THE NEW CONCILIAR RELIGION

Fr. G. Hesse

Okay. Um, I've given you an introduction on the problems of the Conciliar Church, which I call the counterfeit church since it assumes the name of Catholic Church, but does not have the right to claim to be Catholic since it is a new church with a new doctrine and a new liturgy. Yesterday I gave an introduction to the new liturgy. Today, I'm going to talk about Vatican II. That's where it all started, but it started in the last century, as you will hear on the other tapes. But Vatican II is the doctrinal basis of a new church.

And there is one general remark that I have to make about the entire Vatican Council. First of all, I personally, I underline I personally do not believe, because I say personally, because there's no papal pronouncement on it yet. I personally do not believe that Vatican II was an ecumenical council for the simple reason that Vatican II had no intention of defining dogma. I have to remind you that all of the ecumenical councils in history, without a single exception, had the intention of defining dogma. And all of them, with one exception, did. The Council of Lyon never defined dogma because they just never got around to do it, but they wanted to. Third, there was never an ecumenical council called in unless there was a crisis of faith. Like the Council of Trent was called in after the Lutheran reformers messed up the church in the northern countries. Vatican II was called in for no other reason but Pope John's inspiration. So that's no reason to call in an ecumenical council. Maybe I'm wrong with what I say in the sense that it is the Council Fathers and the Pope who formally declare something to be an ecumenical council. But in that case, it is certainly, at least, to say the least, a very exceptional ecumenical council. It is also exceptional in another regard. It is the first council ever to pronounce heresy. Vatican II, as a whole, is unacceptable to a Catholic. And after the talk, you will see why.

Now let's have... We kind of... Time does not permit me to go through all the details of Vatican II, so I will point out the most important errors and heresies.

SACROSANCTUM CONCILIUM

First of all, I have to do away with a mistake of interpretation. The first document of Vatican II, called Sacrosanctum Concilium, is the constitution on the liturgy. Some people seem to believe that the new rite of mass that Paul VI issued in 1969 is against the will of the council. It is not. The document, the first document of the council, Sacrosanctum Concilium, is formulated in a way that you can do with it whatever you want. The very same document you find number 22-2, giving the faculty to the bishop's conferences to have the mass said in the vernacular. And the bishop's conferences are allowed to decide on how far this may go, provided Rome's support. Doesn't say the Holy Father explicitly has to give permission. It only says provided that the Sacred Congregation for the Divine Worship is in agreement. That's new too. Until Vatican II, nobody was allowed to change anything in the liturgy whatsoever without explicit papal permission. And Sacrosanctum Concilium suggests, makes a few suggestions. Like, they want unnecessary repetitions to be canceled. This is why nowadays the Confiteor is not said before communion anymore. This is why the Confiteor is not repeated by the people, by the altar boys alternating with the priest, but the priest says it alone if he ever says it, because you have many options to that. Now, Sacrosanctum Concilium says that the Latin language must be the language of the liturgy, and at the same time, it says that parts of the mass can be in a vernacular. And then it says if the bishop's conference decides so, the whole of mass, the order of mass, the canon can be in the vernacular. So you see it's a totally contradictory document.

And here is a very important thing that you ought to know for all the rest of what I'm going to talk about. Pius VI, in 1799 condemned the Synod of Pistoia. Now that was a thing that took place in 1786. A few bishops in the area of Pistoia in Italy came together and demanded some changes in the attitude of Rome towards certain issues in the church. And they wanted exactly what Vatican II issued. They wanted the liberty of religion. They wanted a certain relaxing of the discipline and so on. Pius VI condemned the Synod of Pistoia, condemned their pronounce-

ments, and in his bull Auctorem Fidei, he says, „The purpose of a council is to clarify terms, not to come up with ambiguous terms." Vatican II is ambiguous from the first to the last line. Vatican II is contradictory from the first to the last line. But I cannot go into the contradictions of Vatican II in this short talk, so I will point out the worst heresies.

LUMEN GENTIUM

And let's start with the Dogmatic Constitution Lumen Gentium. Dogmatic in this context does not mean it's dogma. It means it's a constitution on teaching. It doesn't give pastoral advice. It is teaching. Which, again, is a lie, because both John XXIII and Paul VI said this is a pastoral council, it is not a dogmatical council. But then they came up with two dogmatic constitutions, which do not define anything, do not bind the Catholic to accept it, but are dogmatic constitution. That means constitutions on the doctrine of the church. And Lumen Gentium is the constitution on the Holy Church. Lumen Gentium is in heresy.

Now you have to understand that as a Catholic, you're not allowed to read books that contain heresy. Because in order to make a book licit as reading for a Catholic, it is not needed that the whole book is wrong. It is totally sufficient that part of the book is wrong. So, in the old days when you had a list of books that were prohibited to Catholics, which was called the Index, there were books on the Index that contained one wrong line. There was a very good translation of the Bible on the Index, the Van Ess translation of the Bible into German language, because it contained two or three little errors. For all the rest, it was a very good translation. But because of two or three little errors, the book went on the Index, didn't get the imprimatur, that means the agreement of a bishop, and was prohibited as reading to Catholics. Now Vatican II should be the first book on the Index as far as this century is concerned, because now Lumen Gentium I. This is something you have to remember. Remember Lumen Gentium I, 8, 15, 16. It's easy to remember. 1, 8, 15, 16.

Lumen Gentium I says, „The church, in a way, is the sacrament of salvation concerning all people in the world." Now first of all, the church is not a sacrament. We have the seven sacraments. The Council of Trent defined that we have seven sacraments. That's a definition, a dogmatic definition. And you cannot possibly make it plausible to me that Vatican II wanted to say, „Yes, but in a way containing all these seven sacraments, the church is a sacrament of salvation." It is not a sacrament and a sign. It's not. Because the church is a perfect society. The church has been defined as a perfect society and not a sign. A sacrament is a sign by definition. And it certainly doesn't concern all people, because those who reject the church are not subject to the church. The church is not interested in them unless they convert. The church does not judge them. The church does not deal with them. They do not make part of the church. But Vatican II says something different.

In Lumen Gentium VIII, Vatican II says, „The Church of Christ subsists in the Catholic Church." The word subsist doesn't tell you much in English. It says a lot in Latin. Subsistere in Latin means something that is lying underneath. That means the grass is subsistent to my way of walking, but it could also be subsistent to Father Trincher's way of walking, and not just to mine. So when you say that the Church of Christ subsists in the Catholic Church, that does not exclude the Protestant churches. Vatican II is too intelligent, they were too clever to say that the church contains the Protestant churches and the Orthodox churches and all these other churches. But they said maybe those are churches contained in the Catholic Church, because they said the Church of Christ subsists in the Catholic Church. For almost 2,000 years, the Catholic Church insisted that the Church of Jesus Christ is the Catholic Church, and it is defined dogma that the Church of Jesus Christ is the Catholic Church. It's identical with the Catholic Church. Nothing outside the Catholic Church is part of the Church of Christ, and nothing of the Church of Christ is outside the Catholic Church. So the Catholic Church and the Church of Christ are identical, the Church that Christ founded. Christ founded the Catholic Church and no other church. Christ did not just found the Latin rite. We have other rites in the church, I mean, ways of celebrating, ways of worship, but we have only one Catholic church.

And I have to repeat this now for the third time, Pope Eugene IV in 1441 at the Council of Florence

defined as dogma that nobody who is not subject to the Roman Pontiff can ever be saved. He said that those who are schismatics and heretics cannot be saved, even if they for some reason believe they were shedding their blood for Christ. Now when I say they cannot be saved, I mean, objectively speaking, they cannot be saved. There is no objective way that they could be saved. Subjectively speaking, as far as that person is concerned, we do not know if God will give them an extraordinary grace after death, if they have been honest during their lifetime here. But we do not know it. The church cannot speak about the dead. The church does not look into the hearts of people. It can't. The church has to judge according to external circumstances, to manifested formalities, to formal manifestation of the faith. And the formal manifestation of the faith is if you're a member of the Catholic Church and believe everything the church says, and if you're subject to the Roman Pontiff. And only if you are in the Catholic Church, you have an objective chance of being saved. This is what the dogma means.

Now, I will come back to that later. In Lumen Gentium VIII, suddenly the Protestant churches make part of the Church of Christ. They do not make part of the Catholic Church, but they make part of the Church of Christ because the document says, „The Church of Christ subsists in the Catholic Church." And this comes to the point that Cardinal Ratzinger, abusing Saint Thomas Aquinas in his quotation, being asked what that means, the Church of Christ subsists. Why doesn't the council say that Church of Christ is the Catholic Church? Cardinal Ratzinger said, „Oh, but the word subsist is much stronger than the word is." And that is an academic lie. He was quoting Saint Thomas, but Saint Thomas talks about God himself when he says, „Subsistentia est nobilissima forma essendi." That means subsistence is the most noble form of being. Only in God, because God is not in every single flower, but he subsists to every single flower. He subsists to every single being. He subsists to everything that is in existence, because everything that is, you, me, this house, the plants out there, this planet, the whole universe has its being from God. Even if man created it, it receives the being from God. The New Orleans street cars are created by man, but they receive their being from God because there cannot be anything without God who is being himself. I know this is kind of difficult for you, but it's so difficult because it's the most simple thing in reality. Now when Ratzinger quotes Saint Thomas Aquinas in the wrong context, and this is the method of the council, as you will see later. You quote somebody, but you quote him in the wrong place. And that's a form of lying. You cannot deny that Lumen Gentium VIII makes it optional to believe if the Catholic Church is the only true church or if there can be other churches that have a chance to get you saved. No wonder no Protestants are converting anymore.

The same Lumen Gentium VIII, needless to say, talks about the fact that even the churches that do not have, that are not in union with the Roman Pontiff receive the Holy Spirit. That's another heresy. You can read in the Gospel of Saint John that the Holy Spirit is given only to the Catholic Church. At Pentecost, the Holy Spirit did not come to the Lutherans, to the future Lutherans. At Pentecost, the Holy Spirit did not come to the old religions, the old pagan religions. The Holy Spirit came to the Catholic Church and to nobody else. It came to Saint Peter, first of all, and the apostles. So anybody who is separated from Saint Peter's successor, the Pope, cannot receive the Holy Spirit. It's ridiculous. And when a Lutheran pastor baptizes an innocent child and the innocent child dies baptized and goes to heaven, this innocent child does not go to heaven because it was baptized by a Lutheran pastor, but because a Lutheran pastor illicitly administered the Catholic sacrament of baptism. Is that clear?

Now in Lumen Gentium XV, something that you should look up yourself, but this I recommend from Flannery, The Documents of Vatican II. Do not buy the translation of the other guy with the red cover. Buy the book with the blue book cover because the other guy translates in an accommodating way. Lumen Gentium XVI is something that you can entirely judge on your own. „The Muslims together with us adore one merciful God." Together with us. That's a quotation. (Music plays) „Musulmani nobiscum adorant unum Deum misericordiosum" in Latin. I checked it in Latin to make sure that this heresy stands firm. It stands firm. Now, where's the incarnation? Where's the Trinity? The Quran, the Holy Book of the Muslims, calls, I'm quoting the Quran, calls the idea of a holy trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, an excremental idea. I'm quoting the Quran, take your pardon. And now Vatican II tells me that

they, together with us, adore one merciful God. Now, where's the first commandment? They have another god. They have Allah. The lonely one person Allah. We have Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and the second person of God, the Son, become man. And the Word became flesh. Et Verbum caro factum est at the last gospel at mass. I've never heard about Allah that he would have become verbum, that the Allah would have become caro, the meat, the flesh. I've never heard that Allah assumed a human nature. And if you tell a Muslim that Allah was incarnated on Earth, he will kill you. And he is right from his viewpoint of religion. The Muslims are not as accommodating as the Catholics, and God will probably bless many of them for merely that reason. Now, Vatican II tries to tell me that I pray together with the Muslims to the one merciful God. This is blasphemy. It is heresy and it is blasphemy. And the same Lumen Gentium 16 tells me that the Jews and I pray to the same God. The Jews explicitly reject the incarnation. The Jews explicitly rejected the idea of the blessed Trinity. And they call it names, believe me, in their books, and how. Not even I would quote that. And now Vatican II tells me, we are all praying to the same God. Do you realize that a certain German author Gotthold Ephraim Lessing in the 18th century wrote a play called Nathan der Weise or the parable, The Parable of the Ring, in which he has a representative of the Catholic Church, a representative of the Muslims, and a representative of the Jewish faith agreeing with each other that everything is the same anyway because we pray to the same God. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing was a practicing and open Freemason. And here we have Vatican II, a so-called ecumenical council repeating what Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, the admittedly open Freemason, said in his play. The idea, the concept that the Muslims and the Jews pray to the same God as we do, which our present Pope repeats over and over again, this concept is heresy, it implies a lot of other heresies, and it is blasphemy. And anybody who tells me that we can interpret this in a Catholic way is to say the least a little bit nuts. I quote again, „The Muslims together with us adore one merciful God." Now, give me a Catholic interpretation of that. I don't think that even CNN could come up with a Catholic interpretation on that. And they are very good in making up excuses, lines, and other things. Whoops, I hope nobody will sue me.

DIGNITATIS HUMANAE

And this is Lumen Gentium. There are other things in Lumen Gentium that cry out to heaven for being blasphemous, stupid, and heretical, but we have to go on. The next document concerned is Dignitatis Humanae, and I quoted it already in one of my former speeches, but now I have to quote it in the context again. Dignitatis Humanae number three says, and to make it easier for you to understand what I'm saying, I will quote the present Pope's interpretation of this line quoted from Catechesi Tradendae number 32. „Quarum opes Spiritus Christi non abnuit salutem affere." „For the efforts of which the Spirit of Christ does not deny to bring salvation." Whom does he talk about? He talks about the Protestant churches, the Pope does. That means, he says, „For the, to the efforts of the Protestant churches, the Spirit of Christ does not deny salvation." Now, get this. Is there anybody here who does not understand the distinction between subjective and objective? I presume so. Objective means you are concerned with the matter, the thing. Subjective means you're concerned with the person. That means with his conscience, with his intentions, with his view of things. The wine I'm drinking here is objectively an excellent wine. Subjectively, you might not like it all the same. Some other soft drinks around here, objectively, absolutely bad, but you might like them subjectively. You understand?

Now, Vatican II and the present Pope talk about the Protestant churches, and they talk about the efforts of the Protestant churches. Now, if you tell me that it would be possible that a Protestant who has lived a just life all of his life, who has tried his best to find out the truth, who has tried his best to avoid sin will not be sent to hell by God, I will say, „I don't know, maybe." Through an extraordinary act of grace from God or an act of authentic contrition, he might actually die as a member of the Catholic Church without knowing but wanting to do so. That's possible. We cannot exclude it subjectively speaking. Objectively speaking, if anybody says that the efforts of the Protestant Church, and remember what I said about the innocent child being baptized in a stolen sacrament, anybody who says that the efforts of Protestant

churches can save a soul is a heretic. Dignitatis Humanae of Vatican II and the present Pope says it, so the present Pope is a heretic. We have discussed the question if that makes him cease the Pope or not. It doesn't. He's still the Pope. He's a bad pope. He's a heretical pope, an ignorant pope, and a pope who lies. But that doesn't make him cease to be pope, just like the Archbishop of New Orleans is not exactly what you call a Catholic bishop, but he is the Bishop of New Orleans. And President Clinton is the supreme commander of the armed forces in this country, even though he's a draft dodger. Amen. Amen. (clapping) Thank you. And excuse me, I was talking about President Clinton. Her husband is a draft dodger. (clapping) Yeah.

Now, the efforts of the Protestant churches cannot save anybody. They cannot save anything. The efforts of the Protestant churches can only bring you down to hell, because the efforts of the Protestant churches are heretical efforts, objectively speaking. I do not condemn the poor pastor. And in this regard, I should mention to you that in St. Thomas Church in New York, Episcopalian, I found the best sermon on the devil in a long time. Not in St. Patrick's. However, Christ was never substantially present in the beautiful St. Thomas Church on 52nd Street, Fifth Avenue in New York. And except for baptism, there was no sacrament given there ever. You do not receive confirmation in St. Thomas. You cannot go to confession in St. Thomas. You cannot save your soul in St. Thomas Church, not objectively speaking. You understand when I say, „Not objectively speaking"? This is very important. So Dignitatis Humanae, number three, is heretical, so the whole document is heretical, so the whole council is heretical.

DEI VERBUM

The next thing, in Dei Verbum. Dei Verbum is the document, and it's called a dogmatic constitution. Dei Verbum is the document on the interpretation of Holy Scripture. And there, with the impertinence of quoting Dei Filius of First Vatican Council, they redefine the term of tradition. Now, Vatican II has the gall to quote Vatican I on its own reinterpretation of tradition. The first Vatican Council last century under Pius IX, the first Vatican Council defined dogma, defined tradition as everything that has been handed down to us, including the written tradition, that means Holy Scripture, and oral tradition, and that means everything the apostles heard to come out of the mouth of our Lord Jesus Christ. Period. That's tradition. Some things in oral tradition we do not yet fully know. That's not a development of tradition. Tradition is there. Like, the apostles knew that Our Lady was immaculately conceived. It became a dogma only in 1854. The apostles knew that Our Lady was assumed into Heaven with her body. It became a dogma only in 1950. That's not a development of tradition. This is just finding tradition which is there, and defining tradition which is there. So I repeat, Vatican I, the first Vatican Council, which was a true council, the first Vatican Council said there are two sources of the faith: Holy Scripture and tradition. And tradition, the oral tradition, is exactly what I was talking about. Everything received from the words of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. Now, Vatican II says there is a growth in tradition. (bird chirping) That means tradition is developed under the influence of the faithful's study and their religious experiences. Get this. Now suddenly, we do not need Holy Scripture anymore. Suddenly, we do not need the popes anymore who interpret Holy Scripture and what has been handed down to us from one pope to the other. Suddenly, we have the faithful involved with their religious experiences and with their own studies. You cannot possibly imagine how much I give on the people's studies and their religious experiences, even if they are clergy, and especially when they are clergy.

So this is the new definition of tradition. By the way, parenthesis, the famous document Ecclesia Dei of 1988 in which the Pope fakes to want the old mass to be said, the Pope is a liar because then the year after that he said he doesn't like the fact that so many people are still attached to those forms of worship, or he meant the old mass. And he said that a year after he issued Ecclesia Dei telling the bishops that they should give wide and generous permission for the old mass. That goes to show you the honesty of the man. In Ecclesia Dei, he criticizes Archbishop Lefebvre for his view on tradition. Now, Archbishop Lefebvre, I read everything he ever wrote. Archbishop Lefebvre was a very unoriginal man as far as doctrine is concerned. I have never heard anything out of the mouth of Archbishop Lefebvre that would be in any way

new to me, unless I hadn't studied well my theology before that. Archbishop Lefebvre, as far as his theological pronouncements are concerned, was entirely unoriginal because he was totally and completely faithful to the doctrine of the Church, with absolutely no exception whatsoever. And he quoted the first Vatican Council and said tradition is what the apostles heard coming from the mouth of our Lord Jesus Christ and which has been handed down to us by the popes. And then the present pope accuses Archbishop Lefebvre of a wrong understanding of tradition, quoting Dei Verbum number eight. Do I have to say more about that? The experience of the faithful and their personal studies are adding to the growth of tradition? Thanks, but no thanks.

GAUDIUM ET SPES

Next. The entire document Gaudium et Spes, that's the document on the Church in the modern world, was written, in a sense, not directly, but indirectly written by the founder of the Opus Dei, the so-called, because he isn't, Blessed Josemaria Escriva de Balaguer, who wanted the Church to be a society based on the laity, a concept that has been condemned by Pius X in his encyclical on modernism. He wanted the Church to conform to the modern world, and he wanted a one-world government. Gaudium et Spes, in number 12, utters blasphemy when it says, „All the religions of this world, the non-Christian and the Christian religion, agree with us that all religious efforts and all the efforts of the Church are directed towards man." That's a literal quotation. Directed towards man sounds familiar to the one who has read about the Masons, sounds familiar to the one who has read about blasphemies uttered at the United Nations or at the Presidio, doesn't it? Now to say that all the efforts of the Church are directed towards man is heresy and blasphemy. All the efforts of the Church are directed towards God in reality. Now the old Mass says so. The new Mass, eh, not sure. Gaudium et Spes also postulates, as I said before, a peaceful government of the whole world under one body of government. This is, to say the least, naive in 1965, when most of the governments in this world were already anti-clerical and against the Church. It is to say the least naive. I do not believe for a moment that it is naive. I believe it's diabolical. And I do recommend to you to buy this book on Vatican II, and if you write to me, I will give you all the numbers concerned. Doesn't cost me much time. It's some 40 numbers, something like that, all through the council. You read those numbers, then you know exactly why the Conciliar Church is not the Catholic Church, but the counterfeit church. You just read Vatican II on which they are based.

Another thing about Vatican II, I, there is no need to quote the wonderful document on religious liberty. Please do not call it religious freedom. In this country, the words freedom and liberty are usually confused, not only by the Democrats as usual, but also by the Republicans unfortunately. Freedom is a good thing. Liberty is a bad thing. Freedom means you have the freedom to do what you have to do. Liberty means you are at liberty to do what you want, and that's not liberty but slavery of sin. St. Paul says that, not I. So as long as the Statue of Liberty is not the statue of freedom, I'm not interested in the old broad in the New York Harbor. We talk about the liberty of religion, and the liberty of religion is something in Vatican II that caused many bishops to stop signing documents, because Vatican II, and I always forget the name of the document, they are such crazy names and titles. What's the one on religious liberty? Um, no, I can't remember it right now. I'm sorry. I should have brought the book, but you can find it easily if the one who has the book, just check in the index under religious freedom or freedom of religion or liberty of religion, whatever they call it. Liberty of religion has been condemned by the Popes Gregory XVI, Pius IX, Leo XIII, Pius X, Pius XI, Pius XII. You are not free to choose your religion. You are bound in conscience to choose the Catholic Church and to belong to the Catholic Church. And if you don't, as the church says it, objectively speaking, you cannot be saved. The Church cannot condemn anybody into hell, not even Judas Iscariot. There's no pronouncement on him, ever. So anybody who thinks that he's free to choose the religion might go to hell for it. See, if I was free to choose my religion in this country, I would join with the Episcopalians. They have nicer churches. They have a better salary. I could marry. I could still say, even if in English, a beautiful form of mass in St. Thomas Church. Well, it's not mass, but who cares? In St. Thomas Church, they say the evening service with the veil over the chalice and the

burse, and the missal is on the epistle side, and the altar is facing God, and what an altar. Whoo! Beautiful. One of the most beautiful neo-Gothic altars I've ever seen. And the priest is nicely dressed, and when he gives a sermon, he gives a sermon that reminds you of your duties towards God, of your duty to avoid sin. He talks about you must save your soul. He talks about the glory of the Blessed Trinity. He doesn't talk about Nicaragua. He doesn't talk about the economically disadvantaged. He doesn't talk about the poor people in prison. He doesn't talk about all of that. He talks about God and our duty to save our souls. If I had the freedom of religion, I'd been an Episcopalian for many years already, but I do not have it. I am bound in conscience to adore God in the way that God wants me to adore him, and that means I have to be a Catholic even if it costs me my life. There is no such thing as liberty of religion. Forget it. Forget Vatican II. Let's print a bumper sticker, „Forget Vatican II." That's right. (applause)

REDEMPTOR HOMINIS

Now one last short comment on our dear present pope. (birds chirping) I'm going to quote only one encyclical, and you will be astonished. His first encyclical. It's an old tradition, the pope's first encyclical is the most important encyclical because in the first encyclical, the pope says what is going to be his program for his pontificate. His first encyclical is called Redemptor Hominis, The Redeemer of Man. Mind you, not the redeemer of men, plural, but the redeemer of M-A-N, of man. Undefined, everybody therefore. In this document, apart from the fact that the document is truckloads of you know what, in his document, he never, ever uses the term Roman Catholic or Catholic Church. He speaks about the conscience of the Church. That sounds like one of those TV preachers, right? „The conscience of the Church." He talks about the Church of the New Advent. I don't know what the New Advent is. Probably referring to his constant references to the year 2000. While he will find out to the different, I know that the year 2000 is not gonna make a change to anybody just because it's a two with three zeros. Uh, who cares? And in his document, number ten, second line, he utters the following statement, „The amazement about the value and dignity of man is called the good news, the Gospel. It is also called Christianism." I repeat, „The amazement about the value and the dignity of the human being, or man, is called the good news, or the Gospel. It is also called Christianism." Vocatur item christianismus. In the German translation of this encyclical that I have, the translator was so ashamed of this that he left out the word, „It is also called Christianism." He just left it out in the German translation. Vocatur item christianismus. He just left it out. And I checked the, I don't remember, I haven't memorized it, but I checked the Latin original, and you always have to interpret church documents according to the Latin original, not the Polish original, okay? Because the Latin original will be used by future popes, not the Polish original. So the Latin original is correctly translated the way I do. So I repeat this astonishing line, „The amazement about the value and the dignity of man is called the good news, the Gospel. It's also called Christianism." That's blasphemy. Wow. That's absolute and total blasphemy. Saint Pius X said, „The only dignity of man is in his being a Catholic." That's the only dignity in him. The only dignity of man that I have is in my being a Catholic and a Catholic priest, not in my being Gregory Hesse.

Here Part 1 ends and Part 2 begins.

Fr. Hesse concludes his Vatican II analysis by examining John Paul II's blasphemous definition of Christianity as „amazement about human dignity" rather than Christ's redemption, identifies the conciliar church as a Gnostic sect prioritizing subjective human experience over objective divine truth.

He addresses practical questions about attending Mass when traditional options unavailable, reveals NATO's 1974 estimate of 3,000 KGB agents infiltrating Catholic hierarchy alongside Masonic influence, distinguishes validity from licitness in sacramental theology while explaining anyone can baptize validly with proper intention, critiques false apparitions like Medjugorje for contradicting Church teaching and endorsing conciliar errors.

Fr. Hesse emphasizes recommends SSPX over other traditional groups for doctrinal reliability despite occasional personality conflicts, and concludes that

while humanly speaking restoration appears impossible, Catholics must persevere in traditional practice while awaiting divine intervention.

A GNOSTIC SECT

And in the same encyclical, and with this, I conclude because I'm sick and tired of it. In this same encyclical, the Pope says, „With the incarnation of Christ, man has been revealed to himself." Wow. He's only quoting *Gaudium et Spes* number 22. Man has been revealed to himself. Until this Pope taught me to forget my old faith, I had always believed that the New Testament had revealed the Son and the Holy Spirit to us. I always thought that the message of the New Testament was revealing to some the incarnation and the Holy Spirit. And this Pope tells me man has been revealed to himself? I think he was in India for too long. That's why people went in the ,60s to find themselves. Yay. Yeah.

So what we have here all together is not only a new church, it is a Gnostic sect. Look up in the dictionary the word G-N-O-S-T-I-C. Look it up in the dictionary, Gnostic. It comes from gnosis. (German), no, enlightenment. There is no good translation in English for the word gnosis. There's only one in, not even Italian. *Erkenntnis* in German. Sometimes in psychology, modern psychology, even in the English language, the word *Erkenntnis* is used for that reason, because there's no proper term in English. It's the fact that you realize something, but there's no word for the realization, but I don't think that's good English. So that's gnosis. Now, a Gnostic sect, I don't have to explain to you what a sect is. You know about the Jehovah Witnesses. I like them much more than the new church because the Jehovah Witnesses at least try to mission, to convert other people, which personally, subjectively speaking is a nice effort. Now, in the modern church, they will tell you to join another religion instead. So a Gnostic sect is a sect that believes that man is the superior being, and only the recognition of things in our brain is what counts, which means you have a purely subjective religion, which means you make your own religion, and which means you can do whatever you want, it'll be fine. That'd be nice. As Gilbert Keith Chesterton said, „If I was not a Catholic, I would have a harem." (laughing) So, you see how absurd, you see the absurdity of things. We are living in a Gnostic sect founded by Vatican II, which our dear beloved present Pope calls the Second Pentecost, and I cannot say amen to that. I disagree with him. He's a heretic. I reject his teachings. I do not reject his papacy. I reject what he does in his papacy, and I reject what he says, period.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION: What do you do, like, if, for people who can't reach an old Latin mass? I have a sister that lives in West Virginia, and, you know, she has small children. And I mean, you know...

ANSWER: Yeah. Well, I think that question's on yesterday's tape, so I can answer it briefly now. You must not go to the new mass because the new mass is against the will of the church, against the will of God. It's against divine law. It is an illegal rite, illicit. It's not only against divine law, it's against eternal law too. Eternal law is first and divine law as an interpretation of his own eternal law. And then, positive law, natural law, and then positive law. It's against positive law pronounced by Pius V. It's against the natural law, as the tradition of the church, and it's against divine law as the dogma of the Council of Trent, and it's against eternal law therefore. You cannot attend the Novus Ordo Mass unless you have to for social purposes, like you did. And in this case, you do not say amen because amen does not mean all right, it's okay. Amen means yes, yes, yes. You can't say yes to the new mass. The new mass does not represent the Catholic faith. But, yesterday's conference, I can give you more information on that later on. But now, as the camera is running...

QUESTION: Father, what do you think our chances are to get back to good practice in mass?

ANSWER: Humanly speaking, zilch, zero, rien, nada, nix, nichts, gar nichts, nichevo, niente. In other words, none. (laughing) Thank you. (laughing) Humanly speaking. I'm not... God has to work a miracle on that, but I mean, I don't know if God will work a miracle. He might end the world. I don't know. I don't know. I ain't no prophet.

QUESTIONER: But they're not... deep down know that, you know, they're-

ANSWER: I'm not judging people who do not know. You cannot commit a sin if you don't know. Sometimes ignorance is a sin, but not the thing you do because of ignorance.

COMMENT: I call it the nervous order.

ANSWER: You what? (laughing)

COMMENTER: I call it the nervous order.

ANSWER: Very good. Yeah. You should call it the nervous disorder. (laughing)

COMMENTER: I'll walk in without a chip on my shoulder and go back with a chip on my shoulder. It's a... Absolutely, yeah. I'm radically disoriented.

ANSWER: Well, it's a disorder, but we talked about it yesterday. Is everything I told you about Vatican II so crystal clear that there are no questions? I doubt that. Don't be afraid of asking a stupid question. Only the one who laughs about the stupid question is stupid.

QUESTION: Tell us about the Masons that you think infiltrated in the Vatican, the Masons.

ANSWER: Well, I know that several cardinals were masons. I don't know about living cardinals. I have no information on that. I doubt there is no mason among the cardinals, but I don't know how many. I know several cardinals were masons. There's no sense in naming names here. Most of them you won't know anyway. And I know that the masons have tried already in the last century to infiltrate the church, and they succeeded because Pope Leo XIII's secretary of state was a mason. But this I have said in my first conference. You will have it on tape. And as far as the infiltration of the church is concerned, I can give you an information which I did not mention, I forgot. The day before yesterday, in the 1930s, Stalin started already to insert KGB agents into Western seminaries. And in 1974, NATO in its annual report, not the report you could buy at the newspaper stand, but the report that fortunately I got to see, estimated 3,000 KGB agents to be found among the Catholic hierarchy. That means priests and bishops. 3,000 KGB agents.

QUESTIONER: That was NATO?

ANSWER: NATO in 1974. Don't kill me if it was ,76, but I think it was '74.

QUESTIONER: Are they in the Vatican?

ANSWER: Of course there are KGB agents in the Vatican. You think the KGB is stupid? The KGB is not the CIA, Christians In Action. That's a field term for them. And the infiltration, it must be deep down.

QUESTION: ... by keeping your hands, that it is said by Martin Luther. And the total rejection of... total rejection of our Lord. Of the real presence. Of the real presence of our Lord in the Eucharist. And that's when he brought it all out of-

ANSWER: Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. It is, it is, and it is very typical of Martin Luther because it's not typical Cranmer. Now Cranmer permitted communion on the hand, but he did not allow the communicant to stand. Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, the founder of the Anglican rite. He insisted on the communicant kneeling because he believed it was symbolic bread that could contain, like a can, you know? Contain Christ for those who believe in it. Luther insisted fully and totally on the meal. This is why the Novus Ordo Church doesn't have an altar. It has a buffet table. Yeah, Luther said so. The Herr Doktor Martin Luther said, „An altar is for sacrifice. A table is for a meal." And now we have the Catholic churches with tables, including St. Peter's Basilica now, not the papal altar. The papal altar can't be changed, can't be turned around. That's a different thing. I would have to give a special lecture on old altars of basilicas in Rome. There was never in the history an altar facing the people. The altar always went toward the East. Yes, right. So if the apse of a church had to be built in the West, then the altar had to be turned around. Okay. But in St. Peter's Basilica, in the apse of St. Peter's Basilica, at the chair of St. Peter's where I was ordained, right there, now they have taken away, they have covered up the old altar facing God and they have what I call encrusted spaghetti, the new altar. It looks like encrusted and colored spaghetti. And that's the new altar there.

COMMENT: In Florida, I went with my daughter to one of the masses attained for. And after participating in the church with her father-in-law. She sat there 10

feet from the altar.

ANSWER: Yeah. Only in bishops' churches in the old days, that's what it had to be for the simple reason that when a bishop celebrates the pontifical high mass, the blessed sacrament must not be on the altar. This is symbolic because the bishop fully represents Christ. I only partially represent Christ. I'm not a full priest. I'm a priest good enough for saying mass, I'm not a priest good enough for making priests. These hands are not fertile. I cannot have children. Priests, I mean. Otherwise I could, but I cannot have children, right? These hands cannot consecrate, so I'm not a full priest. And the bishop when he celebrates, especially the bishop of his diocese, on the altar has seven candle holders like the old menorah. There's not the six candles, but there's a seventh candle put up in front of the cross in the center because now he's the full priest, the high priest. The bishop of his own diocese. And the bishop of his own diocese, therefore, does not have the blessed sacrament on his altar, but in the chapel. A cathedral always has a chapel of the blessed sacrament. So nobody could complain about the fact that St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York does not have the blessed sacrament on the high altar. That's normal. That's right. Because it's an Episcopal Church, not Episcopalian. It's the church of the bishop. It's a cathedral. And, but a regular parish church has to have the blessed sacrament in the center of the church and not somewhere shoved away. But this is what the conciliar church thinks about the blessed sacrament, and again, it shows because it's part of liturgy. Well, anyway, the point is, the point is you cannot fulfill your Sunday obligation at the new mass, you must not attend the new mass, and you must not collaborate with them.

QUESTION: Would you work for the local Episcopalian Church?

ANSWER: No, I think this was my daughter.

QUESTIONER: No, I'm asking her. Would you work for the local Episco-

ANSWER: No, why not? They're much better than what you're working for. Huh? I prefer the Episcopalians 10 times over even if they got a bishop resident in Boston now, but who cares? So far, actually, none of the sacraments were cut out.

QUESTIONER: I don't...

ANSWER: No, no, no, no. I didn't say that. Oh, be careful. Be very careful with what you say. If a modern priest, no matter what language he uses, no matter what ritual he uses, if a modern priest has the intention to baptize a child into the Catholic Church for the forgiving of the original sin, and if he says so, then the baptism is valid, as the baptism of a Muslim right out on the highway would be valid. If I have an accident on the highway and there's a guy with me in the car who is not baptized, and the only one passing by is an Arab with a towel head, and I want somebody, I can't move, I'm right there in the car, and this guy right next to me says, „Father, please baptize me. I think I'm gonna die." I would have to wait until somebody shows up and I would ask this Muslim to find me the bottle with water back there and baptize the guy next to me. The church has said everybody can baptize, unless he does not have the intention to do what the church does. Now, when an Arab in an old towel head, says, „You good men, I do what you want," then he wants to do what the church does. He doesn't know what the church does, but he wants to do what I want, and what I want is what the church does. No? So he wants to do what the church does. This is the old teaching of the church. That's not new. So, unless the forgiving of the original sin is excluded, it's valid. If a new priest says, „You're hereby received in our community and I congratulate you, and therefore, I receive you right here and I baptize you in the name of..." This is not a valid baptism, because baptism is not a reception into a community. Baptism, the essential baptism is to get rid of original sin.

COMMENT: All they have on stage is baptism.

ANSWER: Excuse d- All about deacon baptism. Perfect agreement. The church is in perfect agreement. A deacon can baptize. A deacon always could baptize. And a deacon always could solemnly baptize.

QUESTIONER: And they know what are though, so when they- So they're not. You guys know our culture too well.

ANSWER: Oh, we did that? That's why we know it. Yeah, yeah, yeah. He's not a deacon. He's not a deacon in the priesthood, he's a deacon that's been made a deacon. A man of the community.

QUESTIONER: And they know what are they?

ANSWER: Yeah, but wait a second. Again, it has nothing to do with the culture here. Again, the question is, is he a validly ordained deacon? I don't know. I have no idea. I'm not sure. But again, again, listen. I told you before, we are talking about two different things here. Even if he isn't. Even if he isn't. He could... Of course. He's still- We must not confuse- We can talk about all these things. We must not confuse licitness and validity.

QUESTIONER: We can back up. Who's talking here? I or you?

ANSWER: That's okay. Okay, now. We're not talking about licitness. We're talking about validity. I just told you anybody, anybody, a woman too, even a woman can baptize.

QUESTIONER: Oh, yeah?

ANSWER: Yeah, well, there you go. So, he's only pointing out-

QUESTIONER: Wait, you're missing it. What I'm saying is this, that you listen to... The baptismal manuals are stuff that studies them, and they have no intention of doing what the church does, hopefully.

ANSWER: Exactly. That's what I said. If you use one of those books, and one of those books tells you you're receiving somebody into a club, there is no baptism. Huh? But if that deacon, let's say, is a better man than his ritual, and using the liberty of liturgy in our days, uses... has the manual right there, but he says, „We receive this beautiful child here into the church because... and we baptize this beautiful child because it has to get rid of original sin," then baptism is valid. Baptism, not Mass. Baptism.

COMMENT: My daughter told me last week at Justin's church in Florida, they baptized and made their first, and they come from Asia all at one time.

ANSWER: They gotta do it anyway. She- That's illicit, but not necessarily invalid. Depends what they say. Baptism is always valid when the extermination of original sin is not excluded, is implicit.

QUESTION: Does it matter if they define original sin in a different way since then?

ANSWER: Yes, it matters if it's-

QUESTIONER: Since the environment.

ANSWER: Yes. Yes. Yes. That's the trouble with it. Yeah. If original sin is not seen as a spiritual-

COMMENTER: Teaching's the religion teachers, so I don't know what they do in the seminary. They teach the religion teachers that original sin is not as we previously perceived, but as something that you're born into, something like the environment.

ANSWER: Well, the exact words are, „It's condition of the world." Yeah. You can't get rid of the conditions of the world by one child being baptized. That's why we have to protect the spotted owls. Yeah. Oh, it's too bad though. Yeah, collect the whole collection.

QUESTION: Going back to the Mass, give me your opinion. Give us your opinion on Mother Angelica's Mass.

ANSWER: Who? Mother Angelica. She's- I don't follow these things. I'm not interested in what happens out there.

QUESTIONER: You gotta look at the front, see. It's the Novus Ordo. It's terrible.

ANSWER: Yeah, I'm not interested in what they do.

QUESTIONER: But generally, it's all she does is say a few little Latin phrases to make it look good to people.

ANSWER: That's all? Oh, it's a woman? Mother Angelica?

QUESTIONER: Not Angelica. She was the one that started hearing some noises.

ANSWER: And she says Mass?

QUESTIONER: No. Not her full nationality. No. Oh. It's Novus Ordo?

ANSWER: Yeah. Hey, wait a second. This is- It's not Novus Ordo. It's Novus Ordo. Quiet. Shut up. (laughs) What's the Mother Angelica Messes? Novus Ordo? It's Novus Ordo. Well, what I said about Novus Ordo? Well, that, it doesn't matter. Okay, might be valid. It might not be. I would have to hear

it and judge it, and, but I'm not the Holy Office either.

QUESTIONER: Well- Well, that's fine ,cause it's the Catholic Church.

ANSWER: Yeah. Yeah. Well, the new Mass, if the new Mass is said strictly to the book, strictly to the book in Latin, strictly to the book.

QUESTIONER: Today, her Masses aren't that way.

ANSWER: Yeah. Well, if it is strictly to the book, said in Latin, by... Wait a second. If it is strictly to the book, if the man who celebrates the Mass has been ordained strictly to the book, leaving nothing out, changing nothing, then I consider it valid.

QUESTIONER: No, he does not. No, he- See, the thing is-

ANSWER: You'd have to be a theologian.

QUESTIONER: The thing is what you miss...

ANSWER: No, no, I'm not, I'm not contesting the validity here. But if... it's not an issue. The validity is not an issue in that case, because generally speaking, the validity of the new Mass is of no concern to us. Why? The Orthodox... the Russian Orthodox Mass is valid. You still can't go there. The Russian Orthodox Mass is an insult to God because it's celebrated by a priest who rejects the papal infallibility and the primacy of the pope. But the Russian Orthodox Mass is valid. The Greek Orthodox Mass, they're heretics and schismatics, but the Greek Orthodox Mass is always valid. I'm not interested, basically, if the new Mass is valid or not. The reason why I tell you, „Do not go to communion in the new church," is because you do not know and you are bound by the church to follow the safer course. That means go to St. Pius X. You're not allowed to go to the new Mass. But if Mother Angelica's Mass is valid or not, I don't care. Whatever they do there is against the will of God, it's against the will of the Council of Trent, it's against the will of St. Pius V, it's against divine law, it's against eternal law. What are you concerned with? Why do you break your head over something that is illicit anyway?

QUESTIONER: Well, the extraordinary phrase that they hear, they hear Latin used and they add to that-

ANSWER: Yeah. Right. Yeah. That's right. Yeah, but it isn't, you see? No. No. Say it once and for all, it is not. It is not.

QUESTIONER: That's right. But that's your opinion.

ANSWER: No, that's not my opinion. This is the opinion of the Council of Trent. Right. The Council of Trent in the seventh session, Canon 13 says, „Whoever says that any of the pastors," that includes the pope, any of the pastors, „Whoever says that any of the pastors may add unto liturgy, subtract from liturgy, or write up a new liturgy-"

QUESTIONER: But I don't see it subtracted or added or inverted in that Mass.

ANSWER: In the new Mass?

QUESTIONER: In the old one over here, Father, because this way-

ANSWER: Did you follow it with the old missal? Did you follow it with the old missal in your hand?

QUESTIONER: I have many times. Oh. With your traditional missal in your hand?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTIONER: With the traditional missal?

ANSWER: I did not do it today. Does the priest say (*Latin*)? Yes. Oh, is it the old Mass there? No. So what I understood is that if you use Father's criteria, which is another way to say the true Mass is the real problem. If he says the true Mass, fine. If he doesn't, then it's not. Yeah. From what I hear, she just adds a little Latin to fool the people.

QUESTIONER: It's not for the consecration, she does add to it.

ANSWER: But it's not just the consecration.

QUESTIONER: No, it's not just the consecration. The whole, the whole thing.

ANSWER: Yes. Yeah, it must be the whole thing.

QUESTIONER: There are some of them that are real, right from the beginning to the end.

ANSWER: No, no, no. No, I would have heard of that.

Next question.

QUESTIONER: Every time that I went to see it.

ANSWER: Yeah. Well, you got the criteria and check with the old missal and that will give you the answer. Father Kessler can only give you the theology. Yeah. Yeah. I don't know, I don't know what's going on in Mother Angelica's Mass, so I can only answer in principle, okay?

QUESTIONER: Yes. Every time that I have seen Mother Angelica's Mass, the Latin is at the beginning. Consecration comes in English, three priests are on the altar trying to do consecration. Consecration is in English, and the words used are for all. The new translation.

ANSWER: That's the new Mass. Yeah, that's the new Mass. Definitely the new Mass. That's definitely the new Mass, and therefore I'm not interested if it's valid or not because it's illicit in any case.

QUESTIONER: I'll have to pay more attention.

ANSWER: Yeah. It's against the divine law in any case. Yeah.

COMMENTER: That's what's good about those buttons. You can turn it off.

ANSWER: The what?

COMMENTER: That's what's good about the buttons, you can turn them off.

ANSWER: Oh, I would never switch it on. I mean, I watch good movies. (laughing) Yeah, I would never, I would never watch a Mass on TV. I just, I prefer a good movie. Give me *Red October* any time.

QUESTIONER: But they're such beautiful priests. That's the only thing. They're so-

ANSWER: They're so beautiful priests?

QUESTIONER: Very nice.

ANSWER: I prefer beautiful girls. Uh, go ahead. It reminds me of this old Dutch priest who used to-

QUESTIONER: We're not talking about... We're not speaking of the outer appearance of the priest.

ANSWER: Oh.

QUESTIONER: I'm speaking of their inner, their manner.

ANSWER: Oh, maybe they're, maybe, maybe they're almost saints but what they do is against divine law. Yeah. See, I'm a rotten bum but what I do at Mass is not against divine law.

QUESTION: Father, what order are you?

ANSWER: Excuse me?

QUESTIONER: What order are you?

ANSWER: Diocesan.

QUESTIONER: Diocesan?

ANSWER: Yep. I'm Diocesan.

COMMENTER: Next thing she'll want to know is your bishop. (laughs)

QUESTIONER: You are a bishop?

ANSWER: No, no, her is bishop so you can report him. (laughing) Report me, you'll have fun.

QUESTION: I wanted to ask you, in Europe they have all the Novus Ordo also all over Europe, is the case?

ANSWER: They have the Novus Ordo all over the world, and the Novus Ordo has been introduced into the Eastern countries, which is one of the beautiful results of the so-called opening in ,89. In Brno in Czechoslovakia I could see how far they've gone with the Novus Ordo, because in a beautiful church, I think it's St. Thomas Church in Brno, they had an evening Mass, maybe it was an evening service, in Czech, with a new Mass in Czech, with an altar, a so-called altar facing the people, which means with the usual gourmet dining table, and buffet table. And gorgeous Czech blondes at medium age, 21, in tight-fitting dress were singing for the Mass.

QUESTIONER: Where is this? Where is this?

ANSWER: St. Thomas in Brno, if you want to go there. (laughing) So they have been fully Novus Ordo-zied. Yeah, fully Nova Zoroastrian. Yeah. And the cardinal, the cardinal archbishop of Prague is a modernist to the core. Yeah.

COMMENTER: But it took 30 years for this to take

off.

ANSWER: Almost 60- Yeah, it took 2,000 years to build the church to the point where it was, and it took 30 years for them almost to tear it down. But rest assured, we will survive, thanks to the Society of St. Pius X. Amen. Yeah.

QUESTION: And Fatima. Don't you think that Fatima also predicts that the Third Secret is what's going on today?

ANSWER: Well, I cannot give you a definite answer on that. I haven't read it. But this is the only, the only logical answer. It's the only logical answer, but sometimes logics are not the answer. I have to be diplomatic on that. I don't know.

QUESTIONER: Do you believe in them?

ANSWER: Hmm?

QUESTIONER: Do you believe in them? (laughs)

ANSWER: I sure believed in something that was approved by a miracle that has been seen by 70,000 people, and by some other people in 15 miles distance from the place where the miracle took place. This is the only reason why I believe in Fatima, because principally, I'm against visions, against apparitions, and against miracles. I do not believe them until they're proven. As I give you one example, this is interesting to know for you. Saint Catherine Laboure, she was the one with the miraculous medal. Saint Catherine Laboure had apparitions from Our Lady. I believe they're true for one reason. There is one incident in the evening, in the late afternoon, Saint Catherine Laboure had another apparition from Our Lady. Our Lady was sitting in a chair. Saint Catherine Laboure knelt with her hands in the lap of Our Lady, imagine, and they had a nice conversation. And then the bells rang for vespers. Now, you know nuns are supposed to attend vespers, okay? The bells rang for vespers, and Saint Catherine Laboure got up and said to Our Lady, „I'm sorry, I have to go." And went to vespers and let Our Lady sit there.

QUESTIONER: Oh. Oh, so you don't believe in the temple was it, huh?

ANSWER: The next day, Our Lady came back and said to Saint Catherine Laboure, „If you had not gone to vespers as you were commanded to last night, I would not have been allowed to come back." Oh. That should teach you something.

QUESTIONER: That's authentic.

ANSWER: No, that's definitely authentic. Authentic. That is authentic. Because that's the whole point, you see? Most of the apparitions go against the Church teaching. That crazy lunatic down there in Northern Italy called Don Gobbi, with the Marian Movement, who supposedly has Our Lady appearing to him for many years already.

QUESTIONER: What's the name? Don Gobbi. Who is it? Who is that?

ANSWER: Oh, if you don't know him- Oh, oh, oh. Gobbi. Don Gobbi. Oh, what a bummer. Yeah. Stefano Gobbi. Yeah. And Don Stefano Gobbi is as authentic as a Diet Coke. And-

QUESTIONER: That's true.

ANSWER: He is, he is-

QUESTIONER: Diet Coke. He said to get a Diet Coke.

ANSWER: A Diet Coke is not Coke, come on. He is as authentic as a Diet Coke, because he claims to have apparitions from Our Lady, and visions, and whisperings from her, but he endorses the new mass and the ecumenical movement. And now he's saying it's- And in Medjugorje, something similar happened. So Medjugorje is a business fraud anyway. No, Medjugorje was started by a couple of youngsters who wanted to make a joke, and two greedy Franciscans found out how you can make money that way. Franciscans always know how to make money, believe me. And Medjugorje is not authentic, because first of all, Our Lady says the rosary there. That means Our Lady says the Hail Mary. Our Lady cannot say the Hail Mary.

QUESTIONER: Really?

ANSWER: No, of course not. Imagine. How can you say that? How can Our Lady say, pray for us sinners? That would be blasphemy. She's no sinner. No, she never was. Right. Huh? And so Medjugorje is fraud. Look, in Bayside, Our Lady, quotes end quote, said that the unknown flying objects, the flying saucers, are vehicles for the demons. According to my theol-

ogy, a demon doesn't need a vehicle. (laughs) No. And he has no driver's license. He has no driver's license, he has no pilot license.

QUESTION: Father, why, I mean, why can't you get more priests to be like you and...

ANSWER: No, why can't we- Don't say that. It's against the rule of humility of Saint Benedict. Do not praise me in public. You can say it to me in private. I'll say, „Thanks, madam." (laughs)

QUESTION: Well, what can we do to help propagate, to walk away from the-

ANSWER: Make everybody in the United States subscribe to *The Angelus*. This is what you can do.

QUESTIONER: But I want-

ANSWER: Hey, you wanted to know what you can do? Make everybody in the United States subscribe to *The Angelus*. This is what you can do.

QUESTIONER: Get some forms we can- Society of St. Pius X Chapel. We can get some forms we can mail them to.

ANSWER: Yep. Yep. Subscribe to *The Angelus*. That's all I can tell you. And never forget, never forget one thing, because I know how people, how demanding people are, especially nowadays. Everybody wants to have his own priest, a priest to his liking. Don't. You have no right to. You have no right to.

QUESTION: How do we get our young children, our teenagers and our 30-somethings-

ANSWER: Let them read the, what is it called?

QUESTIONER: They don't need. They look at TV.

ANSWER: Yeah. Right. Show them these tapes. If they have, if the only perception left to these poor children is visual, let them have my tapes. They have the tapes. Yeah. And as far as the Society of St. Pius X is concerned, I will never get tired of reminding people of the fact sometimes it could happen to you, that you have a personal experience of lesser enjoyability, that's politically correct talk, with one of the priests of the Society of St. Pius X. Do not be disillusioned. Do not stay away. In the old days... In the last century, not every parish priest was a joy. And yet, you went to his Sunday mass, right?

QUESTIONER: Right. Well, I remember- So don't make that mistake. I went to his Sunday mass.

ANSWER: I ha- It has happened. It happened to several. I couldn't say many because the very great, the very vast majority of the priests of the Society of Saint Pius X are good and holy men. But of course, they're not all perfect. Some of them will not be your style, let's say. Some of them you might not like as much as you unfortunately like me. (laughs) But some of them might not be what you expect. But let this be of no concern to you. You're not going there to see a priest. You're going there to have mass. If you like the priest, then enjoy him. If you don't like him, pray for him. But go to the mass.

QUESTIONER: Because he's valid. Because only at the Chapel of Saint Pi-

ANSWER: Because it's licit. Not because it's valid, but because it's licit.

QUESTIONER: If he is licit, something will turn up in that library.

ANSWER: Of course it's valid. Otherwise, it wouldn't be licit. But validity is not sufficient. A mass has to be valid and licit. That means it has to be in the law of God. It has to be a pleasing act to God. It has to be what God wants. And listen to his sermons. Listen to his sermons. Listen to his sermons because only at the Chapel of Saint Pius X you can be sure that the sermon was correct. It might be an utterly boring sermon. I don't know. It might be a thrilling sermon. But only at the Chapel of Saint Pius X you will be sure the sermon is correct. At, with the Fraternity of Saint Peter, you get a lot of you know what sometimes. And with the other groups. With the Society of Saint Pius X, you can rest assured that the sermons are correct, and in order. They might sometimes be not of very great interest to you, but they will always be correct. You cannot be misled by them. That's the point. Now, how are their priests formed that led me to say that? Their priests are formed in a way that bishops in the 1930s would be happy to have had. Seminaries in the 1930s were not nearly at the intellectual and spiritual level of the Seminary of Winona under the leadership of Bishop Williamson.

QUESTIONER: Excuse me, Rich- uh, Williamson.

Richard Williamson?

ANSWER: Yeah. Richard Williamson. Huh?

QUESTIONER: Where's he make you?

ANSWER: Winona, Minnesota. Oh. That's the seminary for the Society of Saint Pius X in America. In North America, I should say. South America, you have the one, La Reja, in Argentine. And they have seminaries that are very strict, like military academies, and on a level that most bishops dreamed of 70 years ago. Huh? The only reason why I never joined the Society of Saint Pius, one of the few reasons why I never joined the Society of Saint Pius X is because I do not get wine on weekdays, and I do not accept that. (laughs) Period. But there is nothing wrong with them as far as important things are concerned. Believe me.

QUESTIONER: But you don't watch television sometimes. You know?

ANSWER: No, I would give that up readily.

QUESTIONER: Really?

ANSWER: No. Because I know you're not allowed to watch television. Wine is 10,000 times more important than movies. (laughs) Okay. Any other question left?

COMMENTER: With the purifier.

ANSWER: The what?

COMMENTER: Wine is a purifier.

ANSWER: Among many other things. But Gilbert Keith Chesterton, as usual, was right when he said, „There's only one legitimate motive to drink wine, and this is because you like it." (laughs)

QUESTIONER: You said it.

ANSWER: No, I just said because you like it.

QUESTION: What do you think of this pope, running from-

ANSWER: Uh, didn't I express my opinion very clearly? Yeah. Yeah, that was very clear.

QUESTIONER: I mean, where, where did he go? Who do you think is gonna succeed him? What do you think will happen?

ANSWER: Madam, I ain't no prophet. (laughs) Read the... They have a bunch of candidates. I know that the chance of a Catholic pope succeeding is minimal.

QUESTIONER: Who's your buddy going to be? (laughs)

ANSWER: Yeah. (laughs) Yeah. That's right.

QUESTIONER: Are you rooting for a holy pope?

ANSWER: Uh, humanly speaking, no. But I ain't no prophet. No. But Elliot is a prophet. Achou ain't no prophet. (laughs)

QUESTIONER: Who are the good ones that possibly could be?

ANSWER: Forget it.

QUESTIONER: Forget it? They're not that good?

ANSWER: Don't forget I can't look into the hearts of men. There might be a hidden good man, turn out to be, turn out differently than expected. Huh? He may boomerang on them. Yes. And that's our only chance.

QUESTIONER: But then (inaudible)

ANSWER: Yeah. That's right. He might be. So maybe that-