Francis had some dreams, but they are really nightmares for the Church. These are not the dreams of the Patriarch Joseph, nor those of St. Joseph or St. John Bosco. They clearly do not come from the same source as the visions granted to these holy men.

On Feb. 12, 2020, the Vatican released the dreaded Apostolic Exhortation *Querida Amazonia* (QA), relating to the Synod on the Amazon that was held in Rome in October 2019. Dated February 2, the document is a bizarre relation of Francis' "dreams" for the Amazon and the whole Church. This "I have a dream" exhortation epitomizes the depths to which the office of the Vicar of Christ has fallen since the Second Vatican Council. The pre-Conciliar popes taught the revealed truth handed down from the Apostles. Francis, in perfect continuity with Vatican II, shares his personal nightmarish visions of a Church that has shed the face of Christ her head for a Church with an Amazonian face.

Epitomizing this turning from God toward creatures, rather than filling his document with quotations from the Word of God – as one would expect from the Vicar of Christ – the document is filled with quotations from poetry. Now, there is nothing wrong with poetry. Good poetry can help us appreciate truth and beauty. Yet, when teaching we would expect the Vicar of Christ to rely heavily on God's Word rather than sprinkling a few snippets of Scripture in a document filled with quotations of secular poetry. If Francis wanted to use literary genres, the Scriptures themselves are filled with sacred poetry in the Psalms. Yet, this sacred poetry does not align with Francis' nightmare to remake the Church into the image of a pantheist, pagan, modern liberal institution.

Some have reacted with relief and celebration, claiming that the document is not as bad as it could have been since it rejects the most radical changes proposed at the Synod. Yet, after we enter into these dark dreams we will see that the document is a radical manifesto declaring war on the Church of Christ that does not abandon any radical proposals but gives them a green light and claims they are not radical enough.

Dream 1: Marxist Ideology

Francis' first "dream", which he calls "social" (QA, Chapter 1), is really a dream of Marxism. This is no surprise, given his acceptance of a blasphemous crucifix containing the universally recognized symbol of Soviet Communism, the hammer and sickle, and his rehabilitation of communist liberation theologians.

The core of Marxist ideology is belief in class struggle. History and contemporary reality are filtered through a vision of a global class struggle between a small capitalist class that has been and continues to exploit the larger proletariat. It is a materialist ideology that offers a false utopian hope of a paradise on earth. It satiates its lust for power by inciting the

Copyright © catholicfamilynews.com. All rights reserved.

working classes to revolution to avenge these alleged historical oppressions. The pre-Conciliar popes strongly condemned Marxist Communism and its younger sibling socialism with the harshest terms until the Second Vatican Council, when the Vatican bureaucrats "lost" in a drawer the petition of over 400 Council Fathers requesting a condemnation of Communism.

First, Francis' dream accepts the black legends that recast the history of discovery and evangelization of the New World into a story exclusively of class warfare and exploitation. The following lines could have been written by the most red academic or communist operative:

> "The colonizing interests that have continued to expand – legally and illegally – the timber and mining industries, and have expelled or marginalized the indigenous peoples, the river people and those of African descent, are provoking a cry that rises up to heaven…" (QA, 9).
>
> "As the bishops of the Brazilian Amazon have noted, 'the history of the Amazon region shows that it was always a minority that profited from the poverty of the majority and from the unscrupulous plundering of the region's natural riches…'" (QA, 16)

Marxist ideology sees the Church as a part of the bourgeois capitalist class that has exploited the proletariat. Because the Church calls men to spiritual warfare and prioritizes the spiritual over the material, all Communist regimes slander the Church and call for her suppression and persecution. Francis adopts the same false historical narrative of the Marxists. The Church has been on the side of bourgeois capitalism and must atone for her oppression. Not only should we Catholics be outraged by bourgeois exploitation, but he says the Church must *beg forgiveness*. Even though he gives a grudging nod to old missionaries some of whom he says protected the people, he then attacks those missionaries thus:

> "At the same time, since we cannot deny that the wheat was mixed with the tares, and that the missionaries did not always take the side of the oppressed, I express my shame and once more 'I humbly ask forgiveness, not only for the offenses of the Church herself, but for the crimes committed against the native peoples during the so-called conquest of America' as well as for the terrible crimes that followed throughout the history of the Amazon region." (QA, 19)

Copyright © catholicfamilynews.com. All rights reserved.

> "Nor can we exclude the possibility that members of the Church have been part of networks of corruption, at times to the point of agreeing to keep silent in exchange for economic assistance for ecclesial works." (QA, 25)

Rather than seeing the Church as the Bride of Christ, Francis condemns her as a tool of bourgeois capitalists. Like all good Communists, after convicting the Church, his solution is radical Communism. He praises the indigenous peoples of the Amazon for what sounds like an idealized utopia of communist social organization through the abolition of private property:

> "'Everything is shared; private areas – typical of modernity – are minimal. Life is a communal journey where tasks and responsibilities are apportioned and shared on the basis of the common good. There is no room for the notion of an individual detached from the community or from the land'. Their relationships are steeped in the surrounding nature, which they feel and think of as a reality that integrates society and culture, and a prolongation of their bodies, personal, familial and communal…" (QA, 20)

The Church until Vatican II was always at war with Communism because Communism wants to rewrite the history of Redemption from the salvation of man from sin and the devil to the redemption of man from material oppression. The Church never condemns those who seek to improve the material well-being of people, but this improvement must always be oriented to the higher good of eternal salvation. In Marxist fashion, however, Francis redefines the message of the Gospel to be focused on man and not God. He distorts the meaning of salvation, which according to the perennial teaching of the Church transforms us from being "enemies" of God (Rom. 5:10) and "by nature children of wrath" (Eph. 2:3) to not only His "friends" (John 15:15) but His adopted children (cf. 1 John 3:1). Non-Christians who live according to the natural law can establish true friendships with other men (the Greek philosophers are proof of this truth), but only the Church can make us capable of becoming friends of God through faith and Baptism. And yet, for Francis salvation is all about merely human relationships: "Christ redeemed the whole person, and He wishes to restore in each of us the capacity to enter into relationship with others" (QA, 22). This is not the essence of the Gospel. It is our new ability to have a relationship with God that is the good news, not our relations with ourselves.

The consequences of this "dream" are consistent with Marxist goals, in particular, the false hope of a material utopia of "good living." It is not Marx who can deliver on a promise of

Copyright © catholicfamilynews.com. All rights reserved.

living more abundantly. Only Our Lord Jesus Christ and His Mystical Body the Church can deliver on that promise (cf. John 10:10). Yet, Francis is trapped in a Marxist worldview that sees natural good living as the goal of the Church.

Dream 2: Indiscriminate Multiculturalism

Francis' second "dream" (QA, Chapter 2) is also not the dream of the Church he is supposed to head but, rather, the dream of liberal secular multiculturalism. The Church has always been a supporter of true and good cultures. True culture, which is a word derived from the religious word *cult* (worship), is the expression in the daily life of a particular people of the truths embodied in the cult of the true God. The Church has never advocated the indiscriminate exaltation of any purported culture. She protects and preserves true culture that supports and expresses true cult, but she demands the rejection of cultures that are contrary to the Gospel. As quoted by Gratian in his great compilation of canon law, Pope Nicholas III (r. 1277-1280) explains:

> "An evil custom is no more to be tolerated than a dangerous infection because, unless the custom is quickly torn up by its roots, it will be adopted by wicked men as entitling them to a privilege. And then unchecked deviations and various infractions will soon be revered as lawful and honored as immemorial privileges." (*Decretum*, D. 8 C. 3)

Perennial Church teaching and law requires us to discriminate good cultures and customs from evil. Every country's people may develop their own customs to express in daily life the good and truth of the Gospel. The Church fosters and encourages this diversity of good cultures. Yet, it celebrates these differing cultures not for their being "multi" but because and only to the extent that they are unified with what is true and good. The Church evaluates cultures on their objective goodness or evil; modern multiculturalism, in stark contrast, says that every culture is good based solely on the subjective belief of its adherents. And unlike his venerable predecessor Pope Nicholas, Francis embraces the liberal notion of multiculturalism that cultures are by definition good simply because they are different:

> "They [Amazonian indigenous cultures] are our principal dialogue partners, those from whom we have the most to learn, to whom we need to listen out of a duty of justice, and from whom we must ask permission before presenting our proposals. Their words, their hopes and their fears should be the most authoritative voice at

Copyright © catholicfamilynews.com. All rights reserved.

> any table of dialogue on the Amazon region. And the great question is: 'What is their idea of 'good living' for themselves and for those who will come after them?' … Others must be acknowledged and esteemed precisely as others, each with his or her own feelings, choices and ways of living and working." (QA, 26-27)
>
> "In each land and its features, God manifests Himself and reflects something of His inexhaustible beauty. Each distinct group, then, in a vital synthesis with its surroundings, develops its own form of wisdom." (QA, 32)

This radical subjectivism is a hallmark of liberal multiculturalism. Notice that he does not say each culture has its unique way of expressing the same wisdom, that of God, but that each culture "develops its own form of wisdom." According to this logic, the Church does not have definitive objective truths but merely "proposals." She must ask permission of people to proclaim the Gospel, as if the commission of Christ is not enough. This false liberal multiculturalism causes Francis to incorrectly define the Church's mission to teach. He redefines education in a direct rupture from the law of Pope Nicholas: "That is in fact what education is meant to do: to cultivate without uprooting, to foster growth without weakening identity, to be supportive without being invasive" (QA, 28).

Education, which comes from the Latin *ex ducere* ("to lead out of"), is meant to uproot. It is meant to lead the student out of ignorance and into truth. Francis has adopted the same false understanding of education that is the product of liberal multiculturalism. Education is merely meant to help people grow in what they already are, whatever subjective wisdom they have developed for themselves. Francis does not dream of missionaries who lead people out of darkness and into the light of truth. Rather, his nightmare reverses the role of teacher (the Church) and student (pagan cultures). He places the Church as the one who should receive, not give – and what she is given, as we shall see in the next nightmare, is paganism. In Francis' nightmarish reversal of true education, "the Church herself undergoes a process of reception that enriches her with the fruits of what the Spirit has already mysteriously sown in that culture. In this way, 'the Holy Spirit adorns the Church, showing her new aspects of revelation and giving her a new face'" (QA, 68). In Francis' nightmare, in which the Church substitutes the headship of Christ for the face of paganism, the Church does not hand on what she has received but rather receives the erroneous wisdom developed by pagan culture.

Dream 3: Pagan Pantheism

The next "dream" of Francis is a recurrence of the nightmare articulated in his 2015 Encyclical *Laudato Si*. Like its five-year-old predecessor, the reiterated "ecological dream"

Copyright © catholicfamilynews.com. All rights reserved.

found in his new Exhortation (QA, Chapter 3) reads like a UN subcommittee study group that seeks to advance the anti-life, anti-Catholic agenda of atheist globalists under the guise of care for the environment.

More concerning, however, is the goal that undergirds this dream, namely, an inversion of the order of creation. According to the Book of Genesis, man is at the top of the hierarchy of visible creation – second only to the angels in proximity God. All other creatures, sentient and inanimate, are lower in the hierarchy. This teaching of the Book of Genesis is directly opposed to pagan pantheism. This ancient error inverts the hierarchy of creation with God on top followed by angels and man to place God on the bottom, closer to inanimate nature than to man. Pantheism rejects the idea of a personal God Who is the First Cause of all creation and instead exalts animals, plants, and all of the earth as a collective false god. In lieu of the worship of the true personal God Who is atop creation, pantheism worships nature, personifying aspects of nature as divine.

Just as Francis' Marxist dream could have been written by Marx or Lenin, so too this dream could have been written by the most committed ancient or New Age pantheist. We need consider only a few examples:

> "…'the forest is not a resource to be exploited; it is a being, or various beings, with which we have to relate". … 'we are water, air, earth and life of the environment created by God.'" (QA, 42)
>
> "From the original peoples, we can learn to contemplate the Amazon region and not simply analyze it, and thus appreciate this precious mystery that transcends us. We can love it, not simply use it, with the result that love can awaken a deep and sincere interest. Even more, we can feel intimately a part of it and not only defend it; then the Amazon region will once more become like a mother to us." (QA, 55)
>
> "On the other hand, if we enter into communion with the forest, our voices will easily blend with its own and become a prayer: 'as we rest in the shade of an ancient eucalyptus, our prayer for light joins in the song of the eternal foliage'." (QA, 56)
>
> "For all these reasons, we believers encounter in the Amazon region a theological locus, a space where God Himself reveals Himself and summons His sons and daughters." (QA, 57)

Copyright © catholicfamilynews.com. All rights reserved.

> "Inculturation elevates and fulfills. Certainly, we should esteem the indigenous mysticism that sees the interconnection and interdependence of the whole of creation, the mysticism of gratuitousness that loves life as a gift, the mysticism of a sacred wonder before nature and all its forms of life." (QA, 73)
>
> "Similarly, a relationship with Jesus Christ, true God and true man, liberator and redeemer, is not inimical to the markedly cosmic worldview that characterizes the indigenous peoples…" (QA, 74)[1]

This is how far the human element of the Church has sunk. We have a pope calling us to commune with the forest. He apparently dreams that the Mystery of the Most Holy Trinity will be replaced by the mystery of nature. Rather than confirming that Divine Revelation came to an end with the death of the last Apostle, the Amazon is "a theological locus" (source) of revelation, just as the old pagan pantheist saw nature as a sacred revelation of the local deity. Contrary to all of Tradition and Scripture, Francis declares Christian belief is no longer inimical to a pantheistic "cosmic worldview." Too bad the martyrs had to die when they could have just joined in the "sacred wonder before nature."

Although Pope Francis quotes St. Paul's words, "Woe to me if I do not preach the Gospel!" (1 Cor. 9:16), we see in this nightmare that it is not the Gospel of Christ that he seeks to preach. Francis makes clear that his mission is not to call all men to join the Church, outside of which there is no salvation, on the narrow path to salvation but rather: "The Church is called to journey alongside the people of the Amazon region" (QA 61). But to where are the Amazonian people journeying? The Church is not called to abandon the path of salvation to follow others on their journey to a false idol. Her mission is to call all peoples to herself.

According to Christ, He must be the beginning and the end of all things, for He is the Alpha and the Omega. "I am the vine: you the branches: he that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit: for without Me you can do nothing" (John 15:5). But pantheists do not start with a god; their eyes are turned down to the ground. According to Francis, Christ is not the beginning of his journey: "we can respond beginning with organizations, technical resources, opportunities for discussion and political programmes: all these can be part of the solution" (QA, 62). He does suggest that Christ should be tacked on to all of these human solutions as a bonus so that the Church can distinguish herself and not just be "another NGO" (QA, 64). The Church, however, is not an NGO *at all*. She is the Bride of Christ, the Alpha and the Omega, without whom nothing can be done.

In describing this new Franciscan call to preach the Gospel of Pantheism, Marxism and Multiculturalism, Francis creates a false dichotomy between proclaiming the Gospel and

Copyright © catholicfamilynews.com. All rights reserved.

calling all people to obey all the precepts of the Divine Law. Pantheism has no objective moral code since it lacks a personal lawgiver. It is no coincidence, then, that Francis fails to quote the full divine commission as Christ gave it: "Going therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt. 28:19-20).[2]

For Christ, there is no conflict between proclaiming the Gospel and teaching people to obey all precepts of the Divine Law. Francis, however, pretends that calling all people to obey the Divine Law is somehow in opposition to preaching the Gospel: "How sad it would be if they were to receive from us a body of teachings or a moral code, but not the great message of salvation, the missionary appeal that speaks to the heart and gives meaning to everything else in life" (QA, 63). This has been a theme of Francis' entire pontificate. He falsely claims that the Gospel can be separated from the commandments Christ calls us to observe. It is not surprising that Francis quotes his own *Amoris Laetitia* to support the idea that we can preach the Gospel to people without teaching them to observe all that Christ commanded:

> "Nor is there room, in the presence of the poor and forgotten of the Amazon region, for a discipline that excludes and turns people away, for in that way they end up being discarded by a Church that has become a toll-house. Rather, 'in such difficult situations of need, the Church must be particularly concerned to offer understanding, comfort and acceptance, rather than imposing straightaway a set of rules that only lead people to feel judged and abandoned by the very Mother called to show them God's mercy'." (QA, 84, quoting the infamous passage of *Amoris Laetitia* 331)

Rather than calling pagans to "put aside their idols," as the great prayer in the traditional Liturgy of Good Friday proclaims (not included in the *Novus Ordo* version), Francis preaches a new gospel of pantheism in which nature is worshipped and the moral code of Christ is cast aside so that the Church with a new face can journey on the path of nature worship and receive *its* developed wisdom.

Dream 4: A Bold New Church Behind the New Amazonian Face

These dreams of Francis lead him to want to remake the Church with an Amazonian face. His "ecclesial dream" (QA, Chapter 4) seeks to reverse the roles of Church and individual souls. Rather than the Church being the teacher who calls all men to transform their lives to correspond to her Spouse, she is to be remade in the image of the Amazonian pantheists:

Copyright © catholicfamilynews.com. All rights reserved.

> "…the Church also needs to grow in the Amazon region. In doing so, she constantly reshapes her identity through listening and dialogue with the people, the realities and the history of the lands in which she finds herself. In this way, she is able to engage increasingly in a necessary process of inculturation…" (QA, 66)
>
> "While working for them and with them, we are called 'to be their friends, to listen to them, to speak for them and to embrace the mysterious wisdom which God wishes to share with us through them'." (QA, 72)

This ecclesiastical transformation requires the Church not only to "reshape her identity" and receive a new gnostic "mysterious wisdom" but also to receive the religious practices of the indigenous peoples of the Amazon. Thus, Francis calls for a radical reshaping of the liturgy to inculturate pagan religious services into the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. He notes in footnote 120 that the Synod called for a new "Amazonian Rite." Paul VI's *Novus Ordo Missae* isn't new enough for Francis. We know what this new nightmare of a *new* New Mass will look like since we saw a preview in the pagan ceremonies conducted in the Vatican Gardens on Oct. 4, 2019 and throughout the Synod. In two passages of his new Exhortation, Pope Francis seems to be replying directly to those prelates (such as Bishop Schneider and Archbishop Viganò) and lay scholars who had the courage to identify these ceremonies as scandalous idolatry:

> "Let us not be quick to describe as superstition or paganism certain religious practices that arise spontaneously from the life of peoples. …
>
> It is possible to take up an indigenous symbol in some way, without necessarily considering it as idolatry. A myth charged with spiritual meaning can be used to advantage and not always considered a pagan error. … A missionary of souls will try to discover the legitimate needs and concerns that seek an outlet in at times imperfect, partial or mistaken religious expressions, and will attempt to respond to them with an inculturated spirituality." (QA, 78-79)

This sophistry is the very height of absurdity. He is saying it is possible to commit an act of idolatry and in some way make it not idolatry. He seems to be directly chiding critics for too quickly calling superstition what is pagan superstition and error. True liturgy comes from God; superstition comes "spontaneously from the life of peoples." Superstition is invented by man to be an "outlet" for the natural religious sense with which we are born, but it is not

Copyright © catholicfamilynews.com. All rights reserved.

the worship of the true God. It is a violation of the First Commandment, namely, having strange (false) gods before God.

Clearly the repetition of the Pachamama scandal is his vision for the Church and what he is calling for when he says:

> "It means that we can take up into the liturgy many elements proper to the experience of indigenous peoples in their contact with nature, and respect native forms of expression in song, dance, rituals, gestures and symbols. The Second Vatican Council called for this effort to inculturate the liturgy among indigenous peoples; over fifty years have passed and we still have far to go along these lines." (QA, 82)

The radical, Protestantized New Mass of Paul VI has outlived its radicalness. According to Francis, we have "far to go" to complete the dismantling of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and to substitute a pagan ceremony.

In addition to paganizing the Mass, Francis also wants to radically remake the sacred priesthood. The priest is ordained and commissioned to a threefold ministry: (1) to teach the faithful by proclaiming the Gospel (including the moral code Francis disparages), (2) to sanctify the faithful as the guardian and dispenser of all seven sacraments, and (3) to govern the faithful by ruling over communities of the Church as their legitimate pastors. Yet, Francis tries to strip the priest of this threefold office by reducing priests to only two functions: (1) presiding over the Eucharist (he never uses the phrase, "Holy Sacrifice of the Mass") and (2) absolving from sins. While the neo-conservatives may rejoice that Francis still admits that these acts are reserved to priests and that there is such a thing as absolution, Francis has stripped the priest of all his other powers and authorities. His nightmare of a Church is one in which priests pop in to "celebrate the Eucharist" when they can (and absolve some "ecological sins") and the laity – especially women – do everything else. In these words, he reassigns the office of teaching and the authority to govern and even administer sacraments:

> "The laity can proclaim God's word, teach, organize communities, celebrate certain sacraments, seek different ways to express popular devotion and develop the multitude of gifts that the Spirit pours out in their midst." (QA, 89)

He makes clear that this radical reassignment of the priest's role includes transferring the

Copyright © catholicfamilynews.com. All rights reserved.

threefold duty to women:

> "In a synodal Church, those women who in fact have a central part to play in Amazonian communities should have access to positions, including ecclesial services, that do not entail Holy Orders and that can better signify the role that is theirs. Here it should be noted that these services entail stability, public recognition and a commission from the bishop. This would also allow women to have a real and effective impact on the organization, the most important decisions and the direction of communities…" (QA, 103)

Now, some have sighed relief that he did not explicitly institute so-called "deaconesses," a claim which is not quite true as we shall see. Yet, these passages *de facto* do so. His description in sections 89 and 103 corresponds to what permanent male deacons have done since their novel introduction after the Council. They celebrate certain sacraments, direct communities, proclaim God's Word, and, importantly, they do this pursuant to a "commission" from the bishop. By specifically calling for "commissions" from the local bishop for performing these priestly functions, Francis is *de facto* establishing a female diaconate in all but name only.

Some may respond that all Francis is doing is noting the exceptions in Church law that have been used for centuries when priests could not reach the people (such as during the early Roman persecutions and in Japan after the expulsion of the missionaries). Yet, we know Francis is not merely reminding us of these exceptions in the case of necessity because there is nothing bold or novel about these situations that have been woven through the Church's history of persecution. No, Francis is clear that he is referring to something radically new:

> "A Church of Amazonian features requires the stable presence of mature and lay leaders endowed with authority and familiar with the languages, cultures, spiritual experience and communal way of life in the different places, but also open to the multiplicity of gifts that the Holy Spirit bestows on every one. For wherever there is a particular need, He has already poured out the charisms that can meet it. This requires the Church to be open to the Spirit's boldness, to trust in, and concretely to permit, the growth of a specific ecclesial culture that is *distinctively lay*." (QA, 94)
>
> "Similarly, in this historical moment, the Amazon region challenges us to

Copyright © catholicfamilynews.com. All rights reserved.

> transcend limited perspectives and 'pragmatic' solutions mired in partial approaches, in order to seek paths of inculturation that are broader and bolder." (QA, 105)

He is not talking about ancient narrow exceptions for cases of necessity. Those would not be "broader and bolder" and would not grow a "distinctively lay" ecclesial culture.

Conclusion: The "Missing" Dream of Married Priests

Francis does not quote directly from the infamous paragraph 111 from the Amazon Synod's Final Document, which reads (in part):

> "Considering that legitimate diversity does not harm the communion and unity of the Church, but rather expresses and serves it (cf. LG 13; OE 6), witness the plurality of existing rites and disciplines, we propose that criteria and dispositions be established by the competent authority, within the framework of Lumen Gentium 26, to ordain as priests suitable and respected men of the community with a legitimately constituted and stable family, who have had a fruitful permanent diaconate and receive an adequate formation for the priesthood, in order to sustain the life of the Christian community through the preaching of the Word and the celebration of the Sacraments in the most remote areas of the Amazon region."

Since it was widely reported that an earlier draft of *Querida Amazonia* included a quotation from this passage, some have proclaimed it a victory that this quotation seems to have been deleted following the intense criticism of a further relaxation of clerical celibacy, particularly in the publication of a jointly authored book by Cardinal Robert Sarah and Benedict XVI. In reality, this is merely a Pyrrhic victory and the champagne corks should be put back in the bottles. Francis could easily delete paragraph 111 and still enable this disastrous widening of the exception to celibacy granted by John Paul II and Benedict XVI (for certain Protestant "ministers" who convert). He does not need to quote paragraph 111 because he essentially incorporates the entire final document into his Exhortation. At the very opening of *Querida Amazonia* he declares:

> "I will not go into all of the issues treated at length in the final document. Nor do I claim to replace that text or to duplicate it. …

Copyright © catholicfamilynews.com. All rights reserved.

> At the same time, I would like to officially present the Final Document, which sets forth the conclusions of the Synod, which profited from the participation of many people who know better than myself or the Roman Curia the problems and issues of the Amazon region, since they live there, they experience its suffering and they love it passionately. I have preferred not to cite the Final Document in this Exhortation, because I would encourage everyone to read it in full." (QA, 2-3)

To make clear that absolutely nothing can be concluded from his omission of a quotation of paragraph 111, he tells us he does not quote from any of the document; rather, he officially presents the entire document, which we are told to read in full. He also makes clear (likely in the place that originally quoted para. 111) that he supports the rationale given for ordaining married men:

> "Efforts need to be made to configure ministry in such a way that it is at the service of a more frequent celebration of the Eucharist, even in the remotest and most isolated communities. At Aparecida, all were asked to heed the lament of the many Amazonian communities 'deprived of the Sunday Eucharist for long periods of time'. There is also a need for ministers who can understand Amazonian sensibilities and cultures from within." (QA, 86)

As we have already seen, he then intimates that the solution proposed at the Synod and included in para. 111 of the Final Document are not radical enough. Not only is he saying that the ordination of married men is not off the table but he is calling for something even more radical. Hardly a reason to celebrate!

If one were not willing to believe this evidence from *Querida Amazonia* itself, we have further proof that the omission of the quotation of para. 111 may have been done purely for public relations reasons, i.e., to divert the new-conservative criticisms, but that it has no effect on the drive to ordain married men, which is now part of the ordinary papal magisterium and thus unaffected by *Querida Amazonia*. Article 18 of *Episcopalis Communio*, an Apostolic Constitution promulgated by Francis in Sept. 2018, has this to say about the final documents of Synods:

> "§1. Once the approval of the members has been obtained, the Final Document of the Assembly is presented to the Roman Pontiff, who decides on its publication.
>
> If it is expressly approved by the Roman Pontiff, the Final Document participates

Copyright © catholicfamilynews.com. All rights reserved.

> in the ordinary Magisterium of the Successor of Peter.
>
> §2. If the Roman Pontiff has granted deliberative power to the Synod Assembly, according to the norm of canon 343 of the Code of Canon Law, the Final Document participates in the ordinary Magisterium of the Successor of Peter once it has been ratified and promulgated by him.
>
> In this case, the Final Document is published with the signature of the Roman Pontiff together with that of the members."

Thus, para. 111 became part of Pope Francis' "ordinary Magisterium" when he published it following the October Synod. All he could have done in *Querida Amazonia* is retract or overrule all or part of it. Silence never acts as a retraction. By not saying anything about para. 111, Francis makes clear that it is still his policy as fully as it was when he promulgated the Final Document. His only criticism of that document's proposals is that they are not bold enough. Married priests is only the beginning of the nightmare he has in mind for the Church.

Moreover, Francis makes perfectly clear that his nightmares are not restricted to the Amazon. He tells us that his dreams for the Amazon are dreams for the universal Church when he says: "May God grant that the entire Church be enriched and challenged by the work of the synodal assembly" (QA, 4). He later clarifies: "Let us imagine a holiness with Amazonian features, called to challenge the universal Church" (QA, 77). Consequently, we at *Catholic Family News* are not celebrating a victory but intensifying our prayers that God will rescue us from the Revolution of Vatican II and its Napoleon Bonaparte Pope, Francis. He has declared war on the Bride of Christ, seeking to replace the Divine Head of the Mystical Body – Christ Himself – with a new Marxist, Multicultural, Globalist, and Pantheist face. *Libera nos, Domine!*

---

[1] In footnote 105 to this passage (QA, 74), Francis shockingly attempts to use a quotation from St. Thomas Aquinas to defend his bizarre claim that paganism and the Church are really the same. In contrast, the quotation from St. Thomas demonstrates the hierarchy of God's presence in the world. The lowest level of this presence is God's presence to sustain all things in being. This type of presence is very different from the presence of God in the soul through sanctifying grace. Yet, Francis uses this quotation to support his false thesis that God is present in the same way in the Church, pagans, and a river.

Copyright © catholicfamilynews.com. All rights reserved.

[2] In para. 64 of QA, Francis instead quotes the summary of the great commission as found in Mark 16:15, rather than the full words of Our Lord found in Matthew 28:18-20.

Copyright © catholicfamilynews.com. All rights reserved.