

Drawing Aside the Purple Curtain

The Papal System Today: an Analysis of the News

The Vatican Says “No” to Blessing Same-Sex Unions ...But Didn’t Francis Say “Yes”?

Shaun Willcock

The Inquisition Says Rome Cannot Bless Sodomite Unions

This came as a huge surprise to the world.

In March 2021, in answer to the question, “does the Church have the power to give the blessing to unions of persons of the same sex?” the Vatican’s doctrinal office, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith – previously known as the Inquisition – replied: “Negative.”¹ It clarified that the Roman Catholic “Church” does not have the power to give liturgical blessings to homosexual unions, because God “cannot bless sin.” This was a formal response, not off the cuff.

Going further, it stated, “it is not licit to impart a blessing on relationships, or partnerships, even stable, that involve sexual activity outside of marriage (i.e. outside the indissoluble union of a man and a woman open in itself to the transmission of life), as is the case of the unions between persons of the same sex.”

It continued: “Furthermore, since blessings on persons are in relationship with the sacraments, the blessing of homosexual unions cannot be considered licit. This is because they would constitute a certain imitation or analogue of the nuptial blessing invoked on the man and woman united in the sacrament of Matrimony, while in fact ‘there are absolutely no grounds for considering homosexual unions to be in any way similar or even remotely analogous to God’s plan for marriage and family’.”²

The document stated that although homosexuals are to be treated with “respect and sensitivity”, blessing same-sex unions would “approve and encourage a choice and a way of life that cannot be recognised as objectively ordered to the revealed plans of God.” “[God] does not and cannot bless sin: he blesses sinful man, so that he may recognize that he is part of his plan of love and allow himself to be changed by him. He in fact ‘takes us as we are, but never leaves us as we are.’”

Reaction to the Inquisition’s Ruling

Not surprisingly, this latest ruling by the Inquisition has not gone down at all well with liberal and “progressive” Papists who support sodomite “marriage” – particularly in Germany. Over 200 professors of Popish theology in the German-speaking world signed a statement criticising the ruling. It described the Inquisition’s clarification as lacking “theological depth, hermeneutical understanding, and explanatory rigor.” “If scientific findings are ignored and not received, as is the case in the document, [Rome’s] Magisterium undermines its own authority.” “The text is characterised by a paternalistic gesture of superiority and discriminates against homosexual people and their life plans.”³

Some priests said on social media that they would continue to bless sodomite unions, and a number of Roman Catholic places of worship flew rainbow flags.

Rome's Official Position

For Rome to remain at all consistent with its own past teachings and declarations, there really was no other response that the Inquisition could make at this time. According to official Roman Catholic teaching, homosexuality is “intrinsically disordered.”

In 1975 the Inquisition issued a document entitled *Persona Humana*, which stated that no pastoral method can be employed which would give moral justification to these acts on the grounds that they would be consonant with the condition of such people. For according to the objective moral order, homosexual relations are acts which lack an essential and indispensable finality.

In 1986 the Inquisition sent a letter to Rome's bishops throughout the world which said: “increasing numbers of people today, even within the Church, are bringing enormous pressure to bear on the Church to accept the homosexual condition as though it were not disordered and to condone homosexual activity. Those within the Church who argue in this fashion often have close ties with those with similar views outside it. These latter groups are guided by a vision opposed to the truth about the human person, which is fully disclosed in the mystery of Christ. They reflect... a materialistic ideology which denies the transcendent nature of the human person as well as the supernatural vocation of every individual.”

In 1992 the Inquisition published another document in which, although it again reiterated that homosexuals, as humans, had the same rights as all persons, also categorically stated that “there are areas in which it is not unjust discrimination to take sexual orientation into account, for example, in the placement of children for adoption or foster care, in employment of teachers or athletic coaches, and in military recruitment.”

In 2003 the Inquisition stated that “the Church teaches that respect for homosexual persons cannot lead in any way to approval of homosexual behaviour or to legal recognition of homosexual unions. The common good requires that laws recognize, promote and protect marriage as the basis of the family, the primary unit of society.”⁴

In addition there were the statements of such a man as the pope, John Paul II – probably the most beloved pope of all time in the eyes of Roman Catholics. He condemned same-sex “marriage” as being a threat to the fabric of society, and said that Roman Catholic lawmakers had a moral duty to oppose it. He wrote: “Attacks on marriage and the family, from an ideological and legal aspect, are becoming stronger and more radical every day. Anyone who destroys this fundamental fabric causes a profound injury to society and provokes often irreparable damage.”⁵

But Didn't Francis Say Something Very Different? No, Actually...

Given that the quotations above reflect official Roman Catholic teaching, why did it come as such a huge surprise to so many around the world, both Roman Catholic and non-Roman Catholic?

One reason was because, within the ranks of liberal Roman Catholics the world over, the last few years have seen a huge push for acceptance of homosexuality and homosexual “marriages” by liberal Roman Catholics, who have become increasingly outspoken in demanding that Rome move towards acceptance of homosexuality, and that it bless homosexual unions. The chairman of the marriage and family commission of the German bishops' conference declared in 2019 that homosexuality is a “normal form” of human sexual identity. In December 2020 Romish bishop, Georg Bätzing, president of the German bishops' conference, called for changes to be made to the section on homosexuality in the official Catechism of the Roman Catholic institution.⁶

But probably the main reason this ruling generated such surprise was because of Francis' own remarks about sodomy and sodomite unions over the years of his pontificate, which have been widely reported worldwide. In 2019 he said: “homosexual people have the right to be in a family... they are children of God.” Most notably, last year (2020) during an interview in a documentary on his life, Francis said he supported civil unions for homosexual couples. “Homosexual people have the right to be a part of the family. They're children of God and have a right to a family,” he said. “Nobody should be thrown out, or be made miserable because of it.” And: “What we have to create is a civil

union law. That way they are legally covered. I stood up for that.”⁷ His remarks caused a worldwide stir, horrifying traditionalist Roman Catholics and thrilling “progressive” ones. However, he did not actually endorse or say he supported *religious* unions (i.e. Roman Catholic sodomite marriages), only *civil* ones.

So, given his previous statements, did Francis approve this latest 2021 ruling? Yes, he did. The consent of the pope of Rome is a necessary part of any such *responsum* (response) as this. The document states that Francis “was informed and gave his assent to the publication of the above-mentioned Responsum ad dubium, with the annexed Explanatory Note.”

But how is this possible? Was Francis forced to backtrack from his previous statements? Was he being reined in by powerful cardinals within the Vatican?

To many it seemed like it; but no – his endorsement of this document was actually in accordance with his previous statements. To understand this, we need to consider some of the things Francis has said in the past. Much of the following information is found in my 2020 article, *The Jesuit Pope Endorses Same-Sex “Civil Unions”*. It is repeated here because it is very relevant to this latest Vatican document.

What Francis Has Said: Jesuitical Cunning with Words Open to More than One Meaning

Even before he became pope Francis *opposed* efforts to legalise sodomite “marriage”. Back in 2010 he said: “At stake is the identity and survival of the family: father, mother and children. At stake are the lives of many children who will be discriminated against in advance, and deprived of their human development given by a father and a mother and willed by God. At stake is the total rejection of God’s law engraved on our hearts.” And: “Let us not be naive: this is not simply a political struggle, but it is an attempt to destroy God’s plan. It is not just a bill (a mere instrument) but a ‘move’ of the father of lies who seeks to confuse and deceive the children of God.”⁸

But even so, almost from the beginning of his papacy it was very clear that Francis was going to be taking a decidedly “progressive” stance on various issues. He said categorically, “I have never been a right-winger.”⁹ And while rejecting sodomite “*marriages*”, he supported the idea of sodomite *civil unions*, as a kind of compromise. And he did so in such a way as to make it easier down the line, if it ever becomes necessary for the Vatican to change its position, to do so. *Or* even to provoke a schism within the Papal system! More about this possibility further on.

In 2013 Francis said: “Tell me: when God looks at a gay person, does he endorse the existence of this person with love, or reject and condemn this person?” John Allen of the National Catholic Reporter said that Francis was “doing no more than rephrasing the Catechism of the Catholic Church, which denounces homosexual acts but says homosexual persons are to be treated with ‘respect, compassion and sensitivity.’”¹⁰ Maybe so. But other statements were to follow, and they were not so innocent-sounding. That’s the trouble with Francis: as a Jesuit, with a Jesuit’s cunning, he is a master at speaking in such a way that his words are capable of more than one interpretation.

In July 2013 Francis told reporters that if “someone is gay and he searches for the Lord and has good will, who am I to judge?”¹¹ This time, the National Catholic Reporter’s Jimmy Akin rushed to Francis’ defence, stating that taking Francis’ statements together, “what emerges is a portrait of individuals who have same-sex attraction but who nevertheless accept the Lord and have goodwill, as opposed to working to advance a pro-homosexual ideology.”¹² Again, maybe. But maybe not. It could also be argued that what emerges is a portrait of a pope who gives deliberately ambiguous statements, open to more than one possible meaning.

In the documentary, *Francesco*, there is an account of Francis *encouraging* two Italian homosexuals to raise their three adopted children in their parish church. One of the men said that this was very beneficial to their children.¹³ Apparently one of the men, Andrea Rubera, went to a papal mass and gave Francis a letter explaining that he and his partner wanted to raise the children as Roman Catholics

but did not want to cause the children any trauma. A few days later Francis telephoned him, said he thought his letter was “beautiful” and urged the two sodomites to introduce their children to the parish.¹⁴ A very strange response indeed from the man who is supposed to uphold official Roman Catholic teaching, which on paper is opposed to sodomy and sodomite “marriages” – as well as official Roman Catholic teaching concerning *true* marriage! A man who said a few years before, “At stake is the identity and survival of the family: father, mother and children.... At stake is the total rejection of God’s law”.

At the same time, did he really endorse sodomite “marriage” with his remarks about civil unions? Many, not only Roman Catholics but Protestants and Evangelicals, claimed that he did. But this is incorrect. He was not speaking about sodomite “marriage”, but about civil unions. He certainly endorsed *those*.

A spokesman for the United Nations’ secretary-general, Antonio Guterres – a devout Roman Catholic – described Francis’ remarks as “a very positive move”.¹⁵ And James Martin, editor of the Jesuit publication *America*, praised Francis’ comments, saying they were “a major step forward in the Church’s support for LGBT people.” “The pope’s speaking positively about civil unions also sends a strong message to places where the Church has opposed such laws,” he said.¹⁶ “It shows his overall pastoral approach to LGBTQ people, including those who are Catholic, and sends a clear message to those bishops and Church leaders who have opposed such laws.”¹⁷ Who better to know what the Jesuit pope was really meaning than a fellow-Jesuit? This has been the Jesuits’ direction for a long time now¹⁸ – to gradually move the Roman Catholic institution away from its traditional doctrines until sodomy, and sodomite “marriages”, are fully accepted – even though *at this stage* all this is still contrary to official Popish teaching.

At this stage.

This however means that Francis *did* indirectly endorse homosexual acts, *contrary to official Roman Catholic teaching!* He spoke as a Jesuit, with Jesuitical subtlety and forked tongue. And this is precisely why his remarks were understood by liberals and traditionalists in diametrically opposite ways:

Traditionalist (also called conservative) Roman Catholics were outraged at Francis’ remarks and demanded clarification from the Vatican. The archbishop in hiding and a staunch opponent of Francis, Carlo Maria Viganò, declared that “the approval of civil unions is in clear contradiction of the Magisterial documents of the Church”, and, “The [Vatican] Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith has already unequivocally clarified that in no case may a Catholic approve of civil unions, because they constitute a legitimization of public concubinage and are only a step towards the legal recognition of so-called homosexual marriages.”¹⁹ A powerful cardinal, Raymond Burke, said that Francis had created “confusion and error among Catholic faithful.” He said, “[Francis’ remarks] cause wonderment and error regarding the Church’s teaching among people of good will, who sincerely wish to know what the Catholic Church teaches.” He assured Roman Catholics that the statements by Francis were not binding on Roman Catholics, and that neither Scripture, Rome’s tradition, nor the official catechism of the Roman Catholic institution support same-sex activity, let alone civil unions. Thomas Tobin, bishop of the diocese of Providence, Rhode Island, addressed his comments to his people, saying, “The pope’s statement clearly contradicts what has been the long-standing teaching of the Church about same-sex unions. The Church cannot support the acceptance of objectively immoral relationships.... the legalization of [homosexual] civil unions, which seek to simulate holy matrimony, is not admissible.”²⁰

It is surely obvious that a man as intelligent and cunning as Francis *well knew* that his remarks would be understood by millions to be endorsing sodomy.

Adding to the uncertainty, in the wake of the reactions to Francis’ remarks in *Francesco*, for many days the Vatican obstinately refused to respond to the controversy. No official statement was issued to

set the record straight. Just...silence. The supposed “misunderstanding” of Francis’ words was not corrected. Which indicates that they were *not*, in fact, misunderstood at all.

Finally, days after the controversy erupted, the Vatican broke its silence and dispatched its powerful secretary of state, the cardinal Pietro Parolin, to “clarify”. As expected, he said that Francis’ remarks did not pertain to Roman Catholic doctrine regarding marriage as a union between one man and one woman, but to provisions of civil law. And Franco Coppolo, an archbishop and apostolic nuncio, posted the following on Facebook: “Some statements, contained in the documentary ‘Francesco’ by screenwriter Evgeny Afineevsky, have provoked, in recent days, various reactions and interpretations. Therefore, some helpful points are offered, with the desire to present an adequate understanding of the Holy Father’s words.” He stated that the content of his post was provided by the Vatican Secretariat of State to apostolic nunciatures, which they were to share with bishops. According to this post, Francis had affirmed that “it is an incongruity to speak of homosexual marriage”, but that he defended same-sex civil unions. “The Holy Father had expressed himself thus during an interview in 2014: ‘Marriage is between a man and a woman. The secular States want to justify civil unions to regulate various situations of co-existence, moved by the demand to regulate economic aspects between people, such as ensuring health care. These are co-existence pacts of a different nature’.... Therefore it is evident that Pope Francis has referred to certain state provisions, certainly not to the doctrine of the Church, re-affirmed numerous times over the years.”²¹

But *Why* Does Francis Say the Things He Does?

The question remains: *why* does Francis keep saying such things? We must discern the sinister and diabolically subtle method Francis the Jesuit is using when it comes to this issue.

Same-sex civil unions are merely a legislative and cultural stepping stone to eventual acceptance of same-sex “marriage”. They are a tacit approval of such unions, and thus of gross immorality. This is why LGBT activists immediately began to use Francis’ words to claim his support for their cause, and to push for more and more “rights” and privileges. “Bergoglio’s words have already been received by the gay lobby worldwide as an authoritative support for their claims.”²² And here’s the thing: *Francis knew they would be.*

So what is he doing?

He is gradually softening up the “Church” of Rome on the subject of sodomy. But with typical Jesuit subtlety he does not come out and forcefully contradict official Roman Catholic doctrine on the subject; he would take too great a risk if he did that. He simply nudges the Roman Catholic institution in that predetermined direction, little by little. The *end goal* is the complete change of Romish doctrine from officially condemning homosexuality to officially endorsing it, if this becomes necessary. He knows it will take time, patience and subtlety, but he is chipping away, little by little, at traditional Romish doctrine on this point. He makes statements which may be interpreted in more than one way. Liberal Roman Catholics immediately take his words to mean that he supports and endorses sodomy and sodomite “marriage” – and Francis does not contradict them. But at the same time orthodox Roman Catholics are either scandalised, or they do their level best to fit his words into official Roman Catholic doctrine on the matter, which is as difficult as trying to fit a square block into a round hole. They claim that “what the pope really meant was...” Why do they do this? Well, this is what they *want* their pope to have meant. But then he makes another statement – and another. Each one seems just a little more liberal, a little less traditional, a little less orthodox; a little less *Roman Catholic*. But many traditionalist Romanists still keep hoping against hope that he was taken out of context, or that he was misquoted, or that he meant something else. After all, he is the pope of Rome, the defender of the Roman Catholic faith! He couldn’t possibly have meant what it sounded like he meant...could he?

Viganò was absolutely correct when he wrote: “After all, experience teaches us that when Bergoglio says something, he does it with a very precise purpose: to make others interpret his words in the broadest possible sense. The front pages of newspapers all over the world are announcing today [after

the documentary was released]: ‘The Pope Approves Gay Marriage’ – even if technically this is not what he said. But this was exactly the result that he and the Vatican gay lobby wanted. Then the Vatican Press Office will perhaps say that what Bergoglio said was misunderstood, that this was an old interview, and that the Church reaffirms its condemnation of homosexuality as intrinsically disordered. *But the damage has been done*, and even any steps backwards from the scandal that has been stirred up will ultimately be a step forward in the direction of mainstream thought and what is politically correct. Let us not forget the nefarious results of his famous utterance in 2013 – ‘Who am I to judge?’ – which earned him a place on the cover of *The Advocate* along with the title ‘Man of the Year’” (italics added).²³

That there is a “gay lobby” in the Vatican – often referred to as the “lavender mafia” – is a reality, as I have shown elsewhere.²⁴ Viganò was again 100% correct when he wrote: “there are cardinals, bishops, monsignors, priests, and other clerics who belong to the so-called ‘lavender mafia.’ Some of these have been investigated and condemned for very grave crimes, almost always linked to homosexual environments. How can we think that a clique of homosexuals in the command post does not have every interest in pushing Bergoglio to defend a vice that they share and practice?”²⁵

Yes, Francis knew what he was doing. He knew how the media would report his words in the documentary. He knew that even when the Vatican backtracked a little from what he had said, another little step would have been taken in the direction of the world’s ideology – *precisely as desired* by Francis and the Jesuits.

But there is something else which Francis appears to be seeking to achieve by statements such as these: to actually *provoke a schism* within the worldwide Roman Catholic institution.

Many would consider this very far-fetched. But it is a real possibility, which has become increasingly clear to many orthodox Romanists as the Francis pontificate has unfolded. One of these is the archbishop in hiding, Carlo Maria Viganò. Although he is tragically blind to Gospel truth, devoted to Roman Catholic teaching and practice, he has discerned much concerning the forces at work in Rome and in the world today. I have written much about this man, and the reader is referred to those articles so that I do not have to repeat myself here.²⁶ But I will quote at some length from his own statement after the documentary came out:

“But pay careful attention: these words [of Francis] simply constitute the umpteenth provocation by which the ‘ultra-progressive’ part of the [Roman Catholic] Hierarchy wants to artfully provoke a schism, as it has already tried to do with the Post-Synodal Exhortation *Amoris Laetitia*, the modification of doctrine on the death penalty, the Pan-Amazon Synod and the filthy Pachamama, and the Abu Dhabi Declaration which has now been reaffirmed and aggravated by the Encyclical *Fratelli Tutti*.

“It appears that Bergoglio is impudently trying to ‘raise the stakes’ in a crescendo of heretical affirmations, in such a way that it will force the healthy part of the Church – which includes bishops, clergy, and faithful – to accuse him of heresy, in order to declare that healthy part of the Church schismatic and ‘the enemy of the Pope’ [remember that those who, for him, constitute “the healthy part of the Church” are traditionalist Roman Catholics – who are in truth just as lost in false religion as liberal Roman Catholics].

“Jorge Mario Bergoglio is trying to force some Cardinals and Bishops to separate themselves from communion with him, obtaining as a result not his own deposition for heresy but rather the expulsion of Catholics who want to remain faithful to the perennial Magisterium of the Church. This trap would have the purpose – in the presumed intentions of Bergoglio and his ‘magic circle’ – of consolidating his own power within a church that would only nominally be ‘Catholic’ but in reality would be heretical and schismatic.”²⁷

“If canonically it is unthinkable to excommunicate a Catholic for the mere fact that he wishes to remain so, politically and strategically this abuse would allow Bergoglio to expel his adversaries from the Church, consolidating his own power. And I repeat: we are not talking about a legitimate operation, but of an abuse that, despite being an abuse, no one would be able to prevent, since ‘the

First See is judged by none' – *prima Sedes a nemine judicatur.*"²⁸

Is this at all plausible? Yes, it is, as I have written about before.²⁹ Rome always seeks to identify with the world – and the world has moved on from the moral standpoint which Rome once proclaimed. The world has embraced abortion, sodomy, radical environmentalism, illegal immigration, and so much more; and if Rome hopes to be relevant in the world of today, it believes it has to bring itself into line with the world. This is what it has always done in the past.

Now there are really only three ways to accomplish this. The first is by gradually changing its own doctrines to align itself with the world's thinking. And Viganò's analysis notwithstanding, I believe *this* would be its much-preferred method of proceeding: no schism; no split; no need to cast any Roman Catholics out; but to gradually get them to go along with the new papal direction. And so Francis, the Jesuits, and other radical "progressives" within the hierarchy who now rule the roost, keep on subtly pushing the boundaries; moving the goalposts just a little bit more to the left, inch by inch; and even attempting to convince Roman Catholics that such changes are not contrary to official doctrine, and should be enthusiastically embraced by all Romanists everywhere.

If Francis and the Vatican succeed in this, the vast Roman Catholic institution would remain united, which would be the best possible result as far as they are concerned.

However, the second means of accomplishing the objective of aligning Rome with the world of today is that if things *do not* go as planned, and orthodox Roman Catholics refuse to accept this new papal direction, they will break away from Rome and form a new "church", leaving liberal/progressive/Communist Roman Catholic leaders in total and absolute control of the Vatican.

Or there is a third means of accomplishing the objective of aligning Rome with the world of today: that if things *do not* go as planned, and orthodox Roman Catholics refuse to accept this new papal direction and *begin to forcefully fight back* against the Jesuit-instigated plan, even accusing Francis of heresy, Francis will then declare all traditionalists "the enemies of the pope", schismatics, so that they can be expelled from the "church".

The fact is that in the modern world the Roman Catholic religio-political machine is going to lose relevance and clout on the international scene unless it embraces the ideologies of the world today. This is what it has been doing since the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s; but under the Jesuit pope Francis it has accelerated as never before. He embraces everything embraced by the New World Order internationalists: Jesuits, Freemasons, Communists, etc., etc. Not surprisingly, since the Jesuits have always been behind these. He is the darling of powerful people and organisations who support the New World Order. For he is working alongside them for precisely the same goals.

Rome's Hypocrisy While Officially Condemning Homosexuality

We must never lose sight of the fact that regardless of how this latest ruling from the Inquisition sounds good and doubtless thrills the hearts of conservatives, both Romanists and others (to the disgrace of all such "Protestants"), Rome has always turned a blind eye to the sodomy which is in fact *rampant* throughout its priesthood. The Papal system has been filled with those who commit this vile abomination for many centuries, even though its *official* position has been to condemn it. It has piously spoken up in favour of true marriage and condemned sodomy, even while countless numbers of its priests and monks have been sodomites.

They are such hypocrites. This was shown by an amazing statement from rock star Elton John. John, a sodomite himself, supposedly "married" to another man, and who once said he only drew the line at goats (i.e. bestiality) when it came to sexual matters, criticised the Vatican's latest ruling in a post on Twitter. He said: "How can the Vatican refuse to bless gay marriages because they 'are sin', yet happily make a profit from investing millions in 'Rocketman' – a film which celebrates my finding happiness from my marriage to David?? #hypocrisy."³⁰

What was he referring to? Well, it turns out that in December 2019 the Centurion Global Fund made headlines for its use of Vatican assets under its management to invest in Hollywood films, *including*

the Elton John biopic, “Rocketman”! According to the Italian newspaper, *Corriere della Serra*, the Centurion Global Fund raised approximately 70 million euros in cash, and that the Vatican’s Secretariat of State was the source of at least two-thirds of the fund’s assets. The investment by the Vatican was reported to include funds from what Rome calls its “Peter’s Pence” collection, which is supposedly for supporting charitable works and the work of the Vatican Curia.³¹

It is an evil man calling out the evil of the religious institution known as the “Church” of Rome, but in this case John is correct. The Vatican’s hypocrisy is revealed for all to see. It will condemn sodomy, yet profit from sodomy. But in truth there is nothing new in this. The Vatican has condemned contraceptives, but it has also invested in contraceptive factories. It has condemned war, but has invested in arms manufacturing companies.³² And it has a complex but decades-old relationship with Hollywood, with its own Jesuits deeply implicated in the making of some of the most vile and immoral movies ever.³³

So we should not be surprised at Elton John’s revelation. But we should be disgusted.

Is this the Vatican’s Final Word on the Subject?

There are those who now believe the Vatican has nailed its colours to the mast and this is the final word on the subject. One such man was Bill Donohue, president of the Catholic League in the United States. “This [decision] finishes it,” he said. “There’s nothing left to discuss. It’s non-negotiable. The Vatican left nothing on the table with these people pushing this agenda. It made it very clear that the Church can bless homosexuals as individuals, but it will never ever bless homosexual unions, never mind gay marriage.”³⁴

As I have sought to show above, this is by no means certain. Rome is as slippery as an eel, as subtle as a serpent, and considering the Jesuit vice-grip on the Vatican ever since the accession of Francis to the papal chair, there is no way this latest document was released without Jesuit approval. “Homosexual marriage is unacceptable, homosexual civil unions are fine”. This is the message. *For now*. Perhaps the Vatican of Francis realised that, as liberal and “progressive” as many Roman Catholics have become, there are not yet enough of them to have their way. They must backtrack a little, tread more cautiously, so as not to offend the millions of traditionalist Roman Catholics, who are still in the majority. Whatever the reasoning may be, it is just a temporary setback, a pause in their forward march. But there is much more going on behind the scenes than the average Roman Catholic, or man in the street, has any conception of.

April 2021

Shaun Willcock is a minister, author and researcher. He runs Bible Based Ministries. For other articles (which may be downloaded and printed), as well as details about his books, audio messages, pamphlets, etc., please visit the Bible Based Ministries website; or write to the address below. If you would like to be on Bible Based Ministries’ email list, to receive all future articles, please send your details.

Bible Based Ministries

info@biblebasedministries.co.uk
www.biblebasedministries.co.uk

This article may be copied for free distribution if it is copied in full

ENDNOTES:

1. “Vatican’s doctrinal office: Catholic Church cannot give blessings to same-sex unions.” *Catholic News Agency*, March 15, 2021. www.catholicnewsagency.com.
2. “Full text: Vatican doctrinal office’s response to a question on the blessing of same-sex unions.” *Catholic News Agency*, March 15, 2021. www.catholicnewsagency.com.
3. “German-speaking theology professors criticize Vatican ‘no’ to same-sex blessings.” *Catholic News Agency*, March 22, 2021. www.catholicnewsagency.com.
4. “Yes, Pope Francis was involved in the CDF’s document on same-sex blessings.” *Catholic News Agency*, March 25, 2021. www.catholicnewsagency.com.
5. “God ‘cannot bless sin ‘: Pope says gay marriages deserve ‘respect’ only.” *WND*, March 15, 2021. www.wnd.com.
6. “Vatican’s doctrinal office: Catholic Church cannot give blessings to same-sex unions.”
7. “Pope Francis Calls for Civil Union Law for Same-Sex Couples, in Shift from Vatican Stance.” *Catholic News Agency*, October 21, 2020. www.catholicnewsagency.com.
8. “Redemption”. *The Moynihan Letters*, 22 October 2020. MoynihanReport@gmail.com, Urbi et Orbi Communications, New Hope, Kentucky, USA.
- 9.. “Pope Francis Endorses Same-Sex Civil Unions.” *WND*, October 21, 2020. www.wnd.com.
- 10.. “Pope Francis Endorses Same-Sex Civil Unions.”
- 11.. “Pope Francis Endorses Same-Sex Civil Unions.”
- 12.. “Pope Francis Endorses Same-Sex Civil Unions.”
- 13.. “Pope Francis Calls for Civil Union Law for Same-Sex Couples, in Shift from Vatican Stance.”
- 14.. “Pope Says Same-Sex Couples Should be Covered by Civil Union Laws.” *Daily Maverick*, 22 October 2020. www.dailymaverick.co.za.
- 15.. “Pope Says Same-Sex Couples Should be Covered by Civil Union Laws.”
- 16.. “Pope Francis Endorses Same-Sex Civil Unions.”
- 17.. “Pope Says Same-Sex Couples Should be Covered by Civil Union Laws.”
- 18.. Shaun Willcock, *The Jesuits, Their Pope, and the Plan to Fundamentally Change the Roman Catholic Institution*. Bible Based Ministries, 2020. Available as a free download from the Bible Based Ministries website.
- 19.. “Viganò: The Pope and the Gay Lobby in the Vatican, Intentional Ambiguity.” Quoted in “The Plan,” *The Moynihan Letters*, 23 October 2020. MoynihanReport@gmail.com, Urbi et Orbi Communications, New Hope, Kentucky, USA.
- 20.. “Catholic Leaders Issue Sharp Warning on Pope After He Embraces Gay Unions.” *The Western Journal*, October 24, 2020; reprinted by *WND*, www.wnd.com.
- 21.. “Vatican Secretariat of State Provides Context of Pope Francis Civil Union Remark.” *Catholic News Agency*, November 1, 2020. www.catholicnewsagency.com.
- 22.. “Viganò: The Pope and the Gay Lobby in the Vatican, Intentional Ambiguity.”
- 23.. “Viganò: The Pope and the Gay Lobby in the Vatican, Intentional Ambiguity.”
- 24.. Shaun Willcock, *Sodom on the Seven Hills*. Bible Based Ministries, 2019.
- 25.. “Viganò: The Pope and the Gay Lobby in the Vatican, Intentional Ambiguity.”
- 26.. See the following articles by Shaun Willcock, all available as free downloads on the website: 1) *Top-Ranking Vatican Insider Accuses Francis I of a Cover-Up*; 2) *Vindicated: Vatican Insider who Accused Francis I of a Cover-Up*; 3) *An Archbishop in Hiding and a Pope Denying Everything*.
- 27.. “Archbishop Viganò’s Remarks on the New Film in Which Pope Francis Endorses Homosexual Civil Unions.” *LifeSiteNews*, October 21, 2020. Quoted in “Redemption”, *The Moynihan Letters*, 22 October 2020.
- 28.. “Viganò: The Pope and the Gay Lobby in the Vatican, Intentional Ambiguity.”
- 29.. Shaun Willcock, *The Jesuits, Their Pope, and the Plan to Fundamentally Change the Roman Catholic Institution*.
30. “Elton John tweets about Vatican statement on same-sex unions.” *Catholic News Agency*, March 15, 2021. www.catholicnewsagency.com.

-
31. "Elton John tweets about Vatican statement on same-sex unions."
 32. Avro Manhattan, *The Vatican Billions*. Chick Publications, Chino, California, 1983.
 33. Shaun Willcock, *Jesuit Hollywood*. Bible Based Ministries, 2015. Available from our website.
 34. "Vatican says Catholic Church can't bless same-sex marriage: God 'cannot bless sin.'" *The Christian Post*, March 18, 2021. www.christianpost.com.