THE MESSED-UP MASS

Fr. G. Hesse

And here we are already at today's topic, the Holy Mass. What happens to Mass? Now first you have to know that the so-called Tridentine Mass or the so-called Latin Mass, those are both confusing terms because there is no such thing as a Latin Mass in the way it is used nowadays and there's no such thing as a Tridentine Mass. There is only the Mass rite of the Catholic-Latin church. You see, the Catholic Church consists of the Latin rite, the Ambrosian rite, the rite of Braga, the Mozarabic Visigothic rite, the Sarum rite, the Premonstratensian rite, the Dominican rite, and the Eastern rite. And they all have different liturgies even though those liturgies have one thing in common. They all express the idea of the real presence of the Lord on the altar and they all express the idea of the propitiatory sacrifice, that means a sacrifice not just for praise and thanksgiving but a sacrifice for the redemption of sin. And all of these rites go back to the Latin rite which we use, which was the original rite used by Saint Peter in Rome, not in every detail as we know it, but in many parts.

Now the Roman Canon, you have to understand the canon is the part of Mass between the Sanctus, holy, holy, holy until communion. The canon of Mass is something that goes back to the times of the apostles. So it's not just 400 years old, it doesn't just go back to the Council of Trent, it goes back to the time of the apostles. And when Saint Gregory the Great, my patron saint, when he changed... He was pope between 590 and 604. When he added the words, „Diesque nostros in tua pace disponas" to the Hanc igitur of the canon, the people in Rome were outraged and they threatened to kill him because he had dared to touch liturgy. This, we're talking about the year 600. Already by then, the concept of the unchangeability of the Mass had been developed. Later on, after Gregory the Great, nobody dared to add anything to the canon of Mass. Nobody dared to add or change anything in the proper or the order of Mass until Pius XII, who was not the great conservative as some people like to see him in their romantic thoughts, ignored this tradition and had Annibale Bugnini. Those of you who have heard about the Novus Ordo Mass and its creator have heard the name Bugnini. And those of you who will read Father Trinchard's excellent book on the topic will hear about Annibale Bugnini. Annibale Bugnini was discovered, promoted and made by Pope Pius XII and it is of no consequential interest to us if it was in reality a secretary of state who did it or the pope himself. The pope is always responsible no matter how. And that was the first change in liturgy. The rite of Palm Sunday, Holy Thursday, Good Friday and Holy Saturday was changed, something that did not happen in the 1500 years before because when Pius V with his everlasting document, Quo Primum in 1570 canonized, that means set the rules forever, canonized the Mass that was nothing else but the Mass used by the Roman Curia and Rome and the Diocese of Rome, he outlawed any further change, any future change. So, I'll explain later why. So what Pius XII did was the beginning of the liturgical reform. The liturgical reform did not start with Paul VI of most infelicitous memory, but it started with Pius XII.

UNCHANGEABILITY OF THE MASS

Now why is it that Mass must not change? That's very simple. The oldest liturgical rule in the church is in Latin, lex orandi est lex credendi. The law of what has to be believed results from the law of what has to be prayed. Now when our Lord in the Sermon on the Mount said, „I want you to say the Our Father," and then he said the Our Father to make it known to us what he wanted us to say, he established a rule of prayer. Now this rule of prayer made the faith and not the other way around. We have to adjust our faith to what our Lord said in the Our Father and not the other way around. We cannot take the Our Father and change it around to a new faith, or to a new adaptation of the faith to the 20th century. Therefore the highest liturgical law says the liturgy is the basis of the faith. The liturgy, what the liturgy says is what you believe. So if the liturgy changes, the faith changes. (airplane passing) That's the children's ministry. Oh, good.

So the faith never changes. We know that. Once the

church establishes a dogma of faith, no future pope can change it. And before I go on talking about the liturgy, you have to understand the following: the pope is not infallible unless he says so and unless he wants to be so. If the pope prefers pea soup over a New England clam chowder, that has nothing to do with the faith. He's not infallible. If the pope at the Angelus Dominus says that his favorite sanctuary of Our Lady is Loreto, I'm not interested. That's a personal message from a person. Unless the pope says, „I, with the authority bestowed upon me by Jesus Christ, I, as the Bishop of Rome and the bishop of the entire Catholic Church, define, declare, and statute," I'm not interested in what he says. Unless he defines, declares, or statutes, he cannot be infallible. He cannot pronounce an infallible truth. He does not have the necessary help of the Holy Spirit. The present pope, for example, never did so, except maybe, and that can be doubted, maybe on the question about women's ordination, which is obviously excluded and always will be excluded. I don't need the present pope to know that. But that's the only time he used that formula. So when the pope says, for example, the present pope, „The Protestants can be saved by the efforts of their own church," he's nothing but a plain ordinary heretic. And that has nothing to do with his infallible magisterium. He has not the help of the Holy Spirit for that, and he did not say, „I define, declare, and statute that the Protestant can be saved by the efforts of his own church." He just said it in one of his encyclicals. He said it in Catechesi Tradendae number 32. So, the pope is not infallible. On the contrary, he is bound to what his predecessors decreed, statuted, and defined. And only in matters that have not been settled by his predecessors, he can claim infallibility. That must be very clear to you. (church bell rings)

The pope is bound to accept the liturgy that he receives from his predecessors. As a matter of fact, in the old Oath of Incoronation, the Indiculum Pontificis, which was first solemnly signed and mailed to the then princes and kings and the emperor in Europe and other places. This Oath of Incoronation was the first time given by Pope Saint Agatho I in 683, I think it was. So, quite a long time ago. And this Oath of Incoronation has been signed by every single pope until Innocent VIII, and it has been spoken by the popes ever since. And this Oath of Incoronation, among other things, says, „Should we or anybody else dare to change these things, God will not be a merciful judge to us." So the pope at the moment of incoronation, swears an oath before God that he will not change what he has been handed over by his predecessors.

In the Dogma of Infallibility, pronounced the 18th of July 1870 by Pope Pius IX, the fourth chapter says, „The purpose of the papacy is to guide, to watch over the doctrine and to explain it faithfully, to interpret it faithfully." The pope has not been given the Holy Spirit to proclaim a new doctrine. And many theologians, whom you can never quote against the pope, but who you can use as advisers, many theologians have stated, many theologians who have been endorsed by popes and endorsed in their particular statements by popes, have said, „A pope who dares to change the entire liturgy puts himself outside the church." Does that mean the present pope is not pope? No, it doesn't mean it, because the present pope never said that he has the right to change the liturgy. He just celebrates another liturgy, which is sad, but we can't change it, and we're not interested in what he does in that sense and in that case.

So you see the liturgy is something that cannot be changed. If the pope or any other of the pastors dares to change it, he's wrong. And the Council of Trent, in the seventh session, in the 13th canon says, „Whoever says that any of the pastors of the Church..." Now, that includes the pope, doesn't it? Any of the pastors of the church. The first pastor of the church is the pope. Whoever says that any of the pastors of the church „may omit or add anything to the liturgy or change the liturgy or write up a new liturgy, he's outside the church." Whoever says so. So anybody says the pope has the right to change the liturgy, he's not a Catholic. That's against the defined dogma of the Council of Trent. You can look it up, seventh session, Canon 13. Anybody who doesn't believe me can have the footnotes.

THE NEW LITURGY

So, the new liturgy is against divine law. The new liturgy is something that is not a work of the Church. It is not Opus Ecclesiae. It has not been decreed by Paul VI. It has been permitted by Paul VI. It has

been permitted by the present pope. It has been used by Paul VI and the present pope against the will of God, against divine law, and against what the Council of Trent and many other popes and councils before the present ones defined, not recommended or suggested, defined and declared to be binding forever. This is not the only reason, however, why we must reject the new liturgy, the whole Novus Ordo and its structure. This is just the reason seen from the viewpoint of divine law and natural law and eternal law. There is a reason in the new liturgy itself which will make any Catholic who sees through things refuse the new liturgy. Matter of fact, the first reason why I decided never to celebrate the Novus Ordo again was because I found out that a Catholic priest cannot remain a Catholic celebrating this Mass. But why?

Well, first of all, we have to see what is Catholic teaching on holy Mass. The Council of Trent defined that Mass is the unbloody repetition of the sacrifice of Calvary of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is a propitiatory sacrifice and not just a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. Now, Herr Doctor Martin Luther said that Mass was only thanksgiving and praise and not propitiatory. That means for the forgiving of sin. Now, Herr Doctor Martin Luther is, as we know, a heretic, and the Lutherans are heretics, and the Lutherans never had Mass. The Council of Trent also defined that holy Mass is offered first of all for the greater glory of the blessed trinity, then for the forgiving of the sins, and then, among other things, for thanksgiving and praise. The first purpose is the praise of our Lord, the blessed trinity. The second purpose is the propitiatory aspect of Mass, the sacrifice of Christ on Mount Calvary for the forgiveness of our sins. And the third purpose of Mass, of the main purposes, the third purpose of Mass is thanksgiving to God. It's not the first. It's not the second.

In the new order of Mass published, not decreed by Paul VI of most infelicitous memory, published by him... I say published because the only decree ever on the new missal signed by the Pope is a decree that says, „I like this book." I'm talking about the Constitutio Apostolica Missale Romanum of November 1970, I think it was. Pope Paul VI signed that, and Pope Paul VI said he likes the book, and he adds three Eucharistical prayers to the already existing canon of Mass. So, Pope Paul VI never said that I have to use the new missal. It was the congregation who said so, but the congregation cannot decide something behind the back of the Pope, even if the Pope afterwards silently agrees. This, however, is of no importance to me. The point is here there was a Mass, an order of Mass published that does not mention anymore the first purpose of Mass, the greater glory of the trinity. It does not mention anymore the propitiatory sacrifice. It only mentions the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, but generally speaking, praise. It doesn't mention in particular the blessed, most blessed trinity. And it nowhere mentions the real presence of our Lord on the altar. It nowhere mentions the fact that the moment the priest in the name of Christ, in the person of Christ, pronounces the words of consecration, the body, the blood, and intimately connected with that, the soul and the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ are rendered present on the altar.

Now, the Lutherans believe that our Lord Jesus Christ is present only subjectively. That means as long as you believe it. He's present for you in your appreciation, in your faith, in your personal interpretation of what happened. The Council of Trent says from the moment of consecration until the particles are either invisible or gone, our Lord Jesus Christ is present, replacing the substance of the bread and the wine with His own substance, even though the appearance is kept. You understand that this is a very elementary part of the Catholic faith. Otherwise, we would be cookie worshipers. I mean, this is what you get to hear from the Protestants sometimes. „Oh, the Catholics, the papists." Them there papists are cookie worshipers. Well, today they are with priests not celebrating Mass validly anymore. You get a piece of bread on the altar. You get sometimes a priest who's not even dressed for Mass behind a sort of ironing board saying hello to the people, saying a lot of blah blah, doing some gestures that have become meaningless, and then some people still kneel before that. Of course, that's cookie worship, but we're talking about what the church says about Mass. And the church says the body, the blood, the soul, and the divinity of Christ are present in the moment of consecration. The new Mass does not speak about that.

Very cleverly, when a group of theologians, among them a majority of Protestants, by the way... You have to understand that the new rite was written by a majority of Protestants and not Catholics. I know

that because I worked two years for Cardinal Stickler, who was member of that group. It was called the Consilium, the Council. And I think there were some nine members, and seven of them were Protestants. Something like that. I don't remember if it's the exact number, but you can look it up. And they wrote up a new Mass. Now, I told you before that this is not possible. That's against the will of the church and against the will of Christ. So the Mass is illegal. But what they wrote up is even worse. It beats anything you will see in an Anglican prayer book. The Anglican missal, the Common Prayer Book. In the Anglican Common Prayer Book, many things that the Catholic Mass retained are not found in the Novus Ordo Missae in Latin, let alone in the English translation.

And you will read in Father Trinchard's book that he believes, and so do I, that practically—we can't say all, we cannot say most of all, we don't know, but practically more or less all—the Masses celebrated in the English-language Novus Ordo are invalid Masses. That means you do not confect the sacrament, you do not have the real presence of our Lord on the altar, but it's just a meaningless act of a new religion. That's in the English translation. I think it very, very probable, and I agree with Father Trinchard on this point. In the Latin original it's different, but that's of little concern to you because you will hardly ever find a new Mass celebrated in Latin now. The reason for this is very clear.

VALIDITY AND *APOSTOLICAE CURAE*

When we study the infallible document, Apostolicae Curae, issued by Pope Leo XIII over the question if Anglican ministers are validly ordained priests or not. In the last century and the centuries before, many clergymen of the Anglican Rite and many Catholic bishops and priests discussed the question, are Anglican ministers validly ordained priests in the Catholic sense of the word validly ordained? Means real priests forever who are able to celebrate Mass, or are they just appointed ministers without having received the holy sacrament of orders? And Leo XIII said there are three things necessary for a valid ordination or a valid sacrament: the matter, the form, and the intention.

For the matter is easy. We have to have a host on the altar, period. You can't use a cookie. You can't use honey. You can't use a bagel. And we have to have wine on the altar. It won't do with Coke. That's the matter of the Mass. The form is you have to say, „This is my body," at least, „and this is my blood," at least. If the priest was to say, „This is Christ's blood," forget it. It's not valid.

Now, the intention. The church cannot judge your intention and my intention. The church cannot judge what you think and what you really want, but the church can judge what you manifest. Say, for example, in the old days when a priest walked out six o'clock in the morning, dead tired, but dressed nicely for Mass, walked out and said his Mass, you had the impression he wanted to do what the church does. Otherwise, why bother? Might have stayed in bed. If, on the other hand, you have a priest coming out of the sacristy dressed in jeans and sweater, and then he does anything but what you find in the Roman missal, you will see his intention is obviously not to do what the church does because the church does not do that. The church uses her own liturgical books, which have rubrics in there, which you have to follow, and they have words in there which you have to read. So that's the intention manifested. Sometimes a priest who has the intention to do what the church does cannot do it. Like if I find myself in the jungle and there's no missal around, absolutely no missal available, and no bread available, no wine, I can't celebrate Mass, period. Sometimes a priest might have a missal, but he cannot celebrate Mass with it because the missal is the wrong missal. It might be written in Hebrew and he can't read it, or it might be an Anglican missal. And about the Anglican Common Prayer Book, Leo XIII said you cannot use it for a sacrament. Why? Because the Anglican Church officially says there is no sacrifice of Mass, there is no real presence of our Lord on the altar, and there is no real priesthood. So whatever they print in this book, it can't be valid. The book is determined not to celebrate Mass. It's determined to have a nice, entertaining evening prayer.

And with the new missal of Paul VI, the thing is in a doubtful situation. On one hand, the Catholic Church out there, this counterfeit Catholic Church, what I call it, the Catholic Church of the modernists, of the

new bishops and the new priests, officially however says, officially does not deny clearly and always the presence of the blessed sacrament on the altar and does not always say there is no sacrifice of Mass in the sense of forgiving the sins. The pope at least still sticks to that. However, they make it manifest that they do not believe in the real presence of our Lord on the altar. And I will give you one example to show you how intentions become manifest. In this case, intentions of the American Bishops Conference and Rome. It was a couple of Protestants and Catholics who some 10 or 12 years ago signed an open letter to the pope complaining about the fact that you can see wine stains in the wall-to-wall carpets in Catholic churches right there where communion is distributed under both kinds, host and chalice. And they could see the wine stains in the bright gray wall-to-wall carpet. And they said, the Catholics said, „We believe this is the blood of our Lord. How can you do this?" And the Protestants said, „You tell us this is the blood of our Lord. How can you do this?" You know what the answer Rome was? The Sacred Congregation for the Liturgy signed the letter to the American Bishops Conference given them plain faculty to decide to distribute communion under both kinds whenever they want. This is manifested intention not to confect the sacrament on the altar or to confect, much worse, a sacrilege. Here, Rome was officially endorsing the sacrilege or the symbol of communion where it doesn't matter if you spill a drop of wine or not because it's wine anyway. It's symbolic wine. So you can interpret Rome's answer either way, and either way, it does not correspond with the intention to do what the Church does.

So you can see from these things that we at least have to have grave doubt about the validity of the new Mass. The church throughout 2,000 years has explicitly over and over again outlawed the participation in a doubtful sacrament. The Church has always decreed and commanded the faithful to stay away from doubtful ceremonies, and the Church has never allowed anything but the safer course. As a matter of fact, when Innocent III, Pope Innocent III was asked if he could celebrate a certain... it was a question about a certain liturgical local custom, if you were allowed to use this even though it put a question mark on the validity of the sacrament, but you should use it for pastoral purposes to attract more faithful. Innocent III answered, „No. The safer course must always be adopted. You can never use, for something as sacred as the sacrament, anything doubtful. And if you do, you're in grave sin and disobedience to the Church." And this is the reason why a Catholic who wants to remain a Catholic must not participate in a New Order Mass.

REFUSING THE NEW LITURGY

And I will explain this to you in detail because this concerns all of us in daily life. First of all, we are not allowed to participate in the new Mass for the simple reason that the new Mass is against divine law, as I have shown to you. How can you fulfill... I mean, this is absurd. How can you fulfill Sunday obligation by participating in something that is against divine law? It's ridiculous. Second, the Church has always insisted on the safer course. How can you participate in something which is evidently a doubtful ceremony? Third, the Church has always insisted that liturgy must correspond to the faith because the faith is based on liturgy. How can you participate in a ceremony that does not represent the Catholic faith? Read the New English Missal and read the Baltimore Catechism. Read what is said about Mass in the Baltimore Catechism and read the Eucharistical prayers in the New English Missal, in your Sunday missal of the new Mass. You will see that the Baltimore Catechism talks about our Lord, about the Trinity, talks about the sacrifice of Calvary, talks about the propitiatory sacrifice. It talks about the real presence of the body and the blood on the altar. The new missal talks about the poor people in prison, talks about the poor and disadvantaged. It talks about the people who are forgotten. It talks about man, man, man, and man. Oh, excuse me, man and woman, man and woman, man and woman, man and woman. We want to be politically correct. It talks about persons. The whole new liturgy is concerned with persons. Let's pray for this person, that this person be personalized, personalize ourself more personal. It does not talk about the fact that the purpose of our existence is the praise of the Most Blessed Trinity, and it can't because all the prayers that mentioned the old doctrine have been left out in the new rite. And we will go through this at the end.

The reason why I gave you the reason why you can-

not be present, why you should not be and must not attend an Ordo Missae Mass. However, there's one exception only. If somebody in the family dies, if somebody in the family marries and you would upset the whole family, the whole, as the Jews call it, *mishpocha*, and the whole clan, and the whole dynasty, then you may attend, but do not say amen, because amen in Hebrew does not mean, okay, it's all right. Amen in Hebrew means yes, yes, yes. And you don't want to say yes to a sacrilege.

PROBLEMS WITH THE NEW RITE

Why is it a sacrilege? Now, Mass, first of all, starts... the real Mass, the Latin Mass, the Tridentine Mass, the Mass of all times, the Mass that most of all saints and popes ever celebrated, Mass starts with the mentioning of the altar, *Introibo ad altare Dei*. A priest approaches the altar. An altar is not a dining table. An altar, in the concept of the English language and all other languages throughout history, is the very place where you do a sacrifice, you place a sacrifice. The priest in ancient Greece, when he was sacrificing different types of animals to the Greek gods, Pallas Athena and all the others, he would not have dared to face the people instead of facing the statue of Pallas Athene in the Parthenon in Athens. He was on an altar. On an altar, a sacrifice is offered up, and not a dinner. So the concept of the altar had to go. Therefore, the Psalm 42 was left out already by Paul VI before the new Mass came up.

Then you have the offertory. There cannot be a sacrifice without an offertory. You cannot, in no religion ever throughout history, there was a sacrifice without an offertory, without a priest first picking up the lamb and saying, „I offer this to you, our Lord," before he slaughtered the lamb, or whatever the animal was that had to be sacrificed. Even in those horrible pagan rites that fortunately were massacred, like the, what is it, Cartago. They sacrificed babies to the Moloch. They threw babies into the fire as an offering to God. Fortunately, this religion was massacred by the Romans. But all the Aztecs, the Aztecs offered up to 40,000 a day to the gods, cutting out the heart of the live prisoner. Now, somehow those political correct people today never mention these facts. It's strange. However, even there, the priest would first take up the stone dagger, say a prayer offering to one of the Aztec gods, before he carved out the heart of the prisoner. There was never a sacrifice in the history of a religion without an offertory until Paul VI came up with a new Mass. This new Mass does not speak anymore about the fact that the sacrifice is presented to the most blessed trinity. Suscipe Sancta Trinitas is the prayer that you have to look up in your missal. „Accept, oh, Holy Trinity, the sacrifice that I offer up." The new offertory, quote-unquote „offertory", recites a Jewish dinner prayer. And I do not know it by heart. I have never celebrated the Mass, thank God, in the vernacular, but it says, „Blessed is the Lord from whom we receive the bread. The fruit of earth and human labor, which we'll give to you so that it may become our spiritual bread." This is what the Jewish patriarch would say before, this is the way the Jewish patriarch would say grace at dinner. So using this „offertory", quote-unquote, in the new Mass, you communicate the idea of a dinner, not a sacrifice.

Later on, in the Roman canon, for those few priests who use the Roman canon to celebrate Mass, the words of consecration have been changed. In the old days, it was, Hoc est enim corpus meum, and nothing else. The church had no intention of quoting Saint Paul literally. The church was using words that expressed the meaning of the sacrifice of Mass. Because the words of consecration are efficient words. It is the words of consecration in the right frame, of course, and the right intention and with the right matter, but it is the words of consecration that render present our Lord. The words of consecration are not a narration. They are not a report on what happened 2,000 years ago, but they are communicating what happens here, right now. And these have been changed to a literal quotation from the letter of Saint Paul to the Corinthians. Or is it the Romans? I don't remember. And the words of the consecration of the chalice used to contain what you do not find in the letters of Saint Paul or the Gospel, the words Mysterium Fidei, Mystery of Faith. So the priest would say... I hate to translate it into English because a vernacular translation is almost a sacrilege to a sacred text, especially in English, German, and other rotten languages. The priest says, „This is the chalice with my blood, of the new and the everlasting testament, which is given up for you and for most." Not for all, for most. And in that moment, he says, „Mystery of faith," because now the priest at the very moment of consecration professes his own faith in the real presence, professes

his own faith in the fact that here a sacrifice takes place, and he professes his own faith in the fact that it is not he who is speaking. When I celebrate Mass, I say, „This is my body." How is that possible? I do not offer up my body visibly. I'm still here. It is not me, it is not I who speaks, but it is our Lord who speaks. I'm just lending him my voice, and my priesthood that I share with him, that I have received from him. I'm lending him my voice basically. He speaks through my mouth, which is why priests are to be considered sacred by the way. So at the very moment our Lord is present fully, body and blood, I have to do an act of reverence. So I will immediately, I will say, „Mystery of faith," and very shortly after that will genuflect. Long before I show the chalice or the host to the people, I will genuflect because the moment he is present at the altar, I have to do an act of reverence. How can I make it believable to you that I believe that this could become the blood of our Lord if at the moment it has become the blood of our Lord, I do not show any immediate reverence? Absurd. Absolutely absurd. And yet, this is what the new Mass does.

And I have mentioned the best of the best cases, the old Roman canon in Latin. Now, Paul VI added three so-called Eucharistical prayers, whatever that means, to the Roman canon as an option. Now, I give you one example of real liturgical trash. The third Eucharistical prayer, significantly enough, the one the present pope prefers over all the others. The third Eucharistical prayer starts with saying, (church bells ringing) „We have come together here to offer up..." No, it says, „Populum tibi congregare non desinis ut sacrificium..." et cetera. You do not cease to congregate the people so that the sacrifice may be offered up. What does that mean? That means the people have to come together so that Mass can be offered up? Does that mean the people have to come together so, in order that we celebrate Mass? The definition of Mass given, by the way, in the Roman Missal of 1969 and 1970, because you cannot add anything to a wrong definition. You have to take away a wrong definition. If you add other things to it, it doesn't make it change. So we have the definition still in there. The definition of Mass given in the Roman Missal of 1969, signed by Paul VI, is the following. „The Mass or the... what's the term in English?... It doesn't say sacrifice. The Mass or the Supper of our Lord is when people come together and unite under Christ to give praise and thanksgiving to Him." Now, that's the definition of the Roman Missal. Where's the sacrifice for the forgiving of sins? Where's the propitiatory sacrifice? Where's the real presence? Where's the sacrifice of our Lord on the cross? And you know what? This definition, which you can read in the Missal of Paul VI, is almost to the letter the same definition that Archbishop Thomas Cranmer of Canterbury, under Henry VIII, gave to his Mass. And he called it The Mass or the Supper of the Lord. Exactly what the English Missal does now, with the only difference in spelling. In those days, Mass was spelled M-A-S-S-E. That's the only difference.

So the new Mass, to call the new Mass a Protestant rite is an insult of the Anglican community because the new Mass goes far beyond that. The Anglican Mass, at least, still speaks about the fact that we have to have our sins forgiven. The Anglican Common Prayer Book speaks about the sacrifice of praise and the sacrifice of thanksgiving. The Novus Ordo Mass of Paul VI does not mention any type of sacrifice. The word sacrifice hardly ever appears in the whole missal. It has been diligently scratched out of all the common prayers and all the proper prayers in the missal.

Now, I've mentioned the best case, the Roman Canon, and the Third Eucharistical Prayer speaking about kind of presuming the presence of the people as a necessity for celebrating Mass is something that you could not call directly heretical, but definitely leading towards heresy. Because if you read that and hear that over and over again, you will come to the conclusion, „Ah, my presence is necessary for Mass." Well, rest assured, it isn't. Very often I celebrate Mass entirely alone behind closed doors. And believe me, it's a valid Mass, and it's exactly as valid as a Mass with 2,000 people. And it is definitely more valid than the Novus Ordo Mass of the Cardinal Archbishop of New Orleans in his cathedral. And I don't care how many people are present, and it doesn't make a dime worth of a difference if there are two devout old ladies present at Mass or 500,000 people when the Pope celebrates Mass. Doesn't make the slightest difference. We do not, never has the presence of the people been needed for a sacrament. Only the one who receives the sacrament is needed for a sacrament if a recipient is needed. And in Mass, that isn't the case because the communion of the faithful,

strictly speaking, is not even part of Mass. Only the communion of the priest is a necessary part of Mass.

EXTERNAL ASPECTS

And in addition to that, you have all the things that you will not find in the missal itself. See, this is something very often people forget to talk about. A liturgy does not just consist of the book that is used. Where is the book used? By whom is the book used? What book? When? How? What are the circumstances? The new missal is used in churches that I do not have to illustrate or describe to you. You have seen those hideous buildings. When you drive through a beautiful old New England village with beautiful old, useless Protestant churches, the only hideous and godforsaken building around is the new Catholic church. And this new Catholic church does not have an altar anymore. A new law now commands the bishops to remove the high altar in the cathedral. That's a law. He has to put up what is called the altar of the faithful. Altar, altar: it's called altar, but of the faithful, versus the faithful. The altar versus populum. Which, of course, is a banquet table. Herr Doctor Martin Luther said, „We have to do away with the altar and put up a table because on an altar you sacrifice, on a table you eat." Those are the words of Martin Luther. And that's the significance of the table. And those are the words of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, the founder of the Anglican rite. And when you listen to the prayers of the faithful in the Novus Ordo churches out there, you will find out that, I'm not belonging to them, the Novus Ordo Church is much, much worse than the Lutherans or the Anglicans. Much worse. You go to an Episcopalian Church in New York, there is no altar facing the people. There is no altar of the faithful. And their prayers of the faithful don't exist. There is no such thing as a procession of ridiculously dressed people who line up to say some totally insignificant prayers for some poor prisoners in Nicaragua.

Here Part 1 ends and Part 2 begins.

MODERN CHURCHES

Maybe, I don't know if he believes in the existence of the devil or not, but he will certainly not give you the sermon that I read for sale $0.25 each in Saint Thomas Church in New York. And when I want to say my rosary in peace, I do not go into Saint Patrick's Cathedral, which is packed with tourists, got loudspeakers on the columns and TV sets now for the poor people who sit behind the pillar and can't see what's going on up front. This is ridiculous. It's not a church anymore. It has become exactly what our Lord said about the temple, a market. In Saint Thomas Church of the Episcopalians, where our Lord was never present on the altar, however, and who used the common prayer book of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer. In this church, you have peace. The people go in there to pray, except for two Jap tourists who have to click, click, click, click away the whole church. The rest is people who want to pray. In Saint Patrick's, I didn't even find the Blessed Sacrament. I think I couldn't find it. I was there two weeks ago. I couldn't find it. I have no idea. Maybe it was this kind of hideous box that looked like a flea market where you can have your palms read, things like that. I don't know. Maybe it was the tabernacle. I couldn't see any indication of the presence of the Blessed Sacrament. And so I say my rosary in Saint Thomas Church praying for the conversion of the Episcopalians, of course.

And this is part of the liturgy. Don't underestimate these facts. The fact how the priest dresses, the fact what the priest says, the gestures the priest makes, what the church looks like, how you behave with the faithful. It's all part of liturgy.

UNDERSTANDING LITURGY AND SACRAMENTS

And what is liturgy? This is something I bet, except for the Trinchettes, nobody here knows how to answer. What is liturgy? It comes from the Greek word (*unclear*) again, praise, praise God. But what is Mass? It's a sacrament. What is a sacrament? A sacrament is a sign of sanctification, and a sign signifies something. A sacrament is a sign. It's a sign of sanctification. It's a sign of the, the sign itself gives you the grace, and the

sign is the sign of what the grace it gives you. That means the sacrament will give you sanctifying grace, and the different type of sacrament will show to you what the particular grace is needed for. So when you kneel in a dark corner because you don't want to be seen, because you're ashamed, that is when you get the forgiveness of your sins. When we hold the little child and wash its head, we wash away its sin. Not the sin the child committed, but the sin that the child has inherited because of the original sin committed by Adam and Eve, which is like a birth defect, if you understand. Like, if I have cancer, and I ain't got a wife, thank God, but if I have cancer and my wife got cancer, there's a chance my children will get cancer, right? And this is exactly what original sin is about. So the sacrament of baptism washes away the original guilt. At the confirmation, the bishop slaps you. That means like when the English queen knights somebody. And you become a knight and a soldier in the service of Christ with confirmation. And at the last rites, the extreme unction, you will be signed with the sign of the cross with oil because this is what they used in the old days to cure a wound, and believe me, olive oil still works miracles. And so each sacrament has to show what type of grace it will give you.

Now, what's the type of grace, quote-unquote, that the Holy Mass gives you? Well, our Lord himself. And how does it give you our Lord himself? Through the sacrifice of Calvary. I'm sorry, I'm a military man, so I always think of cavalry. That means if Mass does not show you the sacrifice, it cannot give you the grace. This is another reason why Father Trinchard and I believe that most Masses today are invalid, because you get the idea of a banquet and not of a sacrifice. You do not have the idea of a religion which has a priest who sacrifices in the name of Christ, not of the people. He represents the people, but he does not sacrifice in the name of the people. He sacrifices in the name of the eternal High Priest, Christ, to the Father and, in a way, to the Son and the Holy Spirit, which is a mystery. So, Mass does not consist of the book alone. And when you go into modern churches today, you will find that every single church is different, every single priest is different, every single sermon is different, and every single faith is different, except there's one thing common to all. A tasteless banality to the liturgy celebrated, including the archetype cliche dining table with two ashtrays and candles in it, and a bouquet of flowers. Like on the dining table, you have to have right here bouquet of flowers. You do not see what's going on, you do not understand what's going on, but you go home because you heard everything in English and say, „Now finally I understand." I can't tell you how often I have met people who said to me, „I'm so glad Mass is celebrated in English now, because now I understand." And then I ask them some questions and I found out they understand much less, much less than the people in the old days did who had the Baltimore Catechism or the Catechism of Saint Pius X and heard the Mass in Latin and did not have the Sunday missal in those days. The Sunday missal is a new invention. In the old days, you would have no idea what the priest was saying. But the Baltimore Catechism told you what Mass was all about. And if I ask one of the faithful, he will tell me what it is. As a matter of fact, I work very often for the Society of Saint Pius X, and when I ask the faithful what Mass is about, I get very precise, very clear, and very understandable answers. How come? They never hear an English word on the altar. How come they understand? When I go to the Novus Ordo people, I get some real garbage about the social purpose of Mass and help the poor. It's fine to help the poor. Salvation Army does that. Okay. Join the Salvation Army and leave the Catholic Church. Fine. Good for me. But if you want to save your soul before you want to be able to save the poor, then you will have to go along with the doctrine of the Church. And the doctrine of the Church, you cannot find in the new Mass. The new Mass is very accommodating to modern consciences, because it doesn't speak about sacrifice, it doesn't speak about penance, it doesn't speak about sin. And isn't that convenient? How nice a life if I don't have to sacrifice, if I don't have to give up anything, if I don't have to live an inconvenient life? And this is exactly the reason why so many people just don't bother to go to church anymore, because if they want to hear whatever is permitted to them, they just have to switch on the TV, and they will get the same garbage there. And it's much more convenient.

MASS AND SUNDAY OBLIGATION

Why do you go to Mass? Could anybody of you answer me the question, why do you go to Mass? Why

do you bother to go to Mass on Sunday? Why? What for? You can pray in the woods. You can pray in the street. You can pray in the bus. You can pray in a car. Why do you go to Mass? Well, I can tell you why you go to Mass. Because you are present at the most holy of all actions on Earth, if it is the case, if you have the Mass of the Catholic Church, the Mass of the Latin rite, the Mass that the popes of all times, until Pius XII and John XXIII included, commanded you to go to to fulfill your Sunday obligation. The Sunday obligation does not just mean to fulfill the third commandment, which cannot be dispensed of. It also means to get the chance to participate in a miracle and receive the graces, and especially the extraordinary and highest graces of all, our Lord Himself. Saint Thomas Aquinas said that, „All sacraments are directed towards the Eucharist." He said, „The Eucharist is the only everlasting sacrament because it's our Lord Himself offered up." It's not a particular grace for survival, baptism, salvation, confirmation for getting you stronger, confession for having your sins forgiven and receiving the grace not to commit the sin anymore, marriage to be able to live a life in battle for the rest of your life, and the priesthood to be able to offer up the sacrifice of Mass, and the extreme unction to be able to be saved in the last moment. Mass is all of that together. Mass is the highest of all sacrament, and the sacrament towards which all others are directed. And it is impossible... Our Lord said, „Who does not eat of my flesh and does not drink of my blood cannot be saved." It is impossible to be saved if you stay off Mass deliberately. If you can't have Mass, our Lord will forgive you, but He's not that much inclined to forgive if you stay off Mass deliberately.

And all this together, you have to remember what I said before. Do not participate in something which is against divine law. Do not participate in something which is a doubtful action *in sacris*, as we say. Especially in sacred things, you do not go the course of the doubtful course. Like, if you're not sure if your child was baptized, you won't say, „Oh, I don't care." You'll have it re-baptized conditionally, in which case the priest will have to say, „If you are not yet baptized, then I baptize thee in the name of the Father and the Holy Spirit," if you don't know. If you discover, if you find a child somewhere in the street, and you feel mercy for that poor child and you feel compassion and you adopt the child and you don't know if it's baptized, you're certainly going to have it baptized conditionally, right? You won't go the course, you will go the safer course. You will always make sure. And this is why when a priest, for some reason is distracted at Mass, and from one moment to the other, he doesn't know, has he said the words of consecration yet, it can happen. Things like that can happen. He will definitely say them again conditionally. He will always follow the safer course. The safer course cannot be to attend a new Mass in which you don't even know if it's valid or not. And rest assured, the reason why Father Trinchard and I and many others doubt the validity of these sacraments is not because we have too much time to think about things like this, but because Leo XIII, in a dogmatic document, was very clear about it.

And when you take your time to think about what I said, you will find out that it is impossible to attend the new Mass in good conscience, except for social purposes, as I said before. But that does not fulfill your Sunday obligation. And I tell you, in my priestly authority, if you think that you can fulfill your Sunday obligation in the new Mass, you're wrong. You cannot. Don't worry about the past. If you didn't know that, you fulfilled your Sunday obligation subjectively. Not objectively, but subjectively. And here's a distinction I gave to my audience yesterday already. Subjective and objective. But you won't believe how many people don't know the distinction of those two. Subjective means the person concerned. Objective means the thing concerned. You might commit a sin objectively and not commit it subjectively because you didn't know it was a sin. You might commit a sin subjectively but not objectively because you think it's a sin and you do it anyway, and in reality, it's not a sin. You understand the distinction, subjective, objective? So, if in the past you went to Sunday Mass at the regular local parish, don't worry, you don't have to confess this. You didn't know about it. But now I tell you, and I gave you reasons, and you can hear them over and over again on tape and video, I gave you reasons. And believe me, you can look up the sources of my information, and I will indicate a few of those to you. And you will see that what I said has a ground to it. It's good theology, it's sound theology, because I quote the Popes and not modern theologians. I'm not interested in what the modernists have to say. I'm interested in what the church said. And I repeat, the

church doctrine cannot change, ever. The truth can't change. Impossible. The eternal truth cannot change. And if the Council of Trent said that Mass is a propitiatory sacrifice, nobody can ever take that back.

So, in the future, if you have too much trouble to go to the old Mass because you would have to drive two hours, stay home and say a rosary. You'll fulfill your Sunday obligation. Why? Look, what does the third commandment say? The third commandment says, „Sanctify Sabbath," which means, for us, Sunday. Sanctify Sunday. That means do not make business on Sunday if you can avoid it. Do not work on Sunday. Praise the Lord on Sunday. The church says, and the church has all the right to say that, the church says, the best way, and the way the church wants us to sanctify Sunday, is to attend Mass. But to attend Mass is not a divine commandment, but a church commandment. So, it's human law. Human law can be dispensed of as it is said in Latin, *ob grave incommodum*, on the grave incommodity. And Father Schmidberger of the Society of Saint Pius X once was asked what that means, and he said, „Well, you certainly don't have to drive two hours over icy roads in winter to attend Mass, because you're risking your life just to attend Mass." If you do it, it's a nice thing, and it may be a great merit, but you do not have to do it. But if you can find a Mass in the old rite within an hour from here, and you don't go, then you do not fulfill Sunday obligation, period.

I know that this sounds very harsh and hard to you. And Americans always have to be nice. And I try to be nice, but I'm not nice to you if I tell you something which is wrong and might put your soul in danger. I don't think I will be a very nice and kind person if I do not inform you about the truth. And unfortunately, I do not have the necessary four hours to explain everything in detail to you right now. So, I have to be straight and direct to the point. Do not go to the new Mass. It's a sin. And if you can, go to the old Mass, or it's a sin again. And if you complain about mentioning sin all the time, please don't, because you might complain in all eternity down in hell if you do not respect what I say now, watch it. We have to walk the tightrope here on Earth, believe me. It is not easy to live a life of grace. Temptations are everywhere. And many people think temptations are only existing as far as smoking, drinking, eating, and sex is concerned. Now, rest assured, there's 100 more temptations, 1,000 more temptations. And we do not only have the sixth commandment, the only commandment our present pope preaches about. We have another nine commandments, too, starting with the first commandment, only one God, only one church, only one faith. That's the most important commandment. It's the first of our commandments. And if you want sanctify Sunday, can you logically, generally speaking, not about what we said today, but generally speaking, I think you would all agree with me when I say, obviously, you cannot sanctify the Sunday by doing something wrong. And I tell you that attending the new Mass is something wrong for the reasons I gave, and I don't have to repeat now.

CONCLUSION

On the contrary, I'm concluding this speech for the moment because I want to give you the chance to ask questions. And ask the questions now, because I won't be around. Monday, I'm gone. Thank you. Questions? (applause)

Thank you, Father. Thank you. Looks like you said it all. (laughs)

No, I didn't. I'm just waiting for the questions.

QUESTION: You said, „Novus Ordo is illicit." Well, what do you mean by this, and why is it true?

ANSWER: Excuse me?

QUESTIONER: You said it's a sin to go to the new Mass. You claimed that the Novus Ordo is totally illicit. Today, you said it's valid. But is it illicit also, and what does it mean?

ANSWER: No, the distinction is... Look, validity is an objective question that does not concern us directly. Validity is the question if the Mass takes place or not, if it is valid. We're not talking about value. Be careful. I've seen in this country, many people make the mistake of confusing value with validity. Now, value is, if the value of a celebrated Mass is infinite, then it's not subject of discussion here. Validity means, is the sacrament taking place, yes or not? I explain to you what I mean. If I baptize a child with Coca-Cola, it's not baptized, period. If I baptize a child with water,

it's baptized, period. That's validity. Baptism with Coca-Cola is invalid. Mass with Coca-Cola is invalid. Validity just is talking about the fact of the question if the sacrament takes place or not. Licitness is something else. Is it allowed? Am I allowed to celebrate Mass with regular white bread or do I have to use unleavened bread? Now, regular white bread is valid. The Mass takes place, but I commit a sin because I do something which is not allowed. Okay? You understand the difference. Why is the new Mass illicit? Well, I answered the question already in my speech. I said it's against divine law. Why is it against divine law? Because the Popes and the councils have excluded the change in liturgy, period.

QUESTION: And this all began with Pope Pius XII?

ANSWER: Yes, it did. Well, it actually began with something rather, on first sight, rather ridiculous. But it doesn't need much to create an avalanche, right? Pope Leo XIII, when he created the beautiful prayers at the end of Mass, you know what I'm talking about, three Hail Mary, Salve Regina, and the Sancte Michaeli Archangeli, in 1899, he gave the permission that these prayers may be said in the vernacular. Now, basically speaking, there's not much to that. I mean, this wouldn't have destroyed the church on its own. (laughs) It's a minor question. But it was the beginning. Nobody would've agreed with me in 1900. Now, of course, hindsight is the only perfect science, as Murphy's Law says. But now we know this was the beginning, because for the first time, the priest wearing Mass vestments... Now, you have to know something about this. When the priest baptizes or blesses a marriage, he does not wear Mass vestments. He does not wear the chasuble and the maniple. He wears the stole and a sort of coat, the cope, or the choir mantle, as it is called in England. That's a different vestment. Now, Mass vestments, strictly, is the chasuble and the maniple. And the priest, very few priests observe that law, but the priest is supposed to take off maniple and chasuble for a sermon. Why? Because the sermon is not part of Mass. It is permitted to interrupt Mass for a sermon. In the old days, sermons very often were given before Mass, and I do that sometimes. But the sermon is not part of Mass. So, the priest is supposed to, the rubrics say that. The priest is supposed to take off his maniple and the chasuble. Well, it is permitted to keep the chasuble on, but you have to take off the maniple to show symbolically, because I told you, Mass is a sacrament. A sacrament is a sign. So, you have to look at the „superficial", the exterior too. And for the first time, with this tiny little mistake of Pope Leo XIII, the priest was permitted to use the vernacular without taking off his vestments. That means he wore the Mass vestments, the chasuble and the maniple, but he used the vernacular. Now, you know very well what vernacular means. When you talk about a guy cursing, you say, „Oh, he's using vernacular." Profane language. That's the significance. The sacrament is the most holy thing on Earth. And if you use profane language for it, that's the beginning of the end. Also, it changes the significance. Remember the gay ‚90s? Does that mean homosexual or happy? Well, in the '90s, it meant the gay ‚90s. Last century. Nowadays, you don't know what the word gay means anymore. Does it mean somebody's happy, somebody is enchanted, or somebody is a pervert? What does it mean? Huh? So, the significance of words changes, and if you use the vernacular for a sacrament, the significance of the sacrament changes. Clear?

QUESTION: Why would the Pope, and the Church, and the upper clergy in Rome allow the Protestants to write the Mass? How could that... In other words, they wrote it, and then what happened thereafter?

ANSWER: I can only answer the question historically, because otherwise, I would have to pronounce judgment over the person of Paul VI, which I can't, because I don't know what motivated him. Well, Annibale Bugnini, the creator of the new rite, wanted to write a Protestant Mass, absolutely. It's called ecumenical, but that means giving into the others, giving up your own faith and giving into the others. In this regard, it will interest you as an illustration what that means, that in the war in Bosnia, the Cardinal of Belgrade complained to the Pope, and he said, „How come the Serbian Orthodox take care of the Serbian Orthodox, period. The Muslims take care of the Muslims, period. The Catholics take care of everybody except the Catholics." This is ecumenism. Now, this was the Cardinal of Belgrade, not Archbishop Lefebvre who said that. The Cardinal of Belgrade last year. This is ecumenism and its effect. And that's the reason why the new Mass was written by Protestants. Annibale Bugnini wanted a *Novus Ordo Missae*. By the way, not exactly coincidental, the word *Novus Ordo Missae* with the words *Novus Ordo Se-*

clorum on the backside of your dollar bill. Bugnini wanted for the Church what President Bush wanted for the whole world, the New World Order. And Bugnini wanted the new Mass order. Why Paul VI permitted that, I don't know. I can only assume, and one of the rules in combat is never assume anything.

QUESTION: We have a quote from Jean Guitton saying that a friend of Paul VI said the advisor, that he wanted... that Paul VI wanted to have a Mass that was very Calvinist. Do you know anything about that?

ANSWER: No. Excuse me. Would you repeat the question so we get it all, because we can't hear the question.

QUESTIONER: We have a quotation from Jean Guitton.

ANSWER: Ah, ha. They have a quotation from Jean Guitton who said that Paul VI wanted a sort of Calvinist Mass. I don't know anything about that. I only know that Paul VI wanted a new order of Mass. He said, and... But I wouldn't even say he wanted so because Paul VI was a very strange creature. He said in the same speech, 1974, he said, „There is going to be a major change in the Roman Catholic Church." He meant the new liturgy. And a couple of minutes later he said, „And one might ask oneself how this change came about." And he never answered that question. He was the pope who destroyed, almost destroyed the church, and at the same time complained about the auto destruction of the church. He was the pope who had all the prayers mentioning the devil scratched out of liturgy, and then he said, „The fumes of Satan have entered the church." So what do you make of a pope like this? I leave the judgment to you. I can't judge him. I don't know. I've been in Rome for 15 years, but I can't judge the guy. And it's not a pertinent question to our problem today. We are not interested why they destroyed liturgy. I'm interested in proving to you that it has been destroyed and that the new liturgy is illicit and that you cannot participate in it.

QUESTION: Can you say that Vatican II did not give us the new Mass, therefore-

ANSWER: No, I cannot say that because Vatican II contradicts itself, which is one of the tricks of the reformers. They did that 400 years ago in Germany and in England. They contradict themselves. They say, „Oh, we have to stick to tradition." And a couple of paragraphs later they say, „But tradition is alive and we have to change things." And in Vatican II, the first document of Vatican II, which is called *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, you have a paragraph, I think it's 55, that says, „The Latin order of Mass must be... The Latin must be maintained as the language of liturgy." The same document, however, says that you may use the vernacular and it's up to the bishops conferences to decide about it. I mean, either it was crackpots or very clever people who signed this document. And I believe it was both of them, depending on who signed it. Because if you leave it up to the bishops conferences to decide, you're going to have an Australian church, a European church, an American church. And later on you will have a Church of Louisiana and you will have a Church of Mississippi, you will have a Church of the North and the Church of the South, which is the obvious result of bishops deciding what's going on. That's the same document. Article 22-2 of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* says it's up to the bishops conferences to decide. And paragraph 54, I think it is, says that the Latin language must be maintained in liturgy. But this is a lunatic document and unacceptable because a Catholic must not accept documents that are ambiguous. Pius VI said that in *Auctorem Fidei*, a document condemning the Synod of Pistoia in which he says, „No Catholic must ever accept ambiguous documents that are not clear, that cannot be understood directly." And the same pope, Pius VI, in the same document said, „The purpose of a council is to clarify things, not to create ambiguities." Vatican II did not clarify anything. Okay?

QUESTION: In Pope Paul VI in his diaries, we've heard that there was an impostor in his place for a space of about four or five years. Is that a fact? Is this something we can-

ANSWER: Well, my answer to this is, we do not indulge in Catholic Rainbow Press. And first of all, second, I do not believe it for a moment because Paul VI was a heretic before he became pope and he remained the same type of heretic when he was pope. And Paul VI wanted to change things in the church long before he was pope, and he did it when he was pope. Paul VI was, as a young priest, was a communist already who

helped the communist students in Rome and who translated one of the worst books written in this century, which I mentioned yesterday.

QUESTIONER: What book? Which one?

ANSWER: *Integral Humanism* by Jacques Maritain, trying to reconcile humanism with Christendom, which is a folly.

QUESTION: If a person wants to attend the canonized Latin tradition Mass, where do you recommend they go? Do you recommend the Indult Mass?

ANSWER: No, Saint Pius X, and there's a reason for that. It's not just because they're a nice priest. Sometimes they are not. The reason is, the Indult Mass is given under the condition that the priest who celebrates it accepts, in theory or on paper, Vatican II. You cannot accept Vatican II and be a Catholic. That's impossible. And I will show this in my next lecture. I give you just one proof. Vatican II says, I quote Vatican II. Vatican II says, „The Spirit of Christ does not deny salvation, to give salvation, to the efforts of Protestant churches." I quote, *Dignitatis Humanae* number three. This is a direct heresy against what Pope Eugene IV defined in the year 1442 at the Council of Florence, to be found in Denzinger-Schönmetzer 1351. And which says, „Nobody who is not subject to the Roman pontiff, even if he thinks he will shed his blood for our Lord, can be saved." Now watch it. Here's three distinctions I want to give you on your way. I gave them to people yesterday, I now give them to you. Does that mean all the Protestants will go to hell? No. Objectively speaking, they have no chance to be saved. Does that mean all the Japanese will go to hell because for the first 1500 years after Christ they did not have missionaries over there? No, it doesn't mean that. I don't know what will happen to them. Christ did not tell us. He did not tell us everything. Everybody accepts in daily life that in certain professions, and be it in the industry or the military, you have to live sometimes on a need to know basis, and you won't get to know everything, because some things are classified top secret. Except in theology, everybody wants to know everything. Unfortunately, that's not possible. We do not know what happens to an honest Japanese who wants to find out the truth for all of his life but never has the luck to meet a Catholic priest or faithful. I don't know. Well, the church pronounces objective judgment. I gave you a distinction, objective/subjective already. That is very important. You have to understand that, because the usual emotional reaction is, „What? Only a Catholic who is believing everything the Pope says will go to heaven? What is up with all the others, they will go to hell?" I didn't say that. I said objectively they have no chance. Objectively they have no chance, and objectively we have very little chance if we don't watch out, and if we don't stay in the life of grace. But subjectively, I do not know your conscience. I do not know your soul, and the church doesn't. And I do not know what will happen to you when you die. I hope you will go to heaven. I sure hope. I don't know. Objectively speaking, if you do not live a life of grace authentically, you will not go to heaven, period, objectively speaking. And this is the reason why Vatican II cannot be accepted. Vatican II said it's the effort of the Protestant churches. If Vatican II had said one or the other Protestant might go to heaven because he's such an honest person, et cetera, blah, blah, and by an extraordinary act of grace of God he may make it, okay. But Vatican II said the efforts of the Protestant churches will receive salvation from our Lord. That is explicit heresy. And you are not allowed to accept heresy if you're a Catholic. This is why you can't accept Vatican II, and this is why I do not agree with a priest who celebrates the old Mass but says Vatican II is all right. And this is why it is better to go to the Masses of the Society of Saint Pius X, because they reject Vatican II and they reject what is wrong in the present Pope's encyclicals who quotes Vatican II. And he always quotes the worst parts of Vatican II. It's not my fault. He just does that. Huh? And so, of course, again, *ob grave incommodum*, the church commandment does not bind on the grave incommodity. If you live right next, around the corner of the indult Mass, as long as you do not receive communion in the hand there because, for example, in Providence, Rhode Island at the indult Mass, they give communion in the hand, which is a sacrilege. You are not allowed to touch our Lord. I am allowed to touch him with those two fingers because they were anointed at my ordination. Those two fingers have been anointed at my ordination so that I have the right to touch our Lord with those four fingers. I'm a priest now for fifteen and a half years, and I have never had our Lord in my hand, and God forbid that I ever will do it, because the hand is the symbol of power of man. This is how I became a priest. This is how I celebrate Mass.

So don't ever dare to receive our Lord in your hand. If you can avoid going to the indult Mass or the Masses of Fraternity of Saint Peter, go to the Mass of the Society of Saint Pius X. However, as I said before, if there is no danger to your faith, if the priests there at the indult Mass do not speak against the faith and do not tell you about the glories of Vatican II, and if this chapel is just around your corner and you would have to drive one and a half hours to the other one, then go there. But remember what I said, and remember my warning, and subscribe to *The Angelus*. I'm serious.

QUESTION: Why is it all being allowed in the Vatican anymore? Why is this tremendous-

ANSWER: Because the devil is efficient. The devil is very efficient, and he has a lot of useful idiots to serve him. Remember what Lenin said about the useful idiots? He said, „The West is going to buy the rope with which we will hang them." That's what Lenin said. And he talked about the useful idiots, meaning the communists in the West. He talked about the useful idiots in the West who will help communism to its victory. That's how the devil works. Ronald Reagan was right when he called the Soviet Union „the empire of evil". He was made to meet Gorbachev later on, but he was right in what he said in the first place. And I can prove what I say. Look at the mausoleum of Lenin at the old temple of Baal in Babylon, a satanic god. And the devil works with three kinds of people, the always nice and naive who say, „Oh, if it's the Pope, he can't be wrong. And if the Pope tomorrow dyes his hair green, I will dye my hair green, because it reminds me of Saint Patrick." And the second sort of people are the ones who don't give a damn anyway. Those are the useful idiots. And then you have the people who want to destroy. Now, those very often are Satanists, or plain bad people who want to make money, keep their position, and whatever. And they are in that sense also part of the useful idiots. Unfortunately, I have to say, I have had the doubtful honor of getting to know at least 45 cardinals in Rome. I mean, talk to them, meet them. Believe me, they're idiots. (laughs) Many of them. They do not know what is going on because they do not want to know. I know a cardinal who... This is recorded, I will not name, therefore. I know a cardinal who is intelligent, erudite, nice, pious, good willing. But the moment you talk about the inacceptability of Vatican II, his reason just blanks out. He starts to lose his logic. His arguments become confused and perfectly incoherent. And otherwise he's a perfectly logical and intelligent person. These people have been brainwashed. You see, it's the structure of obedience. The enemies of the church in the 1930s and 1940s and 1950s had 30 years at their disposal to drill and tame the Catholic clergy into perfect military, stubborn military obedience. Now, in the military, we have a different type of obedience because we do not deal with eternal law usually. Most officers in the Armed Forces of the United States would never tell an officer to shoot his wife, or would never tell an officer to commit a sacrilegious Mass. So you don't have to deal with that kind of issue. You have to deal with stupid bureaucracy and bad strategy and stuff like that. But in the church, you deal with a lot more important things. Now, in the church you cannot work on the basis of military blind obedience. You have to work on a basis of responsible obedience and instructed obedience, because real obedience will always follow the highest command. If the supreme commander of the Armed Forces of the United States is the president, at the present time, unfortunate fact, but usually a very good system. And if the president says, „We will now wage war against Canada," an officer cannot say, „I won't," unless this is a mean and vicious attack against innocent people and the law of God is against it and the law of the church is against it, in which case the officer will say no. He might get court-martialed. But then you have Saint Thomas More was court-martialed by his king, Henry VIII, because he didn't want to sign an oath against the church and matrimony. So, a priest who says, „Yes, it's against my conscience really, but I'm bound to obedience," has not understood his position, has not understood theology, has not understood the priesthood. The priest's obedience has to go first of all to our Lord Jesus Christ and tradition. And if my pope, John Paul II, says something against the tradition, I will not obey, because I obey our Lord and the church. And if my bishop tells me, „Father Hess, you will celebrate the Mass in the new order," I will say, „Your Excellency, I will not, because God does not want that." And if he says, „Have you had a personal revelation?" I will say, „Yes, the tradition of the church and your predecessors." And this is the answer.

QUESTION: Would it mean that then you would be

told to leave?

ANSWER: I don't care. Our Lord will not tell me to leave. Archbishop Lefebvre was asked why his name does not appear anymore in the papal annuary, where you got all the names of all the bishops. He said, „I don't know and I don't care. I'm interested if my name appears in the Book of Life." And that's the answer of one who had the faith and who did not want to make career. I'm not interested if my bishop likes me. Absolutely not. I'm interested if our Lord likes me, and He likes me, He loves me all the time and forever, but He likes me when I'm in the life of grace. So I'm interested if I'm in the life of grace. I'm interested if I follow the will of our Lord manifested in the tradition of the church, manifested by 260 popes and not the last three ones. And if the last three popes want me to do something different from all the 260 popes before, I will tell the last three popes to get lost. And I'm in perfect obedience.

QUESTION: You young people, you have no questions about all of this? (laughs) You believe everything I say? You understand everything I say? I would expect at least, for example, the following question from you. Does that mean that all of my friends who go to the new Mass are in sin? Does it mean that?

ANSWER: Well, I gave the answer just before. Yeah. I said, no, you got to try to convert them not doing this anymore. But as long as they do it in good faith, it's fine. It's their priests who will suffer for the sin committed, not these people. These people, you have been instructed, and other people present, and I, in the old days, we were instructed by those heretics. They told us this is all perfectly right, all good, all fine. And when you trust those priests, you get lost. But believe me, if you went to the new Mass long time ago or until yesterday or whatever, the priest who talked you into doing it will suffer for it, not you. Priests have great responsibilities and I know exactly, if I tell you something wrong here, at the last judgment, I will get zapped and not you. Huh? So remember that.

COMMENT FROM AUDIENCE: But hear after today, that they know it.

ANSWER: Yes, exactly. Now you have been told. Now the least thing you have to do now is do a little bit on research on what I said to see if you can trust what I said. If you say, „Oh, I don't believe what this guy said," be careful. I have informed you, and I quoted popes. I did not quote Hans Küng and Karl Rahner, and what's his name, Andrew Greeley. I did not quote people who are not in good standing with the church. I quoted 200 popes, I quoted the councils, and I quoted dogma. So you cannot lightly do away with what I said today, otherwise your conscience would be...