A CONVERSATION WITH FR. HESSE

Fr. G. Hesse

INTERVIEWER: Father Hess, there are a lot of questions about who you are. Many people think you're the „bull in the china shop," that you're causing controversy, and that what you do will not lead to unity in the Church. You're new here in the United States, fairly new. What are your credentials? Where did you come from? How'd you become a priest?

FATHER HESS: I went to Rome in 1976 to study for the priesthood. Of course, it was the heydays of the Novus Ordo, the post-Conciliar Church, and the spirit of the council, which engulfed me too. So for a while, I thought the council was all right and the Novus Ordo was all right. Then in 1981, I was ordained a priest in St. Peter's Basilica, which accounts for my outfit; that's an old privilege given to the basilica. Shortly after my ordination, I realized that the Novus Ordo was not anything that would please Christ, both as contents and as formalities are concerned. I'll talk about that later.

In 1983, I got my licentiate in theology at the Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas in Rome, and later on, the doctorate. So my credentials are: I've got a doctorate in theology, a papal doctorate in theology from the University of St. Thomas Aquinas. I am a candidate for the doctorate in canon law from the same university. In both matters, I got a licentiate, bachelor of arts, and an additional bachelor in philosophy. So that accounts for the credentials. Even though I must say, it's true, I have one and a half, or if you want to put it, it depends on the country you're in, two doctorates. These doctorates come from a Novus Ordo Church and Conciliar Church university. I must say that about two-thirds or three-fourths of my theology, I had to study back home, because at the university, they're teaching you all the theologians that made Vatican II: Schillebeeckx, Chenu, de Lubac (who became a cardinal), Rahner, and all these.

And that's probably why I've become what you call the „bull in the china shop." Our Lord said, „Jota unum"—not one jot, one tittle to be taken away from His words. And He said, „My words will be everlasting. Heaven will pass, Earth shall pass, but my words will remain." That means the truth cannot change. St. Vincent of Lérins, he's quoted by the First Vatican Council, which is without a doubt one of the most important and one of the most beautiful councils in the history of the Church. And they quote St. Vincent of Lérins saying, „Yes, there is a progress in tradition, in the sense that you deepen the understanding, but"—*eodem sensu et eadem sententia*—„always in the same sense and in the same judgment." *Sententia* is a judgment. Always in the same sense and same judgment. That means the truth cannot change. And if anybody tells you the truth changes according to the times, he has ceased to be a Catholic. And that, unfortunately, is true now for the Pope and most of the cardinals and most of the bishops. This is why I have become the „bull in the china shop."

MATERIAL AND FORMAL HERESY

INTERVIEWER: Are you saying they are not Catholic, then?

FATHER HESS: Materially, yes. You have to be careful about the distinction. Material heresy and material schism mean it's there, but it's not declared, it's not wanted. If the Pope says, and he does, „In accordance with tradition, I tell you that the Spirit of Christ does not refrain from giving salvation to the efforts of Protestant churches..." I'm quoting *Catechesi tradendae* number 32. If he says, „In accordance with tradition, I tell you this," then he's simply wrong in pronouncing heresy, but not wanting to, because he says, „In accordance with tradition, I tell you." If he were to say, „I don't care what the Council of Florence said. I don't care what Pope Eugene IV said. I tell you..." In that case, he ceases to be pope. That's common opinion among canon lawyers and theologians, that is, if the Pope were to pronounce formal heresy. That means declared as such, undeniable as such. He doesn't. He's just contradictory, that's all.

If I, on the pulpit, were to say, „Oh, well, of course, Christ doesn't mind saving Protestants," I would be

pronouncing heresy. But if I were to say, „No matter what the Pope said, no matter what the council said, I say that Christ will save the Protestants," then I'm pronouncing formal heresy. I become objectively, formally a heretic. If I just make a mistake, even if I repeat the mistake, I'm not a formal heretic. The heresy is there, but I don't want it to be such.

TRADITION AND THE *SENSUS FIDELIUM*

FATHER HESS: Now with the present concept of tradition, one shouldn't be surprised that we get these funny statements. Because if Vatican II in *Dei Verbum* 8 says tradition knows progress, and this progress comes about through the study of the believers and their experiences... that is heresy.

INTERVIEWER: Say that again, Father?

FATHER HESS: The progress in tradition comes about by people studying the faith, studying the Bible, and through their religious experiences.

INTERVIEWER: So therefore, the dogma that was taught by the Church in the past, does it not hold?

FATHER HESS: It would seem so. What the council is trying to say is a mistaken sense of what is called the *sensus fidelium*. The *sensus fidelium* was always described, even by Saint Augustine, as the sense for what all people believed all the time and everywhere. So if you tell the average Catholic who has not studied theology, doesn't know anything, that God is four persons, he will say, „What?" And he will not accept it. He hasn't studied theology. He has not studied the question of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, Son being man and God at the same time, which we know is one and the same person. But he has not studied it. He would not be able to prove what he says academically, but yet at the same time, he knows that God is one in three and three in one. He doesn't understand it. He cannot explain it scientifically. But it's his *sensus fidelium*, the sense of the faithful for the truth, which does not make it a majority decision.

When some people today accuse me of saying things that go against the vast majority of the bishops, the vast majority of the clergy, and the vast majority of the people, I can only say, „Okay, that's one generation." The *sensus fidelium* is for all people for 2,000 years, all Catholics, of course. Because a Buddhist cannot have the *sensus fidelium*. He cannot have that inborn sense for the truth in the way that Catholics have, because he might have the inborn sense, but he doesn't know enough to develop it. What Vatican II tries to do is to extend the meaning of the *sensus fidelium* to something like a majority decision, or the people pondering the truth of the faith in their heart and finding out what it is, an inside revelation. We don't have that. The Church has always rejected that. The Church always said, „If you do not stay with the defined truth, if you do not stay with the teaching of the Church, the ordinary and the extraordinary teaching, then you're not a Catholic. You cease to be Catholic."

BIBLE INTERPRETATION

INTERVIEWER: Father, let's get to the Bible in that same sense. The Church has defined what the interpretation of the Bible is for the Catholic Church. And yet, today, we have Catholics who take the Bible and try to share it together to find out what the Bible really means.

FATHER HESS: Well, that's quite mistaken, because we know what the Bible means as far as the Church has explained it, the popes have explained it. The popes have given us a lot of insights into the true meaning of the Bible. The popes have studied the Bible. The popes have had the Bible studied. The popes asked competent theologians to study the Bible, and then they approved their findings. But, you see, that's a Protestant mistake to think that you find the truth in the Bible, just in the Bible. It's the *sola Scriptura* of Martin Luther, the Bible alone of Martin Luther. The Catholic Church doesn't have that.

The Catholic definition of tradition, as a matter of fact, you will find in the Council of Trent, and you will find again in the above-quoted document of Vatican I, *Dei Filius*, where Vatican I defines as a dogma that the sources of the faith are the written and the unwritten tradition. The written tradition being the Bible and all the approved books of the Bible, and

the unwritten tradition being what the apostles heard out of the mouth of Christ and then transmitted to the faithful and their successors.

To give you an example for both: the written tradition is exactly what several councils in a row, and without contradicting each other, have defined as being authentic Holy Scripture – the books of the Old Testament and the books of the New Testament. And the unwritten tradition, one of the best examples is the assumption of Our Lady. It needed 1950 years until the Church, through the voice of Pope Pius XII, defined the assumption of Our Lady with body and soul to heaven right after her death as a dogma. But the Church always believed it anyway. The dogma was just clarifying terms, but the Church always believed it. The apostles were witnesses to that. The apostles found her grave empty. So they transmitted what they saw, and this is the unwritten tradition in the Church, and it cannot change, because it was completed with the death of the last apostle.

THE CONCEPT OF TRADITION

FATHER HESS: The whole problem today, I think the root of the problem is the mistaken concept of tradition: to call tradition something that can change, something that can grow with the study of the people, with the insights that the people have. It doesn't. Tradition is complete. Tradition is one and complete. The only thing the popes can do is deepen the understanding of it by defining terms that were not yet clear enough.

This root for the whole problem, you can find in the famous document *Ecclesia Dei*, where in number four, the present pope accuses Archbishop Lefebvre and his followers of a wrong concept of tradition. Well, Archbishop Lefebvre and his followers were doing nothing else but quoting the Council of Trent and First Vatican Council on tradition. If you read all the sermons and all the speeches that Archbishop Lefebvre ever gave, you will always find the same concept of tradition. And it's exactly the concept of tradition to be found in the First Vatican Council. And then the pope says, „No. This is wrong."

INTERVIEWER: Does that mean the pope is talking about new doctrines?

FATHER HESS: Yes, he does. In the same *Ecclesia Dei* document, he mentions the new aspects of doctrine. He says there are some people who cannot get along with the teachings of Vatican II because some of the aspects of this teaching are new. Well, at the same First Vatican Council, Pope Pius IX defined solemnly in his *Constitutio Dogmatica I Pastor Aeternus de Ecclesia Christi* of July 18th, 1870, he defined the infallibility of the pope. He did not only define the infallibility of the pope, he also defined the limits of this infallibility when he said, „But the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter to reveal a new doctrine with His assistance, with His revelation, but to defend"—that means to guard—„the *depositum fidei*, the deposit of faith that has been handed down from the apostles, to guard this in a holy way and to explain it in the most faithful way." As a matter of fact, the Latin text speaks about *sancte custodire et fideliter exponere*: to guard in a holy way, and to explain in a faithful way. So the Holy Spirit has not been given to the pope to reveal anything new. (*Neque enim Petri successoribus Spiritus Sanctus promissus est, ut eo revelante novam doctrinam patefacerent*). It was not given to them to reveal a new doctrine. So when the present pope, in his *Ecclesia Dei*, speaks about the new aspects of doctrine, even already he is going against the fourth chapter of the dogmatic definition of infallibility.

IMMUTABILITY OF CHURCH TEACHING

INTERVIEWER: Wasn't Vatican I also... didn't it also state in that papal bull that no one could change what the Church had already said?

FATHER HESS: Of course. That's simple common sense.

INTERVIEWER: But there was a papal bull in there where he actually stated you cannot... whatever the Church has proclaimed, you cannot in further councils try and take that away.

FATHER HESS: Of course, that's speaking about the solemn magisterium of the Church, the extraordinary teaching. But it's only common sense that the ordi-

nary teaching of the Church, that means the non-infallible but binding teaching of the Church, cannot be contradictory, because then, where would the assistance of the Holy Spirit be? Where would that leave the Holy Spirit? Would the Holy Spirit allow ordinary magisterium that goes against the teachings of previous popes to be binding? Well, then we would not be bound by the truth anymore. Christ didn't say, „I'm gonna give you a little bit of the truth." He said, „*Ego sum veritas*. I am the truth." So when a Catholic is faithful to the truth, he's faithful to Christ directly, not to something that Christ just gave us, and that's not part of Him. But the truth for a Catholic is identical with Christ Himself. This is important to understand.

The truth cannot change because God cannot change. It is impossible for anything perfect to change. Now the only thing perfect is not a thing, but God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. God is infinitely simple, He's infinitely perfect, and therefore He cannot change, because if He changed, there would be something coming in that He didn't have yet, or something missing that He had. That would mean an improvement. God cannot improve. God cannot change. So the truth cannot change. The moment Christ says, „I am the truth," He cannot possibly be speaking about the human nature of Christ. He must be saying this as the second person of God. He says, „I am the truth." God is the truth. God cannot change, so the truth cannot change. The Church always said that. This is why I quoted Saint Vincent of Lérins, which again you find in the *Dei Filius* document of the First Vatican Council. Dogma cannot know change, only deepening. Obviously, the Immaculate Conception was something that needed a clarification, so in 1854, Pope Pius IX pronounced the Immaculate Conception as a solemn dogma. That means extraordinary teaching of the Church. But that doesn't change the fact that the Church always believed it. Even though St. Thomas Aquinas didn't, the Church did. The very fact that St. Thomas Aquinas was wrong on this point just shows that even the best theologian of all can be wrong, and how. But the Church always believed it. It was part of tradition. The apostles heard it. It's not to be found in the Bible. Not everything is in the Bible. We do not live with this Protestant saying, „Only the Bible can save you."

WOMEN'S VEILS

INTERVIEWER: Now let me bring something up. Whenever I want to get in an argument, I use the Bible. And I always quote Corinthians, where St. Paul tells the women of the Church to listen to their husbands and to wear veils in church. And, of course, they tell me, „Well, that was the custom of that time." At what point do we interpret the Bible, or read the Bible and say, „Well, that's literally the Word of God. Well, that's not what he really meant." Is the Bible literal in what he says he meant?

FATHER HESS: Yes, but you have to read it in context. Take that passage there when St. Paul speaks to the women. Oh, well, that's very clear. I don't see any problem with it. It's perfectly within the context of the Bible, because in another part of his letters, he says, „*Mulieres taceant in Ecclesia*." Women should shut up in church. And I perfectly agree. Wherever they don't, they cause a mess.

INTERVIEWER: You're not gonna make friends this way, you know that?

FATHER HESS: „*Non veni pacem mittere sed gladium*," Christ said. „I did not come to bring peace, but the sword." So that passage of them wearing veils, how did we start the custom... not the custom, how did we allow the custom of not wearing veils?

Well, the fact that St. Paul wants veils is something that is a matter of discipline, obviously. Women wearing veils in church are following a discipline. It's something that you can reinforce in countries that have never stopped doing it for more than 10, 20 years. I'm not talking about what happened after the council, because after the council, almost everything Catholic went out the window, the very window that John XXIII opened to let in fresh air. Well, he let in Satan.

To give you an example, in Austria, where I usually live and I'm coming from, a very infelicitous emperor called Joseph II dared to abolish the veil for women, which was a perfectly unjust action, and needed not to be followed, but people followed it anyway. So now, it's about 200 years ago that the veil was abolished, and you cannot force it on women again, because of customs. You know the law of customs? Now, some-

thing done that is against the law cannot be custom, but then, it has been done in the belief that they are doing right, and the Church never interfered. The Church did not come up and did not speak up in the 19th century saying, „You have to put the veil back on." So silently, the Church approved it, and it's gone in Austria. It would be not very prudent if a priest was trying to enforce it. What you should do is invite women to go back to the tradition that St. Paul wants anyway. But we're talking about disciplinary matters.

COMMUNION IN THE HAND

INTERVIEWER: I have a problem with that. Here's my problem. If we take that, does not mean that someone out of ignorance about the new Mass, Communion in the hands, the new consecration, because they are ignorant of it, therefore, they're not held responsible for it.

FATHER HESS: Yes, except that would be true if Communion in the hand and the new Mass were a mere question of discipline.

INTERVIEWER: But they think that it's okay, because the Church has not ruled it as heretical.

FATHER HESS: Well, we're not judging these people anyway. We're not judging anybody, because a subjective judgment is not within our competence.

INTERVIEWER: But if the comparison of the veil as discipline, and then Communion in the hands...

FATHER HESS: Yes, but the veil is not a sacrament.

INTERVIEWER: Communion in the hands is not a sacrament?

FATHER HESS: Oh, yes, it's a sacrament distributed. It is, and how. Now, you bring up a very important point. Going back to the definition of infallibility of Vatican I, there is a very, very important line. When the infallibility of the pope is defined, they say that he has this... excuse me, not the infallibility. It's the definition on papal infallibility, but it's talking also about the primacy the pope enjoys. Now, the papal primacy, the document says, does not pertain only to things of the faith and morals, *„Non solum rebus fidei et morum et etiam disciplinae et regiminis Ecclesiae."* It does not only apply to matters of faith and moral, but also to matters of discipline and government of the Church. The papal primacy does, not the infallibility, obviously, but the papal primacy.

Now, why does the Conciliar document bother to make that distinction, saying which in Latin is a lot clearer than it can ever be in English, *„Non solum fidei et morum,"* not just matters of faith and morals, saying thus... Well, that's understood anyway, but also matters of discipline and government of the Church because the papal primacy applies to matters of discipline and government of the church, not the infallibility. The pope can bind his successors in matters of faith and morals. He can never bind his successors in matters of discipline and government of the church. For example, the pope binds all of his successors in everything that he defines, but he also binds his successors in his ordinary magisterium. When Pope Paul VI decided that artificial contraception is not to be used, it is immoral, he said the same thing that Pius XI said, Pius XII said, and he said the same thing that future popes hopefully will say because they're bound by it. But when Pope Pius X changed the law of the conclave, and then Pope Pius XII changed the law of the conclave, and then Pope Paul VI changed the law of the papal election, the conclave, and then the present pope, two years ago, changed the law of papal election, they could do so freely because they're not bound by it. It's a mere question of discipline. Papal election is a matter of administration. Wearing a veil on your hat or not, like for us, not entering into church covered, wearing a hat, or I saying mass, entering the church to say mass with my beretta, is a matter of discipline. The rite of mass is not a matter of discipline.

We're not only talking about a sacrament. There are seven sacraments in the Church. And Saint Thomas Aquinas says six of these sacraments lead towards the seventh, the highest and most important of all, and that's the Most Blessed Eucharist. So we're not only dealing with a sacrament, we are dealing with the most important sacrament. But we are not only dealing with the most important sacrament, we are dealing with the foundation of the faith. The oldest liturgical law is *lex orandi, lex credendi*. The law of what has to be prayed will determine the law of what has to be believed. It's not the other way around. Histori-

cally, it's the other way around. If you want to look at the Church from the viewpoint of a mere historian, you will say, „Okay. Well, first, the Immaculate Conception was believed, and we have the certain text for mass, a proper in the missal. Then the Immaculate Conception was defined, and the text of mass changed, historically." Yes. But the average faithful, and that includes me in that case, we believe the Immaculate Conception because it's celebrated December 8th. We hear about it at mass, and I read the text of mass when I say mass. And that's why I believe in the Immaculate Conception and not the other way around. The law of what has to be prayed will determine the law of what has to be believed. So mass is not only a foundation of the faith, it's the foundation of the faith.

Quo Primum

Interviewer: That leads me to something else. *Quo Primum.*

Father Hess: Yes. They tell me it's a discipline. That's exactly what I'm proving wrong. The way you say Mass... Now we're not talking about every little single rubric. Rubric being a law of how you have to hold your hands, or where at what point you put your hands on the altar like this or like that, or you don't touch the altar at all. Those are little rubrics. But everything of it together: the way the church has to be built, the way the altar has to be built, the way the altar has to be decorated, the way the priest has to dress, the way the priest has to use the missal, the hour at which mass has to be said, the time span that is allotted for mass (which is not two hours like for some priests, and it's not 10 minutes like for other priests; 20 to 30 minutes, by the way, in the old Roman books on moral theology). The way the church is decorated, the way the altar is decorated, the way the priest looks towards God with his back to the people and not the other way around (which would denote, like with this table, a meal or a desk, but not an altar). All of it together, and then the whole book, the Roman missal, all of that together is what you call the *lex orandi*, the law of what has to be prayed. And that, as such, cannot be changed for the simple reason that if you were to change this, you are to change the faith. If the law of what has to be prayed can be changed, then the law of what has to be believed can be changed. But if you change the law of what has to be believed, then you change the faith, and that's exactly what happened with the new mass. The Novus Ordo Missae is the foundation of a new faith, of a new Church, of a Church that denies what the old Church said, of a Church that goes far beyond what the old Church ever allowed. It's the foundation of a faith that makes all the truth of the old Church relative. I'll explain that.

But first, I want to answer your question on *Quo Primum*. The people say *Quo Primum* does not bind the successors of Pius V who wrote the document. If we dealt with a document that is merely disciplinary, that would be true. It has been pointed out to me, I didn't check it, but let's say it's true just for the argument's sake. It has been pointed out to me that Pope Clement XIV abolished the Jesuit order using the same formula that Pius V was using: „This document in itself is irreformable and irreversible, and whoever dares to do so, et cetera, et cetera." And then, Pope Pius VII, I think it was, reinstituted the Jesuit order, and therefore, he must be, obviously, if I was right talking about *Quo Primum* as binding, then Pope Pius VII committed a grave sin when he reinstituted the Jesuit order. What kind of argumentation is this? Abolishing a religious order and reinstituting a religious order is not a matter of faith. It's not a matter of sacraments. It's a matter of church government, period. And I just mentioned before, the pope cannot bind his successor in church government. But to change the missal around is not just a question of church government.

Interviewer: But wasn't the missal an outcome of the Council of Trent?

Father Hess: No. Only the book as such, not the contents. Pope Pius V hardly changed anything in the book. The *Missale Romanum* of 1570 that was published with binding force forever by Pope Pius V is nothing else but the Missale that was used by the Roman Curia a century before. And the Missale of the Roman Curia that was used a century before is basically nothing else but the Missale that was used by Gregory the Great, the last one who dared to touch the Roman Canon. When at the prayer, at the moment the priest holds his hands over the chalice

like this and says, „*Hanc igitur oblationem.*“ And Pope Gregory the Great in 590-something inserted the words „*Diesque nostros in tua pace disponas*“ into the *Hanc igitur*, so that you may dispose our days in your peace. Your peace, mind you. Not the way the world gives it, but your peace. When he did that, the population of Rome almost killed him. They said, „How dare you touch the Canon?“ That was in 590-something. Pope Gregory the Great was pope between 590 and 604. So, in those days, the concept of tradition in prayer and the sacredness of the Holy Mass texts already was developed to a point that the population almost killed the pope for touching it. But Gregory the Great did not scratch out anything or omit anything. He just added beautiful words, and yet he almost was not allowed to do that. This was the real sense of tradition that the Church once had, and that I hope we still have. Because the text of mass is the foundation of your faith and my faith, which is the faith that Christ gave us. Because of that, the text of mass cannot be changed, and the rubrics cannot be changed in important matters.

SUBSEQUENT POPES AND *QUO PRIMUM*

Father Hess: Look, the popes proved me right for the simple reason that all the popes after Pius V until John XXIII felt bound by Pius V. If you open up the *Missale Romanum* of Saint Pius V, 1570, get an edition of something like 1950 or 1960, whatever. Open up the book up front. You will find the *Quo Primum* document of Saint Pius V. You turn the page, you will find the next document, I believe, it's by Pope Urban VIII or something like that. I don't remember. You'll find a few documents by popes, successors to Pius V, and every single document explains very carefully why he dared to touch the book. So, the few successors of Pius V who dared to change little rubrics or little prayers in the missal explained so very carefully, saying that they did not change anything.

When Pius X, Saint Pius X, in 1907, reformed the rubrics of mass and the breviary, by the way. But we're talking about mass here. When he changed a few rubrics in the Missal of Pius V, what did he do? Well, for example, he promoted Sunday. In the old categories, before John XXIII messed it all up with his first, second, third class, you had the category of a feast explained by how it was dealt with in choir, in chanting. So you had the *duplex*, meaning you had to say all the antiphons fully. You had the *semi-duplex* when you said only half of it, and you had the *simplex* when you just pronounced the first word of the antiphon at the beginning of a psalm. Pope Pius X promoted Sunday from a *semi-duplex* to a *duplex primae classis*, but only materially. I explain what that means. Before Pius X, most green Sundays, as we call them, the Sundays in the summer, the Sundays following Pentecost, *Dominica post Pentecosten*, were covered by a saint. You had saint so-and-so and saint here and saint there, and the priest on Sundays would have to celebrate in red chasuble, white chasuble, whatever, but not a Sunday. So Pius X very rightly said, „Hey, wait a second. When in 1570 Pope Saint Pius V published this missal, there were very few saints in comparison to today, few saints in the calendar. And most Sundays were kept.“ So you had the liturgical times of the year: Advent (violet), Christmas (white), after Epiphany (green), Lent (violet), Easter (white), Pentecost (red), and after Pentecost (green). And you would see this. The people would see. But with all the saints coming in until Saint Pius X, the liturgical calendar got so packed with feast days that sometimes during an entire summer, all of June, July, August and September, you wouldn't see a single mass in green. So Pius X said, „I'm sorry, this is not what Saint Pius V wanted.“ So he promoted Sunday from *semi-duplex* to a practical, mind you, to a practical *duplex primae classis*. So now only the highest feast days can make the Sunday secondary to be commemorated and not celebrated. But you know what? Saint Pius X did not dare to change even the name of Sunday. Until John XXIII, Sunday still said *semi-duplex*, even though it wasn't anymore. So Pius X was very, very, very careful in touching the missal and changing rubrics. And in this document that explains the changes, he explains exactly, and almost apologizes why he dared to touch something as sacred as the Roman missal. Now isn't that exactly what I am saying? Do you think that five or six popes after Pius V would have bothered with all these documents if they did not feel bound by the first one? Were all these popes idiots, and now we've got the enlightened man on the throne of Peter? No. It's the other way around, believe me.

Interviewer: In reading *Quo Primum*, I don't see

any... Pope Pius V certainly used every adjective possible to tell the people this is what he meant.

FATHER HESS: Yes, but some people say that's legal formula. Yes. And it is to a point, except that with *Quo Primum*, it's a legal formula that doesn't concern a mere disciplinary matter, but a matter of faith. Holy mass is a matter of faith. If holy mass is a mere disciplinary question and not a matter of faith, then how can it be the foundation of faith? That's contradictory. It's ridiculous, as a matter of fact.

COUNCIL OF TRENT, CANON 13

FATHER HESS: Because the Council of Trent, in the seventh session on the sacraments in general, mind you, there is a canon 13. It says, „If anyone was to say that the approved and accustomed rites of the Church can be held in disdain, or that anything can be added or omitted, or that they can be changed into new rites by whomsoever of the pastors of the churches, let him be accursed." *Anathema sit.* „Whomsoever," mind you. In Latin it says, *„Per quemcumque ecclesiarum pastorem."* *Quemcumque* means whomsoever. Doesn't mean every. I do not need the Council of Trent to tell me that I cannot change the mass round according to my own likings and preferences. I do not need the Council of Trent to tell anybody that the average priest out there cannot change the mass. But most of the times, unfortunately, even with the best publishing companies, you will find a translation running something like, „or says that these rites can be changed into new ones by every pastor," or „by any pastor," meaning both the same. Meaning that the council did not want people to think that the average priest out there can change the mass. That's not true. Trent did not bother with trivial, obvious definitions. And contrary to what happened at Vatican II, the council fathers at Trent still knew their Latin. And they knew exactly why they picked the word *quemcumque*. *Quemcumque* is not just anybody. It means every, whosoever. *Quemcumque* means whosoever. So *per quemcumque ecclesiarum pastorem* means by whomsoever of the pastors. Now, whomsoever includes the Pope, I'm sorry. He's the Bishop of Rome, he's the Archbishop of Latium, he's the Primate of Italy, he's the Patriarch of the West. He also is the Vicar of Christ.

THE "SMOKE OF SATAN"

INTERVIEWER: Then why, then why the new mass?

FATHER HESS: The new mass, why? Oh, well, Paul VI explained it himself. The very same person who wrote up, who had the new mass written up, explained why. He said, „The smoke of Satan has entered the Church." The new mass is the smoke of Satan. The new mass is something intrinsically evil. The new mass, in itself, is something that goes against the will of Christ, it goes against divine law. It goes, therefore, against eternal law. Why? Well, we have mentioned one source that proves me right in this point: *Quo Primum*. *Quo Primum* binds all the successors of Pius V, and all of the successors of Pius V felt bound because they had their documents inserted after the document of Pius V. They did not throw out the document of Pius V and replace it with their own, but they added. So by the time John XXIII had the 1962 edition of the missal coming up, which is the last more or less acceptable version, you had a whole list of documents, some seven or eight popes in there. And none of them dared to throw out the document of his predecessor. If that doesn't look like they felt bound, then what does?

INTERVIEWER: Why? Why?

FATHER HESS: Exactly. Because the Council of Trent, in the seventh session on the sacraments in general, canon 13 says... (as previously explained, „by whomsoever of the pastors of the churches, let him be accursed.")

ECUMENISM AND *MORTALIUM ANIMOS*

INTERVIEWER: And then at the beginning, one of the first questions you asked, you asked me about unity, unity of the Church.

FATHER HESS: Pope Pius XI in *Mortalium Animos* very clearly says that the very concept of calling the Church to be anything but one unified is to be condemned because in the creed, we say, *„Credo in unam*

sanctam catholicam et apostolicam Ecclesiam." I believe in the one Catholic Apostolic Church, the one Church. The Catholic Church has always been one, and the Protestants are not disunited members of the Church, but they are not members of the Church. They are outside the Church. All the Protestants are outside the Church, all the heretics are outside the Church, all the schismatics are outside the Church. The Russian Orthodox are not our sister church. The Russian Orthodox are outside the Church, period, objectively speaking, mind you. Again, I'm not judging the situation of an individual soul. I can't. The poor priest out there in Siberia who has never studied proper theology and doesn't know much about the so-called Church of Rome, I don't know in what state you'll find his soul, and I'm not gonna attempt judgment. Judge ye not, that ye not be judged. But objectively, when we talk about facts and not persons, objectively, he's a heretic and a schismatic. He's a heretic because he says the Pope is not infallible, and he's a schismatic because he says, „The Pope is not my boss." He rejects the primacy of Rome. You reject the primacy of the Pope, you're a schismatic. You reject the infallibility of the Pope, you're a heretic. And all heretics and all schismatics are outside the Church. That's a definition. *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus.* No salvation outside the Catholic Church. And Pope Eugene IV made that very, very clear in 1441 at the Council of Florence, which for those who like footnotes, it's number 1351 in Denzinger-Schönmetzer.

INTERVIEWER: In *Mortalium Animos*, did the pope really tell us that no matter how good it appears, we cannot be in union with the Protestants?

FATHER HESS: He not only said we cannot be in union with the Protestants, he said we are not in union with the Protestants because they have left the Church, and we must not even be present at these interchurch meetings.

INTERVIEWER: So it's the opposite of Vatican II.

FATHER HESS: Exactly. It's the exact opposite.

VATICAN II

INTERVIEWER: But how can that be?

FATHER HESS: For the very simple reason that Vatican II is going against Church doctrine, therefore it's null and void. That's it. Vatican II goes directly against tradition of the Church. It goes against defined teachings in its document *Unitatis Redintegratio* on ecumenism. It goes against the defined doctrine of the Church in its declaration on religious liberty when it says that human beings, through his own dignity, the dignity of his own nature, has the right to choose his religion. This is a sentence that was explicitly condemned by Pius IX in the Syllabus, the Syllabus being a list of condemned sentences, 80 sentences, 80 statements that the Pope in his different documents condemned, and they were put together by the Holy Office under one title, *Syllabus Errorum.* And the Syllabus is ordinary teaching. Okay? It's not extraordinary. It's not necessarily infallible in the sense of a solemn definition, but it's ordinary teaching, and it talks about very, very theological matters. Now, either Vatican II is wrong or Pius IX is wrong.

INTERVIEWER: Well, what happened to the Holy Spirit?

FATHER HESS: The Holy Spirit was present in Vatican II, but he was excluded.

INTERVIEWER: Did he show up?

FATHER HESS: The Holy Spirit shows up whenever you want, but he was excluded in Vatican II by the very fact that John XXIII said, „This is not going to be a dogmatic council. It's not going to be a council that defines anything." Pope Paul VI said, „This is not a council that will define anything." It's only the present pope who tries to turn it into the foundation of a new doctrine. But John and Paul, who were the two popes of the council, and whose decision is final on that too, said it's a pastoral council. Whatever the term pastoral means, it sounds like giving advice to priests on how to convert the faithful and keep them in the flock. But Vatican II did not want to define anything.

And besides that, people are very, very mistaken about the Holy Spirit's existence, both with popes and councils, or, as a matter of fact, papal elections. I've heard people tell me that John Paul II was elected in the regular papal elections, so he's the one God wanted to be pope. No. The Church never said

that. The Church said that at a papal election, which is a mere act of administration, it's like voting for the governor. It's a mere act of administration. The Church said those who participate in the conclave, namely the cardinals, will get the Holy Spirit's inspiration if they ask for it. But the Holy Spirit, I'm sorry, God has bound Himself. God is omnipotent, but when He binds Himself, He's bound. God bound Himself when He gave us our free will. The Holy Spirit cannot go against my free will. He might appear in my dreams and say, „Vote for this cardinal," but then I might be a lousy cardinal and vote for the other one. What's the Holy Spirit gonna do? Burn the vote? Appear as a dove right there in the Sistine Chapel and tell everybody, „I want this one to be pope"? No. The Holy Spirit offers His inspiration, and if you kneel down and pray hard, you will get it. But if you don't care about it anyway, then it's not necessarily the candidate of the Holy Spirit who was elected.

ANNIBALE BUGNINI

INTERVIEWER: Who is Bugnini?

FATHER HESS: Annibale Bugnini. Oh, he's the author of the new Mass. Yes, that's a long story. He was discovered under Pius XII. I wouldn't say by Pius XII. If Pius XII had known what a foul apple that was, he would have never selected him. But probably Giovanni Battista Montini already, who was the pro-secretary of state, one of the two pro-secretaries of state of Pius XII, it seems that he discovered Bugnini, who was at the time a teacher on liturgy at the Lateran University in Rome. Bugnini's ideas about Mass were as wacko as can be, and as the Novus Ordo is anyway. So Bugnini started to reform the Mass, unfortunately with the approval of Pius XII, in 1949 when he rewrote parts of Holy Week. Pope Pius XII, I think, made a grave... But that's my personal opinion as a theologian. I think he made a grave mistake when he confirmed and approved these reforms. Then John XXIII kicked Bugnini out. He didn't like him.

INTERVIEWER: Was it because he was a Mason?

FATHER HESS: I'm not sure that John XXIII knew about that.

INTERVIEWER: Was John XXIII a Mason?

FATHER HESS: Not that I would know. He behaved like 10 of them, but not that I would know. I have no proof for it. But anyway, Paul VI then called Bugnini, and that goes to show you who discovered Bugnini 15 years earlier. He called in Bugnini to head the Consilium. The Consilium was the council for implementing the documents of Vatican II on the new liturgy, on the reforms of the liturgy. Then Bugnini wrote up an entirely new Mass, which was published—published, mind you, be careful about that—published by Paul VI, not promulgated or made obligatory.

THE HOLY SPIRIT'S PROTECTION

INTERVIEWER: So you ask me, where's the Holy Spirit? It's the question over which many friends of mine have lost their theology. Where's the infallibility of the Church today? Where is the indefectibility of the Church? Where is it?

FATHER HESS: It's still there. The Holy Spirit protected the Church from a Vatican II that became obligatory. They didn't define anything in Vatican II. On the contrary, at the end of the document on the Church, *Lumen Gentium*, it's called a Dogmatic Constitution because it deals with Church doctrine, but it's not a dogma, because it doesn't condemn any opinions to the contrary. It just says, „That's how we see the Church." At the end of that document, there is a *nota*, which we have to thank Cardinal Pericle Felici, who was the secretary of the council. And in this note, it says, „None of what is said here enjoys the status of extraordinary teaching. None of what is said here, unless the council specifies otherwise (which the council does in no way and in no place), is to be taken in any way but as ordinary teaching." Now, the moment we deal with ordinary teaching versus ordinary teaching, the one that is versus afterwards goes out the window because there cannot be a contradiction. If Pius IX said, „This is so and so," and Vatican II says the contrary, Vatican II is just null and void, not teaching.

The same Holy Spirit kept Paul VI from making the

new mass obligatory. Pope Paul VI put his personal signature under the *Constitutio Apostolica Missale Romanum*. That's a document that says, „I like this book here." He published the missal in 1969, the new so-called Roman Missal. The first one that did not have documents of the other popes in there, but only Paul VI. It was a new book with a new mass, a new rite, Paul VI said so himself. And the book says, „I like this," and there are only two points of decree: one is, from now on, there are four Eucharistical Prayers. It doesn't say we have to use them. It says, „There are four Eucharistical Prayers, and I want the formula of consecration, the words of consecration, to be the same in all forms." That's the only part of the decree. So that concerns, again, the book itself, but not the use of the book or the obligation to use it. The obligation to use the Roman Missal was pronounced by Pope Paul VI orally in his speech at the consistory of May 26, 1976, and before that, there was a notification of the congregation. Now, I'm sorry, I got *Quo Primum* of Pius V saying, „No new mass must ever be written up. This document cannot be changed." And then there's a notification of the congregation saying I have to use the new missal. The notification is null and void. *Inferior non potest tollere legem superioris*: an inferior cannot take away the law of the superior, and the congregation is bound to any pope whatsoever.

INTERVIEWER: So the new mass did not come out of Vatican II?

FATHER HESS: The new mass came out of Vatican II, and I have proved this on another occasion. But the new mass was never made obligatory with the signature of Pope Paul VI or any other pope.

INTERVIEWER: So no one was bound by anything?

FATHER HESS: No. As a matter of fact, we are still bound by *Quo Primum*. We are bound by Pope Pius V's *Quo Primum* for the simple reason that it was never abolished, and it can't be abolished anyway.

INTERVIEWER: But also, if Vatican II did not say there would be a new mass, there'll be a new mass, but you didn't have to go to it.

FATHER HESS: No, Vatican II was... As far as Vatican II is concerned, as usual, the document on liturgy is completely contradictory. As such, not to be taken seriously. Laws that are not clear do not hold. So the Holy Spirit is still with the Church. It's indefectible because it never made the abomination of the new mass obligatory, and it can't.

ON SEDEVACANTISM

INTERVIEWER: Father Hess, there is a movement in the United States, Sedevacantists. That there hasn't been a pope since Pius XII. That because they feel that the popes were Masonic, they could not be pope, and they don't recognize... The chair has been vacant. What are your thoughts on that?

FATHER HESS: Well, I think the church teaching is very clear on that. We have to distinguish, again, between matters of discipline and matters of faith. You will see why. And we have to distinguish between objective heresy and subjective heresy and between material heresy and formal heresy.

Let's take up the question first: what happens if a pope is secretly a member of Freemasonry? Would he cease to be pope? No. He's just committing a grave sin, and he's excommunicated, and only he can absolve himself from that.

INTERVIEWER: He's excommunicated? And he can still be pope?

FATHER HESS: Personally, sure. If a pope commits... For example, if Pope Alexander VI, the famous Borgia pope, if he had attempted to absolve the concubine he spent the last night with in confession, he would've been solemnly excommunicated, reserved to the Holy See. Does that make him cease to be pope? No. A pope does not cease to be pope because he's in sin, not even when it's public sin. A pope ceases to be pope when he is in formal heresy. Canon law always stated, and the new code of canon law says the same thing: someone who is objectively in heresy, who's in formal heresy, who is in the subjective sin of heresy, cannot hold office.

But I explained on another occasion that as long as the pope does not make his heresies (and there are enough of them) formal, he is pope. He's just a man who is in error, who says the wrong things, but does not say, „This is a new teaching, a new doctrine, and I

say this in spite of the councils before." He doesn't want to contradict. I told you about the mistaken concept of tradition the present pope has. Now, within this mistaken concept of tradition—a tradition that changes with the times and with the understanding of the faithful and their studies and their experiences, quoting again *Dei Verbum* VIII—the pope will say certain things that are against church doctrine, but he will always say, „In accordance to tradition." For him, Vatican II is the second coming of the Holy Spirit, and therefore, whatever that means, it's a second Pentecost, or as Pope Paul VI said (and the present pope never gets tired of quoting Paul VI on it), it's a council almost as important as the Council of Nicaea, or maybe even more important. So, these people just totally overrate the so-called teachings of Vatican II, and they think that this is now tradition because tradition knows progress. So, when the Pope says something that seems to be against the doctrine of the Church as pronounced by the popes of the 19th and the 20th century before, and the Church for 2,000 years, matter of fact, this is just because of the change and the progress in tradition. So, they make it manifest that they do not want to be heretics. Pope John Paul II makes it abundantly clear that he does not want to contradict the definitions of the Council of Trent, but to interpret them in a new way that is fitting to our present times. That makes him a material heretic. It means the heresy is there. The matter of heresy is there. The heresy is there, but the intention is not there. And if I do not know and do not see, I cannot commit a sin. I cannot commit a mortal sin unless I know, want to, and in a grave manner. That's the definition of mortal sin. And heresy is a mortal sin. It's one of the worst sins possible, but there have to be three conditions: grave matter (well, matter of the faith is always grave matter), knowledge, and intention. To be quite frank with you, the present pope is a very lousy theologian, because his philosophy is all screwed up, and I doubt he knows what he's saying. Doesn't make you a formal heretic.

INTERVIEWER: But you believe he's the Pope?

FATHER HESS: Yes, that's the reason why. Because, you see, when Herr Doctor Martin Luther said, „The Church is wrong, and I say," he immediately was a heretic. He knew it, he wanted it, and the matter was there.

FOLLOWING AN ERRING POPE

INTERVIEWER: But you must follow the pope now.

FATHER HESS: I must follow the pope in everything that is not against Church tradition. But if it is against Church tradition, and mind you, I have to prove it. The pope doesn't have to prove anything to me. I have to prove to him that he's wrong. Well, that's pretty easy with him, I honestly tell you. Because I just read the Syllabus of Pius IX, and there you have the same thing that the present pope says, except that Pius IX condemned it.

That leads me to a very important point before I finally answer the question on *sedes vacante*. I have to prove that the pope is wrong. He does not have to prove to me that he is Catholic and that what he says is according to Church tradition. I have to prove to him that he's wrong, and I can do that. But I cannot do it quoting theologians or myself, even. That would be the worst thing. If I was to say, „John Paul II says, but I say," then I'm just a disobedient theologian, nothing else. But I do not contradict the present pope with anything but his predecessors. When I say that the present pope is wrong when he says that the Spirit of Christ does not refrain from giving salvation to the efforts of the Protestant churches, I quote Pope Eugene IV. I quote the Council of Trent. I quote Pope Pius IX. When I contradict the present pope saying, when he says, „The Church is not one. We have to unite the Church, and that we have a sister Church in Russia, and we have a sister Church there," then I just quote Pope Pius XI's *Mortalium Animos* against him. And if the present pope says that at the moment of death on the cross, Christ symbolically descended to hell with His body because His body was in the grave, then he contradicts the Fourth Lateran Council, not me. He contradicts the Fourth Lateran Council that defined as a dogma of the faith... I'm quoting, by the way, a speech of January 11th, 1987. He contradicts what the Fourth Lateran Council defined as a dogma: that the moment Christ died on the cross, His soul descended to hell. Now, the term hell means the waiting place for the just of the Old Testament. There's no discussion on that. And His body couldn't; His body was in the grave. But then John Paul II says, „The moment Christ died, He had the

beatific vision, and we talk about His descendance to hell because His body was in the grave." That's against what the Church teaches also. It's against Church tradition that Christ would have received the beatific vision at the moment of His death on the cross. He had it from the very moment of conception because He's the second person of God united in the hypostatic union with human nature, but in the same person. There are two natures, but the same person. There is His divine nature and there's human nature in Christ, and they're united in the very same person of Jesus Christ who had the beatific vision all of His life, who never ceased to have it. And then the pope comes up and says, „He received it at the moment of death." You see, this is a contradiction. And it's not I who proves the pope wrong. It's not I who judges the pope. I don't judge the pope. I don't prove anything here. I just quote the councils and the predecessors of this pope. And if I have a statement from the Fourth Lateran Council, the Council of Florence, the Council of Trent, and First Vatican Council, and then I have a statement by John Paul II that says the contrary, I know who's right: the councils before because they define dogmas. John Paul is just writing speeches.

CUM EX APOSTOLATUS OFFICIO

FATHER HESS: Why is it that he's still pope when he does all these things? Well, first of all, because as I said, he does not make the intention manifest to be a heretic. The famous heretics in the old days would always say, „The church is wrong when the church teaches this and this and this, I say." It's very clear that the intention to go against church teaching is clear and manifest. The pope never said that. John Paul II never said that he wanted to go against what the church teaches. On the contrary, he still will tell you that everything he says is in accordance with church tradition. Well, it isn't, but he says so, so he has no intention of being a heretic. Thank God. And therefore, he's not a formal heretic.

Now, it is the excellent comment on the new code of canon law issued by the Canon Law Society of America that says, „If a pope was to be in formal heresy, he would cease to be pope." But then opinions are divided on what we would have to do in that case. However, the sedevacantists are not just satisfied with the document on material and formal heresy, they will quote Pope Paul IV, I think it was. The document is called *Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio*. It's a document which enjoys all the infallibility it could have. It uses all the legal formulas for an infallible document. That means, the pope says, „I, in virtue of my apostolic authority, herewith declare, define, and statute that, that, and that. And that has to be held and believed by all people forever." And in that document, which also rules on the election of a future pope on the conclave, it says that, „No cardinal, if he is a heretic or was a heretic, can be validly elected to the papacy." Many sedevacantists use this document as the definite proof that John XXIII, who in their eyes, was a heretic before his election, could not be validly elected. They are quite wrong on that because again, this is why I said you have to be careful about the distinction between matters of discipline, matters of faith. Pope Paul IV, with his *Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio* was able to bind all of his successors forever in everything that concerns moral or dogmatic teaching in his document. To rule on the election of a future pope is not a moral decision. It is not a decision on moral theology. It is not a decision of faith. It's not a matter of morals or faith. It is the ruling of a canonical election. That means, you talk about an act of administration. You talk about an administrative ruling, and that cannot, because it's mere disciplinary, cannot bind his successors. And indeed, the many successors to Paul IV, who came up with new regulations on the conclave, including St. Pius X, never mentioned that paragraph again. So it's not taken up anymore. And I think if the question of a former heretic or a material heretic not being able to become pope was something that the popes cannot change, then we're probably in sedisvacancy for many centuries already. The present pope is not the first heretic in church history.

INTENT AND PAPAL ERRORS

INTERVIEWER: Let me come back to you a little bit. If I kill someone and feel that that will be better for the world, it'd be a good coming out of it, I didn't intend to cause murder, so I... Would I be committing a mortal sin?

FATHER HESS: Objectively, definitely yes. Subjectively, I don't see any escape for you because the church made it quite clear that you must not do that. You know it. You wanted to do it, and it's a grave matter.

INTERVIEWER: But why does that apply to a pope who doesn't have intention?

FATHER HESS: Because it's a very different matter, you see? To kill somebody, under certain circumstances, is always murder. To pronounce an error means always to pronounce an error, no matter what circumstances. But heresy, the word heresy in itself, means the intention of contradicting church doctrine. Otherwise, you do not deal with the sin of heresy. The members of the Church of the New Advent, they understand this to be in perfect accordance with what the church always taught, saying, „When Pope Eugene IV said that nobody who is in schism or in heresy can ever be saved, they were talking just about appearances," which is a foggy concept of the word objective. Now I, myself have not ceased to underline the fact that when Pope Eugene IV says, „Anybody who is in schism or in heresy, even if he was to shed his blood for Christ, cannot be saved," I'm talking about objective judgment. But you see, the point is, the Church of the New Advent does not use distinctions. The Church of the New Advent, headed by John Paul II, will always talk about as if objective and subjective were the same, material and formal the same, act and potency the same. This is why on many occasions, I have insisted on these distinctions.

There are many things that you are not allowed to say unless you make a distinction clear. I'll give you the most obvious example. If I was to say to you right now, „I am Pope." True or not?

INTERVIEWER: It's not true.

FATHER HESS: Yes, sir. It is true. Potentially, I am Pope. The probability is equal to zilch, but not the possibility. Potentially, I am Pope.

INTERVIEWER: I know I could become... I could be Pope. Right. I could become a bishop, then a cardinal, and be elected Pope, right? So potentially, I'm a Pope.

FATHER HESS: Right. But you said very rightly that I am wrong, because you understood what I said, the way I said it. The usage of language is a law. It's not just a mere convention. It binds you. You have to follow the rules of a language. And in the usage of language, no matter what language you speak, you do not name things that are only in potency without saying so. Can you imagine how scandalized people would be if I was to tell them at the same time, „I'm Pope and the physical father of many children"? Potentially, I am. Of course, I could break my vows of chastity and my promise of celibacy and have a lot of children. I could also become Pope if I'm made a bishop and a cardinal and elected. But I'm not allowed to say, „I'm the father of many children," without explaining what I mean.

This is the whole point. Now Pope John Paul II on uncountable occasions in his encyclicals, especially *Dives in Misericordia*, will tell you that all people are saved. That's the same thing I just did. Is it true that all people are saved? No, it is not. But is it true that all people are saved potentially? Yes. Christ dying on the cross made it possible for all people to be saved; that does not include the slightest probability. It's only a chance. Our Lady in Fatima showed very clearly that hell is not only not empty, but highly populated. So many people did not make it, that's for sure.

PRIVATE REVELATIONS

INTERVIEWER: I have to interject here. Because when I bring this proposition up about the Pope, I'm quoted from Father Gobbi. Father Gobbi, I believe, said that this pope is Mary's... She raised him to be the present-day pope, her favorite pope. So, what I'm saying here is if this pope is Mary's favorite pope, one who has been raised up to be her favorite pope, why did he disobey her command at Fatima?

FATHER HESS: Well, I would just say the fact that he disobeyed her command at Fatima is the definite proof that he's not her favorite pope. Period. And I'm personally not interested in private revelations by some... What's his name? Don Gobbi of the Marian Movement. Yes. Well, I think he's as inspired as I am. Zilch. I do not believe it, and there's no need for me to believe it.

INTERVIEWER: But Our Lady had called through Medjugorje and the different places-

FATHER HESS: Oh, don't talk to me about Medjugorje, because in Medjugorje, Our Lady says the Hail Mary. Our Lady cannot say the Hail Mary. It is impossible for Our Lady to say the Hail Mary. So anybody who tries to explain to me that Our Lady says the Hail Mary, I know that's fake. It's a hoax. Medjugorje is a hoax, and most of the apparitions are a hoax. Our so-called Lady of so-called Bayside said that the UFOs are the vehicles of the demons. That's against any sound theology that I've ever heard. Demons do not need vehicles, and they don't need a driver's license. I'm not interested in all these hundred thousands of private revelations.

INTERVIEWER: But those who are turning cold over there. People are being converted. Look at the fruits of Medjugorje.

FATHER HESS: That's too bad. The fruits of Medjugorje, the devil will always be willing to give in on a lot of fruits if he ultimately can cheat the people. And you see, what's the message of Don Gobbi? Vatican II is right, John Paul II is right. What's the message of Medjugorje? Vatican II is right, John Paul II is right. What's the message of all these self-appointed... Mind you, they called me a self-appointed theologian. Well, it was the Pope who appointed me a theologian by giving me a papal doctorate. But these self-appointed seers and visionaries, they just serve the devil by proving the conciliar church, the Church of the New Advent, and all the abominations that were pronounced in Vatican II to be right.

To me, that's again, proof that Saint John of the Cross, whose spirituality I hope nobody will doubt, was very, very right when he said, „Do not trust visions, do not trust apparitions, and do not trust miracles even when they are right. Do not indulge in this because it will take away the faith from you." Remember the Apostle Thomas? „Blessed are those who do not see but believe."

CONSECRATION OF RUSSIA

INTERVIEWER: Why did they consecrate Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary? Why did they not do it?

FATHER HESS: You're asking me to analyze the intentions of the last five popes. Why is it that Pope Pius XII didn't do it? Why is it that John XXIII didn't do it, Paul VI didn't do it, John Paul I didn't do it, John Paul II didn't do it? I don't know. I have a suspicion, a growing suspicion that the so-called Third Secret of Fatima talks about Vatican II, and that would make it abundantly clear why they didn't

And while Vatican I, the last Catholic council so far, said very clearly that miracles are necessary for salvation, Vatican I was not talking about every single little miracle happening somewhere. Vatican I was not talking about visions, apparitions, and miracles in general. Vatican I mentioned occasional miracles, like the Miracle of the Blessed Eucharist in Lanciano. That's a place in Italy where, 1100 or something years ago, a host during mass turned into visible flesh and blood, and so did the wine in the chalice. And it's a proven miracle. It's just been analyzed some 10 or 15 years ago by modern atheist scientists, out of whom two immediately converted. It's a miracle proven to be authentic, and at the same time, a real miracle because it's impossible that you will find human flesh and blood to be a horizontal slice of a human heart intimately connected with the old appearance of the host. So these are miracles that can prove the faith. Sometimes when people are not satisfied by the logics of the church doctrine, by the logical consequences in the church teaching until Vatican II, sometimes then you need a miracle to convert them. But you have to be very careful with them. Visions, apparitions, and miracles very often are a substitute for the faith. I do not need the miracles in Lourdes in order to keep my faith. I have to pray to God that He will never make me lose my faith. But in order to keep my faith, I do not have to read the latest statistics on miracles in Lourdes. As a matter of fact, I'm not interested in that. Saint John of the Cross was very right when he said, „Beware of apparitions, beware of visions, beware of miracles." Why do you need them? You have the teaching of the Church. You better believe what the Church teaches. And then you might enjoy occasionally some miracle or whatever. But I do not need these things, and I'm not interested in Don Gobbi, I'm not interested in Medjugorje. Personally, I would have the right to say I don't believe in Fatima. Well, I do believe in Fatima, and how. But I would have the right to say I don't believe it. It's not church doctrine.

publish the secret, and that would make it abundantly clear why they don't believe the whole thing. But that's theory.

THE QUESTION OF SALVATION

INTERVIEWER: On the matter of Muslims, atheists, can be saved, can a traditional Catholic be saved?

FATHER HESS: Well, I get the impression that according to the Church of the New Advent, we are now the only ones who are not Catholic and cannot be saved. I don't listen to these things anymore.

INTERVIEWER: So a traditional Catholic would be the only one in jeopardy of losing his soul.

FATHER HESS: Probably. I don't know what they really want. And I'm not interested. See, I follow the Church. I follow the popes. I'm interested in what the Church teaches.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF 1958

FATHER HESS: When Archbishop Lefebvre uses the year 1958, you will always see with the Society of St. Pius X or Archbishop Lefebvre, they will always tell you, „1958, 1958, 1958." Now, they are not Sedevacantists, definitely not. And it would be slander to call them Sedevacantists. They are not. They pray for the pope every day in their chapels, publicly, and I'm a witness to that because I have done it in their chapels for them.

The reason why Archbishop Lefebvre says 1958 is for practical reasons. The changes in the Church did not come about in 1958, period. The liturgical changes started in Germany in 1917, in the United States in the 1920s, 1930s. In Austria, in the 1930s, they said mass in the vernacular *Versus Populum*, towards the people. The actual changes in the *Missale Romanum* started under Pius XII when in 1949 Holy Week was destroyed in my eyes. Destroyed, but it's substantially there.

And then, of course, there was the 1962 missal, and 1965 missal, and 1967 missal. Then you had the new Mass of Paul VI in 1969, 1970 edition. You had the vernacular versions come out in 1974 following. And now they are talking about another reform, just like in the old days, 1517 Germany with Herr Doctor Martin Luther. So the changes came about gradually, needless to say.

The point why Archbishop Lefebvre always says 1958 is very simple. Until 1958, there was not one official church document that was wrong. Pope Pius XII never wrote anything that was wrong, as far as I can judge. After that, with John XXIII coming in and ridiculous documents like *Pacem in Terris*, things started to change. So they're not reliable anymore. And 1958 is a good way for the people who do not want to go into the details of all the history to remember. It's very practical for them to remember 1958 as the date of the change so they know if a church document is dated before 1958, they can trust it. If it's dated after 1958, it might still be right, but they cannot trust it. And that is why 1958 was used by Archbishop Lefebvre and by the Society of Saint Pius X.

1962 MISSAL AND HOLY WEEK

INTERVIEWER: Why do you say Holy Week was destroyed? What happened?

FATHER HESS: Some people quoted me saying that I do not celebrate the Mass of 1962. And they said, „Very good. Father Hess does not celebrate the Mass of 1962 because the Mass of 1962 is definitely not the Mass of Saint Pius V." Wrong again. I just said that the official changes, printed changes in the missal, changes that would make you doubt that the rule of Saint Pius V was kept, started in 1949. I would never say that 1962 is unacceptable.

I can explain to you very shortly and very simply why the Society of Saint Pius X, namely Archbishop Lefebvre, decided to use the 1962 missal. There are rules in the church. And one of the highest rules in moral theology is that self-defense will always be content with the minimum necessary in order to get rid of the situation you want to get rid of. When Archbishop Lefebvre consecrated four bishops in 1988, he knew he was not gonna live for long any-

more. He knew the moment he realized that Rome was gonna trick him, he decided on acting right now in self-defense. At the same time, if he claims the rules of self-defense, then he has to stick to the rules of self-defense. The 1962 missal, according to Archbishop Lefebvre, according to Father Schmidberger (who was his successor as the Superior General), and according to my own view, is the last acceptable book. Because after that, the changes were visibly too many and too drastic to make it credible that you're talking about the same missal, and the same book, and the same mass.

However, I am not bound to these laws of self-defense. And what Pius XII did with Holy Week is something that I cannot accept. If a future pope was going to say, „Father Hess, you will say the Mass of 1962." I would say, „Yes, sir," and do it with a bleeding heart, but I will do it, because it's acceptable. If he was to say to me, „You're gonna celebrate the Mass of 1967," or, „You're gonna celebrate the new Mass," I will say, „Your Holiness, you do not have the competence to say this," because of what I explained earlier. The pope is bound, and I think he's bound a lot more than what we believe him to be. When Pius XII allowed the *Missa Praesanctificatorum*, the Mass of the Presanctified of Good Friday, to be turned into the Liturgy of the Word, which is what happened, I think he exceeded the limits of his competence.

It was Archbishop Lefebvre who decided on the 1962 missal, not the pope. The pope came up with the so-called indult on the 1962 Mass only after Archbishop Lefebvre had decided that the 1962 missal is the last acceptable version. I've studied the different versions of mass. And some things in the 1962 missal strike me as almost unacceptable, but not entirely unacceptable. The 1965 version where you have all the propers in vernacular and the *Judica me* psalm (Psalm 42) at the beginning is gone, and the last Gospel is gone. Now that, I'm sorry, is too much. But the changes of the 1962 missal, as regrettable as they are, under the laws of emergency, would have to be followed, but I'm not under that law of emergency. A future pope will have to decide what we use.

CANONIZATION OF MARTIN LUTHER

INTERVIEWER: Are they trying or, will they try to make Martin Luther a saint?

FATHER HESS: Well, that's a very difficult question. According to what most theologians say, canonization, not beatification, canonization is infallible. I therefore am inclined to agree with Pope Benedict XIV's document, *De Canonizatione Sanctorum*, that the Pope enjoys infallibility in canonizing anybody. The question now is, if the present pope was to undertake not the beatification of Martin Luther, but the canonization of Martin Luther, would I have to become a sedevacantist? And to be honest, I don't know.

There is another question involved. Does the present pope still enjoy infallibility without ceasing to be pope, I mean? Take an example. What if a pope was to say, „I personally do not believe in an unchangeable truth"? If he was to say, „There is no unchangeable truth," then he's in formal heresy and he ceases to be pope. But what if a pope was to say, „I personally do not believe in any kind of unchangeable truth"? Makes him a material heretic. We had three of them in church history before Vatican II. They didn't cease to be pope. They were heretics, but they did not cease to be pope. But if a pope says, „I do not believe in unchangeable truth," is he still able to define anything, even in his official capacity of being pope? And I think unfortunately, that's a question that's beyond me. I can only quote popes. I cannot decide on any issue. I can pronounce opinions as long as the church allows me to discuss a matter. When the church says this is now defined and beyond discussion, then I cannot discuss it anymore, I can only explain it. As long as the church does not say that this has been defined forever, I'm allowed to discuss it. I'm not decided, but I cannot decide on it. I personally believe it will not happen.

If the present pope canonizes Martin Luther, I will certainly take personal action. I will immediately cease to mention him in the canon. But I do not know if I would be able to preach that. I do not know if that would be enough certainty to become officially a sedevacantist. I can tell you that I have seen the pictures of Martin Luther with the halo already.

ATTENDING THE NEW MASS

INTERVIEWER: A lot of people called me and the question is, „I only have the new mass to go to. There were no Latin masses available."

FATHER HESS: The church has answered the question in the past when the church did not allow you to fulfill your Sunday duty in a Russian Orthodox mass. Now, the Russian Orthodox mass is recognized as valid. The church has never, as a matter of fact, doubted the validity. Validity means it takes place. It doesn't mean it's allowed to go there. Most people confuse valid and licit. Valid means the sacrament is actually there; it happens. Licit means it's also allowed to do so. I could celebrate a valid mass in a bathroom, but I'm not allowed to do so. It would be valid, but it would be illicit. The church has always recognized the sacraments of the Russian Orthodox Church as valid. Always. The church has not allowed you to fulfill Sunday duty. Why? Because objectively, these sacraments are illicitly administered by somebody who does not believe in the infallibility of the pope and who rejects his primacy. Faculties in the church are usually, unless we are talking about error, derived from superiors, that means from the pope down.

According to that rule, you cannot attend the new mass. Now, the new mass is not celebrated by formal heretics and formal schismatics, but the new mass is against the will of Christ, and I showed you why: because of the definitions of the Council of Trent, because of *Quo Primum*, because of the profession of faith, *Iniunctum Nobis*, of the same Council of Trent which says, „We must hold steadfast to all the traditional rites."

So to answer the practical question, what do you do? Well, exactly what Archbishop Lefebvre said, „Don't go." Period. You must not confuse a church law with divine law. The third commandment (sometimes in this country called the fourth commandment) of sanctifying Sunday means exactly what it says: sanctify the holy day. It doesn't say how, it says, „Sanctify the holy day." That is a precept that not even God Himself can dispense from. If you're in a hospital, unless you're comatose, you have to dedicate Sunday to the Lord, even if it's only a short prayer. The church, not God, not Christ, the church decided that we have to fulfill our Sunday duty by attending mass. That, therefore, is a positive law rightfully given by the church, as is her job to explain the commandments to us. But it's nevertheless the church and not God Himself who says, „You must attend Sunday mass."

If God tells me I have to do something, I know that God will provide me with everything needed to do it. That's why the Ten Commandments are not, „Do this and do this," but, „Do not." I don't need any special provision in order to not do something, but I need sometimes special provisions in order to be able to do something. Now, if the church says, „You will go to Sunday mass," the church has to provide Sunday mass. If the church does not provide Sunday mass, I cannot possibly attend Sunday mass. If I'm a member of a scientific team down in Antarctica and the church does not provide me with mass, I cannot go to mass, period. And the church always said, „In that case, you're excused." If I'm living out somewhere in the country and we get 25 inches of snow and I cannot get out of my house, I cannot go to Sunday mass, period. *Nemo ad impossibilia tenetur*. Nobody's obliged to do more than he can.

If the church does not provide me with holy mass, then I can't go. And the Conciliar Church does not provide me with holy mass for the simple reason that

it is my divine right, God-given right, to receive all the sacraments in my rite (R-I-T-E). My church happens to be the Latin Catholic Church. The rites of the Latin Catholic Church are the ones confirmed by the Council of Trent, Pope Pius V and his successors. They are not the changed new rites. Paul VI called it the *Novus Ordo*, the New Order of Mass. The New Order of Mass, I don't know to whom it belongs except the devil. But it's not my liturgy, it's not my rite, and it doesn't belong to my church, and I cannot go there. Period. If the church does not give me an old mass, I cannot go there.

I asked Father Schmidberger of the Society of Saint Pius X, „What's the limit? Do you have to drive four hours in order to get to an old mass?" He said, „No." He said, „An hour, an hour and a half, 15 miles, whatever." Catholics should be generous. It depends, is there an icy road or a nice summer day? The church never said you have to risk your life for going to mass. The church said, „Sanctify Sunday by going to mass." If you can't go to mass, then you can't go. Try to make it for Easter and Christmas and the most important feasts if you have nobody in reach. But you cannot fulfill Sunday obligation at the new mass because the new mass in itself is schismatical, against the will of God, against divine law, and against eternal law. How can I fulfill eternal law by going against it? It's absurd. You can't. Archbishop Lefebvre was completely right. Better the old mass once a month than the new mass every day.

Here Part 1 ends and Part 2 begins.

This second conversation with Fr. Hesse delves deeper into: sacramental validity questions, whether New Mass ordinations are legitimate, if priests should seek conditional re-ordination, accusations of Freemasonry among Church hierarchy, a critique of organizations like Opus Dei and the Knights of Malta, and the sedevacantist position regarding papal legitimacy after John Paul II's controversial actions like kissing the Quran.

The discussion also covers the problematic nature of beatifying contradictory figures like Pius IX and John XXIII, while exploring the limits of papal infallibility and the Church's indefectibility in light of Vatican II's doctrinal departures.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

That's where we meet again. We've had good response to our faithful conversations with Father X. How are you remembering about that? Was that 1997?

,97. And then we did that. Of course, we had bells ringing in the little classroom. How fast the time passed. That's how meanwhile the time flees.

So what has happened is that a lot of people have contacted me because I think they're afraid to ask you questions. Would you again sort of tell us why we should be listening to you? What is your background and your credentials?

Okay. Well, the answer would not be really that they should listen to me. I've studied for 10 years. Matter of fact, you see, while you were working, working hard for most of your life, I'm now 47, for most of my life, I didn't work hard. Not in that sense. I've worked in factories, chemical industry, Germany, whatever. But I know what work is. But most of the time, instead of working, I was reading. If I had a better memory, then I would be much closer to perfection as far as my knowledge is concerned. But I have done my studies at the Angelicum in Rome, but that's not the point. That's a high school, sort of high school outfit. Pretty low level as far as the academic level is concerned, but I had the luck of having some of the old teachers who introduced me to Saint Thomas in the proper way. And once introduced to Saint Thomas, I started to, instead of studying most of the time modernist books most of the teachers at the Angelicum wanted me to read, I just spent my spare time, and I also spent my studying time with the writings of Saint Thomas and the famous book which is called Denzinger Schönmetzer, the collection of the papal magisterium in Latin. That's a book that I'm studying now for 25 years. That's the reason why there are certain things that I really know. And at the same time, I hope, at least, that I've not lost my common sense.

The reason why I say you're not listening to me, but to the church teaching as much as I can remember it.

Now, there are young people out there who will remember certain things much better than I do. At the same time, many people have not learned the theological method. That's not only common sense. It's also that you will never have all the answers ready all the time. See, we are doing a sort of live interview here, and I have not been prepared for this. I don't even know what your questions are gonna be. But you may rest assured that whenever you face me with a question that I do not have the answer for, I will not give an answer. I will not give you a substitute for an answer.

One of the things today that is thoroughly misunderstood, also among traditionalists, is to think that who has the better argument has the truth. That's not true. That's what people may think about some idiotic TV discussions between presidential candidates. They might think that the one presidential candidate that has the better arguments and has the better, apparently the better reasoning and the better preparation, must be the better man. But that's not true, because in public discussions, very often, the purpose of the discussion is that I am right, not to find out the truth.

The reason why I can answer your question, why should people listen to me in the first place, is that I will always try to the best of my knowledge to reproduce doctrine that is traditional with the church. One of the reasons why I'm not in all too familiar and good terms with the conciliar churches is because they want, they would want me to quote Vatican II, and after having stopped quoting Vatican II, to quote Paul VI and John Paul II. And they are highly embarrassed when you come up with quotations that are from the Council of Trent or Pope Pius X, and that proves them wrong, ‚cause they're not interested in the truth. Most of the time, they defend a certain political purpose, or they just want to be right. And unfortunately, even among traditionalists, it's a widespread phenomenon that many priests just want to be right. They want to be able to say, „See, I was right, and you were wrong." I've never been interested if I was right. I'm interested in what is the truth, what is correct, what is right. And the reason why I would never say you should listen to me, but the reason why there could be much worse things you could do than listening to me is because at least I try my very best not to make up things. I try to give quotations as much as my memory permits me to do so. The reason why I'm not sitting here with a prepared manuscript that I will read to you is because it would be useless. Latest on page two, you would be soundly asleep.

LIVE INTERVIEWS AND DELIVERY

Well, as you said to me, you don't know the questions I'm going to ask you.

No, I have no idea. The point that I have to make a point about this. One of the reasons why I decided to do interviews like this live and not with prepared questions and prepared answers and prepared manuscripts is, God has given his talents freely. He gives them individually to each individual. He gives them differently to each individual. Somebody might be much better in reading than in talking freely. Some other person might be a lot more gifted for talking freely. I happen to know, and it's not my merit, because I didn't buy that, I didn't work for that. It has been given to me. I have the merit that when I talk freely people stay awake. When I read a book to you, people fall asleep.

The best sermon in history, and you cannot challenge me on that, as you will see. The best sermon in history is Christ's speech to the Apostles at the Last Supper recorded in the Gospel of Saint John. Read, by the way, you talk about spiritual reading. That's spiritual reading. Read of what our Lord Jesus Christ had to say to the Apostles at the Last Supper. What Christ says here is of infinite value, of absolutely infinite value. And I consider it from all aspects, the literary aspect, not just talking about theology, revelation as a matter of fact, what it is. The revelation of God's will and God's thoughts and God's intentions. But I also consider it the most beautiful speech ever done from the literary viewpoint. However, mind you, not in itself where it has infinite value. By circumstance, it can become worthless. Namely, when at night you come home from your work, you sit down. You're tired, but you want to do something for your spiritual life. And there's this guy in front of the camera and he's reading the Gospel to you, and he goes on... „But I did not call you employees, but I wanted you to be my friends." You will be sound asleep after the third line of our Lord's, Jesus Christ's own words. So that's

what you call a delivery. To deliver something. And I just can't... I'd rather risk a wrong quotation before I read something to you with scientifically researched fixed quotations that will put you asleep solidly.

VALIDITY OF THE NEW MASS

You were reared in the new church.

Yes.

When did you decide when you were up on that altar with the new Mass that, „I cannot do this anymore?"

A few months after I was ordained, and mind you, there's one thing that I have to say about that. I've never celebrated one single Mass in the vernacular. I started out from the very beginning, in 1976, I started to say the new Breviary, the Liturgia Horarum. For those who know Latin, I shall call it the Liturgia Errorum. Say you the Liturgia Horrorum, the Liturgy of Horrors and Errors instead of Hours. But I did it in Latin. One of the reasons why I needed several years to find out that it's no good is because I did it in Latin. Not that I don't understand Latin, that's not the point. But once you are faced with translations of the new Breviary in English, you will understand why I say if I had done it in English from the very beginning, or in German, I would have stopped very soon, because I would have seen the blasphemies that come about in the translations. In the Latin original, usually you can find them.

Are you saying to me, Father, that to say the new Mass in Latin from Vatican II would be a valid Mass at that point?

I firmly believe so.

Okay.

For the simple reason that you cannot necessarily talk about the new sacraments, I'm talking about all seven sacraments in the new rite. You cannot necessarily call them Latin rite. As a matter of fact, I'm firmly convinced that they might be all kinds of things, but they cannot be of the Latin rite. The point is, the Latin has more than one rite. Now traditionally in the Latin Church you have the Roman Rite, which basically is nothing else but the rite that used to be celebrated in the Roman Curia. And that Pope Pius V in 1570 canonized it. You have the Ambrosian Rite, which is pretty similar. The Dominican Rite, which is pretty similar. But then you have the Rite of Braga in Portugal. You have the Primus Noltentium Rite. You have the Rite of the Carthusians whose founder we celebrate today, Saint Bruno, or Adruobis. And we have the Mozarabic-Visigothic Rite which is celebrated in Spain and which is quite different to the Roman Rite.

From the very fact that we have to consider different rites, and from the very fact that Pope Innocent III said that you shouldn't change, that a pope who changes all the rites and all the sacraments and comes up with new ones put himself in schism with the church. And from the very fact that at the Council of Trent, seventh session of the Council of Trent about sacraments in general, Canon 13 says, „Whosoever says that the traditionally handed down rites that are used in the solemn administration of sacraments can be held in disdain or can be shortened, or can be turned into new rites by any one of the pastors of the church." Any one just means whosoever, because the Latin word (Latin), doesn't mean anyone, but it means whosoever. Doesn't matter who it is, he can't do it. Now, whosoever means the Pope is included. Who says so is outside the church. That's why I think that the Pope doesn't have a right to change all the rites. If he does so, at the least, he is committing a schismatic act because that's against the unity of the Church. And I mean, just look around. There is no such thing as unity anymore here. Everyone does what he wants.

What do you do with a rite that you recognize not being the Latin Roman rite, as such, when you consider its validity? Now, for the Roman rite, we have a definition. For the Roman rite, the sacramental forms and the matters are defined. We know if we don't use bread and wine for mass, it can't be mass anyway. If you don't use water for baptism but Coca-Cola, it can't be Baptism anyway. We know these things. We also know if you baptize in the name of Christ, which Pope Nicholas I said would be valid, we know it's not valid in any case. It has to be in the name of the Father, Son, Holy Spirit, Trinitarian Baptism. At the same time, when we are faced with a schismatic rite, which is something the Church had to deal with extensively and intensively, latest after the great schism between the Eastern and the Western churches in the

year 1054, the Church had to deal with the question, how do we determine which rite is valid? So they went according to the content. That means they examined the form of the sacrament and said, „Does this form express the essentials of the sacrament? Yes or no?" They didn't say, „Is this form deviating in one or two or three single terms or words from what they are supposed to do?" No. They examined those rites according to, does it express the essence of the sacrament? Yes or no?

The last one to make these things very sure was Pope Leo XIII in (Latin) at the end of the last century when he established that the Anglican ordinations were not valid. And he established finally and forever that they were not valid mainly because of the defect of intention, not of the form. Originally of the form, but not back then. So when you deal with the question, are the Novus Ordo sacraments valid, you have to examine the matter, the form, and the official, mind you, and that's the whole point, the official intention, the objective intention, the manifest intention. The Church has never tried to look into one's soul. You can't even do that in a confessional. How would I know as a priest if the guy who's just confessing his sins is saying the truth or not? I can only pronounce a judgment on what I've heard. God knows his soul. The fact that Saint John Maria Vianney knew it was a special gift, another one of these aforementioned (Latin), the freely given gifts.

And according to that, we have to face the fact that in Latin, the fact that they leave out (Latin), mystery of the faith, is not a change in the essences of mass. The essence of mass is the double consecration. It's very important to understand. The essence of mass is the double consecration. Twin, it should be called. The twin consecration. Bread and wine. Therefore, the essence, and this is something you can look up in the old moral theologists, is this is my body, and this is the cup of my blood. That's the essence. And that is given in the Latin new rite. The question starts with vernacular translations that change the actual message of those words by saying, which has been given for all instead of for many. Those who expect Father Hess to be the judge on everything will be highly disappointed when I tell them, I do not have definite proof that new mass in English is invalid. I also do not have definite proof that the new mass in English is valid. Therefore, I have proof that it is doubtful. I have never had a doubt about the Latin new mass celebrated correctly, of course. Why correctly? There is big, big, big, great, great important mistake about that. People think they can judge a priest's intentions. No, you can't. But, and this is how the Church did it and does it, if a priest dressed in whatever the local vestments are, but obviously those vestments that are used for mass, approaches an altar, whatever that is, as long as people would commonly say, „Yes, that's an altar." Has the missal up there. Uses the official book issued by the church. Issued, I said, because when we talk about the Novus Ordo, we're not talking about a promulgated law. Issued book by the church. Then they would say, „Okay, Father's gonna say mass." You see, again, I talked about the common sense on another occasion, and I have to repeat it. Common sense is the sense for the probable. You see that somebody has this makes it visible that he has the intention of doing what the church does.

It's like when you have a priest of the Society of Saint Pius X, he leaves the sacristy. He is dressed as a priest is supposed to dress. He approaches an altar that looks like an altar is supposed to look like. On that altar, there is a missal, which you of course can only presume, they're not gonna let you see it to check. But you presume this missal up there is a real authentic missal of Saint Pius V, therefore a missal of the Catholic Church, Roman Latin rite. And then he starts (Latin). There you presume, okay, Father's saying mass. And that's very important because this way the priest makes it manifest. Manifest means visible, almost tangible, if you were allowed to, that he's saying mass. Therefore, if a priest in the new rite performs the way he's supposed to, your point of departure will be the presumption that he wants to do what the church does. I'm not saying this is always the case. There are some people out there in this country who take everything that I say and then say the contrary and say, „Okay, Father, so you did not say that." I'm sorry. Human language is not that simple or simplistic. After having been in huge European palaces, if I say to you, „John, this is a beautiful house," and it's a beautiful house, but I've been in bigger houses than this one here. Some of these theologians, so-called theologians will say, „Okay, Father, so you're saying this is a small house." No, I didn't say that. I said, „I've been to bigger ones." I didn't say, „This is a small house." And it's not a small house. I don't consider this a small house, but

I've been to bigger ones. See, this is no way of arguing theology. In theology, you do not never ever try to hook somebody else to his own quotation. Real theology, the way Saint Thomas dealt with it, the way most of the greatest theologians did, you only want to find out the truth. You're not interested in what the other one says. This is why I say you don't listen to me. Hopefully, if I don't make a mistake, I'm not infallible. If I don't make a mistake, hopefully you're listening to what the Popes say, but you don't listen to what I say. You listen to what the Popes said, minus the faults of my memory.

Now wait, the point I'm making here is, we're talking about probability. I consider the new mass properly celebrated in Latin or in a correct translation, which, for example, in the Polish language is correctly translated. I consider it as much as I have the authority to judge on that, I consider it valid. If you say there is the general instruction to the new mass which delivers a heretical definition of mass, I'm sorry to disappoint you on this point. It does, but that is the rubrics. Officially. And you have to read Apostolicae Curae, the document on the annual canonizations on that, where Pope Leo XIII says, „If the rite is shortened, if things are left out, with the obvious intention of changing the doctrine, and the doctrine is changed, then it's invalid." On paper, officially, ask the Vatican, write a letter to Cardinal Ratzinger. Officially on paper, the church is steadfastly holding to the real presence, the sacrifice of mass, and the priesthood. In practice, in real life, they don't. But on paper, they do. I now come back to you.

But excuse me, there's one thing that I finally have to add. These are my viewpoints. This doesn't change the fact that I consider the new mass as such doubtful. And that, of course, puts it in a different light. Denzinger-Schönmetzer Quotation 2101 says, „You're not allowed to frequent sacraments, not even for pastoral reasons, according to a probability."

RE-ORDINATION AND OTHER SACRAMENTS

Another question I have is, do you believe... And this is a question that's asked of me since I set you up with that, talking about the validity of the mass. If you felt that the sacraments of Vatican II were doubtful, would you not try to have yourself reordained because you may have not been ordained correctly?

Yes. Definitely yes to that. But I don't doubt them. See, you talk about the sacraments. There are seven. As long as one follows the newly published rite on baptism, I'm only aware of the Latin edition. And so, those people who always like to book me on my own arguments, don't quote me on the vernacular editions, thank you. I'm talking about Latin. I have no doubt about baptism, even though the exorcism is ad libitum. I've no doubt about confession, especially not about confession. All that's needed for confession is (Latin) in whatever language, as long as it's clearly understood. I've absolutely no doubt about ordination whatsoever. I will go into detail about this, obviously.

But before you go that far... Malachi Martin, who was, of course, someone you sort of liked, in his, I think it was Deserted Vineyard, said, „We don't know at this point who is really truly ordained."

Yes, correct. That has a different background, this thing, which I will come back to. Now, when we talk about the new sacraments, I said, if the intention is manifested that the priest is going to celebrate mass... See, I'm not quoting myself here. I'm quoting a person that I consider to be a real authority on this and, quite frankly, I don't care if people agree with me on this point. Archbishop Lefebvre said, „Basically speaking, the new sacraments are valid, unless..." And then he made the exception that I will go into detail with. But he said, „Basically speaking, it's valid." And Archbishop Lefebvre said that, as a point of departure, we consider the new mass valid, unless, and then he said pretty similar things to what I have said. And I consider Archbishop Lefebvre an authority. I do not consider 17-year-old self-appointed theologians who are not even in the priesthood, have never studied properly in anything, to be authorities. I do not even consider myself to be that much of an authority. But Archbishop Lefebvre, according to a church tradition, when things get rough, so to speaking, you trust the bishop rather than the priest, basically speaking. Now, this could be turned beautifully against me with the American Bishops Conference today, but at the same time would say, „Well, look at the priest then, worse."

The point I'm making is, we are dependent on a certain authority on many things, because even papal

statements are anything but clear, at least sometimes. And as far as the probability is concerned, I exclude it. I have a problem with confirmation because I don't think that Paul VI could validly allow anything but olive oil to be used for confirmation, which is the matter of confirmation. And therefore, if you go ahead and use some peanut oil or sunflower oil or whatever, I consider confirmation invalid. However, I'm not a pope and I have no final judgment on that. I consider it, it's definitely doubtful. Definitely, from what we know, it's doubtful. When we consider extreme unction without olive oil, I can't see how it would work.

Well, today, the ordinations don't have...

Oh, no, I'm sorry. The matter of ordination is the imposition of hands, not the olive oil. Now, as far as the ordination is concerned, Paul VI, I don't know about, I have to be honest, I did not compare the old and the new rite on the ordination of deacons, diaconate. But I did only recently with a friend of mine in Austria, who's a pretty erudite theologian, we compared the forms of ordination of the new and the old ordination to the priesthood and the consecration for bishops. I know the argument that's looming in the background, quoting Sacramentum Ordinis by Pope Pius XII. If the infallible document that Pope Pius XII published under the title Sacramentum Ordinis, where he said that (Latin), „For validity, the form of diaconate has to be: colon, such and such; priesthood: colon, such and such; bishophood: colon, such and such." If that was applicable for all ordinations, we would have, since then, no valid ordinations in the Eastern rites. Mind you, the United or the Schismatic. We would have no valid ordinations in any rite that doesn't correspond to the Latin Roman rite in this point. Obviously, therefore, the document that Pius XII published is regarding the Roman Latin, the Roman Latin rite.

I said before, „What do you do if you're faced with a rite that you cannot properly categorize?" Well, obviously you have to judge it according to contents. Now, Paul VI claimed, I have not checked up on it, so that's another one of these things. A theologian who pretends that he will be able to answer everything correctly in a public discussion is not a man who wants the truth, but is a man who wants to be right. Beware of people who want to be right all the time. I have been wrong more often on more things than you... than in theology, than you ever knew that could be right or wrong. If I started to give you an account on everything that I have been wrong about in the old days, especially in theology, we'd be sitting here for another six hours with another three tapes.

Sorry, I have to come back. I'm talking about the Episcopal Ordination. See, with the Priesthood Ordination, there has been one word difference, UT, a conditional word in... And it's not necessarily a conditional word in Latin. According to all traditional moral theologies I've ever read, even when an infallible papal decree defines that for the validity of a sacrament, the form has to be such and such and such. If a nonessential word is left out, that does not significantly change the sense of these words. Even according to the rather strict rubrics in the old men that talk about the possible defects while celebrating mass, would consider it sinful if it's done deliberately, but would consider it valid. That means that even from the viewpoint of the Latin Roman rite, priesthood ordination cannot be considered invalid. And the bishop who ordained me a priest, by the way, was consecrated in the old rite in 1965, Archbishop Sovatani.

The thing that concerns us here is are the bishops that are ordained in the Novus Ordo Consecration Rite valid bishops? Again, under the condition that all the other necessary conditions are fulfilled, the form is definitely valid. Paul VI claims, and I said before I have not checked up on that, but Paul VI claims that he took that form from the Byzantine Rite. I don't care. The point is, there are several different ways of consecrating validly a bishop. Now, the Church in Rome has always considered all the seven sacraments with the schismatic, heretical Russian Orthodox and Greek Orthodox Churches valid. If you bothered to read translations of the Episcopal Consecration and the Priesthood Ordination in the Eastern Rites, you'd be surprised what you find. It's not clear at all. As a matter of fact, I can tell you one thing. As I had to deal with this recently, I compared the Episcopal Consecration under Pius XII, the set in his Sacramental Ordinance, with the new one. And the funny thing I found was that the old Episcopal Consecration form is not as clear about the actual role of a bishop as the German translation of the new one.

So, we're talking about something that is contained in the form of the sacrament. And as I said before, as I cannot consider the new ordinations to be necessarily

of the Latin Roman rite, leave it open right now if the Novus Ordo is just plainly schismatic or if it's a Gnostic sect, as Bishop or if it's just a conciliar sect, as Archbishop Lefebvre called it. If it's, let's say it's sectarian and heretical, then we have to deal with it exactly the way the Church dealt with the Russian Orthodox and the Greek Orthodox rites, which are all recognized, all of them. And they're not necessarily as clear as the Novus Ordo rights on many things, but I have not yet found a theologian who will definitely prove to me that the new Episcopal Consecration misses out on the essences of bishophood.

The old one is anything but clear for the simple reason we are facing a phenomenon here which is quite amazing. When you read the old Code of Canon Law, the 1917 Code of Canon Law is something that some people in this country always love to quote against me in my face. But we have a problem there, because in the Code of Canon Law of 1917, it says that the major orders are (Latin), deaconate, and priesthood. Pius XII said, „Uh-uh, it's deaconate, priesthood, and bishop." Saint Thomas Aquinas said, and it was a tradition in the Latin Church, that the matter of ordination at priesthood is the handing over of the instruments, which had to be while the bishop was still holding them, chalice and paten, had to be touched by the candidate for ordination. I mean, guess what? The mass of ceremony at my ordination insisted that I do it. That, „You must touch it," he said. „You must touch it." He was obviously not all too aware of the Sacramental Ordinance Decree by Pius XII, who said, „No, the matter is definitely the imposition of hands, because with the Greek United, for example, you never had the handing over of the instruments." Logical, clear to last point. However, Canon law doesn't define things and never has defined things, and some people ought to get this in their head. It's the purpose of papal magisterium to define things, not of canon law.

FREEMASONRY AND CLERICAL CONSECRATIONS

All right, I have another one. Can a priest or a religious bishop, archbishop, cardinal, pope be a Mason?

Nope.

What if he is?

According to the old code of canon law, he's excommunicated. According to the new code of canon law, he has to be justly punished. That's what the law says.

Question. Who consecrated Lefebvre?

Excuse me?

Who consecrated Lefebvre as bishop?

Uh, Cardinal Liénart.

I'm getting, someone asked me the question or told me that that person or that bishop, archbishop was a Mason. That's going around.

Yeah, I know.

Can you clear that up?

Apart from the fact that it's not that easy to produce proof for the fact that Cardinal Liénart was a Mason...

If he were, if he were. Supposition.

That's what I'm saying. As it's not the purpose of this conversation here to clear up the rather insignificant detail if Archbishop, Cardinal Liénart of Lyon was a Mason or not. If he was a Mason, then I would suggest to that person who suggested that Archbishop Lefebvre might not have been consecrated a bishop validly, to read up, to check up on the Rite of Ordination, which demands that it has to be three bishops. And all the three bishops have to consecrate. All the three bishops have to have the intention of consecrating. All the three bishops have to impose their hands. Therefore, if that person is able to prove to me that all the three bishops who consecrated Archbishop Lefebvre were most definitely Masons, then I would say, „Huh, that's too bad." That means that Archbishop Lefebvre has been illegally consecrated, but validly.

No one...

Oh, yes. You always get people who would suggest any kind of things, but the church has never said that one who is excommunicated cannot ordain. See, only a sacrament that in its validity, as to its validity is dependent on liceity, on being allowed, is doubtful in that case. Not a sacrament that doesn't depend on it.

So, so your answer to them would be that there had

to be three bishops?

That's not the point. The point is not only there had to be three bishops, there were three bishops who consecrated Archbishop Lefebvre. But also, if all the three of them had been Masons, which is not easily established. Even if that had been the case, he would've been validly consecrated because the fact that you're excommunicated means you don't have your office. If Archbishop Liénart, which I am not that sure about... I don't believe that if I buy at the local cash register, if I buy one of those black and white newspapers that tell me that a B-17 bomber fleet had been found on the moon and that Adolf Hitler was a woman, I usually don't waste my time to check up on these things. And I have long ago stopped to check on every Mason that I supposedly have been made a member.

But you're saying because, and even if someone were excommunicated...

He ordains validly.

Okay. Okay. All right.

KNIGHTS OF MALTA AND OPUS DEI

Have you ever heard of a group called the Knights of Malta?

Yes, definitely.

And who are they, and are they part of... what are they part of the Church again?

There are several theories. There is a very interesting group in, I think it's Pennsylvania. It's in Pennsylvania, yes. Who claim to be the true Knights of Malta, and who say that the Knights of Malta right now in Rome would not be the right Knights of Malta. And their argument is that when the order of the Knights of Malta sort of died with the grandmasters, was it treason or whatever? I don't remember. My memory for historical details is unfortunately not good. They claim there had been a sort of serious vacancy among the grandmasters of the Knights of Malta, and then Leo XIII reestablished the Knight Order of Malta. They say that can't be because if it is actually as the Italian license plate says S-M-O-M, SMOM, (Italian), Sovereign Military Order of Malta, it wouldn't be sovereign if it's out of papal graces. Now, they say that because the Roman Knights of Malta are dependent on papal grace, they're not sovereign, and they can't be the true Knights of Malta. And then they, I've never been able, however, to find detailed information on who after the tsar... which one, which tsar was it? Paul?

Paul.

I think it was Paul, who supposedly was the last grandmaster of the true Knights of Malta, how that succession would end up in Shickshinny, Pennsylvania. I don't think...

The point, no...

Excuse me. The point I'm making is this: I couldn't care less if the Knights of Malta in Rome are authentic or not. I know they're not Catholics because they follow everything that Vatican II says and the pope says.

But I don't think that was the intent of the other question. I think the intent of the question is that there are a lot of subversive secret societies...

Oh, the Knights of Malta have never been secret.

Okay.

Never. None of those groups, not that I'm aware of.

There is... Oh, you want a secret society? Try to find out the membership of all the members in the Opus Dei and you've got a secret society. Try it. The Escriva testimonies... Excuse me, the Escriva witnesses. That language mistake, beg pardon. The Jehovah Witnesses, the Escriva witnesses, try to find out a full membership list of the Escriva witnesses. Josemaria Escrivá de Balaguer, the founder of the Opus Dei.

Evidently, the Opus Dei, you think there's something subversive with them or...

Yes, definitely.

Well, what... Can you expand on that?

Yes. The founder of the Opus Dei, who supposedly is verified, at the time when Pius XII... I believe that Pius XII was pope and was able to do it. In 1949, put the membership in the party, in the Communist Party under excommunication. And also, at the same time, put under excommunication any work done for the

Communist Party. The founder of the Opus Dei, and this is something that the Opus Dei confirms in at least one of their publications, accepted members of the Spanish Communist or Italian already, I don't remember that, but Communist Party into the Opus Dei. And when one of those communists, that's a dialogue I read in one of the Opus Dei publications. When one of these party members of the Communist Party said to the founder of the Opus Dei, „But, Monsignore, in that case, I would have to leave the Communist Party," the founder of the Opus Dei said, „Oh, no, there will be no need for that." So what do you make of that? What do you call that? When the membership in the Communist Party was under excommunication, the founder of the Opus Dei admitted members of the Communist Party into the Opus Dei without telling them to leave the Communist Party. Can you beatify a man who was in public disobedience against the pope? And the time, mind you, when there was no church crisis like now. By the way, the founder of the Opus Dei said that he had a doctorate in not only in theology, but also canon law. I've never found anybody who would show me that. People have asked the Opus Dei to produce the document, and there's no answer. I'm not saying he's a liar, I'm just saying I would like to see it.

MARTIN LUTHER

In your, one of your tapes, you spoke of Martin Luther. Now, I have heard that someday he may be a Catholic saint.

(laughs) Right?

In fact, years ago, someone got a picture down at the...

I need a gold coin for that. (laughs) Gold coins.

...of Martin Luther with a halo in one of the Catholic cathedrals.

Oh, a halo? Yeah. I don't know. A hell. Oh, oh. That's another thing, but... Now, you spoke about Martin Luther, and you felt he was a very evil man. He said things...

Tan Books and Publishers. Thomas A. Nelson. Tan Books and Publishers have an excellent book. The title is... I don't remember the author, but Tan Books requires a title, a number, or an author, and they will be able to ship the book to you. In Tan Books, you will find facts about Luther. Read the book. Luther used names for our Lord that I refuse to repeat. And Luther admitted freely that he had his inspirations from the devil. Do we need more?

Nope.

PAPAL ACTIONS AND SEDEVACANTISM

You ready?

Yeah.

There is a picture of the pope kissing the Quran.

Yes. Public act of apostasy. And he calls it a holy book. It's a public act of apostasy. If I had scientifically irrefutable proof that that act of apostasy would be a formal act of apostasy, I would side with the sedevacantists. Sedevacantists, I'm sorry. Apologize.

All right, now there's no doubt that he kissed the Quran.

Yeah, there's no doubt.

Is there any doubt that he called it a holy book?

No.

Now, how do you make that the extension, that he was a formal heretic?

People who have studied recent American history are witness to the fact that a president can say a lot of nonsense. Does he cease to be president? I know. The argument is a president doesn't lose his office by being a heretic. You could- In the church, you lose your office by being a heretic.

I would say for you, you can lose your office by being treasonous.

That's an excellent argument.

He subverts the government. What would be the difference?

In this century, the 20th century, which will not, which has not ended last December 31st, but will end this December 31st, for those who have a spark of mathematics left in their memory, because it was

called the 20th century, and the 20th century cannot end in 1999. Even if Kaiser Wilhelm der Zweite of Germany in 1900 decreed this to be the first year of the 20th century, doesn't change the fact that the 20th century has given ample proof for treacherous people being heads of states without losing their office.

Now, we are here actually touching another question, which you might have in your list of questions. I don't know. But we're actually touching another question here. Do we have a pope? Yes or no? I have only one answer for this, and I will repeatedly give this answer. As long as I do not have scientifically irrefutable proof that this present pope is not pope, I will hold him as such. Why? Papal pronouncements on when a pope, not just when somebody loses his office, but when a pope loses his office, have been scarce, to say the least. Very few popes, unfortunately, because I do not believe it, but very few popes have contradicted the theory that the pope is above canon law. Mind you, I'm quoting even church fathers. Forgive me, I don't have the page. I don't have the author, and I don't have the book, but it's an old saying, „The pope is above canon law." Pope Pius IX said about himself, „I am tradition." Which is impossible. Of course, a mental error is no impediment to sanctity. However, Pope Pius IX said, „I am tradition." I don't believe that. I don't believe that a single pope can be tradition. Impossible. The popes have unfortunately been very, very, even contradictory on this subject. When the Bishop of Brixham in 1869 asked Pius IX what will happen... They were discussing the infallibility to be pronounced as a dogma. And Pius IX was asked by the Bishop of Brixham, „What will happen if a future pope was to pronounce heresy?" Pius IX didn't say he would lose his office. Now, this is in writing, and you can find it in the famous collection of papal pronouncements or papal private correspondence. The collection is, for those who like footnotes, M-A-N-S-I, Mike, Alpha, November, Sierra, India, MANSI. And it's in the 5000s. I wish I had a better memory for things like this. It's 5000, 5500 something if I remember well. The quotation, Pius IX says, „Or you just don't follow him." You don't say this guy loses his office. You don't say he ceases to be pope. You say, „Okay, then you just don't follow him."

But isn't there... Just like Saint Thomas Aquinas said...

But isn't there another document that speaks of something like, if the pope does something heretical, he's no longer pope?

No, no, wait a second. You can't do something heretical. You can only pronounce it.

Oh, pronounce something heretical. Yeah, but he is no longer pope.

Yeah, the point is, canon law presumes that you're a formal heretic. That's canon law, anyway. Moral theology, like Primo for example or Verins or Vidal say that, discussing the topic, discussing the issue of a pope losing his office, say, only if it's informal heresy. That's a... We don't have the time here, and we would have to go for five hours to discuss these arguments.

And what I have to say... No, no, I'm fully satisfying you because you'll see that this is what you were asking.

No, it was not what I was asking.

No, I'm sorry, you said... Someone has brought up that you evade an issue, that there is a document that says that when the pope commits something heresy, all right? He is no longer pope, ipso facto.

No, I didn't say that.

No, no, I am saying there is a document to that.

Yes, right. And people... Yeah, there are many, there are many documents to this point.

Okay. Saint Robert Bellarmine, who is at least a doctor of the church, right? Saint Robert Bellarmine says, „Even if a pope was to pronounce just material heresy, he would ipso facto cease to be pope."

Oh, okay, why doesn't that hold?

The point I'm making is, there have been so many contradicting theories on this subject. Take for example this, even though I don't accept it, it's there. And if I accept it or not is not the point. It's there. The old saying that the pope is above canon law. If the pope is above canon law, you cannot apply canon law on him. Who would do that anyway? Canon 333, paragraph three of the New Code of Canon Law, and that's an almost literal copy from the relevant canon in the old

canon law says, ‚Contra sumum pontificem recursus non datur. There is no appeal against the Roman pontiff.' So, the oldest problem as to this topic, does the Pope cease to be pope when he becomes a heretic? The oldest problem is not to determine is he a heretic or not? But to determine if he's pope or not. Who's going to do that? You see, this is the whole point.

Archbishop Lefebvre, again, pronounced pretty well on this subject. He was asked, of course, you can imagine, the seminarians in Econe, they had the same problems. And they knew most of the arguments back and forth, against and for. And they asked him, and he said, Archbishop Lefebvre said very clearly, he said there, ‚They have excellent arguments. There are very good arguments to believe that he's not pope.' But when you consider canon law, which certainly applies to us, obviously it's not that sure if it applies to the pope, but it certainly concerns us. Then you have to consider the fact that the pope doesn't have to prove anything to us. The onus probandi, this is called in Latin, the burden of proof lies with us. It might as well be, and I firmly believe, I'm firmly convinced that the sedevacantists have much better arguments for their viewpoint than we have for upholding the pope. They have much better arguments. But who's going to decide on that? Who's going to decide on that? Who decided on the arguments for Immaculate Conception and against Immaculate Conception? I don't believe it was a priest from Vienna speaking to John Maffei in Philadelphia. You see? The point is, I have discussed this extensively with many theologians. I've discussed it with theologians who are really erudite. I've also discussed it with theologians who, especially on the telephone, try nothing else but to hook me up on my own lines by stating the contrary. I've discussed it with serious people and I've discussed it with less than serious people. I do know from my reading, some sedevacantists have gone through the trouble of writing excellent, usually theologically very erudite, thesis on this topic. The very fact that I'm not convinced is completely sufficient for my mentioning the pope in the canon, because even if I personally was convinced that he's not pope, you think I'm stupid? If I mention John Paul II in the canon, and at the last judgment I find out he wasn't pope, what is God gonna do to me? Nothing. But what if I firmly believe that he is not pope and I don't mention him in the canon anymore, and at the last judgment I find out he was pope? Uh-oh.

The burden of proof is something of a very decisive nature in sensitive issues like that. This is one of the reasons we discuss the validity of ordination. The pope doesn't have to prove to me that I've been validly ordained, and I don't have to prove to you that I've been validly ordained. The other part has to produce the proof. The burden of proof doesn't lie with the one that is presumed to be right by the law. The burden of proof lies with the one who challenges it. That's not just true in canon law, it's true in all logical civil laws. The pope, for example, of course, this is not a conclusive argument if he actually holds the office of being Peter and Vicar of Christ, but the pope is recognized as a head of state by a three-digit number of countries. Now, the one who challenges that is the one who has to present the proof. If the president of the United States says, „Okay, now I'm gonna appoint a new ambassador to the Vatican," he doesn't have to produce proof that there is a head of state in the Vatican. And he doesn't have to produce proof that the Vatican is a recognized state or that the Catholic Church is a recognized institution. Some things are presumed. And if you do not follow the presumption, you have to produce the proof. Now, I say it again, the sedevacantists do have the better arguments than we have. But are they conclusive? I don't think so. And even if they were conclusive, who's going to establish by authority that this is the case?

BEATIFICATION, CANONIZATION, AND INFALLIBILITY

Ready for another one?

Yeah.

This is mine. Do it. When a person is beatified, becomes a saint...

Uh, beatified or?

And also becomes a saint. Declared a saint.

Yeah, canonized.

Can there be a mistake there?

Whew. I have to be honest, I do know the answer for beatification. Beatification has never been considered

infallible.

Okay, but, okay, the next step, of course, before...

Canonization, I have recently had the occasion to discuss this with one of my best friends, whom I consider a person more intelligent, more erudite than I am. And he said that even when you read Benedict XIV, Prospero Lambertini, Pope Benedict XIV, who most probably was one of the most erudite, most intelligent, most educated Popes in history, wrote the famous document, De beatificatione beatorum et canonizatione sanctorum, About Beatification of the Blessed and Canonization of the Sanctified. He decided on many of these issues. And even when you read his document, it does not become fully clear if canonization is to be considered infallible. I personally believe it's infallible, canonization. I cannot say, look, I'm talking to people who, at least most people who are going to watch this tape, usually have trust in my information, and I don't want to disappoint them, because I don't have the right to do that. That's why I underline the fact that I personally believe that canonization is infallible, but I'm open to facts. Sometimes you face a fact, and then you see it doesn't hold up.

Why I bring this up... The indefectibility of the Church may be questioned here.

Yeah.

Because if sainthood... was this... There cannot be any mistakes in somebody being canonized.

Mm-hmm.

I now bring up this to you. We bring up John XXIII, and we bring up Pius IX.

Ah, yeah, okay.

Now, basically... Aren't they contradictory?

No. (sneezing) Yes. Definitely.

So, therefore...

Yeah, but that's two different questions here. Now, the indefectibility of the Church, those of you who have it already won't have to order it from Tan Books, but the indefectibility of the Church is something that has been abused, especially recently, the concept of indefectibility. Tan Books and Publishers offer also an excellent English translation of the famous German book by Ludwig Ott. The family name is spelled Oscar Tango Tango, Ott, Catholic dogma. And Ludwig Ott is usually very reliable in quoting Church doctrine. Now, the indefectibility of the Church doesn't mean that everything the Church does is all right. The indefectibility, like the unity of the Church, is basically the understanding that the Church is always one, always true. When you look at the Creed, it says, „Unam sanctam catholicam et apostolicam Ecclesiam" The one, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. That's the indefectibility of the Church.

The greatest problem with infallibility is something that I will not sufficiently clear up in this conversation because unfortunately that's not... I just can't do it. I mean, I'm not... I don't make the... I don't cheat you. I'm not gonna pretend I know the answer if I don't know the answer, okay? And the limits of infallibility, when does the Magisterium become infallible? When can you rely on the Magisterium? What's the borderline between infallible and non-infallible? It's something that today is of a greater importance than ever, but it doesn't mean that it's cleared up. The subject is not cleared up. It doesn't?

Now, coming back to you, you asked about beatification and Pius IX. I will not disappoint you on this. As far as canonization is concerned, I honestly do not know if canonization is to be considered infallible. I consider it infallible, but I do not know that. I cannot say this with certitude. I'm sure there will be some very intelligent people who will come up with quotations. The problem with quotations is you can contradict Christ with the Gospel. So, careful with quotations, especially with single quotations, out of context.

You wanted to know about Pius IX and John XXIII. Here's my answer. Pius IX, yes, John XXIII, no, and I can prove it. I cannot prove to you that Pius IX is a saint. How would I be able to? I cannot prove that to you. I believe it for one reason. But saint, beatified, okay, blessed. I had the privilege to know the promoter of the cause of Pius IX personally for many years. His name was Monsignor Antonio Fioritti. In his quality, Canon of the Basilica of St. Peter's in Rome, we met at least 100 times in those years that I was in Rome. And he was the, is or was, at least... Honestly, I don't even know if he's still alive, but he was the promoter of the cause of Pope Pius IX. When

in 1979, he presented to me a medal of Pius IX that had been printed out of the lead coffin in which Pius IX had rested before his body was recovered for the examination for the cause at the congregation for the cause of the saints. He told me that basically... Now we're talking about ,79. John Paul II was pope for one year and had not yet had a chance to change all the rules and regulation of how to become a saint, okay? So that's important to remember. And back then in '79, Monsignor Antonio Pio Lanti told me that everything is ready for the beatification of Pius IX. So we are talking about facts that date back to a time before the present pope changed procedures. Now this doesn't mean that that's not proof that Pius IX is definitely blessed. I believe it, and I venerate him, and I celebrated mass in his honor.

But as far as John XXIII is concerned, the case is easy. Remember what I said about the founder of the Opus Dei and decree against communism? Okay. Now in the 1950s, when Pope Pius XII was pope, Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli, the later John XXIII, became after he had been nuncio in Paris, he became patriarch of Venice, archbishop patriarch of Venice. When he was patriarch of Venice, that's a famous case that you can find in all the archives, and it was all over the newspapers back then. He sided with the local communist union, just issue or not is not the point here. Sided with the local communist union against the Italian state. And one of his famous, what do you call them? The pastoral letters that are issued for lent, he had to take it back because Pius XII angrily grabbed his white telephone and called him and said, „Take it back." He did that, but he still sided with the communists against the Italian government. Now this... In a time when the decree that he later on as pope confirmed, was still valid. You cannot beatify a man like this. I'm sorry, because there are rules. We are not talking... This is one thing that has to be understood. Beatification or canonization mean that the man is in heaven. Yes. But beatification... But the failure to beatify or to sanctify or to canonize a person does not mean he's not in heaven.

So I'm not discussing that. I'm coming to this point. It seems to me that someone is trying to make John XXIII a saint, and if he does, and they put it in with Pius IX, they both become saints and yet are contradictory.

Yes, of course. Doctrinally at least, not character wise.

No, no. But doctrinally.

Well, of course, Pius IX was not a liar, John XXIII was. There is a famous case that will soon be dealt with scientifically in a publication. I wish I could give you the publisher and the footnote. But I'm not allowed to at this point because it hasn't been published yet by them. And we're not talking about the Fatima Crusader or my personal friends with Father Gruner and the publishers. But we're talking about somebody that I have no right to quote here before the publication is actually out. But the case of John XXIII will be dealt with individually and in detail. Now, there was this famous encyclical by John XXIII in favor of the Latin language. And when a few of the liberals whose names we know... Again, Father Hess' memory is not what you think. So, I don't remember the name, I don't even remember the title of the document. But what I'm indicating to you here is, this is a conversation and not a scientific proof for everything I say. Pope John XXIII had published that decree on Latin. Actually, it's not a decree, it's an encyclical in favor of Latin. So some liberals confronted him with that. They were not alone. It was other cardinals present. John XXIII told them, „Oh, don't worry about it. I had to do that." Means it was for the show. Can you beatify a person like that?

That's my problem with defectibility.

Correct. And the problem with defectibility is simply because of a wrong definition of defectibility. The church has been jam-packed with idiots for 2,000 years.

Do you think there are people who were saints that were really not saints?

Quite possibly. One of the reasons why I think that everyone who has been canonized is in heaven, is because the declaration that somebody is a saint might not be true as to his virtues, to his life, to the example he gave. But why wouldn't the Pope be able to use his keys for the person as such? He's got the keys. I'm gonna have to jump back to you on this. That's not a doctrine. That's a theory of mine. Let me come back to this. Actually, it's a suspicion. It's not even...

VATICAN II AND INFALLIBILITY

The American church is trying to tell everyone that Vatican II was a godsend to the church.

Hmm. Maybe as a punishment.

Now, who started Vatican II?

John XXIII.

Now, if he's made a saint, could it be Vatican II was wrong?

Yes. Well, that's the issue I'm talking about. Well, that's no contradiction anyway, not even in the old days. Is Saint Ambrosius a saint? Yes. Saint Ambrosius, the church father, Saint Ambrosius said that if a heretic who has been baptized in the name of Christ converts, he doesn't have to be re-baptized. Saint Ambrosius said that. That's nonsense. It's baloney. Why, well, who said that a saint cannot pronounce baloney or do baloney?

I am saying that it seems to me they're trying to authenticate Vatican II by making John XXIII a saint.

Correct. Because just like everybody else, almost everybody else today, infallibility is the fashionable error of the century. There was a priest, his name was Abbe. Abbe is the title. (French). Reverend Father Le Fouque, F-O-Q-U-E. French. He was director of the seminary, of the French seminary in Rome when a certain young seminarian called Marcel Lefebvre attended the French seminary in Rome. (French) said in... We're talking about the ,20s. Now that Saint Pius X has uncovered and dealt with the modernists, we are facing the worst of all heresies, the heresy that the pope can't do anything. Even if Pius IX said, „I am tradition." Now, Pius IX was a joker. If you read a detailed biography of Pius IX, which I had bothered to do 30 years ago first time, you will find out that Blessed Pius IX was a man of great humor. And just like Father Hess on his tapes, Blessed Pius IX would not always say something that's immediately to be taken as infallible statement or doctrine, because when Pius IX talked as a regular normal human being, he was exactly as infallible as I am. Zilch, zero, nada, nothing, niente. Oh, yeah. And so I'm not... Contrary to some people whose tactic it is all the time to do that, I'm not gonna hook Pius IX on his statement, „I am tradition." It's a very dangerous statement, but then I have other more dangerous statements.

Pius IX said when you talk about infallibility, he not only said if a pope was to pronounce heresy, you just don't follow him. If you look up Denzinger-Schönmetzer, you will find Denzinger number 3050 following up to 3070-something, you will find the solemn dogma of infallibility. After that, in the Denzinger collection, you will find a document that had been written by the German Bishops Conference because the German Reichskanzler, the Reichschancellor, Bismarck challenged that dogma on totally absurd grounds. So, the German bishops got together. In those days, they were Catholic. The German bishops got together and came up with a document explaining papal infallibility. Pope Pius IX saw the document, read the document, and signed it, so it's his. And in that document, listen to the terminology of Pope Pius IX. Now, this document originally is in German, so I don't know. I read Latin as I read German, but I grew up with German. The document doesn't say, it explains that Bismarck said, „Does that mean the infallibility that now the pope is the Bishop of Berlin and the Bishop of Dresden and the Bishop of Cologne and the Bishop of Munich?" Which some people today seem to believe. But Pius IX just had the German bishops answer it by saying, „No. If for some reason the Bishop of Berlin does not take care of his diocese, the pope..." And mind you, this is a literal translation I'm giving you. „If the Bishop of Berlin for some reason doesn't mind the business of his, doesn't take care of the business of his diocese," and now comes the literal quotation. „The pope has to in-

terfere." Look at the wording, has. You find it twice in the same paragraph. That means the German bishops didn't say, „If for some reason the bishop of so-and-so and such-and-such does not take care of his diocese, it's in the judgment of the pope if he will do something about it or not." They didn't say that. They said the pope has to react. The pope has to interfere. Twice in one paragraph. He has to do it. And Pius IX signed it. (car horn honking)

Pius IX did nothing else but what his predecessors did, who believed in the old oath of coronation, papal coronation. It was an oath. The last time was signed by the predecessor, forgot who it was, but Pope Bonifacius VIII, who became pope in 1302. He was signed uninterruptedly by 600 years of papacy between Paschalius I and Bonifacius VIII, Boniface VIII. And that oath of incoronation says that he swears he won't change anything that has been handed down from his predecessors.

When was that changed?

It wasn't ever changed.

No, no, none of it was changed, but the pope does not say that anymore.

That's... Oh, because that was just a guarantee of orthodoxy to the Holy Roman emperor and kings. And that's why after Boniface VIII didn't sign it, it doesn't mean that it's out of, how do you say, that it has been... That's a piece of the past. If 600 years, for 600 years all the popes signed it, that means it's something accepted in Church tradition. There's no need the pope signs it. You ought to know it. We know that the present pope doesn't know it, but he ought to know it.

The point I'm making is papal infallibility, what does it mean, papal infallibility? I wish I could give you a sufficiently detailed answer, because the available quotations will not. Even the dogma as such, because the dogma, for example, in 3070 says, „The Holy Spirit has not given to the successors, had not been given to the successors of Peter that with his revelation, they will pronounce a new doctrine, open up a new doctrine, (Latin)" But that with his assistance, they will faithfully, saintly guard and faithfully explain a handed down tradition from the apostles.

(music plays)

Here Part 2 ends and Part 3 begins.

This third conversation with Fr. Hesse addresses the ongoing decline of the Church, the suppressed Third Secret of Fatima, clarifies the complex conditions for papal infallibility, and explains why the SSPX represents authentic Catholicism rather than schism.

Fr. Hesse also discusses the validity of modern ordinations, the necessity of the traditional Mass for receiving grace, and the doctrine of salvation outside the Church, concluding with reflections on Catholic patriotism.

INTRODUCTION

Father Hess. 2001, our third encounter. Tonight, since you have beat me up so much before, I brought an army with me.

Viel Feind, viel Ehr.

What's that mean?

Lots of enemies, lots of honor.

Oh. Now, of course, you do not know them. You've never met these people before. Nor do they have questions they have said they're going to ask you. So this will be pretty spontaneous.

One did?

One did.

We'll throw them out.

No.

No? Okay. I forgot what he asked anyway. Okay. All right.

Do you think in the year that we met, this year, that the church has improved or going down?

Going down. Going down because I think that if you remember our last encounter last year, when we talked about the fourth secret of Fatima, that's not exactly what you call spiritual progress. When the

church, or let's put it this way, not the Church of Christ, not the Catholic Church, but when these people in Rome start to lie about things like the Secret of Fatima, and they did lie most definitely as was proven in the Fatima Crusader, especially in the article by Andy Suzanek. If they start to lie about even things like that, then I can't call that spiritual progress. So we're going down. Humanly speaking, mind you, the Holy Spirit... When I say humanly speaking, I cannot tell the Holy Spirit what to do. I cannot tell Christ what to do. Humanly speaking, we are finished.

FATIMA'S THIRD SECRET

Do you think that Our Lady's prophecy is coming true now at Fatima?

What prophecy?

Well, we've heard that Our Lady at Fatima told Lucia, Sister Lucia, that the pope was supposed to consecrate Russia to her immaculate heart, and all the bishops together.

Correct.

That has been done and it has not been done.

No, it has not been done in any way.

Well, whoever you want to listen to, it has been done and it hasn't been done. All right. Listen to Sister Lucia.

You contend that it has not been done?

Absolutely not. Fatima Crusader proves that too.

So you're saying to me Sister Lucia said that it has not been done?

Correct.

Yet other people say she said-

That was a hoaxed interview, I think it was in 1991, and it has been proven a hoax.

Do you think it's suspicious, Father, there was a man, a priest who knew the message of Fatima, and it was Father Malachi Martin, is that correct?

Yes. Yes, I knew him.

Did you like him?

Yeah.

Is it suspicious that he didn't come out with that until he died?

Certainly it's suspicious. But that's all I can say. I have no detailed information on the decision for the exact moment of publication. It is certainly suspicious. I'm used to seeing suspicious things coming out of the Vatican. Even the meat they sell is suspicious. I should know. I've been shopping there.

Father, you have not seen the secret.

No.

Do you know people who have seen it?

I do not personally know anyone who has seen it, really seen it.

In the second order then, you know some in the first order who knew someone who did see it?

In the second order, yes. Yes.

So could you sort of maybe clarify what you think... Not clarify, but tell us what you think the secret could have been?

It's logically conclusive. There is no alternative. It has to be one thing. Our Lady knew. Now, you have to understand, Our Lady does not know the future. There is only Father, Son, and Holy Spirit who know the future. Right?

Yes.

So Our Lady does not know the future unless she's told. Our Lady knew exactly when First World War would finish. She knew exactly under which pope, and she named him, Pius XI, the Second World War would break out. She knew exactly that Russia would spread her errors. John XXIII was a great help in that point. She knew exactly that the pope won't consecrate Russia to the immaculate heart, because she said, „Eventually the pope is going to do it, but it will be late." She also knew that Russia was going to be the instrument of chastisement and that entire nations would be annihilated, which is exactly what the European Union, by the way, is doing now. And she knew nothing about Vatican II? Who's gonna believe

that? She knew about those 55 or 60 million people that died in World War II, and she knew nothing about one billion Catholics being deprived of the truth by what is going on since Vatican II? She didn't know about that? That is impossible. It's not improbable, it's impossible. She was told the future in order to tell us at Fatima. She was told the future beyond 1965, beyond the 20th century as a matter of fact, because she said, „Russia will be consecrated to my immaculate heart, but it will be late. It hasn't been done yet." So she referred to an event that is most definitely going to take place in the 21st century. And then she knew nothing about Vatican II, the most revolutionary of all councils? If it was a council, which I deny. She didn't know anything about that? That is perfectly impossible. The third secret of Fatima must, is bound to contain the crisis of the faith following Vatican II. Therefore, it must in some way mention Vatican II. There is no way around that.

La Salette did that. Am I correct, Father?

In a certain sense, yes, indirectly. Yes. La Salette spoke about suspicious popes.

Well, actually, La Salette used the term (French), in French, two worm-ridden popes, whoever they were.

Say that again, Father?

Worm-ridden popes.

Worm-ridden popes?

Worm-ridden popes. (French). Ooh. In French. Who wants to look it up in the dictionary? (French).

Why will not the Vatican consecrate Russia to Immaculate Heart? We hear that there were treaties signed or papers signed between the Vatican and Russia in order that certain bishops could attend a meeting. Is that correct?

I've only two explanations for it, but I don't know if they're true. This is guesswork, of course. The first is very clear. John XXIII made an agreement with Moscow that Vatican II was not going to speak about communism. He denied that in public, which made him a public liar, because we have proof that he did so, which means that his beatification is as invalid as somebody else's. And then, the present pope is not exactly what you call a man entirely estranged to the errors of communism. If you read, for example, Laborem Exercens, which is a more or less Marxist viewpoint on work, and if you read some of the statements he does in other encyclicals, which are right now, you can shoot me down for what I say because right now I can't give you the footnotes. I don't have the memory to memorize everything that this pope said and which was wrong. He said too many things that were wrong that I could remember everything. To me, it is totally sufficient... if you want, I can give you at least two examples that are horrible to prove to you that this pope makes mistakes. And I've given them to you in our conversations, number one. And quite possibly...

Ecumenism, ecumenism you did also.

Yes. You did two. Yes. And quite possibly, the present pope simply does not want to consecrate Russia because it might offend communists. But don't ever think there are no communists left in Russia. If you think there are no communists left in Russia, switch on the TV when they show up with their red flags and shout and scream at Putin, or whomever else they can get. So there are enough communists left.

WINE AND CHESTERTON

Father, I've had some feedback on wine that you drink.

Yes. Yeah.

And some people through this country feel that you should not be drinking wine.

Uh-huh.

And I know in the past we discussed this. And you have a phrase by Chesterton who is your favorite.

Yeah.

You want to give us that again?

Well, it might be an occasion to do that. The point about wine is, whosoever tells me that I'm not allowed to drink wine is a blasphemer. Because if he tells me that drinking wine is a sin, then he tells me that Christ was all of his life a sinner, because he had to drink wine back then. What is that supposed to mean?

We'll turn that bottle around so we can see it. Go ahead, Father, it's all right.

Carbonated water, high fructose corn syrup, and/or sucrose, caramel color, phosphoric acid, natural flavors, caffeine. I get my caffeine in the coffee in the morning, by the way. I get my phosphoric acid in cabbage or cauliflower or Brussels sprouts. Wow. That's 3-0. Carbonated water, high fructose corn syrup, and/or sugar. They don't even know what it is. Caramel color, phosphoric acid, caffeine, citric acid, and natural flavors. I've been told there's lime oil in there, and cinnamon oil, and caffeine from the coca leaves and whatever. Now, I think I must quote Chesterton.

„Feast on wine or fast on water and your honors shall stand sure. God almighty's son and daughter, he the valiant, she the pure. If an angel out of heaven brings you other things to drink, thank him for his kind attention. Go and pour them down the sink."

(claps)

Gilbert Keith Chesterton, when he died, received the title Defender of the Faith, given by Pope Pius XI. Chesterton drank wine all of his life. He drank beer all of his life. When he lit his cigars, he lit them with a match doing the sign of the cross. He wrote a poem on giving thanks, not only when you eat, but also in the morning for having had a good night, and during the day for having had a good glass of wine, and during the day for having had a good pipe or a good cigar. He was a man who appreciated the gifts of God. And he was not this horrible kind of hypocrite who makes himself God by pronouncing an 11th, 12th, and 13th Commandment, „Thou shalt not drink wine, thou shalt not smoke," and whatever comes in their perverted minds. Only God can give me commandments, and you better do some thorough research to find something in the Ten Commandments that tells me that I must not drink wine when Christ all of his life not only drank wine, his first miracle was asked by Our Lady to produce wine. And he chose wine to become himself, not Pepsi. Or Coke. Cheers.

Cheers.

(applause)

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY (EX CATHEDRA)

Father, do you want to take some questions for our gang here?

Rest assured, go ahead. Shoot me.

Uh, Scott?

Um, something John and I were talking about after last Sunday's mass about what are the conditions in which the pope can speak infallibly, ex cathedra as you were, from the church in matters of dogma and faith? When does he say something that is infallible and when does he say something that is not considered fallible?

Well, that is a very difficult question in the sense that while we might have a pretty good idea on what is needed for an infallible pronouncement, it is still a matter of discussion among theologians. We have some of the doctors of the church that are very strict on papal teaching. We have some other doctors of the church that are kind of vague on it. I think you touched a weak point in church doctrine as such in the sense, not that church doctrine would be weak as such, but needless to say, many things have been deepened through the centuries. Not changed as Vatican II claims in Dei Verbum VIII, but many things have been deepened. When Vatican I, for example, quotes St. Vincent of Lérins on the point, how tradition can deepen over the centuries, the understanding of tradition can get a deeper sense, a preciser sense. And Vatican I quotes St. Vincent of Lérins saying this is true. Tradition does know a certain type of progress in the sense of a deeper understanding of a doctrine, but he says in Latin, always in the same sense and in the same judgment. That means it is absolutely impossible that something that has been church doctrine for many centuries will be changed, but it can be deepened.

I will give you an example. It needed until 1854 until Pius IX decided to declare the Immaculate Conception a dogma. St. Thomas Aquinas, not because of denying the Immaculate Conception, but because of a misunderstanding over the two concepts of conception and animation, denied the Immaculate Conception. St. Thomas Aquinas, mind you. Now, since 1854, we know in the precise sense of the words that

Our Lady was conceived immaculately, without a trace of original sin. It might be necessary, which would not contain any change whatsoever, that in the future a pope would have to explain the word conception as such a little bit better. It was none less but my old buddy Ronald Reagan who said, „As long as science cannot prove to me that animation takes place after conception, I'll be against abortion." And that's very true. I wish an American bishop would've said that. It was Ronald Reagan who said it, and he was right. He said, „As long as science cannot prove to me that animation takes place after conception, I will be against abortion." That's what St. Thomas said. St. Thomas said, „If animation takes place after conception, abortion between conception and animation would still be a crime, but it couldn't be murder, because you cannot murder something without a soul." Today they tell you that animals are murdered. That's ridiculous. You cannot murder an animal. You can kill an animal but you cannot murder it. You can only murder a person, and in order to be a person, you need a soul. So, Ronald Reagan, who sometimes had the wisdom of a simple person, and which I appreciated very much, he understood the problem that is still in context with that same dogma. So St. Vincent of Lérins said there must be obviously many times a deeper understanding, but always in the same sense and in the same judgment.

Now, to your question, what are the terms of infallible judgment? That is something where you will sometimes even within papal documents... I'm not talking about what's published today. Waste of time. But talking about documents until, let's say, until 1958, until Pius XII died. All right. You will find contradictions even within papal documents. For example, Pius XII says in Humani Generis that the moment a papal act is published about something, a papal decree... He doesn't say a dogmatic constitution. He says a papal instruction... I think the word is instruction, but I'm not sure right now. Anyway, it is quite something less than a dogmatic constitution or a papal bull. And he says once that is published, the discussed subject cannot be subject of theological discussion anymore. Pius XII was not right on that. The church has always accepted that as long as something is not defined doctrine, either revealed doctrine, that means it's in the Gospel, or of the faith of the Church. That means the Church has always believed it. Like the Church has always believed that Christ had the beatific vision from the very moment he was conceived in his holy mother's womb. And I will come back to that maybe. And as long as something is not defined by a council or by a pope, what you call the (Latin), the defined, clear, defined faith. Of course, it was open to theological discussion.

Like, take certain documents on the sacraments. Can you imagine what would have happened when John XXII said that when people die, their souls do not go to hell, heaven, or purgatory until the Last Judgment? There was an outcry when John XXII said that. And he not only said it, he wrote a book about it, and he sent that book to the University of Paris. And the teachers in the University of Paris asked him if he was gone bonkers or mad or whatever. They were furious. „How can you dare say such a thing?" So it was quite open to theological discussion. As a matter of fact, thank God, John XXII, who was a profoundly good man, the day before he died, more or less, he repented, and he took it back, and he left it to the judgment of his successor. And his immediate successor made sure that this thing was cleared up.

Take another example. Now, when Pope Gregory the Great... Now, Saint Gregory the Great was the last Church Father. I also believe that he was the greatest pope ever. Now, that is, of course, subject to discussion. When Saint Gregory the Great, who became pope on September 3rd, 590, and who died on March 12th, 604, somewhere in those 14 years decided he's gonna put a few words into the Roman Canon of mass. (coughs) (Latin), he added the words (Latin), „So that You may dispose of our days in Your peace." Very good addition. The people of Rome almost killed him for that. Said, „How dare you touch the Holy Roman Canon!" It was, in a way, a papal decree, as Pius XII says in Humani Generis. It was a papal instruction. Of course, the pope signed the piece of paper, which is an instruction if he signs it, saying that hence forward, in the Roman canon, all priests will use the words (Latin). It's a papal decree, and it's not subject to discussion, Pius XII says. Saint Gregory the Great never blamed the people of Rome for being angry with him. He never said a word about it. He understood it. He was a saint, and I only accept liturgical reforms coming from saints anyway, which says something about Holy Week reform by Pius XII. But the point is, as long as something is not necessarily to be believed, that's what you call it has to

be accepted with the ascent of faith. As long as that is not true, of course it's a subject to theological discussion. It is a subject, however, to respectful, prudent, and careful discussion. You cannot simply say in something that a pope has stated, „Oh, I don't accept that." That you cannot do. But if there's something a pope says which I find wrong, I have to prove him wrong because he doesn't prove to me that he's right. And in Church history, there have been several times when popes said things that were most definitely wrong. Pope Nicholas I said, „‚I baptize thee in the name of Christ,' would be valid baptism." Church Father Saint Ambrose said that. That doesn't make it true. It is simply wrong. Popes, Pope Saint Gregory the Great disagreed with one of his predecessors on two theologians at the Council of Ephesus, and Pope Gregory the Great put them under anathema, or vice versa. I don't remember. So there have been things like this. But there has never been an important contradiction in any important doctrine. And that gives us a hint for an answer to your question. If the pope pronounces something that the Church believes anyway as infallible, of course it is.

The reason I ask this is a lot of Catholics assume whenever the pope speaks, he's either right or he's infallible, and they blindly follow him or the council, whatever council may be.

You said it very well. They blindly follow him.

And that's... And I have been guilty of that myself in my younger years.

Me too. Most of us probably were. Yeah, sure. Sure.

QUO PRIMUM AND THE TRIDENTINE MASS

One thing that is, I guess, a big question today is the mass. Quo primum, which is, I guess, a decree or an encyclical from Pope Pius V-

It's a bull.

It's a bull. So a bull would be considered dogmatic?

No, no, no, no, no. The point is this. In Quo primum, Pope Pius V says, also Saint Pius V. Pope Pius V says that this document can never be changed in itself, and it can never be abrogated. It can never be called back. It can never be changed. The document as such is irreformable, as he says. „This is an irreformable decree." He also says that no one ever in the future can change this document. I've been told as a sort of counterargument that the same wording was used by Pope, I think it was Clement XIV when he abolished the Jesuit Order. That didn't keep Pope Pius VII from reintroducing the Jesuit order. Now, if wouldn't it be true that if Pope Clement XIV in his decree abolishing the Jesuit order says that this decree can never be reformed, ever, and Pius VII just simply didn't care about that and reintroduced the Jesuit, that the same would be true for Quo primum? That would sound logical, unless you overlook the essence of it.

A legalist, which I was too. I've been many, many wrong things. But you learn! And if you don't learn, you're dead. A legalistic thinking very often overlooks the substance of something. Like you can be a legalist over the United States penalty code of law, but first you gotta know the Ten Commandments in order to understand if that law is a just law. Okay. So I made the same mistake here. I said to myself, „Okay, well if the decree abolishing the Jesuit law was an irreformable decree, and yet it was taken away by future pope, in that case, Quo primum should run under the same heading as a reformable or abolishable decree." But there are two things against it. First of all, a pope usually has a very serious reason when he says, „This decree is irreformable." The popes are not exactly... At least most popes in history were not exactly idiots. If they knew and presumed that the moment they were dead their successor could change the thing, then why would they say it can never be reformed? Why would they say that in the first place? As long as they live, it can't be reformed anyway. ‚Cause he's in charge. So first of all, when the pope says that, that means he has the firm intention of keeping this document forever, not just for his lifetime. So Pius VII needed a grave reason to reintroduce the Jesuit, but this is still not the essence of things. To abolish a religious order, no matter how old it is, is necessarily a matter of discipline. Obviously. The pope cannot take away the priesthood from anyone. God Himself cannot do that. So the pope couldn't turn all those Jesuits into lay people, but the pope could tell those Jesuits, „From now on, you cannot be a Jesuit. Do what you want. I mean, do this or this or this, but you cannot be a Jesuit." That's

a matter of discipline.

Isn't the Roman Missal also a matter of discipline?

I would think so.

No, I don't think so either.

No?

And I'll tell you why. The oldest liturgical principle, and liturgy is something got to do with Roman Missal, right? So, the oldest liturgical principle is Lex Orandi Statuat Legem Credendi. The law of what has to be prayed will determine the law of what has to be believed. This has to be clearly distinct from the deposit of faith. Now in the deposit of faith, we have the Immaculate Conception, but we didn't have it as a law to be believed until 1854. Until 1854, you were, let's say you were doing risky business in denying the Immaculate Conception, maybe even sinful business. But you were not a heretic. Since 1854, if you deny the Immaculate Conception, you're a heretic. Now, even Pius XII, who for some reason that I will probably never understand turns that principle around, even he says that Pius IX just followed what was there. The law of what had to be prayed laid down that any priest everywhere, anywhere on December 8th in the Roman Missal had to say the mass of the Immaculate Conception. That was a law of prayer. Lex Orandi. That Lex Orandi determined in 1854 the Lex Credendi, the law of what had to be believed, namely the dogma of Immaculate Conception. Now, that shows us something that, apart from the deposit of faith, the law of what has to be prayed, meaning the Roman Missal, is obviously not just discipline. As a matter of fact, it is not just not discipline, it is in a certain sense the foundation of not the faith, that would be the deposit of faith, but it is the foundation of the law of what has to be believed. That does not mean... Pius XII is again right on that. That does not mean that the pope cannot define a dogma that's not to be found in the Roman Missal. There is no mass for the papal infallibility. So that doesn't keep Pius IX from defining the dogma of papal infallibility. But if you define something, you better check if it's in Roman Missal or not. So the Roman Missal is not merely disciplinary. The Roman Missal is concerning to faith. It is in the before mentioned sense a matter of faith.

Now, it is quite understandable, I think, that the pope cannot bind his successors in disciplinary matters. The pope, Pope Urban VIII, who gave me the privilege to wear violet buttons just like a monsignor, could not possibly write up an infallible decree that determines that the pope of 2011 has to adhere to this decree, or couldn't take away my violet buttons. It's obvious. Common sense will say that. At the same time, common sense will tell you that the moment the Council of Trent defined that no one of the pastors of the church can change the rites, no one of the pastors of the church can change that dogma. Because a dogmatic definition will always bind everyone to come, including, of course, the one who ought to be the number one in obedience, the vicar of Christ. We seem to forget sometimes that the pope is not in charge. He's only the vice president.

Because of Quo Primum, the way people read it, we're assuming Latin Mass is the only mass of the Catholic Church. The only mass...

The Missal of 1570 is the only rite of the Roman, the Roman Latin rite. Roman rite. Don't forget, there's an Ambrosian rite in Milan. There is the rite of Braga in Portugal. There is the Mozarabic Visigothic rite in Spain. The Premonstratensian monks have their own rite. The Dominicans have their own rite. In England, before that monster called Henry VIII came about, you had the rite of Sarum. And then we have the Eastern rites, of course, and they're all legitimate rites and all legitimate worship of God. And we are united with them in the same worship of God, but not in the same rite. R-I-T-E. We are united with them in the same worship. So, for the Latin Roman Church, of course, there can only be one rite, and the only rite that is for the Latin Roman Church is laid down in the Missal of 1570, unchangeable forever. Therefore, what Paul VI did was schismatic because it concerns the unity of the Church.

So it was schismatic from Vatican II when they brought about the new mass?

Yes.

So, it is considered an invalid mass, and yet-

No, no, no. Don't confuse things. No. If you bring about something that's not allowed, then it doesn't make that invalid. Look, I'm not allowed to run over you with my car at the red light. But I certainly would validly kill you. It would be valid, wouldn't

it? But it wouldn't be licit, would it? There's a question. I can only licitly kill you if I'm the henchman and you're licitly condemned to death. Then I can licitly and validly kill you. Outside that situation, unless there's war, I can very much validly kill you, but not licitly. So, when I say the new mass is not allowed, I don't say at the same moment that it is not valid.

If I, as a Catholic, go to the new mass from Vatican II, and I receive Holy Communion and stay for the whole mass and go home, I had said my confession in proper manner, received Holy Communion in the new mass, was that a valid sacrifice in turning bread and wine into blood?

The question is not if it was valid or not. That doesn't even concern us in a certain sense. It doesn't. The point is, in the Council of Trent, the seventh session of the Council of Trent, Canon 13 on the sacraments in general, it says, „Whosoever says that the traditionally handed down rites used in the solemn administration of the sacraments can be either held in low esteem or can be condemned or can be changed into new rites by any one of the pastors, whosoever." (Latin) And the Council of Trent, mind you, in those days, the Council fathers still knew Latin. At Vatican II, they didn't know Latin. Trent, they knew Latin very well. They did not make a mistake when they used the word (Latin). In the literal sense, (Latin). (Latin) does not allow an exception. It includes the pope himself. Innocent III said, „If a future pope was to change all the rites of the sacraments, he would put himself outside the Church." Pope Eugene IV gave the title of Defender of the Faith to a certain Spanish cardinal named Juan de Torquemada. He was the uncle of the famous Inquisitor, for having written the Summa de Ecclesia. In the Summa de Ecclesia, Juan de Torquemada says the same thing. He says, „If a future pope was to change all the rites of all the sacraments, he will put himself outside the Church." Now, Trent says the same thing in Canon 13 of the seventh session as a dogma. (Latin) allows no exception. It includes the pope. And yet, Paul VI came up with a new Protestant rite that was also written by six Protestant pastors who were present. But the point is that he did it. And the point is that this way, he committed a schismatic act because that's an act against the unity of the Church.

Now, publishing a schismatic rite is bad enough in itself. Don't forget that until Vatican II, you were not allowed to satisfy your Sunday duty attending a Russian Orthodox or Greek Orthodox mass. Now, ever since the Great Schism in 1054, the Church has recognized the validity of all seven sacraments in the Greek Orthodox Church and the Russian Orthodox Church. So the Church has recognized, ever since the Great Schism, that every single Russian Orthodox mass presumably is valid. And you are still not allowed to satisfy your Sunday duty there for a simple reason. The Russian Orthodox deny the papal infallibility. They deny the authority of the pope. They deny the Immaculate Conception. They deny the Assumption. They deny all the councils except seven or four. They fight each other if they would accept the first four or the first seven ecumenical councils. They are heretics and schismatics, so you can't go there. How can you fulfill your Sunday duty by attending an act that's not pleasing to God? It's absurd.

Now, the new mass, the so-called new mass of Paul VI not only is schismatic, as you can see from Council of Trent and from what else I said, it is also doubtful because of the translations, because of the translation of the consecration of the wine. It is a doubtful sacrament. Pope Blessed Innocent XI, you can check that in Denzinger-Schönmetzer 2101. I remember that because a famous Viennese streetcar got the same number. In that sentence, Pope Innocent XI condemns the theory that for pastoral reasons, you could go to doubtful sacraments. So you can't go there because it's schismatic. You also can't go there because it is doubtful. And that's why Archbishop Lefebvre of most blessed memory said, „You'd rather stay home than go to the new mass." What does the third commandment say? Does it say go to mass? No. It says, „Sanctify Sunday." The church determines that you have to go to mass, therefore, the church has to provide. Wherever the church doesn't provide, you're excused. You're not excused from the Sunday duty. You gotta do something. Say a special rosary or read the missal, the Sunday missal of the people. What about somebody who does research in Antarctica? There ain't no chaplain there. And once he's there for the winter, he's stuck for six months. Is he in mortal sin because he doesn't go to mass? No, of course not. He can still sanctify Sunday. And that is, I guess a sufficient answer to what you asked, but there's some... I'll come back to you. Okay.

But we have, Joan? Oh. You have a question for Father?

Yes, Joan. Okay.

Father, please, the sacrament of ordination. Are the priests, post-conciliar priests, are they validly ordained?

Presumably, yes. In, I think it was 1949, but anyway, Pope Pius XII published a decree, which is called Sacramentum Ordinis. Sacrament of Orders. In which with all the necessary formulation, „we hereby declare that this is to be believed forever by all Catholics," and so on. That the form of the sacrament of ordination to the diaconate, priesthood, and bishophood has to be such, such, and such. He says, therefore, for the validity of becoming a deacon or a priest or a bishop, such and such words are absolutely required. If these words are omitted, the sacrament has not taken place. Signed by Pius XII forever. So that says if within the Latin Roman rite, somebody is ordained to the priesthood with different words, he does not become a priest within Latin Roman rite. And here's the point. Does that document that Pius XII concerned, does that concern the Greek United Church? Not the Greek Orthodox, the Greek United? No, of course not. The Greek United have a totally different way of ordaining priests.

Just one example. Until Pius XII, it was open to discussion if the matter of priesthood... Every single sacrament has matter, form, requires matter, form, and intention. Baptism, the matter is the water, the form is I baptize thee in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Confirmation, for example, the matter is extra virgin Italian olive oil, and the words are whatever they are. In the priesthood, Pius XII determined the matter of ordination is the imposition of the hands. The bishop for the deaconess ordination puts one hand on my head. For the priesthood ordination, Cardinal Sabatani pushed my head into my rib cage, and I really felt the ordination. So the imposition of hands is the matter of priesthood, and then there's a certain form. Until a few decades ago, it was open to discussion if that would be the matter of priesthood or the transmission of the instruments, as you call it. There's a part of the rite of ordination to the priesthood in which the bishop will hand me the mass chalice with the paten on top, and I have to hold tight onto the chalice and onto the paten while he is still holding it, while he pronounces a prayer out of the book. Until Pius XII, you could, without being a heretic, say that this is the matter of ordination. The Greek never had that rite. You see? The Greek never had it. So that's a totally different rite. Therefore, no matter what Pius XII said in his rite, this is valid for the Latin Roman rite only.

I was unfortunately and innocently, I never had to confess it because I didn't know better and I had the best intention, I was unfortunately ordained in the Novus Ordo. As I have just proven to our friend here, the Novus Ordo is not the Latin Roman rite. It is a schismatic rite. So I was ordained in a schismatic rite, like as if the Patriarch of Moscow had ordained me. I'd still be a priest, but I'll be ordained in a schismatic rite. The Novus Ordo is a schismatic rite. Therefore, you cannot apply Pius XII's document. You have to judge the Novus Ordo according to the rules that have to be applied in any such like case. I'll give you an example. In the 19th century, Pope Leo XIII had to examine the ordinations of the Anglicans. And in his document, Apostolicae Curae, he determines on how to go about to determine if a sacrament given by schismatics is valid or not. He arrives at the conclusion, which would be another topic. He arrives at the conclusion that Anglican ordinations are invalid. But the point that we need here is, how did he go about it? Well, he checked on the matter, which is there. If a Russian Orthodox bishop imposes his hands on an Anglican deacon, for example, the matter of priesthood is there. But then he determined the form is not there because the way they understand the words of consecration has nothing got to do with the Catholic faith, and the intention is not there. Cannot be there. Objectively, the intention cannot be there. We are not looking into the inside of a human being. We are not looking into another human being's soul. We are looking at an objective intention, a manifest intention. If I dress like a Roman Catholic priest, if right here on an altar, there is a church, an altar, the missal, the chalice, and I start to say mass, I make it obvious that I want to say the Catholic mass. So, that's what we're talking about. And Leo XIII very rightly said that's not the case with the Anglicans because they deny the sacrificial priesthood and they deny the sacrifice

of mass. Therefore, they cannot use the missal in a proper way, whatever it says in there. And if they can't do that, then they also don't know what the priesthood is, therefore they cannot use the Anglican, the common prayer book of the Anglican Church to make a bishop.

What we need to know here is, how is it with the form in the rite of Paul VI? Well, of course I checked that. You wanna be sure, right? Better safe than sorry. I don't want to find out at the last judgment that I never was a priest. I checked the form of the diaconate, I checked the form of the priesthood, and I checked the form of the bishophood. They are most definitely valid. Most definitely. And the funny thing about it is that as far as the bishop's consecration is concerned, the German translation actually refers a little bit preciser to the bishophood than the old form would do. You couldn't believe when you look into Oriental rituals on how the sacraments have to be administered in some certain recognized and united Oriental rites, what strange kind of forms and wordings they use for the sacraments. It is very audacious, just plainly to deny the validity of a sacrament without going into proper studies.

As far as the new priesthood is concerned, I can see the only danger lying in the fact that in today's seminaries, the future priests are not properly trained. Now, again, I'm not referring to a subjective intention because that might as well be, „I'm gonna do what the church does. I want to do what the church does," which is sufficient intention. But what if from early youth that boy has been told that there is no mass, there is no real presence, there is no Eucharist, it's all symbolic, it's all a thanksgiving, hooray, and there is no sacrificial priesthood, he's only the president of a liturgical assembly, he's the under-manager of the local branch of the Charity Trust Incorporation Limited, and that's how he enters the seminary. He doesn't know what a sacrament is, he has no intention of administering a sacrament because he denies the sacraments, and then he's ordained a priest. Can he be ordained a priest? I doubt it. That's a different thing. But if there is at least the appearance of the future priest knowing more or less what he's doing, and if the bishop follows the book, I can also not doubt it.

Father, what language were you ordained in?

Latin, of course. I made sure that even the reading of the Gospel were in Latin. Better safe than sorry.

Thank you.

THE SSPX

Uh, Father, you ready?

Yeah.

Why is the Society of Pius X not the same as Martin Luther?

For being the exact opposite of Martin Luther. The exact opposite.

They, on their own, have their own rite, in a sense.

No.

Okay. Okay. They question what the pope has said.

Yes.

Okay. Didn't Luther do that?

No.

He didn't?

No. He started his Reformation out of entirely personal reasons. That has been proven in Protestant books, mind you. He got so much, he was a very, let's say, temperamental and, let's say, an indulging character. We discussed that yesterday. So refer to it if you ask that question. He, to cut a long story short, anyone who wants the detailed answer on what I'm saying might as well get that tape. But Luther was desperate about his own state of mind and soul. Chesterton says that the worst mistake you can do is when you realize that you are hardly able to reach the ideal, to just simply lower the ideal, instead of admitting that you're not capable of doing it and trying again, and trying hard.

Let me rephrase it, all right?

Okay.

How can they... How can they be called Catholic? What gives them the right to say that they will not listen to the Pope and to ordain priests? How can they do that?

Simple. The Catholic Church needs priests, otherwise

there is no Catholic Church. The Catholic Church needs Catholic priests. It is impossible, positively, definitely impossible to become a Catholic priest in any one of the conciliar seminaries. No exception. Because the two essential conditions for becoming a priest nowadays, except for being a man and unmarried, are to accept Vatican II and to accept the new liturgy. We have talked about the new liturgy. You cannot become a Catholic priest if you accept the schismatic rite. If you, from the outset, decide you're going to celebrate the schismatic rite. You can even less become a Catholic priest if you accept Vatican II, which is heretical. I give you an example. It's also a blaspheming council. I give you that example too.

The heresy in Vatican II, for example, is on religious liberty, to establish religious liberty as a civil law. Now, the church has always accepted religious liberty or religious freedom in the sense like a political agreement. The church is not allowed to teach that as a doctrine, obviously. Gregory XVI condemned that notion. So did Pius IX, Leo XIII, Pius X, Pius XI, and Pius XII. Pius XI explicitly outlawed the participation in non-Catholic gatherings like it is happening today. And Vatican II, on another hand, says something that is of quite some juicy significance right now. Vatican II says, „The Muslims together with us, together with us adore one merciful God," which is blasphemy and heresy because the Quran says that the infidels, which means you and me, have to be killed and rubbed out unless they convert, which means unless we kiss the Quran like the Pope does, we are supposed to be killed. Now, the Quran says not only that, the Quran calls the idea of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, even though they misunderstand the Catholic doctrine on the Holy Trinity, they call that idea preposterous or, to quote it literally, excremental. That's the term used in the Quran. A council that tells me that the Muslims together with us are worshiping one merciful God is a council that doesn't tell me the truth.

The Society of St. Pius X rejects what is wrong in Vatican II, and they reject the new mass, not just because it's not as nice as the old mass, but because the new mass is at least leading into heresy by obscuring the doctrine of Trent on mass, on the repetition of the unbloody repetition of the sacrifice of Calvary, at the same time, the real presence of the body and blood of our Lord on the altar, and which means nothing else that they are faithful to Catholic tradition while the Pope very obviously is not. Vatican II in Gaudium et Spes number 12 says, „Believers and non-believers unanimously agree that all the efforts of mankind are directed towards man as the center and summit." That is what I call a godless statement. To accept that means you cease to be a Catholic. The only way to stay a Catholic is to accept tradition against what is against tradition. Vatican II is partly against tradition.

The present pope's statements, I'll give you one, are at least blasphemous, if not heretical. There is a blasphemous statement. In Dominum et vivificantem, the present Pope, that's his encyclical on the Holy Spirit says, „The worst of all possible sins, the sin to kill the Son of God has redeemed us." That's an unspeakable, dirty blasphemy. So it is the sin that was committed that redeemed us. It is not the obedience of Christ like it says in the Holy Liturgy on Holy Thursday, Good Friday, Saturday. And in the antiphon, the Obedientia Christi usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis, the obedience of Christ unto the death, unto the death, death on the cross. It's not Christ's obedience, it's not Christ's suffering that has redeemed us. John Paul II without mentioning Christ's sufferings, I'm not quoting out of context, I leave that to politicians. I don't do that. I'm quoting within context says, „The most horrible of all sins, the sin of killing the Son of God has redeemed us." Maybe he's only misunderstanding it, but the way it stands, it's a blasphemous statement.

The present pope also merits to enter the Guinness Book of Records because he managed to pronounce three heresies in one paragraph. On January 11th, 1989 he said, „The line of the creed..." He was referring to the Apostles' Creed. „The line in the creed that says, and he descended unto hell has to be understood metaphorically, because they laid His body in the grave, while at the moment of death He received the beatific vision." That is three heresies in one sentence. First of all, it is doctrine of the Church, dogma, that you must not interpret the creed or any dogma in a metaphoric sense. It has to be understood literally. Even canon law has to be understood literally. It says so in the new code. Fourth Lateran Council defines as a dogma that it says literally, the line, „And Christ descended unto Hell," has to be understood as Christ's soul going to Hell because His body was laid in a

grave. So His soul descended to Hell, not His body. His body was laid in a grave. John Paul II understands it metaphorically, saying, „When His body was laid in the underworld, therefore that's the descension to Hell." And then he says because His soul at the moment of the death on the cross received the beatific vision. It is faith of the Church. The Church has always believed from the very beginning what common sense will tell you. Was Christ Son of God? Yeah. If He was the Son of God, if He was the second person of the Trinity, united with manhood in one person, how could He not have had the beatific vision from the very moment of conception in His mother's womb? He had to have it. He couldn't have received it at the moment of death on the cross. So here we have a pope who mentions three heresies. I don't know if he wanted to be a heretic. We're not interested in that. But in one sentence, he says three wrong things. In another sentence, he blasphemes.

In his first encyclical, Redemptor Hominis, he does not once mention the term Roman Catholic or Catholic Church. He talks about the Church of the Council, he talks about the conscience of the Church six times on one page, and he talks about the Church of the New Advent, whatever that may be. It is not the Church that I belong to, and that I was baptized into, and that I work for and I'm ready to die for. I'm not ready to die or work for the Church of the New Advent. I'm also not ready to die and work for the Adventists, and I'm also not ready and work for, due respect, the Southern Baptists. And as much as I'm interested in the Southern Baptists, I'm interested in the Church of the New Advent. But in his first encyclical, he names it the Church of the New Advent, the Conciliar Church, the Church of the Council, the conscience of the Church. He doesn't call it the Catholic Church. Whose president is this man, or vice president? The point is, in his first encyclical, he says, „The astonishment and the admiration of the dignity of man is called the Gospel." That's interesting. I always thought the Gospel was about Christ, namely Christ God. „Before Abraham was, I am," Christ said. Which means, He says, „I'm God." Now comes this pope and says, „The real Gospel is the admiration and the astonishment of the dignity, about the dignity of man." Well, he's just referring to Gaudium et Spes number 12, where believers and non-believers unanimously agreed on all the efforts of mankind that directed God's manners at center and summit. I reject that. The Society of Saint Pius the Tenth rejects that. Who's the Catholic here?

SALVATION OUTSIDE THE CHURCH

Yes, we have many questions tonight, Father.

Sure.

But one question that really bothers me a lot is, many years ago you had a statement that every human being who never heard about Christ, but does follow the natural law and does the best according to his ability is automatically a member of the Church. On the other hand, we have that dogma, no salvation outside the Catholic Church. Can you put any light on that? Because it is really so much misunderstood and very hard to find your way through that jungle.

Well, with the answer I'm going to give now, I'm certainly going to make a few enemies in this country on both sides. But as I said, (German), lots of enemy, lots of honor, as we say in German, right?

Right.

And I just refer to Saint Thomas Aquinas and the Council of Trent. I think that's sufficient. The Council of Trent says nobody can be saved outside the Church. Nobody can be saved unless he has received a baptism of water and the Holy Spirit, (Latin). The thing itself or in the vote of doing it. Like, usually the examples quoted are the catechumen in the old days you had the catechumen, right? The man who was ready to get baptized, who will put on his white suit, which is the reason for Whitsunday after Easter, the next Sunday, White Sunday, Dominica in Albis because they would still wear this dress. And Saint Thomas Aquinas speaks about what some people in this country violently reject. Well, if I have the choice between some people in this country or Saint Thomas Aquinas, my choice is made. Saint Thomas Aquinas goes to the point of saying, „In the baptism of water and the Holy Spirit, especially when administered to a child, there cannot possibly be the same merit as in the baptism of the blood." That means somebody shedding his blood for our Lord. A non-baptized person wanting to become a Catholic, not achieving his, not reaching his goal, and being mur-

dered before he can be baptized. Some people in this country know history to the last point and say that has never happened. Maybe it has never happened. I'm not denying this. I'm only saying what Saint Thomas says, and he says, „Well, the most noble form of baptism inevitably has to be if you are shedding your blood for Christ, wanting to be a Catholic."

When Pope Eugene IV at the Council of Florence in 1441, ,42 said, „Nobody can be saved outside the church. If somebody's outside the church, even when he thinks he's shedding his blood for our Lord cannot be saved," then that means people who do not have the intention of being part of the Catholic Church, heretics and schismatics. Somebody who rejects the Catholic Church, but doesn't reject Christ, and thinks that is possible. Of course, it's not. You and I, we know that it is not possible to reject the Catholic Church and to accept Christ in the true sense of the word. But, I mean, to err is human, and many people may think that is so. I cannot underline enough that first of all, I stick to what St. Thomas said about it because St. Thomas said that 700 years ago. No pope has ever denied it. No pope has ever condemned that question in the Summa Theologiae of St. Thomas. No pope has ever condemned it. I have the right to stick to it, and I stick to it first. Second, why would I be bothered with what happened to somebody else? I gotta save my soul first and then yours. And you are baptized, so the question is of no concern to me. I leave it to God. That's the old question, what happens to the unbaptized, especially the aborted children? We'll find out. Rest assured, we'll find out. St. Gregory the Great had a theory about it, which I share. Some other theologians have other theories about it. But as far as I'm concerned, my problems lie elsewhere. People always ask me what happens to that poor orange-dressed monk somewhere up in Nepal or in Bhutan? I don't know. Am I concerned? No. I have to worry about my friends going to heaven. And first of all, I have to worry about myself going to heaven. Did I sufficiently answer your question?

I still don't understand. Somebody who never had the chance to listen to Christ. I mean, there are millions of people dying and never heard about Christ. I won't say nowadays so much, but years ago, and they try to live their best, to their best ability. You know, I personally don't understand or believe that, but you know, this place pointed it out, and it must be before 1950.

Yeah, but we are dealing with a question that really doesn't concern us. I have complete and total trust in God's justice. He's not gonna send anybody to hell who definitely doesn't want to go there. Two people go to hell. The ones who want to go there, like Martin Luther, and the ones who don't care if they go there, or don't try hard to avoid it. God is not going to send to hell anyone who most definitely tried his best not to go there. My faith in God's justice is infinitely higher than my faith in my fellow human beings.

CRITICISMS OF THE SSPX

Not under here. I thought it'd be nice to give a plug to the Society of Pius X. A lot of people... I just got something from Richard Ibranyi that they're schismatic and they're chicken and they sort of are on the fence.

The Society of St. Pius X is what? Schismatic.

Well, I've heard that.

Yeah.

But they are what? Chicken?

Yeah. Because they're on the fence. They will not... They know that the pope is not the pope. And they-

The Society of St. Pius X has to save souls.

No, no, no. I'm getting to the point that they know that the pope is in error, but they still say that he's the pope. And yet they put documents out that once the pope says something that's against the faith, he's no longer the pope. Right? But I think more so I'm trying to get at is a lot of people do not go to the society because they're told you can't go there. It's... they're schismatic, they're not following the pope. Why would you tell people they should go... or not should go, but they can go to the Society of Pius X Church?

Well, you see these statements are not to be taken seriously. Nobody criticized the West for its financial systems and its systems of justice and injustice more than the communists. The worst capitalists in the

20th century was the communist hierarchy. So why wouldn't it be logical if now the Vatican is full of schismatics that they would be the first ones to call the last Catholics... Excuse me, will you please keep that down a little bit? Now, why wouldn't automatically... Think strategically, of course, which I know you do, but for the sake of argument. Isn't it obvious that the greatest schismatics of our days, which are the ones that try to tell me that I should really say the new mass would call those who don't schismatics? Obviously. I mean, most of the times it's the greatest idiot who calls everybody else an idiot. So, that's one thing that's obvious. It is easily contradicted and proven wrong. It is easily proven wrong by what I said before. The ones who say the new mass are the schismatics, not the ones who say the old mass.

I think I would want you to expand on the thought that they use that because of the situation of church... that the society has that-

Canon Law defines schism very well and very clearly.

No, no. That the society, because of what's happened in the church has to step in and do what they're doing.

I said that, didn't I?

Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't-

I said... No, I said that the only way today to become a Catholic priest is to go through a seminary of the Society of St. Pius X, because you cannot become... Or maybe there are others, I don't know, but you cannot become a Catholic priest in any one of the conciliar churches' seminaries, because you would have to accept Vatican II, and you would have to accept the schismatic new rite.

And there's another thing about The Society of St. Pius X. Now, they're called chicken. The Society of St. Pius X are not, most definitely not a bunch of politicians. The Society of St. Pius X purpose very clearly stated by Archbishop Lefebvre... I happen to be the one person who has recorded on tape all of Archbishop Lefebvre's sermons and speeches in the German language, on cassette tape. And I was asked to do so by the former superior general of The Society of St. Pius X, Father Franz Schmidberger, who asked me to record all of Archbishop Lefebvre's sermons and speeches. So, I not only read Archbishop Lefebvre's sermons and speeches, which are great, I studied them. And it is very clear from what he said, „We have to keep the people in the church." That means give them a chance to go to confession, Catholic confession, to mass, Catholic mass, have their children baptized within the Catholic Church, not some church of the New Advent. The purpose of The Society of St. Pius X is to preserve the Catholic priesthood. The purpose of The Society of St. Pius X is not to fight for anything else. They are not politicians. They are not a political party. They are the group that has to preserve priesthood. Don't forget, I'm not a bishop, so I will die out when I die, because I cannot have spiritual children. Therefore, I'm the last of my generation, be it as a man, be it as a priest, unless I become a bishop, which is highly unlikely. But in The Society of St. Pius X, through the bishops we have, the priesthood is continued. It can't be continued in the Church of the New Advent. Even though it may validly go on, it won't be a Catholic priesthood. Much less Catholic, as a matter of fact, than any Russian Orthodox priest I ever met.

Could you also speak about when Lefebvre consecrated the bishops? He was told by the pope not to do that.

Obviously for political reasons. He had to do it for the reason that I gave you. If he had not done it, who would make Catholic priests now? Christ said, (Latin), „And the gates of hell shall not prevail." The gates of hell would have prevailed if in a few decades we'd had no Catholic priests no more. Right? That's what Archbishop Lefebvre did. That's what he had to do. That was his mission. That was his special calling. At the time when everybody else retires, he started his greatest work. He was 65 when he started his greatest work in 1970. He had to keep the Catholic priesthood surviving. One day, all Catholic priests, more or less, at least the vast majority of Catholic priests, will have Archbishop Lefebvre as their ancestor, I think, if things continue the way they do. But I ain't no prophet.

MASS, GRACE, AND SALVATION

Do you agree, Father, that the mass provides the graces for us as Catholics?

Definitely.

Without the mass, then there are no graces?

I cannot remember ever a pope having spoken about mass in an encyclical without mentioning that fact. Especially Pope St. Pius X made it explicitly clear that the mass is the center of our Christianity, the essence and the heart.

Without graces, can anyone achieve heaven?

Impossible.

If, therefore, the mass is the only means of receiving graces, those who do not participate at mass, then do not receive graces?

The mass is not the only means.

Okay.

The mass is the heart of Christianity.

Okay.

There are other ways of receiving graces. The mass is the heart of Christianity, and the mass is the highest of all sacraments. As St. Thomas Aquinas says, „All sacraments are directed towards the Eucharist as the greatest of all sacraments." But what good is the Eucharist to you if you are not baptized? You cannot receive sanctifying grace in any sacrament whatsoever before you're baptized. If you're not baptized, you cannot go to confession. Impossible. Now, again, I'm not talking about the fate of somebody who was never baptized. I leave that in God's hands. He knows a little bit more about these things than you and I together, and all saints together, and all popes together. The point I'm making is, first, you have to be baptized. That's absolutum, as we say in Latin. That's necessary for salvation. You have to be baptized. Once you're baptized, you lose the faith if you do not stick to the sacraments. How long can a man stay outside mortal sin without grace? Well, some people longer, some people shorter, none of them for a long time. Christ gave us the sacrament of confession, not because to make it easy for us to sin, but to make it possible for us to commit less and less sins. Because the most important part of confession is not the fact that our sins are forgiven. The most important part of confession is that we receive sanctifying grace. Without sanctifying grace, no one ever will go to heaven. No one ever. It is absolutely impossible. There is not a single human soul in heaven without sanctifying grace. Without sanctifying grace, the fire of God will burn 10,000 times hotter than hell. Hell is an act of mercy. God gave hell to those who hate him out of mercy. Their pain would be 10 billion, 10 to the 99th potency higher if they had to face him without wanting him, so he shut the door.

DEALING WITH PROBLEMATIC BISHOPS

Tom. Father, what rights, not... I don't want to speak in rights, but what can we do about a bishop who will not correct other bishops because he will not interfere in the diocese? Is that not a complete rejection of the Catholic Church? What can we do about him?

Yeah. The same we can do about the Southern Baptist Church or about the Mormons in Salt Lake City.

Nothing?

I have answered your question, and it interests me as much as what the Mormons in Salt Lake City do. At least the Mormons in Salt Lake City have built one of the most beautiful towns on earth.

Yes.

And they have an excellent streetcar system running there, and that's all I'm interested in. No, but what an American bishop does not do because another American bishop does not do because another American bishop does not do, is none of my concern. I hope that the 2001 will be a good wine in California. That's of my concern.

But I have children, Father, and I understand. You have to try to convert them to the Catholic faith. They cannot be Catholics in the Conciliar Church of the New Advent. But again, I am not presuming God's judgment. I'm talking objectively. I'm not talking about your children, whom I do not know, and even if I knew them, I wouldn't know them. Do you think a confessor knows a penitent? No. A confessor knows what he hears, and maybe that's not even true. Only God knows your soul, only God knows my soul, and God knows my soul better than I do. So, how can I talk about other souls if I don't even know mine well?

I think maybe I got you a little misguided, because my efforts have been toward the one thing that you mentioned earlier tonight, and that was, I forget what it exactly what it was, but you said, anyway, this bishop spoke right over the anchor to all his congregation if they were listening, and we're supposed to listen to our bishops.

Yeah, but Andrew Greeley even publishes books.

Yes, I know.

Does that concern me? Tom Clancy's books are infinitely better. So, in the same catalog, then?

I don't receive a fee from Tom Clancy for that. Tom Clancy's books are excellent. Amen. Andrew Greeley's books are lousy. That's how you treat those bishops, like Andrew Greeley. That's where I treat ‚em. If Andrew Greeley wants to sue me now, he's welcome.

Okay. Well, I'll get sued with you, then.

CLOSING REMARKS

Father, I think we'll end the night.

Right.

And we're running out of tape. But I would like you to speak to the Catholics of the United States. I think the US is in some serious position right now. A lot of us are gonna be tested in the coming year. I know you love the United States.

Yes. I know that.

So, could you give us some parting words so that the Catholics of the United States might hear what you have to say for them?

Yes. Pope Pius XII said, „You cannot be a Catholic and not a patriot." I agree with Pope Pius XII. The people who try constantly to run down this country are my enemies. I'm not talking about governments. Show me one country in the whole world where you have a holy government. The Vatican doesn't have one. How would another one have one? The Vatican has a government that's anything but holy, so why would you expect a holy government in this country? I don't. To be a patriot means that you are willing to fight and to die for your country. It doesn't mean you're willing to fight and die for your government. The armed forces in this country, be it the US Army, the US Navy, the US Air Force or the Coast Guard or the Marines, they do not fight for the government. They might sometimes be tricked into fighting for something that looks like fighting for their country. But I know that anyone who, in his heart, is fighting for his country and anyone who, in his heart, is dying for his country is pleasing in the eyes of God. And that's why we should have respect for our flag. We should condemn the people who burn it. I hate them not as individuals, but in what they are doing. I hate their acts. You always have to show respect for a flag, even if it's the enemy's flag. You can take it as bounty, but you cannot burn it. And the people who burn America's flag are just simply living in a primitive kind of hate. Hate is from the devil. Patriotism means to love your country, and love is coming from God. God decided for every single American that he's going to be born in America. Therefore, God expects every single American to love his country. Amen to that.

Father, would you bless the United States for us, please?

Yes. And all Americans, all Americans who love this country.

(Benedictio Dei omnipotentis Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti descendat super vos et maneat semper.)

God bless America.

(clapping)

Thank you, Father.