

Amoris Laetitia: A Year since its Publication

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

Miles Christi - 20/03/2017

With his second and endless¹ Apostolic Exhortation, which contains 58,000 words, called *Amoris Laetitia* (« The Joy of Love »), published a year ago, Francis unquestionably reached a new dimension in the matter of iniquity, to the point that it was precisely from this text that there began to be heard timidly critical voices towards him among the « conservative » members of the conciliar hierarchy.

With this supposedly magisterial document, Francis took to its conclusion the prolonged and Machiavellian process of ideological subversion that led to its publication, which mainly includes the two Synods of the Bishops of 2014 and 2015, as well as an overwhelming amount of indigestible texts and reports, full of omissions, ambiguities, manipulations, falsehoods and half-truths.

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

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

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

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

¹ Probably the most extensive document ever produced by a Pope in 2000 years of Church history. This document largely exceeds, among other lengthy texts, the 45,000 words which contain the encyclical, *Veritatis Splendor*, of John Paul II or the 31,000 words of *Caritas in Veritate*, of Benedict XVI. Let's compare this tedious chronicle with, for example, the 4,500 words of the encyclical *Mortalium Animos*, of Pius XI, or the 6,400 words of *Humani Generis* of Pius XII...

Francis had set forth this idea for the first time in *Evangelii Gaudium*²; I will repeat the entire passage because it shows us his gnostic thinking and also because, if one takes it with a sense of humor, I am convinced that it will provide a moment of relaxation from laughing at such bombastic prose. Here is the passage, which is a true piece of anthology but... be careful of your head spinning!

«A constant tension exists between fullness and limitation. Fullness evokes the desire for complete possession, while limitation is a wall set before us. Broadly speaking, “time” has to do with fullness as an expression of the horizon which constantly opens before us, while each individual moment has to do with limitation as an expression of enclosure. People live poised between each individual moment and the greater, brighter horizon of the utopian future as the final cause which draws us to itself. Here we see a first principle for progress in building a people: time is greater than space. » § 222

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

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

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

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

«Time governs spaces, illumines them and makes them links in a constantly expanding chain, with no possibility of return. What we need, then, is to give priority to actions which generate

² http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium.html

new processes in society and engage other persons and groups who can develop them to the point where they bear fruit in significant historical events. » § 223

But let us return to § 3 of *Amoris Laetitia*. After reminding us of the absurd principle according to which “time is superior to space”, and which you undoubtedly will not soon forget, Francis explains that in the Church one needs to guard “the unity of doctrine,” but “that should not hinder the subsisting of different interpretations of certain aspects of doctrine.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

«Reflecting on this, Saint John Paul II noted that the biblical texts “give no reason to assert the ‘inferiority’ of marriage, nor the ‘superiority’ of virginity or celibacy” based on sexual

abstinence. Rather than speak absolutely of the superiority of virginity, it should be enough to point out that the different states of life complement one another, and consequently that some can be more perfect in one way and others in another.» § 159

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

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

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

Pius XII repeated this dogmatic truth in his 1954 encyclical *Sacra Virginitas*³:

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

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

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

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

³ http://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-xii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_25031954_sacra-virginitas.html

situation may be, which is to say including those who have no intention of ending their scandalous life. And then considers words such as these:

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

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

« Our species, like others, will be extinguished, but the light of God, that will not be extinguished, which in the end will invade all souls and then everything will be in all. »⁴

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

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

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

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

Here is what Pius XII said about situational ethics during an address in 1952 at the International Congress of the World Federation of Young Catholic Women:

⁴ Interview with Eugenio Scalfari on September 24, 2013, published on October 1 in *La Repubblica*

«This new ethic is so outside the Faith and Catholic principles that even a child if he knows his catechism will realize and understand this. It is not difficult to recognize how the new moral system derives from existentialism, which whether it makes an abstraction of God, or simply denies Him, in any case turns man on himself.»⁵

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

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

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

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

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

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

«This [is] the healthy realism of Catholicism. It is not Catholic [to say] ‘either this or nothing.’ This is not Catholic, this is heretical. Jesus always knows how to accompany us, he gives us the ideal, he accompanies us towards the ideal, he frees us from the chains of the law’s rigidity and tells us: ‘But do that up to the point that you are capable.’ And he understands us very well. He is our Lord and this is what he teaches us.»⁶

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

⁵ <http://nullapossiamocontrolaverita.blogspot.it/2016/05/la-condanna-della-morale-di-situazione.html>

⁶ http://en.radiovaticana.va/news/2016/06/09/pope_those_who_say_%E2%80%9Cthis_or_nothing%E2%80%9D_are_heretics_/1235939

«From essential relations between man and God, between man and man, between spouses, between parents and children, on essential relations in the community of the family, in the Church, in the State, the following results among other things, [here follows a long list of sinful behaviors, including adultery and fornication] all of which is gravely forbidden by Divine Law. There is nothing to question. Whatever the individual situation, there is no choice but to obey.»⁷

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

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

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

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

Here are two other bits of literature from *Fornicationis Laetitia*, the final Bergoglian *Eschatological Expectoration*:

«For this reason, a pastor cannot feel that it is enough simply to apply moral laws to those living in “irregular” situations, as if they were stones to throw at people’s lives. This would bespeak the closed heart of one used to hiding behind the Church’s teachings, “sitting on the chair of Moses and judging at times with superiority and superficiality difficult cases and wounded families”. [...] Because of forms of conditioning and mitigating factors, it is possible that in an objective situation of sin -which may not be subjectively culpable, or fully such -a person can be living in God’s grace, can love and can also grow in the life of grace

⁷ <http://nullpossiamocontrolaverita.blogspot.it/2016/05/la-condanna-della-morale-di-situazione.html>

*and charity, while receiving the Church's help to this end.*⁸ *Discernment must help to find possible ways of responding to God and growing in the midst of limits. By thinking that everything is black and white, we sometimes close off the way of grace and of growth, and discourage paths of sanctification which give glory to God. » § 305*

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

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

On June 16, 2016 in the opening speech of the *Pastoral Congress of the Diocese of Rome*, held in St. Peter's Basilica, Francis returned to the subject, pushing ungodliness to unimaginable limits. Here are three brief extracts:⁹

1. *« They prefer to live together, and this is a challenge, it calls for work. Not to say straight away: “Why don't you get married in Church?” No. Accompany them: wait and cultivate. And cultivate fidelity. »*
2. *« Yet really, I say that I have seen a great deal of fidelity in these cohabiting couples, a great deal of fidelity; and I am certain that this is a true marriage, they have the grace of matrimony, precisely because of the fidelity that they have. »*
3. *« It is the culture of the provisional. This happens everywhere, even in priestly life, in religious life. The provisional. This is why a part of our sacramental marriages are null, because they [the spouses] say: “Yes, for a lifetime”, but they do not know what they are saying, because they have another culture. »*

⁸ Following is a footnote numbered 351 in *Amoris Laetitia*: *« In certain cases, this can include the help of the sacraments. Hence, “I want to remind priests that the confessional must not be a torture chamber, but rather an encounter with the Lord's mercy” (Apostolic Exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium* [24 November 2013], 44: AAS 105 [2013], 1038). I would also point out that the Eucharist “is not a prize for the perfect, but a powerful medicine and nourishment for the weak” (ibid., 47: 1039). »*

⁹ https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2016/june/documents/papa-francesco_20160616_convegno-diocesi-roma.html

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

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

<http://saint-remi.fr/fr/anti-liberalisme/1463-three-years-with-francis-the-bergoglian-deceit.html>

