VATICAN II VS. CHURCH DOGMA

Fr. G. Hesse

Yesterday, when discussing the first document of Vatican II, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* on the liturgy, I forgot to quote what Pope Gregory XVI in his encyclical *Mirari Vos* had to say about the idea of changing the church, simplifying the liturgy, and adapting ecclesiastical law to the needs of the times. Some people accuse me of being very explicit in what I say. I'll show you what Gregory XVI said. This is *Mirari Vos*, numbers 10 and 11:

„It would therefore be a crime, a formal derogation from the respect due to the Ecclesiastical laws, to blame by an insane liberty of opinion the discipline which the Church has consecrated, by which the administration of holy things and the conduct of the faithful are regulated, which determines the rights of the Church and the obligations of its ministry, and to declare that discipline hostile to certain principles of natural law or incapable of acting by inherent imperfection or declare it subject to the civil authority."

„But since, to use the words of the Fathers of the Council of Trent..." This is number 11. „... it is certain that the Church was instructed by Christ and His apostles and that the Holy Ghost never fails by daily assistance to teach us all truth, it is the height of absurdity and outrage towards it to pretend that the restoration and regeneration have become necessary to secure its existence and its progress, as if it could be believed that it was thus subject either to faintness, darkness, or other alterations of this kind. And what do these bold innovators seek except to give new foundations to an institution which would thereby be only man's work and realize what Saint Cyprian cannot sufficiently detest by rendering the Church human from all Divine that is?"

I think this is pretty clear. Gregory XVI condemns the idea of a restoration and regeneration of the Church necessary to secure its existence. Vatican II did not believe Gregory XVI, and this is why Vatican II ceased to be Catholic.

UNITATIS REDINTEGRATIO AND CHURCH UNITY

The next document we have to deal with is probably the most scandalous of all: the decree on ecumenism from Vatican II, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, November 21st, 1964. This document was published on the very day, exactly 10 years before Archbishop Lefebvre published the declaration of the principles of the Society of Saint Pius X. The decree on ecumenism cannot really be understood in its evilness, in its lie, before you understand the Catholic concept of the unity of the Church.

Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical on the unity of the Church, June 29th, 1896, called *Satis Cognitum*, speaks and pronounces as the supreme pastor and teacher of the Church, the Catholic concept of the unity of the Church. He says, in number five, he quotes Saint Cyprian: „There is one God and one Christ, and His Church is one and the faith is one, and one the people joined together in the solid unity of the body and the bond of concord. This unity cannot be broken, nor the one body divided by the separation of its constituent parts." And again, „The Church cannot be divided into parts by the separation and cutting asunder of its members. What is cut away from the mother cannot live or breathe apart." And again, Saint Cyprian: „Whosoever is separated from the Church is united to an adulteress. He has cut himself off from the promises of the Church, and he who leaves the Church of Christ cannot arrive at the rewards of Christ. He who observes not this unity observes not the law of God, holds not the faith of the Father and the Son, clings not to life and salvation."

This is the unity of the Church. And Pope Leo XIII continues in number six: „But Christ indeed, who made this one Church, also gave it unity. That is, He made it such that all who are to belong to it must be united by the closest bonds, so as to form one society, one kingdom, one body, one body and one spirit as you are called in one hope of your calling." (Ephesians 4:4).

And Leo XIII continues in number eight: „On the one hand, therefore, it is necessary that the mission of teaching whatever Christ had taught should remain perpetual and immutable, and on the other, that the

duty of accepting and professing all their doctrine should likewise be perpetual and immutable." And he quotes Saint Cyprian again: „Our Lord Jesus Christ, when in His gospel He testifies that those who are not with Him are His enemies, does not designate any special form of heresy, but declares that all heretics who are not with Him and who do not gather with Him, scatter His flock and are His adversaries. ‚He that is not with me is against me, and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth.'" And then, Leo XIII remarks, quoting the Epistle of James: „Whosoever shall offend in one point is become guilty of all. Whosoever denies one truth the Catholic Church teaches, denies them all."

Remember what I said about objective and subjective. The Russian Orthodox priest somewhere in Siberia who has never heard of the Catholic Church under communism, perhaps did not know better. We are not judging him. We are not pronouncing subjective judgment. Objectively, he was a heretic and a schismatic, separated from the Church, and in the state of mortal objective sin against the first commandment.

Leo XIII, in number 10, describes the Church: „God indeed even made the Church a society far more perfect than any other. For the end of which the Church exists is as much higher than the end of other societies as divine grace is above nature, as immortal blessings are above the transitory things on the earth. Therefore, the Church is a society divine in its origin, supernatural in its end, and its means proximately adapted to the attainment of that end. But it is a human community inasmuch as it is composed of men. For this reason, we find it called in Holy Writ by names indicating a perfect society. It is spoken of as the house of God, the city placed upon the mountain to which all nations must come. But it is also the fold, presided over by one shepherd and into which all Christ's sheep must betake themselves. Yea, it is called the kingdom which God has raised up and which will stand forever. Finally, it is the Body of Christ that is, of course, His mystical body, or the body living and duly organized and composed of many members. Members indeed, which have not all the same functions, but which united to one another, are kept bound together by the guidance and authority of the head."

This is the true description of the Church, and not what Vatican II blasphemously pretended to teach in the document *Lumen Gentium*, which we discussed yesterday. Leo XIII makes it abundantly clear that there is only one Church. There is no such thing as sister churches. There is no such thing as churches that are not united with the Catholic Church but are still considered „churches." They are not churches; they are sects. They are religions that are enemies of Christ. Maybe they don't want to be enemies of Christ, but objectively, they are. It might be that a mentally challenged person who is really nothing else but a psychopath, an arsonist, fire alarm prone, in politically correct terms, would set fire to this hotel. He does not want to kill you because he doesn't even think of it, but he is our enemy all the same, objectively. And this is what I have to say about the churches that are not Catholic. All of them, without an exception.

UNITATIS REDINTEGRATIO ON ECUMENISM

Vatican II, blasphemously as ever, even more heretical than before, demands ecumenism—ecumenism in a new sense, not in the old classic sense of talking about everything that belongs to the house, as Leo XIII just described the Church, the house, and the *Oecumene*, everything that belongs to the house. Ecumenism nowadays means everything that belongs to that strange, very mythical, not mystical, but mythical house of all the churches and all mankind and everybody anyway.

It is hard to believe Vatican II would really dare to say the following, but it did. *Unitatis Redintegratio* number three: After having stated there's only one Church of God, they nevertheless deface themselves when they say, „According to the condition of each church or community, these liturgical actions must most certainly can truly engender a life of grace, and one must say, can actually give access to the communion of salvation." They're talking about Protestant services. I'll give you the whole paragraph:

„The brethren divided from us..." (Leo XIII just said, quoting Saint Cyprian, they are not just divided from us. They are not our sister churches. They are the enemies of Christ. Not for Vatican II, perhaps because Vatican II is the enemy of Christ.) „...also carry out many liturgical actions of the Christian religion. In

ways that vary according to the condition of each church or community, these liturgical actions most certainly can truly engender a life of grace, and one must say can aptly give access to the communion of salvation."

So here, we hear that the Protestant Mass of Thomas Cranmer in the Cathedral of Canterbury in England can truly give access to the community of salvation. This is heresy and it is blasphemy. This is not proximate heresy; this is direct heresy. This is condemning the popes' judgment on the Protestant churches. It is condemning the popes that excommunicated Henry VIII and his followers. It is condemning the pope that excommunicated Martin Luther and his followers. It is condemning the popes that said if you go to a Protestant church on Sunday, you are excommunicated. This one line alone would be sufficient to grab this whole book and dump it where it belongs: in the trashcan.

But no, it is not sufficient yet for Vatican II. They want more: „It follows that the separated churches and communities as such, though we believe they suffer from the defects already mentioned, have been by no means deprived of significance and importance in the ministry of salvation, for the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them as means of salvation, which derive their efficacy from the very fullness of grace and the truth entrusted to the Catholic Church." So, if you go to a Protestant church, you get the grace derived from the Catholic Church? No. The popes have explicitly condemned this opinion, the Council of Trent and Vatican I, and especially recently, Pope Pius XI in his encyclical *Mortalium Animos*, which you can have from the Angelus Press. It's short, easily understood. You should get it.

Pope Pius XI talks about the people „who hold that the unity of faith and government, which is a note of the one true Church of Christ, has up to the present time hardly ever existed and does not exist today. They consider that this unity is indeed to be desired and may even, by cooperation and goodwill, be actually attained, but that meanwhile it must be regarded as a mere ideal." And they immediately go on to say that, „The Roman Church too has erred, and corrupted the primitive religion by adding to it and proposing for belief doctrines not only alien to the Gospel, but contrary to its spirit." Others again even go so far as to desire the Pontiff himself to preside over their mixed assemblies." This is the ecumenical meetings with the Anglican Church. „For the rest, while you may hear many non-Catholics loudly preaching brotherly communion in Jesus Christ" (Vatican II is among those non-Catholics), „yet not one will you find to whom it ever occurs with devout submission to obey the Vicar of Jesus Christ in his capacity to teacher or ruler. Meanwhile, they assert their readiness to treat with the Church of Rome, but on equal terms, as equals with an equal." Assisi. „But even if they could so treat, there seems little doubt that they would not do so only on condition that no pact into which they might enter should compel them to retract those opinions which still keep them outside the fold of Christ." You can easily see that it is always the Catholic Church, the so-called Catholic Church, with Pope John Paul II (who's definitely not a Catholic), to say that we retract opinions. They don't. The Protestants have not retracted one of their errors.

And in *Mirari Vos* again, Gregory XVI says, in number 14: „We now come to another and most fruitful cause of the evils which at present afflict the Church and which we so bitterly deplore. We mean indifferentism, or that fatal opinion everywhere diffused by the craft of the wicked that man can, by the profession of any faith, obtain the eternal salvation of their souls." He calls it a wicked opinion. He says, „It's a wicked opinion diffused by the craft of the wicked that man can by the profession of any faith obtain the eternal salvation of their souls, provided their life conforms to justice and probity. But in a question so clear and evident, it will undoubtedly be easy for us to pluck up from amid the people confided to your care so pernicious an error." That means what Vatican II writes in the decree on ecumenism has been called pernicious error by Gregory XVI. „The apostle," meaning Saint Paul, „warns us of it. One God, one faith, one baptism. Let them tremble then who imagine that every creed leads by an easy path to the port of felicity and reflect seriously on the testimony of our Savior Himself, that those are against Christ who are not with Christ, and that they miserably scatter by the fact that they gather not with Him, and that consequently they will perish eternally without any doubt if they do not hold to the Catholic faith and preserve it entire and without alteration." Let them hear Saint Jerome himself, relating that at the epoch when the church was divided into three parties, he, faithful to what had been decided, inces-

santly repeated to all who endeavored to win him over, „Whoso is united to the chair of Peter is with me." Now, mind you, he said, „To the chair of Peter." He did not say, „To the present successor of Peter." He said, „To the chair of Peter." It is the present successor of Peter who is not united to the chair of Peter, because he says things directly opposed to what his predecessor said.

And in number 15, Gregory XVI says: „From this poisoned source of indifferentism flows that false and absurd, or rather extravagant maxime, that liberty of conscience should be established and guaranteed to each man." And to this I will have to come back with the document of Liberty of Conscience in Vatican II, because Vatican II really went into teaching almost everything that had been condemned by the previous popes. It is of no wonder when we find the present pope pronouncing and uttering heresy; he just follows the council he praises so often and so much as being the second Pentecost, which is blasphemous to say. The Holy Spirit came once.

„But the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them, the Protestant and divided churches, as means of salvation." Pope John Paul II, in *Catechesi Tradendae* number 32, says, (*quorum conatibus Spiritus Christi salutem operari non recusat*), „To the efforts of whom the Spirit of Christ does not deny to give salvation." (*Quorum conatibus*) is referring to the previous sentence talking about *Ecclesiae Protestantae*, the Protestant churches. The Protestant churches, to the efforts of whom Christ does not deny to give salvation. That is heresy. If the pope had said that a Protestant could possibly be saved in spite of the religion he belongs to, I would not have objected. Nobody would have been able to object. No. He said, „For the efforts of which Christ does not deny salvation." Jesus Christ, our Lord, is not capable of giving salvation to the efforts of the Protestant churches because God cannot contradict himself. One church, one faith, one baptism. The Protestants, some of them, have the Catholic Sacrament of Baptism. Not a single Protestant religion has our faith. They deny the real presence in the Blessed Sacrament. They deny the sacramental priesthood. They deny the Sacrament of Confession. They do not have one faith with us. They deny the faith. And Saint Cyprian, affirmed by Leo XIII and Gregory XVI said, „If they deny only one point of faith, they deny all of them. Therefore, they are not even Christians in the real sense of the word."

Baptism has never turned a human being into a real Christian. In order to be a real Christian, you also have to agree to the faith. A Protestant child that knows no better implicitly agrees with the Catholic faith until the age of reason and some people beat it out of him. A Catholic child does the same until it comes under the influence of Vatican II and the people who belong to the Church of the New Advent, as it is called in *Redemptor Hominis* by John Paul II.

Then, of course, if the Protestant churches, according to the viewpoint of Vatican II and the heretical present pope, have the faith, then how come they deny some things that we hold firm? How come they deny some things that we hold steadfastly to? Well, this is a question the pope doesn't answer because the council hasn't answered it. It's one of the tricks of Modernism, as Pius VI said in his encyclical *Auctorem Fidei*, condemning the pseudo-synod of Pistoia. The trick of the Modernists is to be ambiguous, to teach things that can be taken back halfway, but also interpreted in another way. And as Saint Pius X says in his encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* on Modernism in 1907, there he says, „The Modernists, they always give you some and then take away some other things." When you discuss with a priest of the Opus Dei, as I have had the doubtful pleasure of doing, when you discuss with a priest of the Fraternity of Saint Peter, as I have had the doubtful pleasure of doing, they will always say, „But is the pope not Catholic? Because see, here he says something, and it's so beautifully Catholic." No. The pope cannot be a Catholic if he says 99% of the time the true things and 1% of the time the wrong things. There are 100% Catholics or no Catholics. That's what Saint Cyprian said very clearly, and he was just referring to our Lord himself. Our Lord said, and I quoted this yesterday, „For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." One jot or one tittle. You say no to one thing only the Catholic Church teaches, you have just left the Catholic Church, really left it, left it for good until you convert and come back, until you convert and submit yourself again to the entire teaching of the Church. *Iota Unum.*

The Protestants therefore are not Catholics. They're outside the Church. They're outside the house. They do not belong to any type of *Oecumene*. They cannot

be dealt with in ecumenical activities. The only thing you can do with the Protestants is pray for their conversion to the Catholic faith. And unfortunately, I have to say the same thing about those people who adhere to Vatican II, as the Fraternity of St. Peter does, and to those people who believe the Novus Ordo can be celebrated in a Catholic way, as the Fraternity of St. Peter does. Mind you, their individual priests might think quite differently, and some of them do. But the society itself has signed a paper to that point.

And of course Vatican II, needless to say, demands dialogue with the Protestants. I don't know what they want to discuss. I have lived in Rome for 15 years. For 15 years, I was always confronted with the desire for dialogue. I've never understood what they really want to discuss. Conversion was never the issue. Conversion was never the topic. Every year in January, there was a week, the week following the 25th of January, which is the conversion of St. Paul, mind you. They had the Ecumenical Week, and there were priests and bishops coming in from the Secretariat for the Unity of the Christians. Apart from the fact that most of them don't even know how to celebrate Mass—I had the Bishop Secretary there. This is public, so I might as well talk about it. I had the Bishop Secretary of the time there, Torella Cascante, who needed the book to pronounce a correct blessing at the end of Mass. We did not need the book. These are the people who decide on what we will discuss with the Protestants. Well, I'm not surprised. The new Mass of Paul VI was written up by, among other members of the commission, seven Protestants. People have asked me, „How do you know? Please, where's the footnote? Please give me the quotation." You have the quotation. Ask Cardinal Stickler in Rome. Read in the *Latin Mass* magazine, the interview with Cardinal Stickler, where Cardinal Stickler says, „There were seven Protestants in the commission. I should know. I was a member of the commission." And Cardinal Stickler has repeatedly, in private—I was his secretary for two years, we talked almost every day—repeatedly in private, told me about it. Repeatedly. So this is the footnote. If that's not good enough, I can't help you.

THE "PILGRIM CHURCH"

I've told you yesterday that I detest the term „Pilgrim Church," and that I consider it quite wrong to talk about a Church that has to fulfill a pilgrimage on Earth. Some people might think, „Why is he so hung up with the concept of Pilgrim Church?" This is because of the way Vatican II itself interprets the term „Pilgrim Church." And here it goes. *Unitatis Redintegratio*, number six:

„Christ summons the Church as she goes her pilgrim way to that continual reformation." To that continual reformation. *Mirari Vos* condemned the claim for a necessary reformation. The *Ecclesia Semper Reformanda* does not mean that the Church as a whole, the Church as the mystical body, the Church as the perfect society has to be reformed. That's impossible. The *Ecclesia Semper Reformanda* means the members of the Church, and they badly need it more than ever. „Christ summons the Church as she goes her pilgrim way to that continual reformation of which she always has need, insofar as she's an institution of men here on Earth." You're right about that. „Consequently, if in various times and circumstances there have been deficiencies in moral conduct or in the Church's discipline, or even the way that the Church teaching has been formulated—to be carefully distinguished from the deposit of faith itself—these should be set right at the opportune moment and in the proper way."

No, sir. The very concept of condemning the formulation of Church teaching in the past is heretical, and it has been condemned explicitly in *Mortalium Animos* when Pope Pius XI says, number 12 (now, don't get me confused, I'm not quoting Vatican II now, but the Catholic Church, in the person of Pius XI):

„How so great a variety of opinions can clear the way for the unity of the Church we know not, so far as dialogue is concerned. That unity can arise only from one teaching authority, one law of belief, and one faith of Christians. But we do know that from such a state of affairs, it is but an easy step to the neglect of religion or indifferentism, and to the error of the modernists who hold that dogmatic truth is not absolute but relative. That is, changes according to the varying necessities of time and place and the varying tendencies of the mind, that it is not contained in an immutable tradition, but can be altered to suit the needs of human life."

Number 13: „Furthermore, it is never lawful to employ in connection with articles of faith the distinction invented by some between fundamental and non-fundamental articles." This is exactly what *Unitatis Redintegratio* number six does. I say again, number six of Vatican II says: „The reform is needed, for even in the way that the church teaching has been formulated, to be carefully distinguished from the deposit of faith itself, this should be set right at the opportune moment and in a proper way." So they are distinguishing the *Depositum Fidei*, the Deposit of Faith, from some other teachings of the Church, which obviously seem to be minor. They are not. I repeat what Pius XI said: „Furthermore, it is never lawful to employ in connection with articles of faith the distinction invented by some between fundamental and non-fundamental articles, the former to be accepted by all, the latter being left to the free acceptance of the faithful." I quoted *Humani Generis* yesterday where Pius XII says, „Ordinary teaching binds every Christian." You freely, without proving your point, deny ordinary teaching, you just leave the Church, and please join another one. The supernatural virtue of faith has as its formal motive, the authority of God revealing, and this allows of no such distinction; that faith is absolute. It is not relative. All true followers of Christ, therefore, will believe the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God with the same faith as they believe the mystery of the August Trinity, the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff in the sense defined by the Ecumenical Vatican Council (number one, of course), with the same faith as they believe in the incarnation of our Lord. If somebody tries to tell me, as John Paul II does, that the Orthodox Church is our sister church, I reject that. The Orthodox Church rejects the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff as defined in Vatican I. Therefore, they reject everything else.

COMMUNICATIO IN SACRIS

Furthermore, the council goes on to say: „Grace to be obtained sometimes commends it. The concrete course to be adopted when all the circumstances of time, place, and persons have been duly considered is left to the prudent decision of the local episcopal authority, unless the bishop's conference according to its own statutes or Holy See has determined otherwise." They are talking about worship in common. Worship in common with non-Catholic religions has been under the pain of excommunication for more than 1,500 years. Anybody who dared to concelebrate with the Russian Orthodox (they have concelebration), Catholic priests who dared to concelebrate with the Russian Orthodox were immediately excommunicated. A member of the Catholic Church that dared to fulfill, quote-unquote, „Sunday duty" at the mass of a schismatic or heretical church was immediately in a state of mortal sin, according to the judgment of the Church. Now, they leave it to the local episcopal authority to decide if you will have *communicatio in sacris*.

They actually really use the term. „Worshipping common, *communicatio in sacris*, is not to be considered as means to be used indiscriminately for the restoration of unity among Christians. There are two main principles upon which the practice of such common worship depends. First, that the unity of the Church which ought to be expressed, and second, that of sharing in the means of grace. The expression of unity very generally forbids common worship." However, and then comes the paragraph that I quoted: „For the good of the faithful, for promoting unity, you may nevertheless do it." And later on, the same document says (first they say *communicatio in sacris* is not the proper means, but in number 15 they say): „Therefore, some worship in common, *communicatio in sacris*, given suitable circumstances and the approval of Church authority, is not merely possible, but is encouraged." This is the most double-tongued council in history, and these are the most double-tongued documents in the history of the Church. In one point they say, „*Communicatio in sacris* is not the proper means," then they say it is encouraged, left up to the local authority.

THE EASTERN CHURCHES

They talk about the Eastern Churches. I refer to the Eastern Churches that are not in communion with the Catholic. Number 17: „What has already been said about legitimate variety, we are pleased to apply to differences in theological expressions of doctrine in the study of revealed truth. East and West have used

different methods and approaches in understanding and confessing divine things. It is hardly surprising then if sometimes one tradition has come nearer to a full appreciation of some aspects of a mystery of revelation than the other, or has expressed them better." That means not just talking about the united churches in the East, but also talking about the Eastern churches in communion with the Holy See. This document here tries, dares to say that they have understood things better. In *Quo Primum*, Pius V, quoting the Church Fathers, calls the Catholic Church the mother and mistress of all churches. The very mother church of all. The teacher of all the other churches. There is no such thing as a truth expressed better in another church, even in a church united with Rome. There is no such thing. The Church Fathers rejected that concept, and so have all the popes until Pius XII. That does not keep Vatican II from pronouncing the contrary in number 17 of *Unitatis Redintegratio.*

DIALOGUE WITH PROTESTANTS

Then in number 22, they say: „Although the ecclesial communities separated from us..." (That means the heretics and schismatics are excommunicated.) „...lack the fullness of unity..." (The wrong concept of unity again. Either there is unity or there's no unity at all. There's unity or separation. There is no such thing as full unity, half unity, quarter unity, sixteenth unity. That is garbage. These people are mentally challenged, I tell you.) „...with us which flows from baptism, and although we believe they have not preserved the proper reality of the Eucharistic mystery in its fullness..." (Where is the old saying that if you deny one dogma, you deny all? „Not preserved in its fullness," especially because of the absence of the Sacrament of Orders...) That's probably a minor impediment. „...Nevertheless, when they commemorate the Lord's death and resurrection in the Holy Supper, they profess that it signifies life in communion with Christ, and await His coming in glory. For these reasons, the doctrine about the Lord's supper, about the other sacraments, worship and ministry in the Church, should form subjects of dialogue."

Doesn't that sound familiar to you? When they say here, „The Lord's death and resurrection, when they commemorate the Lord's death and resurrection in Holy Supper, they profess that it signifies life and communion with Christ, and await His coming in glory." That's a proper response to the *Mysterium Fidei* after the consecration in the new Mass. Vatican II here, and again, the interpretation of this paragraph is not mine; the proper interpretation of this paragraph is to be found in the new liturgy. Vatican II, in this line here, gives up the doctrine of real presence and sacramental priesthood when it demands dialogue with people who reject the presence of Christ on the altar and reject the sacramental priesthood. I do not dialogue with them. I explain the faith to them and then I tell them right in their face, „Take it or leave it."

MODERN ECUMENISM

The result of this scandalous document was a meeting between Paul VI and Athenagoras, the Patriarch of the Greek and Byzantine Churches, not united with Rome, in 1965, which had the ironical result of some of the monasteries at Mount Athos excommunicating their patriarch because he embraced the Roman papist bishop. At least these are heretics with principles. There is no dialogue on Mount Athos.

The result was the following statement. This is not Vatican II itself; it's a document resulting from Vatican II. In number two of the Common Declaration, they say: „Among the obstacles to be found in the way of the development of these brotherly relationships of trust and esteem, there is the memory of those painful decisions, acts, and incidents which led in 1054 to the sentence of excommunication delivered against Patriarch Michael Cerularius and two other persons by the legates of Rome." They call these painful decisions, and they call that incidents. Acts and incidents. That means it was a painful decision, an act, and an incident when Saint Leo IX excommunicated the heretical and schismatic patriarch. Saint Leo IX excommunicated them. The present pope never gets tired of quoting this, but he overlooks that these excommunications were pronounced most of the time by saints. It was Saint Leo IX who excommunicated that schismatic patriarch. It was Saint Gregory VII who excommunicated the emperor, and it was Saint Pius V who fought the Turks, a fact for which

now John Paul II goes out of his way to apologize.

As a matter of fact, the few lines of this document that I've read to you are so scandalous, so efficient in their lies, that I can only recommend to you to have a look at the present relations between the Catholic Church in Rome and the Eastern Churches. In one of the next issues of the *Catholic Family News*, you will be able to read John Vennari's conference given in Philadelphia three weeks ago. [...] Saint Josaphat died for the unity of the Ukrainian church and Rome. Pope John Paul II mocks the martyrs who have died for the unity of the Ukrainian church and Rome. When he says—he doesn't say it personally, that's the way you do it today, you let the congregation sign this stuff—and in the Balamand Statement, the Catholic priests to Ukraine here are asked to submit to the Orthodox local bishop. This is high treason. If it was not the pope, he would be due to capital punishment, except that no earthly authority can judge the pope on these things. But let us remember what Innocent III said: „The less a man is judged by man, the more he will be judged by God."

CONCLUSION

I will on another occasion go into the depths of ecumenism and the absurdities it has caused, especially with the present pope. Meanwhile, I recommend you read *Mortalium Animos*. It is short, precise, and to the point. I recommend you read *Mirari Vos* by Gregory XVI. Again, a short encyclical. In those days, the popes believed in expressing themselves in short and distinct ways, clarifying terms, not coming up with ambiguous terms and hundreds of pages of blah blah as the present pope so much enjoys to do. I cannot, unfortunately I do not have the jurisdiction to keep him from doing that, but I want you to understand that what he is doing is high treason to Christ; it is high treason to the Catholic Church. There is no dialogue with people who reject the truth. As a personal principle, if you'll forgive me for making a personal remark, I have lots of patience for people who are interested in the truth. My patience for those who do not want to hear the truth is limited to a, „Hi."

Thank you.

Here Part 1 ends and Part 2 begins.

INTRODUCTION

... in Saint Peter's Basilica and the northern side nave. Saint Josaphat died for the unity of the Ukrainian Church and Rome. Pope John Paul II mocks the martyrs who have died for the unity of the Ukrainian Church and Rome. When he says... He doesn't say it personally. That's the way you do it today. You let the congregation sign the stuff. And in the Balamand Statement, the Catholic priests to Ukraine are asked to submit to the Orthodox local bishop. This is high treason that if it was not the pope, he would be due to capital punishment, except that no earthly authority can judge the pope on these things. But let us remem-

Building upon previous critique of Vatican II's ecumenism, Fr. Hesse exposes the heretical redefinition of tradition in Dei Verbum, which claims tradition „progresses" and „grows" through believers' contemplation rather than remaining immutable as taught by Vatican I and Trent.

He denounces *Ecclesia Dei* as the most fraudulent document of recent decades, demonstrating how it falsely labels Archbishop Lefebvre's episcopal consecrations as „schismatic" contrary to canon law and church history.

Fr. Hesse further proves that Dignitatis Humanae, the Declaration on Religious Liberty, directly contradicts the Syllabus of Pius IX by promoting religious freedom as a civil right, showing how Cardinal Ratzinger admitted it constitutes an „anti-syllabus."

He reveals how this document forced Catholic countries like Colombia to remove Catholicism as their state religion. Fr. Hesse concludes with Gaudium et Spes, which he identifies as potentially the worst Vatican II document for its humanistic orientation that places man rather than God at the center of creation, describing this as „Satanism" that substitutes man for God and promotes cooperation with the „New World Order" while abandoning Christ the King.

ber what Innocent III said, „The less a man is judged by man, the more he will be judged by God."

I recommend to you... I will on another occasion go into the depths of ecumenism and to the absurdities it has caused, especially with the present pope. Meanwhile, I recommend to you to read Mortalium Animos. It is short, precise, and to the point. I recommend to you to read Mirari Vos by Gregory XVI. Again, a short encyclical. In those days, the popes believed in expressing themselves in short and distinct ways. Clarified terms, not come up with ambiguous terms and hundreds of pages of blah, blah as the present pope so much enjoys to do. I cannot... Unfortunately, I do not have the jurisdiction keep him from doing that. But I want you to understand that what he is doing is high treason to Christ. It is high treason to the Catholic Church. There is no dialogue with people who reject the truth. As a personal principle, if you'll forgive me for making a personal remark, I have lots of patience for people who are interested in the truth. My patience for those who do not want to hear the truth is limited to a, „Hi." Thank you. (coffeemaker gurgling) (chair creaking)

You must bear with me. Sometimes, as far as the quotations are concerned, my eyesight is not what it used to be. And sometimes in the quick run of a conference, I don't find the proper quotations in time. And I don't want to interrupt too much because, in that case, the tape would have to be cut 10 times and 20 times over again before you get a decent copy. So let me quote now two paragraphs of Mortalium Animos, which I should have quoted right at the moment when we were talking about dialogue.

Pope Pius XI in Mortalium Animos Number 10 says, „The pan-Christians..." He gave that term pan-Christians to all these idiots who wanted to have a common religion of all Christians, which of course, as you understand by now latest, is impossible and absurd. I quote, „These pan-Christians who strive for the union of the Churches would appear to pursue the noblest of ideals in promoting charity among all Christians, but how should charity tend to the detriment of faith? Everyone knows that John himself, apostle of love, who seems in his gospel to have revealed the secrets of the sacred heart of Jesus and who never ceased to impress upon the memory of his disciples the new commandment to love one another, nevertheless, strictly forbade any intercourse with those who professed a mutilated and corrupt form of Christ's teaching." Saint John says, „If any man come to you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not in the house, nor say to him, ‚God speed you.'" That means I'm going further than Saint John did. I say, „Hi" to the heretics. And for those who have not my first tape, Heretics all, whoever you be, in Tarbes or Nimes or over the sea. You never shall have good words from me. Caritas non conturbat me. But Catholic men that live upon wine are deep in the water and frank and fine. Wherever I travel, I find it so. Benedicamus Domino. (clapping) Hilaire Belloc.

Number 11 of Mortalium Animos, „Therefore, since the foundation of charity is faith pure and inviolate, it is chiefly by the bond of one faith that the disciples of Christ are to be united. A federation of Christians then is inconceivable in which each member retains his own opinions and private judgment in matters of faith, even though they differ from the opinions of all the rest. How can men with opposite convictions belong to one and the same federation of the faithful? Those who accept sacred tradition as a source of revelation and those who reject it, those who recognize as divinely constituted the hierarchy of bishops, priests and ministers in the Church, and those who regard it as gradually introduced to suit the conditions of the time, those who adore Christ really present in the most holy Eucharist through that wonderful conversion of the bread and wine, transubstantiation, and those who assert that the body of Christ is there only by faith or by the signification and virtue of the sacrament. How so great variety of opinions can clear the way for the unity of the Church we know not. That unity can arise only from one teaching authority, one law of belief and one faith of Christians. But we do not know that from such a state of affairs, it is but an easy step to the neglect of religion or indifferentism." The rest, I quoted. When I quoted Mirari Vos by Gregory XVI saying that, „We must hold steadfast to the consecrated traditions." This, at the same time, means what I said yesterday, that the customs of the church and the administration of the sacraments, the rites in celebrating the sacraments have been handed down to us as a sacred tradition. No man shall touch them, not even the Pope. Otherwise, you could not call them consecrated. Something that every pope might change according to his own beliefs is not something that you could call consecrated. The law of how to elect a pope that may be

changed by every pope to his liking is not a consecrated thing, and never was considered such in the church. If canon law has to be adapted to the times and sometimes, needless to say, canon law being positive law ruling the relation of one question to another, is something that will have to be adapted to the present times. But canon law is not sacred. It is only a lot holier than secular law.

DEI VERBUM

The next document we have to discuss, I'm going to talk about very shortly. It is the Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, Dei Verbum, November 18th, 1965. The fact that it's a dogmatic constitution does not mean it is a dogma. A dogmatic constitution, before it declares to be a dogma, only means to say it is a constitution teaching. It is not a constitution giving practical advice. It is a constitution that is teaching. What makes a dogmatic constitution a dogma is the solemn pronouncements, mostly in the negative form at the end of the document saying, „Whosoever says that this is not so, let him be accursed outside the church." Anathema sit.

In number eight, Dei Verbum pronounces a heretical definition of tradition. You can read about this in detail in one of the next issues of the Catholic Family News, because that's what I spoke on in Philadelphia three weeks ago. My whole conference will be published in the Catholic Family News. I'm only going to say one thing here. According to the will of the fathers of the council, of the Vatican Council, somehow the document, the concept of tradition has been changed round. Now, tradition can change. I quoted Leo XIII before saying, „Tradition cannot change. The faith cannot change. Dogma cannot change. There is no hierarchy of truth. There is only one and the same truth." I quoted Pius XII saying that, „The ordinary Magisterium is to be obeyed. The ordinary Magisterium being only such when..." And by the way, there's lots of theological manuals from the old days that will say the same that I say. The ordinary Magisterium, the ordinary teaching of a pope only being binding, of course, if he does not contradict his predecessors. Here in this council, they dare to change the concept of tradition by saying, „Tradition knows progress." And the exact quotation is, „The tradition that comes from the apostles makes progress in the church with the help of the Holy Spirit. There is a growth, an insight into the realities and words that are being passed on. This comes about in various ways. It comes through the contemplation and study of believers who ponder these things in their hearts. It comes from the intimate sense of spiritual realities which they experience. Thus, as the centuries go by, the church is always advancing towards the plenitude of divine truth until eventually, the words of God are fulfilled in her." No. The church is in the possession of the full truth. The church cannot approach, the church cannot come closer. It cannot advance towards the plenitude of divine truth. The church has the divine truth in its fullness. That is a dogma of the Catholic faith. And tradition is not something that changes with the pondering of believers. I don't care about the pondering of believers, and I'm not interested what the religious experiences of Mr. X and Mrs. Y are. They do not change the truth. They do not add anything to tradition. The only way in which tradition can grow is in the sense of the deepening of the understanding. But as Saint Vincent of Lérins pointed out, quoted by Vatican Council I, Saint Vincent of Lérins says, „There is a deepening in understanding of the truth, but Eodem sensu, eadem sententia, in the same sense and in the same judgment." You cannot reverse the judgment of 500 years ago through a better understanding or because of a better understanding. You can only deepen the understanding. When in 1854, the 8th of December, Pius IX proclaimed the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception, he did not say anything new. He just made sure that now we have precise terminology on what it means.

ECCLESIA DEI

I've talked about that, but in the same context, I have to mention the sad fact of the most fraudulent document issued by the Holy See, signed by the Holy Father, in the last 30 years. And this is the very same document on which the Fraternity of Saint Peter and other groups base their existence. The document is called Ecclesia Dei. The document directly contradicts the tradition of moral theology handed down to us in the past and from other popes when it says in number three, „In itself, this act..." They talk about

the episcopal consecrations performed by Archbishop Lefebvre with the assistance of Bishop Castromayer. „In itself,

this act was one of disobedience to the Roman Pontiff in a very grave matter, and of supreme importance for the unity of the church, such as it is the ordination of bishops whereby the apostolic succession is sacramentally perpetuated. Hence, such disobedience..." I checked this with Latin. It is indeed such. „Hence, such disobedience, which implies in practice the rejection of the Roman primacy constitutes a schismatic act." No, it doesn't. Such disobedience as such does not constitute anything but disobedience. And the new code of canon law agrees with me, because the new... Mind you, the old canon law, of course does, because never in the history of the church was an illegal Episcopal consecration considered a schismatic act. Schism is automatically connected with the extreme penalty of excommunication. How come the church never put illegal Episcopal consecrations under the pain of excommunication until 1949 when Pius XII was faced with the National Church of China consecrating bishops against his will? The new code of canon law does not list when it says in Canon 1382 that the Episcopal consecrations without the mandate of the Pope are automatic excommunication, does not list this crime under the crimes of schism, under the crimes against the unity of the church. The new code of canon law does not mention the Episcopal consecrations in context with schism. So the Pope cannot. The Pope is bound to canon law unless he wants to change it. So number three is a lie. Number three is an error in moral theology.

Number four says, „The root of this schismatic act," which it is not. „The root of this schismatic act can be discerned in an incomplete and contradictory notion of tradition." So the Pope now accuses Archbishop Lefebvre of an incomplete and contradictory notion of tradition, which is quite funny when you consider I have read everything that Archbishop Lefebvre ever wrote. And all I found was most unoriginal statements. Most unoriginal. He quotes the popes, he quotes the councils, he quotes the saints, he quotes the church fathers, he quotes the appointed doctors of the church, and he never says anything out of his own. Archbishop Lefebvre is one of the most unoriginal persons in this world as far as doctrine is concerned. God bless him for that, and we thank him for that. His concept of tradition is exactly identical with the concept of tradition dogmatically pronounced in Dei Filius of Vatican I, and dogmatically pronounced in the appropriate section and session of the Council of Trent. And it is completely in accordance with everything that was ever said about tradition in the history of the church until the infelicitous year of 1958. I say again, „The root of his schismatic act can be discerned in the incomplete and contradictory notion of tradition. Incomplete because it does not take sufficiently into account the living character of tradition." That tradition has a living character is a concept condemned so often that sometimes there's so many quotations that I cannot, I just simply do not have them present. But you will find this in the Catholic Family News. It comes with this living character of tradition, which as the Second Vatican Council clearly taught, comes from the apostles and progresses in the church with the help of the Holy Spirit. „There is a growth in insight into the realities and words that are being passed on. This comes about in various ways. It comes through the contemplation and study of believers who ponder these things in their hearts. It comes from the intimate sense of spiritual realities which they experience, and it comes from the preaching of those who have received along with their rite of succession in the episcopate, the sure charism of truth." This is exactly a definition according to everything that Pius X condemns in his encyclical against modernism, Pascendi Dominici Gregis. But as this was my second conference in Philadelphia, I recommend you the reading of the appropriate issue of Catholic Family News. We do not have the time here.

DIGNITATIS HUMANAE

The next one among the most scandalous documents of Vatican II is the Declaration on Religious Liberty. The title itself is to be condemned. Declaration on Religious Liberty, Vatican II, Dignitatis Humanae, December 7th, 1965. It starts with blasphemy. Number one, „Contemporary man is becoming increasingly conscious of the dignity of the human person." St. Pius X said, „The only dignity in the human person is in his being a Christian." Leo XIII said, „Enough talk about the dignity of man. Let's talk

about the dignity of God." (Audience applauds) Thank you for applauding Leo XIII. (Audience laughs)

Consequently, the council says in number two, „The council further declares that the right to religious freedom is based on the very dignity of the human person as known through the revealed word of God, and by reason itself. This right of the human person to religious freedom must be given such recognition in the constitutional order of society, as will make it a civil right." Can you believe this? Let's see what the Catholic Church says about that. In Mirari Vos, Gregory XVI condemns this concept when he says in number 15, „From this poisoned source of indifferentism flows that false and absurd, or rather extravagant maxim, that liberty of conscience should be established and guaranteed to each man a most contagious error, to which leads the absolute and unbridled liberty of opinion, which for the ruin of church and state spreads over the world, and which some men by unbridled imprudence fear not to represent as advantageous to the church. ‚And what more certain death for souls,' says Saint Augustine, ‚than the liberty of error?'"

The very proposal of religious liberty, something that was found among proud souls in the 19th century was condemned by Pope Pius IX. The document is called The Syllabus of Pius IX, syllabus of principal errors of our time, which are censured in the consistorial allocutions, encyclicals, and other apostolic letters of our most holy Lord, Pope Pius IX. It is a collection of statements from the writings of Pius IX issued by the Holy Office in the name of the Pope, sanctioned by him. And it gives a list of 80 statements. All the 80 statements are solemnly condemned in this document. And anybody who agrees with any one of these statements automatically ceases to be a Catholic. So understand what I'm quoting now is not the doctrine of the church. It is condemned.

Number 15, „Every man is free to embrace and profess that religion which guided by the light of reason he shall consider true." Condemned sentence.

Number 16, „Man may in the observance of any religion whatever find the way of eternal salvation and arrive at eternal salvation." Condemned sentence quoted by Vatican II as doctrine in the aforementioned document and this document.

17, „Good hope at least is to be entertained of the eternal salvation of all those who are not at all in the true church of Christ." Condemned statement.

18, „Protestantism is nothing more than another form of the same true Christian religion in which form it is given to please God equally as in the Catholic Church." Condemned statement in the collection of Pius IX. Not literally quoted by Vatican II, but indirectly. The syllabus makes sure that the document on religious freedom written up by the council fathers is un-Catholic, contradictory to the teaching of the church. Cardinal Ratzinger has admitted that. Nobody of the so-called halfway 50% or 45 and a half percent traditionalists who say Father Hess should not break with the church by saying that Vatican II is heretical, anybody who says that is really in contradiction to the present prefect of the congregation of the faith who said, „The decree on religious liberty is certainly an anti-syllabus." And the syllabus is the list of condemned sentences, which I just quoted to you. So Cardinal Ratzinger says the same thing that I do. Why he does not draw the consequences is not for me to judge. But the decree on religious liberty is definitely to be condemned. And it is, as a matter of fact, the point in which Archbishop Lefebvre said, „No. I will not sign anything anymore now." Some of the first documents nonetheless, they contained all the errors Archbishop Lefebvre signed, and he said, „Because at the time, we were not able to imagine that a pope would sign documents that are wrong, so we submitted." Understandable error. And I can tell you, I'm a witness to this error because I committed it myself many years ago. I said, „It's impossible that the Pope signs things that are against the faith." I have learned my lesson and so have you.

„It is through his conscience that man sees and recognizes the demands of divine law. He is bound to follow this conscience faithfully in all his activity so that he may come to God, who is his last end. Therefore, he must not be forced to act contrary to his conscience." The church never said that anybody may be converted by force. But at the same time, the church said, „If you do not conform your conscience to our teaching, you will," excuse me if I say it in the Irish way, „go to hell." And now Vatican II requests the states to turn this into a law. In number four, „Therefore provided the just requirements of public order are not violated, these groups have a right to immunity so

that they may organize themselves according to their own principles. They must be allowed to honor the supreme Godhead," or whatever that is, „with public worship, help their members to practice their religion and strengthen them with religious instruction and promote institutions in which members may work together to organize their own lives according to their religious principles." So please, contribute to the next donation to build a mosque in Los Angeles. The Pope sent a delegate to the official opening of the Islamic mosque in Rome. Friends of mine in Rome, who belonged to a group that is called Very Right Wing, but they are very Catholic, catapulted slices of salami into the mosque. God bless them. Actually what, they're good people. See, we shoot them with slices of salami. The Quran says in Surah 47 that they ought to kill us. Well, Vatican II is certainly a perverted council because it's actually here requesting from the civil authorities to give complete freedom to other heretical, schismatical, and pagan religions.

And this is something that has been again condemned by Pius IX in the syllabus. I quote, „Number 20: The ecclesiastical power ought not to exercise its authority without the permission and assent of the civil government." This is now in the Balamand statement I quoted before with the Orthodox Churches. „Number 21: The church has not the power of defining dogmatically that religion of the Catholic Church is the only true religion." Vatican II doubts it all the time. They do not say exactly the same, which was condemned here, but they always say something which comes out the same. Because if the Catholic Church, if the civil authorities that always throughout the tradition of the church had to submit to the Pope. Remember Gregory VII excommunicated the German emperor for not submitting to the Pope. And Henry VIII was excommunicated, rightly so, because he split with Rome. Now Vatican II says, „This is all right." And as a matter of fact, the Pope together with that abomination of a so-called bishop calling himself the Archbishop of Canterbury, being a layman of course, because their orders are definitely invalid as Leo XIII declared dogmatically in his Apostolicae Curae. The Pope together with a layman in Canterbury blessed the people. If I had been stupid enough to be there, it would have worked out.

„Number 22 of the condemned sentences: The obligation by which the Catholic teachers and authors are strictly bound is confined to those things only which are proposed to universal belief as dogmas of faith by the infallible judgment of the church." This is a necessary requisite in order to be able to have dialogue and in order to say that the other religions can save you too. I have told you what the other Popes have said about a hierarchy of truth. And at the end of the list of condemned sentences, we will see what Pius IX said about new theories on the powers of the state and the relation between church and state. In number 77 condemned sentence, „In the present day, it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be held as the only religion of the state to the exclusion of all other forms of worship." This sentence has been condemned. Now, the document on religious liberty asks the civil authorities to turn religious liberty into a civil right. What was the result? The Constitution of Colombia in South America said that the official state religion of Colombia is the Catholic religion, the Catholic faith. The pope, Paul VI, had them remove that. The Vatican exercised pressure on the Colombian government for more than three months until they gave in and canceled that paragraph of their constitution. Archbishop Lefebvre, who was well-versed with the different constitutions of the different parts of Switzerland, different provinces of the Confoederatio Helvetica, which is Switzerland, the Helvetic Confederation, said that in one of the French-speaking parts of Switzerland, to be precise, the Rhone Valley, the Canton Valais, their local constitution held the Catholic religion as the state religion. The apostolic nuncio in Switzerland forced them to remove that paragraph. This is the interpretation of the document on religious liberty. So let no man say that I viciously interpret it in a way they don't. They interpret it even stronger than I would have ever.

Another condemned sentence is 78 of the syllabus. „Hence it has been wisely decided by law in some Catholic countries that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own peculiar worship." Now, this is a direct quotation from Vatican II that has been directly condemned by Pope Pius IX, okay? Number 79. „Moreover, it is false that the civil liberty of every form of worship and the full power given to all of overtly or publicly manifesting any opinions whatsoever and thoughts conduce more easily to corrupt the morals and minds of the people and to propagate the pest of indifferentism." Mind you, this statement is saying it is false to

say that the pest of indifferentism is provoked by civil law allowing all religions. Vatican II demands from civil law to allow all religions and foster them and help them. Number 80. „The Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself and come to the terms with progress, liberalism, and modern civilization." This has been condemned. „The Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself and come to terms with progress, liberalism, and modern civilization." The Roman Pontiff, believe me, has not only come to terms with them, he superated their own desires in his own secularism and in his own indifferentism and in his own treason to the Catholic faith. He's a traitor. To make sure he understands it, in Polish, the word is zdrajca. Religious liberty, Vatican II says, „Religious communities have the further right not to be prevented from publicly teaching and bearing witness to their beliefs by the spoken or written word." It's time to put the Jehovah Witnesses on welfare, isn't it? „Also included in the right of religious freedom is the right of religious groups not to be prevented from freely demonstrating the special value of their teaching." The special value of their teaching. Yes. How about the Islamic viewpoint on women? I'm surprised that Hillary hasn't come out strong against Islam. Heil Hillary. „Also included in the rights of religious freedom is the right of religious groups not to be prevented from freely demonstrating the special value of their teaching for the organization of society and the inspiration of all human activity." This is not coming from Andrew Love, if you know whom I mean. This is not coming from the White House. This is Vatican II. These groups have the right to decide in accordance with their own religious beliefs, the form of religious upbringing which is to be given to their children. This is why now when a Catholic marries a Protestant, there's no further demand of having the children baptized Catholic. Doesn't matter anyway. „The civil authority therefore must undertake to safeguard the religious freedom of all the citizens in an effective manner by just legislation and other appropriate means. It must help to create conditions favorable to the fostering of religious life so that the citizens will be really in a position to exercise their religious rights and fulfill their religious duties and so that the society itself may enjoy the benefits of justice and peace which results from a man's faithfulness to God and his holy will." Who are the only ones who fulfill the holy will of God? The Catholics. Nobody else. Vatican II says they all do.

I think this is sufficient as far as the document on religious liberty is concerned. Another last quotation. „The freedom of the church is the fundamental principle governing relations between the church and public authorities and the whole civil order." This is right, of course. „The church claims freedom for herself in human society before every public authority. The church also claims freedom for herself as a society of men with the right to live in civil society in accordance with the tenets of the Christian faith." So now here, we have for the first time a proper understanding of religious liberty. Why is it that the Catholic Church has never publicly condemned the First Amendment to the American Constitution? Because the popes have always known that if a country is not Catholic anyway, we might as well use their ideas about religious liberty. This does not make a teaching. Vatican II turned it into teaching. The First Amendment to the American Constitution adopted in 1791 is not teaching. It's a workable arrangement. Nothing more. The American Constitution is not a document that teaches the people, it is not a religious document. It is not a document that says, „This is what you have to believe." But, „This is how we are going to organize our society." And in our society with all the religions coming over from Europe, just think of the Mayflower that never sank, unfortunately, with all these religions coming over, the state had little choice. It might have strived for a more Catholic constitution, but anyway, it's not a teaching document. The scandal here is that Vatican II now turns something that we had to tolerate for 200 years into teaching. „At the same time, the Christian faithful in common with the rest of men have the civil right of freedom from interference in leading their lives according to their conscience. A harmony exists therefore between the freedom of the church and that religious freedom, which must be recognized as the right of all men, and all communities must be sanctioned by constitutional law." It is sanctioned by constitutional law in this country, but where in this document is the mentioning of Christ the King? Pope Pius XI in Quas Primas pronounced as a solemn truth to be held forever that Christ is the king of all societies, and that only in the kingship of Christ we are fully dignified human beings, as Pius X said, „The dignity of the human being lies in his being a Christian." This document, even when it talks about the freedom of the Catholic Church itself, does not mention Christ the King. This goes to show you in which

spirit these things were written.

GAUDIUM ET SPES

I've dealt with religious liberty, sad as it is, this is not yet the worst to come in Vatican II. In many ways, the worst of all documents, even though it is not explicitly as heretical as the other ones that I quoted are, is the Pastoral Constitution, so it's not even dogmatic, but it's still the worst. You will see. Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. Gaudium et Spes. December 7, 1965. They really talk about what is actually the relation between the church and the world today. „And the Church in her..." The Conciliar Church, „In her incredible generosity offers," I quote, „To cooperate unreservedly with mankind in fostering a sense of brotherhood to correspond to the destiny of theirs." Christ the King is out the window again. The church now wants to cooperate unreservedly, and as you will see in number 80, with the New World Order. „The destiny of the human race is viewed as a complete whole, no longer, as it were, in the particular histories of various peoples, now it merges into a complete whole." So we are one with the Jews, we are one with the Protestant, we are one with Islam. Tell your Muslim brother next door that you are his brother united with him, but prepare for some answers. Tell the Orthodox Jew in your community who still respects the synagogue more than the Vatican Council respects the Catholic churches by destroying them one and another, tell the Hasidic Jew who follows the rules of his religion, whatever they are, tell the Hasidic Jew that you are one with him. You will get a probably very kind answer.

„What is the final meaning of man's activity in the universe?" The council doesn't give the answer, believe me. „The people of God..." That's the church, we have seen that in Lumen Gentium, the people of God, identical concept to the concept of the church. „The people of God and the human race, which is its setting renders service to each other." Oh, now the church together with all the other human beings, we render service to each other. Again, tell your Hasidic neighbor that you are rendering service to him. He will say, „What? I have not seen it." In number 12, the same scandalous document says, „Believers and unbelievers agree almost unanimously..." Almost means we do not. „Believers and unbelievers agree almost unanimously that all things on earth should be ordained to man as to their center and summit." That is Satanism. This is the result of Jacques Maritain's attempt to reconcile humanism and Christendom in his horrible book, L'Humanisme Integral, Integral Humanism, which was translated into Italian, Umanesimo Integrale, by a certain Giovanni Battista Montini and forwarded with the most praising terms. Giovanni Battista Montini was Paul VI. The very concept that the churches work towards man as their summit and center, it is Satanism because it is substituting God with man. It is putting man in the position of God. Gilbert Keith Chesterton said about this, „If you say I am, and you do not specify what you mean when you say I am, then you pronounce the Word of God, you pronounce the name of God. You claim the name of God for yourself." „The vision of a haloed host that weep around an empty throne, aureoles dark and angels dead, man with his own life stands alone." „‚I Am,' he says, his bankrupt creed. ‚I Am,' and is again a clod. The sparrow starts, the grasses stir, for he has said the name of God." Gilbert Keith Chesterton knew what it meant when you put man in the position of God. The only time of the year in Holy Mass that I break the sacred rubrics of mass is on Passion Sunday when Christ in the Gospel says, (Latin). „Before Abraham was, I am." This is the second time of two times, the second time in the Old and New Testament that God says His own name. The Hasidic Jewish neighbor I quoted before would be scandalized, absolutely totally scandalized by Gaudium et Spes Number 12 telling him that his religion is ordained towards man as the center and summit. He will say, „Oh no, it is not. It is God." Because he knows that he commits a mortal sin if he even, in his religion, names the name of God. Yahweh, I Am. God Himself says it only twice in Holy Scripture. When Moses faces the burning thornbush on Sinai and he says, „Who are you?" And God answers, (Latin). „I Am who Am." And when Christ says (Latin), „Before Abraham was, I Am," contrary to Vatican II, the Jews react very consequentially. They pick up stones to stone him because he had just said the name of God referring to His own person. They were wrong. Of course the Jews were wrong. They did not recognize Christ as the Son of God, but their reaction was at least logical. You cannot say I am and

not add anything. I'm a man. I'm a priest. I'm 44 years old. I'm a doctor of theology. But I cannot say I am. Only God can say I Am because God is infinitely simple being. And when Moses asks Him, „Yes, but what do I tell those people down there who you are?" God says, „Tell them that you met the one who is." Qui est. Nothing else. Just the one who is. And that is why from that day on, the word Yahweh, I Am, was so sacred, so sacred that whoever pronounced it was subject to capital punishment.

The logical consequence of that is Vatican II saying in Number 21, „Although the Church altogether rejects atheism..." Although. It's always although and then but. Yeah. Although we are all Catholics, but... Yes. „Although the Church altogether rejects atheism, she nevertheless sincerely proclaims that all men, those who believe as well as those who do not, should help to establish right order in this world where all live together. This certainly cannot be done without dialogue." Uh-huh. I guess one of the Council Fathers was George Bush when he said the New World Order. Yeah. No, I take that back. I don't dislike George Bush half as much as the people who wrote this. He's not a Catholic bishop.

Here Part 2 ends and Part 3 begins.

Concluding his systematic critique of Vatican II, Fr. Hesse exposes how *Gaudium et Spes* blasphemously claims Christ reveals man to himself rather than revealing the Trinity, and demonstrates the council's dishonest methodology through its abuse of quotations and misleading footnotes.

He refutes Vatican II's universal salvation doctrine by citing the dogmatic declaration of the Council of Florence that categorically states no one outside the Catholic Church can be saved, regardless of good works or even martyrdom. Fr. Hesse reveals that *Gaudium et Spes* was authored by Opus Dei founder Josemaria Escriva de Balaguer and promotes the „New World Order," then analyzes how modernism operates through the false principle of change versus Thomistic philosophy's principle of non-contradiction.

He shows how modernists use the laity as „the factor of progress in the Church" to undermine tradition through their supposed „inner needs" and religious experiences. Fr. Hesse concludes with extensive questions covering whether Vatican II bishops ceased to be Catholic, sedevacantism, papal elections as human acts rather than Holy Spirit interventions, and practical guidance for identifying true Catholics through their agreement with Archbishop Lefebvre's traditional positions.

CHRIST REVEALING MAN TO HIMSELF

In 22, 2, (laughing) the Council blasphemously says, „In reality, it is only in the mystery of the Word made flesh that the mystery of man truly becomes clear." Right. For Adam, the first man was a type of him who was to come. Excuse me. Who was to come. This is right. This is the prophecy of Christ to come, the new Adam. Christ the Lord, Christ the new Adam, in the very revelation of the mystery of the Father and His love fully reveals man to Himself and brings to light his most high calling.

THE TRINITY AND MAN

So, for some reason, maybe because in the old days, they were not fully enlightened about what is really the Catholic religion, I grew up with the strange concept that in the New Testament, God reveals Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to us, the Trinity. Now, Vatican II teaches me that in His coming, Christ reveals man to Himself. Gaudium et Spes number 22 is one of our beloved present pope's favorite statements. He quotes it over and over again. In the New Testament, man was not fully revealed to himself; but in the New Testament, we finally understood what the God of the Old Testament was. In the Old Testament, we only hear about God the Father. So Christ became flesh, became man in order to explain to us that there's God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. And He did not say, „Go in all the world and baptize in the name of the man, the man, and the man." He said, „Go and baptize everybody in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." And Saint Paul, talking about the New Tes-

tament, very clearly says that here God finally revealed Himself to us. Now, the council says, man was revealed to himself. Of course, if man is the center and summit of all the activities of the church, then man is God.

CHRIST'S UNION WITH MAN

He who is the image of the invisible God is himself the perfect man who has restored in the children of Adam that likeness to God which had been disfigured ever since the first sins. Human nature, by the very fact that it was assumed, not absorbed in him, has been raised in us also to a dignity beyond compare. For by His incarnation, He, the Son of God, has in a certain way... The council always loves that term, „in a certain way," but they never say what. Has in a certain way united Himself with each man. I talked about this yesterday. I am pope. Hey, I want to see some reactions. (laughing) Oh, yeah. Potentially, I am. Yes, I am pope. Potentially, I am. I might be elected. (laughing) The probability is 0.00000... (laughing) If the council had wanted to tell the truth, which is obviously not the case—they did not want to tell the truth—if the council had wanted to teach the truth, I think 2,000 bishops, not all of whom were dummies, would have come up with a declaration saying, „For by His incarnation, He, the Son of God, has united Himself with each man *potentially*." You don't have to say, „in a certain way," because that doesn't mean anything. Potentially, He has. From the moment He died on the cross, He gave every single man the chance to say yes to Him. They don't, (laughing) so He has not united Himself with every single man, no matter what the council says.

QUOTATIONS AND FOOTNOTES

And at this very point, as a parenthesis on the council's methodology, I allow myself to digress a little from the content of the council to show you that these people, their methodology is something that in junior high school would be considered profoundly dishonest and unworthy of a scholar: namely, the abuse of quotations and wrong footnotes. I'll show you what I mean. The council says, „Human nature, by the very fact that it was assumed, not absorbed in Him, has been raised in us also to a dignity beyond compare." Footnote 22. Footnote 22 says, „Confer the Council of Constantinople, 2 Canon 7. Neither was God the Word changed into the nature of flesh, nor His flesh changed into the nature of the Word." Denzinger, 428. „Confer also the Council of Constantinople number 3. For as His all holy and immaculate and souled flesh was not destroyed by being deified, but persisted in its own state and sphere." Denzinger-Schermetzter number 556. Confer the Council of Chalcedon. „Recognized in two natures without confusion, without change, without division, without separation." Denzinger-Schermetzter number 302 footnote ends. This footnote, telling us that when God became man, the nature of God was not in the least touched, is now after saying, „By the very fact that He was assumed not absorbed in Him, has been raised in us also to a dignity beyond compare." The footnote does not corroborate what the council says. The council postulates that now our dignity has been raised beyond compare because Christ became man. The Council of Chalcedon, the Third Council of Constantinople, and the Second Council of Constantinople condemned such opinions, or likewise opinions, or similar opinions. And now Vatican II, (hands clap) just like a junior grade high school idiot who wants to cheat his teacher into believing that he is capable of scientific work, quotes something totally out of context. (motorbike engine roars)

But this was done by 2,000 bishops. The next one, same page. „For by His incarnation, He, the Son of God, has in a certain way united Himself with each man. He worked with human hands, He thought with a human mind, He acted with a human will." Footnote, „Confer the Council of Constantinople number three. So also, His human will was not destroyed by being deified, but was rather preserved." Okay. Now, the council quotes a council to show us that really, the will of Christ by the incarnation was not destroyed. But the council puts this footnote after the statement that now Christ, God, in a certain way, united Himself with each man. God, by assuming—the second person of God, by assuming a human nature—does not unite Himself in a certain way with each man, because then Christ would not have said, „Those who do not follow Me, do not have part of

Me." The very fact that we have a nose, and two ears, and two eyes, and a mouth in common, and a human will and a human soul in common with Christ does not unite us with Him. Christ was very explicit about that. „Who's not for Me is against Me." Period. (Cars drive by) Who is Ɣabha reipé tēs qāpiot. Who can take it, take it. Otherwise, you have the Irish solution. (laughs) Ɣabha reipé tēs qāpiot. So you see, the council claims to quote authority, but indeed does not. And this is a method which I admittedly used when I was in high school. Never after that. (laughs) Then I did, but the teacher didn't find out. (laughs) (sighs)

SALVATION OUTSIDE THE CHURCH

Then the council speaks about the hope for resurrection. „All this holds true, not for Christians only, but for all men of goodwill in whose hearts grace is active invisibly."

BAPTISM *RE AUT VOTO*

Now, we have quite a fight about that in this country, considering that Leonard Feeney said that if you're not baptized with the water and Holy Spirit, you cannot go to heaven. He's just quoting Christ, and indeed he does. Christ said, „If you're not baptized with the water and Holy Spirit, you cannot go to heaven." The Council of Trent, in accordance with tradition, interpreted this line by saying, „Those who have not been baptized with the water and the Holy Spirit," Re aut voto. That's a literal quotation from Trent. „Re aut voto." Indeed or in a votum. Now, the votum is not a vague desire to do good. The votum baptismi is the promise to get baptized. At least it is the promise to want baptism the moment you can, the moment you know about it. It is the votum, the promise to give up your own opinions, your own wishes, your own standpoints for God. This is not a vague desire. (coughs) It is not a vague goodwill. And that is how this line is to be understood. The gospel must never be interpreted out of context literally, because this is what Martin Luther did. Like, in another place, Christ says, this is the communion of the devoted mass of the Holy Eucharist on Thursdays. You can look up the direct quotation there. Christ says, „Who does not eat of my flesh and not drink of My blood will not be in heaven." That would mean literally interpreted that no innocent child can go to heaven because he has not received the body and blood of the Lord. And even though sometimes in history it happened miraculously that an angel would come and distribute communion to an innocent child or a saint would come, some stuff like that, does not mean that all the innocent children who have not been able to receive communion are not in heaven. This would be against church doctrine, it would be against the defined doctrine of the church, Fourth Council of the Lateran. But this council here, and that explains why people sometimes go a little bit beyond the limits of church doctrine to fight this, which is very understandable. This council here says, „All this holds true, not for Christians only, but for all men of goodwill." No, it doesn't. Christ explicitly said that it is not enough to have goodwill and good works. Saint Paul explains that very well, too. You have to have the faith. The faith alone can save. Not the faith alone, but without the faith, you cannot be saved. Martin Luther said, „Sola fides, the faith alone." The Catholic Church says, „No, you have to have the faith, the good works, the sacraments. But without the faith, you cannot be saved, no matter how many sacraments you receive and how many good works you do."

EXTRA ECCLESIAM NULLA SALUS

As a matter of fact, it is about time to give you the literal quotation of what I quoted already several times over from the Council of Florence. Pope Eugene IV, proclaiming as a dogma of the church says... I give you the quotation first in Latin, because for those who want to look up things and do not have the sources, it will be easier. This is the Council of Florence in the year 1441 or ,42. They had different ways of counting the years in those days. (Latin) signed by Eugene IV. When a council solemnly declares, saying, (Latin) that the church firmly believes, professes, and preaches, then this is to be considered extraordinary teaching. It is to be considered dogma. The paragraph reads, (Latin) Nullus extra Catholica

ecclésiam existentis, non solum paganos, sed nec Judæos aut hæreticos aut schismaticos aeterni vitæ fíri posse participes, sed in ignem æternum ituros, qui paratus est diabolo et angeli ejus, nisi ante finem vitæ eadem fuerint aggregati. Tantumque valere ecclesiastici corporis unitatem, ut solum in ea manentibus, ac salutem ecclesiastica sacramenta proficiant, et iunia, elemosinae, accettare pietatis officia, ac exercitia militiae Christianae praemia aeterna parturiant. Neminemque, quantascumque elemosynas fecerit etsi pro Christi nomine sanguine mefuderit posse salvari. Nisi in Catholica Ecclesiæ gremio et unitate permanecerit. In English. The church firmly believes, professes, and preaches that nobody who is outside the Catholic, outside the church, who exists outside the Catholic Church, neither... Not, not only the pagans, but also not the Jews, also not the heretics, also not the schismatics, can be participant in eternal life. They cannot (Latin). But they will go into the eternal fire, which is prepared for the devil and his angels, unless they are joined with the church before the end of their life. And the council professes, believes and preaches that this ecclesiat-... The unity of this ecclesiastical body, we have again the Catholic concept of unity, not the heretical concept of Vatican II. The churches that are schismatic and heretical have to be united with us in order to have full union. The church has always enjoyed full union. So the council says, „And this unity of the body, of the ecclesiastical body, is worth so much that only those who remain within her and receive the salvation of the ecclesiastical sacraments, and profess them, and do their fastings and elemosynes, and all the other offices of piety, and all the other exercises of Christian virtues would have the eternal prize." That means salvation. Only those who remain within her will be able to save, be saved. And then the council quotes a source of a saint, thus canonizing his scriptures. The council says, „Nobody, how often and how many elemosynes he might have done, even if he was to shed his blood for the name of Christ, cannot be saved if he's not within the Catholic Church and its union."

I think this is pretty explicit. Objective judgment. I remind you, objective judgment. The church refuses to declare anybody in hell. The church would not allow me as a priest to say that Adolf Hitler or Joseph Stalin are in hell. I cannot judge that. Father Six was the worst criminal anyway because he put the lives of the souls in jeopardy when he affirmed Vatican II. We can never say that anybody's in hell. The church, however, has to say what you have to do in order to avoid hell. And objectively speaking, there is no such thing as Protestant martyrs. And objectively, therefore, when the present pope in Ut Unum Sint, I think it's 78 or 80. In Ut Unum Sint says that the saints come from all religions, he professes heresy and blasphemy. There cannot be a saint outside the Catholic Church. That is impossible. If anybody who is not within the Catholic Church for some act of mercy of God, which is beyond us, manages to go to heaven, as Archbishop Lefebvre very well said—then he does this despite of being a non-Catholic, and in spite of his religion, not because of his religion. This, however, does not keep the different documents of Vatican II to pronounce the contrary.

INTERNATIONAL ORDER AND AUTHORSHIP

I will skip most of the scandalous statements in Gaudium Et Spes. I have given you the worst ones. But let me quote 88, „Christians should willingly and wholeheartedly support the establishment of an international order." Oh. (laughs) This was written by Paul VI, not George Bush. (laughs) I have given you the most important quotations to document Gaudium Et Spes, and at least to some of the present people's surprise, I will now tell you who wrote this document. It was not George Bush, indeed. Indirectly, it was the so-called Blessed Josemaria Escriva de Balaguer, founder of the Opus Dei. I do not say that. His successor and former secretary, Dom Alvaro de Portillo says so in the introduction to one of the books of Josemaria Escriva de Balaguer. I've learned to be careful with pronouncements on the Opus Dei. They're very vicious in discussion, especially in written discussion, as Father Paul Kramer will prove to you in his book, at least concerning one of their priests. The introduction written by Alvaro de Portillo says that at the time of the council, while Josemaria Escriva de Balaguer was not able to attend all of the sessions, his secretary was there as an expert, Alvaro de Portillo. And Alvaro de Portillo, in his foreword to the book says that, „Gaudium Et Spes expresses very clearly the majority of the thoughts and ideas of the founder of the Opus Dei." And indeed, there are witnesses to the fact that when, in the

time of Pius XII, membership in the Communist Party was under excommunication, Josemaria Escriva de Balaguer admitted communists into his Opus Dei without asking them to leave the party. This is how much the future saint, quote-unquote, respected the pope's orders.

MODERNISM AND THE LAITY

Here we see a pernicious doctrine coming up that puts the laity as the basis of all change. I have just been quoting Pius X's encyclical on modernism. And even though I did so in Philadelphia, and you will be able to read about it in the Catholic Family News, I will read the most important point of Pascendi Dominici Gregis to you. In the edition of the Saint Paul editions, you find the encyclical letter of Pope Pius X on the doctrines of the modernists, Pascendi Dominici Gregis together with the syllabus condemning the errors of the modernists. This is another syllabus, not the one of Pius IX. They have their own numbers in their edition, number 27, the pope says... The pope is talking about the methods of the modernists who destroy faith. And he says they believe in the principle of change.

THOMISTIC PHILOSOPHY AND CHANGE

Thomistic philosophy says that a thing is what it is, res est quod est. Thomistic philosophy is based on the principle of non-contradiction. A thing, one and the same thing, cannot be and not be at the same time. That's impossible. From the same viewpoint, nothing can be and not be at the same time. As a matter of fact, not just from the same viewpoint, but things cannot objectively be and not be at the same time. It is not possible that I am a priest and not a priest at the same time. It is not possible that this is a magnifying lens, and at the same time it is not. And if some rude person would abuse this wine glass as an ashtray, it does not become an ashtray. It is a wine glass abused as an ashtray. But even if it was to be found as an archaeological finding in 200 years from now, and they would say, „Hey, wait a second. What is this? I've never seen this before," because Hillary meanwhile abolished alcohol again. (laughs) Might say, „Okay, I'm gonna stamp out my joint here." (laughs) And he calls it an ashtray. Does that make it an ashtray? No, it doesn't. It's still a wine glass abused as an ashtray. Things are what they are, and not anything else. In modern philosophy, on which unfortunately, the present pope's philosophy is based, things are not necessarily what they are. It depends on the century, the view of the culture. It depends on how I see it. It depends on how other people see it. This is not an objective basis of thinking. It is, as a matter of fact, lowering oneself into pure and total subjectivism. Subjectivism is something to be condemned, also because subjectivism means that everybody's right. And that is, of course, a lot of nonsense. Only one thing can be right, not many at the same time. A thing is what it is, and nothing else. This is a wine glass and not an ashtray.

CONSERVATIVES AND PROGRESSIVES

Now, as things change naturally, we have a dialogue between the changing things... in this dialogue, we have to discuss from different viewpoints. And so, Pius X, who was an extremely intelligent and experienced person, very well analyzed the deepest problem of the modernists. He says, „There are the conservatives and there are the progressives." You'veheard that before, didn't you? „Although evolution is urged on by needs of necessity, yet if controlled by these alone, it would easily overstep the boundaries of tradition, and thus separated from its primitive vital principle, would make for ruin instead of progress. Hence, by those who study more closely the ideas of the modernists, evolution is described as a resultant from the conflict of two forces, one of them tending towards progress, the other towards conservation. The conserving force exists in the Church and is found in tradition. Tradition is represented..." This is what the modernists say, not Pius X, okay? „Tradition is represented by religious authority, and this both by right and in fact. By right, for it is in the very nature of authority to protect tradition. And in fact, since authority, raised as it is above the contingencies of life, feels hardly, or not at all, the spurs of progress." So this is the conservatives. That means Cardinal Ratzinger would condemn a heresy because he, being an author-

ity behind closed walls, not understanding anyway what's going on in the world, not aware of the needs of the faithful, naive, academic, full of dust- (laughing) ... will have to defend tradition, at least to a certain point, which he does. But, „The progressive force, on the contrary, which responds to the inner needs, lies in the individual consciences and works in them, especially in such of them as are in more close and intimate contact with life."

OPUS DEI AND LIBERALISM

This is exactly why you have the Cursillo and all the basic groups, and why you have the laity telling the bishops what they need, and why you have all the laypeople saying the prayers of the faithful instead of saying the prayers the saints wrote. This is why we have a discussion between the progressives and the conservatives. And here comes in the role of the Opus Dei. The Opus Dei has sworn a particular fidelity to the Papacy, just like the Jesuits long ago. Long ago. (laughing) The Opus Dei defends whatever the pope says. They're absolutely loyal to the pope. They are not absolutely loyal, if ever, to the teaching of the Church. They are loyal to what the pope says now. If the pope now says that the Muslims together with us adore one merciful God, the Opus Dei will say, „The Muslims together with us adore one merciful God." If the pope says now there must be dialogue with the non-Christians, and the Holy Spirit can be found in other religions, and that the Spirit of Christ does not deny salvation to other churches such as the Protestant, then the Opus Dei will say, „Yes, absolutely, that's what it is." And if the present pope says that every human being is entitled to choose his own religion, the Opus Dei will say, „Yes, that's exactly what it is." If the pope, on the other hand, says that you must not practice artificial contraception, the Opus Dei will, for the same reason, say, „Yes, exactly, you must not." If the pope says abortion is murder, the Opus Dei will say abortion is murder. And this is the difference now to the liberals. The liberals will always say what they like in the Opus Dei and in the pope, and they will condemn what they do not like, because why is this? Well, Vatican II has given them full authority. So has the present pope. They are the ones who cause the change in tradition. They are the ones with their inner needs and with their religious experiences, and with their own pondering the facts come to the conclusion the Holy Father has said, „I must find myself." (laughing) He did. He did, he did, he did. Redemptor Hominis, I think it is. „The Holy Father has said now find, I must find myself. I only can find myself in sex." (laughing) „So probably, the Holy Father has to change his opinion on artificial contraception. Also, at the same time, I heard that my local bishop said that I may take the pill, but my local parish priest said that I may take the pill, and the bishop said the same thing, and the Holy Father's not chastising them. So maybe in reality the Holy Father thinks the same thing. I don't know." I'm quoting a lady, literally, her name will not be named. You wouldn't know her anyway. But this is a literal quotation. „My parish priest said it's all right. His bishop did not say anything against it when confronted with the question, and the pope did not yet criticize the bishop for anything." So this lady finds herself in wild sex. (laughing) This is the needs of the faithful, as it is called here. This is the inner needs. This is their contribution to the development of tradition.

PIUS X ON THE LAITY

All of this can be reduced, and I quote now Saint Pius X again. „All of this can be reduced to the following. ‚Already we observe the introduction of that most pernicious doctrine which would make of the laity the factor of progress in the Church.'" Saint Pius X on Vatican II's concept of tradition. The laity as the factor of progress in the church. One of the things that Josemaria Escriva de Balaguer, the founder of the Opus Dei, never got tired to insist is, to say that the Church is based on the laity. It is not. As Archbishop Lefebvre very well said, „The Church is essentially a priestly church." God, the pope, the bishops, the priests, and the laypeople. The latter of whom cannot be anything without the clergy, and cannot have any proper vocation. There are some among us here who exercise an admirable mission (pauses) among the non-Catholic members of the Church of the New Advent. Their mission has my blessing. Their mission cannot be a mission if it is not blessed by a priest. Their mission is not a mission if it is not blessed by the Church, and if it is not asked for by the Church. If the Church did not want some of you to do this

wonderful mission, then you would not have a mission. You would just be doing your own business. But because the Church, because the priests, and because the bishops, because Archbishop Lefebvre said, „We must inform the people, because we must tell the people the truth." We must inform them. And because I, as a priest of the Catholic Church, say unto you, „You must inform your family, your friends, your neighbors." You have the mission. This mission comes from above, like I have received it from above. I have been asked to inform the people, and Archbishop Lefebvre received his mission when at his own consecration. The book of the Gospel was put on his head like this. (pauses) This is the moment a bishop receives the mission. This is the moment he receives the power to teach in the name of our Lord. And only when he receives this, he can, with imposition of his hands at the priestly ordination, give this mission to a priest. And I give it to you with my blessing. (applause) (Benedicite Omi Potentis, Patris Filii et Spiritus Sancti descenda super vos et per mannes eis semper.)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Questions and answers. Please, when you ask a question—Speak, speak out loud please. Yeah. Please shout and scream so you can be heard on the tape. Yes? (?). Hey, we should do one thing. Who wants to ask a question? Come up here to this table and speak into the microphone, please. Don't be afraid. Don't be shy. (laughing) The one who laughs about questions is dumb, not the one who asks them.

Q1: THE SIGNING BISHOPS

QUESTIONER: The first question is, um, do you think that all the bishops who signed the documents at the Second Vatican Council, uh, ceased to be Catholic because they signed those documents?

SPEAKER: I refer to the distinction of objective and subjective that I did yesterday.

QUESTIONER (CLARIFYING): Can you repeat the question? (crosstalk) She asked me, she asked me if all the bishops and priests who s-, all the bishops who signed all those documents in Vatican II are, if they left the Church.

SPEAKER: Of course not. I again have to repeat, you have to talk about things objectively or subjectively. Most of these bishops, and I still feel sorry for them, were presented with mountains of papers 40 minutes before they had to vote on them. Only the bishops who knew what they were signing, and signed it willingly, left the Church. Most of the bishops of Vatican II had no clue what was going on. And as a matter of fact, some of the bishops in Vatican II afterwards confessed that. They said, „At the time, we had no idea what was going on." One of the bishops who signed the first document in Vatican II, which I have sufficiently dealt with yesterday, said, „If we had known what this means, we would've never signed it." Vatican II is a council that was made by experts. Experts drew up a lot of rubbish, sometimes something like 30 pages, 30 full-size legal paper pages. And they were given to the bishops 40 minutes before the council voted on yes or no. Now, you have to understand human weaknesses, too. A bishop in his diocese has no time for anything. If a bishop... And in those days, these bishops were real bishops. They took, most of them, took care of their diocese, tried to solve the problems of the care of the souls. For them, Vatican II was a vacation. They went to Rome for glorious three months, and all I had to do is come celebrate with the pope and press a button for yes or no. Many of these bishops were idiots who didn't know anything about theology. Believe me, I've met them. Many of these bishops were not idiots at all, but were too consumed with the problems of their own diocese to give too much of a thought to the documents in the council. Many of the bishops were just simply tricked. They were told, „This is all right. And the Pope will take care that nothing bad comes out of it." Which was a lie. The Pope took care that everything bad came out of it. Many other bishops just fell into a century-old trap, like Archbishop Lefebvre said, „I signed because I couldn't possibly believe that the Pope would sign something which is so wrong." And only when he heard about ecumenism, he said, „No. I'm sorry. That's too much." And he didn't sign anymore. One of the few enlightened characters who plainly simply refused to sign any of the documents of Vatican II was Bishop de Castro Mayer. Oh, wow. (clapping)

Q2: SEDEVACANTISM

QUESTIONER: Uh, Father, could you please comment on, uh, the allegation that the Chair of Peter is vacant?

SPEAKER: Yes. There are some people who say because the present pope is a heretic, we do not have a pope. I have mentioned this yesterday already. I repeat short and to the point. Unless a pope is in formal heresy, he does not cease to be pope. The present pope has never said contrary to what the Council of Trent teaches, I say... He has never said, „Contrary to what Pope Eugene IV says, I tell you that the spirit of Christ does not refrain from giving salvation to the Protestant church, to the efforts of the Protestant churches." If he had said that, he would immediately cease to be pope. The commentary on the new code of canon law issued by the Canon Law Society of America says, „If a pope was to teach formal heresy, he would cease to be pope. On that, we all agree. But then we don't know what to do if he ceases to be pope." However, the present pope, it's very devious, but nevertheless, the present pope says, „In accordance with tradition, I tell you..." The present pope, because of his totally wrong concept of tradition, believes that the syllabus of Pius IX is outdated. He never says, „Contrary to what Pius IX said, I tell you..." He just says, „In accordance with what everybody before us said, I tell you..." And then, he comes up with a heresy. That makes him a material heretic, but not a formal heretic. Pope Innocent III very clearly indicated the possibility that there might be a pope who teaches heresy and never said that he will cease to be pope. You will see just from the logical context, Pope Innocent III said, „If a future pope was to proclaim heresy, you just must not follow him." This means at the same time, he still is pope. The president of the United States of America is a traitor to this country because against the Second Amendment of the Constitution, to say the least. He has not ceased to be president. If he will try to abolish Congress, he would immediately cease to be president. But at the moment, he's a lousy president, but he is president. He is in the White House. He is the supreme commander. He is the president. All we can say is, „Unfortunately." which I quoted yesterday, I think I quoted it yesterday, but I did so in Philadelphia, too, Paul IV. In this document, Paul IV, it's a dogmatic document. The document can never be revoked or changed, except for disciplinary matters. This is what I explained yesterday. Pope Paul IV says, „A cardinal who was a heretic or is a heretic cannot become validly pope." This is a disciplinary regulation of a disciplinary matter because the papal election's an act of administration. It is not an act by the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit offers His inspiration to all the participants in the conclave. But the Holy Spirit cannot go against the free will of human being. It would not be a free will anymore. Therefore, 120 cardinals at the same time might as well reject the Holy Spirit's inspiration. And many of them did, obviously, in 1978. The election of a pope is nothing but a mere act of administration, and it can be ruled over by any pope who wants. As a matter of fact, no pope after Paul IV ever said again that a cardinal who was a heretic cannot become pope. A cardinal who is a formal heretic cannot become pope because if he's a formal heretic, he does not hold office. But a cardinal who was a heretic, no matter formal or material, definitely can become pope if he converts. No pope after Paul IV has ever said anything to the contrary. When Pope Pius X renewed the order of the conclave, he didn't mention that fact at all. And even though it is mentioned in a document that is infallible in itself, disciplinary matters cannot be infallible. Refer to my lecture yesterday.

Q3: SEDEVACANTIST GROUPS

QUESTIONER: At the see of the countries have stated the chair is an empty inspired default. They're an error, right?

SPEAKER: They're an error, yes. I would not say that the state of account is not schism because many theologians hold that if you consider a pope a suspicious person, and if you have grounds to prove that he is a suspicious person, if you hold him suspicious, then you are not in schism if you reject him. Not his being pope, but him. Uh, if the present pope is not a suspicious person, I ain't seen one yet.

Q4: VATICAN II AND TRADITION

QUESTIONER: Um, Father, in light of all that you have said about Magis II, is it possible or desirable to reconcile with tradition and with authentic church doctrines, or must it be entirely ?

SPEAKER: I was asked if, in light of what I said today, it is possible and desirable... if it is possible or desirable to reconcile Vatican II with tradition or to repudiate it totally? I would choose the latter option for the simple reason of what I said yesterday. Many parts in Vatican II, as you could easily see today, are in direct contradiction to the church teachings so they cannot be reconciled. That's impossible. And it would be much easier, since Vatican II did not come with anything original or positive content, there is no interest, not any teaching of interest in this council that we would want to preserve, or at least not really much. It would be much easier to write up a declaration that explains why the council has to be rejected as such. I remind you of what I said yesterday, in toto, not in omnibus. It is impossible to reject the council in every single line. You can't do that. You would be a heretic because the council quotes Trent and other councils. But you have to reject it as such, as a council, as a book. I mean, the easiest way to explain this is, there's many truths in this book, there are many lies in this book, so you reject the entire book, not page so-and-so, page so-and-so, page so-and-so. Actually, in a certain sense, not even I have the authority to do that. All I can do is to prove to you by quotations that parts of this book are totally unacceptable. I think I did that. I cannot say now, in giving you a full list of theological qualifications, „This here, point so-and-so is heresy, point so-and-so is near to heresy, point so-and-so is just erroneous." I do not have the authority for that. A future pope has the authority, but a future pope can save himself a lot of trouble if he just quotes the worst parts of the council, says, „This is herewith condemned because it's heretical, against the faith, rash, offensive to pious ears," and whatever, and the rest of the book, forget it. Practically, this is the only thing he will have to do unless he wants to write up another 5,000 pages of declaration, which nobody will read anyway, as usual. And I think the council has to be rejected as such, even though it is impossible to reject every line.

Q5: THE PAPAL ELECTION

QUESTIONER: Um, I was a normal brainwashed conciliar Catholic, and I... I was taught that the election of the pope was, uh, an act of the Holy Spirit. Yeah.

SPEAKER: She said she was a... she said she was a normal brainwashed conciliar Catholic. That's a very good expression. And she was taught that the election of the Holy Spirit... the election of the pope is an act of the Holy Spirit. No, it is not. The Holy Spirit offers to every participant in the conclave his assistance. I have a very strong conviction that an honest and dear person to me, somebody with whom I worked, Cardinal Stickler, whom I hold very dear in my heart as a friend of 22 years, whom I believe to be a very, very honest person, deeply pious. If he was, he will never be in a conclave because he's now over 80, and according to the stupid rules of politics, they cannot participate. However, it's a valid rule. If Cardinal Stickler was to enter the conclave, he would kneel down, ask the Holy Spirit to tell him whom to elect, and at least in a dream at night, he would find the name. The Holy Spirit will give the name to be elected to everyone who asks for it. But how can the Holy Spirit, I ask you in all logics and reasoning, how can the Holy Spirit force a cardinal to elect a certain other cardinal to pope? How can he force him? Where's the free human will then? So by the nature of the free human will, the conclave cannot be an act of the Holy Spirit.

Q6: JESUS AND THE CHURCH

QUESTIONER: The question was, „If Jesus... if Jesus promised to be always with the church, what part of the church is he with?"

SPEAKER: There is no such thing. I have to go back to what I quoted from Leo XIII's Satis Cognitum. The church is always one. Jesus is always with the one church. The one church is indefectible. The one church is infallible. Those people who willingly speak against the doctrine of the church, they have personally left the church. Christ is not with them. There is no such thing as a part of the church that Christ is with and a part that he is not. The paradox today is that when Pope John Paul II is speaking, the pope of the Catholic Church is speaking, the vicar of Christ is speaking, but the moment he speaks against the doctrine of the church, he personally puts himself outside the church, personally. And this has been foreseen as a possibility. When Innocent III... I have to quote him again. When Innocent III said, „If a future pope was to teach heresy, do not follow him."

QUESTIONER: I understand all that, Father, but somewhere in this world must be some doctrine, must be some assurance that-

SPEAKER: Yes, everything the popes... there must be some doctrine somewhere. There must be some security somewhere. This is why Archbishop Lefebvre never got tired of telling everybody, „Read what the popes wrote until 1958, until the death of Pius XII." There cannot be a single doubt about what the popes wrote, and this is the answer. Everything until 1958, you can be sure.

Q7: THE CHURCH TODAY

QUESTIONER: (clears throat) I'd like to try to clarify a question and follow up on it. The idea is, where is the one true church now? Much of the magisterium has said theoretically, a certain percentage, 40%, 50%. If not now, but in the future.

SPEAKER: I was asked, „Where is the one true church to be found now?" I take it as asking the mere practical question. How do I know who's a Catholic? It's very simple. Ask him what he thinks about what Archbishop Lefebvre said. You may never get along. That's- I'm talking about doctrinal things. I'm not talking about political things. Sometimes people cannot get along with them because there's personal questions involved, jealousy, stupidity, ignorance, whatever. I'm not saying... I'm not saying that anybody who is not in agreement with the Society of St. Pius X is not in the Church, because that's something that Archbishop Lefebvre, Bishop Fellay, Bishops Williamson, Tissier de Malleray, Galarreta, would definitely refuse and did refuse. I'm saying that those people who are in agreement with Archbishop Lefebvre, you will know that you're facing a Catholic. I cannot, as I am not the pope, say that all people who disagree with Archbishop Lefebvre are outside the Church. You wanted a practical answer to a practical question. You want to know when you face a priest who is saying the right things. There is a positive proof. There is no negative proof. If you face a priest who says Archbishop Lefebvre was right, then you face a Catholic in his doctrine.

Q8: A PRIESTLY VOCATION

QUESTIONER: Father, if a man comes to you and says, „I think I have a vocation to the priesthood, Father," what advice would you give him as to how he could realize that and save his soul?

SPEAKER: If a man was to come to me to say, „Father, I think I have a vocation, I want to become a priest." I would say, „Try Winona or one of the other seminaries of the Society of St. Pius X, whichever one you like best."

Q9: THE NEW CATECHISM

QUESTIONER: No, another? Yeah. Uh, Father, is the new Catechism trustworthy?

SPEAKER: I was asked if the new Catechism is trustworthy. I apologize for not having mentioned it before. As the new Catechism literally quotes the worst

parts of Vatican II, I think I have answered the question. (laughing) Okay? That's it then. Thank you. (clapping)