PROOFS OF GOD: THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Fr. G. Hesse

INTERVIEWER: Father Hesse, is the Catholic Church the one true Church that God created?

FR. HESSE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Can you prove that?

FR. HESSE: Yes and no.

INTERVIEWER: Give me the no.

FR. HESSE: I will give you the yes, and I will give you the no. If I can prove to you that a priest can turn this glass of wine, within the context of Mass of course, into the Blood of our Lord, then I've given you proof. If I cannot prove that to you, then I will have to admit to having failed. What is proof? Circumstantial evidence? Factual evidence? The only solution left according to probability? What is proof?

Max Planck, without whom there would have been no Albert Einstein, said in one of his greatest little papers, in 1941, *Sinn und Grenzen der exakten Wissenschaften*, "Sense and Limits of the Exact Sciences." Or not as a literal, but a real translation, "Purpose and Limits of the Exact Sciences." He said, "Even within the modern Western concept of scientific proof, no scientist can escape, in publishing the results of his research, without letting his *Weltanschauung* interfere." *Weltanschauung*, a term known to those who have studied philosophy in the United States as being your view of the world. With all the atheism going on today, of course the word God has been substituted with the word evolution, whatever that means. Darwin didn't know, and we don't. And some others substitute the word God with nature. Some others say Mother Nature or Earth. Whatever they call it, we might hate it, but many of them are talking about God without knowing God, without knowing what God is, who he is, and so on. They cannot help but let their own *Weltanschauung* interfere with their scientific results.

MATHEMATICS, CHEMISTRY AND HISTORY

So what is proof? However, let's take one of the most exacting understandings of the word proof, to be found in what is called the *exakten Wissenschaften*, the exact sciences. In the Western concept of exact science, supposedly a concept without mythology, supposedly a concept without superstition. I can easily show to you that modern physics, less chemistry, but modern physics, even things like astronomy, are jam-packed with superstition, guesswork, and of course errors. But they all will look like science.

Is there a mathematical proof for the Catholic Church being the only true Church? No, that's impossible. God allowed us to discover mathematics, but mathematics cannot prove anything. On the contrary, what do mathematics prove outside numerical concepts? Can mathematics prove that you exist? No. Can mathematics prove that we are sitting here talking? No. Mathematics can prove that four and four is always eight, and if you call four and four nine, then you just substituted the word eight with the word nine. Mathematics is something that doesn't even exist on its own. Mathematics is always in something else. It's in our mind basically, which is the only reason why God cannot break mathematics. If he works a miracle, he turns five bread into 3,000 and something, then he just did five plus five plus five plus five, and you name it. You formulate it the way you want it. God cannot turn four apples plus four apples into nine apples. It would just simply be four plus four plus one, and the one is the miracle. ¸Cause God is not absurd, not illogical. However, that doesn't prove that he exists or that the Church would be true or in existence. I just wanted to show you that with mathematics, you can only prove very few things. Very few.

Are we then to apply a chemical proof to the existence of God and the true Church? What does chemistry prove? 35 years ago, most biochemists in this country agreed with the Federal Drug Administration on carbohydrates being the necessary basis of your life. Now, biochemists will tell you, "No, that's

not true. You better watch your carbohydrates. You better concentrate on vegetables and fruit." I happen to believe that. However, I wouldn't be surprised if in 10 years from now, they tell you, "Fish alone is your salvation." Biochemistry is a science that I believe to be among the most serious, the most honest, and the most reliable. Unlike astronomy, where they always try to find life on some unknown planets, unlike astronomy where they always try to tell you that there is 100,000 planets with a civilized life going on, where they still look for life on Mars. Unlike astronomy that will always try to tell you that the universe has never started and will never end, which is something we attribute only to God, unlike astronomy, biochemistry usually tries to stay within its own scientific borders, and it's a science that I very much appreciate and study. However, biochemistry is absolutely incapable of telling you what wine is.

Oh, yes, biochemistry can write three big, big books on wine. The biochemists are divided over the issue on how many substances are to be found in wine. They don't even know how many, let alone what. Some biochemists will swear an oath to you that there's only 200 things in this wine. Some others will swear an oath to you, "Oh, there's gotta be at least 600 because we have already separated," as you say in chemistry, "we have already separated our 180" or something, or maybe now it's 220 already. But I guess because you find this and that and that in wine, there must be such and such and such. Biochemistry cannot even explain wine to you. And you know what? Biochemistry cannot even explain water to you. In some electrochemical processes, we find a type of water. Oh, yes, it's H_2O, and it's not heavy water, and it's not ultra-heavy water. It's just hydrogen, hydrogen, and oxygen. That water, however, freezes one centigrade or half a centigrade lower than regular water. It won't give you those opaque type of ice crystals. It will give you crystal clear, almost bluish crystals. It's H_2O, but you only find it... Well, not only, but you usually find it in some determined electrochemical processes. Biochemistry, biochemist, biochemical proof for God? Yes, and yet there is one. We'll talk about that later.

Then how about a historical proof of God? Jokingly, I could give you one that the Church must be a divine institution. If the Church has survived for 2,000 years such a bunch of bad priests and bad popes, it must be divine. Proof? No. Then what proof? Theological proof? No. Theology, by definition, is based on revelation. What if there was never a revelation? What if some intelligent people wrote up the Gospel, some intelligent people wrote up the Old Testament? They were intelligent enough to make you believe it's divine inspiration. No, no proof.

PHILOSOPHY AND THE FIRST HUMAN BEING

And how about philosophy? The word philosophy, Greek *philo sophia*, *sophia*, wisdom, *philo*, I like it. Somebody is a Francophile, that means he likes the French. If somebody likes this and this and this, you always add the Greek syllable *phil*. So *philosophia* means philosophy, the love for wisdom. In ancient Greece, wisdom was not necessarily distinguished from the word knowledge. A philosopher is a man who applies his reason to find out the truth. Let's see if we can prove the Church being the only true Church, or God existing, with the mere application of our reason.

Well, I look at myself, and I say, "Here I am. I exist." If you like the term exist, because the term exist implies you're coming from somewhere else, because there is the *ex-sistere*. I'm here, and I'm *ex*-somewhere, from somewhere. I came to be. I'm sitting here, and I'm thinking about it. Why do I sit here? The very fact that I think about it shows that I'm actually here.

The famous French philosopher Descartes, in Latin called Cartesius, as he would say, said, "*Cogito, ergo sum*. I think, therefore I am." The man therefore attributed his existence to the very fact that he was thinking. How could he think before he existed? Goes to show you how wrong a philosopher can be. Well, obviously, I think because I am here, so *sum, ergo cogito*. I am, and therefore I'm here, therefore I think. Where did I come from? Thank you. My parents, I know. Where did my parents come from? Their parents, who made their parents, theirs, and theirs. Let's go back all generations. We pretend there is no revelation, so I don't know anything about Adam and Eve. Was there ever a first human being? Yes. There is mathematical proof that it is absurd to state that there was never a first human being. That would be...

In mathematics, that would be the famous N plus one. N plus one. N, the unknown number, plus one. Is it possible that there were N plus one human beings? If you expand your mind, it would be, ignoring revelation or any religious binding, conceivable that there was an infinite amount of man. Yet N plus one is again a number. A number is finite. If there was an infinite number of human beings, an infinite number of men, who made the first one? Is it conceivable? Would you call a human being rational who would tell you there has been an infinite amount of human beings, there never was a first human being?

Yes, you could. I can also prove to you that everybody is persecuting me. And you will perhaps suggest that I suffer of paranoia. And then you will perhaps suggest to me that I should rather go into the matter and check if really everybody is after me, really everybody's out to destroy me. The whole world is after me, and the whole world wants to destroy me. And I would listen to your reason. I would say, "Yes, John, you got a point. That makes great deal of sense to me." You would say, "Uh-huh. Yeah?" And after about three weeks of your constantly explaining to me in the most precise and concise logics why it is that it is not the whole world that's after me and that it's not every single human being that's after me... Like you, for example, you just spent three weeks of your precious time to explain to me that I shouldn't have sleepless nights over the whole world being after me. And I would say, "Yes, John, but I think you are the very first who's after me. Why else would you go through three weeks to prove to me that you're not my enemy? Good trick, John, but I'm not gonna fall for it."

Medicine calls it paranoia. Gilbert Keith Chesterton calls it the maniac. A maniac is a man whose logics start from what he says, that rubber cell of one idea. Philosophy has something to do with wisdom. You don't call a paranoid person somebody who has really wisdom. You call him a sick man. We won't condemn him. On the contrary, he's sick. He's maybe quite innocent in this, of his state, but you can't say that somebody who will tell you that every single human being is out to kill him is a normal human being. So, it seems that if we want, not to be normal in the sense of following majorities, God forbid, but in the sense of applying our reason the way we have it. I'm not saying it was created. We're not at that point yet. I'm saying I sit here, I think about something, and I hopefully don't do it the way a maniac does, in that single-minded, single-cell, rubber-cell idea that is determining and oppressing every other thought. And I would have to say, okay, there was a first human being.

THE FIRST MOVER

So let's see in the way a proof, like in court, circumstantial evidence, probability, inescapability in your thinking. We have to arrive at the conclusion there was a first human being. Let's, for the moment, for the sake of argument, agree with those people who naively think that the first human being came out of the sea, got somehow four legs, and then went up a tree and became man... who created that first cell that started life? Where did that cell come from? Where did that planet come from in which that cell was formed? Where did that sun come from whose light, which is something measurable, created that first spark of life? Where did the matter come from out of which that sun started to work the way it works? Where did that space and time come from in which the sun became what we know, the sun, a medium-sized star? What was in the beginning? Let's say it was 15 billion years ago. I have absolutely no problem with that. Let's say 15 billion years ago, something started the Big Bang. Who ignited that Big Bang? Who lit the fuse for the Big Bang? Big Bang of what? Where did whatever did the Big Bang come from? What came from where and went into that so-called Big Bang how? Was there something before the Big Bang? Well, maybe, possibly, yes. But where did that come from? Let's say, like some suggest, this Big Bang is already the *n*th time of a Big Bang. Then we are back to the question, who was the first human being. So what was the first Big Bang? Or, okay, you don't agree with the theory of the Big Bang. Fine with me. What was the first universe? What was the first spark? Where did that come from?

We have to arrive very necessarily, unless we wanna join with the paranoids in that crowd, we have to arrive very necessarily at the point where we say something was first. Something was first. Was it something? Everything that moves is moved by somebody else. I move this glass. If I drop it right now, what makes it fall in my lap and spill the wine? Modern

science will tell you it's gravity. In metric system, 9.81 meters per second square, gravity. Supposedly, a certain Newton discovered it, or maybe some people will say he invented it. Inevitably, gravity is very much of influence in our life. Those who get older know what I'm talking about. Or those who have already broken their legs because of a fall, those who have jumped a bridge and survived will tell you that gravity is of quite some importance to us. What moves gravity is, okay, matter, concentrated matter, mass moves gravity. Where did the mass come from? We'll always end up with the same question, what was first? What was the first thing? Who was the first mover? And now we already, in our common sense language, we didn't say what was the first mover. In common sense, you would say, "Who was the first one to move anything?" Now, aha, aha. Inevitably, almost, I know I'm manipulating you, but inevitably, we came to use the word who. Can we prove that we ought to use the word who? I guess so.

PATTERN AND MIND

What have all fingerprints... You can check in the FBI files, what have all fingerprints of all men in common? A pattern. Something like a curve around the thumb here. There is no such thing as a fingerprint that looks like a chessboard. All fingerprints of all people all over the Earth, if it's now 5 billion something or 6 billion something, and if it was 40 billion, there would be 40 billion fingerprints, all 40 billion fingerprints having more or less the same type of pattern. Sure, it's called a species. Must have something in common. There's a pattern. Yes. In that thing that the most illuminated scientists of our days call evolution, there is quite such a thing as a fingerprint, a pattern.

A pattern is one of the most distinct characteristics of personality. We talk common sense, otherwise it's a waste of time to continue talking. We talk common sense. Pattern means something that is common to several things. Behind a pattern, there is always that what we call a mind. A mind creates a pattern. You don't have to know whose painting it is. If you have studied art history, you'll find out. You don't have to read the signature. If you have studied art history or the history of music, you will be able to assign a certain piece of music that you've never heard before to a certain composer. Not infallibly so, but you will be able to do so. Pattern is the word. There is a pattern in that what illuminated scientists today call evolution. There's a pattern.

I don't even go into the fact that evolution cannot be proven because the missing link is still missing, and everywhere it's missing, and anywhere it's missing. We never dug up the missing link. We didn't dig up the first thing between a chicken and a rat or a chicken and a bird and a chicken and a nightingale. We never did. However, let's say we still haven't dug it up. Tough luck for us. It's still a pattern. Into that whole thing some oh-so-illuminated people call evolution, there's still a very distinct and clear pattern. Show me one galaxy where a certain amount of matter under certain more and more determined conditions to today didn't turn out to be a sun, didn't evolve into a rotating Sun. Just take the fact of rotation. The entire universe is based on rotation. There's always the mass gravity center and some other things flying around it. Saint Thomas said, "The angels are holding up those planets." Today, science believes that mathematics alone can do it, or physics. We'll find out if Saint Thomas was right. I believe he was, but we can't prove it. And of course, Saint Thomas would've been wrong if he said that was the only reason. Today's science knows a lot more and says the only reason why a planet is rotating around Earth is because of gravity and speed. Who gave that planet the speed? What gave that planet the speed? Even though every single celestial body has very little in common with any other one. Just look at the difference between the four giant planets. And you know what I mean. However, the pattern's the same.

There is the Sun, and there is, is it nine or 10 or 11, maybe it's even 12 planets rotating around that Sun. That Sun is rotating around the center of gravity of our Milky Way, which most probably is a black hole. Then we look at the Andromeda Fog, two million light years away, and we'll see, again, the same thing. There's a center of gravity. See, I'm talking about the Andromeda Fog, the galaxy, and the light goes out. Goes to show you, there's a pattern. The light will go out when I'm sitting here. It will not go out when we don't need it. (*Laughter*) There is a pattern, again. There's a pattern wherever you go. Some people call it Murphy's Law.

And we look at that galaxy, the Andromeda, same thing. Center of gravity, everything's rotating around it. That's not a pattern [?]. See, our galaxy's a fingerprint. Andromeda's a fingerprint. NGC 532 G [?], whatever the galaxy's called, the stellar system, fingerprint is a pattern. Behind the pattern, there is a mind. We rightly say, "Who was the first mover?" So now, miraculously, the light has gone on again, and Murphy's Law has been beaten again. We have come to the point of substituting the word what with the word who. Who made the first move? Who put the first thing, whatever it was? It is not an unintelligent idea to say that, physically speaking, the universe was created by the creation of time and space. That is something that has been plausibly defended in a doctoral dissertation. Even if that dissertation is fully true, it will still not suffice to say something started it. You will need, in applying common sense, which is the way towards wisdom, you will have to admit who did it because of the pattern. A pattern is also the visible or noticeable expression of a mind. Who has a mind? What has a mind? In order to create a pattern, be it a pattern in music, art, or the fingerprint, or the universe, needs a mind.

The very concept of mind presumes personality. Otherwise, we have to go on and change the dictionary and put in different terms for mind, personality, pattern, whatever. If we want to stay with common sense, we will use the English language not necessarily in the exclusive context of today's notions, but we will use it in a common heritage of usage. One of my favorite dictionaries, *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, the very name *American Heritage Dictionary* refers to what I mean, it's a heritage. A pattern is a word that has many other ways of being written down in other languages, but they will always mean the same. So it is with the word personality. At least there's some common denominator to the word person or personality, and to the word mind.

OUTSIDE TIME AND SPACE

Who made the first move? Who put whatever, or who made whatever was needed to get this whole thing, the universe and whatever it is, going? Who? We will see something else. Whoever that was, and we don't know who it was supposedly, whoever made the first move is obviously someone before whom nobody was and nothing was. Otherwise, we'd be back to the original question, who was the first human being? What was the first planet? What was the first sun? Where did the Big Bang come from? What was the first Big Bang? When was the first Big Bang? Who made it? Who started it? The one who started is really the one who started, otherwise we're talking nonsense here, total and utter nonsense. The very one who started the whole thing must be logically not just greater than what he started. If he's just simply bigger, larger, or greater, or older, or more powerful than what the whole thing is, the universe, the whole creation, what we call it creation, let's not call it creation, everything that we know must be infinitely, I say infinitely, not eternally, infinitely smaller than whatever or whoever, we have come to agree on the point whoever, whoever made this thing.

Why must it be infinitely smaller? Well, whatever, whoever made everything that we know, obviously not only configurated this whole universe, everything that we know, according to a certain pattern, but very obviously, he is. He was? Uh-uh. The modern physical science will prove to you that time and space are nothing but dimensions. If time is a dimension and space is a dimension, then whoever made this whole thing has no time and no dimension, no space, no time. Space and time, that's why I said what I said before, space and time are his creations too. They're limited, they're countable, they're measurable. Whoever started this whole thing is therefore absolutely and totally outside of time and space. A part of what we have cannot create everything we have. That is obvious nonsense. A cake cannot be smaller than all of its pieces. And the traditional way of putting it is the slices of a cake cannot be larger than the whole. Okay. Whoever made this is outside time and space. Outside time and space means, we have come to the point to understand there is a person, that person never started and will never stop. If it starts, we apply the concept of time. If it ever stops or ceases to exist, then we apply the concept of time. There was a yesterday therefore, and there will be a tomorrow then. So whoever started this whole thing has no extension and no duration. He never started, he will never cease, he has no size and no limit. That's what we call perfect.

PERFECT AND INFINITELY SIMPLE

Why could we call it perfect? *Perfacere* in Latin means to do something thoroughly through, to make it perfect, I mean, to apply everything that's needed to fulfill the whole thing. Nothing is needed anymore. Nothing is lacking. Is it possible that whoever made this whole universe was lacking in this universe, so he made it? If he was lacking the universe, then how could he make it? If he made it, he is bigger, larger, and greater than what he made. If he's bigger, larger, and greater than what he made, then he doesn't need it. Does he need anything? If he needed something, he would need something else. Where does that something else come from? If he needs something, if he's lacking something, the word lack implies that there is something that you lack, there's something you miss out on. It is impossible to say that that very first being, that very first mind that created the whole thing, lacked something.

The definition of lack is not a definition as such. It is the declaration of something missing. I cannot say something is amiss if I do not know what is amiss. If I know what is amiss, then I know something that is larger or bigger or greater or more complex or more simple than what is here. I cannot say, "Look, this table is missing a fourth leg..." if I do not know that a table with four legs exists. Maybe this table isn't even lacking a fourth leg because it was conceived as a three-leg table. The word missing is a negative. A negative presumes a positive. First, I have to determine something positively in order to be able to say later on, "Okay, but it misses and lacks such and such." Whatever is the very first has no space, no time, but a mind cannot lack anything. It's impossible. A lack can only be there if it was more before. Can that one mind that has created this universe lose something? If it lost something, then it could still be greater, bigger, or larger than the universe he, that mind, created. However, if he lost something and there was something in a way of dimension or moral dimension missing, again, we apply the impossible concept of missing. Missing means you have some definition prior to that. As I said before, first I have to determine what is a table. If I determine there is no such thing as a table with less than four legs, then I have to find a new term for this thing here that has three. For those who can't see, there's a table with three legs that's quite charming. The very, very concept of the negative, the very concept of something lacking needs a prior concept that will determine what might be lacking.

But that very first mind that is prior to everything that we know or do not yet know, that very first universe, if you want, that very first Big Bang, if you want, that very thing that is first of all other things, that very mind that has imprinted its pattern on everything that we know, on everything that we call creation and beyond and more, that very first thing cannot lack anything by definition. It also must be absolutely, totally, and perfectly simple. There's no way around it. It must be absolutely simple. Why? Complicated means it's composed. Who composed it? Who? Compose, in the English language, that's a wonderful thing. We have so many Latin terms. *Componere*, to put together. This is a composition. There is a glass with wine in it. Without the wine in it, this thing doesn't make sense. With the wine in it, holding the wine, now it's a composition that makes sense. But it's complicated, it's complex, it's composed. Not just a glass, but what I hold in my hand is composed. There's the glass, there's the wine in it. The purpose is another thing. The purpose. Well, I'll come back to that later, next week maybe. Composition, impossible. It can't be the first. The first cannot be composed. The first must be infinitely simple.

Summing up what we said so far, at the origin of everything, there is a mind, therefore a person. There is a mind that's infinitely simple and perfect. What if that mind changes its mind? Change into what? If it could change, it would be perfect [?]. If it could change, yes. What does change mean? Change means it becomes different, difference. Difference means it's not what it was. If it is not what it was, then it wasn't perfect in the first place. Or what if it just loses the perfection? Then it must be composed, because infinite simplicity cannot lose anything. Infinite simplicity cannot fall apart. That's impossible. So it cannot lose anything. Can it gain? No, no. If it gains, it's not infinitely simple anymore. The moment it gains, it's complex. It gained what? Infinite simplicity cannot gain infinite simplicity.

THE ONE WHO SAYS "I AM"

What would that mind that has created everything, and that is perfect, infinitely simple, what would that mind say about itself? Can it speak? Well, if it can create a universe, it can also speak. Can it speak? Maybe in a way we don't understand. Let's say we presume we understand it. That mind would have to say, "I," because it's a mind. And it's infinitely simple. If it's infinitely simple, then it is, it's not complex, it's perfect, but basically it is. So "I is" is bad language, so you say, "I am." We're at the point that we know, realize, applying our common sense, long before everything else, somebody was able to say, "I am." You wanna call that God? Why would you call it God? The Latin word for God is *Deus*. *Deus* is the genitive of the nominative of *Zeus*. You wanna call it God? Well, sometimes we human beings have to rely on compromises. Therefore, there is somebody who can say about himself, "I am," and cannot really add anything else. Anything he adds might be interesting, but will not be a perfect self-description.

That very first mind that made all these fingerprints... To make something out of nothing is the perfect definition of creation, by the way, if you wanna check in the dictionary. To turn something into something else already is called creation, but that infinitely simple being that can only say, "I am," obviously must have created out of nothing. Otherwise, there must begin something before and then something before that, and we are back to the number one question. So there's somebody who can only say about himself, "I am."

You wanna call it God? I don't care if you call it God, or if you call it evolution, or whatever you call it. I've just proven to you that God exists. Now that I have proven to you that God exists, only now I will add that, by the way, Vatican I pronounced it a dogma that the human being, applying only his reason, can discover God. This "I am" is perfect, infinite, eternal, absolutely simple. And therefore, it must be absolutely, totally good. Unless you want to change every single language existing on Earth, which is again a maniac's task. Every single language in the whole world, whether it applies it right or wrong, understands the word good as something not lacking, the word bad as something lacking. God, "I am," lacks nothing. If he lacks nothing, then he's perfectly good. So there is one God. He never started, he never stops. That's what you call eternal. There can nothing be added, nothing been taken away. That's what you call infinitely simple or absolutely simple. He has a person [?], and therefore, the best way for him to describe himself would be to say, "I am."

THE NAME OF GOD IN SCRIPTURE

Still playing the skeptic, there's a funny book in which you find that term. Some people call that book the Old Testament. Some people call it the Bible. That's the only book I know in which you find several times that somebody, contradicting all rules of grammar, contradicting all rules of reason, says about himself, "I am." I don't know if that book is true. However, there is a point in that book where some bearded old man goes up to a mountain, finds a thorn bush that's glowing. Pretty incredible story. Tall story. And out of that bush comes a voice and talks to him. Of course, he scratches his head and says, "Yeah, sounds good to me, but whom am I talking to?" And the answer is, "I am who I am." Doesn't make sense, unless we have discussed what we discussed. That burning thorn bush obviously was claiming to be God.

Then on another occasion, another bearded fellow walks around. He's known as a carpenter or carpenter's son, who learned the business too. And some learned men, wise priests, challenge him on his talking about Moses, who was centuries before that. And they say, "You're not yet 40 [recte: 50] years of age, and you talk as if you knew Moses." And he says,

"Before..." Abraham, I'm sorry, not Moses, Abraham. Well, who cares what the name is? He says, "Before Abraham was, I am." Another guy who claims to be God, the pious people around him very logically, very consequently grabbed stones, because in those days it was under capital punishment to pronounce that word. Because these people believed that whoever says, "I am" makes himself God.

On another occasion, they finally arrested that man. And in order to be able to arrest him, he turns around and says... He was looking at some people coming up, obviously challenging him, and says, "Who are you looking for?" "Oh, we're looking for somebody who's called," wait a second, let me see, "who's called Jesus of Nazareth." And he turns around, and the interesting thing is, he doesn't say, according to that book, he doesn't say, "You found him. Congratulations." He says, "I am." These people are terrified, step back, fall onto Earth. They're all terrified. And again, because contrary to most translators of that book, even where you would suspect anything but lousy translations, say, "Oh, I'm the one." But in the original text of the book, as far as we can determine in the history of literature, in the original text he doesn't say that. He says, "I am." It's that chapter that's called *The Passion of Saint John* in that book. He says, "I am." He doesn't say, "I'm the one you're looking for," or, "You found him. Congrats." Or he doesn't say, "I'm here," or, "I'm the one." He says, "I am." They're shocked. Again, they're faced with a man who calls himself what they believe was the name of God.

I've just proved to you that it is the name of God. The only book where that name appears in that context is the Bible. Is that proof that the Catholic Church is the only true Church? No, not at all. It's a hint, very strong hint. It's what you call in court admissible proof. It's not just a hint. It is at least a less than probable coincidence that there's only one book where what we have established must be the name of who created everything is claimed by two people, one who doesn't appear because there's only a burning bush, and another one who says it more than twice.

THE SOUL AND REVELATION

Now, we have concluded everything that can be absolutely proven by reasoning alone. That I can tell you. Here we stop. There is that "I am." What else can we say about him? Here is the "I am." What else? Where is he? Who is he? We cannot escape the conclusion that he is infinitely good. Very relative term, especially nowadays, what is good? If he's infinitely good according to common understanding worldwide, and if he made us, then he must be somehow interested in our welfare. That doesn't sound plausible at all when you look at everything that's going on in this world. Just think of what happened recently. Doesn't sound like somebody who cares very much about us. But then we know, on the other hand, and that is conclusive proof, we know that this "I am" who created us is not only infinitely good, but he's also eternal. We also know, conclusive proof, that he has equipped at least a few of us with such a thing called mind. We won't go into the discussion about how many of those people that we call people are mindless people, but anyway, I guess you got one and I got one, mind. If he created us giving us a mind, then he must have given us [something] that goes a little bit beyond what we can touch. The very fact that we can talk about God, the "I am," who cannot be touched, who cannot be seen, who cannot be felt, who cannot be but be, means that we can grasp something that's infinitely greater than you and me together. And we are great, I hope. We can grasp something that's infinitely greater than the entire universe. Therefore, we must have in us something that's infinitely greater than the universe. That can't be matter.

You wanna call it spirit? Call it spirit. You wanna call it the ungrabable, the untouchable? Call it whatever you want. In Papua, they call it *tabu*, the *tabu*, that which you can't touch. Call it what you want. The usage of the English language, we'll call it soul. That what can't be touched in a human being, the soul of a human being, that which is superior to the body of a human being. Let's stay conventional and call it soul. If he has given us a soul, then he has given us that something greater than matter. Would it be something that will disappear with us? Possible. No conclusive proof that it won't. However, the probability is entirely in favor of that soul surviving. Why did he bother to give us a body if afterwards only the soul is there? I don't know. I can't prove it to you. I don't know. Probability will say obviously because that body will somehow still be there. Spiritual body, apparition. I don't know. We can't go into that. But we can definitely say that the soul in a human being

is not an invention of some fabulists. It is a logical conclusion. It's the only thing that has probability going for it. Conclusive proof like we did in finding the "I am," impossible. Proof by probability. Proof not only by probability 60 versus 40, but proof by the only probable answer. The only answer that has plausibility, the only answer that has sense, that has a ring of sense to it, a ring of reason to it. If we have that soul and if the one who created that soul is infinitely good in the common understanding of all healthy and normal people in this world, then He cannot abandon us. He obviously does on Earth. It's obvious. The things that people have to go through are unspeakable, unbelievable, and incomprehensible. That I find proof by probability, again, that the soul must be eternal, having an origin, obviously, but no end. If the one who supposedly is such a good being and whom we could prove by logics to be necessarily so, somehow lets all these things happen, then we have to come again to the conclusion by the highest and only possible probability and plausibility that to Him very obviously, what happens here is of not that much an importance as to what will happen with this soul of ours. The only thing I can conclude from this conclusion is that He must somehow let us know on what we have to do for this soul of ours. Whether the body will survive or not is another question, but the soul will survive. Therefore, there must be something that we'll have to do for this soul. And that's basically where it stops, ,cause you see, we can indeed conclude by plausibility and probability that there must be such a thing as revelation. We call it revelation. Well, obviously, the one we cannot touch and cannot see is telling us something. So that's revealing something. There must be something like revelation.

THE TRINITY AND THE ONE BOOK

Could we, in the same not contradictible manner in which we proved the existence of the "I am," ever prove that there is three who can say "I am"? Most definitely not. It's contradictory. We can give it a proof by plausibility, saying if He's infinitely good, and we always associate the good with love, and as we are created according to a pattern, there must be a reason why all people, all times, everywhere associate good with love, and love, good. Sometimes the wrong good, but they don't love it because it's the wrong good, but because it's the wrong good [?]. That love is impossible for somebody who cannot love on an equal basis, and therefore, you could say the only theory about the "I am" that makes any kind of sense is the one of saying there is three who can say "I am," who are, however, the same. We cannot go further than that. If we were capable of going further than that with the same totally, absolutely conclusive proof that there is what we call Holy Trinity, we wouldn't need faith. There wouldn't be such a thing as the gift of faith, and Vatican I would've had to say, "We can grasp and arrive at the recognition of the entire Catholic truth just by using the light of reason." Vatican I didn't do that. Vatican I said God, yeah, the existence of God, not more.

However, when you consider what today is called proof, and what is accepted commonly under the term proof, then I can prove every single issue of the entire Catholic doctrine to you, including why the Church is the only true Church in the world. Simple. We know, we do not suppose, we do not go by probability, we absolutely most definitely know that the one who says "I am" is perfect, eternal, infinitely simple, and cannot change. It is most highly improbable that he never said anything to us about himself, that he keeps himself totally obscure from his own creatures. Why, in the first place, did he make those creatures? Why, if he never says a word to them? That's totally illogical and contradicts entirely the pattern of our thinking. The pattern of our thinking cannot be entirely different from the pattern of thinking of the one who perfectly well made us. Even though we're not perfect and perfectly well made, he perfectly well made us. If we have a certain pattern of thinking, and I'm talking about what most people believe everywhere and all the time, then that pattern must correspond to the one who made it. According to that, the one who made it loves us. You don't love somebody by staying silent, not the human way of doing it, not the human way of conceiving the very term of love. He must have spoken to us.

The next proof of probability that would uphold in a totally impartial court is that there's most definitely only one book that correctly represents the name of the one who made us. Totally contradicting grammar, therefore indicating the eternity, contradicting or at least juxtaposing time, says, "Before Abraham was, I am." And says, "I am who am." *Ego sum qui sum*, in

Latin. And who says, when Moses asks him, "Yeah, but what I'm going to do, tell those people down there whom I talk to?" "Tell them you talk to the one *qui est*, who is." An impartial court would have to give the benefit of doubt to that book that speaks in that way.

LOVE AND THE TRIUNE GOD

Love cannot be fully expressed to something inferior. That gives the benefit of doubt among all theories about God to the one about the triune God, one and the same being in three persons. Only there, the creator of everything can love on its own level without having to create something. Would God be perfect if he was only one person? Can God be perfect if he's only one person? We saw that by reasoning, he's not only eternal, but he must also be infinitely good and therefore be infinitely loving. Loving what? Infinitely loving what? Did he therefore need to create something to be loved? I reject that. I reject that as most highly improbable. I cannot prove it to you, but I reject that the perfect love, the perfect good, in order to love what, whom, has to create somebody to be loved. Could it be infinite and perfect self-love? Yes, and it is. But again, love whom? Himself only? What do we, in our pattern of mind for many thousand years, call that? Is that what we use the term love primarily for? No. In all the history of this patterned mankind, the term love was always used towards an object of love, and very rarely was anyone satisfied with naming that object as myself. You love something or somebody. And again, if we go according to the pattern that has been imprinted to the minds that were created by the primary superior mind, then we understand the term love first of all as a term going to something or somebody. If that is true, which I cannot conclusively prove to you, then only the Trinity makes sense. If God was one person, as the other religions claim, then he needed to create something to love... or he made a mistake in that creation, giving us the wrong pattern imprint on our innocent thinking. That's very important, on our innocent thinking, by making us understanding to turn innocently as loving something or somebody and not just ourselves.

ONE TRUTH, ONE CHURCH

What has that got to do with the Catholic Church? Well, one thing must be absolutely sure, and that's something that I can prove to you absolutely and totally conclusively. If that "I Am" talked to us, then he obviously gave us something of himself. That is unchangeable. We call it the truth. Whatever we call it, it is unchangeable. He is unchangeable, so that can't change. If it's unchangeable, and if it's one and the same, as there is only one "I Am" for the moment, before we accept the Trinity, there's only one God, let's call it this way, there's only one God. He cannot change. He cannot lack anything. He cannot have anything added to him. He has never started, will never stop. Then whatever he tells us must be perfect, unchangeable, if he's speaking himself, like when he says, "Before Abraham was, I am," then that can never change. If that can never change, then there's only one truth. Somebody's gotta have it. There is one group in this whole world that has the whole truth, and all others are in definite error. There is no way around that statement. That is definite proof.

Is it proof of Church? Not sufficient. We have the proof of plausibility and probability on many sides. Like I said before, there's only one book that names the name of God correctly. We have, at the same time, only one institution that at least, for a time span of 1,800 years, hardly ever changed anything in its pronouncements, and that's called the Catholic Church.

Why is it that in that Catholic Church, if it has the truth, the very same group of people who said that human being, with the light of his reason, can detect the existence of God, which we have just proven, that that very same group of people said that miracles are necessary for salvation, which in the term of the skeptic would mean something that is against everything that we know is necessary for our minds to be somehow kept for eternity? A very skeptic way of formulating the term miracles are necessary for salvation. Well, obviously because there is no conclusive proof by reason. The very same "I Am" who revealed something of himself to us decided, for whatever reason, not to give us enough in order to be able to arrive at the same conclusion without him. That is obvious. For those, however, who are not satisfied by this, not because of self-determination, but because of really

looking for something, the truth, looking for the truth, he has given us help.

THE MIRACLE OF LANCIANO

Can I prove that that is the case? According to all modern accepted sciences, yes. Biochemistry doesn't even know how many substances are in here. Biochemistry will irrefutably prove to you that this is not blood. Biochemistry will also irrefutably prove to you that this is wine, may become vinegar, may evaporate, but cannot become blood, let alone human blood, and stay as fresh, coagulated human blood for 1,300 years. Chemistry says, "No, that's absolutely impossible." Physics says, "That's absolutely impossible." Medicine says... Well, medicine knows very little about human being, but medicine says, "No, that's absolutely impossible." All so-called exact modern sciences say, "No, I'm sorry. That is impossible."

In the small and insignificant town of Lanciano, south of Rome, about, if I remember well, 1,200 or 1,300 years ago, and obviously, in his heart, innocent and honest priest. It was the local parish priest, if I remember well. [He] had grave doubts about the Catholic doctrine of what is called the real presence of the Body and the Blood of our Lord on the altar. The Catholic Church teaches that whenever a priest with the intention of saying Mass, in the proper frame of saying Mass, has a piece of white unleavened bread in front of him, and a glass of wine in front of him, and pronounces certain words over the glass of wine, afterwards the glass of wine still looks like a glass of wine. But supposedly, according to what this Catholic Church teaches, is not wine anymore, but is the Blood of the one who in that above mentioned book says, "Before Abraham was, I am." Of course, that is hard to believe. You hold a glass of wine in your hand, it looks like wine, it tastes like wine, and somebody says it isn't wine. It contradicts everything we know in modern science.

But what happened 1,200 years ago also contradicts everything that we know in modern science. There, the round piece of unleavened white bread became human flesh without ceasing to look like bread in the center of it. Outside, and it has been examined under the microscope by three scientists who claim to be atheists, therefore were not to be suspected of being Catholic devotionalists. They examined the whole thing under the microscope, and they said, "This is the horizontal slice of a human heart." They determined the exact blood group, and they said it looks like it had been cut yesterday, and it was cut 1,200 years ago. It also wasn't cut just as a horizontal slice of a human heart, but looking on it on top, you have a sort of crown of real human flesh. They said horizontal slice of blood [?] because there's two, both types of muscles in it, lengthwise and across, and that's only in the human heart. But in the middle, as I said before, it still looks like the white Host. That, again, is completely and totally impossible according to everything we know in modern science. Yet, it can be visited in the insignificant town of Lanciano, and somewhere there is a book with pictures, detailed description of that scientific research. The same is true for the blood in the chalice that has coagulated, but is still fresh after 1,300 years.

We are faced with something that contradicts the entire modern science. And in the most drastic possible way, it's not like, you're sick, you're having cancer, I put my hand on your body, and instantly you're healed. There is no explanation for that either, yet. But biochemistry, at least biochemistry and physics will tell you that there cannot be possibly anywhere, ever, an explanation for what I have just described. That, I consider conclusive, irrefutable proof that the doctrine about the real presence of the Body and the Blood of our Lord on the altar in the Catholic Mass, or in the Mass, in Holy Mass, must be most positively true. Otherwise, that "I Am" we talked about is absurd. And then we revert to the first question of all questions, who was the first human being? What was the first cell? What was the first piece of matter? When was the first universe? Who made the first universe going? Who made the first Big Bang going? I guess we will come to a plausible and probable conclusion that if you think the whole thing thoroughly well through, which one out of a million people might do, if you think it through all the way using that common sense, you have to become a Catholic. Or, you have to lock yourself up in the rubber cell where all the paranoids and all the other maniacs go.

In the end, you will necessarily have to conclude either the Catholic Church is right or nothing is right. I am not sure that this will present conclusive proof. If it presented conclusive and irrefutable proof, then the

Church would be wrong about the doctrine of the gift of faith. However, face the logics of my initial thinking and face the miracle of Lanciano, out of many other miracles, what conclusion can you come to? Well, if the faith is a gift, then with the help of God, you will be a Catholic, and I cheer for that.