Three things stand out: Traditiones Cojones ( excising the one Roman Rite from the conciliar church) / his embracing of globalism / Abu Dhabi Declaration (false religions are willing by God) Fratelli Tutti / / Amoris Laetitia – perhaps the most blasphemous text ever to stain anti-papal letterhead.

Before commenting

- Jorge Bergoglio (stage name: Francis) is NOT the least bit original: In July of 2014, he said, “I am the first pope who didn’t take part in the Council and the first who studied theology after the Council…”

NB: Jorge Bergoglio is a MAN OF THE COUNCIL first and foremost, not unlike his conciliar predecessors. He just so happens to be more explicitly heretical and blasphemous, and more aggressive in seeing the Council through to its logical conclusion. **We might even say that among his conciliar predecessors, Francis has more integrity that those who preceded him.**

For example: Whereas BXVI was pleased to invent the novel idea of an Ordinary Form and Extraordinary Form of the one Roman Rite , coexisting with one another, Francis, by contrast, is doing his best to see the Council’s intent realized. How? By excising the conciliar church of the ancient rite. **NB: The conciliar text (SC) does not even hint that the 1962 missal should remain in use untouched alongside the revised rite.**

We’ve all heard the rejoinder of the tradservatives countless times: *Yea, but the new Mass doesn’t reflect the will of the Council (e.g., the use of Latin, Gregorian Chant, no mention of Mass facing the people, etc.),* i.e., they are claiming recourse to the authority of the Council.

**NB: SC art. 3 states that the Council wishes to set forth norms and principles that CAN and SHOULD be applied to the reform moving forward.** The Council never assumed for itself the right to dictate to the pope as to how the reform would unfold. They provided a framework that he could use, or not, as he sees fit.

POINT: IF VII is Catholic / IF PVI and his conciliar successors are true popes: **the tradservatives have no leg to stand on.** Francis is correct, he is being true to the Council, as would be his right as pope

Another example of Bergoglio’s integrity:

In an interview Oct 2014: "For us,” meaning, himself and that crop of young men formed by the conciliar theology of rupture, “Paul VI was the great light."

RIGHT: If Paul VI was a true pope … or, if one really believed that he was a true pope … then *he should have been*, and should have been treated as, every Catholic’s “great light,” i.e., his rule of faith. Our Lord said: *I am the Light of the world!* Indeed, and His Vicar is that light made visible on earth!

WHAT HAPPENED? The most pious and dedicated of Catholics came to realize early on that he could NOT be treated as such.

**Another example of Bergoglio’s integrity:** His unbridled support for globalism.

Paul VI – Bergoglio’s “Great Light” was the first claimant to the papacy to visit the UN. Most viewers recall very well what he stated: “**People turn to the United Nations as if it were their last hope for peace and harmony. We presume to bring here their tribute of honor and of hope along with our own.”**

**Pius XI: *When once men recognize, both in private and in public life, that Christ is King, society will at last receive the great blessings of real liberty, well-ordered discipline, peace and harmony.***

Even before the Council, December 10, 1948, the United Nations General Assembly published an international agreement called the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UHDR), that presumes to set forth certain rights deriving not from God, but directly from … wait for it … the dignity of the human person.

* UDHR: “The foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world is … the inherent dignity of all members of the human family”
* UDHR: The common understanding of human rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance …

And who has the authority to define human rights and freedoms – to say nothing of duties and obligations?

* The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government!

We see this reflected in the text of VII in a number of ways.

**All things on earth should be related to man as their center and crown… For government officials who must … promote the universal good are very greatly dependent on public opinion and feeling*. Gaudium et Spes***

These are the seeds of full blown globalism, and it’s the theology in which Bergoglio was formed.

As we speak here in 2023, we know all too well where this leads: To a world in which a cabal of powerful global elites dictate what human rights are – e.g., abortion, gay marriage - who gets them, who doesn’t, what is required in order to enjoy freedom – e.g., forced vaccination, digital ID – and so on.

But what does the Church teach? ALL authority comes from God, and ALL authority has been given to Christ the King.

No support for the UDHR can be found in the magisterium of Pius XII, in fact, he remained silent about the text.

EVERY single one of the conciliar claimants to the papacy – Francis included – have lauded the UDHR.

**QUOTE:** *to bring about integral and timely disarmament, food security and peace; to guarantee the protection of the environment and to regulate migration: for all this, there is urgent need of a true world political authority.* – BXVI

***If no one power can enforce order, our world will suffer from a global order deficit…* - Klaus Schwab** COVID-19: The Great Reset (pg. 105)

-- Abu Dahbi: All religions willed by God.

This is a direct fruit of the Council’s Declaration on Religious Liberty:

**The right to religious freedom has its foundation in the very dignity of the human person as this dignity is *known through the revealed word of God* and by reason itself.(2) This right of the human person to religious freedom is to be recognized in the constitutional law whereby society is governed and thus it is to become a civil right.**

The true doctrine of the Church is that false religions and the practice thereof have no right, but can, however, be tolerated. ERROR HAS NO RIGHTS.

At VII, however, it is said that Scripture itself makes known that religious freedom, regardless of truthfulness or falsehood, piety or offensiveness, is a human right. Where do rights come from? From God, of course. From here, it is a very small step to say that God must therefore will these religions, otherwise, men would not enjoy the right to practice them – as VII says – both privately and publicly.

AMORIS LAETITIA

Epistle for Third Sunday of Lent: **“For know you this and understand: That no fornicator or unclean or covetous person (which is a serving of idols) hath inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God. Let no man deceive you with vain words.”** Eph 5

AL is an act of deception couched in some 60,000 words.

**The conscience of those persisting in adultery can recognize with sincerity and honesty what for now is the most generous response which can be given to God …**

This is a bold accusation: He is essentially saying that the Divine Law is at times too difficult for some to keep. He’s accusing God of being unjust.

**, 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. 303**

He’s saying that God wills objective sin!

This seems like an unprecedented outrage, but it’s not. Remember, the Declaration on Religious Liberty does essentially the same: It suggests that man has a RIGHT to embrace, practice, and disseminate whatever false religion he may choose. This goes directly against the First Commandment - thou shalt not have strange gods before Me!

Again, this the Almighty Council saying that objective evil has a God given right.

If this be so, then why not the Sixth Commandment, adultery.