VATICAN II VS. SYLLABUS OF ERRORS

Fr. G. Hesse

Everyone, I want to thank you all for coming today to meet Father Gregory Hesse. He is, uh, recently beginning talks in Philadelphia, Medford, Oregon, and we're very happy to have him here with us today. Next week, he will be speaking in New Orleans, and then Ohio and New York before his return to his home in Vienna, Austria. His trip to the US are being sponsored by Meta. You all, you're all familiar with Meta. Yeah. Uh, Father Hess studied and worked among bishops and cardinals in Rome for 15 years. He has his bachelor's from... Father Gregory Hesse. Accionis nostras quaesumus domine. Esperando preveniat adiuvandos prosequimcunque nostros oratio et operatio vertice in principio per te accepta. Finem tropicae Christum Dominum nostrum. Sancte Pio Decime, ora pro nobis.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS AND CLARIFICATIONS

WINE AND CHRIST'S FIRST MIRACLE

First things first, I heard some people disapproved of my drinking wine on the first video that was made in New Orleans at the, uh, in springtime this year. Those people who do not like me to- to drink wine and those people who do not like to see me drinking wine should remember what the first miracle was that Christ made. Do I have to say more? No. Thank you.

THE "SELF-APPOINTED THEOLOGIAN"

Some people... I have to correct another misunderstanding. Some people had the audacity to call me a self-appointed theologian. That is not correct. I hold a doctorate in theology of the Pontifical University of Saint Thomas Aquinas in Rome. That means the pope appointed me a theologian, not I.

CARDINALS AND CHURCH POLITICS

Sometimes people ask me what, uh, Cardinal so-and-so meant and what he's going to... W- When he said something and what he's going to do in- in the future, and how is the relationship between the pope and the cardinals, and how is the relationship between the cardinals and the bishops and so on. And in my first tape, I said that this is, to me, a kind of theological Weekly World News and National Enquirer. I do not want to offend these papers, but don't ask questions about what should be in the Rainbow Press and not in Good Theology.

COUNCIL OF TRENT, CANON 13

There's another thing that I have to clear up. I was quoting Canon 13 of the Seventh Session of the Council of Trent. And this canon, this is very important, this canon outlaws any f- future writing up of a new liturgy. This canon is unfortunately most of the times translated in a wrong way. Even with tan books... I

can only recommend tan book- tan books to you, but sometimes, of course, everybody makes mi- makes mistakes, you just heard mine. Uh, sometimes things are not translated in a correct way, and that can cause a lot of confusion.

Now, Canon 13 of the Seventh Session of the Council of Trent in English, „If anyone says that the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church once to be used in the solemn administration of the sacraments may be contemned or without sin be omitted at pleasure by the ministers or be changed by every pastor of the churches into other new ones, let him be anathema." That translation is wrong. It doesn't say or changed by every pastor because in the Latin it says, „Si quis dixerit receptos et aprobatos Ecclesiae Catholicae ritus in solemni sacramentorum administratione ad hyperi consuetos aut contemni aut sine peccato a ministris pro libito omitte audient novos alios per quem cumque ecclesiarum pastorem mutari posse anathema sit." „Per quem cumque," by whomsoever. And that makes... That gives a totally different significance to this canon. If you say that if anyone says that the- the- the Catholic and the- uh, the- the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church can be changed by every pastor, you're not saying anything new. We don't need the Council of Trent to tel- to tell me that, uh- uh, I must not change the rites. I don't need the Council of Trent for explaining to me that the- the- the Catholic liturgy cannot be changed around by every single parish priest. And that's not what the council intended to say. As a matter of fact, the council is talking about, uh, people who, um, do not esteem the approved and habitual rites of the church because it says, „Once to be used in the solemn administration of the sacraments these rites may be contemned." And the council says whoever says they may be contemned is to be held outside the church. The Council of Trent says, „Whoever says that he can leave out things, something, words, sentences, meanings, gestures in these rites at pleasure by the ministers, he ought to be considered outside the church."

Now, the Council of Trent has just said that nobody can change the rites. It doesn't have to repeat it by saying changed by every pastor. The council in- in- in fact intended to say and said per quem cumque ecclesiarum pastorem, by whomsoever. Now, whomsoever includes the popes. The pope is a pastor of the churches, he's Bishop of Rome, Archbishop of the Province of Latium, Primate of Italy, Patriarch of the West, Vicar of Christ, and servant of the servants of God.... the pope cannot write up new rites. That's what the Council of Trent said. This is what Pope Innocent III said when he said, „If a future pope was to change round all the sacraments and everything, you do not follow him." And at the Council of Florence, Pope Eugene IV had as his personal theologian, a certain Cardinal Torquemada, the uncle of the famous and saintly inquisitor in Spain. And Cardinal Torquemada wrote a book which is called Summa Ecclesiae. And in his book, Summa Ecclesiae, he says, „If a pope was to try to change all the rites and the sacraments, he puts himself outside the church." Pope Eugene IV read that book, and he gave the title Defender of the Faith to Cardinal Torquemada.

IMPORTANT THEOLOGICAL DISTINCTIONS

Before I start to explain to you the problems of Vatican II, I want to make some very important distinctions. I know this, in recent conversations, in discussions, even with famous writers, with famous learned men, very learned men, that there seems to be a great difficulty to apply the distinction of objective and subjective, even by people who are very learned and are quite able to explain the distinction to me academically. Still, they have a problem applying it. So let me make a few distinctions, starting with objective/subjective.

OBJECTIVE VS. SUBJECTIVE

Now, the word objective. You can check me, you can check me on everything I say. Check me with the American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language if you don't trust my explanation. Objective means something concerns the object, the thing. Subjective means something concerns the person. So when I pronounce an objective judgment, I judge facts and things or actions. When I pronounce a subjective judgment, I judge a person, and I do not want to do that, by the way. Objectively, this is a very good

wine. Subjectively, not everybody might like it. Objectively means concerning the thing itself, what it is and how it is. Subjectively means what it means to me, how I understand it. When the Council of Florence, Pope Eugene IV, in 1441, said that nobody who is not subject to the Roman pontiff, even if he was to shed his blood for Christ, cannot be saved, the pope was pronouncing an objective judgment. The pope did not say that all Protestants are in Hell. The pope said, „Objectively speaking, they have no chance to be saved." Subjectively, what the Lord will do with them, we do not know. (Latin) The Church does not judge internal things. (Latin) The Church does not judge the dead. So this is the distinction of objective and subjective.

MATERIAL VS. FORMAL

There has to be a distinction of material and formal. Material means some- means something is there, it exists, it is there. Formal means it is e- it is declared as such. When I say that the present pope is a heretic, sometimes that causes raised eyebrows and harsh criticisms. I say the present pope is a material heretic. That means there is heresy to be found in his writings, and I will prove it to you, and I have proved it to you on the first tape. I do not say he is a heretic in the sense that he wants to say heresy, that he commits the sin of heresy. I would not dare to pronounce this judgment. Nobody can judge the pope anyway, and nobody can chur- can judge other people's intentions and other people's consciences. We can only judge what we see. I see there is heresy printed, so it is there. Material heresy. The matter of heresy is there. I do not say it is formal heresy. To show you the difference, the present pope always says, „In accordance with tradition, I say to you..." and then he says something wrong. Well, obviously, he doesn't mean to say heresy, or he wouldn't say, „In accordance to tradition." But if he was to say, „Contrary to what the Council of Trent taught you, I say..." In that moment, he ceases to be pope, most probably, because that would be objective formal heresy, not material heresy.

VALID VS. LICIT

There's another distinction. It is unbelievable what people say after I held a speech or gave a sermon. I once said, „The new Mass of Paul VI, celebrated in Latin according to the book, most probably is validly celebrated." And somebody walked out of the session and said, „Father Hess says the new Mass is all right." I didn't say it's all right. I said it's valid under certain circumstances. Valid means validity. It takes place, it is there. It is not licit. The question of liceity, is it licit or not licit, means is it allowed or not allowed? Under certain circumstances, the new rites of the sacraments may take place as well. That doesn't mean they are allowed. See, the Russian Orthodox Church, the, the, the Catholic Church always recognizes the fact that the Russian Orthodox Church has all the seven sacraments valid-... but not licit because they're heretics and schismatics. They're heretics because they say the pope is not infallible, never infallible, and they are schismatics because they say the pope does not have the primacy. But they celebrate validly. So you have to get this distinction right, valid and licit.

ACT VS. POTENCY

Then, there's something very important to be said about today's usage of language, and here I want to give you the distinction of act and potency. The entire philosophy of Saint Thomas Aquinas is based on the distinction of act and potency. A thing, anything, anything that is, can be in two ways: actually or potentially. Something that is might be already what it should be and is, and it might be something else in the future. Vatican II and the present pope do not use this distinction because they're based on a different philosophy, and that causes a lot of confusion. When the present pope says, „Our people are saved," is he right? Yes, he is right. Oh, yeah. Oh, yes. Our people are saved in potency, potentially. Possibly they are saved. Possibly. When Christ, Christ died on the cross, in order to enable mankind to be saved. Doesn't mean that everybody will be saved, and actually, not everybody is saved. Our Lady showed the children that Hell is packed with people when she appeared in, in, uh, Fa- in Fatima, in 1917. So, when I speak

English, you will agree with me, I have to submit to the rules of speaking English. When I speak, I have to submit to the rules of speaking. I do not think you would appreciate it very much if I was to tell you, „I am pope." I am pope, potentially. So is every male present. I am pope, potentially. As long as I tell you that possibly I might become pope but the probability is zilch, you will say, „Yes, okay." (laughs) But if I was to say to you, „I am pope," you would say, „This guy is nuts." Rightly so. If I say to you, „Possibly, possibly, in as far as potentiality, possibility is concerned, Christ saved everybody," he did not as far as the actuality is concerned save everybody because there's enough people who say no. So, uh, I try my best to submit to the rules of the English language and to the rules of language, and I request the pope to do the same. I have a right to request it because he's our supreme teacher, and I have a right to demand from my supreme teacher that he uses the language correctly. So I want him to say, „Not everybody is saved, only potentially everybody is saved." So far for the distinctions.

HERESY, SCHISM, ERROR, DISOBEDIENCE

Then there is a difference between heresy, schism, error, disobedience. Schism means, „I separate myself from the Church, not denying anything of the faith itself, but I separate myself from the Church, denying the Church authority." If I tell you that you shouldn't listen to the pope when he says something wrong, I just tell you what Pope Innocent III said. I just tell you what Pope Pius IX said. If I was to tell you, „You should not regard this pope anyway," then I would lead you into schism. Do not deny the power of decision to the pope. Look, President Clinton is president or not? Yes. Unfortunately, yes. (laughs) She is pre- uh, um, excuse me. He, he, he is president. (laughs) He is president. Is she, uh, is he the, uh, is he the, the, the supreme commander of the Armed Forces of the United States? Yes, unfortunately. Yes. We must not deny this. We have no right to deny this. But if he was to tell me as supreme commander that I should disregard the Ten Commandments, I will say, „No, sir. I will not." I reject the command. I do not reject his power to give the command. And this is our relationship to the present pope. We are sorry for what he does, but we do not deny that he is pope. We do not deny that he has the power. We do not deny that only the Catholic Church is the right church. We do not deny that the Catholic Church has to be led by the pope as the Vicar of Christ. (coughs) Anybody of you who denies that is in schism with the Church.

What does heresy mean? Heresy means, materially, objectively, first of all, heresy means you deny or doubt a defined doctrine of the Church. If you'll say, „Our Lady was not immaculately conceived," you're a heretic. If you say, „I'm really not sure if this really happened," you're a heretic. Materially first, because you might have misunderstood something. Formally, if you say, „I don't care what the Church says, it's not true." You might be in error. Contrary to heresy, which means that you know the dogma of the Church and you deny or doubt it, you might have an, uh, a mistaken understanding of what the Church says. You might be erroneous. Sometimes this present pope is-... in error, sometimes it's in heresy, materially. If I have to suppose that there is something the church defined that he has to know, and he says something to the contrary, then I see he is a heretic. If I see that he misunderstood, clearly misunderstood a dogma, then I have to talk about error. Always judging objectively and materially.

Disobedience has nothing got to do with schism or heresy or error. When Archbishop Lefebvre denied the pope's command not to consecrate bishops, well, at first gl- at first glance, he was disobedient. I have explained in my other tape why he was not disobedient. He was disobedient to a wrong and unjust and dangerous command coming from the pope. He was not disobedient to tradition and the will of Christ. But in a, in no case, and from no viewpoint is it justified to say that he's in schism. Schism means to deny the authority of the pope, not to disobey a command. I've explained that. These distinctions must be clear in your minds, otherwise you will not understand what I'm g- about to say.

LOCI THEOLOGICI

And then there's something that I have to explain about what is called in Latin, the loci theologici, the

theological places, the theological positions. I told you that something might be heresy and something might be erroneous, but there are finer distinctions than that. A Catholic truth can be de fide divina, by divine faith. That is when the Council of Trent or the Council of Florence or First Vatican Council declared a dogma. It might be de fide catholica. That is when the church has always believed it. De fide catholica means the church has always believed it, it's part of the faith, like the creed. De fide definita means the church has always believed it but once in history, a pope made a definition. When in 1854 Pope Pius IX proclaimed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, he did not tell us anything new. He just made a definition about what it is exactly to mean.

Then you might have a theological judgment, which is called fidei proxima, closest to the faith. That means it's not a dogma, but the church has always believed it, and it could be a dogma anytime. Like for example, the Co-redemptrix, the fact that Our Lady has had the first role in helping with redemption. That will have to be defined eventually for the simple reason that many people are confused about what it means. Did Our Lady redeem us? No. Our Lord did, and only our Lord. Then why may she get the title of Co-redemptrix? What does it exactly mean? Well, I'm not the pope and I won't define it, but the pope should in the future. But it is a sententia fidei proxima, that means you may not deny it without fear of punishment from God.

Then there is a sententia certa, that means it is not actually of the faith, but, uh, we are very sure about it. Then there's something which is sententia communis. That means we might not even be sure about it, but everybody says so. Not in the sense of democracy, but in the sense of historical accordance, in the sense that, uh, most of the saints agreed on it, most of the theologians in, in history and church teachers agreed on it, and most of the popes agreed on it. That's a sententia communis. And then you have a sententia probabilis. It is probable, that means. We don't know exactly, but probably that's what it is. Like, uh, the old question, what happens, uh, in certain circumstances if somebody who is not, uh, uh, in the state of grace dies with an act of contrition? Church always said if he does a perfect act of contrition, he will be saved, but we don't... It's not a dogma. It is most probably so. Most probably he will be saved. It is, uh, the sententia probabilis means we don't know any better than what we got here. Probably this is what it is, but, uh, uh, we have not yet understood sacred scripture and tradition enough to be sure about it.

ECCLESIASTICAL CENSURES

And then there's the ecclesiastical censures. I've been criticized for calling Vatican II a heretical council, because they said there's many true things in here, many true quotations, and then there are many quotations in here that are definitely not heresy, but just strange, ambiguous, funny, weird. So let me make... let me, uh, uh, uh, explain these terms to you. If something is heretical, it is directly denying a dogma of the faith. If something is heresy proxima, close to heresy, it is not actually denying literally a dogma, but it's coming pretty close to it. If something is erroneous, it is not denying a dogma, it's just making a mistake about it. If something is errori proxima, closest to an error, it is not wrong in itself, but by circumstances. If something is temeraria, it means it's rather daring to say so. In the first document of Vatican II you will find a lot of things that the church considers daring. It's daring to say so. What does it mean, it's daring to say so?

Now... the fact that priests in the traditional rite of the Latin church say the Leonine prayers after mass, the three Hail Marys, the Salve Regina, and so on, has been established by Pope Leo the 13th. They cannot possibly say it's an ancient tradition, right? But if I was to say, „Oh, we don't need that," obviously it's not heresy. It was not defined that we have to say it. Obviously it's not close to heresy. Obviously it's not erroneous because we're not talking about the truth or the faith. If I was to say we don't need the Leonine prayers, I would say something that is daring, because how dare I say it? How dare you say it? And at the same time, it's malis sonans. It doesn't sound good. It never sounds good if you criticize tradition. And it is piarum aurium offensiva. It's offensive to pious ears. Somebody tells me, „I don't give a damn about the Leonine prayers," I'm offended, because I hold them dear to my heart. They're more needed than ever before nowadays. If somebody really expresses his, uh, his, uh, uh, viewpoints like this, I'm offended. I'm offended in my pious ears, because in my piety, in my submission to tradition, in my ac-

cepting what is tradition, in my respect for Leo the 13th, I'm offended. And it is scandalous too when done, when done in public, because some other people will be offended and say, „What's this guy? What's his authority? How does he dare to say Pope Leo the 13th was wrong?" Now, I will say to you in certain circumstances that, uh, John the 23rd, Paul the 6th, John Paul the 1st, and John Paul the 2nd are wrong, and sometimes even Pius the 12th in his actions was wrong. How dare I say it? Well, when I say it, I explain it to you. I do not just say that's a fact and you better, you better believe it. That would be daring and offensive, and this is another sin here of the church.

THE MANDATE TO SPEAK TRUTH

So before I start a detailed lecture of some of the scandalous documents of Vatican II, let me quote the Gospel. „But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and he were drowned in the depth of the sea." Some people say, „Why does this Father Hess not... Why is he not kind and nice like all the others? Why does he fight? Why does he draw a sword when we want peace?" Think not that I am come to send peace on Earth. I came not to send peace, but a sword. (Latin) Some say this Father Hess is a rigorist. Let me quote another rigorist. „For verily I say unto you, till heaven and Earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall not in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Why is it that Father Hess wants to say the truth, the truth, the truth, and not some nice and kind things? Because Our Lord didn't say, „I get you... I, I, I give you a little bit and little bit here and a little bit there of the truth." No, He did not say that. He said, (Latin). „I am the way, the truth, and the life." He said, „I am the truth." God is the truth. He's not a truck full of truth. He is the truth. He does not give us one truth and another. He gives us Himself in holy communion, and that's how we are united to the truth and that's how we have to be united to the truth. And that's why I always say I don't care who it is, but if a priest lies to you, that's the worst sin. „But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

SACROSANCTUM CONCILIUM

Now, let's have a closer look at the first constitution of Vatican II. It is called, like, tr- in the tradition of the church, you name papal or conciliar documents usually with the first two or three words in Latin, so it's called Sacrosanctum Concilium of December 4th, 1963. ... yeah. But they are wrong. When Father Kramer... I recommend the book to you. When Father Kramer, in his theological vindication of Roman tradition, says that Vatican II did not want the Novus Ordo Missae, he's right. He's right in the sense, which he explains very well, he's right in the sense that what the new, Novus Ordo Missae came out to be is far beyond what Vatican II wanted. But Vatican II blasphemously wanted to change the liturgy. And how. And we will see how.

UNION AND ADAPTATION (SC 1)

„The sacred council has set out to impart an ever increasing vigor for the Christian life of the faithful, to adapt more closely to the needs of our age those institutions which are subject to change, to foster whatever can promote union among all who believe in Christ." This concept of union is erroneous and has been condemned by Pius the 11th in his encyclical Mortalium animos on ecumenism, condemning what today is called ecumenism. Pope Pius the 11th in his document Mortalium animos says it is absolutely wrong and to be condemned to say that the church is not in union.In the creed, we see (Latin). The church is always one. The church is never divided. The Protestants are not Catholic Church, not in union, Protestant Church, not in union. The Protestants are heretics outside the church. The Russian Orthodox Church is not our sister church, as John Paul II says. The Russian Orthodox Church is outside the church, because it denies the papal infallibility. That's a dogma. They are not in union with the Church. They are outside the Church. The Catholic Church is always one, and it is always in union with itself. So, we

must not adapt liturgy and change liturgy around in order to achieve union. What union? We have it. There's no need to achieve it. We have it. (Latin). But no, number one of Sacrosanctum Concilium wants it to adapt more closely to the needs of th- of our age and to foster whatever can promote union among all who believe in Christ.

REVISING THE RITES (SC 4)

And while the council, in number four, says, „Finally, in faithful obedience to tradition, the Sacred Council declares that Holy Mother Church holds all lawful recognized rights to be of equal right and dignity." That means Latin right, first of all. „That she wishes to preserve them in the future and to foster them in every way. The council also desires that, when necessary, the rights be revised carefully in the light of sound tradition and that they be given new vigor to meet present-day circumstances and needs." On one hand, the council says that the reform must be according to sound tradition, but then the council says to meet present-day circumstances and needs. Pope Pius VI in Auctorem Fidei called this request scandalous, rash, and offensive to pious ears. So what Vatican II is saying here has already been condemned by a previous pope. And Vatican II, needless to say, is contradicting itself, as we will see in some of the fir- of the, the, uh, following points.

CHRIST'S PRESENCE (SC 7)

In number seven, the council confuses... I don't say it denies, I don't say it explains in a wrong way. I just say it confuses the presence of Christ in the Church by saying, „To accomplish a great- so great a work, Christ is always present in His church." How is He present? „Especially in her liturgical celebrations. He is present in the sacrifice of m- of the Mass, not only in the person of His minister, the same now offering through the ministry of priests who formerly offered Himself on the cross, but especially in the Eucharistic species. By His power, He is present in the sacraments, so that when anybody baptizes, it is really Christ Himself who baptizes. He is present in His word since He himself who speaks when the Holy Scriptures are read in the church. Lastly, He is present when the church prays and sings, for He has promised where two or three are gathered together in my name, there I am in the midst of them." So how is He present now? How? In the old days, the church would never have written a paragraph li- like that because the church would have said, „Christ is substantially," that means body, blood, and with it, His soul and divinity, „present in the tabernacle and on the altar during the sacrifice of mass. He is spiritually present when two or three are gathered in His name." Like when you say a rosary together, you can get a plenary indulgence for that, but not when you say it alone, unless you say it alone in front of the blessed sacrament. „So when two or three are gathered in my name, I'm amongst them." That's a spiritual presence. And He is present in persona in the priest offering, because of course, when I say mass, Christ is offering the sacrifice, not I. This is why I don't say at the words of consecration, I don't say, „This is the body of Christ," but at the word of s- of the words of consecration, I say, (Latin). „This is my body." So I lend my voice, unworthy instrument that I am. Believe me, I am. All priests are. Unworthy instruments that I a- instrument that I am, I lend my voice to Christ and he says, (Latin). „This is my body." So he's present in persona. But the council does not make these distinctions. The council says he's present. And indeed, this is one of the reasons why in number seven of the Instituti Generalis Missalis Romani, the institution had to use the Roman- the new Roman missal. In number seven it says, „The mass is when, uh, Christ is present, because, uh, He said, ‚Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there I am in the midst of them,'" which is a heretical definition. And the fact that later on, some of the, uh, uh, d- defpart of the definition of the Council of Trent was added doesn't change the fact that the first part cannot be a definition, but attempts to be.

ACTIVE PARTICIPATION (SC 14)

In number 14 of the same constitution, the church ignores... I mean, excuse me, Vatican II, not the

Catholic Church. Vatican II ignores another distinction. Mother Church earnestly desires that all the faithful should be led to what... to that full con- conscious and active participation in liturgical celebrations which is demanded by the very nature of the liturgy and to which the Christian people, a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a redeemed people, have a right and obligation by reason of their baptism. In the restoration and promotion of the sacred liturgy, the full and active participation by all the people is the aim to be considered before all else.But this is not heresy. It is not, uh, it's not denying a dogma. But it is conducive into the heresy of saying, „A priest cannot celebrate alone." Because if the council... Why does the council want the, in the restoration promotion of the sacred liturgy that the full and active participation by all the people is the aim to be considered before all else? That means that the, uh, uh, uh, the full and active particip- participation by the people is the most important thing. Indeed, in the s- in the third so-called Eucharistical prayer of the abominable mass of Father VI, it says, (Latin). You do not stop to con- to, to gather the people so that the mass may be sa- may be sacrificed, may be celebrated. Do I need the people to celebrate mass? No, sir, I don't. Matter of fact, in today's condition, the way things are now, most of the times when I'm back in Vienna, Austria, I celebrate the mass entirely alone. I don't even have an altar boy. Go and, go and try and find an altar boy in Vienna. Good luck. I ain't found one yet. (laughing) So when I celebrate mass, I celebrate it alone. Well, there are some heretics running around who say that I must not do that. But that is, that is heresy, because Council of Trent condemned that explicitly. And here Vatican II says, „The most important thing is to make sure the people can participate." Oh, no, it isn't. The most important thing is to keep the tradition of mass.

UNDERSTANDING THE RITES (SC 21)

And consequently, consequentially, excuse me, in number 21, the council says, „In this restoration, both texts and rights should be drawn up so as to express more clearly the holy things which they signify. The Christian people, as far as it is possible, should be able to understand them with ease and take part in them fully, actively, and as a community." What does that mean? Until Vatican II, they did not participate as a community? Uh, how do I understand this? See, Vatican II is certainly the, not, not the clearest council in history, uh, if I'm allowed to this understatement of the century. (laughing) The Christian people, as far as possible, should be able to understand them with ease. (laughs) This is one of the most unrealistic and stupid things I've ever heard in my life. (laughs) Uh, you think I got my doctorate just by, uh, hanging around and easily understanding everything? No, I didn't. As a matter of fact, uh, the university which gave me a doctorate did not help at all to make me a good theologian, because now they teach Vatican II. They also teach Vatican II. Sometimes, however, they teach Vatican too. (laughs). And, uh, I didn't learn much there with the exception of a few Dominican fathers who I hold in great esteem and where-and fond memory. Most of the teachers there were just quoting the theologians that wrecked Vatican II and the church. I have studied theology for 10 years, more than that, because I started to get interested in theology before I went to Rome, before I decided to become a priest. I really started to study theology in 1974. That's a few years ago. I have not yet understood every single part of mass. So how do you think... What do you think the result would be in a liturgical reform if we make sure that other people understand with ease? That makes putting up and totally imbecile, right? Something s- so downright, downright stupid that, th- the village idiot will understand it. The mass is not supposed to be understandable for the village idiot. The mass is not even supposed to be understood by the people. The mass is supposed to represent the entire faith of the church. The oldest liturgical rule is still lex orandi est credendi. The law of what has to be prayed constitutes the law of what has to be believed. If liturgy does not explain the faith to me, I do not know what to believe. But liturgy does not explain the faith to me in a scientific manner, like in a lecture. Liturgy is, by definition, as all sacraments, a sign that represents the specific grace that comes from the sacrament, ex opere operato, by the work itself, by the sacrament itself, not the one who celebrates, not the one who receives. But by the sacrament, it's from the sacrament itself. And, uh, the liturgy shows the people what is the faith. How come that in the old days when people were not able to read and write, they understood the faith? They taught their children in the... they raised

their children in the faith. They explained the faith to their children. They did not even un- th- they were not even able to read English, let alone Latin. The mass was said in Latin every day. Nobody was able to understand that except a few very learned people. Most priests are, believe me, believe me, most priests are totally incompetent as far as Latin is concerned. Most priests are not able to translate Latin, they're not able to read Latin, they're not able to understand Latin. In the old days, it was o- one of the most common things that you had a priest who was illiterate. He couldn't even read the missal, he had to learn it by heart. I'm talking about many centuries ago. Saint Gregory the Great, when he was pope, he said he will not consecrate a bishop who does not know the 150 Psalms by heart. Why? Because most of them couldn't read well anyway or not at all. So how do you make them say the Breviary? We'll come back to this later. How do you s- make them say the Breviary-Yeah. Well, Gregory the Great said, „You will learn the 150 Psalms by heart. You will know them by memory." Because this was the only way to make them say the bravery. Do you think they understood the Psalms? No. Definitely not. I have never pretended to understand everything in the bravery. I don't. Saint Chrysostom, I think it was who said, „Don't try to understand prayers, say them." (laughing) And now the council wants me... The council wants us to change a liturgy into something that is understood with ease? That's impossible. Either you give up the highest principle of liturgy, which they did, or the people will not understand it with ease. Why do you think the Council of Trent, that was a little bit more intelligent than Vatican II, why do you think the Council of Trent insisted on the priest teaching the people about Mass in their sermons? The catechism of the Council of Trent gives you a whole load of titles for sermons on, uh, the difference between the offertory, the consecration, and the communion. Well, in the old days when people were not able to read and write, good priests taught them from the pulpit what the Mass is. Good people told their children what the Mass is about. It was understood with ease in comparison today. With all the confusion going on today, every priest celebrating his own right, every priest, uh, uh, preaching his own truth, people don't understand anything anymore. When Archbishop Riardo Feva wrote a letter to, uh... An open letter to confused Catholics, he was addressing almost all of the Catholics. Yes. Absolutely, because almost all of the Catholics are totally confused. Even here, among us, there is confusion, confusion, and confusion. So the Mass is understood less than ever today. This is the result of obeying Vatican II in this point.

BISHOPS' CONFERENCES (SC 22:2)

In number 22, this will be the number I will quote most often. Number 22:2. In order to give you the context, I've been accused of misquoting Vatican II out of context. Number one, 22, number one. „Regulation of the sacred liturgy depends solely on the authority of the church that is on the Epistolic See, and as laws may determine on the bishop." Number two. „In virtue of power conceded by law, the regulation of the liturgy, which, within certain defined limits belongs also to various kinds of bishops conferences legitimately established with competence in given territories." So far, it means nothing else but some things will be decided not by the Holy See, but by the bishops conferences. But then throughout the rest of the document, they only quote number 22:2. When I'm... when I'm through with this document, you will see what 22:2 really means. You will see the real context of 22:2.

SACRED SCRIPTURE (SC 24-25)

In number 23, excuse me, 24, this council says, „Hence, in order to achieve the restoration progress and adaptation of sacred liturgy, it is essential to promote that sweet and living love for sacred scripture to which the venerable tradition of Eastern and Western rights gives testimony." Aha. So the church before Vatican II had no sweet love for liturgy. Excuse me, for sacred scripture. So they didn't have sufficient love for sacred scripture. „The liturgical books are to be revised as soon as possible. Experts are to be employed on this task, and bishops from various parts of the world to be, uh, to be consulted." So they want us to rush up. Hurry, hurry. We need this reform right now. Yesterday. They want more sacred scripture. Why? Because the Protestants want more sacred scripture. Because for the Protestants, there's... there's no tradition, there's only sacred scripture. So now we have endless quotations from sacred scripture that no-

body understands anyway, and we have much less of the beautiful traditional prayers of the church. And we got the reform indeed, as the council requested very, very soon, four years after the council had ended. (laughing) I say again, number 25. „The liturgical books are to be revised as soon as possible. Experts..." I've heard that before. „Experts are to be employed on this task and bishops from various parts of the world to be to con- to be consulted." After having heard number 25, do you really believe Vatican II did not want a new liturgy? „Are to be revised as soon as possible." Then we need experts to do this and bishops from various parts of the world. Well, maybe Vatican II just wanted, uh, uh, said, „As soon as possible," it means after 20 years, 50 years. I will come back to number 25 later. You will see what the council really meant. See, one of the ways... Yes. ... of confusing people is to say something in number 22, then quote it in number 75, 120 and put it out of context. Pius VI, when he condemned In Nocturam Fide, the Synod of Pistoia said, „It is the typical strategy of the reformers, the liberals to use ambiguous terminology, to use things that can be understand one way or the other." And then they tell you, „We didn't say that," but they act according to it.Father Schillebeeckx, who was one of the great, great, great, great grand theologians of Vatican II. Archbishop Lefebvre quotes him in one of his books, said, „Well, now we use ambiguous terms. After the council, we will know how to interpret them." (pauses)

ACCLAMATIONS AND GESTURES (SC 30)

In number 30 of the same constitution, it says, „To promote active participation, the people should be encouraged to take part by means of acclimations, responses, psalms, antiphon, hymns, as well as by actions, gestures, and bodily attitudes. And at the proper time, a reverend's silence should be observed." Well, that's the one thing we didn't get. (laughs) This is a Protestant Pentecostal request. This is when people participate, „Whee!" (laughs) This is when people run around like crazy for exchanging the sign of peace. „Hi." (laughs) And this is when mostly women are running around in the sanctuary, busy all the time with I don't know what. (laughs) It is Protestant and Pentecostal to think that the people should participate in Mass that way. The priest and the altar boys are sacri- are, are, are celebrating Mass. The people assist. They do not celebrate.

PRIVATE PERSONS AND CLASSES (SC 32)

Number 32, accordingly says, because people are now very important, they have to be there anyway. „In the liturgy apart from the distinctions arising from liturgical functions or sacred orders, and apart from the honors due to civil authorities in accordance with liturgical law, no special exception is to be made for any private persons or classes of persons, whether in the ceremonies or by external display." So we are all equal now, in liturgy too. Not just by constitutional law in this country, but now we're all equal in the liturgy. Now, how about... How about the old count of a village somewhere in Europe, who entirely out of his own money, built a church? He's to be... Sit somewhere back there. He has to sit somewhere back there. He may not have his proper seat up front. Why not? Is there a hierarchy? Well, yes, believe me. In the conciliar Church, there is a hierarchy more developed than ever before in the Church. There is Madam Co-priest, who stands right next to the celebrant- (laughs) ... holding the host at the Ecce Agnus Dei. There is Madam Reader, there is Madam Diacon, Deacon. There's Madam Acolyte. (laughs) They have a hierarchy and how? And they fight over it. „No. No. I'm going to say the reading next Sunday." „No, you are not." „No, I'm sorry." „No, I'm sorry. You will not say the reading next Sunday." „No. This is my job. I'm the reader in this church. And I will do it." „No, and you will not stand next to the priest holding the host at the Agnus Dei." „I do that by tradition in this parish. I've done it from the very beginning Father came to, uh, take over this parish. And I will do it tomorrow too." (laughs) They have new, entire new classes now. (laughs)

THE PEOPLE'S PRAYERS (SC 33)

33 says, „Although the sacred liturgy is principally the worship of the Divine Majesty..." I'm glad they

remember that, „... it likewise contains much instruction for the faithful." The sermon, yes? That's what Council of Trent said, the sermon. „For in the liturgy, God speaks to His..." Sorry, „To His people, and Christ is still proclaiming His Gospel. And the people reply to God, both by song and prayer." I can take that to point. „Moreover, the prayers addressed to God by the priest who, in the person of Christ, presides over the assembly are said in the name of the entire holy people and of all present." No. No, they're not. Many of the prayers in the Mass are not said, said in the name of the people present. Many prayers are. Council here says all of them. That's why they changed round the term „I" to „we" in the new liturgy. The prayer after the, uh, Agnus Dei in Mass, the priest says, um, „Domine, qui dicxisti, pacem meam da vobis, pacem meam, pacem meam da vobis; ne uspícias peccáta mea." Do not pay attention. Please forgive me my sins. The priest says, „My." Priest doesn't say our, he says, „Mine." So the priest is praying to God, that's his prayer, and it's a silent prayer. It's not a prayer of the people. Many other prayers in the Mass are in the „I". At the offertory for example, the priest says, „I offer you this Immaculate Host." „I", because he's speaking in the name of Christ. It's not the people who offer up the Immaculate Host, it is Christ who offers up the Immaculate Host. So first of all, there are many prayers that are not said in the name of the people, and the people cannot answer to it, and they don't say, „Amen," as a matter of fact. During the entire canon, nobody's allowed to say, „Amen." Only at the end of the canon, at the Per Ipsum, you may say, „Amen," but let the altar boy do it anyway. And, uh, so therefore, the priest is offering Mass, the priest is offering Mass, the priest is offering Mass. He does not preside over the whole community offering Mass. If somebody dares to call me Mr. President, I'm gonna kick him out. (laughs)

MORE SCRIPTURE READINGS (SC 35.1)

In number 35.1, the council says, „In sacred celebrations, a more simple, more varied, and more suitable reading from sacred scripture should be restored."... catering to the Protestants again. More scripture. Please, give us more scripture. As if we have now, by now understood all the readings of the old missal. Anyway, we want to hear something more. I bet you there is not a single person here, and we all go to the old rite, and there's not a single priest here, starting from me... starting with me, excuse me. There's not a single priest here who understands all of the readings and everything of all the readings in the Latin missal, which is only a selection from sacred scripture. I dare challenge anybody present to prove to me, and if it needs a week, to prove to me that he understood every single point of all the readings. I can a- I could ask you some very nasty questions on that, believe me. And I have asked questions on that which I was not able to answer, and I've asked people who are more learned than me, and they said, „I'm sorry, Father, I don't know." I've asked bishops. They says, „I don't know. Maybe it means this or this and that." Holy Scripture has not yet been deciphered entirely, and the readings of the old mass are quite sufficient to get us to heaven. The old mass produced a lot of saints. The new one hasn't produced one yet. Not even the so-called blessed founder of the Opus Dei is a, is the result of the new mass. He never said it.

LATIN AND VERNACULAR (SC 36)

Then, the council demands, in number 36, one, the use of the Latin... Now you will get a classic example of what modern theology is all about. 36:1, „The use of the Latin language, with due respect to particular law, is to be preserved in the Latin rite." Number two, „But since the use of the vernacular, whether in the Mass, the administration of the sacraments, or in other parts of the liturgy, may frequently be of great advantage to the people." Oh, it's to be preserved, but then it might be of great advantage to the people. „May frequently be of great advantage to the people. A wider use may be made of it, especially in readings, directives, and in some prayers and chants. Regulations governing this will be given separately in subsequent chapters." And you will hear them. Number three says, „These norms being observed, it is for the competent territorial ecclesia- ecclesiastical authority mentioned in Article 22:2..." You see? They quote 22:2, not 21, not 22:1. 22:2, all the time. Bishops Conferences. Bishops conferences. „To decide whether and to what extent..." Uh-oh. „... the vernacular language is to be used. Its degre- its decrees have to be approved, that is confirmed by the Apostolic See. Where circumstances warrant it, it is to consult with

bishops of neighboring regions which have the same language." Number four. „Translations from the Latin for use in the liturgy must be approved by the competent territorial ecclesiastical authority already mentioned." So, there is one line saying the use of the Latin language must be preserved in the Latin rite, and then they say, „But you can have the vernacular." How far you can have the vernacular, you will see in following paragraphs.

RACES AND NATIONS (SC 37)

Number 37. „Even the liturgy of the Church does not wish to impose a rigid uniformity." Well, they don't. They really don't anymore. „The Church does not wish to impose a rigid uniformity in matters which do not involve the faith or the good of the whole community. Rather does she respect and foster the qualities and talents of the various races and nations. Anything in these peoples' way of life which is not indos- indissolubly bound up with the superstition and error, she studies with sympathy, and if possible preserves intact. She sometimes even admits such things into the liturgy itself, provided they harmonize with its true and authentic spirit." What's the true and authentic spirit of a liturgy whose first purpose is to make the people participate? Of core- of, well, of course. You got half-naked girls running around and saying Prayers of the Faithful. Uh, well, yeah, I can show you the pictures. Uh, you have the pope, uh, at Mass, during Mass, uh, wearing the feathers of a tribal chief of a Native American tribe, instead of..... vicious and downright satanic religions. Uh, if you do not believe what I say, then I recommend to you to turn on the TV every time the pope travels.

Here Part 1 ends and Part 2 begins.

Dissecting the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy further, Fr. Hesse exposes Vatican II's demand for „radical adaptation" that produces the chaotic papal masses seen during John Paul II's travels, including his calling Our Lady „Grandmother" in Vienna and omitting consecration words due to vernacular confusion.

He demonstrates how the council's messianic claims about liturgical reform being directed by the Holy Spirit contradict the empty churches and seminaries that result from these changes. Fr. Hesse proves that Vatican II's demand to „simplify the rites" was already condemned by Pope Pius VI, and explains how papal authority binds successors in matters of faith and morals but not discipline.

He shows how the council's authorization of communion under both kinds leads to sacrilegious wine stains in church carpets, how the new concelebration and vernacular requirements destroy liturgical dignity, and how Article 22:2 transfers authority to bishops' conferences to create entirely new rites for all sacraments. Fr. Hesse concludes by exposing the council's approval of indigenous music, art, and architecture that produces the hideous modern churches, and warns of the „time bomb" provision to fix Easter on a set Sunday date, which would break apostolic tradition.

SACROSANCTUM CONCILIUM (CONTINUED)

RADICAL ADAPTATION (SC 40)

Number 40 says, „In some places and circumstances, however, an even more radical adaptation of the liturgy is needed, and this entails greater difficurtors, difficulties, for this reason." Number one, „The competent territorial ecclesiastical authority mentioned in Article 22(2) must in this matter carefully and prudently consider which elements from the traditions and cultures of individual peoples might appropriately be admitted into divine worship. Adaptations which are considered useful or necessary should then be submitted to the Holy See, by whose consent they may be introduced." This is why we get all the weird, funny, and crazy liturgies going on when the pope travels. Sometimes when the pope celebrates a Mass, there's practically nothing left of the traditional rite, nothing. To the point that, uh, by the way, this will, uh, cause great scandal, but it should be known, that when the pope said Mass in Vienna,

with his obsession of the vernacular, he was calling Our Lady, „Grandmother." Instead of Gottesmutter in German, he said, „Großmutter Maria." (laughs) See, if that had happened in Latin, nobody would have noticed it at least. (laughs)

PAPAL MASS IN VIENNA

And there was, there was, this is an inside information. Some people will deny that, but I don't care. There was an investigation in the Holy Office on the validity of the papal Mass in Vienna, because he omitted, by mistake, of course, he omitted something in the words of consecration. I'm personally absolutely convinced this was only a mistake. However, this would not have happened in the Latin rite. This would not have happened if the pope says, every day of his life, Hoc est enim Corpus Meum: Hoc est enim Calix Sanguinis mei. Novit aeterni testamenti. Mysterium fidei. De provobis et tramultis, effundetur remissionem peccatorum. Equotiuscumque feceritis mei memoriam patientis. I know the Mass by heart, Oratio Missa at least. I really know it by heart. And you have to. It has to become a holy, a sacred routine, because if it does not become a holy, a sacred routine... I'm not talking about Buddhists rattling with their, uh, prayer mills, (imitates prayer mill) (laughs) It has to become a holy and sacred routine, because otherwise, you would make horrible mistakes at Mass. Sometimes the priest is too tired. Sometimes he had to get up too early. Sometimes he has to say the Mass too late. Sometimes he's sick. Sometimes he's just confused, because, uh, we are human beings, and things may happen to us that cause great confusion. Sometimes we are not really present at Mass, spiritually. I mean, uh, sometimes, uh, it, it, hey, it, it happens, believe me, it happens that after Mass you say, „Did I say Mass?" You have a scheduled Mass, 7:00 in the morning. For me it's awful. You have a scheduled Mass, 7:00 in the morning in the parish, and for some reason, maybe it's your fault, because you went to a celebration and didn't come home to, to, uh, arrive in, in time. Maybe it's not your fault, because you had to, uh, give the sacraments to a dying person, you had to assist somebody, uh, with extreme unction and, uh, and, and the Viaticum, the Last Rites, and you come back at 3:00 at night, and then you have to say Mass at 7:00, and you're really standing there like a zombie celebrating. You better have developed a holy sacred routine in doing this, because otherwise you might just forget the words of consecration. This is another one of, this is another aspect, an evil aspect, of the new Mass. When you're a traveling bishop and priest in our days, you have to say the Mass in 50 languages. That's not possible. But Vatican II wanted it. Don't say Vatican II didn't want that. Number 40 says they wanted it.

LITURGICAL REFORM (SC 43)

In number 43, they say, „Zeal for the promotion and restoration of the sacred liturgy is rightly held to be the sign of the providential dispositions of God in our time, and as a movement of the Holy Spirit in his church. It is today a distinguishing mark of the life of the Church, and indeed of the whole tenor of contemporary religion through thought, uh, religion, thought, and action." So they are really messianic about their reforms. So the Messiah wants the reform. The liturgical reform is dictated by the Holy Spirit. I can't blame John Paul II and calling Vatican II a Second Pentecost, and something the Holy Spirit made. If they say it, they say it. And they, they insist it's today. It is today a distinguishing mark of the life of the Church. Yes, it is a distinguishing mark of the life of agnostic sect called The Church of the New Advent, and indeed the whole tenor of contemporary religious thought and action, but it's not the tenor of my religious thought, and it's not the tenor of my religious actions. I don't want the reform, and I deny the reform, I reject the reform. It's, uh, illegitimate against the will of God. But they say, they, they attribute an, a, a messianic message to it. Now, finally, we will convert the whole world with a new liturgy. That's probably the reason all the people are converted so much today that they don't need to go to church anymore, which is the reason why churches are empty and seminaries are empty.

LITURGICAL COMMISSIONS (SC 44)

In number 44, the council says, „It is desirable that the competent territorial ecclesiastical authority mentioned in Article 22(2)," I'm sorry I bore you with this Article 22(2), but they do. Article 22(2), „Set up a liturgical commission to be assisted by experts." We got them again. What experts? (laughs) What experts? The Tridentine Council said a lot about Mass. The popes have said a lot about Mass. Pius XII was an, uh, a real expert when he wrote Mediatio a Dei. I don't need experts. I have Mediatio a Dei. I have all the beautiful, beautiful writings of the Church fathers-... of the popes, of the councils, of the saints. What do I need experts for? I need an expert to repair my fridge. (laughs) Not liturgy. „To be assisted by experts in the liturgical science, sacred music, art, and pastoral practice. As far as possible, the commission should be ad- aided by some kind of institute for pastoral liturgy." Well, we got them, uh, uh, growing like mushrooms now. „Consisting of people who are eminent..." Excuse me. Uh, my eyes are getting old. „Consisting of people who are eminent in these matters." Yes. You know what I would have said? Hopefully, what I would have said being present in the, in the Sacred Aula in S- in St. Peter's Basilica at the Council, I would have raised my s- my hand and said, „Yes, why don't you read Mediator Dei by Pius XII?" He was a competent man, and he was an expert on liturgy, even if he didn't show it all the time in his actions. In his writings, he did. So if cer- I, I read again, b- I'm sorry I interrupted this. „As far as possible, the commission should be aided by some kind of institute for pa- pastoral liturgy, consisting of people who are eminent in these matters, not excluding laymen, if circumstances demand. It will be the task of this commission, under the direction of the abovementioned competent territorial ecclesiastical authority, see Article 22.2," (sighs) to regulate pastoral liturgical action throughout the territory and to promote studies and necessary experiments, whenever there is a qu- a question of adaptations to be proposed to the Holy See. So now the Council that claims that everything has to be according to sound tradition says, „We want experiments, liturgical experiments." Um, at a Holy Mass, if it was a Holy Mass, I don't know, in the seminary in Vienna in Austria, they replaced the readings of Saint Paul with a reading from Peter Handke, who is a Communist German author. And when Cardinal König was asked, uh, „How come? How is this possible?" He said, „Oh, it's an interesting liturgical experiment." (knocks on wood) (laughs) I need a gulp of wine after that. (laughs) So let's forget Saint Paul. He was against women anyway. (laughs) Let's rea- let's read Karl Marx. (laughs)

SIMPLIFICATION OF RITES (SC 50)

In number 50, the Council wants us to simplify. „The Rite of Mass is to be revised in such a way that the intrinsic nature and purpose of its several parts, as well as the connection between them, may be more clearly manifested, and that devout and active participation by the faithful," we ca- we heard that before, „may be more easily achieved. For this purpose, the rites are to be simplified, due care being taken to preserve their substance, facts..." Or excuse me, „parts which with the passage of time came to be duplicated or were added with little advantage are to be omitted." First of all, this is an impertinence first class to say that, uh, there are parts in the old Mass that were added with little advantage. The Council Fathers at Trent would have kicked this guy out who said that. And Vatican II now wants, „For this purpose, the rites are to be simplified." The very concept of simplifying the rites has been condemned by Pope Pius VI in Auctorium Fidei as rash and offensive to pious ears. How dare the Council Fathers at Vatican II now to request something that was condemned by a previous pope.

PAPAL AUTHORITY AND SUCCESSORS

When a pope condemns something, no one of his successors may change that. A priest in this country, geographically not far from here, said that the pope cannot bind his successor. I explained in my other tape and Father Paul Kramer in his book explains very well that this is not true. The pope binds his successors in everything that is not disciplinary positive law. Disciplinary laws, he does not bind his successors. Of course not. In positive law, that means the great major part of canon law, he does not bind his successors. If

the pope decides to change the, uh, the, uh, the, the law of election to the papacy, he may do so. Many popes did that. The present pope did it, and the next pope will be elected to the law established by John Paul II, rightly so. But the pope cannot change the faith. You read that in Denzinger-Schönmetzer 3070, the fourth chapter of the Constitutio Dogmatica Pastoris Aeternus de Ecclesia Christi of the 18th of July, 1870 at First Vatican Council, defining the infallibility of the pope. And in the fourth chapter, the Council says, „Spiritus Sanctus non enim datus est successoribus Petri ut eo revelante aliquam novam doctrinam patefacerent, sed ut eo assistente, traditam per apostolos revelationem seu fidei depositum sancte custodirent et fideliter exponere." The Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter, so with his, uh, revealing, uh, they may proclaim a new doctrine, but that with his assistance, they may wholly sa- sauh, uh, sancte, that's, uh, difficult in, in English, they may in a holy way guard it and explain it faithfully. What do they have to guard and explain? They have to guard and explain the depositum fidei, that means the faith that was handed down to us from the apostles.So a pope can very well bind his successor with that. When a pope proclaims a dogma, nobody, not even the conciliar church doubts. I mean, the conciliar church may be, but not, uh, not the pope, the prenot the present pope. Uh, the pope may not change around the dogma. He's bound by his predecessor. The pope may not change things of the faith. If Pope, uh, Pius IX condemned the idea of separation of chchurch and state, the present pope may not request the contrary. He's bound. A decision in moral theology of a pope binds his successors, and this is the reason why in the same dogmatic constitution of the papal infallibility, the, uh, the, uh, the council, va- Vatican I actually says that the pope holds... Now listen to this distinction. The pope holds the primacy, (Latin). He does not hold to primacy only in the matters of faith and morals, but also in the matters of government and discipline of the church. So now they make a very important distinctions, distinction. It is understood any way that he holds the primacy in matters of faith and morals, but he also holds the primacy in matters of discipline and government of the church. So there's two levels here. A pope cannot bind his successor in the law of discipline and government, but he can very well and does bind his successor in a matter of faith and morals. The church has always said that. The popes have sworn that as the oath of incarnation in writing from 678 to 1302. That we have in writing. So most probably by 678, the popes had sworn to that already for many centuries. And after 1302, the popes certainly, uh, lived in the same spirit, which is proven by church history, by the teaching of the popes and by tradition. The pope is bound to tradition. The pope is subject to tradition. And if a pope makes something part of tradition, if a pope declares that something is part of tradition, he binds his successor. So you cannot turn these things around. And if, uh, uh, Pope Pius VI condemned the idea of, uh, uh, simplifying the rites, then Paul VI is bound to that.

VERNACULAR AND COMMUNION (SC 54)

In number 54, the council says, „A suitable place may be allotted to the vernacular in Masses..." Aha, again, „... which are celebrated with the people." But all Masses should be celebrated with the people, the council says, so a suitable place has to be allotted to the vernacular in all Masses. See how you have to read the council? The context? See what the context is? „Especially in the reading at the common prayer and also as local conditions may warrant in those parts which pertain to the people according to the rules laid down in Article 36 of this cons- of, of the constitution." Article 36 is referring to 22:2. We got that again. „Wherever a more extended use of the vernacular in the Mass seems desirable, the regulations laid down in Article 40 of this constitution to be observed." What does the Article 40 of this constitution say? Well, the Article 40 says, „In some places and circumstances, however, an even more radical adapt- adaptation of the liturgy is needed." And it refers to 22:2 again. So let the bishops conferences write up new rites. You see the context? If you read Vatican II in context and with references, you cannot say they didn't want the vernacular new rite.

Then it says, „Communion under both kinds may be granted when the bishops think fit." When the bishops think fit. Now, they don't even say 22:2. They say, „When the bishops think fit, le- let's dis- let's dis- distribute communion under both kinds." The Council of Trent said that's no good and it shouldn't be done. The con- Vatican I says, „Yes, it might be

done. The bishops decide." Not only to clerics and religious but also to the laity... All right, can read this. „In cases to be determined by the Apostolic See. For example, to the newly ordained in the Mass of their ordination, to the newly professed in the Mass of

their religious profession, to the newly baptized in the Mass which follow their baptism," and so on. After this, after the council, you know what happened? They found bloodstains. I call them bloodstains, but mo- probably the Mass was not valid anyway, then it was wine stains, in the wall-to-wall carpet of a church, of many churches, of many churches. So, uh, a lot of Catholics and Protestants, and Protestants signed a letter to the Holy See saying, „Why? Please explain to us. If the Catholic, Catholic Church says this is the blood of Christ, why do you distribute communion under both kinds if that is the result, if you get those stains in carpets?" That was at the time when, uh, Vigilio Noay was, uh, prefect of the congregation for the sacred rites. You know how he answered? The congregation wrote a letter to the American Bishops Conference and gave them the faculty to decide freely when distri- when communion may be distributed under both kinds. So that means today, Rome is in a condition that when you point out the sacrilege and danger to the blessed sacrament to Rome, Rome will enlarge the faculties for this sacrilege, not condemn them. This is how they interpret Vatican II. Some irreformable people who are not willing to learn try over and over again to explain to me that Vatican II is not as bad as I make it. They are so wrong about it. Who is the authority to interpret Vatican II, the pope and the bishops or I? Well, look what the pope and the bishops make of Vatican II.The present pope is quoting Vatican II, Vatican II, Vatican II, Vatican II. See what he does. See what he decides. The bishops are always talking about the spirit of Vatican II. They quote Vatican II, they quote Vatican II, they quote Vatican II. See what they do. Sacrilegious, sacrilegious, sacrilegious. The Diocese of Cincinnati, for 10 years, had hosts with honey and milk in them. Most probably, for 10 years, the Diocese of Cincinnati has not had a single valid mass celebrated. That is their interpretation of Vatican II. Then comes Cardinal Ratzinger and says, „No, these are just abuses." At the same time, he says that, uh, some parts of Vatican II are an anti-syllabus. The syllabus is nothing else but the, uh, the condemnation, the solemn condemnation of errors in the church by Pius X... Pius IX, excuse me. So the things that have been condemned by sa- by Pius IX now are doctrine of the church, and Ratzinger admits it. (book closes) So this is their interpretation of Vatican II, not mine. (smacks lips)

CONCELEBRATION (SC 57)

The new rite very often is characterized by concelebrations. They say Vatican II didn't want that. Number 57 says, „Concelebrations whereby the unity of the priesthood is appropriately manifested has remained in use to this day in the Church, both in the East and in the West. For this reason, it has seemed good to the Council to extend permission for celebration in the following cases." I don't bore you with those cases. Now, you can concelebrate wherever you want. Um, as a matter of fact, that- that's what I call, uh, historical irony. In the Episcopal Cathedral of Trent, a friend of mine tried to celebrate mass there. They told him, „No. Either you participate in our 9 o'clock in the morning concelebration or you may not celebrate mass here." This is the church in which the Council of Trent was held. Sometimes I s- I'm surprised God did not let it crumble yet, like Assisi. (laughs) By now, this faculty for the concelebration given by the Church has been extended to the point that they even ignore the new Code of Canon Law, which in Canon 902 says that no priest may ever be forced to concelebrate. That doesn't change the fact that, in very many churches, under the eyes of the bishop in his cathedral, priests are forced to concelebrate, which is why I travel with a travel altar and, sad to say, have celebrated masses in motel rooms. A new rite for concelebration is to be drawn up and inserted into the Pontifical and into the Roman Missal. Why? We have a rite of concelebration in the Latin Church. At an Episcopal consecration, the bishops concelebrate what the bishop consecrates. But... And at the Rite of Priestly Ordination, the priests concelebrate with the bishop who just consecrated them. We have the rite, except that in the old days, every priest and every bishop was saying the full mass. Now they s- they just say the words of consecration, and that's about it. And for the rest of the mass, they've got nothing to do. (book closes) As a matter of fact, there's nothing more ridiculous. And I've done it every day, almost every day, for 10 years in St. Pe-

ter's Basilica, in the sacristy of St. Peter's Basilica. There are very few things more ridiculous and more scandalous to me than watch future concelebrants before mass, watch the priests dress up waiting for concelebration. I don't want to go in this type of comedy, but believe me, it would make a good show on TV. They chat around. Very few of them pray. Very few of them prepare for anything sacred. When they sit in the... in, uh, in the sanctuary, usually this is what you get. (laughs) This is concelebrants in mass. And I've just given you, uh, one type. There are many others. Some of them don't say anything. Some of them, uh, are just snoring through the whole thing. (coughs) We had a beautiful rite of concelebration. If the Council had really wanted concelebration, it would not have asked for a new rite to be drawn up. It would have used the one existing. Apart from the fact that it is not a tradition in the Latin Church to concelebrate, except at ordination and consecration.

SACRAMENTS AND SACRAMENTALS

Number 62 says, „With the passage of time, however, there have crept into the rites of the sacraments and sacramentals certain features which have rendered their nature and purpose far from clear, far from clear to the people of today. Hence, some changes are necessary to adapt them to present-day needs." Again, simplify the rites to the point that the village idiot will understand them. (laughs) The council is very repetitious, as you can see. Number 63, „Because the use of the vernacular in the administration of the sacraments and sacramentals can often be of very great help to the people, it uses to be extended according to the following norms. In the administration of the sacraments and sacramentals, the vernacular may be used according to the norm of Articles 36." We have read that before. You can look it up or wind back the tape. „The competent territorial uh, ecclesiastical authority designated in Article 22-2..." I think when you go home tonight, you'll all be dreaming. You're not going to have nightmares about Article 22-2 of the... But... Sorry, but, uh, I didn't write it. (laughs) „According to Article, uh, 22-2 of this Constitution shall further with, prepare, in accordance with the new edition of the Roman Ritual, local rituals adapted linguistically and otherwise to the needs of the different regions." Uh, they have dialect missals now. I mean, uh, uh, there's something which, in the United States, is, uh, not, uh, as bad a problem as it is in other countries because this is more or less still one country, and even though, uh, there is quite a difference in the accents here, uh, you don't really have too, too many dialects in this country. But Europe is packed with dialects.... and believe me, once you have heard the Mass in Viennese dialect or Sicilian dialect, you're sick. (hands thud) I love the Sicilians, but not the dialect at Mass. You heard that, Benita? (laughing) Subtitles are true.

In number 68, the council says, „The baptismal right should contain variants to be used at the discretion of the local ordinary." Now, it's not 22:2. „When a large number are to be baptized..." The council really thinks that after that council, there will be a large number (laughs) to be baptized. That's the joke of the century. (laughs) I have just baptized three people in Argon. Three, yes, I was busy. (laughing) Uh, „Likewise, the shorter rite is to be drawn up especially for mission countries, which, uh, uh, which, uh, catechists and also the faithful in general may use when there is danger of death and neither priest nor deacon is available." I don't see the meaning of this. In my bravery, which I have to use every day as a priest, on the last page it says, „In the case of emergency, you just say, ‚Ego te baptizo, nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.'" Can you, can you shorten that? No, you can't. If you shorten that, the baptism is invalid. So, (laughs) I don't... I- I- I- I- I don't understand, uh, in a case of an emergency, they call it... They talk about a case of emergency. So, we even need a new rite for that? Or maybe because now everything has to be in the vernacular, and in Papua dialect, dialect you baptize, „In the name of the Father, the Son, and Taboo-taboo." (laughing) Yeah, the Papuans don't have a word for a spirit except Taboo. They don't have a word for holy except Taboo. So you give the taboo... Excuse me, the sacrament of bapt- (laughing) You give the taboo a baptism in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Taboo-taboo. (laughing) It shows you the advantages of the vernacular. (laughing)

The Rite of Confirmations to be revised, blah, blah, in number 71. 72, the rite and the formula of penance are to be revised. 76, ordination rites have to be revised. 77, the marriage rite has to be revised. Now, you know, they all are new rites now. And that has

been explicitly condemned by the Church. If people use... Those who... Now, this will cause me a great number of enemies, but it's the truth. Those who use the new rites and approve of them are materially in schism with the Church. The Church has said whoever says that new rites may be created, Anathema sit, he may be cursed. Pope Innocent III said, „There must not be new rites." Pope Eugene IV praised the Cardinal Torquemada, who said there must not be new rites. Priests who say, „The Church may rite up new rites and may use them, and I may use them, and they may use them," are in material schism with the Church. I say material because most of them don't know it. I'm not accusing or condemning any individual here, which of course I know, even though, uh, I'm very clear on this in my tape, people will run around and say, „Father Gese condemned everybody to hell." Okay, if they want to go on with that slander against the Eighth Commandment, fine. It's not my business. But, uh, I do not condemn every priest, and I do not condemn any priest. I'm just saying they are in material schism with the Church, and you better believe it after what I told you and what you... You can check everything I said. I give you footnotes. <<(Latin>>.) I give you what I have received. I do not make up these things.

In 79, the council is even more explicit. „The sacraments are to be revised." „These sacraments are to be revised." Revised, mind you. „Account being taken of the primary principle of enabling the faithful to participate intelligently..." That's a joke. „Actively and easily." I... We have talked about that. I don't need to repeat it. „The circumstances of our times must also be considered." That has been condemned both by Pius VI, Pius IX, and Pius XII. „The circumstances of our times must also be considered." Not in the liturgy. The eternal sacrifice is the eternal sacrifice. It is the eternal sacrifice of all times. It is not the sacrifice of the 20th century, or the 21st century, or the glorious millennium. „When rituals are being revised as laid down in Article 63..." We read that before. „New sacraments may also be... New sacramentals..." You have to be careful with that. The council did not say new sacraments. Council said new sacramentals. Sacramentals are blessings and all kinds of things. „May also be added as necessity requires." I agree with that, of course. Uh, sacramentals have to be added. In the old, uh, in the old, um, Rituale Romanum, you will not find a proper blessing for, uh, uh, a military jet fighter, because it didn't exist then. So, some new blessings indeed have to be drawn up. „Provisions should be made for the administration of some sacramentals..." Now, get this. „At least in special circumstances and at the discretion of the ordinary, the bishop may decide by qualified lay persons." Qualified lay persons? If that's not an oxymoron, I ain't heard one yet. (laughing) Qualified lay persons? Okay. Uh, get your car blessed by your neighbor. (laughing) I'm sure Mahoney is in agreement with that. (laughing) Or excuse me, uh, His Most Reverend Eminence. Sorry. (laughing) This is really disgusting, but it, it is, it is. It is... I have to, I have to give this to you. I have to read it to you.

THE DIVINE OFFICE (SC 91-92)

Number 91. „So that it may be possible in practice to observe the course of the hours proposed in Article 89..."... the Psalms are no longer to be distributed throughout the week, but through a longer period of time. I mentioned before, and I said I will come back to this, that the priest in his breviary says the Psalms. That's why Saint Gregory the Great wanted the bishops to memorize them. The oldest rule of the breviary is that you say the 150 Psalms in a week, that there may never be a week in your priestly life without having said all of the 150 Psalms. Number one purpose of the breviary is that. Some ultra traditionalists who go far beyond what, uh, is due and what is right criticize Saint Pius X for having reformed the breviary. They say this was against the explicit will of Pius V. Saint Pius V, and here we have an example when it is needed to reform things according to the times. When Saint Pius V was pope, priests did not have cars. Priests spent a lot of their time walking, traveling. In those days, you had to walk to the next village. A priest has to say prayers seven times a day. He has to give praise to God seven times a day in the breviary. Prima, Tertia, Sexta, Nona, Vespere, Completorium, Matutine, Laudes. Those are what is called the hours of the breviary. In the old days, in order to enable the priest to be able to say at least part of this breviary every day without needing the text of the breviary, the Prima, Tertia, Sexta, and Nona, as the name says, the prayers that should be but do not have to, but should be said at 7 o'clock, 9

o'clock, 12 o'clock, and 3 PM, those prayers were the same every day except Sunday. So, priests, after a while of being priests, memorized them, and on their way to the next parish or the next church could recite them by memory. Also, in those days, it was very difficult and very expensive to obtain a printed breviary. In the 20th century, to obtain a printed breviary is neither expensive nor difficult, except if you want an old breviary, then it might be difficult today, but that's not the point. At the time of, uh, Saint Pius X, it was easy for a priest to receive his... to, to obtain a, a breviary, and Pius X did not write up a new breviary. He r- restored the breviary to a new organization of the Psalms, a new distribution of the Psalms during the week, so you did not repeat the same Psalm all over and over again Monday through Saturday, but you just said the 150 Psalms. Before Saint Pius X, the prayer at night did not have nine but 12 Psalms. It was endless. And during the day, you repeated the same Psalm over again. Pius X rightly understood that the purpose of the breviary is to make you say 150 Psalms during the week, not 170 and not 130. This is now the purpose of the breviary. But hear, hear what Vatican II says, 91, „So that it may be possible in practice to observe the course of the hours proposed in Article 89." Possible in practice, that means because the priests today are drowned in bureaucracy and paperwork so they don't have time for the breviary anymore, in the, for the old breviary, so the breviary had to be shortened and made simpler. The, the Psalms are no longer to be distributed throughout the week, but through a longer period of time. Now a priest says all the 150 Psalms, excuse me, 147 Psalms, because the council considered, uh, uh, not the council, the, the liturgical reformers con- considered three Psalms, I've forgotten the number, that condemned the heretics to hell, scandalous, and took them out of the breviary. So, in the new breviary, you have 147 Psalms, not 150. This is against a standing tradition of 2- 2000 years in the Latin Church. (coughs) And now the priest says 150 Psalms in three weeks, or four weeks, I don't remember. This is against the standing tradition of 2000 years in the church. This is, at first sight it means nothing, but if you give it a closer look this is one of the most scandalous paragraphs of this document.

In number 92C, the council says, „The accounts of the martyrdom or lives of the saints are to be made historically accurate." That means we have all been fed you know what, uh, until the council. Fairy tales, fairy tales. And now we have a scientific platform. Now our breviary is giving us a scientific account of the saints. We have seen what the scientific account of sanctity is when they recently just said that the Shroud of Turin is a, a falsification, and other experts came up and said, „No way." They were just wrong about the, the carbon-14 method. This is modern science. In 1989, you say, „This is the way it should be," in 1997 you say, „No, they were absolutely wrong," and in 2003, they will again come up with a new theory. Uh, I trust tradition. I trust the stories being handed down from the early Roman martyrs, and I cannot possibly tell you what I think about science dealing with the, the saints' biographies. It would be offensive language. I would have to use the vernacular. (laughs)

HYMNS RESTORED AND PURGED

Hymns. Now, in, in the breviary, you do not only have the, the Psalms, but you also have Latin poetry, gorgeous poetry, magnificent poetry, poetry so beautiful that nothing in the 20th century comes close to it even. These are the hymns. „Hymns are to be restored to their original form."That's another one of these archaeologisms, as Pius XII would have called it in 0000 days. „As far as may be desirable." Whatever that means. „They are to be purged of whatever smacks of mythology or accords ill with the Christian piety." (laughs) Well, I'm saying the, I'm singing the old breviary every day, and I haven't found a single hymn that I've found obs- o- o- offensive to my piety. I made the mistake and said the new breviary in Latin, until I found out it's disgusting, offensive to my piety, and in vernacular translations, even heretical. This is what the council got in exchange for one of the most beautiful part, uh, pieces of poetry in the history of mankind.

VERNACULAR OFFICE (SC 101)

Then again, in paragraph number, uh, 101, one and two and three, we're talking again about the vernacu-

lar. And, uh, this may come as a surprise to you. They quote again 22:2.

TRUE ART (SC 112-113)

Number 112 says, „The church indeed approves of all forms of true art, which have the requi- uh, the requisite qualities and admits them into divine worship." This is why churches today look what they look. I recommend you an exte- extended tour through New England. These New England villages are so cute. They're so beautiful. You have all the Protestant, heretical, and, and, uh, very often pagan churches there. Beautiful buildings. And then you find one hideous monstrosity there. It is the Catholic Church or the local cement factory. (laughs) But usually, the local cement factory looks much better. Most of the times, the local church is the most hideous building around. Just to show you how the Church interpreted this paragraph 112. „The Church indeed approves of all forms of true art." Well, if they had stuck to this paragraph, they would have had to tear down the churches built before the council already, post-war. Some of them were absolutely hideous and disgusting, but no comparison to what we got after the council. Number 113, „As regards the language to be used, the provisions of Article 36 are to be observed for the Mass, Article 54, for the Sacraments, Article 63, 63 and for the Divine Office, Article 101." That means we get the vernacular again.

INCULTURATION OF MUSIC (SC 119)

119, „In certain countries, especially in mission lands, there are people who have their own musical tradition..." (beatboxes) „... and these, and this plays a great part in their religious and social life. For this reason, their music should be held in proper esteem." << Oh, when the saints. Oh, when the saints >> and so on. „And this plays a great part in their religious and social life. For this reason, this should, this music should be held in proper esteem and the suitable place to be given to it, not only informing their religious sense, but also in adapting worship to their native genius." (laughs) That's the native genius. „As indicated in Articles 39 and 40." My talents of imitation are not good enough to give you another, o- other examples of different type of Aboriginal music that you will find now inserted in Mass. Not that I'm against, uh, against local traditions, believe me. Actually, I'm a real fan of country music. I am. But if I hear it in church, I get sick. (laughs) << Life is like a mountain railroad. With an engineer who's brave >> and so on. (laughs) << Keep your hands upon the throttle. From the cradle to the grave. >> (laughs) „Therefore, in the musical training of missionaries, great care should be taken to see that they become competent in promoting the traditional music of these people, both in schools and in sacred services, so far as it may be practicable." Offertory. (plays table) It's local music, isn't it? Why not have it at the offertory for a change? But other instruments also may be admitted for use in divine worship. This is what I meant. Drums, guitars. Guitars. In the judgment... Electric guitars, mind you. „In the judgment and with the consent of the competent territor- territorial authority as laid down..." This is very new to us here. In Article 22:2. (laughs) „This may be done, however, only on condition that these instruments are suitable and, or be made suitable for sacred use." Well, they certainly made all these instruments used, suitable for their kind of sacred use. „And that they accord with the dignity of temple." Yeah, that's what I would call it now, the dignity of the temple. „And may truly contribute to the edification of the faithful." Saint Pius X wanted Gregorian. Saint Pius... Uh, excuse me, he's not a saint. Pius XI wanted Gregorian. Pius XII wanted Gregorian. Paul VI made a feeble attempt to make it believable that he wants Gregorian. Well, I haven't heard Gregorian in a long time.

INCULTURATION OF ART (SC 123)

Number 123 is again another paragraph on inculturation. „The art of our own times from every race and country shall also be given free scope in the Church." They did that. „Provided it bring to the task the reverence and honor due to the sacred buildings and rites. Thus, it is enabled to join its voice to that wonderful chorus and praise in honor of the Catholic faith sung by great men in past ages." How was this? They will

say, „Vicious, vicious Dr. Hesse again says that the council wanted all the beau- all the won- all the, the, the disgusting new churches." Vicious Dr. Hesse again is not able to distinguish an abuse from what the council wanted. I say again, I am not the interpreter of the council. The popes and the bish- the popes and the bishops are.I have... It has not come to my notice that the Pope would have condemned any one of these hideous churches, but that he would have told the bishop, „Do not consecrate this." In the Canton of Zug in Switzerland, Z-U-G, the local bishop consecrated a church on which walls there were obscene drawings. He did not ask for the removal of these drawings. He said, „Put up a few curtains," then he consecrated the church. There are consecrated new Catholic churches where a swimming pool is to be found under the altar. Switzerland again. This was in the 1970s. (clears throat)

SACRED BUILDINGS (SC 128)

In number 128, the council says, „The canons and exostical statutes which govern the provision of external things, which pertain to sacred worship should be revised as soon as possible, together with liturgical books as laid down in Article 25. These laws refer especially to the worthy and well-planned construction of sacred buildings, well planned, the shape and construction of altars, the nobility, placing, and security of the Eucharistic tabernacle, the suitability and dignity of the baptistry, the proper ordering of the sacred languaget, of the sacred images," I'm sorry, „and the scheme of decoration and embellishment." Uh, the next paragraph, I spare you the next paragraph, 222.2. (laughs) Look, uh, at, uh... Try to find a book, or modern books, or Book Corner, or whatever they're called, try to find a book on recent ecclesiastical architecture and flip through the book. And compare the interiors of modern churches. Now of course, they're very, very different from each other because every architect wants to present his masterpiece of art, uh-huh. And, uh, so he makes sure that he doesn't copy, uh, uh, other people's, uh, um, uh, plans. But you'll always find the same hideous altar facing the people with two ashtrays and candles on one side, flowers on the other. You will find the ambo, where, uh, Madam Reader reads the readings, and you will find the tabernacle somewhere over there. And in many churches, when you look into the church, you will not know where to find the center of the church. It's an octagon, it's a polygon. There's the altar here, the ambo over there, tabernacle somewhere there. You enter the church, you have to search, not just to look, to search for the tabernacle. Where is the tabernacle? Most of the times, you will not find the tabernacle because you're not able to imagine that such a hideous thing could be a tabernacle. You will find the altar, not like... I mean, we, we are not celebrating mass here and yet this table is, uh, uh, it's, it's symmetric, it's centered. Uh, with some churches, you will find the altar over there then the tabernacle over there. It must never be in the middle, you know? Tabernacle over there and the ambo right here. But then it might not right, be right here in the center. It will be somewhat off center. This is the interpretation given to the vast majority... For, to give, given to this paragraph by the vast majority of bishops. Because as you should know, no church can be constructed and consecrated without the bishop's approval. The majority of the churches in our days look like I described them. So this is the authentic interpretation. The Pope has never refused to celebrate in one of these hideous monstrosities that are rightly called temple here and are not churches. Again, I do not interpret this, they do.

THE EASTER "TIME BOMB"

And to conclude this torturous reading of one of the most imbecile documents in church history, I read the appendix to you. Why? I'm sure you heard the term time bomb. Archbishop Lefebvre said that there are many things in Vatican II that you should consider spiritual time bombs. They don't mean much in the context of the council, but they can be interpreted in a way that will be disastrous. I'll give you a time bomb that has not yet exploded, but will. The Second Vatican Council, the Sacred... Uh, I'm, I'm sorry, I apologize. The Sacred Second Vatican Ecumenical Council... By the way, the word ecumenical does not mean the council is ecumenical like we understand wrongly today. The word ecumenical council means... It's coming from the Greek term oikos, house. Oikomene is the household. I don't have a housekeeper, so I, uh, do my own cooking and I clean my apartment, so I'm my own housekeeper. I'm my own

hausfrau. Uh, I am responsible for my own oikomene, things pertaining to the house. And ecumenical council means things pertaining to the house. Ecumenical means that everybody who is in union with the Pope is invited and the others are not. So the word ecumenical should mean everything pertaining to the Catholic Church. And here's the great theological lies of our, lie of our days that I will talk about, uh, uh, in the second part. The Ecumenical Council means everything pertaining to the Catholic Church. Today, that means the sister churches, and nephew, and niece churches, and whatever, and that's exactly why ecumenism is what it is today. The original meaning means just pertaining to the Catholic Church. The Sacred Second Vatican Ecumenical Council recognizes the importance of the wishes expressed by many concerning the assignment of the feast of Easter to a fixed Sunday, and concerning an unchanging calendar, having carefully considered, et cetera, et cetera. So, that's the next time bomb to explode. Easter will not be as w- as it used to be after the first full moon. It might be something like, uh, April 7th every year. That would break a tradition as old as the church itself. This time bomb is to come.

CONCLUSION

In my second part, I will spare you of detailed reading. I gave you the first document considered by some to be harmless, not heretical, not damaging. Well, if this is harmless, then what must be others be like? Tomorrow or in the next par- in the next par- in, in the second part anyway, I'm going to talk about the unacceptable pronouncements of Vatican II in the other documents. Thank you. (clapping)

Here Part 2 ends and Part 3 begins.

Completing his analysis of Vatican II, Fr. Hesse clarifies how Quo Primum's liturgical prescriptions bind papal successors in matters of faith but not mere discipline, and explains the distinction between extraordinary and ordinary papal magisterium to show how popes bind successors through encyclicals and moral teaching.

He dissects Lumen Gentium, the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, exposing its heretical claim that the Church is „in the nature of sacrament" rather than a perfect society, and its infamous „subsists in" formula that allows for „sister churches" outside Catholic unity. Fr. Hesse demonstrates how the council's concept of the Church as „pilgrim" contradicts her indefectible and perfect nature, refutes the claim that „elements of sanctification" exist outside the visible Church, and shows how the document promotes collegiality to weaken papal authority.

He proves that Vatican II's teaching on Muslims „together with us adoring one merciful God" constitutes objective heresy against the Council of Florence. Fr. Hesse concludes by explaining the council's own admission that it lacks binding authority, draws parallels to the Church's historical rejection of books containing errors, and formally rejects Vatican II in toto while answering questions about traditional Catholic positions.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS, SECOND PART

MONSIGNOR-LIKE DRESS

The Basilica of Saint Peter's in Rome, where I was ordained, has a privilege given to, I think it was Pope Urban VIII who did it, that whoever is ordained in the Basilica of Saint Peter's may dress as a monsignor, but he doesn't have the title. So I dress like a monsignor, but I'm not a monsignor, I'm Father Hess. And, uh, or Father Gregory. If you want to call me Father Gregory, go ahead, that's fine with me. And, uh, but the privileges given to a place are not at the discretion of the one who holds, holds them. That's according to Canon Law. Uh, the privilege has been given to the place, so I use the privilege, except in, uh, Advent and Lent if somebody gets me a castor that's all black. And, um, and this explains my dress. I'm sure that the same people who complained about my wearing black BDUs on the other tape are going to complain about my violet sash now, this here. (laughs) Let them. If they have nothing else to worry about, they must be very happy people. (laughs)

RECAP AND PREVIEW

I've shown you, and I'm sure it was tedious and boring for some, but it had to be, I've shown you how the council operates. How the council fathers, the experts, and the theologians dealt with something as sacred as tradition. I've shown you that they are, objectively speaking, totally dishonest in this council and contradictory to themselves. Now, going on in analyzing the, uh, the documents of the very same council, rest assured, I will not bore you with a full reading anymore. Because actually, uh, the document on liturgy is somewhat interesting to all of us because we suffer from the results of it. But, uh, the other documents in the council are so deadly boring that I might, fathers, fa- fall asleep right through the lecture of it. (laughs) Uh, I, I, I will never know, uh, I'm a man who likes to read, uh, Tom Clancy and Clyde Kussler and the, the real page-turners, you know what I mean. I will never find out what, and maybe the Holy Spirit, but I don't believe in personal inspirations, maybe it was just the grace of God that enabled me to study this incredibly boring book five times over. I hope I've never have to do it again, but I, I fear, I'm afraid I might have to. Uh, the council is incredibly boring, incredibly loquacious, and packed with blah blah, and what we call verbal diarrhea. (laughs) Excuse me, but that's what it is. It doesn't say much, and the few things it says were disastrous, as you will see.

PROTESTANT BILLBOARD SIGNS

However, uh, I forgot to give you another beautiful quotation. I'm a collector, and you could help me with that if you ever see, uh, those Protestant, uh, neon lighted, uh, uh, billboard signs outside the church with some wise cracks there, uh, uh, uh, write to me, collect them. Here's one. „I was going to waste. Jesus recycles me." (laughs) The other one, „Kmart is not the only saving place." (laughs) Sorry about that digression from scientific precision.

QUO PRIMUM AND PAPAL AUTHORITY

QUO PRIMUM AND SUCCESSORS

As an appendix to, uh, the, uh, to what I said about, uh, Vatican II and liturgy, I have to clear up a mistake. A missal in fifteen, in 1570 is not binding to successors. As a matter of fact, one of the most prominent traditionalists in this country said that. Their argument very often is the following, „Furthermore, by these presents and by virtue of our Apostolic Authority, we give and grant in perpetuity that for the singing or reading of Mass, in any Church whatsoever, this Missal may be followed absolutely without any scruple of conscience or fear of incurring any penalty, judgment or censure and may be freely and lawfully used, nor shall Bishops, Administrators, Canons, Chaplains and other secular Priests or Religious of whatsoever Order, or by whatsoever Title it is designated, be obliged to celebrate Mass otherwise than enjoined by us. We likewise order and declare that no one whosoever shall be forced to coer- or to coer- or coerced into altering this Missal and this present Constitution can never be revoked or modified but shall forever remain valid and have the force of law, notwithstanding previous Constitutions or Edicts of Provincial or Synod, Synod Councils and notwithstanding the usage of the Churches aforesaid, established by very long and even immemorial prescriptions saving only usage of more than 200 years." They say the same legal formula, „Can never be revoked or modified but shall forever remain valid and have the force of law," was used by Benedict the Fif- the 14th when he dissolved the Jesuit Order. Therefore, if I was right in saying that Quo primum must never be changed, Pope Pius the Seventh, uh, was wrong when he, uh, reinstituted the Jesuit Order and went against the decree of his predecessor. These people do not understand that we deal with a disciplinary matter, not a matter of faith. If a pope dissolves the Jesuit Order, another one might as well say, „Well, we have the Jes- Jesuit Order back again." I don't know if this was good or bad.... judging to what happens today, it might have been a very bad decision, but that's not the point. The point is, we're talking about disciplinary matters. I told you that, uh, the pope cannot find his successors in disciplinary matters and matters of positive law. The way how mass is said, however, is

not a mere question of discipline and positive law. If the oldest liturgical law of all is, uh, Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi, the law of what has to be prayed determines the law of what has to be believed, then Holy Mass is not only a question of faith, but the basis of faith. If you change Holy Mass around, and if Holy Mass is not what it was, then you have a different basis of the faith. That means you have, you have different laws of praying, you have different laws of believing. So, when a pope uses a formula like this on the question, „If I may wear violet buttons or not?" his successor might as well say, „I don't care." But if a pope uses this formula on something as important as the Roman liturgy, his successor may not say that. Therefore, I read again, abbreviated, „By these presence and by virtue of our apostolic authority, we order and declare that no one whosoever shall be forced or coerced into altering this missal, and this present constitution can never be revoked or modified, but shall forever remain valid and have the force of law." This constitution deals about the basis of the faith. It deals about matters of the faith. It cannot be revoked.

HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION BY POPES

When Pope Pius X decided that the, uh, the Sunday, the Sunday during the year is to be elevated to the rank, practically to the rank of duplex prima classis, that meant the rank of a very important feast, he did not revoke or modify this constitution. He did not say, „This cannot remain valid and have the force of law." On the contrary, he explained. He explained that he was restoring the importance of Sunday, because at the time of Saint Pius V, there were a lot less saints in the calendar than you will be find- you'll find now. So at the- at- at- at the times of Saint Pius V, there were many Sunday masses in Green Chasuble. By the time Saint Pius X was pope, there were very few Sunday masses in Green Chasuble, because most Sundays during the summer have some saint to be celebrated, some saint more important than the Sunday used to be. And this is not good. This is not the intention of Pius V, and it's not the old mass. So, he elevated the rank of Sunday in order to have the Green Chasuble, part of the sign that every sacrament is, in order to have the Green Chasuble and the Sunday celebrated again, and not just commemorated. The very fact, we talk about interpretation, is it the Herr Doctor Hesse who interprets this apostolic constitution or the popes? Yes, it is the popes, not the Herr Doctor Hesse. It is not Father Gregory who interprets this constitution. The popes did. And if those traditionalists who say that this is not binding would bother to read all the decrees that you find in the Roman Missal of Saint Pius V issued by his successors, including John XXII... or excuse me, John XXIII, you will see that the popes interpret the Quo primum as something unchangeable. Because up till 1962 with the missal of John Pa- of- of John XXIII, you always found at the beginning of the missal Quo primum and all the decrees of the other popes who changed little things, rubrics mostly. And the popes who dared to change things in the missal, even if it was only minor rubrics, explained why they did it. Now, if Quo primum was not binding to a successor, why would the successor want to explain himself that well? If he has the right anyway to change things, he doesn't have to explain that. If the pope says, „From now on, every priest who is ordained in Rome will automatically have the title of Monsignor," he does not have to explain that. If the pope says, uh, „I want- I want you to say the rosary, uh, not only every day, but on Sunday three times," it might be a bit demanding, but he doesn't have to explain why he wants it. He's the pope. Why did all the popes after Pius V until Paul VI of most sollicitous memory, why did all these popes explain every single change they made? Because they knew that Quo primum was binding, so they had to explain, „Uh-oh, we did not go against Quo primum with what we did." And they explained why what they did was not against the will of Saint Pius V binding them forever. This had to be cleared up. It is, uh, ridiculous to argue against the binding authority of this document, because it's probably one of the most important ever issued, and it binds the popes. It binds the popes because of the Canon 13, the seventh session of Council of Trent, because of Injunctum Nobis by Paul IV that said, „We hold steadfast through all traditions, because of the, uh, tradition of the Church, because of the oath of incoronation, and because of all the teachings of all the popes until 1958."

EXTRAORDINARY AND ORDINARY MAGISTERIUM

The teaching of the popes, what does that mean? What is the authority of a pope teaching?

A pope can teach in an extraordinary magisterial man- manner or an ordinary magisterial manner. A pope may define a dogma or condemn a heresy, binding every single Christian, not only in his conscience and obedience, but by his divine, divine faith. Even in the new code of canon law, this rule has been maintained, believe it or not. Now, what's the difference between extraordinary and ordinary magisterium? The ordinary magisterium is when the pope, in a non-solemn way, decides on moral issues or teaches theology. He teaches something about the faith. Pius the 12th, in the 1940s and ,50s, was faced with modernist priests and bishop who said, „We only have to believe the pope when he, when he pronounces a dogma." They said, „We don't have to believe and obey the pope in the other things." Now usually, mankind has a tendency, just like a pendulum, one extreme to the other. Either it's far right or far left. Either it is, uh, beyond what is right or it is not reaching what is right. There are many people in this country who are really downright what should be called papalists. (mocking voice) „If the pope tomorrow dyes his hair green, I will do it too." (laughing) (mimicking voice) „Oh, the pope can do everything. He's always infallible." (normal voice) He's not infallible unless he claims to be infallible and uses the necessary formula. The pope has, in order to be infallible, he has to say, „By virtue of my apostolic authority, I herewith declare such so and define that so-and-so, so-and-so, so-and-so." This is to be held forever by every Catholic, by every single Catholic under the pain of excommunication. This is to be held forever. Every Catholic must believe it. Pope John Paul II used this formula once in his, uh, 19-year career as pope. When he decided that women cannot be ordained to the priesthood, he said, „This is to be... I decide this forever, by virtue of my apostolic authority, and this has to be believed by everybody forever." It seems that this was an infallible pronouncement. When the pope says, „I think this and this and this and this happened," then he's just... Uh, he's just, uh, uh, speaking as a private person.

Pius the 12th said in his encyclical, Humani generis, concerning some false opinions which threatened to undermine the foundations of Catholic doctrine, in number 20 he says, „Nor must it be thought that what is expounded in encyclical letters does not of itself demand consent since in writing such letters, the popes do not exercise the supreme power of their teaching authority." Let me get a sign where to, uh, to, to, to repeat, where, where to continue with the text. „And generally what is expounded and inculcated in encyclical letters already for the, for other reasons that pertains to Catholic doctrine, but if the supreme pontiffs in their official documents purposely passed judgment on a matter up to that time under dispute, it is obvious that the matter, according to the mind and will of the same pontiff, cannot be any longer considered a question open to discussing among theologians." I want to see who dares now, after having heard this, still to say that the pope cannot find his successor in the ordinary magisterium. That means with an encyclical. The pope says here, „In writing such letters, the popes do not en- en- ex- exercise the supreme power of their teaching authority, but generally what is expounded and inculcated in encyclical letters already for other reasons that pertains to Catholic doctrine, but if the supreme pontiffs in their official documents purposely pass judgment on a matter up to that time under dispute, it is obvious that the matter, according to the mind and will of the same pontiffs can not be any longer considered a question open to discussion among theologians." When Pope Paul the VI wrote Humanae Vitae, he did not pronounce a dogma. But no future pope may ever dare to say that artificial contraception is all right. When Pope Pius the ninth condemned all kinds of heresies in his syllabus of errors, he did not proclaim a dogma. But woe unto the pope who says the contrary. The pope today says the contrary. So this is the teaching authority.

POPES BOUND BY TRADITION

The pope can bind his successor in many things. Why? There's an old Latin saying, (Latin). „An equal does not have power in an equal." Yes, right. That's why, in all things that are left up to the individual pope to decide, he cannot bind his successor. But when the pope says, „This here from now on has

to be considered part of tradition," he doesn't have to say that verbally, literally. He just has to say, „We condemn this error. We don't want this to be discussed any longer. And I herewith say that's what it is or that is what has to be done by all Christians, by all faithful." Then he's making this part of tradition.Now, the tradition (clears throat)... Tradition does not grow... Excuse me (clears throat). Tradition does not know change. We'll talk about this in the next session. Tradition is something that has been concluded with the death of the last apostle. So the Pope does not add anything to tradition. He just says, „This is part of tradition. This always has been part of tradition." And now that he has said that, no successor may say anything to the contrary. Never, ever. When the Pope in 1950 made the assumption of Our Lady a dogma, again, he did not say anything new. The apostles were witnesses to the empty grave. The Church has always believed that Our Lady's in heaven with body and soul. And, uh, even before Pius XII proclaimed it a solemn dogma, Pius IX would not have had the right to say, „No, this is not true." He would have put himself outside the Church. The Popes are absolutely bound to tradition, and this is the reason why Vatican II is unacceptable.

LUMEN GENTIUM

We will now, and that's the last thing for today, analyze some of the most important points of the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, Vatican II, Lumen Gentium. Again, the first two words of the document. November 21st, 1964. It is not an irony, but providence of God that November 21st, 1964, Vatican II pronounced the worst of all heresies. On November 21st, 1974, on the 10th day of this horrible document, Archbishop Lefebvre pronounced the principles of the Society of Saint Pius X, saying that we hold stesteadfast to tradition, that we are faithful to the eternal Rome, not the modernist Rome of today. What is this modernist Rome of today teaching?

"SACRAMENT" (LG 1)

It talks about the mystery of the Church. „Since the Church in Christ is in the nature of sacrament, a sign, an instrument that is, of communion with God and of unity among all men, she here proposes..." et cetera, blah, blah. This is number one of Lumen Gentium. Is the Church in the nature of sacrament? No. There are seven sacraments in the Catholic Church. There is no Christ sacrament, church sacrament, seven sacraments. We have seven, not nine sacraments. I know, I will be called a rigorist again, but the dogma has to be taken at face value. And Trent defined their seven sacraments, „And whosoever says there's another thing but the seven sacraments, let him be accursed." Anathema sit. The Church is not in the nature of a sacrament, but it is a perfect society. We'll see that later. The Church is not a sign. The Church is an instrument. Absolutely, yes. But the Church is not a sign. The Church is not symbolic. It's a reality. It's a perfect society on Earth. It's the instrument with which Christ saves. You cannot call it a super sacrament for that. It is the perfect society, the instrument which contains and administers, as the only legitimate one, seven sacraments. It is definitely an instrument of communion with God, but it is not an instrument of unity among all men. The Church is as much an instrument of unity among all men as I am Pope. I am Pope potentially. The Church is potentially an instrument of unity among all men. Actually, it is not. Christ said that, „He will cause wars, divisions, fights, family members fighting family members." He said, „Who's not willing to hate his own brother, mother, father, son in- for my sake is not worthy of me." He didn't mean the word hate in the sense we understand it today. The Latin word odire might as well mean avoid. Sometimes family members have to avoid other family members because they have the faith and the other ones don't. Christ did not come to unify all of mankind necessarily. He only wanted them unified in the faith, not outside. So, uh, the Church may be an instrument of unity among all men, but it definitely won't be. „Non veni pacem, mittere sed gladium. I did not come to bring the peace, the peace, but a sword."

GROWTH TO MATURITY (LG 5)

Then we are faced with a new concept of the Church here in number five. This is not heresy. It is just truckloads of you know what. (laughing) „While she, the Church, slowly grows to maturity, the Church longs for the completed kingdom, and with all her strength, hopes, and desires to be united in glory with her king." How does the Church grow to maturity if she's a perfect society? The Church cannot grow to maturity. The Church is infallible. The Church is indestructible. The Church is perfect. The Church cannot grow to maturity. Pope Pius XII, in the same Humani Generis, said, „It is a, a daring and wrong concept to say that the Church can grow in experience and maturity."He condemned that. He said the Church is perfect. The Church is indestructible. Christ said, (Latin) Matthew 16:18, „And the gates of hell shall not prevail against her."

INDEFECTIBILITY AND FALLIBILITY

With this statement, I have to add, uh, a parenthesis right here. If the Church is infallible, if the Church is perfect, and if the Church is indefectible, then why do I say that the pri- the priests, the bishops, and the Pope today are off their track or in material heresy, material schism, and in a way, do not belong to the Church? Because they don't. The Church is indefectible, not their members. I'm not indefectible. I am not infallible, and I am not perfect. I realize that every time I go to confession, how perfect, indefectible, and infallible I am. The, the members of the Church are not indefectible. The hierarchy is not indefectible, as far as the hierarchy is, uh, consistent of members. The Church, herself, is a perfect society. The Church, herself, is indefectible. Then, uh, if the Church is at the same time visible, where is the Church to be found? I understand it's confusing, it's complicated. Is Cardinal Archbishop Mahoney... Is he the Cardinal Archbishop of Los, Los Angeles? Yes, he is, and, and he's appointed Cardinal Archbishop of Los Angeles, but is he Catholic? No, he's not. Materially, he's schismatic and heret- and, and a heretic. These people do not belong to the Church. Pope Innocent III said, „It is quite conceivable that the future pope may teach heresy and put himself outside the Church." Pope Innocent III did not say he ceases to be pope. He said, „It's quite possible that the future pope may teach heresy and put himself outside the Church, in which case we do not... we must not follow him." And he said, „The very fact that the pope cannot be judged by any authority on Earth should remind the pope of the fact that the less somebody is judged by human beings, the more he will be judged by God." The Church is a perfect society as such, not in a majority. This is a horrible democratic concept of the Church. A father in this country... a priest in this country, whom out of charity I do not want to name, said that Father Hess obviously knows this, and the priests and all the bishops don't. Okay. If that's a point of reasoning, then we might as well draw up a new charter of the Church as a democracy. We're not even this country as a democracy. It's a constitutional republic, if you take the Constitution serious, which the president doesn't, nor her husband. (laughing) But, um, this country is a constitutional republic. It's not a democracy. But the Church is a monarchy, an absolute monarchy. The monarch is elected by designated electors. This is to say, the cardinals. The Church is a monarchy. The pope governs the Church, and if he doesn't, then I can't follow him. And if he pronounces heresy, then I will not agree with it. And if he gives wrong commands, then I will not follow them. I can. Saint Thomas Aquinas made that abundantly clear, and so did Innocent III, two named popes, Innocent III and Pius IX, and, uh, indirectly Eugene IV. I cannot follow him and I will not. But the Church, herself, is indefectible, and she's not governed by a majority, but by tradition. Is it impossible that out of 3,500 bishops, 3,496 would go against tradi- 94 would go against tradition? Is it possible? Yes, it is. Yes, of course. They have not been promised the Holy Spirit. The majority does not decide what is right or wrong. If the majority decides what is right or wrong, I can tell you what is right or wrong. In that case, I'd have at least three girlfriends. (laughing) Oh, the majority would agree with that. Not the majority of Catholics, but the majority of Americans would. And the majority of bishops nowadays. Maybe. I don't wanna be sued for libel. Maybe.

EUCHARISTIC BREAD (LG 7)

Uh, here's an example of, uh, of, uh, insolicitous wording. „Really sharing in the body of the Lord, in the breaking of the Eucharistic bread, we are taken up into communion with Him and with one another." Why can't they say, „In the sacrifice of holy mass"? This is not heresy, but why, why can't they say in... Where is that? This, uh, yeah, uh, number seven. Why can't they say, „In the holy sacrifice of mass"? Why do they have to say, „In the breaking of the bread?" Underlining the meal again. Martin Luther, the head doctor, Martin Luther would have loved that.

"SUBSISTS IN" (LG 8)

Now, we come to something that is not just an infelicitous wording, but downright heresy. Number eight, Lumen Gentium number eight. In the second paragraph, I read, „This is the sole Church of Christ, which in the creed, we profess to be one holy catholic and apostolic." They say that, yes, but how?... which our Savior, after His resurrection, entrusted to Peter's pastoral care, commissioning him and the other apostles to extend and rule it. Him and the other apostles. Here we got the concept of collegiality. Christ did not say, „You are Peter, and upon all of you, I will build my church." No, no, this is why in English it is still translated with the, disappeared in the usage of English, second person singular, „Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church." On thee, Peter. Not on you, Peter, and the apostles. On thee. Thou art Peter. (Latin) (laughing) This Church, constituted and organized as a society... Why did they have to say ‚a society'? It's not a society, it's a perfect society. It is the only perfect society. It is at least, if you don't wanna, if don't, if you want to avoid the term perfect, at least say ‚the society'. This Church, constituted and organized as a society in the present world, subsists in the Catholic Church. I've explained this on the other tape, but I have to repeat it here. The Church does not subsist in the Catholic Church, the Church of Christ. The Church of Christ is the Catholic Church. I think it was Cardinal Ratzinger, let me always be careful, I don't really don't want to be sued for libel. I think it was Cardinal Ratzinger who said, „Yes, but the word esse in Latin, to be, is much stronger than the word subsistere, to subsist." Uh, if he said it, then he is a very wicked, and sly, and subtle liar. If he said it. Saint Thomas Aquinas says, (Latin) „Subsistence is the most normal, is the most noble form of being." He talks about God, Saint Thomas Aquinas does. Now, God subsists in everything. Unlike Pantheism, this is not God, except for an alcoholic. This is not God. (laughing) But God subsists in the existence of this bottle. God subsisted in the wine making for this bottle. God subsisted in the actions necessary to cap this bottle. And God subsists even in this tiny m- movement of my hand grabbing the bottle. He subsists to it. That means He gives it being. He does not identify Himself with it. This is not God. This is not God, and my actions here are not God. Therefore, the word subsist means He is not the bottle. He gives subsistence to the existence of this bottle. But the Church of Christ is the Catholic Church. Therefore, the Church of Christ does not just subsist in the Catholic Church, it is the Catholic Church. Why did the council say the Church of Christ subsists in the Catholic Church? Because in that case, you can say, „Well, there's other churches in which He subsists." Our, indeed, the Pope, again, not I, the Pope is the competent authority to interpret this paragraph. (laughing) Well, he very competently interprets this paragraph when he says that the Russian Orthodox Churches, heretics and schismatics, are our sister Churches, to the point that he calls the Ukrainian Church united with Rome as something that separated itself from her mother Church. So now, as Bishop Fellay pointed out so well, or was it Bishop de Malareia? I don't remember. So now, we are the ant. The Orthodox Church is our sister Church, and the Ukrainian Church is the daughter to the Or- Or- Orthodox Church. So it's our niece Church. Complicated relations. (laughing) And that's what I call verbal diarrhea. (laughing) Why does the Church subsist in the Catholic Church? That means it subsists to other Churches too, the Church of Christ. Because, it says in the same, number eight, „Nevertheless, many elements of sanctification of truth are found outside its visible confines. Since these are gifts belonging to the Church of Christ, they are forces impelling towards Catholic unity." Now you got the re- the reason. Now the circle is full. Unity in the Church means we reunite with the heretics and schismatics, then the Church will be united. Therefore, it is quite logical to say that the Church of Christ subsists in this other sis-

ter Churches too, and that is why we are not united. Do you see the satanic reasoning behind this? I explained to you that the Catholic Church is always one and united. Therefore, the Catholic Church is the only one that is the Church of Christ. Now, Vatican II says we are not united because our sister Churches, the Protestant Churches, are not united with us. And that explains why the Church of Christ subsists in the Catholic Church, because the Catholic Church obviously is not the only one. If the Catholic Church was the only one, then the Protestants can only convert to the Catholic Church, but not reunited with us.They left the church. But, uh, the present Holy Father, who is the competent interpreter for this document, admired the heritage of Dr. Martin Luther several times when he was in Germany. Therefore, these gifts belonging to the Church of Christ, the Church of Christ now is not only the Catholic Church, but the sister churches too. They have forces impelling towards Catholic unity.

ELEMENTS OF SANCTIFICATION

Now, how about this, uh, „Nevertheless, many elements of sanctification and truth are found outside these visible confines." Is that true? Well, uh, no. Is, uh... When a, when a, when a Pr- when a Protestant pastor baptizes a little innocent Protestant child and a truck runs over them, and the, the poor innocent Protestant child goes to heaven, does that mean many elements of sanctification are found outside the Catholic Church? No. It means that the Protestant, the Protestant pastor administers the Catholic sacrament of baptism illegitimately and illicitly outside the church. Unless it's an emergency, in which case every human being may baptize. But if a Protestant, uh, minister solemnly administers baptism in his Protestant garage, then, uh, or temple or cute little New England church, then he administers illegitimately, illicitly the Catholic sacrament of baptism. The sacrament that belongs to the Catholic Church, that is property of the Catholic Church. You see? So these, uh, the, the element of, of, of sanctification called baptism is not found outside the Catholic Church, but is abused outside the Catholic Church.

ANYONE WHO FEARS GOD

Um, having discussed this, there's another implicities wording here. Number nine. „At all times and in every race, anyone... in every race, anyone who fears God and does what is right has been acceptable to him. He has, however, willed to make men holy and save them, not as individuals without any bond or link between them, but rather to make them into a people who might acknowledge him and serve him in holiness." That's right. At all times and in every race, anyone who fears God and does what is right has been acceptable to him. If the council had followed this, number nine of Lumen Gentium, they would have never said that there are elements of truth to be found outside the church, outside its visible confines. They would have never said that, uh, we have to, uh, uh, uh, strive for an ecumenical brotherhood with other churches. What is right? What is right? Well, converting to the Catholic Church, of course. What is right? Saint Augustine says, „There are Catholic things outside the church, and there are many un-Catholic things inside the church." Yes. That's abuses, sins, sacrileges, the new liturgy, stuff like that. (laughing) Un-Catholic elements inside the church, if it's still inside the church. And there are Catholic things outside the church. Oh, yeah. I found one of the most beautiful sermons on the devil in Saint Thomas Church in New York, which is Episcopalian. They still talk about the devil. The pastor there, may he convert to be a Catholic one day. I would hope, I would hope for that, because he seems to be a good pastor. The pastor of, uh, the rector of Saint Thomas Church in New York, Fifth Avenue, 52nd Street. Uh, you find these sermons, uh, you just donate a quarter and you take the sermon back home. Very beautiful sermon on the power of the devil, on the traps the devil sets in order to make us perish our soul. Excellent sermon. So that, that is a Catholic element outside the Catholic Church, but it's not an el- an element of sanctification. It is a help for conversion. It is something that exists outside the Catholic Church. And for a sheer coincidence, not because of destiny, might be a help for conversion. This is how this is to be understood when Saint Augustine says, „There are un-Catholic things in the church and Catholic things outside her."

Now we come to new terminology. Number thirteen. „The one people of God is accordingly present in all

the nations of the earth." Wha- mind you, in the same paragraph it says, „The church or people of God." That means now, uh, the people of God is a new expression for the term church. It's a new term. Church is identical with people of God. And this church, therefore, is present in all nations of the earth. That's at least optimistic, if you ask me, because as far as I know, in the Republic of Bhutan or the Kingdom of Bhutan or whatever it is, B-H-U-T-A-N, uh, Catholic priests are not allowed there. In the Soviet Union, the Catholic, uh, priests were not allowed. Was the Catholic Church present? In a way, yes, underground. But the council doesn't say underground, so this is new terminology. Now, everybody who wants to be holy belongs to the church. „Holding a rightful place in the communion of the church, there are also particular churches..." Now, you've got it. „... that retain their own traditions without prejudice to the chair of Peter, which presides over the whole assembly of, of charity." Do- does this paragraph mean the Oriental churches that are united with the Pope? It doesn't say.A defender of the counsel will say, „Of course, they mean the ones who are united with Rome." But then, some of them, and the Pope, starting with the Pope say, „Oh, uh, the Russian Orthodox Church, definitely not united with Rome, but it's a sister church." See, uh, it's confusing. I don't know what to make of it.

THE PILGRIM CHURCH (LG 14-15)

Number 14, „Basing itself on scripture and tradition, it teaches that the Church, a pilgrim now on Earth, is necessary for salvation." Fine, I'm glad they say it in number 14. In number 16, they don't. „He's present to us in His body, which is the Church, a pilgrim on Earth." What's the purpose of a pilgrimage? To find grace and enlightenment, to improve, to mature, to mature your spiritual life, to improve your spiritual life, to get better. Same mistake as before. The Church is perfect. She cannot be a pilgrim of her... One thing follows the other. „The Church knows that she's joined in many ways to the baptized who are honored by the name of Christians, but who do not, however, profess the Catholic faith in its entirety." It means the heretics. Mm-hmm. „And have not preserved unity or communion under the success of Peter." That means the schismatics. So let's translate this and read again. The Church knows she's joined in many ways to the heretics and schismatics. I would've liked the counsel to explain to me in what way, uh, the Church is joined to heretics and schismatics when the Church says they are outside the Church. The Church dogmatically defines that they are outside the Church. How can she be joined to them? This is, to go back to the theological sense-centuries. This is not heresy. It is close to heresy. „These Christians are indeed in some real way joined to us in the Holy Spirit." That is heresy and blasphemy. „For by His gifts and graces, His sanctifying powers also active in them." Interesting. „And He has strengthened some of them even to the shedding of their blood." This is direct heresy against the Council of Florence, then Sanger-Scholometz of 1351, Pope Eugene IV who said, „Even if they shed their blood for Christ, they cannot be saved." Again, I repeat, objectively. But the counsel pronounces objectively, of course, because the counsel, just like the whole Catholic Church, the counsel cannot judge the dead. The counsel cannot judge the internal intentions. The counsel cannot judge souls. The counsel can only, like the Church can, only judge objective ways of getting, of being saved. So the counsel, he ta- speaks objectively, by nature, objectively. „These Christians are indeed in some real way joined to us in the Holy Spirit, for by His gifts and graces, His sanctifying power is also active in them, and He has strengthened some of them even to the shedding of their blood." This is the exact contrary of what the Council of Florence says. Therefore, the counsel right here is in heresy.

NON-CHRISTIANS (LG 16)

Now how about all the poor Japanese who have never had a Ca- Catholic missionary until the year 1500-something? I don't know. Leave me alone. Give me a break. I don't know. The Church doesn't know. We don't know. God doesn't tell us everything. God doesn't tell you what I say in confession. Thank God. God doesn't tell us everything. I don't know what happened to the poor Japanese until the first Catholic missionary showed up and baptized the first Japs. I don't know. And I don't even try to find out, I have other problems. (laughing) People are so hung up about the Buddhist monks in Bhutan and the, the,

the Japanese until 1500 that they forget to save their own soul. Number 16, „Finally, those who have not yet received the Gospel are related to the people of God in various ways." The Church, that means. Those who have not yet received the Gospel. It would've been nice if they had added, „Potentially." They might convert and then they are in the Church, so potentially they are related to the Church. Potentially they are in the Church. Actually, they are not. „There is first that people to which the covenants and promises were made, and from which Christ was born according to the flesh, in view of the divine choice, they are people most dear for the sake of the Fathers, for the gift of God and without re- repentance." The Jews, of course. Now, are the Jews related to the Catholic Church? I'm talking about the Jewish faith. I'm not talking about the individual Jew. Is the Jewish faith, whatever they call it, the Mosaic faith, all the different... The Hasidim and whatever, are they related to the Church? No, they're not. Saint Paul says quite clearly, „The Jews rejecting Christ do not even see the truth of the Old Testament, but through a veil or a curtain." Do the Jews pray to the same God we do? No. Is the God of the Old Testament the same God of the New Testament? Yes. But as they do not accept the God of the New Testament, they also reject the one of the Old Testament because they are identical. You see? Those people who contradict me on this point, I've got them in a beautiful trap. (laughing) Either you say the Jews do not pray to the same God or the God of the Old Testament is not the same as the New Testament.I'll leave the choice with you. Saint Paul is very clear on that. The Jews have rejected God when they crucified Christ. All Jews? No, the Jews. Not the individual. I don't know about the individual.

But the plan of salvation also includes those who acknowledge the creator in the first place, amongst whom are the Muslims. They profess to hold the faith of Abraham, and together with us, they adore one merciful God. No, they don't. Here I've had heated discussions with people who do not understand the distinction of objective and subjective. The Muslims reject the New Testament in the sense the Catholic Church uses it. The Muslims pray against us to one merciful God. Each Muslim? No, the Muslims. The council says, (Latin). And I've heard it said, uh, uh, one of, of the arguments that they use is, okay, that means all the Muslims will go to hell. I didn't say that. I don't know. That means the Muslims do not believe they are praying to the same God. That's not what I said. It's not what the council said. The council said they do pray to one merciful God together with us. If the council had wanted to stay with, uh, outside heresy and within the faith, the council would've had to say, „The Muslims pray to one merciful God." They do. Allah is a merciful god in the Koran, and he's one god in the Koran. But it's not our God. Saint Paul said that God, the god of the Pagans are demons. Saint Paul said that. He spoke about the Pagan religions at the time of Christ, but then again, the moment, uh, Muslims were not baptized anymore, they went back to Paganism. And that is even worse, much worse, because it's apostasy. The Muslims are apostates. They reject the entire faith. The first Muslims were. Now, the Muslims are neither apostate, nor heretics, nor schismatic, they're just Pagan. Period. They cannot pray to one merciful God together with us. They pray to one merciful God, and they pray a lot more to one merciful God than the Christians do. They follow a lot more, the funny precepts of the Koran, written in the name of one merciful God than the Christians follow the, the New Testament. They are much more of an example in their religion than most Christians are in the true religion. But they do not pray together with us. It is absurd to claim that people who uphold the Koran are praying together with us to one merciful God. Objectively, they do not. The poor little Arab out there in the desert doesn't know what he's doing maybe, and God one day might, might say, „Okay, you tried, you tried your best." I don't believe it for a minute. But subjectively, he might pray together with me. Subjectively, he might think that he does so. He might do so, subjectively. Objectively, definitely not. Objectively, he follows a book that says, „The very idea of the Trinity is excremental." I'm quoting the Koran. Pardon me. They follow a book that in Surah 47 says, „Kill the infidels." That means us. Objectively, they do not pray together with us, but against us. They pray for the perish of our faith, of our faith. They pray for the destruction of the Catholic faith. They pray for the destruction of the Catholic Church. They pray for the conversion of the Catholics to Islam. To call this, to, to, to say that they pray together with us is therefore close to heresy in denying at least the importance of the dogma on the Trinity and incarnation, which the Muslims reject. And on the mother of God, which the Muslims

revere, but not as mother of God, but as a holy woman. And it is definitely by saying all these things, blasphemous. It insults God. It's offensive to pious ears.

OFFICE HOLDERS (LG 18)

In number 18, the council says, „The holders of office who are invested with a sacred power are in fact dedicated to promoting the interests of their brethren." No, sir. They are not. I am not. I am not empowered, and the purpose of my being a priest is not to promote the interests of you. I am here to promote your faith and the interests of God. I'm here to promote your following the Ten Commandments, which is at least what the Sixth Commandment is concerned, not your interest, really. Beg your pardon, but at least with most people, right? Starting with me. The Sixth Commandment is not my interest. My interest is to follow God and his orders, to say, „Yes, sir," to God. I do not promote your interests. I promote your salvation, and therefore God's interest, because God wants everybody to be saved. But not without the individual's agreement.

COLLEGIALITY (LG 22, 25)

In number 22... No, it's not 22:2. (laughing) In number 22, the council says, „And if the bishops..." In the church. „And if the bishops whilst loyally ex- respecting the primacy and preeminence of their head..." That's optimism-... „exercise their own proper authority for the, for the good of their faithful, indeed even for the good of the whole church, the organic structure and harmony of which are strengthened by the continued influence of the Holy Spirit. The supreme authority over the whole church, which this college possesses is exercised in a solemn way in an ec-ecumenical council." The College of Bishop doesn't possess any supreme authority. Only the pope does. And then they say... You see? This is the, a dev- it's a devious way of thinking, talking, writing, and preaching. When the bishops, together with the pope decide on something, the supreme authority of the whole church is talking. Yes, because why? The same council later on says it. Because of the authority given to the pope. So the supreme authority in the church is not the College of Bishops, but the pope. The same council says if the College of Bishop decides without the pope or against the pope, it's not valid. The decision is not valid. Therefore, why? Why? Why does the council say here, „The supreme authority over the whole church, which this college possesses."? The College of Bishops does not possess any supreme authority. The pope has it, and only because the pope has it, the College of Bishop has it as long as they confirm what the pope says and agree with what the pope says, or have their pronouncement confirmed by the pope. I'm turning pages here because most of it is such tiring blah, blah. „Although the bishops, taken individually, do not enjoy the privilege of infallibility, they do however proclaim infallibility infallibly the doctrine of Christ on the following conditions, namely when, even though despairs throughout the world, but preserving for all that amongst themselves and with..." Excuse me. Okay. „Throughout the world,

but preserving for all that amongst themselves and with Peter's successor, the bond of communion in their authoritative teaching concerning matters of faith and morals, they are in agreement that the particular teachings to be held definitely, definitively and absolutely." Again, the bishops don't possess anything. It says only in agreement with Peter's successor. Why do they bother, bother talk, uh, many lines and many pages about the privilege of infallibility given to the bishops? Why? And the very fact that in, in, in, in the same number, uh, 25... I didn't give the number, excuse me. In the same n- number 25, there is a very beautiful description of the papal infallibility. You see that the council bothers, even though it does not deny the papal infallibility, and even though it does not logically contradict what it says about the in- papal infallibility, bothers to tell you several times over that the bishops have the su- supreme power. Why? What for? What's the purpose? Why did they bother to do that? Well, again, the historical and papal interpretation of it is that most of the powers today are given away to the College of Bishops, the Bishop Conferences, the Synod of Bishops, the Council of Bishops, to the point that in Redemptor Hominis, the first encyclical this pope wrote, this pope really defaces himself when he says that the unity of the Church is consistent in the Synod of

Bishops, the, uh, Bishop Conferences, the Episcopal, uh, Councils, the Parish Councils. So we have a Soviet church. Soviet means council. All councils, all bureaucratic blah, blah with majority vote. That is the unity of the Church. But according to Redemptor Hominis, it is. In Redemptor Hominis, the Pope does not mention the unity of faith, the unity of the liturgy, and the unity under Peter. No, he mentions the unity of the Church as something consistent in the Episcopal Conferences, the, the local conferences, the local synods, uh, the, the, uh, parish councils, the episcopal councils, the priestly councils. That means we have a committee church. And now the Vatican is the central committee. This is the Soviet Union in the Church. And the purpose of the collegiality is indeed to weaken the power of the papacy. You will read about this in Father Paul Kramer's book.

THE DIACONATE (LG 29)

In, uh, number... This is an extensive number, 29. At the end of number 29, now the council finally starts to make proposals. „It will be possible in the future to restore the diaconate as a proper and permanent rank of the hierarchy." The Council of Trent did not want that. „But it pertains to the competent local episcopal conferences..." This is 22:2 again. (laughing) „... of one kind or another, with the approval of the Supreme Pontiff to decide whether and where it is of, of, of fortune that such deacons be appointed. Should the Roman Pontiff think fit, it will be possible to confer this diaconal order even upon married men, provided they are... they be of more futur- more mature age..." Whatever that means. I've met imbeciles at the age of 80. (laughing) Not imbeciles again, but always been imbecile. „And also on suitable young men, for whom, however, the law of celibacy must remain enforced." At least that. Uh, this is destruction of the diaconate, because the diaconate is s- is a, a state of orders towards the priesthood.The Council of Trent explicitly said, „We do not want you to give minor orders to people who do not strive for the priesthood." And that's very rightly so, because believe me, celibacy is not easy. You need the graces of the office. And the graces of the office come with the priesthood, not with some benedictions. They come with the diaconate, but not as much as a priest gets them. Also, uh, if somebody wants to live a celibate life, why wouldn't he want to become a priest anyway? Unless he becomes a brother in the monastery, which is entirely different, not to be compared to the diaconate. And again, the council does not talk about the minor orders. Consequently, Paul VI attempted to abolish them. Attempted, I say, because he did not outlaw them, first. Second, uh, he- his, uh, decision is invalid anyway, because, uh, the sub diaconate at least goes back to the time of the apostles.

LAITY, RELIGIOUS, AND CLERGY

Everything that has been said of the People of God is addressed equally to laity, religious and clergy. Where's the hierarchy? (laughing) I- I'm- I'm very glad if at the last judgment I'm judged exactly as you will be. I'd be glad about that, because I know it won't be that way. I'm a priest. I'm above all of you, so I will be judged first, and I will be judged a lot more harshly than you will. But make no mistake, Hell is Hell, wherever you end. (laughing) The rest is blah, blah. Blah, blah. Blah, blah. (laughing) Blah, blah. The pilgrim church, an entire chapter on the pilgrim church. I'm not gonna bore you with this.

THE CHAPTER ON OUR LADY

Then finally, there's an appendix, chapter eight, on Our Lady. Many council fathers wanted the council to speak in a separate document on Our Lady. Cardinal Koenig of Vienna said, „No, there's need- no need for it." And believe it or not, by the time the council was finished, I think some people would agree with me when they say, „Thank God the council at least didn't say much about Our Lady." Nothing good would've come out of it anyway.

THEOLOGICAL QUALIFICATION

At the end of this document, which is ending my conference today, at the end of this document, there's

an explanary- explanatory note. Announcement made by the secretary general of the council at the 123rd general congregation, November 16, 1964. A query has been made as to what is the theological qualification. I explain. Remember when I said, when I talked about the positions of, uh, uh, the theological positions, when I said something is of divine faith, defined faith, close to the faith, (Spanish language 00:02:43), a reasonable sure- we're sure about it, or it's just probable? This is what is mean- what's meant here, theological qualifications. Mm-hmm. That means, is this council dogmatic or not? A query has been made as to what is the theological qualification to be attached to the teaching put forward in the scheme, The Church, on which a vote is to be taken. The Doctrinal Commission has replied to this query in appraising the modi- the modi," that means the different ways of, „proposed to the third chapter of the schema, The Church." That means Lumen Gentium. „As is self-evident, the conciliar text is to be interpreted in accordance with the general rules which are known to all." That means face value. So please, uh, don't try to tell me that all this can find- can really find a Catholic interpretation. On face value it doesn't, and that's good enough for me. On this occasion, the Doctrinal Commission referred to its declaration of March 6, 1964, which we reproduce here. I quote, ‚Taking into account conciliar practice and the pastoral purpose of this present council, the Sacred Synod defined as binding on the Church only those matters of faith and morals which it has expressly put forward as such. Whatever else it proposes as the teaching of supreme magisterium of the Church is to be acknowledged and acce- accepted by each and every member of the faithful according to the mind of the council, which is clear from the subject matter and its formulation following the norms of theological interpretation.' That means, the council is at most ordinary magisterium, not extraordinary magisterium. I read Pope Pius XII on ordinary magisterium to you, and I explained what the, in a context with what, uh, uh, Pope, uh, Innocent III and many other popes and saints and Doctors of the Church, I forgot to mention Saint Robert Bellarmine, say the council does not have the authority of ordinary teaching, because in parts of its documents, it contradicts directly. You have seen a few of the heresies. The ones I'm going to tell- to talk about, uh, at the next session will be even be worse. Because the council contradicts ordinary and extraordinary magisterium in the past, the council cannot claim the authority of ordinary magisterium. Archbishop Lefebvre asked Cardinal Pericleo Felici, the secretary of the council, on the theological qualifications, in addition to this declaration. And Cardinal Felici said, „Well, of course, as far as those, uh, those things are concerned that the council quoted from former councils anyway, they have to be upheld." Of course. But as far as the new things are concerned, they have to be taken with care. Now, taken with care means you look at how the church interpreted things in the past, and how the church took position to documents in the past.

CONGREGATION OF THE INDEX

At the- in the old days, there was an index, a list of forbidden books. There was a proper congregation in the Roman Curia, Congregation of the Index, just on that topic. (clears throat) Just, uh, uh- there was a few pious and learned priests-... who would read through endless boring and stupid books in order to find out if they're acceptable to Catholic or not. Now, just to show you how the church thought about that once upon a time, the wonderful novel by Alexandre Dumas, The Three Musketeers, was put on the index because Alexandre Dumas made fun of the cardinals of the Holy Roman Church. Cardinal Armand Jean Richelieu... Armand Jean du Plessis de Richelieu, cardinal and archbishop of Paris, grand admiral of the king, Louis XIII, was a criminal. He signed the contract with the Turks against the Catholic Empire of Austria. He was a criminal. He bribed Protestant, uh, uh, he, he bribed Catholic... Uh, h- he bribed, excuse me. He bribed princes and counts in Germany in order to become Protestant, therefore binding their local territory to the Protestant religion, and therefore destroy the power of Austria against France. Cardinal Richelieu was a politician of the worst kind. He was the Clinton of his age. (laughs) (laughs) And yet, because he was a cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, the church did not approve of a lay author making fun of him in a book. If you say that's exaggerated, I agree. I've read The Three Musketeers four times over. (laughs) (laughs) And I read... And I saw practically all the movies based on the book. And I love the book. And Cardinal Richelieu was a criminal. But anyway, the church found it scandalous just because

they made fun of the cardinal, of a cardinal of the Holy Roman Church. Now, you can imagine how the Congregation of the Index treated a book that contained heresy. Back home, I have a very good translation of the Bible into German written by, uh, Van Ess, V-A-N-E double S. Van Ess. The Van Ess Bible is on the index because it contains a few minor errors. It's been put on the index, even though it's the Bible, it's been put on the index because of a few minor errors. Take an educated guess (laughs) what the congregation of the Index would have done with this book. (laughs) (laughs)

REJECTION OF VATICAN II

And this is why, and be very careful about the distinction I'm about to make, this is why I reject Vatican II. (German). (German), I reject Vatican II as a whole, not in each line. That would be heretical, because they... Occasionally Vatican II quotes the Council of Trent, and Nicaea, and whatever. I quote... Or excuse me, they quote, uh, old councils. And a- as far as they do that, they proclaim the doctrine of the Church. But as far as the new things are concerned, as Cardinal Felici said, they have to be taken with care. Therefore, I solemnly reject this book. I reject Vatican II in its entirety, not in every single line, as such. I reject this book as... because it contains heresy, not because everything in it is heresy. (clears throat) The, the, the translation of the Bible made by Martin Luther is not entirely wrong, but it has always been rejected by the Church because of a few mistakes deliberately or erroneously inserted. The Church rejects a book the moment the Church finds one single grave error in the book. If the Church has always done that, then I have to do so. I've just shown you a few errors. Let's just call them errors. Some people get upset when I pronounce the judgment on what is heresy, what is not heresy. I couldn't care less what they say. But anyway, uh, at least some of the things in this council are erroneous. Therefore, I reject it. And you have to if you want to stay Catholics. Thank you. (clapping)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

10 minutes of questions and answers. Please ask important questions. And give me... Uh, wait, before I answer a question- (clears throat) ... I retain the right to reject the question- (laughs) ... without personal offense. Anybody is personally offended because I reject the question, he did not understand. We don't have enough time to answer all the questions. I will choose what question I consider important. Ask.

Q1: ENGLISH TRANSLATION

QUESTIONER: Is there any chance that the English translation is improperly translated from the Latin?

SPEAKER: Thank you. Very good question. Excellent question. I'm sorry I forgot to tell you. This is the translation of the ca- of the documents of Vatican II translated by Austin Flannery O.P. This is the best translation of Vatican II in any language. And to show you how devious some translators are, there is another translation, I forgot the author... there's... or the translator. There's another translation available in, in America. It's usually... I mean, in the old days, it had a red cover, not the blue. And they translated that, uh, horrible heresy of Lumen Gentium 16, „The Muslims together with us adore one God." In Latin, it is, „Musulmani nobiscum adorant unum Deum." Nobiscum means together with us. The other guy translated it, „Along with us." That is a very devious mistake in, in translation. Because if you say, „The Muslims, along with us, pray to one merciful God," it's just about an acceptable statement, just about. It's close to error. But together with us is an expression that has to be rejected. The Latin original-... says Nobiscum. Nobiscum, look it up in your Latin dictionaries. Nobiscum is not along with us, it's with us, together with us. Nobiscum. And, uh, I have checked the most important statements in this book with the Latin original text. And I found this book to be an excellent translation. Next.

Q2: THE 1962 MASS

QUESTIONER: Uh, one of the traditional priests was saying the mass 23rd, do you know if there's any, uh,

violation there for primo?

SPEAKER: No. I will talk about this in New Orleans. Next question.

Q3: CATHOLICS WHO DISAGREE

QUESTIONER: I'm a little confused in this because where it is... If the church is doing this or if the Vatican can sort of establish them. Where then, if... W- And you're, you're educated. That sounds like to me. Where are they going to go? Where are the people who, who don't agree with this? Where, where, where's the outlet for them? How are they going to... Who's going to establish something?

SPEAKER: I- Uh, a future pope will have to. I wish I had the answer for this, but, uh-

QUESTIONER: What church should they go to then?

SPEAKER: Uh, uh, uh, I wish I had the answer. I wi- I wish I had the answer. Is there a state of, uh, you know- It's the greatest confusion in church history. There have been confusions like this before, like when, when, uh, when Pope Liberius, uh, sided with the Arianist heresy and the only one to reject him, to, to reject his error was Saint Athanasius. You can imagine how confused the people were. Or, uh, uh, think of the, the situation of, uh, uh, Pope Honorius siding with the Monothelists, which, uh, is saying that Christ has only one will, not divine and human w- will. And remember the situation of John XXII who said that the souls of the dead cannot face, uh, a specific vision or cannot go to hell before the last judgment, which is definite heresy against the, uh, the Fourth Council of Constantinople. And, uh, the, uh, the Fourth Lateran Council, I'm sorry. And the... John XXII took it back only on his deathbed. And then there was a time, uh, remember, uh, the, the 14th century, the end of the 14th century, we had three popes. And people didn't know who was the pope. That's why I, I repeatedly said, (Latin). The church doesn't judge internal intentions. If a human being makes a mistake because the church con- because the conciliar church confused them, he will not be accountable for it. Yeah?

Q4: ENGLISH BIBLE TRANSLATION

QUESTIONER: Father, what, in your opinion, is the best Bible today in English?

SPEAKER: Uh, the one you'll find in the book stands of the Societies and Empire of Defense. They checked it off.

Q5: ARCHBISHOP THUC'S CONSECRATIONS

QUESTIONER: Uh, Father, on the subject of self-consecration, do you consider

SPEAKER: The church did, because there was... The church did, and I do, because there was no necessity to do so. But that's a, that's a long story. That's a, that's a long story. I, I, I, uh, um, I put it in a nutshell, but we can't go into this too much. Archbishop Turk, when in 1949 he consecrated bishops was against the will of the pope, had not... He did not have the absolute need to do so. In my first tape, which is available from Raider Publishers, I explained why Archbishop Lefebvre had to consecrate bishops. If he had not done so, there would be not a single seminary left, uh, in, in this world which allows a young man who rejects Vatican II like I do, and who rejects the new rite like I do, to become a Catholic priest, so this was an act of self-defense and defense of the church. It was an act of extreme necessity.

QUESTIONER: 1949 though, we had a tough time with Vietnam.

SPEAKER: Excuse me?

QUESTIONER: 1949? Yeah. Or 1959? You said 1949.

SPEAKER: Oh, excuse me. Yeah, yeah. You mean 1959. Yeah, yeah. Yeah. There was no need. Well, obviously, he felt there was a need because- He felt there was a need so the, uh, the, the excommunication in the new code of Canon Law does not apply. But, uh, but, uh, no, the, the, the, the, uh, the, the general... See, that's why I told you this is another conference. Generally speaking, generally speaking, that

was not the situation which Archbishop Lefebvre found himself in and I don't think that the, uh, uh, the justification of self-defense can be applied.

QUESTIONER: So, then you consider him to be schismatic or schismatic?

SPEAKER: No.

QUESTIONER: That's all I needed to know.

SPEAKER: Absolutely not. Not for that. All right. If y- if I consider him schismatic, it might be for other reasons, but not for that. No illegal episcopal consecration makes you a schismatic. The church has never said that. The church has never believed that. And the present pope, in his letter Ecclesia Dei, is lying about this and going against traditional moral theology. I've explained this in Philadelphia. Read the Catholic Family News. Next question.

Q6: THE FSSP

QUESTIONER: What about the St. Peter Society founded by the Holy Father 15 parishes throughout the United States?

SPEAKER: The St. Peter Society, uh, I, a- again, I have to underline because, uh, people have indeed walked out on me, uh, uh, just because I said the St. Peter Society is wrong. Uh, I do not talk about the members of the St. Peter Society. I do not judge any one of them, but the St. Peter Society officially, officially mind you, and this is the whole point, officially had to agree not to criticize and condemn Vatican II and not to criticize and condemn the Novus Ordo. Do I have to say more? Next question. Yeah?

Q7: LATIN IN THE SACRAMENTS

QUESTIONER: Do you believe in the, um, Latin of course, but to what extent should Latin for example, the confession? Would it be more valid than the-

SPEAKER: There's no such thing as more or less valid. It's valid or not valid, that is the question. Uh, the Lat- Latin has to be used as much as possible and sensible because Latin is a dead language, English is a decaying language.And, uh, a la- a- a dead language does not change. As long as I speak Latin, I automatically, wanting to or not, I automatically say the same things the Council of Trent said. This is why you will find Latin quotations in my talks, because I want to enable those who do not, uh, own the Denzinger-Schmitt collection of papal pronouncements and conciliar pronouncements, I want them to be able in, uh, uh, to check the Latin and to check what the church really says. Because what the church says... Look at, uh, how language change. Uh, we are in the ,90s, aren't we? And they are gay '90s, believe me. (laughing) Does that mean the same it meant, uh, 100 years ago? Yes. (laughing) The gay ,90s in San Francisco 100 years ago, were they the same gay '90s there are now? (laughing) Yes. The language changes, changes. I personally, uh, Pius XII, in my judgment, this is the judgment of, uh, a theologian. It is not a papal judgment. A future pope will have to decide what I say. Pius XII, as far as I'm concerned, gave, uh... he gave in too much into the vernacular. Uh, I think that the, the vernacular, it's always dangerous. The vernacular is dangerous, first of all, as far as the content of theology is concerned. Second, as far as mistakes are concerned. You heard what I said about the papal mass in, in Vienna. Third, it confuses people. Least, it confuses people, uh, not least. First of all, it confuses people by making them believe now they understand everything. They do not. Less even once they get the idea that now they understanding something. Uh, when, uh, uh... I, I, I don't think that anybody should go to confession at all if he does not know what the priest means by his saying, uh, „Ego te absolver peccatis tuis in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti." I mean, he, he didn't have the proper catechesis then. Uh, a child, I do not admit a child into confession that says, uh, „I want you to say this in the vernacular because I don't understand what you said." I explain to the child what it means before I admit him to first comm- first, uh, confession. I explain to him what the Latin, uh, uh, means. I explain to him the significance of c- of, of confession. The only exceptions are... the matrimonial consent has to be in the vernacular. Because in Latin it is, uh, (Latin), so and so, so and so, and then the answer is volo, I will, I want to. Do you want this here present so-and-so as your legitimate wife, according to the rite of the Holy Roman Church? And the answer is, in English, „Yes." Nobody can say afterwards, „I meant something else." If you use the Latin word

volo, volo does not only mean I want, I will, it also means I fly. (laughing) Also, I don't want anybody to say afterwards, „Father, but I didn't know what you were asking us, so I said anyway yes." (laughing) Renders marriage invalid. At baptism, sometimes a baptism of the adult, I have to ask the, an adult, „What do you want?" So I instruct them before, just to repeat what I say, and I explain to them what it will be. Like, I, I have to ask him, uh, „What, what do you want?" „Baptism." „What will baptism give you?" „Faith." And then before I baptize him, I say again, (Latin). „Do you want to be baptized?" And he says, „Yes, sir." Uh, so I explained to him before. When I look at you and say, „You say yes, then you say yes to this and this and this and this." Why do I need the vernacular? Next question. Yeah.

Q8: PIUS XII AND VATICAN II

QUESTIONER: Is there any truth to the initiation of Vatican II being, uh, accountable to Pius XII? Uh, what? Was it his idea when he kicked off Vatican II and then it was, uh... been held on by John XXIII and the pope following him?

SPEAKER: I've never heard that before. It was- No. Okay. I'm tired. Let's conclude this with a short prayer. (Latin). Kneel as much as you can. (Latin). Thank you. Thank you.