



FIRST WOUND: The exhortation *Amoris Laetitia*

Jorge Bergoglio, the cardinal of Buenos Aires, was elected pope in 2013 and took the name Francis.

In 2015, he convened a synod on the family in Rome and published the results a year later in the post-synodal letter “Amoris Laetitia.” This synod also discussed the problem of those people who live in a second intimate union while the ecclesial marriage still exists. The term “remarried divorcees” is generally used for this situation.

The papal letter, however, became a stumbling block for not a few of the faithful, because in relation to the problem addressed, a door was opened that under certain circumstances it would be possible to receive Holy Communion. This new direction differed considerably from the previous ecclesiastical practice. It was article 305 of this letter, with note 351, which in a certain way became a kind of “Gretchen question”. In this article it was laid down that believers could be admitted to the sacraments “in the midst of an objective situation of sin,” “on the basis of mitigating factors.”

This statement was in direct contradiction to the Church's previous doctrinal tradition, which was also held unchanged by Francis' two immediate predecessors, John Paul II and Benedict XVI.

John Paul II, in his letter “Familiaris Consortio,”¹ reaffirmed in Article 84 the practice of the Church “of not admitting to Eucharistic Communion divorced persons who have remarried” unless they “take on themselves the duty to live in complete continence, that is, by abstinence from the acts proper to married couples.” In 1994, Pope Benedict XVI had rejected the push by the bishops of the Upper Rhine region, who wrote to Rome seeking access to the sacraments for “remarried divorcees.” In his reasoning, he referred to the teaching of the Church, which cannot allow this.

As the late German philosopher Robert Spaemann made clear in a 2016 interview with CNA², “the Church has no authority, without prior conversion, to approve disordered

¹ https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_19811122_familiaris-consortio.html

² <https://www.catholicnewsagency.com/news/33812/full-text-interview-with-robert-spaemann-on-amoris-laetitia>

sexual relationships through the administration of the sacraments, thereby anticipating God's mercy.”

In spite of all attempts to interpret the change as a continuation of previous teaching, those critics who see in this a break with the previous doctrinal tradition have to be justified.

It was four cardinals who addressed the Pope with this problem in a "dubia", in order to get clarity from their point of view about certain questions which arose from this letter in relation to the situation addressed. They did not receive an answer, nor were they granted an audience to clarify this matter with the Pope. It should be added that a number of clerics and other persons wrote to the Pope pointing out further questionable formulations on the part of the pontiff, which from their point of view contradicted the previous teachings of the Church or at least were not formulated clearly enough for them. They, too, did not receive an answer.

On the other hand, the bishops of the pastoral region of Buenos Aires wrote a letter entitled “Basic Criteria for the Application of Chapter VIII of *Amoris Laetitia*”, in which they stated that “if one comes to recognize that, in a concrete case, there are limitations that mitigate responsibility and guilt (...), *Amoris Laetitia* opens the possibility of access to the sacraments of Reconciliation and the Eucharist.” Pope Francis responded to this letter by pointing out that “the writing is very good and fully explains the meaning of Chapter VIII of ‘*Amoris Laetitia*’. There are no other interpretations”³.

From all this it is evident that the new pope was striving for a change in sacramental practice.

As a result, unfortunately, what Prof. Spaemann feared and formulated in the above-mentioned article also happened:

*“According to the respective passages from *Amoris Laetitia*, not only remarried divorcés but also everyone living in some certain "irregular situation" could, by further nondescript "mitigating circumstances", be allowed to confess other sins and receive Communion even without trying to abandon their sexual conduct - that means without confession and conversion.”*

³ <https://www.ncronline.org/vatican/popes-letter-argentine-bishops-amoris-laetitia-part-official-record>

Developments within Church practice have confirmed his predictions.

For some believers, a decisive moment now came: do I follow the Church's previous teaching and see the Pope's chosen direction as an erroneous deviation, or do I follow the path that Pope Francis wants to lead the Church in this important matter?

For me personally, I have answered this question at least since the letter *Amoris Laetitia* and the controversial passage from Article 305 with the corresponding footnote 351: The Pope deviates from the truth here and I cannot follow him.

As it can be seen in other essential questions of the doctrine and practice of the Church, one discovers now, in some respects, the tendency to put aside the objective consideration of the given situation. Instead, one turns more to the personal situation of the person concerned. This is called a paradigm shift (change of perspective). It is true that the given objective situation is not completely faded out, it steps more into the background and can turn into an ideal. However, in this way it loses its normative character.

Let us look at the concrete problem:

From the Catholic teaching, sacramental marriage is indissoluble. Only the death of one of the partners allows a new marriage or the establishment of a marriage invalid by the Church. If these two conditions are not present, a second marriage cannot be contracted because it is objectively contrary to the marriage covenant. Expressed in religious language, this means that in such a case one does not live in the state of grace and therefore cannot have access to the reception of Holy Communion. One lives, so to speak, in a perpetual adultery.

Opposed to the clarity of this teaching, with the corresponding requirement of conversion to leave a wrong path, is the now more common practice of Catholics who, for a variety of reasons, have entered into a second intimate union, but still wish to participate in the sacramental life of the Church.

To make this possible, the Church expects repentance for the violation of the marriage. If children have resulted from the second union, the Church allows them to continue living together in the irregular situation if the partners lead an abstinent life, that is, do not perform intimate acts that are reserved for marriage alone. This commitment allows them access to the sacraments.

These previous ecclesiastical requirements are now being modified under the influence of the relevant passages of *Amoris Laetitia*. Access to Holy Communion can now also become possible under certain circumstances - in agreement and consultation with a priest and the formation of one's own conscience - for people who live in a situation that is objectively disordered from the Church's point of view. According to point 303 of *Amoris Laetitia*, in some situations conscience can come to decisions that do not correspond to the divine commandments, but are based on the circumstances of a situation. This approach is called situational ethics!

In order to become aware of the scope of this change introduced by "*Amoris Laetitia*", it is useful to listen to what Pope John Paul II had established in *Familiaris Consortio*⁴:

"The Church reaffirms her practice, which is based upon Sacred Scripture, of not admitting to Eucharistic Communion divorced persons who have remarried. They are unable to be admitted thereto from the fact that their state and condition of life objectively contradict that union of love between Christ and the Church which is signified and effected by the Eucharist. Besides this, there is another special pastoral reason: if these people were admitted to the Eucharist, the faithful would be led into error and confusion regarding the Church's teaching about the indissolubility of marriage."

This fundamental position is now no longer maintained in its clarity: instead, in *Amoris Laetitia*, Pope Francis now authorizes individual priests and pastors to examine each case with regard to the administration of the holy sacraments (penance and communion). Without making this dependent on sexual abstinence, in case an external separation is not possible for certain reasons, he now no longer generally excludes those who live in an irregular situation (this also applies to unmarried cohabitants) from receiving the sacraments.

Accordingly, the door has opened to a new practice, which has also largely entered into the life of the Church!

For some Christians, this new regulation is an act of mercy, which takes a more differentiated view of the pastoral situation and is intended to integrate the people concerned more fully into the life of the Church. There is no doubt that some of the affected people get into such a disorderly situation due to the most adverse circumstances and need a sensitive pastoral accompaniment. The Pope also wants to consider the reception of the Holy Eucharist as a remedy that comes to the aid of man!

⁴ John Paul II, Apostolic exhortation "*Familiaris consortio*", art. 84.

But with this new approach to the problem, is a greater mercy really effective?

It cannot be overlooked that "in many church communities a practice of receiving communion has long since developed which deviates from the objective ecclesiastical norms. For many years, certain circles within the church have repeatedly called for the church to adapt its moral standards to the "reality of life" of many people. This practice, which sprang from acts of disobedience to directives, has now, as it were, been given retrospective blessing.

Obviously, a false concept of mercy has taken effect here, which is perhaps better described on the human level as compliance. True mercy, however, has truth and justice as its basis. God's mercy, therefore, cannot be a softening of the requirement of God's holiness, which is called to keep the commandments of God without reservation.

The loving mercy of our heavenly Father consists in being always ready to forgive and to raise up mankind, who often sins and is weak, in case of appropriate repentance. This is always combined - albeit with great patience - with the call to repentance, namely to bring life into harmony with God's directives.

This also applies to the situation of those Catholics who have entered into an irregular second union. True pastoral care can only mean supporting them to act again in accordance with the directives of the Church, going back to the practice in force before *Amoris Laetitia*.

One should give those Catholics who find themselves in such a situation, concrete help to deepen their spiritual life. They should intensively use the meditation of the Word of God in order to get the strength from the Word of God to redirect their lives in order to live in harmony with the objective reality. There are many other ways to help them and start a healing process. However, the administration of Holy Communion is not this. That would be a kind of deception, capable of confusing both the soul itself and other people. If the soul is not in the state of grace, then receiving Holy Communion is a sacrilege.

If the person concerned decides to follow God's instructions and live only that kind of communion which does not violate God's commandments, then it can lead to a great spiritual revival. God will understand this act as a declaration of love to Him and will respond with great affection. If one becomes weak in this serious way of cultivating abstinence, then the way to holy confession is open.

The Lord will even offer that all the struggles and attentions that one now takes upon oneself to respond to His love can serve as atonement for one's own and others' sins. This, in turn, can motivate one to be all the more responsible with the grace that God has associated with sincere devotion to Him and the commandments of the Church.

The direction given by the current Church leadership is therefore misleading. It will not contribute to the strengthening of marriages and families, but to their weakening. Unfortunately, it is a deception with far-reaching consequences.

We will also encounter this "spirit of deception" in the further cases which I will explain in the following. Thus, it will become apparent that the aberration of *Amoris Laetitia* is not a single case - as serious as it is - but that there is a "different spirit" at work that wants to put itself in the place of God as unrecognized as possible. We will rediscover him in the other issues that will come up.

Obviously, this is not sufficiently perceived in the present hierarchy of the Church. One can even assume that those shepherds who follow Pope Francis in content believe they are serving the Church. Thus, they are involved in the deception. This, however, is tragic, because the faithful no longer receive clear directives on which they normally depend and also gladly follow. Misguided directions, however, cannot be followed, even if they come from the top of the church. This is commanded by love for the Lord and thus by love for the truth. The ship of the church has slipped dangerously and those who are supposed to steer it have not yet come to their senses! This increasingly causes a serious emergency, which can only be overcome by looking to the Lord of the church!

SECOND WOUND:

The Abu Dhabi Declaration

The Risen Lord left His disciples with the mandate to take the Gospel to the whole world, to offer salvation in Christ Jesus to all people (Mt 28:19). This missionary mandate remains valid today.

The Church is fruitful to the extent that she fulfills this mission. It is the Holy Spirit who admonishes, strengthens, enlightens and constantly reminds her of the mission entrusted to her by the Redeemer. If the Church were to neglect this mission, it would be an unmistakable sign that the Holy Spirit is no longer so vividly present in her. Mere human reasoning would take His place. But human thinking can very easily become clouded, because human intentions, however good they may be, can fall under the influence of darkness and be put at its service.

We find a clear example of this in the apostle Peter: he wanted to prevent Jesus from going up to Jerusalem, knowing that suffering would await Him there. But Jesus vehemently rebuked him: *“Get behind me, Satan! You are a hindrance to me; for you are not on the side of God, but of men”* (Mt 16:23).

This Gospel passage shows us that the devil can hide behind even a good human intention. If the discernment of spirits is not sufficiently applied, the devil can use these intentions for his evil plans.

In our reflection on *Amoris Laetitia*, we had already discovered this way of proceeding. And we can see something similar in the area of interreligious dialogue. The latter can only be fruitful on a spiritual level if it serves to prepare the ground for the proclamation of the Gospel. Knowledge of another religion can help us to recognize the good that God has sown in it and serve as a starting point for the proclamation of the Good News. Interreligious dialogue can also contribute to a better and less tense coexistence between people of different religions, and can serve to soften a fruitless hardening of hearts.

But this dialogue must never become an instrument for relativizing the importance of the Gospel and putting it on the same level as other religions. This, unfortunately, is what happened in a joint declaration signed by Pope Francis and Grand Imam Ahmed Al-Tayyeb in Abu Dhabi on February 4, 2019. In a passage of this “Document on Human Fraternity” one can read the following statement: *“The pluralism and the*

*diversity of religions, colours, sex, race and language are willed by God in His wisdom, through which He created human beings.”*⁵

Although Pope Francis later clarified - at the request of Monsignor Athanasius Schneider (Auxiliary Bishop of St. Mary's in Astana, Kazakhstan) - that this statement refers to God's permissive will, the official texts remained unchanged and are used as a point of reference for the encounter with other religions⁶. On the basis of this statement, it should be taught that God wills the diversity of religions.

Many other statements of the current Pontiff also suggest that he has abandoned the mission understood in its original sense, namely, to proclaim the Gospel with authority to move people to conversion and entry into the Catholic Church.

A clear indication of this trend was the lecture given by Archbishop Bruno Forte on April 4, 2022, at the Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas (“Angelicum”) in Rome on the perspective of the Catholic Church in relation to Judaism.

Among other things, Archbishop Forte suggested that in order to promote Jewish-Christian relations purified “of every form of anti-Semitism,” Christians should stop affirming and preaching that faith in Christ is necessary for the salvation of Jews as well.

Archbishop Forte echoed a statement issued by Jews in 2016 (“Between Jerusalem and Rome”), quoting the following passage from that document: *“We call upon all Christian denominations that have not yet done so to follow the example of the Catholic Church and excise anti-Semitism from their liturgy and doctrines, to end the active mission to the Jews, and to work toward a better world hand-in-hand with us, the Jewish people.”*⁷

Underlying these statements by Bruno Forte is the view that God has provided the Jews with their own way to Himself through the Old Covenant, and therefore they do not need the Gospel to be proclaimed to them. The following words of Jesus clearly contradict this tendency: *“I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no one comes to the Father, but by me”* (Jn 14:6). It is also worth remembering the words of St. Augustine: *“[The Christian religion is the one] which possesses the universal way for delivering the soul;*

⁵https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/travels/2019/outside/documents/papa-francesco_20190204_documento-fratellanza-umana.html

⁶ <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/bp.-schneider-pope-must-formally-correct-statement-that-god-wills-false-religions/>

⁷ <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/italian-archbishop-contradicts-church-teaching-says-jews-dont-need-to-accept-christ-to-be-saved/>

for, except by this way, none can be delivered” (De Civitate Dei, 10, 32.1).

As long as we do not close our eyes to reality, we can immediately see the seriousness of the Abu Dhabi Declaration and the statements of Bishop Bruno Forte. If interreligious dialogue takes this course, it will change from being a good instrument for the proclamation of the Gospel to being a weapon of relativization and destruction of the unique and indispensable character of the Gospel message. The tragedy is that the current hierarchy of the Church and the actual Pope represent this position in public. Obviously, in this matter too, one can see a blind obedience to the hierarchy, without realizing that here the missionary mandate of the Lord to proclaim the Gospel to all peoples is being falsified.

It would not be fair to place the blame for all this solely on Pope Francis and his pontificate. After the Second Vatican Council, some of whose documents, in my opinion, contained imprecise formulations on the relationship between the Church and other religions, the current that valued interreligious dialogue for its own sake, rather than as an instrument at the service of evangelization, gained strength.

The then Cardinal Ratzinger, as Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, clearly defined the uniqueness of Christ in the document “Dominus Iesus” of August 6, 2000, implicitly pointing out the limits of interreligious dialogue: *“It would be contrary to the faith to consider the Church as one way of salvation alongside those constituted by the other religions, seen as complementary to the Church or substantially equivalent to her, even if these are said to be converging with the Church toward the eschatological kingdom of God.”*⁸

The current pontificate, on the other hand, is a vivid example of the fact that the current of equating religions has largely taken hold in the Church. This tendency found its official expression, so to speak, in the Abu Dhabi Declaration.

The renowned philosopher Josef Seifert called this declaration the “heresy of all heresies” and asks in his article of February 8, 2019: *“How can God will religions that deny Christ's divinity and resurrection?”*⁹ He therefore concludes that Francis' declaration embraces all heresies.

⁸ Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Declaration “Dominus Iesus” (August 6, 2000), Art. 21: https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000806_dominus-iesus_en.html

⁹ <https://www.corrispondenzaromana.it/international-news/grave-concerns-about-pope-francis-abu-dhabi-document-by-professor-josef-seifert/>

To this grave error, the doors of the Catholic Church have now been thrown wide open, and her appearance has changed accordingly. Instead of Catholics proclaiming salvation to all people in all ways the Holy Spirit shows them, their thinking is confused by this erroneous tendency. If this course is continued, it is to be feared that the uniqueness of Christ's message of salvation will be abandoned for the sake of promoting peace among religions.

Pope Leo XIII had already clearly pointed out this danger: *“The great error of this age [is] that a regard for religion should be held as an indifferent matter, and that all religions are alike. This manner of reasoning is calculated to bring about the ruin of all forms of religion, and especially of the Catholic religion, which, as it is the only one that is true, cannot, without great injustice, be regarded as merely equal to other religions”*.¹⁰

What a great deception is revealed here, worked by that “other spirit” (cf. 2 Cor 11:4) which fears nothing more than the proclamation of the Gospel and the sincere conversion of men to God! The voice of the serpent in Paradise seems to be heard here once again, but now disguised in religious garb in order to deceive more effectively. It is as if he were saying, “Did God say that only one religion is the right way? Did He not will all religions equally?”

But how could this flagrant change be introduced into our holy Church?

Obviously, the fire of the Holy Spirit no longer burns in her with the same intensity, for this distortion of the missionary mandate cannot be inspired by the same Spirit that drove so many missionaries to carry the Gospel to the farthest corners of the earth, even at the risk of their own lives and unimaginable fatigue. A spirit of deception must have infiltrated the highest echelons of the Church, clouding its spirit of discernment.

How is it possible that Jesus' unequivocal command to evangelize all peoples - beginning with the Jews - has been neglected to the extent that Church leaders are even in danger of becoming instruments for the promotion of a universal religion?

Something similar is happening in ecumenism. Instead of emphasizing the catholicity of the Holy Church and thus inviting the various Christian confessions to embrace the

¹⁰ Leo XIII, Encyclical "Humanum genus" (April 20, 1884), n. 16:
<https://catholic.net/op/articles/2208/cat/1198/humanum-genus.html>

fullness of the faith contained therein, one's own identity is increasingly being concealed under the illusion that greater unity can be achieved in this way.

But what do people really need? They are called to repent and turn to God, to keep His commandments and to accept the grace that the Father offers us in His Son. If they accept and cooperate with this grace, they will be able to shape political realities and the life of nations in the light of God. But this will not be possible as long as governments and international institutions confuse and coerce people with their anti-Christian policies.

It cannot be emphasized enough that the Abu Dhabi Declaration is a deception that seeks a unity that is not based on God, because at the same time it implies a renunciation of the missionary mandate that the Lord has entrusted to the Church. People are deprived of the proclamation of the Gospel. The representatives of Islam are left in their ignorance of Jesus as the Son of God, so that they do not find the way of salvation. The Jews - God's "first love" - are deprived of the light of the Gospel, which alone can show them the way to God in all its fullness.

Moreover, this attitude also affects those of other religions and all people throughout the world. The Gospel is no longer authentically proclaimed to them, and they are therefore deceived, for the Name of Jesus is the only "name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved" (Acts 4:12).

Behind such developments can only be the influence of Lucifer himself, who deceives human beings.

Msgr. Athanasius Schneider is right when he says:

"No authority on earth – not even the supreme authority of the Church – has the right to dispense people from other religions from the explicit Faith in Jesus Christ as the Incarnated Son of God and the only Savior of mankind with the assurance that the different religions as such are willed by God Himself".¹¹

In the next wound, in which we will deal with the idolatrous Pachamama ritual in the Vatican, we will see how far one can go - even within the Catholic Church - when this erroneous direction is taken and the discernment of spirits is no longer sufficiently applied.

¹¹ <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/bishop-athanasius-schneider-issues-statement-on-controversial-document/>

THIRD WOUND:

The Pachamama Cult in the Vatican

As part of the Amazon Synod, held in October 2019, an idolatry of the indigenous deity Pachamama took place in the Vatican Gardens and later in St. Peter's Basilica. Monsignor Athanasius Schneider, auxiliary bishop of Astana (Kazakhstan), described the event as follows:

“On October 4, 2019, on the eve of the Amazon Synod, a religious ceremony was held in the Vatican Gardens, in the presence of Pope Francis and of several bishops and cardinals, which was led partly by shamans and in which symbolic objects were used; namely, a wooden sculpture of an unclothed pregnant woman. These representations are known and belong to indigenous rituals of Amazonian tribes, and specifically to the worship of the so-called Mother Earth, the Pachamama. In the following days the wooden naked female figures were also venerated in St. Peter’s Basilica in front of the Tomb of St. Peter. Pope Francis also greeted two bishops carrying the Pachamama object on their shoulders processing it into the Synod Hall where it was set in a place of honor. Pachamama statues were also put on display in the church of Santa Maria in Traspontina.”¹²

Acts of veneration of a pagan deity in such a holy place, at the See of the Catholic Church in Rome and in the presence of the Pope? Is it conceivable that such a thing could happen? It was only possible to reach such an extreme because the discernment of spirits has obviously been blurred and the facts are no longer perceived on the objective level. In fact, this cult was objectively a transgression of the first commandment of God's law.¹³

Monsignor Athanasius Schneider, in his open letter, points out that these ceremonies of worship to images of pagan deities would have been the concrete application of the Abu Dhabi document, in which it was stated that “The pluralism and the diversity of

¹² <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/bishop-athanasius-schneider-issues-open-letter-condemning-pachamama-statue-as-new-golden-calf/>

¹³ As the first commandment, God said to His people through Moses: "I am the Lord your God (...) You shall have no other gods before me. You shall not make for yourself a graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; you shall not bow down to them or serve them" (Exodus 20:2-5).

religions (...) are willed by God in His wisdom”. Therefore, the Pachamama idolatry was the logical consequence of the Abu Dhabi Declaration.¹⁴

Here is another indication that “another spirit” is manifesting itself in the Church, about which I spoke at length in the article “The Second Wound of the Church: the Abu Dhabi Declaration”.¹⁵

Those responsible for the Pachamama cult will certainly have justified it as a gesture of inculturation. This latter term refers to the intention of incorporating certain cultural and traditional elements of the various peoples into the Catholic plenitude, so that they may feel more at home in the Church and, at the same time, enrich her with the expression that is proper to them. Unfortunately, the concept of inculturation has also been applied to the liturgy. On the basis of this idea, the most diverse elements of the traditions of peoples, whether from Africa, South America, Asia or remote islands, have been integrated into the "Novus Ordo" Mass. Perhaps it is considered that, in such inculturation, the words of the Apocalypse would become a reality: *“They shall bring into it [the Church] the glory and the honor of the nations”* (Rev 21:26).

Monsignor Erwin Kräutler, Bishop Emeritus of Xingu (Brazil) and one of the organizers of the Amazon Synod, erroneously defended the controversial representations of the Pachamama of the Amazon region as a “form of expression of the indigenous people” that could be “integrated into our liturgy”.¹⁶

Here again we must point out what we already noted in our previous reflections on *Amoris Laetitia* and the Abu Dhabi Declaration: a good intention can become its opposite if the discernment of spirits is not sufficiently applied.

Thank God, on this occasion, some voices from the Church hierarchy were raised, qualifying this Pachamama cult as idolatry. Cardinal Gerhard Müller, Prefect Emeritus of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, clearly stated that the liturgy celebrated on October 4 in the Vatican Gardens, in the presence of Pope Francis, had included “a certain veneration, or adoration, of idols”. He therefore called it a violation of the first commandment and defended those who threw into the Tiber the

¹⁴ <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/bishop-athanasius-schneider-issues-open-letter-condemning-pachamama-statue-as-new-golden-calf/>

¹⁵ <http://en.elijamission.net/blog-post/the-abu-dhabi-declaration-a-serious-crooked-attacks-attack-on-the-churchs-missionary-mandate/>

¹⁶ <https://www.kath.net/news/69611>

Pachamama figures that had been installed in the Church of Santa Maria in Traspontina: *“Putting them out can be against human law, but to bring the idols into the church was a grave sin, was a crime, against the divine law”*.¹⁷

While Catholics have images of saints, we do not adore them; we merely "venerate" the image as a representation of that holy person. The "adoration" would in no way correspond to them, neither to human beings nor to creation - so Müller explained, and he referred to the theology of St. Paul. His conclusion was this: *“To bring the idols into the church was a grave sin, was a crime, against the divine law”*.¹⁸

Let us pause for a moment to consider the gravity of this event.

If we take seriously the statements of Cardinal Müller, of Monsignor Schneider, and of other voices that have spoken in the same sense, what happened here was a grave and public violation of the first commandment of God's law: *“You shall make for yourselves no idols and erect no graven image or pillar, and you shall not set up a figured stone in your land, to bow down to them; for I am the Lord your God”* (Lev 26:1).

There are enough examples in the Old Testament to show that it was primarily the idolatry of the people of Israel that provoked the “wrath of God”. Why?

The Bishop Emeritus of Marajó in the Amazon region, Monsignor José Luis Azcona, raised his voice and condemned pagan rituals as “scandalous, demonic sacrileges”:

“Pachamama is not and never will be the Virgin Mary. To say that this statue represents the Virgin is a lie. She is not Our Lady of the Amazon because the only Lady of the Amazon is Mary of Nazareth. Let’s not create syncretistic mixtures (...). These celebrations depend on the spirits that are evoked and it is evident that this is witchcraft, from which the letter of St. Paul to the Galatians warns us, in chapter 5, verse 29, when he denounces the sin of idolatry that is incompatible with the Gospel and with mission (Gal 5:29)”.¹⁹

This is the key to why God cannot overlook the sin of idolatry. In fact, worship is offered to demons who hide behind idols of every kind (cf. 1 Cor 10:20). Now the

¹⁷ <https://www.corrispondenzaromana.it/international-news/cardinal-muller-the-great-mistake-was-to-bring-the-idols-into-the-church-not-to-put-them-out/>

¹⁸ Interview: “The World Over” with Raymond Arroyo, 24. October 2019:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sGxDlPh5d_A&t=71s

¹⁹ <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/demonic-sacrilege-brazil-bishops-condemns-vatican-gardenspachamama-ritual>

Catholic Church, as the Spouse of Christ, is especially called to teach mankind the true worship of God and salvation in Christ. When public idolatrous worship takes place in the See of the universal Church and in the presence of her supreme representative, this is an abomination and a false and deceptive sign, both for the faithful and for all humanity.

In this regard, I would like to recall that only a few weeks after this event, the coronavirus crisis began, as a result of which churches were closed, public worship was interrupted, and even St. Peter's Square was temporarily emptied. I will return to this issue in the context of the “fifth wound”.

I am aware that some of the faithful will not find it easy to digest the reflections I am giving in this series on the “Five Wounds on the Body of Christ”. After all, these are concrete transgressions that are taking place within our Holy Church and at the top of her hierarchy. However, from my point of view, it is an inescapable duty to raise one's voice when one perceives the influence of the powers of darkness and finds that those who occupy the highest offices have fallen under its sway.

A public act in the See of the Catholic Church that attacks the first and most important of the commandments is a grave transgression that requires public expiation, even if one is not aware of it.

Don Nicola Bux, a renowned Italian theologian and former Consultor of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, stated in this regard: ²⁰

“If it is the clergy themselves who put an idol on the throne in caricature of the true God and the work of Satan, then, as the Scriptures teach, the Lord will surely leave the temple, and a cleansing will be necessary to bring Him back. The temple is a symbol of our soul: if we defile it with demonic acts, the Holy Spirit gives it up. Let us not forget what the apostle writes in admirable words: ‘He who spoils the temple of God, God will destroy him. For the temple of God is holy and you are’ (1 Cor 3:17).”

Don Nicola Bux then suggests: *“Cardinal Sarah, Prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Order of the Sacraments, could perform an exorcism in St. Peter's Basilica, thus purifying the basilica”.*

²⁰ <https://www.theeponymousflower.com/2019/11/don-nichola-bux-perform-exorcism-on.html>

In the meantime, Cardinal Sarah is no longer Prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship and, unfortunately, the proposal of Don Nicola Bux was not implemented.

We cannot close our eyes: the Pachamama cult, which has not yet been atoned for, weighs heavily on the Church and on the present pontificate. This transgression cannot be justified or relativized. It must be atoned for and publicly corrected by the Pope. So far, this has not happened, and looking at the course of events, we cannot expect Pope Francis to do so either, unless the miracle of conversion and recognition of these errors takes place. Certainly we can pray earnestly that this will happen.

Meanwhile, the third wound in the body of the Church, like the first two, continues to bleed.

Although a young Austrian had the courage to remove the Pachamama figures from the Church of Santa Maria in Traspontina and throw them into the Tiber in a prophetic act; although there have been various more hidden acts of reparation by the faithful who have felt the gravity of this abomination in the Vatican, this is not enough. Some of the consequences that such abominations usually entail may have been mitigated, but the abyss has not yet been closed.

Here again we see the same spirit that attacked the sacred sacraments through the ambiguous passage of *Amoris Laetitia* and distorted the missionary mandate of Christ through the Abu Dhabi Declaration. The abomination in the holy place is an unmistakable sign of its destructive presence in the Church.

It is necessary to renounce this spirit and to fight it with the spiritual weapons at our disposal. The faithful will have to make an act in relation to the current pontificate, similar to the one made by Auxiliary Bishop Athanasius Schneider in regard to the Pachamama cult:

“In view of the requirements of the authentic worship and adoration of the One True God, the Most Blessed Trinity, and Christ Our Savior, in virtue of my ordination as a Catholic bishop and successor to the Apostles, and in true fidelity and love for the Roman Pontiff, the Successor of Peter, and for his task to preside over the “Cathedra of the truth” (cathedra veritatis), I condemn the veneration of the pagan symbol of Pachamama in the Vatican

Gardens, in St. Peter's basilica, and in the Roman church of Santa Maria in Traspontina”.

21

²⁴ <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/bishop-athanasius-schneider-issues-open-letter-condemning-pachamama-statue-as-new-golden-calf/>

FOURTH WOUND: “Traditionis Custodes” – the Persecution of the Traditional Mass

In order to better understand the seriousness of the Motu Proprio “Traditionis Custodes” published by Pope Francis on July 16, 2021, let us briefly recall some facts of the history of the liturgy in recent decades:

After the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965), a liturgical reform took place which resulted in the so-called “Novus Ordo Missae”, that form of the Roman Rite in which Holy Mass is celebrated today in the vast majority of the universal Church. The “Novus Ordo” came to replace the traditional Roman Rite, also known as the “Vetus Ordo” or “Tridentine Mass”. Although the latter name is derived from “Trent”, the traditional rite is much older than the Council held there, dating back to the time of Pope St. Gregory the Great (590-604). It underwent minor changes over the centuries until it was codified by Pope Pius V in the Roman Missal, which remained in universal use until 1969.

The significant changes introduced after the Second Vatican Council were not received with the same enthusiasm by all. There were certain sectors of the Church that wished to continue celebrating the Mass in its traditional form. Although this celebration was not forbidden “de iure”, its use was severely restricted and “de facto” resembled a prohibition.

In 1984, Pope John Paul II promulgated an indult allowing bishops to authorize their priests to celebrate Holy Mass in the pre-conciliar form. In 1988, he issued the Motu Proprio “Ecclesia Dei”, which guaranteed the possibility of attending the Tridentine Mass for those faithful who felt attached to Tradition and at the same time wished to remain in full union with Rome. In this letter the Pope asked for a “broad and generous” application of the norms for the use of the 1962 Roman Missal.²²

He also established the Pontifical Commission “Ecclesia Dei” to address the demands and concerns of traditionally oriented communities and faithful.

²² John Paul II, Motu proprio "Ecclesia Dei", n. 6: https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/motu_proprio/documents/hf_jp-ii_motu-proprio_02071988_ecclesia-dei.html

On July 7, 2007, Pope Benedict XVI issued the Motu Proprio “Summorum Pontificum”, in which he allowed (or rather, affirmed the licitness of) all priests to celebrate Holy Mass and administer the sacraments in the traditional form, defining it as the extraordinary form of the Roman rite (“usus antiquior”).²³

As a result, the Traditional Mass experienced a revival, and not a few of the faithful learned to appreciate it. The spiritual climate began to improve, and it seemed that the wise and just measures of Pope Benedict XVI would restore a certain peace within the Church, which had been seriously disturbed until then, and bring about a reconciliation with her own tradition.

This changed drastically when Pope Francis promulgated the Motu Proprio “Traditionis Custodes” on July 16, 2021, imposing severe and concrete restrictions on the celebration of the Traditional Mass.²⁴ Msgr. Athanasius Schneider describes the consequences in these terms:

*“Traditionis Custodes and the new document from the Congregation for Divine Worship are destroying the patient work of peace, reconciliation, and ecclesial communion accomplished by Pope John Paul II through the Motu Proprio Ecclesia Dei and by Benedict XVI through Summorum Pontificum. They truly built bridges to the Tradition and to a considerable portion of traditional clergy and faithful, showing thereby what it truly means to be a “pontifex.” Whereas Pope Francis has now dismantled the bridge that his two predecessors built”.*²⁵

In this writing, I do not intend to address the differences between the two forms of the Roman Rite, although this would certainly be a valuable and important topic. Nor do

²³ Benedict XVI, Motu Proprio "Summorum Pontificum": https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/motu_proprio/documents/hf_ben-xvi_motu-proprio_20070707_summorum-pontificum.html

²⁴ Revoking with immediate effect the provisions of his predecessor in this regard, Traditionis Custodes declares the post-conciliar Mass to be "the only form of the Roman Rite", forbids the celebration of the traditional Mass in parish churches, establishes that permission to celebrate it should be granted to a priest only by special authorization of the bishop after consultation with the Apostolic See, prohibits the approval of new communities wishing to celebrate this Mass, among other drastic measures.

²⁵ Diane Montagna's interview with Bishop Athanasius Schneider (December 22, 2021): <https://remnantnewspaper.com/web/index.php/articles/item/5751-exclusive-bishop-athanasius-schneider-on-vatican-crackdown-on-traditional-sacraments>

I wish to focus on my personal preference for the “Vetus Ordo” because of the valuable experience I have had with this rite.

Rather, my intention is to identify once again that spirit which we have already seen at work in the first three wounds of the present Pontificate; a spirit which seeks to destroy the sacred patrimony of the Church and, if it does not succeed, at least to limit it to such an extent that, over time, this form of the Rite will become extinct because fewer and fewer priests will receive from Rome the authorization they now need to celebrate it. Of course, this will also affect the faithful who prefer the Traditional Mass.

What kind of spirit is at work here that wants to destroy and limit what the Church herself says is her very heart, her millennial liturgy? What kind of spirit is it that at the same time does not protect the “Novus Ordo” from all kinds of experiments and distortions?

Unfortunately, it must be noted that not only is Pope Francis tightening the noose around the Traditional Mass and controlling its celebration, but he is also repeatedly making derogatory remarks about people connected to Tradition. Calling them “rigorists” and “retrograde” is the most common vocabulary he uses to express his hostility towards the Traditional Mass and its adherents.²⁶

Therefore, it can be seen that the attack and marginalization is not only directed against the Traditional Mass per se, but that the latter represents only the expression of that catholicity which has been constantly attacked by the spirit of modernism after the Second Vatican Council.

It should also be noted that the faithful who adhere to the Traditional Mass are usually less inclined to fall into modernist errors and adhere to the unchanging doctrine and traditional values of Catholic morality.

The goal of all this hostility and injustice against the traditional rite is thus made clear. The target of these attacks is the faith itself, which is expressed in all its authenticity in

²⁶ For example, in a meeting with the Jesuits of Mozambique and Madagascar (<https://www.vaticannews.va/en/pope/news/2019-09/pope-conversations-jesuits-mozambique-madagascar-spadaro.html>) he made the following comment: *"Have you never seen young priests all stiff in black cassocks and hats in the shape of the planet Saturn on their heads? Behind all the rigid clericalism there are serious problems. I had to intervene recently in three dioceses with problems that expressed themselves in these forms of rigidity that concealed moral problems and imbalances"*.

this rite. Thus, by attacking the Traditional Mass, the goal is to tear down a wall that protects the sanctity of the Church.

Before this background, it is clear why a resistance must be formed and is being formed on this issue, whose great intention is to prevent that the celebration of the Tridentine Mass is denied or restricted. Because it is so deeply rooted in the Catholic identity, many of the faithful are willing to travel long distances to participate in the celebration of the Sacrifice of Christ in the “Vetus Ordo”, albeit clandestinely, in the “desert”, so to speak.

27

Thus, this new wound inflicted on the Body of Christ, which directly attacks its heart and those who wish to be nourished by the strength of that heart, is in line with the three wounds previously treated: “Amoris Laetitia”, the Abu Dhabi Declaration, and the Pachamama cult.

It can no longer be overlooked that we are at the beginning of an intra-ecclesial persecution. Those priests who defend the traditional values of the Catholic Church and express criticism of the changes introduced by the current Pontificate must expect to be prevented from continuing to exercise their priestly ministry. Modernists have nothing to fear, even if they publicly contradict Church teaching; only those faithful who want nothing more than to live the faith and tradition of the Church as they have always been.²⁸

What is happening is a growing disfigurement of God's holy Church. Instead of the ecclesiastical hierarchy protecting the faithful from heresy, providing clarification and guidance, we see a Church with a modernist, ecumenical and dialogical bent that begins to relativize and deform Catholic identity. If in the past it was said “*Roma locuta, causa finite*” (Rome has spoken, the case is closed), today it can almost be said that if Rome

²⁷ When asked in an interview about the effect that the Motu Proprio “Traditionis Custodes” could have, Msgr. Athanasius Schneider stated: “*The many Catholic families and ever-growing number of young people and priests (...) who attend the traditional Mass, will not be able to allow their conscience to be violated by such a drastic administrative act. Telling these faithful and priests that they must simply be obedient to these norms will ultimately not work with them, because they understand that a call to obedience loses its power when the aim is to suppress the traditional form of the liturgy, the great liturgical treasure of the Roman Church. In time, a worldwide chain of catacomb-Masses will surely arise, as happens in times of emergency and persecution*”.

²⁸ Cardinal Müller criticized this disproportion: “*Given the disproportion between the relatively modest response to the massive attacks on the unity of the church in the German ‘Synodal Way’ (as well as in other pseudo-reforms) and the harsh disciplining of the old ritual minority, the image of the misguided fire brigade comes to mind, which – instead of saving the blazing house – instead first saves the small barn next to it.*”

has spoken, it is better to examine carefully whether what has been said fully corresponds to the unchanging doctrine of the Church or whether, on the contrary, it creates confusion.

This is an extremely complex and difficult situation. When the heart is no longer healthy, the whole body suffers. It is therefore essential that the faithful know how to defend the Traditional Mass against attacks, even if this means fleeing into the “spiritual desert” in order to protect this treasure from those who would take it away from them.

The faithful must open their eyes and realize that we have already reached this situation. We are no longer in a normal state where we can blindly trust the representatives of the Church. Our respect and love for the sacred offices does not mean that we should close our eyes when ministers err.

Rather, we are called to pray for them and, if possible, to help them to awaken from their blindness. Under these circumstances, it is they who need our help, lest they become more entangled in the web that has trapped them. The one who has deceived them is a dark spirit disguised as an angel of light (cf. 2Co 11:14).

May the Lord deliver them so that they may fearlessly exercise their ministry in the light of the Holy Spirit and be shepherds after God's own heart! Priests and bishops should not cooperate, either actively or passively, with the errors of the present Pontificate, even if this means withdrawing to the "desert" and serving the Church there in times of persecution. Many shepherds of previous generations knew how to resist the various forms of unjust domination. In the present ecclesial situation we are also confronted with injustice, and the faithful need shepherds to stand by their side.

FIFTH WOUND:

An ominous alliance between Church and State

The reaction of the ecclesiastical hierarchy to the measures taken against the coronavirus since the beginning of 2020 consisted in a disastrous and very concrete alliance between the State and the Church, affecting a large part of humanity. The directives of governments and international institutions were followed without question.

Pope Francis even introduced in the Vatican an ordinance according to which Vatican City workers and visitors were required to present a health certificate from Covid-19, attesting to vaccination or immunization after having passed the disease²⁹. Those officials who refused to be vaccinated had to resign. The Supreme Pontiff was in no way sympathetic to priests who objected to government measures against the coronavirus and, for example, continued to offer liturgical celebrations in countries where the government had banned them because of confinements.

But this is not the only case in which this unholy alliance is evident. Time and again, Pope Francis has exhorted the faithful to give obedience to international institutions and supranational bodies, without saying a word about the anti-Christian agenda they pursue in many areas, such as promoting abortion³⁰. Thus, obedience to such institutions can in no way be generalized. Rather, it is necessary to examine with a fine spirit of discernment which orders can be obeyed and which cannot.

The three years of the Covid-19 crisis have clearly shown that such close cooperation between Church and State is not only fruitless, but can even be detrimental to humanity.

Let us recall the dense and large shadow that the Covid crisis cast over this world, changing it in just a few days in ways that were unimaginable to us until then. Following the example of China, where the outbreak occurred and then spread to almost every country in the world, drastic measures were taken to prevent the spread of the

²⁹ <https://www.catholicregister.org/faith/item/33517-vatican-to-require-vaccination-proof-or-negative-covid-19-test>

³⁰ At the press conference during the flight back from Mozambique, Madagascar and Mauritius, Pope Francis said: "When we acknowledge international organisations and we recognise their capacity to give judgment (...), if we consider ourselves humanity, when they make statements, our duty is to obey".

coronavirus. The WHO declared a global public health emergency, and the vast majority of governments followed its instructions, which from then on began to determine people's lives.

The goal was to vaccinate the entire world's population as quickly as possible to combat the virus. However, the promises made in connection with this "vaccine"³¹ and the false hopes created did not stand up to reality.

It soon became clear that, after vaccination, people were neither protected from the virus nor did they prevent others from contracting it³². Similarly, the masks that had to be worn did not help to prevent the spread of the virus; they even had harmful effects on health³³. A very atypical scenario for liberal states emerged: those scientists who warned against vaccination and predicted its negative consequences were suddenly marginalized, although they had enjoyed great prestige until then³⁴. They were effectively branded as false prophets or "conspiracy theorists". Alternative treatments for Covid-19 were rejected or even banned because they allegedly lacked scientific basis.

In short, only one valid narrative was allowed, and it was vehemently and uniformly promoted by the media and public authorities. Any other information or criticism of the methods used quickly became the object of suspicion.

As a result, an unhealthy atmosphere developed in society, as people who, for reasons of faith or common sense, opposed the measures imposed - especially "vaccination" - were often excluded from public life. An "unvaccinated" person was seen as a non-conformist, someone who behaved selfishly, irrationally, and irresponsibly toward society.

³¹ Since "vaccines" against SARS-CoV-2 are not vaccines in the conventional sense, but "the administration of an experimental substance based on genetic material", as defined by attorney Dr. Michael Brunner, I will henceforth use the term "injection".

³² In an urgent letter, more than 160 experts called the COVID vaccines "unnecessary, ineffective and unsafe" and the cause of "foreseeable mass deaths" (<https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/160-experts-slam-covid-vaccines-as-unnecessary-ineffective-and-unsafe-in-powerful-letter>).

³³ A Stanford study published in April 2021 found that face masks do not help prevent the spread of coronavirus infections and that their use is actually harmful: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7680614/>

³⁴ The microbiologist Prof. Sucharit Bhakdi, whose scientific expertise was always highly respected until he criticized coronavirus vaccines, warned early on about the possible consequences of vaccination. He was recently charged with sedition. (<https://diebasis-partei.de/2023/05/solidaritaet-mit-prof-sucharit-bhakdi/>).

Now, three years later, some of the people who were in favor of the vaccination are beginning to realize that they fell for a hoax. Many have suffered negative effects, both physical and psychological. Unfortunately, it cannot yet be said that this realization is a widespread phenomenon. A sad reality!

So far, it has not been sufficiently admitted that the number of deaths after vaccination has increased compared to previous years³⁵, that the number of miscarriages and fetal deaths has increased³⁶, that more and more people are suffering from the negative consequences of the injection... There was statistical manipulation and corruption of all kinds. Journalists were not allowed to report on the negative effects, and Internet sites were required to remove critical reports.

By all means, the false official narrative had to be maintained.

As I mentioned at the beginning, unfortunately, Church leaders willingly participated in the dissemination of the official narrative and the implementation of the corresponding measures. This is all the more disconcerting when one considers that the four Covid-19 injections conditionally approved in Europe used cell lines from aborted children, either in their development phase, in production, or in subsequent laboratory testing. Normally, this would represent a conflict of conscience for the Catholic faithful. However, just before the start of the vaccination campaign, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issued a note stating that, in view of the danger of this pandemic, it would be licit to undergo a morally questionable injection because participation in procured abortion would be only "remote" and indirect³⁷.

In some cases, the promotion of the "vaccine" by Church leaders reached grotesque proportions. In Vienna, St. Barbara's Chapel in the famous St. Stephen's Cathedral was

³⁵ In the case of Germany, it has now been shown that in 2020, at the height of the "pandemic", there was no discernible excess mortality. From the spring of 2021, there was a sudden and steady increase in mortality that is evidently temporally related to vaccination.

³⁶ There have been more fetal deaths in pregnant women following vaccination with Covid-19 than from all vaccines ever administered combined over the past 30 years. One study shows that between 82% and 91% of pregnant women miscarry after Covid "vaccination" when the fetus is less than 20 weeks old (<https://transition-news.org/2433-todesfalle-bei-schwangeren-frauen-nach-covid-19-impfung>).

³⁷ Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (2020), Note on the morality of the use of some Covid-19 vaccines: *"The fundamental reason for considering the use of these vaccines morally licit is that the kind of cooperation in evil (passive material cooperation) in the procured abortion from which these cell lines originate is, on the part of those making use of the resulting vaccines, remote. The moral duty to avoid such passive material cooperation is not obligatory if there is a grave danger, such as the otherwise uncontrollable spread of a serious pathological agent"*.

turned into a vaccination center, where people could go even during religious ceremonies to be inoculated³⁸. In other words, these sacred places were desecrated because they are reserved for prayer and not for a vaccination campaign.

Thank God, there were also some warning voices in the hierarchy and clergy of the Church. In the letter "Veritas liberabit vos", several cardinals and bishops expressed their concern about the events that were taking place and stressed that it was incompatible with Catholic morality to use embryonic cell lines for medical purposes³⁹.

Pope Francis' statement that "to get vaccinated (...) is an act of love: love for oneself, love for our families and friends, and love for all peoples" was destructive and misleading for many people⁴⁰. His slogan: "It is an ethical choice because you are gambling with your health, with your life, but you are also gambling with the lives of others"⁴¹ was used, for example, by the Pontifical Academy for Life.

The Pope is not just a private person who can simply express his personal opinion. The Catholic faithful are accustomed to obey the Pope, and many regard him as a spiritual father. Therefore, when the Pope speaks publicly in this way, many Catholics, even if they were unsure before, no longer have any qualms about submitting to this injection. On the other hand, with these words, the Pope indirectly accused those faithful who had a different point of view and refused the vaccination for justified reasons of being uncharitable. This is a serious accusation for a Christian, since charity is a divine commandment that must not be violated under any circumstances.

It was a particularly sad chapter in the history of the Church and a deep wound in the Mystical Body of Christ that priests and other collaborators of the Church were often forced by their bishops to submit to the injection⁴². There have even been cases in which

³⁸ <https://www.orderofmalta.int/news/vaccinations-in-st-stephens-cathedral-vienna/>

³⁹ In their appeal to the Church and the world, "Veritas liberabit vos," Cardinals Müller and Zen, Archbishop Viganò and Bishop Strickland, along with numerous physicians, lawyers, journalists, and Catholic leaders, stated, "*Let us also remember, as Pastors, that for Catholics it is **morally unacceptable** to develop or use vaccines derived from material from aborted fetuses*".

⁴⁰ <https://www.vaticannews.va/en/pope/news/2021-08/pope-francis-appeal-covid-19-vaccines-act-of-love.html>

⁴¹ <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-pope/pope-francis-to-have-covid-19-vaccine-says-it-is-the-ethical-choice-for-all-idUSKBN29E0LY/>

⁴² "For those who have not yet been vaccinated, I must urge them to do so." Reminding clergy of the oath of obedience is something he does "very rarely," said Bishop Fürst of the Diocese of Rothenburg-Stuttgart in Germany. He expects his clergy to do all they can "through action and prayer" to "help overcome the

bishops, invoking the principle of obedience, have demanded it of priests. As far as I know, something similar happened in a monastery I know.

In those difficult times we lived through during the so-called pandemic, the leaders of the Church were by no means the prophetic voice that would have publicly insisted on the need to find methods to combat the virus that did not contradict its moral principles. People did not find guidance in the Church, much less those who saw that something was wrong with this injection and the way in which others were being coerced. And they were not few!

Above all, the Church hierarchy did not ask why God allowed this plague, such an essential question for a person of faith. They did not consider that perhaps the Church itself had spiritually opened the doors to this plague because of the transgressions it had committed. Perhaps then they would have realized that only a few weeks earlier the idolatrous Pachamama cult had taken place in the Vatican, which may have offended God so much that He withdrew His protective hand and allowed the coronavirus crisis to occur.

Calls for prayer, fasting and penance to ask God to put an end to this plague were hardly heard.

Thus, it is clear that the leaders of the Church acted as agents of those powers who imposed draconian measures on humanity: churches were closed, the administration of the sacraments was temporarily suspended, communion in the mouth was denied, the liturgy was disfigured by the obligatory use of masks, holy water was replaced by disinfectant gel...

It is urgent that those responsible become aware that, as with the other wounds inflicted on the Church, they allowed themselves to be carried away by the spirit and attitudes of the world, were deceived and then deceived others. A painful but necessary realization! If one does not admit this, one will continue to collaborate with the antichristian powers.

Although the other four wounds that we have mentioned are more intra-ecclesial in nature, they have in common with this fifth wound that "other spirit" that we have identified in the previous ones. There is a real danger that, as global and anti-Christian

pandemic and protect our fellow human beings, and therefore to get vaccinated"
(<https://www.katholisch.de/artikel/32441-erinnerung-an-gehorsam-bischof-fuerst-ruft-priester-zur-impfung-auf>)

systems of governance emerge, broad sectors of the Church hierarchy will not recognize them as such and will even cooperate with them.

In such a case, the faithful who do not allow themselves to be blinded will have to go for a time into the "spiritual desert" as described in chapter 12 of the Book of Revelation.