

AT LAST, A BISHOP CONDEMNS VATICAN II

In the paper *The Statement on Pope Francis* it seems we spoke too soon. Of the 5,600 odd bishops of the Catholic Church one has appeared who is prepared to condemn Pope Francis over his flawed teachings and appalling behaviour, Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò, the late Secretary General of the Governorate of the Vatican City and Apostolic Nuncio to the United States of America. He has, more significantly, condemned the Second Vatican Council for the imposture that it is. The Archbishop's statement published on Life Site News deserves close study.¹

He raises a number of questions for the faithful, not the least of which is the issue of the legitimacy of Jorge Mario Bergoglio's elevation to the Chair of Peter. However his appeal to the Bull *Cum ex apostolatus officio* of Pope Paul IV (1559) as —

“establish[ing] in perpetuity the nullity of the nomination or election of any prelate – including the Pope – who had fallen into heresy before his promotion to cardinal or elevation to Roman pontiff” —

is problematic. Theologian, the late Fr Gregory Hesse, remarked its lack of dogmatic force and that it was ignored by subsequent popes, most tellingly by Leo XIII when, in 1879, he elevated former heretic, John Henry Newman, to the rank of cardinal. Moreover, Paul IV is notorious among the successors of St Peter for his paranoia and lack of charity, and the bull seems to have been a product of his irrationality.² Australian theologian, Fr Brian Harrison, published a paper in May 2000 claiming that an heretical pope would govern the Church validly if illicitly³ which seems to the writer a reasonable position and one consistent with Christ's promise not to abandon His Church.

It will be said that, in asserting that Jorge Mario Bergoglio's elevation was flawed, the Archbishop has rendered himself sedevacantist and, accordingly, that one should follow neither him nor his reasoning. The answer to this is straightforward. *Distinguendum est*: it is necessary to distinguish between the *legal* position, which is that *until the Church Herself rules to the contrary*, Jose Maria Bergoglio is the lawfully appointed Pope - and every priest not only may, but must, pray for him in the Canon of the Mass and elsewhere - and the *factual position* which may be otherwise *but the certainty of which is not ours to determine*. It is enough for the faithful to consider the Archbishop's charge and abide with serenity the Church's ruling in due course, never ceasing in the meantime to pray for the Pope. No prayer, even for a seemingly unworthy object, is wasted (*Matthew* 5: 44-45). As to his reasonings in general,

¹ https://www.lifesitenews.com/opinion/archbishop-vigano-i-accuse-bergoglio-of-heresy-and-schism/?utm_source=featured-news&utm_campaign=catholic For those who would read it here, a copy of the Archbishop's Statement translated from the Italian with slight editing to render the text more idiomatic may be found in the Appendix.

² John Salza and Robert Briscoe in their *True or False Pope?* (Winona MN, 2015) assert (pp. 392-3) that it was aimed at preventing Cardinal Morone from being elected pope.

³ *A Heretical Pope would govern the Church illicitly but validly*. Originally available on the Living Tradition website as paper n. 87. The reader should be able to find a copy on the internet.

again *distinguendum est*. If the Archbishop is wrong about the Jorge Mario Bergoglio's elevation, this does not detract from the force of his general criticisms.

The Archbishop has attacked the Pope elsewhere⁴ for promoting the Religion of Humanity "that will serve as the synarchy of the New World Order", a claim that may seem to be excessive. But it sounds with the conclusions of the erudite study by Argentinian professor of philosophy and dogmatic theology at the SSPX Seminary in Buenos Aires, Fr Álvaro Calderón: *Prometheus: the Religion of Man* (Angelus Press, 2010). Fr Calderon's thesis is that humanism, a consequence of the Church's influence on mankind, first appearing in the Renaissance, found expression in Protestant form with the Reformation, in rationalist form with the Enlightenment and atheistic form in the French Revolution; and that it has returned to triumph in the Catholic Church at the Second Vatican Council. Fr Calderon makes this claim:

"The Second Vatican Council is Prometheus in his act of larceny. It was a manoeuvre of all too human prudence carried out by a divinely constituted hierarchy which burned for men the incense that belongs to God alone. As in the parable of the unfaithful steward, the Council cancelled man's debts to God, promising salvation to all; and in the worship of its *New Mass* gave man the better part..."

Archbishop Viganò raises a most serious issue in the diminution, under the watch of Pope Francis, of the Divinely instituted Office of St Peter as earthly head of the Church, showing how his abandonment of the title Vicar of Christ (in 2020) continues a process begun by Paul VI (in his conduct and words) and pursued by John Paul II and Benedict XVI, the authority for which aberration is the pernicious teachings of Vatican II. In the name of 'Christian Unity' the Dicastery dignified with that dubious title essays in a document released just the other day, the impossible task of endeavouring to reverse the Church's clear teaching in the only ecumenical *Vatican Council* on the unique dignity of the Papal Office.⁵

The Archbishop asserts that he regards Vatican II as completely devoid of magisterial authority. He rejects the heterodox doctrines contained in its documents which have been condemned by the popes up to Pius XII, or which contradict the Catholic Magisterium in any way. He is right to wonder how any bishop could be challenged over a lack of a communion that current Church prelates claim to exist with heretics and schismatics.

Not to conduct too exhaustive an analysis of the Archbishop's Statement, the following quotes deserve attention.

1.

"The enemies of the Catholic Church fear the power of grace which works through the sacraments, and above all the power of the Holy Mass... [It] is precisely this awareness of the power of the supernatural action of the Catholic priesthood in society that lies at the origin of their fierce hostility to tradition..."

⁴ Cf. <https://exsurgedomine.it/230930-cic-eng/>

⁵http://www.christianunity.va/content/dam/unitacristiani/Collezione_Ut_unum_sint/The_Bishop_of_Rome/The%20Bishop%20of%20Rome.pdf

This is the point made in our *Statement on Pope Francis* which addressed the diminution in effectiveness of impetrative value of Mass offered according to the *novus ordo*.

2.

“[T]he subversive use of authority in the Church aimed at Her destruction (or Her transformation into a church *other* than the one willed and founded by Christ) [is] sufficient... to render *null and void* the authority of this new subject which, usurping power, has maliciously superimposed itself onto the Church of Christ... [W]ith the eyes of that time and the traditional formation of most of the cardinals, bishops, and clergy, the *scandal* of a hierarchy that contradicted itself appeared such an enormity as to induce many prelates and clerics not to believe it possible that revolutionary and Masonic principles could find acceptance and promotion in the Church. But this was precisely the “masterstroke of Satan” – as Archbishop Lefebvre called it – [he] who knew how to make use of the natural respect and filial love of Catholics for the sacred authority of the pastors to induce them to put obedience before the truth...”

Here the Archbishop highlights what is perhaps the most critical issue arising on his rebellion against the Pope and the current officials of the Roman Dicasteries, and on his condemnation of Vatican II, namely, the reaction of the Catholic faithful. Such is the length of time since popes, bishops, priests and religious began to depart from Catholic principle under that Council’s baleful influence, the faith of innumerable of the faithful has already been compromised or greatly diminished.⁶ These might ask: one bishop has chosen to speak: 5,599 remain silent. Why should we support the one and ignore vast majority?

The evil at the heart of the dilemma is a philosophical one generated by Luther’s rebellion 500 years ago: *subjectivism*. Is truth determined by reality, or by opinion? Luther said: “Not what God says but what I say.” Taking this cue, Descartes inverted sound philosophy to declare: “Not what reality tells me but what I think.” Catholics of the 20th and 21st centuries are heirs of the harm that has resulted and its implication that they should follow the silent 5,599 in preference to the one who appeals to natural and Catholic principle.

3.

“My war against moral and financial corruption unleashed the fury of then-Secretary of State Cardinal Tarcisio Bertone when – in accordance with my responsibilities as delegate for the Papal Representations – I denounced the corruption of Cardinal McCarrick and opposed his promoting corrupt and unworthy candidates for the episcopate... [In due course I was led] to consider many events I had witnessed during my diplomatic and pastoral career in a different light, and to grasp their coherence with a single project that by its nature could be neither exclusively political nor exclusively religious, since it included a global attack on traditional society based on the doctrinal, moral, and liturgical teaching aspects of the Church...”

The Pope and curial cardinals and bishops ought to be defending the natural order of society built on the family which are, each of them, of God. Instead, they are busy undermining them, defending the divorced and the sexually deviant. Here is the reason for the Archbishop’s foray into what many Catholics may consider unnecessary areas of concern.

⁶ Ironically, it was Pius X who called on the faithful ‘to love the Pope’. His predecessor, Leo XIII, who had experienced a private revelation of the evils that lay ahead of the Church, might have expressed himself with more circumspection.

The abiding problem with the world, as we noted in the earlier article, is the universal lack of leadership. This is especially the case with Catholic bishops whose duty extends beyond the faithful to all men. They are lamentably deficient in the execution of their duties, a situation which is aggravated by the utter lack of moral and religious leadership from the Pope.

4.

“Witnessing the total subversion of the divine order and the propagation of infernal chaos with the zealous collaboration of the leaders of the Vatican and the episcopate, makes us understand how terrible are the words of the Virgin Mary at La Salette – “Rome will lose the faith and become the seat of the Antichrist” – and what a hateful betrayal is constituted by the apostasy of the pastors, and by the even more unheard-of betrayal of the one who sits on the throne of the Most Blessed Peter... [This blasphemy is] consummated with the fearful complicity of many, too many, prelates reluctant to recognise in the Second Vatican Council the principal cause of the present revolution and the adulteration of the Catholic Mass as the origin of the spiritual and moral dissolution of the faithful...”

Here again there is resonance with what we said in comment on the Statement criticising Pope Francis concerning the departure from the right liturgical order of Holy Mass of that fruit of Vatican II’s defective document, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, the *novus ordo missae*. Yes, one can remain a Catholic while attending that ersatz rite, but it militates against the faith!

5.

“Today it is more necessary than ever for us pastors to wake up from our torpor: *Hora est iam nos de somno surgere* (Rom 13:11). Our responsibility before God, the Church, and souls requires us unequivocally to denounce all the errors and deviations that we have tolerated for too long, because we will not be judged either by Bergoglio or by the world, but by Our Lord Jesus Christ. We will give an account to Him of every soul lost through our negligence, of every sin committed by each soul because of us, of every scandal before which we have remained silent out of false prudence, through a desire for quiet living, through complicity.”

We can only repeat: the abiding problem in the world is the inaction, the silence, the lack of leadership of the Church’s bishops. Time will show whether a few, several, many, will feel compelled to respond to the Archbishop’s admonition, if not for the sake of the faithful and for the world, for the sake of their own salvation. The world needs their leadership in the immense vacuum brought about by the subversion of the papacy

There is plenty for the faithful to read in what the Archbishop has to say, plenty for them to pray about in respect of the future of God’s Church under the appalling existing regime. We will close with a quote from the first chapter of Fr Calderón’s book cited above.

“Formally considered, the modality impressed upon the Church by the Second Vatican Council is a new religion. It has as its *final end* to render homage to the dignity of the human person, in which it coincides with atheistic humanism; but, unlike the latter, it finds in man a transcendent value as a living image of the God-head, which would crown God as Creator. In this venture all the riches of the Church have been squandered as *matter*—not only its doctrines and institutions, but even the nobility of its most ingenious sons—by way of subtle anthropocentric redirection, a task prepared with long-suffering patience by the ‘modernism’ which St Pius X condemned at

the beginning of the last century, and by the ‘new theology’ condemned by Pius XII until the 1950s. And if this transformation could be imposed on the Church, it was because the ecclesiastical hierarchy itself was used as an *agent*, modified for the purpose according to the Machiavellian principles of modern democracy.”

Michael Baker

July 2nd, 2024—*Visitation of the Blessed Virgin*

APPENDIX

ARCHBISHOP VIGANÒ: I ACCUSE BERGOGLIO OF HERESY AND SCHISM

Source: https://www.lifesitenews.com/opinion/archbishop-vigano-i-accuse-bergoglio-of-heresy-and-schism/?utm_source=featured-news&utm_campaign=catholic

Editor’s note: *The following essay is the full English translation of a statement from Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò in response to the charge of schism from the Vatican’s Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith, published in Italian on June 28, 2024.*

*‘But even if we or an angel from heaven
Should preach to you a gospel other than the one that we preached to you,
let that one be accursed.
As we have said before, and now I say again,
if anyone preaches to you a gospel other than the one that you received,
let him be anathema.’ — Gal 1:8-9*

“When I think that we are in the palace of the Holy Office, which is the exceptional witness of the Tradition and of the defence of the Catholic Faith, I cannot stop myself from thinking that I am at home, and that it is me, whom you call ‘the traditionalist’, who should judge you.”

So spoke Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre in 1979, when he was summoned to the former Holy Office, in the presence of the prefect, Cardinal Franjo Šeper, and two other prelates.

As I stated in my communiqué of June 20, I do not recognize the authority of the tribunal that claims to judge me, nor of its prefect, nor of the one who appointed him. This decision of mine, which is certainly painful, is not the result of haste or a spirit of rebellion; but rather is dictated by the moral necessity which, as bishop and successor of the apostles, obliges me in conscience to bear witness to the truth, that is, to God Himself, to Our Lord Jesus Christ.

I face this trial with the determination that comes from knowing that I have no reason to consider myself separate from communion with the Holy Church and with the papacy which I have always served with filial devotion and fidelity. I could not conceive of a single moment of my life outside this one Ark of Salvation, which providence has constituted as the Mystical Body of Christ, in submission to its Divine Head and to His vicar on earth.

The enemies of the Catholic Church fear the power of grace which works through the sacraments, and above all the power of the Holy Mass, a terrible *katechon* which frustrates many of their efforts and wins to God so many souls who would otherwise be damned. And it is precisely this awareness of the power of the supernatural action of the Catholic priesthood in society that lies at the origin of their fierce hostility to tradition.

Satan and his minions know full well what a threat the one true Church poses to their antichristic plan. These subversives – whom the Roman pontiffs have courageously denounced as enemies of God, the Church, and humanity – are identifiable in the *inimica vis*, Freemasonry. It has infiltrated the hierarchy and succeeded in making it lay down the spiritual weapons at its disposal, opening the doors of the citadel to the enemy in the name of *dialogue* and *universal brotherhood*, concepts that are intrinsically Masonic. But the Church, following the example of her Divine Founder, does not dialogue with Satan: She fights him.

The causes of the present crisis

As Romano Amerio pointed out in his seminal essay *Iota Unum*, this cowardly and culpable surrender began with the convocation of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council and with the underground and highly organized action of clergymen and laity linked to the Masonic sects, aimed at slowly but surely subverting the structure of government and magisterium of the Church in order to demolish Her from within. It is useless to look for other reasons: the documents of the secret sects demonstrate the existence of an infiltration plan conceived in the 19th century and carried out a century later, exactly in the terms in which it was conceived. Similar processes of dissolution had previously taken place in the civil sphere, and it is no coincidence that the popes were able to grasp in the uprisings and wars that bloodied the European nations the disintegrating work of international Freemasonry.

Since the council the Church has thus become the bearer of the revolutionary principles of 1789, as some of the proponents of Vatican II have admitted, and as is confirmed by the appreciation on the part of the Lodges for all the popes of the council and of the post-conciliar period, precisely because of the implementation of changes that the Freemasons had long called for.

Change – or better still, *aggiornamento* – has been so much at the centre of the conciliar narrative that it has been the hallmark of Vatican II and has posited this assembly as the *terminus post quem* that sanctions the end of the *ancien régime* – the regime of the “old religion”, of the “old Mass”, of the “pre-council” – and the beginning of the “conciliar church” with its “new mass” and the substantial relativisation of all dogma.

Among the proponents of this revolution appear the names of those who, until the pontificate of John XXIII, had been condemned and removed from teaching because of their heterodoxy. The list is long and also includes Ernesto Buonaiuti, the excommunicated *vitandus*, a friend of Roncalli, who died unrepentant in heresy and whom just a few days ago the president of the Italian Bishops’ Conference, Cardinal Matteo Zuppi, commemorated with a Mass in the cathedral of Bologna, as reported with ill-concealed emphasis by *Il Faro di Roma*:

Almost eighty years later, a cardinal who is completely in line with the Pope is starting again with a liturgical gesture that has in all respects the flavour of rehabilitation. Or at least a first step in that direction.

The Church and the antichurch

I am therefore summoned before the tribunal that has taken the place of the Holy Office to be tried for schism while the head of the Italian bishops – identified as being among the *papabili* and

“completely in line with the Pope” – is illicitly celebrating a Mass of suffrage for one of the worst and most obstinate exponents of Modernism, against whom the Church – the one from which according to them I am separated – had pronounced the most severe sentence of condemnation. In 2022, in the Italian Bishops’ Conference newspaper *Avvenire*, Professor Luigino Bruni praised Modernism in these terms:

“[...] a process of necessary renewal for the Catholic Church of its time, which was still impervious to the critical studies on the Bible that had been established for many decades in the Protestant world. For Buonaiuti, accepting scientific and historical studies on the Bible was the main way for the Church’s encounter with modernity. A meeting that did not take place, because the Catholic Church was still dominated by the theorems of neo-scholastic theology and blocked by the Counter-Reformation fear that the Protestant winds might finally invade the Catholic body.”

These words would suffice to make us understand the abyss that separates the Catholic Church from the one that replaced Her, beginning with the Second Vatican Council, when the “Protestant winds” finally invaded the Catholic body.

This very recent episode is only the latest in an endless series of small steps, of silent acquiescence, of complicit winks with which the very leaders of the conciliar hierarchy made possible the transition “from the theorems of neo-scholastic theology” – that is, from the clear and unequivocal formulation of Dogmas – to the present apostasy.

We find ourselves in the surreal situation in which a hierarchy calls itself Catholic and therefore demands obedience from the ecclesial body while at the same time professing doctrines that, before the council, the Church had condemned; and at the same time condemning doctrines as heretical that up until then had been taught by all the popes.

This happens when the absolute is removed from the truth and relativised by adapting it to the spirit of the world. How would the pontiffs of recent centuries have acted today? Would they judge me guilty of schism, or would they rather condemn the one who claims to be their successor? Together with me, the modernist Sanhedrin judges and condemns all Catholic popes, because the faith that they defended is mine; and the errors that Bergoglio defends are those that they, without exception, condemned. The words of the Jesuit martyr Edmund Campion in response to the verdict finding him guilty of treason in 1581 apply to the present Vatican no less than they did then to the defender of the Faith: “In condemning us, you condemn all your own ancestors”.

Hermeneutic of rupture

I ask myself, then: what continuity can be given between two realities that oppose and contradict each other? Between Bergoglio’s *conciliar and synodal church* and the one “blocked by counter-reformation fear” from which he ostentatiously distances himself? And from what “church” would I be in a state of schism if the one that claims to be Catholic differs from the true Church precisely in its preaching of what She condemned and in its condemnation of what She preached?

The adepts of the “conciliar church” will reply that this is due to the evolution of the ecclesial body in a “necessary renewal”; while the Catholic Magisterium teaches us that the truth is immutable and that the doctrine of the evolution of dogmas is heretical. Two churches, certainly: each with its own doctrines and liturgies and saints; but whereas for the Catholic believer the Church is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, for Bergoglio the Church is conciliar, ecumenical, synodal, inclusive, immigrationist, eco-sustainable, and gay-friendly.

The self-removal of the conciliar hierarchy

Is it possible, then, that the Church has begun to teach error? Can we believe that the one Ark of Salvation is at the same time also an instrument of perdition for souls? That the Mystical Body separates itself from its Divine Head, Jesus Christ, making the Saviour's promise fail? This cannot, of course, be admissible, and those who support such an idea fall into heresy and schism.

The Church cannot teach error, nor can her Head, the Roman pontiff, be at the same time heretical and orthodox, Peter and Judas, in communion with all his predecessors and at the same time in schism with them. The only theologically possible answer is that the conciliar hierarchy, which proclaims itself Catholic but embraces a faith different from that constantly taught for 2,000 years by the Catholic Church, belongs to another entity and therefore does not represent the true Church of Christ.

To those who remind me that Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre never went so far as to question the legitimacy of the Roman pontiff, while acknowledging the heresy and even the apostasy of the conciliar popes – as when he exclaimed: “Rome has lost the Faith! Rome is in apostasy!” – I remind them that in the last 50 years the situation has worsened dramatically and that in all probability this great pastor today would act with equal firmness, publicly repeating what he said then only to his clerics:

“In this pastoral council, the spirit of error and lies has been able to work at ease, planting time-bombs everywhere that will blow up institutions in due course.” (*Principes et directives*, 1977).

And again:

”He who is seated on the Throne of Peter participates in the worship of false gods. What conclusion should we draw, perhaps in a few months’ time, in the face of these repeated acts of communication with false cults? I don’t know. I wonder. But it is possible that we will find ourselves forced to believe that the Pope is not Pope. Because at first sight it seems to me – I do not yet want to say it in a solemn and public way – that it is impossible for someone who is a heretic to be publicly and formally Pope.” (March 30, 1986)

What makes us understand that the “synodal church” and its head Bergoglio do not profess the Catholic faith? It is the total and unconditional adherence of all its members to a multiplicity of errors and heresies already condemned by the infallible Magisterium of the Catholic Church, and from the ostentatious rejection of any doctrine, moral precept, act of worship and religious practice that is not sanctioned by “their” council. [None] of them can in conscience subscribe to the Tridentine Profession of Faith and the Anti-Modernist Oath, because what [these] both express is the exact opposite of what Vatican II and the so-called “conciliar magisterium” insinuate and teach.

Since it is not theologically tenable that the Church and the papacy are instruments of perdition rather than of salvation, we must necessarily conclude that the heterodox teachings conveyed by the so-called “conciliar church” and the “popes of the council” from Paul VI onwards constitute an anomaly that seriously calls into question the legitimacy of their magisterial and governing authority.

The subversive use of authority

That is, we must understand that the subversive use of authority in the Church aimed at Her destruction (or at Her transformation into a church *other* than the one willed and founded by Christ) constitutes in itself a sufficient element to render *null and void* the authority of this new subject which, usurping power, has maliciously superimposed itself onto the Church of Christ. That is why I do not recognise the legitimacy of the dicastery that is putting me on trial.

The manner in which the hostile action against the Catholic Church was carried out confirms that it was planned and intended, because otherwise those who denounced it would have been listened to and those who cooperated in it would have immediately stopped. Certainly, with the eyes of that time and the traditional formation of most of the cardinals, bishops, and clergy, the “scandal” of a hierarchy that contradicted itself appeared as such an enormity as to induce many prelates and clerics not to believe that it was possible that revolutionary and Masonic principles could find acceptance and promotion in the Church.

But this was precisely the “masterstroke of Satan” – as Archbishop Lefebvre called it – who knew how to make use of the natural respect and filial love of Catholics for the sacred authority of the pastors to induce them to put obedience before the truth, perhaps hoping that a future pope could in some way heal the disaster that had been accomplished and whose explosive results could already be guessed. This did not happen, despite the fact that some had courageously sounded the alarm. And I also count myself among those who, in that troubled phase, did not dare to oppose errors and deviations that had not yet fully shown themselves in their destructive value. I do not mean to say that I did not have an inkling of what was happening, but that I did not find – because of the intense work and the all-encompassing tasks of a bureaucratic and administrative nature at the service of the Holy See – the right conditions that would have allowed me to grasp the unprecedented gravity of what was taking place before our eyes.

The clash

The occasion that led me to clash with my ecclesiastical superiors began when I was delegate for the Pontifical Representations, then as Secretary General of the Governorate, and finally as Apostolic Nuncio to the United States. My war against moral and financial corruption unleashed the fury of then-Secretary of State Cardinal Tarcisio Bertone when – in accordance with my responsibilities as delegate for the Papal Representations – I denounced the corruption of Cardinal McCarrick and opposed his promoting corrupt and unworthy candidates for the episcopate presented by the Secretary of State, who had me transferred to the Governorate because “I prevented him from making the bishops he wanted”.

It was always Bertone, with the complicity of Cardinal Giovanni Lajolo, who hindered my work aimed at combating widespread corruption in the Governorate, where I had already obtained results important beyond all expectations. It was also Bertone and Lajolo who convinced Pope Benedict XVI to expel me from the Vatican and send me to the United States. There I found myself having to confront the vile events of Cardinal McCarrick including his dangerous relationships with political representatives of the Obama-Biden administration and also on an international level which I did not hesitate to report to Secretary of State Pietro Parolin who took no account of it.

This led me to consider many events I had witnessed during my diplomatic and pastoral career in a different light, and to grasp their coherence with a single project that by its nature could be neither exclusively political nor exclusively religious, since it included a global attack on traditional society based on the doctrinal, moral, and liturgical teaching aspects of the Church.

Corruption as an instrument of blackmail

This is why, from once having been an esteemed apostolic nuncio – for which few days ago Cardinal Parolin himself recognized me for my exemplary loyalty, honesty, correctness, and efficiency – I have now become an inconvenient archbishop, not only because I have asked for justice in the canonical processes undertaken against corrupt prelates, but also and above all for having provided an interpretive key that shows how corruption within the hierarchy was a

necessary premise to control, manipulate, and coerce it with blackmail to act against God, against the Church, and against souls.

This *modus operandi* – which Freemasonry had described in detail before infiltrating the ecclesial body – mirrors that adopted in civil institutions, where representatives of the people, especially at the highest levels, are largely blackmail-able because they are corrupt and perverted. Their obedience to the delusions of the globalist elite leads peoples to ruin, destruction, disease, and death – death not only of the body, but also of the soul. Because the true project of the New World Order – to which Bergoglio is enslaved and from which he draws his own legitimacy from the powerful of the world – is an essentially satanic project, in which the work of the creation of the Father, the redemption of the Son, and the sanctification of the Holy Spirit is hated, erased, and counterfeited by the *simia Dei* [the ape of God] and his servants.

If you do not speak, the very stones will cry out

Witnessing the total subversion of the divine order and the propagation of infernal chaos with the zealous collaboration of the leaders of the Vatican and the episcopate makes us understand how terrible are the words of the Virgin Mary at La Salette – “Rome will lose the faith and become the seat of the Antichrist” – and what a hateful betrayal is constituted by the apostasy of the pastors, and by the even more unheard-of betrayal of the one who sits on the throne of the Most Blessed Peter.

If I were to remain silent in the face of this betrayal – which is consummated with the fearful complicity of many, too many, prelates reluctant to recognise in the Second Vatican Council the principal cause of the present revolution and the adulteration of the Catholic Mass as the origin of the spiritual and moral dissolution of the faithful – I would break the oath taken on the day of my ordination and renewed on the occasion of my episcopal consecration. As a successor of the apostles, I cannot and will not accept to witness the systematic demolition of Holy Church and the damnation of so many souls without trying by every means to oppose all this. Nor can I consider a cowardly silence for the sake of a quiet life preferable to giving witness to the Gospel and defending Catholic truth.

A schismatic sect accuses me of schism: this should be enough to demonstrate the subversion taking place. Imagine what impartiality of judgment a judge will be able to exercise when he depends on the one whom I accuse of being a usurper. But precisely because this event is emblematic, I want the faithful – who are not required to be familiar with the functioning of the ecclesiastical tribunals – to understand that the crime of schism is not committed when there are well-founded reasons to consider the election of the Pope dubious, [whether] due to the *vitium consensus* [or] irregularities or violations of the norms which govern the conclave (cf. Wernz-Vidal, *Ius Canonicum*, Rome, Pont. Univ. Greg., 1937, vol. VII, p. 439).

The Bull *Cum ex apostolatus officio* of Paul IV established in perpetuity the nullity of the nomination or election of any prelate – including the Pope – who had fallen into heresy before his promotion to cardinal or elevation to Roman pontiff. It defines the promotion or elevation as *nulla, irrita, et inanis* – void, invalid and without value –

“even if it took place with the agreement and unanimous consent of all the cardinals; nor can it be said that it is validated by the receipt of the office, consecration, or possession [...], or by the putative enthronement [...] of the Roman pontiff himself or by the obedience given to him by all and by the course of any duration of time in the said exercise of his office.”

Paul IV adds that all the acts performed by this person are to be considered equally null, and that his subjects, both clerics and lay people, are freed from obedience with regard to him, “without

prejudice, however, on the part of these same subjected people, to the obligation of fidelity and obedience to be given to future bishops, archbishops, patriarchs, primates, cardinals, and Roman pontiffs who are canonically installed”. Paul IV concludes:

“And to the greater confusion of those thus promoted and elevated, where they claim to continue their administration, it is permissible to request the help of the secular arm; nor for this reason are those who withdraw from loyalty and obedience towards those who have been promoted and elevated in the way already mentioned, to be subject to any of those censures and punishments imposed on those who would like to tear the tunic of the Lord.”

For this reason, with serenity of conscience, I maintain that the errors and heresies to which Bergoglio adhered before, during, and after his election, along with the intention he held in his apparent acceptance of the papacy, render his elevation to the throne null and void.

If all the acts of governance and teaching of Jorge Mario Bergoglio, in content and form, prove to be extraneous and even in conflict with what constitutes the action of any of the popes; if even simple believers and non-Catholics understand the anomaly of the role that Bergoglio is playing in the globalist and anti-Christian project carried out by the World Economic Forum, the U.N. Agencies, the Trilateral Commission, the Bilderberg Group, the World Bank, and by all the other sprawling branches of the globalist elite, this does not demonstrate even slightly that I desire schism by highlighting and denouncing this anomaly.

Yet I am attacked and prosecuted because there are those who delude themselves that by condemning and excommunicating me my denunciation of the *coup d'état* will somehow lose its coherence and consistency. This attempt to silence everyone solves nothing; indeed it makes those who try to conceal or minimize the metastasis that is destroying the ecclesial body all the more culpable and complicit.

The ‘deminutio’ of the synodal papacy

To all this we may add the study document ‘The Bishop of Rome’ which the Dicastery for Promoting Christian Unity recently published and the downgrading of the papacy which is theorised in it, in application of John Paul II’s encyclical *Ut Unum Sint*, which in turn refers to the constitution *Lumen Gentium* of Vatican II.

It appears entirely legitimate – and dutiful, in the name of the primacy of Catholic truth sanctioned in the infallible documents of the papal Magisterium – to ask whether Bergoglio’s deliberate choice to abolish the apostolic title of Vicar of Christ and choose to define himself *simpliciter* as Bishop of Rome does not constitute in some way a *deminutio* of the papacy itself, an attack against the divine constitution of the Church, and a betrayal of the *Munus petrinum*. And upon closer inspection, the previous step was taken by Benedict XVI, who invented – along with the “hermeneutic” of an impossible “continuity” between two totally foreign entities – the *monstrum* of a “collegial papacy” exercised by the Jesuit and the emeritus simultaneously.

It is no coincidence that the study document cites a phrase from Paul VI:

“The Pope [...] is undoubtedly the most serious obstacle on the path of ecumenism” (Speech to the Secretary for the Promotion of Christian Unity, 28 April 1967).

Montini had begun to prepare the ground four years earlier when he dramatically laid aside the Tiara. If this is the premise of a text that is intended to serve to make the Roman papacy “compatible” with the denial of the primacy of Peter that the heretics and schismatics reject; and if Bergoglio himself presents himself as merely *primus inter pares* amidst the assembly of Christian sects and denominations not in communion with the Apostolic See, failing to proclaim the Catholic doctrine on the papacy defined solemnly and infallibly by the First Vatican Council,

how can one fail to think that the exercise of the papacy, and indeed the very intention to accept it, has been affected by a defect of consent... such as to render the legitimacy of “Pope Francis” null or at least highly doubtful?

Which “church” could I separate myself from, which “pope” would I refuse to recognise, if the former defines itself as the “conciliar and synodal church” in antithesis to the “pre-conciliar church” – i.e., the Church of Christ – and the latter demonstrates that he considers the papacy as his own personal prerogative to be disposed of by modifying and altering it at will, always in coherence with the doctrinal errors implied by Vatican II and the post-conciliar “magisterium”? If the Roman papacy – the papacy, to be clear, of Pius IX, Leo XIII, Pius X, Pius XI, Pius XII – is considered to be an obstacle to ecumenical dialogue, and ecumenical dialogue is pursued as the absolute priority of the “synodal church”, represented by Bergoglio, what better way could this dialogue be implemented than by removing those elements that make the papacy incompatible with it, and therefore tampering with it in a completely illegitimate and invalid way?

The conflict of so many brother bishops and faithful

I am convinced that among the bishops and priests there are many who have experienced and still experience today the excruciating internal conflict of finding themselves divided between what Christ the pontiff asks of them – and they know it well – and what the one who presents himself as Bishop of Rome imposes with force, with blackmail, and with threats.

Today it is more necessary than ever for us pastors to wake up from our torpor: *Hora est iam nos de somno surgere* (Rom 13:11). Our responsibility before God, the Church, and souls requires us unequivocally to denounce all the errors and deviations that we have tolerated for too long, because we will not be judged either by Bergoglio or by the world, but by Our Lord Jesus Christ. We will give an account to Him of every soul lost through our negligence, of every sin committed by each soul because of us, of every scandal before which we have remained silent out of false prudence, through a desire for quiet living, through complicity.

On the day on which I was supposed to present myself to defend myself before the Dicastery for the Doctrine of Faith, I have decided to make public this declaration of mine, to which I add a denunciation of my accusers, their “council”, and their “pope”. I ask the holy apostles Peter and Paul, who consecrated the soil of the *Alma Urbe* with their own blood, to intercede before the throne of the Divine Majesty, so that they may obtain for the Holy Church that She may finally be freed from the siege that eclipses Her and from the usurpers who humiliate Her, making the *Domina gentium* the servant of the antichristic plan of the New World Order.

In defence of the Church

My defence is therefore not a personal one, but rather a defence of the Holy Church of Christ, in which I have been constituted a bishop and successor of the apostles, with the precise mandate of safeguarding the Deposit of Faith and preaching the Word, insisting *opportune importune* – in season and out of season – rebuking, reproving, exhorting with all patience and doctrine (2 Tim 4:2).

I strongly reject the accusation of having torn the seamless garment of the Saviour and of having departed from being under the supreme authority of the Vicar of Christ: in order to separate myself from ecclesial communion with Jorge Mario Bergoglio, I would have to have first been in communion with him, which is not possible since Bergoglio himself cannot be considered a member of the Church, due to his multiple heresies and his manifest alien-ness and incompatibility with the role he invalidly and illicitly holds.

My accusations against Jorge Maria Bergoglio

Before my brothers in the episcopate and the entire ecclesial body, I accuse Jorge Mario Bergoglio of heresy and schism, and I ask that he be judged as a heretic and schismatic and removed from the throne which he has unworthily occupied for over 11 years. This in no way contradicts the adage *Prima Sedes a nemine judicatur*, because it is evident that, since a heretic is unable to assume the Papacy, he is not above the Prelates who judge him.

I also accuse Jorge Mario Bergoglio of having caused – due to the prestige and authority of the Apostolic See which he usurps – serious adverse effects, sterility, and death in the millions of faithful who followed his insistent invitation to undergo the inoculation of an experimental gene serum produced with aborted fetuses, even to the point of issuing a formal “Note” declaring that using the vaccine is morally permissible... He will have to answer before the tribunal of God for this crime against humanity.

Finally, I denounce the secret agreement between the Holy See and the Chinese communist dictatorship, by which the Church has been humiliated and forced to accept the government appointment of bishops, the control of liturgical celebrations, and limitations on its freedom of preaching, while Catholics loyal to the Apostolic See are persecuted with impunity by the Beijing government with the complicit silence of the Roman Sanhedrin.

The rejection of the errors of Vatican II

I consider it an honour to be “accused” of rejecting the errors and deviations implied by the so-called Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, which I consider to be completely devoid of magisterial authority due to its heterogeneity compared to all the true councils of the Church, which I fully recognize and accept, just as I fully recognize and accept all the magisterial acts of the Roman pontiffs.

With conviction I reject the heterodox doctrines contained in the documents of Vatican II and which have been condemned by the popes up to Pius XII, or which contradict the Catholic Magisterium in any way. I find it disconcerting to say the least that those who are trying me for schism are those who embrace the heterodox doctrine according to which there exists a bond of union “with those who, being baptized, are honoured with the name of Christian, though they do not profess the faith in its entirety or do not preserve unity of communion with the successor of Peter” (Lumen Gentium 15).

I wonder how readily one can challenge a bishop for the lack of communion which is also claimed to exist with heretics and schismatics.

I equally condemn, reject, and refuse the heterodox doctrines expressed in the so-called “post-conciliar magisterium” that originated with Vatican II, as well as the recent heresies relating to the “synodal church”, the reformulation of the papacy in an ecumenical key, the admission of concubinaries to the sacraments, and the promotion of sodomy and “gender” ideology.

I also condemn Bergoglio’s adherence to climate fraud, a mad neo-Malthusian superstition engendered by those who, hating the Creator, cannot help but also detest creation, and man along with it, who is made in the image and likeness of God.

Conclusion

To the Catholic faithful, who today are scandalised and disoriented by the winds of novelty and the false doctrines that are promoted and imposed by a hierarchy rebellious against the Divine Master, I ask you to pray and offer your sacrifices and fasts *pro libertate et exaltatione Sanctæ Matris*

Ecclesiae, so that Holy Mother Church may find Her freedom and triumph with Christ, after this time of passion.

May those who have had the grace of being incorporated into Her in baptism not abandon their Mother who is today lying prostrate and suffering: *tempora bona veniant, pax Christi veniat, regnum Christi veniat.*

Given in Viterbo, on the 28th day of the month of June, in the Year of Our Lord 2024, the Vigil of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul.

+ Carlo Maria Viganò, *Archbishop*
