



009948576

CLASE 8.ª

(This document is presented to the Apostolic Nunciature of the Holy See in Spain insofar as, as the Pope's legation, its mission is to "manage procedures related to the Holy See and act as an intermediary in order to serve the faithful and help them in their relationship with the Holy Father and with the Vatican Institutions".

It is presented by Antonio Moya Somolinos, a Spanish national, DNI 50409257L, for the purposes of entry registration and return of the sealed copy as a step prior to the electronic presentation to the Department of Clergy. It is requested that this complaint in paper format and the attached memory card (containing 12 attachments) be sent to the Department of Clergy.

The synopsis with which it begins is considered a LETTER OF TRANSMISSION, in accordance with the custom that has been manifested to us for the presentation of this type of writing.

It is presented in Spanish, Latin, Italian, French, English, German and Portuguese. It is made on stamped paper of the Spanish State, 8th class folios 009948501 and correlatives (front and back) up to , both inclusive.

ADDRESS FOR NOTIFICATION PURPOSES. CONFIDENTIALITY.

The following addresses are designated for notification purposes:

Postal notification: "Antonio Moya Somolinos, PO Box 5134; Postal Code 14080. Spain".

Notification by email: denunciaopus@gmail.com

Notification via SMS and WhatsApp: +34652172226.

Telephone calls to this number are not answered.

We recall the legal obligation of confidentiality in everything related to personal data of the complainants in order not to be used outside of this matter).

INTERNATIONAL ECCLESIASTICAL INSTITUTIONAL COMPLAINT AGAINST OPUS DEI FOR REGULATORY FRAUD AGAINST THE HOLY SEE AND THE MEMBERS THEMSELVES

Synopsis of the complaint:

This is an INSTITUTIONAL COMPLAINT based on a fundamental reason and seven derived reasons.

The main reason is OPUS DEI'S INSTITUTIONAL REGULATORY FRAUD , which has

been systematically hidden from the Church Hierarchy. This situation has allowed the Statutes - the legal normative document of Opus Dei - to be de facto replaced by 46 (forty-six) "internal" documents with a normative character, both external and internal. The daily government of Opus Dei was based in these documents , where the bases are laid for the systematic violation of respect for the dignity of the person through abuses of power, conscience and spiritual . In the process, God is replaced by the founder , the charism is confused with the institution and an appropriation is made biased towards said charism - which belongs to the Holy Spirit for the service of the Church -. As a consequence, Opus Dei has taken a sectarian drift, becoming an institution that shares common characteristics with a destructive sect within the Catholic Church . We believe that this drift ends up resembling its environment as a structure of sin , in the style described by Saint John Paul II in his encyclical *Requested king social n.36 and 37*.

The seven derived reasons are summarized in the word "ABUSES": abuses of power, conscience and spiritual , systematically perpetrated from the institution on all its members : priests incardinated in the personal prelature of the Holy Cross and Opus Dei (clerics, according to the CDC No. 294) , and lay members numeraries, auxiliary numeraries, associates and supernumeraries (organic cooperators , according to CDC n. 296) .

The complaint is STRUCTURED as follows:

First of all, it presents the historical origin of this *de facto situation* that involves the institution as a whole, without prejudice to the personal responsibilities of those who direct it.

The fundamental reasons for denouncing institutional fraud and possible sectarian drift are set out below , mentioning the evidence.

Third, the seven derivative grounds and abuses are presented , supported by evidence.

Fourthly, they include -in an orderly manner and in Annexes- the violated teaching and legislative documents .

Fifth and lastly, a request is made in several sections, accompanying the complaint:

is requested, so that it protects Catholics who have been members, who are members and who could be members in the future, with the suppression of Opus Dei in the way it currently develops.

Alternatively , in parallel or after this measure, the re-founding of the institution by the hierarchy of the Church is requested with new norms and new rulers who act with the feeling of the Church .

Canonical penalties are also requested for the main leaders of the current Opus Dei.

As mentioned, 11 (eleven) annexes are attached , collected on a memory card protocolized with a password (June 26, 2023).

**TO THE HOLY FATHER FRANCISCO, AND
BY HIS AUTHORITY, TO THE DICASTERY OF THE
CLERGY.**

ANTONIO MOYA SOMOLINOS, with DNI of Spain 50409257L and the other signatories of this document appear before His Holiness and made an institutional ecclesiastical complaint against Opus Dei for regulatory fraud against the Holy See and the members themselves.

All the signatories are baptized; Several of us have long belonged to Opus Dei. To a greater or lesser extent what sincerely moves us to present this writing is the good of the Church and of the people.

The facts that are denounced are not considered specific facts produced by individual actions (although individual canonical sentences are also requested from those responsible for the government of Opus Dei. **THE COMPLAINT IS INSTITUTIONAL.**

The individual persons for whom canonical penalties are requested at the end of the complaint, to the extent of their responsibilities, are, without being exhaustive, the following:

D. FERNANDO OCÁRIZ BRAÑA, prelate of the personal prelature of the Holy Cross and Opus Dei, D. MARIANO FAZIO, auxiliary vicar of the prelature, D. ANTONIO PUJALS, general vicar, D. JORGE GISBERT, secretary vicar; as well as other members of the General Council (D. Javier de Juan, D. Carlos Cavazzoli , D. Andrew Joseph Laird , D. Luis Romera and D. Julien Nagore) and of the Central Consultancy (D^a. Isabel Sánchez Serrano, D^a. María Díaz Soloaga, Ms. Nicola Walte, Ms. Fernanda Lopes , Ms. Kathryn Plazek , D^a.Inocencia Fernández, D^a. Susana López and D^a.Rosário Libano Monteiro).

Also included in the complaint are the members of all the Regional Commissions and Regional Consultancies of Opus Dei and very specifically the Regional Vicars, the Vicar-Priest Secretaries and the Delegates of the prelate in each region. In those countries where there are Delegations, the Vicar Delegates and the Vicar-Priest Secretaries of each delegation are also included in the denunciation.

We profess the presumption of innocence of the persons cited as long as there is no sentence that undermines said presumption.

**INDEX OF THE CONTENT OF THE
COMPLAINT**

One. Historical origin of the current situation.

Two. Main reason for the complaint.

Three. Seven consequences as derived motives under the common factor of ABUSES by leading Opus Dei to a sectarian drift and making it a de facto structure of sin. This section is ordered in **SEVEN THEMATIC BLOUES** that are documented, not exhaustively, by seven documentary blocks extracted from OpusLibros corresponding to **ANNEX 7** of this complaint: 1) Abuses of conscience, spiritual and power. 2) Fraud of the concept of "spiritual family " (depressions, suicides and fraudulent use of psychiatry). 3) Ideologization of the figure of the founder. 4) Fraud to the Church. 5) Fraud to the State and civil society. 6) Distortion of the Christian vocation and aggressive proselytism. 7) The case of auxiliary numeraries.

Four. Support and grounds of the complaint.

Five. Petitions.

Six. Others I say.

This complaint is based on a **SINGLE REASON: the existence of an INSTITUTIONAL REGULATORY FRAUD AGAINST THE HOLY SEE AND THE MEMBERS OF OPUS DEI THEMSELVES.**

From this **FUNDAMENTAL REASON**, there are also other **SEVEN DERIVED REASONS** that we will expose later.

**I. HISTORICAL ORIGIN OF THE
CURRENT SITUATION OF OPUS DEI .**

The origin of the current situation of Opus Dei goes back to its first years as a foundation . From the beginning, Saint Josemaría Escrivá seems to consider himself a special and extraordinary figure with a transcendental mission. He manifests in his writings that his role is quasi messianic ; frequently, above the Supreme Pontiff and the hierarchy of the Church. According to his main collaborator, Álvaro del Portillo, he aspired to have an episcopal rank that would "facilitate" him to carry out his "saving" mission.

An institutional problem rooted in Opus Dei since its inception is its **ideologization** ¹.

¹ We understand by "ideology" the deviation of elevating one's own ideas above reality and imposing them on others, even resorting to illegal means or means that are harmful to people's rights and dignity. This



009948577

CLASE 8.^a

Inevitably, the institution gradually took a sectarian drift without going into details about when it regresses towards a destructive sect. Opus Dei members are usually guided to consider the founder and his successors not with respect and affection, but as depositaries of a faith, which they call "theological." For example, the main founding parties are based on supposed "miracles" or particular revelations, which in Opus Dei are taken as a basis to assert that the founder and his writings deserve "theological faith" and are the path of salvation, just like belonging to the Church.

This distortion in the response to the faith that Opus Dei members are led to profess mixes authentic truths with meaningless assertions. On the other hand, the interpretation of sacred texts by the founder differs from that of other Christians, due to previous ideologization. For example, evangelical fraternal correction is interpreted not as an admonition to turn your brother away from sin, but as a means of training that serves both to dominate through denunciation, and to standardize human behavior, such as crossing one's legs, during a talk.

The progressive ideologization and sectarian drift were facilitated by the initial presence in Opus Dei of people such as Blessed Álvaro del Portillo², who supported and encouraged the distorted vision of reality promoted by the founder. Over time, a more cohesive and self-referential group was formed that extended the messianic character of the founder to the institution itself, placing his "goodness" above any other institution of the Church and, at times, above the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

Some of the characteristics of sectarian drift³ that are noticed in Opus Dei are the following:

1. The group is united by a doctrine that is transmitted in a "messianic" way⁴ and is led by a

charismatic figure who considers himself the possessor of the Absolute Truth.

2. The structure of the group is theocratic, vertical and totalitarian.

3. Total adherence to the group is required, which implies distancing from social relationships, affective ties and previous activities.

4. Members live in a closed community or in total psychological dependence on the group.

5. Individual liberties and the privacy of the followers are suppressed.

6. The information that reaches the members of the group is controlled.

7. A set of manipulation and coercive persuasion techniques are used, such as meditation or spiritual rebirth.

8. A more or less strong rejection of the rest of society is encouraged, considering them enemies or at least suspects.

9. The main activities of the group are proselytizing and collecting money.

10. Under duress or psychological pressure, followers are obtained the delivery of their personal assets and considerable sums of money.

These characteristics are all applicable to Opus Dei. Logically, no one officially defines themselves as a member of a sect, especially within the Catholic Church. What is relevant is not the term used, but whether or not there is a sectarian trend to a greater or lesser extent.

As the religious moral authority is the most powerful, the most dangerous sectarian drifts are those that support or benefit in some way from the cover and moral authority provided by belonging to the Catholic Church. This faithfully complies with the Latin locution "corruptio optimize lousy".

what is considered the CENTRAL MOTIVE and ONLY origin⁵ of this complaint can be presented.

Individual ideology becomes even more worrying when it becomes social, affecting a community that acts in a coordinated manner to impose this ideology regardless of reality and ethics.

² Psychological reasons for the dependence are suspected, without professional confirmation

³ We consider that we can define a "destructive cult" as a group that uses coercive persuasion techniques in its recruitment or indoctrination process, which lead in one way or another to the destruction or severe damage of the individual's previous personality. At the same time, they lead to the total or partial rupture of the affective and communication ties of the follower with his social environment and with himself. In addition, its operating dynamics can infringe inalienable legal rights in a Rule of Law.

⁴ A phrase repeated internally in Opus Dei is that there are characters who are key figures in the history of salvation: Moses, Saint Paul and Saint Josemaría.

⁵ This complaint has a precedent in a judicial process that Opus Dei initiated in Spain against Agustina López de los Mozos, director and head of the OpusLibros portal, for the publication on the blog of the 46 normative documents mentioned above.

II The MAIN REASON for this INSTITUTIONAL COMPLAINT. INSTITUTIONAL REGULATORY FRAUD OF OPUS DEI TO THE HOLY SEE AND TO THE OWN MEMBERS OF THE INSTITUTION.

This Institutional fraud means that the Statutes of Opus Dei do not go beyond being, before the Holy See, a simple local reference. Before the members of Opus Dei, directly, they were *de facto non-existent* as long as they could.⁶ The Statutes were not translated, nor were the members of Opus Dei ever informed.

This situation was already reported to the Holy See on March 19, 2008 (**ANNEX 1**).

The true RULES by which Opus Dei was governed and is governed were a series of 46 books and documents that were known to part of the members of Opus Dei⁷ and which were hidden from the Holy See.

Litigation and consequences:

As mentioned in a footnote, these documents were the subject of a lawsuit in Madrid Commercial Court number 10 resulting in a Judgment of January 24, 2013. (ANNEX 2) In this lawsuit, **Opus Dei** led the commercial courts against Agustina López de los Mozos, director of the digital newspaper OpusLibros, accusing her of violating copyright and intellectual property rights. The ruling forced the books to be removed from the web⁸.

⁶ The arrival of the internet and some translated leaks made the statutes readable.

⁷ The knowledge of these documents was based on belonging or not to different levels of government: central, regional, local or specific orders. Those who were not in the group only received the regulations through their immediate superior.

⁸ In the aforementioned judgment of January 24, 2013, the director of OpusLibros was sentenced to remove the aforementioned documents from said website, as they are the intellectual property of Opus Dei.

⁹ The aforementioned 46 books that were the subject of the lawsuit were these:

1. Ratio Institutionis . Training Plan. Rome, 1997.
2. Catechism of the Prelature of the Holy Cross and Opus Dei, Rome, 2010. Eighth and last edition.
3. Catechism of the Prelature of the Holy Cross and Opus Dei, Rome, 2003. Seventh edition.
4. Catechism of the Prelature of the Holy Cross and Opus Dei. Rome, 1995. Sixth edition.
5. Internal Regulations of the Administration, Rome, 1985.
6. Vademecum Internal Publications, Rome, 1987.
7. Vademecum of priests, Rome, 1987.
8. Vademecum of the apostolate of public opinion, Rome, 1987.
9. Glosses on the Holy Cross Priestly Society, Rome, 1987.
10. Of the spirit and customs, Rome, 1990.
11. Caeremoniale Operas Dei. Rome, 1999.
12. Experiences on the way of carrying out fraternal talks, Rome, 2001.
13. Vademecum of the Local Government. Rome, 2002.
14. Experiences of apostolic work. Rome, 2003.
15. Experiences of the group managers. Rome.

The aforementioned 46 books of normative content, hidden from the Holy See and of constant reference for the superabundant regulation of the life of those who are part of Opus Dei , were sent between 2007 and 2008 by members of Opus Dei -some of them directors - to the OpusLibros portal, directed by the journalist Agustina López de los Mozos, considering that there was a general right of members and former members to know them.

Considering that their knowledge was a matter of transparency, OpusLibros published those 46 documents, in addition to translating the current and previous statutes from Latin.

This commercial litigation¹⁰ and its consequences are relevant to this complaint, for the following reasons:

16. Experiences of pastoral practice. Rome.
17. Experiences on liturgical ceremonies. Rome, January 2004
18. Experiences of local councils. Rome, March 2005.
19. Glosses on the work of Saint Michael, Rome, 1987.
20. Vademecum of the Local Councils, Rome, 1987.
21. Vademecum of the Headquarters of the Centers, Rome, 1987.
22. Initial training program (B-10). Rome, 1985.
23. Notebooks, 12 volumes published between 1970 and 1999.
24. Books of Meditations, 6 volumes (2nd edition, 1987/90).
25. Script of Circle of Male Supernumeraries.
26. The prayers of the Work.
27. Instruction on the supernatural spirit of the Work of God, Josemaría Escrivá de Balaguer, 19-11-1934.
28. Instruction on how to proselytize, Josemaría Escrivá de Balaguer, 1-IV-1934.
29. Instruction on the work of Saint Gabriel, Josemaría Escrivá de Balaguer, 1941.
30. Instruction on the work of Saint Michael, Josemaría Escrivá de Balaguer, 1941.
31. Instruction for directors, Josemaría Escrivá de Balaguer, 31-V-1936.
32. Card " Singuli dies ", Josemaría Escrivá de Balaguer, March 24, 1930.
33. Letter " Videns eos ", Josemaría Escrivá de Balaguer, March 24, 1931.
34. Letter " Res omnes ", Josemaría Escrivá de Balaguer, January 9, 1932.
35. Letter " Vos autem ", Josemaría Escrivá de Balaguer, July 16, 1933.
36. Circular Letter, Josemaría Escrivá de Balaguer, Burgos, 1-9-1938.
37. Letter " Non ignoratis ", Josemaría Escrivá de Balaguer, Rome, 10-2-1958.
38. Letter 28-11-1973. Josemaría Escrivá de Balaguer, Rome 1973.
39. Letter VI-1973, Points 36,37 and 38.
40. Letter 11-14-1974, Josemaría Escrivá de Balaguer, Rome 1974.
41. Alone with God, Rome 1996.
42. Growing within, Rome 1997.
43. Works by Bishop Alvaro del Portillo, property of " Scriptor , SA"
44. Letter " Our Father in Heaven", Alvaro del Portillo, Rome, 6-26-1975.
45. Letter from the Father, Alvaro del Portillo, Rome, 3-19-1992.
46. Letter from the Father, Alvaro del Portillo, Rome, 1-9-1993.
- O) A work by Bishop Javier Echevarría, whose copyright corresponds to the Prelature of Opus Dei
46. Letter, Rome, 17-V-2010.

¹⁰ Opus Dei and the Scriptor society , interposed by it, had the cunning not to file the complaint against OpusLibros before the criminal jurisdiction, but before the commercial jurisdiction. If it had been criminal, the judge would have had jurisdiction to investigate the content and background of those documents.



009948578

CLASE 8.¹

1. Opus Dei recognized that the 46 documents are authentic in their text and origin and therefore claimed them as copyright, inherited from the founder.

2. Opus Dei had to recognize verbatim, in court, that "the only normative document in Opus Dei are the Statutes," according to law.

3. It became clear ¹¹that there was and is an extensive and exhaustive important institutional corpus that regulates the life of the members, in parallel to the norm granted by a competent pontifical authority and unknown to it.

4. It was also possible to verify that they are not mere ascetic or spiritual writings¹², but normative texts, which are used as such at the government level and that it is in the interest of the Opus Dei authorities to keep ecclesiastical authorities out of the knowledge of the majority of the members, potential applicants to join, etc.

IN ANNEX 3, THE COMPLETE TEXTS OF THESE 46 BOOKS ARE CONTAINED IN PDF FORMAT AND ARE PRESENTED ON THE MEMORY CARD ATTACHED TO THIS COMPLAINT.¹³

Reading and analysis:

Beyond the litigation, the analytical reading of these 46 books is incontrovertible proof of the sectarian drift of Opus Dei and of the institutional regulatory fraud against the Holy See and the members of Opus Dei themselves. Even from the date of the Judgment until today, ten and a half years, these 46 documents continue to be the true regulations by which Opus Dei is governed, outside of the Holy See and against the most elementary procedural norms of Law.

It is a REGULATORY FRAUD against the members of Opus Dei, in two aspects:

1. First, it has de facto replaced the Statutes approved by the Holy See¹⁴ with a set of pseudo-norms that are given the value of divine norms from within the institution.

2. It has created in them an uncritical and disinterested conscience that ignores the key aspects that should regulate¹⁵ their organic cooperation with the Prelature (CIC 296).

Indeed, the Statutes of Opus Dei have always been hidden from members, not only because they are never mentioned in the internal training media, but also because the founder himself always strictly prohibited ¹⁶both divulging them and translating them. This makes knowledge impossible for members, given that almost all of the members do not know Latin or have a poor knowledge of it.

As can be seen, some of these books have a title that suggests that the content is of an ascetic or spiritual nature or of the institution's own customs. But it's not like that; ALL have a normative character.

But it is not only this. Within each book, the normative aspects are mixed with other ascetic ones, which makes the normative content more serious, as it is presented in a spiritual context that makes the Opus Dei member who reads it vulnerable by creating in his conscience a disposition of spiritual delivery that is diverted towards a provision that is really of a normative-institutional nature.

If we add to this the promotion of an uncritical mentality among the members of Opus Dei for the sake of an alleged "unity" that is rather uniformity of thought, what the members of Opus Dei understand when reading these books or being quoted in the media internal formation, are always normative provisions that affect even the internal forum above the norms of ordinary Christian morality and one's own conscience.

Obviously, any regulation, in order to be so, must be PROMULGATED AND PUBLISHED BY THE COMPETENT LEGISLATOR, and when dealing with those 46 books on subjects whose normative object, by their very nature, should be dealt with in statutes, that concealment before the Holy See is a VIOLATION OF THE PONTIFICAL RIGHT TO LEGISLATE, since the

¹¹ It can be verified by reading those texts.

¹² Like the texts and books published during the life and post-mortem of the founder

¹³ We note that the 46 documents that we present as ANNEX 3 are identical to those that OpusLibros posted on its website and later withdrew by court order. None of the signatories had or has to do with that litigation and, therefore, with a judicial mandate from the Spanish judge. By providing them, we now know that they are the authentic ones and we provide them as PROOF of the institutional behavior of Opus Dei that we denounce. We emphasize that we provide them as evidence in a complaint, not as a publication.

¹⁴ That they are not for reading by active members or for potential candidates to join Opus Dei.

¹⁵ CDC, book II, part I, title IV, 296 *Through agreements established with the prelature, the laity can dedicate themselves to the apostolic works of the personal prelature; but the mode of this organic cooperation and the main duties and rights attached to it must be adequately determined in the statutes.*

¹⁶ Specifically, in the Constitutions of Opus Dei of 1950, in which it was approved as a Secular Institute, in article 193 the following is stated: "These Constitutions, the published instructions and those that may be published in the future, as well as the other documents must not be disclosed; moreover, without the permission of the Father, those of said documents that are written in the Latin language do not even have to be translated into the vulgar languages"

function of legislating these statutory contents corresponds to the Holy See.

This legislative usurpation has been done, not only outside the Holy See, but behind its back, with **VOLUNTARY INSTITUTIONAL CONCEALMENT**, also hiding from the members the seriousness of such an action.

This supposes a **SECTARIAN DRIFT** because:

1. Through what can be perceived from the content of these 46 documents, Opus Dei has voluntarily and institutionally placed itself outside of what the Catholic Church mandates and forcing its members under sin.

2. has done it **to knowingly**, making them the subject of exhaustive and suffocating hyperregulation of their lives that includes:

- a. Information regulation
- b. limitation of freedom
- c. Progressive separation from your environment

3. All the elements are given so that the **abuses can be manifested: of conscience, of power and spiritual power over its members**, which in some cases has resulted in the **SUICIDE** of some members (as witnessed in OpusLibros).

4. An environment of extremely high psychological pressure has been created

- a. in proselytizing
- b. in search of money
- c. In personal submission and the renunciation of all legitimate aspirations

5. **lifelong irreparable interior damage** has occurred. Beyond **frequent religious traumas**, not only in the members who are still part of the institution today, but in those who have left it, with serious damage, from which many have not been able to recover, even after several decades.

6. A systematic lobbying work has been carried out at the level of ecclesiastical authorities and press management to install a vision that hides a conscious **self-concealment before the Holy See**.

In other words, **the institutional sectarian drift** would have been very close to being consummated definitively, had Opus Dei been approved as Prelature nullius dioecesis, **as had been requested during the founder's lifetime**.

Therefore, we are before the **proof** of the sole and fundamental reason for this complaint.

This situation supposes a serious damage to the members of Opus Dei to the extent that these

pseudo-norms have a profound impact on their lives, their will, their moral judgment and personal discernment, their internal jurisdiction, their personal dignity and freedom and even the most elementary natural ethics.

ANNEX 4 develops an **exhaustive analysis of such documents**.

We want to note:

That some of these 46 documents consist of several volumes, such as the volumes of "Notebooks" (No. 23), of different approaches, or those of "Meditations" (No. 24).

That in the analytical notes of these books carried out in **ANNEX 4 an exhaustive reading of the list of ANNEX 3** is not intended, but only to offer a **tool** to help quickly identify that normative character, which could go unnoticed in a superficial reading.

That the **PROOF** of the **MAIN SINGLE REASON** for the complaint is the documents themselves, the 46 books in **ANNEX 3**.

That in certain books (especially those of "meditations" or "letters") texts of spiritual value are mixed together with crimes against conscience. This makes them especially dangerous and harmful, since they not only conceal their character in some way, but also appeal to a **provoked or induced vulnerability and a conscience dependent on the institution**, instead of directing that dependence on God.

Reviewing the situation created by Opus Dei, we think that 5 (five) stages could be detected:

- Ideologization.
- sectarian drift.
- Institutional regulatory fraud
- Individual induced religious trauma.
- Development of a structure of sin.

The reasoning that we have just exposed leads us to conclude that if Opus Dei is becoming a structure of sin, it is because it has been **consented to and promoted from the leadership of Opus Dei**. That is to say, **DOLO** exists on the part of the central government of the institution¹⁷. Obviously this is not exempt from canonical responsibility.

II. SEVEN CONSEQUENCES DERIVED FROM REGULATORY FRAUD, THE CHANGE OF THE CHARISM OF OPUS

¹⁷ General Council and the Central Advisory of Opus Dei in Rome, and also in those who are part of the Regional Commissions and Regional Advisories in the countries where the prelature is established.



009948579

CLASE 8.^a

DEI UNDER THE PRESSURE OF A SECTARIAN DRIFT AND ITS STRUCTURE OF SIN THROUGH REGULATORY FRAUD.

We understand that the consequences that derive from what constitutes the main reason for this complaint ARE IN THEMSELVES ALSO REASONS FOR COMPLAINT¹⁸ to the extent that each derived consequence is in itself illegal, reprehensible and incompatible with an institution of the Church. We have grouped them into EIGHT BLOCKS with a common factor: All of them are ABUSES OF CONSCIENCE, OF POWER AND SPIRITUAL.

ONE: ABUSE OF CONSCIENCE, SPIRITUAL AND POWER ABUSE.

In this section, specific cases and testimonies of institutional cover-up of crimes, especially pedophilia, committed by members of Opus Dei are presented and analyzed. Cases of manipulation and coercive persuasion aimed at those members who have a certain critical sense and have expressed divergent opinions within the institution are also addressed. These coercive tactics have led in many cases to acting in a sectarian manner towards these individuals.

It is important to note that in Opus Dei there is a supplanting of discernment and individual conscience, as well as a systematic violation of the personal sphere and privacy of the people who are involved in Opus Dei activities, especially those who are already part of the institution.

This supplanting of individual discernment is done consciously, through what the founder called an "inclined plane." Through this process, the will and intimacy of those who join the institution is gradually weakened, leaving them psychologically and spiritually vulnerable and deprived of their own discernment. They are progressively oriented to identify more with the institution than with Christ, and are even made to believe that "God's will is manifested through the directors" (a phrase repeated insistently within Opus Dei). They are made to believe that their conscience, which should be the closest moral standard and the sanctuary of their being, is excluded from discernment and only directors and God have a place.

According to canon 630 of the Code of Canon Law, a series of precepts are established related to

respect for the freedom of conscience of members of religious institutes with regard to the right to choose a confessor and spiritual direction. These precepts should be applied even more strictly in the case of the laity, such as those of Opus Dei. However, in Opus Dei this precept is systematically violated, there being a constant flow of conscience information between the directors and those who carry out the spiritual direction of the members, who are designated by the directors. The secrecy of confession has even been violated, which has led to the resignation of several priests of the prelature.

It is true that the previous prelate, Monsignor Javier Echevarría, wrote a letter on October 4, 2011 in which he raised the existence of freedom of choice for the spiritual director and the separation between the internal and external jurisdiction, something that had never occurred in the institution by mandate of the founder and that is not yet carried out, despite the fact that this letter continues to be published on the website of the prelature (as part of the institutional disinformation). What is stated in that letter is not only completely false, since Opus Dei has never lived that way, but it is also false that the founder held said position. Opus Dei has always carried out the obligation to render an account of conscience and to do so with whomever the directors designate. This practice is carried out weekly for numeraries and associates and every two weeks for supernumeraries. Although after the letter of October 4, 2011, no written trace of this way of acting is left, it continues to be carried out through verbal control exercised by the directors of the centers, the delegations and the regional commissions.

There is a clear control of the privacy of consciences from the direction of the institution through the spiritual direction. In Opus Dei, spiritual accompaniment is not practiced, but a spiritual "direction" imposed by the institution through its appointees, thus violating the secret conscience of those whom they guide.

Frequently, there is an intolerable invasion of the privacy and conjugal life of supernumeraries by the institution through denunciation from the spiritual direction and sometimes violating the sacramental seal.

The testimony of the secularized numerary priest, Don Antonio Esquivias, in his book "Heaven in a Cage" is illuminating. In this book, he narrates in first person his experience in the Regional Commission of Spain, where he managed the reports of conscience written by the Spanish numerary members, including

¹⁸ We understand that some of these crimes are also illegal in the civil or criminal order of the countries where Opus Dei operates, which does not mean that they should not be dealt with in a complaint in the ecclesiastical sphere, since since the first Christians, the disciples of Christ we must want to be the best citizens of the temporary city.

details such as the frequency with which they had masturbated.

This identification of the institution with God has consequences that disrupt and destroy the moral order, showing shades of "quiet-seeming fanaticism." Within Opus Dei, a single "moral norm" seems to prevail: the end (of Opus Dei) justifies the means. Any deviation from the moral order ends up being considered virtuous to the extent that it benefits the institution.

Along these lines is the devaluation of evangelical fraternal correction, which in Opus Dei is practiced as a denunciation, since all fraternal correction is not done "alone", not even for a sin. This involves at least the director and the person with whom the corrected member confides. After consultation with the director of the center, it is taken as matter of the same, not what our Lord established, but "whatever may go against the spirit of the Work", that is, seeking the strengthening of the institution, regardless of Christian morality. Use of this means to manipulate the interior life and the internal forum of the members and lay organic cooperators.

The consequences of this dynamic are extremely destructive for people's consciousness.

Abuses of conscience, power and spiritual are closely related to fraud in the exercise of virtues that is practiced in Opus Dei

Opus Dei has always promoted a spirituality centered on "doctrine" (*ours is to give doctrine*). Rarely was he encouraged to live the aspects of charity, mercy, "care for widows and orphans", forgiveness, etc.

From the doctrine, a rigid religiosity is promoted, plagued by conscientious scruples, legalistic, excluding others if they do not belong to the prelature. Many times he remembers the self-righteous profile of someone who has a thousand religious regulations to comply with, but is not capable of sharing bread or comforting the sad.

An important aspect is the exorbitance in the normative and regulating eagerness of the life of the members. We have mentioned as a fundamental reason for this complaint the 46 secret books that make up the real normative corpus of Opus Dei under the cover of statutes that have never been mentioned nor are they mentioned in the media or in the lives of the members.

But this is not something isolated, that refers only to those 46 books. IT IS SOMETHING THAT IS PART OF THE DAY TO DAY, specifically in the ordinary work of government of the institution,

embodied in a multitude of letters that reach the numerary centers from the regional commissions or from the delegations and in the letters that reach the commissions from the general council.

These writings regulate the life of the members, especially the numeraries, down to extremely minute details such as the days a year in which the numeraries may not wear stockings or wear shoes that show their toes, etc.

This suffocating hyper-regulation is demanded with full force to the point that on certain occasions, instead of being sent these writings by internal suitcase by other full members, they have been taken by a full member commissioned from the General Council directly to their destination with obligation to be read **aloud and on their knees** by all the members of the destination center.

It is not strange that a collective attitude like this ends in collapse, not because it has turned the institution and its government into a mere ideology, but because such is the logical destiny of every institution that in an excessive regulatory effort does not take into account that precisely this attitude it is its own ruin.

As the French engineer Robert Le Ricolais said, "every systematic universe leads fatally to ankylosis".

A conclusion reached by Max Weber is also true in the sense that if a charism does not lead to a certain institutionalization, it is in danger of being lost. However, an excess of institutions ends up blurring the charism or appropriating it, as has happened with Opus Dei, which after almost a hundred years has lost sight of the charism to the point that the Pope himself has had to come out in defense of it. (Ad Charisma tuendum)

Another very prominent aspect is the indisputable preference of the good name of the institution over the truth. Along these lines, there are lies about suicides (mentioning that the person died "by accident"), departures of members (preferably saying that he ran away with someone of the other sex), venereal diseases in priests, etc. What has been mentioned about the prelate's letter of October 4, 2011 is very revealing; They preferred to lie publicly to thousands of members, rather than say that the Church had indicated that Opus Dei was going against existing pastoral regulations.

All adolescents were taught for decades to lie to their parents, denying their incorporation into Opus Dei, lying to attend the training media at the direction of the directors, etc.

While the preferential option for the poor was ignored, the exercise of charity, the practice of



009948580

CLASE 8.ª

forgiveness offered and received, etc. They insisted on "holy shamelessness", "holy intransigence", "unity with the Father" and other types of non-evangelical virtues, but of great impetus in the institution.

The virtue of justice was understood only unilaterally: thus, due to their commitment, the numeraries and associates had to give all their patrimony and income from their work to the institution. This led to the progressive impoverishment of the numerary members until making them financially, professionally, spiritually and emotionally dependent, and taking their vulnerability and mediocrity to the extreme of total dependence on the organization.

GOD . FRAUD OF THE CONCEPT OF SPIRITUAL "FAMILY" (DEPRESSION, SUICIDES, PSYCHIATRIC ISSUES)

The most painful consequences of the abuses present in Opus Dei are, perhaps, the suicides and the people who have abandoned the faith after leaving the institution. However, it is also important to address the abuses in the field of psychiatric medicine, used to break the will of those who dare to express any discrepancy regarding the institutional inconsistencies they have observed.

These abuses are abundant and their effect translates into the generation of depressions in members who previously enjoyed good health and psychological balance. Although it could be argued that there have always been people with a certain psychological vulnerability and that this is also manifested in the religious sphere, the high proportion of people under psychopharmacological treatment in Opus Dei is surprising, especially among numeraries, compared to other Church institutions.

In addition, these "methods" have been applied by physicians who are tenured members, some of whom are not specialists in psychiatry. Even more worrying is the fact that these doctors have left blank, signed prescriptions at the centers, allowing in many cases the directors of the center, without being doctors, to prescribe the psychotropic drugs, thus violating the most basic principles of medical (and Christian) ethics. Its sole objective is to annul the will of the "dissenter" until turning him into a broken person, who in many cases has been returned to his parents after having ruined his life.

These types of practices and their devastating consequences are unacceptable and require deep reflection and a forceful response. It is essential to protect the integrity and emotional well-being of the members of any religious institution, promoting an

environment of respect, understanding and support instead of resorting to coercive and abusive methods.

The emotional imbalance and violation of the vulnerability of organic cooperators is also based on forcing the institution to be considered as a family. However, this idea of family differs from the true families of organic cooperators and members of the prelature. It tries to convey the idea of a family that excludes royal families, and whose supposed "rights" are controlled exclusively by the directors. These directors, based on the premise that "Opus Dei is a family with supernatural ties", exercise the abuse of power, conscience and spirituality without any restriction, mentioned in the previous point.

On the other hand, an opposition is established between the supposed "supernatural family" within Opus Dei and the so-called "blood family", generating a dynamic of exclusion instead of integration. The existence of internal terms such as "familiosis" is even mentioned in the training media, considering it an alleged "spiritual disease" that represents an "attachment" to the family as opposed to the "vocation to Opus Dei".

This vocation is almost always presented as a "lit lantern" as opposed to the rest of the Christians, who would be the "off lantern" (doctrine of the founder filmed in front of thousands of people). Therefore, an appropriation of the Christian vocation takes place, maintaining that belonging to Opus Dei is only given by a divine call "from all eternity and irrevocable". It is progressively inculcated in the lay organic cooperators that whoever leaves Opus Dei abandons God, betrays him, and becomes creditor of "the pains of hell", with the conscience damage that this has meant and still means in so many people.

In line with the idea of the institution as a family with supernatural ties, the figure of the prelate as "father" with a paternalistic function is built. Thus, a relational asymmetry is generated between him and the lay organic cooperating members that deepens their vulnerability. Opus Dei has sometimes been referred to as a "nursery for vulnerable adults." Disabled by the institution to make free decisions, just the opposite of what Jesus Christ has come to bring us, the freedom of the children of God.

Added to the previous data is the absolute lack of sensitivity, with thousands of events documented on the OpusLibros portal, due to human suffering, especially that generated by the prelature itself. There, the concept of the charity of Christ is forgotten in a practical way, practicing discarding with those who no longer consider "useful", leaving them in many cases

destitute. For example, as a repeated sample, cases of numeraries and auxiliary numeraries are cited who, after several decades of years in Opus Dei, are returned to their parents' house (in many cases, octogenarians) after having induced irrecoverable psychological illnesses in them, and of having left them without patrimonial assets and without a job from which to live or contributions for future old age.

THREE. IDEOLOGIZATION OF THE FIGURE OF THE FOUNDER.

The ideologization of the figure of the founder is a worrying issue within Opus Dei. There is an appropriation of the charism and a confusion between the charism and the institution, implying that the charism is identified with the ways that the founder established to institutionalize it. This excessive institutionalization and personalization in the figure of the founder leads to its prevalence over the figure of the Pope and the bishops, even giving their opinions a value of theological faith. This represents a fall in ideology, away from the true charism and the service that charisms provide to the Church, as taught by Saint Paul.

In other Church institutions, as in the case of Marcial Maciel and the Legionaries of Christ, the founder's aberrations gave rise to direct intervention by the Holy See. Although Opus Dei has not experienced public scandals of this magnitude, that does not contradict the damage caused by an ideological founder. As we are seeing in this complaint, the damage to souls, to the Church and to communion is equally serious, or even greater than in the aforementioned case.

In fact, if the problem of the Legionaries of Christ had consisted solely of the aberrations of the founder, it would be enough to remove him and appoint a worthy successor to solve the problem. However, both in the case of the Legionaries and in that of Opus Dei, the evil was institutional. The solution in the case of the Legionnaires was adequate, if painful. According to statements by Cardinal Guirlanda, after several years, the Legionaries of Christ can now walk on their own.

Meanwhile, Opus Dei remains paralyzed and cannot find a way to serve Christ from his own charism, even requiring the Pope himself to remember him on his own motion (*Ad Charisma Tuendum*). The great obstacle for Opus Dei to deploy the service to the Church to which it is called is its own founder, who is ideologized to the point that, apart from official words and declarations, followers follow him instead of Jesus Christ.

The problem with the founder's ideologization is that his ideas and opinions have also become the object of ideologization, but of a social nature. This ideology has taken root in the institution itself and is part of it. It is a cancer for both Opus Dei and the Church to understand Opus Dei and its founder from within, above the Church, the Pope and the bishops, and act outside of them, trying to systematically disobey and discredit them when they appropriate, through third parties who make believe that this discredit comes from "private opinions of those people". An example of this is the recent media campaign carried out by the University of Navarra against the Bishop of Teruel and against the Pontiff himself in the Gaztelueta case, where an attempt has even been made to present the convicted criminal José María Martínez Sanz, a tenured member of Opus Dei, for a crime of pedophilia, with a final sentence from the Supreme Court of Spain.

It is important to recognize that these cases of ideology and abuse do not represent all members of Opus Dei. There are people within this institution who live their faith in an authentic and exemplary way. However, it is crucial to address and confront these issues to prevent further harm and abuse in the name of the institution and the original charism.

It is essential to distinguish the institution from the people.

The Church, the Pope and the bishops have the responsibility to ensure the integrity and well-being of the faithful. Impartial and transparent investigations are essential to address allegations of abuse and ensure that adequate measures are taken to protect victims and prevent further abuse.

In recent years there have been several cases of sexual abuse by members of Opus Dei. It should not be forgotten that sexual abuse always has its origin in a prior abuse of power, conscience and spirituality, and that in the case of Opus Dei these abuses are institutionally induced due to relational asymmetry consciously promoted by the institution itself among those who direct and those who are not directors.

Ultimately, Opus Dei and any other religious institution must remember that their main mission is to serve Christ and the Church, following the principles and teachings of the Gospel. The ideologization and overvaluation of the founders must not prevail over obedience and communion with the universal Church. Only through true humility and a profound search for truth and justice, Opus Dei will be able to find its way to serve the Church fully and authentically, freeing itself



009948581

CLASE 8.ª

from the burdens of the past and focusing on its spiritual vocation.

FOUR. FRAUD THE CHURCH.

The founder always maintained that "Opus Dei serves the Church as the Church wants to be served." It is not what is manifested in the facts. It is perceived that Opus Dei has always used and tries to use the Church, using the Church as a political entity to achieve its ambitions for power within it.

Self-referentiality is a worrying characteristic in Opus Dei, since it shows a lack of openness towards the universal Church and a tendency to look for its own interests and ambitions for power. This attitude is reflected in the way they relate to ecclesiastical authority, usurping the jurisdiction of the bishops and systematically disobeying them.

The truth is often misrepresented, especially in relation to apostolic activity, which is not such, but proselytizing-sectarian, aimed solely at achieving more members and greater power within the Church. Sometimes it could even be deduced the "purchase" of the wills of diocesan bishops through the money from the CARF foundation or through educational activities that they manage as tools of "ecclesiastical politics", taking the Church as a merely mundane entity.

In addition, Opus Dei has shown to be reluctant to participate in diocesan instances and important ecclesial events, such as the National Congress of Laity in Spain and similar events, which shows its lack of commitment to synodality and its preference to act in isolation and authoritarian.

Opus Dei always maintained a constant aversion towards the Jesuits and a general contempt towards the religious under a so-called "lay mentality" that could be interpreted as psychological compensation since the members were little less than religious camouflaged in fact, and with ignorance of the variety of gifts with which the action of the Holy Spirit is expressed in his Church.

A consequence of the lack of understanding about the multitude of gifts and charisms of the Holy Spirit would be in the fraudulent application to the laity of norms proper to institutes of consecrated life. They are not called as such, which generates a state of lack of definition and normative ambiguity that ends up generating all kinds of damage, religious and psychological.

There is a fine line frequently crossed in the preaching, training and praxis within Opus Dei, which is sometimes recognized as "semi-Pelagianism". In this sense, there is very little preaching that goes in the direction of abandonment, the recognition of God as

Lord of history, the action of the Holy Spirit through his Church. For this reason, the founder always spoke of "granting, without yielding, with the intention of recovering", in relations with the authority of the Holy See regarding Opus Dei.

We can also mention that when the Synod of the Amazon took place, the prelate, since nothing else was discussed in those days, made veiled mention of it in one of his web messages of October 1, 2019: *"At the end of these lines, I ask you to pray for the fruits of the extraordinary missionary month that Pope Francis has called for and for the Synod of Bishops that will begin in a few days in Rome."* This confused way of expressing himself is very striking, since he calls "Synod of Bishops" what was not properly the Synod of Bishops - which since the time of Saint Paul VI has been held biannually - but the Synod of the Amazon, convened by the Pope, but not as one of the ordinary synods of bishops.

With this way of expressing himself, the prelate avoided disseminating to the members of Opus Dei this initiative of the Pope that he internally viewed with suspicion, especially on the subject of compulsory priestly celibacy, to prevent Opus Dei members from fixing their attention on that synod in which the proposal that in said area it ceases to be mandatory for priests in the terms in which it was proposed was approved by a large majority.

On the subject of compulsory priestly celibacy, Opus Dei used third parties, specifically Cardinal Sarah and Archbishop Georg Ganswein, both members of the Priestly Society of the Holy Cross, of which the Opus Dei prelate is the General President, to involve, in one of Cardinal Sarah's books, Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI, who refused to get involved. Well known subject.

Another example of fraud towards the Church is the manipulation they have carried out in the *Anuario Pontificio* 2023, page 1031, disobeying the directives of the Church and the Pope to benefit themselves. Indeed, in said Yearbook and on that page the personal prelatures appear within the hierarchical structure of the Church, contrary to the 2016 letter *luvenescit Ecclesia* n.23, where the Pope, through the SCDF, recalls that "the fundamental ecclesial regime must be respected", favoring the active promotion of charismatic gifts in the life of the universal and particular Church, preventing the charismatic reality from conceive parallel to the life of the Church and not in an orderly reference to hierarchical gifts"

In footnote 116 of said pontifical document it is stated verbatim that personal prelatures are " **ecclesial realities of a charismatic nature** ".

It is an evident fact that Opus Dei has provided false information to the Editrice Vaticana Bookstore, dependent on the Holy See and publisher of the *Annuario Pontificio* 2023, completed on January 23, 2023, the date on which both *Praedicate the Constitution Evangelium* as the *Motu Proprio Ad Charisma Tuendum* , respectively dated March 19, 2022 and July 22, 2022, the first of which placed (n. 117) the personal prelatures in the Clergy department, and the second adopted a series of measures towards the Opus Dei to make it legally coherent with its charismatic nature, and not hierarchical, including ordering an adaptation of the current statutes.

It should be noted that this documentary falsehood embodied in a document as important in the Church as the *Annuario Pontificio* is a discredit for the Pope by contradicting his normative provisions as the highest legislator of the Church.

Another fraud on the Church occurs with its own lay members, who believe - through internal means of formation and incorporation ceremonies - that they "are under the jurisdiction of the prelate." This is a fraud, because in article 125.2 of the statutes themselves, which are systematically hidden from the laity, it is clearly stated that over them the jurisdiction "extends only to what refers to the peculiar mission of the prelate", that is to say , to organic cooperation in the pastoral mission, which is none other than to spread the call to holiness through work and the ordinary occupations of life, leaving the diocesan bishop as ordinary of all the lay members who fall under its jurisdiction in accordance with the Code of Canon Law.

That is to say, from the direction of Opus Dei there is a constant violation and usurpation of the authority of the residential bishop, by making the laity believe that their ordinary is the prelate when in reality, according to CIC 295.1, it is only an ordinary of the clergy . incardinated in the personal prelate.

In short, Opus Dei has demonstrated a pattern of deceit, manipulation, and self-referentiality in its relationship with the Church. This is contrary to the very essence of Christianity, which calls for humility, obedience and selfless service. It is necessary to address these problems and seek the necessary reform so that Opus Dei can find its true purpose and fulfill its mission authentically and in communion with the Church.

In conclusion, the exposed complaint reveals a series of serious problems in Opus Dei that go beyond simple discrepancies or isolated criticism. These are fundamental issues that affect the integrity of the institution and its relationship with the Church.

The abuses, manipulation, ideologization and regulatory fraud described in this complaint are cause for deep concern. These problems affect not only the members of Opus Dei, but also the Church as a whole, since they undermine the fundamental principles of transparency, justice and service that must govern the Christian community.

It is imperative that these issues be addressed seriously and responsibly. The Church, together with the competent authorities, must carry out a thorough investigation and take the necessary measures to correct these practices and protect those who have been victims of abuse and manipulation.

It is essential to remember that faith and belonging to a religious institution must be in harmony with ethical principles and evangelical values. The Church must be a place of welcome, respect and love, where the dignity and well-being of all its members is promoted.

FIVE. FRAUD TO THE STATE AND CIVIL SOCIETY.

The issue of fraud related to the civil legal personality of Opus Dei in several countries is presented, including the publication of books such as "Opus Dei before state law" by Comares editions, 2007 (whose coordinator is Mr. José María Vázquez García Peñuela, a numerary member of Opus Dei, rector of the International University of La Rioja, whose main owner is a supernumerary member of Opus Dei) who argues that this organization is part of the hierarchical structure of the Church against the CIC promulgated and published in 1983.

In previous years, members specialized in Canon Law and State Ecclesiastical Law have held relevant political positions, especially in right-wing governments, which has led Opus Dei to be treated as part of the hierarchical structure of the Church in some countries. like Spain (where there is an approximate 50% of the total members of Opus Dei in the world). This implies that Opus Dei enjoys certain protection and is not subject to state control in economic matters and personal data of its members.

This situation allows Opus Dei to provide false information, even to the Holy See, as reflected in the already mentioned *Annuario Pontificio* 2023.

In other countries, such as Argentina, Opus Dei is not part of the hierarchical structure, but has the



009948582

CLASE 8.ª

status of a non-state public law entity. As such, it has prerogatives that it has used, but also obligations to be controlled and audited, which it has carefully avoided.

Article 29 of the Statutes of Opus Dei, (*While the temporary incorporation lasts or once the final one has been made, for someone to voluntarily leave the Prelature, a dispensation is required that can only be granted by the Prelate, having heard his own Council and the Regional Commission*) establishes the requirements for a member to leave the Prelature, but the dispensation of the Prelate is questionable, since it is never provided in writing but through verbal communication without documentary evidence. This is used to manipulate the number of lay members to suit Opus Dei.

Only Opus Dei directors have access to current member data. Based on testimonies and articles in OpusLibros "Correspondence", it is estimated that Opus Dei currently has no more than 40,000 members worldwide, including lay people, priests and members of the Priestly Society of the Holy Cross. Very far from the 93,764 that appear in the aforementioned Anuario Pontificio 2023.

Opus Dei has been known for always lying about the number of its members, as recognized in the book "History of Opus Dei" by Gullón- Coverdale, both numeraries. In that book, page 447, it has been publicly recognized that the 60,000 members that Opus Dei has always maintained existed at the death of the founder, were actually 32,800.

In addition, there is a lack of credibility in the data provided by the Anuario Pontificio in relation to the priests incardinated in the Prelature. The Bulletin of the Roman Prelature is no longer published on paper and does not include the names of deceased members. For years there have been more casualties of priests than new ordinations. Likewise, in recent years applications for admission have been very scarce, especially for numeraries, in all the countries where they are established.

It is concluded that Opus Dei has used the importance of numbers to gain respectability and credibility, even at the cost of lying or living off income. This attitude of falsehood towards the Church, the State and civil society should be corrected authentically, according to the Gospel preached by Pope Francis.

Neither can this attitude of lying and using systematic lies toward the lay members themselves, who have the right to know the truth about the institution to which they belong, be trivialized.

Within this fraud against civil society, it is necessary to highlight the fraud with respect to ethics and morality that is practiced in Opus Dei institutionally under the de facto "rule" that the end justifies the means as long as that end is "the good of the Work", although such "good" is actually a moral evil.

In general and due to a praxis crystallized over the years, black money is systematically used, violating:

- limits on cross-border transportation of money, avoiding bank transfers that leave traces

- tax obligations for not registering in some cases up to 100% of the contributions received

- tax or social security obligations in the case of employees, lying or falsifying working conditions, continuously.

There is little ethics in the management of the money available for the promotion of peoples in situations of poverty or indigence. In each region and delegation of developing countries there is an office where projects are prepared to present to social and religious international donors. In these, the truth is usually "adjusted" so that it appears that social work is going to be done with vulnerable groups; In most cases, money is sought for other types of expenses. In developed countries, there are members of Opus Dei who act as a link with donor institutions; in some cases, they are even entire organizations such as Fomento de Fundaciones. The ties are too complex for this denunciation, but it was fully expressed by the comment of the Belgian consul in Argentina when he said that "poor people's money (the Belgian taxes) was being used to pay for the houses of the rich" (the center in construction).

There is no consideration of moral obligations when talking about money. The Opus Dei acts in economic matters through opaque commercial companies interposed, secretly controlled by the prelature. The prelature decides who works in each one, who will be its directors, which directors of the delegation or of the region will be the ones who will monitor them, attend their meetings, etc. By means of a blank signature of the resignation of its directors, the management and control of the directors is ensured. Through interposed companies, tax and social security regulations are fraudulently violated, and these companies also serve to evade responsibility for the activities organized in Opus Dei centers.

In this way, in addition, in the event of falling into civil, criminal, tax or commercial liability, those responsible are always the managers appointed by the

directors of Opus Dei and never these, who are the ones who really control those companies or societies.

As a sample button, in Argentina exclusively, Opus Dei has formed 17 interposed companies that own a huge amount of assets. This handling of different associations allows that, in the case of auxiliary numeraries, for example, if there is a labor trial for unpaid wages, most likely the person will have to sue 5 different interposed associations that own the different buildings where has worked. This makes successful litigation practically impossible if you do not have a law firm capable of following each case.

Another example is the case of sexual abuse during a camp organized by a men's club, a corporate work of Opus Dei. In response to the complaint, they responded that Opus Dei had nothing to do with it, since the interposed society was the organizer of the activities and that Opus Dei was only in charge of spiritual direction.

Through these structures, not only a certain legal impunity develops, but also an excessive desire for money, patrimonies, inheritances, legacies, material wealth. In fact, around the year 2010 the advisability of "treating" notaries, lawyers, etc. was indicated through a government note, that they were in contact with older people who had money and questionable offspring, in this way, it could be suggested to them to testate in favor of Opus Dei, in their interposed societies.

In this sense, CARF's actions are a clear example.

The patrimonial assets of the lay numeraries and associates are being emptied little by little and over the years they are being induced to testify in favor of one of those opaque interposed companies. The examples of these cases are abundant. In fact, they have almost always managed to get numeraries to test in this way by creating a scrupulous conscience in them in case they had the idea of testing in another way.

They always transmit to their lay members an anti-legal or non-legal mentality that makes them more vulnerable, by not discerning the levels of legality and obligation of the issues that are presented to them as normative, resulting in an alteration and disruption of the moral order and a progressive destruction of moral conscience, by giving greater importance to something ambiguous and self-sufficient such as the "spirit of Opus Dei" in the face of common moral issues that the Church's Magisterium teaches, for example on issues of Church Social Doctrine.

Given these data, a striking aspect of Opus Dei's interpretation of the way of living morality and

Christian doctrine is the concept of silence about any crime that is committed that may affect the "honor" of Opus Dei.

The criterion is experienced as a kind of *omertá*. As is known, the *omertá* implies "a categorical prohibition of cooperating with state authorities or using their services, even when one has been the victim of a crime." A person must avoid interfering if they see something that is not correct and cannot report a crime to the authorities under any circumstances.

The reason that Opus Dei always gives for acting this way is that "dirty laundry is washed at home."

We will only comment on cases that are publicly known, avoiding those that we know personally, but have not been made public or the people have died.

Along these lines, they have covered up:

Sexual abuse committed by members of Opus Dei in Chile, Spain, USA, Uruguay, Argentina.

Destination of fugitive members for embezzlement and fraudulent bankruptcies affecting thousands of victims in Uruguay, Paraguay, Mexico, Spain, Argentina.

Financial crimes and documentary falsification (avoid giving data).

Crimes of illegal transfer of people (adults and minors) through cross-border crossings in Paraguay, Bolivia, Argentina.

Falsification of documents (such as fee receipts in international cooperation fund programs for expenses not authorized by the program.)

Crimes such as the improper use of stamped and signed medical stubs/recipes used by center directors to "prescribe" medicines to other members or buy at a discount falsifying the supposed patient.

Conduct black money from the salary of numeraries in the form of donations to interposed companies to achieve tax benefits in the personal income tax return.

Recently, a priest from the Priestly Society of the Holy Cross, in reference to this immoral aspect of Opus Dei, and in clear self-criticism, told us in confidence that the permanent cancers of the Church have always been "power, money and hypocrisy".



009948583

CLASE 8.^a

SIX. DISTORTION OF THE CHRISTIAN VOCATION. AGGRESSIVE PROSELYTISM .

Basically, this block deals with the confusion that Opus Dei induces in the members, making them take the part for the whole, that is, mentioning the word "vocation" in a self-referential key, referring it not to the universal Christian vocation to holiness, mentioned by Ephesians 1, 4, but understanding that the vocation is to Opus Dei, or at most that God calls to Opus Dei, not to faith in Christ, of which, the charism of Opus Dei, like other charisms, is just a way of living that universal vocation to holiness in Christ.

In Opus Dei, and specifically the current prelate, they usually correctly affirm that there is only the Christian vocation, equal for all and to holiness. But behind closed doors they always preach the vocation to the members in an exclusive sense, in such a way that abandoning Opus Dei is considered equivalent to betraying Jesus Christ.

This affirmation is always carried out when a member is considering the possibility of leaving Opus Dei, creating horrible internal problems of conscience in those who are in that situation.

In Opus Dei an aggressive proselytism is practiced that only seeks to increase the number of members at all costs, regardless of the spiritual and conscience damage that is created with such action, creating all kinds of scruples and erroneous consciences about one's life.

SEVEN. AUXILIARY NUMERARY.

Among the many existing contradictions in the life of Opus Dei is the issue of auxiliary numeraries. Auxiliary numeraries are treated as victims of authentic slavery and human trafficking.

These women have not received an adequate salary nor have they had decent work hours, nor have they had social security, human, cultural or professional promotion, nor have they been given a balanced working life, rest, vacation or retirement. This has plunged them into an extreme situation of material, human and cultural impoverishment; and a great vulnerability, taking away the defense mechanisms that would have led them to a serene discernment in their lives.

Those who leave the institution often leave with no belongings other than the clothes on their backs, and even lose contact with the friends they had during their time in the organization. And normally, when they go out, they find that family relationships, friendships, etc. they had when they entered Opus Dei no longer have them.

Although currently, due to various judicial sentences against Opus Dei, the auxiliary numeraries have access to social security, the institution continues to violate and distort the truth in relation to the contributions of these women, who never charge for their work actually carried out in the institution. Even, to date, a tenured member, a judge in Argentina, has told a journalist that Opus Dei "does not pay them, nor would he pay his sisters."

a section of OpusLibros documents dedicated to this thematic block appears in **ANNEX 7**, we would also like to note that a large part of **ANNEX 9**, which we will discuss later, refers to testimonies from former auxiliary numeraries.

FINAL COMMENTS ON SECTION III OF THE COMPLAINT.

All the illicit contained in these seven thematic blocks have the character of CONTINUED in time, so they have not prescribed. Those who direct Opus Dei have not carried out any action aimed at correcting this continued action.

The foundation of these seven thematic blocks is in **ANNEX 6**, which consists of the ENTIRE OPUSLIBROS WEB PAGE, with 20 years of activity, in which there are around 10,000 direct testimonies from people who witness these outrages, as well as more of 450 books that narrate or analyze these situations.

OpusLibros is in Spanish. There are other similar web pages in English (ODAN) and German (Opusfrei).

ANNEX 7 contains a selection of collaborations posted on OpusLibros coinciding with the seven thematic blocks that we have dealt with in this section of the complaint.

This analysis is not intended to be complete, but representative of a series of OpusLibros collaborations, and its purpose is to show, as a tool, part of the rich documentary collection that is collected on this website.

Therefore, while **ANNEX 3** has a documentary nature, **ANNEXES 6 and 7** have a testimonial nature, that is, they come to show the consequences in practical life, in the internal destruction of so many innocent people, institutionally impoverished, as a consequence of the different types of institutionally induced abuses.

We are aware that we have not touched on the issue of priests incardinated in the prelature with the breadth and detail that it would deserve, which together with the auxiliary numeraries are, in our opinion, the most affected by the abuses committed institutionally from the prelature, having with respect to the prelate,

an exorbitant dependence that violates human dignity itself, since according to article 125.2 of the current statutes, "The jurisdiction enjoyed by the Prelate is full both in the external and internal forum with respect to the priests incardinated in the Prelature "

Within this section III of the complaint, apart from the **ANNEXES 6 and 7** mentioned, there are other annexes that also support the **SEVEN CONSEQUENCES DERIVED** from the fundamental reason for the complaint. We present them below.

ANNEX 8 includes a series of 35 online meetings through the Zoom application, organized by the *Ágora Quántica* platform and directed by Antonio Moya Somolinos, who for 42 years was a full member of Opus Dei. They are entitled "Freedom Colloquiums on Opus Dei." They began in September 2022 and have been held uninterruptedly on Fridays at 7:00 p.m. Spanish time. They started with just half a dozen people participating. Currently, around 30 or 40 people from about ten or twelve countries usually meet online, from the Philippines to Canada, passing through other countries in Europe and the Americas (North, Central and South). Lately there have also been some new African additions. The meetings are spontaneous and are recorded and posted on YouTube on a weekly basis. They tend to have an average weekly audience of between 2,800 and 3,000 people, with abundant comments on the forums.

We provide the videos of these meetings in both MP4 format and YouTube links, as well as a brief synopsis of the content of each video.

ANNEX 9 is a compilation of interviews conducted over the years by Carlos Martínez, a former numerary member who was for 36 years, with other former members from a wide variety of countries, mainly former auxiliary numeraries.

ANNEX 10 contains a selection of explanatory videos of Opus Dei. There are many on the Internet, many of them sensationalist or made by people who do not know the reality of Opus Dei well. We have wanted to collect here those that seem to us to be more objective and serene.

ANNEX 11 is an *online meeting* through the Zoom platform of an internal meeting that Ms. Isabel Sánchez León, Central Secretary of Opus Dei had with 174 women of Opus Dei from Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay and Bolivia in November 2022 on the occasion of a Service Commission of some women from the Central Advisory of Opus Dei in Rome to these countries.

The meeting was leaked by one of the attendees and posted on Facebook. A copy is collected in MP4 format.

In this meeting you can see how the state of the institution at that time is explained internally to the women of Opus Dei.

IV LEGAL AND TEACHING FUNDAMENTALS. INFRINGEMENT.

Throughout this denunciation, reference has been made to the encyclical of Saint John Paul II *Requested rei sociales* n.36 and 37 to argue the notion of structure of sin in which we understand that Opus Dei has fallen.

At these points in this encyclical there is also reference to other Church documents, mainly the documents of the Second Vatican Council, always little appreciated in Opus Dei, especially in those aspects that contradict its own worldly interest. Although it was later softened, the aversion of the founder of Opus Dei to the Council is well known, as well as the sudden appropriation he made of it when he saw around 1968 that it was not convenient for his worldly ambitions to go against it.

We also find something of interest to which we have also alluded earlier and which Pope Francis deals with at some length in the apostolic exhortation *Gaudete et Exultate* on the call to holiness in today's world, specifically in chapter 2 (Two subtle enemies of Holiness), numbers 35 to 62, when talking about Gnosticism and Pelagianism, clearly applicable to Opus Dei in view of the facts that we have just revealed in this complaint.

Paraphrasing the Pope in number 61, we could say that "in the midst of that thick jungle of precepts and prescriptions" into which Opus Dei has fallen outside the Church, Jesus has given us the face of each brother in whom the very image of God. (...) "At the end of time, the Lord will shape his work of art with the waste of this vulnerable humanity", all those people with institutionally induced vulnerability, and then discarded

Collective pride, self-referentiality, has made Opus Dei not see that "charity is at the center" (n. 60).

This is the foundation, not only of the Church's magisterium, but also of its legislative function, regardless of the fact that canonical penalties are in many cases extremely low in relation to the damage caused to the Church and to the dignity of Christians. Children of God.

In this sense, and referring to the current CIC, and in view of the facts that we have revealed in this complaint and in its annexes, we understand that the



009948584

CLASE 8.ª

forementioned actions could be subsumed within the type of ABUSE OF ECCLESIASTICAL POWER BY THE PRELATE AND HIS VICARS of canon 1.389 n.1 and 2 (they prescribe after three years, but we have noted that they are continuous performances over time).

Also the crime of ILLEGITIMATE DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY contained in canon 1.397, especially in cases of pressure on the conscience of a member who has thought of leaving the institution or in the already described cases of auxiliary numeraries or numerary priests incardinated in the prelature under the aforementioned article 125.2 of the statutes, or in the case of abuse of power depriving of liberty through the use of psychotropic drugs. The case of numeraries and auxiliary numeraries who change their residence against their will or in violation of immigration laws could also be subsumed in this type. This infraction would have a five-year prescription, unless it is a continuous case.

As an abuse of ecclesiastical power (c. 1389) that prescribes after three years, the cases of members who from one day to the next, without money or work, have been placed outside the institution, or who have been forced to quit jobs or make large donations. Cases on the theme of "the good shepherd" (violation of secrecy in the Sacrament of Penance and in spiritual direction) and the "visions of the vocation by the grace of state" can also be included here to force others (mainly people very young) to ask for admission to Opus Dei supplanting their personal discernment.

Other acts of clear abuse of ecclesiastical power is ordering, ordering, things that cannot be ordered and ordered, or ordering to do or stop doing "under penalty of eternal damnation" as the previous prelate did with María del Carmen Tapia and it continues to be done today with those who consider leaving the institution, mainly priests.

We know of recent cases not prescribed that have the current Auxiliary Vicar of the prelature as the protagonist of this action.

V REQUEST .

FOR ALL THE ABOVE, and prior reports and opinions that proceed by law,

WE REQUEST:

FIRST: INTERVENTION OF THE HOLY SEE, SO AS TO PROTECT CATHOLICS WHO HAVE BEEN MEMBERS, ARE MEMBERS AND COULD BE IN THE FUTURE, WITH THE SUPPRESSION OF OPUS DEI THE WAY IT IS CURRENTLY DEVELOPED.

We understand that the approximately 2,000 members that make up the prelature may need to be relocated in the manner in which it is decided by the department for the Clergy, proposing options to the current members that in any case favor their freedom of choice and their priestly ministry, either secularization (in which case we request that their material needs be provided with dignity) or incardination in the particular church that they choose and welcome them and in which they feel comfortable having expectations of being treated with love and valued his priesthood for the benefit and service of the other faithful.

At this point it is important to remember that (canon 294) the purpose of personal prelatures is "a suitable distribution of the clergy", and that the prelature of Opus Dei does not imply any peculiar pastoral or missionary work in favor of a specific region or social group. "

SECOND : In order for the charism that originally gave rise to Opus Dei to continue to be useful to the Church, **WE ALTERNATIVELY REQUEST , IN PARALLEL OR AFTER THIS MEASURE, THE RE-FOUNDING OF THE INSTITUTION BY THE CHURCH HIERARCHY WITH NEW RULES AND NEW RULERS WHO ACT WITH THE FEELING OF THE CHURCH**

We suggest that the episcopal conferences, under the initiative and tutelage of the Holy See, establish public associations of the faithful that embrace this charism and are willing to spread it in the respective spheres of those episcopal conferences.

THIRD : **WE REQUEST PROVISION SO THAT, IN ECONOMIC MATTERS DERIVED FROM THE ABOVE, THE RIGHTS OF PEOPLE ARE RESPECTED AND ACTED WITH JUSTICE** , thinking first and foremost of the good of souls.

FOURTH : **WE REQUEST CANONICAL PENALTIES FOR THOSE MAINLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ILLICIT ACTIONS INCLUDED IN THIS COMPLAINT, each according to the level and implication of their responsibility, in application of the aforementioned canons 1,389 and 1,397 .**

We request it in Madrid, at the Apostolic Nunciature, on June 26, 2023

ANOTHER NUMBER ONE

Within the working group for this complaint, we have always kept in mind the primacy of individuals over institutions, and doubts have been raised as to whether the request to suppress Opus Dei is excessively harsh to the point of generating injustice in people from Opus Dei, lay people, who act with a clear intention and have always done so.

We have also thought about the damage derived from lay numeraries who, after an entire life mistakenly dedicated to the institution, instead of to Christ, but confused, in good faith, with the suppression

of Opus Dei, could literally find themselves destitute, at having practically no professional experience except for the deficient preparation that has given them dedication throughout their lives to unpaid internal work, and therefore, without a working life, without a retirement benefit at sight, without patrimony (because the one they had, little by little they have handed him over to the institution), without friends (because their polarized dedication to the institution has made them cut ties with those who could have been friends during their lives) and even without family members, because their dedication to Opus Dei has made to neglect during life dealings with relatives from his childhood or his youth.

We have also thought about the educational companies that would be affected by a suppression of Opus Dei.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, we are of the opinion that there is no institutional will to obey the Hierarchy of the Church on the part of Opus Dei and therefore, any measure or limited intervention or partial modification that does not entail a total modification of the people who govern Opus Dei, will prove insufficient in a few years, with the consequent damage to the Church and to souls.

We understand that Opus Dei is one of those institutions in which institutional arrogance has permeated so deeply that it is no longer possible for it to survive in the communion of the Church with only a partial change of statutes.

For the members of Opus Dei themselves, probably the best thing is to first carry out the disappearance of the institution, to re-found it later with other postulates and other leaders.

ANOTHER NUMBER TWO

Regardless of the decision that the Holy See makes regarding Opus Dei, we understand that it is not good for the Church that the entrustments of diocesan or pontifical churches to priests of the prelature remain, such as, for example, the Pontifical Basilica of San Miguel, not only because of the damage done to the good name of the Pope that a pontifical basilica is governed by a Church institution with the characteristics stated in this complaint, but also because it is public knowledge that, under the worship and pastoral activities carried out in said temples, the presence of priests of the prelature in them is a cover to carry out proselytizing activities that we have described in this complaint as one of the types of abuse of consciences.

In this sense, Opus Dei is very far from what Benedict XVI stated in his inaugural speech in



009948585

CLASE 8.^a

Aparecida 2008: "The Church does not grow by proselytism but by propagation."

ANOTHER ID NUMBER 3. In Opus Dei there is a sense of superiority over everyone else, including the Pope and the Hierarchy. From a legal point of view, they have always aspired to be a private church in order to have as much autonomy as possible that would allow them to carry out their peculiar way of understanding the Gospel without restrictions. There are external documentary evidence in which it is stated that from at least 1942 to 1962 the founder tried to be a bishop without succeeding.

On September 14, 1970, the second phase of the Special General Congress that Opus Dei held in Rome to tackle the institutional question ended. Said congress entered the execution phase on that date by the Technical Commission, chaired by Álvaro del Portillo and constantly directed by the founder himself.

The result of these works was the writing of what was called internally "Codex Iuris Particularis", of 194 articles, which was approved and signed by the founder on October 1, 1974.

Codex Iuris Particularis and said Act have been filed in the General Secretariat of the General Council of Opus Dei.

The legal form that the founder wanted in that document at that time for Opus Dei was that of prelate nullius. The idea was that if the founder died, Opus Dei would have the sole legal purpose of moving forward with that legal form. This is how it happened, since the founder passed away on June 26, 1975.

In 1979, already with Saint John Paul II, the institutional file was opened again. At that time, the idea of personal prelatures existed with a little more legal development. Álvaro del Portillo saw that from this juridical form it would be possible to obtain what St. Josemaría wanted, to form part of the hierarchical structure of the Church through a jurisdiction of a personal nature instead of a territorial one.

This path was followed, which in its final stretch coincided with the reform of the Code of Canon Law in which personal prelatures would be regulated in a more defined way, which were nothing more than initiatives not yet experienced (none existed yet) aimed at to be a new evangelizing tool typical of the new times marked by the Second Vatican Council.

The problem for Opus Dei came with the final wording of CIC nn. 294 to 297 (in the personal prelatures there would only be clerics but they would not have "proprio populo", since laymen did not belong to them) and with their location within the scheme of

the Code, that is, outside the hierarchical structure of the Church.

Opus Dei bishops, but titular bishops of formerly disappeared dioceses, Vita and Cilibia, since Opus Dei was not a private church nor did it belong to the hierarchical structure of the Church.

From Opus Dei this legal form was accepted, always with the phrase that internally became recurring within the institution since 1950 when Opus Dei became a secular institute. It is a phrase of the founder: "Give in without conceding with the intention of recovering".

This phrase, this constant idea, reveals over and over again that Opus Dei has never been willing to obey the Church and the hierarchy. They have always thought that they are far above the bishops and the Pope, in that messianic vision that they have always had of themselves and that has degenerated into an institutional arrogance that leads them to see the founder above faith and religion. Christian herself. They are the ones who believe they have enough dignity to "concede" and with the power to administer the grace to "cede".

Álvaro del Portillo "gave in" on the issue of personal prelature in 1982 because he understood that becoming part of the Church's hierarchy would be the consequence of creating a state of progressive opinion in which, outside and inside the Church, Opus Dei appeared as a diocese or even much more than that, with great media, economic and spiritual power, the latter embodied in a multitude of "vocations" at a time (the 1970s and later) in which other Church institutions, once more flourishing, now languished.

Hence the effort to show a constant growth in the number of members, falsifying reality as far as they have been able. However, there are data that can hardly be hidden: in the Pontifical Yearbook of 1984 it appears that the personal prelature of Opus Dei had 354 major seminarians; in 2023 only 95 appear. This is consistent with the decreasing number of ordinations of full members in recent years. The constant closure of centers around the world is also public, and specifically of numerary training centers, or the merger (contraction) of regions until reaching the current 28, or that since 2011 there has not been any new country to which has spread Opus Dei.

We understand that at a critical moment like the one you are currently going through, in which you are even confused about your own identity within the Church, your point of reference is the draft statutes, the Codex Iuris Particularis, approved and signed by

Saint Josemaría Escrivá on October 1, 1974, which no one knows about.

The statutes that Saint John Paul II gave them in 1982 were valid to the extent that they were oriented to the Codex Iuris Particularis of Saint Josemaría. They understood the 1982 statutes as acceptable to the extent that they could have the same prerogatives of power within the Church as those contained in the text of October 1, 1974, which for Opus Dei is more sacred than the Gospel itself, because it was approved and signed by the founder, who for them is not simply a saint or its founder, but much more.

We offer the above explanation because, although Opus Dei denies it, any legal solution that is given to them, from the leadership of Opus Dei will take it as something to "cede without conceding with the intention of recovering." In Opus Dei's internal training facilities, it is always said that for them "our Father (Saint Josemaría) is Christ passing by." They see Jesus Christ incarnated in the figure of the founder.

any legal form that does not grant them the power that appears in the 1974 draft drawn up by Saint Josemaría. They will wait (they openly say so) for this Pope or the next ones to pass in order to "recover" what Saint Josemaría wrote in 1974.

There has been a congressman from last April who has leaked the internal feeling: They think of "about 70 years" the time they will have to wait to achieve their purpose, in view of the environment that is breathed today in the Church (greater proximity to the world, greater tolerance, synodality, greater weight of pastoral theology to the detriment of dogmatics and morality, more ecumenism and interreligious dialogue, etc).

Other Opus Dei congressmen think that a Third Vatican Council would correct the "deviations" of the previous one, or that in about 20 years a new Code of Canon Law will be redrafted in which the personal prelatures are already part of the hierarchical structure of church.

They continue to "cede without conceding with the intention of recovering."

We sincerely believe that a reform of Opus Dei is impossible that does not start from its suppression to later undertake a re-foundation in which it is guaranteed that those who currently govern it are left out, not only of its government, but of the organization itself. It is also essential that this totally secret document of Opus Dei, the Codex, be intervened in this process. Iuris Particularis of October 1, 1974: if the ultimate purpose of Opus Dei is not known from the authority of the Church, it will never be possible to

adequately address the institutional problem. They will always deceive the Holy See.

ANOTHER SIDGE NUMBER 4. The 46 books that make up **ANNEX 3** are the fundamental **PROOF** on which this complaint is based to demonstrate the regulatory fraud of Opus Dei to the Holy See and to the members themselves. Exact copies of these 46 books that we have saved in a ProtonDrive account are provided. In said account, for which we have our access code, the aforementioned books appear with a code attached to each one. The codes of said books are reproduced separately, one by one".

ANOTHER IDENT NUMBER 5 Although it does not appear on the first page of the complaint, we have added a translation in Korean since the Prefect of the Department of Clergy is of that nationality, in order to make it closer to him in his mother tongue. We do not know the linguistic quality of it because it is translated from the Google translator.

ANOTHER SIDGE NUMBER 6 Given that this denunciation has a series of abuses of power, conscience and spirituality as its motives, we understand that in addition to being addressed to the Department of Clergy, it is also appropriate that the Department for the Doctrine of the Faith be the addressee, Section of Abuses. Therefore, we inform you that once said complaint is registered at the Apostolic Nunciature of Spain, we will direct it electronically to the two aforementioned departments.

In Madrid, June 26, 2023

Antonio Moya Somolinos and other signatories
of the pages