

“MY ALWAYS IS ALSO FOREVER”. This sentence can only be applied to Benedict XVI. The missing “piece”! New exclusive interview with Estefanía Acosta.



By Katejon

Translation of FromRome.info

Introduction

Hard to describe what comes next, as it is not, as we are not competent writers or journalists, to make an orderly and attractive introduction. However, this is likely not the case. So let's begin by suggesting to readers who have not already done so, to help them understand this interview, that they can read beforehand our response to Father Lodi (link note 6).

This interview, and this is not a rhetorical or marketing figure, should be made available to “all people of good will”. Everybody! Laity and clergy. In the first place as an act of charity, which can

only be carried out in the truth, as H.H. Benedict XVI in *Caritas in Veritate*. And what is it about? It is explained by its predecessor, H.H. John Paul II: “The Roman Pontiff, in fact, has the ‘sacra potestas’ to teach the truth of the Gospel, administer the sacraments and pastorally govern the Church in the name and with the authority of Christ, but this power does not include any power over **natural or positive divine law**” (Address to the Tribunal of the Roman Rota, January 21, 2000). This is what it is all about: **divine right**.

As we read about the author in her book: “Estefania Acosta Ochoa (1989) is a native of Medellín, Colombia. Magister in Law from the University of Medellín (with honorable mention in her master's thesis in constitutional law), she was for years an official of the State Judicial Power and university professor, working in the areas of civil and commercial law”. This “simple and unknown young provincial lawyer from the periphery of Colombia, almost, therefore, a ‘voice of the one who cries out in the desert’ (Mt 3, 3), as read in the Preface of that one, he lets go-again-the verb, responding *sin tapujos* to an exclusive series of questions formulated by **Katejon**, ranging from the (vehement) reaffirmation of the nullity of the resignation of Benedict VI and the election of Jorge Mario Bergoglio to the canonical situation of those who stubbornly refuse to recognize the invalidity of both, through information on the recent visit to his country of an “apostle” of the Benedictine pontificate, the Italian priest Alessandro Minutella, until the expected response to the renowned Brazilian priest Luiz Carlos Lodi da Cruz.

But there is something unpublished, not even mentioned in his book, the fruit of arduous and mature reflection. It is the definitive answer to a case that until now had caused Benedict XVI's assertion as the only and legitimate Pope to fall into discredit, or not to be received with the seriousness and respect required. The “piece” that was missing in the legal “puzzle” surrounding the *quaestio Benedictus XVI*. What cannot leave those who are doing this reading indifferent.

In recent years we have seen how many good members of the Church, when trying to defend their values and traditions¹, face a growing contradiction: that of having to, against all odds, defend a pontificate that objectively destroys these same values and traditions, impelled, like us, by obedience or minimally the complacent acquiescence of intelligence to a Supreme Pontiff (cf. canon 752 of the CDC). What for the majority already tired of so many *líos*, ends up leaving to Heaven the task of getting rid (and getting rid of) of so many papal entanglements, neglecting and allowing the institution of the Papacy to vanish - playing the enemy's game. Elementary, those who see in *Francis* a legitimate Pope.

God speaks, as we know, through the small and simple. Let us hear this (almost) “voice of the one who cries out in the desert”, before it is also beheaded; or that we are.

†

Katejon: Greetings lawyer Acosta. Again, and in advance we are grateful for granting us this little “update interview”. We want you to know that it is always gratifying to have you with us and on the same side in the enormous struggle for God, the Church and the Papacy. On behalf of all our readers, we welcome you!

¹ Cf. **Dezinger Bergoglio** (<<https://en-denzingerbergoglio.com/>>).

Estefania Acosta: Greetings to Katejon and to all her readers. For my part, I am also grateful to have you in this decisive fight, and especially, that there are still mass media that, at least for the moment (until God allows it), continue to open gaps of light in the midst of the darkness of deception and lies that flood the world today more than ever.

K: As a first point, we would like you to take stock of these 9 months of publication of your book *Benedict XVI: Pope “emeritus”*? (From its Brazilian edition, the first to be launched, in January of this year, by Katejon, and for which we reiterate our gratitude on behalf of the entire Portuguese-speaking public), canon law study on the question of the resignation of Pope Benedict XVI and the subsequent election of Cardinal Jorge Bergoglio, in 2013. How has it been the reception? Are you satisfied with the results obtained so far?

EA: The book, in addition to the original in Spanish and its Portuguese edition, has been published in English and recently in Italian.

Regarding its dissemination, the results have been truly impressive: in total (that is, considering all the versions mentioned), sales have spread, through Amazon, to no less than ten countries, in the continents of America, Europe and Asia, surpassing the 1,000 copies mark, and the book has been highlighted by the media adequately, besides Colombia, his country of origin, in Spain, Italy, France, Germany, the United States and, of course, by Katejon in Brazil. I think these are “astounding” results due to the fact that she is mainly an unknown writer and devoid of what could be called “accreditation titles” in the matter of canon law, and also because she did not have the support of a publisher or used a marketing campaign.

However, it is also true that the book has been ignored, or more precisely silenced, in various areas. Thus, in the lay sphere, it is striking how some media that in the past have opened space for debate on the “papal question”, establishing dialogues with recognized laity and clergy of various positions on the matter, they have not (as far as I know) done the more minimal allusion to the work, as if it did not represent any contribution to the debate, despite the fact that, both in the book and in related documents subsequent to this one, answers and counterarguments are offered - not yet satisfactorily refuted - to the questions and the arguments raised in these dialogues.

In the clerical sphere, taking into account that the book was published eight years after the “election” of who calls himself “Pope *Francis*”, the silence of the high hierarchies is hardly logical: both the cardinals, who in their majority, because they have been appointed by an anti-Pope (*Francis*), they do not truly bear such dignity, as those bishops who for the same reason have unlawfully received episcopal consecration, are sadly bound by so many earthly chains that their “natural” option (from the dynamics of the world) is none other than (pretending) to muzzle the truth about the current legitimate holder of the pontificate, His Holiness Benedict XVI.

Typically, if the motives underlying this scandalous silence had to be enumerated², I would point out these: cowardice / human respect - those who fear being ridiculed, censored, sanctioned, etc., - selfishness / “personal interests” - v.gr. those who keep any aspiration to the pontificate, which in turn could only be satisfied through the “disappearance” of Mgr. Bergoglio from Peter’s Chair

² In this regard, see: **O silêncio ensurdecador da mídia sobre a (não) renúncia de Bento XVI.** in: <<https://katejon.com.br/wordpress/?p=3483>>.

and the ignorance of the papal authority of H.H. Benedict XVI -; ignorance / error - I know, for example, the case of a priest who assumes, apparently sincerely, that publicly and openly commenting on the “papal question” constitutes a “lack of charity” vis-à-vis *Francis*; the pride - not a few will think that it is not worth reading an author who is not at her height of canonical / theological formation - and the evil - mainly, of the ecclesiastical masonry -.

There have also been a few who have attempted to publicly refute the book's central arguments. In principle, it could be assumed that the existence of these refutations constitutes an “advance” with respect to the silent / silencing position referred to, and certainly some type of “advance” would have to be recognized in this sense, however, those have been developed with such deplorable levels of intellectual honesty and argumentative rigor, which rather contribute to blocking the debate, leading it through vicious circles, to such an extent that we might wonder if one - or several - of the categories of motives mentioned above could not be applied to their authors.

To close the answer with positive reflections, I must register how, by “informal” means (through comments on blogs or YouTube channels), some lay people have stated that, after finding themselves in darkness / doubt / anguish / bewilderment regarding the “papal question” that we go through, have found in the book a source of certainty about the (legal) fact that it is H. H. Benedict XVI, and not *Francis*, the true Pope of the Church, and with this they have received understanding, consolation and strength in the face of the current apocalyptic scenario. I have also seen how, in an even more significant way, some priests have found in the book occasion and foundation to openly proclaim their adherence to Pope Benedict and to definitively break all ties with the false ecclesiastical hierarchy, and a few others, who had already taken that step, have used the work as a true workhorse to reinforce their position and spread the truth as much as possible. Finally, this book, thanks also to its publication in four languages, has been a “pretext for unity” among Catholics from different countries, and even continents, who have dared to publicly defend the Bride of Christ and the successor of Peter - especially among those who, due to their journey / recognition in the journalistic or literary field, their status as consecrated ministers, their constant publications in “informal” communication media, their studies in legal / linguistic / theological matters, etc., hold a certain media influence -. Of course, these networks in turn have allowed, not only that the ecclesial community is strengthened around The Truth and under the guidance and encouragement of reliable informative referents and authentic and faithful pastors, but also that the world, and in particularly the henchmen of the evil one, show that Christ and His Blessed Mother have an army awake and ready to fight.

K: We are aware that your study is already a bibliographic reference on university campuses and research centers on topics related to canon law and related issues. And that has even been and is being read by priests, bishops and even cardinals. It's true?

It is true. As far as university campuses are concerned, I can cite the *Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore*, whose library, as far as I could ascertain, contains the book in its English version. That the study has been and is being read by priests and bishops, I am certain; in the case of the cardinals, I would not state it categorically.

K: Any comments on these readings? Have you received any feedback from institutions, accredited persons, or clergy? Can you quote or comment on any?

EA: From those particular sources I have not yet received any direct communication.

K: You are constantly cited, for example, by the Italian journalist and writer Andrea Cionci, from whom we have translated some articles, and who, by mentioning you, as well as the jurist Antonio Sanchez Saenz, reinforces that the thesis in favor of invalidity both of the resignation of Benedict XVI as of the election of Bergoglio until now it has not received an adequate refutation on the part of any interested party, jurist, canonist, prelate or even the Vatican; which keeps this thesis standing.

EA: That's right. Speaking of the Vatican, the situation is unheard of, especially if one takes into account that, thanks in large part to the tireless work of A. Cionci, the debate has surely reached the "pontifical" rooms themselves (read, anti-papal). That Rome has never questioned us; that the Vatican has not exhorted, required or even sanctioned us; that in these more than eight years the senior hierarchies have not officially addressed the debate, summoning qualified people in the different fields of knowledge related to the question at hand; that some high prelates have referred only tangentially to the discussion, carefully refraining from addressing our study / our names; and above all, that H.H. Benedict XVI ... all this is a clear sign that in the Vatican "mediatic stratagems" and the obsessive and scary support for power prevail over zeal for the salvation of souls, the search for truth and authentic communion in the Church. It is, without a doubt, what we jurists would call a "positive silence", according to the well-known saying, recently cited even by Professor Sanchez; *silence is consent*³.

K: In this sense, how do you see the insistence of the majority, especially of those who have a vincible ignorance, in denying the fact of the invalidity of the resignation, or at least its possibility, or in neglecting its confrontation with seriousness, depth and honesty?

EA: It seems to me that those who, perceiving that the Papacy is currently going through an objectively anomalous situation, deliberately refrain from diving to the bottom of the canonical question (which may well be explained in layman's terms, and has been in fact already, sufficiently and in different languages), it is because they do not want to see confirmed the hypothesis that - for whatever reason- is *a priori* plausible but at the same time "problematic" (that is, that it is Benedict XVI and not Francis the true Pope of the Church). That is to say, in my view, in these cases it is a matter of people simply not wanting - for some of the motives enunciated in the second answer of this interview - to find technically proven what they already know uselessly (either by indirect means, by common sense or by sense of faith, by *the signs of the times*, etc.). Some find themselves in that situation due to undue "scruples", and even intimidation from their faith communities, priests or superiors who "order" them, based on community statutes or community guidelines, or what would practically be warnings of eternal damnation, to stay out of the debate and, of course, accept *Francis*, and not Benedict XVI, as the current Vicar of Christ. To them in particular I say that such "scruples" and "orders" are absurd and worthless before God. It is the duty of every Christian to know the things necessary for salvation, and the identification of the Supreme Pontiff, presupposed for submission to him and for ecclesial communion, is one of those things. No one can validly prohibit the fulfillment of that duty, and such prohibitions are in no way binding on conscience. God, who is Truth itself, is offended, not

³ See: Ratzinger "é o verdadeiro papa: depois de Bergoglio, serão todos antipapas". O parecer do jurista. In <<https://katejon.com.br/wordpress/?p=3354#.YToNM51KiZo>>.

by those who seek the truth with all their hearts, but by those who despise or postpone it based on personal interests. There is then no excuse to evade the papal question; whoever does so, know that he places himself at enmity with God.

K: Allow me, as an example, a breakdown of the previous question. As it became known, a renowned Brazilian priest recently wrote an article⁴, later expanded on video⁵, about his book, receiving a response from the Portuguese-language translator⁶, with a comment, on that blog, by our French reader, worthy of mention, of which we highlight this significant extract: “[...] the Catholic Church is full of priests who think they are doing the right thing, defending with stupid arguments the legitimacy of Jorge Bergoglio. In France perhaps even more than in Brazil. spirits of fear and wrong obedience that unintentionally transform good shepherds into servants of the False Prophet.” Could you say something about both?

EA: In relation to the article / video of the priest, in the first place those arguments (which they pretend to be) of a technical nature should be separated from the general subjective appreciations about what, according to him, the purposes and effects of our book would be. The former could be reconstructed as follows: (i) the book rests on “frills and subtleties” relative to the supposed distinction between the words *munus* and *ministerium*, a difference that -said the Father- “I have never seen ... I have always used a word for another “; (ii) according to the book Benedict would have incurred a “substantial error” (canon 188 of the CDC) in his *Declaratio* of “resignation”, linked to the use of those words, when really “*to what everything indicates, the intention of the Holy Father, by using 'ministry' instead of 'munus', it was purely stylistic* “; (iii) the CDC does not strictly require a sacramental formula for the validity of the papal resignation: it is enough that it is a clear, public and unequivocal announcement; (iv) Benedict XVI, in the very announcement of his “resignation” and afterwards, has reiterated that he acted with complete freedom and that speculations about the invalidity of the act are “absurd”, so that, if the thesis of the book were true and furthermore the “resignation” would have been determined by “grave fear” (ibid.), Benedict would be a liar and a villain: he would have been an accomplice in the convocation of a “conclave for the election of the new” Supreme Pontiff “(exact words of the *Declaratio*) - which would really have been a council for the election of an anti-Pope - misleading the entire Church.

As for the subjective appreciations of the Father, there are essentially two: the book is an example of “logic at the service of psychology” - that is, an illogical response to the confusion that “has been producing the” pontificate “of *Francisco* -, and it also causes great damage to the Church.

The first group of arguments reproduces old and recurring fallacies that, thank God, have been completely disproved in a careful, detailed and systematic way, in the document entitled “**Adversus fallacies**” - A reply in defense of the book *Benedict XVI, “Emeritus Pope”?* - document that was precisely published by Katejon, both in its original in Spanish and in its translations into English and Portuguese⁷. Although I could limit myself on this occasion to a mere reference to that reply - whose reading in fact I highly recommend - I would like to establish a brief

⁴ Cf. <<https://www.providaanapolis.org.br/index.php/todos-os-artigos/item/706-francisco-nosso-papa>>.

⁵ Cf. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GiC0EcRXEzI&ab_channel=Pr%C3%B3-VidaAn%C3%A1polis>.

⁶ <<https://katejon.com.br/wordpress/?p=3415#.YTfHPZ1KiZo>>. Portuguese and Spanish versions.

⁷ <<https://katejon.com.br/wordpress/?p=2167#.YTkJoFVKjIU>>;

<<https://katejon.com.br/wordpress/?p=2175#.YTkJoFVKjIU>>;

<<https://katejon.com.br/wordpress/?p=2179#.YTkJoFVKjIU>>.

clarification: the Father in question simply did not understand, or pretends not to have understood, the central argument of our book. Indeed, I have **never** located the nullity of the *Declaratio* on the grounds of “substantial error” or “grave fear” referred to in canon 188 of the CDC - in fact, I have always and vehemently refuted the arguments that have been developed and continue to be developed along this line -; the book, on the other hand, places the cause of nullity / non-existence in the very object of the resignation - and it must be remembered that the object is a structural or defining element of every legal act - (canon 124 § 1 of the CDC).

This radical misinterpretation of the book explains the subsequent errors in the priest's discourse: that he qualifies as insubstantial “frill and subtlety” the objective, demonstrable and demonstrated difference in the canonical meaning of the terms *munus / ministerium*; that he shifts due attention to the objective meaning of words towards the “intention” of the user; that he alludes to “sacramental formulas” whose non-existence is expressly admitted in the book itself, and thus wants to avoid that the words *munus / ministerium* are not related to non-existent extrinsic requirements or solemnities of the act, but rather, constitute the “heart” itself (the object) of the *Declaratio*; in short, to overlook, precisely, that in no way can it be said that the *Declaratio* is “clear, public and unequivocal” in the sense of containing a resignation to the Petrine *munus* (ecclesiastical office / office). On the other hand, regarding the Father's reflections on what Benedict XVI declared, during and after his “resignation”, regarding the validity of the act, of the conditions of freedom in which it was issued and of the identification of the true Pope ... in this case these are not properly legal issues that merit a contextual reconstruction that precisely our priest omits, or refers only in a superficial / partial / mutilated way, and which, obviously being impossible and unnecessary to enter here, we refer then to our reply [**Adversus fallacies** - ndr] (and of course to the book, for those who have not yet read it) -.

Additionally, I would like to return to the following phrase of the Father, in order to clarify an aspect of the greatest relevance in this whole matter: “Our Pope is *Francisco* [affirms the priest]. There is nothing solid that makes us doubt it”. Obviously, the content of this sentence is false - there are a huge number of reasons and signs that show that the Pope is Benedict, and not *Francis* -. But what I would like to refer to here is the starting point that is implicitly assumed in the Father's proposition, and that in many cases has been used to silence from the outset any debate related to the papal question. Some, going to the presumption of validity of legal acts (canon 124 §2 of the CDC⁸), transfer us, without further ado, the burden of proof to those who recognize in Benedict the current vicar of Christ insofar as they require us to distort, beyond all reasonable doubt, the legitimacy of *Francisco*; and others go even further, to the point of wanting to “prohibit” us from meddling in such authentication, arguing that it would only take place in an official ecclesiastical setting, so that, -according to them-, while the nullity of the legal acts of “resignation” and “election” to the pontificate, in the cases of H.H. Benedict XVI and *Francis*, respectively, is not formally declared by the “competent ecclesiastical authority”, the validity of both must be accepted without question. In principle, these postures could be considered as a manifestation of respect for the official authority, for the different roles and competencies established within the Church. However, its falsehood is evidenced, not only thanks to history (cf. Saint Catherine of Siena, Saint Bernard of Clairvaux), but also to canon law itself. Note that

⁸ “The legal act duly carried out in terms of its external elements is presumed valid”.

the aforementioned canon expressly binds the presumption of validity of legal acts that do not even comply with their internal elements (structural, defining, constitutive, essential, etc.). Given, then, that the “object” of a legal act is found in this last category of elements and that in the supposed “act of resignation from the pontificate” carried out by Benedict XVI, the pontificate itself does not exist as an object, such an act is simply, “naturally”, non-existent, which is why a presumption of validity is not configured against it that must be disproved and, much less, an official declaration must be awaited so that the non-existence can be recognized by the Church. In this sense, it is not really up to us to “misrepresent” that the Pope is *Francis*, or to recognize him as such until a formal pronouncement is issued to the contrary: we have shown that the “resignation” of Benedict XVI is in fact non-existent, and this is sufficient.

Thus, given that the technical arguments put forward by the priest are ultimately fallacious, and the veracity of our book then remains in place, naturally his subjective appraisals also fall to the ground: our thesis is not about “psychology” but of the truth, and the truth can never cause harm to the Church.

Finally, in relation to the French reader's comment, I would add only that, indeed, positions such as those of the Father referred constitute an optimal service to the cause of the Antichrist, although the possible motivations can only be listed in an abstract way, leaving our omniscient God the judgment of each individual person.

K: Today we see a massive renewal of Catholic publications, especially focused on the doctrine, morals and customs of the Church. Wouldn't it be in everyone's best interest to promote *disputatio* -type debates on the current papal question, even if it were to put into practice so much generalized theory?

EA: I think you must do one thing without neglecting the other, because both are closely related. Let me explain: journalists / bloggers / youtubers / evangelizers, etc., who are dedicated to the papal question, should not neglect the doctrinal, moral and customs aspect, first of all because - and this is something that unfortunately we lose sight of with frequency - ecclesial communion under subjection to the Roman Pontiff is a necessary, but not sufficient, requirement for eternal salvation - as we know, this also demands full and unconditional adherence to the truths of faith (and even more so to the very Person of Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Eternal Word, the only Savior of the world), the frequent and fervent practice of the sacraments of, the sincere living of the commandments and the cultivation of prayer - and secondly because the fact that, for many, the recognition of *Francis* as anti-Pope was made possible from the observation that his behavior from the Chair of Peter has shown himself radically incompatible with what, juridically, theologically, ontologically, is, represents and guarantees a Pope - the stone on which ecclesial unity is built, in scrupulous and loving obedience to the Word of God -, evidence how linked are the pontifical authority and the deposit of which it is the main guardian⁹. And, on the other hand, it seems to me that those who engage in doctrinal, moral and customary matters, neglecting the papal

⁹ I reproduce here what I have registered in note 37 of the aforementioned document *Adversus fallacies...*: “Be very careful! Not that *Francis* is an antipope *because* he dedicated himself to destroying faith from the chair of Peter; on the contrary; That he had dedicated himself to destroying faith from the Chair of Peter, is only possible *because* he is an antipope. That is to say: that *Francis* be a destroyer of faith it is a sign, but not the reason, by which he can be recognized as antipope”. [nda]

question, foolishly pretend to do good by simultaneously serving God and demons. This affirmation would not even demand an explanation: how to spread the Word of God and at the same time recognize as the highest ecclesial authority the one who has served precisely as the father, not of unity and preservation, but of stumbling and destruction of that same Word (read, *Francisco*)?, how to serve God and at the same time overlook that to reach his beatific vision in Heaven, ecclesial communion is necessary, and this cannot occur without subjection to the (true) Roman Pontiff¹⁰, who today is none other than H.H. Benedict XVI?

K: We recently learned of the visit to Colombia of one of the first and most energetic defenders of the legitimacy of the pontificate of Benedict XVI, the R.P. Alessandro Minutella. That his visit was extended to Medellin and that there, among the commitments on his agenda, was to meet the author of “*Benedict XVI: Emeritus Pope?*” Could you talk about this meeting, your impressions and what deeds did you get from it?

EA: It was a providential event, and like all providential events, marked by great difficulties and, in the end, by immense fruits and satisfactions¹¹. It was a fairly quick visit: the meeting with the groups from each of the cities visited lasted a few hours, destined, first of all, to the celebration of Holy Mass (in Latin and in communion with H.H. Benedict XVI), and later, to a question-and-answer space. In my case, I had the opportunity to share the whole day with Father Minutella and his team here in Medellin: after the meeting, we spent a moment at the hotel where they stayed and then we visited an orphanage, and even, already at night, Father and I had the opportunity to record a short conversation that was disseminated through the Facebook page and the YouTube channel of *Radio Domina Nostra*¹².

The effects of this tour of Don Minutella were many and enormous: firstly, the increase of the bonds of unity between the different groups of the faithful in Colombia and between the Colombian and Italian peoples: secondly, the opportunity, generally scarce in the country, to live the Mass in Latin, and in communion with the true Pope - in fact, for many it was the first Mass in Latin of their lives ... an experience that moved them to tears -; thirdly, the visibility at the international level of the communities that aspire to be the Remnant Church; fourth, consolation and strengthening in The Truth, in the midst of daily doubts and trials; in fifth place; One of the Colombian priests who attended the meeting - who some years ago broke with the parish structure of the false church led by Mgr. Bergoglio - made the decision to commit himself even more strongly to the daily celebration of the Holy Mass in communion with Benedict XVI, thus benefiting more faithful and of course glorifying our God: sixthly, two concrete works of mercy that Father Minutella conceived and has been managing with the help even of the Italian people - one of them refers to the orphanage mentioned and the other, it seems to me, a project of formation of seminarians -; and finally: the release of Don Minutella's book, *Pedro, ¿dónde estás?* (Spanish version), which surely would have been, will also be disseminated among the priests of different parishes - I know that some of the faithful attending the meeting acquired several copies for this purpose -.

¹⁰ Cf. H.H. Bonifácio VIII, papal bull *Unam Sanctam*. [nda]

¹¹ That can be seen in this video:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4gSVGBnIkXY&ab_channel=RadioDominaNostra>.

¹² In: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pDdpL-B-mSU&ab_channel=Katejon>. In this video the author cites and explains the phrase-title of this post.

Also, in my case I have obviously remained in contact with Don Minutella and his team, and we are all available for any reciprocal collaboration that the Heaven may determine for the future.

It was undoubtedly, as the Father himself has understood it, a work by *La Madonna*.

K: One aspect of all the current controversy, also mentioned in the article / video of the aforementioned priest, resides in the - let's call them that - different categories of Catholics, whose positions are agglutinated around three great "blocs", namely, the ones who are linked to "Francis" as the legitimate Pope, those who have their only visible Head in Benedict XVI, and those who are linked neither to one nor the other, nor to the post-conciliar popes, the so-called Sedevacantists. As the number of discontents with "Francis" has increased, and the Catholic generally refuses to deliberately address the question of Benedict's resignation, there is a tendency for some Catholics to adhere to sedevacantism, which has arguments not inconsiderable in their defense. Quoting once again our French reader, we find in his comment that "Benedict XVI's calculated silence still leaves the door open for the expression of monstrosities to be exposed in full light. When the Truth is finally revealed, we will find some of our own brothers who would have recognized his blindness". How to respond to this current "babylonian" state?

EA: Before answering punctually, I must note that neither the sedevacantists nor the "subjects" of *Francis* would be Catholics in a legal sense - although they are in an ontological sense, given their (indelible) condition of baptized -, because the situation of schism, in which both parties reject subjection to the (true) Roman Pontiff - who today is none other than Benedict XVI - leads to excommunication *latae sententiae* (canons 205, 751, 1364 §1 of the CDC).

Now, as to how to respond to the "current 'babylonian' state" I think the first step would necessarily be the conversion of the heart: God, who is good and merciful, never abandons those who sincerely seek him. The first thing then would be to ask yourself: what is in my heart? Do I accept the Word of God, with all its consequences? I put before

Do I put anything before pure love over Truth? Is there some petty, personal interest, however small, that moves my thoughts, words, and actions? Do I have any fear in advance of the demands of The Truth? In short, what is the most important thing for me? What am I really looking for when I say I want to get out of the Babylonian confusion in the midst of which the Church is?

Secondly, the knowledge of our faith, of our Church. I know who God is, what He is like and what He expects from His children? I know what the Church is and what it is like? Do I know the Catechism of the Catholic Church? I have read the Holy Scriptures (complete), do I go to them frequently? And the private revelations: I know the ones that have been approved, do I know how to discern the ones that have not been? Do I spend time on spiritual readings of various kinds? If necessary, do I sign up for Catholic formation courses or groups?

Third, the honest, fair consideration of the arguments that are held in each "block" - and this in light of what is suggested in the two previous steps - Have I compared the sources that are cited in those arguments - canons, councils, encyclicals, theological works, etc.? Do I understand the concepts that are used in those arguments? Do I try to clarify those that I do not understand? Do I check if the premises of such arguments are true, and do I verify the logical sequence between the premises and the conclusions? Do I take the time and effort necessary for this task - when I

say I don't have time for this, is that true? Am I mediocre or compromised? Do I convince myself in advance, without further ado, that I am incapable of being seriously involved in these matters? Do I intend to make up for the effort to form my own criteria, sheltering myself with other people's opinions - which sometimes I don't even understand -? Do I give more value to gossip and yellow journalism than to objective and documented information?

Finally, once a criterion has been formed on the subject at hand, can I give a reason for it? Am I willing to debate, to be questioned or contested?

As can be seen, it is a constant self-examination, a personal task - which of course does not exclude collaboration between brothers -. In fact, it is a process similar to the one that many Catholics have developed and continue to develop when confronted with the fallacies of the Protestant sects. That well-known saying of "ignorant Catholic, future Protestant" can perfectly be adapted as "ignorant Catholic, future sedevacancist", or "future Bergoglian".

K: Do you know, in addition to the one mentioned in relation to Don Minutella, any more specific initiative "*una cum Benedictus*"? Any apostolate of any priest, religious or lay person, such as, for example, the one that the Franciscan hermit Alexis Bugnolo, from FromRome and Ordo Militaris, has been doing? Do you think that a greater agglutination of those who recognize Benedict XVI as their only and legitimate Pope is needed?

EA: As far as I know, initiatives in this regard are being carried out through small nuclei or groups of people faithful to the True Pope, in private places and with a not yet very precise periodicity. This has been happening in a rather spontaneous way: people are getting to know each other, helping each other and sharing information, some offer their homes or places of work for the celebration of Holy Mass, and the few priests who are in public communion with Benedict XVI and they have already withdrawn from their parishes, they try to "multiply" when they can to serve as many people as possible.

I believe that concrete initiatives such as those you mention should be based on the expansion and strengthening of fraternal ties, the formation of communities that would be the seed of the future faithful rest, the dissemination of the evangelical message and especially of the prophecies that help us to understand and face our time, the apostolate around ecclesial communion under Pope Benedict, the renewal of love for a worthy liturgy and for Eucharistic adoration, the conversion of the heart, doctrinal and spiritual growth, etc. The rest, the "logistical" question (the search for resources, facilities and other), would occur, it seems to me, as a natural consequence of all the above.

K: So far, based on your assessment, do you think it has been worth all your effort in carrying out this work? At this time, is there any other project currently in progress?

EA: I would think that I should leave that assessment to the Lord. We know that the human measure and the divine measure to value actions and their "results" are very different, and that the true and definitive measure is the divine one. In the short term, what I envision is to continue delving into the subject - there are always details to "polish", enrich or correct, new perspectives to be addressed, additional information to be collected, objections to face, etc. - and disseminating the book as far as I can, until God allows. I do not have any other specific project in hand, for now.

K: We thank you once again for your availability and charity in granting us this interview, and we assure you of our creations for your person and work. May God and the Virgin of Chiquireira bless, enlighten and guard you in defense of the truth.

EA: Likewise. May God and Our Lady of Concepcion Appeared bless this blog, its readers and all the Brazilian people.

Benedicamus Domino: Deo gratias!

Long live the Pope!

On September 8 of the Year of Grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ, 2021. Feast of the Nativity.

Reproduction is allowed provided the source is cited

<<https://katejon.com.br/wordpress/?p=3501#.YT7ZdZ1KiZo>>.