



# Vatican Bombshell: Gay Silicon Valley Conspiracy Uncovered!

By ROD DREHER •



[giulio napolitano/Shutterstock](#)

Archbishop Carlo Maria Vigano, who served at the papal nuncio (that is, Vatican ambassador) to the United States from 2011-2016, has dropped an atomic bomb on Francis’s papacy, charging that “corruption has reached the very top of the Church’s hierarchy.”

In a lengthy statement, Vigano says that Francis has known for years about Cardinal Theodore McCarrick’s sexual abuse, but brought him

into the pontifical inner circle anyway, and sent him around the world on papal missions.

In fact, says Vigano, the Roman curia has known about McCarrick since the year 2000, but McCarrick was protected by gay supporters honeycombed throughout the Vatican. Pope Benedict XVI ordered McCarrick out of public ministry in 2009 or 2010, but McCarrick, abetted by powerful gay allies in the Curia, defied Benedict.

Vigano demands the resignation of Pope Francis, writing:

At the Angelus on Sunday, August 12, 2018 Pope Francis said these words: “Everyone is guilty for the good he could have done and did not do ... If we do not oppose evil, we tacitly feed it. We need to intervene where evil is spreading; for evil spreads where daring Christians who oppose evil with good are lacking.”

If this is rightly to be considered a serious moral responsibility for every believer, how much graver is it for the Church’s supreme pastor, who in the case of McCarrick not only did not oppose evil but associated himself in doing evil with someone he knew to be deeply corrupt. He followed the advice of someone he knew well to be a pervert, thus multiplying exponentially with his supreme authority the evil done by McCarrick. And how many other evil pastors is Francis still continuing to prop up in their active destruction of the Church!

Francis is abdicating the mandate which Christ gave to Peter to confirm the brethren. Indeed, by his action he has divided them, led them into error, and encouraged the wolves to continue to tear apart the sheep of Christ’s flock.

In this extremely dramatic moment for the universal Church, he must acknowledge his mistakes and, in keeping with the proclaimed principle of zero tolerance, Pope Francis must be the first to set a good example for cardinals and bishops who covered up McCarrick's abuses and resign along with all of them.

I have posted the entire text below. I've read it twice now, and I'm telling you, this story is as big as it gets.

Vigano worked in the Curia before being moved to Washington by then Secretary of State Tarcisio Bertone over his own objections. Vigano believed he was being punished by Bertone for informing Pope Benedict of rampant corruption in the Curia. With this statement today, Vigano declares open warfare at the highest levels of the Roman Catholic Church.

Other highlights from the statement today:

- In 2000, the nuncio in Washington informed Cardinal Angelo Sodano, at the time the Vatican's Secretary of State, about the allegations against then-Archbishop Ted McCarrick — that he was forcing himself on seminarians.
- McCarrick had been No. 14 on the official list for Washington, but somehow he was given his red hat.
- In 2006, Vigano, working within the Curia, drafted a memo warning that the allegations against McCarrick were so severe that Rome should remove him from the cardinalate. He was ignored. He did so again in 2008, summarizing Richard Sipe's

open letter to Benedict. He was again ignored. Vigano believes that pro-gay Cardinal Tarcisio Bertone, then the Secretary of State, prevented the news from reaching Pope Benedict.

- Finally, in 2009 or 2010, Pope Benedict learned of McCarrick's sins, and "imposed on Cardinal McCarrick sanctions similar to those now imposed on him by Pope Francis: the Cardinal was to leave the seminary where he was living, he was forbidden to celebrate [Mass] in public, to participate in public meetings, to give lectures, to travel, with the obligation of dedicating himself to a life of prayer and penance."
- McCarrick was told of these sanctions face to face twice — by Vigano, and by his predecessor in Washington. Vigano says he informed Cardinal Wuerl about them as well. If true, Wuerl's denials that he knew about McCarrick are lies. Says Vigano, "The Cardinal lies shamelessly."
- McCarrick defied Benedict's order.
- Benedict's sanctions against McCarrick were widely known among the most powerful cardinals in the Curia. Vigano names them in such a way as to indicate that they are all part of a gay mafia out to undermine Catholic teaching.
- After Francis was elected, he set McCarrick free to wander the globe on his behalf. McCarrick became highly influential in Francis's Vatican. Vigano: "In a team effort with Cardinal Rodriguez Maradiaga, he had become the kingmaker for appointments in the Curia and the United States."

- “The appointments of Blase Cupich to Chicago and Joseph W. Tobin to Newark were orchestrated by McCarrick, Maradiaga and Wuerl, united by a wicked pact of abuses by the first, and at least of coverup of abuses by the other two. Their names were not among those presented by the Nunciature for Chicago and Newark.”
- Vigano does not know when Francis first learned about McCarrick, but “in any case, the Pope learned about it from me on June 23, 2013, and continued to cover for him. He did not take into account the sanctions that Pope Benedict had imposed on him and made him his trusted counselor along with Maradiaga. ... Even in the tragic affair of McCarrick, Pope Francis’s behavior was no different. He knew from at least June 23, 2013 that McCarrick was a serial predator. Although he knew that he was a corrupt man, he covered for him to the bitter end; indeed, he made McCarrick’s advice his own, which was certainly not inspired by sound intentions and for love of the Church. It was only when he was forced by the report of the abuse of a minor, again on the basis of media attention, that he took action [regarding McCarrick] to save his image in the media.
- There is a concentrated effort by these cardinals, and Father James Martin, SJ, to change Catholic teaching on homosexuality

Vigano writes:

Francis is abdicating the mandate which Christ gave to Peter to confirm the brethren. Indeed, by his action he has divided them,

led them into error, and encouraged the wolves to continue to tear apart the sheep of Christ's flock. In this extremely dramatic moment for the universal Church, he must acknowledge his mistakes and, in keeping with the proclaimed principle of zero tolerance, Pope Francis must be the first to set a good example for cardinals and bishops who covered up McCarrick's abuses and resign along with all of them.

Vigano's testimony gives weight to the theory that Benedict XVI resigned because he knew the lavender mafia in the Curia held all the cards, and that he couldn't do anything. When the leader of the SSPX urged him to reform the Church, Benedict supposedly pointed to the entrance to his office, and said, "My authority ends at that door." ([I posted something about that here.](#))

[Vigano told Lifesitenews.com:](#)

"The main reason why I am revealing this news now is because of the tragic situation of the Church, which can be repaired only by the full truth, just as she has been gravely injured by the abuses and the coverups. I do this to stop the suffering of the victims and to prevent new victims and protect the Church: only the truth can make her free."

It's clear now: in the Vatican, this is civil war.

The entire document is below. Make sure you're sitting down when you read it.

**UPDATE:**

---

**Ross Douthat**  @DouthatNYT · Aug 25, 2018 

Replying to @DouthatNYT

In fact, both popes. But Benedict appears as a figure (weakly, insufficiently) attempting to act on testimony concerning McCarrick's crimes, while Francis is portrayed as intent on restoring the pederast cardinal to activity and influence \*despite\* his awareness of those crimes.

**Ross Douthat** 

@DouthatNYT

This is either an extraordinary and vicious slander or an act of revelation that should be the undoing of just about every figure mentioned in its pages. It has an apocalyptic feel either way.

7:17 PM - Aug 25, 2018

 1,677  607 people are talking about this



<https://platform.twitter.com/widgets.js>

**UPDATE.2:** Vatican reporter [Edward Pentin's account at \*National Catholic Register\* is very lucid](#), and contains this confirmation from Pope Benedict's circle:

“What is certain,” Viganò writes in his testimony, “is that Pope Benedict imposed the above canonical sanctions on McCarrick and that they were communicated to him by the Apostolic Nuncio to the United States, Pietro Sambì.”

The Register has independently confirmed that the allegations against McCarrick were certainly known to Benedict, and the Pope Emeritus remembers instructing Cardinal Bertone to impose measures but cannot recall their exact nature.



## TESTIMONY

by

His Excellency Carlo Maria Viganò

Titular Archbishop of Ulpiana

Apostolic Nuncio

In this tragic moment for the Church in various parts of the world — the United States, Chile, Honduras, Australia, etc. — bishops have a very grave responsibility. I am thinking in particular of the United States of America, where I was sent as Apostolic Nuncio by Pope Benedict XVI on October 19, 2011, the memorial feast of the First North American Martyrs. The Bishops of the United States are called, and I with them, to follow the example of these first martyrs who brought the Gospel to the lands of America, to be credible witnesses of the immeasurable love of Christ, the Way, the Truth and the Life.

Bishops and priests, abusing their authority, have committed horrendous crimes to the detriment of their faithful, minors, innocent victims, and young men eager to offer their lives to the Church, or by their silence have not prevented that such crimes continue to be perpetrated.

To restore the beauty of holiness to the face of the Bride of Christ, which is terribly disfigured by so many abominable crimes, and if we truly want to free the Church from the fetid swamp into which she has fallen, we must have the courage to tear down the culture of secrecy and publicly confess the truths we have kept hidden. We must tear down the conspiracy of silence with which bishops and priests have protected themselves at the expense of their faithful, a conspiracy of silence that in the eyes of the world risks making the

Church look like a sect, a conspiracy of silence not so dissimilar from the one that prevails in the mafia. “Whatever you have said in the dark ... shall be proclaimed from the housetops” (Lk. 12:3).

I had always believed and hoped that the hierarchy of the Church could find within itself the spiritual resources and strength to tell the whole truth, to amend and to renew itself. That is why, even though I had repeatedly been asked to do so, I always avoided making statements to the media, even when it would have been my right to do so, in order to defend myself against the calumnies published about me, even by high-ranking prelates of the Roman Curia. But now that the corruption has reached the very top of the Church’s hierarchy, my conscience dictates that I reveal those truths regarding the heart-breaking case of the Archbishop Emeritus of Washington, D.C., Theodore McCarrick, which I came to know in the course of the duties entrusted to me by St. John Paul II, as Delegate for Pontifical Representations, from 1998 to 2009, and by Pope Benedict XVI, as Apostolic Nuncio to the United States of America, from October 19, 2011 until end of May 2016.

As Delegate for Pontifical Representations in the Secretariat of State, my responsibilities were not limited to the Apostolic Nunciatures, but also included the staff of the Roman Curia (hires, promotions, informational processes on candidates to the episcopate, etc.) and the examination of delicate cases, including those regarding cardinals and bishops, that were entrusted to the Delegate by the Cardinal Secretary of State or by the Substitute of the Secretariat of State.

To dispel suspicions insinuated in several recent articles, I will immediately say that the Apostolic Nuncios in the United States,

Gabriel Montalvo and Pietro Sambì, both prematurely deceased, did not fail to inform the Holy See immediately, as soon as they learned of Archbishop McCarrick's gravely immoral behavior with seminarians and priests. Indeed, according to what Nuncio Pietro Sambì wrote, Father Boniface Ramsey, O.P.'s letter, dated November 22, 2000, was written at the request of the late Nuncio Montalvo. In the letter, Father Ramsey, who had been a professor at the diocesan seminary in Newark from the end of the '80s until 1996, affirms that there was a recurring rumor in the seminary that the Archbishop "shared his bed with seminarians," inviting five at a time to spend the weekend with him at his beach house. And he added that he knew a certain number of seminarians, some of whom were later ordained priests for the Archdiocese of Newark, who had been invited to this beach house and had shared a bed with the Archbishop.

The office that I held at the time was not informed of any measure taken by the Holy See after those charges were brought by Nuncio Montalvo at the end of 2000, when Cardinal Angelo Sodano was Secretary of State.

Likewise, Nuncio Sambì transmitted to the Cardinal Secretary of State, Tarcisio Bertone, an Indictment Memorandum against McCarrick by the priest Gregory Littleton of the diocese of Charlotte, who was reduced to the lay state for a violation of minors, together with two documents from the same Littleton, in which he recounted his tragic story of sexual abuse by the then-Archbishop of Newark and several other priests and seminarians. The Nuncio added that Littleton had already forwarded his Memorandum to about twenty people, including civil and ecclesiastical judicial authorities, police

and lawyers, in June

2006, and that it was therefore very likely that the news would soon be made public. He therefore called for a prompt intervention by the Holy See.

In writing up a memo on these documents that were entrusted to me, as Delegate for Pontifical Representations, on December 6, 2006, I wrote to my superiors, Cardinal Tarcisio Bertone and the Substitute Leonardo Sandri, that the facts attributed to McCarrick by Littleton were of such gravity and vileness as to provoke bewilderment, a sense of disgust, deep sorrow and bitterness in the reader, and that they constituted the crimes of seducing, requesting depraved acts of seminarians and priests, repeatedly and simultaneously with several people, derision of a young seminarian who tried to resist the Archbishop's seductions in the presence of two other priests, absolution of the accomplices in these depraved acts, sacrilegious celebration of the Eucharist with the same priests after committing such acts.

In my memo, which I delivered on that same December 6, 2006 to my direct superior, the Substitute Leonardo Sandri, I proposed the following considerations and course of action to my superiors:

- Given that it seemed a new scandal of particular gravity, as it regarded a cardinal, was going to be added to the many scandals for the Church in the United States,
- and that, since this matter had to do with a cardinal, and according to can. 1405 § 1, No. 2°, “*ipsius Romani Pontificis dumtaxat ius est iudicandi*”;
- I proposed that an exemplary measure be taken against the Cardinal that could have a medicinal function, to prevent future

abuses against innocent victims and alleviate the very serious scandal for the faithful, who despite everything continued to love and believe in the Church.

I added that it would be salutary if, for once, ecclesiastical authority would intervene before the civil authorities and, if possible, before the scandal had broken out in the press. This could have restored some dignity to a Church so sorely tried and humiliated by so many abominable acts on the part of some pastors. If this were done, the civil authority would no longer have to judge a cardinal, but a pastor with whom the Church had already taken appropriate measures to prevent the cardinal from abusing his authority and continuing to destroy innocent victims.

\*All the memos, letters and other documentation mentioned here are available at the Secretariat of State of the Holy See or at the Apostolic Nunciature in Washington, D.C.)

My memo of December 6, 2006 was kept by my superiors, and was never returned to me with any actual decision by the superiors on this matter.

Subsequently, around April 21-23, 2008, the Statement for Pope Benedict XVI about the pattern of sexual abuse crisis in the United States, by Richard Sipe, was published on the internet, at richardsipe.com. On April 24, it was passed on by the Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Cardinal William Levada, to the Cardinal Secretary of State Tarcisio Bertone. It was delivered to me one month later, on May 24, 2008.

The following day, I delivered a new memo to the new Substitute, Fernando Filoni, which included my previous one of December 6, 2006. In it, I summarized Richard Sipe's document, which ended with this respectful and heartfelt appeal to Pope Benedict XVI: "I approach Your Holiness with due reverence, but with the same intensity that motivated Peter Damian to lay out before your predecessor, Pope Leo IX, a description of the condition of the clergy during his time. The problems he spoke of are similar and as great now in the United States as they were then in Rome. If Your Holiness requests, I will personally submit to you documentation of that about which I have spoken."

I ended my memo by repeating to my superiors that I thought it was necessary to intervene as soon as possible by removing the cardinal's hat from Cardinal McCarrick and that he should be subjected to the sanctions established by the Code of Canon Law, which also provide for reduction to the lay state.

This second memo of mine was also never returned to the Personnel Office, and I was greatly dismayed at my superiors for the inconceivable absence of any measure against the Cardinal, and for the continuing lack of any communication with me since my first memo in December 2006.

But finally I learned with certainty, through Cardinal Giovanni Battista Re, then-Prefect of the Congregation for Bishops, that Richard Sipe's courageous and meritorious Statement had had the desired result. Pope Benedict had imposed on Cardinal McCarrick sanctions similar to those now imposed on him by Pope Francis: the Cardinal was to leave the seminary where he was living, he was forbidden to celebrate [Mass] in public, to participate in public

meetings, to give lectures, to travel, with the obligation of dedicating himself to a life of prayer and penance.

I do not know when Pope Benedict took these measures against McCarrick, whether in 2009 or 2010, because in the meantime I had been transferred to the Governorate of Vatican City State, just as I do not know who was responsible for this incredible delay. I certainly do not believe it was Pope Benedict, who as Cardinal had repeatedly denounced the corruption present in the Church, and in the first months of his pontificate had already taken a firm stand against the admission into seminary of young men with deep homosexual tendencies. I believe it was due to the Pope's first collaborator at the time, Cardinal Tarcisio Bertone, who notoriously favored promoting homosexuals into positions of responsibility, and was accustomed to managing the information he thought appropriate to convey to the Pope.

In any case, what is certain is that Pope Benedict imposed the above canonical sanctions on McCarrick and that they were communicated to him by the Apostolic Nuncio to the United States, Pietro Sambi. Monsignor Jean-François Lantheaume, then first Counsellor of the Nunciature in Washington and Chargé d'Affaires a.i. after the unexpected death of Nuncio Sambi in Baltimore, told me when I arrived in Washington — and he is ready to testify to it— about a stormy conversation, lasting over an hour, that Nuncio Sambi had with Cardinal McCarrick whom he had summoned to the Nunciature. Monsignor Lantheaume told me that “the Nuncio's voice could be heard all the way out in the corridor.”

Pope Benedict's same dispositions were then also communicated to me by the new Prefect of the Congregation for Bishops, Cardinal Marc Ouellet, in November 2011, in a conversation before my departure for Washington, and were included among the instructions of the same Congregation to the new Nuncio.

In turn, I repeated them to Cardinal McCarrick at my first meeting with him at the Nunciature. The Cardinal, muttering in a barely comprehensible way, admitted that he had perhaps made the mistake of sleeping in the same bed with some seminarians at his beach house, but he said this as if it had no importance.

The faithful insistently wonder how it was possible for him to be appointed to Washington, and as Cardinal, and they have every right to know who knew, and who covered up his grave misdeeds. It is therefore my duty to reveal what I know about this, beginning with the Roman Curia.

Cardinal Angelo Sodano was Secretary of State until September 2006: all information was communicated to him. In November 2000, Nunzio Montalvo sent him his report, passing on to him the aforementioned letter from Father Boniface Ramsey in which he denounced the serious abuses committed by McCarrick.

It is known that Sodano tried to cover up the Father Maciel scandal to the end. He even removed the Nuncio in Mexico City, Justo Mullor, who refused to be an accomplice in his scheme to cover Maciel, and in his place appointed Sandri, then-Nuncio to Venezuela, who was willing to collaborate in the coverup.



Sodano even went so far as to issue a statement to the Vatican press office in which a falsehood was affirmed, that is, that Pope Benedict had decided that the Maciel case should be considered closed.

Benedict reacted, despite Sodano's strenuous defense, and Maciel was found guilty and irrevocably condemned.

Was McCarrick's appointment to Washington and as Cardinal the work of Sodano, when John Paul II was already very ill? We are not given to know. However, it is legitimate to think so, but I do not think he was the only one responsible for this. McCarrick frequently went to Rome and made friends everywhere, at all levels of the Curia. If Sodano had protected Maciel, as seems certain, there is no reason why he wouldn't have done so for McCarrick, who according to many had the financial means to influence decisions. His nomination to Washington was opposed by then-Prefect of the Congregation for Bishops, Cardinal Giovanni Battista Re. At the Nunciature in Washington there is a note, written in his hand, in which Cardinal Re disassociates himself from the appointment and states that McCarrick was 14th on the list for Washington.

Nuncio Sambì's report, with all the attachments, was sent to Cardinal Tarcisio Bertone, as Secretary of State. My two above-mentioned memos of December 6, 2006 and May 25, 2008, were also presumably handed over to him by the Substitute. As already mentioned, the Cardinal had no difficulty in insistently presenting for the episcopate candidates known to be active homosexuals — I cite only the well-known case of Vincenzo de Mauro, who was appointed Archbishop-Bishop of Vigevano and later removed because he was undermining his seminarians — and in filtering and

manipulating the information he conveyed to Pope Benedict.

Cardinal Pietro Parolin, the current Secretary of State, was also complicit in covering up the misdeeds of McCarrick who had, after the election of Pope Francis, boasted openly of his travels and missions to various continents. In April 2014, the Washington Times had a front page report on McCarrick's trip to the Central African Republic, and on behalf of the State Department no less. As Nuncio to Washington, I wrote to Cardinal Parolin asking him if the sanctions imposed on McCarrick by Pope Benedict were still valid. *Ça va sans dire* [it goes without saying] that my letter never received any reply!

The same can be said for Cardinal William Levada, former Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, for Cardinals Marc Ouellet, Prefect of the Congregation for Bishops, Lorenzo Baldisseri, former Secretary of the same Congregation for Bishops, and Archbishop Ilson de Jesus Montanari, current Secretary of the same Congregation. They were all aware by reason of their office of the sanctions imposed by Pope Benedict on McCarrick.

Cardinals Leonardo Sandri, Fernando Filoni and Angelo Becciu, as Substitutes of the Secretariat of State, knew in every detail the situation regarding Cardinal McCarrick. Nor could Cardinals Giovanni Lajolo and Dominique Mamberti have failed to know. As Secretaries for Relations with States, they participated several times a week in collegial meetings with the Secretary of State.

As far as the Roman Curia is concerned, for the moment I will stop here, even if the names of other prelates in the Vatican are well

known, even some very close to Pope Francis, such as Cardinal Francesco Coccopalmerio and Archbishop Vincenzo Paglia, who belong to the homosexual current in favor of subverting Catholic doctrine on homosexuality, a current already denounced in 1986 by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, then-Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, in the Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons. Cardinals Edwin Frederick O'Brien and Renato Raffaele Martino also belong to the same current, albeit with a different ideology. Others belonging to this current even reside at the Domus Sanctae Marthae.

Now to the United States. Obviously, the first to have been informed of the measures taken by Pope Benedict was McCarrick's successor in Washington See, Cardinal Donald Wuerl, whose situation is now completely compromised by the recent revelations regarding his behavior as Bishop of Pittsburgh.

It is absolutely unthinkable that Nunzio Sambini, who was an extremely responsible person, loyal, direct and explicit in his way of being (a true son of Romagna) did not speak to him about it. In any case, I myself brought up the subject with Cardinal Wuerl on several occasions, and I certainly didn't need to go into detail because it was immediately clear to me that he was fully aware of it. I also remember in particular the fact that I had to draw his attention to it, because I realized that in an archdiocesan publication, on the back cover in color, there was an announcement inviting young men who thought they had a vocation to the priesthood to a meeting with Cardinal McCarrick. I immediately phoned Cardinal Wuerl, who expressed his surprise to me, telling me that he knew nothing about that announcement and that he would cancel it. If, as

he now continues to state, he knew nothing of the abuses committed by McCarrick and the measures taken by Pope Benedict, how can his answer be explained?

His recent statements that he knew nothing about it, even though at first he cunningly referred to compensation for the two victims, are absolutely laughable. The Cardinal lies shamelessly and prevails upon his Chancellor, Monsignor Antonicelli, to lie as well.

Cardinal Wuerl also clearly lied on another occasion. Following a morally unacceptable event authorized by the academic authorities of Georgetown University, I brought it to the attention of its President, Dr. John DeGioia, sending him two subsequent letters. Before forwarding them to the addressee, so as to handle things properly, I personally gave a copy of them to the Cardinal with an accompanying letter I had written. The Cardinal told me that he knew nothing about it. However, he failed to acknowledge receipt of my two letters, contrary to what he customarily did. I subsequently learned that the event at Georgetown had taken place for seven years. But the Cardinal knew nothing about it!

Cardinal Wuerl, well aware of the continuous abuses committed by Cardinal McCarrick and the sanctions imposed on him by Pope Benedict, transgressing the Pope's order, also allowed him to reside at a seminary in Washington D.C. In doing so, he put other seminarians at risk. Bishop Paul Bootkoski, emeritus of Metuchen, and Archbishop John Myers, emeritus of Newark, covered up the abuses committed by McCarrick in their respective dioceses and compensated two of his victims. They cannot deny it and they must be interrogated in order to reveal every circumstance and all responsibility regarding this matter.

Cardinal Kevin Farrell, who was recently interviewed by the media, also said that he didn't have the slightest idea about the abuses committed by McCarrick. Given his tenure in Washington, Dallas and now Rome, I think no one can honestly believe him. I don't know if he was ever asked if he knew about Maciel's crimes. If he were to deny this, would anybody believe him given that he occupied positions of responsibility as a member of the Legionaries of Christ?

Regarding Cardinal Sean O'Malley, I would simply say that his latest statements on the McCarrick case are disconcerting, and have totally obscured his transparency and credibility.

\* \* \*

My conscience requires me also to reveal facts that I have experienced personally, concerning Pope Francis, that have a dramatic significance, which as Bishop, sharing the collegial responsibility of all the bishops for the universal Church, do not allow me to remain silent, and that I state here, ready to reaffirm them under oath by calling on God as my witness.

In the last months of his pontificate, Pope Benedict XVI had convened a meeting of all the apostolic nuncios in Rome, as Paul VI and St. John Paul II had done on several occasions. The date set for the audience with the Pope was Friday, June 21, 2013. Pope Francis kept this commitment made by his predecessor. Of course I also came to Rome from Washington. It was my first meeting with the new Pope elected only three months prior, after the resignation of Pope Benedict.

On the morning of Thursday, June 20, 2013, I went to the Domus Sanctae Marthae, to join my colleagues who were staying there. As soon as I entered the hall I met Cardinal McCarrick, who wore the

redtrimmed cassock. I greeted him respectfully as I had always done. He immediately said to me, in a tone somewhere between ambiguous and triumphant: “The Pope received me yesterday, tomorrow I am going to China.”

At the time I knew nothing of his long friendship with Cardinal Bergoglio and of the important part he had played in his recent election, as McCarrick himself would later reveal in a lecture at Villanova University and in an interview with the National Catholic Reporter. Nor had I ever thought of the fact that he had participated in the preliminary meetings of the recent conclave, and of the role he had been able to have as a cardinal elector in the 2005 conclave. Therefore I did not immediately grasp the meaning of the encrypted message that McCarrick had communicated to me, but that would become clear to me in the days immediately following.

The next day the audience with Pope Francis took place. After his address, which was partly read and partly delivered off the cuff, the Pope wished to greet all the nuncios one by one. In single file, I remember that I was among the last. When it was my turn, I just had time to say to him, “I am the Nuncio to the United States.” He immediately assailed me with a tone of reproach, using these words: “The Bishops in the United States must not be ideologized! They must be shepherds!” Of course I was not in a position to ask for explanations about the meaning of his words and the aggressive way in which he had upbraided me. I had in my hand a book in Portuguese that Cardinal O’Malley had sent me for the Pope a few days earlier, telling me “so he could go over his Portuguese before going to Rio for World Youth

Day.” I handed it to him immediately, and so freed myself from that extremely disconcerting and embarrassing situation.

At the end of the audience the Pope announced: “Those of you who are still in Rome next Sunday are invited to concelebrate with me at the Domus Sanctae Marthae.” I naturally thought of staying on to clarify as soon as possible what the Pope intended to tell me.

On Sunday June 23, before the concelebration with the Pope, I asked Monsignor Ricca, who as the person in charge of the house helped us put on the vestments, if he could ask the Pope if he could receive me sometime in the following week. How could I have returned to Washington without having clarified what the Pope wanted of me? At the end of Mass, while the Pope was greeting the few lay people present, Monsignor Fabian Pedacchio, his Argentine secretary, came to me and said: “The Pope told me to ask if you are free now!” Naturally, I replied that I was at the Pope’s disposal and that I thanked him for receiving me immediately. The Pope took me to the first floor in his apartment and said: “We have 40 minutes before the Angelus.”

I began the conversation, asking the Pope what he intended to say to me with the words he had addressed to me when I greeted him the previous Friday. And the Pope, in a very different, friendly, almost affectionate tone, said to me: “Yes, the Bishops in the United States must not be ideologized, they must not be right-wing like the Archbishop of Philadelphia, (the Pope did not give me the name of the Archbishop) they must be shepherds; and they must not be left-wing — and he added, raising both arms — and when I say left-wing I mean homosexual.” Of course, the logic of the correlation between being

left-wing and being homosexual escaped me, but I added nothing else.

Immediately after, the Pope asked me in a deceitful way: “What is Cardinal McCarrick like?” I answered him with complete frankness and, if you want, with great naiveté: “Holy Father, I don’t know if you know Cardinal McCarrick, but if you ask the Congregation for Bishops there is a dossier this thick about him. He corrupted generations of seminarians and priests and Pope Benedict ordered him to withdraw to a life of prayer and penance.”

The Pope did not make the slightest comment about those very grave words of mine and did not show any expression of surprise on his face, as if he had already known the matter for some time, and he immediately changed the subject. But then, what was the Pope’s purpose in asking me that question: “What is Cardinal McCarrick like?” He clearly wanted to find out if I was an ally of McCarrick or not.

Back in Washington everything became very clear to me, thanks also to a new event that occurred only a few days after my meeting with Pope Francis. When the new Bishop Mark Seitz took possession of the Diocese of El Paso on July 9, 2013, I sent the first Counsellor, Monsignor Jean-François Lantheaume, while I went to Dallas that same day for an international meeting on Bioethics. When he got back, Monsignor Lantheaume told me that in El Paso he had met Cardinal McCarrick who, taking him aside, told him almost the same words that the Pope had said to me in Rome: “the Bishops in the United States must not be ideologized, they must not be right-wing, they must be shepherds....”



I was astounded! It was therefore clear that the words of reproach that Pope Francis had addressed to me on June 21, 2013 had been put into his mouth the day before by Cardinal McCarrick. Also the Pope's mention "not like the Archbishop of Philadelphia" could be traced to McCarrick, because there had been a strong disagreement between the two of them about the admission to Communion of pro-abortion politicians. In his communication to the bishops, McCarrick had manipulated a letter of then-Cardinal Ratzinger who prohibited giving them Communion. Indeed, I also knew how certain Cardinals such as Mahony, Levada and Wuerl, were closely linked to McCarrick; they had opposed the most recent appointments made by Pope Benedict, for important posts such as Philadelphia, Baltimore, Denver and San Francisco.

Not happy with the trap he had set for me on June 23, 2013, when he asked me about McCarrick, only a few months later, in the audience he granted me on October 10, 2013, Pope Francis set a second one for me, this time concerning a second of his protégés, Cardinal Donald Wuerl. He asked me: "What is Cardinal Wuerl like, is he good or bad?" I replied, "Holy Father, I will not tell you if he is good or bad, but I will tell you two facts." They are the ones I have already mentioned above, which concern Wuerl's pastoral carelessness regarding the aberrant deviations at Georgetown University and the invitation by the Archdiocese of Washington to young aspirants to the priesthood to a meeting with McCarrick! Once again the Pope did not show any reaction.

It was also clear that, from the time of Pope Francis's election, McCarrick, now free from all constraints, had felt free to travel continuously, to give lectures and interviews. In a team effort with

Cardinal Rodriguez Maradiaga, he had become the kingmaker for appointments in the Curia and the United States, and the most listened to advisor in the Vatican for relations with the Obama administration.

This is how one explains that, as members of the Congregation for Bishops, the Pope replaced Cardinal Burke with Wuerl and immediately appointed Cupich right after he was made a cardinal. With these appointments the Nunciature in Washington was now out of the picture in the appointment of bishops. In addition, he appointed the Brazilian Ilson de Jesus Montanari — the great friend of his private Argentine secretary Fabian Pedacchio — as Secretary of the same Congregation for Bishops and Secretary of the College of Cardinals, promoting him in one single leap from a simple official of that department to Archbishop Secretary. Something unprecedented for such an important position!

The appointments of Blase Cupich to Chicago and Joseph W. Tobin to Newark were orchestrated by McCarrick, Maradiaga and Wuerl, united by a wicked pact of abuses by the first, and at least of coverup of abuses by the other two. Their names were not among those presented by the Nunciature for Chicago and Newark.

Regarding Cupich, one cannot fail to note his ostentatious arrogance, and the insolence with which he denies the evidence that is now obvious to all: that 80% of the abuses found were committed against young adults by homosexuals who were in a relationship of authority over their victims.

During the speech he gave when he took possession of the Chicago See, at which I was present as a representative of the Pope, Cupich

quipped that one certainly should not expect the new Archbishop to walk on water. Perhaps it would be enough for him to be able to remain with his feet on the ground and not try to turn reality upside-down, blinded by his pro-gay ideology, as he stated in a recent interview with America Magazine. Extolling his particular expertise in the matter, having been President of the Committee on Protection of Children and Young People of the USCCB, he asserted that the main problem in the crisis of sexual abuse by clergy is not homosexuality, and that affirming this is only a way of diverting attention from the real problem which is clericalism. In support of this thesis, Cupich “oddly” made reference to the results of research carried out at the height of the sexual abuse of minors crisis in the early 2000s, while he “candidly” ignored that the results of that investigation were totally denied by the subsequent Independent Reports by the John Jay College of Criminal Justice in 2004 and 2011, which concluded that, in cases of sexual abuse, 81% of the victims were male. In fact, Father Hans Zollner, S.J., Vice-Rector of the Pontifical Gregorian University, President of the Centre for Child Protection, and Member of the Pontifical Commission for the Protection of Minors, recently told the newspaper La Stampa that “in most cases it is a question of homosexual abuse.”

The appointment of McElroy in San Diego was also orchestrated from above, with an encrypted peremptory order to me as Nuncio, by Cardinal Parolin: “Reserve the See of San Diego for McElroy.”

McElroy was also well aware of McCarrick’s abuses, as can be seen from a letter sent to him by Richard Sipe on July 28, 2016.

These characters are closely associated with individuals belonging in particular to the deviated wing of the Society of Jesus, unfortunately today a majority, which had already been a cause of serious concern to Paul VI and subsequent pontiffs. We need only consider Father Robert Drinan, S.J., who was elected four times to the House of Representatives, and was a staunch supporter of abortion; or Father Vincent O'Keefe, S.J., one of the principal promoters of The Land O'Lakes Statement of 1967, which seriously compromised the Catholic identity of universities and colleges in the United States. It should be noted that McCarrick, then President of the Catholic University of Puerto Rico, also participated in that inauspicious undertaking which was so harmful to the formation of the consciences of American youth, closely associated as it was with the deviated wing of the Jesuits.

Father James Martin, S.J., acclaimed by the people mentioned above, in particular Cupich, Tobin, Farrell and McElroy, appointed Consultor of the Secretariat for Communications, well-known activist who promotes the LGBT agenda, chosen to corrupt the young people who will soon gather in Dublin for the World Meeting of Families, is nothing but a sad recent example of that deviated wing of the Society of Jesus.

Pope Francis has repeatedly asked for total transparency in the Church and for bishops and faithful to act with parrhesia. The faithful throughout the world also demand this of him in an exemplary manner. He must honestly state when he first learned about the crimes committed by McCarrick, who abused his authority with seminarians and priests.

In any case, the Pope learned about it from me on June 23, 2013 and continued to cover for him. He did not take into account the sanctions that Pope Benedict had imposed on him and made him his trusted counselor along with Maradiaga.

The latter [Maradiaga] is so confident of the Pope's protection that he can dismiss as "gossip" the heartfelt appeals of dozens of his seminarians, who found the courage to write to him after one of them tried to commit suicide over homosexual abuse in the seminary.

By now the faithful have well understood Maradiaga's strategy: insult the victims to save himself, lie to the bitter end to cover up a chasm of abuses of power, of mismanagement in the administration of Church property, and of financial disasters even against close friends, as in the case of the Ambassador of Honduras Alejandro Valladares, former Dean of the Diplomatic Corps to the Holy See.

In the case of the former Auxiliary Bishop Juan José Pineda, after the article published in the [Italian] weekly L'Espresso last February, Maradiaga stated in the newspaper Avvenire: "It was my auxiliary bishop Pineda who asked for the visitation, so as to 'clear' his name after being subjected to much slander." Now, regarding Pineda the only thing that has been made public is that his resignation has simply been accepted, thus making any possible responsibility of his and Maradiaga vanish into nowhere.

In the name of the transparency so hailed by the Pope, the report that the Visitor, Argentine bishop Alcides Casaretto, delivered more than a year ago only and directly to the Pope, must be made public.

Finally, the recent appointment as Substitute of Archbishop Edgar Peña Parra is also connected with Honduras, that is, with Maradiaga. From 2003 to 2007 Peña Parra worked as Counsellor at the Tegucigalpa Nunciature. As Delegate for Pontifical Representations I received worrisome information about him.

In Honduras, a scandal as huge as the one in Chile is about to be repeated. The Pope defends his man, Cardinal Rodriguez Maradiaga, to the bitter end, as he had done in Chile with Bishop Juan de la Cruz Barros, whom he himself had appointed Bishop of Osorno against the advice of the Chilean Bishops.

First he insulted the abuse victims. Then, only when he was forced by the media, and a revolt by the Chilean victims and faithful, did he recognize his error and apologize, while stating that he had been misinformed, causing a disastrous situation for the Church in Chile, but continuing to protect the two Chilean Cardinals Errazuriz and Ezzati.

Even in the tragic affair of McCarrick, Pope Francis's behavior was no different. He knew from at least June 23, 2013 that McCarrick was a serial predator. Although he knew that he was a corrupt man, he covered for him to the bitter end; indeed, he made McCarrick's advice his own, which was certainly not inspired by sound intentions and for love of the Church. It was only when he was forced by the report of the abuse of a minor, again on the basis of media attention, that he took action [regarding McCarrick] to save his image in the media.

Now in the United States a chorus of voices is rising especially from the lay faithful, and has recently been joined by several bishops and

priests, asking that all those who, by their silence, covered up McCarrick's criminal behavior, or who used him to advance their career or promote their intentions, ambitions and power in the Church, should resign.

But this will not be enough to heal the situation of extremely grave immoral behavior by the clergy: bishops and priests. A time of conversion and penance must be proclaimed. The virtue of chastity must be recovered in the clergy and in seminaries. Corruption in the misuse of the Church's resources and of the offerings of the faithful must be fought against. The seriousness of homosexual behavior must be denounced. The homosexual networks present in the Church must be eradicated, as Janet Smith, Professor of Moral Theology at the Sacred Heart Major Seminary in Detroit, recently wrote. "The problem of clergy abuse," she wrote, "cannot be resolved simply by the resignation of some bishops, and even less so by bureaucratic directives. The deeper problem lies in homosexual networks within the clergy which must be eradicated." These homosexual networks, which are now widespread in many dioceses, seminaries, religious orders, etc., act under the concealment of secrecy and lies with the power of octopus tentacles, and strangle innocent victims and priestly vocations, and are strangling the entire Church. I implore everyone, especially Bishops, to speak up in order to defeat this conspiracy of silence that is so widespread, and to report the cases of abuse they know about to the media and civil authorities.

Let us heed the most powerful message that St. John Paul II left us as an inheritance: Do not be afraid! Do not be afraid!

In his 2008 homily on the Feast of the Epiphany, Pope Benedict reminded us that the Father's plan of salvation had been fully revealed and realized in the mystery of Christ's death and resurrection, but it needs to be welcomed in human history, which is always a history of fidelity on God's part and unfortunately also of infidelity on the part of us men. The Church, the depositary of the blessing of the New Covenant, signed in the blood of the Lamb, is holy but made up of sinners, as Saint Ambrose wrote: the Church is "immaculata ex maculatis," she is holy and spotless even though, in her earthly journey, she is made up of men stained with sin.

I want to recall this indefectible truth of the Church's holiness to the many people who have been so deeply scandalized by the abominable and sacrilegious behavior of the former Archbishop of Washington, Theodore McCarrick; by the grave, disconcerting and sinful conduct of Pope Francis and by the conspiracy of silence of so many pastors, and who are tempted to abandon the Church, disfigured by so many ignominies. At the Angelus on Sunday, August 12, 2018 Pope Francis said these words: "Everyone is guilty for the good he could have done and did not do ... If we do not oppose evil, we tacitly feed it. We need to intervene where evil is spreading; for evil spreads where daring Christians who oppose evil with good are lacking."

If this is rightly to be considered a serious moral responsibility for every believer, how much graver is it for the Church's supreme pastor, who in the case of McCarrick not only did not oppose evil but associated himself in doing evil with someone he knew to be deeply corrupt. He followed the advice of someone he knew well to be a pervert, thus multiplying exponentially with his supreme authority the evil done by McCarrick. And how many other evil pastors is



Francis still continuing to prop up in their active destruction of the Church!

Francis is abdicating the mandate which Christ gave to Peter to confirm the brethren. Indeed, by his action he has divided them, led them into error, and encouraged the wolves to continue to tear apart the sheep of Christ's flock.

In this extremely dramatic moment for the universal Church, he must acknowledge his mistakes and, in keeping with the proclaimed principle of zero tolerance, Pope Francis must be the first to set a good example for cardinals and bishops who covered up McCarrick's abuses and resign along with all of them.

Even in dismay and sadness over the enormity of what is happening, let us not lose hope! We well know that the great majority of our pastors live their priestly vocation with fidelity and dedication.

It is in moments of great trial that the Lord's grace is revealed in abundance and makes His limitless mercy available to all; but it is granted only to those who are truly repentant and sincerely propose to amend their lives. This is a favorable time for the Church to confess her sins, to convert, and to do penance.

Let us all pray for the Church and for the Pope, let us remember how many times he has asked us to pray for him!

Let us all renew faith in the Church our Mother: "I believe in one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church!"

Christ will never abandon His Church! He generated her in His Blood and continually revives her with His Spirit!

Mary, Mother of the Church, pray for us!

Mary, Virgin and Queen, Mother of the King of glory, pray for us!  
Rome, August 22, 2018

Queenship of the Blessed Virgin Mary  
Official translation by Diane Montagna

Posted in [Christianity](#), [LGBT](#). Tagged [homosexuality](#), [Pope Benedict XVI](#), [Roman Catholicism](#), [lavender mafia](#), [Pope Francis](#), [Cardinal Theodore McCarrick](#), [Cardinal Donald Wuerl](#), [Archbishop Carlo Maria Vigano](#), [Roman curia](#).

---

MORE FROM THIS AUTHOR

Islam & France Headed For Clash

Orthodox Messes Great And Small

---

Hide 172 comments

## 172 Responses to Vatican Bombshell: McCarrick Conspiracy Uncovered!

[← Older Comments](#)

**Ms** says:

August 26, 2018 at 3:57 pm

Lamm2, the prehistoric triple spirals don't bother me at all. In fact, I like them. The Church has always used pre Christian sources, adapting them, from a belief that these earlier things were a veiled prefiguration of Christ, not understood before Christ but understood after Christ's life. (Like seeing a prophecy in Virgil's Fourth Eclogue). And I'm glad that there is something I can like about this trip!

---

**Todd Flowerday** says:

August 26, 2018 at 4:05 pm

“[NFR: You are full of beans. Vigano is now going to be stripped of all his bark. What he did was a brave thing — perhaps foolish, but certainly extremely brave. He will not know one night's peaceful sleep for the rest of his life. — RD]”

Wha ...? He will certainly get succor in the MaChurch crowd who will forget Nienstedt and hail him as a disgraced hero. Or does the lavender mafia suddenly include gunrunning. You do realize that mafia, as you use the term, is a metaphor, right?

---

**kevin on the left** says:

August 26, 2018 at 4:05 pm

“[NFR: Yes, that's the point! McCarrick defied Benedict, knowing that he had powerful curial supporters. — RD]”

If a penalty is imposed, and no one is told, and the person it is imposed on it is totally ignoring it, then there are two options: a dark conspiracy is protecting them, or there was not penalty imposed. I know which way Occam's razor is pointing on this one..

---

**John** says:

August 26, 2018 at 4:19 pm

Rod,

Recall the Nienstedt incident. Vignano implicated in cover-up then. Vignano may have been sticking up for one of his own (Nienstedt considered a conservative). Doesn't mean Vignano's testimony now isn't true (would have been a good idea to address Nienstedt) but it does show that the gangs in this internecine warfare are now taking the fight to the streets. It is and will be a bloody mess.

<https://www.ncronline.org/news/accountability/memo-vatican-nuncio-quashed-sexual-misconduct-inquiry-archbishop-nienstedt>

---

**Erdrick** says:

August 26, 2018 at 5:03 pm

Lamm2 says:

August 26, 2018 at 1:39 pm

“They are green and feature the triple spiral, a pre-Christian Celtic symbol found on Neolithic monuments across the island.”

Small quibble – if they're neolithic, then they're not Celtic in origin. The Celts didn't get to Ireland until the Iron Age. Maybe the Celts adopted them.

Pshr says:

August 26, 2018 at 2:15 pm

John says:

“But know this for certain, outside the Church there there is no salvation.”

You should know for certain that polytheism and idolatry can never lead to salvation.

Are you Muslim?

---

**Barbara James** says:

August 26, 2018 at 5:05 pm

As a former Catholic (I'm Protestant), I find myself wondering what could have caused such a large number of gay men to become attracted to the priesthood.

I think the recent pieces about the seminaries helped solidify my thinking.

In the mainstream culture, most men are heterosexual and dating or marrying women. If a man isn't, he might be seen as suspect. But if a gay man hasn't resolved his issues regarding his sexuality, he can hide behind the church's celibacy requirement, which excludes men from sex with women. Yet, there are lots of men around. So gay sex becomes the loophole.

Add to that the deference paid to priests because of clericalism, that creates a strong source of power and unaccountability, especially as everyone becomes complicit in the wrongful behavior, either as a bystander, or as a participant. No one wants to give that power up.

What would it have looked like if the church followed the more Protestant model of parishes (lay people) interviewing, investigating, and voting to call their clergy?

The Protestant notion of the priesthood of believers gives far more power to the people in the pews than Roman Catholicism does. There needs to be a new reformation.

---

**Kat** says:

August 26, 2018 at 5:08 pm

I should have popped popcorn to read Vigano's document! WOW. This was my gut a few weeks ago. Francis is a part of this. The best possible scenario is that he was so enamored with McCarrick's fundraising that he turned a blind eye to his numerous offenses but with that Villanova talk by McCarrick it seems evidence that Francis was brought in as one of their (lavender mafia's) own to make the changes they wanted. I was particularly struck at how calculated Francis was at testing Vigano's loyalties asking him about McCarrick and Wuerl. Wow. Wow. Wow.

---

**Raskolnik** says:

August 26, 2018 at 5:09 pm

@Perseus

The last thing anyone should want is for any Catholic to lose their faith in the Living Christ. I wish you well and will be praying for my Catholic brothers and sisters in this time of tribulation.

---

**Pastor Brian** says:

August 26, 2018 at 5:16 pm

Rod:

Children, it is the last hour, and as you have heard that antichrist is coming, so now many antichrists have come. Therefore we know that it is the last hour.

1 John 2:18

---

**Augustine** says:

August 26, 2018 at 5:27 pm

Pope Francis IS the “lavender mafia”, indeed its godfather!

---

**Lamm2** says:

August 26, 2018 at 5:56 pm

@Ms – thank you for explaining the tradition. If I understand this tradition, it is one that offers the symbol of a “veiled prefiguration of Christ” instead of the symbol of an unveiled Christ on a cross – the crucifix. Why mask Christ in an esoteric Celtic symbol that even few Irish would associate with Christ? Why hide Christ? That simply makes no sense from a Lutheran point of view.

---

**Michael Festa Sr** says:

August 26, 2018 at 6:51 pm

My opinion of this abomination before Our Blessed Lord?  
Rid ourselves of all the conspirators, not only in Europe, but in the United States,also. This situation is clearly an attempt by the “father of lies” to level our Catholic community into a house blown up in a war zone. Where do we stand? In what way will Our Blessed Lord “clean house” sort of speak. He will act, and it will be justified! You cannot build a house on sand, and expect it to withstand the “storms” of time. I will stand on the very words out of Jesus’ Mouth, “...and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it”. By those very words, these predators have no future. They are certainly doomed by their corruption. By God, like many who opposed His Church. His justice is powerful and righteous. And I will stand on the Great God. The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Protect us O God,against these “unholy”. They are liars, exactly like the one who started this mess long ago. And Jesus said ” ... I saw them fall from Heaven”. He will cleanse His House as necessary, and it will continue to flourish as it once did!

---

**JohnPerth** says:

August 26, 2018 at 8:48 pm

“Another James” – that looks like an exception that proves the rule. One man, exposed early, dealt with permanently. I stand by my judgement that the flood of homosexuality is a Vernacular-rite phenomenon.

I’m SSPX and it’s happened within that organisation too, but it was dealt with firmly and it isn’t common, indeed it has hardly happened at all. Entirely different from the Novus Ordo environment. The other massive difference is that in the Vernacular Rite milieu celibacy amongst heterosexual priests is a scandal of the first water. We don’t hear about it because it doesn’t offend modern sensibilities, consenting adults and all that. Totally different from before V2, and from trad clergy. We’re all sinners, but our religion makes sinners into saints over time, as it always has, whereas the Vernacular Rite mess doesn’t. Indeed, if you examine some of the seminaries they appear to be factories for making saints into sinners.

---

**Sid\_finster** says:

August 26, 2018 at 9:04 pm

What good is a Pope with absolute authority and universal jurisdiction?

The Iron Law of Oligarchy and The Iron Law of Institutions. The Iron Laws, Rod, The Iron Laws! They apply to everything, everywhere, all the time.

Even if a Pope, any Pope, were to attack the problem with the best of will and the energy to focus on nothing else, he’d find that if the Catholic bureaucracy doesn’t want to go along, there is nothing he can do, even if that Pope had all the power of Caligula in a funny hat.

Unless that Pope can be everywhere, all the time, or had people who could be there for him, that Pope would find himself frustrated, unable to tell truth from falsehood, unsure whom to really trust, trapped in the middle of a thousand vendettas, blackmails, lawsuits and counter-accusations (in and out of the press), dealing with open and covert revolts. All of this cheered on and actively aided by hostiles, not all of whom are named “Cosimano”.

The Vatican would even be out of money as dioceses would delay or openly refuse to forward needed funds. (Think the Pope is a signatory on every diocesan checking account?) Sure, the Vatican could sue, but even assuming it would win, in the meantime the diocese can stall, clean out accounts, leak “deep cover” stories to friendly

journalists, insist that they and not the Pope are the real reformers, etc. And lawyers cost money and other bills gotta be paid.

And that's just the (desperately needed) process of reform saying nothing of anything else that the Catholic Church does.

---

**Lamm2** says:

August 26, 2018 at 9:31 pm

@Edrick – “Small quibble – if they're neolithic, then they're not Celtic in origin. The Celts didn't get to Ireland until the Iron Age. Maybe the Celts adopted them.”

Good catch. Thanks. I appreciate the correction. Darn Irish Times report – who'd a think they would have missed that error?

---

**Roger Chylla** says:

August 26, 2018 at 10:01 pm

I really don't want to hear about this civil war nonsense. There is only one response that a faithful Catholic should have to these charges. They should have a hunger for the truth and nothing but the truth. We should not be celebrating or fighting for our factions but be veracious critical journalists right now looking to see whose testimony stands up to verification and corroboration. The truth will set us free and nothing else will.

---

**Ted** says:

August 26, 2018 at 10:39 pm

Kat : oh, fundraising, not so much. Off course if Uncle Ted was just a schmuck who liked boys he wouldn't have gotten half so far. But what enamored Francis was his gay “friendliness”. Depend on it.

---

**Verne Rosenberger** says:

August 26, 2018 at 11:40 pm

Lord, help Carlo Vigano who so boldly and truthfully exposed the hypocrisy of the Pharisaical Pope and “church” that he sounds much like our Lord Jesus denouncing the “church” of his day. Woe to you false leaders and blind leaders of the blind. Turn to



Psalm 119 and examine your hearts in the light of God's perfect law. Only a heart truly born again and clothed in the righteousness of Christ can walk in the law of the Lord. Love the God of law and righteousness. Every day worship and repent and ask for the holiness that comes from God

Verne

---

**Steve Gibson** says:

August 27, 2018 at 12:30 am

Someone commented on a Facebook page for Andrea Mitchell, in a post about this story. They claim that Vignano shut down an abuse investigation in Minneapolis, as nuncio.

The most recent story in your tag for Minneapolis describes this incident.

<https://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher-tags/minneapolis/>

As someone not following this story closely, it's hard to see anyone I can trust.

---

**Dan Green** says:

August 27, 2018 at 9:42 am

My guess is nothing will come of this. The organization is too big with still lots of money and lots of influence. Point being for lack of a better word the Organization will embrace damage control.

---