

Dear in Christ,

The text that follows below is a letter signed by several bishops, sent to Fr. Tiago and to the faithful, which we believe you should know.

The seriousness of the facts publicly known and proven, which we suppose to be unknown to you, merits this communication, so that whoever may be concerned may take the canonical measures which, despite the fact that the See is vacant, should not fail to be complied with, and in order to

We sent you the original letter in Spanish, and we also attached it in Portuguese, French and English.

LITERAL CONTENT OF THE LETTER

Dear in Christ, Fr. Tiago, all members in obedience to this Father, and all the faithful whom I was able to serve on some occasion, and to every person who loves the truth.

Peace and Good.

Constrained by the Apostle to the Gentiles, when meditating on the following text in his own handwriting, and in the light of recent events:

"He preaches the word, insists in time and out of season. He rebukes, pleads, admonishes with all patience and doctrine. For the time will come when many will not endure sound doctrine, but will multiply teachers according to their desires because of the itch to hear. And they shall turn away the ears of the truth, and shall apply fables. But you watch over all things, endure the works, do the work of an evangelist, fulfill your ministry (2 Tim. 4:1-5)."

We can only speak, because this quotation from St. Paul perfectly sums up the obligation of a Catholic bishop, for whose breach he will give an account to God.

These servants, without any merit on our part, bishops of the Catholic Church, consider that this warning of St. Paul is addressed not only to Timothy, but to any bishop, and, therefore, his warnings are incumbent upon our persons.

The fulfillment of our duty has meant the expulsion of some of the signatories from the centers from which they exercised their apostolate.

However, the truth is that there have been a series of disagreements between D. Tiago and the bishops, because the pastoral activity of this father is a serious departure from the discipline of the Church, which the bishops are obliged to monitor.

In no way do we intend this writing to be subjective, but, on the contrary, we will strive to objectively expose the discipline of the Church permanently violated by Fr. Tiago, having been warned about some of these matters more than a year ago, without obtaining any correction from him. For this reason we will use the systematically violated canons of Canon Law and of the sacrosanct Council of Trent, whose breaches are public.

This judgment is not on the internal forum, which belongs only to God, since the Church only judges on the external forum; in other words, in no way is the conscience with which the criminal acts have occurred judged.

We will expose, in particular, the doctrine of the Catholic Church that will shed light on three aspects, namely: is the order of Our Lady of Mount Carmel led by Fr. Tiago, a truly Carmelite order? What is

the situation of Fr. Tiago's ministerial priesthood? Do their houses or "monasteries" respect the discipline established by the Most Holy Council of Trent on the virtue of chastity?

Before beginning to develop these matters, it is worth knowing that, if Fr. Tiago has finally come to embrace the authentic Catholic position – *in sede vacante the first obligation of the Church is to elect a pope: a Church without a head was a monstrosity* (Catholic Encyclopedia, theme Western Schism) – it is only by the grace of God, that he wanted some of these useless servants of the Lord, to speak on the telephone with Fr. Tiago and after visiting him in Morlaix, the true Catholic doctrine on the matter was explained to him.

SECTION I: THE SITUATION OF THE "ORDER" AND THE STATE OF FR. TIAGO

A. IS THE ORDER OF OUR LADY OF MOUNT MOUNT, LED BY FR. TIAGO, A TRULY CARMELITE ORDER?

Canon 492 &3 reads as follows:

Neither the name nor the habit of an already established religion can be adopted by those who do not legitimately belong to it or by another new religion.

Nec nomen nec habitus religionis iam constitutas assumi potest ab iis qui ad illam legitime non pertinente aut a nova religione.

Let us explain as clearly as possible this canon of the Catholic Church.

Neither the name nor the habit: That is, neither the name of the Carmelites, nor the habit adopted by them, can be used, in the case at hand.

of an already established religion: The *Ordo Fratrum Beatissimæ Virginis Mariæ of Mount Carmel*, is an already established order, because the patriarch of Jerusalem, Albert, already gave them in 1209 a rule, which synthesizes the ideal of Carmel.

it can be adopted by those who do not belong legitimately to it, nor by another new religion: that is, it is absolutely forbidden to use the name and habit by those who do not belong legitimately to it, nor by another religion, i.e., order, congregation or institute, etc., newly created.

Now, how do you legitimately belong to it? Specifically, does Fr. Tiago belong to that order legitimately? Let us see what the Code of Canon Law says in this regard, and among other requirements, let us study canon 572 &2:

***572. For the validity of any religious profession it is necessary:
&2
That he be admitted to the profession by the legitimate superior according to the constitutions***

***572. Ad validitatem cuiusvis religiosæ professionis requiritur ut:
&2
Eum ad professionem admitat legitimus Superior secundum constitutiones.***

Let us appreciate, in the first place, that we are not talking about lawfulness or illegality, but about validity or invalidity.

The question that immediately arises is the following: Was the person who collected Fr. Tiago's vows a legitimate superior? According to the statement of the "tertiaries" themselves subject to Father Tiago, he made his vows before Marcus Aurelius, a religious of the false conciliar church, therefore fallen into modernist heresy, which places him outside the Church by excommunication *latæ sententiæ*; Others, however, in a somewhat confused manner, say that he made them before a conciliar bishop.

The aforesaid Marcus Aurelius, or the bishop conciliar, equally heretical, was so much a legitimate authority? Not at all, according to canon 188 & 4, and the Bull *Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio*, of Pope Paul IV:

<p>Art. 188: By virtue of the <u>tacit</u> waiver admitted by the same law, they vacate ipso facto, and without any declaration, any offices, if the cleric: &4 He publicly apostates from the Catholic faith.</p>	<p>188. Ob tacitam renuntiationem nem ab ipso iure admisam quaelibet officia vacant ipso facto et sine ulla declarattione, si clericus. &4 A fide catholica publice defecerit.</p>
--	--

<p><u>Bula Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio &3:</u> ... (All who) have been caught, or have confessed, or <u>are convicted of having deviated (from the Catholic Faith), or of having fallen into heresy, or of having incurred schism, or of having aroused or committed them; or also those who in the future should depart from the Catholic Faith, or fall into heresy, or incur in schism, or provoke them, or commit them, or those who should be caught or confess or admit to having deviated from the Catholic Faith, or to have fallen into heresy, or to have incurred in schism, or to have provoked or committed them, since in this they are much more guilty than the others, (...)</u> And on the other hand, being entirely contrary and incapable of such functions, they will also be considered as relapsed and exonerated in everything and for everything, <u>even if they have previously publicly abjured such heresies in judgment. And they may not be restored, replaced, reinstated or rehabilitated, at any time, to the pristine dignity they had, to their authority, monastery, benefice.</u></p>
--

Tacit means that it is assumed and inferred, it is implied, that is, in this context it means that by deviating from the faith, renunciation is assumed ipso facto.

Canon 188 & 4 of the Code of Canon Law of 1917 does nothing more than collect the doctrine of the Bull *Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio*, which is the source of the Code.

It is very clear that both the aforementioned religious and the alleged bishop, both of the conciliar church, whoever it was who collected the votes of Fr. Tiago, were not members of the Catholic Church, because they had accepted the conciliar and post-conciliar heresies, so they were modernists, that is, heretics, according to the Encyclical Letter *Pascendi* of Pope St. Pius X. and that they left the Church by an excommunication *latæ sententiæ*, that is, without the need for a declaration from the Church. In embracing modernism there was a tacit renunciation ipso facto, if they had ever been legitimate authorities and therefore deprived of their dignity, according to canon 188 & 4, and if they were never legitimate authorities, they could never obtain it, even if they had adjured their heresies, according to the *Bull Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio*.

According to what we have seen from Catholic doctrine and discipline, Fr. Tiago never made valid vows in the Carmelite order. As a consequence of this conclusion, we have: **1)** that the use of the habit and name of the order is illicit; **2)** the votes of the first, second and third orders are invalid because they were made before an illegitimate authority; **3) it** is not lawful for him to open monasteries without the permission of the legitimate authority. The same provisions fall on the members of his "order". As to the value of the vows made by him, or those made before him, the following must be distinguished, because three things are required according to &2 and 3 of canon 1307 for the vow: **a)** deliberation; **b)** purpose of will; **(c)** promise, with which the vow is fulfilled, since it indicates a true obligation to do or omit something in favor of God, and the simple desire or purpose does not properly impose obligation. Since the vow is a deliberate and free promise, it follows, according to the canonists of note, that it is not valid if it is effectively influenced by ignorance or substantial error, violence or grave fear. Therefore, in general, there are two common circumstances:

The first is that the vote of the members of this "order" is private and not public, because it is not made before the legitimate authority, which alone is competent to accept them in the name of the Church, as we see in canon 1308 &1, which expressly says:

1308 &1:

The vote is public if a legitimate ecclesiastical superior accepts it in the name of the Church; otherwise it is private.

1308 &1

Votum est "publicum" si nomine Ecclesiae a legitimo superiore ecclesiastico acceptetur; secus "privatum"

The second is that even private votes are invalid if they are effectively influenced by ignorance or substantial error, violence or serious fear; As for ignorance, the majority confess that they have not read the "rule", and even less the "constitutions".

What is the only possibility for this group of faithful, if they want to follow a Carmelite spirituality? First, to obey the Church in everything; second, no longer to wear the habit of the Carmelites, nor the name of the order already constituted; thirdly, to approve new statutes, which must be subject to each bishop where they are established, without which, if they did not have the authorization of the bishop in any part, they could not be established in any way; fourth, as long as at least the laudatory decree is not issued by the pope, even if it is extended to several dioceses or territories, it will continue to be the new institute or congregation of diocesan right, fully subject to the ordinary bishops according to law, according to canon 492 & 2, until a legitimate pope declares it of pontifical right.

We end this first section by reiterating that we do not want to judge on the internal forum, but that, in accordance with our obligation before God, we only do so on the external forum: The gifts that Fr. Tiago has received are not hidden from us, for which we thank God and neither are his stubborn disobedience hidden from us, but we affirm that these gifts only bear good fruit if in everything they are subject to doctrine and discipline of the Immaculate Bride of Christ.

Finally, it should be said that epikeia cannot be applied in this matter, since no religious order is essential to the being of the Church, but accidental. And, in addition, some aspects, such as vows, affect divine right.

Let us remember that the benign but fair interpretation of the legislator's mind is called epikeia, based on considering that the material letter of the law does not apply to a specific case not foreseen by the legislator, and that it would probably have been excluded by him if he could have foreseen it. It is therefore a question of interpreting the true mind of the legislator against the material words of the law.

It is already understood that epikeia, according to the Thomistic doctrine, **has only application to human laws**, and one must be very parsimonious in its use, so as not to turn it into a real abuse. The main rules to which you must submit are the following:

1st. It can be used when the law is harmful or very difficult to comply with even for a remarkably virtuous person.

2nd. It is not licit when it is easy to have recourse to the superior competent to dispense it, **nor when it is a question of natural law or an invalidating ecclesiastical law.**

B. WHAT IS THE SITUATION OF FR. TIAGO'S PRIESTLY MINISTRY?

In this chapter we will distinguish two sections, because they affect the souls cared for by him up to the present.

SECTION I: ON THE CERTAINTY OF ITS ORDINATION

Three attempts at priestly ordination by Fr. Tiago can be distinguished. Initially, Fr. Tiago was ordained with null result by a false bishop conclar.

As everyone knows or should know: In the new Rite of Episcopal Consecration promulgated in 1968 by Paul VI, the grace of the fullness of Priestly Orders (the episcopate) is null and void; producing the invalidity of the new rite; That is, since that year there have been no bishops in the so-called Conciliar Church. As a consequence, all the priests ordained by these false bishops are not true priests, but lay people. Therefore, Fr. Tiago during most of his ministry was a layman, so the attempt to make any sacrament, other than baptism, was null and void. In marriage, the ministers are the spouses.

Having become aware of his situation, Father Tiago had himself ordained *sub-conditione* by Williamson, one of the four "bishops" consecrated by Lefebvre. This is not the place to explain the reason for the doubt about the validity of the consecrations by Lefevre. We do not know the date on which Fr. Tiago went to Williamson to try to receive a sub conditione ordination; but it could not have been before 2012, and we think that he requested such an ordination around 2020 or in subsequent years. But the date is not important, because the doubt about the validity of Williamson's episcopal reception affected the validity of Fr. Tiago's new priestly ordination.

Since the sacraments cannot be conferred because one sins mortally, Fr. Santiago asked Bishop Michael Philippus French to ordain him a priest, which shows in the internal forum that he had doubts about the validity of his priesthood. And indeed, this bishop ordained Fr. Santiago a priest on January 28, 2023. From this, we conclude several things:

- 1st. Fr. Tiago has been a true Catholic priest only since January 28, 2023. He used to be a layman.
2. All his priestly ministry prior to that date is invalid, or doubtful.
3. From the certificate of ordination of Bishop Michael Philippus French to Fr. Tiago, it is clear that the ordination was at all, not *sub-conditione*. This indicates that neither Fr. Tiago nor the consecrating bishop had any doubts about the invalidity of their previous ordinations, but that the one attempted by Williamson was considered totally invalid, according to the certificate of ordination of Msgr. French.

In light of these incontrovertible facts, any student in the first year of moral theology knows three things:

1. That, if in Fr. Tiago's conscience there was invincible (unaffected) ignorance that what he was doing was a simulation of the sacraments, there would be no personal sin during the time of such ignorance.
2. That once he was warned in conscience, he should either stop simulating the sacraments, or be validly ordained a priest, which he did in 2023. We do not know if between the perception of reality in his conscience and the new ordinations, he continued to simulate sacraments; if he did, he sinned mortally.
- 3rd. That, once the assurance of his ordination has been achieved, on 28/1/2023, he has the moral obligation to communicate the situation to all those who were deceived by his simulations, even if he did so in good faith. On the contrary, it indicates in the external forum a **very serious moral dishonesty**, and a contempt for souls. Up to the present, it is not difficult for us to have any communiqué where, from humility, he clarifies all these events, which affect the salvation of the souls of many. If anyone does not see the grave importance of this conduct, it is because he does not know the field of Catholic morality. A single example can illustrate the gravity: the Church teaches that mortal sins with attrition can only be forgiven by confession before a validly ordained priest. So, what is the situation of the person who with only attrition confessed mortal sins to a layman, because that was until 1/28/2023? You can answer yourself.

The reason why this letter is addressed to every person of good will is precisely to communicate the delicate situation in which many souls may find themselves. And since Fr. Tiago has not fulfilled his moral obligation, at least in general, it is up to these bishops to do so.

SECTION II: OF CRIMES IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS

Let us read canon 2364, before continuing:

<p>2364:</p> <p><i>A minister who dares to administer sacraments to those who are forbidden by divine or ecclesiastical right to receive them, shall be suspended from administering sacraments for such time as the ordinary may determine, according to his prudent discretion, and shall be punished with other penalties proportionate to the gravity of the guilt, without prejudice to the particular penalties established in the law against some crimes of this kind.</i></p>	<p>2364:</p> <p><i>Minister qui ausus fuerit Sacramenta administrare illis qui iure sive divino sive ecclesiastico eadem recipere prohibentur, suspendatur ad administrandis Sacramentis per tempus prudenti Ordinarii arbitrio definiendum aliisque pœnis pro gravitate culpas puniatur, fimis peculiaribus pœnis in aliqua huius generis delicta iure statuis.</i></p>
---	---

We have to observe that the penalty established by this canon is *vindictive*. And, according to canon 2286, *vindictive punishments are those whose direct purpose is the expiation of the crime, in such a way that their remission does not depend on the cessation of the contumacy in the offender*. Vindictive penalties may be imposed in perpetuity, for a certain period of time or with the approval of the person who imposes it. *On the subject of the temporal vindictive penalty, say the learned professors of the Pontifical University of Salamanca, there is none that cannot be imposed by the Church, without excluding the death penalty, according to the most probable opinion, if it is necessary to restore the ecclesiastical juridical and social order*. That is, the penalty does not depend on the delinquent cleric repenting and not reoffending, but on the crime being expiated.

Now we know from canon 1069 & 1 that **bigamy** is an attack on marriage, not by the violation of an ecclesiastical law, but by the violation of a more important law: the natural law. And this law is so serious that not even the pope can dispense with this dire impediment.

<p>1069 & 1:</p> <p><i>An invalid attack on marriage is that which is bound by the bond of a previous marriage, even if it has not been consummated, except for the privilege of faith.</i></p>	<p>1069 & 1:</p> <p><i>Invalide matrimonium attentat qui vinculum tenetur prioris matrimonii, quanquam non consummati, salvo privilegio fidei.</i></p>
--	---

This impediment, called *de ligamem*, is of natural law, and therefore no dispensation from it can be granted. Not even the Vicar of Christ. It ceases at the moment when the marriage is dissolved for any reason: by the death of one of the spouses or according to canons 1119, 1120 et seq. The ordinary way of proving the dissolution of marriage is documentary evidence. In the absence of this proof, when it is a question of proving the dissolution by death of one of the spouses, it is necessary to observe what is prescribed in the Instruction of the Holy Office of 1868, which can be seen in A.A.S. (1910), 11, 199 et seq., and which many editions of the C.I.C. publish as an appendix.

The punishment against bigamists, that is, those who, having a conjugal bond that prevents it, attempt to contract another marriage, even if it is only the so-called civil one, are ipso facto **infamous**; and if, disregarding the admonition of the Ordinary, they remain in illicit conspiracy, they must be **excommunicated** or punished with personal interdict, according to the gravity of the guilt.

We have one more step left to have all the Catholic doctrine and discipline that gives us clarity on the personally proven facts, which we will narrate in the end. Let us see, then, canon 1019 & 1.

<p>1019 &1:</p> <p><i>Before celebrating the marriage, it must be stated that there is nothing to oppose the validity and lawfulness of its celebration.</i></p>	<p>1019 &1:</p> <p><i>Antequam matrimonium celebretur, constare debet nihil eius validæ ac licitæ celebrationi obsistere.</i></p>
---	--

Canon 1020 leaves no doubt about the obligatory nature of the information that must be required of the future contracting parties, which is absolutely necessary in all cases and must include the following points: **a)** baptism and confirmation; **b)** parishes where the contracting parties have resided; **(c)** their age; **d)** if they are Catholic; **(e)** widowhood or dissolution of the previous marriage if the case so requires; **(f)** absence of impediments; **g)** freedom of consent; **(h)** Christian doctrine, if this point is not sufficiently established by other means. And, in the event that there is any doubt as to the veracity of the contracting parties or if it is suspected that they have concealed the truth, reliable witnesses must be heard, who will give testimony under oath.

Canon 1022 states that those who are going to marry must be proclaimed. Canon 1024 requires that marriage proclamations must be made on three consecutive Sundays or days of obligation, in the church, during Mass, or during other divine offices in which there is a greater attendance of the faithful and that they must be made in all the parishes that are proper to the contracting parties, if there is more than one.

FACTS

It is a proven and certain fact – because one of the signatories of this letter and a seminarian arrived at the place of the "wedding" once it had concluded – and without any doubt, that on March 16 of the year of the Lord 2024, Fr. Tiago celebrated in a neighboring town of Fatima, Portugal, a marriage that suffered from the impediment called *ligament*, which is of natural law, so that not even the pope himself, if there were one, could dispense with it. The situation of the contracting parties was as follows: An unmarried man, before converting, joins in concubinage with a married woman who was separated from her husband while still alive; from this concubinary union a girl was born. Later, the male converted to the Catholic Church and for a long time was willing to keep chastity, while the adulterous party, baptized in the Catholic Church, frequented evangelical services. The obligatory nature of the marriage proclamations by which some of the faithful could denounce the attack on marriage that Fr. Tiago was willing to commit, **and finally committed, was not fulfilled.**

In May 2024, one of the bishops who signed this communication sent a letter to Fr. Santiago to, among other things, admonish him about the serious crime he had committed. His answer was: that *I was very severe*. But as a Catholic, what hurt me the most was to see that Fr. Tiago knew the situation of being married to a person who was still alive, whose husband lived in Brazil. But how did he justify the crime he had committed? Answering that according to the married spouse (the female party) she had told her that her previous marriage, celebrated by the Catholic rite, she considered invalid because her husband had no intention of having children. That is to say, Fr. Tiago, **without fear of God**, it seems, arrogated to himself the role that only the Pope exercises through the Tribunal of the Rota to declare the nullity of a ratified and consummated marriage, since according to the adulterous party, they had indeed had conjugal relations; Fr. Tiago therefore mocked a natural impediment that no one on earth can dispense. To make matters worse, the legitimate spouse was not asked either; something that is done, even among the most pagan courts.

In the letter he was warned that he had an immediate duty to contact this bigamous couple, to inform them that their "marriage" was null, and that, every time they had conjugal relations, they sinned

mortally. And that, if Fr. Tiago did not comply with this obligation, he himself committed mortal sin every time the flesh of the concubines was united. To this day, we have not been informed that he has proceeded correctly in this matter; having the obligation to do so before the bishop who admonished him and wanted to correct him. It seems that there have been other similar cases, according to some faithful, it even seems that he is scheduled to celebrate another bigamy in Paraguay, but these servants cannot give credit for it, but only for what they have verified, not only documentarily, but with their own eyes. This bigamy was assisted by more than 30 faithful witnesses from different parts of Portugal and a faithful from Curitiba, Brazil, in which some did not dare to denounce the situation, we suppose for fear of Fr. Tiago.

The failure to comply with the duty of making marriage proclamations seems to be a habit in Fr. Tiago. This fact, which caused real and deep sorrow to one of the undersigned bishops, marked a separation with Fr. Tiago.

In view of the above facts and the laws of the Church indicated, the situation of Fr. Tiago, right now, is the equivalent of being suspended from administering the sacraments for the time determined by the Ordinary (the bishop to whom he is subject, who must have sufficient moral and canonical knowledge), and since the crime is very serious, The penalty must be proportionate to the gravity and expiation of the crime, according to his prudent discretion, and he must be punished with other penalties proportionate to the gravity of his guilt, without prejudice to the special penalties established in the law against certain crimes of this kind, according to canon 2364 cited above. In addition, his repentance is not enough to determine the duration of the penalty, because being a vindictive penalty, the purpose is the expiation of the crime.

With respect to this present denunciation, since the crimes are **of public action**, if they can be denounced by any faithful or by a public accuser, and according to the C.I.C all crimes are public, except those of libel and defamation, for which action the complaint of the offended party is necessary, and there is no defamation when the crime is *flagrant* -personally proven by one of the undersigned after the act- public, or notorious in fact, performed before more than thirty people, and affects the supernatural good of souls, and for greater abundance, the contumacy has continued in the failure to practice the obligatory marriage proclamations, successively and systematically violating the law of the Church; And, on the other hand, since the crime is *flagrant*, as we have said, when it is discovered by an authority of the Church in the very act of execution, and there is no pope, nor judicial structure due to the current state of Sede Vacante, it only remains to try to achieve the repentance of Fr. Tiago, which we desire, by means of the denunciation that legitimately belongs to us.

Without further ado, we can only pray to God that Fr. Tiago repents, and after serving the penalty imposed by the bishop to whom he submits, all the faithful can once again enjoy the fruits that the Lord grants through the gifts he has given to this father. finally subject to the authority of the bishops of the Church.

SECTION III: DO THE HOUSES OF THIS "ORDER" RESPECT THE DISCIPLINE OF TRENT IN RELATION TO CHASTITY?

Let us check what canon 500 & 3 establishes, and then canon 876 & 1 and 2, to have a perception of Catholic discipline on the matter we are now going to address:

<p>500 &3:</p> <p><i>Without a special apostolic indult, no men's religion can have women's congregations subject to it, or retain the care and direction of such religious as it is specially entrusted to it.</i></p>	<p>500 &3:</p> <p><i>Nulla virorum religio sine speciale apostólico indulto potest sibi súbditas habere religiosas Congregationes mulierum et aut earum</i></p>
--	--

	<i>religiosarum curam et et directionem retinere sibi specialiter commendatam .</i>
--	---

<p>876 &1:</p> <p><i>In order to hear validly and licitly the confessions of any religious and novice, priests, <u>both secular and religious</u>, of whatever rank and office they may be, need special jurisdiction, and every particular law or privilege to the contrary is revoked, and except as prescribed by canons 239, &1, number 1, 522 and 523.</i></p> <p>876 &2</p> <p><i><u>This jurisdiction is conferred by the Ordinary of the place where the house of the religious is located.</u></i></p>	<p>876 &1:</p> <p><i>Revocata qualibet contraria particular lege seu privilegio, sacerdotes tum sæculares tum religiosi, cuiusvis gradus aut officii, ad confessiones quarumcumque religiosarum ac novitiarum valide et licite recipiendas peculiari iurisdictione indigente, salvo præscripto can. 239, &1, n.1º, 522, 523</i></p> <p>876 &2</p> <p><i>Hanc iurisdictionem confert loci Ordinarius, ubi religiosarium domus sita est, ad normam can. 525.</i></p>
---	--

We saw in section **A**, that this community cannot use either the habit or the name of an already established order. The following would not have to be explained, if it were not for the fact that, in good faith, almost all of them have believed, albeit erroneously, that they did belong to the Carmelite Order. Since we do not judge the internal forum, we can say something about the external forum, which must be consistent with the conscience.

Chapter V of the twenty-fifth session of the Council of Trent was entitled "*Providences on the Enclosure and Custody of the Nuns.*" The text prescribed the obligation to observe active and passive enclosure, and placed in the bishops the care of the prescription and exhorted Christian princes to render their assistance in this matter, all under pain of excommunication. Subsequent normative developments, the most outstanding of which were the motu proprio *Circa Pastoralis* of 1566 and the bull *Decori et honestati* of 1570, both of St. Pius V, and the bull *Deo sacris virginibus* of 1572 of Gregory XIII, confirmed two serious objectives: One, the extension to all the nuns of the prescriptions relating to this rigorous enclosure, that is, the uniformization of the varied panorama of women's religious life. And two, the absolutely firm will to enforce the closure strictly.

From 1563 onwards, the rigorous observance of the cloister would become the most important piece of the reform planned by the ecclesiastical hierarchies for the nuns and the female convents, whose number, moreover, would not stop growing in the following century and a half. It was conceived as an inalienable objective and was given the highest priority in the attention of those who were in charge of the discipline of the feminine convent world. Thus, in one of the many treatises that had an impact on this subject, it was recalled how St. Charles Borromeo commanded his visitors that wherever they visited his Archbishopric "*the first and principal matter of their visit was to inquire whether in the Monasteries of Nuns there were frequent communications with Ecclesiastics, or Lay or Religious, and that they punish them rigorously, and remedy them effectively.*"

In November 2023, I wrote to Fr. Tiago, having already visited the houses of Morlaix, in France, Camanducaia in Brazil, and the house in Paraguay. In the letter he warned him that in none of the three monasteries were the minimum canonical norms observed to prevent the occasion of scandal, since the safeguarding of the chastity of women and men was in danger.

In the house of Brazil, within the enclosure that is supposed to be cloistered, women and men lived in separate cells, and often the space of the refectory was visited by men, while the women were working, and conversations between the two sexes were very frequent, even at night. Ordinarily, other women, tertiary or lay people and men were also accommodated there within the same

supposedly cloistered enclosure. Even Fr. Tiago frequently slept in the cloistered enclosure, directing the "nuns" and "oblates", in contravention of the norms of the Church.

The situation in Morlaix was not very different, nor was the situation in Paraguay orthodox.

As is known to all, not only *did Fr. Tiago retain the direction of the "nuns", either through him or through one of the male religious of his trust, but he exercised the direction of all of them, contrary to the aforementioned canon 500. In addition, he heard the confessions of the nuns without special jurisdiction, which can only be conferred by the ordinary bishop, in violation of canon 876 cited.*

And even more, he dwelt in the "monastery" itself, in contravention of the clear mandate "*Providences on the enclosure and custody of the Nuns*", established in chapter V of the twenty-fifth session of the Council of Trent, and contravened the *Circa Pastoralis* of 1566 and the bull *Decori et honestati* of 1570, both of Pius V, and the bull *Deo sacris virginibus* of 1572 of Gregory XIII, on the prescriptions relating to this rigorous enclosure and the absolutely firm will to enforce the enclosure strictly.

On the return to Brazil of one of the undersigned, in March 2024, unfortunately, the fears had been confirmed, there were not a few faithful who sent news of the scandalous occasions they suffered. The most surprising thing was that they came not only from Brazil, but also from Paraguay and from people who had been in Morlaix, France. Some of those people were totally trustworthy. They never claimed to be witnesses of de facto violations of chastity, but they did claim to witness various situations that gave rise to serious scandal, such as the locking of this father in the room of a "nun", without him answering the knocks on the door, and for which many could make reckless judgments or not. Certainly the scandal is so serious that some married women have wanted to put digital cameras at the entrance of the cells of the "nuns" for fear that their husbands could be tempted and arrested in this situation, since often strangers, men, married couples or single women, spend the night in the "religious" houses of Fr. Tiago. after his own example.

In words, one of the undersigned reiterated to Fr. Tiago, in May 2024, that this situation of the monasteries was against all discipline of the Church. But nothing has changed that father.

We have no doubt that all this is the result of the insubordination of this "order" with respect to the discipline and laws of the Church, governing itself arbitrarily, in rebellion against the discipline of the Church - which it refuses to comply with on the grounds that in sede vacante no one has jurisdiction, without taking into account that there are many norms that can and must be complied with - without any respect for the bishops, which undoubtedly produces an anarchic situation that in no way resembles the Catholic Church, but just another sect.

But there is always room for change, repentance, knowing that the Lord forgives the contrite heart. For this contrition, that is, for contrition to be true, it is necessary that the whole law of the Church be assumed, and not only in these three items, but in others that now is not the time to develop, wanting to focus only on what is essential to be able to feel Catholic.

Our duty as bishops, with regard to these matters of this organization of Fr. Tiago, has concluded: in our conscience we have fulfilled the mandate of St. Paul: *Rebuke, supplicate, admoesta com toda a paciência e doutrina.*

We now expect your Excellency to fulfill also, with the help of divine grace, the same duty that the Holy Apostle to the Gentiles, St. Paul, asks of us. Souls now have the doctrine and discipline of the Church so as not to be deceived or confused.

For our part, let us choose the glory of God and, if the Lord so wills, may our fame be trampled on once again and the glory of the Most Holy Trinity exalted.

In Braganza Paulista on January 12, 2025, Feast of the Holy Family



Bishop José Ramón.

Obispo Julio Aonzo