

NOW OR NEVER

Cardinal Kasper and all the Bergoglio's sycophants, mobilized for the Synod on the Family, are absolutely logical and perfectly coherent with the principles on ecumenism introduced by the Council when they propose a new, 'pastoral' approach to marriage. With the sentence « *it's a task of the Church to recognize those seeds of the Word spread beyond her visible and sacramental borders* » they bring again to the fore *Gaudium et Spes*, 22¹ and the ecclesiastical elements that allegedly exist outside the Church. The switch from ecclesial ecumenism to matrimonial ecumenism it's a logical and consequential step: there would be then – so they say – some elements of the Christian marriage outside the sacrament. Indeed, just like the Council did with the other Christian confessions and with the other religions, they consider the possibility to recognize « positive elements » even in such « imperfect forms » as civil marriage and cohabitation, without any objective element of moral evaluation; at the same time, adapting to evil without opposing oneself to it is included between the new "courageous pastoral choices" and their consequent revolutionary virulence that would open sceneries unthinkable till today.

But now there is something more at stake: if we attribute to the relationships established by homosexuality a potentially positive drive deserving pastoral care and juridical protection, homosexuality itself isn't a sin – much less the one which cries out to God for revenge – or a disordered tendance opposed to natural law anymore. However, if we want to see positive features in a union against nature; if a mortal sin ceases to be such, as Roberto de Mattei reminds:

it is the very same idea of sin that ceases to be, while the old Lutheran idea of mercy anathematized by the Council of Trent rises again. In the Canons on Justification published on January 13th, 1547 we read: « *If any one shall say that justifying faith is nothing else than confidence in the divine mercy* » (can. 12); « *that Christ Jesus was given of God to men, as a redeemer in whom to trust, and not also as a legislator whom to obey* » (can. 21); « *that there is no mortal sin but that of infidelity* » (can. 27), « *let him be anathema* ».

[here: <http://www.corrispondenzaromana.it/verso-il-sinodo-del-2015/>]

The news dispatched by the media have raised more confusion still: the media Synod is already influencing many modernist priests who are applying the "pastoral" openness against doctrine; many believers lead astray by this situation demand these novelties from priest who are still anchored to the perennial principles of the Church. Confusion and uncertainty about future developments reign, even when we remain realist about the

signals given by the facts that have happened till now. Sadly, the breach – acknowledged by many people – is undeniable.

Nor should we understate the fact that, even if the text of the final *Relatio* – which presents many amendments compared to the text *post disceptationem*, together with 470 "ways" (that is, the proposal of amendment proposed) – reports those issues that didn't receive the synodal approval, we may consider this only a Pyrrhic victory.

It is time for the pastors who don't agree to speak aloud. Every one of them. The Pope has already written down the names of the dissidents: Cardinal Burke's removal – together with the recent *ad hoc* appointments intended to influentiate the works – is an example of the possible consequences. Before the next wave of epurations, it is advisable for every pastor – even those who are not directly involved in the Synodal Conference – to speak aloud and to be present on the media as much as possible in order to fix the damages already done by a worldwide media propaganda about indiscriminate 'pastoral' openings, and in order to inform as many people as possible, *ab intra* and *ad extra*, about this pontificate and the deviations that it's introducing into the Church.

How is it possible not to consider these acts as a work of demolition of the last vestiges of the Catholic doctrine about morals and sacraments, presented as a logical consequence and extension of the notorious Vatican II 'novelties'?

In the current abyss that 'Bergoglimism' is opening – taking advantage of the fissures opened by many ambiguities used as exceptions and adopted then as rules – we can clearly recognize the fruit of Conciliarism. Praxis has overstepped the "old" doctrine – *de facto* (the idea of *de iure* has disappeared²) – imposing a "new" one, so that the present Pope may take the liberty of despising Tradition, the "perennial Rome" and even its Liturgy [here: <http://chiesaepostconcilio.blogspot.it/2013/09/nec-plvs-vltra-here-and-no-further.html> (english)]. This scenery is far different from the ones presented by all the previous post-conciliar pontificates, even considering all the deviations that they introduced (a savage liturgical reform; Assisi and the Parallel Alliance with the "elder brothers"; the rehabilitation of Luther...). But today we have reached the *redde rationem*: Joachimite Pentecostalism, the contempt of reason and sane theology, sociologism, Theology of Liberation, liberalization of sodomy, acceptance of sins and codified errors instead of love for the (repentant or induced to repentance) sinner and the (corrected and educated) mistaken.

The Synod has given us the opportunity to see many masks drop and

recognize residual yearnings of faithfulness. Sadly, if the last won't be put into effect through efficient actions before the already ongoing purges and the enactment of the next manipulatory moves, the further consequences would be irreversible or – at least – it would be much more difficult to repair the damages that they will cause. On the other hand, it's impossible to demonstrate – as many try to do – that the Pope is *super partes*.

The very same Sandro Magister, one of the most alert and objective observers, affirms just today [here: <http://chiesa.espresso.repubblica.it/articolo/1350910>].

It's not true that Bergoglio didn't talk in the two weeks of the Synod. In the morning homilies at Santa Maria he hammered every day the zealous traditionalists, those who overburden men with unbearable weights, those who have only certainties and no doubts, the very same whom he pounced on in the last speech with the Synodal fathers. [...] Pope Francis and his lieutenants, from Forte and Spadaro to the Argentinian Archbishop Víctor Manuel Fernández, hit their target when they let this explosive issue enter the highest levels of the Catholic Church. We'll see what will happen next. Because that's how Bergoglio's revolution works: "it is long-term, not having the obsession of immediate results". Because "what matters is to begin processes instead of occupying spaces". These are words from the *Evangelii gaudium*, the program of his pontificate.

I cannot but propose again here what I affirmed in the past and reiterate my invitation to *Parrhesia* to the pastors, who will always be supported by the sound part of the herd – no matter how *pusillus* (small). Doctrine is immutable while praxis is not, but even pastoral praxis must not contradict doctrine, or else it would establish a different one in disguise.

Now, the 'Kasper thesis' – associated every day with new revolutionary voices – that the very same Pope has thrown in the arena in order to begin the battle of the purpled gladiators, openly contradicts doctrine. The only coherent attitude for a Cardinal or a Bishop is to condemn – openly and immediately, without any further hesitation – both Kasper's thesis and – above all – Francis's inconceivable attempt to subject to an examination something that cannot be discussed, on pain of immediately losing the Catholic Faith. And now, *hic et nunc*, let the guardians of Faith publicly intervene, even with an out-and-out *libellus accusationis*.

NOW OR NEVER.

Maria Guarini

-
1. <http://chiesaepostconcilio.blogspot.it/2012/12/brunero-gherardini-lantropocentrismo.html> (italian) - <http://chiesaepostconcilio.blogspot.it/2013/10/sunt-nomina-rerum-there-are-names-for.html> (english)
 2. Even the stifling of Tradition is perpetrated not according to the law but through authoritarian measures (see the cases Francescani dell'Immacolata and Ciudad del Este), without explicit justifications or with specious expedients.
With an examination of the *Virtual Council, Real Council and Fake Hermeneutics* [here: <http://chiesaepostconcilio.blogspot.it/2014/07/concilio-reale-virtuale-ermeneutica.html> - (italian)] (the same title could be used for an analysis of the Synod, real, virtual, *et alia*), I have pointed out the tactics of frustrating the debate by saying that the opponents use a different interpretive form when they examine reality: by changing language [here: <http://chiesaepostconcilio.blogspot.it/p/il-compito-di-svelare-le-non-e-solo-del.html> - (italian)], the Council has also changed the criteria of approach to reality. It's not infrequent to talk about the same thing to which – however – different meanings are given. Furthermore, the main trick of the present hierarchs consists in using apodictical sentences, without even bothering to demonstrate them with incomplete, sophistic definitions. They don't need to demonstrate anything because they subverted anything *ab origine*. The lack of theological, definite principles or demonstrations in this pastoral anomaly is exactly what takes away from us the very same matter of debate. It is comparable to a changing, shapeless fluid which dissolves any clear, unequivocal, defining, true meaning. In order not to sink into the liquid sewage and the quagmire of the new, historicist, transient new-Magistry, we need the impassioned, perennial, fruitful (anything but museum-like!) firmness of the Dogma.