



Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò

INTERVIEW BY FRANCA GIAN SOLDATI

Published in 'Il Messaggero' Newspaper on August 20, 2024 (p. 10)

- 1. A step back in time: in 2011 Pope Ratzinger implored you to accept being appointed as Nuncio to the United States, leaving the role of the Governorate where you were cleaning it up internally. You had clashes with Cardinal Bertone, then Secretary of State, whose name is linked to the scandal of the misappropriation of funds from the Bambino Gesù [Hospital] even though he was never investigated. What did Benedict XVI say to you? How did things go that day, and what were the main reasons for the disagreement with Bertone?**

To speak of a “disagreement” seems euphemistic to me. Thirsty for power, unscrupulous, manipulative, and contiguous to Masonic circles: this is the portrait of Cardinal Bertone, to whom Benedict XVI was unfortunately subjugated. Bertone did everything he could to remove me from the Secretariat of State, because in my very delicate role I prevented him from promoting “his” candidates, men of his circle, who were corrupt and often sexually perverted. He managed to transfer me to the Governorate on July 16, 2009, where in my action to combat the vast network of corruption I had discovered the role and complicity of the Secretary of State himself in covering, supporting, and promoting the malfeasance and in making personal profit from it. Benedict XVI told me – during the private audience granted to me on April 4, 2011 – that he wanted to appoint me President of the Prefecture for Economic Affairs of the Holy See, but Bertone (with the complicity of Cardinal Lajolo, President of the Governorate, who was also involved in the network of corruption) imposed himself forcefully on the Pope and obtained my expulsion from the Roman Curia.

Aware of this plot hatched to the detriment of the Holy See and Benedict himself, and knowing that the Pope’s will that I continue to “clean up” was being subverted (while my removal would have nullified the work done and left the corrupt unpunished), I initially tried to resist, not without great difficulty, since I was precluded from having any direct access to the Pope.

Thus, after a long inner travail, a personal letter from Benedict XVI convinced me to accept the nomination to the United States. He wrote to me: “I would like to tell you that I have been reflecting and praying about your condition after the latest events. The painful news of the death of His

Excellency Msgr. Pietro Sambri has confirmed me in the conviction that your providential position at this time is the Nunciature in the United States of America. Furthermore, I am certain that your knowledge of this great country will help you to take on the demanding challenge of this work, which in many ways is decisive for the future of the universal Church.”

2. Bertone still lives in the “famous” apartment in the Vatican, while you, when your mandate in the United States ended, had your apartment in the Curia taken away. A further humiliation. Here too: how did things go, and how do you explain it?

The apartment I was assigned was located in the Santa Marta Hospice, known as Santa Marta Vecchia (not to be confused with the Domus Sanctæ Marthæ) where the priests who worked in the Secretariat of State were housed and where I had already lived for eleven years. It was John Paul II who made it available to me when I returned from Nigeria. The then Secretary of State Cardinal Sodano sent me a letter in which he specified that the reason for this assignment desired by the Pope was “so that you may reside permanently in the Vatican.”

On the same day of my seventy-fifth birthday, in January 2016, I received a letter signed by the then Substitute Becciu in which I was informed that Bergoglio ordered me to leave my apartment immediately, also denying me the possibility of residing in the Casa San Benedetto prepared by Benedict XVI for retired Nuncios. The justification given to me was that there was a need for that apartment for the heads of the Dicasteries. As far as I know, it remained vacant for at least the next seven years, and perhaps it still is today. This was clearly a vindictive action, because Bergoglio wanted to get rid of those who knew too much and those who, being neither blackmailable nor corruptible, were therefore not able to be manipulated. Bergoglio also knew that I would not be deceived by his lies, since I was amply aware of them.

The important thing, however, was to get me away from the Vatican, and this is what happened. With today’s eyes, however, I thank Providence for this expulsion: had I remained within the Vatican walls, I do not think I would have been able to enjoy the necessary freedom to express myself and to denounce Bergoglio and his accomplices.

3. Recently, the court of Enna [in Sicily] sentenced the priest Don Giuseppe Rugolo, arrested in Ferrara in April 2021, to 4 years and 6 months in prison for attempted aggravated sexual assault against a minor. The investigations revealed disturbing cover-ups: how can this attitude be reconciled with the supposed “zero tolerance” for cases of sexual abuse by the clergy affirmed by Pope Francis?

In 2019, Bergoglio promulgated the Motu Proprio Vos Estis Lux Mundi, later amended in 2023, in which he established that a Bishop who covers up a case of sexual abuse by one of his priests must be removed and prosecuted. This document was intended by Bergoglio to give credence to the “zero tolerance” narrative. The sequence of scandals that have come to light even very recently demonstrate that this is in reality a mere facade operation, which also has the immediate effect of taking cases of this type to Rome, allowing them to be controlled and – indeed – covered up.

Faced with the detailed complaints of the young Antonio Messina for acts committed between 2009 and 2013 in Piazza Armerina by Fr. Giuseppe Rugolo, who was still a seminarian at the time, the Curia and the Roman Dicasteries contacted by the victim and her parents in 2016 did not take

any action. Bishop Rosario Gisana actually moved to cover up the case and offered the victim 25,000 euros to hush everything up. In a wiretap that was made public, Bishop Gisana admitted: “The problem is also mine because I covered up this story... oh well; never mind; we’ll see how we can get out of it.” Fr. Vincenzo Murgano, the priest who had suggested to Antonio Messina that he should just “forget” the violence, has been responsible for the service for the protection of minors of the Diocese of Piazza Armerina since 2019.

Transferred to Ferrara in 2019 for “treatment,” Fr. Rugolo was assigned by Archbishop Giancarlo Perego to the pastoral care of the faithful, thus exposing young people to the risk that the priest would repeat his crimes. Archbishop Perego, informed of “a proceeding against Fr. Giuseppe for an episode prior to his ordination,” declared that “[Bishop Gisana] showed me that this incident had already been evaluated by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, and that it absolutely did not constitute a limitation to his presence with us.” Perego’s responsibilities are therefore the same as Bishop Gisana’s, since he could not have been unaware of the reasons for the transfer of the Sicilian priest to his diocese. Yet in the summer of 2020, Archbishop Perego even allowed Fr. Rugolo to organize a camp for teenagers in the parish of Vigarano Mainarda. The trial documents show that between March 2020 and January 2021, Fr. Rugolo accessed pornographic sites with the search term “teen” at all times of the day and night, with an average of at least 60 per day, while he met with local young people and hosted a former student of his from Enna in a hotel in Ravenna.

Last December 2023, when Fr. Rugolo and other accomplices were sent to trial during the criminal trial conducted by the Court of Enna, Jorge Mario Bergoglio publicly expressed his appreciation for the work of Bishop Gisana: “Well done; this bishop, well done. He was persecuted, slandered, and he was firm, always, just, a just man. For this reason, that day when I went to Palermo, I wanted to stop first in Piazza Armerina to greet him; he is a good bishop.” With this public act he heavily interfered in the autonomy and independence of Italian judges, using the authority and prestige of the Papacy – which Bergoglio usurps – to shamefully cover up the corruption of his protégés.

The Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith, so eager to impose excommunications on those who denounce the modernist coup underway in the Church, obviously remains silent. Its Prefect, Tucho Fernández, is a pornographer and author of obscene heretical and erotic pamphlets – including *La pasión mística* [The Mystical Passion] and *Sáname con tu boca* [Heal Me With Your Mouth] – and it is clear that such a figure has no intention of shedding light on scandals in which both he and his Principal have shown a disturbing contiguity, protecting and even promoting the culprits. How likely is it that Bishop Gisana and Archbishop Perego will be tried by Fernández, when it is actually Bergoglio should be the first defendant in this and other similar criminal cases? Dog doesn’t eat dog!

The Catholic Church is in the same situation as many governments: it is held hostage by a subversive network of corrupt and perverted people who have reached the top of the institutions and are capable of silencing all the scandals in which they are complicit. When the horrors committed by this global criminal organization, especially crimes against minors, come to light, those responsible will have nowhere to hide.

4. And so we come to the schism: how are you experiencing this moment full of tensions?

During these very days, citizens in Great Britain are protesting against the government, whose policies of ethnic replacement through the continuous flow of illegal immigrants make peaceful coexistence impossible and cause an exponential increase in crime. The police have orders to repress all demonstrations and to protect the gangs of violent non-EU citizens, mostly Muslims, ready to establish Sharia law manu militari in England. In practice, the British government, in order to make the English people disappear according to the globalist agenda, promotes and finances uncontrolled immigration while repressing and taxing its own citizens.

The situation in the Church is very similar – in Rome, too, there is a government that wants to replace its Hierarchy and the people of the faithful by “unloading” – so to speak – into the very bosom of the Church a mass of people who lead lifestyles objectively incompatible with Catholic Faith and Morals, but whom Bergoglio’s synodal Church considers as the main interlocutors and whom it welcomes in the name of inclusiveness and “todos todos todos!” Those who are naïve think that the Hierarchy acts in this way out of a zeal for charity that is perhaps excessive and human pity for migrants. Those who observe reality without blinders understand that the ultimate goal of Bergoglian immigrationism is to create division in the ecclesial body, knowing what the results are also by looking at the precedent of what is happening in civil society.

This project of ethnic (and in this case, religious) substitution acts on two fronts: on the external front, it makes us believe that in order to belong to the Church it is not even necessary to believe in the Son of God, Our Lord Jesus Christ, and that all doctrinal and moral differences can be overcome in the name of an impossible brotherhood (just as globalist governments make us believe that it is possible to welcome hordes of Muslims into Christian nations without devastating consequences on the social fabric). The insistence of Bergoglio and almost all the bishops on welcoming immigrants is part of this divisive action. On the domestic front, however, Bergoglio abuses the authority of the Papacy (which he usurps) in order to remove from the Church those Catholics who have remained faithful, so that he can eliminate any internal opposition to his subversive plan.

Those who denounce the Bergoglian coup and more generally the globalist coup d’état must be silenced. The excommunication against me, even if manifestly invalid and null and void, constitutes a form of repression of dissent and should serve as a deterrent for others. I am convinced that I would have gravely failed in my duties as Bishop and Successor of the Apostles if I had continued to remain silent, as unfortunately all my confreres do.

5. The Vatican claims it declared you to be in schism because in some of your statements you have denied the authority of the Pope. How do things now stand?

Schism is a sin against the unity of the Church. It is carried out at the moment when a baptized person refuses to submit to the authority of the Roman Pontiff and to remain in the communion of faith and charity of the Catholic Church. But what happens if on the Chair of Peter there is – instead of a Pope who defends and governs the Church – there is a usurper who systematically demolishes her, and who is chosen and appointed by fraud by the St. Gallen Mafia for this very purpose? The Catholic Church is presently occupied by an extraneous body that superimposes itself on her and obscures her, similar to an eclipse: this extraneous body is not the Church, but the anti-church of the False Prophet, and as such it is not possible to be in communion with it. Catholics belong to the Catholic Church, not to its conciliar and synodal counterfeit of which Bergoglio is the head. It is

Bergoglio who is in a state of schism with the Church of which he claims to be Pope, and as a heretic and schismatic he does not have nor can he exercise any power, nor demand any obedience.

I reiterate, however, that the use of the judiciary for political purposes that we witness in the civil sphere, especially in the United States of America, is mirrored in the ecclesiastical sphere through instrumental and specious canonical sanctions. And I know for certain that the excommunication against me was desired directly by Bergoglio, who is so arrogant and brazen in his action that he rewarded with an ecclesiastical office the official who carried it out, appointing him archbishop: we are well beyond simony.

6. Where do you live? In Switzerland, in the United States, or near Viterbo?

After my memorial about Cardinal McCarrick was published in August 2018, a contact of mine from the United States warned me that my life was in danger: for this reason I do not reside in a fixed place. I don't want to end up like Cardinal Pell, nor my predecessor in Washington, the Apostolic Nuncio Pietro Sambi (who strenuously confronted McCarrick so much that you could hear his screams throughout the Nunciature as he rebuked the predatory Cardinal). Archbishop Sambi died in circumstances that have never been clarified, after a trivial operation at John's Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore (which is connected to the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the World Economic Forum in Davos). McCarrick disappeared for a month in 2011 – simultaneous to the death of the Nuncio – and did not attend his funeral. The death certificate issued to Msgr. Jean-François Lanteaume, Chargé d'Affaires at the Nunciature, did not explain the causes of the Nuncio's death, nor was an autopsy ever carried out on Archbishop Sambi.

7. What are your thoughts on the accusation that you have rejected the Second Vatican Council?

The accusation of having “rejected the Second Vatican Council” has nothing to do with schism, because if anything it touches on questions of the Magisterium and not on canonical discipline. The accusation is specious: there are cardinals and bishops who deny solemnly defined truths of the Faith without Bergoglio ever lifting a finger against them; indeed, they receive his applause.

I would like to draw attention to a fundamental and very important element. We must understand that “the masterstroke of Satan,” the sworn enemy of the Church, has occurred by his appropriating authority and abusing the power connected with her, so that his disintegrating action has had all the appearances of at least formal legality. The Second Vatican Council was to be the juridical instrument with which to place the dynamite at the very foundation of the Church, and then detonate it later. It had to look like a Council, it had to give the idea of having the same authority as the Council of Nicaea or Trent, but at the same time it could not define as truths to be believed any heresies that the Magisterium had already condemned. Thus those errors were insinuated by means of equivocation – deliberately imprecise formulations which at the right moment could serve as a basis on which to implement the revolution. People continue to speak of “the Council,” but we should have the honesty to recognize that for the “conciliar church” born with Vatican II there is only one “council,” which surpasses in authority and importance all the other twenty ecumenical councils of the Catholic Church.

The anomaly is represented by this Council, because it was used for a subversive purpose, under the formal appearance of a solemn act of the Church and with the authoritativeness (as well as the authority) of the Pope and the Council Fathers. The purpose of Vatican II was to create the doctrinal premises – not necessarily explicit and indeed often hidden in ambiguous formulations – to revolutionize the Church, Protestantizing and secularizing her, so as to be able to ferry her towards the syncretistic union of all religions. And this is the project of Freemasonry: the ecumenical and inclusive Religion of Humanity.

The Second Vatican Council has spread through the Church like a cancer. It has committed the entire ecclesial body – in every order and degree, in its institutions and structures – to the subversion of its divine constitution. The new Catechism, the new Code of Canon Law, the new Mass, the new Sacraments, teaching in seminaries and universities, preaching in parishes, the action of Catholic associations, religious life in convents and monasteries: everything has been tampered with and reshaped according to the conciliar paradigm. The results are there for all to see.

For this reason, just as the authority of the Pope cannot be used to destroy the Papacy, so the magisterial authority of a Council cannot be maliciously used to destroy the Church. It ipso facto loses its authority, since it overturns its rationale, that is, its ultimate end. My rejection of the Council is therefore motivated precisely by the fact that this Council contradicts the infallible Magisterium and all twenty previous Ecumenical Councils.

8. It is said that you want to create a parallel Church, a bit like Archbishop Lefebvre did. What plans do you have for the future?

Archbishop Lefebvre never wanted to build a parallel church, but rather he always testified to his fidelity to the one Church of Christ and to the Papacy. Archbishop Lefebvre continued doing the same things he had done as a bishop until before the Council: it is the “conciliar church” that changed doctrine, morals, liturgy, and discipline. He continued to ordain priests, to give them a traditional formation, and to ensure the celebration of the Apostolic Mass.

Today, fifty years later, the subversive plan denounced by Lefebvre is even more evident, and the answers that were valid then today require a new approach. Although it was evident that Popes such as Paul VI or John Paul II were modernists, it was unthinkable to hypothesize their explicit intention to destroy the Church. Today Bergoglio has dispelled all doubts and shows himself as an inimicus Ecclesiae fiercely determined to carry out the task assigned to him and that he himself had set for himself.

I am convinced that my action – and that of every pastor who has at heart the souls entrusted to him – must today be broader and must be addressed not only to young vocations, but also to the “recovery” of the many good priests and religious – as well as, of course, the lay faithful – who understand the very serious crisis triggered by the Council. In times of war, so to speak, anyone who is able to fight must unite and enlist, even if they have not attended a military academy. All these souls who love the Lord can be accompanied with charity to re-embrace the Catholic Faith in its integrity and to consciously reject the conciliar revolution and its disastrous consequences.

Founding a parallel church is the dream of all heresiarchs: a true Catholic, even more so if he is a bishop, remains in the one Church and continues to serve her, even if he is the only one left to do so. I try to do and preach what the Church has always done and taught, because this is what I have solemnly sworn, and what the Lord commands me. On the other hand, today no honest Catholic can deny that the Hierarchy has completely sold itself out to the powerful of the world, and that its betrayal is a scandal even to those who are not believers.

9. What should be our response to this rupture?

We are going through a period of very serious crisis in the Church and in society. The authorities of all institutions are now carrying out the will of the globalist elite and obey supranational powers. We are witnessing a deep and almost unbridgeable rift between those who govern – both the State as well as the Church – and the citizens or the faithful. We may say that on the one hand the social pact that is the basis of the recognition of the authority of the State has failed, and on the other the bond of obedience to Christ on the part of those who exercise authority in the Church has also been destroyed. In practice, the rulers of the State have rebelled against Christ the King and the exponents of the Catholic hierarchy have rebelled against Christ the High Priest: their authority has been usurped. It is necessary to heal this wound by restoring to Christ His Universal Lordship.

10. Throughout all these years of tensions, has Pope Francis ever picked up the phone to call you, or has he ever sent you letters or messages through an intermediary?

I have never received private communications of any kind from Bergoglio (nor from any Vatican authority). In public, the Argentine Jesuit has had no qualms about insulting and slandering me. In a 2019 interview with Valentina Alazraki for the Mexican broadcaster Televisa ([here](#)), Bergoglio publicly lied, denying the conversation that he had with me on June 23, 2013. He even went so far as to obsessively claim to know nothing about McCarrick:

“I knew nothing about McCarrick, of course, nothing. I have said so several times; I didn’t know anything; I had no idea. And when [Viganò] says that he spoke to me that day, that he came . . . I don’t remember if he spoke to me about this, if it’s true or not. I have no idea! You know that I knew nothing about McCarrick, otherwise I would not have been silent.”

I cannot fail to mention Bergoglio’s recourse to slander, in an attitude that betrays a cowardly soul willing to discredit the honesty of the interlocutor rather than refute his accusations.

This occurred after the publication of my testimony on my return from the trip to Ireland, when Bergoglio told the journalists present:

“You all read [Viganò’s] communiqué carefully and make your own judgment. I will not say a word about this. I believe that the communiqué speaks for itself, and you have enough journalistic capacity to draw conclusions. It is an act of trust: when some time has passed and you have drawn conclusions, perhaps I will speak. But I would like your professional maturity to do this job: it will do you good, really. That’s okay.”

A year later, responding to the Mexican Vatican journalist Alazraki, he returned to the subject:

“This case of Viganò, I hadn’t read the entire letter; I saw a bit of it . . . And I already know what it is, and I have made a decision: I trust in the honesty of journalists. And I said to you, “Look, you have

everything here, study and draw your own conclusions.” And this you did, because you did the work, and in this case it was fantastic. I was very careful not to say things that were not there, but then a judge in Milan said them, three or four months later, when he convicted him. . . . I kept silent, because if I had spoken I would have been throwing mud. So that journalists could find it out. And you have discovered it, you have found all that world. It was a silence based on trust in you, journalists. Not only that, but I also told you, “Hold it; study it; that’s all.” And the result was good, better than if I had started to explain, to defend myself. You judge the evidence in hand.”

Bergoglio tried to make me look like a dishonest man and a thief, referring to my painful and personal family events, which involved my brother priest (who was afflicted by a stroke and manipulated by unscrupulous lawyers), whom I did not want to attack by challenging an unjust sentence, preferring instead to follow the Gospel command (Mt 5:40). The accusations against me were widely disavowed by all my brothers and by the evidence of the facts ([here](#)).

As is typical of the nature of tyrants, Bergoglio has an implacable hatred for me, not only for what I have revealed about him, but also and above all for what I am still able to reveal. By excommunication he wanted in a certain way to condemn me to death, but the truth cannot be killed.

It is now understood that Bergoglio does not want to solve the crisis of which he is the architect: he wants to make it irreversible, because his purpose is to create division: divide et impera.

11. You have accused Pope Francis of having ignored the rumors relating to the homosexuality and abuse of minors by Cardinal McCarrick, who was later convicted of pedophilia, reduced to the lay state, and expelled from the College of Cardinals. The Vatican only took action in 2017 after an accusation that was considered credible. Why didn't it act earlier? What concrete evidence was there?

As Delegate for the Pontifical Representations, I dealt with the McCarrick case myself, and since then I have asked for his dismissal from the Cardinalate. My direct superiors are responsible for not having taken due account of my judgment based on incontrovertible testimony. Obviously, McCarrick’s work was convenient for someone in the Secretariat of State, starting with the huge sums raised through the Papal Foundation that the Cardinal had set up in the United States. I remember well a comment made to me by the Argentine Leonardo Sandri, then a Monsignor with whom I shared the same office for eleven years when we were both secretaries of the Substitute: “But this McCarrick is always here!” Sandri later became the Substitute, and it was precisely to him that I delivered my Note detailing McCarrick’s misconduct, but ambition and the prospects of advancing his career led him to keep quiet and cover up the scandals. The fact that he repeatedly expressed to me his bad opinion of Bergoglio – “That man is a madman!” – did not prevent him from becoming his accomplice anyway.

Bergoglio owes his “election” to McCarrick: McCarrick himself declared this during a conference at Villanova University where on October 11, 2013 he affirmed that he had favored the election of Jorge Mario Bergoglio during the General Congregations prior to the Conclave held a few months earlier, and that he had spoken about it with “a very influential Italian gentleman” ([here](#)) who supposedly confided to him how in the space of a five-year period the new Pope would “reform” – that is, revolutionize – the Church.

McCarrick also had strong connections with members of the Democratic Party and assiduously frequented the White House during the Obama-Biden administration, but also under previous Presidents. McCarrick was involved, for example, on behalf of the American government in negotiations with the Iranian Ayatollahs for the development of nuclear weapons.

And that's not all: McCarrick worked closely with the then White House Chief of Staff, Denis McDonough, in the management of the Alliance for Prosperity desired by President Obama, which in 2014 alone – under the guise of a humanitarian action – facilitated the trafficking of 65,000 unaccompanied children who were transferred to the United States across the Mexican border, as White House stenographer Mike McCormick revealed.

Finally, Bergoglio also made use of McCarrick to make the secret agreement between the Vatican and China, which was strongly desired by both the Jesuits and the democratic establishment.

Bergoglio's extraordinary action of removing McCarrick's status as Cardinal and dismissing him from the clerical state served to save Bergoglio's "reputation." But these sanctions were not decided after a fair trial: the witnesses were not given the opportunity to name McCarrick's accomplices, and no judge was ever able to impose any compensation for the victims, because Bergoglio arrogated to himself the right to declare the cause *res judicata*, without ever disclosing the official decree, which is also a public act. The administrative measure decided on by Bergoglio was intended to hide the network of complicity in which he was and is personally involved, and this is exactly what happened.

The reason why the Vatican only acted in February 2019 (i.e., six months after the publication of my August 2018 Memorial) is that the scandal was no longer manageable, despite the fact that McCarrick's crimes had been known for decades. The paradox arose with the publication on November 10, 2020, of a substantial Report on McCarrick drawn up by Attorney Jeffrey Lena and costing the Holy See millions, in which he falsely goes so far as to say that I was the one responsible for the failure to timely initiate canonical proceedings against McCarrick ([here](#)).

12. As a bishop and pastor of souls, would you like to leave a message to our readers?

Holy Scripture warns us about the reign of the Antichrist that will be established throughout the world in the last times, and about the role of the False Prophet in manipulating the masses. It is difficult not to see the preparation for all this in the globalist ideology that embodies the synarchic project of Freemasonry and in the total subservience to it of the leaders of the Bergoglian church. And here we are not speaking of abstruse questions, but of the very foundations of the Catholic Faith: the uniqueness of the Church as an instrument of salvation, her mission for the conversion of souls to God, and the need to restore the social Kingship of Christ as the only safeguard against all tyranny, both temporal and spiritual.

Before the Second Coming of Our Lord, the Church, which is His Mystical Body, must go through her own Passio in a ferocious persecution: Sacred Scripture clearly tells us this, in particular the Book of the Apocalypse of Saint John. This should help us to understand the importance of bearing witness to Christ and denouncing the false prophets who try to persuade us to come to terms with the world.

13 August 2024