

**TO THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS
OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH,
TO ALL PRIESTS, RELIGIOUS,
RELIGIOUS AND LAY PEOPLE OF GOD
TO ALL THOSE WHO LOVE CHRIST
AND HIS TRUTH OF SALVATION
TO ALL THOSE WHO LOVE
BLESSED VIRGIN OF GUADALUPE,
MOTHER OF THE TRUTH OF SALVATION**

S T A T E M E N T

**"BLESSED VIRGIN OF GUADALUPE,
'MATER VERITATIS SALUTARIS' "
(MOTHER OF THE TRUTH OF SALVATION).**

Tepeyac, Mexico City

October 22, 2021

October 22, 2021

Liturgical feast of
Saint John Paul II the Great,
43rd Anniversary of the
solemn start of
his pontificate

BLESSED VIRGIN OF GUADALUPE !!!,
QUEEN OF MEXICO AND EMPEROR OF AMERICA
PATRONESS OF THE SPIRITUAL BATTLE OF THE CHURCH
(cf. Heb. 12,4),

"MATER VERITATIS SALUTARIS"
(Mother of the Truth of Salvation)

AND MOTHER OF
ALL YOUR CATHOLIC SERVANTS,
UNWORTHY SONS OF THE "CRISTEROS" MARTYRS,
THAT GET UNDER YOUR PROTECTION
IN DEFENSE OF THE FAITH, OF THE TRUTH OF SALVATION
FROM FAITHFULNESS TO THE SAVING MISSION OF THE
CHURCH
—ooOoo—

**DECLARATION, TESTIMONY AND ANNOUNCEMENT
OF THE TRUTH OF SALVATION OF CHRIST,**

PREACHED BY THE CHURCH FOR TWO THOUSAND YEARS:

"JESUS CHRIST IS THE SAME YESTERDAY, TODAY AND FOREVER" (cf. Hebrews 13,8).

INTRODUCTION

We declare the undersigned, as a group united by faith, laity and priests, that we cannot be silent and that we must bear witness to the genuine truth of Christ, his authentic way of salvation, according to his holy Gospel, and about which Saint Paul promises to keep it intact by reprimanding us like this: "But even when we ourselves or an angel from heaven will announce a different gospel to the one we have announced to you, be cursed!" (Galatians 1.8).

As is well known, in the past 2019 was carried out the Synod for the Amazonia, and for almost two years the Synod of Germany has been developing. In both Synods there

have been texts and postures left out of the Truth of faith proclaimed by the Church. In the case of the Synod for the Amazon, it is negatively memorable the "cult" to the "Pachamama" in the Vatican gardens in the presence of the Pope Francis, contemplating various religious in prostration and adoration before the "Pachamama" as if this idol was God himself. Also at the Synod of Germany there has been a deviation of faith, since positions such as the acceptance of homosexuality as compatible with the Christian life and salvation, the possibility of the priestly ordination of women, the general change in sexual moral and marriage moral that have perennially been preached by the Church, etc.

However, these positions would not in themselves represent a problem of faith, since the German Church faith is not binding at all, were it not for some of these positions are assumed in follow-up to Pope Francis, for which, Diocese, Episcopal Conferences and many others feel supported to propose positions contrary to the Magisterium of the Church. Given this, it must be said that, whoever it comes from, no position that goes against the Truth of Salvation is acceptable.

And if because of maintaining the same faith and the same Gospel transmitted by the Apostles on the part of Christ, priests and laity are persecuted or reviled, in the case of the laity "labeling" ourselves as fanatics, traditionalists, fundamentalists, ignorant, naive, manipulated, etc., or in the case of priests, withdrawing their ministerial licenses or imposing other canonical penalties to coerce them, we declare that to keep the burning flame of Christ's saving truth (cf. Lk 12:49) in our world, we are all ready for it and for greater consequences: "... judge whether it is right before God to obey you rather than God" (Acts 4,19).

If the defense of the faith requires it, we will continue as long as necessary witnessing and acting in forceful proclamation of the saving truth of Christ.

We are not referring to merely theoretical discussions, but **to existential situations** in the concrete life of millions of Catholic Christians who must resolve a dilemma: If I want to save myself I must or I must not do or avoid this or that: it is the question that those who listened contritely to the preaching of the apostles did: ...what do we have to do brothers? (Acts 5,37), is also what John the Baptist preached without ambiguities when it comes to the way of salvation: "... John said to Herod: 'Don't it be lawful to have your brother's wife '... '(Mk 6,18), or what Christ said, and that it was not the positions and texts that popular response that the Jews expected, but an answer for a concrete salvation path: "Whoever repudiates his wife and marries another commits adultery ..." (Mk 10.11-12); and what Saint Paul said clearly and "Parousia": "... Do not be fooled! the impure, nor the idolaters,... nor the homosexuals, nor the thieves... will inherit the Kingdom of God "(I Corinthians 6, 9-10). In the end the dilemma is absolute, salvation or damnation.

There are many current ambiguities in the concrete path of salvation, many they could state and examine, but for now we stick only to the below developed (cf. A, B and C, from section I I), which affect the life and salvation of millions of people.

It is about making a clarifying reflection within the Catholic faith and, destined for those who profess that faith, **it is an internal discernment, within the realm of members of the Catholic Church.**

Therefore, this Statement does not attempt at all to take any position of the kind civil or political, but of an internal discernment within the Catholic Church, and aware that if the Church cannot be purified with the authentic Christ doctrine, it is impossible that he can be "light" for the world (cf. Jn. 8,12).

I) OBEY GOD BEFORE ANYONE ELSE

- 1) **The indefectibility of the Church, the defense of the faith, and the salvific truth of Christ.** We know that the indefectibility of the Church comes from Christ, and that because of this gift, the Church cannot fail in her salvific mission. Coupled with this mission there is the Revelation that is the Truth of Christ and his Gospel. The truth may be philosophical, natural, sociological, merely human, etc. But there is also a supernatural truth, truth of faith, but not because it is of faith is it a truth of theory or technicalities, but it is a truth of salvation, an existential truth, supernatural truth that leads us to eternal Life. It is the Truth that saves us. The defense of faith is to defend this truth that saves us.
- 2) **The saving truth, the truth of existential faith.** The defense of the faith is not only to defend technical theological issues that few can understand and that has little to do with the daily life of the believer. The saving truth is always existential, and encompasses the integrity of the human being, it is existential truth in Christ, which it leads us to keep his Word in our daily way of life.
- 3) **Prophetism against the mundaneness of the "politically correct", the prophetic guarantor of the truth of salvation.** We are in circumstances where it is intended to make the truth of salvation disappear from the face of the Earth. It is "Politically correct" to want to hide the truths of God because they are uncomfortable, the audacity, bravery, courage, the "Parousia" of the prophets is what maintains humanly valid the speaking of the Truth of salvation. What the world needs is authentic prophetism, it requires that the prophets do not stop talking. To be silent makes us "mute dogs".¹

I I) SOME SPECIFIC DOCTRINAL POSITIONS IN WHICH WE CANNOT OBEY POPE FRANCIS FOR BEING CONTRARY TO THE SAVING TRUTH OF CHRIST:

Among other unacceptable doctrinal positions, as an example we cite the following. We will do the following: we will state what should be, what is the truth, and we will explain below why the position of Pope Francis is contrary to these truths.

A) THE "DIVORCED REMARRIED" CANNOT ACCESS THE EUCHARIST", THE OPPOSITE IMPLIES A HERETICAL POSTURE DIRECTLY OPPOSED TO THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST AND THE CHURCH.

Presuppositions:

1. When we speak of "divorced and remarried" we are talking about those people whose marriage sacramental bond is in force, but they have nevertheless assumed another

¹ Is 56,10.

conjugal relationship with a person with whom they do not have that sacramental and canonical bond.

2. When speaking that these people cannot receive the Eucharist, it is understood if before they have not repented and requested with a true purpose of conversion the sacrament of penance, in which case it is assumed as a condition to leave sin of which they regret.

3. Since the canonical sacramental bond is in force, it means that it is not a question of a null marriage "ab initio", but a marriage validly contracted and celebrated.

4. Once a canonical and sacramental marriage is validly performed it is indissoluble.²

What Pope Francis says: Pope Francis deals with the case of the "divorced remarried" in his Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation "Amoris Laetitia", particularly in Chapter VIII of it. In relation to this same topic and in reference to same Chapter VIII the "Buenos Aires Pastoral Region" emanates a writing entitled "Basic criteria for the application of Chapter VIII of Amoris Laetitia" (AL);³ Pope Francis responds⁴ to the sending of that letter saying: **"The writing is very good and fully explicates the meaning of chapter VIII of Amoris Laetitia. There are no other interpretations."**

Now, let us analyze the writing to which Pope Francis refers, at the point of the possible access to the sacraments by the "divorced and remarried". In the N. 6 of the pastoral letter of the Bishops of the "Buenos Aires Pastoral Region" says:

"In other more complex circumstances, and when a declaration of invalidity was not obtained, the mentioned option may not in fact be feasible. However, discernment is possible. If it is recognized that, in a specific case, there are limitations that mitigate responsibility and guilt (cf. [AL] 301-302), particularly when a person considers that they would fall into further offending the children of the new union, Amoris Laetitia opens the possibility of access to the sacraments of Reconciliation and Eucharist (cf. [AL] notes 336 and 351). These in turn dispose the person to continue maturing and growing with the power of grace".

Comments:

a) "... when a declaration of nullity could not be obtained ...", this sentence is ambiguous, as it could mean that the previous marriage in question was actually really null "ab initio" but this could not be proved, or else after examination and ruling of an Ecclesiastical Court could not be proven that the marriage was effectively void from the beginning, and therefore the marriage is effectively valid according to the Code of Canon Law n. 1060 that says that "... there must be for the validity of the marriage, as long as the contrary is not proven ". Now the phrase alluded to leaves a little excess and

² La fidelidad a esta doctrina costó la separación de toda la iglesia de Inglaterra, en tiempos del Rey Enrique VIII.

³ Said document was signed by the Bishops of the Region on September 5, 2016.

⁴ Letter from Pope Francis to Bishop Sergio Alfredo Fenoy, Delegate of the Pastoral Region Buenos Aires, Sept. 5. 2016

contributes to the confusion, because even when the marriage turns out to be null, the people in the new union have not contracted canonical-sacramental marriage, so in principle if they cohabit conjugally ("more uxorio") they are if not in adultery, at least in "free union" or in "amasiato". For the same reason they commit the sin of fornication, and therefore if they take communion commit sacrilege.⁵

b) **"In other more complex circumstances,... the option mentioned may not be in fact feasible"**. What option are they referring to? They say it themselves in the number above, the n. 5, it is the option of **living in continence**, therefore not as spouses, not conjugally (not "more uxorio"), here is the text of n. 5:

*"When the specific circumstances of a couple make it feasible, especially when both are Christians with a walk of faith, **you can propose the determination to live in continence**. Amoris Laetitia does not ignore the difficulties of this option (cf. [AL] note 329)... "*

c) **"... the mentioned option (living in continence) may not in fact be feasible. However, a path of discernment is also possible "**. That is, according to this written, it does not matter that you do not live in continence ... you can also do a discernment leading to the reception of the sacraments of reconciliation and of the Eucharist ... without mentioning at any time that this requires repentance and conversion, and as a requirement of conversion it should be specifically the situation of sin; on the contrary, the brief reaffirms that in fact they are not living the option of living in continence.

d) **"If it is recognized that, in a specific case, there are limitations that mitigate responsibility and guilt (cf. [AL] 301-302), particularly when a person considers that he would fall into a further fault damaging the children of the new union, Amoris Laetitia opens the possibility of access to the sacraments of the Reconciliation and the Eucharist"**

Here a certain condition is set for discernment to land on the reception of sacraments, and that condition is not that they repent and leave sin as spiritual requirement necessary to receive them, but **"If it is recognized that, in a specific case, there are limitations that mitigate responsibility and culpability when a person considers that he would fall into a further offense harming the children of the new union... "**

In other words, according to this letter from the Bishops of the Pastoral Region of Buenos Aires, there are situations in which the "divorced and remarried" are not so guilty of adultery, because according to this their responsibility and guilt are mitigated because they fear harming the children of the new union weighs heavily on their conscience. This position is a diametric change of the Gospel, adultery stops being adultery when the children of the new union may be damaged in some way by the fact of may your parents withdraw from sin by separating. Doctrine is incredibly contradictory with the doctrine of Christ ("... He who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery against her; and if the woman repudiates her husband and marries another, commits adultery ": Mk 10, 11-12). Will you justify such a situation (fear of harming children

⁵ According to Saint Paul, "they eat and drink their own condemnation": 1 Cor 11:29

because parents live chastely or separate) that they continue to live in adultery and so that one can receive communion? Never in two thousand years has anyone accepted such a doctrine in the church. If that wrong line of thought were followed, it could be argued many things to receive communion while being and abiding in all kinds of sins.

e) ***"These (the sacraments) in turn dispose the person to continue maturing and growing with the power of grace"***: here the concrete reception is already taken for granted of the sacraments, without ever having presupposed that there must be a repentance and conversion to receive them, and that such conversion implies specifically leave sin: "Neither do I condemn you. Go and sin no more" (Jn. 8,11). On the other hand, also this letter from the Bishops of the Buenos Aires Pastoral Region forget that receiving the sacraments in such circumstances (being in sin and without change of life) **is sacrilege**, and they tell the lie that the sacraments in such circumstances produce grace, because apart from the fact that the deep meaning of the sacraments is falsified, they do not take into account the Pauline warning: eat and drink the body (of the Lord) unworthily, eat and drink his own condemnation ... " (1 Cor. 11:29).

—OoOoo—

None of the above can be reconciled with the doctrine of Christ in this regard: Jesus tells us: "... whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery against her, and if the woman divorces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery "(Mk 10, 11-12); "... Whoever divorces his wife, except in the case of (living in) an illegitimate union, and marries with another, commits adultery "(Mt 19,9).

The bimillennial doctrine of the Church has always upheld this same doctrine in fidelity to the Master. As shown, for example, the Council of Trent (any student of theology and the Magisterium of the Church knows the determining weight of the definitions of this Council) says:

"If anyone says that the Church is wrong when it teaches, and teaches according to the doctrine of the Gospel and of the Apostles (cf. Mk 10; 1 Cor. 7), the bond of marriage by adultery of one of the spouses cannot be dissolved; and that neither of the two, not even the innocent spouse who gave no reason for adultery, can contract a new marriage, as long as the other lives; and that the man who after repudiating his adulterous wife marries another and the woman who after having repudiated her adulterous husband marries another commit adultery is excommunicated "(Council of Trent, Canons on the Sacrament of Marriage, 7).

Here we can see how even in the extreme case of adultery of one's own spouse, it cannot legitimately have a new union with another person.

There are many references to the soundness of this doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage in the Magisterium of the Church, and logically, without ever considering the possibility of Communion for the one who lives in adultery. ⁶

⁶ With reference to the doctrine of indissolubility, see Catechism of the Catholic Church n. 1640.

Thus, the Catechism of the Catholic Church regarding the indissolubility of Marriage (n.1640):

"Therefore, the marriage bond is established by God himself, so that the marriage celebrated and consummated between baptized persons cannot ever be dissolved ... The Church has no power to pronounce against this provision of divine wisdom (cf. CIC canon 1141) ”.

From the indissoluble bond of marriage is deduced the attribution of adultery to any another couple that is not united with the marriage-sacramental bond and the consequent inaccessibility to Eucharistic communion, a doctrine later confirmed by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith by promulgating the **“Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the reception of Eucharistic Communion by the divorced faithful remarried”**, September 14, 1994.

All this in continuity with the Magisterium of Saint John Paul II in “Familiaris Consortium”:

"On the other hand, the marriage between two baptized people is the real symbol of the union of Christ with the Church, a union not temporary or "ad experimentum", but faithful eternally; therefore, between two baptized there can be only one indissoluble marriage" (n. 80).

In conclusion of all the above, this doctrine of which Pope Francis has said that **"The writing is very good and fully explicit the meaning of chapter VIII of Amoris Laetitia. There are no other interpretations"**, it is contrary to the teaching of Christ in the Gospel, to the bimillennial doctrine of the Church, and as Trent has sanctioned, it is a heretical doctrine: it is not possible to receive the sacraments of reconciliation and Eucharist while living conjugally *"more uxorio"* with someone who is not your legitimate spouse.

—ooOoo—

Therefore, it is good not to be confused by ambiguous or contrary teachings to those that infallibly the Church has taught, therefore **obeying God before men** (cf. Acts 5,29), obeying the Church and her bimillennial Magisterium, as clearly did Saint John Paul II and Benedict XVI, we **declare** with all respect possible, **that in this matter we cannot obey Pope Francis** who has said that the interpretation of the Bishops of the Pastoral Region Buenos Aires about of *"Amoris Laetitia"* is correct, since the aforementioned writing is heretical and contrary to the teaching of Christ.

By directly approving said doctrine, to the extent of having it published in the Minutes Apostolicae Sedis, Pope Francis is teaching an error and a heresy, and in that we can neither obey nor have communion with Pope Francis, but rather obey God. This teaching of Pope Francis (for he has assumed the teaching of the Buenos Aires Pastoral Region) **directly contradicts the teaching perennial of the Church, as we have seen.**

In conclusion, there can be no exception in which a person who already has a valid marriage sacramental bond with another, can lawfully live conjugally (“more uxorio”) with

another who is not his wife canonically speaking.⁷ Whoever affirms otherwise is outside the Church's communion of faith and salvation.⁸

The publication of a Rescript in which a theological qualification is given to both documents (the Pope's letter to the Delegate of the "Buenos Aires Pastoral Region", and the writing of the Pastoral Region) as "**authentic Magisterium**",⁹, That is, the official teaching of the Church, being the serious thing that the writing of the Pastoral Region Buenos Aires is in contradiction with the saving truth of Christ. We report this text in its original Latin, as well as a translation:

RESCRIPTUM "EX AUDIENTIA SS.MI"

Summus Pontifex decernit ut duo Documenta quae praecedunt edantur per publicationem in situ electronico Vaticano et in Actis Apostolicae Sedis, velut Magisterium authenticum.

Ex Aedibus Vaticanis, die V mensis Iunii anno MMXVII.

PETRUS Card. PAROLIN, Secretarius Status

TRANSLATION:

RESCRIPTO "(Proceeding) FROM THE HEARING WITH THE BLESSED (FATHER) "(with the Pope)

The Supreme Pontiff has decided that the two preceding Documents are prepared for publication on the Vatican website and in "Minutes Apostolicae Sedis ", as an **authentic Magisterium**.

Given in the Vatican, June 5, 2017.

Pietro Cardinal PAROLIN
Secretary of state

Comment:

It is a serious matter, since both documents are elevated to the **Authentic Magisterium of the Church** (it does not mean that this Rescript affirms that it is infallible doctrine, but Yes, since it is Authentic Magisterium, it is the teaching of the Church); in the Rescript it says that such qualification is approved by Pope Francis in a personal audience with him. The seriousness of this Rescript is that, the Letter of the Good Pastoral Region Aires" turns out to contain heresy, as we have seen.

B) THE CHURCH CANNOT PROMOTE, IN ANY WAY, HOMOSEXUAL UNIONS, AS IT CANNOT BE AFFIRMED, IN ANY WAY, THAT THEY ARE WAY OF SALVATION.

Previous notes:

⁷ The first bond would have to be undone, which cannot be because it is indissoluble, and the second he would have to have another sacramental bond with the person with whom "more uxorio" now lives, and for this he should receive the sacrament of marriage, but if he has a sacramental bond prior is prevented from doing so.

⁸ The Council of Trent in its canons usually says: "If someone said ... **anathema sit**". Latin formula means that it is an infallible matter, to which we are bound absolutely to believe under pain of no longer belonging to the Church, nor being in communion with the true faith.

⁹ It does not mean that it is an infallible teaching, but it does mean that it is an official teaching of the Church.

- As noted at the beginning, the observations on this subject are not at the level of external civil debate, but as an internal dialogue with people of the same faith.

- From the Catholic faith a brother or sister who experiences tendencies homosexuals, he is still our brother and sister, and in that sense it is never of charity or fraternal love to despise any brother of any condition.

- It is a duty for those who have faith in Christ, to proclaim the Gospel to all brothers and sisters as as the Lord preached to us, realizing that we must all become and adapt our thinking and acting to the demands of his path of eternal life. Everybody when we convert we have to make an effort.

- We are talking about brothers and sisters who experience homosexual tendencies, in so far as from faith, the human being is not born homosexual, but in the dilemma biological of being a woman or of being a man. The homosexual tendency can be generated in an inadequate process of introjection of one's own psycho-sexual identity, given that the human being, being the image of God, is rational and free, he is the only being in the material creation that must consciously assume the determined sexuality in its corporeity.

- We do not think here of the development of the public debate on the issue of homosexuality, homosexual unions, civil unions between people of the same sex, so-called equal marriage, etc. Here we are dealing with a dialogue internal among believers.

What Pope Francis says.

In some statements he has pronounce on the issue of unions homosexuals, encouraging the approval of civil union laws for couples homosexuals:

a) **“What we have to do is a law of civil coexistence. They have the right to be legally covered... I defended that ”**: words of Pope Francis in the Documentary "Francesco", reported in **"The Pope encourages civil union for couples homosexuals, a change in the Vatican's position ”**: ACI Prensa, October 21, 2020.

b) “These are laws that seek to help the situation of so many people of sexual orientation. And it is important to help these people, but without imposing things that their nature in the Church does not proceed (catalog as marriage the union homosexual). But if a homosexual couple want to live together, the States have the possibility of civilly supporting them, of giving them security in matters of inheritance, of health ”(Pope Francis on the return flight from the Apostolic Voyage to Slovakia and Hungary, Rome Reports in Spanish, September 15, 2021)

In summary here, Pope Francis affirms:

A homosexual union cannot be called a marriage by the Church, because in the Church marriage is between man and woman. The latter is correct, but then it goes into contradiction when saying that if they want to lead a life as a homosexual couple together, states give them, not as individuals, but as a couple, give them security social and all the benefits that the law can give them; is thus left to free choice the form a homosexual couple, those who wish to do so (and nowhere does it say that go

to live in continence). And in full support of this way of acting, it is requested in favor of which special attention by the States.

In these statements, the Pope does not distinguish whether he is speaking as a Pastor to those who, feeling homosexual, want to form that civil couple and are faithful Catholics.

Questions arise, will it be up to the Petrine Ministry to request civil rights to this situation, and at the same time give your approval for such couples? what to say if those involved are faithful Catholics? Is it proper for the Petrine Ministry to ignore 100% what Holy Scripture has taught so clearly and the Church has obeyed meekly for two thousand years? A Church that forcefully teaches that homosexuals acts are **inherently bad**, and if they are consciously practiced they are without a doubt the path of eternal perdition. What good will a union do homosexual enjoying civil rights, while being lost forever? ”¹⁰, Someone that preaches as something good or normal, which in reality is a path of perdition is acting like a false Prophet, saying what in reality God did not command him to say. By promoting laws in favor of homosexual unions, approval is given tacit to the immorality of homosexual acts.

In this internal dialogue between Christ believers, we are not interested in the civil aspects of this question, but the terrible message that Pope Francis is giving and that carries a misrepresentation when it comes to salvation: indeed, it is terrible that it is said that a couple in a homosexual union can, if they want, live together and no one makes them notice the very serious warning that Saint Paul gives them: *“Do not be deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, **nor homosexuals** ... will inherit the Kingdom of God ”*(1Cor 6,9-10).

—OoOoo—

On the other hand, that an authority like the Pope (or the same would be a cardinal or Archbishop¹¹,) says that “the Church should or can support the civil union of homosexual people”: this is not true as can easily be read in the document approved by Saint John Paul II: “Considerations about the Projects of legal recognition of unions between homosexual people ”¹²: There it is said with clarity:

“The Church teaches that respect for homosexual persons cannot in any way, lead to the endorsement of homosexual behavior or to the legalization of homosexual unions ... Legally recognizing unions or equating them to marriage, would mean not only approving a deviant behavior and making it a model for today's society, but also obfuscating fundamental values that belong to the common heritage of humanity.”.

¹⁰ “And what good is it for someone to gain the whole world and lose his own soul?": Mk 8:36

¹¹ Recently some Bishops have made statements along the same lines, cf. "Carlos Aguiar, Mexico's Catholic leader, supports a civil union for homosexual couples. Carlos Aguiar endorsed Pope Francis' comments on civil unions between homosexual couples ", in Forbes digital magazine, December 11, 2020.

¹² Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (under the presidency of then Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, later Pope Benedict XVI), June 3, 2003

Now, supporting a civil union with gay rights is a civil issue, in which there would be several precisely secular and civil opinions, but when someone from the Catholic Hierarchy, especially if it is the Pope, thinks about it, said opinion implies and necessarily implies a moral connotation, since it is implicitly endorsing that morally two people of the same sex can live together habitually, performing homosexual acts.

So, it is not true and let no one deceive us that someone can be saved by consenting consciously in performing homosexual acts, less if they are habitually like a permanent coexistence.

In the words of Pope Francis we find that he tacitly declares a union legal habitual homosexual, which implies an institutionalization of a contrary situation God, and that involves the performance of consciously consensual homosexual acts and dear ones, **which have been declared by the Church as "intrinsically bad"**¹³. **Thus, in this matter, we cannot obey Pope Francis and to commune with him, the path of homosexual acts consciously being pampered is not a way of salvation.**

And if someone presents us in the name of God a path other than the one that God proposes, he is simply a false prophet.

C) NOT SYSTEMATICALLY KNEELING BEFORE CHRIST EUCHARIST IS A HERESY "DE FACTO" .- It is understood that this systematic attitude is not due to physical handicap. **Thus, in relation to the attitude before the Holy Eucharist** we declare that we cannot obey Pope Francis or have communion with him, nor follow him in the example, in the sense that systematically and habitually he does not worship before the real presence of Christ, and this constitutes a "de facto" heresy (as we will see later), and in contradiction with a constant and indisputable practice in the Church, and that precisely sanctions the liturgical norm, since only it prescribes genuflection before the Eucharist. It is obvious that the question here is not that if the Pope Francis does or does not have a physical handicap, but rather the constant and he does not systematically kneel in the presence of Christ the Eucharist; well, you can verify up to the present moment, that at any mass, or on any day of "Corpus Christi Christi", nor in any adoration has he been seen, the one who should confirm us in the faith, pay homage of adoration to Christ the Eucharist, ignoring the kneeler explicitly placed for him.

Thus, Pope Francis also disregards the Catholic rite that prescribes kneeling, but even more seriously, realizing "de facto" the heresy of denying worship to the Lord.

We say that it is a "de facto" heresy, because besides that, by not kneeling before The Eucharist does not follow what is prescribed by the Church or the praxis of the universality of the faithful, witnessed by all the centuries of existence of the Church and Christianity, contradicts Catholic doctrine:

"If anyone says that the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist should not be adored with the cult of latria (of adoration), even external, to Christ, only-begotten

¹³ See what Pope Saint John Paul says about "inherently evil" acts II in his Encyclical Veritatis Splendor (6 August 1993) n. 80

Son of God; and that, therefore, it should not be venerated with a festive particular celebration; nor is it to be solemnly walked in processions, according to the rite and laudable and universal custom of the Holy Church; or that should not be exposed publicly to the adoration of the faithful and that those who worship him are idolaters, **be excommunicated** ¹⁴

We have said above that it is a "de facto" heresy, since clearly the Church excommunicates the one who falls into the enumerated heresies, one of them refers to the one who says that "one should not worship with the cult of latria" (adoration) the Eucharist, worship "**even external**" what is that even external worship of worship? we all know, kneel before Christ, King of kings and Lord of lords.

In contrast, Pope Francis knelt on multiple occasions or in a manner continues, a moment for each person whose feet were washed, in the first wash of feet he made; knelt before the relics of Anglican martyrs (non-Catholic) in a Trip to Africa (video record in the Vatican Television Center, YouTube video of the April 5, 2016). Just to cite a couple of examples, also taking into account that, although with some difficulty, he goes up and down stairs, such as those in airplanes, etc., all this shows that he can kneel, there has being also no instance of the Vatican who has ever argued anything about it, no one has explained anything about this matter, it has been scandalous his lack of external adoration before Christ the Eucharist; what is certain is that it has been a constant throughout his pontificate that he does not systematically kneel before the Blessed Sacrament.

BEFORE THE FALSE DOCTRINES ABOVE EXPOSED AND COMBATED, MEANING AND SCOPE OF THE "UNA CUM ..." IN OUR CONVICTION OF CATHOLIC FAITH

As we lay people participate in the mass, we have been accustomed to join spiritually, from the heart and with conviction to the words that the priest says and that he has been used to utter with spiritual conviction too "... **with Pope Francis, and with our Bishop N.**" that translates the beautiful Latin formula "... **una cum Papa nostro N. et Episcopo nostro N.**". This formula represents an important Tradition in the life of the Church, since it expresses the communion of faith with the Headquarters of Rome, and with the bishops who are in communion with the Apostolic See. It also expresses an absolute communion with the Petrine Ministry.

This has been for centuries, however, under current circumstances - as we have seen above - in which, by separating on certain matters the Pope Francisco of the Apostolic and Petrine Magisterium, of a constant Magisterium during two thousand years, and leaving us in the circumstance of not being able to obey him in those subjects:

- the "... **una cum**" can be maintained, of course, as a communion of charity, praying for the salvation of the Pope ... - but as for communion in the Truth of faith and

¹⁴ Council of Trent, "Canons on the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist", 6

salvation, it is necessary to specify that the signatories of this Declaration, the "***una cum Papa Nostro Franciscus***":

- a) we cannot adhere to it as absolute, but since we have exposed that at various points we cannot obey Pope Francis, we declare that by pronouncing or joining this formula in the celebration of the Mass, we ***do it partially*** ...
- b) It should also be noted that this communion expressed in the "una cum", given the circumstances in which we cannot obey, it can and it tends to decrease, and diminish alarmingly.

The monolithic use of "*una cum*", ideal at other times in the history of the Church, has always been conditioned to what it is proposed to believe is not, in contrast to the faith of the Church.

The current circumstances have caused conscience conflicts in many faithful laic and not a few priests. If I say that I am not with the Pope I exclude an important aspect that is communion with the Petrine Ministry, and if I say yes I am in full communion, then how do I say I am in full communion with something that contains something that is heretical?

We perfectly well know that our adherence to the Pope must be absolute when our conscience testifies to us that it is acting as a true servant of Christ. Our conscience leads us to spontaneously say "with the Pope", but this noble sentiment has been abused, interpreting it as a absolute and blind approval of everything the Pope says, and this is not the case, because in current circumstances we see that we cannot obey the Pope Francis in everything, for that reason this communion with Pope Francis is partial, and unfortunately tending to decrease. In this we do nothing more than honestly discover our conscience and tell ourselves internally the Truth.

This do not means , in the matters indicated, not obeying Pope Francis without more, but of being disabled, of not being able to be in communion or obedience with him when there are essential differences between him and the bimillennial Magisterium of the Church, as in the indicated subjects.

Obviously what is said of the "una cum" with the Pope is also valid in what it refers to as the "una cum" with one's own bishop or with the bishop of the place.

THE COMPLEMENT OF THE "UNA CUM", THE "FAMULO TUO" FORMULA

In the Eucharistic anaphora it says "***... una cum famulo tuo Papa Nostro N....***", and this is a magnificent complement to the "***una cum***" as it gives the profound meaning: it is that "being in communion with the Pope (and the Bishop)" is conditioned on the Pope (and Bishop) being truly a servant of Christ ("Famulo tuo") in communion in the Truth of salvation, and this is absolutely important.

We also declare that this same dynamic is fully valid in the conscience of every priest and faithful lay Christian in the universal Church, since his adherence to the Pope is conditional on one's conscience, if you see that he is really being a servant of Christ.

If at any point someone thinks that we are wrong in our appreciation, we ask them to clarify us, and that it does not end as with the "dubia", which inexplicably they have never wanted to answer.

Finally, we point out that if you agree with an assumed "una cum" consciously in a partial way, the priest could say: "... **with Pope Francis in everything that is a servant of Christ**", and the faithful Christian can assume this yourself internally.

FINAL THOUGHTS

With all this, what we wish is that we return to the authentic Gospel of Christ. What we have now manifested is speaking the truth, seeking communion in the truth of faith revealed by Christ to his Church, sanctioned by his authentic and bimillennial magisterium. Only the words of The Master guided and continue guiding the path of the Church, the truth will set us free "(Jn. 8:32).

To all our friends and brothers, cardinals, archbishops, priests, bishops, religious or laity we apologize if the subject is not pleasant, but we feel that it has been necessary to expose it. We pray that we will all be one in faith and in preaching the way of salvation.

To the Blessed Virgin of Guadalupe, "Mater Veritatis Salutaris", Mother of Truth salvation, we commend this not an easy spiritual battle for the Truth of the Salvation, the Truth of Christ, She, "**the Mother of the true God for whom one lives.**"

We ask her forgiveness for our lack of trust in her most powerful intercession, before the evils that afflict us, and for not having mourned the closure of his Holy House in her day¹⁵, being the first time in history that a December 12th was not allowed to people of God pay homage to her, being that She is the only one, that from God can get us ahead.

We ask for her intercession so that the set of situations that have surrounded and marked the closing of her temple, contrasted with other activities in the same city where She lives (crowds at events, street shops, shopping centers, collective and mass transport, etc.), do not bring us consequences, because wrong is who believes that there will be no consequences, consequences without human intervention, so we

¹⁵ Regarding the closure of the Basilica of Guadalupe on the days of the Guadalupana festivities of December 10 to 13, 2020.

ask that these at least are not so strong by our abandonment of his blessed hand; that she does not leave us without her blessed hand that would be our misfortune and destruction.

Holy Virgin of Guadalupe! With all certainty we know that no one can dethrone you, and that everyone who tries, without human intervention (cf. Dn 2.45), after a little time, he will fall into the ruin of his life if he does not regret. Blessed Virgin, have mercy on each and every one of us and Mexico that is your Nation. We propose to apologize and make amends for you, and return to be your children by returning to the path of your most Holy Son. That's why today we say you again with repentant hearts, but welcoming your goodness and Mother Mercy: Saint Mary of Guadalupe, Save our Homeland and keep our faith.

LONG LIVE CRISTO REY AND SANTA MARÍA DE GUADALUPE

!!! TOTUS TUUS !!!

MEXICO ALWAYS FAITHFUL !!!

Signed in the spiritual presence of the Blessed Virgin of Guadalupe, in Tepeyac:

Note: Although groups of people wish to join this Declaration, it is needless to say, that what is said in it, does not take its force from the number of signers; the group that has signed is convinced that the strength of this statement is in the truth.

Contact team and social communication coordination:

María Eugenia Valdez
Jaqueline García
Julieta Mena
Mariano Llera
Guillermo Trejo

**www.mater-veritatis-salutaris.org
contacto@mater-veritatis-salutaris.org
56 - 3271 - 2603 / internacional (52) 56 – 3271 2603
MATER VERITATIS SALUTARIS 2021**