



Boston Catholic Journal



NIHIL NISI IESUM

Dedicated to Mary, Mother of God

Salus Animarum Suprema Lex Esto (Canon Law 175)

The Salvation of Souls is the Supreme Law in the Church

The Demonic Perversion of the Confessional

and the Perpetuation of Homosexuality in the Priesthood

“**Archbishop Carlo Viganò** claimed that Pope Francis “*continued to cover*” for disgraced and now defrocked McCarrick, and not only did he repeal the sanctions imposed by Benedict, but also made McCarrick “*his trusted counselor.*” He claimed that McCarrick, the former archbishop of Washington, *advised the pope to appoint a number of bishops in the United States*, including Cardinal Blaise Cupich of Chicago, Cardinal Joseph Tobin of Newark, and Bishop Robert McElroy of San Diego.”

Francis' Response?



“I Will Not Say a Single Word”

“Pope Francis said [Aboard the papal plane, Aug 26, 2018 / 15:30 pm] that he will not comment on claims by a former Vatican ambassador to the U.S. that the pope knew about allegations against Archbishop Theodore McCarrick and reinstated him in ministry. The pope said people should make up their own minds about the claims. Asked whether it was true that Archbishop Carlo Viganò, the statement’s author, had informed him in 2013 about McCarrick’s alleged sexual misconduct with priests and seminarians, and if it was true Benedict XVI had previously imposed sanctions on the former cardinal, the pope said he was distracted by the previous question and would have preferred to talk about the trip. ... “I read the statement this morning, and I must tell you sincerely that, I must say this, to you ... I will not say a single word on this.” *

Why ... why ... did Francis *refuse to reply* to the shocking accusations brought about by Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò with these infamous words? *Twice* he claims that he “**must**” say nothing about the accusations. “**Must.**” He does not say “**I choose not to ...**,” or “**I would prefer not to ...**” — but that he “**must not.**” Francis chose his words very carefully. Why?

This question has baffled countless Catholics, journalists, and reporters concerning **the widespread Abuse Scandal of Predatory Homosexual Priests.** There is an answer — an answer that is at once conspicuously cogent, compelling, and credible. In fact, it may be the answer to the most salient question surrounding the worst scandal that has ever plagued the Roman Catholic Church in the 2000 years of Her history:

How was this possible?

Dr. Taylor Marshall, philosopher and director of the *New Saint Thomas Institute*, has provided us with a uniquely insightful answer which, when fully explicated, answers not only this vexing question concerning Francis, but the vicious mechanism by which homosexual predation within the clergy flourished and continues to be perpetuated.

The Answer is Breathtaking! The Sacrament of Penance — *the Confessional* — the very means established by Christ to *renounce and repudiate sin* and re-establish the soul to a state of grace consonant with God — has been *perverted to become both the means and the end of perpetuating sin!* Imagine, the devil has spuriously co-opted a Sacrament! The object is to perpetuate homosexuality in the the priesthood — and to destroy it — and with it, Christ’s Holy Catholic Church! How was this possible?

Manipulating the Seal of the Confessional!

In order to understand this answer, *it is imperative that you understand the following:*

- *A priest may never “under any circumstance break the “Seal of the Confessional” even if it costs him his life. If he does break that seal, he is automatically excommunicated from the Church (read on) and can no longer exercise any priestly function or faculty, celebrate any Mass, or receive Holy Communion. He is outside the Church. **This is the vital point to keep in mind.***

- Let us assume that a homosexual priest has sodomized or sexually violated (raped) a young man.
- To protect himself from the possibility of the exposure of his sin and crime, he enters the Confessional. However, upon his confession, *he immediately binds the priest to whom he confesses* — both by the *Seal of the Confessional* and by *Canon Law* — **to never reveal it to anyone under any circumstance whatever**, no matter how many times he has done it or continues to do it.
- This is a *very* forceful and cogent explanation of *why Francis remains silent*. *This — and this alone — is why Francis “Will not say a single word about it [the accusation].”*

That is to say that Francis had two possible and compelling reasons for his refusal to say “a single word”:

1. By breaking the Seal of the Confessional himself, he would *immediately* be incurring ***excommunication latae sententiae*** (the punishment is concurrent with the action) ***upon himself***.

2. And to *bind* any priest to whom *he himself* may have confessed *his complicity in perpetuating the same sin*, from ever disclosing it.

We believe that this explanation exceeds mere conjecture, but there is no way that we can ever know it for certain for the very reasons we have already articulated: ***a priest can say absolutely nothing*** relative to what is disclosed in the Confessional — either *exculpatory* or *inculpatory* — not even by so much as the slightest gesture ... for in doing so, he would be automatically excommunicating himself.

Demonic Perspicacity

This is nothing less than a demonically clever artifice, for it **uses a *Sacrament***, *something holy and inviolable, which in itself (in se) cannot ever be evil* — to enable a person to manipulate the sacrament ***in order to continue to commit or perpetuate evil without disclosure or penalty*** — and to bind any priest to silence who knows of his unspeakable sin through Holy Confession. It has been, and is, instigated by the devil and the demons. It is the work of darkness.

In a word, Francis could not respond to the question because, by Canon Law, if any priest — including the pope — breaks the “Seal of the Confessional” by word, gesture or deed; if he in any way whatever — violates the Seal of the Confessional

and reveals the sins of the Penitent to anyone* — even to save his own life — and even if the Penitent is no longer living — the priest is automatically excommunicated *latae sententiae* (the instant he breaks the Seal) from the Church.

Of course Francis could never “say a single word” — not if he were to remain “pope” rather than *excommunicating himself from the Church*.

And this, very likely, is also **how** homosexuality became so pervasive within the priesthood and the episcopacy! *Each was covering for the other by binding the other to silence through the sacred Seal of the Confessional — even if the Confessor was not homosexual himself!*

This self-perpetuating problem can be understood in a broader context:

- homosexual *seminarians* ...
- become homosexual *priests* ...
- who become homosexual *bishops* ...
- who become homosexual *cardinals* ...
- *who then vote for a pope who himself may be homosexual or sympathetic to advocating homosexuality.*

The longer the ordination of homosexuals, the more *pervasive* homosexuality will become in the Church —until, in an ultimate effrontery to God, a “synod” or “council” or “pope” declares, to its self-serving purposes, *that homosexual acts are no longer sinful* — despite every word condemning it in Holy Scripture and the teaching of the Church for 2000 years.

Consider once again, the following scenario: a homosexual seminarian has viciously sinful and perverse sexual relations with another seminarian — or a homosexual priest has raped an Altar boy or preyed upon a youngster (one shudders to think of such horrendous scenarios — and thousands occur!) Guilt torments him, afflicts him, for he recognizes that what he has done is so monstrous, *such* an offense against God and man, that he cannot tolerate it himself. What does he do?

He goes to confession ...

This is where the vicious cycle begins. Once he reveals his sin to the Confessor, that priest is bound not to let what he has heard from this seminarian influence him in any way. It is as though a confession never occurred as far as the world outside the Confessional is concerned — and the priest effectively becomes a sacred amnesiac. The priest cannot act upon what was confessed to him in any way. Even

if the offender routinely has sex with other men, the Confessor cannot in any way influence the candidate's soon-to-be vocation as a priest. **It is nothing less than diabolically conceived, implemented, and perpetuated — it has the “Mark of the Beast” upon it, from conception to conclusion.** What is worse — if possible — in confessing the vile sin of homosexual predation, he stirs the lingering lust in the Confessor — who *himself* is a homosexual predator — who then marks his target for further grooming to satisfy his own perversion! He has just found another ... like unto himself!

In a diabolical **mockery** of the Sacrament of Confession, the two, if both are priests, resume their predatory perversion and **reciprocally confess and absolve each other!** And — to use Francis's flimsy deflection — not “a single word” can be said to anyone!

“Not a Word can be Said”

It cannot be sufficiently impressed upon us that the moment the seminarian kneels in the Confessional (or, more commonly in the *Novus Ordo* Church, sits in a lounge chair and comfortably encounters the priest face-face in what resembles a clinical session — an environment that lends itself to “other pertinent” and more

frightful possibilities inside what is now called the “Room of Reconciliation” — *“not a word can be said”* — to anyone outside the Confessional — *ever*.

This ... *this* is how Homosexuality is Perpetuated in the Priesthood

One very troubling question remains: which side of the Confessional was Bergoglio in? The Confessor’s or the Penitent’s ... or both? He cannot reveal this. And *this may well account for his malicious reference to the Confessional as “a torture chamber.”*

Before the Sacrament of Penance itself is mindlessly vilified, it is equally vital to understand that the Sacrament of Penance is inviolably sacred and indefeasibly holy, for only through this Sacrament is sin absolved, the penitent cleansed, and upon enacting his penance, exempted from all temporal punishment, and reconciled to God and the Church. Mortal Sin is removed and with it — eternal punishment in a very real place called Hell.

To use this sacred Sacrament, by which sins are absolved — *to sustain, and even implement sin itself* — *is a sin so grave, so sacrilegious, so blasphemous, that a*

*category even greater than that of “Mortal Sin” itself seems necessary. Something, perhaps, akin to “**Demonic Sin**”? Why? Because complicity in this category of sin is so heinous, so blasphemous, that it is a participation in a sin that can only be predicated of the demons — and the “Father Lies” himself.*

* <https://www.catholicnewsagency.com/news/39231/pope-i-will-not-say-a-single-word-on-viganos-allegations-of-cover-up>

** Who may not be genuinely penitent at all, in which case the absolution granted by Christ through the priest is invalid and the “penitent” is further guilty of the greater sin of Sacrilege

¹ The Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 decreed, “Let the confessor take absolute care not to betray the sinner through word or sign, or in any other way whatsoever. In case he needs expert advice he may seek it without, however, in any way indicating the person. For we decree that he who presumes to reveal a sin which has been manifested to him in the tribunal of penance is not only to be deposed from the priestly office, but also to be consigned to a closed monastery for perpetual penance.” See also: Canon 983.1 of the current Code of Canon Law,

which declares that “It is a crime for a confessor in any way to betray a penitent by word or in any other manner or for any reason.” (#2490 CCC).

Geoffrey K. Mondello
Editor
Boston Catholic Journal



Copyright © 2004 - 2023 Boston Catholic Journal. All rights reserved.