



NovusOrdoWatch.org
"TRADCAST" Podcast Program
Episode 013
April 26, 2016

— Official Transcript —

[Disclaimer: The following program contains content that is not suitable for children. Listener discretion is advised.]

[SEGMENT 1]

No one causes chaos like Chaos Frank, and these last weeks prove it!

Welcome, folks, it's TRADCAST number 13, and this is a special edition dealing exclusively with the big event that took place on April 8, 2016, the release of the so-called post-synodal apostolic exhortation *Amoris Laetitia*. We've been the official *Amoris Laetitia* Chaos Watch headquarters, and it's only fair that we should dedicate an entire podcast to just this document and the turmoil that has so far resulted from it.

The Joy of Love — that is the meaning of the title, and... look, YOU KNOW that Francis wanted this thing to be called *Amoris Gaudium* but in the Vatican they told him, forget it, man, you can't have everything be *Gaudium*. This ain't gonna fly. Besides, a lot of people probably already have their web browsers and email boxes set to block anything that has the word "gaudium" in it, so we need an alternative. So, *Laetitia* it is. At least that's my theory.

My apologies, by the way, for coming out so late with this TRADCAST, but things don't always go as planned, and it's actually a good thing that we've had a few days since the release of this *Laetitia* monster because that allowed us to go through different reactions and commentaries from various camps and so that was actually a good thing...

Oh yeah, by the way, did you hear? John Vennari and Chris Ferrara have already said that they're going to resist this thing. Yeah! No, really now. This time I think it's going to be really bad resistance too. More on that later.

Now, before we begin, we need to run our special jingle for this. Since Francis is the author of this document, you are about to get everything from.... THE JORGE'S MOUTH!

Alright, so, quick reminder, anything we reference here in this podcast as far as documents, videos, and so on, will all be linked on our show page at tradcast.org, so you can get all the information talked about here and can verify everything for yourself. So remember that: Go to tradcast.org and look for episode 013.

If we had to describe *Amoris Laetitia* in one single word, I think it would be, “however.” Or a synonym, you know, like “nevertheless”, “but”, “although”, “on the other hand”, “at the same time”... something like that. Because this document reads like Vatican II: blah blah joy, blah blah ideal, blah blah can never change, blah blah... however... blah blah pastoral, blah blah socio-cultural contexts, blah blah discernment, blah blah walking together, blah blah... at the same time... and so on.

So yeah, with this document it is definitely Vatican II all over again, and in every sense... We have an overlong, modernist, ambiguous text that contains all sorts of explosive suggestions without necessarily stating them outright, and we have two main sides, one arguing that, “relax, it’s all good, nothing’s changed, this is just pastoral, and besides, Francis affirms the indissolubility of marriage;” and other side, people either panicking or celebrating because they can tell that the document does indeed provide an opening for giving the *Novus Ordo* sacraments to those who live in adultery, fornication, or worse. That’s exactly how it was at Vatican II, and we all know how that worked out. And, you know it’s funny, but when this thing came out on April 8, it only took a few hours before the first commentary got posted online that argued that we need to read the exhortation “in light of Tradition” — you know, hermeneutic of continuity and all that — but let’s not get ahead of ourselves. We’ll cover this later. First, let me give you the rundown on what transpired on the morning of April 8, the day this “sexhortation”, as it has been called, was released.

The press conference began at 11:30 am Rome time, that was 5:30 am Eastern time, and it was priceless. It was roughly two hours long, and we have the video for you in our show notes, so you can watch it yourself with the English audio if you want to do some penance. The four presenters were two bogus cardinals, the Italian Lorenzo Baldisseri and the Austrian “Dominican” Christoph Schonborn, and then an Italian married couple who are both academics: the husband an expert in the situation ethics of the French phenomenologist and existentialist Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and his wife a theologian whose doctoral dissertation was on “the phenomenology of Christianity.” Yeah — perfect for the New Church... I mean, you wouldn’t want anyone to confuse this with Catholicism. So that set up was good.

“Cardinal” Baldisseri went first and gave an outline and a summary of the document, with some quotes and stuff, but one thing he didn’t mention was that the ghostwriter of the document, meaning the main person who wrote the draft that Francis then revised and issued as his own, was ... “Smoochie”! Yeah... well, we call him “Smoochie” here. It’s “Archbishop” Victor Manuel Fernandez, the rector of the so-called Pontifical Catholic University of Argentina, one of Francis’ best buddies — his own personal theologian, in fact. Why do we call him “Smoochie”? Because in the 1990s he wrote a book called, *Heal me with your Mouth: The Art of Kissing*... Yeah, and why don’t we just leave it at that. We reported on this some time ago actually, and we’ll certainly put a link to that in our show notes, as well as a link to a brief video we made introducing Francis’ ghostwriter, Mr. Fernandez. We also recently put together a movie poster spoof just for Fernandez. Yeah, the movie is called *The Jorge Whisperer*. With our apologies to Robert Redford.

Anyway, so Baldisseri introduces the document and then, then comes Schonborn, Christoph Schonborn, the “Cardinal-Archbishop” of Vienna, Austria. And if you thought Fernandez was bad, you ain’t seen nothin’ yet. We’ll have more on Schonborn later in this broadcast. But for now, the press conference: Schonborn got into what everyone was wanting to hear about, those infamous “irregular unions”, irregular family situations — the new pastorally-correct term for either shacking up before marriage, i.e. fornication, or adultery, or sodomitical unions. “No one must feel condemned”, Schonborn said, and then he went on to talk about the new pastoral language used since the Synods on the Family, in 2014 and

2015, where the “tone” started to gain in esteem for the “reality” of family situations, without judging or condemning anyone, and that this tone is now also present in the exhortation *Amoris Laetitia*.

Schonborn blathered on for over 30 minutes in total, and then the married academics spoke for about 20 minutes, and then finally it was time for questions from the journalists in the audience. And of course right away the first few questioners asked about, guess what, communion for the divorced and remarried, because, ultimately, that’s all they care about, that’s all they wanted to know and that’s all they really cared about. — No one cares about all the “joy” stuff. — Schonborn, of course, wouldn’t give them a clear answer, which is why three journalists in succession had to ask about the issue and wanted clarification. But, of course there’s no such thing as a Modernist speaking clearly, so in the end, after Schonborn was done answering — and I bet it was a total of ten minutes or so of him “clarifying” — after he was done they basically knew as much as they did before they asked him.

So, the fact that even at the official presentation of the document, no clear answers were given, indicates that the text itself is ambiguous and this is exactly what we’re going to see now: everyone in the New Church is going to interpret it as desired, which will ultimately lead to the situation that whether or not an “irregular” couple can receive the *Novus Ordo* sacraments, will simply depend on what *Novus Ordo* parish they attend, or at least what diocese they’re in. And while some tenacious conservative *Novus Ordos* will always argue that nothing has changed, the practical reality will be that anyone who wants to receive communion will now be allowed.

Just like with Vatican II, just like with annulments, just like with eating meat on Fridays, etc. We’ve been through this many times before. No one will know or care what it may actually say on the books, in some obscure document, or whether some footnote was only ambiguous or anything. That may work great for a show on EWTN or Catholic Answers or for a new book from Ignatius Press — you know, “what the Pope really said” — but the reality is quite different. Just read the headlines in the press. Everyone is saying that Francis has opened the door to communion. It’s the door to hell, of course, but nobody cares about that. These people don’t believe in hell anymore.

Now, please don’t say that, oh, that’s just the evil media trying to “hijack the Pope’s document”. If that’s the case, then why won’t the Vatican press office denounce the media for spreading a false message? And who made the document ambiguous in the first place, by the way?

This is actually a point the Vaticanist and author Antonio Socci brought up. Since the secular newspapers are celebrating now that “the Pope has opened communion to the divorced and remarried”, then, if that’s not correct, why doesn’t the Vatican press office contradict and respond to those “false headlines”? I mean, they always immediately rush to deny anything else that supposedly isn’t true, right? So, if one paper says, “Pope has a cough”, there is an immediate, “No, he doesn’t!”

So, anyway, for the record: The day before the release of the document, we made the following prediction on our blog, the “*Novus Ordo Wire*”. Here’s what we said:

“Although we are but a few hours away from the release of *Amoris Laetitia*, we’ll go ahead with the following prediction: We predict that the document will offer a ‘pastoral synthesis’ to give each side a little something. The conservatives, as always, will receive words: The dogma regarding the indissolubility of marriage remains untouched, a valid marriage between two baptized people can only end at death, no one can change this, yadda yadda. The liberals, on the other hand, will receive the action: With the agreement of the local

ordinary, pastors may decide that specific individuals in exceptional circumstances — wink, wink — can receive the sacraments. This, we predict, will be the authorized practice, a de facto permission at the discretion of the local bishop. They may call it ‘toleration’, speak of ‘conscience’, or couch it in other ‘pastorally sensitive’ language, but in essence this is what will happen, we anticipate. Coupled with Francis’ drive-thru annulments, the result will be a virtual free-for-all. Chaos is guaranteed!”

That was our prediction, and, as we now know, it was spot on.

It’s been roughly two weeks now — yeah, a very rough two weeks now! — since the release of *Amoris Laetitia*, and there has been a gigantic flood of reactions to the thing. At this point, we have posted well over 150 links to commentaries and analyses, on our blog, and the funny thing is that reactions have differed sharply. You have anything from people commenting that this is a wonderful document which does not grant an opening for reception of the sacraments to those who are publicly unworthy, and then some saying that there is a cautious opening, and others saying it’s a catastrophe, a complete disaster, a rupture with 2,000 years of Church Tradition, etc.

All these different reactions underscore exactly what we’ve been saying here with regard to it being Vatican II all over again. The document is written in such a way as to permit many different interpretations, and that is exactly what will happen on the local level: Each diocesan bishop will have it mean whatever he wants to, and then you will have a pastoral nightmare, which of course was absolutely fully intended. I can already hear some conservative *Novus Ordo*s bragging that they live in an ultra-conservative diocese because their bishop doesn’t give communion to public adulterers. And that will then be the new standard of orthodoxy. It’s pathetic!

I’m pretty sure that we’ll see a bloodbath, figuratively speaking of course, in some parishes, where the pastor is conservative and will refuse to heed his liberal bishop’s directive to give communion to anyone who asks. Want to bet? That will be really interesting to watch, and... oh, by the way, how will this affect the indult communities, like the Fraternity of St. Peter, Institute of Christ the King, etc? Just wait till the first public adulterers, fornicators, or sodomites line up at the communion rail. That’ll produce fireworks.

The Society of St. Pius X, of course, will do whatever they please, as they always do, and there’s a lot to say about them too because there have been some significant developments as of late but we can’t get into that now. We’ll have to leave it for a future TRADCAST. I’ll just mention that Francis has now announced, as we expected and as we predicted in September of last year, that he is not letting the faculties he’s given the SSPX for confession, expire in November, but rather they will be extended not just for the Year of Mercy but indefinitely. The timing of this announcement, of course, was impeccable, because it basically coincided with the release of *Amoris Laetitia*, and so each side got a little something. ...Well, can’t upset those traditionalists too much, else they might catch on and suspect that maybe Mr. Bergoglio is not who he claims to be. So, great job, Francis, that was very good timing.

Well, so much for the introductory remarks. Here’s how we’ll proceed with the remainder of the show: We’ll take a quick break, then we’ll have the second segment, and there we will look at some of the highlights — or lowlights, actually — of what *Amoris Laetitia* actually says, and then we’ll break again briefly and come back with a third segment, in which we’ll go through some of those many, many commentaries and reactions from various camps, especially our favorites from the recognize-and-resist camp, where John Vennari and Chris Ferrara have already announced that they’re going to resist this thing, yeah... They’re going to resist real badly, this time, I think... Be right back!

[SEGMENT 2]

TRADCAST episode 013, second segment, glad you're still here... TRADCAST is produced by Novus Ordo Watch at NovusOrdoWatch.org... free of charge... you're welcome!

Alright, this is going to be pretty painful now, but we need to start looking at the actual text of *Amoris Laetitia*, the post-synodal "apostolic exhortation", which is of course as apostolic as Barack Obama is pro-life.

The document itself consists in its English version of 254 pages of text and almost 400 footnotes. Now don't worry — I'm not going to read you all of it because that would be unconstitutional — you know, cruel and unusual punishment. But some penance is necessary and salutary for all of us, so I've picked out some of the most outrageous paragraphs written by the Argentinian apostate, Jorge Bergoglio, commonly known by his stage name, "Pope Francis".

I will tell you first which paragraph I'm quoting from, and it won't necessarily be the whole paragraph each time — Heavens, no! — so if you want to read the whole thing in context, you can certainly do so by clicking on the link for *Amoris Laetitia* we have posted in our show notes at tradcast.org, just look for episode 013.

We'll start with paragraph 2 — here Francis presents himself as the great synthesizer:

"The debates carried on in the media, in certain publications and even among the Church's ministers, range from an immoderate desire for total change without sufficient reflection or grounding, to an attitude that would solve everything by applying general rules or deriving undue conclusions from particular theological considerations."

In other words, Francis is the big reconciler between those two evil extremes and he's going to come down right in the middle because, as you know, virtue is in the middle. Heaven forbid we should apply general theological rules. I mean, that would start to sound like moral theology! Can't have that!

Next, paragraph 3, has this cool stuff:

"Since 'time is greater than space', I would make it clear that not all discussions of doctrinal, moral or pastoral issues need to be settled by interventions of the magisterium. Unity of teaching and practice is certainly necessary in the Church, but this does not preclude various ways of interpreting some aspects of that teaching or drawing certain consequences from it. This will always be the case as the Spirit guides us towards the entire truth (cf. Jn 16:13), until he leads us fully into the mystery of Christ and enables us to see all things as he does. Each country or region, moreover, can seek solutions better suited to its culture and sensitive to its traditions and local needs."

Did you get that? Here Francis is already muddying the waters. Instead of using his supposed papal office to clarify and settle teaching and show how it is and isn't to be applied, he instead does the opposite. He suggests that people better not think that there is only one way to understand something. Typical Modernism. He's injecting this uncertainty but of course without saying so explicitly. He's hiding behind plausible deniability by using terms such as "some aspects" of teaching and "undue conclusions from particular theological considerations". It's vintage Modernist B.S. And by B.S. I don't mean Barbara Streisand.

And notice how he says, effectively, that this attitude of “the Church can’t give sound and binding pastoral advice” is because “the Spirit” — which one, by the way? — won’t lead us into all truth until we are in Heaven. You know, like we need pastoral advice then. I mean, what a moron. No, actually he’s not a moron, he’s very shrewd, a very shrewd Modernist.

The whole point of pastoral guidance is to ensure we make it to Heaven, and it is the right and duty of the Catholic Church, being the divinely-established guardian of all matters pertaining to Faith and morals, to interpret and apply God’s divine law — in this case, “Thou shalt not commit adultery” — to every situation that occurs. It’s that simple. That is the job of the Catholic Church and of the Pope. Not that Francis is one, but you get the idea. How God’s divine law is to be applied in each and every circumstance is not dependent on local customs, tradition, or culture. So what Francis is doing here is totally undermining Catholic principles, and of course the reason why he’s doing that is obvious.

Let me also say something real quick about this idiotic but academic-sounding principle that he came up with that “time is greater than space.” As anyone can immediately see, you cannot compare time and space because that’s comparing apples to oranges. No, not even that, actually; it’s more like comparing bicycles to calories. I mean, you can’t do it. To say that time is greater than space, that’s like saying that this book is bigger than a dream. It’s absurd. It’s a category mistake. So, it’s easy to see why, if that is going to be your starting principle — an absurdity like “time is greater than space” — then any conclusions you try to derive from such a principle will also have to be absurd.

Next paragraph in *Amoris Laetitia* we want to look at: Paragraph 52 — and I warn you, keep a barf bag handy for this one:

“We need to acknowledge the great variety of family situations that can offer a certain stability, but *de facto* or same-sex unions, for example, may not simply be equated with marriage. No union that is temporary or closed to the transmission of life can ensure the future of society.”

There you have it: the disgusting practices of sodomites “may not simply be equated with the sacrament of holy matrimony”. Well, that’s encouraging! But of course sodomite unions are now considered part of “family situations” that can “offer a certain stability”. The only problem Francis seems to have with sodomite relations is that they’re closed to the transmission of life and therefore can’t ensure the future of society. But hey, at least that, right? My gosh, the guy is so conservative, it’s not even funny.

I’m getting nauseous.

Oh, some people will say, “But wait a minute, Francis also talks about same-sex unions in paragraph 251, and there he says, ‘there are absolutely no grounds for considering homosexual unions to be in any way similar or even remotely analogous to God’s plan for marriage and family’. So there!” — Right? Well, not quite.

If you read paragraph 251 in its entirety, you will see that Francis is merely quoting the “*Relatio Finalis*”, the final document of the Synod on the Family 2015, and leaves it uncommented. He simply quotes what the synod fathers said, and he doesn’t say whether he agrees or disagrees with that. So, this is actually very clever of him. The reader gets to determine what to make of it. As usual, Francis wants to confuse rather than clarify.

Next, paragraph 156:

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

He then goes on to talk about what he calls "reciprocal submission"... Yeah, reciprocal submission, that always works out really great in practice, when the husband submits to the wife and the wife submits to the husband at the same time. Awesome. But this is not just crazy, it is blasphemy, because Francis is saying that St. Paul's exhortation for wives to be subject to their husbands is just a cultural thing and not God's law.

It was actually John Paul II who first introduced this blasphemy, back, I think, in the 1980s, where all of a sudden this passage, Eph 5:22, was reinterpreted. Oh, and guess what passage Francis didn't quote: He didn't quote the rest of Eph 5:22, nor what follows right after in verse 23, namely: "as to the Lord... Let women be subject to their husbands as to the Lord, because the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the church. He is the saviour of his body." Minor detail! The Catholic Church is the Bride of Christ Jesus, the Lord — and guess who submits to whom here: Obviously, the Church submits to her Divine Groom, and not the other way around. What a devil Francis is!

Next, paragraph 159 — yes, I know this is painful, but for me too, okay? So, I'm suffering with you. Paragraph 159, regarding virginity:

"Saint Paul recommended virginity because he expected Jesus' imminent return and he wanted everyone to concentrate only on spreading the Gospel:... Nonetheless, he made it clear that this was his personal opinion and preference ..., not something demanded by Christ... All the same, he recognized the value of the different callings ... Reflecting on this, Saint John Paul II noted that the biblical texts "give no reason to assert the 'inferiority' of marriage, nor the 'superiority' of virginity or celibacy" based on sexual abstinence. Rather than speak absolutely of the superiority of virginity, it should be enough to point out that the different states of life complement one another, and consequently that some can be more perfect in one way and others in another..."

Now, this is heresy. The Council of Trent defined infallibly: "If anyone says that the married state is to be preferred to the state of virginity or celibacy, and that it is not better and happier to remain in virginity or celibacy than to be united in matrimony: let him be anathema" (Council of Trent, Session 24, Canon 10; Denz. 980).

Alright, so we've got a little heresy there — no big deal, what's one more at this point...

And our next paragraph is... oh yes, paragraph 296... This is where the really hot potatoes are, beginning with paragraph 296... through paragraph 312. Now, don't worry, we're not going to go through all of those... but we'll start with paragraph 296, and the first thing to notice here is the title, the heading of the section that begins with paragraph 296. In the English translation, the heading says: "The Discernment of Irregular Situations", and the word "irregular" is in quotes. In the non-English translations of the document, the heading says, "The Discernment of so-called irregular situations".

So, first of all, what are those situations that are irregular? You guessed it: any sort of sexual union outside of marriage. See, we don't call them adultery, fornication, or sodomy anymore — because that could offend adulterers, fornicators, and sodomites. Now they're

just “irregular situations” — no, wait, not even that! They’re only so-called irregular situations, because, you know how it is: In a few weeks, some effeminate Novus Ordo presbyter is going to figure out that it is really not nice to suggest that there is something irregular in people’s behavior. I mean, that is just pure discrimination. Who are you to say what’s regular and what isn’t? Besides, how irregular can it be if everybody does it? This kind of language is exclusionary. It’s hateful. It’s bigoted. It’s got to go. You can already hear them yell: “No one is irregular!”

So, expect that in the very near future. Expect that those irregular situations are going to become quite regular in Novus Ordo parlance; and they’re going to find some new term instead, perhaps something like “different” situations, or “non-traditional” situations, or... something like that. They will probably have a contest to see who can come up with the best term to describe what used to be known as adultery, fornication, and sodomy.

So anyway here we go, paragraph 296:

“...The way of the Church is not to condemn anyone for ever; it is to pour out the balm of God’s mercy on all those who ask for it with a sincere heart... For true charity is always unmerited, unconditional and gratuitous’. Consequently, there is a need ‘to avoid judgements which do not take into account the complexity of various situations’ and ‘to be attentive, by necessity, to how people experience distress because of their condition.’”

This is so dumb, it really shouldn’t need any comment. The way of the Church is not to condemn anyone for ever? And exactly what source does he quote or cite for this? None, of course! Well, he quotes himself, actually, from a homily in February of 2015. Yeah, nice try... Look, our Lord says in Matthew 25:41: “Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels” And in the Apocalypse we read the following, chapter 20, verses 9 and 10: “And there came down fire from God out of heaven, and devoured them; and the devil, who seduced them, was cast into the pool of fire and brimstone, where both the beast and the false prophet shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.”

But, Francis says, the way of the Church is to pour out the balm of God’s mercy on all who ask for it with a sincere heart! Wrong again! Sincerity alone is not enough to be forgiven. You have to be contrite, and not just any kind of contrition suffices either. You must be supernaturally contrite, for example, to receive God’s merciful forgiveness — that means that you must be sorry for your sins either because they offend God, who is infinitely good and whom you have infinitely offended, or because you fear the loss of heaven or the pains of hell. Such are supernatural motives; this is necessary. On the other hand, merely natural motives would be if you’re sorry for your sins because they contradict the natural law, for example, or because they have caused you some temporal affliction, pain, embarrassment, financial loss, or whatever. So that’s one thing. Contrition has to be supernatural, and there has to be a number of other things as well, but this is enough for the moment to refute Francis’ lie that a sincere heart is all that is needed to be forgiven. It’s simply not true. Sincerity is not enough. It’s necessary, but it’s not sufficient.

Then, as far as avoiding harsh judgments that don’t take into account the complexity of various situations or how people experience distress and stuff... I mean, if only Pope Clement VII had thought of that with regard to King Henry VIII! You know, the distress and stuff! Come on, it was a complex situation, alright?! ...I mean, does anyone really think that if the Novus Ordo Sect had been around in the 1530s, that they would have refused Henry VIII an annulment? Fat chance!

Alright, next...

Paragraph 297:

Francis: "It is a matter of reaching out to everyone, of needing to help each person find his or her proper way of participating in the ecclesial community and thus to experience being touched by an 'unmerited, unconditional and gratuitous' mercy."

We'll stop right here for a minute. What he says here is false, at least in the way in which he means it. Mercy is not unconditional — and the New Testament is full of examples proving that. And while mercy is gratuitous and unmerited, that is true only in the sense that for God to offer us pardon of our sins at all is gratuitous on His part and totally unmerited by us. But now that He has gratuitously deigned to offer us pardon at all, He has established that we merit certain graces, and of course forgiveness can only be obtained if there is true repentance.

So, the fact that God allows you to receive forgiveness, mercy, and merit in the first place, that is His gratuitous and unmerited gift.

Francis continues — now, this is still part of paragraph 297:

"No one can be condemned for ever, because that is not the logic of the Gospel! [—Ah! There we go again! Brilliant! —] Here I am not speaking only of the divorced and remarried, but of everyone, in whatever situation they find themselves. Naturally, if someone flaunts an objective sin as if it were part of the Christian ideal, or wants to impose something other than what the Church teaches, he or she can in no way presume to teach or preach to others; this is a case of something which separates from the community (cf. Mt 18:17). Such a person needs to listen once more to the Gospel message and its call to conversion. Yet [— Here comes the famous Vatican II 'however' again —], even for that person there can be some way of taking part in the life of community, whether in social service, prayer meetings or another way that his or her own initiative, together with the discernment of the parish priest, may suggest."

Here again we're going to interrupt and make a quick observation. Francis just said that even those people who flaunt an objective sin as if it were the Christian ideal can play a role in the "life of the community". So, this would mean, for example, that if a sodomite couple is out there saying that perversion is awesome, and everyone should be like them, then that doesn't mean they couldn't help out with the parish soup kitchen, or lead a prayer group, or conduct Bible study, or whatever, as long as the parish priest says it's okay. This is incredible! This is what Francis essentially has just said.

Let's continue — still paragraph 297:

"As for the way of dealing with different 'irregular' situations, the Synod Fathers reached general consensus, which I support: 'In considering a pastoral approach towards people who have contracted a civil marriage, who are divorced and remarried, or simply living together, the Church has the responsibility of helping them understand the divine pedagogy of grace in their lives and offering them assistance so they can reach the fullness of God's plan for them', something which is always possible by the power of the Holy Spirit.'"

Notice that, in contrast to paragraph 251, here Francis quotes the Synod Fathers and then explicitly adds that he supports what they said, whereas he didn't do that in paragraph 251, which is the paragraph where he was critical of sodomite unions, or rather, where he quoted the synod document critical of sodomite unions and then didn't clarify whether he agreed or disagreed.

So, in this last part of paragraph 297, Francis says that the Church must help those living in adulterous relationships or in fornication to reach what he calls the “fullness of God’s plan for them”. But this implies, of course, that their current situation — adultery or fornication — fulfills God’s plan in part. That is an abominable and blasphemous claim! There is nothing whatsoever in fornication or adultery that has anything to do with God’s plan. In fact, it is the opposite: It is a direct contradiction of God’s plan; it’s a mockery of it. Here we have people who are constantly breaking their marriage vows, if we are talking about an adulterous couple, or who are enjoying the privileges of the married state without actually having bound themselves irrevocably to each other until death do them part. In other words, all the rights of the married state, but none of the duties, in the case of those fornicating. Sorry, but this doesn’t in any way approach God’s plan, not even partially, any more than stealing is but an imperfect realization of making a purchase. Come on!

Okay, let’s finally move on to paragraph 298. Now it’s getting better and better. Listen to this Modernist blather:

“The divorced who have entered a new union, for example, can find themselves in a variety of situations, which should not be pigeonholed or fit into overly rigid classifications leaving no room for a suitable personal and pastoral discernment. One thing is a second union consolidated over time, with new children, proven fidelity, generous self giving, Christian commitment, a consciousness of its irregularity and of the great the difficulty of going back without feeling in conscience that one would fall into new sins.”

We’ve got to stop right here for a second. What absolute trash! First, if people are living in adultery, then that’s what it is: adultery. Sorry if that’s too rigid for Mr. Bergoglio, but that’s just tough. Our Lord told the woman at the well flat out that the man she was now with is “not her husband”. Look it up: John 4:18.

Then, Francis talks about an adulterous relationship that is “consolidated over time” — you know, as in, “we’ve been committing adultery for a long time now!” — and then he talks about “proven fidelity”! Think about this! Fidelity to your mistress! Hello Francis, hello Novus Ordo world, you cannot be faithful to someone you’re not married to! Faithfulness refers to the marriage vow, and by being in an adulterous relationship you are continually breaking that vow! You are making a mockery of it, you are trampling it under foot, you are spitting on it! For Francis to state that one can be “faithful” to one’s mistress is beyond outrageous! And then he talks about “generous self-giving” and “Christian commitment”... yeah, well, to whom? To one’s mistress! Listen, Jorge, there is no such thing as a “Christian commitment” to one’s adulterous lover!

And then, Francis mentions “a consciousness of its irregularity”... So, what’s that supposed to mean? That the adulterers know full well that they’re committing adultery? What — that’s now a virtue!?

And finally, he talks about the “great difficulty of going back without feeling in conscience that one would fall into new sins”. That’s more B.S. right there. Think about it: “I have to continue to commit adultery, else I’m going to commit other sins.” So this is how we now excuse adultery? The moral command, “Thou shalt not commit adultery”, which, by the way, is God’s Sixth Commandment and not a suggestion, binds absolutely, that means it does not permit of exceptions. One cannot claim that one will then fall into other sins. In fact, to say this is then to say that one cannot help sinning, that one is compelled to sin, which is blasphemy and heresy, because it is divinely revealed that God will always give sufficient grace to overcome every temptation.

Council of Trent, Session 6, Canon 18: "If anyone shall say that the commandments of God are, even for a man who is justified and confirmed in grace, impossible to observe: let him be anathema" (Denz. 828).

This is also confirmed by a number of Scriptural verses, such as 1 Cor 10:13.

Let's go back to Francis. Still paragraph 298: "The Church acknowledges situations 'where, for serious reasons, such as the children's upbringing, a man and woman cannot satisfy the obligation to separate.'"

Okay, that's fine — of course a couple who is in an adulterous union and has children to take care of... these people obviously cannot just separate, but they have an obligation to cease all sexual activity. They must live as brother and sister. Yes, this is difficult. And yes, I certainly sympathize with all who, because of whatever sins they committed and mistakes they made in life, are now in such a situation. But there is no other way. We all have a cross to bear, and this cross, if embraced and born patiently, if we persevere, will lead us to salvation. What's the alternative? The alternative is damnation — and you don't want to go there.

Back to Francis. At this point in the paragraph, he puts a footnote. It's footnote 329, which says: "In such situations, many people, knowing and accepting the possibility of living 'as brothers and sisters', which the Church offers them, point out that if certain expressions of intimacy are lacking, 'it often happens that faithfulness is endangered and the good of the children suffers'" — what garbage!

First, there is no faithfulness endangered between adulterous pseudo-spouses because obviously it is their illegitimate unions that are the violation of faithfulness. So this is really turning things on their head. To excuse adultery on the grounds that the children would suffer if they didn't continue with their adultery, is shameful. Besides, we might add that God is the author of the moral law. It is He who prescribes that adulterous couples must live in celibacy if they have children to raise, and God, being all-knowing, has already foreseen from all eternity whatever situations might arise, and yet He still made the moral law what it is. God isn't part of the picture here.

Francis continues: "Those who have entered into a second union for the sake of the children's upbringing, are sometimes subjectively certain in conscience that their previous and irreparably broken marriage had never been valid".

Well, that's nice. They're certain in conscience. And now God is somehow bound by what they've conveniently decided in conscience? Individual conscience doesn't trump God or the Church. Conscience must subject itself to God and the Church. And that's that.

Paragraph 299. Jorge says: "I am in agreement [— Ha! There we go again! See, he does say when he agrees with the Synod fathers! —] with the many Synod Fathers who observed that "the baptized who are divorced and civilly remarried need to be more fully integrated into Christian communities in the variety of ways possible, while avoiding any occasion of scandal."

There is the Vatican II tactic again, that little caveat at the end: "While avoiding any occasion of scandal." That is the Modernists' way out in case anyone should give them grief about their de facto acceptance of adulterous unions. They can always point to that "avoiding any occasion of scandal" part and say, "See, we didn't say it was okay. If anyone is scandalized, then we're saying don't do it." This is then the part quoted by people like

Jimmy Akin and Tim Staples from Catholic Answers. They'll point to that. But of course in practice that disclaimer will disappear completely, and in fact it doesn't make any sense because that disclaimer negates the entire first part of the sentence. And that's because it is impossible to accept an unrepentant adulterous couple as parishioners without causing scandal.

Francis continues, still paragraph 299: "Such persons need to feel not as excommunicated members of the Church, but instead as LIVING members, able to live and grow in the Church and experience her as a mother who welcomes them always, who takes care of them with affection and encourages them along the path of life and the Gospel."

Awww... how nice the Church is: She doesn't tell them that adultery is a mortal sin; now marital fidelity is just an ideal the attainment of which they are encouraged to strive for. What rubbish!

But of course it's false, probably heresy, for Francis to say that unrepentant adulterers (or fornicators, or whatever) are living members of the Church. To be a living member of the Church, you must be in the state of sanctifying grace, and this state cannot co-exist with mortal sin. So, while they can perhaps be members of the Church, as defined by Pope Pius XII in 1943 — and I say "perhaps" because Canon 2357 in the Code of Canon Law does mention them as — I forget exactly how it's put — something about how they are not part of the ecclesiastical life or something, but we will leave that issue aside for the moment.

But while they can perhaps be members of the Church, they certainly and definitely cannot be living members and still continue to live in mortal sin. But hey, that's just one of those minor details, I guess.

Okay, now we come to paragraphs 300 through 311, and this is where Francis addresses what everyone had been waiting for, and that is the question whether those in "irregular situations" — adultery, fornication, sodomy, whatever — can be admitted to the Novus Ordo sacraments, especially the Novus Ordo version of Holy Communion.

I can't read it all to you, or else we'll never finish, and at this point you're probably as tired of this garbage as I am. So, tell you what: I'm going to summarize Francis' position, I'll give some very few quotes, and then I'll critique it, but if you want to read the actual full text of what he says in context, remember you can find that in our show notes at tradcast.org, episode 013, and find the link there to the full text. Okay?

Paragraphs 300 to 311 — Francis is essentially saying the following:

- You can't have a general rule, yes or no, for whether such people can receive the sacraments — the circumstances are too varied and complex to make a general rule. By saying this, Francis has just abolished the hard and fast rule that those who are in public mortal sin — also called "public sinners" — must be denied the sacraments. You can even find that hard and fast rule in the Novus Ordo Church's own law: It's Canon 915. What Francis is saying here is new — there was a blanket rule before, in Canon Law, that required denying the sacraments to such people. From a "no", Francis has now gone to an "it depends", which, of course, as we all know, is going to simply become a "yes" in practice — and he knows that too.
- As far as the justification given, he says that because of various factors, it is possible that someone lives in adultery, fornication, or sodomy is living in these sins without being fully responsible, i.e. without being guilty of mortal sin. That is what he is saying, and that is preposterous. Francis wants priests to help people discern just how culpable they are in their very personal "irregular situation". This is even more

ridiculous, because right there this presumes that the people know they're living in sin. Besides, priests have a duty to make people aware if they're committing sin; that is their job, and the fact that so far these people have been barred from the sacraments was an official reminder that they're in mortal sin, so this whole thing is a farce of staggering proportions.

- One funny thing here is that at the end of paragraph 300, Francis mentions there's a risk of causing the impression that the church is maintaining a double standard — no way! Priceless!
- Now, there is one portion I must quote because it is so unbelievable and expresses a key point of the new orientation introduced by Francis: From paragraph 301: "Hence it can no longer simply be said that all those in any 'irregular' situation are living in a state of mortal sin and are deprived of sanctifying grace. More is involved here than mere ignorance of the rule. A subject may know full well the rule, yet have great difficulty in understanding 'its inherent values', or be in a concrete situation which does not allow him or her to act differently and decide otherwise without further sin." — Wow! In other words, you can now be an adulterer, sodomite, or fornicator and still enjoy the life of sanctifying grace, even if you are quite aware that these things are forbidden by God's law, because you might be in a situation in which you thought you couldn't help but sin, or because you just didn't understand why these things are wrong. Wow! This is so bad, it's downright satanic.
- Let me quote you another unbelievable blasphemy, from paragraph 303: "Conscience can do more than recognize that a given situation does not correspond objectively to the overall demands of the Gospel. It can also recognize with sincerity and honesty what for now is the most generous response which can be given to God, and come to see with a certain moral security that it is what God himself is asking amid the concrete complexity of one's limits, while yet not fully the objective ideal." This is satanic, again! Francis is saying that God Himself is looking at your situation and saying, "Well, look, yes, you're in adultery [—or fornication or sodomy or whatever —] and that's really not ideal, but I know things are tough, so, do the best you can — you can keep lusting after your sexual partner for now, just be a little more kind, more self-sacrificing, and help out at the local soup kitchen, and then we'll figure out the sexual stuff later." This is unbelievable! Blasphemy! This is antichrist!
- Francis has just made all sexual perversion into, not foul sins that must be repented of immediately and fully, with the help of God's grace, but instead, every perversion is now merely an imperfect participation in the ideal of Holy Matrimony, for which we should merely strive. This is the most frightening blasphemy! Very wicked!
- Further, he also complains about, ooh, general rules, and how insufficient they are, as though the rule "thou shalt not commit adultery" were somehow unable to be fulfilled in a particular situation. It's utter trash! But not just that: It's horribly dangerous trash!
- Then, it gets kinda funny again. Francis is concerned that you might get the right — wrong — impression! In paragraph 307, he says: "In order to avoid all misunderstanding, I would point out that in no way must the Church desist from proposing the full ideal of marriage, God's plan in all its grandeur... [— blah blah —] A lukewarm attitude, any kind of relativism, or an undue reticence in proposing that ideal, would be a lack of fidelity to the Gospel and also of love on the part of the Church for young people themselves. To show understanding in the face of exceptional situations never implies dimming the light of the fuller ideal, or proposing less than what Jesus offers to the human being." This again is absolute and very dangerous garbage. Fornication, adultery, and any other kind of sexual perversion is introduced here as simply less than the full ideal... By analogy, it's like saying that formaldehyde is food that is not fully healthy, that it's food that's not ideal nourishment. No, that's false! Formaldehyde is no nourishment or food at all; it is not partially healthy; it will kill you!

- Then Francis makes the disclaimer that in no way must the Church desist from proposing the full ideal of marriage and all that, and that is in paragraph 307 — and then he immediately goes into paragraph 308, which starts with, “At the same time...” and then he basically undoes everything again. It’s the same old game. They started it at Vatican II, and they’ve played it ever since, and we all know the results of that.

Alright, this is all of the text in *Amoris Laetitia* we’re going to cover.. Basically what we have here is Francis effectively granting full license to people to receive the sacraments if they so wish and their pastors don’t forbid them, under the cover of the usual Modernist disclaimers beginning with “Nevertheless”, “However”, and “at the same time”. Sin is now simply an imperfect participation in virtue, rather than its contradiction, and I suppose the devil himself is now a heavenly angel who is just giving to God the most generous response he can in the concrete complexities of his limits. You can’t make this stuff up!

For Francis, the glass is now always full: either half full, or just a little bit full, or, even if it’s totally empty, it’s still *potentially* full... The only problem is: It’s not even a glass!

Enough of this, on to our third segment, but first we’ll take a much-needed break!

[SEGMENT 3]

And here we are again, still tradcasting like there’s no tomorrow... because, for all I know, there just might not be... You are listening to a truly special edition of TRADCAST, a mega episode, covering Francis’ post-synodal apostolic exhortation *Amoris Laetitia*. If you’re still with us, if you didn’t pass out during the second segment because of what Francis was saying, then you’ll be happy to know that we will now have a look at some of the reactions to the antipope’s document, and this is really the part that will be the most fun and that I personally was most looking forward to.

As the official *Amoris Laetitia* Chaos Watch headquarters, we’ve linked to a very large assortment of reactions, analyses, commentaries, and summaries of the document by people in various camps: Novus Ordo, semi-traditionalist, secular, and of course, also sedevacantist. At this point, we’re well past 150 links, so there’s a lot of content you can find there. We’ve put a link to our Chaos Watch page in our show notes for this episode, so you can see for yourself what the fallout has been and continues to be. And really, go through our list some time; you’ll be amused at how divergent the various headlines and post titles are, with anything from, essentially, “Pope saves the Church” to, “This is all bovine excrement”, and every little nuance in between. It’s quite interesting; it’s quite a spectacle.

Alright, so let’s pick out a few of these reactions and look at them more closely. Perhaps we should start with the web site that calls itself “Church Militant”. That’s Michael Voris’ warehouse operation in Detroit, and we’ve come to call them “Church Disneyland” because it really is fantasy over there — well, because they are in La La Land and they demonstrated it once again with regard to *Amoris Laetitia*. When it was published, on April 8, Church Militant released a succinct post with the title “Pope Francis releases final words on Synod: Reaffirms Church Teaching on Marriage” — I kid you not. In that article, they just cherry-picked those parts that sounded fairly orthodox, at least for Novus Ordo standards, and they completely ignored any of the blasphemous, outrageous, and heretical parts that we looked at earlier in this podcast in the second segment. So for them that was par for the course.

Then, on April 10, they ran a story on “Cardinal” Walter Brandmuller, who was saying, well, “The exhortation needs to be... read in light of Tradition! Of course Church Militant was there to cover that right away... At this point, anyone with a pulse of course must be asking himself, if everything always needs to be read in light of Tradition, why don’t we just junk all this new stuff and just use Tradition? Wouldn’t that be easier? And besides, why do we always have to read everything in light of Tradition? Why can’t Francis just write in light of Tradition? You ever thought about that?”

Then, on April 11, three days after the exhortation was released, Church Militant went back to something Francis had said on his trip back to Rome from Mexico, back in February, and they marketed it as a “papal clarification” on the exhortation, when that’s obviously not what it was. The same day, they ran a story on “Cardinal” Burke, Voris’ favorite — by the way, he’s called him “Pope Leo XIV” before — Burke, like Brandmuller, said basically the same thing, that the key to interpreting *Amoris Laetitia* is in light of Church dogma and discipline. Which is funny because it’s getting mighty confusing with all these keys, because “Crisis” magazine, they came saying that *Amoris Laetitia* is the key to understanding Francis’ “pontificate”. But then, *Amoris Laetitia* itself needs to have a key, of course, right? So, to understand Francis, we need to understand *Amoris Laetitia*. But then *Amoris Laetitia* was written by Francis and is needed to understand him... And, besides, wasn't the whole idea for Francis to clarify the position of his church on all these issues? I don't know; I'm confused. These keys are too much. I can't handle any more keys.

Then, on April 12, Church Disneyland followed up with another story on “Cardinal” Burke, who said that *Amoris Laetitia* is not infallible. This observation of course, would be relevant if Catholics only had to assent to infallible papal pronouncements — assuming Francis to be Pope for a minute, which is what Church Militant believes — but of course that isn’t true. Catholics don’t have to assent to just what is infallible, but to everything that comes from the Magisterium. It’s kind of the point of the Magisterium.

Anyway, then, when on April 16 Francis himself was asked by a reporter on the plane about whether adulterers now had the option of receiving the sacraments, he literally responded “yes — period”, and then he referred people to “Cardinal” Schonborn’s explanation, not “Cardinal” Brandmuller’s or “Cardinal” Burke’s commentary. Did you get that, Michael Voris? Are you listening? [Voris: “The Pope means exactly what he says.”] Yes, Mr. Voris, it’s a good thing to remember that, isn’t it? While Church Militant did cover that in their “Headlines” broadcast of April 18, they followed it up immediately with a reminder that Burke said it’s not infallible. Now you know why we call them Church Disneyland, and, really, you should too. Come to think of it, maybe that is why their flagship program is called “The Vortex”. A vortex spins, right?

Anyway...

Oh yeah, Mr. Zuhlsdorf — John Zuhlsdorf, “Father Z”, as he likes to be called — now that was rather amusing. The eve before the document was released — that would be the evening of April 7 — Mr. Zuhlsdorf, who had received an advance copy that he had looked at, published a blog post saying basically: “Relax, everyone, it’s not too bad. I can’t tell you what the exhortation says, but I can say that we’ve dodged a bullet.” Yeah well, looks like that was a bit premature there. So just remember this for the future, when Mr. Zuhlsdorf gives you his expert take, maybe it’s just not that reliable.

Then, “*Rorate Caeli*”, the famous indult blog... The night before the official release of the exhortation, they published a leaked summary with no commentary, and with no hint as to how they had obtained it. Then, on April 10, they rolled out Dietrich von Hildebrand against Francis... You know, supposedly the great counterweight to the Modernist revolution — when

the truth is that von Hildebrand with his phenomenology was extremely dangerous and in no wise Thomistic... But anyway, we can't get into that now, but that would be a great topic actually for a future episode of TRADCAST. I want to mention this because it is a typical feature of semi-traditionalism to always oppose the Pope — remember that's what they believe Francis to be — to always oppose the Pope with some other big figure that they've somehow chosen to put their trust in or to adhere to — be it Cardinal Burke, or Archbishop Lefebvre, or Malachi Martin, or Michael Davies, or whoever. The current big hero is Bishop Athanasius Schneider.

There is this symptom among the semi-traditionalists that always seeks a substitute for the Pope as the real guide in matters of faith and morals, the real — I don't want to say "Pope" — but the real authority figure to listen to and cling to. This is particularly visible in the Society of St. Pius X, where Archbishop Lefebvre is considered the guiding light, much more so than the Pope. Who do they adhere to, Archbishop Lefebvre — or Paul VI or John Paul II? Obviously the answer is clear. This is really why we call them semi-traditionalists, or neo-traditionalists, or even pseudo-traditionalists: Because they are traditional only to an extent; their idea of tradition is actually quite novel, at least when it comes to the papacy; and so their traditionalism really is no traditionalism at all because you can't have just a partial traditionalism. Don't misunderstand — I'm not trying to say that these people aren't of good will or they aren't pious or anything like that. I'm not saying that at all. No doubt most of them are extremely good-willed and very pious and mean to do the right thing. But that has nothing to do with anything.

Then, some other sources we want to look at: The New York Times saw right away what was going on when the document was issued and headlined, "Pope Francis Calls on Church to Be Welcoming and Less Judgmental". Crux News also got it right and published a piece entitled "Pope's family manifesto offers cautious opening on Communion". Now, others on the other hand were in denial and published pieces with the following titles:

- Francis has left Church teaching on Communion for the divorced and remarried absolutely intact (Catholic Herald)
- Francis shatters Reformers' Dreams with 'Modern Family' Document (Breitbart)
- Partial papal fig leaf for unmarried couples, divorced Catholics (Deutsche Welle)
- Pope Francis's revolution has been cancelled (Damian Thompson at The Spectator)

Then... Steve Skojec at One Peter Five was one of the first to see what was going on with this exhortation and published a post entitled, "Pope Francis Departs from Church Teaching in New Exhortation". Same goes for Life Site News, their piece was headlined, "Pope Francis opens door to Communion for 'remarried' Catholics in landmark exhortation". Skojec also had a piece published on ForeignPolicy.com, in which he denounced Francis as "the dictator of the Vatican". Well, this funny, because I thought that these people agreed that the Papacy is a Monarchy.

Louie Verrecchio correctly noted that the devil is in the details — that is certainly true...

Jimmy Akin, of course, had twelve things to know and share, and one of those was the revelation — no doubt from the god of surprises — that some people who live in fornication, adultery, or sodomy might not be in mortal sin! "Due to various cognitive or psychological conditions", as Akin says... So, prepare for more pseudo-theological and pseudo-psychological toxic waste from Mr. Akin and his friends at Catholic Answers. If these guys can defend this, there's nothing they can't defend.

Patrick Archbold at the Creative Minority Report called it a "shameful document" — quite right, indeed, but ... imagine calling an official papal document "shameful". Can you imagine

what St. Pius X would have done with you? But then again, these people do not believe in the papacy. Because of their refusal to countenance Sedevacantism, they have reduced the papacy to a parody of itself. That's a real shame. They have sacrificed the papacy in order to have a Pope. Of course, what they have now is neither the papacy nor a Pope. All they have is, well, Frank — Jorge, Francis I. And they believe in a false doctrine of the papacy, a false version of the papacy according to which the pope is essentially just a nice guy who sometimes says Catholic things, and when he does, great; when he doesn't, ignore him. What a mockery of the papacy! And why? For what!? I guess it is the price of not being sedevacantist.

Over at Patheos, Dave Armstrong of course immediately hailed *Amoris Laetitia* as Francis' 1968 moment — that's reference to the widespread view among conservative *Novus Ordo*s that Paul VI's encyclical *Humanae Vitae* was a great restatement of traditional Catholic teaching against birth control — which it really wasn't, but that's another topic. So, Armstrong clearly jumped the gun, but I wasn't surprised at that. He is one of those incorrigible die-hard *Novus Ordo*s in Wonderland. He'll be the last to leave the New Church when it collapses entirely — he'll be turning the lights off, probably even after Tim Haines leaves... I mean, Francis could basically burn down St. Peter's Basilica and build a Voodoo temple on top of the ruins, and Armstrong would find a way to explain it, and blame those evil "radical Catholic reactionaries" for criticizing it.

Anyway...

Roberto de Mattei called the exhortation "catastrophic" — that was interesting...

Antonio Socci spoke of a "turning point in Catholic doctrine" and a "coup in the Church"... and Michael Brendan Dougherty accused Francis of "hubris" and "cowardice".

Robert Royal argued that *Amoris Laetitia* seems to be really two documents, one conservative and one liberal, and that of course is exactly the tactic of the Modernist, who will sound conservative and completely orthodox on one page, and on the next be a raving liberal. St. Pius X identified this as one of the characteristics of Modernism. You can look that up for yourself in his encyclical *Pascendi*, n. 18.

The Society of St. Pius X criticized Francis' exhortation as well, as a triumph of Subjectivism, but of course you know this rings very hollow now that they're preparing to rejoin Rome under Francis, I guess any day now.

Oh, then the "Call Me Jorge" blog pointed out that the Bergoglios in Argentina must be celebrating because Francis actually has a publicly adulterous sister as well as a fornicating nephew who lives with his girlfriend... So yeah, they're celebrating, though I doubt that any of them will actually dig through their famous relatives' manifesto of joy...

"Fr." Ray Blake published a post in which he argued that the exhortation was neither magisterial nor very important, and, of course, had to be read in light of tradition! That was Ray Blake.

Then I want to quote to you a very short post from a blog named "Dymphna's Road". The post is entitled "A Future Conversation?": "Mama, what does 'pastoral' mean?" The mother responds, "It means, Child, that when your father and his new 'wife' go to church, the priest has to pretend that I'm dead."

Then, at The Remnant, Chris Jackson gave a pretty good overview of what a bunch of hooley Francis' document is, and I want to share with you one memorable quote from Jackson's

piece: "Christ said, 'Be ye perfect as your Heavenly Father is perfect.' Francis would say 'Be ye mediocre, because perfection is too excessive.'" Touché! That was Chris Jackson at The Remnant.

Then, Chris Ferrara, the famous lawyer-columnist from Virginia, also chief rhetorician at The Remnant, failed to surprise. Of course, it was clear right away that for Ferrara, *Amoris Laetitia* was going to be ... non-binding! — like everything else that he doesn't agree with! Awesome.

So, Ferrara wrote two things. One was a small piece for the Fatima Center, where he says the following: "What we have here is a massive new addition to The Great Façade of non-binding ecclesial novelties... The trick, you see, is to promulgate the latest novelty and let people *think* it binds the Church; and then, even though it really doesn't, it *does*. Pay no attention to the truth behind the façade!"

Yeah, that's Ferrara's usual spiel about how everything *Novus Ordo* is non-binding, but it's far from the reality. We can leave that for another time. The truth is that even though Ferrara keeps harping on the "it's not binding" thesis, what he really means is that one is not allowed to adhere to it. See, this is another one of his lawyerly tricks: He says that you don't have to adhere to it, but from what he writes it is clear that he really means you're not allowed to adhere to it because if you do, you're putting your soul in danger — in grave danger, to say the least.

So, while he makes everyone believe that he's saved the indefectibility of the Church because — ha, ha — this is all non-binding, he really hasn't done anything of the sort because non-binding is not enough! He's likening the Church to a mother who doesn't push her child off the cliff and doesn't say the child must run off the cliff, but most certainly allows the child to run off the cliff. That's not a mother, that's a monster.

You know, it's interesting: Somehow everything in the New Church is fake for Ferrara, right? Fake Magisterium, not really binding, blah blah... fake saints, fake canon law, fake liturgical rite that no one needs to attend, blah blah blah... but, fake Pope? Nah, that couldn't happen! That would be a patent absurdity! Right?! You know, I've had enough of this silliness! Just man up and face the truth: The guy is not the Pope! But no, according to Ferrara, nothing is binding except for the idea that this abominable satanic apostate and destroyer of souls is the Vicar of the Second Person of the Most Holy Trinity! That is binding somehow.

Speaking of what is binding... wouldn't Ferrara agree that Pope Pius IX's encyclical *Quanta Cura* from 1864 is binding? Yeah, I think he would. Well, here's what *Quanta Cura* says:

"Nor can we pass over in silence the audacity of those who, not enduring sound doctrine, contend that "without sin and without any sacrifice of the Catholic profession assent and obedience may be refused to those judgments and decrees of the Apostolic See, whose object is declared to concern the Church's general good and her rights and discipline, so only it does not touch the dogmata of faith and morals." But no one can be found not clearly and distinctly to see and understand how grievously this is opposed to the Catholic dogma of the full power given from God by Christ our Lord Himself to the Roman Pontiff of feeding, ruling and guiding the Universal Church."

That was Pope Pius IX in *Quanta Cura*, paragraph 5. Pope Pius IX just condemned Chris Ferrara and his position. So much for Ferrara the traditional Catholic.

Now, in *The Remnant*, Ferrara just published a lengthy critique of the post-synodal exhortation, entitled "*Amoris Laetitia: Anatomy of an Pontifical Debacle*". Throughout his

essay, he keeps mentioning that it is impossible for Francis to do... what he just did! Of course by "impossible" he means, not that a true Pope would be divinely protected from doing this, but simply that if he does do it, there will always be at least one lawyer-columnist somewhere on the globe to denounce him. What idiocy! This has nothing to do with traditional Catholicism. Ferrara, just like his confreres in the semi-traditionalist world, has completely abandoned the traditional Catholic teaching on the papacy, and he makes the very idea of "Pope" virtually meaningless.

Now, of course, Ferrara's critique of *Amoris Laetitia* is spot-on. There is no question about that. But by continuing to insist that this destruction of Catholicism is accomplished not by wicked *enemies* of the Church but by legitimate and true authorities in her, to whom submission is owed, he is causing incalculable damage to souls and to the Faith itself. And of course, as always, Ferrara spins in order to argue his position. So, for example, he says the following: "Thus, *Amoris Laetitia* purports to abolish a discipline that cannot be abolished without violating divine law." Well, we've got news for our lawyer columnist: Francis doesn't purport to abolish a discipline that cannot be abolished without violating the divine law, he does it. He abolishes it. Maybe Ferrara hasn't realized it yet, but if, as he believes, Francis is the Pope of the Catholic Church, then he has full authority over the discipline of the Church.

Now, of course Ferrara will say, "No Pope has the authority to abolish divine law", and of course that's true, but the whole point is that a true Pope cannot do what Francis just did. That's why Christ gave us the papacy. He didn't give it to us so that whenever something goes wrong with the Pope, we turn to Mr. Ferrara to find out what we really should be thinking. That's not how it works in the Catholic Church. We might as well all be Protestants then because they say, "No Pastor can say anything against Scripture. And when he does, he has no authority." That's what the Protestants say, right? That is basically Ferrara's understanding of the papacy.

Here, let me give you another Ferrara quote: "That a Roman Pontiff could declare in a papal document that public adulterers of any kind exhibit 'fidelity' and 'Christian commitment' makes one wonder if Francis thinks that, after fifty years of 'ecumenical dialogue,' it is time for the Catholic Church to emulate the Anglican Church in recognition of Henry VIII's groundbreaking foray into 'Catholic divorce.'"

Well, obviously, this man, Francis, is not the rock on which the Church rests like on an unshakable foundation. Rather, he is sand, or quicksand, on which his false new church is collapsing. And Ferrara is being the useful idiot who ensures that the quicksand looks and feels as much like rock as possible. That's what going on here.

Alright, another quote from Ferrara. He chastises *Novus Ordo* pundits who are willing to swallow anything to defend the Vatican II Church, so people like Jimmy Akin, Karl Keating, and Dave Armstrong, for example: "Moreover, to admit that *Amoris Laetitia* is indeed 'a subversive document,' as Philip Lawler says, would be to admit the entire traditionalist critique of the regime to which they themselves belong, this document being the lowest point yet on a continuous downward trajectory traditionalist writings have accurately tracked and rightly opposed for decades, while the neo-Catholic establishment did nothing but applaud the latest novelty. Having been so wrong for so long, they would rather go down with their sinking ship, which is not to be confused with the unsinkable Barque of Peter. Their vessel is the ghost ship that came out of the fog of Vatican II and will inevitably disappear beneath the waves of history as the ephemeral thing it is. But what calamities the Church must endure until then!"

Well put, Mr. Ferrara, except that it applies equally to you with regard to Sedevacantism. So let me rephrase that a little bit and throw it right back at you. This is what it would sound like:

“Moreover, to admit that Francis is indeed not a true Pope but an anti-Catholic impostor, would be to admit the entire sedevacantist critique of the semi-traditionalist establishment to which they themselves belong, this document being the lowest point yet on a continuous downward trajectory sedevacantists have rightly exposed for decades, while the neo-traditionalist establishment just kept whining and whining, but always refused to draw the only possible conclusion which alone can legitimize any resistance to the Vatican II Church at all. Having been so wrong for so long, they would rather go down with their sinking titanic, which is not to be confused with the unsinkable Barque of Peter, simply because it has a captain, and the lifeboats do not.”

In conclusion, Ferrara tries to pre-empt those who do not buy into his position that Francis’ exhortation is nothing but his non-binding personal opinion. He argues that it cannot be binding because, well, the Magisterium can’t contradict itself. Yeah, very true, Chris, but maybe that should tell you something. Show us, Chris Ferrara, a single dogmatic theological manual or direct magisterial teaching that claims that there are no *a priori* conditions for what constitutes teaching as magisterial — that, instead, it’s a matter of first checking to see if the teaching is correct and only then determining whether it’s magisterial or not. I’m sorry, Counselor, but your mere say-so doesn’t cut it.

It’s funny but even in his hapless attempt to cover all his bases, Ferrara ironically contradicts himself. On the one hand, he says *Amoris Laetitia* cannot be magisterial because it’s a contradiction to the magisterium, and the magisterium *can’t* contradict itself. He says: “Just as God cannot contradict Himself, the Magisterium cannot contradict itself. For the Magisterium is the teaching office of the Church, which is not determined by the latest utterance of the current Pope.”

Ah! Very good. Hey, the Pope is only the head of the Church and the Universal Teacher of the Church, but of course Church teaching isn’t determined by the Pope. Awesome, Mr. Ferrara. Very traditional!

Let’s just take Ferrara’s words at face value. He continues: “Therefore, whatever contradicts the constant prior teaching of the Church cannot possibly belong to the Magisterium, no matter what formal appearances it has been given.” Okay. So far, he’s being consistent. But now here comes this: “Rather, it would constitute error, which is possible with any exercise of the ‘ordinary’ Magisterium that involves true novelties. Otherwise, we would have to say that absolutely every papal pronouncement, no matter what novelty it contains, is infallible.”

Did you get that? Ferrara just argued that the Magisterium cannot contradict itself, and in the very same breath argued that when it does, it is in error — but then, that is fine because otherwise we’d have to say the Magisterium is always infallible.

Oh man! My head hurts. This has nothing to do with Catholic teaching on the Magisterium. This is simply Ferrara spouting nonsense to ensure that you don’t follow Francis and yet also don’t become a sedevacantist. What theological sources does he quote to back up his position on the Magisterium? None, of course! But hey, Francis is the one who gets blasted for publishing his opinions, yet Ferrara is doing the exact same thing. And like Francis, he too is wrong, at least on the magisterium and papal authority issues.

Here, let me share with you some real papal teachings — binding papal teachings, I might add — which you're never going to hear about from Chris Ferrara — or John Vennari, or Michael Matt, John Salza, or any of those people:

We will start with Pope Pius IX:

"This chair [of Peter] is the center of Catholic truth and unity, that is, the head, mother, and teacher of all the Churches to which all honor and obedience must be offered. Every church must agree with it because of its greater preeminence... Now you know well that the most deadly foes of the Catholic religion have always waged a fierce war, but without success, against this Chair; they are by no means ignorant of the fact that religion itself can never totter and fall while this Chair remains intact, the Chair which rests on the rock which the proud gates of hell cannot overthrow and in which there is the whole and perfect solidity of the Christian religion. Therefore, because of your special faith in the Church and special piety toward the same Chair of Peter, We exhort you to direct your constant efforts so that the faithful people of France may avoid the crafty deceptions and errors of these plotters and develop a more filial affection and obedience to this Apostolic See. Be vigilant in act and word, so that the faithful may grow in love for this Holy See, venerate it, and accept it with complete obedience; they should execute whatever the See itself teaches, determines, and decrees." (Pope Pius IX, Encyclical Inter Multiplices, nn. 1,7)

Then we have Pope Leo XIII:

"In the Catholic Church Christianity is incarnate. It identifies itself with that perfect, spiritual, and, in its own order, sovereign society, which is the mystical body of Jesus Christ and which has for its visible head the Roman Pontiff, successor of the Prince of the Apostles. It is the continuation of the mission of the Saviour, the daughter and the heiress of His redemption. It has preached the Gospel, and has defended it at the price of its blood, and strong in the Divine assistance, and of that immortality which have been promised it, it makes no terms with error, but remains faithful to the commands which it has received to carry the doctrine of Jesus Christ to the uttermost limits of the world and to the end of time and to protect it in its inviolable integrity." (Pope Leo XIII, Apostolic Letter Annum Ingressi)

You probably haven't heard that before, at least not from the semi-traditionalists.

Now, next, Pope St. Pius X. He says the following:

"In fact, only a miracle of that divine power could preserve the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, from blemish in the holiness of Her doctrine, law, and end in the midst of the flood of corruption and lapses of her members. Her doctrine, law and end have produced an abundant harvest. The faith and holiness of her children have brought forth the most salutary fruits. Here is another proof of her divine life: in spite of a great number of pernicious opinions and great variety of errors the Church remains immutable and constant, 'as the pillar and foundation of truth', in professing one identical doctrine, in receiving the same Sacraments, in her divine constitution, government, and morality..." (Pope Pius X, Encyclical Editae Saepe, n. 8)

Pope Leo XII:

"But if one wishes to search out the true source of all the evils which We have already lamented, as well as those which We pass over for the sake of brevity, he will surely find that from the start it has ever been a dogged contempt for the Church's authority. The Church, as St. Leo the Great teaches, in well-ordered love accepts Peter in the See of Peter, and sees and honors Peter in the person of his successor the Roman Pontiff. Peter still

maintains the concern of all pastors in guarding their flocks, and his high rank does not fail even in an unworthy heir. In Peter then, as is aptly remarked by the same holy Doctor, the courage of all is strengthened and the help of divine grace is so ordered that the constancy conferred on Peter through Christ is conferred on the apostles through Peter. It is clear that contempt of the Church's authority is opposed to the command of Christ and consequently opposes the apostles and their successors, the Church's ministers who speak as their representatives." (Pope Leo XII, Encyclical Ubi Primum, n. 22)

Pius IX again:

"All who defend the faith should aim to implant deeply in your faithful people the virtues of piety, veneration, and respect for this supreme See of Peter. Let the faithful recall the fact that Peter, Prince of Apostles is alive here and rules in his successors, and that his office does not fail even in an unworthy heir. Let them recall that Christ the Lord placed the impregnable foundation of his Church on this See of Peter [Mt 16:18] and gave to Peter himself the keys of the kingdom of Heaven [Mt 16:19]. Christ then prayed that his faith would not fail, and commanded Peter to strengthen his brothers in the faith [Lk 27:32]. Consequently the successor of Peter, the Roman Pontiff, holds a primacy over the whole world and is the true Vicar of Christ, head of the whole Church and father and teacher of all Christians. Indeed one simple way to keep men professing Catholic truth is to maintain their communion with and obedience to the Roman Pontiff. For it is impossible for a man ever to reject any portion of the Catholic faith without abandoning the authority of the Roman Church. In this authority, the unalterable teaching office of this faith lives on. It was set up by the divine Redeemer and, consequently, the tradition from the Apostles has always been preserved. So it has been a common characteristic both of the ancient heretics and of the more recent Protestants — whose disunity in all their other tenets is so great — to attack the authority of the Apostolic See. But never at any time were they able by any artifice or exertion to make this See tolerate even a single one of their errors." (Pope Pius IX, Encyclical Nostis et Nobiscum, nn. 16-17)

Pope Leo XIII:

"...the Church has received from on high a promise which guarantees her against every human weakness. What does it matter that the helm of the symbolic barque has been entrusted to feeble hands, when the Divine Pilot stands on the bridge, where, though invisible, He is watching and ruling? Blessed be the strength of his arm and the multitude of his mercies!" (Pope Leo XIII, during an Allocution to Cardinals, March 20, 1900)

That, ladies and gentlemen, that is what the Catholic Church teaches about the papacy. So, here's a suggestion: if you're going to be a traditional Catholic, maybe you'll want to actually embrace traditional Catholic teaching — including the teaching on the papacy. And guess what: This will require you to conclude that Francis is not Pope, and in fact there hasn't been one since 1958, when Pope Pius XII died. I'm sorry if you don't like it, but that's just how it is. Reality doesn't care what we like.

So we always have to remember it is possible for the Catholic Church not to have a Pope at a particular point in time, and yes, it is even possible that there has not been a Pope since 1958. It is perhaps not likely — if you look at it in a vacuum, just by itself — that this should happen, but what is not possible that the Catholic Church should have a Pope who has defected, because, as we just saw in all these quotes, it is impossible for the divinely guaranteed Papal Chair to fail.

So, reality is what it is and we really need to understand that God expects us to look reality squarely in the eyes. That's what the Saints did, right? They didn't sit back and say, "Oh,

but that can't be! That makes me uncomfortable! That is going to shake up my little world! What are my friends going to think? What about my marriage annulment?" — and so on. The excuses are endless, but it's time to stop making excuses. Why would God ever put an end to a situation that those who profess to be His loyal subjects are not even willing to admit is real?

Yes, I know that there are many objections that can now be raised against Sedevacantism, and we can cover those in a future podcast. We'll also soon start organizing an army of prayer warriors to petition God, through the Most Holy Rosary, to send a true Pope and put an end to this horrible state of affairs that the Church is suffering through currently. So, yes, obviously there has to be more done on our part than simply pointing out that Francis isn't Pope and the Vatican II Church is a fraud. Absolutely. But for Heaven's sake, it all starts with that.

We were talking about Chris Ferrara, by the way and we got a little side tracked. Ferrara wraps it up and says the following: "Every Catholic worthy of the name has a duty to resist this attempted overthrow of the perennial Magisterium by a wayward Pope who clearly has no respect for the teaching of his own predecessors..." Ah yes, the perennial Magisterium, a favorite among semi-traditionalists. "What the Church has always taught" is another way they like to put it. Well, if the Church doesn't teach it now, then it's not true to say she has always taught it. We'll put a special link in our show notes to the truth about the so-called "Vincentian Canon", the rule of St. Vincent of Lerins, which was that a teaching is magisterial if it is believed always, everywhere, and by all. The Neo-Traditionalist camp has been misrepresenting that rule very badly, and back in 1875, Cardinal Johann Franzelin clarified just what that rule actually means and what it doesn't mean, and we've published the cardinal's explanation in English on our web site, so make sure you don't miss that. The post is entitled "Deflating another Resistance Myth", and you can find it at tradcast.org for episode 013.

Finally, let's come to John Vennari of Catholic Family News. He played papal gatekeeper, of course, as he usually does, since according to his version of "traditional" Catholicism too the faithful have to be kept away from the Pope and can't be instructed by him, unless the papal teaching has first met with the approval of Mr. Vennari or one of his colleagues. So, he published a Q&A on the exhortation entitled, "Situation Ethics Enshrined". And one of the first questions — I love this — one of the first questions was, "What are we to think of *Amoris Laetitia*?" You know, like a Catholic should go to a journalist from New York to find out what he is to think about a papal document. Unbelievable.

Vennari correctly identifies Francis' junk theology in this exhortation as situation ethics and shows how flawed and dangerous it is. Vennari is certainly right on that, and he usually is — he's usually very good at exposing and refuting Modernism. The problem with Vennari is that, just like the others in his camp, when it comes to the papacy, the magisterium, etc., when it comes to these issues, his reason shuts down because he does not want to be a sedevacantist. That's all this is. And so here is what he says: "Other Catholics believe they are duty-bound to defend and accept anything that comes from the Pope, even though — as Cardinal Burke noted — the document is a 'personal opinion' of Francis and is not [to be] confused with the binding faith owed to the exercise of the magisterium." Now just think about this for a minute. If I can reject what the Pope says — then why in the world should I somehow be bound by what a cardinal says about what the Pope says?! Come on!

If Francis is giving an opinion and then Burke gives his opinion on that opinion, why go by what the Cardinal says if you can go by what the Pope says? It's mind-blowing. But this is typical of Vennari. He finds authorities — or supposed authorities — that agree with him on a matter, and then he will quote them as though their words could trump those of the Pope

— and of course Vennari believes Francis to be the Pope. Now, can you imagine what Vennari would have said if “Cardinal” Burke had said every Catholic is obliged to adhere to Amoris Laetitia? Do you think Vennari would then be telling you to adhere to it? Of course not. Then he would have simply said, who cares what Burke thinks; he’s wrong. So, don’t let yourselves be hoodwinked by these tricks. Vennari is not using Burke because he accepts him as an authority — he’s using Burke because Burke agrees with him.

So, Vennari quotes Pope Pius XII’s condemnation of situation ethics, and that’s very good. But, Mr. Vennari, do you not realize that if Francis is Pope, why should anyone heed Pius XII’s condemnation? If Pius XII condemns situation ethics and Francis rehabilitates it, why should anyone choose Pius XII over Francis? What’s good for the goose is good for the gander: If the same authority that once condemned situation ethics now advocates it, then you cannot say that the condemnation was okay but the rehabilitation wasn’t. See, this is why this whole Pope/Sedevacantism issue is so important! These people are totally wrecking the Catholic doctrine on the papacy.

Alright, enough of the reactions from the semi-traditionalist camp. Let me just point out that there have also been, of course, some great sedevacantist commentaries, some by “The Thinking Housewife”, some by Tom Droleskey, one video by Fr. William Jenkins, and one heck of a radio show, two hours long, in which Bishop Donald Sanborn and Fr. Anthony Cekada take apart Francis’ “sexhortation”. It’s all linked in our show notes for TRADCAST 013.

Alright. Let me now offer some final commentary on this whole drama about Amoris Laetitia.

Like I said in the beginning, this is Vatican II all over again. The verbose and obscure language, the ambiguity, the liberals declaring victory, some neo-cons in denial, traditionalists saying it’s a catastrophe that needs to be resisted, and still others saying, “Don’t worry; it’s all just pastoral”.

And just like at Vatican II, where they introduced the Frankenchurch heresy of ecclesial elements that supposedly exist in other religions, so Amoris Laetitia uses the same principle of elements applied to moral theology, where you now no longer have virtue and vice, but rather just everything is virtue, either in its fullness, which is the ideal to which all are encouraged to strive, or at least in part, in elements, where the ideal is not realized fully but is approaching it more or less. And so the Novus Ordo Sect has now turned fornication, adultery, and sodomy into incomplete participations in Holy Matrimony. It’s unbelievable!

And so, “Thou Shalt Not Commit Adultery” has now been turned into, “It would be Ideal if you did not put yourself into an irregular situation”! We’ve actually created a number of memes that we’re linking to in our show notes. Yeah, little memes where we’ve updated some Bible verses and adjusted the language in accordance with Francis’ new revelation there from the god of surprises: You’ll read about the woman who was caught in an irregular situation, the real reason why St. John the Baptist was beheaded, what our Lord actually said to the woman at the well, and more! Check it out, the post with the memes is called “After Amoris Laetitia: Illustrating the Absurdity”.

Yeah, a little bit of satire, little bit of humor... It’s a very effective way of driving home a point about the ridiculousness of the Novus Ordo establishment. The New Church is only dangerous insofar as people take it seriously. And so, the sooner this thing falls apart, the better.

By the way, the true and truly beautiful Catholic teaching on Christian marriage, on Holy Matrimony, is presented by Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical *Casti Connubii* of December 31, 1930. We're putting that in our show notes as well. You'll notice clear language, clear teaching, and no balderdash. That's really refreshing. None of that "pastorally sensitive language" stuff. No, back then, people had no difficulty understanding the words, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." But now, for modern man, you know, that's clearly not a language people can understand. That's just too difficult. We need something simpler. That's why Francis just produced 254 pages of text about joy and discernment and accompaniment and what not — just to make everything clearer. That's just like at Vatican II, when they went from "The Church of Christ is the Catholic Church" to "The Church of Christ subsists in the Catholic Church". Back then too, they claimed they were making it clearer. But of course everybody went, "Huh?"

Look, the fact of the matter is, everyone can understand "Thou Shalt Not Commit Adultery." And that commandment did not come with a footnote, by the way. And it did say, "adultery" — it did not say "irregular situation" or "imperfect matrimonial form" or something like that. All this "pastorally sensitive language" nonsense is the vehicle with which all candid talk about sin and guilt is to be suppressed. They want to do away with that, and this will ultimately result in a practical "outlawing" of the hard truths of the Gospel. This way, all understanding of sin, culpability, hell, and so on, all that understanding that may still exist in some parts of the New Church, will be fully obscured, and quite probably any pastor, any cleric, who still dares to use such terminology will be severely punished.

So, if you've ever wondered why we're so candid at Novus Ordo Watch with our language — why we use such terms as "sodomy", "perversion", "fornication", "adultery" and so on — well, one of the reasons is that this is precisely the language that the anti-Catholic forces in the world are trying to outlaw — whether legally or socially —, and the most effective way to counter that is to shout from the rooftops exactly what they do not want to hear. Enough of all the incessant effeminate talk about "joy" and "tenderness" and "gift" and "accompanying" and all that! The Novus Ordo Sect is a false church made by effeminates for effeminates. That's what it is, and it shows in every way.

Now, let's about true mercy for a second. I realize that we may very well have people listening right now who, for whatever reason, are right now in an adulterous union, but who also are wanting, sincerely, to do God's will, and they're only now coming to realize that they're in serious trouble. Maybe you've been Novus Ordo all your life and gotten a marriage "annulment", and now you're coming to realize that the Vatican II Church is a fraud and therefore so is your "annulment", and therefore you are really not married to the person that all these years you thought was your spouse. Please, do not despair! I realize that there is a lot here that may be beginning to dawn on you right now, and you're mighty torn between what is the right thing to do, and what if the sedevacantists really are right, and so there is a lot of pain and a lot of struggle going on in your heart. We understand that.

So, let me offer you this: If you would like to speak with a sedevacantist priest about your situation, please, send us a message and we will connect you with one, perhaps even one in your area, depending on where you live. Just email us at tradcast@novusordowatch.org, or just use the contact form that we're linking in our show notes at tradcast.org.

Alright, let me say a few more things about the people we call semi-traditionalists, or neo-traditionalists. They take a "recognize-but-resist" position with regard to the people they claim are the lawful authorities of the Catholic Church: recognize them as lawful, but refuse them submission, resist them, ignore them, whatever. These people, these semi-traditionalists, even though they scream at the top of their lungs that Francis absolutely

is Pope and that we cannot say otherwise, betray in their other words and actions that they do not in fact believe this. If he's the Pope, then everything the Church teaches about the Pope, about the papacy, applies to him. Do the Semi-Traditionalists believe that? Absolutely not! They treat him like the village idiot. They refuse him submission in just about everything. In fact, the only time they invoke his supposed papacy as anything of consequence is when arguing against Sedevacantism, or when they need their "sacraments" to be valid, or when they need to have a marriage "annulment". Their "pope" is nothing but a bandaid. The whole thing is a sham.

And look at where their stubbornness has led them. Whether they like it or not, they are Francis' enablers, they are the enablers of his revolution. All Francis needs for his revolution to succeed is for people to believe that he is a valid Pope, that he is the true and legitimate Vicar of Christ, successor to St. Peter. That is what gives him all his power; and so, conversely, if you take that recognition away from him, his entire revolution will collapse.

So, honestly, all these people complaining now about Francis and how horrible this all is — I don't want to hear it. They are part of the problem. They make Francis what he is. But, you know, some people just refuse to take the only medicine that can help them just because they say it's too bitter to swallow. Well, can't help you then. Do whatever you like, but please don't call it Catholicism.

These people think that a true Pope can be subjected to a trial! Look at what Louie Verrecchio says in a post dated April 9: "This is the very definition of formal heresy, and while I have absolutely no hope whatsoever that it will happen, Jorge Bergoglio must be tried to determine if indeed he is guilty of the same." Hello, Louie, if he is the Pope, then no one can subject him to a trial because no one has authority over him! Welcome to Catholicism! — This was from Verrecchio's post entitled, "Council of Trent declares, Let Francis be Anathema", April 9.

But, you know, if they can't subject him to a trial, at least they can resist, right? On the very day of the release of the exhortation, Chris Ferrara said: "Let the resistance begin!..." John Vennari, too, said: "Prepare for battle!" The big, bad resistance is back. Watch out, Francis, here they come! The Resisters! And they're meaner and badder than ever before!...

Really, Mr. Ferrara and Mr. Vennari, and everybody else? What are you going to do? What? Another conference? Another book? Another video-recorded skype chat with Michael Matt? Maybe another petition? Or how about we quickly talk about Fatima again and the consecration of Russia? Or... wait! I know! Diabolical Disorientation! There! Or have John Salza tell everyone how evil it is to say that the guy in Rome who's currently destroying Faith, hope, and charity in individuals and also in families, is not in the fact the Vicar of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity! Maybe that's it.

Well, good luck, gentlemen... Maybe the very tactics and methods that haven't worked for you in the past 50 years will finally work now. You know, like Francis gives a hoot about what some retired lawyer in Virginia thinks about his "pontifical" document or whether anyone "resists" this thing. How are they going to resist it anyway? The ones implementing it are the local bishops and priests of the Vatican II Sect. Vennari, Ferrara, and all the others only exist to assure everyone that this hellish, sacrilegious, heretical, blasphemous, and satanic document comes from a true and valid Pope.

This is so frustrating. But these people cannot be convinced because they do not want to be convinced. And it is not possible to convince someone against his own will. No discussion is of any use because this is not a problem of the intellect; it's a problem of the will. They don't want Sedevacantism to be true. Well then, gentlemen, you better not complain about

your heretical “pope”! You’re going to get the pope you’re willing to accept. You accept a heretic — well, you got him!

At this point, let me not forget to bring up Pope Pius VI. In 1795, Pius VI published an apostolic constitution entitled “Auctorem Fidei”. It is marvelous. It condemned a lot of the errors of Vatican II which had been put forth in their prototype stage by a local council in Pistoia, Italy. One of the tactics used at that local council was the use of ambiguous language to introduce heresies under the guise of orthodoxy. Here’s what Pius VI, a true Pope, had to say about that: Referring to the former bishop of Pistoia, Scipione de’ Ricci, he said this: “...he embarked on confusing, destroying, and utterly overturning it by introducing troublesome novelties under the guise of a sham reform.”

Further on in his bull, the Pope continued as follows:

“In order not to shock the ears of Catholics, the innovators sought to hide the subtleties of their tortuous maneuvers by the use of seemingly innocuous words such as would allow them to insinuate error into souls in the most gentle manner. Once the truth had been compromised, they could, by means of slight changes or additions in phraseology, distort the confession of the faith that is necessary for our salvation, and lead the faithful by subtle errors to their eternal damnation. This manner of dissimulating and lying is vicious, regardless of the circumstances under which it is used. For very good reasons it can never be tolerated in a synod of which the principal glory consists above all in teaching the truth with clarity and excluding all danger of error. Moreover, if all this is sinful, it cannot be excused in the way that one sees it being done, under the erroneous pretext that the seemingly shocking affirmations in one place are further developed along orthodox lines in other places, and even in yet other places corrected; as if allowing for the possibility of either affirming or denying the statement, or of leaving it up to the personal inclinations of the individual — such has always been the fraudulent and daring method used by innovators to establish error. It allows for both the possibility of promoting error and of excusing it.”

Does this not sound familiar? This is exactly what we’ve been seeing since Vatican II... Here you see how a true Pope responds to this... Let me continue with one more quote from Pius VI:

“It is as if the innovators pretended that they always intended to present the alternative passages, especially to those of simple faith who eventually come to know only some part of the conclusions of such discussions, which are published in the common language for everyone’s use. Or again, as if the same faithful had the ability on examining such documents to judge such matters for themselves without getting confused and avoiding all risk of error. It is a most reprehensible technique for the insinuation of doctrinal errors and one condemned long ago by our predecessor St. Celestine who found it used in the writings of Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, and which he exposed in order to condemn it with the greatest possible severity. Once these texts were examined carefully, the impostor was exposed and confounded, for he expressed himself in a plethora of words, mixing true things with others that were obscure; mixing at times one with the other in such a way that he was also able to confess those things which were denied while at the same time possessing a basis for denying those very sentences which he confessed. In order to expose such snares, something which becomes necessary with a certain frequency in every century, no other method is required than the following: Whenever it becomes necessary to expose statements that disguise some suspected error or danger under the veil of ambiguity, one must denounce the perverse meaning under which the error opposed to Catholic truth is camouflaged.”

[Voris: “BAM!”] ...Yes, thank you, Michael Voris.

So, here you can see the difference between the drivel of Vatican II and the Novus Ordo magisterium, and the real Roman Catholic Magisterium. There is no doubt about which is which.

Now, looking at all the Novus Ordo "popes" together, one can see that all the papal pretenders before Francis were a lot more dangerous than he is, because although he is more extreme in his apostasy, he is also very open about it; he doesn't really try to hide it. But his five predecessors tried to hide it much more, especially Benedict XVI, and he was very successful with that.

And so, what makes Francis so dangerous, ironically, is that he makes his predecessors, especially Benedict XVI and John Paul II, look like orthodox, traditional Catholics. And that danger cannot be overestimated. Look at how sly this tactic is: Everyone is now juxtaposing Francis with Benedict and John Paul. Even The Remnant, the newspaper for the supposed last remaining few traditional Catholics, is very often now simply contrasting Francis with some Novus Ordo "pope" before him, to show that he is allegedly departing from the conciliar magisterium. Think about this: This extremely subtle tactic of making the pre-Francis Novus Ordo magisterium the standard of Catholic truth is already showing signs of success! Look at how many people are falling for it!

Think about it: Who is more dangerous? The one who openly attacks Catholicism, like Francis, or the one who does it secretly, hiding poison in a candy bar, coming through the back door, offering the gift of the Trojan horse — like Benedict XVI with his "grand concession" of allowing all to celebrate the Latin Mass — as long as they don't adhere to the traditional Faith? — Yeah, that was basically in the fine print...

The true difference between Francis and his Novus Ordo predecessors is not in the principles but in the development or application of those principles. Whereas Benedict XVI and John Paul II may have been more covert in their Modernism in some ways, they and their predecessors Paul VI and John XXIII had planted the seeds that are now germinating.

You know, years ago people in the SSPX/Recognize-and-Resist camp would say stuff like, "Well, if the Pope ever does such and such, then I'll be a sedevacantist!" You don't hear that much anymore, probably because the "Pope" has already done that. I mean, what more does it take?

Another thing I've noticed among conservative Novus Ordos is that their outrage is strangely selective. For example, when Joseph Ratzinger, Gerhard Ludwig Muller, and Walter Kasper deny the Bodily Resurrection of Christ, barely anyone notices or cares, but if Francis publishes a long, ambiguous document with a footnote that allows public adulterers to go to "communion", all hell breaks loose.

Some people are acting like this is the first time Bergoglio has spoken heresy. Where have they been?! He's claimed St. John the Baptist wasn't sure Christ was the true Messiah, that the Blessed Mother may have thought God lied to her, that Christ Himself apologized for making His parents worry when He stayed behind at the temple in Jerusalem, that Faith without charity is not true Faith, that there can be true martyrdom outside the Catholic Church, and on and on! The list is endless. Why is it that outrage is usually only reserved for things of a sexual nature? Usually the conservative Novus Ordos only make a big stink when it's something that touches on abortion, contraception, divorce, sodomy — stuff like that. That's when they roll out their petitions and stuff. But where was the outrage when Bergoglio said Catholics and Protestants are one, are united, in martyrdom? That's heresy. That's calling God a liar. Where was the outrage?

Sometimes, when you put stuff like that in front a Novus Ordo, or a semi-traditionalist — when you make them aware of what Francis' latest heresy is, you get a response of: "Oh, that's so sad" or, "That makes me sad." Folks, you need to stop being sad about everything; it's time to get angry! A holy, righteous anger is what is needed here. When our Lord saw that the Jews had turned the temple into a den of thieves where they were buying and selling, He didn't retreat into a corner and start sobbing. No, he got angry!

Now, of course, mere anger isn't enough either, but it often is necessary to get people moving. So, what can you do? We should definitely have a future TRADCAST just on that topic. But for now, we've posted twelve things you can do to help bring down the Novus Ordo Church. The link is in our show notes. Twelve things — pick one or two or six, or however many work for you, and get busy. It's time to defeat this false church. And there are many more things that can be done, so that list can definitely be expanded, but that's what we have for right now.

About a year ago, a number of sedevacantists in the Cincinnati, Ohio, area protested "Cardinal" Oscar Rodriguez-Maradiaga when he gave a talk at the diocesan seminary. They held up signs saying "Francis is a false pope" and "Maradiaga is not a cardinal" and stuff like that, right there on a public sidewalk where cars were driving by. They raised awareness. It wasn't a lot of people — only 6 or 7 or so. But see how much impact just a few people can have. You just need to get out of your chair and do something. I mean, what a monumental embarrassment to the Modernist Archdiocese of Cincinnati. Here they are hosting the man who's been called the "Vice Pope" because he is so close to Francis, and he comes to visit and there are protests outside where he's speaking, where he's being denounced as a false cardinal and his boss a false pope. I mean, wow! We can do things.

Well, it's finally time to wrap things up here. Again, I am very sorry for how long you had to wait to get this episode, but it took a lot of work to put it together, and I think I'm not exaggerating if I say that at least 50 hours were put into the production of this show: the research, the script writing, the recording, the editing, the optimizing of the audio and distribution of the content, and so on. Thank you for your patience!

If you benefit from what we do here, if you would like to support our work, please click on the link for the twelve things you can do to help Novus Ordo Watch and pick an option that works for you. Yes, you can even make a donation if you would like; there is a link for that too. It is much appreciated.

Thank you for listening... Don't keep this show a secret. Until next time — God bless you.

[END]