of his heretical, naturalist and pantheistic book The Mass on the World:

«This is also the great vision of Teilhard de Chardin: in the end we shall achieve a true cosmic liturgy, where the cosmos becomes a living host.»

One could equally cite Benedict XVI’s homily on Corpus Christi on June 15, 2006:

«Creation, with all of its gifts, aspires above and beyond itself to something even greater. Over and above the synthesis of its own forces, above and beyond the synthesis also of nature and of spirit that, in some way, we detect in the piece of bread, creation is projected towards divinization, toward the holy wedding feast, toward unification with the Creator himself.»
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Here, for illustration, is a brief extract from the impious work of Teilhard:

«In the new humanity which is begotten today the Word prolongs the unending act of his own birth; and by virtue of his immersion in the world’s womb the great waters of the kingdom of matter have, without even a ripple, been endued with life. No visible tremor marks this inexpressible transformation; and yet, mysteriously and in every truth, at the touch of the supersubstantial Word the immense host which is the universe is made flesh. Through your own incarnation, my God, all matter is henceforth incarnate. [...] O Lord, do not let your descent under the universal Species be for me only cherished and caressed as fruit of a philosophical speculation, but let it become for me truly a real Presence. In power and in law, whether we like it or not, You are incarnated in the World, and we live held up by You.»

Benedict XVI, then, was the first “Pope” to mention the name of Teilhard de Chardin, to rely on him and honor him. If I have included these quotations of Paul VI, John Paul II and Benedict XVI in this discussion about Francis, it is simply to not lose sight that Bergoglio is only a link in the long chain of penetration of gnostic ideas in the Church -Bergoglio being undoubtedly the most shocking, the one who has dared to take off his mask with amazing effrontery, showing himself for what he really is, in all his frightful ugliness and diabolical malice, but who could do nothing if the methodical work of modernist infiltration had not been carried out in every aspect of the life of the Church for more than a half-century by all his conciliar predecessors.

To conclude this section, here is an extract from the homily of Father Raniero Cantalamessa, preacher of the pontifical household, in Saint Peter’s Basilica at the celebration of Vespers for the World Day of Prayer for the Care of Creation, instituted by Francis in 2015:

«How long has the universe had to wait, what a long run-up it has had, to reach this point! It took billions of years during which opaque matter evolved toward the light of consciousness like the sap that slowly rises from under the ground to the top of the tree to flow into its leaves, flowers, and fruit. This consciousness was finally attained when “the human phenomenon,” as Teilhard de Chardin calls it, appeared in the universe. But now that the universe has reached this goal, it expects that human beings perform their duty and take on the task, so to speak, of directing the choir and to intone, in the name of all creation, “Glory to God in the highest!”

10. Francis, paroxysm of conciliar ecumenism

With regard to ecumenism, Francis is in perfect accord with the conciliar “Popes”, all inspired by Vatican II on the value of other Christian “confessions” and non-Christian “religions.” The only special thing of his pontificate is that he makes the conciliar rupture even more flagrant, taking it to its logical consequences. Let us look at some quotations. The first is from a press conference during his trip to Manila on January 15, 2015:
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«Every religion has dignity, every religion which respects human life, the human person.»\textsuperscript{107}

The next is from his interview with Father Antonio Spadaro in August of 2013:

«In ecumenical relations it is important not only to know each other better, but also to recognize what the Spirit has sown in the other as a gift for us. » When Spadaro asked how the pope envisions the future unity of the Church, he answers: “We must walk united with our differences: there is no other way to become one. This is the way of Jesus.”\textsuperscript{108}

This goes back implicitly to the holistic symbol of the polyhedron: the harmonization of the totality integrates all the particular differences. It is clear: unity is achieved by practice, by the will and by action, not by truth and the profession of the same faith. But that is in no case the “way of Jesus”, as Francis deceptively claims, because Our Lord has justly taught us that only the truth will make us free.

During his visit to a Pentecostal church in Caserta, Italy on July 28, 2014, Francis made some hallucinatory statements, explaining that unity in the Church, which would include heretical and schismatic sects, must be based on the polyhedron model of globalization, which he designates by the name “diversity”, which “diversity”, you undoubtedly have guessed, is the work of the “Holy Spirit”, nothing else! His gnostic concept of the polyhedron again serves him as a conceptual tool to establish globalization, to legitimize the construction of a world unified politically and religiously outside of Catholic truth, in a façade of pluralism that hides its basic gnostic and anti-Christian unity:

«What does the Holy Spirit make? I said he makes something else, which one might think of as division, but it isn’t. The Holy Spirit creates “diversity” in the Church. He creates diversity! It’s true this diversity is so rich, so beautiful. But then, the same Holy Spirit creates unity, and this way the Church is one in diversity. And, to use a beautiful word of an Evangelist whom I love very much, a diversity “reconciled” by the Holy Spirit. He does both these things: he creates the diversity of charismata and then makes harmony of the charismata. […] We are in the epoch of globalization, and we think about what globalization is and what unity would be in the Church: perhaps a sphere, where all points are equidistant from the centre, all equal? No! This is uniformity. And the Holy Spirit doesn’t create uniformity! What shape can we find? Let us consider a prism: the prism is unity, but all its parts are different; each has its own peculiarity, its charisma. This is unity in diversity.»\textsuperscript{109}

\textsuperscript{107} http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2015/january/documents/papa-francesco_20150115_srilanka-filippine-incontro-giornalisti.html
\textsuperscript{108} http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2013/september/documents/papa-francesco_20130921_intervista-spadaro.html
In his interview with Father Spadaro in August of 2013, Francis explains that a multitude of “churches” exist, with some older than others, and the former bear the wisdom of their experience, while the latter bear the strength of their youth. Nevertheless, all of them are called to build a future together, while avoiding falling into the trap of self-sufficiency and not yielding to a dominant position.

«The young Catholic churches, as they grow, develop a synthesis of faith, culture and life, and so it is a synthesis different from the one developed by the ancient churches. For me, the relationship between the ancient Catholic churches and the young ones is similar to the relationship between young and elderly people in a society. They build the future, the young ones with their strength and the others with their wisdom. You always run some risks, of course. The younger churches are likely to feel self-sufficient; the ancient ones are likely to want to impose on the younger churches their cultural models. But we build the future together.»

On the occasion of his visit to the Lutheran church of Rome, Sunday November 15, 2015, a woman married to a Catholic asked Francis what she should do regarding Communion. His reply was stupefying. Keep in mind that the speaker is considered to be the Pope, the supreme doctor of the Church in matters of faith and morals. Francis replied that it was up to her to see, that he did not know, that he did not have “theological insights”, that in fact the Lutheran eucharist and the Catholic Mass are almost the same thing, that it is only a “linguistic” difference, that it all comes down to a problem of interpretation and “theological” explanations, that “life” matters more than “explanations”, etc.

This is a real piece of modernist anthology. If a cleric had made such a declaration before Vatican II, he would have immediately been suspended from his ministry and accused of heresy. But in the “Conciliar Church” it is the “Pope” himself who makes such unheard of statements and nobody reacts, not a bishop, not a cardinal: there is a deafening silence on the part of the clergy which should shame them; we are in the presence of lackeys, diplomats, mute dogs. And this includes bishops of the “Tradition”, who busy themselves trying to be “recognized” by this notorious heretic. So here we have the unlikely situation where totally unknown laymen without particular theological competence must do the work of all those pusillanimous functionaries in cassocks who are beholden to the enemies of Our Lord. This speaks volumes on the abysmal depth of the crisis we are undergoing. But here are the words of Francis… judge for yourself:

«When you pray together, that Baptism grows, it becomes strong; when you teach your children who Jesus is, why Jesus came, what Jesus did, you do the same, whether in Lutheran or Catholic terms, but it is the same. The question: and the Supper? There are questions to which only if one is honest with oneself and with the few theological “lights” that I have, one must respond the same, you see. ‘This is my Body, this is my Blood’, said the Lord, ‘do this in memory of me’, and this is a viaticum which helps us to journey. [...] I respond to your question only with a question:

how can I participate with my husband, so that the Lord’s Supper may accompany me on my path? It is a problem to which each person must respond. A pastor friend of mine said to me: ‘We believe that the Lord is present there. He is present. You believe that the Lord is present. So what is the difference?’ - ‘Well, there are explanations, interpretations...’ Life is greater than explanations and interpretations.”

During his visit to the Waldensian church of Torino on Monday June 22, 2015, Francis repeated the same counter-truth on “unity in diversity”. But to this heresy of “polyhedral syncretism”, and to the blasphemy that the Holy Spirit was the inspiration of different heretical sects, he adds here yet another blasphemy against the sanctity of the Mystical Body of Christ, asking the Waldensians to please pardon the Church for her inhuman (!!!) treatment of them in the past. Here are his words:

«The unity produced by the Holy Spirit does not mean uniformity. Indeed, brothers are united by one and the same origin but they are not identical to each other. This is very clear in the New Testament, where, although being called brothers, all of those who share the same faith in Jesus Christ, one intuits that not all Christian communities, to which they belonged, had the same style, nor an identical internal organization. Rather, within the same small community different charisms could be perceived (cf. 1 Cor 12-14), and even in proclaiming the Gospel there were differences and sometimes contention (cf. Acts 15:36-40). Unfortunately, it happened and continues to occur that brothers do not accept their differences and end up making war against one another. By reflecting on the history of our relations, we cannot help but be saddened by the disputes and acts of violence committed in the name of our faith, and I ask that the Lord grant us the grace to recognize ourselves all as sinners and to be able to forgive one another. It is by the initiative of God, who never resigns himself to the sin of man, that new ways open to experience our fraternity, and we cannot escape it. On behalf of the Catholic Church I ask your forgiveness. I ask your forgiveness for unchristian-like and even inhuman attitudes and conduct which, historically, we have had against you. In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, forgive us!»

In the chapter on blasphemies I mentioned the story of Tony Palmer, an Anglican “bishop” who did not convert to Catholicism at the request of Cardinal Bergoglio, and who later died in a traffic accident; Bergoglio, who had become Francis, arranged that Palmer be granted a Catholic Episcopal funeral. Since this story relates to the question of ecumenism, in order to show the gravity of the matter and the extreme perversity of Francis, allow me to transcribe here an extract of an article that Sandro Magister, the eminent Italian Vaticanist, devoted to the matter:

«The second is Bishop Tony Palmer, a member of the Communion of Evangelical Episcopal Churches -which is not under Canterbury but is nonetheless part of the Anglican galaxy- a South

African who moved to Italy with his Catholic wife and children, whose friendship and meetings with Bergoglio began during a trip to Argentina in 2011 and intensified after his election as pope. Palmer died in a traffic accident in July of 2014. [...] Here, then, are the testimonies of the Anglicans Venables and Palmer, collected by the English Vaticanist Austen Ivereigh in the excellent biography of Bergoglio that he published at the end of 2014: “In 2009, when Pope Benedict XVI created a new legal church structure for Anglicans to join the Catholic Church known as the ordinariate, Bergoglio called the Buenos Aires-based Anglican primate of the Southern Cone (in communion with Canterbury), Bishop Gregory Venables. Over breakfast, ‘he told me very clearly that the ordinariate was quite unnecessary and that the Church needs us as Anglicans.’ This was also Bergoglio’s message to Palmer, who was looking at the ordinariate and wondering if it was for him. ‘He told me that we need to have bridge builders. He counseled me not to take the step because it looked like I was choosing a side and I would cease to be a bridge builder.’ Palmer says Bergoglio believed he should remain an Anglican.”

During a press conference on the flight returning from Armenia on June 26, 2016, Francis defended the heretic Martin Luther, justified his revolt and endorsed his heretical doctrine on justification, while nonchalantly as usual giving a fierce blow to the Catholic Church. Here is what he said:

«I think that Martin Luther’s intentions were not mistaken; he was a reformer. Perhaps some of his methods were not right, although at that time, [...] we see that the Church was not exactly a model to emulate. There was corruption and worldliness in the Church; there was attachment to money and power. That was the basis of his protest. He was also intelligent, and he went ahead, justifying his reasons for it. Nowadays, Lutherans and Catholics, and all Protestants, are in agreement on the doctrine of justification: on this very important point he was not mistaken.»

It is not a case of proving that Luther was mistaken and that there is no possible agreement between Catholics and Protestants on the doctrine of justification; to realize this it suffices to read the decree on justification promulgated January 13, 1547 in the sixth session of the Council of Trent. Or likewise to consult any manual of dogmatic theology prior to Vatican II. To illustrate this, I am copying here six of the thirty-two canons related to the Lutheran doctrine of justification, to show the extent of total incompatibility between Catholic doctrine and that of Martin Luther, with whom his contemporary apologist, the Argentinian heretic Jorge Mario Bergoglio, says he is in full agreement. Here they are:

«CANON V - If any one saith, that, since Adam's sin, the free will of man is lost and extinguished; or, that it is a thing with only a name, yea a name without a reality, a figment, in fine, introduced into the Church by Satan; let him be anathema.

---

113 http://chiesa.espresso.repubblica.it/articolo/1350982?eng=y
CANON VII - If any one saith, that all works done before Justification, in whatsoever way they be done, are truly sins, or merit the hatred of God; or that the more earnestly one strives to dispose himself for grace, the more grievously he sins: let him be anathema.

CANON IX - If any one saith, that by faith alone the impious is justified; in such wise as to mean, that nothing else is required to co-operate in order to the obtaining the grace of Justification, and that it is not in any way necessary, that he be prepared and disposed by the movement of his own will; let him be anathema.

CANON XI - If any one saith, that men are justified, either by the sole imputation of the justice of Christ, or by the sole remission of sins, to the exclusion of the grace and the charity which is poured forth in their hearts by the Holy Ghost, and is inherent in them; or even that the grace, whereby we are justified, is only the favour of God; let him be anathema.

CANON XV - If any one saith, that a man, who is born again and justified, is bound of faith to believe that he is assuredly in the number of the predestinate; let him be anathema.

CANON XXIV - If any one saith, that the justice received is not preserved and also increased before God through good works; but that the said works are merely the fruits and signs of Justification obtained, but not a cause of the increase thereof; let him be anathema."115

After reading these canons, the logical solution obvious to everyone, provided they have a minimum of good faith, is the following:

Anathema sit Georgius Marius Bergoglius

Here is the supplementary canon that will one day be useful to add to the list established by the Tridentine decree:

«If anyone says that the intentions of Martin Luther were not erroneous, that he was a reformer, that the Church at that time was not a model to imitate, that today Lutherans and Catholics are in agreement on the doctrine of justification and that Luther was not mistaken on this point, let him be anathema.»

To conclude this section dedicated to the heretical ecumenism practiced by Francis and all his conciliar predecessors, I cannot refrain from sharing some news that concerns me closely because it refers to the Argentinian edition of the official Vatican newspaper l’Osservatore Romano, which, it was recently learned, will begin in September in a weekly edition appearing on Saturday. The editorial project was consigned by Francis himself to the Lutheran Argentinian theologian Marcelo Figueroa, and its radio diffusion on Sundays will be the work of Santiago Pont Lezica, director of FM Milenium radio. These men both met with Francis this past June in the Casa Santa Marta, along with Father Federico Lombardi, in charge of the Vatican press.

Pont Lezica defines the style of his radio as being characterized by “a great spiritual charge, with a clear ecumenical message. It has texts of the Koran and of other religions, even if in Argentina the majority of the population is Christian.”\textsuperscript{116}

11. The question of the death penalty

While I could have included this matter in three other chapters: those treating of heresies, blasphemies and pantheism, since the position of Francis on this subject is at the same time heretical, blasphemous and shows a pantheistic thinking -because Francis actually confers on human dignity an absolute value equivalent to divinization-, I have decided to dedicate a separate chapter to it because of its very particular specificity.

Let us read an extract from a video message that Francis addressed to the sixth World Congress Against the Death Penalty held in Oslo from June 21 to 23, 2016, a congress sponsored by secular organizations and supporters of the “rights of man”, especially from the far left and subversive Amnesty International:

« [...] nowadays the death penalty is unacceptable, however grave the crime of the convicted person. It is an offence to the inviolability of life and to the dignity of the human person; it likewise contradicts God’s plan for individuals and society, and his merciful justice. Nor is it consonant with any just purpose of punishment. It does not render justice to victims, but instead fosters vengeance. The commandment “Thou shalt not kill” has absolute value and applies both to the innocent and to the guilty. [...] It must not be forgotten that the inviolable and God-given right to life also belongs to the criminal.»\textsuperscript{117}

These words signify an immorality of God in the Old Testament, as well as of the Church for 2000 years, because neither has ever respected the “inviolable right to life” which criminals would enjoy. But it is not the first time that Francis publicly takes a position in favor of abolition: we already saw this in his speech to the U.S. Congress in September of 2015, in which his plea to abolish capital punishment was accompanied by a deafening silence on the crime of abortion.

Here is a part of his speech to the delegation of the International Association of Penal Law on October 23, 2014, in which Francis hardens his position even more, this time condemning not only the death penalty but also lifetime imprisonment, always under the false pretext that the “dignity of the human person” is above everything else:

«All Christians and men of good will are thus called today to fight not only for the abolition of the death penalty, whether legal or illegal, and in all its forms, but also in order to improve prison conditions, with respect for the human dignity of the people deprived of their freedom.

\textsuperscript{116} \url{http://www.lanacion.com.ar/583986-santiago-pont-lezica-con-estilo-propio}
\textsuperscript{117} \url{http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/messages/pont-messages/2016/documents/papa-francesco_20160621_videomessaggio-vi-congresso-contro-pena-di-morte.html}
And I link this to life imprisonment. A short time ago the life sentence was taken out of the Vatican’s Criminal Code. A life sentence is just a death penalty in disguise. [...] These abuses can only be stopped with the firm commitment of the international community to recognize the primacy of the pro homine principle, meaning the dignity of the human person above everything else.»

Francis had also supported the abolition of the death penalty in his Exhortation Amoris Laetitia, using the most odious type of imposture by pretending solidarity with a truth held by all Catholics, the condemnation of euthanasia:

« [...] the Church not only feels the urgency to assert the right to a natural death, without aggressive treatment and euthanasia”, but likewise firmly rejects the death penalty.» § 83

The ill will shown by Francis reminds me of that of Paul VI in the conciliar declaration Dignitatis Humanae on religious liberty, which says that “this doctrine of freedom has roots in divine revelation” but without giving a single citation from Scripture to support this radical novelty. Here Francis is using the same strategy: with a peremptory tone he claims that “the Church firmly rejects the death penalty” but he is incapable of citing a single magisterial document to confirm his assertion. On the contrary, there are numerous texts in Scripture and the magisterium that prove both the falsehood of the alleged right to religious liberty for all religions in the public sphere and the legitimacy of applying the death penalty.

But since these are pretended Popes who teach such lies, the majority of Catholics feel intimidated by their enthronement and don’t dare to challenge them. Worse yet, they don’t even dare to recognize them for what they are, and in their cowardice and lack of intellectual honesty, they defend them, becoming accomplices in mystification. For example, think of the work of Père Basile, monk of the French monastery of Le Barroux, once traditionalist, entitled The Right to Religious Liberty in the Tradition of the Church. A case of homogeneous doctrinal development of the authentic magisterium. An imposing brick of 700 pages attempting to show that it’s daylight in the middle of the night… To tell the truth, it would not at all surprise me if one day there appears a study that might be called: The biblical roots of the immorality of the death penalty. A case of homogeneous theological development that confirms the inalienable dignity of the human person…

The fifth commandment forbids murder and signifies “thou shalt not kill the innocent” but not “thou shalt not kill anyone whatever the circumstances” -it suffices to read the Old Testament to be convinced of this. The Church never taught the existence of a supposed inviolable right to life for criminals. Strictly speaking, simple good sense suffices to show the Bergoglian falsification. Indeed, no one judges it immoral to kill his attacker in exercising legitimate self-defense, no one

would dream to blame a policeman taking down a terrorist holding hostages, or a soldier mortally wounding an enemy in the field of battle. Absolutely no one. Not even the abolitionists whom Francis unconditionally supports in their ideological subversive fight for the “rights” of criminals. But above all, Revelation teaches us that it is God Himself who instituted the death penalty against murderers, as we can read in the book of Genesis, chapter 9, verse 6:

«Whosoever shall shed man's blood, his blood shall be shed: for man was made to the image of God.»

And it must be added that God not only orders that men apply the death penalty, but that He Himself applies it when directly intervening in human affairs, chastising corrupt populations, as in the well-known case of Sodom and Gomorrah, and again in the great flood, when God decided to exterminate all of depraved humanity on the face of the earth, with the sole exception of Noe and his family. See chapter 6, verse 13 of Genesis:

«He said to Noe: The end of all flesh is come before me, the earth is filled with iniquity through them, and I will destroy them with the earth.»

In Mosaic law, many criminals received the death penalty (for adultery, incest, idolatry, etc.) In the New Testament, Saint Paul confirms the legitimacy of the death penalty, as well as its divine origin, when referring to the sin against nature. Here is the relevant passage from the Epistle to the Romans:

« [...]And, in like manner, the men also, leaving the natural use of the women, have burned in their lusts one towards another, men with men working that which is filthy, and receiving in themselves the recompense which was due to their error. And as they liked not to have God in their knowledge, God delivered them up to a reprobate sense, to do those things which are not convenient [...] Who, having known the justice of God, did not understand that they who do such things, are worthy of death; and not only they that do them, but they also that consent to them that do them.» (Rom. 1, 27-28/32)

It is clear that Francis formally contradicts divine revelation. But this is well known and surprises no one. Only that here, a colossal blasphemy is added to the heresy, because if the right to life were truly “inviolable”, as Francis claims, then, according to the impious Bergoglian logic, God Himself would be a monstrous criminal and abominable genocidal murderer. And the Church would Herself be guilty, because, among other things, She preached the Crusades and instituted the Inquisition.

The obvious conclusion from the words of Francis is that the Biblical God is a cruel and malicious being and His Church is the same. This is what Francis teaches surreptitiously, hypocritically avoiding to affirm it expressly, at least for now, and limiting himself to setting forth the premises. No doubt that later on others will draw the conclusions from them, which, moreover, are completely clear.
12. Toward a world government

We have already addressed the question of globalism and the way Francis favors it by every means, especially by his “ecological preaching” and his crusade against the so-called “global warming”. This union of the world outside of Christ and His Church, built in a naturalist and revolutionary secular framework, has frequently been invoked by Francis. Here are two passages from *Laudato Si’*, his “socio-ecological” manifesto:

«The establishment of a legal framework which can set clear boundaries and ensure the protection of ecosystems has become indispensable; otherwise, the new power structures based on the techno-economic paradigm may overwhelm not only our politics but also freedom and justice.» § 53

«Beginning in the middle of the last century and overcoming many difficulties, there has been a growing conviction that our planet is a homeland and that humanity is one people living in a common home. An interdependent world not only makes us more conscious of the negative effects of certain lifestyles and models of production and consumption which affect us all; more importantly, it motivates us to ensure that solutions are proposed from a global perspective, and not simply to defend the interests of a few countries. Interdependence obliges us to think of one world with a common plan.» § 164

To conceive of the planet as “homeland”, to think of “a unique world”, to create a normative system” with “inviolable limits”: is there any need to state that what Francis advocates is none other than the establishment of a world government endowed with effective political power and founded certainly not on evangelical law but on the “Rights of Man” without God and on his false “ecological gospel”? Let us state this clearly: in order to enforce the globalist program, a true stateless cosmopolitanism leading toward a UN Universal Republic under the pretext of “ecological concern” for our “common home” threatened by “global warming”, it is necessary to have a global government capable of imposing this totalitarian utopia on the recalcitrants. This plan is even more explicit in the following passage of the encyclical, where Francis cites Benedict XVI, who in turn cites John XXIII, which proves, if need be, the continuity of the global Masonic project of Francis’ predecessors since Vatican II:

«Given this situation, it is essential to devise stronger and more efficiently organized international institutions, with functionaries who are appointed fairly by agreement among national governments, and empowered to impose sanctions. As Benedict XVI has affirmed […]: ‘To manage the global economy; to revive economies hit by the crisis; to avoid any deterioration of the present crisis and the greater imbalances that would result; to bring about integral and timely disarmament, food security and peace; to guarantee the protection of the environment and to regulate migration: for all this, there is urgent need of a true world political authority, as my
predecessor Blessed John XXIII indicated some years ago.\textsuperscript{120} (Benedict XVI, Caritas in Veritate, § 67) » § 175 \textsuperscript{121}

This paragraph 67 of Benedict XVI’s encyclical Caritas in Veritate is a true ideological manifesto of the New World Order to be put into effect under the auspices of the United Nations and it gives an entire plan of action. It is worth citing it in full, despite its length; the underlinings are the words that appear in italics in the original text:

«In the face of the unrelenting growth of global interdependence, there is a strongly felt need, even in the midst of a global recession, for a reform of the United Nations Organization, and likewise of economic institutions and international finance, so that the concept of the family of nations can acquire real teeth. One also senses the urgent need to find innovative ways of implementing the principle of the responsibility to protect and of giving poorer nations an effective voice in shared decision-making. This seems necessary in order to arrive at a political, juridical and economic order which can increase and give direction to international cooperation for the development of all peoples in solidarity. To manage the global economy; to revive economies hit by the crisis; to avoid any deterioration of the present crisis and the greater imbalances that would result; to bring about integral and timely disarmament, food security and peace; to guarantee the protection of the environment and to regulate migration: for all this, there is urgent need of a true world political Authority, as my predecessor Blessed John XXIII indicated some years ago. Such an authority would need to be regulated by law, to observe consistently the principles of subsidiarity and solidarity, to seek to establish the common good, and to make a commitment to securing authentic integral human development inspired by the values of charity in truth. Furthermore, such an authority would need to be universally recognized and to be vested with the effective power to ensure security for all, regard for justice, and respect for rights. Obviously it would have to have the authority to ensure compliance with its decisions from all parties, and also with the coordinated measures adopted in various

\textsuperscript{120} http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si.html
\textsuperscript{121} Bernard Dumont spoke clearly on the subject in his article Globalist Convergences in number 132 of the review Catholica: «It is thus by successive stages that one arrives at the current situation, in which a symbiosis is at work between an explicit adhesion to the idea of a global political organization and many signs, little phrases and symbolic gestures that show the sincerity of a praxis charged with exemplarity. So one sees how the lengthy text of Laudato Si’ dedicates only one paragraph (175) to the question of global authority, essentially satisfied to cite the passage of Caritas in Veritate that one just read. But the rest of the document addresses all sorts of items placed on the agenda by pressure groups acting in the shadows of the United Nations and other transnational bodies, to legitimize their approaches, moving away from the usual content of encyclicals. But the omnipresence of such questions signifies support of a weighty global propaganda. The fact that the presentation of the text was confided to high level persons in the implementation of such propaganda and the activities it promotes constitutes in itself a highly significant gesture. This is not an isolated fact, but on the contrary part of a whole, forming a sort of dynamic and unequivocal message. It is useless to underline at what point the incessant and many sided appeal to unconditionally open the doors to “migrants” belongs to the same praxis, amidst other signs, like the vaguely pantheistic scenography enacted on December 8, 2015 in Saint Peter’s square, at the same time as the Conference of Paris on the climate. http://www.catholica.presse.fr/2016/08/10/3914/
international forums. Without this, despite the great progress accomplished in various sectors, international law would risk being conditioned by the balance of power among the strongest nations. The integral development of peoples and international cooperation require the establishment of a greater degree of international ordering, marked by subsidiarity, for the management of globalization. They also require the construction of a social order that at last conforms to the moral order, to the interconnection between moral and social spheres, and to the link between politics and the economic and civil spheres, as envisaged by the Charter of the United Nations.»

And here is a short passage from John XXIII’s encyclical *Pacem in Terris*, published on April 11, 1963, which constitutes the official declaration of the Vatican’s adherence to the Judeo-Masonic globalism of the United Nations:

«We think the document [the Universal Declaration of Human Rights passed by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948] should be considered a step in the right direction, an approach toward the establishment of a juridical and political ordering of the world community. It is a solemn recognition of the personal dignity of every human being; an assertion of everyone’s right to be free to seek out the truth, to follow moral principles, discharge the duties imposed by justice, and lead a fully human life. It also recognized other rights connected with these. It is therefore Our earnest wish that the United Nations Organization may be able progressively to adapt its structure and methods of operation to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks. May the day be not long delayed when every human being can find in this organization an effective safeguard of his personal rights; those rights, that is, which derive

122 http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20090629_caritas-in-veritate.html#_ednref146
123 Two years later on October 24, 2011, the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace published a long document developing the Ratzinger project to install a world government, and here is a brief extract: «However, a long road still needs to be travelled before arriving at the creation of a public Authority with universal jurisdiction. It would seem logical for the reform process to proceed with the United Nations as its reference because of the worldwide scope of the UN’s responsibilities, its ability to bring together the nations of the world, and the diversity of its tasks and those of its specialized Agencies. The fruit of such reforms ought to be a greater ability to adopt policies and choices that are binding because they are aimed at achieving the common good on the local, regional and world levels. […] The conditions exist for going definitively beyond a ‘Westphalian’ international order in which States feel the need for cooperation but do not seize the opportunity to integrate their respective sovereignties for the common good of peoples. It is the task of today’s generation to recognize and consciously to accept these new world dynamics for the achievement of a universal common good. Of course, this transformation will be made at the cost of a gradual, balanced transfer of a part of each nation’s powers to a world Authority and to regional Authorities, but this is necessary at a time when the dynamism of human society and the economy and the progress of technology are transcending borders, which are in fact already very eroded in a globalized world. The birth of a new society and the building of new institutions with a universal vocation and competence are a prerogative and a duty for everyone, without distinction. What is at stake is the common good of humanity and the future itself.»

http://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20090629_caritas-in-veritate.html#_ednref146
directly from his dignity as a human person, and which are therefore universal, inviolable and inalienable.» (§ 144-145)  

From then on, this policy would be scrupulously followed by all the “conciliar popes”, dedicated body and soul to the promotion of naturalist and secular globalism, making man and his “sacred character” the keystone of the social life and juridical principles that govern international relations. Here is an extract from the speech of Paul VI at the United Nations on October 4, 1965:

«People turn to the United Nations as if it were their last hope for peace and harmony. We presume to bring here their tribute of honor and of hope along with our own. [...] We are tempted to say that in a way this characteristic of yours reflects in the temporal order what our Catholic Church intends to be in the spiritual order: one and universal. Nothing loftier can be imagined on the natural level, as far as the ideological structure of mankind is concerned. [...] What you are proclaiming here are the basic rights and duties of man, his dignity, his liberty and above all his religious liberty. We feel that you are spokesmen for what is loftiest in human wisdom -we might almost say its sacred character- for it is above all a question of human life, and human life is sacred; no one can dare attack it.»  

Finally, here is an extract from the speech of John Paul II at the United Nations on October 2, 1979:

«I would like to express the wish that, in view of its universal character, the United Nations Organization will never cease to be the forum, the high tribune from which all man's problems are appraised in truth and justice. (n° 7) [...] The Universal Declaration of Human Rights -with its train of many declarations and conventions on highly important aspects of human rights, in favour of children, of women, of equality between races, and especially the two international covenants on economic, social and cultural rights and on civil and political rights -must remain the basic value in the United Nations Organization with which the consciences of its members must be confronted and from which they must draw continual inspiration. (n° 9) [...] In a movement that one hopes will be progressive and continuous, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the other international and national juridical instruments are endeavouring to create general awareness of the dignity of the human being, and to define at least some of the inalienable rights of man. [...] All these human rights taken together are in keeping with the substance of the dignity of the human being, understood in his entirety, not as reduced to one dimension only. These rights concern the satisfaction of man's essential needs, the exercise of his  

124 http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-xxiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_11041963_pacem.html  
125 http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/speeches/1965/documents/hf_p-vi_spe_19651004_united-nations.html
freedoms, and his relationship with others; but always and everywhere they concern man, they concern man's full human dimension." (n° 13)

This says it all. The United Nations has become the supreme moral authority of mankind, the Declaration of the Rights of Man is the new Gospel, and the “conciliar popes” are its devout spokesmen and religious guarantors. The era of Christianity and Catholic unity has ended, and in its place there is the Judeo-Masonic New World Order, sponsored by the Vatican II hierarchy and their adulterated religion, at the service of the infernal powers and working tirelessly toward the coming of the universal reign of the Antichrist…

**Conclusion**

«And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all tribes of the earth mourn: and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with much power and majesty. And he shall send his angels with a trumpet, and a great voice: and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the farthest parts of the heavens to the utmost bounds of them.» (Mt. 24:30-31)

Upon reading this, it is essential to consider its terrifying reality in the light of divine revelation. It should escape no one that the present crisis is not of the same nature as those experienced by the Church in the past. It has an eschatological dimension, by the fact that the mystery of iniquity is visibly installed in the holy place.

I repeat, this crisis is not due solely to Francis, even though it is clear that, since his arrival, the events have accelerated at a dizzying pace. No, this crisis is only the culmination of a long war against the Church by Satan and his earthly minions, for the purpose of infiltrating her, occupying her places and institutions, so as to modify her cult and doctrine, emptying it of all substance, transforming it from within into an abominable aping of the Mystical Body of Christ, into a diabolical counterfeit of the Church, a monstrous parody taking her place in the eyes of the world, which will finally show its true face, that of a satanic counter-Church totally consecrated to the service of the Antichrist.

For those who find my analysis excessive, let me cite Pope Leo XIII in his Supplication to Saint Michael the Archangel, contained in the Exorcism against Satan and the other apostate angels, published in 1890, whose prophetic character applies perfectly to the present situation:

«His most crafty enemies have engulfed the Church, the Spouse of the Immaculate Lamb, with sorrows; they have drenched her with wormwood; on all her desirable things they have laid their wicked hands. Where the See of the Blessed Peter and the Chair of Truth have been set up for the light of the Gentiles, there they have placed the throne of the abomination of their wickedness, so that, the Pastor having been struck, they may also be able to scatter the flock. Therefore, O thou

---

This prayer helps us to understand what has happened since the election of John XXIII and the convocation of Vatican II, the subversive assembly directed by the modernist parties infiltrated in the Church since the end of the 19th century and charged with getting her in line with the “modern world.” Saint Pius X explained all this perfectly in his admirable encyclical *Pascendi* on the errors of modernism, published in 1907. The throne of Peter, the seat of Truth, the holy place of the New Covenant, is occupied by men won to the cause of the liberal, progressive and modernist revolutionary sect, and, since their takeover of power at Vatican II, they are tirelessly dedicated to overturn everything, to defile everything, to demolish everything.

This reading of the crisis is also reinforced by the words of Saint Paul to the Thessalonians, with which he explains to them that the Antichrist will sit in the temple of God: a clear allusion to the Chair of Peter, and stating that, in order for this to happen, it is necessary that the obstacle that impedes its manifestation be removed first; and that obstacle can be none other than the legitimate papacy, the foundation upon which Christ instituted His Church. Once pontifical infallibility had been neutralized by the arrival of the modernist impostors on the Throne of Peter, a devastating tidal wave conveying the modernist errors and the most abominable heresies poured into the Church, sweeping everything away in its wake, and thus, having removed the infallible seat of Truth, the requisite condition has come about to make possible the arrival of the Man of Iniquity.

Here, then, is the key text of Saint Paul to be able to understand the present situation, which, in my eyes, clearly corresponds to the latest crisis of the Church, terminal and apocalyptic in nature, that in which the *mysterium iniquitatis* will reach its climax, and which Our Lord, repeating the expression used by the prophet Daniel, calls “the abomination of desolation in the holy place” (Mt. 24:15):

«Let no man deceive you by any means, for unless there come a revolt first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth, and is lifted up above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself as if he were God. Remember you not, that when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now you know what withholdeth, that he may be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity already worketh; only that he who now holdeth, do hold, until he be taken out of the way.»
(2 Thes. 2:3-7)

I would like to present a passage that is very enlightening for our times, taken from the motu proprio *Sacrorum Antistitum*, promulgated by Saint Pius X on September 1, 1910, in which is found the antimodernist oath that all clerics had to take before receiving major order and also before receiving a professorship or an ecclesiastical office. This oath was suppressed by Paul VI
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in 1967\textsuperscript{128}, because it was obviously incompatible with the aggiornamento undertaken by John XXXIII and with his Concilium Malignantium II (as in Ps. 21:17)\textsuperscript{129} whose inspiration arose largely from the modernist movement condemned by Saint Pius X in his encyclical Pascendi and in the decree of the Holy Office Lamentabili.

Here is the citation of the antimodernist motu proprio that applies eminently to Jorge Mario Bergoglio, alias Pope Francis, but who more appropriately should have the honorific title of:

Francis the Unholy, the Supreme Blasphemer of the Vatican

«Now it is a fact that we no longer have to deal with, as in the beginning, the adversaries disguised in sheep's clothing, but with declared and ferocious enemies, within the same house, who, having made a pact with the worst enemies of the Church, they seek to destroy the Faith. These are men whose arrogance against the wisdom that comes from heaven is renewed every day, who claim the right to reform it as if you were corrupting; who want to renew it as if old age had consumed it; who want to give it new impetus and adapt it to the wishes of the world, to progress, to the conveniences of the century, as if she were opposed not to the shallowness of a few, but to the good of society.»\textsuperscript{130}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
\textsuperscript{128} http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19670717_formula-professio-fidei_en.html \\
\textsuperscript{129} «They have opened their mouths against me, as a lion ravening and roaring. I am poured out like water; and all my bones are scattered. My heart is become like wax melting in the midst of my bowels. My strength is dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue hath cleaved to my jaws: and thou hast brought me down into the dust of death. For many dogs have encompassed me: the council of the malignant hath besieged me. They have dug my hands and feet. They have numbered all my bones. And they have looked and stared upon me.» (Ps. XXI:14-18) This passage from Holy Scripture applies primarily to the Passion of Our Lord, that is to say, to his physical body. But it applies equally, in a spiritual sense, to the Passion of the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ. The concilium malignantium in the Vulgate -the council of the wicked- refers primarily to the Sanhedrin that condemned Our Lord to death, and secondly, to Vatican Council II, which decreed the crucifixion of His Church, now living Her passion. She must follow her Spouse in His Passion, to eventually follow Him also in His Resurrection and in His Glory. So, just as the physical body of Christ died and resurrected, so also the Church, His Mystical Body, will undergo a mystical death, and then She will resurrect also, at the coming of Her Master in glory and majesty. I cannot help but see a very significant numerical concordance of the number 21: in fact, the Passion of the Church was predicted in Psalm 21, it was triggered by the 21\textsuperscript{st} ecumenical council, and everything leads one to believe that it will be consummated during the 21\textsuperscript{st} century. I thank Mr. Jean Vaquié for having set me on this exegetical path that seems very enlightening for the times in which we live.
\textsuperscript{130} http://www.a-c-r-f.com/documents/VAQUIE-Concile_mechants.pdf
\textsuperscript{130} « Neque enim iam res est, quemadmodum ab initio, cum disputatoribus prodeuntibus in vestimentis ovium, sed cum apertis infensisque inimicis, iisque domesticis, qui facto foedere cum Ecclesiae capitalibus hostibus, propositam habent fidei eversionem. Sunt hi nempe, quorum audacia adversus deductam caelo sapientiam quotidie consurgit, cuius corrigendae sibi ius arrogant, quasi esset corrupta; renovandae, quasi esset senio confecta; augendae aptandaesque saeculi placitis, progressionibus, commodis, quasi eadem, non levitati paucorum, sed bono societatis esset adversa. » https://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-x/la/motu_proprio/documents/hf_p-x_motu-proprio_19100901_sacrorum-antistitum.html
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
This ephemeral triumph of the powers of evil on the earth and in the Church, this momentary and ignominious universal victory of Satan in the persons of the Antichrist and the False Prophet, will be followed by that of Our Lord Jesus Christ and His Church, as the prophet Daniel foretold:

«And that the kingdom, and power, and the greatness of the kingdom, under the whole heaven, may be given to the people of the saints of the most High: whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all kings shall serve him, and shall obey him.» (Daniel 7:27)

The great Jesuit exegete, Cornelius a Lapide, commented on this prophetic passage as follows:

«I say that this reign of Christ and of the Saints is certain and will not be only spiritual, as it always was on earth when the Saints suffered persecution and martyrdom, but it will be corporal and glorious, because they will reign gloriously with Christ forever. However, Christ and the Saints will begin this reign on earth after the death of the Antichrist. Then, once the reign of the Antichrist is destroyed, the Church will reign everywhere and there will be only one shepherd and one flock, composed of Jews and Gentiles, because he does not say “above” but “under heaven”, signifying all the earth, all that exists under heaven. Then, soon after, this reign will be confirmed and glorified for all eternity.” (Commentaria in Danielem Prophetam 7, 27)\(^ {131} \)

To conclude, and for the sake of nourishing our hope and not becoming discouraged during this long and painful wait for that glorious day, here are two passages, one from an encyclical of Pius XI and the other from the Apocalypse, which help us understanding it and desiring it with a renewed love:

«We instituted the Feast of Christ the King of All, to be solemnly celebrated throughout the whole Christian world. Now when we did this, not only did we set in a clear light that supreme sovereignty which Christ holds over the whole universe, over civil and domestic society, and over individual men, but at the same time we anticipated the joys of that most auspicious day, whereon the whole world will gladly and willingly render obedience to the most sweet lordship of Christ the King.» (Encyclical Miserentissimus Redemptor of Pius XI, 1928)\(^ {132} \)

---

\(^ {131} \) « Dico ergo, certum est hoc regnum fore Christi et Sanctorum: illudque non tantum spirituale, quale fuit in terra, cum ipsi persecutionibus, martyriis et morti obnoxii: sed etiam corporale ac gloriesum, quo scilicet Sancti et corpore et anima beati, cum Christo in coelis gloriese regnabunt in saecula saeculorum. Porro hoc regnum inchoabunt Christus et sancti in terra, mox post necem Antichristi; tunc enim Antichristi regno everso, Ecclesia ubique terrarum regnabit, et fiet tam ex Judaeis quam ex Gentibus unum ovile, et unus pastor: et hoc innuitur hic, cum ait, non “quae est super”, sed “quae est subter omne caelum”, id est in omni terra, sive in omni plagia caelo subjecta. Deinde paulo post hoc regnum confirmabitur et glorificabitur in coelis per omnem aeternitatem. »


\(^ {132} \) https://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-xi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19280508_miserentissimus-redemptor.html
« Alleluia: for the Lord our God the Almighty hath reigned. »

«And a voice came out from the throne, saying: Give praise to our God, all ye his servants; and you that fear him, little and great. And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of great thunders, saying, Alleluia: for the Lord our God the Almighty hath reigned. Let us be glad and rejoice, and give glory to him; for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath prepared herself. And it is granted to her that she should clothe herself with fine linen, glittering and white. For the fine linen are the justifications of saints. And he said to me: Write: Blessed are they that are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb. And he saith to me: These words of God are true.» (Apocalypse 19:5-9)

August 15, 2016, on the solemnity of the Assumption into Heaven of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary