Machine Translated by Google

MANIFESTO TO REDEEM CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

Enough of the silence! Shout with a hundred thousand tongues, for, since it has been silenced, the "The world is rotten," proclaimed Saint Catherine of Siena.

1-FOUNDATION FOR THE DEFENSE OF THE DOCTRINE:

In matters of doctrine and faith, human respect is not acceptable; rather, all silence is culpable, as Saint John says: *If anyone comes to you and does not bring this teaching, do not receive him or greet him, for whoever greets him shares in his wicked works* (2 John 10-11). Thus, it is understood that the principal duty that Saint Paul entrusted to one of the first bishops, Saint Timothy, is to maintain *the good deposit of faith* (2 Timothy 1:14), so that the church may truly be *the house of the living God, and the pillar and foundation of the truth* (1 Timothy 3:15). That is why the Catechism of the Catholic Church says in number 2088: *The first commandment asks us to nourish and guard our faith with prudence and vigilance, and to reject everything that is opposed to it;* and the Code of Canon Law recalls this same thing in canons 750: *All are obliged to avoid any contrary doctrine,* and 752: *The faithful are to take care to avoid everything that is inconsistent with it,* obviously referring to the same doctrine; thus it is also indicated in canon 760: *The mystery of Christ must be presented fully and faithfully in the ministry of the word, which must be based on Sacred Scripture, Tradition, the liturgy, the Magisterium, and the life of the Church;* moreover, these words of Jesus can be applied to the defense of the faith: *If your brother sins, go and tell him his fault between you and him alone; and if he listens to you, you have gained your brother; But if he does not listen to you, take one or two others along with you, so that the whole matter may be established by the testimony of two or three witnesses. If he refuses to listen to them, tell it to the church; and if he refuses to listen even to the church, treat him as you would a Gentile or a tax collector* (Mt 18:15-17). Hence, in Denzinger 1105, denying the contrary thesis, the denunciation of the heretic is ordered. The reason for these sharp provisions lies in the fact that Catholic doctrine is not a mere theory but contains the very person of Christ, by expressing his entire salvific mystery. That is why it is so important to preserve this doctrine in its entirety, as is indicated in these words: " When *the Son of Man comes, will he find faith on earth?"* (Lk 18:8). For if a single point of doctrine is lost, the person of Christ and his salvific action disappear. Consequently, aware that we are in the great trial of the Church, of which the Catechism speaks (nos. 675-677), and in the great apostasy, announced by the Apostle (cf. 2 Thess 2:3), and feeling concerned by my own priestly ministry, and especially in the face of the widespread episcopal defection, I make my own
First, the words of the psalmist: *I have not closed my lips, Lord, (...) nor have I hidden your defense within my breast* (Psalm 39:10-11), and also those of Daniel, so as to avoid being a "mute dog" (cf. Isaiah 56:10), or a "sleeping watchman" (cf. Ezekiel 3:17), in

Machine Translated by Google

whose case God could not count on me to build a wall against the breach that threatens to demolish the whole church (cf. Ezek 22:30), and not wanting to be counted among the cowards and accomplices (cf. Rev 21:8), but seeking, as the apostles said, *to obey God rather than men* (Acts 5:29), to cry out with all my strength: *"Are you out of your minds, Israelites?* (Dan 13:48), do you not see that you have condemned, and are leading to execution, the church, represented by the chaste Susanna?" Indeed, just as Jesus surrendered himself to the Passion and was condemned by his own priests, so too now the church is heading towards a similar Passion, and shall we, its priests, be the ones who condemn it: some by action, and others by omission?

2-JUSTIFICATION FOR THIS MODE OF DEFENSE:

Because the processing of a complaint against the Pope is legally flawed According to canon 1404: *The First See cannot be judged by anyone,* since otherwise it would not effectively be the First See, but would be subject to another superior instance to which it would have to give an account, and the provisions of canons 331, 333 § 3, and 1405 regarding the supreme and total power of the Pope would not be fulfilled. This power prevents the See from being denounced or accused, since such actions only seek to initiate legal proceedings: impossible against one who, being the supreme judge, cannot also appear as a party. This leads canon 333 § 3 to conclude: *There is no appeal or recourse against a sentence or decree of the Roman Pontiff,* both in the magisterial and disciplinary spheres, to the point that canon 1372 even requires canonical sanction for anyone who appeals to any instance against an act of the Pope. I have no other means to vindicate Catholic doctrine and unburden my conscience before they have than to cry out the stones (cf. Lk 19:40), than to make this manifesto public, in which, having assumed that, as Scripture warns: *He was allowed to wage war against the saints and to conquer them* (Rev 13:7), it is only permissible to seek supernatural success, perfectly formulated by the apostle: *May I never boast except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ* (Gal 6:14), I, Francisco José Vegara Cerezo, accuse the so-called "Pope Francis," first of all, of heresy, as I will subsequently try to prove from his own magisterial documents:

3-ARGUMENTATION REGARDING THE HERETICAL CHARACTER OF THE POPE FRANCISCO:

3.1- In the apostolic exhortation Evangelii gaudium, of November 24
As of 2013, it is found:

247. A very special look is directed to the Jewish people, whose Covenant with God has never been revoked, because "God's gifts and his call are irrevocable" (Rom 11:29).

Machine Translated by Google

This thesis contradicts Christ's words at the Last Supper, when he spoke of the new covenant (cf. Mt 26:28; Mk 14:24; Lk 22:20; and 1 Cor 11:25), for it is evident that an unrevoked covenant remains in force and has not given way to a new one, which consequently can only come into force after the revocation of the previous one, as stated in Hebrews: " He *has received a more excellent ministry, inasmuch as he is also mediator of a better covenant, which is based on better promises. For if the first covenant had been faultless, there would have been no need for a second. By calling for a new covenant, he has made the first one obsolete, because what is obsolete and growing old is ready to disappear"* (8:6-7, 13).

It is true that God's gifts and calling are irrevocable, but
for the one who receives them, because God never goes back, which does not mean that some gifts are not transitory, as, in fact, all temporal gifts are, including the covenants prior to Christ, which were transitory and revocable in themselves, not being absolute but relative to Christ, whose perfect, definitive and fully effective covenant is the only one truly irrevocable in itself, as the exclusive source of the gift of eternal salvation, while the previous ones only have the same reference to Christ as irrevocable, insofar as they are pedagogical preparations; that is why Jesus said: *Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them* (Mt, 5, 17), where it is indicated that the Law and the Prophets did not have definitive meaning in themselves, but that their meaning would be fulfilled by Christ, whose fulfillment would then be the only truly definitive thing, revoking everything before, not by abolishing it in its deep sense, but by assuming and perfecting it; Hence, since the meaning of all salvific plans is to refer to Christ, making the Mosaic covenant perfect and irrevocable means detaching it from Christ, in order to make it

Effective in itself, rendering the incarnation and redemption meaningless; moreover, denying the novel, definitive and central character of Christ's covenant: *God blessed forever* (Rom 9:5), implies undermining the very specificity of Christianity.

3.2- The apostolic exhortation Amoris laetitia, signed on March 19, 2016, contains, among others, the following aberrations:

299. Baptized persons who have divorced and remarried civilly should be more fully integrated into the Christian community in every way possible, avoiding any occasion of scandal. The logic of integration is key to their pastoral accompaniment (…). They are baptized, they are brothers and sisters, and the Holy Spirit bestows upon them gifts and charisms for the good of all.

How can it be said that the Holy Spirit bestows gifts and charisms on public sinners who have ostensibly broken with the life of grace and reject the indispensable grace of conversion? What good can they possibly do?

Machine Translated by Google

How can those who harm the Church through public scandal be treated? Given the gravely sinful nature of breaking a marriage and establishing another bond, which violates the sixth commandment, it must be clarified that, although public sinners visibly remain part of the Church, their sin deprives them of all avenues of grace not directed toward their conversion. Therefore, they have only one path to integration: conversion, which is the only happy and joyful experience that can open them to the gifts and charisms of the Holy Spirit.

They not only don't have to feel excommunicated, but they can live and to mature as living members of the Church.

It is evident that the gravity of the transgression of the sixth commandment is being denied, because, if sin kills spiritually, what life or maturation within the Church is left for the sinner? The motherhood of the Church can only be expressed then in intercession and in a heart-rending call to conversion, which is the only way that he can live again for God.

301. It is no longer possible to say that all those who find themselves in a so-called "irregular" situation live in a state of mortal sin, deprived of sanctifying grace. (...) A person, even knowing the norm well, may have great difficulty understanding "the values inherent in the norm," or may be in specific circumstances that prevent them from acting differently and making other decisions without incurring further guilt.

It is false, firstly, because it goes against God's justice, that it is possible to stop sinning by committing another sin; secondly, because it goes against God's grace, that a person is inculpably incapable of escaping a state of sin; and thirdly, that someone who leads a public life of sin can be in a state of grace, which would indicate that the moral norm is itself unjust, by labeling as a sinner someone who is not, invalid in some cases, ceasing to be universal, and objectively insufficient, since subjective conditions would prevail; consequently, the moral norm would lose all truly normative value.

303. This conscience can recognize not only that a situation does not objectively correspond to the general proposal of the Gospel. It can also sincerely and honestly recognize what, for now, is the generous response that can be offered to God, and discover with a certain moral certainty that this is the self-giving that God himself is calling for amidst the concrete complexity of limitations, even if it is not yet fully the objective ideal.

Machine Translated by Google

Could God, denying his own goodness, justice, and mercy, ask, being unable or unwilling to take someone out of sin, that they continue in that sin? Obviously, God never asks for less than conversion and charity, for he never refuses to give them.

In morality there are no ideals but duties which, for that very reason, must be possible, since the impossible cannot be demanded; in moral theology the Christian life is never an unrealizable ideal, since for grace nothing is unrealizable, except salvation without conversion; therefore this is always the first effect of grace.

304. It is narrow-minded to dwell only on whether a person's actions conform to a general law or norm, because that is insufficient to discern and ensure full fidelity to God in the concrete existence of a human being. It is true that general norms represent a good that should never be disregarded or neglected, but their formulation cannot encompass absolutely every particular situation.

How can we speak of a general rule if it does not encompass the universality of cases? The general moral rule of the Christian life is the fulfillment of supernatural charity, and thus it is evident that only those who fulfill supernatural charity respond faithfully to God and are in a state of grace, while those who do not are in sin.

That which forms part of practical discernment in a particular situation cannot be elevated to the status of a rule. This would not only lead to an unbearable number of cases, but would also jeopardize the values that must be preserved with special care.

The task of morality is precisely to discern under which norm each practical situation falls, and what are the characteristics that take an act out of one norm and place it under another, and thus casuistry occurs, on the contrary, when acts unacceptable in the norms are recognized.

305. Because of mitigating or extenuating factors, it is possible that, in the midst of an objective situation of sin—which is not subjectively culpable, or not fully so—one can live in God's grace, one can love, and also one can grow in the life of grace and charity.

The obligatory formation of conscience is directed toward the knowledge of objective moral good and evil, to seek the former and escape the latter; therefore, it goes against the objective essence of morality and against the justice of God for someone to remain blamelessly entrenched in objective evil, and moreover, to grow in grace; in what grace, if remaining in that state of objective sin already implies resisting the first and indispensable grace, which is that of

Machine Translated by Google

Conversion? Morality would then lose all objective character, becoming subject to the subjective assessment of circumstances, thus falling into the subjectivity of circumstantial morality, as if intention were enough to establish the goodness of an act, when the truth is that this goodness requires that of all the elements: the act itself and the intention, while the evil of a single element produces by itself the moral degradation of everything.

307. The Church must by no means renounce proposing the full ideal of marriage, God's plan in all its greatness.

It is a great mistake to think that marriage is an ideal, which would place it in the realm of the practically unrealizable, but rather, in the light of the Gospel, it should be understood as a perfectly feasible path, as is every vocational path of following Christ, for those who remain faithful to the grace of God.

3.3- The apostolic exhortation discussed was supplemented by the document entitled “Basic Criteria for the Application of Chapter VIII of Amoris Laetitia”, prepared by the bishops of the pastoral region of Buenos Aires, which states, among other things:

We will focus only on chapter VIII, since it refers to “guidance from the Bishop” (300), in order to discern the possible access to the sacraments of some “divorced in new unions”.

6) In other, more complex circumstances, and when a declaration of nullity could not be obtained, the aforementioned option may not be feasible. Nevertheless, a path of discernment is still possible. If it is recognized that, in a specific case, there are limitations that mitigate responsibility and culpability (cf. 301-302), particularly when a person considers that they would fall into further sin, harming the children of the new union, Amoris Laetitia opens the possibility of access to the sacraments of Reconciliation and the Eucharist (cf. Notes 336 and 351). These, in turn, dispose the person to continue maturing and growing with the power of grace.

First, the objectivity and universality of the moral norm disappear, and a morality of circumstances is advocated once again, according to which circumstances could establish “limitations that mitigate responsibility and guilt,” even to the point of erasing the moral objectivity of the act, since a morally bad act would lose its objective evil due to the subjective evaluation of the circumstances, which, contrary to what is stated there, would not be merely mitigating, reducing the evil, but actually determining, turning it into good, as seen in the fact that access to communion is permitted, which requires the state of grace; second, a principle is established

Machine Translated by Google

Machiavellian, according to which a good end: protecting the offspring of the new union, would justify a bad means: maintaining that sinful union; thirdly, it attacks the sacrament of penance, which can only be received when there is sorrow for the evil committed, which is the new adulterous union, and a purpose of amending it, which requires ending such a moral irregularity; fourthly, it profanes the sacrament of the Eucharist, which requires the state of grace, incompatible with the objective situation of the contumacious and scandalous sin that maintaining the state of adultery entails; fifthly, it destroys the sacrament of marriage, which, on the one hand, ceases to be the only source of grace for the sexual union between baptized persons, and, on the other hand, loses its indissolubility and unity; Sixth, the sacrament of Holy Orders is emptied, since the administration of penance no longer depends on the objective judgment of the sacred minister, nor does the administration of the Eucharist, but anyone can demand both sacraments according to their subjective opinion; and, seventh, the whole supernatural order of grace disappears, which begins with conversion, which ceases to be indispensable, and which continues with the moral practice of objective virtues, which now become governed by the morally sovereign subjectivity of the individual, subject only to a highly imprecise and not at all objective discernment.

3.4- The above document acquires magisterial force due to the formal approval given to it by Pope Francis in a letter dated September 5, 2016, in which it is stated:

The writing is excellent and fully explains the meaning of Chapter VIII of Amoris Laetitia. There are no other interpretations. And I am sure it will do much good. May the Lord reward you for this act of pastoral charity.

Therefore, the very serious doctrinal errors of said document acquire magisterial rank, comparable to that of the exhortation itself being interpreted, notably sharpening the dogmatic disintegration that it was already carrying out.

3.5- Another important document is the Abu Dhabi Agreement, dated February 4, 2019, in which it says:

Freedom is a right of every person: everyone enjoys freedom of belief, thought, expression, and action. Pluralism and diversity of religion, color, sex, race, and language are expressions of a wise divine will, with which God created human beings. This Divine Wisdom is the source of the right to freedom of belief and the freedom to be different. Therefore, it is condemned to force people to adhere to a particular religion or culture, as well as to impose a style of civilization that others do not accept.

Machine Translated by Google

Firstly, it is false that religious freedom can be understood in an absolute sense, as if man had the right to choose any religion indiscriminately, since objectively only the Catholic Church contains the fullness of revelation and the means to achieve salvation; therefore, the true meaning of religious freedom lies in the freedom that every man must have to follow his own conscience, which excludes any religious imposition on someone against his conscience; now, conscience, which is a subjective moral norm, also does not have an absolute meaning, which would end the primacy of moral objectivity, but rather conscience has the primary duty to be formed adequately, in order to know objective moral truth, including religious truth; But obviously, this duty must be assumed by each individual, from which the goodness or evil of their choice will derive, and not imposed from outside. Secondly, attributing the diversity of religions to the "wise divine will with which God created human beings" implies, above all, naturalizing all religions by equating them in the creational order, which is natural according to the state of pure nature. It also dissolves the supernatural order, which, as revealed, is superior to mere natural creation. Furthermore, it denies the fundamental specificity of the Catholic Church as the full depository of salvific truth. Finally, it imputes to the wisdom of God, firstly, the mendacious falsehood of endorsing religions that are extremely opposed to each other, when truth is based on consistency or the absence of contradiction, and also the evil of assuming religious theories and practices that, being false, are also evil, since good is inseparable from truth, and falsehood, and therefore identifiable with evil, is that which is not true. It must be acknowledged that it is difficult to utter more colossal blasphemies.

3.6- Also important is the apostolic letter Desiderio desideravi, of the 29th of June 2022, and which contains:

5. The world does not yet know it, but all are invited to the wedding banquet of the Lamb (Rev 19:9). The only thing needed to enter is the wedding garment of faith, which comes through listening to his Word (cf. Rom 10:17).

Since it is evident that it refers to access to Eucharistic communion, which requires the state of grace, one falls into the Protestant-type error of thinking that the only sin is that which attacks the faith, and omits that any serious infraction of the commandments goes against charity, and deprives one of the aforementioned state of grace, which is not recovered without ordinarily passing through the sacrament of penance; therefore, at the same time as a thesis is theoretically accepted Protestantism, contrary to Catholic doctrine, in practice encourages sacrilegious communion.

Machine Translated by Google

3.7- The next document to consider is the response, published on October 2, 2023, from Pope Francis to the first “dubia” presented by five cardinals:

Answer to the second “dubium”:

The Church has a very clear conception of marriage: an exclusive, stable, and indissoluble union between a man and a woman, naturally open to procreation. Only this union is called "marriage." Other forms of union only achieve this "in a partial and analogous way" (Amoris Iaetitia 292), and therefore cannot strictly be called "marriage."

The seriousness of the falsehood, so subtly slipped in, unequivocal proof of his bad faith, lies in establishing a relationship of analogy between what is radically opposite, since only marriage is morally good, while all those other forms are morally bad.

However, in our dealings with people, we must not lose sight of pastoral charity, which should permeate all our decisions and attitudes. Defending objective truth is not the only expression of this charity, which also includes kindness, patience, understanding, tenderness, and encouragement. Therefore, we cannot become judges who only deny, reject, and exclude.

Clearly, the breaking of the essential link between objective truth and charity prepares the ground for any aberration, since, outside of truth, only falsehood remains, which contradicts the authenticity of any virtue, including charity.

God is the truth, and he who does not seek the truth, or seeks something else above the truth, such as that which is not true, can only be a lie, cannot truly do the true will of God, because he himself is not in the truth, and because obviously God cannot even be not in the truth, so as not to fall into falsehood.

Therefore, pastoral prudence must properly discern whether there are forms of blessing, requested by one or several people, that do not convey a mistaken conception of marriage, because, when a blessing is requested, it is expressing a plea for help from God, a request to be able to live better, a trust in a Father who can help us to live better.

The appeal to pastoral prudence is used to justify any kind of blessing, however aberrant it may be, including that of something as abominable as a homosexual couple.

Machine Translated by Google

It is interesting to emphasize the profuse use of strongly connotative language, that is: based on notions loaded with connotation, which is the emotional factor that accompanies the ideological one, and which manages to beguile and deceive, inoculating the characteristic feel-good "mercy-itis", from which a humanist image of God is concocted as a perfect projection of the highest ideals of man; thus humanity would show itself capable of replacing the revealed God, who would remain as a mere terrible and merciless caricature.

On the other hand, although there are situations that from an objective point of view are not morally acceptable, pastoral charity itself requires us not to simply treat other people as "sinners" whose guilt or responsibility may be mitigated by various factors that influence subjective imputability (Cf. St. John Paul II, Reconciliatio et Paenitentia, 17).

Once again, the same devious and tortuous tactic appears, due to its Machiavellian nature, of trying to justify with something good: pastoral charity, what is radically bad: an objectively immoral situation.

Decisions that, in certain circumstances, may form part of pastoral prudence should not necessarily become a norm. That is to say, it is not appropriate for a Diocese, an Episcopal Conference, or any other ecclesial structure to constantly and officially establish procedures or rites for all kinds of matters, since everything "that forms part of practical discernment in a particular situation cannot be elevated to the status of a norm," because this "would give rise to an unbearable casuistry" (Amoris Iaetitia 304).

Now, in the name of pastoral prudence, all general regulations are eliminated, in order to, contrary to what has been stated, lead to a casuistry that dissolves all objective morality.

Response to the fifth “dubium”:

There are many ways to express repentance. Often, for people with deeply wounded self-esteem, confessing guilt is a cruel torture, but simply approaching confession is a symbolic expression of repentance and a search for divine help.

It is clear that the confession of sins committed would no longer be necessary for sacramental validity, which, in reality, would be annulled.

Following Saint John Paul II, I maintain that we should not demand overly precise and certain resolutions of amendment from the faithful, which ultimately end up being

Machine Translated by Google

abstract or even egocentric, but even the foreseeability of a new fall "does not prejudge the authenticity of the purpose" (Saint John Paul II, Letter to Cardinal William W.
Baum and the participants of the annual course of the Apostolic Penitentiary, March 22, 1996, 5).

In the name of a false love of God towards us and a twisted interpretation of the teachings of John Paul II, the previously necessary purpose of amendment is ultimately diluted.

3.8- Another document is the letter, endorsed by Pope Francis, from the Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith to Bishop Negri, dated October 31, 2023, which reads:

Can a transgender person be baptized?

This specifically implies that "not even the doors of the Sacraments should be closed for any reason. This is especially true when it comes to that sacrament which is 'the door,' Baptism […] The Church is not a customs house, it is the fatherly home where there is room for everyone with their life full of hardships."

Thus, even when doubts persist about a person's objective moral situation or their subjective disposition toward grace, we must never forget this aspect of the faithfulness of God's unconditional love, capable of generating even with the sinner an irrevocable covenant, always open to development, even unpredictable development. This is true even when a purpose of amendment is not fully evident in the penitent.

To claim that baptism can be received unconditionally goes against the very essence of a sacrament that demands conversion as the first unavoidable step and necessary condition for salvation; that is why Jesus began his public ministry, proclaiming: *Repent, and believe in the gospel* (Mk 1:15), and culminated it, before ascending, by entrusting the same to the apostles: *Proclaim the gospel to all creation; whoever believes and is baptized will be saved, but whoever does not believe will be condemned* (Mk 16:15-16); now, conversion implies the intention to change, breaking with the former life, to begin a new one, and to keep the divine commandments, and these requirements are obviously incompatible with the very serious condition of transsexuality, freely assumed and maintained.

God's love is unconditional only in itself, since the being of God is indeed love, as Saint John tells us; however, towards us God's love is conditional in its fulfillment, since it is only realized if we freely accept it.

Machine Translated by Google

Can a transgender person be a godparent at a baptism?

Under certain conditions, an adult transsexual who has also undergone hormonal treatment and sex reassignment surgery may be admitted for the role of godfather or godmother.

Where then is the life congruent with faith in one who, living as a transsexual, maintains a rebellion against God the Creator, remaining in an objective situation of grave sin? Furthermore, the commitment that the godparents must acquire in the name of the baptized child would lack all value when the same subject lives in radical contradiction with Catholic moral doctrine.

Can a same-sex couple be godparents to a baptism?

In accordance with canon 874 § 1, 1st and 3rd of the Code of Canon Law, a godparent may be someone who is suitable for the role (cf. 1st) and "lives a life in conformity with the faith and the role assumed" (cf. canon 685, § 2 of the Code of Canon Law). The case is different when the cohabitation of two same-sex partners consists not in mere cohabitation, but in a stable and declared marital relationship, well known to the community.

In any case, proper pastoral prudence requires that each situation be considered wisely, in order to safeguard the sacrament of baptism and, above all, its reception, which is a precious good that must be protected, because it is necessary for salvation.

On the one hand, it is simply said that the case of two homosexuals living together is "different," when the reality is that it is a case completely opposed to the way of life congruent with the faith, and, on the other hand, not only is all possibility not categorically denied, but it is effectively left open, as if there could be some case in which pastoral prudence could wisely consider the acceptance as a godfather of a person whose behavior is so contrary to the faith.

Can two same-sex couples appear as the parents of a child, who must be baptized, and who was adopted or obtained through other methods such as surrogacy?

For a child to be baptized, there must be a well-founded hope that he will be baptized. educated in the Catholic religion (cf. Can. 868 § 1, 2 or CIC; can. 681, § 1, 1° CCEO).

First and foremost, it is clear that two people of the same sex cannot legitimately act as parents for the simple reason that they are denying the complementary nature of fatherhood and motherhood, which is the order

Machine Translated by Google

beloved by God, and besides, how can there be any hope that "parents" who are not such, and who live in radical opposition to Christian doctrine, will provide a minimally Christian education, when they cannot even provide the most basic human education?

Can a transgender person be a witness at a wedding?

There is nothing in current universal canon law that prohibits a transgender person from being a witness at a wedding.

Can a same-sex couple be a witness at a wedding?

There is nothing in current universal canon law that prohibits a homosexual person in a cohabiting relationship from being a witness at a marriage.

The fact that the law does not consider this possibility, nor therefore expressly reject it, does not mean that it is congruent with marriage, and that the possibility of acting as a witness should then be allowed, because what sense does it make for someone who contradicts such a conception in their own life to act as a witness to ecclesiastical marriage, reserved, as an article of faith, to the man and the woman?

3.9- The last document is the declaration of the Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith, approved by Pope Francis, published on December 18, 2023, and called Fiducia supplicans, which contains:

31. Within the framework outlined here lies the possibility of blessings for couples in irregular situations and for same-sex couples, the form of which should not be fixed by ecclesiastical authorities in any ritual way, so as not to create confusion with the blessing proper to the sacrament of marriage. In these cases, a blessing is imparted that not only has an ascending value, but is also an invocation of a descending blessing from God himself upon those who, recognizing themselves as helpless and in need of his assistance, do not claim legitimacy for their own status, but rather pray that all that is true, good, and humanly valid in their lives and relationships may be invested, sanctified, and elevated by the presence of the Holy Spirit. These forms of blessing express a plea to God to grant those helps that come from the impulses of his Spirit – which classical theology calls “actual graces” – so that human relationships can mature and grow in fidelity to the message of the Gospel, free themselves from their imperfections and frailties and express themselves in the ever-greater dimension of divine love.

It is all such a great aberration that it falls into the most blatant contradictions, for, to begin with, can one impart a blessing that in itself

Machine Translated by Google

Is it itself a pure rite, without any ritual form? And then how can one say that it does not intend to create confusion, when that is precisely what is achieved by trying to transform evil into good? Or how can one affirm that it does not intend to legitimize such a situation, if that is what the blessing before God means? And how can one say that neither sin nor union is blessed, when the former resides precisely in the latter, in which, in turn, the couple is defined, which is a union of two? What then does it matter what good there may be in a life, if that has no supernatural value, since mortal sin ruins everything and leads to damnation if there is no conversion? Now then, what conversion can there be, if the church, by blessing it, legitimizes and, as the very name of "blessing" indicates, declares such a sinful situation "good"? That is the perverse effect derived: that, by covering up the reality of sin, conversion is prevented, which is always the first and indispensable effect of grace, and which is only possible when sin is discovered, recognized and abhorred.

The magisterial document goes so far as to speak of sanctification by the Spirit; but how can the Spirit sanctify what it has already declared in Scripture to be abominable? Indeed, this is seen in Leviticus 18:22: " You *shall not have sexual relations with a male as with a woman, for that is an abomination,"* and in Romans 1:27: *"For men have abandoned natural relations with women and are consumed with lust for one another. Men commit shameful acts with other men, and receive in their own bodies the due penalty for their perversion."* The same apostle also says: *"This is the will of God, your sanctification: that you abstain from sexual immorality; that each of you know how to control his own body in holiness and honor, not in passionate lust like the Gentiles, who do not know God." Let no one wrong his brother or take advantage of him in this matter, for the Lord will avenge all such things, as we have already told you and bear witness to, because God did not call us to impurity but to holiness. Therefore, whoever despises this instruction does not despise a man but God, who gives you the gift of the Holy Spirit* (1 Thessalonians 4:3-8). If it is evident that God's will is contrary to every illicit or impure sexual act, how can one even claim the blessing, which is an action of the Spirit, of that which, besides being impure, goes against the nature created by God, who, as Jesus affirmed, *in the beginning created them male and female* (Mark 10:6)? The contempt for God truly reaches the extreme of rejecting this clear warning: *Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit?* (1 Corinthians 6:19), according to which the same Spirit would now have to bless the "wicked and shameful" act that profanes his temple, that is: he would bless his own profanation, which would be a double profanation: that of his temple and that of his act of blessing, which would be profaned, by being directed toward another profanation; is there then a greater blasphemy than to project onto God the contradiction, which is pure absurdity and thus the logical translation of moral evil? There is nothing more diabolical than the declaration, as good, of sin, which is the supreme and absolute evil before God; hence the forcefulnes

Machine Translated by Google

“Good” to evil, and “evil” to good, who put darkness for light, and light for darkness, who put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! (Is 5, 20).

The absurdity is beyond belief, equating homosexual and irregular relationships with any other type of relationship, as if they too could "mature and grow in fidelity to the message of the gospel, free themselves from their imperfections and frailties, and express themselves in the ever-greater dimension of divine love"; but what maturation and growth can sinful relationships have, other than an increase in sin itself? And what liberation from imperfections and frailties can that which is itself the fruit, more than of imperfection and fragility, of perversity and rebellion against God's commandment? And is it said that this very thing can express divine love, when it is impossible to conceive of a more resounding denial of it?

There is no better expression to define such a string of barbarities than the one used in Scripture itself: the “abomination of desolation” (Dn 11:31; Mt 24:15, and Mk 13:14). With this magisterial document, the Church takes a definitive step in the journey begun with Amoris Laetitia, since it is precisely the great abominable sin, which, for the Bible, is homosexual practice, that is placed in the holy place, which is, above all, the sacred action of blessing, which is profaned, and also, in short, since the approval is magisterial, the doctrine of the Church, which is violated from within, since the contradiction logically undermines the system it affects.

Glimpsing from this Pauline text the importance of blessing for God: “ Blessed *be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us in Christ with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places, even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and blameless before him in love”* (Ephesians 1:3-5), we understand the gravity of the following quotes, which find their full application today: “ And *now this command to you, priests: If you do not listen and take to heart the glory of my name, says the Lord of hosts, then I will put a curse on you, and I will curse your blessing; indeed, I have already cursed it, because none of you takes it to heart.” Behold, I will break your arm, and throw dung in your faces: the dung of your feasts, and you will be blown away with it* (Malachi 2:1-3), and also: *Her priests have violated my law, and profaned my holy things; they have not made a distinction between the holy and the profane, nor have they taught to distinguish between the clean and the unclean, but they have covered their eyes, so as not to see my Sabbaths, and I have been dishonored in their midst* (Ezekiel 22:26).

In short, this establishes the heretical, aberrant, and scandalous nature of Pope Francis's teaching, which inevitably leads to comparing it with the ordinary and extraordinary teachings of all previous popes.

Machine Translated by Google

4-CONSEQUENCE OF THE POPE'S MAGISTERIAL HERESIES FRANCISCO:

If it were argued that Pope Francis has not made any definition “ex cathedra”, and therefore has not yet committed the extraordinary magisterium of the Church, the answer is that, as indicated in point 892 of the Catechism: *To this ordinary teaching the faithful must adhere in a spirit of religious obedience, which, although distinct from the assent of faith, is a continuation of it;* the ordinary magisterium is also covered by *divine assistance,* and, even though it is not precisely definitive, it must avoid strict opposition to what has already been defined, so as not to frustrate the divine guarantee with which Catholic doctrine is supposed to be clothed, nor precipitate God himself, who would be the guarantor, into any contradiction, which is absolutely impossible, as Scripture assures us: *He remains faithful, for he cannot deny himself* (2 Tim 2:13), and also: *Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever* (Heb 13:8); Hence this exhortation: *Even if we or an angel from heaven should preach to you a gospel contrary to the one we have preached to you, let him be accursed.*
(Gal 1:8); consequently, it must be recognized, without ambiguity, that the acceptance of the magisterium of Pope Francis, which, as has been seen, overturns fundamental points of moral doctrine, implies the rejection of all previous magisterium, and not only that, but it ultimately leads to the recognition of the falsity of a doctrine: the Catholic one, which, founded entirely on papal magisterium, purported to be established as true and thus as irrevocable, which with the contradictions provoked by Pope Francis would have been patently denied; even, once the substantial variability, contrary to the firm truth, of Catholic doctrine was evidenced, one would have to conclude the dissolution of the Catholic Church itself, which had brandished as the supreme sign of its identity fidelity to a dogmatic doctrine that would have disappeared, demolished in its entirety with a single point being suppressed; This, then, is the dilemma that, implacably, is imposed upon us: since two contrary things cannot be true at the same time, but rather one must necessarily be false, and furthermore there is no middle ground, but rather the affirmation of one extreme necessarily implies the negation of the other, since both are contrary, we must choose between obedience to Pope Francis and fidelity to the dogmatic doctrine established by the other popes.

Of course, any argument that attempts to separate the essence of the church from the permanence of its doctrine would be completely wrong, as if that essence no longer had a clear doctrinal meaning; therefore, any characterization of the church that prioritizes or reduces itself to the merely institutional aspect, insofar as it is the absolute maintenance of the formality of a mere functional organizational chart, suffers from a serious theological deficiency, reducing the church to a mere empty shell, when, in reality, the church:

Machine Translated by Google

The Catholic Church is formed by the intimate intertwining, in historical continuity, of two elements: the doctrinal, which in an organic development is always deepened and perfected through its progressive clarifying explication, which obviously excludes any contradiction, which always provokes rupture; and the institutional, which, founded on the uninterrupted chain of sacramental practice, which ensures apostolic succession, establishes identity through the necessary personal succession. The marvel, inexplicable in a merely human way, lies in the fact that throughout the already extensive history of the Church there had never been any breakdown of the described balance between the doctrinal and institutional aspects, but rather, however deficient the individuals who in each period have embodied the supreme institution, which is the papacy—the true constitutive hinge of the Church—may have been, both the validity of the institutional succession mechanism and respect for the doctrinal content had always been maintained. However, since the facts are there with all their solid objectivity, and it is now impossible for the impetuous subjective swell to mask or undermine them, it must be agreed that the disastrous pontificate of Pope Francis has ruined everything.

5-ARGUMENTATION FOR THE INVALIDITY OF THE POPE FRANCISCO:

As the only possibility then of preserving the dogmatic doctrine, and of safeguarding the very existence of the Catholic Church, founded on communion with that doctrine, comes my second accusation against Pope Francis: that of being a false pope, so that, in perfect logic, the rejection, as spurious, of the magisterium of Pope Francis manages to reaffirm the validity of that of all the previous popes, contradicted by the one who is now denied.

5.1- The invalidity of Francis' papacy, although it may seem strange, is not due to him, but is based on the invalidity of Benedict's resignation, which vitiates all subsequent acts from the outset.

It may seem paradoxical, but such is human misery, and the pope who asked for prayers, so as not to flee before the wolves, ended up doing just that, and the wisest man in history committed the greatest mistake in all of history, which has brought us to a crisis never seen before: the great tribulation, *such as has not been since the beginning of the world until now, nor will there ever be again* (Mt 24, 21).

The question lies in when Benedict resigned, since it is obvious that in the consistory, where he only expressed the intention, the resignation was not fulfilled, since, as he himself announced, the Petrine see was not vacant until February 28; but on that date the supposed resigning pope did nothing, and it cannot even be said that what was announced came into effect.

Machine Translated by Google

For the mere announcement of an action does not produce the action itself, and the entry into force of what has not been done is also nothing; thus, to say that one resigns, but that the seat will be vacant on February 28, which is the immediate effect of the resignation, is the same as saying "I will resign"; however, doing nothing on that day means not fulfilling what was announced.

Since resignation is a juridical act, we must refer to canon 124 and following; the aforementioned canon states: *For a juridical act to be valid, it is required that it has been performed by a capable person, and that the elements that essentially constitute that act are present, as well as the formalities and requirements imposed by law for the validity of the act;* obviously, there is nothing to argue about Benedict's capacity, but it is clear that the Pope has full capacity to resign, as recognized by canon 332 § 2: *If the Roman Pontiff should resign his office, for validity it is required that the resignation be free and formally manifested, but not that it be accepted by anyone;* now, this canon emphasizes that for validity two things are necessary: freedom and formal manifestation; we will presuppose the first; but the second, on the contrary, is completely lacking, being one of the essential elements whose concurrence is required by canon 124, already cited; Furthermore, the visible nature of such an element means that what is stated in paragraph two of the same canon does not apply here: *The legal act duly performed is presumed valid with respect to the external elements,* since it is precisely those external elements that fail.

Canon 126 is crucial, because it establishes: *An act performed through ignorance or error is null when it affects what constitutes its substance, or falls on a sine qua non condition (...);* here we see how the law does not compensate for ignorance or error, but directly applies nullity.

The canons that definitively settle the matter are 188 and 189; the first, applying the nullity to the matter at hand, states: *A resignation made with substantial error is null by virtue of the law itself.* And where can such an error be placed? The following canon clarifies: *For a resignation to be valid, whether or not its acceptance is required, it must be presented in writing or orally before two witnesses.* Now, it seems that Benedict did precisely that in the consistory; however, paragraph three provides an important clue: *A resignation that requires acceptance has no effect if it is not accepted within three months.* But obviously, a papal resignation does not require acceptance by anyone. Therefore, what follows should apply: *A resignation that does not require acceptance takes effect through notification by the resigning party, made according to the norm of law;* that is, the effect of the resignation follows directly from the notification. But this is not what happened in the resignation announced by Benedict; rather, its effect was delayed. Thus the pope produced a completely invalid resignation, for, upon notifying it, he did not consider it fulfilled, so that he had not made it, and, the announced deadline having passed, he did not

Machine Translated by Google

He did nothing, so he continued not to do it, since the key lies in the fact that papal resignation is only valid if it is done formally: by notification before at least two witnesses, with the intention that it takes effect in that same notification (c. 189 § 3).

The postponement then becomes the element that directly negates what, according to canon 124, is the substantial element of this waiver: the immediate fulfillment of the effect, which, as canon 189 § 3 states, resides in the notification itself, and thus becomes one of the *requirements imposed by law for the validity of the act* (c. 124 § 1); therefore, this *substantial error* (c. 188): the lack of the substantial element, produces, since *it affects what constitutes its substance* (c. 126), the nullity of the entire act *by virtue of the same law*
(c. 188).

In short, since the resignation occurs in the same declaration, for this is the cause, and that the effect, both: cause and effect, must be immediate, and follow one another; now, in Benedict's resignation, when the cause was stated, the effect was not intended to be stated, so there was no true cause either, and, when the effect was intended to be stated, the cause was not stated, so there was no true effect either.

5.2 - In favor of the validity of Benedict's resignation, one could argue the supreme power of the Pope to resign as he pleases; but this is irrelevant here, because, although the Pope can do as he pleases in many matters, he must nevertheless act on his own, and not wait for things to happen by themselves. Therefore, if he announces his resignation, he must fulfill it, and not say that it will take place on its own on a date he deems appropriate, since the effects only occur when the appropriate cause is at work. Does this diminish the supreme papal authority? No, because nothing prevents the Pope from changing any canonical norm, since all norms receive their validity from him. However, if he does not change them, he must conform to them, which, in essence, is nothing more than conforming to himself: to the formality of his own authority. What is unacceptable is to allow for contradiction, as if the Pope could contradict his own norms without even bothering to modify them.

5.3- As an example, one could consider the validity of the appointment of a cardinal who, contravening canon 351 § 1, was not a priest; the answer must obviously be invalidity, as long as the normative condition of the priesthood is maintained, so that the pope who insisted on appointing someone who was not a priest, would first have to change the norm, in order to make, at least, the exception possible, and establish its legal validity; then, if that happens with the cardinalatial appointment, reserved to the pope, the same must be said of the papal resignation.

Machine Translated by Google

5.4- In conclusion, if Benedict's resignation was against law, by introducing a period that it prohibits, and if the pope cannot validly contradict the law that he himself establishes, it must be recognized that that resignation, as stated in canons 124 § 1, 126 and 188, was completely null, and that nullity, never remedied, entails the nullity of the conclave and the election of Francis, since, as expressed in canon 332 § 1, the validity of the papal appointment is based, presupposing the episcopal order, on the strict compliance with the established legal procedure, which currently requires that, after the death of Benedict, who remained pope until his death, his resignation and everything that came after be ignored, and a conclave be held with the cardinals appointed up to Benedict himself, who are the only ones truly valid and capable of electing a valid pope; Until then, it must be considered that the legal status of the church is that of a vacant see, which is precisely the only way in which theologically the integrity of its doctrine is maintained, without which the barque of Christ would have been irremediably shipwrecked (cf. Mt 8, 24; Mk 4, 38, and Lk 8, 23), and his promise would have been completely unsuccessful (cf. Mt 16, 18).

Francisco José Vegara Cerezo, February 19, 2023.